

beer through the books since prohibition, but I believe there is about the same amount of whiskey, if not a little more, although an enormous number of people have left the district, especially the township.

246. You say an enormous number of people have left the district?—A large number of people have been starved out.

247. Will you give me their names?—I would not like to do that, but I could go over their businesses. I will take them as they go up the street. First, there is the saddler, then follow a chemist, a fancy toy-shop, a butcher, two tailors, and a draper.

248. Who was the draper?—I distinctly refuse to say who he was.

249. Is there not another saddler in the place of the one who left?—He went to Coolgardie and then came back again.

250. What about the chemist?—He is in Perth.

251. Is there not another in Tapanui?—Yes; Dr. de Lautour has started. He was a previous resident.

252. Another business is opened, then?—No, because Dr. de Lautour did his own dispensing when the other was there.

253. And is there not a butcher in the place of the one who left?—I do not say there is.

254. Are there not tailors there in place of the two you refer to as having been starved out?—As far as I know, there is only one.

255. Are you in favour of the prohibitory law and the abolition of licenses?—No, I am not.

256. How many people have left the district altogether?—I know a great lot.

257. You said there were an enormous number?—I should have added to that, "settlers who refused to come into the township."

258. Have there been any business premises enlarged there during the last two or three years?—I can only remember one, and that is Dawson's store.

259. Very considerable enlargements?—Yes. But I should have explained to you about the people who have left the district. I would like to say why people do not come into the town; it is because when they go into the Temperance Dining-room they are accused of going in to get a drink.

260. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say that about the same quantity of whiskey goes into the Tapanui district now as before prohibition?—Yes.

261. In what form?—Quarter-casks, 2-gallon jars (a great number), and cases.

262. You are aware that persons have been prosecuted for sly-grog selling in Balclutha?—Yes.

263. Is the whiskey that goes into Tapanui consigned to these persons?—No.

264. To whom?—Mr. Quin acted as agent at one time, but he has had none lately. He used to get a big lot. The stuff now goes to private people direct, and a large quantity to Mr. Simmonds, who holds a wholesale license.

265. What you wish to convey is that the people who now drink whiskey in Tapanui buy it outside the district, and have it sent to them, instead of buying it inside?—I know that there were places where a 2-gallon jar was never kept on the premises, and where now it is the practice to have it, or a 10-gallon keg of beer.

266. You say the quantity brought into the district is kept up by those means. Instead of being consigned to the retailers, it goes to the people who consume it?—None is consigned to retailers.

267. It goes direct to the people who wish to consume it?—Yes; or the wholesale agent.

BERTRAND EDGAR DE LAUTOUR, examined on oath.

268. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Bertrand Edgar de Lautour.

269. *Mr. Taylor.*] You are practising in Tapanui?—I am a surgeon, practising in Tapanui.

270. How long have you been there?—Eleven years next September.

271. You were there when licenses were abolished?—Yes.

272. Do you think the law has been enforced by the police to the extent it should have been in the suppression of the liquor trade?—I do not. At any rate, particularly up to about June, 1895, when Constable Parker was in charge of the district, absolutely no steps were taken, I believe. For the first six months you could not tell the difference between the old days and the changed position. People went in and out as usual. We wearied ourselves, as members of the Blue Mountain Lodge, writing to Colonel Hume, the Premier, and Inspector Pardy. Our lodge meets fortnightly, and hardly a meeting passed at which the Secretary was not instructed to write calling the attention of these to the fact that the law was being broken, and that no steps were being made to stop it. In 1895 matters were better, but still things might have been improved. I recognise the great difficulties the police had to contend with. I have been told myself that such-and-such a detective was on the way. I have received that information from a man who is a mutual friend of the liquor dealers. The liquor dealers had told him, and he told me, and I knew of the matter within a few hours of the man leaving Dunedin.

273. What was the name of the detective?—I do not know, but if he is here I hope he will not be offended. He was known as the detective with the goggles. He wore blue spectacles. It is a matter of public rumour that Constable Parker warned Mr. Simmonds that the man was in town, and to look out for him. I believe it is absolutely correct. At first we complained to Colonel Hume and Inspector Pardy, who courteously answered our letters, but said there was no sly-grog selling. Inspector Pardy said he had made inquiries, and that we were mistaken, as there was no liquor being sold. That was the letter from Inspector Pardy to the Blue Mountain Lodge. In reply to that we brought him to the point and said, "If that is so, how is it that a certain individual is seen going into a certain hotel sober; he is in that hotel a certain time, and

comes out drunk. How is that?" We gave the dates. Again, we said, "If this is so, and no grog is being sold, how is it that another individual is seen going into the hotel?" In fact, for the first three or six months you could not tell the difference between the old days of license and the new days.

274. Has there been a distinct change since then?—Yes. There is only one complaint I have personally with the police. On the 15th of October of last year a man named James Mills met with an accident. The poor fellow had been drinking all day in either or both of the temperance hotels in Kelso. I was called to attend him; he was a patient of mine. He got drunk—so drunk that he was not capable of walking properly. He was in charge of his dray, and shortly after leaving the township he fell down and the dray went over him, and remained on his leg, crushing it horribly, for about half an hour before he was discovered. I was telephoned for to Dunnett's hotel, and I found him with a horribly mutilated leg which necessitated amputation. I patched him up as well as I could, and sent him to the Invercargill Hospital on the Saturday, and he died there on the Monday. They did not amputate; the man died before they could do it. I urged as well as I was able that an inquest should be held in that case, and I could never get it.

275. *Colonel Pitt.*] The police could not hold an inquest; it is the duty of the Coroner to fix it?—Oh, thank you; then I have no complaint against the police.

276. To whom did you report?—Constable Mathieson, and to my knowledge he reported to the Coroner.

277. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you get any reason from the police as to why an inquest was not held?—Only that the Coroner did not think it necessary. Mr. Hawkins did not think it necessary to hold an inquest over a man who was killed by the drink of the closed publichouse.

278. Do you notice as many evidences of drunkenness in the district you are practising in as before the hotels were closed?—Not one-fiftieth part. Neither do I notice drunken men in the street, nor in my professional treatment of cases do I notice the class of cases that used to come—persons suffering from a recovery, or showing signs of having been drinking. I see none of them now.

279. Do you visit many homes during the year?—Yes, and I see a wonderful difference in some of those homes.

280. For the better?—Yes.

281. Following on a statement made by the last witness, I will ask you whether you find liquor in more homes now than before "No license"?—I see it nowhere except in the homes of those who used to frequent the publichouses.

282. Has the population of Tapanui decreased?—I should say it has increased. There is a large bush population now. I do not know a single store that has not been replaced. There are now two tailors. As for my old place I used to keep drugs at home for dispensing, but that was not a chemist's shop. I never formerly kept a shop—excepting a surgery.

283. Since the hotels have been closed have there been any violent deaths?—Five before and two since. Of the two, one was the case of a man who was drowned in the Pomahaka, and the other was James Mills. The five relate to a period of ten years, and the two to a period of three years and nine months.

284. *Colonel Pitt.*] You think the police have not done what they might have done for the suppression of the liquor traffic?—Yes.

285. Will you say what, in your opinion, they have left undone?—I think they might have been more frequent in their endeavours. They are spasmodic. As soon as one raid is done the sly-grog sellers say, "Now, it is safe; we can go ahead like anything." As a matter of fact, the party had hardly left Tapanui last time when the traffic was going on more than ever.

286. You think that prosecutions should be continued?—Yes.

287. Will the police get evidence of it?—I know it bristles with difficulties, but it should not be an impossibility. If the Police Force is true to itself it should not be difficult. In most of the raids the information has come from members of the police.

288. Can you say that?—I do not know from whom else it could come.

289. Can you tell us any one else from whom it might come?—No. I knew the information, however, before the people reached the district. I knew it at 10 o'clock in the morning.

290. If an unknown detective is being sent it should not be known in the district?—No, but it has been known.

291. *Mr. Poynton.*] Speaking as a citizen, do you think the Police Force in the Clutha should be increased, or could you suggest any alteration of the present number?—No, I do not think so. I should like to suggest that in the event of "No license" being declared in any district there should be a change of constable as soon as possibly convenient. We suggested that as a lodge. We urged on Colonel Hume to change Constable Parker. Although I have spoken rather strongly against Constable Parker I have a deal of sympathy for him, because prior to "No license" he was, like most constables, very friendly with the publicans, and not only friendly but on friendly relations—his family and the publican's; and it is a hardship to expect a man to turn round—in fact, one would have a contempt for a man who would do it.

292. *Mr. Taylor.*] That is why you suggest a change of constables?—Yes.

293. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You said that, up to June, 1895, the police were entirely inactive?—That is my opinion.

294. Do you make it as a statement?—Yes.

295. Is it not a fact that in March, 1895, there were four prosecutions?—Yes.

296. Well, what do you mean?—Up to that time they were inactive.

297. You say that up to June, 1895, the police did nothing whatever?—I said the first six months.

298. Well, you are wrong are you not?—I am referring principally to the first six months.

299. As a matter of fact, then, there were prosecutions in March, 1895?—Yes.
300. With reference to the man Mills, you say he procured drink in either one or other of the two temperance hotels?—Yes.
301. What proof have you of that?—He was in them all the day, and when I saw him after the accident he was drunk.
302. Did you see him in them?—No.
303. Do you know that before you arrived on the scene of the accident the man was in a fainting condition and was given a tumbler of whiskey?—No. It would have taken six tumblers to have shifted Mills.
304. Do you know that he had been given whiskey?—Yes, I found he had been vegetating between the two hotels all the day.
305. As regards Elliott, the man who was drowned, do you know that he obtained the drink from the wholesale house?—Yes.
306. Not illicitly?—No.
307. *Colonel Hume.*] I think you stated that I said there was no sly-grog selling. To whom did I state that?—To me.
308. Was any one else present?—My wife for one, and Mr. J. T. Burrell, for another, and Mr. Whitefield; and, I am not quite sure, but I think Mr. McGavin was present.
309. Did I tell you I had ascertained the fact?—Yes; you said you had been round the district, and that you could get no drink; and I said it was not likely.
310. And you say that I did nothing?—There was a kind of understanding that we, the Prohibitionists, were to hold our hand. You complained of our writing to the papers. I said, "I have never written to the papers," and that we would not write. You promised that something would be done within a month, and within a month something was done.
311. What was done?—The first convictions.
312. And at 10 in the morning you heard that the police were on the way up?—Yes, I was told that in Wensted's chemist's shop.
313. You do not go to the hotel?—No, I never go there, except professionally.
314. Does the man in whose place you were go there?—He used to go there.
315. Probably he had heard about my telegram that I sent the night before, asking that a bed should be kept for me. But you do not think it is our duty to go round and detect sly-grog selling?—You expressed surprise in my house when they would not sell it to you. You gave me the impression that, because you got none, there was none being sold.
316. Did this detective with the blue goggles come that day?—I think there is a little misunderstanding. I did not know that he was coming until I saw him.
317. You say you used to hear that such and such a one was coming?—Yes, and perhaps we heard that there were more detectives up than there were ever up; but there were not more than there ought to have been.
318. Do you attribute the death of this man to the police in any way?—No; but I did think that an inquest should have been held, until I was put right.
319. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say your patients do not display any signs of drink, but that they used to?—Yes. I might say that I hardly have a case now of a man suffering from chronic alcoholism. I have had here and there, but nothing like what it used to be.
320. Chronic alcoholism follows the drinking of spirits?—Or drinking anything. I have seen the worst of it with beer drinking, which is worse than spirit drinking.
321. The stationmaster says the same quantity of whiskey goes in?—Yes; but he was basing his calculation on the population, and I join issue with him there. I say the population is larger.
322. You do not think his evidence is reliable in that respect?—He has made a mistake in calculating, that is all.
323. You would expect, if the same quantity of whiskey goes in, to find the same evidences of alcoholic poisoning?—Yes. He said it goes either to the people or to the wholesale house, but he did not say how much went to the one and how much to the other. I think a small proportion goes to the people.
324. But the people will consume it?—The wholesale man might stock it for a time. It might be stored there.
325. I think you advanced the opinion, from the appearance of patients, that the consumption of liquor was less than before?—So I do.
326. So your opinion is different to that of the stationmaster?—I say that the wholesale man may have it stored. He may have hundreds of gallons.
327. *Mr. Taylor.*] Cannot the wholesale man trade outside the Clutha district?—Yes, he can.

ANDREW CHRISTIE, examined on oath.

328. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Andrew Christie.
329. What rank do you hold?—Second-class constable, stationed at Mosgiel.
330. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in the service?—Thirteen years and nine months.
331. Since you rejoined?—Yes.
332. Did you join as third-class constable this time?—Yes.
333. When were you promoted?—About four years ago.
334. When did you come to Balclutha?—In 1891.
335. Were you here at the time hotel licenses were abolished?—Yes.
336. How long after?—Until August, 1896.
337. Did you have any prosecutions for sly-grog selling during the time you were here?—Yes.
338. Between June, 1894, and August, 1896?—Yes, I had five.
339. Who were they against?—Anderson and Moir, and I assisted in two cases at Catlin's.
340. What was the date?—I could not tell you.

341. Was Collins one of them?—Collins is not in my district.
342. Anderson and Moir were in Balclutha?—Yes.
343. Whom did you swear your informations before?—Mr. Hawkins and Mr. Dabinett for the Balclutha prosecutions.
344. Why not before Balclutha Justices of the Peace?—We did not want to let the Justices of the Peace know our business.
345. Were they friendly with the persons you were prosecuting?—Two of the Justices were old hotelkeepers—Mr. Dunne and Mr. McCorley.
346. *The Chairman.*] Were you stationed at Balclutha at the time?—Yes.
347. How many Justices of the Peace are there here?—Four.
348. At what date did you prepare the information?—I could not say.
349. Was the Magistrate here?—No. At one time I went to Gore to him.
350. Why go to Gore to see him when you could have sworn the informations before any one of the four Justices?—I went to him because I had been instructed to do so by the Inspector.
351. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was the instruction in writing?—No. I was in town when I got it.
352. *The Chairman.*] Did the Inspector give you any reason?—No.
353. *Mr. Taylor.*] You never swore an information before a local Justice of the Peace?—I swore two before Mr. Dabinett, of Catlin's.
354. How far is that away?—Twenty-five miles.
355. Did you ever collect accounts while you were in Balclutha?—No.
- [Examination adjourned.]

SATURDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1898.

ROBERT HISLOP, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—Robert Hislop.
2. What are you?—Stationmaster at Clinton.
3. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been there?—Fifteen months.
4. Where were you before that?—Mosgiel.
5. Who was stationmaster at Balclutha before you?—Mr. Coker.
6. Have you noticed much drunkenness in Balclutha since you have been there?—Very little.
7. Have you seen any drunken men at all?—I have occasionally seen one or two men a bit talkative.
8. Is there much liquor passing through your hands by way of consignment?—Very little.
9. If the Commissioners wished it, could you prepare a return to show the quantities?—Yes, so far as it is booked as liquor. I have no reason to suppose that any quantity is brought in under the head of "Sundries."
10. *The Chairman.*] Are there any licensed houses at Clinton?—No, Sir.

JOHN RAMAGE, examined on oath.

11. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—John Ramage.
12. What is your occupation, and where do you reside?—I am a tinsmith and plumber, residing at Balclutha.
13. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been here?—For nearly twenty-six years.
14. Do you remember the time when hotel licenses terminated—June, 1894?—Yes.
15. Do you think that since that time the police have done all they could have done to suppress sly-grog selling?—Do I understand the question to be, Do I consider that the police have done all in their power to suppress sly-grog selling from the first to now?
16. That is it?—No, I certainly do not.
17. Who was the constable here when the hotels were closed?—Constable Christie.
18. Do you think he was active in the performance of this particular duty?—No, I do not consider that he was at all active. Of course, I have no definite grounds for saying so, but I say it from general observation.
19. You think that sly-grog selling was prevalent while he was here?—Very much so.
20. Has it decreased since?—Considerably.
21. Do you remember a disturbance immediately following the carrying of the vote on the licensing question, in which Mr. Henry's house was assaulted?—Yes; it was some time after the "No license" vote was carried.
22. Was it before the hotels were closed?—Well, it was some time after the vote was carried.
23. But was it after the hotels were closed, in June, 1894?—Yes.
24. What were the circumstances?—They were these: Mr. Henry and myself had good reason to sit up during that night and keep watch, because of a disturbance that had occurred the year before.
25. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was it upon your house?—No, it was on Mr. Henry's house; but I was watching in my house at the same time.
26. *Mr. Taylor.*] Had you had warning that it would be necessary to watch?—Yes.
27. *The Chairman.*] What was the intention of sitting up?—I would like to explain that immediately after the "No license" vote was carried I was warned, with others, that we were marked men, and I was told to be on the look-out, as it was feared that something might be done. Constable Christie gave me that warning. He advised us to shadow each other, and never to go far away, because he had a fear that the liquor party would do something.

28. Whom do you mean by the liquor party?—They were the ex-hotelkeepers, and others who were connected with the liquor trade in the town.

29. And he said you should be on the alert?—Yes.

30. Did he say against whom?—He mentioned no names.

31. And in consequence of that you sat up?—Yes.

32. *Mr. Taylor.*] What was the date?—It was a year before Mr. Henry's affair occurred.

33. That is, when the previous vote had been taken?—Yes. It was immediately after the vote was taken that I received the warning. I was doubtful whether Constable Christie would report the matter to the head of the department, so I deemed it my duty to do so; and I received a reply to the communication I sent.

34. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you call the head of the department?—Inspector Pardy.

35. *Mr. Taylor.*] Will you read the reply you got?—This is it:—

27th March, 1894.

SIR,— I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th instant, stating that you have reason to believe that you and others are in danger of being molested because you have taken an active part in the temperance interest. In reply, I beg to inform you that I have instructed the constable at Balclutha to render you every assistance and protection in his power should you in any way be assaulted, or anything occur calling for police intervention. (Signed on behalf of Inspector Pardy.)

36. Was there any disturbance?—Yes. In the first place, I would like to say that Constable Christie got to know that I had communicated with the department, and he came to me in a great way over it. He asked me if I thought I had done any good. I said, "It is a matter of opinion. Do you think I did any harm?" He said, "I do not know, but I think you did a foolish thing." I said, "That may be, but I deemed it my duty to report the matter to the Inspector, because how was I to know that you would do it. I had no guarantee that you would." He seemed very much annoyed; and I said I had reported the matter to the Inspector so that, if anything should arise, the department would know in what way to look for it. I also told him that, so far as my letter to the department was concerned, I could have shown it to him, as I had said nothing against him.

37. Was there any disturbance afterwards?—Yes. At the following New Year—nine months after the writing of the letter—I was away from home with my wife and family. I was at Port Molyneux. All the windows in my shop and front room were smashed in. That was on the 2nd or 3rd of January; and it so happened that my son and I came home that night, as we were suspicious that something might happen. I think the assailants did not think there would be any one at home: and we were just getting the kettle boiled when the windows went in. I went to the station for Constable Christie, but he was not there. I then went back to the house and kept watch. After a time I called Mr. Henry, and asked him if he would go to the station with me. We went together, but the constable was not there. We went back to the house, and a second window was smashed in. Then I sent another gentleman to the station, and still Constable Christie was not to be found. Early next morning a fire occurred, in which Blackwood and Chapman's stable was burned down; and I went there, while Mr. Henry did "sentry-go" over the premises, and the first sight I got of the constable was at that fire.

38. *The Chairman.*] What was the interval of time between your first visit to the station and your seeing him at the fire?—As near as I remember, the first visit to the station was about 11 p.m., and the fire was about 2 a.m. or half-past 2. At the first opportunity I laid the matter before him, and such circumstantial evidence as would have justified him in making an arrest that morning on suspicion; and he recommended me to keep quiet, and I said I would; but, unfortunately, he kept quiet too.

39. Did you lay an information?—No. He did not advise me in that way. What he said to me led me to believe that he would be able to follow it out, and I acted on his advice.

40. Was there an information laid by anybody?—No; and there was no apparent action taken even by the police, for the constable sought for no further information, and did not seem to interest himself in the matter.

41. Did he go to your place at all?—Yes, he had a look at what damage was done, but beyond that there was no apparent action, and I heard no more of it. That led up to the occasion of the watching of Mr. Henry's.

42. *Mr. Taylor.*] What do you know of that affair?—I was watching my own premises the following year again. I am not certain as to the date. We were both on the watch, in case anything would occur similar to what had occurred, and, while watching, a band of larrikins was going up and down the street. On one occasion they knocked at Mr. Henry's door as they passed, and Mr. Henry opened the door. I then saw that the object of the knocking was to get him to come out. Immediately he and his wife went out they were pelted with rotten eggs.

43. Did you go for the constable that night?—Yes. Mr. Henry and I went for him. We went twice for him, but he was not at home, and in the morning, at daybreak, we went again and found him. He got up and answered the door in his nightshirt, and we related the whole thing to him. We told him we had been there, and that we could not find him; and he said he had been round at a certain hour at Mr. Moir's—that is, the Farmers' Arms Hotel, which is next door to Mr. Henry's. The reason he was there, he said, was that there was a row on, and he went to see about it, or to quieten it.

44. Did he get any conviction in connection with that disturbance?—Not that I am aware of.

45. *The Chairman.*] Were proceedings taken by Mr. Henry himself?—I do not know of any.

46. *Mr. Taylor.*] He left the matter to the police?—Yes.

47. Has any police constable in Balclutha ever collected accounts for you on commission?—

Yes.

48. What commission?—It was only on one occasion, and it was a very small amount.

49. What were the circumstances?—It was an account of some odd shillings that I considered a bad mark. I did not expect to get the money.

50. Did you speak to the constable about it?—Yes. I put the matter in his hands, and he was successful in collecting it for me.

51. Did he deduct anything from the amount for collecting?—No. When he brought the money to me I told him, "Well, this is found; I never expected to get it," and I think I threw a two-shilling piece to him. As it was found money it was worth that.

52. *The Chairman.*] You wish to bring that before our notice?—No. I have no particular desire to do that; but I have been asked the question.

53. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you noticed any difference in the amount of disorder on the streets since the hotels were closed, compared with the previous time?—Yes; a great deal.

54. There is less disorder?—You might say there is no disorder at all now compared with what there used to be.

55. Have matters improved since Constable Christie's removal?—Undoubtedly so.

56. The town has been quieter?—Yes; and there is less drunkenness.

57. And you infer from that that the police have been more vigilant in the enforcement of the licensing law since his removal than formerly?—Yes.

58. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What is the present condition of the streets in Balclutha as regards orderliness?—They are very orderly.

59. Is there any disorder at all about the streets?—Very little. If you refer to disorder arising out of drunkenness, I say there is very little.

60. You say that, in your opinion, the police have not carried out their duties properly with reference to the suppression of the drink traffic here?—Yes; viewing the whole matter from the time of "No license" to the present time.

61. Do you think they are endeavouring to carry out the law at the present time as far as it is possible for them?—I am of opinion that it is possible for them to do more than they are doing; but at the same time I think they are doing a great deal.

62. Can you tell me in what way the police could do more than they are doing?—No; I am not well enough acquainted with police matters to be able to do that. I cannot tell you how they could do more.

63. Can you give particulars as to any neglect of duty on their part at the present time?—No, I cannot.

64. How long have the police been endeavouring to carry out the law here in Balclutha?—I believe they have from first to last been endeavouring to carry it out, but in a very feeble way at some periods.

65. You do not think, then, that they have wilfully winked at breaches of the law?—Now, at the present time?

66. Nor at any time?—I believe they are often guilty of that.

67. Up to what period?—Up to the time of Constable Christie's removal. In short, I wish to say that it is my opinion that during Constable Christie's time in Balclutha he did not carry out his duty in regard to the licensing laws.

68. Do you think that since Constable Christie's removal there has been an honest endeavour on the part of the police to carry out the law?—Undoubtedly I do.

69. *The Chairman.*] What was the date of Constable Christie's removal.

70. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] It was in August, 1896. (To witness:) Then, your first statement in your cross-examination, that the police had not carried out the law, applied to the period prior to Constable Christie's removal?—I do not think I stated that.

71. But is that what you now state—that the period at which the police were lax in their duty was the period prior to his removal?—Yes.

72. Did Constable Christie do anything at all to suppress the traffic?—Oh, yes.

73. You have been asked if constables ever collected accounts for you on commission, and your answer is "No," is it not?—I do not think so. I did not answer in that way.

74. But is not your answer equivalent to "No"?—Certainly not.

75. Well, tell me what commission a constable has received from you, or any date a constable has ever collected for you on commission?—I say that on one occasion a constable collected for me, and that I handed him two shillings.

76. And you consider that that was commission, and that he collected the debt for you on commission? Was there any pre-arrangement between you and the constable that he was to receive a certain sum?—No.

77. If out of a feeling of gratitude for getting some money you had thought was lost you gave the constable 2s., do you think that that can be properly expressed as collecting debts for you on commission?—I cannot give you a legal opinion on the point.

78. If you put the collection of accounts into the hands of a professional man there is an understanding, is there not, as to the terms on which he will collect?—Yes.

79. And if he collects those accounts and you do not pay him for collecting them he has a right to sue you?—Yes.

80. Now, if you had given this constable nothing at all, had he any right to take action against you to recover anything?—No.

81. It was left to your gratitude whether you gave him money or not?—Yes.

82. Can that be construed, then, into collecting debts for you on commission, giving it the most liberal rendering?—I have stated the circumstances, and you can either make it commission or not.

83. But your statement has been made to appear that a constable has been collecting debts on commission for you, and I wish the facts to be clearly explained. Personally I should like to get the name of the constable out—

84. *The Chairman.*] I do not think this contains a charge under the regulations.

85. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Yes, if a constable receives a gratuity. He is not expected to receive a penny without reporting it. (To witness :) Do you know of any other persons who have had moneys collected by the constable in the way of debts?—Yes.

86. In this township?—Yes.

87. Do you know many?—Not personally; but it was a common thing, if you had a bad debt, for the one to suggest to the other that it should be given to the constable. It was suggested to me.

88. This constable was Clerk of the Court?—Yes.

89. And also bailiff?—Probably he was the bailiff.

90. Did you take any proceedings against the man who owed you money?—No.

91. I should like to know a little more as to how it came about?—It came about in this way. I got to know that it was the general custom with a few in the place. I did not go personally to the constable. I made out the account and sent my son with it to the constable, with a request that he would be good enough to collect it.

92. What was the amount?—It was something under a pound.

93. Could you give us the names of other people that this constable has collected money for?—Yes.

94. *The Chairman.*] This is a charge against a constable, and cannot be gone into unless twenty-four hours' notice is given to him.

95. *Colonel Hume.*] You have been here twenty-six years?—Yes.

96. Has it been a pretty orderly place during that time?—It was never a disorderly place.

97. Then, some credit for its being orderly is due to Constable Christie while he was here?—Probably so.

98. You have told us that in your twenty-six years' experience you had two windows broken on one occasion, and that you saw some larrikins throw two rotten eggs at a man and his wife. That seems to be the total sum of the disturbance you have told us of for these twenty-six years?—I did not tell you anything of that sort.

99. Did you not say you had two windows broken?—No.

100. *The Chairman.*] What windows were broken?—The windows in the shop. There were four shop-front panes and the glass in two sashes in the front-room window.

101. *Colonel Hume.*] They were your windows?—Yes.

102. And was I right in my suggestion about the man and his wife?—Yes.

103. And that is the amount of disturbance that occurred in Constable Christie's time?—That is what occurred in connection with me personally.

104. And you say there has not been much disturbance here?—I did not say anything of the sort.

105. You say it has not been a very disorderly place?—That is what I said.

106. Will you give us a single instance in which, in your opinion, Constable Christie neglected his duty in carrying out the liquor laws?—In my reference in that direction I am simply speaking in a general way.

107. You cannot give a single instance?—I cannot give any particular instance.

108. And I suppose you have a very good idea, as you watched the constable very well?—I never did anything of the kind.

109. Then, you know little as to whether he did his duty or not?—There are various ways of knowing these things.

110. But you cannot give an instance in which he neglected his duty?—No. I am speaking in a general way.

111. But you are perfectly certain that the department was right when it made the change?—Yes.

112. You had a good idea as to who broke the windows?—Very likely.

113. Had you or had you not?—I had my suspicions of certain individuals.

114. Why did you not lay an information against them?—Because I was advised to remain quiet.

115. And you did?—Yes.

116. And when nothing was being done, why did you not take the matter into your own hands?—Because I was convinced that the powers that be were not carrying out their duty, and that had I done so it would have been a fruitless effort.

117. Who are the powers that be?—I mean the police.

118. Constable Christie?—Yes.

119. *The Chairman.*] Then, what does your evidence amount to, if you do not say he neglected his duty?—I simply give it as my opinion.

120. *Colonel Hume.*] Is it not the fact that the reason you did not lay an information is that you thought you had not sufficient evidence to prove it?—I do not consider that that is so.

121. Do you consider that you had sufficient evidence?—I consider that with the evidence I had the police could have carried the matter to a successful issue.

122. When you found they did not, how is it you took no action?—I simply allowed the matter to rest in the hands of the police.

123. When you found the policeman did not lay an information, why not then lay an information yourself?—The action of the police would seem to have overturned my belief in the evidence I had.

124. Therefore, you considered you had not sufficient evidence. Is that not so?—Yes. But I am not putting it right. I did not altogether consider I had sufficient evidence, but I thought that with the close relationship existing between the police and the liquor party it was almost impossible for me to expect the assistance of the police.

125. Will you tell us what this evidence was that you gave to the police, this strong circumstantial evidence that you had?—At the time my family and I were at Port Molyneux, and there were two individuals in Balclutha who made very close inquiries, even from my children, as to whether their father was down here, and whether their mother was down here; and then they made inquiries from others, in order to make certain. These individuals had no reason, or no connection with me or my wife, to justify them in making any inquiries, and that, combined with the warning I had received from the police, led my suspicions in that direction.

126. *The Chairman.*] In what direction?—In the direction of those two individuals. And a strange thing was that when I laid my suspicions before Constable Christie, his own suspicions agreed with mine, and ran in the same direction.

127. *Colonel Hume.*] Were these two individuals what you would term larrikins?—No, not in the ordinary term of larrikin.

128. Then, I take it they were not the people who threw the eggs?—No.

129. Then, how do you connect the one with the other?—I do not connect them. They were twelve months apart.

130. And you do not think that the close connection you say the constable had with the liquor party prevented his going into the rotten-egg business?—I could not say as to that.

131. When you found Constable Christie inactive about your windows, did you report it to the Inspector?—No.

132. It was not important enough?—I acted on the constable's advice. As a matter of fact, I refrained from making any comments outside, for fear I would interfere with the efforts of the police.

133. Did you keep speaking periodically to the constable about the matter?—Occasionally I spoke to him.

134. You did not threaten to write to the Inspector if nothing was done?—No, I made no threats.

135. Do you say that sly-grog selling has decreased since Constable Griffiths came to Balclutha?—Yes.

136. What do you speak for—Balclutha?—Yes, and the Catlin's. I speak of the latter place principally from reports, but I speak of Balclutha from my own observation.

137. The constable who is here now is giving every satisfaction to you?—Yes.

WILLIAM MATHIESON, examined on oath.

138. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—William Mathieson. I am a second-class constable, stationed at Tapanui.

139. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in Tapanui?—Three years on the 5th June.

140. Have you had much to do with the administration of the licensing law there?—Yes.

141. Had you much experience of the licensing law before you went there?—Considerable.

142. Where?—Auckland, Dunedin, and Lawrence.

143. In your opinion, does sly-grog selling still go on in the Clutha?—I can only speak of the Tapanui district. I have no knowledge of the district as a whole.

144. Well, of the Tapanui district?—I am inclined to think it does, in a small way.

145. Do you think there is as much liquor sold in Tapanui as in other towns of the same size where licenses exist?—I think it is absurd to say that.

146. How do you deal with the supply of drink at races, at shows, and at sports; are special licenses granted?—No. There has been no license granted for the sale of intoxicating liquor at public gatherings during my time.

147. Do you attend those gatherings?—Always.

148. Are there any evidences of sly-grog selling to be observed there?—No; on the contrary. The gatherings I have attended have been races, the annual show, and the annual sports at Kelso, and I have no recollection of seeing an intoxicated person at any of the meetings.

149. *The Chairman.*] Within what period?—Three years.

150. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you any suggestion to make as to how sly-grog selling in the Tapanui district could be effectually stamped out?—I would not like to make my suggestions public property. It would defeat the ends of justice.

151. If the prosecutions were more frequent would not those engaged in the trade give it up?—Yes, I think so.

152. They have too much time allowed them?—Yes. If it was possible to bring them before the Court more frequently, and secure convictions, it would unquestionably stamp the trade out.

153. Having had special experience in the Clutha district, what are the difficulties you have to contend with most in the enforcement of this law?—Public feeling and public opinion.

154. Where do you swear your informations in connection with sly-grog cases?—On the first occasion, which was November, 1895, after the cases were matured, I went to Dunedin by instructions, to see Inspector Pardy. I put the whole case before him. Search warrants and informations were prepared, and Inspector Pardy asked me if there was a Justice of the Peace in the district whom I could trust to take the informations. Knowing that the utmost secrecy was required, I said I would not take the responsibility of recommending any one.

155. You would not trust them?—I would not say that.

156. Have you confidence in the secrecy of your Justices of the Peace?—I would not trust them, but they may be trustworthy.

157. Is there not a feeling in the district that they are sympathetic with the sly-grog sellers?—Yes, that is so.

158. Where were those informations laid ultimately?—I obeyed instructions, and laid them before Mr. Hawkins, whom I found at Gore.

159. *The Chairman.*] You have no doubt of Mr. Hawkins's sympathy?—I believe he is to be trusted.

160. *Mr. Taylor.*] How far is Gore from Tapanui?—Twenty-five miles.

161. Is it correct to say that a witness in a recent prosecution at Tapanui had to be taken under police protection?—I have no recollection of it.

162. I am now reading from the parliamentary report prepared by the Magistrate for the district. He says, "In a recent case at Tapanui it was necessary that the informer should be taken under police protection." Is that correct?—No.

163. If the Magistrate has stated that he would be incorrect?—Yes. It is true that a witness in a recent case, at my invitation, stayed with me for two days prior to the prosecution; but that was not the motive. I invited him to stay with me.

164. Was there any demonstration against the man?—Not the slightest; but a few larrikins called out names to him.

165. Has the population of Tapanui increased or decreased since you took charge?—I have not had the opportunity of compiling statistics for the borough, but I should say it has not decreased. I think it is rather on the increase, judging from the operations of the building trade.

166. What other difficulties have you to contend with in enforcing the licensing law in your district; have you reason to suppose that witnesses are systematically suborned?—Yes.

167. That is the result of your three years' experience?—Yes.

168. Suborned by those interested in sly-grog selling?—Yes.

169. *The Chairman.*] As a result of your experience as a constable, is that remark to be confined to cases of sly-grog selling?—Yes.

170. Is there anything of the same kind in other cases?—I would not like to go that far, but at the present time I have no recollection of any particular case. The sly-grog cases are fresh in my memory, and what I say applies specially to them, but it may apply also to other cases. My experience has taught me to be more careful in watching witnesses in sly-grog selling cases than any other witnesses who have come under my notice.

171. Was that the reason you had for keeping the witness in your house?—That was my principal reason—to prevent him being intimidated.

172. *Mr. Taylor.*] Would it materially assist you in your duties, as far as the enforcement of the licensing law is concerned, if all private hotels were under police surveillance, as are the public hotels?—It would meet the difficulty entirely, because it would be impossible to sell in the houses if the police were permitted to enter without a warrant.

173. *The Chairman.*] Do you make the suggestion that it should apply to every boarding-house as well, throughout the colony?—I do not care to say that it should be throughout the colony, but it would meet the difficulty in my district.

174. *Mr. Taylor.*] It was suggested by a witness yesterday that a number of tradespeople in Tapanui had been starved out. What have you to say of that?—I have no knowledge of it.

175. Do you know the township well?—Yes.

176. Supposing the means were placed at your disposal, do you think it would be possible to get more frequent convictions for sly-grog selling in your district?—Yes, if the proper means were adopted. If I make suggestions now they become public property, and that would frustrate my efforts. I would prefer to make no suggestions.

177. After having had practical experience, do you think that sly-grog selling in the Clutha can be practically stopped?—Yes, to all intents and purposes.

178. In view of your special experience, do you think the department have done all they might have done to suppress sly-grog selling?—Yes. The department has replied to every suggestion I have made with regard to detecting sly-grog selling, and I think I have made a good many suggestions in one way and another. I think that only on one occasion there was some little delay in replying, and if I recollect aright the suggestion was adopted, but it was too late for my purpose. I do not know that there was any unusual delay, but it was something like a month or five weeks.

179. Could the enforcement of the licensing law be more effective if there was some police authority in the Clutha district under whom constables could act without referring to headquarters?—I believe the principal cause of the delay is that Inspector Pardy has too much to attend to, and too large a district to travel over, and confidential correspondence must lie in Dunedin and await his arrival. My instructions are to forward all communications on the subject to Inspector Pardy confidentially; and I know that sometimes he has been away, and that my communications have been lying waiting for him for some time.

180. You think more prompt action could be taken?—If a competent man were in charge of the electorate, to act in conjunction with the constable, it would act better.

181. A witness said yesterday that he thought the influence of those engaged in the liquor business had prevented the police from efficiently administering the liquor law?—Throughout the colony?

182. Speaking specifically of Clutha?—That has not been my experience.

183. At Tapanui, what convictions have you obtained?—The first time was in November, 1895, when I obtained six convictions. The second time was a year afterwards, when the cases were dismissed. That was in August, 1896.

184. *The Chairman.*] How many cases?—Two informations. The third time was when five informations were heard, and there was one conviction. That was in November of 1897. There was one conviction, two were withdrawn, and two were dismissed. On the first occasion there were eighteen informations, three informations against each person. There were six convictions and twelve withdrawals.

185. Who were the informations withdrawn by?—Inspector Pardy.

186. *Mr. Taylor.*] What convictions have you had for drunkenness?—Not one.

187. Dr. de Lautour made reference to the case of a man named Mills. Do you consider an inquest should have been held?—I specifically pointed out, when reporting to the Coroner, how the death took place—what was asserted—that it was drink; and that death was attributable to an accident while in a state of intoxication. I also said the only point would be the illegal sale of liquor, and asked would an inquest be held. Mr. Hawkins replied, “Cannot order inquest under the circumstances.”

188. Is it not the custom to hold an inquest in connection with all accidental deaths?—No, unless there are some suspicious of foul play.

189. You say the influence of those engaged in the liquor trade in the Clutha does not affect the action of the police. What is your experience elsewhere?—I have heard it asserted from time to time that publicans have a lot of influence, but it has never affected me in any way.

190. *The Chairman.*] How have you heard it?—I have heard it said among the police that so-and-so was shifted for doing his duty.

191. *Mr. Taylor.*] Among the police? Have you heard it said that it was to the advantage of the men not to be too active in the enforcement of the liquor laws?—I may have heard such a remark.

192. Has the feeling been expressed?—Not of late years. That was the feeling some years ago, when I first joined the Force.

193. *The Chairman.*] When did you join?—Thirteen years ago.

194. *Mr. Taylor.*] When were you promoted to second rank?—From four years and a half to five years ago.

195. Has Inspector Pardy given you all assistance in the enforcement of the licensing laws in the Clutha district?—Yes.

196. Have you been under any other Inspectors?—Mr. Weldon, Mr. Broham, and Mr. Moore, and, for a short time, Mr. Thomson, in Wellington.

197. Where did you serve under the others?—Mr. Broham in Auckland, Mr. Moore in Lawrence and Dunedin, and Mr. Weldon in Dunedin.

198. What is the feeling among the men in the Force in regard to their position in the Force generally—promotions, transfers, and so on? Has there been dissatisfaction?—There was considerable dissatisfaction in the Force until the system of transferring men from one end of the colony to the other was stopped. About six or seven years ago an Inspector had power to remove a man at his own sweet will without the slightest excuse. I was a victim to that kind of thing. I was transferred from Dunedin to Auckland, for what reason I know not, and I had to go, or leave the Force.

199. How long had you been in Dunedin?—Four or five years. It was at Inspector Moore’s instigation.

200. *The Chairman.*] Had an Inspector power to move men from one district to another without the intervention of the Commissioner?—I understand the Commissioner would call for the removal of a constable from one district to another, giving no name, and it was left to the Inspector to remove whomsoever he liked.

201. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long were you in Auckland?—Eighteen months or two years.

202. Where were you removed to?—I exchanged with another constable in Wellington.

203. *The Chairman.*] How could you exchange places?—One constable in Wellington wanted to go to Auckland, and I wanted to go to Wellington, so we put in applications for transfer.

204. You agreed to send in an application?—Yes.

205. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was it not customary for such applications to be granted?—Yes, it was customary for such applications to be granted by the Commissioner.

206. *The Chairman.*] What year was that?—In 1892.

207. *Colonel Hume.*] Did you pay your own expenses?—No; I had some children to escort to the Industrial School at Nelson, so I was cleared of that liability.

208. *Mr. Taylor.*] Why did you wish to leave Auckland?—I had private reasons for doing so.

209. Were they connected with the Force?—I do not wish to impeach any one, and I would rather it remained at that.

210. Was it a grievance in connection with the Force?—I felt I was not getting justice under Inspector Broham. That was my primary reason.

211. How long were you under him?—Eighteen months, or close on two years.

212. Did he approve of your exchanging?—I did not interview him. I simply put in my application to the Commissioner through the Inspector.

213. Have you ever known political influence being used in the Police Force to secure transfers or promotions?—Of my own knowledge, No.

214. What is the feeling among the men as to the distribution of rewards?—I do not know. I am not among the men now.

215. When you were among them, what was the general feeling?—For myself, I had four cases at least which should have been recognised by reward, but they were not.

216. *The Chairman.*] How many rewards have you received during the three years you have been in Tapanui?—Three.

217. And did these four cases occur in Tapanui?—No. Two of them were in Auckland. I did not apply for the reward. I do not approve of the practice of having a case, and then, as it were, begging for the reward.

218. Have you ever applied in any cases for the reward?—Yes, rather than be overlooked I have applied.

219. *Mr. Taylor.*] Respecting convictions on defaulters’ sheets, is there any great discontent among the men as to the way convictions are entered on defaulters’ sheets?—Yes, I have also had experience in that way, and I would like to bring it forward. I would like to see my defaulter’s sheet. I have only seen it once. [Sheet produced.]

220. *The Chairman.*] You apparently joined on the 27th December, 1885; and the first and only record of default is on the 5th March, 1891: "Leaving his beat to change his clothes between 9 a.m. and 1 p.m. without permission"?—Yes, that is what I wish to explain.

221. You were fined 2s. 6d.—Yes. That was under Inspector Broham. I wish to ask for the erasure of that item from my sheet, as it is there unjustly.

222. *Mr. Taylor.*] What were the circumstances?—I was on duty in Queen Street in the summer time, dressed in summer clothing—white helmet hat and white starch trousers—and it came on to rain. A tropical shower came on. I looked in vain for the sergeant in charge to obtain his permission to go and make a change, and I waited on my beat to see if he would arrive. We should be paid two visits every four hours. Not seeing any sign of him, and getting wet—having to stand under a verandah to protect myself—I met the constable on the neighbouring beat—Constable Stephenson, now dead—and said to him, "If you will relieve me of my beat I will go and change my clothing, and when I come back I will relieve you." Section 53 of the regulations permits this to be done. I went home, and was absent probably ten or fifteen minutes. I was at the barracks. I came back and relieved Constable Stephenson, who also went home to change his clothing; and, after his return, Constable Stephenson relieved Constable John McCabe, now at Gisborne. The sergeant (John McMahon) appeared about relief-time and asked us where we got our coats. We explained to him what we had done. He reported the matter to the sergeant-major—then Sergeant-major Pratt—and was instructed to report it to the Inspector, with the result now stated on my defaulter's sheet.

223. Were you ever taken before the Inspector?—Yes; but during my service that is the only offence for which I have been fined. I have been before the Inspector about half a dozen times.

224. *The Chairman.*] There is only the one record?—Yes, and I had to fight hard or there would have been more.

225. *Mr. Taylor.*] Under Inspector Broham, are not the men very much pestered by trivial complaints?—I should say harassed—that was my experience; and, in saying so, I could give details, with regard to fires especially.

226. That is, with regard to attendance at fires?—Yes.

227. That regulation has been amended recently?—In Dunedin it has. In Auckland, constables had to attend fires, although they occurred at the rate of two or three a night. No excuse was allowed. The sergeant-major or the Inspector would parade the men and call the roll, and the absentees were called before the Inspector next day.

228. If a man had been on an eight-hours' beat, was he liable to attend a fire within a few minutes of being relieved?—Yes.

229. Is that so in Dunedin?—No; but I could not be sure. I think there was an alteration made in Dunedin. I believe the regulation there is that on the first alarm of the bell the constables are not supposed to turn out, not unless the night-watchman instructs them that it is a serious fire. If it is serious all hands turn out.

230. *The Chairman.*] Do you say that in Auckland all the men had to attend a fire, including those on beats?—I believe that all hands had to muster at the fire.

231. And leave their beats?—I think certain of the beats had to be protected. One man, for instance, had to be left in Queen Street.

232. *Mr. Taylor.*] In Dunedin, if you have an arrest, is it the custom to write up your report after leaving the beat?—In Dunedin, No; but in Auckland, Yes.

233. Before you turned in?—Well, I think an alteration was made in Auckland too, but it is within the last few years; but it used to be otherwise. In Dunedin, the constables who had reports to make went in at the consideration of the sergeant, probably at 4 o'clock, handed the reports to the sergeant, and fell in with the men when they came in and were dismissed.

234. Did Inspector Broham exhibit violent temper to the men?—He did to myself.

235. Has there been discontent among the men, as to the way in which the reports against their conduct have been dealt with? A charge is made against a constable, and he sees it and makes his reply. Then it goes to the Commissioner with the Inspector's report. Was it the custom when you were in the large centres for the constables to see the Inspector's reports?—No.

236. Is that unfair?—Yes; I think the whole system was unfair. I never had an experience of an Inspector's office until I went to Auckland, and the system was one-sided there. The Inspector was judge and jury. I can give an instance of it.

237. Let us have the instance?—It concerns Sergeant Emerson, now out of the Force. I was on night duty under him. An assault was committed in Queen Street by a restaurant-keeper, a darkie named Cox, who assaulted a man. The man complained to me, and while making inquiries the sergeant came along and I reported the matter to him. The sergeant went into the restaurant and arrested the keeper, and instructed me to bring the assaulted person to the station. I did so. He said, "Take the man to the hospital, and see what the assault is like." I said that before going to the hospital I would give the names of two men who had seen the assault. I went to the hospital, and returned about 12 o'clock. Then, the sergeant instructed me to go and see to the finding of the two witnesses. I said it was almost an impossibility to find the witnesses at that hour. Next day the sergeant asked me in the afternoon to go with him to find the witnesses, but we could not find them. That night (Saturday) the sergeant instructed me to write a report to the effect that I could not find the witnesses. I said, "I have no report to write with regard to the witnesses, and if you think I have neglected my duty report me for it." On the Monday I was ordered to the Inspector's office. Inspector Broham read a long report from Sergeant Emerson, who charged me with insubordination and disobedience of orders. The case was proceeded with at once in the presence of the sergeant and the sergeant-major, and after a lengthy hearing the Inspector decided to convict me for the offence. This meant a serious matter to me, and I said that rather than proceed with the matter I would

apply to the Commissioner for a rehearing, as it was unjust. Next afternoon the clerk took the evidence down in writing, and the Inspector then dismissed the charge, and threw the papers to one side. It was with difficulty that I managed to get my rights, and I took the earliest opportunity of leaving Auckland.

238. *The Chairman.*] And there was no conviction recorded against you?—No. That is my experience of Inspectors' offices. Of course, I do not suggest that such is the case in Dunedin, where I have been treated with the greatest courtesy by Inspector Pardy.

239. When you intimated that you would forward the matter to the Commissioner, fresh evidence was taken in writing and the case was dismissed?—Yes; Sergeant Ellison, now at Wanganui, was the clerk who took the notes.

240. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you think that, in regard to promotions, they should be by seniority or by merit?—I think they should be by merit. It is impossible to have an efficient Force if you stick to seniority.

241. Is there not a feeling in the Force that constables have been unjustly punished by frequent transfers?—That was the feeling at the time I am speaking of, but it is not so now. They are better treated now than they have been for years, and they are more satisfied.

242. Is your experience under Inspector Pardy that he encourages constables by his treatment of them to discharge their duties efficiently?—Yes.

243. In regard to offences by constables, should they be tried by a tribunal apart from their officers?—Yes. I think the Magistrate's Court should be open to all constables as a first tribunal.

244. *The Chairman.*] Are transfers not so frequent now as they used to be?—Not by a long way. At the time of my removal some eight or ten constables were removed all over the colony, but for what reason we did not know. It is, of course, a stain on a constable's official character to be removed. It is always thought he is removed for something.

245. You think that all police offences should be dealt with by the Magistrate?—Yes; either publicly or privately.

246. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever known of a feeling among the men that activity in enforcing the licensing law was not desirable if they wished to get promotion?—There was a feeling that it did not do one any good.

247. As a matter of fact, have you never known of an instance where publicans have boasted that they would get certain police-officers removed?—I have heard of publicans talking in that way.

248. Have you heard of such a threat in connection with the Shamrock Hotel, in Dunedin?—Yes.

249. Whom did they threaten?—Sergeant Mackay.

250. Was Sergeant Mackay pretty vigilant in connection with licensing matters?—He was very active.

251. *The Chairman.*] Who made the threat?—I say I heard that such a threat was made by the people of the Shamrock Hotel—Tilburn.

252. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was not that common talk among the men in the barracks at Dunedin?—Yes.

253. Was Constable Mayne associated with you in Dunedin?—Yes.

254. Did you ever hear him boast of his political influence?—No.

255. Did you ever hear of any other constable boasting of his political influence?—I cannot recollect any.

256. Did you ever serve with Constable Aitcheson?—Yes.

257. Have you heard him boast of his political influence?—He was a man who boasted of many things, and no notice was taken of it.

258. Was there a feeling that he had political influence?—It was so said among the men.

259. Was the same thing said about Constable Mayne?—I have no recollection of it.

260. Inspector Pardy said, in Dunedin, that his plans for the detection of sly-grog selling had sometimes leaked out. Have you any knowledge of how it leaked out?—I have not.

261. A witness said yesterday that the people talked commonly in Tapanui about a detective with the goggles being in the district?—It was before my time.

262. Do you know of any plans having leaked out while you were there?—No. The plans I had in operation were known only to the Inspector and myself. I took care of that.

263. Did you move about among the farmers of the district much?—Yes.

264. Did you notice signs of drinking there?—No.

265. Compared with other places you have been in in the colony, what is the reputation of your district for sobriety?—I was in Tapanui ten or eleven years ago when licenses existed there, to relieve Constable King for a fortnight, and I attended a two days' race-meeting. My opinion of it was that it was a "pretty hot shop," and others who were there said it was a warm meeting.

266. *The Chairman.*] Had you any difficulty in performing your duty then?—There were the usual drunken disturbances that had to be suppressed, but I had no difficulty in doing my duty.

267. *Mr. Poynton.*] Were there two constables?—I was there to relieve Constable King.

268. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is there a general feeling in your district that those engaged in illicit trading have the sympathy of the Justices of the Peace?—That is my opinion. There has been a change of late, and there is one man who has no sympathy with them. I cannot class them altogether as in sympathy with the sellers.

269. *The Chairman.*] You stated that at Tapanui in the last few years you have had no cases of drunkenness at sports?—That is so.

270. Were you in Dunedin at the races?—No.

271. Have you been at any public gatherings in Dunedin lately?—No.

272. Have you much crime in your district?—Very little.

273. Very little of all kinds?—Yes.
274. What is the most prevalent crime or offence in your district?—I do not know that there is any I could name.
275. You are the only constable in your district?—Yes.
276. Do you think that numerically the Force is not strong enough there?—I think it would be advisable for the head of the department to adopt some system of sending detectives round, to follow some avocation in the district, until such time as they could carry out their plans.
277. What did you mean when you spoke about the police having more “means” in the district?—I did not mean monetary means, but some detective assistance in a particular way.
278. Has there been in the past any difficulty in obtaining assistance if you wished it?—Not the slightest.
279. Has there been any impediment whatever, or difficulty, or discouragement put in your way to prosecute the sly-grog sellers by your superior officers, or by the department?—No, none whatever.
280. *Inspector Pardy.*] You heard what was said about the spasmodic efforts of the police to put down the traffic?—Yes.
281. Is it not the fact that after a prosecution, and for some time after, these sly-grog sellers are extremely cautious?—Yes.
282. And is not that the reason why so long a period takes place between a series of prosecutions?—Yes.
283. You know that we did not stop because we had a prosecution?—That is so. There have been repeated attempts.
284. Is it not the fact that witnesses often go back on us?—Yes.
285. I have no recollection of the delays you speak of?—The first was about August or September, 1895, and the second about July in 1896, or perhaps earlier.
286. Did you ever ascertain from me the cause of the delay?—No.
287. Probably you are not aware that there was a difficulty in the way at the time, not through my being absent, but a difficulty I could not overcome?—I am not aware of that.
288. Is it not the fact that I have devoted a large portion of my time and brains to making plans to attack the liquor trade?—Yes, and it has been a difficult task.
289. In regard to defaulters’ sheets, I want to clear myself, as you have spoken generally in respect to Inspectors. Are you aware that I have never entered a charge on a man’s sheet without informing him of it?—I believe that has been your system.
290. Are you aware that in charges made against the men, either by the outside public or by the sergeants, I give the men any remand or adjournment they ask for?—I confined my remarks to Inspector Broham. I was never before Inspector Pardy.
291. As regards transfers, you spoke about the Inspectors generally. Do you know that I have never made a transfer unless under instructions from Wellington, and that the name of the constable was always mentioned?—I believe so. I have heard it said among the men that in New Plymouth the men were more satisfied than they were anywhere else. I understand that what Mr. Pardy states was the system he acted on.
292. *Mr. Taylor.*] While in Dunedin, do you know whether it was the custom for any constable to frequent breweries at night-time?—Yes, I believe it was the custom.
293. *The Chairman.*] Within your knowledge, or do you only believe it?—I have never frequented breweries myself, but I believe it was done.
294. Why?—Because I have frequently seen a quantity of beer being carried down.
295. Where?—To the police-station, and coming from the direction of the brewery.
296. The question was, Whether you are aware that the police frequented the brewery at any time?—I believe so.
297. Why?—I have seen them coming from that direction at relief-time. I have seen them coming from the direction of Speight’s brewery.
298. Do you say you have seen quantities of beer being carried by the men?—By a man.
299. A constable?—Yes. He is not in the Force now.
300. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was it not common talk in the barracks that such had been the custom for years?—Yes.
301. *Mr. Tambridge.*] How long ago was that?—Close on five years ago.
302. You remained in the vicinity of Dunedin for years after that?—No, I have been at Tapanui.
303. Did it continue after you left the neighbourhood?—It fell away considerably. Towards the latter days of my services in Dunedin I question if it was carried on at all.
304. So that in 1894 the habit of going to the brewery had discontinued altogether?—Almost discontinued.
305. Since you have been in Tapanui, have you done your utmost to stop sly-grog selling?—Yes.
306. Your very utmost?—Yes.
307. Then, it is wrong for the schoolmaster and the doctor to say you have not done so?—Yes, entirely wrong.
308. And you think that if the steps you recommended were adopted it might be entirely stamped out?—Not entirely; I said “almost.”
309. Have you recommended any steps to Inspector Pardy, or any one else, that have not been adopted?—I said before that all my recommendations have been adopted.
310. Your two answers were inconsistent. You said that if the steps you recommended were carried out the traffic might be entirely stamped out, and I want to know whether any steps you have recommended have not been carried out?—I verbally suggested to Inspector Pardy something

that he was to consider. That was on his last visit to Tapanui. It was a step that might be taken, and he agreed with it, and said that when he had time to think it over he would take it into consideration. That suggestion might be adopted yet.

311. As regards the amending of the law, do you think that if all boarding-houses were open to inspection, the same as licensed houses, the difficulty would be met in a great measure?—Yes, I feel sure it would.

312. *The Chairman.*] With reference to hardships in connection with the police being called out to fires, and the injustice that you consider existed in the manner in which reports were dealt with, do those complaints not refer to a remote period?—Yes. I understand that when Mr. Seddon took office he abolished the system, and issued a circular of a retrospective nature dealing with the production of all reports in connection with constables. Since that we have had a more independent position than before.

313. So that those hardships do not exist at present?—No.

314. Therefore, with reference to the condition under which you are at present serving you have no complaint as to those particulars?—No.

315. Have you ever in your service been reproached for your activity in connection with licensing matters?—No.

316. On the other hand, have you been encouraged?—Under Inspector Pardy, Yes; under Inspector Broham and Inspector Moore I was neither encouraged nor discouraged.

317. Did you take any action in your earlier days against the licensees of houses?—Yes. Under Inspector Weldon I was detailed for special duty to detect Sunday trading, along with Constable MacRae, now of Milton. We laid five or six informations, which resulted in the conviction of some, and the dismissal of others. In Lawrence, in conjunction with Constable Bowman, now Sergeant Bowman, of Dunedin, I also got a conviction. In Auckland I initiated a prosecution against Mr. Lynch, of the Clarendon Hotel, and the charge was dismissed. A second information was laid, and also dismissed.

318. And were you rebuked in any of those cases?—No. Under Inspector Pardy, of Dunedin, I laid informations against hotelkeepers, which resulted in their conviction; and I was encouraged by him in being detailed off to perform confidential duty. I took that as encouragement.

319. Your experience throughout the whole of your service has been the contrary of what has been suggested here, then—that the liquor interest interferes with the free action of the police in dealing with the liquor question?—That has not been my experience.

320. Your experience has been the contrary?—Yes.

321. On the question of pensions, do you think the men would prefer a pension in preference to a retiring-allowance?—I am in favour of a pension.

322. Would you be in favour of contributing to the pension fund by stoppages from your pay?—Yes, certainly.

323. Do you think there should be an age of retirement, when officers and all should retire?—Yes, I do.

324. You think it would encourage promotion?—Yes; if such a pension system were in vogue.

325. Do you think that without a pension it is difficult to maintain an efficient Police Force?—Yes.

326. Owing to what?—Owing to the number of old men who seem to get glued to the service, and cannot give it up on account of having no competency for themselves.

327. Should uniforms be provided by the officer or the department?—If the circular recently issued is to be adhered to—all constables to be in uniform—then, I say, that country constables should be provided with uniform. A man in the country has to provide leggings and cord trousers, and working among horses he destroys two suits to the one used by the man in the town. There is another matter which I wish to bring under the notice of the Commissioners. It is in connection with the Illicit Distillation Act. I produce a copy of the circular issued by Colonel Hume in 1892. It is as follows:—

(Circular Memo., No. 9/92.)

Police Department, Wellington, 6th April, 1892.

Illicit Distillation.

WITH reference to the illicit distillation which it is believed is still carried on in some of the inland districts, it is notified for general information and guidance that although the rewards now offered under Customs G.O. No. 388 are very liberal, still, as a further incentive to zeal and energy, the Hon. the Defence Minister is pleased to direct that any conviction of importance obtained through the special exertions of a police official shall, on the recommendation of the Customs Department, be made a cause for promotion under Regulation No. 61.

The discovery and suppression of illicit distillation in inland districts depend to a large extent, if not altogether, on the police, and at seaports they should be a valuable agency against smuggling.

A. HUME, Commissioner of Police.

I obtained a conviction under that Act, which conviction, the circular says, may be cause for promotion in addition to the reward.

328. When did you obtain the conviction?—On the 24th June, 1896. I received a reward from the Customs Department. I applied for promotion, but received no reply.

329. What was the date of your application?—About the 7th or 8th of July.

330. *Colonel Hume.*] Did you make application to the Customs Department for the reward?—No, I applied to my Inspector, and did not deem it my duty to have anything to do with any other department but my own. I simply drew attention to the circular, and left the rest to the department.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, examined on oath.

331. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Thomas Griffith.

332. What rank do you hold in the service?—First-class constable.

333. Stationed where?—At Balclutha.

334. Since when?—Since August, 1896.

335. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you join the Force?—On the 3rd May, 1876, at Dunedin.
336. Did you resign at any time?—Yes. I remained in the Force till the 30th June, 1882, and I resigned by voluntary resignation after having served for some years as a first-class constable.
337. When did you rejoin?—On the 1st February, 1883, after an absence of only seven months.
338. In what rank did you rejoin?—Unfortunately at the bottom of the list, as third-class, and I was kept third as long as it was possible to keep me.
339. What is the opinion of the police generally in regard to the present Commission? Did the men desire its appointment?—That wants a little explanation. The good men think it is the best thing that has ever happened, and the bad ones think it is the worst.
340. Were any special reasons given for your being placed in Balclutha in 1896?—No, unfortunately; it was a grievance on my part that I was sent here.
341. Where were you stationed before that?—At Mosgiel; but, for a trumped-up case by a madman—one which I wish the Commissioners to take note of—I was sent here against my will.
342. What was the name of the man who charged you?—It was a man named Ruthin, who said I had been great with his wife. He had followed me about so much, and given me so much abuse, that at last I had to arrest him. He was bound over to keep the peace; and then he sent threatening letters to me, and that was the cause of my coming here.
343. Nothing was said to you when you were removed to Balclutha, as to the need for being active in suppressing sly-grog selling?—Yes.
344. Who said it?—Inspector Pardy said I would have to do my duty without fear or favour, and that I would have to put down sly-grog selling.
345. What has happened in that connection since you came here?—I have had prosecutions, and several convictions.
346. Will you give us a list of them?—I have had about twenty-three cases, some of which have been dismissed.
347. As a result of your experience, what is the best way to stamp out sly-grog selling here?—If they would fine £100, as the Magistrate did at Invercargill, and double subsequent fines, there would be little sly-grog selling.
348. You think the fines are too small?—Yes.
349. It does not discourage the trade?—That is so.
350. Has the department always followed your suggestions in regard to the suppression of the sale of liquor?—Yes.
351. In your experience as a police-officer, are the licensing laws as strictly enforced as other laws?—No, they are not.
352. Why?—Because the publicans' and brewers' interests have had such an influence on politics that the constable who did his duty was shifted from post to pillar. Immediately he made himself obnoxious to a certain class and carried out the laws he was removed.
353. *The Chairman.*] You have cases to cite?—I got nine shifts myself in twenty years.
354. Do you attribute that to political influence?—I have not a doubt about it.
355. What reason have you for saying that these nine removals had anything to do with politics?—It was public talk that I would be removed, and immediately I was.
356. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have publicans threatened that they would have you shifted?—Yes.
357. And you were shifted?—Yes.
358. And that is the reason you think they had an influence?—Yes.
359. *The Chairman.*] Did they announce that they would have you shifted?—Yes, they did.
360. Who are "they"?—The publicans at Outram.
361. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where were you first stationed when you joined the Force?—I joined in Dunedin.
362. What station did you occupy next?—Riverton, then Invercargill, Mataura, Lowther, and Waikaia, where I was when I resigned.
363. When you rejoined, where was it?—Invercargill.
364. And after Invercargill?—I was sent to Lumsden, and then to Outram, next to Mosgiel, and then to Balclutha.
365. Do you know of any officers who have remained in stations for fifteen or twenty years?—Not in Southland. Unfortunately, I have been kept in the worst climates—in Southland.
366. Have you on more than one occasion been threatened for interfering with publicans?—Yes, at Mataura.
367. You have had experience yourself as a publican, have you not?—Yes, for seven months.
368. *The Chairman.*] Where was the first threatening you had?—At Mataura.
369. And the next?—At Waikaia.
370. Were you not successful as a publichouse-keeper?—No. I lost all I had, and I rejoined the Police Force.
371. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been threatened by the publican interest on more than two occasions?—Yes.
372. And has the threat been followed by removal?—Yes, always.
373. Do you think that fear of the publichouse interest has been general among the men?—Yes, it has been very general.
374. Have you heard the men say so?—Yes. The men have told me I was a fool for doing my duty with the publicans, and that in my old age I would have to fall back to get a living from the brewery.
375. Were reasons ever given by the department for your removals?—I was removed from Mosgiel through the madman business.
376. On other occasions was it simply an order?—I would simply get the order.

377. Do you think the registration of all boardinghouses and private hotels, giving the police the right of entry, would facilitate the enforcement of the licensing law?—It would, undoubtedly.

378. Where do you usually swear informations in connection with sly-grog cases?—I get them signed by the Magistrate, or by Mr. Dabinett, of Catlin's, or at Dunedin.

379. Are there any Justices of the Peace in Balclutha?—Four or five.

380. Do you not go before them?—No.

381. Any special reason?—Yes.

382. What?—For fear it would leak out before I got a search warrant to have the place searched; and if it leaked out I would get the blame for it.

383. Do you regard the local Justices of the Peace as sympathetic with the sly-grog sellers?—Yes, and that was the reason I went elsewhere.

384. Have they thwarted you in your duty?—Some of them would.

385. Did you ever have an interview with any Justice of the Peace about a witness named Hamilton having been spirited away in connection with one of your cases?—It was common talk.

386. Have you discussed it with a Justice of the Peace? Did you suspect a Justice of the Peace of having spirited the witness away?—Yes.

387. Who was it?—John McNeill.

388. Did you see George Thomson about it?—I may have discussed it in the ordinary way of conversation.

389. You had no special interview with Thomson on the matter?—I do not think I had. I followed the witness to the ranges on the Roxburgh Station, and I was out all one night hunting for him. When I came across him I gave him £1 out of my own pocket so that he would have no excuse for not coming to Court, but he returned the money to me in a letter, stating that he could not find it convenient to attend.

390. Is there dissatisfaction in the Force in regard to the method of entering offences on the defaulters' sheets?—In the past it could not possibly have been worse.

391. How recently?—When the Seddon Government came into power.

392. Then, a regulation made by Mr. Seddon improved matters?—Yes. There was a regulation issued, when Mr. Seddon became Defence Minister, that when Inspectors reported constables they had to give the constables a copy of the report, so that they might reply to any charge against them.

393. Before that, were constables the victims of offences of which they knew nothing?—Yes.

394. Do you think that constables charged with offences should have some tribunal to try them other than the department?—Yes. If the Inspector formulates a charge he is the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury all in one. That might be right enough if men were honourable and just, but when they take advantage of their position or take "a down" on a constable he has marks put against him that he has no right to have.

395. *The Chairman.*] Are you speaking of the present state of things?—I am speaking of the state of things that existed before 1891.

396. *Mr. Taylor.*] How does Balclutha, under "No license," compare, so far as order and sobriety are concerned, with other towns of a similar size?—It is superior to any town of a similar size in the colony. It is a very rare thing to see a man the worse of drink in Balclutha.

397. Have you had any arrests for drunkenness in Balclutha since you have been here?—One, and it was at the railway-station.

398. He would come from outside?—Probably.

399. Is sly-grog selling on the decrease or the increase?—On the decrease.

400. Is it not possible to stamp it out?—It is a difficult thing to say that. There is sly-grog selling where there are licensed houses, in Dunedin, Invercargill, and Christchurch. It is very hard, like many other evils, to stamp out.

401. If the prosecutions were more frequent would it not discourage the men?—Prosecutions have been so frequent lately that the sellers are getting so clever that they can evade us.

402. They are very astute?—Yes. All strangers who come to the place are looked on as detectives, no matter what size he is.

403. Have you applied for removal from here?—Yes.

404. On what grounds?—Chiefly owing to the attitude of the Magistrate to me.

405. What do you refer to specially? Was it in connection with some prosecutions?—Yes. Mr. Hawkins generally treats the police as rogues and vagabonds.

406. *The Chairman.*] What was his attitude to you?—On a Court day one of the solicitors asked me for some forms, and I told him to go into my office to get them. He came back, and said he could not find them, and I went and got them for him. I did not delay. When I returned the Magistrate called me and addressed me from the bench, saying I had no right to leave the Court; that I was his servant, and that I was to attend to him, and to him alone. I tried to explain that I was on Court duty, getting the forms for the solicitor; but he would not allow me to explain, and the result was that the people in the body of the Court thought that I had committed a great crime. I determined then that, if possible, I would get away from the district.

407. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has he discredited your evidence in cases?—He discredited three of us in a case once.

408. That is why you are of opinion that he thinks you are perjurers?—Yes.

409. You know that there is a reward fund in connection with the Force?—Yes.

410. Are the awards equitably distributed?—No.

411. Is there dissatisfaction among the men on that score?—Yes.

412. Would it not be better if the system of monetary awards were abolished altogether?—What would you give instead?

413. Make marks for promotion?—Yes, that would be better.

414. The men are jealous of the rewards that are issued?—Yes, because they are not issued fairly.
415. Have you ever known of cases where persistent agitation has secured rewards?—Yes, if one had friends.
416. Were you connected with the Lochindorb attempted murder?—Yes.
417. In what way?—I worked it up from the first.
418. When was that?—In May last.
419. Was there a conviction?—Yes. It was a case that was not reported to me. The man shot did not believe his mate shot him; the doctor did not report it, and the station-owner did not report it; and yet I followed the case up day and night in terrible weather.
420. *The Chairman.*] Did the Inspector know this?—Yes.
421. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you get any reward for that action?—No. The man was brought to justice, and received a sentence of fifteen years. There was another case of housebreaking I would like to mention.
422. Have you known of a case in connection with the Police Force where political influence has over-ridden the influence of the department?—The ruination of the Police Force is political and masonic influence.
423. Have you ever known of a case of outside influence obtaining something a man would not have got in the ordinary course?—It is like this: A man is promoted, and no one knows why. We will say McIntyre, for instance. One member of the Force will ask another, "Why did McIntyre get promoted?" and the reply is, "He is a Mason, and is well in with all the 'big-bugs.'" Or another case will be heard of, and he will be asked why he got over the heads of his seniors; and the reply is that his family is strong in such a member's district, and they worked it with the member, and the member with the department.
424. Is that feeling general among the men?—Yes.
425. Do you know of any case of promotion which the men consider to be unfair?—I am at a disadvantage, in that I did not expect to be called on to give evidence, but if I had time to look over the last promotions I could pick out several cases. There are constables who are promoted over me to be sergeants who have not near the service I have, and who have never had such good cases as I have had.
426. Take the case of Constable O'Rourke, of Otaki?—I do not know him.
427. He was promoted for some special reason that was not gazetted. Would not that cause dissatisfaction in the Force?—Yes, it looks as if there was something suspicious.
428. If the department told you that it was an oversight that the reasons were not gazetted, would that allay your suspicions?—Not unless it was to be seen in print.
429. *The Chairman.*] And notification of special reasons is better made late than never?—Yes.
430. *Mr. Taylor.*] You rejoined as third-class constable in 1882?—Yes.
431. When were you promoted to second-class?—On the 28th August, 1888, for merit.
432. And when were you promoted to first-class?—In 1894.
433. *The Chairman.*] Were you Clerk of the Court at that time?—Yes. The promotion in 1888 was for exceptional merit in connection with the detection of offenders. My notice of promotion reads: "For exceptional merit in connection with the detection and conviction of offenders, Harry Freen and Albert Edward Mawer, convicted of housebreaking; as well as spirited conduct in arresting Martin Johnston when armed with a double-barrelled gun, which was loaded, cocked, and presented at the constable. Third-class Constable Thomas Griffith is promoted to the rank of second-class from the 1st instant.—Wellington, 3rd September, 1888."
434. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you leave Outram?—About four years ago.
435. You went to Mosgiel?—Yes.
436. Did you use any political influence to get shifted from Outram?—No.
437. Who is the member for the district?—Mr. Carnecross.
438. Did you not discuss with him the advisability of getting a shift?—No; but I know what you are referring to. I believe some of my friends did, owing to the treatment I received there; and I wanted to get near a school for my children. I was then shifted to Mosgiel.
439. Have not constables been driven to use outside influence?—Yes; because they could not get justice inside.
440. Is there not a feeling within the past six months that things are improving?—Yes; since the new Commissioner came.
441. You have confidence in the new arrangement?—Yes. We feel that we have an officer at the head of the department who understands police duty.
442. And you feel that he has a free hand, and that he will not be touched by members?—Yes, it is said he will have a free hand, and that he will be untrammelled by politics.
443. Did you have a prosecution against Dunne, jun., while you were here?—Yes; and against Dunne, sen.
444. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You said that some constables had been promoted over your head?—Yes.
445. Will you give me some names?—If I had the *Gazette* I could point out some.
446. Were your former services allowed to you?—Yes; my previous services were allowed to me on the 9th March, 1895.
447. But you rejoined the Force as a third-class constable?—Yes. I applied to have my former services allowed to me, and the request was allowed, but afterwards cancelled.
448. Why was it cancelled?—The Inspector raised a point of broken periods, and it was taken from me.
449. It was found that in giving you back your former services they had made a mistake?—So they said.
450. You know now that if a constable resigns from the Force he loses all claim to his former services?—Yes; but what I complain of is that immediately I came back to the Force they made me do the work of a first-class constable.

451. Your number in the Force is 433, is it not?—Yes.
452. Now, the junior officer holding superior rank to you at present is Sergeant Wright, is it not?—Yes.
453. Do you know his number?—It is 424.
454. He is senior to you?—Yes.
455. You were advanced to first-class constable in 1894?—Yes, for meritorious conduct.
456. And Sergeant Wright was advanced to first-class constable on the 21st March, 1893, so that he is not only your senior in service but in the rank of first-class constable?—Yes; but I am allowed my time.
457. You see you cannot count your former services?—Yes, I am allowed it, but they will not let me count it in.
458. You have been very successful in prosecutions in Balclutha?—Yes. I have been successful wherever I have been stationed. I have been known as the “thief-catcher.”
459. I should like to know where you think rewards have been improperly given?—Well, I have seen that for sitting on a horse’s head and keeping it down—the animal having fallen down—a constable has got a reward of £5. In other cases constables have been rewarded for the most trifling things.
460. What do you refer to?—It was the case of a man who stopped a runaway horse.
461. Do you not think that sometimes a man might incur serious risk to life and limb in stopping a runaway horse?—Sometimes he might.
462. And a man who risks himself in that way, and who is probably the means of saving the lives and limbs of other persons, is deserving of reward?—Yes. A great many others would do the same thing as well as the policeman.
463. Do you begrudge those men the rewards they got for stopping runaway horses?—No; but I say that rewards have not been given fairly.
464. Have you not spoken of Lochindorb?—Yes.
465. Were you recommended for reward in that case?—The Inspector told me I had been recommended.
466. You do not know the reason it was not granted?—I understand the Commissioner of Police said I had only done my duty.
467. You did not get the papers back?—No. My reason for thinking I should get a reward is that it is possible for a man to display greater tact and ability in arresting a man who only gets eighteen months than in the case of a man who is executed for murder. It is not so much the arrest, as the manner in which a case is got together, and the trouble and worry in getting evidence.
468. It is not the length of imprisonment that a man gets that should carry reward, but the ability displayed?—Yes. In the Lochindorb case, for instance, the station is a long way off. The hut was miles away from other houses, and it was occupied by only the two men. There were exceptional circumstances surrounding the case that really entitled me to recognition.
469. *Mr. Taylor.*] The Inspector recommended the reward, did he not?—I believe so.
470. *Colonel Hume.*] Did you arrest the murderer?—No; but I was the cause of his being arrested.
471. How so?—I found out the boat in which he left, and went to the telegraph-office on a Sunday and sent the news to Dunedin.
472. And was he arrested in Dunedin?—In Wellington.
473. Then, your telegram was practically useless?—No; my telegram told the police the boat he was on.
474. You say that the discontent owing to the rewards is that the constables who have arrested certain people have not been rewarded; now you think the person who arrested a murderer ought to have got a reward?—If he displayed any special intelligence, he should.
475. And you should have got some as well?—Yes, it should have been apportioned if there was merit in the case at all.
476. Would you give us another case in which you think the rewards have not been properly distributed?—Yes. I had a case of robbery at Titiri. It occurred in the Milton district. I traced the offender in that case, and the day following that on which I got the correspondence I had arrested him. He was sentenced to three years. I think I was recommended by Inspector Parry for reward, but I got nothing. The public were pleased at the arrest, and subscribed £4 or £5; but I refused to take it, and the money was sent to the Inspector, who sent it to Colonel Hume. That gentleman refused to let me have it, saying I had only done my duty.
477. What was that case?—It was the case of James Millar.
478. What year?—Nearly five years ago.
479. You stated that the way promotions were made gave great dissatisfaction in the Force?—Yes.
480. Carry your memory back to 1890. Can you tell me any promotions that have given dissatisfaction since then?—Sergeant Wright’s case was quoted by the Commissioner, but it does not affect me.
481. I would like you to carry your memory back further, as the dissatisfaction appears to have been when I was Commissioner?—I think it was when you were the Commissioner that the greatest dissatisfaction was.
482. Can you give us a case?—I did not think I was entitled to promotion, but I have heard other constables commenting on other cases.
483. Do you read the *Police Gazette* carefully?—Yes.
484. Were there many promotions made?—Very few.
485. But they gave dissatisfaction?—Every one was dissatisfied.

486. It was because you expected promotion?—No, I did not expect it, but others complained that some men had been promoted over their heads.

487. Were there any men promoted over your head?—Not mentioning my back service, I may say I had no grievance.

488. Can you give us any case, then?—I cannot. When a body of men get together they talk about things, but at present I cannot give you a particular case.

489. You said it should be gazetted according to the Act, if a man was promoted for any special act, or promoted out of his turn?—It would be better if it was gazetted.

490. Now, if you studied your *Gazette* carefully you would know that this man O'Rourke was gazetted?—I do not know anything about him.

491. If he was gazetted there would be no grievance?—I know nothing about him.

492. Did you not say that the grievance was that it did not appear in print?—I said that if a man was promoted over the heads of others it would be better if it was in print.

493. *The Chairman.*] Do you know any man who was promoted for special services whose name did not appear in print?—No.

494. Then, you have no complaint on that ground?—No.

495. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, really, your complaint is that you are not allowed to go over the heads of men who were parading the streets for eight hours a night while you were a publican?—No, that is not it. I do not think that is a fair way to put it. I say that seeing I got my back services allowed, and that I was made to do the work of a first-class constable and only got a third-class constable's pay, it was not fair treatment. I was sent to take charge of important stations for the simple reason that I had had experience, and that my Inspectors thought I had the ability.

496. Are there not other third-class constables in charge of outside stations?—I am not aware of any.

497. Are there not fifty or sixty?—Not in such important stations as the ones I had.

498. Mosgiel?—No.

499. Where?—Lumsden and Waikaia.

500. There was a third-class constable at Waikaia—Mayne?—Yes, Mayne was there.

501. Was he a third-class constable?—Yes, and I think he is that yet.

502. And there was nothing detrimental to the district in consequence?—Perhaps it would have been better if a first-class constable had been in charge.

503. *The Chairman.*] You say that you have no drunkenness here, and that only one case was taken at the railway-station?—Yes.

504. How far away is the nearest licensed publichouse?—Stirling—not three miles away.

505. And, notwithstanding that fact, you have no cases of drunkenness?—No.

Subsequently, the witness said: I have been confidentially informed that Constable Christie is under the impression, and the public as well, that I have been the cause of charges being brought against him. I now swear that I am not. I have never supplied Mr. Taylor or any one else with facts about Constable Christie.

506. *Inspector Pardy.*] You heard it stated in Court that prosecutions in sly-grog cases suffered through you having to refer to me. Is that the case?—No. I wish to say that I have never met in all my experience a better officer than Inspector Pardy, or one capable of better giving advice.

507. Do you not get valuable advice from me?—Yes. I now wish to produce a list of breaches of the licensing laws I prosecuted in, and where:—

PROSECUTIONS FOR BREACHES OF LICENSING ACTS BY CONSTABLE GRIFFITH, AND WHERE PROSECUTED.

1. Dunedin to Riverton: Prosecuted Mr. Schmidt, hotelkeeper, Riverton, for permitting a raffle. He was fined. I was removed at the instance of Mr. ———, hotelkeeper, by influence with the member for the district, Mr. Hodgkinson. I was transferred to Invercargill.

2. Invercargill to Mataura: I had Messrs. Cameron and Humphries fined for breaches of the Licensing Acts; Mr. Humphries for billiard-playing after hours; and Mr. Cameron for dancing in his hotel after hours. I also had hotelkeepers at Gore cautioned.

3, 4. Mataura to Lowther: I had at Lowther two prosecutions for sly-grog selling—Messrs. Fell and R. Howarth. I also had objected to the license of the Centre Hill Hotel, for permitting drunkenness. Place burnt down; Mr. Frances, licensee, cleared.

5. Lowther to Waikaia: I had Mr. Davidson and D. Mathewson prosecuted for breaches of the Licensing Acts. I resigned here, and rejoined at Invercargill.

At Invercargill I had Mr. Stark, of Avenal, fined for Sunday trading. I had Mr. ———, Strathearn Hotel, fined for Sunday-trading. I had Mr. ———, Clifton Hotel, prosecuted for Sunday trading; and others reported and cautioned.

6. Invercargill to Lumsden: I had Mr. George Tucker's license taken from him, and other hotels cautioned by the Licensing Bench. I also had Richard Howarth fined for sly-grog selling.

7. Lumsden to Outram: I had Peter Ferguson and John Henderson fined for sly-grog selling. I had Thomas McKay prosecuted for breaches of the Act. I had Mr. Charles Johnstone's license refused. I had Mr. Andrew ——— license taken away.

8. Outram to Mosgiel: Hotels well conducted here.

9. Mosgiel to Balclutha: Laid twenty-one informations for sly-grog selling since August, 1896. Six convictions, £210 fines and costs; fifteen cases dismissed.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, examined on oath.

508. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Alfred Edward Remer.

509. What rank are you?—First-class constable.

510. Stationed where?—At Clinton.

511. When did you join?—I think it was in 1880.

512. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where did you first serve?—In Wellington. I was there as mounted constable under Inspector Shearman. I was then transferred to Ashburton as mounted man, and served there under Inspector Broham for about twenty months. When I left Timaru I was

transferred to charge of Pembroke, where I remained for nine years, and at my own request I was transferred from Pembroke to Clinton. That was about two years ago.

513. Did you know it was vacant when you applied for transfer?—I applied four years before I obtained my transfer, and it was in the course of time that my request was granted. I limited applications to stations where I would have a similar station to Pembroke.

514. How long have you been at Clinton?—I think I went there in May, two years ago.

515. Who was your predecessor?—Constable Pascoe.

516. Is he in the Force now?—No, he has left.

517. Was he dismissed?—Yes.

518. Was it gazetted?—The cause of his dismissal was not gazetted, but I think it was for drunkenness.

519. Was he in charge of the Clinton district for a time after the hotels were closed?—Yes, for about a year afterwards.

520. Is there any sly-grog selling in Clinton now?—Not to my knowledge.

521. None whatever?—I do not think there is any. I may speak positively on the point, because Clinton is the hotbed of Prohibition. The Justices of the Peace there are staunch—one of them very staunch—in the temperance cause; and I am sure that if illicit selling of liquor was going on they would quickly let me know. I have had absolutely no complaint of sly-grog selling going on since I have been there, and I have seen nothing of it.

522. Are there any signs whatever of drinking?—None. Of course, I cannot say it is not going on, but there is no reason to think it is.

523. Have you had prosecutions for sly-grog selling since you have been in the Clutha?—No.

524. Would you have any hesitation in swearing informations before a Clinton Justice of the Peace?—None whatever.

525. You would not be embarrassed in the execution of your duty by the sympathies of the Justices of the Peace?—No; for the reason that I know they are straightforward, honourable men, and what they did in an official way would be only known to myself.

526. Do you think the registration of private hotels throughout the colony, and especially in "No license" districts, giving the police the right of entry, would facilitate the enforcement of the licensing law?—Unquestionably, it is the one thing that is necessary, I think, to help the police.

527. Have you had any licensing prosecution in any of your stations?—Yes; possibly as many as most men. When in Wellington I prosecuted single-handed against hotelkeepers, and they were convicted. In Ashburton, I also prosecuted in some cases, and one publican lost his license. At Pembroke, I had two or three convictions for sly-grog selling. It is safe to say I prosecuted twenty times.

528. Has there been a feeling in the Police Force that political interference has interfered with the Force?—Yes; but, as far as I am concerned, I know nothing of it beyond that the feeling exists. I have to say too, that men have been put above me. For instance, there is Wright. I was a second-class constable before Wright joined the service. I remained a second-class constable while Constable Smith, of Featherston, went through all the ranks. I was second-class constable when Constable O'Rourke was doing duty in Wellington as third-class constable, when the Chairman of this Commission told him on one occasion to speak English. That constable is now in the first-class, and is senior to me.

529. Have you discussed the promotions of Constables Smith and O'Rourke with any one during the last year? How did you know about them?—I saw it in the *Gazette*, and I was much hurt. There was a page of promotions made by Colonel Hume, and I should have taken no exception to them, but at the foot of the list I saw that these two men had been promoted to first-class. There was a memorandum to the effect that promotion had gone strictly by seniority, where efficiency and suitability was shown, and I naturally was up in arms, and wanted to know in what respect I was unsuitable; and I made a lengthy report to the head of the department. The reply was that promotion had gone strictly by seniority, except in two cases, which were special promotions.

530. For which the special reasons were not gazetted?—No. Neither were they given to me, but I did not follow the thing further. I took Colonel Hume's word for it, that there were special reasons for promotion, and there I let it stop.

531. Suppose the reasons for promotion of Constable O'Rourke were that he had shown ability in identification of prisoners, would you consider that sufficient?—Yes.

532. The bare fact of reasons not being given is likely to create discontent?—Yes.

533. Do you think that other men in the Force have also noticed these discrepancies?—Yes.

534. Is there a feeling in the Force that political influence has been rife?—It is talked about among the men, but I have had so little contact with them in the last twelve or thirteen years that I cannot say. I have been at Pembroke and Clinton nearly all the time. There is a feeling, however, that something is very "crooked" in connection with the promotions.

535. Is there a feeling abroad now that the Force is going to see better times?—Certainly. I could give one instance where some influence was brought to bear. I applied for a transfer from Pembroke, giving good and sufficient reasons, and instead of being transferred I was kept there until four years afterwards. Inspector Pardy was at my station visiting on one occasion and told me that the transfer would likely be within a few weeks, and that I was going to Lawrence. I objected to go to Lawrence, because the emoluments of the station were nothing, and there was another man to look after, and it was within the goldfields. Inspector Pardy told me that what I would lose in one way I would gain in another, and I then said I would go wherever I was sent. I wanted to get near a larger centre. Inspector Pardy said whenever a place could be found for Sergeant Conn I would go to Lawrence; but on that very day there appeared a paragraph in a Dunedin paper stating that Sergeant Mackay was to relieve Sergeant Conn, therefore the Inspector

knew nothing of the transfer. The original conversation between Colonel Hume and Inspector Pardy was, I believe, that I was to go to Lawrence; but the result was that another man was sent, and Inspector Pardy did not know it. I did not mention it as a complaint, as I am glad I did not go.

536. Do you not think that that kind of thing is likely to interfere with discipline, as it shows that your superior officer is powerless to protect you?—Yes. I think an officer in charge of a district knows the capabilities of his men, and, if he has not the actual power to transfer within his district, he should have the power to recommend; and that recommendation should be given effect to, unless there are reasons for doing otherwise.

537. You have been in charge of a number of townships of a similar size in New Zealand: How does Clinton compare with the townships of a similar size which have publichouses?—There is absolutely no disorder in Clinton.

538. You served under Inspector Broham for a time?—Yes.

539. Did he harass you in the execution of your duty?—No, I do not think so.

540. Were you ever before him charged with trivial offences?—Yes.

541. Frequently?—No; I was only before him once.

542. What was the charge?—It was in connection with the arrest of Jonathan Roberts, charged with horse-stealing. He escaped from custody. On the following day I made out a brief of the offence; and I came across a man named Dale, who was an old friend of mine. I believe he was an old policeman. In taking his evidence I was not as cautious as I should have been. Generally, when I ask a man for his evidence, I instruct him to tell me what he knows of his own knowledge; but it appears that Dale told me a long rigmarole, which I took for direct evidence, instead of which it was hearsay evidence, and I knew nothing of it. Inspector Broham, very properly, instructed the sergeant in charge to report me; and I was reported. But the sergeant's report over-reached the mark; he set out that it was a false statement. It was Detective Livingston. The report came to me for my explanation; and I said I could not plead guilty to making a false statement, because that would be tantamount to telling a lie, but that if they would alter the charge to neglect of duty I would submit to it. I consider that I should have guarded against the mistake, and I felt hurt that I had been let into the trouble. I went before Inspector Broham, who refused to alter the charge. He told me to bring Dale in. I objected, as he was a hotelkeeper; and Inspector Broham said, "You must bring him in." Inspector Broham said that if it was proved that Dale did not make certain statements contained in the evidence I would be punished, and if he did make them I would be blameless. On the following day I went before Inspector Broham again, and Dale then admitted that he did make the statements; and I was fined 5s. I would also like to say that I believe my defaulter's sheet will show that the fine was not for making a false statement but for neglect of duty.

543. Was there a general feeling that Inspector Broham was irritable in his conduct towards the men?—I can only speak of my own knowledge. I felt such a sense of injustice over this case that I made up my mind to leave the service. To show that Colonel Hume did not consider the evidence was of any moment, I may say that within a month afterwards I was transferred to Pembroke, one of the most lucrative stations on the goldfields. The cost of transferring me from Timaru to Pembroke, and the constable from Pembroke to Timaru, would be about £45.

544. *The Chairman.*] You think there is no disorder at Clinton?—No.

545. And you have not had a drunken man in your hands for a long while?—That is so. The only arrest I had for drunkenness was a woman who came from the train. There are two or three "hard cases" who occasionally get liquor down, and they are in a state of muddle until they consume it.

546. Where is the nearest licensed house?—At Pukerau.

547. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have had considerable experience in prosecuting publicans?—Yes.

548. Have you found your position in the service prejudiced through your activity against the publicans?—No. My opinion has always been that a constable who prosecutes a publican shows the department he is perfectly fearless, and it is a feather in his cap.

549. You have been encouraged, then?—Yes.

550. Your experience is quite contrary to what has been alleged, that owing to political influence constables are afraid to take action against publicans?—I am quite against that.

551. Your experience is quite the contrary?—Quite the contrary. I think it is quite as reasonable for a man not to take action against a thief, for fear that thieves in general would take action against him.

552. Are you in favour of retiring-allowances, or pensions?—Pensions.

553. And would you be willing to contribute towards it?—Yes, provided the emoluments of the station were not taken away. I hold the position of Clerk of the Court, for which I receive £10 a year in addition. If this was taken away from me it would be simply giving the money to the superannuation fund, and in that way I would be working for this fund, while many other members of the Force had not been. With reference to the bailiff work, most men in charge of country stations hold the appointment of bailiff, receiving 1s. a mile for the service of every summons. If the rule of the service was to take this money and put it into a general fund to go towards the superannuation fund, I am confident there would be a tremendous amount of inconvenience in the Justice Department. The summonses would not be served. For some of them I draw £1 for the service of summonses. I might spend more than £1 to get it served. I sometimes have to employ a man to serve summonses when I cannot do it myself.

DANIEL STEWART, examined on oath.

554. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Daniel Stewart. I am a solicitor, practising in Balclutha.

555. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been in Balclutha long?—Seventeen years and a half.

556. Do you remember the licenses expiring?—Yes.

557. Who was the police constable here then?—Constable Christie.

558. Do you think everything has been done in the direction of sly-grog sale suppression that might have been done?—I could not say that, although I could not specify any instance of neglect of duty on the part of the constable.

559. What is the impression of the town?—That the people who have been selling grog on the sly for three or four years ought to have been caught before now.

560. Have they not been caught before now?—Some have.

561. Has prosecution not been persistent enough?—I know the police had difficulties at first. There was a deal of public sympathy with those who lost their licenses, and no doubt information was held back. Then another difficulty was that some of the Justices of the Peace were sly-grog sellers, and others were sympathisers with them. That would prevent the police doing their duty.

562. Have not some of the Justices of the Peace in Balclutha been charged with sly-grog selling?—Two of them have.

563. Do you think the amount of sly-grog sold here is on the decrease?—I think the amount has very much decreased.

564. What are the evidences, taking three years before the hotels were closed and three years since? Has the town changed much as regards sobriety?—It was a common thing to see drunkards. I remember one Sunday seeing six drunken men at a hotel door. In the last four years I have only seen one drunken man; that was a short time ago.

565. Do you think the registration of private hotels and boardinghouses, giving the police access, would assist in the discharge of their duty?—I have no doubt constables have been deterred by being stopped from entering private hotels. I think all these places should be registered, and the names of the boarders registered too.

566. Has more been done toward the enforcement of the licensing law since Constable Christie was removed than before?—I think so. I consider Constable Griffith is an excellent officer, and is doing all he can to keep the place in order. I do not blame Constable Christie. He was here before the licenses were taken away, and those who were then hotelkeepers were his personal friends, and no doubt he felt in a false position, and was not so eager to get convictions as he might otherwise have been.

567. Do you think the suggestion is a good one, that whenever a license is removed the constable should be changed, so as to break up his friendships?—Yes.

568. Do you think sly-grog selling could be exterminated if the police took steps?—Yes; if the constable were intelligent, as the present officer in Balclutha is, and had a free hand, and was allowed to take every chance he got, he would be able to keep it down.

569. *The Chairman.*] Has he not a free hand?—There is a certain amount of red-tapeism about it. It would be better if the man on the spot could take action at once.

570. *Mr. Taylor.*] If a sergeant were stationed here, would that, in your judgment, tend to further the enforcement of the law?—Yes, either a sergeant or an astute constable. I think a constable would do very well.

571. A constable is bound to report to headquarters; do you think that he and a sergeant could act jointly?—I think the constable should have a free hand, and should be told that he must stop the sale.

572. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I think there is a misunderstanding about reporting to headquarters. Do you know that a constable has power to get information without communicating with headquarters?—Constable Christie told me he had to report all these things.

573. Surely, he never said he had to report to Dunedin before he could set about getting information?—Yes; he said he had to send the facts to Inspector Pardy, and wait instructions to prosecute.

574. Do you not know that Constable Griffith has absolute power to get all the evidence he can without communicating with Inspector Pardy?—Yes; but he cannot move.

575. You mean he cannot lay an information?—Yes.

576. Does that interfere with the law being carried out?—If he is tied down by certain rules, and must send his evidence to Dunedin and wait till Inspector Pardy comes back, if that officer is away. And the Inspector might not have the same knowledge of the people as the constable on the spot, and he might think the case not good enough.

577. Has Constable Griffith ever told you he laid an information that he considered sufficient that has not been accepted by his superiors?—He never told me about communicating with his superiors; but Constable Christie once told me that he had to submit all evidence before he could take action.

578. But not before he could set about getting evidence?—No.

579. You gave Constable Griffith credit, I hope, for doing his best to stop the trade?—Yes.

580. And Inspector Pardy also?—Yes, as far as I know. I do not blame any one, but I say it seems strange that people should be carrying on sly-grog selling during three or four years notoriously, and that there should be no convictions, and only two prosecutions during the whole time.

581. Have these same people notoriously carrying on not been prosecuted?—Yes, but they have not been convicted.

582. Well, the police are not responsible for non-conviction?—I hold they are responsible. It is their business to keep down offences of all kinds, and if they fail the blame rests with them.

583. You do hope some time to arrive at Utopia?—I do not think so. I do not think the millennium is near us, but I think the traffic could be pretty well stamped out.

584. In four years you have not seen a drunken man in Balclutha?—I said I had seen one.

585. But you will not be satisfied while a glass of drink is consumed in Balclutha?—Well, I am not an abstainer, and do not hold extreme views on the liquor question.

JAMES THOMSON examined on oath.

586. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—James Thomson.
 587. Where do you reside?—Balclutha.
 588. What are you?—A dealer.
 589. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in Balclutha?—For twenty years.
 590. Do you remember the time when licenses ceased to exist?—Yes.
 591. Do you notice any alteration in the condition of the town, so far as sobriety and order are concerned, since the hotels were closed?—Yes, I think so.
 592. There is an improvement?—Yes.
 593. Do you remember on one occasion when Mr. Henry's house was the subject of annoyance by larrikins?—I heard of it.
 594. Where were you that night?—I was in the Farmers' Arms Hotel. It was the last night of the old year.
 595. Was the police constable there?—I could not say.
 596. Did you not see him?—He may have been there, but I was not there very long myself.
 597. Did you not have a conversation with him?—I could not say.
 598. Was there a disturbance there?—Not that I am aware of. There were three or four of us, and we went to the back of the house. I do not remember if I got inside.
 599. Was that after the license had been taken away?—Yes.
 600. Was there a crowd in the house?—Yes, and there were a lot of people about the street. It was about 11 o'clock at night.
 601. How many people were inside?—I did not count them.
 602. You got inside the house?—I would not swear that I did.
 603. Well, how do you know that there were people inside?—I heard them talking.
 604. Was the door opened?—I think it was, but I could not swear to it.
 605. Did you not see that there were a lot of people inside?—Yes.
 606. How do you know?—We could see through the window. It is a boardinghouse, and the people were in the dining-room.
 607. Have you ever been inside the Farmers' Arms Hotel?—Yes.
 608. Since the license was taken away?—Yes.
 609. Have you bought liquor there?—No.
 610. Did you ever go inside with the police constable?—I might have.
 611. Did you ever see Constable Christie inside?—I could not swear I did.
 612. Will you swear you have not?—No.

WILLIAM MOIR, examined on oath.

613. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—William Moir.
 614. What are you?—A farm labourer, residing in Balclutha. I used to keep a temperance hotel there.
 615. Up to what date?—It is two years in August since I left.
 616. *Mr. Taylor.*] You were resident here when the licenses terminated?—I did not have the place then.
 617. But you were in Balclutha?—Yes.
 618. Do you think there is much sly-grog selling going on?—I could not say; I never go about the houses, and I am seldom on the street.
 619. Do you think the evidence of the sale of liquor, such as drunkenness and disorder, are more observable now than before the houses were closed?—I think there is not the amount there used to be. I think there is not the evidence there used to be. If there is a case of drunkenness now, it is talked of more now than it used to be.
 620. Do you remember the night before New Year, when Henry's house was the object of attack? Were you in the Farmers' Arms?—Yes.
 621. Was a policeman there?—Yes. Constable Christie came there, after the slinging of the eggs was pretty well over.
 622. Was he in the hotel?—Yes.
 623. Have you had a policeman there on any other occasion?—Sometimes I had visits from Christie.
 624. Did he have refreshments there?—Yes, certainly.
 625. Was he in uniform?—Sometimes.
 626. Do you think all is done in Balclutha to suppress sly-grog selling that might be done?—There might be more done; but I think Constable Griffiths has done a good deal to put it down for the time he has been here.
 627. *The Chairman.*] Have you ever been prosecuted?—Not by Constable Griffiths, but I was prosecuted by Constable Christie.
 628. You are not keeping a boardinghouse?—No.
 629. *Mr. Taylor.*] On that night was Constable Christie inside the house?—Not late at night. If he was, it was early in the evening.
 630. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Constable Christie was the cause of your being prosecuted?—He was the constable when I was prosecuted.
 631. Did he give evidence against you?—Yes.
 632. You have no reason to screen Constable Christie from anything?—No.
 633. What were you fined?—About £300.
 634. In how many of the prosecutions in which you appeared was Constable Christie concerned?—All but two, I think.
 635. *The Chairman.*] How many times were you prosecuted?—Six or seven times.

636. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] And in how many of the cases did Constable Christie appear?—If I am not mistaken he was in all the cases but two.

637. You have not a friendly feeling, then, towards Constable Christie?—Naturally I have not, but I suppose the man was doing his duty.

638. He frequented your house, and sometimes had refreshments there, and sometimes not?—That is so.

639. What were the refreshments? Were they temperance drinks or intoxicants?—Good whiskey; that was what he had.

640. Notwithstanding that he had been in your house, he was the means of your being prosecuted, and being fined £200 or £300?—Yes.

641. *The Chairman.*] Prior to these prosecutions he was in your house?—He would keep coming until within three or four days of my getting the summons, and would then knock off.

642. But he has not been there since the prosecutions ceased?—The last prosecution was in the week in which Constable Christie was leaving here, and the week in which I left too.

643. *Mr. Taylor.*] He was at your house between the prosecutions?—Yes.

644. *The Chairman.*] Your fines amount to £300?—The last one cost me £150.

GEORGE THOMSON, examined on oath.

645. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—George Thomson.

646. *Colonel Haume.*] Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

647. *Mr. Taylor.*] When were you appointed to the Commission of the Peace?—I think it was in 1896.

648. Do you reside in Balclutha?—I have lived here for twenty-eight years.

649. Were you appointed on a petition?—No.

650. Was it because you were Mayor?—It was after I had been Mayor for four years that I was made a Justice of the Peace.

651. You were resident in Balclutha when the licenses terminated?—Yes.

652. Do you think there is much sly-grog selling carried on here now?—I have no right to think; I only talk of facts.

653. Do you know of it?—No, I do not.

654. Did you give evidence on the 15th August, 1896, in a case against Anderson for sly-grog selling?—Yes.

655. Well, do you not think sly-grog selling goes on?—There was at that time.

656. And you have no doubt there is a little now?—I have no doubt.

657. Do you know that there is?—I do not know for a fact.

658. Do you know McCorley's house?—No. I know one that used to be kept by him, the Railway Hotel.

659. Do you know Dunne's?—Yes.

660. Do you know Mr. Hay's?—No.

661. Mr. Myers's?—No.

662. Mr. Anderson's?—There is no such house.

663. Mr. Murray's?—Yes.

664. Mr. Heaney's?—Yes.

665. Do you think the police have done all they can to suppress sly-grog selling?—They have been very energetic.

666. Is there as much sly-grog selling since the licenses were taken away as before?—I do not know.

667. *The Chairman.*] Are these houses now kept by McCorley, Dunne, and others?—They are now known as the Railway Hotel, the Crown Hotel, the Criterion Hotel, and the Farmers' Arms Hotel. They are still called hotels.

668. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you ever go to these houses?—Yes; I would go to any house in Balclutha, except the parsonage.

669. Do you ever see drink sold in these houses?—I object to answer that.

670. Did you ever have any financial transactions with the police constable in Balclutha?—What do you mean?

671. Did he ever discount trade bills for you?—The constable never discounted a bill for me in my life.

672. Have you ever seen the police constable in this house?—Yes; he has taken me in there to sign a document.

673. And on any other business?—I know that he has gone in there sometimes to see me, or, perhaps, to see Inspector Pardy.

674. Have you ever seen him there drinking?—I have often had a drink with the police constable. If the landlord liked to shout, I would do it to-morrow.

675. Have you ever had, to your recollection, drinks in any of these houses with the constable?—I could not swear to it.

676. Do you remember the prosecutions for sly-grog selling against Anderson in August, 1896?—Yes.

677. Did you give evidence?—Yes.

678. Did you say that you had incited others to purchase liquor from these people?—I admitted I had a drink in the place.

679. In the sly-grog shop?—Yes.

680. Were you a Justice of the Peace at the time?—I was.

681. Do you consider it your duty to inform the police of breaches of the law?—I am not an informant, and I do not mean to be. We have all sinned, and come short, and I suppose I am the same.

682. *The Chairman.*] Did you say you had bought the drink?—No, I did not say so.

683. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you not admit in August, 1896, that it was purchased liquor?—No. There is one thing I would like to say: I saw by Inspector Parry's evidence in Dunedin that he said three Justices of the Peace had admitted to inducing people to drink whiskey on one occasion; but that was a mistake. I was one of the parties who admitted having a drink, but I was not then a Justice of the Peace. Inspector Parry made a mistake. There were two and not three.

684. Do you import liquor at all?—Yes.

685. In what quantities?—From 10 gallons downwards. Unfortunately, I have none to-day.

686. Do you import for anybody besides yourself?—No.

687. And you do not sell?—No; but I give away on many occasions.

688. Do you think that since the hotels were closed there has been as much drunkenness on the streets of Balclutha as before?—I have been here twenty-eight years, and I have never seen much drunkenness; and I was amazed to hear that only one man had been seen drunk recently. Last Saturday night I saw two drunken men in front of my own shop; they had come across the bridge from Stirling.

689. Do you think there is as much drunkenness connected with the sly-grog selling in Balclutha as there used to be with the hotels?—I do not think so. For twenty-eight years I have been travelling round nearly every householder in the Clutha, and my experience is this: When there were licenses I was entertained at some houses with tea, and at these houses they now take me in and give me whiskey; and I believe there is as much whiskey drunk here to-day as there was before the licenses were taken away.

690. That is your belief?—That is my opinion, and I am a man of some experience.

691. What is the effect of prohibition?—It has been detrimental to me.

692. To your own business?—Yes. During four years before the licenses were taken away I had a turnover of £10,500 a year, and since prohibition it has been reduced to something like £4,000.

693. When did you assign your estate?—After the prohibition vote. I had a large property. I had erected large buildings, and at the time the prohibition vote was carried I could have written a cheque for £1,000, and after the vote was carried the credit of the town went down. No money-lender would lend a farthing, and the crisis came when I was pressed; but I think it ungentlemanly for Mr. Taylor to bring this matter before the Commission. I would like to say, however, that within six weeks I paid in sufficient to pay 20s. in the pound, and was left with £2,000 cash.

694. What date was that?—I think it was May, 1894.

695. That was a month before the houses were closed?—Yes; but the vote had been carried three months' previously. I wish to add that Constable Christie did all he could to find out the offenders in Mr. Ramage's case. I know for a positive fact that Constable Christie not only did his best, but all he possibly could. He came to me and asked me to help him.

JAMES HENRY, examined on oath.

696. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—James Henry.

697. What are you?—A bootmaker, residing at Balclutha.

698. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been here long?—Nearly thirteen years.

699. Do you remember the occasion on which you were interfered with one night?—Yes.

700. What was the night of the offence?—It was on the night of the 1st January, 1896. About 12.20, or 12.30, shortly after midnight, I heard loud knocking at the door as if made by a hard instrument. I went out and saw a group of young fellows. A band had just been playing, and that was the means of the crowd collecting. I recognised at least three of the young fellows. I had scarcely got outside to ask them what they wanted when they commenced pelting me with rotten eggs.

701. *The Chairman.*] Were you struck with them?—Yes.

702. *Mr. Taylor.*] What did you do?—I went down the street to find the constable, but he was not at the station. I went back by a circuitous route thinking he might be in the main streets, but I could not find him. In the meantime the same body of men, or some of them, had pelted my wife with eggs. She had come out of the door to watch me while I was on my way to the police-station, thinking the crowd might mob me, but they did not.

703. Did you find the constable?—Yes; next morning.

704. Where did you find him?—At the police-station. It was about 3 o'clock in the morning, and he was in bed; but he got up, and I reported the matter to him. He did not go round that morning to see what had been done, as he had to go to Port Molyneux, or Catlin's, where there were sports.

705. Did you tell him the names of the people you suspected?—Yes.

706. Did any conviction follow?—No. I told him the names of those who were throwing the eggs. The constable said he had warned one of the fellows to behave himself that night.

707. Had you been warned by Constable Christie that you were a marked man?—No; I believe I was not one of the marked men. There was no necessity to warn me. I am not frightened of them. I am a soldier.

708. Did he see you about the matter again?—Yes; I think he did.

709. Do you think there is much sly-grog selling going on now?—No.

710. That is, compared with what there used to be?—No.

[Examination adjourned.]

DUNEDIN.

MONDAY, 4TH APRIL, 1898.

JAMES PRATT, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] You are a first-class constable, stationed where?—At Clyde.
2. I have before me your letter. Without going through the whole of this in detail, will you just refer to the particular matters you want to bring under our notice?
3. *Mr. Poynton.*] Does this letter include all the things you wish to bring before the Commission?—I am beginning at the end in a way. I have come here to-day not dreaming for a moment there was anything but one reprimand on my charge-sheet, and I find I have got three or four. I never had the slightest idea they were on.
4. *The Chairman.*] Did you know of the one on the 17th February, 1891?—Yes.
5. Do you say the others were brought to your notice and escaped your memory, or do you say they were not brought to your notice?—They did not escape my memory.
6. You were cautioned as to them: were you aware of that?—Yes.
7. But you were not aware there was anything on the charge-sheet?—I was only in Invercargill a couple of days when I was charged with the first offence. I may state the circumstances of the case. I was told to visit the train at 10 o'clock in the morning, and I did not know the exact time of departure. Just as I entered the station I heard the train whistle. I immediately ran down to the train, and met Inspector Buckley coming from the station. The train was just moving from the station. He never said anything. I was brought up the next day and charged with neglect of duty, I suppose.
8. Neglect to attend the departure of the train?—The departure of the train? I had only been there two days, and I did not know when the train went.
9. You did it under a mistake at the time?—Yes. I left the office never thinking there was an entry.
10. The second entry is disobedience of orders, in walking with Constable Ferguson. It was when you were sent out on plain-clothes duty, with instructions not to interfere with the other constables, in 1887?—I hardly remember the circumstances, but I know this: that Constable Ferguson and myself chanced to meet. We were walking in the same direction, and we walked, I think, about 100 or 200 yards. I was brought up for it. I never dreamt for a moment that it was entered against me on the sheet. I was reprimanded for that.
11. The third is, you were admonished for gossiping with Constable Walton. Do you remember that?—That is the only one I came here for the purpose of explaining the circumstances of. I was going to ask your Worships to go into that. On the date named, the 17th February, 1891, Constable Walton and I were on duty. We were both on Princes Street. Our point of meeting was Hardy's Corner. I went up Princes Street. Walton took the beat down towards George Street. He had been sent away to look after some crimes that had been committed in George Street, and I was told to look after both beats until he came back. I did so. I do not know how long he was away, but he was away for a considerable time—for about an hour or so. On his return we met exactly at Hardy's corner. When Constable Walton came close to me, I asked him if he was going to take up his own beat. He said, "Yes;" and I said, "I suppose I can go on my own beat now." Those were the only words that passed. Directly the last word was out, I observed the late Inspector Moore coming through a crowd of people, who were assembled beside the fountain. There was a large crowd of people listening to the Salvation Army, and the crowd extended over to the bank. The fountain and the bank are opposite each other. Inspector Moore said he saw us talking together from the time he left Phillips's Hotel till he came to the telegraph poles, a little below the fountain. We were brought up, and we asked to be allowed to get witnesses to prove that we were not there twenty seconds. I am certain we were not there over twenty seconds. He refused us that, and said we were gossiping. Had I been allowed to get witnesses, or given the opportunity of proving that the charge was false, his own evidence would have shown that it was incorrect. We appealed against his decision to the then Commissioner, Colonel Hume, expecting of course, when we appealed, that we would be allowed to get witnesses to prove our case. We were brought up, and the case was heard before Colonel Hume, and the Commissioner upheld the decision of the Inspector. We expected to be allowed the opportunity of bringing witnesses to prove that we were not there twenty seconds, but we did not get that opportunity—in fact, Colonel Hume said if there were twenty witnesses he would believe the Inspector first.
12. *Mr. Poynton.*] You did not have the opportunity of bringing witnesses?—No. I may say it was impossible for the Inspector to have seen us from Phillips's hotel. We were standing in a hollow: we were not on the footpath; and if you go to Phillips's hotel and look up the street, you will see you could not see any one at Hardy's corner. It was impossible for him to have seen us at Hardy's corner until he came through the crowd. That is the point I wished to bring forward at the time. I saw him the minute he came through the crowd, thirty yards away. I said, "That is the Inspector." We were going to separate at the time, but possibly we might have stopped a second or two longer if he had not made his appearance. He said we were talking together for five minutes, and we were holding our hands up. Walton is like a recruit coming from the depot—he always has his hands hanging down. I said I might, but I was satisfied he did not. I may state I could have proved at the time that it was to get at me that he brought the charge against us. I was led to believe he said to Constable Walton afterwards he was sorry for bringing him up. I will mention an instance of how I was persecuted down here. At the very first parade after I was brought in from Kaitangata, I was marched out in charge of a third-class constable, though I was senior constable in Dunedin at the time.

13. *The Chairman.*] Do you remember anything about the fourth item: Neglect of duty, for not making inquiries into the truth or otherwise of the statement made to him by Arthur Clappett—namely, that a row took place in the Otago Hotel on Sunday, the 21st June, 1891?—I remember the occurrence. A man came up to me in Princes Street; we were relieving at the time, and he mentioned something. It was a drunken man, and I took no notice of what he said. It so happened that what he said turned out to be correct—that there was a row at this hotel, and, of course, that brought about an inquiry into the matter. I explained the circumstances at the time, and I thought that I fully exonerated myself from any blame whatever. I was never told that I was admonished or reprimanded or anything else for it.

14. You did not know that was entered against you?—No, I did not think for a moment that there was an entry made.

15. But you were reprimanded?—I was brought up.

16. Do you know when you were brought up if a record was made of what happened?—When I was brought up, of course, I expected I should be told of anything that was to be done before I left the office.

17. And you were not told?—No.

18. Now, with regard to the time when you were marched out in charge of a third-class constable?—I brought my treatment before Colonel Hume, at the time we were brought up on the charge of gossiping.

19. Verbally or by letter?—We did it by letter.

20. Did you get a reply?—We got a reply that he would be down in a certain time. When he come down we were brought to the office, and this was gone into. I may say that Inspector Moore had previously threatened me. He said he had heard I had been using some words about him at Balclutha, on leaving there, and if he heard any more about my using such words he would have me removed.

21. You deny having used those words?—Yes. I never used insulting language towards any one. My character is well known about. I could get hundreds to testify to it. The letter should be there, and my reply to it.

22. Is it in consequence of that communication you think he had personal animosity against you?—It started there.

23. You say in your complaint, "I would not have taken so much notice of this had I not known that it was done to get a case against me, as I had been threatened by the Inspector some time before leaving Kaitangata, on account of some things he alleged I did, or said, on account of him shifting me from Balclutha. His conduct towards me when doing duty in Dunedin showed plainly that he intended making it unpleasant for me, as appeared afterwards, as I had to bring his treatment of me before Mr. Commissioner Hume, and afterwards before the Defence Minister, now Premier (see my petition presented by Mr. William Hutchison, M.H.R., then)." Am I to take all this as facts from you on oath?—Yes, certainly.

24. You proceed: "The first parade I attended I was marched out by a third-class constable (Rutledge) in charge. The late Sergeant-major Bevin afterwards explained, when I brought my case before Colonel Hume, that Inspector Moore instructed him not to put me in charge. I may mention here that next day I was in charge, being the senior constable then in Dunedin. Numerous other annoyances occurred during the time I was in Dunedin, until I could stand it no longer. I then put my case before Colonel Hume (Commissioner), but got no satisfaction; after which I was compelled to lay my case before Parliament to see if there was any justice to be got, when it was acknowledged I was badly treated, and an order sent to have me put in charge of a station at once." Your case came before Parliament, then?—I understood so. It went before the Defence Minister at the time, Mr. Seddon.

25. You do not know whether it went before Parliament?—I know there was something mentioned in the House.

26. You say, "It was acknowledged I was badly treated." How was it acknowledged?—The Defence Minister, Mr. Seddon.

27. By letter to you?—I got a telegram from Mr. Hutchison. He acknowledged I had been badly treated.

28. You say that the Minister acknowledged that you were badly treated?—Yes. I expect he could not have done anything else, on the case that I put before him.

29. You say you brought your case before Parliament. Can you say yourself whether it was dealt with?—Mr. Hutchison and several other members took my case up. I understood it went before the Defence Minister, and he took the case up himself.

30. What year was this in?—That was just before I left Dunedin. A reply was sent down to the Inspector that I was to be sent immediately in charge of a station, and, I believe, accompanying this there was an order that in future all the married men were to be sent away from Dunedin; because I showed in my petition where there was a number of constables brought in from different stations that had been in charge of stations for years—1s. a day taken from them. They were brought in and docked of 1s. a day, and I showed where there were twelve single men in charge of stations.

31. In 1891, you say, your case was brought before Parliament by Mr. Hutchison?—Yes.

32. You lodged a petition?—Yes. I also interviewed Mr. Pinkerton about it; in fact, I interviewed all the members here, and they advised me to put my case before the department, and if I got no satisfaction, then to go to them. I put my case before Colonel Hume, and I got no redress, and then I put my case before them.

33. What was done with the petition you presented?—The only thing I know was I was ordered through this to be transferred immediately in charge of a station.

34. That was communicated to you by Mr. Hutchison?—Yes. I got a telegram from Mr. Hutchison. I would like the correspondence on the matter to be read—that is, with regard to my removal to Alexandra.

At this stage the following correspondence was read by Mr. Tunbridge :—

Memorandum from Inspector Hickson :—

Memorandum.

Police Office, Dunedin, 18th August, 1891.

I BEG to represent that there is good accommodation for a married mounted constable at Alexandra South, where Constable McIntyre, a single man, is stationed. When Constable Walton was removed from there, Constable McIntyre was the only available mounted constable of experience and capable in my then district—namely, Southland and Lake. Constable McIntyre is a smart, intelligent, and well-conducted constable. My only object in bringing this under your notice is that if there be a married mounted constable capable of taking charge of a country station who is not provided with a house, you might, if you thought it advisable to do so, send him to Alexandra and remove McIntyre into a town. The only other station in my present district having a single constable in charge is Waikaia, but there is no accommodation for a married man there. The accommodation consists of two small rooms, a bedroom and kitchen.

J. HICKSON, Inspector.

Telegram from Colonel Hume to Inspector Hickson, dated 24th August, 1891 :—

PLEASE offer Alexandra South to Constable Pratt, and let me know whether he will accept it.

Telegram from Inspector Hickson to the Commissioner of Police, Wellington, dated 25th August, 1891 :—

IN accordance with your instructions I offered Alexandra South to Constable Pratt. He promised to give reply to-day. Now, at his request, I have given him until to-morrow evening to consider.

Report from Constable Pratt :—

Police-station, Dunedin, 27th August, 1891.

CONSTABLE Pratt reports, relative to his taking charge of Alexandra Station :—

I beg respectfully to report, with reference to the above, that I would prefer waiting for a short time until a vacancy would occur in one of the suburban townships joining Dunedin, providing that I would get the preference to such vacancy. As Alexandra is such an out-of-the-way place, and no chance of my being able to get any of my three children, now available for situations, a billet there, and provisions, &c., being so dear, that I would not be benefited by the change, seeing that it would cost me over what I have now to pay for rent extra to keep my family of eight, all of whom are costly to keep, the youngest being over five years. The distance from Dunedin is 148 miles, and the cheapest way to cart furniture to there would be to send it direct from here, and which takes about six days' journey, I understand, for a team of horses, and would be expensive for a large family to go there. I would therefore ask Mr. Inspector Hickson to have the goodness to represent the above circumstances to Mr. Commissioner Hume, hoping that he may see fit to grant my request, or send some one with a small family there who would not be inconvenienced. I would not ask to have any constable removed to make room for me, although I have been removed three times out of four recently to make a place for others, at a loss of over £200. I will go to Alexandra if my proposals cannot be granted.

JAMES PRATT.

Telegram from Inspector Hickson to Commissioner, dated the 27th August, 1891 :—

CONSTABLE Pratt does not like going so far into the country as Alexandra South, where he would have no opportunity of putting his children to trades and situations; but if he cannot get a suburban station he will accept Alexandra, if allowed cost of removal. Please delay deciding until receipt of his report, which I am posting to you.

J. HICKSON.

Telegram from Commissioner Hume to Inspector Hickson, dated the 3rd September, 1891 :—

SEE no chance of a suburban station being vacant, and therefore again offer Alexandra South to Constable Pratt. His expenses of moving there with his family will be paid for by the department. Let me know his decision.

Telegram from Inspector Hickson to Commissioner Hume, dated the 5th September, 1891 :—

CONSTABLE Pratt accepts Alexandra Station, and will be ready to leave Dunedin Friday next, 11th inst. Shall I send him, and bring Constable McIntyre to Dunedin?

Telegram from Commissioner Hume to Inspector Hickson, dated the 7th September, 1891 :—

PLEASE send Constable Pratt to Alexandra, and bring Constable McIntyre to Dunedin.

Minute by Inspector Hickson, dated the 11th September, 1891 :—

CONSTABLE Pratt left here this morning for Alexandra on transfer, and Constable McIntyre has been instructed to proceed from there on transfer to Dunedin, leaving there on Monday next.

Witness : It cost the Government £45, or thereabouts, to send me there. I got my furniture, of which I had two wagon-loads, very much damaged, and if there had been a place where I could have got new furniture I would have thrown it into the river. I tried my best to be allowed to stop in Dunedin with my family.

35. *The Chairman.*] But you consented to go to Alexandra?—What I asked was this: I wished to be given a suburban station, and if the Commissioner would guarantee this I would prefer remaining in Dunedin.

36. You are not aware of any communication between Mr. Hutchison and the Minister?—Oh, no.

37. You do not know what was done by Parliament?—No; I do not know the course Mr. Hutchison took. He just notified me he brought the case before them.

38. You were moved from Alexandra to Clyde. Are the prices as high at the Clyde as here?—More so. The further you go away from a centre, or from a railway-station, the prices get higher.

39. The prices of living at Clyde are very high?—Very high.

40. How long have you been at Clyde?—Two years.

41. Is there anything else you would like to mention?—I wished to refer to my different transfers from the beginning. I joined the service on the 4th March, 1875, in Dunedin, under Superintendent Weldon. Previous to that I had served sixteen years in the artillery at Home. I was battery sergeant-major for four or five years. I also obtained a gunnery instructor's certificate. On coming out here, I produced my credentials—which could be hardly excelled for any position of trust—and directly I presented them Mr. Weldon took me into the office. I was taken into the office that very same day as assistant clerk. After being three months in Dunedin, I was sent in charge of Winton station. There were five or six, I dare say, who were senior to me; but I was chosen for the charge of Winton station. I wish to show that Mr. Weldon thought there was something in me. I remained at Winton till the 27th September, 1877.

I was then transferred to Invercargill—for what reason I never could know. At that time men were only left for short periods in charge of stations. I remained at Invercargill till the 27th May, 1878, when I was moved to Mataura. Just before I left Winton I had to attend to some voting-papers. It was a very wet and inclement day, and I got a very severe wetting. I was removed to Invercargill in the meantime, and I never felt anything for a fortnight. Shortly after my arrival at Invercargill I took inflammation of the lungs through this wetting, and I was laid up for two months, after being given up by the doctors. During the time I was ill half my pay was stopped. I asked to have the money refunded, but I never got it. I thought that was cruel. Shortly after a circular was issued that all men sick, unless it was brought on by their own actions outside of police duty, were to get full pay. My report got that brought about. Here I may bring under your notice the fact that I never had a house but one—all the time I was in the service—that was fit to live in; in fact, they were not fit for Chinamen to live in. The remarkable thing was that directly I left the stations a new station was commenced. I always had the misfortune to live in old houses. At Mataura I was living in an old house that was leaky in all directions. It was an old hotel, containing twenty-two rooms, and it was not fit for a Chinaman to live in. Then I was sent in charge of Gore on the 3rd October, 1878. The only house we could get was a three-roomed house. It was a very old house, and a very bad one. I had seven or eight of a family at that time. I remained there about four years, and a little before I left they built a new station. I wish to remark on the duty I did at Gore. When I went there there was a big population there, and I was Clerk of the Court, Clerk of the Licensing Court, Officer of Customs, Inspector of Slaughteryards, and so on. I had also a great deal of police duty to do at the time, and I had no assistance whatever. The Magistrates often wondered how I managed the work. I wish to show that when work was required to be done I could do it, and do so without a grumble. A little before I left there was a civilian Clerk of the Court appointed, at £200 a year, I think. I was getting £10 a year as Clerk. There was also a bailiff appointed at a salary. There was a constable there at the time, and a very short time after there was another added. I state now from facts that I did more work than the four of them did afterwards, as the work fell off after I left. I was sent to Wyndham on the 13th December, 1883, and I remained in charge of Wyndham until the 24th August, 1887, when I was transferred under circumstances which I wish to draw your attention to. It is not right, of course, to mention names, but I wish to bring in a man's name to show that he got me transferred from there through underhand work.

42. Is he an officer of the department?—No, he is a civilian. I could get dozens to prove that what I say is correct. When I was at Wyndham it was a very bad place; in fact, it was noted all over the colony for being a hotbed of larrikinism. Unfortunately, I have always been doomed to be sent to a bad place. I could get hundreds of people to prove that people were then frightened to go there on account of this larrikinism. The man I refer to is a saddler named Winter. This man was then a kleptomaniac. Over and over again, it has been known, if he saw anything he would take it away. The police were always watching this man. He had been brought up repeatedly by the police, and his great delight was to send policemen off in wrong directions, which he has done several times. Detective Eade was out for two days through wrong information that this man gave him. I suspected him of receiving stolen property, and I had occasion to get a search warrant to search his place two or three times. Naturally this man disliked me, and he set himself to get me out of the place. He had been bragging for two months how he would have me out of there. I heard this talk going about, but I simply laughed at it. I did not take any notice of it. However, he reported the matter to the Minister of Justice. He made a number of false charges.

43. What was the result of the search warrant—did you find what you searched for?—No, we did not find it. He was too cunning for us. There were several warrants executed against him.

44. Without success?—Without success, generally. He made a number of false charges. It was referred to Commissioner Gudgeon, and Inspector Buckley held an inquiry into the circumstances of this man's complaint. Inspector Buckley came up and handed to me the report of this man. I read it, and I denied it. I told him it was a false concoction from the beginning to the end, and I could prove that not a single word of it was true. Inspector Buckley could not find him on that occasion; and he came up again in a fortnight, and could not find him again. I may say I found out that on both occasions the man was in the town. However, on the third occasion he found him, and brought him into the office. The charge was read out, but the man said he did not want to go on with the case, and he made all sorts of excuses that he could not get his witnesses to come up. I defied him to get a witness to prove what he said, and said that it was a concoction of lies all through. More than that, I demanded that an inquiry should be held before two Justices of the Peace. I did not want an inquiry before the Inspector. He made no attempt to prove these charges, and the Inspector had to go back without any result. In seven or eight days I was transferred from there to Invercargill. I came to the conclusion, of course, that this man had got me transferred—that there was some underhand work between him and the Inspector.

At this stage the following correspondence was read by Mr. Tunbridge:—

Letter from W. J. Winter:—

SIR,—

Wyndham, 26th April, 1887.

My attention has been drawn for some time to the dissatisfaction our constable, Mr. Pratt, is giving to the public. A considerable amount of larceny is committed every week, and never once has he tried to catch the offender, but, on the contrary, he goes first to a particular acquaintance of the party he suspects and tells him his intentions, and explains how the goods are safe, and, of course, the whole matter is in the mouths of the public before Mr. Pratt is able to be up next morning from the severe cold he caught watching some person. Then it ends in "By Jove, I just missed him; he slipped away." I can prove all I have stated herein, and in conclusion would suggest that a good man be put in his place at once to save a great deal of trouble to the inhabitants.

I am, &c.,

W. J. WINTER, Saddler, Wyndham.

The Minister of Justice, Wellington.

Commissioner Gudgeon's minute, dated 2nd May, 1887 :—

INSPECTOR BUCKLEY.—Please report on this matter. Of course, if the constable is inefficient to the extent mentioned herein he must leave; but the idea of foisting him upon some other district is absurd.

Report of Inspector Buckley :—

SIR,—

New Zealand: Police Inspector's Office, Invercargill, 31st May, 1887.

With reference to attached correspondence of the 7th instant, *re* W. J. Winter's complaint against Constable Pratt of Wyndham Station, I have the honour to report that I have visited Wyndham twice to see Mr. Winter about it. On my first visit, some persons he said he wished to call as witnesses were absent. I then appointed another day, and on my visit on that day Mr. Winter declined to make any statement himself or call any witnesses in support of his complaint, but persisted that the constable had told some people in the township that he suspected him (Winter) of having stolen property in his possession, and that he intended to search his trap when he was driving home to his private residence from his place of business (about two miles), and he feels aggrieved that the constable should tell residents what he suspected and what he was going to do. Had the constable come to him (Winter) and told him of his suspicions he was quite welcome to search his premises, but thinks that he exceeded his duty in speaking about him in the manner he did, and then did not search his trap or premises, although he drove home on the evening the constable said he would search him the usual way, and he could have done so had he so wished. As to the constable's conduct in this instance I have but Mr. Winter's word, and would hesitate in pronouncing the constable in the wrong, as he denies ever telling any one that he intended searching Winter's trap. I had occasion to transfer Constable Pratt from Gore to Wyndham on the 13th December, 1883, on account of his not being able to carry out the duties of the Gore sub-district satisfactorily. Since then the police duties at Wyndham have been steadily increasing, and latterly the constable does not appear to be able to cope with them, and does not give satisfaction either to myself or the public, and I therefore think he is not fit to have charge of a station or to do mounted duty, as he seems to be very slow and timid in the performance of his duties, but he would answer for the foot division in a town. I would therefore recommend that he be dismounted, and replaced at Wyndham by a thorough energetic constable well up in his duties. I have no foot constable in this district suitable for the mounted division, or I would suggest placing him in charge at Wyndham, and Constable Pratt to take his place. Constable Pratt is a very steady man, and after his length of service (twelve years) I would be sorry to say he is wholly incompetent for any position in the Force, as I believe he would be a very good foot constable on beat duty. The majority of the residents at Wyndham give him an excellent character for sobriety, but are of the opinion that the township requires a more energetic and persevering man.

I have, &c.,

A. BUCKLEY, Inspector of Police.

Minute of Commissioner Gudgeon :—

MR. FOX.—The following transfer will take effect: Constable Pratt, of Wyndham, will be transferred to Invercargill and Constable Bogue, of Dunedin, take his place. Inspector Buckley will transfer a man to Dunedin *vice* Bogue. When Constable Fleming is discharged, Constable Strickland, of Temuka, may (by paying his passage) replace him.

Letter from Constable Pratt :—

Police-station, Invercargill, 31st August, 1887.

CONSTABLE PRATT'S representations relative to his removal from the charge of Wyndham Station to do foot-duty at Invercargill, &c.

I beg most respectfully to represent to Mr. Commissioner Gudgeon that on the 19th instant I received orders to hand over the charge of that station to Constable Fouhy on the 24th instant, and report myself same day at Invercargill to do foot-duty there. On receipt of the above I asked to be informed of the cause of my removal, and on the 24th instant was told that it was owing to reports from time to time from Wyndham. In justice to myself, I feel constrained to crave Mr. Commissioner Gudgeon's attention to the following representations, in the hope that you will reconsider my case, as I am prepared to have my actions investigated on any point (if fairly gone into) by any one you may appoint. There may have been, and always must be, things undone in any district; but I can say that if such has taken place, it was not through my neglect or carelessness. If anything was undone, it was because I was doing more important duty. If I erred on any matter, it was one of judgment, and light. The only report that has been brought under my notice for the twelve years that I have been in charge of various stations is one made by one William Winter, saddler, of Wyndham, dated the 26th April last, which you are aware of, I presume, and owing to which Mr. Inspector Buckley visited Wyndham for the purpose of investigating. Winter failed to substantiate his statements (as there was no definite charge made), although defied by me to do so in the Inspector's presence, knowing very well that he could not do so. I admit one of his statements, that a number of larcenies have been committed, but not that I used no means to detect them. But I also know that he had committed some of them, and all the crimes of a serious nature that have been committed were done by one man, an associate of Winter's. Such is well known to the police, and has baffled more than me, as in every case nearly a detective also investigated the cases. I wish to say that there has been remarkably little crime outside of Wyndham Township, for which please see crime reports from there for last four years. Winter is well known to the police as a bad character for last fifteen years. He was the leader of a set of larrikins, whose deeds had been commented upon by nearly all the papers in the colony some few years ago. He has misled the police frequently. He is an associate of George Davey, who has committed all the crimes referred to. I am certain of that for various good reasons, and so are nine out of every ten of the inhabitants, not only of the township, but the district also. The cause of Winter's report against me is well known to be on account of inquiries I made about him with reference to a saddle, &c., stolen some time ago from the Rev. Mr. Wood, of Wyndham, for which George Davey and Andrew Cross were arrested. Cross was convicted, and confessed, and stated that it was Davey who got him to assist him. Davey was acquitted for want of evidence. It is known by me and Detective Ede that Davey went over to Winter's house the morning after the theft, and returned again before daylight, and every one nearly in Wyndham as well as myself knows that Davey took the saddle to Winter's, and it has not been seen since. Winter has been stating to every one there since that he would have me removed, and has told a crowd of people there that he knew fourteen days before I left I would have to go, which appears strange, if so. If other reports have been made, I venture to say it is by others of a similar character, and whom I could name. I am persuaded that no one of any respectability has. There are several there who are not above suspicion also, and who may have had similar reasons to report, but I can justify my inquiries. If I have been reported, I think I should have been asked what I had to say, which has not been done in any case. In conclusion, I beg to remark that after joining the Force I was six months in Mr. Inspector Weldon's office, and was then sent by him to take charge of Winton Station. I was there about two and a half years; again at Invercargill about six months; went from there to Mataura, and remained there about five months; was sent from there to take charge of a newly-formed station at Gore, where I remained, I think, about five and a half years; and, lastly, in charge of Wyndham Station for nearly four years, during which time I am not aware of having been reported for any omission of duty or a breach of the rules, &c., of the Force. I have served sixteen years in the artillery in Her Majesty's service, six of which I have been battery sergeant-major, and received a certificate qualifying me to act as gunnery instructor. I left the service at my own request, to better myself and family, and can produce credentials from my commanding officer and others to show that I have been highly esteemed by them. With my large family of ten (from twenty years to one year old), the change is a serious loss to me in many ways, as I have not removed them from Wyndham, as house-rent is much cheaper there. Pending the consideration of the above, I beg to apply to be removed from here to take charge of a station in the Dunedin district.

The Commissioner of Police, Wellington.

JAMES PRATT, First-class Constable No. 161,

Letter from Inspector Buckley :—

SIR,— New Zealand: Police Inspector's Office, Invercargill, 2nd September, 1887.

In forwarding the attached representation from first-class Constable Pratt, No. 161, relative to his transfer from Wyndham Station to this, I beg to refer you to my letter of the 31st May last, recommending the constable's removal from Wyndham for inefficiency, and in proof of that recommendation I forward herewith correspondence from me, dated the 26th March, 1886, calling upon him to explain why he did not visit the scene of a fire at Edendale, three miles from his station—about which there could be no question of its being a case of incendiarism—for eight hours after it was reported to him by Mr. J. J. Weaver, the owner of the property. The constable should have proceeded to the fire immediately on the report being made to him, and not allowed a period of eight hours to elapse before doing so, thus allowing time for any trace that might have led to detection being removed. It is not correct that the only complaint made against him of which he was acquainted was that of Mr. Winter, as the two accompanying letters of Mr. Mair and Mr. Shirley, dated the 23rd March, 1886, and 8th May, 1886, respectively, will show. Those letters were forwarded to the constable for his report, and his reports are attached thereto. I also frequently told him that complaints were verbally made to me of the manner in which he did his duty, and cautioned him that if the complaints continued it would end in his removal. He was always complaining of the amount of work he had to do, and that he could do no more; and on many occasions when he spoke about the busy times he had of it, I asked him to apply for a transfer, and that I would get a constable to do the duty, and I had no doubt would give satisfaction to the public and his authorities. I could quote more instances of where the constable showed want of attention, amounting almost to neglect of his duty; and it was only in consideration of his large family that I did not ask for his removal before I did. Mr. Winter was no doubt, some years ago, said to be the ringleader of a band of men who were in the habit of perpetrating practical jokes, but I am not aware that he is a thief. He may associate with the man Davey whom the constable mentions, but I am not inclined to believe that Mr. Winter joined him in acts of theft as suggested. I may add that the constable, when in charge of Wyndham Station, was very dilatory in sending in his returns and other documents, frequently having to be written to for them long after the time they should have reached this office.

I have, &c.,

A. BUCKLEY, Inspector of Police.

Minute by Commissioner Gudgeon, dated the 17th September, 1887 :—

INSPECTOR BUCKLEY.—Constable Pratt was moved from Wyndham simply because he could not cope with the criminals of the district. From what I could gather he had no power over any of the people, and did not give satisfaction either to his own department or to the people. If he wants to go to Dunedin let him try to effect an exchange with some man in that district.

Petition from Mr. J. W. Raymond, J.P., and four other Justices of the Peace :—

SIR,— Wyndham, 23rd August, 1887.

We have learned that Mounted-constable Pratt, who had been stationed here for four years, and has on the whole given satisfaction, had been ordered to remove to Invercargill to do foot-duty. As this removal to a place where the expense of maintaining a numerous family will be greater than at Wyndham, and as the pay and the emoluments will be considerably less, the removal can be looked upon only as a punishment. We are informed that the reason for this removal has been stated to be on account of complaints that have been made against the constable. We understand that the constable has not been made aware of the nature of these complaints, and that he is desirous to have an opportunity afforded of meeting and rebutting them. We venture to suggest that an officer who has served so long in the Force with credit to himself is entitled to have such an opportunity afforded to him.

We have, &c.,

(Here follow the names.)

W. E. Gudgeon, Esq., Commissioner of Police, Wellington.

Minute by Commissioner Gudgeon, dated the 19th September, 1887 :—

INSPECTOR BUCKLEY.—Please instruct Constable Pratt to explain how it comes to pass that these gentlemen are so well posted in his grievances, and ask him whether he is aware that to employ outside or political influence is against the regulations and punishable.

Constable Pratt's explanation :—

Police Station, Invercargill, 22nd September, 1887.

CONSTABLE Pratt's explanation and reply to Mr. Commissioner Gudgeon's minute of the 19th instant, *vide* attached correspondence :—

I beg most respectfully to state with reference to the above, that I have told several who asked me at Wyndham before I left that I was transferred to Invercargill to do foot-duty there. There are few who reside there but are well aware of the loss I sustain by being removed to Invercargill. The cause of my removal has been largely discussed at Wyndham, and few there are there who are not under the belief that it was on account of the report sent in to the Minister of Justice some time ago by a W. J. Winter, saddler, there, against me (which Mr. Commissioner Gudgeon is aware of). Winter had informed nearly every person there that he reported me. I heard it over six weeks before I saw it officially. He has told it over and over again that he would have me removed from there. He informed nearly a dozen people together on the street there that he knew fourteen days before I knew it that I was going. The above conversation has come under the notice of at least some of the Justices there, I know. Knowing that they are all well aware of the bad character that Winter bears, and also that Winter has a spite against me through having had occasion to make inquiries about him relative to a stolen saddle, that nearly every one there believes he received from a notorious bad character, George Davey; and, believing that that report was the cause of my removal, they have taken the case up. I presume they have done so from what they were sure to have heard, as they well know how I have done my duty there, and what I had to contend with; and as they are also well aware that there was no inquiry into Winter's report,—as Winter told every one so, and that he did not like to injure me,—notwithstanding that I defied him when he was brought face to face before me by Mr. Inspector Buckley some short time ago; and as the Justices are well aware of the whole of the case through hearsay, I am not surprised at the action they have taken, which has been unsolicited by me. I may have said there that Winter is the only one who has ever reported me during my long service, and that I would like to have had an opportunity of showing him up, which I could have done. As I have been asked so many questions at the time about the cause of my removal, my answers to such would be well known, and lead the Justices to come to the knowledge of what is set forth in their letter of the 23rd ultimo. I have not asked them under any circumstances to plead for me. It has been a spontaneous act on their part. I am well aware that soliciting aid in any such way is against the rules of the Force and punishable.

JAMES PRATT.

Letter from Inspector Buckley :—

SIR,— New Zealand: Police Inspector's Office, Invercargill, 24th September, 1887.

In forwarding Constable Pratt's explanation to your minute of the 19th instant, attached, I would like to state what passed between the constable and myself on the day after his arrival here on transfer from Wyndham, as having some bearing on the matter. To explain how the conversation arose, I must state that the constable after he received my memorandum ordering his transfer from Wyndham wrote to me asking to be informed of the reason of his removal, at the same time stating that he could not look upon his removal in any other light than that of a punishment. I returned his application, stating that he was removed owing to complaints being made from time to time of the manner in which police duties have been carried out at Wyndham, which correspondence he has not returned. On his arrival here in my office I asked him why he applied to be informed of the cause of his removal, at the same time telling him I thought it was impertinence on his part to ask such a question, as policemen are liable

to be removed at any time. He replied that he required it for a particular purpose, and that I would hear more about it shortly, emphasizing "that I would hear more about it shortly" with a very significant shake of his head. He then appeared anxious to have some more conversation on the matter, when I told him I did not wish to discuss the subject with him. As I was to hear more about it, I considered it best not to say any more about it just then.

I have, &c.,

A. BUCKLEY, Inspector of Police.

Minute by Commissioner Gudgeon, dated the 29th September, 1887:—

INSPECTOR BUCKLEY.—Please inform Constable Pratt that I did not remove him without due cause—that he is not the best possible judge of his own fitness for any position, and that if I find he uses outside influence in matters connected with the discipline of the Force I will recommend his discharge.

Letter from Commissioner Gudgeon:—

GENTLEMEN,—

Commissioner's Office, Wellington, 29th September, 1887.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd ultimo on behalf of Constable Pratt. The delay in answering the same has arisen from the fact that I forwarded the letter to Inspector Buckley for his report, which has now been received. In reply, I have the honour to inform you that Constable Pratt has on no less than three occasions been reported by different residents for inefficiency, and on one occasion by his Inspector. On my recent visit the constable's own report on affairs generally convinced me that he had neither the courage nor ability to enable him to cope with the difficulties connected with his work, and he complained that he had too much to do. Now, as it is necessary that the very best men in the Force should be employed on out-station duty, since they have not the advice of sergeants or Inspectors to assist them, I deemed it advisable to move the constable, and regret that it should have injured him financially; but you will agree with me that the public good in such matters is paramount. In seeking outside influence, Constable Pratt has been guilty of a serious breach of discipline, and, although I shall not on this occasion take official notice of his fault, I am none the less convinced of his unfitness for the Force.

I have, &c.,

W. E. GUDGEON, Commissioner.

J. W. Raymond, Esq., J.P., and others, Wyndham.

Reply from J. W. Raymond, J.P.:—

Wyndham, 8th November, 1887.

SIR,—

I have to acknowledge yours of the 29th September, and have to apologize for delaying so long. Our object in addressing you was merely to give Constable Pratt an opportunity of rebutting the charges made against him, as we felt sure that some of them were certainly assailable. I might also add that our action was purely spontaneous, Constable Pratt not on any occasion having solicited our sympathy.

Yours, &c.,

W. E. Gudgeon, Esq., Commissioner of Police, Wellington.

J. W. RAYMOND, J.P., and for co-Justices.

Witness: You can see how I was falsely charged with soliciting the influence of these gentlemen. I never knew a single thing about what these gentlemen were doing until I got this report from Commissioner Gudgeon. That was the first intimation I got of it.

45. *The Chairman.*] Your real complaint, I take it, is that all along you were never allowed what you consider proper inquiry into these charges?—Yes. I deny neglect of duty *in toto*. That is misrepresentation. I am quite satisfied that Commissioner Gudgeon got information afterwards that caused him to change his mind with regard to me. He may have heard from the Hon. Dr. Menzies, who signed that petition, as to the Wyndham matters, and six months after he removed me he seems to have changed his mind altogether. Six months afterwards he came down to Invercargill. I was on parade, and he called me out. He said, "Constable Pratt, I am going to send you in charge of Balclutha Station. I understand it is the best station in Otago, and I hope you will get on all right." Now, that does not look like the action of a man who has formed the opinion that I was useless. He must have had some confidence in me or he would not have made that statement. My impression is he found out I had been badly treated; and I took his words to me to convey this: "Now, you have been badly treated, and I am going to send you to the best station in Otago to make amends for it." I was sent to Balclutha on the 2nd May, 1888, and I remained there till the 21st January, 1890. There was nothing particularly happened, but I got the credit that I got in every place I have been in for putting down larrikinism. The only thing I wish to mention about Balclutha is that I was living in a wretched house there. There was a new house building just as I was leaving; in fact, it was finished three or four weeks before I left. I was sent from Balclutha to Kaitangata. I was transferred by Inspector Moore. I, of course, complained about being transferred. I understood, when I was sent to Balclutha, I would be allowed to remain there a considerable time, as I had been shifted so often before. When I went to Kaitangata I had only a four-roomed house. One of these rooms was used as an office, and I had ten of a family. Some of my family were twenty-three or twenty-four years of age at that time.

46. *The Chairman.*] You say you had children of that age living with you?—Some of them were over twenty. Through these frequent shifts my family has been ruined, as I could never get anything settled for them. At Kaitangata I had to rent a house at 5s. or 6s. a week, and put half my family into it. I applied to the Inspector to recommend the addition of two rooms, but he refused. I then asked for the material to be supplied, and I would find the labour to put up extra rooms. That was refused. Thinking I was going to be there some time—in fact, Inspector Moore inferred that I would be there the remainder of my time—I converted an outhouse that was there into a sleeping-room, and I made an office. I did this at my own expense, and I never got a penny from the department for it. I also fenced in a section—an acre of police reserve—and I made a garden there.

47. Did you make any application to the department in respect of this for a refund?—I do not know that I claimed. I think I should have been refunded the money. I am almost sure I mentioned it to the department. When I left, I agreed with my successor that he should pay £4 for the vegetables and other things. He did not pay. I applied for leave to sue him, and it was refused. I was removed from Kaitangata to Dunedin on the 14th October, 1890. I asked the reason for my being removed. I may state that Mr. Thomas Mackenzie, then member for the district happened to come there, and I found out he telegraphed afterwards to Wellington to have me remain there. He knew my family, and he did all he could to stop my transfer. I knew nothing about his action at the time. I never sought influence in any shape or form. There were two replies came about the cause of my removal. I forget what they were now. However, I had to

go. I heard the people got up a petition there, and I was afterwards informed it was signed by every man in Kaitangata but one. It shows the people were satisfied with my actions; and yet I was told by the department that it did not follow if I satisfied the public I satisfied the department. I think it should follow. I left my family at Kaitangata, and left there for the purpose of taking my discharge, I was so disgusted with my treatment. I was advised by the men, however, not to leave and throw up my service. I put my case before the department, and I could get no satisfaction, and I had to put it before the House. I, after a couple of months, brought my family to Dunedin, and a short time afterwards I was sent to Alexandra. My treatment in the service has been most harassing, and, had I not had such a family, I was so disgusted with my treatment that I would have thrown my billet up.

48. *The Chairman.*] You attribute your removal to Alexandra South to your appeal to Parliament?—There is nothing very much to be said about my time at Alexandra. It is a well-known fact that this place was another hotbed of larrikinism; and it is well known there was no man living that could cope with Alexandra. It was notorious for years before I went there as a hotbed of larrikins, doing outrageous things. The department will say I could not cope with the crimes committed there; but I say it was impossible for any man single-handed to cope with the crime there. The crimes committed were something awful. For instance, tying a Chinaman up, and setting fire to his place, and leaving him there to roast. The unfortunate fellow chanced to get out, and was found next morning by his comrade. I merely mention this to give you an example of the sort of people I had to contend with. You never heard, I suppose, of any such things being done in any part of the world. I had these men up several times, and if I had a dozen witnesses to prove the charges they would have twenty to prove they were in bed. On another occasion they threw kerosene on a Chinaman and set fire to him, and he was seriously burned. I have been out till 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning in all sorts of disguises to try and catch them. Of course, they were watching me. I may say I had these men up for setting fire to the Chinaman, and they were fined £1 each by the Justices. The fact was, I was simply laughed at—no support in any one way or the other. Had I had the Magistrate that is there now, larrikinism would have been stamped out long before it was. I wish to mention this, as the department will say I was not fit to cope with Alexandra. Mr. Pardy will know that he has sent up the smartest men he has—detective after detective—and they never made anything more out of it than I did. I could get every man in Alexandra—that is, every respectable man—to say that no constable in New Zealand could cope single-handed with the larrikinism there. When I was called to leave Alexandra I objected to it; in fact, I would have left if I had got my family to go to Invercargill. I was given twelve hours to go to Clyde. I had to pack up two wagon-loads of furniture and go to Clyde in twelve hours. I was transferred to Clyde on the 14th November, 1895, as gaoler. What delayed me was that I had asked that the transfer should be held over for a week, as there was nothing urgent, and I wished to make arrangements. I was waiting to know whether it would be granted or not, and the first thing I got was that if I was not at Clyde in a certain time I would be suspended.

49. *The Chairman.*] Had you not had the order for transfer some time previously?—Yes, a week before. I asked to have it suspended for a week, and I got no reply to my request. If I had got my family to go to Invercargill I would have left the service and followed them there very soon. Character does not appear to be of any use in the service from my experience. The only thing I have to say about Clyde is, that I am in a house that is not fit for a Chinaman to live in. Last session there was £400 granted for the purpose of building a new house, and by some mistake or other it did not come to pass. This session there has been £400 granted to put up a new station at Clyde, and I may say if some action is not taken this winter to put up a new place I will have to send my family away. I have now seven of a family, including myself and wife. My children had to get up frequently last winter in the night, as they could not sleep owing to the cold. In the summer it is 95 deg. some days, and in the winter it is below zero, I do not know how far. They had to get up in the night owing to the cold, though I had a stove burning all night near them. The only decent house I have had to live in during my service was while I was at Alexandra.

50. What age were you when you went into the Force?—Thirty-seven.

51. Is there anything else you would like to state?—There have been a number of charges brought against me in this correspondence to-day which I never had any idea I would have to meet. I never had any idea such statements would be made. I verbally contradict every one of them. With reference to not going to a fire till eight hours afterwards, it is ridiculous. I remember the occurrence, and even if I was not there till eight hours afterwards I showed good reason for it, I guarantee; but it is incorrect to say I did not go till eight hours afterwards. I say the representations made by Inspector Buckley while I was at Wyndham were false, and I could have shown them to be false. I say also that Inspector Buckley shifted me through, I will not say what influence, but I know Winter and he were two Masons; and it was my opinion at the time, and it was also the opinion of every one at Wyndham, that Winter had brought about my transfer. I say I insisted on an inquiry. If this inquiry had gone on I would have shown that what Inspector Buckley says against me there is false. I have been shifted through his representations to please this man, and I say he has falsely represented me all through.

52. Do you not feel satisfied in your own mind that the action of the department in putting you back again in charge of a station after your removal from Wyndham conveys, as you felt it did at the time, there was an admission that some injustice had been done?—I thought so. In my petition to the House, I asked to have the power taken from Inspectors of removing men from stations without giving them the option of holding an inquiry, when they demanded it. I demanded an inquiry there; and I knew I would not get it, and I did not get it. I wish to draw attention to the reply which appears in *Hansard*, that in future neither the Inspector nor the Commissioner can shift a man without the sanction of the Defence Minister. I brought that about. I pride myself on having that altered. I was deprived of my long-service medal for two

years, owing to these two charges being on the sheet. I did not know these charges were on the sheet till I saw them, when I was inquiring about my long-service medal. I also distinctly state I have been shifted from Balclutha through political influence. It was a well-known fact at the time. The Inspector shifted me from there to put this man Keenan in my place. I will get fifty people in Balclutha to say that is a fact.

53. Are you prepared to show it?—Not now. I could have shown it at the time. It is a well-known fact that Keenan had been offered other stations, and did not accept them. He would not go to a place except some station about Milton, and I am satisfied I was only shifted from there to make room for this man. I say he was a disgrace to the Force for years before he went there.

54. Is he in the Force now?—No. He was dismissed. He remained at Balclutha for nine days. He was drunk all the time. He was reported several times to the Inspector for being in that state before any notice was taken of it. I say distinctly, I was shifted from Kaitangata to make room for Constable Poole through political influence—Mr. J. C. Brown.

55. Do you know if any influence was used on his behalf?—That was well known at the time. I would like to see Inspector Moore's reason for shifting me.

At this stage the following correspondence was read by Mr. Tunbridge:—

Telegram from Inspector Moore to Commissioner of Police, dated the 23rd January, 1890:—

CONSTABLE Pratt, at Balclutha, not able to cope with duties there, I suggest he be replaced by Constable Keenan from here, that Pratt be removed to Kaitangata with his large family, and Constable Dale from latter place to Dunedin. Deem this arrangement advisable. Your permission sought.

Telegram from Commissioner Gudgeon to Inspector Moore, dated the 27th January, 1890:—

MAKE any changes you believe advisable, viz., Pratt, Dale, and Keenan.

Telegram from Inspector Moore to Commissioner Gudgeon, dated the 7th October, 1890:—

RE TRANSFER of Constable Pratt from Kaitangata to Dunedin, authorised 29th ultimo, A.C./1767: Constable Pratt asks that this transfer be suspended pending receipt of his complaint for having been transferred four times during thirty-two months, which complaint, he says, will arrive here this evening. I have instructed him to obey orders, and proceed to Dunedin on the 14th instant. I have arranged for Constable Poole, of Roxburgh, to relieve him on that date, and if these transfers are not effected much inconvenience will result. Constable Pratt has not performed his duties satisfactorily either at Balclutha or Kaitangata, and he has threatened to resign if transferred again. I shall be glad of your decision in this matter.

Letters from Inspector Moore:—

SIR,—

Police Office, Dunedin, 23rd September, 1890.

RE unsatisfactory manner in which the constable named in the margin—Constable Pratt—performs police duties, and recommending his removal from the charge of Kaitangata Station, and his transfer to Dunedin.

In submitting the annexed correspondence for your consideration, I have the honour to state that for some time past complaints have been made to me of the unsatisfactory manner in which Constable Pratt generally performed his duties. I may say that it was on this account he was removed from the charge of Balclutha Station, on the 3rd February last, to Kaitangata, a less important station, where it was hoped he would be able to give satisfaction; but I regret to say that complaints are still made of his neglect and dilatoriness in the discharge of his duties. I may further state that this constable seems always to have a grievance, which he appears to brood over; and he has stated that if he is again transferred he will resign and leave the Force. Under the above circumstances, I am at a loss to know what to do with this constable, but I would strongly recommend he be relieved of Kaitangata Station, and transferred to Dunedin, where he would be under the eyes of non-commissioned officers, and subject to strict discipline.

I have, &c.,

S. MOORE, Inspector of Police.

CONSTABLE A. Christie, Balclutha.

Police Office, Dunedin, 12th September, 1890.

You having verbally informed me that some time since you sent summonses to Constable Pratt, of Kaitangata, for service, that he kept the said summonses three weeks, and neglected to serve them and make return thereof in time for the hearing of same at Court; also, that the Magistrate at Balclutha had complained from the Bench of Constable Pratt's conduct; hence be good enough to furnish a full report of the particulars regarding the matters referred to.

S. MOORE, Inspector of Police.

Witness: I wish to say a word or two about that. That is the only charge that Inspector Moore could ever get against me. He had been travelling about, and he heard the Magistrate had said something. Some man made a complaint about a summons not being served that was sent to me at Kaitangata. He complained in Court, and the Magistrate said he had nothing to do with the matter—that if he had any report to make, he should make it to the Inspector. However, the man did not report to the Inspector, but the Inspector heard of it, and he asked me for an explanation. I gave an explanation that would satisfy any one that was not biased or prejudiced against me. I demanded an inquiry into the charge, but he would not give it. That was the only charge that ever he mentioned he had against me. I know, too, it was the only one he could get. I could have got twenty witnesses to prove about this man that I was charged with neglecting to serve. I could have shown that he had not a vestige of right to charge me. The fact of the matter was, the man was at Timaru that he was charging me with not serving. I knew he was trying to "have" me. He went three days to Invercargill to try and get charges against me. I defied him, when he went back, to bring them before two Justices of the Peace and prove them. I could have shown these charges were false, every one of them. I have always been trying to get an inquiry and I could never get it. That is the way I have been treated. I have been passed over by about fifty for promotion. I am prepared to stand any examination in police duties with any of those that have been passed over me, and I will back myself, and I do not know one in twenty of them. I say it is a mere chance you get promoted. If you are in a place such as I am now there would be very little chance of promotion. There is nothing extraordinary happening there. Unless you have a murder case in your district, and discover the murderer, or rescue some one from drowning, or have political influence at your back, you never have a chance of promotion. I say if a man does a meritorious act he should be paid in cash, and promotion should be by seniority accompanied by fitness. I also complain of the place I have to live in now. I assure you I will have to shift my family from there if nothing is done before the winter, for they cannot live there during severe weather. I have five children with me. The oldest is twenty-seven or twenty-eight, there is another about twenty, another eighteen, one of thirteen or fourteen, and one of ten.

56. *Colonel Hume.*] Are you prepared to say you did not plead guilty to these first two charges in your defaulter's sheet?—I was not asked to plead guilty or not guilty.

57. You did not plead at all?—No, I did not.

58. Did you go down to that train at Invercargill?—Yes.

59. Had not the train gone before you got there?—The train was just moving from the platform as I got to the station.

60. What was your object in going to the train?—That was part of my duty, to see the train off.

61. To see who went in it?—Yes.

62. You admit walking with Constable Ferguson?—I do; but I never thought it was an offence.

63. The result of these things being entered in your defaulter's sheet was that you did not get your long-service medal for some fifteen months or two years?—Yes.

64. Anything else?—That is all.

65. There is no money attached to the long-service medal?—No.

66. You admit you were talking with Constable Walton?—Yes; we met accidentally.

67. And when the Inspector investigated, you said nothing about having any witnesses to call?—I never thought it was worth talking about.

68. Were you punished for being there any particular time, or simply talking?—The charge is there.

69. And yet your grievance is I would not allow you to call witnesses, when you admit the charge?—We denied being guilty, from first to last.

70. Were you talking?—We were.

71. You wanted to get some evidence to show you were not talking above a certain time?—What we wanted to show was that Inspector Moore said we were there five minutes, and we were not there thirty seconds.

72. It never struck you to ask to bring witnesses before your Inspector?—We certainly asked for witnesses when Inspector Moore brought us up.

73. *The Chairman.*] Did you ask the Inspector to let you call witnesses?—Certainly.

74. *Colonel Hume.*] The next thing is, neglect of duty to inquire into a row at the Otago Hotel—did you inquire into that?—No, I did not. I never thought that was there. I simply explained to the Inspector at the time, and I never thought there was anything more about it.

75. As regards talking with Constable Walton, if the Inspector says, "I saw them at Rattray Street, both facing each other and motioning with their hands, as if discussing something, for about three or four minutes from the time I saw them," then he is making a false statement?—Undoubtedly, not a question about it.

76. As regards the complaint about these entries being made in your defaulter's sheet without you knowing of it: do you know that this could not happen now, that it was stopped long ago?—I do not know.

77. With regard to your complaint about being marched out in charge of a third-class constable when you were a first-class constable, it has not been carried on since?—No.

78. Now, with regard to married men being brought in from stations and docked of 1s. a day, will you give us the names?—There was Constable Walton, and others.

79. How did you lose 1s. a day?—We were on the goldfields. It did not include myself. I said that others were brought in for the purpose of docking them.

80. Tell us one it did include?—Constable Walton was at Alexandra, and he was brought in here; also Constable Nolan: he is at Woodhaugh now.

81. I understood you to say there were single men sent to take charge of stations instead of these men. What single men were sent?—Constable McIntyre. He was at Alexandra. There was another at Waikāia. I showed where there were twelve single men in charge of stations throughout Otago, and there were seven or eight unfortunate married men doing duty here, and paying high rents.

82. Did you ever read my reports?—Yes.

83. Did I draw attention to that in my reports?—Yes, I think so.

84. Did I approve or disapprove of it?—Oh, it was not your fault, bringing them in. My petition to the House got that altered. I take the credit of that.

85. You were moved from Alexandra to Clyde. How far is that?—Seven miles.

86. Are you a Freemason?—No.

87. Have you ever used any political influence at all?—Never asked any one. I deny I ever asked any one to do anything for me.

88. What is the population of Kaitangata?—About five or six hundred.

89. They got up a petition in Kaitangata to keep you there?—Yes. I was told so afterwards. I never knew anything at all about it when it was got up.

90. Is it an actual fact that a petition was hawked round a "tuppenny-ha'penny" place like that and you knew nothing at all about it?—It is because it was done very quickly there.

91. And very quietly?—Yes, very quietly.

92. Can you tell me how the petitioners knew you had fenced round this place?—They had eyes to see.

93. They go on further to say you spent the little money you had: how did they know that?—It was very easily seen. It was very easy to see I put up these two rooms.

94. How did they know you were not paid for it?—I do not know, I am sure. I had to go and buy the timber, and if they had any observation at all they could see I was doing it.

95. You got the order to move on the 4th October, and this petition was sent in on the 6th, two days afterwards?—I do not know when it was sent. I did not know anything at all about it. I never saw the petition. I never heard such a thing had taken place till afterwards.

96. You did not say anything to the Mayor of Kaitangata?—No.
97. You stated it was utterly impossible for one man to suppress the larrikinism at Alexandra?—Yes, at that time.
98. Did the man who succeeded you suppress it?—No, it was done before he got there.
99. *The Chairman.*] By yourself?—Well, by action taken by me before he got there.
100. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, one man did suppress it?—Well, I put a check on it while I was there. My belief is, if I had been allowed to remain there, I would have had no more trouble. It was just dying out. They got tired of it. One or two of them had been punished.
101. Then you did suppress it?—I take the credit of being the means of doing so.
102. Then, you see no necessity for two men being at Alexandra?—Not after I left.
103. But, before that, there ought to have been?—Yes, half a dozen were necessary.
104. How soon did you leave Alexandra after you got the order to go to Clyde?—I cannot say from memory.
105. Do you think there were eight days elapsed from the time you received the order till you went?—There might; but I was waiting for an answer to my request to be allowed three or four days to make other arrangements, as I intended going to Invercargill with my family and leaving the service.
106. Is it not usual for a man to pack up directly he gets orders to go?—I should think not. It is, if he is prepared to go; but I was not prepared to go.
107. You have a pretty good billet at Clyde now?—Yes.
108. And, as regards the house, there was a sum placed on the estimates last year to build one?—Yes.
109. That is an indication that I, at least, thought a new house was necessary?—Yes.
110. Now, you told us that a man could not get promotion unless there was a murder, or something very nearly approaching it, committed in his district, or else he must have political influence?—Yes.
111. We will take some station—Arrowtown. Was not the man at Arrowtown promoted the other day?—Yes; but I am not referring to these last promotions. I refer to cases previous to that.
112. We will take the case of Smith, who is at Featherston. Was there any murder committed at Featherston?—I do not know.
113. Was not the Featherston man promoted?—Well, a man named Smith was promoted over me.
114. Will you tell us one promotion that has been made in consequence of murder, or political influence, or masonic influence?—Yes. When I was at Mataura, a young man named Ross came to me to make inquiries as to joining the Police Force. He said he had a notion of joining the Force, and he asked what course he should take in order to get in. I said he might have to go to Wellington in order to join, but possibly he might get on in Dunedin without going to Wellington. I never saw anything more of Mr. Ross till six years afterwards, when I was down at the Supreme Court over a case. I found Ross was a sergeant—the man that I had given advice to six years before as to joining the Force.
115. Do you know where he is now?—He is out of the service.
116. Which was it—political influence, masonic influence, or a murder?—Well, it was influence of some kind. I should say political. Mr. Gourlay, Mayor of Dunedin, was a friend of his. He married Mr. Gourlay's daughter. That is a very good instance of political influence.
117. Can you give us one of masonic influence?—I have not much knowledge of constables, only those I have been immediately connected with. I heard all these things. I do not know them personally, but it is quite common talk that such is the case.
118. You have no complaint to make as to your present situation?—No, if I was supplied with a house.
119. Were there any arrests made for this roasted Chinaman, or this Chinaman that was covered with kerosene?—No; it was not in my time that happened.
120. What was the population of Alexandra—about?—It was very small, the time I was there. It was about a hundred people.
121. Then, out of these one hundred people you could not manage to fix on anybody that committed the offences?—I always knew them. I had them up dozens of times, but I could never get a conviction against them.
122. And yet you say there were no arrests made?—They were summoned.
123. What was the result of it?—The result was that they were fined £1 each by the local Justices.
124. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say that to get justice you have had to get assistance from Mr. T. Mackenzie, member for Clutha; Mr. Hutchison, member for Dunedin; and Mr. Pinkerton, member for Dunedin?—Yes.
125. You think similar steps had to be taken under the old rule pretty often?—Yes; I think so.
126. They have been forced into that position?—Yes; I think so.
127. *The Chairman.*] You said you never used political influence, to Colonel Hume; and now you say you had to use that influence to get justice: which is true?—Both are true. I only made representations when I could get no justice from the department.
128. *Colonel Hume.*] I understood you to say you never did get justice. Did you get justice when you went to these people?—Yes, certainly. They acknowledged I was badly treated. That is about all the justice I got.
129. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Your first transfers were made under Mr. Weldon's rule?—Yes.
130. And subsequent transfers were made under Mr. Gudgeon and Colonel Hume?—Yes.
131. How soon did injustice commence against you?—I say from the very first.

132. And it has continued right down to the last?—Yes.
133. You have had the misfortune to receive injustice at the hands of Mr. Weldon, Mr. Gudgeon, and Colonel Hume?—Any shift I got under Mr. Weldon was purely for my benefit. From Invercargill to Mataura, of course, was for my benefit.
134. From Winton to Invercargill: was that for your benefit?—I have not complained about that, except the shortness of the period. What I complain of is the shortness of periods between my transfers.
135. Do you think if you had given satisfaction you would have been transferred?—I think I would, because at that time constables were usually shifted every two or two and a half years.
136. Mataura to Gore, that was four years afterwards: you do not complain of that?—Oh, no; that was for my benefit.
137. Gore to Wyndham; that was four years?—I do not complain about that.
138. You have made all these the subject of complaint?—Well, they have been in a way. The men that relieved me in those places have been there ever since almost. Mulholland relieved me at Winton. He was there until the other day, when he came down here.
139. Is it not a fact that Mulholland was at Cromwell for about five years?—Yes, but he had only one shift.
140. You have had, therefore, the misfortune to incur the displeasure, or, at any rate, according to your own ideas, to have had injustice meted out to you by every officer you have served under?—Well, it looks like it.
141. That is your contention?—No. I only say there are two—Inspector Buckley and Inspector Moore.
142. Do you not allege you were unjustly treated by being sent out to Alexandra instead of being kept at Dunedin for a suburban station?—No. I did not allege I was treated unjustly. I could not say I was treated unjustly; but I asked that that should be done.
143. Have you not made that a cause of complaint, and did you not dwell on it for a long time?—I say I should have got that as a favour. I asked it as a favour. I did not dwell on it much.
144. *The Chairman.*] You do not complain of your appointment to Alexandra?—No, because it was for my benefit.
145. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As regards your removal from Alexandra to Clyde, you say larrikinism was rife at Alexandra, and you were not able to put it down?—Yes, and no single constable in New Zealand could put it down.
146. While you were there a public meeting was held by the inhabitants?—Yes.
147. Did they not make representations that police should even be drawn from the North Island to carry out the laws?—They could see more constables were wanted there.
148. Constable Chisholm succeeded you at Alexandra, did he not?—Yes.
149. How long was he there before larrikinism was dead?—It was conquered before he went there.
150. What was the meaning of the public meeting then, asking that police should be sent from the North Island, if it was conquered just immediately before your removal?—It is no wonder at all they did, because half a dozen policemen could not cope with it.
151. But you say it had been conquered?—I believe there would have been no more larrikinism there if I had been allowed to remain there.
152. Did not Constable Chisholm, immediately after he went there, succeed in getting a number of them in custody and convicted?—I never heard of it.
153. At any rate, within three months after Constable Chisholm's arrival in Alexandra, was not larrikinism stamped out practically?—It is not stamped out yet.
154. But I mean the acute stage of larrikinism?—From what I heard it is not stamped out yet, or anything like it.
155. Do you know of any complaints?—I know this: it was the Magistrate that stamped it out, not the constable.
156. Have you heard of any Chinamen having windows broken?—No. The Chinamen are not in Alexandra now. They shifted out of the town.
157. Do you know, since Chisholm has been there, of any windows being broken?—I am not aware.
158. Do you know of any Chinamen being set fire to?—I am not aware.
159. Do you know of any dynamite bombs being placed in a Chinamen's hut since he went there?—No. The Chinamen are living outside the town four or five miles. I understood there was a case of a Chinaman having kerosene thrown on him.
160. Is it not a fact that the people in Alexandra simply made a butt of you?—No, no such thing.
161. Simply treated you as little better than a child?—No, no such thing.
162. What was the meaning of the dummy in the river?—I do not know.
163. Were they not playing practical jokes on you?—It was not directed against me.
164. But you were unfortunate enough to fall into it?—I was unfortunate enough to be there; and if Chisholm had been there it would have occurred in the same way.
165. Do you think Chisholm would have been stupid enough to carry a dummy seven miles without discovering it was not a man?—I do; and I think the Inspector would have done it too. There were two doctors who were deceived over it.
166. But it had no hands or arms?—Well, two doctors were working at it for twenty minutes before they discovered it was a dummy. It was very natural looking; and as I was in a hurry to get it to Alexandra, it was very easy deceiving me.
167. You got it into a cart and carried it seven miles, and got two doctors to see it?—Yes. I may say the sergeant was there, and when he looked at it he could not detect it.

168. *The Chairman.*] Sergeant McLeod?—He was in charge. There were two hundred or three hundred people looking at it for ten minutes, and none of them ever thought it was a dummy. It was the most clever thing got up that I ever saw.

169. Did you act under McLeod's orders, in having this carted seven miles?—No. He was there when the dummy was landed. It was brought up the river, and taken out of the boat and laid on the beach.

170. Did Sergeant McLeod direct you what to do with it?—Yes. He ordered it to be put on a stretcher, and taken to a place and examined by the doctors. I would have given £20 for the Inspector to have been there, and I am quite satisfied he would have been deceived as well as I was.

171. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Your complaints are that you have been moved about a great deal too much, and that you have not received the promotion you ought to have got?—Yes. I have not got my deserts in any way.

172. What you mean is, if you had received your deserts you would have been made a sergeant?—I would not have taken a sergeancy if it was offered to me. If I had been offered a sergeancy five or six years after I joined I might have taken it; but after that I would have refused it.

173. You would not have accepted it had it been offered you?—No, I would not; but I was entitled to receive it.

174. If I decline to offer it to you in the future you will not feel aggrieved?—No. I would not accept the position. I am satisfied I shall not be offered it. In any case, I think it would be an insult to offer it to me now.

175. *The Chairman.*] Why would you not accept a sergeancy?—If I had been asked when I was at Balclutha to come down to Dunedin as sergeant-major I would have refused it.

176. Why?—Because I was better off where I was. I would lose money over it. At that time I was better off in charge of a station; but now there is nothing to be made in charge of a station.

177. What is the difference?—The system has changed. The Court work is taken from constables, and all things they made anything out of have been taken away from them.

178. Do you not think it is a bad system that any of these country stations should be so profitable that it checks a man's desire for promotion in the service?—Yes.

179. Do you think it is desirable that these good stations should be held by any one man for a lengthened period? Is it not an injustice to the rest of the Force?—Yes. I recommend in my report that frequent changes should be made, especially in the goldfields—dear places. I have been up there seven years, and my pay has not kept me all the time.

180. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You get in your present position free fuel and light and quarters, and your pay is more than that of an ordinary first-class constable?—I receive £156 a year.

181. And free fuel and light and quarters, and 6d. a day extra?—Yes.

182. And 1s. a day long-service allowance?—Yes.

183. And you get a prisoner perhaps once a month?—Sometimes two or three in the month. Of course it varies very much.

184. Your duties as gaoler are extremely light?—Oh yes. Of course I do police duty when I have no prisoners.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, examined on oath.

185. *The Chairman.*] You are a first-class constable, stationed at Balclutha?—Yes. What I wish to refer to are unjust charges on my defaulter's sheet. There are two charges. The first is "Unnecessary delay, and visiting places other than those he was instructed when sent on mounted patrol; fined 10s." The second is "Attending a fire in Tay Street in plain clothes and leaving without instructions to do so; fined 10s." The date was the 7th July, 1883.

186. The witness in the case was Sergeant Slattery, and he is dead?—I desire to give evidence on these charges. I complain that I was never guilty of those charges; that I was never charged with them, and I never pleaded guilty to them.

187. Was the evidence of Sergeant Slattery taken?—No, it was not. It is stated on the sheet that I pleaded guilty to them; but I did not. I was never charged with them, and I was never guilty of them. Those are not the charges that were read to me at all.

188. Slattery was not examined in your presence?—No, he was not. I will give you the whole details of the matter. I was a mounted man in Invercargill at this period. Usually in the afternoon, when there was nothing special, I took a patrol into the country. On the date mentioned, I took a longer patrol than usual. I went through a country that I had not been through for a very long time, called the West Plains, a district outside Invercargill. On my return to the station, as I was coming in, I met the Inspector. He asked me where I had been. I told him I had been on mounted patrol, and that I had taken a turn round by the West Plains, as I had not been in that district for a long time, and I took that way for a change. He returned, and asked the sergeant what time the mounted man was to be in. Sergeant Slattery said he gave me no instructions when I went out on mounted patrol, and he did not tell me to come back at any hour. The Inspector complained of that, and said that I should have been instructed to come in at a certain hour, and there that matter ended. I went on to the stable. I had two horses to look after then at the station, and, after doing up my stable and horses and kit, I was returning to my home, leaving my hat and jumper behind in the stable, where I always left them. While crossing over Tay Street, the fire-bell rang, and people ran to the fire. The fire happened to be, in this particular instance, outside of the Town Belt. It was a great time in Invercargill for fires. This was an old wooden building, belonging to, I think, Mr. Thompson, and it was unoccupied. There was a great crowd of people gathered about. The constable on the beat was there; Sergeant Slattery, Constable Wright, and myself. Promoted lately to sergeant, Sergeant Wright is now in Wellington, and he can be asked

as to the truthfulness of what I am now stating. I returned from the fire with Constable Wright. While at the fire, seeing that it was an unoccupied house, and there was no furniture or inmates, or anything to be watched, Sergeant Slattery said, "There is no good anybody stopping here. The man on the beat can do this." I was going down the street home, when I saw the Inspector coming; and hearing the sergeant say he was going to leave, I turned back to tell the sergeant that the Inspector was coming. He remained there for some time; and as the Inspector had growled at me for stopping out a little longer than usual, I wanted to let him see I was at the fire, and I took a turn round where he was standing, and soon afterwards, with Constable Wright, I returned to my home. Two or three days following this, Sergeant Slattery came up to me in the barrack yard and said, "Griffith, I have been instructed by the Inspector to report you." I said, "What for?" He said, "Being at the fire in plain clothes the other night; and staying out longer than usual on mounted patrol." I said, "All right, sergeant, if you are told to report me, I suppose you will have to do it." It would be three or four days after this I was called before the Inspector. The Inspector said he had a report from Sergeant Slattery against me. He held it in his hand. He said, "Sergeant Slattery reports that you stopped longer on mounted patrol than there was any necessity for. What have you got to say to that?" I said, "Sir, the fact of it is: I have been going so often out to the Waikiwi and through that part of the district that I took a turn that afternoon on the West Plains. Several of the settlers were very anxious to see the police up there. I had a long talk with some of them. It was a new district, and I wanted to find out the roads. If it is an offence to do any extra duty, I will not be guilty of it again." The Inspector said, "Sergeant, what time did you tell this mounted man to return?" The sergeant said, "I did not tell him any time." He said, "Sergeant, how does this man do duty?" The sergeant replied, "He is a very good man, Sir. It is the first time I have seen him stop any longer than usual in coming in." He then said, "Constable, you are also charged with stopping at a fire in plain clothes. What have you got to say to that?" I said, "I was partly in plain clothes. As you are aware, I always leave my jumper and hat in the stable, and I left them there at 9 o'clock at night, and when walking across Tay Street the firebell rung. Everybody went to the fire, and I ran to the fire also, so that I might be of assistance in case of danger to life and the saving of property. If it is any offence to go to a fire except in full uniform I was not aware of it. I will not be guilty of it again." "Fined £1," he said. I remonstrated with the Inspector as well as I could—said I thought it was very unjust treatment; that I had a long police experience, and that was the first time I was ever before him; that it was the first time I was ever before any Inspector, and that, under the circumstances, I failed to see what crime I had done. I told him that I did not disobey any order: that the sergeant did not tell me what time I was to come back; that all I had done was a little extra duty, and if that was an offence I would not be guilty of it again. As to going to the fire when not in uniform, there were other constables there in plain clothes, and if it was an offence to go in plain clothes I would not do it again. It was no good. I may now state I did not know what I was charged with. I was never on duty at the fire, except to go there as any other constable off duty. I was a mounted man, and I was on duty from 7 o'clock in the morning till 9 o'clock at night.

189. You say the sergeant told you there was no occasion for you to remain—that the constable on the beat could attend to it?—Yes, because it was outside the Town Belt, and there were no other houses near it.

190. You knew what you were charged with, except as to leaving without instructions?—The leaving without instructions is what I complain of. There were no orders to the contrary at that period, and the sergeant said what I have stated. As regards being on mounted patrol, I was not told to be in at any special hour.

191. You knew the charge against you—delay in returning from your patrol—unnecessary delay in visiting places other than those you were instructed?—I was instructed to visit no places, and that is where the offence is created.

192. You told us you went to a part of the district you had not been to for a long time before—that you were not in the habit of visiting?—That is so.

193. You were never told what part of the district you were to go to?—Never. I went on mounted patrol to exercise the horses. There were two horses, and exercise had to be given one of them every day, so that one horse would only be exercised two or three times a week. I appealed against it at the time—that I was never before the Inspector before, and that any man taken before a Magistrate for the first time would get off, except in the case of a serious crime; but my appeal was in vain. I certainly did not know that these charges were qualified like that, to make them offences. What I want to point out is this: In this instance the Inspector was the prosecutor, the witness, the Judge, and the jury. In ordering the sergeant to make this report to him he was the witness, and at the same time he was the prosecutor and the Judge. It was an extraordinary state of affairs. It would not be allowed in anything in the world except the New Zealand Police Force in those days. I think when constables are charged with offences they should be given the same fair-play as is given to criminals—namely, bring them before a Magistrate or Justices—a Magistrate, for preference—and let the charge be dealt with in open Court. I may say I served in the Royal Irish Constabulary before I served in New Zealand—and that is one of the strictest Forces in the world—and I was never charged with anything.

194. Your opinion is that charges against constables should be dealt with by the open Court?—They should get the same justice as is accorded to prisoners. The charge should be dealt with in open Court—by the Magistrate for preference.

195. *Colonel Hume.*] Did you plead guilty or not guilty to these charges?—I pleaded not guilty.

196. Then, you are prepared to swear that this defaulter's sheet is a false document?—I am prepared to swear that what I say is true.

197. But it says here you pleaded guilty—that is a false statement?—It is. I was never charged with that offence. In the first place, I was not told to go to any place. The whole country was open to me; and I never pleaded guilty to that.

198. You said the Inspector was the prosecutor, the witness, and the Judge, and the jury, and that would never occur in any country but the New Zealand Police?—Not that I am aware of.

199. Take the next service, the nearest service—the Permanent Artillery—supposing an officer in the Permanent Artillery saw one of his men drunk, would he not be witness, prosecutor, and Judge?—He would, if he took it upon himself.

200. What else could he do?—He could call upon one of his sergeants.

201. Take the case of one of Her Majesty's ship captains. He sees one of his men drunk. Is he not the witness, prosecutor, and Judge?—I do not know. I was referring to the Police Force. I do not know anything about the Permanent Artillery or the captain of a ship. I am talking of the Police Force. It would not occur in the Royal Irish Constabulary. If an Inspector did make a charge, a Board of officers would be appointed, and the Inspector would appear as a witness. He would not sit in judgment himself. I may state that the first I knew about these charges being on my defaulter's sheet was after Inspector Buckley retired from the service. You will see there will be some facts that will corroborate now what I say. I then applied to Inspector Moore, who was in charge at Invercargill, for a copy of my defaulter's sheet, and I got it. I wrote to Sergeant Slattery, who was then at Reefton, if my memory is good, and I requested him to send me particulars of the matter, and asked if he did not remember that I was never charged with these offences, and how was it that they were entered on the charge-sheet. I wrote twice to him, and I could not get an answer from him. Seeing that he would not answer me, I was anxious to force him, and I wrote on returning the defaulter's sheet, on my own report, which was attached to the copy of the defaulter's sheet, "I never pleaded guilty to these charges. I was never charged with them, and there is not a particle of truth in them."

202. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was that during Sergeant Slattery's lifetime?—Yes; immediately I found out these charges were there, and when I could get no reply from Sergeant Slattery, I wrote this in order to force an inquiry.

203. *Colonel Hume.*] Are you a Mason?—I am.

204. I think you told us the other day you had never used political influence to get yourself on in the Force?—No; I said the trouble in the Police Force was political and masonic influence.

205. Then, you went on to say you had never used political influence?—Yes.

206. You joined the Force in 1883?—The last time in 1883—Yes.

207. You were promoted to second-class in 1888, and first-class in 1894?—Yes.

208. Then you got on fairly quickly?—I did.

209. And yet you did not use any political influence?—No, I did not.

210. Did you use any masonic influence?—No, I did not.

211. Then it appears a man did not require any political or masonic influence to get on in the Force fairly well?—It seems that is why some of them get on.

212. Will you answer the question?—That is the general impression.

213. But what do you know?—In my own case I got on, but without either—by merit.

214. You went on to say the Force was very much more satisfied in the last six months?—I did.

215. Did you not then go on to tell us you had been passed over for promotion?—No; I did not. I was labouring under the impression that I was unfairly treated because I thought my past service of six years, when I resigned, should count for promotion in some way or the other. When the Commissioner explained to me that that period could not count, I was satisfied then I had not been unjustly treated.

216. Up till last Saturday you thought you were unjustly treated?—Yes; till last Saturday I thought I should have been promoted with the last batch of promotions.

217. You say you did not know of these charges on your sheet till after Inspector Buckley left the Force?—That is it. How I got to get it was, I was mentioning that I was sorry for his treatment by the Government, and it came out in that way.

218. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What time did you leave the station on mounted patrol that day?—It would be 2 o'clock, or 2·30 o'clock.

219. And what time did you return?—About 7·30 p.m., if my memory serves me right.

220. You were away from 2·30 till 7·30 p.m.?—I think so.

221. What had been your usual hours for patrolling?—I did not usually go in till about 6 or 6·30 p.m.

222. You were away an hour to an hour and a half longer than usual?—About an hour to an hour and a half, from memory.

223. You do not wish to maintain that a constable has a right to leave the station and remain away as long as he chooses?—I do not mean that. It is to a constable's advantage to know the district he is stationed in—to know all the roads and the byways, the lanes and the people. This was a part of the country I had not been in. I thought to myself that some day or night I would have to go into this district, and I would know nothing about it, and that I had better take a turn round it. I was not told to go anywhere, or to come home at any hour. If I had been so told then it would have been an offence.

224. About masonic and political influence, can you give us an instance?—That would be very hard for me to do. I could not. How can you ask me that? But it is the general impression.

225. You cannot give any instance yourself?—I could not.

226. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you not said that, although you yourself did not ask for political interference, your friends had interfered on your behalf?—Very likely they did. Where a constable has a grievance no doubt his friends would know of it, and they may use influence behind his back to remedy it.

227. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As to the method of dealing with reports in 1883 in regard to constables, does it still prevail?—I really do not know.

228. Do you not know that if a constable is charged with an offence now, witnesses are called in his presence, their statements are taken down in writing, and he is given the opportunity to cross-examine those witnesses?—I made a mistake when I said I did not know. I do believe a constable can elect to be tried before the Stipendiary Magistrate.

229. *The Chairman.*] Do you know as a matter of fact, when there is a charge against a constable, he is given every facility for calling witnesses before his officer?—Yes; I think Mr. Pardy would adjourn it for any constable to get witnesses from any part.

230. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Not only are you allowed to call witnesses, but you are also present when the evidence against you is taken down in writing?—I am sure I would get that privilege from Mr. Pardy.

231. Do you know it is the rule?—I am not clear. Thank goodness, this is my first experience of being on the carpet.

232. *The Chairman.*] Do you think it would be a good thing if the right were provided for by regulation?—It would; and it would be better if it was tried in open Court by the Stipendiary Magistrate. I refer to charges brought against constables, not only by the Inspector but by any other man.

On Monday, 7th April, 1897, the following correspondence was handed in:—

To Sergeant Macdonell, Invercargill.
In September, 1883, Constable Griffith was fined by Inspector Buckley on two charges for neglect of duty. Look up records of that period and see if any correspondence has been filed about those charges, and forward to me if found.
WM. S. PARDY, Inspector.

Police Station, Invercargill, 6th April, 1898.

REPORT of First-class Constable Jeffery, No. 263, relative to Constable Griffith being fined for neglect of duty in September, 1883:—

I respectfully report that I searched the diary from the 1st February, 1883, when Constable Griffith came to Invercargill, to the 12th July, 1884, when he left on transfer to Lumsden, and can find only one entry against him, and that was on the 7th July, 1883, when he attended a fire in Tay Street in plain clothes, and left without receiving instructions to do so. I also searched the Invercargill correspondence for Invercargill for 1883, and cannot find any report against Constable Griffith.

Sergeant Macdonell.

G. C. JEFFERY, First-class Constable No. 263.

RESPECTFULLY forwarded to the Inspector.—E. MACDONELL, First-class Sergeant No. 179.—6th April, 1898.

DAVID LATIMER, examined on oath.

233. *The Chairman.*] You are a first-class constable, stationed at Dunedin?—Yes.

234. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you commence duty in Dunedin?—About eight or nine years ago.

235. When did you join the Force?—In 1878.

236. Have you been on many stations?—This is my fourth station.

237. What are the names?—Christchurch was the first, Timaru next, Ashburton next, and then I was back to Timaru for a short while before I came here to Dunedin.

238. Have you done street duty in Dunedin?—Yes.

239. What are you doing now?—I am doing watch-house duty.

240. How long have you been at that?—Nine months.

241. Before that you were on regular street duty?—Yes. Well, I used to be doing watch-house duty.

242. Were you ever ordered for removal, and have the order cancelled?—No, not that I know of.

243. As a result of your experience in Dunedin, can you say it was the custom for constables to frequent any breweries at night-time?—Well, some years ago it was, but not latterly.

244. Whose brewery was it?—Speight's brewery.

245. Has it happened within the last year?—It has not happened within my knowledge for the last three years.

246. *Colonel Hume.*] At night was this?—At night.

247. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did not some of the men regularly bring liquor from there into the barracks?—Well, there was one, some time ago. It is a good number of years ago. He is not in the Force now.

248. *Colonel Hume.*] That was when the barracks was up Maclaggan Street?—No, it was where they are now.

249. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is there a better feeling in the Force during the past six months than there was formerly?—Oh, yes; a better feeling.

250. So far as your experience goes, has there not been a feeling until some six months ago that men were compelled to use political influence if they wished to get justice?—Yes, there was a feeling. It was talked about.

251. General talk?—General talk.

252. *The Chairman.*] What do you attribute the better feeling now in the Force to?—Well, there have been some promotions lately. The men have been better satisfied.

253. Is it that they feel these recent promotions have been got without political influence?—Oh yes, I think they have. I may say that Mr. Pardy gave the men a caution some time ago with regard to going to breweries, and that practice has been entirely discontinued. Things generally are a lot better than they used to be. Some five or six years ago there were fifty or sixty brothels in Dunedin, and I think they have entirely disappeared.

254. *Mr. Taylor.*] The police are more vigilant now than they used to be?—Yes.

OWEN McCORMACK, examined on oath.

255. *The Chairman.*] What is your class?—Third-class constable, stationed at Dunedin.
256. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you join the Force?—About six years ago.
257. When did you come to Dunedin?—About August, 1895.
258. Have you being doing street duty ever since?—I have.
259. Can you say of your own knowledge whether it was customary since you came here for any of the men to frequent Speight's brewery at night-time?—Since I came here it was not. There were a couple of men here, but they are not here now. I believe before I came here it was the usual thing.
260. What did you see of it after you came?—I did not see much of it since I came. Inspector Pardy spoke to us at a parade, and said if any of us were known to be going there we would get our immediate dismissal.
261. *The Chairman.*] How long ago was that?—That would be about two years ago.
262. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know of political influence being used by the men in connection with any matters?—Not that I am aware of.
263. Is there not a general feeling in the barracks that men do resort to political influence to get redress?—It is an understood thing. It is the barrack-room talk.
264. Did you serve with Constable Mayne?—I did.
265. Did he not boast in the barrack-room of political influence?—I was never mixed up with him, but I think he used to sometimes.
266. Was there not a general feeling he could pull the wires?—Oh yes, there was a general feeling.
267. During the last six months has there not been a change in the feeling amongst the men?—Yes, a lot better.
268. Is that due to the change in the control?—I think so.
269. What is the rule so far as Sunday holidays are concerned. What time off do you now get on Sundays?—We get four hours off one Sunday in four.
270. Do you know what is the rule in other stations?—Yes. They get a full day off, supposing they are full-handed.
271. Supposing they are full-handed. How do they manage them—they only send half the men out on Sundays all day on duty?—That is all.
272. If all the men are turned out on Sundays, as you are, there will be as big a staff on the streets on Sunday, when there is scarcely any one moving about, as on a Saturday night, when the streets are full of people?—Just the same.
273. Is there a feeling amongst the men that they should have a full Sunday every month?—Yes, there is a feeling.
274. Have all the men, as far as you know, in Dunedin, who are qualified to take charge of country stations, been acting as Court orderly in their turn?—I think so.
275. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Which do you prefer, a pension or a retiring-allowance?—A pension.
276. Even though you would have to contribute a small sum towards it?—Yes.

JEREMIAH TOOMEY, examined on oath.

277. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you join the Force?—In July, 1894.
278. Did you come from the Artillery?—Yes.
279. Where have you been stationed since?—Dunedin Central.
280. All the time?—Yes.
281. Been doing street duty the whole time?—No. When I first joined I was doing plain-clothes duty for a time, and this last twelve months I have been doing inside watch-house duty principally.
282. Is it within your knowledge that, since you came here, any of the constables have been in the habit of going to Speight's brewery at night while on duty?—It was the custom when I first came down.
283. If some of the men say it was the custom until the last year or two, do you know whether they would be speaking correctly?—I think it has been discontinued longer than a year.
284. *The Chairman.*] Can you say how long it has been discontinued?—I remember the Inspector mentioned as to publichouses and breweries. I cannot speak as to dates.
285. *Mr. Taylor.*] When the men used to go it was pretty clearly understood that, if they wished, they had the opportunity?—I believe so.
286. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I would like to get your opinion as to pension or retiring-allowance: which do you think would be most acceptable to the men?—Personally, I would prefer a pension.
287. In preference to a retiring-allowance?—Yes.
288. Even although you would have to contribute a small sum towards it?—Yes.

PATRICK O'NEILL, examined on oath.

289. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—First-class sergeant, in charge of the Central Station, Dunedin.
290. When did you join the Force?—In 1863; promoted first-class sergeant in 1874.
291. How long have you been in Dunedin?—I have been in charge of the Dunedin Station for about six years—not quite six. Previous to that I was on the goldfields.
292. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where were you stationed before that?—North Dunedin.
293. In the Dunedin circuit how long have you been?—About sixteen years, I should say, altogether.
294. How long were you at North Dunedin?—About twelve or thirteen years—not quite so much, perhaps.

295. When were you ordered for removal from Dunedin?—I was never ordered for removal from Dunedin.
296. You have been twice at the Central Station?—No. When I joined the Force I was attached to the principal station at Dunedin, and I was subsequently transferred to different parts of the province. The Central Station was then the depot.
297. Where was your first move?—I went to Waikouaiti from Dunedin.
298. How long were you there?—About two years.
299. After Waikouaiti, where were you?—I came back to Dunedin again. I then went to Hampden in charge of the Hampden Police-station.
300. And after that?—I came back to Dunedin again.
301. Then, where were you stationed?—I was sent from there to Outram.
302. How long were you there?—I was there about six months, and came back to Dunedin from there.
303. Where were you stationed after Outram?—I came to Dunedin, and from Dunedin I was sent to Outram some time after to take charge.
304. How long were you there this time?—I was there perhaps twelve months the last time. Then I was brought into Dunedin and promoted to second-class sergeant.
305. Were you sergeant at Outram?—I was constable. I was made second-class sergeant at once. That was the custom in those days. There were no third-class sergeants then.
306. Were you first-class constable before you were promoted?—Yes; in fact, I was always first-class, because there was no other class of constables when I joined the service.
307. *The Chairman.*] What year was that promotion to second-class sergeant?—About 1872.
308. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where did you go after that?—I remained in Dunedin for a time. I then went temporarily to Oamaru. I was there some time relieving the Inspector, who got into some trouble there. After Oamaru I went to Naseby to take charge. After Naseby I went to Clyde. I was sergeant in charge there under the Inspector, and I did the clerical work. I came from Clyde to North Dunedin under Mr. Weldon, and remained there about twelve or thirteen years. Then I got promoted to the Central Station at Dunedin on the death of the sergeant-major, and have been there ever since.
309. Were all these removals effected without your raising any protest?—Every single one of them without raising a protest.
310. Or making any application?—Or making any application whatever.
311. They were pretty numerous shifts?—They were busy times, and things were unsettled, and we were all shifted about. We had to put up with that in those days.
312. Do you know Mr. McArdle?—Yes. He is a Justice of the Peace at Dunedin.
313. Do you know him intimately?—Yes. I know him as a Justice.
314. Where were you stationed when he was in Dunedin?—I think I was at the Central Station, and in North Dunedin.
315. Did he ever interfere on your behalf in regard to any transfer?—I am not aware that he did. I told you that I never urged anything for transfer or promotion.
316. Your papers will not show any interference?—No; in fact, in my early days you dare not use political influence.
317. Do you think the rule in regard to political interference is observed?—Latterly it has improved a good deal.
318. But, say, now—in the last seven years?—Well, of course, political influence did exist, and was used considerably by some members of the Force.
319. *The Chairman.*] When?—Some years past, and up to some time ago. Not very recently, perhaps.
320. *Mr. Taylor.*] As a matter of fact, during the past six months, has not the change that has been effected tended to stop that?—I think it has killed it considerably, if not entirely.
321. So far as your observation goes, was it not very keen three or four years ago?—Yes.
322. You think the recent change is tending to put the men in better spirits?—I think so.
323. Do you remember a circular issued in May, 1895, in regard to the duties of Court orderlies?—Yes.
324. Has that been carried out in Dunedin?—Yes. The orderlies were to be relieved quarterly. There was a constable named Mayne, who was Court orderly at the time. His time of three months expired. I ordered him for street duty. He complained that he was not fit for street work then, and asked to be taken before the Inspector. He sent in an application, and the result was he remained on as Court orderly. I got no orders to remove him.
325. Was that as a result of a decision of the Inspector?—I do not know whether it was the decision of the Inspector, but I got no further orders.
326. *The Chairman.*] Did you get orders to let him remain on?—I got no orders to let him remain on. He was then on and performing Court orderly duty.
327. *Mr. Taylor.*] Until he was removed to Christchurch?—Yes.
328. Since Mayne left has this circular been carried out?—Yes. A constable named Quinn was appointed soon after, and he was relieved a few days ago.
329. About when did Mayne leave?—July or August last. I think there was another constable appointed for a short time, and Quinn has been doing it for the last two or three months. We were short of men at that time. I was getting hold of any man I could to do the job, pending the appointment of a man. After Mayne left, Constable McIntyre was appointed, and he remained as Court orderly until his transfer to Arrowtown.
330. For about three weeks?—More than that.
331. Was it a month?—It would be more than that; perhaps a couple of months. It would not be three months, at all events. McIntyre remained on, I think, till the 1st January, 1898, and Constable Quinn held it up till a few days ago. Constable Patterson is acting now.

332. Is Constable Quinn eligible for a country station?—Well, he is a single man.
333. Does not the order say that, in selecting men for the post, those men are to be chosen who are likely to be appointed to the charge of a country station where they are likely to be performing duties of Clerk of the Court. Has that been observed?—A man gains little experience for that by doing the duties of Court orderly in Dunedin.
334. But, is Constable Quinn qualified for a country station? As a matter of fact, can a bachelor take a country station?—They are not usually appointed to country stations.
335. Are they appointed now?—They used to be, but not latterly.
336. Is he qualified, according to the rule; is he a married man?—He is not a married man.
337. Is Constable Patterson a married man?—No, but he is a man very well up in years. He is rather sensible—what may be called a level-headed man in the police. Constable Patterson has for some time past been used as a relieving constable.
338. How long has Quinn been under you?—Some four or five years.
339. Has he done much street duty in that time?—Yes, a good deal.
340. Done any watch-house duty?—No.
341. Done any clerking?—No.
342. Has he done any relieving duty?—Yes.
343. Where?—He has done relieving duty in Queenstown. He has been, I think, to one or two other stations. I cannot remember now, as there are so many backwards and forwards.
344. Then, neither Quinn nor Patterson, in the ordinary meaning of the word, are qualified for country stations—that is, they are both single men?—Both single men.
345. Who acts as Inspector of Weights and Measures?—Constable Hanson.
346. Is that his sole duty?—His sole duty. He acts under the Adulteration of Foods Act also.
347. Does he do any Sunday duty?—No, nothing except what pertains to his office. He has to make up his books, of course, and he has very little time to do that during the week, because he is engaged inspecting weights and measures and taking samples in connection with the adulteration business.
348. What is the rule with regard to inspection of weights and measures?—I do not know.
349. What time does the watch-house keeper get off as far as Sunday is concerned?—The day watch-house keeper gets four hours off every Sunday.
350. And what does the ordinary constable get?—The day watch-house keeper and the Court orderly take the watch-house every alternate Sunday, four hours off each. The ordinary constable gets four hours off about once a month—every fourth Sunday.
351. Do you regard ordinary street duty or Court orderly duty as being the most arduous?—Well, ordinary street duty is the more arduous.
352. Then, the men who do the most arduous duties do not get the greatest amount of leave on Sunday?—The most of the men doing street duty are not competent to be watch-house keepers—at any rate, a number of them.
353. What do they lack?—They lack penmanship. They cannot write well enough.
354. Have you got many illiterate men in the ranks?—You cannot call them illiterate men. There are some fairly educated men whose writing is scandalous to look at.
355. Do you know what the rule is in other towns in regard to Sunday leave to ordinary constables?—I only heard what the custom is. In Wellington I heard they get off the whole Sunday once every six weeks, duty permitting.
356. Are you sure it is not once a month in Wellington?—No. I have heard that was what Inspector Pender said—that they get off once in every six weeks, duty permitting.
357. You do not know what the rule is in Christchurch?—No. I suggested here to the men some time ago that if they wished to take Sunday off they could have it; but it was not so beneficial as the system that existed. For instance, the relief that goes on at 9 o'clock goes on again at 5 o'clock at night, and we want all our force between 5 and 9 at night on the evenings of Sunday; and we want all our force between the hours of 5 and 9 in the morning. At that time in the morning there is property left exposed, unwatched, and the police, therefore, require to be doubly vigilant. Between the hours of 9 and 5 in the day there are numbers of people about, and there is no necessity for so much watching. There is danger to property between the hours of 5 and 9 in the morning and between the hours of 5 and 9 at night; when the streets are crowded we require a full force.
358. Could not a percentage of the men be off from 9 to 5 on Sunday?—Yes. We do that; that is where our four-hour system comes in. I think it is the best system. There are two reliefs between 9 and 5. One relief comes off at 1 o'clock: I take two men off that. Then, there is the 5 o'clock relief, and I take two men off that. I think it would be a risky thing to reduce the police between the hours of 5 and 9 in the morning.
359. Can you not afford the full eight hours?—We cannot; our men have to relieve others on country stations, on escort and other duties, and our staff is reduced. I know one thing—that the Inspector is quite willing to fall in with any system that will relieve the men, so far as he can with safety to the public interest.
360. Do you think the special privileges which the Court orderly and watch-house keepers have on Sundays are likely to cause discontent amongst the men?—I do not think so. I never knew anything of it. They are kept pretty busy during their term of office. They have a lot of returns to make out, and they have to look after the prisoners in the cells, and sometimes these prisoners are very troublesome.
361. *The Chairman.*] Does the Court orderly serve summonses?—He serves all police summonses, but he does not serve civil summonses.
362. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do all the men start exactly at the same time on Sunday—I mean the 9 o'clock relief?—Yes.

363. None are ever excused for Church?—No. They can go to Church if they like when off duty.

364. Are not some allowed half an hour's grace?—The men on night duty can always go to Church, and the men coming off at 9 o'clock in the morning can also go to Church. Those men coming off at 5 o'clock in the evening can likewise go to Church.

365. But I refer to the men coming on at 9 o'clock: are not some of them relieved half an hour to go to Church?—No.

366. Within your experience, are any of your men ever late in parading for the 9 o'clock relief on Sundays?—No. Any man late for duty is reported to the Inspector. That rarely occurs—once or twice within the last two or three years.

367. In your experience, in Dunedin, have you had frequent prosecutions in connection with licensing cases?—Yes.

368. Have you ever had a prosecution against the Shamrock Hotel?—Yes.

369. As a result of your initiative?—No. I conduct prosecutions in the Court.

370. What hotels have you ever laid informations against?—Well, latterly I have been in charge of the station, and I have not been out so much.

371. But when on street duty?—Yes, I have. I had one case against the National Hotel for a breach of the law, and some others I cannot recollect now.

372. You never had a prosecution against the Shamrock?—Never.

373. Do you know the Shamrock people have threatened to have some sergeants removed?—No. I saw something of it in the paper.

374. Have you ever heard publicans threaten to have a constable shifted because of interfering with their business?—No, I have not. I do not chum up with the publicans.

375. Do you remember a circular about instruction classes?—Yes.

376. Has that been strictly enforced?—Yes.

377. Are the lectures given once a week?—Yes; I give them.

378. What subjects do you cover?—The city by-laws, Police Offences Act, Justices of the Peace Act, Criminal Code, and Summary Jurisdiction Act.

379. Do you insist on regular attendance?—Yes.

380. Is the roll called at the lectures?—No. We do not call the roll because some of the men are on duty. We assemble all the men at the station.

381. Supposing the men absented themselves, would you have a record of that?—I would report any man who absented himself for disobedience of orders—neglect of duty.

382. If there is a man missing you know where he is?—Know where he is.

383. What is your opinion about the period an officer should be allowed to stay at any one station? Do you think periodical shifts are for the good of the service?—It may be good in small places, but in cities it is very injurious to the service.

384. Have you ever known a sergeant in the city examined as to whether he was sane?—I have heard of a sergeant being examined.

385. Do you know whether it was not a fact?—I believe the doctor did not report him insane.

386. Was he examined by a doctor?—Yes.

387. He was not declared insane?—He was not declared insane.

388. Still in the service, is he?—Still in the service.

389. Are all your men here thoroughly competent?—Very good men.

390. Have you any men now you would recommend should be weeded out?—No, none at all. We have a very good staff of men in Dunedin just now.

391. Is Sergeant Shirley here?—Yes.

392. A good officer?—A very sober man. There is not a more sober man in the service.

393. A thoroughly capable officer?—Yes; he is a very good sergeant.

394. Do you know when he was ordered back here it was protested against in the interests of the service?—That may be so.

395. Do you know?—I do not know of my own knowledge.

396. Did you discuss it with your Inspector, whether it was advisable he should come back here?—I did not. I saw something in the paper where the Inspector said it would have been better if he had not come back here.

397. You do not agree with that?—Oh, I do not say that.

398. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have been questioned about the leave to the constables: does the Inspector permit leave as far as it is possible consistent with the public safety?—That is so.

399. You are sometimes very short of men in Dunedin, are you not?—Yes, very frequently.

400. Do you consider you have sufficient men here in Dunedin, taking into account the casualties—men sick, men on relieving duty, men on escort duty, and other causes?—No, I do not think we have.

401. What number would you suggest would be sufficient to meet these casualties?—We would want between five and six men more.

402. Then it would be possible to give the men their full day's leave?—Yes.

403. If your present strength were always available you would have sufficient men?—Oh, yes.

404. As regards the question of pension *versus* retiring-allowance, what is your opinion about that?—I think a pension would be the best system. In fact, there is a pension in almost all Police Forces.

405. And as regards uniform, what is your opinion about that?—The uniform at present is supplied by the men themselves.

406. Do you think the men should be compelled to supply their own uniform?—My opinion is that the men should be supplied with uniforms, and there would then be uniformity through the whole service.

407. Do you think there should be any age for compulsory retirement?—No; I think a man should be allowed to remain in the Force as long as he is fit to do his work.

408. Are there not some men whom you know who, owing to old age, are incapable of performing proper police duties?—Yes, there are some.

409. If there was a pension system, you think that would do away with that?—Yes, do away with that.

410. What is your idea with reference to men joining the Force? At the present time the minimum age is twenty-three, and the maximum age forty: do you think men joining at upwards of forty years of age make good constables?—I think forty is too high. I think the ages should be between twenty-three and twenty-eight or twenty-nine. If you get young men you can train them and make policemen of them, but if you get men well up in years it is very difficult to deal with them. The men of the older age whom you get have been men disappointed in other spheres of life—men from the diggings, knocking about the country working on farms, employed about hotels—and there is a difficulty in getting these men to submit to police discipline.

411. Therefore you think young men make the best policemen?—Yes.

412. As regards Constable Quinn, do you know Constable Quinn has very strong hopes of getting married pretty soon?—Yes, I understand that is the case.

413. And if he became a benedict you think he would be quite qualified to take charge of a country station?—Oh, a very suitable man indeed.

414. You said you thought the frequent transfers in cities were not conducive to the welfare of the service?—That is my opinion.

415. Do you find it is an advantage in large cities that men should get to know the inhabitants?—Very advantageous indeed.

416. You do not think that applies so much in the country districts?—No. In small country districts it may be necessary to shift the men now and again.

417. In country districts the men have very little supervision?—That is so.

418. And as to men in cities, under supervision as they are, you do not think the fact that they get to know people is likely to make them lax in their duties?—No, I do not think so—in fact, it is very difficult to work a city with strange policemen, and the public interest is likely to suffer if you have a lot of strange policemen. You can get as much work out of one or two policemen who know a city as you would get out of half a dozen men that are strange to the place.

419. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know whether it was the custom for any of your men to frequent city breweries?—I do not know it of my own knowledge, but I have heard a good deal latterly about it. It came to my knowledge some years ago they were in the habit of frequenting them, but the thing is completely wiped out now.

420. Did you ever learn the details?—No.

421. Did you ever hear the key of the premises was left in a certain place for your men?—No.

422. Have you done street duty at all during the last five years?—No. I supervise the men.

423. You would not be likely to discover that of your own motion?—I would be likely to hear something of it.

424. Did you report it to the Inspector when you heard of it?—I never heard latterly. The first rumour of that kind occurred before the Inspector's arrival in Dunedin.

425. But did you make any inquiry?—No. The thing had gone—ceased to exist—when I heard about it.

426. And it has not existed since?—From what has come to my knowledge, apparently through your instrumentality and others, I believe there was something in it—at any rate, to lead me to think there was something in it.

427. *The Chairman.*] With regard to pay, do you think that it should be raised according to length of service, or according to rank held in the service?—I think there should be some system of long-service pay—to increase the pay as a man went along, and to induce the men to remain in the service.

428. Do you think that would be satisfactory?—I think so.

429. What is your idea with regard to having various grades of constables? Do you think that all constables should be of one rank, and increase the pay according to length of service?—I think two ranks of constables are not unreasonable at all. I think a man who joins the service should be put as second-class constable for two or three years, and then he should be appointed to first-class.

430. You would observe two ranks of constables; you would not make any difference in the pay of the two ranks?—Certainly I would.

431. With regard to sergeants, do you believe in a distinction in the ranks of sergeants?—The rank of third-class sergeant should, in my opinion, be abolished, and make two classes of sergeants.

432. *Colonel Hume.*] I would like to have your opinion as to the recruiting from the Permanent Artillery. Do Permanent Artillerymen, in your opinion, make good constables?—We have got very bad men from the Permanent Artillery.

433. Have you got any good ones?—We got some good ones too.

434. What is your opinion generally?—If you let me select my men I would go into the country and get a lump of a farm-servant, and train him up. They know too much in the Permanent Artillery. It is very hard to get them to submit to discipline.

435. You think the discipline they are submitted to in the Artillery does not fit them for police duties?—That is so.

JOHN BELL examined on oath.

436. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—First-class sergeant, and district clerk at Dunedin.

437. How long have you held the office of district clerk?—Since 1866. I reverted from the Civil Service to first-class sergeant on the 15th May, 1888.

438. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been in the Dunedin district long?—Yes, all the time I have been in the service.

439. Have you never served under Inspector Emerson?—No.

440. What is the practice here in regard to detectives—have they to report to the Inspector every day as to the whole of their actions the day before—their whereabouts and so on?—No, not every day. They have a diary in which they enter particulars of their duty.

441. Supposing an Inspector refuses to take verbal reports from a detective, would you consider that a very harsh, a very absurd arrangement?—I think it is very unlikely he would do so; but if the Inspector wanted a written report he would ask the detective to furnish it.

442. *The Chairman.*] What Inspectors have you served under?—I served under Commissioner Branigan, Commissioner Weldon, Inspector Moore, Inspector Hickson, and Inspector Parly.

443. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have had a very long experience in office-work?—Yes, Sir.

444. We have heard a good deal about the system of dealing with defaults. I believe some years ago the system that is now in vogue in dealing with defaults was not generally practised, was it?—There has not been much alteration.

445. Years ago, if a complaint was made against a constable, was it the practice to take the evidence in writing in the presence of the constable, and give the constable the opportunity of cross-examining witnesses, and also allowing the constable to produce evidence if he wished?—Yes, certainly.

446. Years ago?—Years ago.

447. How far back?—Well, as far as I can remember, except in trivial cases.

448. In trivial cases the Commissioner would hear both sides and decide, and that was the invariable practice?—Yes.

449. Do you know if that practice existed with the Inspectors at the outer stations?—I do not know.

450. Do you remember the case of Constables Pratt and Walton being reported for gossiping by the late Inspector Moore?—Yes.

451. Have you any recollection as to how that case was dealt with?—I have not. I think it is recorded. The defaulters' book will show.

452. Would the defaulters' book show any more than appears on the defaulters' sheet?—No.

453. The late Inspector Moore was the prosecutor as well as the Judge; and was any written evidence taken, do you know?—I am not sure.

454. Would it be the practice to take written evidence in a case of that kind—it was a trivial case, gossiping in the street?—Well, it may or may not. It was a trivial case. It then depended on what the Inspector thought of it—whether it would be necessary to take it down in writing or not.

455. With regard to the detectives making full reports to the Inspector in writing, is it not the practice for the detectives to make reports on any matter of importance?—Yes, certainly they should.

456. The Inspector and detectives confer together every morning and exchange ideas?—Every morning.

457. Verbal communications would pass between the Inspector and the detectives that would not be in the nature of reports?—Yes.

458. I take it that is what you wish to convey—that men would make reports without making them in writing?—Yes; discuss a case.

459. It is more a matter of conference than a subordinate submitting a report to an Inspector?—Yes.

460. But in every matter of importance detectives make a written report, do they not?—Yes. If they do not, they ought to do so. It is the custom.

461. This morning conference is not held to relieve them from making written reports?—No.

462. They keep a diary showing the hours they are on duty, and therefore the duty on which they are engaged, and that diary is taken into the Inspector every morning?—Not every morning.

463. How often does the Inspector see that diary?—He sees it when he pleases.

464. You know Inspector Parly's system of dealing with defaults?—Yes.

465. As a matter of fact, you are always present when he deals with defaulters?—Not exactly that. I am in the office, as a rule.

466. Do you not take down the evidence when he is dealing with a defaulter?—No. Inspector Parly takes it down himself.

467. Does Inspector Parly always take the evidence when dealing with a defaulter?—Yes.

468. What is the custom: do you inform constables about entries on their defaulters' sheets?—The Inspector informs them if it is to be entered in the sheet. He generally writes it on the report of the case. In trivial cases he simply writes his decision on the report, and says whether it is to be entered on the defaulter's sheet or not. If it is to be entered on the defaulters' book, then it comes out to me to be entered.

469. In cases where men do not plead guilty, are not the depositions taken in writing?—Yes. It is important when they plead not guilty.

470. In every case where a man pleads not guilty the evidence is taken in writing?—Yes; unless it be a very trivial case.

471. *The Chairman.*] Can you say whether in all cases where constables plead not guilty the evidence is taken down?—Latterly it has been so, but formerly it was not so.

472. In every trivial case, if a man pleads not guilty, the evidence is taken down in writing?—Yes.

473. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] And he has an opportunity of defending himself by calling witnesses?—Yes.

474. And cross-examining witnesses who are called against him?—Yes.

475. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has not the impression been amongst the men—a matter of common conversation for years past—that the use of political influence was necessary to obtain favours?—It has been very common.

476. Have you ever heard any men in your station boasting about their influence?—No, I never heard it.

477. But a feeling has permeated the Force that political influence is necessary?—Yes; that it is necessary to use political influence if they want to get promotion. I have heard that rumoured about.

478. Within your long experience in Otago, have there been many transfers ordered that have subsequently been cancelled?—Some few.

479. What is the general feeling about cancellation of transfer orders?—It was supposed that the wires had been pulled, as it is commonly called, and that that was the cause of such an order being countermanded.

480. Is there a better feeling in the Force the last six months?—I have not heard so much about it lately.

481. *The Chairman.*] Do you limit it to six months? When did you begin to hear less of political influence than you used to hear?—It has toned down considerably since the new Commissioner was appointed. There seems to be a feeling in the Force that it will not be much use now to use political influence as formerly. There seems to be a feeling about the Force that it has been handed over to a permanent expert police-officer.

482. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What is your opinion about pension *versus* retiring-allowance?—I think a superannuation fund should be established.

483. *The Chairman.*] You think there should be a pension?—Yes, on the lines of the pension system in Victoria or New South Wales.

484. What is that?—Well, that a man should be allowed to retire after fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years' service, and the pension should be on a sliding-scale, according to the length of service. With a subsidy of about £20,000 from the Government, it could be made self-supporting by deductions from the pay of all ranks of, say, 5 per cent. We had a list of men who were in favour of it made out some time ago, and we found in this district the great majority of the men were in favour of the 5-per-cent. reduction.

485. Is that Mr. Hutchison's scheme that you have outlined?—Yes. Well, it cannot be said to be his scheme. It was got up in Dunedin, and handed over to him to take it in charge. He fathered the thing.

486. *Colonel Hume.*] You say there is a better feeling in the Force now, because it has been handed over to an expert police-officer. How are you going to stop the wire-pulling you have described?—Because they think the Force is handed over from the political head to a permanent Police expert.

487. You have had considerable experience in office work. Do you think it is probable for any constable in this district to have an entry in his defaulter's sheet without knowing that entry was there?—Well, men who had defaults some years ago might: it is quite probable. I believe some of the Inspectors put defaults on the sheets and did not tell the men about them—simply heard the case and decided.

488. Have any Inspectors you have been district clerk for done that?—I think Inspector Weldon did it. It was not formerly the rule to tell them; but latterly it was the rule to tell them.

489. Then, it is quite probable?—Quite probable.

POSTSCRIPT.

DEAR SIR,—

District Police Office, Dunedin, 12th April, 1898.

On perusing my evidence I notice that my services in the Police Force are not fully given. When giving my evidence in Dunedin on the 4th instant, I banded in a document showing the date of joining the Force, &c., but as it was not read out it was not taken down by the shorthand reporter, hence the omission. I have, therefore, to ask you if you will kindly have the enclosed particulars substituted.

I am, &c.,

The Chairman, Police Commission.

JOHN BELL, District Clerk, First-class Sergeant No. 4A.

My services are as follows:—I joined the police of this colony on the 15th October, 1861, with four years and a quarter service in the English Police. I was promoted to the rank of first-class sergeant in 1869, and further promoted to the Civil Service on the 1st April, 1870; salary £250 per annum. On the 1st April, 1874, my salary was increased to £262 10s. per annum; and on the 1st April, 1875, I was further advanced in salary to £275 per annum. On the 15th May, 1888, through retrenchment in the department, I was called upon to revert to the rank of first-class sergeant, with seniority dating from the 21st September, 1869. Please see the *Police Gazette* of 1888, page 100.

WILLIAM JOHN QUINN, examined on oath.

490. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—Third-class constable, stationed at Dunedin.

491. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you join the Force?—In 1892 or 1893.

492. Where were you first stationed?—Dunedin.

493. Been here ever since?—Yes.

494. What part of that period did you spend on street duty?—I was in plain clothes for about six months when I first came here.

495. Did you do plain-clothes duty immediately you came here?—Yes, I think so.

496. Without doing any street duty?—Without doing any street duty.

497. Did you make application to be employed on plain-clothes duty?—No. I was sent away to the country.

498. On what duty?—Sly-grog.

499. Were you engaged on that for six months?—No. I did work in town.
500. Did you take up plain-clothes work in the city without any previous service in the city?—
I was in plain clothes here. I was watching two criminals.
501. How long out of that time have you been Court orderly?—Barely three months.
502. Have you had charge of the watchhouse any length of time?—No, not much.
503. Have you been doing clerical work much?—No.
504. How long have you been on relieving duty?—I was away to Queenstown on one occasion, and to Roxburgh on another.
505. How long were you at the two stations?—I* was twelve days at Queenstown, and a week at Roxburgh.
506. Have you ever made any application for special work?—No.
507. Are you on street duty now?—Yes.
508. What has been the impression in the Force amongst the men as to the necessity for using political influence, until the new Commissioner was appointed?—Well, if a man was ordered for removal he would pull the wires, as the saying is, and prevent it if possible, if he did not wish to go.
509. Was there a general feeling that political influence was interfering with the ordinary discipline of the Force?—There was some time back.
510. *The Chairman.*] What do you call "some time back"?—Twelve or eighteen months back.
511. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has it been weakening since the agitation has been on about the Police Force?—Yes. I do not hear anything at all about it now.
512. Have the men begun to think political influence will be severed from the Force?—Yes, now.
513. Has it been common barrack-room talk, the necessity for using friends to get favours?—
I only heard one man.
514. Who was that?—Aitcheson.
515. Have you heard him boasting about it?—Yes.
516. He was very open—brazen—about it?—Yes.
517. You have heard much about it in a general way?—I have heard it remarked about the station.
518. Do you attend the instruction classes?—Yes.
519. How long have you attended them?—I could not say. I have been a few times there.
520. Have you been there half a dozen times?—Yes.
521. Have you been there a dozen times?—I could not say.
522. Do you think you have been more than a dozen times?—I never took any note when they were started.
523. *The Chairman.*] How long have they been started?—I could not very well say. It is a good time now.
524. Where are they held?—In the library.
525. Do you not know how often they are held?—When I was Court orderly I was away a good bit. I had summonses to serve, and there was necessity for me to be away from the station.
526. *Mr. Taylor.*] How many times do you think you have been present—can you remember whether it has been twelve or twenty times?—I was present a good number of times.
527. There should have been a hundred classes held—have you attended the half of them?—I could not say. Sometimes we would be on duty.
528. *The Chairman.*] Have you attended half a dozen times?—Yes.
529. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know if the classes were held last Monday?—They were held on Tuesday this week.
530. Have you always accounted for your absence to your officer?—Yes. If I am off duty I am always present.
531. As a matter of fact, has not the attendance at these classes been rather lax?—I could not say. I have seen as many as twelve and fifteen men there.
532. Is it considered amongst the men a very urgent thing that they should be present at these classes?—Yes. There are instructions from Sergeant O'Neill to that effect.
533. What is the practice: is it considered an important matter that they should attend these instruction classes?—Yes.
534. When were you there last?—I could not say. It is a good while ago. It is three months ago since I was there.
535. You have been acting as Court orderly: that would explain your absence?—Yes.
536. Have you attended any classes by the Inspector?—Yes.
537. How often are they held?—Once a month.
539. Are they held regularly?—Yes.
540. Had you any tuition at all in police duties before you went on street duty?—No.
541. Is there a strong feeling amongst the men that they should be allowed one Sunday a month off?—Yes, there is.
542. You have been having that as Court orderly?—No. I had four hours in the watch-house every Sunday.
543. You had four hours off every Sunday?—Yes.
544. You think every fourth Sunday could be given the men without serious inconvenience, or hampering things?—Yes, if they were full-handed.
545. There is a general feeling that they could have it?—Yes.
546. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Since the circular came out ordering these instruction classes have you attended every class when you were off duty?—Yes.
547. There is no doubt about that?—No doubt about that.
548. If a man that is not on duty is absent from the class, is he treated as a defaulter?—Yes. He is brought before the Inspector for being absent.

549. Therefore, the men are not allowed to follow their own sweet will about these classes?—No.

550. The older men are not called upon to attend the classes?—The only one I know that is exempted is Constable Patterson.

551. How long has he been in the service?—Seventeen years.

552. He is excused, because men of long service are held to be competent?—Yes.

553. In your duties as Court orderly you were engaged very frequently up till a late hour at night?—Sometimes seven and sometimes ten at night.

554. Taking it generally, what hours do you consider you would be engaged on the average?—About nine hours a day.

555. Longer, in fact, than those who are on ordinary street duty?—Yes.

556. So that the Court orderly work is not such an easy duty?—No. There is a lot of running about.

557. I suppose every day there is a number of summonses to be served?—Yes, about six or seven every day.

558. And other inquiries besides?—Yes.

559. You were engaged when you first came into the Force in plain clothes for a time, were you not, in connection with the sly-grog business?—Yes.

560. What is your opinion about pensions?—I believe in the pension.

561. In preference to a retiring-allowance?—Yes.

562. Would you be willing to contribute to a pension?—Yes.

563. *Colonel Hume.*] Did Constable Aitcheson ever boast to you or in your presence about his having political influence?—Yes.

564. What did he say?—It was over being absent from parade. He was fined 2s. 6d. for being absent, and he used to boast how he got it back.

565. What did he say?—He said he went to some friend of his in town here.

566. Did he say whom?—He did not say who he was. He said he got him to write up to Wellington about it. He said he was glad to beat the Inspector.

567. And did he make any other boast but that one?—No, not to my knowledge.

568. Where did this conversation take place?—In the police-station. He slept in the same room as myself.

569. Was anybody else present but you?—No.

570. Did he boast at any other time about anything?—Not to my knowledge.

571. You did not see him after he got dismissed?—No, I never saw him after he got shifted to Invercargill.

572. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Constable Aitcheson was dismissed?—Yes, I believe so.

573. Do you know how long he was in the service when he was dismissed?—About five years.

574. What class was he when he was dismissed?—Third-class constable.

575. Then Constable Aitcheson's influence was not successful in getting him promoted?—No.

576. And it was not successful in preventing him being dismissed?—No.

TUESDAY, 5TH APRIL, 1898.

JOHN FREDERICK WOODHOUSE, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—John Frederick Woodhouse. I am a barrister and solicitor in Dunedin. I wish on behalf of Bishop Nevill to state the facts with reference to a property in Filleul Street, referred to in the evidence given before the Commission by Mr. James McGill and Mr. J. B. Thomson, and to explain Bishop Nevill's connection with the property which Mr. McGill stated was inhabited or frequented by improper characters, and on which it was said the Bishop had a mortgage of £1,000 for which he was receiving 10 per cent. The facts are these: Some eighteen years ago Bishop Nevill was asked, through the gentleman who then acted as his agent in financial matters in Dunedin, to advance £1,000 on a leasehold security, the borrower being Mr. William Asher, who held a lease of the particular property referred to from Lund's trustees. Lund's trustees are well known in Dunedin as probably the largest private owners of property in the city. They are very large owners indeed, and they are noted for the way in which their estate is managed, and for the care that is taken with regard to it. I have the lease here, dated 10th September, 1877, and it is, as are all Lund's leases, a carefully drawn document. It is a long lease—sixty years, with the usual terms—and it contains very stringent clauses affecting the tenant. He is bound before the expiration of the first year to erect substantial buildings to the value of £500 at least. He is also bound not to allow any improper trade or business to be conducted. Generally there are stringent conditions throughout the lease showing that the landlords intended that their place should be kept in proper order and condition. It was on the security of this lease and the buildings which had then been erected, or were in course of erection, that the Bishop was asked to lend money, and, on the advice of his then agent, who is not here now, the Bishop did advance the money. The Bishop thinks he looked at the property, but he would not be quite certain about that.

2. What was the year of the advance?—1880. I produce the mortgage from Mr. Asher to the Bishop, dated 18th June, 1880. It is a mortgage of the lease to secure £1,000, and the rate of interest is 10 per cent., with a currency of five years. I would point out that that is eighteen years ago, when the rate of interest was considerably higher—very much higher, almost double—what it is now; and this was a leasehold security upon which a higher rate of interest would

be expected than would be expected from a freehold security. The Bishop then advanced the money, and this mortgage was executed. That is the only mortgage the Bishop has ever had over the property. There is a periodical revaluation of the rent provided for in the lease. Mr. McGill, in his evidence as published by the newspaper, states that he had "searched the register, and found that he (Bishop Nevill) had a mortgage of £1,000 on it, for which he was getting 10 per cent." But Mr. McGill does not state that that was a leasehold security, and that the mortgage was executed eighteen years ago. Had he done so, I do not think people would have come to the conclusion, which I have no doubt a great many have come to, that the Bishop is now receiving 10 per cent. for this property. As I shall presently state, the Bishop is not now receiving 10 per cent., but 5 per cent. What I wish to say is that Mr. McGill could not have discovered what interest the Bishop was receiving.

3. He only cited the information he got from the Registrar?—I think it is a pity he did not state the facts he found on the register. He would have found a mortgage of eighteen years old, and it is a matter of common knowledge that interest has gone down considerably during that period, and that no person pays the interest now that he paid then.

4. *The Chairman.*] I think Mr. McGill said more than that?—I am going by what the public would see in the paper. The report may be incorrect; but it appears that either Mr. McGill had discovered that that was the rate that the Bishop was getting, or that he had discovered facts that would reasonably show that that was the rate. I may add that when the Bishop lent the money the property was just about completed, and consisted mainly of a new brick terrace of houses. When the mortgage became due in 1885, the Bishop requested Mr. Asher to pay it off. Mr. Asher was not then able to do so, and the Bishop has tried to get it paid off ever since. In June, 1886, the rate of interest was reduced to 8 per cent. In December, 1890, it was reduced to 5 per cent., and that is the rate of interest that the Bishop has been receiving ever since. He discovered that it was not a good security—from the point of value, I mean, not because he was aware that there was anything improper about the property, and he has tried very hard to get the money paid off. He offered some time ago to Mr. Asher—and that offer remains open still—to take £600 in discharge of the mortgage. Mr. Asher has, however, not been able to do that. Mr. Asher has been paying the interest agreed upon, and the Bishop has never gone into possession of the property. If he did, his only way to obtain effectual possession and control would be to sell through the Registrar, and become the purchaser, in which case he would saddle himself with a liability in respect to the lease, which has a good many years to run, which he would probably never be able to get rid of. He has therefore, for those reasons, never assumed control of the property, and has consequently had nothing to do with the tenants at all. The Bishop has been complained to with regard to the tenants. He was complained to by Mr. McGill; but the Bishop did not, according to his recollection, make the reply which Mr. McGill says he made—"that he was sorry, but that he had invested money in the place, and he was afraid if he took any prompt action he would lose by it." As a matter of fact, the Bishop has known for some time past that he would lose his money; and what he says is, that he said he was only the mortgagee, that the matter was in the hands of Mr. Asher, and that he would speak to Mr. Asher on the subject. The Bishop did speak to Mr. Asher, and also to his present agent, and requested him to see Mr. Asher. What Mr. Asher said was that it was not correct that there were any improper characters about the place, or anything to complain of with regard to the tenants, and that all the tenants were respectable people, or words to that effect. Mr. Asher will give his own version with regard to the tenants. The Bishop was not in a position to do anything. All he could do was to do what he said he would do—to speak to Mr. Asher; and when he did, he received the assurance which Mr. Asher gave him—that there were no improper characters or persons living in the premises. That, therefore, is the Bishop's position, which he would like to be understood.

5. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you copies of the letter in which it is stated that the amount would be reduced to £600?—I think that was verbal.

6. *The Chairman.*] Did the Bishop see the property?—He thinks he did, but he is not quite sure.

WILLIAM ASHER, examined on oath.

7. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—William Asher.

8. Where do you reside?—York Place, Dunedin.

9. What is your occupation?—House and estate agent, Princes Street.

9A. I understand you desire to give us some information in regard to the property owned by you in Filleul Street?—The first intimation I had of the matter being brought before the Commission was when I saw a report in the *Otago Daily Times*. Before that I had no idea it was coming before the Commission. It has been said that the police have not done their duty, and that I am letting my houses to bad characters. Both of these statements I emphatically deny. The police have lately been continually inquiring who are the occupants of my houses, to the annoyance of my tenants and myself; yet they have not made any complaint of anything to me. I quite indorse what was said by Inspector Pardy—that he did not know that the girls who were referred to as living in my houses had been at any time before the Court; and to the best of my belief they never have. They appear to me to be modest, discreet girls living with their invalid mother. I will refer later on to this family. Chief Detective O'Brien said he had his doubts about a house in Cargill Street, and one in Great King Street, but he did not think there was a similar place in my property in Filleul Street. From inquiries made by the police, however, he would have known if there had been, and I can vouch to the best of my belief that every tenant living in this property is honest and industrious, working and earning their bread at various callings, and that they are quite as respectable a lot of tenants as any occupying Messrs. McGill and Thomson's houses. I have heard that tenants to whom I refused to let houses have got them from Mr. McGill. There was

one in Leith Street, when he owned the property. The two poor girls whose character he has tried to ruin work and support their sick mother, and one of their employments frequently causes them to be out until half-past ten o'clock p.m. They are escorted home by a gentleman friend every night, and by their mother's wish and sanction. The girls, I should think, are about eighteen years of age. Besides this, people inform me that they are old tenants of Mr. McGill's, and paid him 12s. 6d. a week for one of his houses. At present they are paying me 7s. The person who is referred to as "Scotch Lizzie" I do not know. She has no house from me. The remainder of Mr. McGill's evidence is equally untruthful, or misleading, and to the best of my belief and recollection he has never complained to me personally respecting the tenants of these houses. He once made a complaint to me about something else which we disputed about, but it had no reference to these houses. In respect to his uncalled-for remarks about the Bishop, the mortgage expired many years ago, and I have been requested to pay it off, but I could not, and the Bishop is kindly charging me 5 per cent. until I do so. The property cost me over £2,100, and I would be glad to sell it for about half. The Bishop spoke to me some time since in respect to a complaint that had been made to him. He did not tell me who had made the complaint, but I assured him that it was perfectly untrue. When his agent spoke to me about the same matter, I pressed strongly upon him to go through the property with me and I would introduce him to every tenant, and inquire and tell him their businesses to the best of my ability. In respect to Mr. J. B. Thomson's evidence, I have to say that the police never cleared out my property in Filleul Street, and that the row of houses has never all been vacant at one time. The most I can recollect as being vacant at one time is three out of nine houses. Drink is my greatest trouble with small tenants, and I check it all I can; and when I cannot succeed I give them notice to leave. Invariably I require from a tenant to whom I let a house a reference as far as morality and sobriety are concerned; but in any case I will not apply to Mr. J. B. Thomson for my character in reference to morality and sobriety.

10. *Mr. Woodhouse.*] Did the Bishop not offer to accept £600 from you?—Yes. The agent offered to accept £600 and release the mortgage.

11. When was that?—About three years ago.

12. He has been trying to get you to pay it off since?—Yes.

13. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was his offer to reduce the mortgage in writing?—No, it was verbal.

14. It did not come from him direct?—No, it came from his agent.

15. These houses have not been kept as brothels?—Not for the last three or four years, to the best of my knowledge; but I might say that the great difficulty in this class of houses is not whom you let them to, but whom your tenants take in as boarders.

16. Do you remember letting a house to Thomas Haddock, in Asher's Lane?—No.

17. Do you know that on the 21st November, 1895, he was charged with keeping a brothel in Asher's Lane?—No, he was not in my house. I have no recollection of the name.

18. Do you remember children named Sarah Mabel Lucas, Margaret Beat, Annie Boyd, and Mary Boyd being charged with associating with prostitutes in Asher's Lane on the 1st June, 1896?—No. But Beat's daughter lived with her mother in my lane.

19. Do you remember these four children being charged before the Court?—No, it was not in Asher's Lane. I have an idea of their being charged.

20. Do you know that they were charged with associating with prostitutes in your houses, and that they were sent to the Caversham Industrial School?—Not in my house.

21. Do you remember Kate Comber having one of the houses?—No.

22. You do not remember her being charged with using obscene language on the 11th August 1896?—She was not in my houses.

23. Does any one own houses in Asher's Lane but you?—No.

24. Do you remember a person named Hunter?—Yes.

25. Were they decent people?—He was a ganger for the "unemployed."

26. Do you remember Lilly Clisby?—No.

27. Rose McLaughlin?—No.

28. Will you be surprised to hear that Clisby was charged with breach of the peace on the 22nd September, 1896, and fined 10s.?—I do not know anything about it.

29. Do you remember Elizabeth McCausland?—I do not know anything about her.

30. Will you be surprised to hear that she was before the Court for drunkenness?—I do not know her.

31. Do you know Annie Conway?—Yes, I know her.

32. Do you know that she was before the Court charged with drunkenness?—It was not from my houses.

33. Do you say that positively?—Yes, I do.

34. And you think the girls referred to by Mr. McGill are about eighteen years of age?—I think so.

35. Do you know anything about them?—I can only give you their history in a way.

36. If the police say they are only fifteen and sixteen will you deny it?—No, I have no reason to deny it. I know that fourteen years ago these people were renting a house for which I drew the rent. At that time the mother was keeping a boardinghouse and was supporting her husband, who had met with an accident at Stewart Island, a tree having fallen on him. He had lost the use of one side, and his wife supported him by keeping boarders.

37. You state the police have made no complaint to you about your property?—No.

38. Never?—No.

39. Has Mr. McGill ever complained to you?—No.

40. Did you ever tell Mr. McGill that you got better rent from a certain class of people?—No.

41. Do you consider that the houses are sanitary?—Yes.

42. What is the size of the back-yard?—It is about 8 ft. deep, and they have the full breadth of the section in front.

43. Is there a dividing fence between the houses?—There is one dividing fence between the six houses; the other three are detached.

44. What is the total frontage of the houses from end to end?—From 90 ft. to 96 ft.

45. Any of them connected with the sewer?—The houses are not, but the closets are.

46. And you say you have not let property to prostitutes?—I have not, to the best of my knowledge.

47. Have you any property in Chalmers Place?—No.

48. Do you know the property there?—Yes.

49. What is the character of the houses there?—They have a bad character.

50. You have some bad property in Moray Place?—I had.

51. Was it let to prostitutes?—Yes.

52. There is another right-of-way off Filleul Street in which you have property. Has that not been in the possession of prostitutes?—No; they are all good people, and I do not recollect any people of that class except some who got in casually; but I turned them out. It is to be remembered that if an agent lets a house he cannot turn a tenant out for at least three weeks, or sometimes five.

53. How long has the Chief Detective been in Dunedin?—A long time.

54. Do you know that he has only been removed from Oamaru?—I thought he was the old sergeant. I see I have made a mistake in the name. I was referring to Sergeant O'Neill.

55. Do you not regard a man who has been here only a few weeks as an authority on Asher's Lane?—No.

56. Are the two girls working?—Yes.

57. What are they working at?—They were working at the theatre in Bland Holt's time. Previous to that there was one out as a nurse-girl, and the other stayed at home nursing her mother.

58. You assured the Bishop that the complaints were untrue?—Yes.

59. Have you been bankrupt since the mortgage was entered into?—No; but I have made an assignment.

60. How did you treat the lease?—I handed it over to the creditors, and they refused to have anything to do with it.

61. As a matter of fact, when you made the assignment, did the property not legally become the Bishop's?—You will have to ask a lawyer that.

62. When did you make the assignment?—I cannot tell you.

63. Was it five years ago?—It was more than that.

64. There was no conveyance, was there, of the interest in the lease from the Bishop to yourself?—I cannot tell you that. It was fifteen years ago.

65. Immediately after the mortgage expired?—I think it was.

66. The mortgage expired thirteen years ago: was it before that that you assigned the estate?—I could not tell you.

67. And you cannot say whether you conveyed your interest in the mortgage to the Bishop?—I cannot tell you.

68. What was done with the old lease—what did the creditors do with it?—They sold it back to me for a consideration.

69. And the old mortgage still stands on it?—The old mortgage still stands on it.

WILLIAM STONE PARDY, examined on oath.

70. *Mr. Taylor.*] Can you tell me what persons have been before the Magistrate from Asher's Lane, and on what charges?—This is a list of all convictions from Asher's Lane, the lane referred to by Mr. Thomson and Mr. McGill:—

RETURN showing Offences committed in Asher's Right-of-way for which Persons have been prosecuted.

Date.	Name.	Offences.	How disposed of.
21/11/95	Thomas Haddock	Keeping a brothel	Dismissed.
1/6/96	Sarah Mabel Lucas	Children associating with prostitutes	Sent to Caversham Industrial School.
	Margaret Beat		
	Annie Boyd		
	Mary Boyd		
	Kate Comber		
11/8/96	Kate Hunter	Obscene language	Dismissed.
22/9/96	Sydney Hunter	Breach of the peace	Fined 10s.
	Janet Beat		Dismissed.
	John Beat		Fined 10s.
	Lilly Clisby		Dismissed.
	Lilly Clisby		Fined 10s.
	Rose McLaughlin		Dismissed.
22/11/96	Elizabeth McCausland	Drunk	Fined 5s.
22/11/96	Annie Conway	Drunk	Fined 5s.
1/12/96	Elizabeth McCausland	Obscene language	Forty-eight hours' hard labour.

Central Station, Dunedin, March 19th, 1898.

D. LATIMER, Constable.

71. *The Chairman.*] It extends from 1895 to 1896?—Yes, and there have been none since.

72. The name of neither of the girls who have been mentioned appears in the list?—No. It was a mistake on the part of Detective McGrath. I am positive of that.

73. *Mr. Asher.*] I may say that the majority of the people named in the return do not reside in my houses. The only one I recognise is Hunter, who, I believe, was charged with drunkenness. (To witness :) Do you say that these people resided in my houses?—I am not able to answer that question.

74. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have the police ever complained to Mr. Asher about the character of the property?—I cannot say about this land, but I wrote to him about another, and I find that Mr. Asher was in this fix: he had only a lease of the property, and could not turn the people out. I wrote to him that such and such a house owned by him "is occupied as a brothel, and if you do not put the occupants out you will be prosecuted under the Criminal Code Act." Except in one instance it always had the desired effect, and in that case the woman had a lease.

75. *The Chairman.*] Do you swear that, within your own knowledge, these people were occupants of houses in Asher's Lane?—I cannot say from my own knowledge.

76. You took it from what source?—From our books.

WILLIAM ASHER, further examined on oath.

77. *The Chairman.*] Tell us if any of the persons named in this list were occupants of your houses?—Kate Hunter is one. She was living with her husband, who was a ganger for the "unemployed." John Beat was another. He is a man working in one of Mr. Keith Ramsay's steamers, a regular worker, and to all appearances a very decent man.

BISHOP NEVILL, examined on oath.

78. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember what took place in regard to the lease when Mr. Asher assigned his estate?—I do not know anything about Mr. Asher assigning his estate.

79. Have you ever known anything about the character of the tenants in the property upon which you have a mortgage?—I have no personal knowledge of the subject at all. I have had one or two complaints, but I have not even seen the houses to this day that I know of.

80. Did Mr. McGill complain to you?—He came to my house once, and it is possible he might have spoken to me in the street before that. I recollect when he came to my house one time.

81. Did you take any steps to satisfy yourself as to the character of the houses?—Yes, I spoke to my business agent, who said he would speak to Mr. Asher, and I also met Mr. Asher myself and spoke to him, and he said the rumours were not true.

82. The Inspector of Police has just sworn that, in June, 1896, four children were charged at the Court with associating with prostitutes in a house in Asher's Lane, and were committed to the Industrial School at Caversham?—I did not hear of that.

83. A man was charged with keeping a brothel in Asher's Lane in November, 1895?—No, I know nothing of that. I took the measures I promised Mr. McGill I would take, and said that if what he stated was true I was sorry to hear it, and would consult my business-man, and speak to Mr. Asher; both of which I did.

84. The police evidence generally with regard to Asher's Lane was that it had a very unsavoury reputation: are you aware of that?—No. No one spoke to me about it except Mr. McGill.

85. Have you not been inspecting it within the last week or two?—I do not know where it is to this day. I know generally, of course.

86. At what time did you offer to reduce the capital from £1,000 to £600 in the event of it being paid off?—It might be some three or four years ago. We had reduced the interest at various times before that.

87. *Mr. Woodhouse.*] It is stated in the paper: "The Bishop said he was sorry, but that he had invested money in the place, and he was afraid if he took any prompt action he would lose by it"?—I would deny that. It is some time ago, and I cannot say the exact words, but my recollection of the conversation was that Mr. McGill called at my house, and represented that objectionable characters were living near him, and were a nuisance to him. I said I was sorry to hear it, and if I could do anything I would be happy to co-operate in getting rid of the nuisance. I said I was only the mortgagee, and that all I could do was to speak to my agent, and I would also try and see Mr. Asher on the subject. That is the whole of the conversation as far as I know. It was not a long conversation. It was only at my front door. That is the pith of the conversation, I am sure. I said nothing to him about rates of interest.

88. And this investment was brought to you by the gentleman then acting as your agent?—Yes.

89. On his advice you took it?—Yes. He said it was sufficient security for the capital.

90. And you left it in his hands?—Yes. I am very busy in other matters, and I left all things to my agent.

91. Is this property sometimes known as Asher's Lane?—I believe so.

92. When were you made aware of it?—I have heard the houses called Asher's houses, but until the Commission sat I never knew that the property mortgaged to me was known as Asher's Lane. If I had seen anything in the paper about Asher's Lane prior to that I would not have known it was my property.

Mr. Woodhouse: No, the houses are called "Regent Terrace."

JOHN DUNNE, examined on oath.

93. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—John Dunne.

94. What are you?—A small farmer, residing at Balclutha.

95. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been in Balclutha many years?—Since 1870.

96. You had one of the licenses that expired in 1894, had you not?—At that time I was the tenant of a house which was Mrs. Dunne's property. We had let the hotel, and at the time the license was taken away it was occupied by Mr. Colvin.

97. Since the hotels were closed, have the police done all they could to enforce the licensing laws?—Yes.

98. Is the order of the town better since the hotels were closed?—I think the order is better than it has ever been before. In 1870 I was the sergeant of police in Balclutha: I was in the police service many years, and a more orderly place than Balclutha I have never been stationed in. I have heard a lot about the disorder in Balclutha, but I have not seen it.

99. Is there much sly-grog selling carried on there now?—I could not say.

100. Do you think there is as much grog sold there now as there was under license?—I do not see how I could answer that.

101. You are a citizen?—I do not think there is anything like it.

102. Have you ever boasted to any one that Constable Christie was removed from Balclutha because he exposed the drinking of the Justices of the Peace?—I have never heard of that.

103. Did you have a hand in getting him removed?—No.

104. You did not discuss the matter with any one?—No. I have never interfered with a policeman since I left the Force.

WILLIAM STONE PARDY, further examined on oath.

105. *The Chairman.*] I am requested by Constable Parker, who is now stationed at Waimate, to ask you to speak as to his character and the way he did his duty while acting under you?—In regard to general duty he gave me satisfaction.

106. What is his present rank?—I think he is a second-class constable. He was under me for about two years or more. He was serving at Tapanui.

107. How did he do his work?—His general duty was very satisfactory, but I was not satisfied with the way in which he acted with regard to the enforcement of the licensing law in the district. In saying that, I mean I did not consider he was exerting himself enough. I think he ought to have exerted himself more than he did. Apart from that he was a very good man, and I have no fault to find with him.

108. *Mr. Taylor.*] Had you sufficient confidence in Constable Parker while at Tapanui to disclose to him any plans you might have had for raiding sly-grog shops?—I can say this: that I trusted nobody.

109. *The Chairman.*] Did you disclose them to him?—No.

110. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was it not reported to you that he had warned the publicans at Tapanui when your men were coming round?—Yes, it was.

111. Had you reason to think it was true?—I could not get evidence to support it, and therefore gave the constable the benefit of the doubt. From what I heard I thought it best not to inform him what I was doing. The first he would hear of it would be when he was told to make the search.

PATRICK BOWMAN, examined on oath.

112. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Patrick Bowman.

113. What are you?—Third-class sergeant, stationed at Dunedin.

114. What is the matter you have to bring before us?—All I have to say is embodied in the report I have sent in, as follows:—

In December, 1890, having been transferred from charge of Waikaia to Arrowtown Station, I was appointed police gaoler at the latter place, and continued in such position until the gaol was closed in March, 1895. During that time I was paid by the Police Department as a first-class constable, but in March, 1895, I discovered that police constables acting as gaolers at all other police gaols in the colony were paid by the Prisons Department at the rate of £156 per annum, the Police Department paying the long service. This made a difference of £10 per annum to me, the amount received from the Police Department being £164 5s. while the amount payable by the Prisons Department (£156), with the £18 5s. long service, would make £174 5s. Previous to the gaol being closed, having discovered that I had been treated in this exceptional manner, I represented the matter in writing to Colonel Hume, who was in charge of both Prison and Police Departments, and asked that I be paid the difference; but he did not see fit to pay the claim, saying that I had been paid by the Police Department. Of course, I had no appeal from this decision, although feeling that it was an unjust one. I now respectfully submit that Colonel Hume was not justified in treating me differently to all other police gaolers in the colony simply because I did not discover that I was underpaid until the time already mentioned, and that I am in justice and equity entitled to the balance, which amounts to over £42. I leave the matter with confidence in the hands of the Commissioners.

115. *Colonel Hume.*] Have you any objection to my producing the papers in connection with the case?—I would ask you to produce all the correspondence.

116. On the 28th January, 1895, you wrote: "I beg to bring the following matter under the notice of my superior officer: I was appointed gaoler at Arrowtown on the 26th December, 1890, and have since been paid by the Police Department, whereas the constables at all the other police gaols of the colony are paid by the Prisons Department at the rate of £156 per annum, long-service pay being paid by the Police Department. I am therefore being paid £10 a year less than the other police gaolers during the past four years, and would respectfully request that the matter be brought under the notice of Lieut.-colonel Hume, Inspector of Prisons, for consideration." Inspector Pardy sent the letter back with the note: "Constable Bowman should state the number of prisoners confined in the Arrow Gaol during the past year." Constable Bowman replied as follows: "I beg to state the number of prisoners confined during the past four years is as follows: 1891, 10; 1892, 4; 1893 and 1894, 1. Those numbers are, of course, exclusive of lockup prisoners, of whom there are a good few. I may state that when there are no prisoners under sentence I have extra work to keep the gaol and surroundings clean and in good order." I took steps then to close the gaol, and did close it, and my reply was: "Inspector Pardy.—Please sell prison property by auction. As Constable Bowman was paid by the Police Department he has no claim for extra salary."

Witness : I beg your pardon. The first answer I got was that the prison was closed ; and this was an answer to another letter. I ask that you read the correspondence in the proper sequence.

117. *Colonel Hume.*] This, then, is the answer you refer to : "8th February, 1895.—It seems to me that this police gaol might now be closed. If the gaol was closed, Constable Bowman would have more time for police duty proper." That was sent to Inspector Pardy, who wrote back, "I do not see any necessity for keeping this gaol open, as it is not required under present arrangements." Then you wrote again about pay : "I beg to report, according to the *New Zealand Gazette* of 28th February last, the Arrow police gaol has ceased to be a police gaol. I would respectfully ask whether, in future, I should furnish the annual return of public property (on 30th June) to the Prisons or Police Department. Most of the property has been in use for a number of years, and would scarcely be worth paying the carriage of it to other prisons. In connection with the above, I beg to ask whether my application of the 28th January, for four years' extra salary as police gaoler has as yet been considered." On that I wrote, "Please sell prison property by auction. As Constable Bowman was paid by the Police Department, he has no claim for extra salary." You said that all police gaolers were paid at the rate you stated. Is that correct?—Yes ; but you told me the other day there were other gaolers, that I did not know about, whose cases were the same as mine. All I can say is, that the four gaolers closest to me were not paid as I was ; but I had naturally concluded that they were in the same position as myself.

118. We will take the nearest—Queenstown. How was that paid?—There was no gaol there in my time.

119. How is Cromwell paid?—There is no police gaol there.

120. You stated that all the police gaols in the colony were paid as you have described?—Yes, and my reason for saying so was, that the next four to me were paid as I have stated ; but you have told me that there are others in the same category as myself. I was not aware of that.

121. And that only five were paid by the Prisons Department?—I do not remember the number you stated.

122. And now you have no complaint?—It is for the Commissioners to decide. If the four police gaols close to me were treated differently to me I think it is a complaint. I reckon I have been as good a man as any of the four.

123. Clyde is the headquarters of the district?—No.

124. Is the sergeant not quartered there?—Yes, but he has nothing to do with me.

125. Is Clyde not the central part of the district?—It has been constituted the headquarters lately, under the present Commissioner.

126. Was it not the headquarters once?—Some years ago.

127. Is Naseby not another headquarters?—I do not know.

128. There has always been a sergeant there?—I believe so.

129. Did you ever see the estimates? Did you see provision there for a gaoler at Arrowtown?—No, and that was the reason I applied. There should have been provision.

130. You did not apply till 1895.—No.

131. How long had you been a police gaoler?—For four years.

132. You never applied till the gaol was being closed?—I knew nothing about it being closed when I applied.

133. You believe the statement I make now—that there are about thirty-three of the gaols?—Yes, but I want to know why the other four close to me are paid differently to me. I cannot answer that ; and I would like to know why you did not give me that reply some years ago, and not keep it up to the present time.

134. I told you in 1895?—I beg your pardon. You never said there were other police gaolers paid the same as I was.

135. I told you you were paid by the Police Department?—But why did you not say there were others paid the same as I was?

136. *The Chairman.*] When were you appointed gaoler, and by whom?—I was appointed by *Gazette* notice, in December, 1890.

137. What intimation did you have as to pay?—The pay went on as usual. I was paid by the Police Department.

138. Had you applied for the office?—No.

139. Did the notification you received of the appointment convey no intimation about salary?—No. I might mention that the officer who held the position before me was a sergeant whose pay came to about the same as he was paid by the Police Department, consequently he did not apply to be paid by the other department.

140. Do you know whether he was paid by the Police, or the Prisons Department?—By the Police.

141. And the same principle went on?—Yes.

COLONEL HUME, examined on oath.

142. *The Chairman.*] What do you wish to say about this case of Sergeant Bowman's?—In 1883, I think, a Bill was passed in the House introducing police gaols all over the colony at which prisoners could be retained for twenty-eight days. There were nearly forty of these gaols. Many of them have since been done away with. Seven of them were placed on the estimates for salaries from the Prisons Department, six of which were to be in charge of constables, and the seven were to be paid by the Prisons Department at the rate of £156 a year, the Police Department giving them their long-service pay if they were entitled to it, in addition to the £156. The seven specially paid by the department were Oamaru, Timaru, Clyde, Naseby, Lawrence, Westport, and Tauranga. All the constables, or sergeants as the case might be, in charge of the other stations which were gazetted as police gaols were gazetted gaolers. I may say that Arrowtown was a place at which there was a police gaol.

143. Is that the station of which this sergeant was gaoler?—Yes.
 144. And paid by the Police Department?—Yes.
 145. *Sergeant Bowman.*] Is it not a fact that in a number of those places the gaoler held the rank of sergeant?—In very few of them. Ashburton, I think, was one.
 146. Not Arrowtown?—It may have been.
 147. It would not be necessary for those men to apply? It would be immaterial to them?—No, it would not be necessary.
 148. Do you not think it would have been common courtesy on your part to have given me that reply when I represented the matter to you three years ago?—I am sorry I did not. I must have overlooked it.
 149. If you had stated that there were others treated as I was I would have been satisfied?—I did what I thought was right.

JOHN RAMAGE, further examined on oath.

150. *The Chairman.*] You reside at Balclutha?—Yes.
 151. You are a tinsmith?—Yes.
 152. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did Mr. Burley ever owe you any money?—Yes.
 153. How much?—A small amount, about 12s. I think.
 154. When was it paid?—About the 8th December, 1894.
 155. Who paid it to you?—Constable Christie.
 156. Where was the payment made?—In my shop.
 157. Did you give him anything?—Yes.
 158. How much?—If I remember rightly I returned him 2s.
 159. Are you certain you returned him something?—I am positive I returned him 2s. I remarked that it was found money, and that I had not expected to get it. I may say here that he declined to accept the money; but I pressed it, and said it was something for his trouble.
 160. Did he take it ultimately?—Yes; he put it in his pocket.
 161. Did you approach him with the view to his collecting the money?—Yes. I asked him to collect the money for me or summons for it.
 162. Did you speak to him about the collection?—I am not sure that I spoke to him personally on that occasion, but I spoke to him personally on another occasion afterwards, if I remember rightly.
 163. How did you approach him?—I made out the account for the money. I made it out in duplicate, and sent my son with it to Constable Christie.
 164. Is your son in town to-day?—He is at Balclutha.
 165. *The Chairman.*] Did you ever see either of the accounts again?—I do not remember.
 166. *Mr. Taylor.*] If you had received the money through the Court you would have had to sign for it?—Yes. I do not think I gave a receipt to the constable, and what makes me almost certain about it is that I have a recollection that Mr. Burley afterwards sent several times to me for a receipt, and I think that ultimately I made out one and sent it to him. He seemed to be afraid he would not get a receipt.
 167. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Did you bring this charge against Constable Christie?—No.
 168. In reply to Mr. Taylor you said, "If I remember rightly I returned him 2s." What do you mean by that?—I meant exactly what I said.
 169. Do you mean that you are doubtful about it?—No, I have no doubt about it.
 170. What do you mean by saying "If I remember rightly?"—It might have been half-a-crown, but it was 2s. anyhow. It was not less than 2s.
 171. And you say that Constable Christie did not want to take it?—That is so.
 172. You were grateful to Christie for what he has done?—Yes, certainly.
 173. It was found money?—Quite so.
 174. And you thought he ought to get something for what he had done?—Yes.
 175. Was it in your shop that he paid you the money?—Yes, in the front shop.
 176. How much did you get?—12s., I think.
 177. That was the amount that Burley owed you? Are you clear on that point?—I am thus far clear: I omitted to take a note of it from my books, and I telephoned and got a reply that it was 12s.
 178. So that, as far as your own memory is concerned, you could not remember how much it was?—No. I only knew it was something under £1.
 179. You said at Balclutha that you were not sure what the amount was, but that it was under £1?—Yes.
 180. You only know that amount by getting it in the telegram?—Yes.
 181. Did you remember the date without reference?—No.
 182. How did you get the date?—In the same telegram.
 183. Might I look at the telegram?—Yes.
 184. What you did was to telegraph to your son to tell you the date of the transaction and the amount that Burley owed you?—Yes.
 185. So you were not very clear as to the date, the amount, and the sum you gave to Christie, whether it was 2s. or 2s. 6d.?—That is so.
 186. And you say that when you sent your son to him the order was to summon if he thought necessary?—He could either summon or collect it.
 187. You know that Constable Christie was Clerk of the Court?—Yes.
 188. Was there much time intervened between the time of your son taking the account to Constable Christie and Constable Christie giving you the money?—I could not say.
 189. You are not very clear on that point either?—It was some time after, but how long I could not say.

190. That is all of the transaction you recollect?—Yes.
 191. How did it come to be laid? Did you lay it?—No.
 192. Did you mention it to Mr. Taylor?—I mentioned it to Mr. Taylor.
 193. I suppose you did that out of gratitude to Christie for getting you the money?—I decline to answer that.
 194. You take a prominent part in the Prohibition League in Balclutha, do you not?—I have taken a prominent part.
 195. Mr. Taylor and you are rowing in the same boat in that respect?—I do not know about that.
 196. In different boats?—I do not think that is necessary.
 197. You have not always been a temperance man?—No, and I am sorry to say I was not.
 198. You had a bit of trouble at Mataura once, had you not?—No.
 199. Were you not in the hands of the police there for getting drunk on board the train?—No, I was in the hands of the police, not for getting drunk on board the train, but for being drunk on board the train, and that is one of the reasons why I am a prohibitionist, and I could give a good many more.
 200. That was before you were a prominent member of the Temperance League?—I cannot say that I was a prominent member.
 201. Was that the reason you joined the temperance people?—No, but I could give you a number of reasons.

WILLIAM E. BURLEY, examined on oath.

202. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—William E. Burley.
 203. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you reside at Balclutha?—Yes.
 204. Do you know Mr. Ramage?—Yes.
 205. Do you remember being indebted to him in the sum of 12s.?—I was indebted to him at one time in a small way—I do not remember the sum.
 206. To whom did you pay it?—I suppose I paid it to him. If I remember rightly, I heard that Mr. Ramage was going to summons me, and I asked Constable Christie to pay the money for me, as he was financing for me at the time. I had borrowed a few shillings from Christie at different times. I believe I owe Christie the money for that transaction yet, but I suppose I will pay it some day.
 207. *Mr. Taylor.*] How often had you borrowed money from him?—Four or five times.
 208. Small sums?—Small sums, and, I think, £5 one time. He offered it to me as a friendly action.
 209. Did he never discount a bill for you?—No, never in his life.
 210. Did you give Christie an I.O.U. for the money?—No.
 211. Whom did you get a receipt from for the money?—I do not know whether I got it from Constable Christie or Mr. Ramage, or whether I got a receipt at all.
 212. Did Constable Christie ever collect accounts for you?—Never in his life.
 213. Did you give Christie no acknowledgement whatever for the money you borrowed from him?—No. Since I borrowed money from him I failed, and went through the Court, and you may see by the papers that I owed him £12.
 214. *Mr. Poynton.*] He appeared on your schedule as a creditor?—Yes.
 215. *The Chairman.*] Did Christie tell you that Ramage was going to summon you?—I could not tell you.
 216. The £12 was for money lent?—Yes.
 217. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did any other part of it represent accounts that Christie had paid on your account?—I could not say for certain.
 218. When did you file?—February, 1897.
 219. If you borrowed money from the police constable, cannot you remember whether some of it, besides Ramage's, was to pay accounts with?—I believe a small amount was paid to Mr. Mills on my behalf.
 220. Did you hear that Mr. Mills was going to summon you?—Yes, about the same time.
 221. Did Christie not tell you that Mills was going to summon you?—No.
 222. Where did you hear it?—I heard it from outside.
 223. How much was Mr. Mill's account?—Perhaps 18s.—under £1, anyhow. It is five or six years ago now.
 224. Are you sure Christie did not tell you that you were going to be summoned by those two people?—I am sure of it.
 225. Can you remember who told you?—No, I cannot.
 226. Is there any other part of the money borrowed to pay accounts in Balclutha?—Well, when I was being pushed by different merchants I would ask Christie to lend me money.
 227. Did you ever get money from Christie to pay Burlinson?—I paid him.
 228. Did you get money from Christie to pay Mitchell?—No.
 229. Do you remember other bills paid with the money you borrowed?—I remember there were some Dunedin firms. I was in business at the time.
 230. No Balclutha firms?—Only Mills, and Ramage.
 231. *The Chairman.*] What was your business?—Cabinetmaker, upholsterer, furniture maker, and so forth.
 232. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember what Christie said when you presented the duplicate accounts?—I do not remember anything of that.
 233. *The Chairman.*] Did he ever present them to you?—No.
 234. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you not send to Ramage for a receipt?—No.

235. *The Chairman.*] What amount did you owe Ramage?—7s. 6d. or 6s. I can tell you now who gave me information about the account. It was from Ramage's son. He gave me the account one evening, and said that if the money was not paid within so many hours I would be summoned. I then told Christie about it and he paid it.

236. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did the son bring the account?—Yes.

237. And did Christie bring an account in duplicate to you?—No, I am clear on that..

238. Have you talked the matter over with Christie to-day?—No.

239. Have you talked it over with Mr. Macdonald?—No. I asked him when we were to come to give evidence. I thought it was to be 2 o'clock, and he told me it was half-past 12.

240. Did you go into the room in the passage with him?—I was standing at the door of it, and Mr. Taylor was beside us.

FREDERICK MILLS, examined on oath.

241. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Frederick Mills.

242. Where do you reside?—At Balclutha.

243. What are you?—A shoemaker.

244. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember whether Mr. Burley ever owed you any money?—I believe he did at one time, but it was a long time ago.

245. What was the amount?—I am not certain.

246. If he said it was about £1, would that be nearly right?—Yes.

247. Was the money paid?—Yes.

248. Who paid it to you?—Mrs. Burley paid part, and I think Constable Christie paid the balance. I think I summoned Burley, but I am not clear on the point.

249. Can you remember the details of the transaction between yourself and Christie when he gave you the money?—No, not at this moment.

250. What other accounts have you had to do with—with Christie?—I had three or four. I had Miss Kerr's, and Charles Shand's.

251. Did they both owe you money?—Yes.

252. Who paid it for them?—Christie paid them both.

253. Did you summon them?—Yes.

254. The record will be in the Court books?—Yes; at least it should be.

255. What were the special circumstances connected with Shand's case?—Did you have great trouble to get the money?—Yes.

256. Was it recovered through the Court in the ordinary way?—Yes.

257. Did you give evidence in the case?—Yes.

258. Did you pay Christie anything?—No.

259. What do you mean by "great trouble"? Was there delay?—Yes. I had trouble in getting the money out of Shand.

260. Where did you get the money?—At my shop.

261. Did you give a receipt for the money?—Yes.

262. What were the particulars of Miss Kerr's case?—She took no notice of my bill, and I summoned her, and got the money through Christie again.

263. At the shop?—Yes. She did not appear at all. She paid Constable Christie.

264. Did she pay into Court?—She paid Constable Christie. She did not come to Court. She sent the money to me herself.

265. Then, Christie did not give that to you in your shop?—No, but it was through him that I got it.

266. How?—He served the summons on her, and told her what I was going to do, and I got the money.

267. Did you get the money in full?—No.

268. Did you make a return to Christie for his trouble?—No. I never make a return to a constable who has a duty to perform. He had several cases for me, and I have got the money through the Court.

269. Did you give Christie a receipt for the money?—Yes; I always gave him a receipt.

270. In the Court books?—I do not know that.

271. There are printed forms in the Court to sign?—Yes.

272. It would be on one of those, then?—Yes.

273. Did you summon in all the cases referred to?—Yes; and sometimes he has got the money without summonses.

274. In a case where he got money without summoning, would you give him an account to collect?—Yes; and when he brought me the money I would give him a receipt for it.

275. Has that happened half a dozen times?—I do not think so, but it has happened more than once.

276. Had Christie paid over all these amounts before he left Balclutha?—Yes.

277. He did not settle any of them after he got to Mosgiel?—No; but he settled a small account of his own after he got to Mosgiel.

278. Did you sell goods for him?—Yes.

279. Did you never make any arrangement with him as to recompense for the trouble he had in collecting those accounts?—I remember that on one occasion I omitted to charge him with a pair of boots, but I did not do that intentionally as a means of recompense to him.

280. *The Chairman.*] Then, why do you mention it?—I thought he had got money for me that I could not have got myself.

281. Did you intentionally not charge him with the boots?—I thought he had done me a favour, and I did not charge him.

282. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you have any conversation with him about that item?—I cannot remember.

283. How came you to know that Constable Christie would collect accounts?—I asked him to do it, with authority to summon if he could not collect them.

284. You regarded him as a collector for the time being?—I thought that, being a policeman, he would get it sooner than I would.

285. Did you know he was Clerk of the Court?—Yes.

286. Do you not know that the Government charge, for all moneys recovered through the Court, certain Court fees?—Yes, and I paid them.

287. But you do not pay them when Constable Christie got the money without summoning?—No.

288. Did anybody tell you that Constable Christie would collect accounts?—I do not think anybody did tell me.

289. *Mr. Macdonald.*] I suppose you had on various occasions given Christie accounts to take out summonses for?—Yes.

290. And when you gave him these you expected him to take out summonses?—Yes; I gave him authority to take out summonses.

291. So that you went to him in his capacity of Clerk of the Court?—Certainly, as policeman.

292. *The Chairman.*] If so, you would have signed a plaint-note, would you not?—I never signed any.

293. *Mr. Macdonald.*] You would sign anything he put before you?—I would.

294. And that was done on various occasions, I suppose?—Yes.

295. You left it to Christie to manage the affair for you?—Yes.

296. *The Chairman.*] Did you pay him the Court fees for summonses when you took him the accounts?—I knew that if he took summonses out he would pay it, and charge me.

297. *Mr. Macdonald.*] I suppose you do not remember exactly what you did?—No, I do not remember.

298. How long ago is it since all this happened?—Well, it is now some time since Christie was in Balclutha.

299. How long ago is it since these transactions took place?—About three or four years.

300. *Mr. Taylor.*] When you gave Christie instructions to recover the money you did not give him any Court fees?—No.

301. What kind of authority did you sign? Was it a blue printed form, or a memorandum?—I gave him bills to collect, with authority to summon if he did not get the money.

JAMES WILLIAM MITCHELL, examined on oath.

302. *The Chairman.*] Your name is?—James William Mitchell.

303. You reside at Balclutha?—Yes.

304. What are you?—A tailor.

305. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Constable Christie?—I do.

306. Have you ever had any financial transactions with him?—No, I cannot say I have, other than that he was Clerk of the Court at Balclutha, and I had some business with him in that way.

307. What was that?—It was ordinary Clerk of the Court work.

308. Will you give me one case?—There was the case of Andrew Sharp.

309. Did you summon Andrew Sharp?—Yes.

310. Did you recover the money?—Yes.

311. Where did you receive it?—I think it was at the Courthouse.

312. Did you sign the usual receipt?—Yes.

313. Have you ever recovered money without actually going to Court for it?—Not through Constable Christie.

314. Have you ever discussed accounts with him at all?—Not except in the way of Clerk of the Court in taking out summonses.

315. Did you always get your money promptly?—Yes.

316. Did you have occasion to write to Christie at Mosgiel?—Not about any money received through the Court for me.

317. On what money business did you write?—On account of some one else.

318. Was it about an account he collected for you?—A man said he paid some money into the Court, and said it was for me, and I wrote and asked about it. Christie sent me this letter [produced].

319. Who is James Robertson?—A farmer at Warepa.

320. One of your customers?—Yes.

321. Had you asked Christie to collect the money for you?—No.

322. Did you authorise him to get the money for you?—No, but I had told him to summon.

323. Did you sign a form of the Court or pay the Court fees?—No.

324. Was the man summoned?—No. I thought he had been, but he had not been.

325. Do you know if Christie saw Robertson about the account?—No.

326. Why did you write to Christie?—Because Robertson told me he had paid the money into Court.

327. *The Chairman.*] At the time you wrote to Christie had you taken out a summons against Robertson?—I had taken out a summons through Constable Griffith.

328. *Mr. Taylor.*] You did not wait until you had received this letter from Christie?—I thought the summons had been taken out. Robertson paid me the money; it was about the time I sent that letter. He said he had paid Christie some money on my account, and that is why I wrote the letter to Christie.

329. Did you tell Christie to collect or to summon?—To summon. He never collected money for me.
330. Have you ever taken a summons out before?—Yes, lots of times.
331. What is the usual formula?—To go and sign the plaint form and pay the fees.
332. Did you do so in Robertson's case?—Yes, when I summoned him.
333. But when you saw Christie?—I had forgotten about it. I had an idea that I had summoned him. I had summoned others about the same time, and I was not sure about this one, but it turned out that I had not summoned him.
334. Do you remember any of the other names?—I think Sharp's was about the same time. I had trouble about him.
335. What about him?—I had trouble in getting the money from him. I had to summon him, then take out a judgment summons, and then a warrant for his arrest for contempt of Court. He afterwards sent the money to me.
336. Was that in Christie's time?—Yes; Christie paid me the money he got, straight away.
337. Did you always get prompt settlements?—Yes.
338. Did you take the money frequently in your shop in connection with these summons cases?—I remember one amount I got at the shop from Christie.
339. What receipt did you give for it?—I could not say.
340. Did you sign the usual blue printed form?—I would not swear to that.
341. *The Chairman.*] Was the money you got at the shop money for which you had sued?—Yes; I had sued some one at Port Molyneux.
342. *Mr. Taylor.*] Cannot you remember who it was?—I forget his name.
343. Did you sign the receipt form?—I think I did, either at my shop or at the Courthouse.
344. Did Christie ever discount any bills for you?—No, he never did.
345. Did you write to Christie more than once about this?—No.
346. Did you write to him about any other amounts?—No.
347. Will you swear you did not write more than once?—I might have written twice, but I am sure in my own mind I did not do so.
348. How long ago is it since you told Christie to summon for the money?—It must have been twelve months before the date of the letter; somewhere in 1896.
349. Could not you have found from the records of the Court whether he had paid?—That is what I looked up when I wanted to find the amount of the judgment. I then found that I was wrong, and that the summons had never been issued. I was satisfied then that I had made a mistake in thinking it had been issued. I had issued a number at one time, and I had thought it was among them.
350. Did Christie see Robertson about the money?—I do not know.
351. Did you see Robertson?—Yes; I summoned him.
352. But before you summoned him had you seen him about the account?—Yes, several times.
353. Did you ask him for the money?—Yes, and he put me off.
354. Did you discuss the matter with Christie before he left Balclutha?—Yes.
355. Did you ask him for the money?—No. I told him to summon, and afterwards I asked him if the matter had been settled. I was going to take out a judgment summons, and Christie said it was hardly worth while, as the man was in trouble about some other cases, and that if I waited I would have a better chance. I knew that some one was pressing Robertson at the time.
356. So you let it stand over?—Yes. Then when Christie went away I went to Constable Griffith and said I would take out a judgment summons. I ascertained by searching the records that no summons had been taken out. It was my mistake.
357. You are clear about Christie telling you not to take the judgment summons out?—Yes, I am pretty clear on that.
358. What other moneys did you instruct Christie to collect for you?—None, except in his capacity of Clerk of the Court.
359. Did you always sign the plaint?—I suppose I did. I would not swear but that I missed some.
360. And if you did what would happen? Would you expect Christie to summon?—No.
361. What would happen?—I suppose if the Magistrate knew it was not signed nothing would be done.
362. Did you always pay the fees when you went round to see about the summonses?—Mostly.
363. Not always?—I might have missed it a few times.
364. Then what would happen?—One time I was going to pay the fees to Christie, and he said, "This man will pay," and I will get it then.
365. Did you run an account with Christie?—No.
366. He never bought anything from you?—He might have.
367. Did you do odd jobs for him?—Very little—practically nothing.
368. Did you make an entry in your books for these jobs?—Anything I did I entered in the books. I never did anything for him for nothing.
369. Did you think that Christie, or anybody else, would look after the accounts for nothing?—I do not want them to do it for nothing.
370. What about Robertson?—I thought I had summoned him.
371. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you suggest that Constable Christie acted in any way improperly in connection with Robertson's account?—No.
372. You now believe you were under a wrong impression when you thought you had summoned him?—Yes.

373. And you think it was your own mistake?—Yes.

374. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you talked the case over this morning with Christie?—I had a conversation with Mr. Macdonald.

375. Where?—I had two or three words with him in the adjoining room.

376. What did he ask you?—He asked me who called me as a witness, and I said it was Mr. Taylor.

377. How did you know I had called you?—You told me in the lobby. You said that Mr. Macdonald was interviewing your witnesses, and I took it that I was one.

378. What was the nature of the conversation with Mr. Macdonald?—He asked me who called me, and I said it was Mr. Taylor. He then asked me what I was called for, and I said I did not know, and that I thought it was a waste of time.

379. Did you not discuss Robertson's case?—Not much. I did not even show him that letter.

380. Did he suggest any line of answers?—No.

MICHAEL BERNSTONE, examined on oath.

381. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Michael Bernstone.

382. What are you?—A tailor at Balclutha.

383. Do you know Constable Christie?—I do.

384. How long have you been in Balclutha?—Not fully five years.

385. Did you ever have any financial transactions with the constable?—Once.

386. What was the nature of it?—I had summoned a party of the name of J. Reid, and I got judgment for the amount in Court. The full amount was £4 10s., and he paid £2 into Court, and the next day judgment was given for £2 10s. The party was "not much account," and I could not get the money, and for that reason asked Constable Christie to take out a judgment summons. He did not do so, but shortly afterwards the money was brought into my place by the constable. I thanked him very much, and there was no more about it.

387. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you sign a receipt?—I do not remember; but I remember that I got the money in my shop.

388. The full amount?—Yes.

389. Is that all the business Christie has done for you?—He has done several others, but through the Court.

390. What happened in the Magistrate's Court between you and Constable Christie one day?—Oh, that was a matter in which I summoned him for a suit of clothes, and my lawyer got the money.

391. How much was paid in?—The full amount.

392. Were the costs paid?—Yes; 3s. for the summons.

393. Did you not complain to the Magistrate that the costs had not been paid?—Yes; I said the cost of issuing the summons, the lawyer's fee of 5s., had not been paid.

394. Did you get it ultimately?—Yes.

395. But you had to complain to the Court about it?—It was not for the sake of the 5s. that I complained, but I got the money.

396. How long had he owed the money?—About three months.

397. Is that unusual?—Well, sometimes people are long-winded, but you cannot help that.

398. Have you your books with you?—No.

399. Has Christie ever collected money for you?—No; but he brought in this money because I had told him to take out a judgment summons.

400. Did you see Reid about the case?—No; he was at work miles away.

401. Do you know how Christie got the money?—No, and he did not tell me. I remember he said, "I have your money from Reid," and I made no inquiries, but I thanked him very much.

402. Where did you settle up with him?—He brought the money into the shop one day.

403. Have you talked the matter over with any one to-day?—I cannot say I have.

404. With whom have you had a conversation? With Mr. Macdonald?—No.

405. With Christie?—Not about this case of Reid's.

406. What was it about?—I asked him what it was all about, and he said, "I suppose they want to make out a case."

407. Did you not know that it was about the collection of moneys?—No, not until I saw the subpoena. I have only the one case.

408. You have no record of any other transaction?—Not so far as I remember.

409. What else did you say to Christie? Did you talk Reid's case over?—No.

410. Did you speak about it at all?—We did not say much.

411. Was Mr. Macdonald there?—No.

412. Did you not speak to Mr. Macdonald at all?—I do not remember.

413. Have you spoken to Mr. Macdonald at all to-day?—Not outside in the passage.

414. Whom did you see in the room?—Mrs. Heaney. Constable Christie also came in, and then I went out.

415. Where did you speak to him?—In the passage.

416. And you said you did not know what you had been brought up for?—I said, "I want to know why we are brought up here," and he said it was about money matters.

417. Are you very familiar with Christie?—No.

418. Very friendly?—No.

419. Have you ever made statements to people in Balclutha that Christie has collected accounts for you?—This is the only account he has collected for me.

420. *The Chairman.*] In this case the man paid the money into Court before the judgment summons was issued?—It came to my shop before the judgment summons was issued.

421. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is money recovered in this way not usually paid into Court?—Yes, and a receipt given for it.

422. But this amount was taken to the shop?—Yes.

ALEXANDER BURNETT HENDERSON, examined on oath.

423. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Alexander Burnett Henderson.

424. What are you?—A builder, residing at Balclutha.

425. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember Constable Christie being in Balclutha?—Yes.

426. Have you any occasion to think he neglected his duty while there?—I have.

427. *The Chairman.*] When?—The night before Christmas, 1893, I was at my gate when a man came along in a drunken state; he was so drunk he could not walk.

[This case was not proceeded with, twenty-four hours' notice of the matter not having been given to Constable Christie.]

Mr. Taylor: I will at once give notice of it to the constable.

JAMES HENRY, further examined on oath.

428. *Mr. Taylor.*] You said in your evidence at Balclutha that the constable did all that was necessary to work up the case?—I did not say that.

429. Did you not say, "I think he did a good deal to work up the information"?—No.

430. *Mr. Macdonald.*] I think the witness did say it. I thought his words were important, and I noted them myself?—Well, he did at first. I have no doubt of that; but when my letter appeared in the paper it seemed to annoy him. It explained the whole matter.

431. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did he tell you he was annoyed?—I have explained before what he said. He said I ought not to have written, or that I had no right to do so. I had showed Christie a copy of the letter before it appeared in print.

432. He knew it was going to appear?—Yes. I thought it was rather strong.

433. Did he come to see you about the case?—Yes.

434. What did he report?—When I went to the constable's house that morning at 3 o'clock I explained to him what had taken place, and asked him to call round. He said he was going away that morning by an early train. He came round next day. He told Mr. Ramage and myself that morning at 3 o'clock that about the time of the egg-throwing he had been round to Moir's back-door at the Farmers' Arms Hotel. He had heard a row there, and he also said he had exchanged some strong language with James Thomson. He may not have put it in those words, but that is what I inferred from what he said. I next found out from Constable Christie that I should be obliged to lay an information for assault. I think he told me that in Mr. Stewart's office.

435. *Mr. Macdonald.*] He asked you to lay an information?—I do not think he asked me. He said he thought I would have to lay an information for assault, and my reply was that I could not afford to take the matter up myself. The matter then dropped. Some correspondence still went on in the papers; it went on for three weeks.

436. *Mr. Taylor.*] There was no prosecution?—No.

437. *Mr. Macdonald.*] What is your grievance against Christie? Somebody struck you with rotten eggs, I understand?—Yes.

438. And you say you made a charge to Christie?—I reported the matter to him.

439. You now withdraw any censure you formally put on Christie for not being there at a certain time? You admit he had to leave at 4 o'clock that morning? You have no charge against him in that respect?—I came here because I was summoned. I have no charge against anybody.

440. You admit that he had to go away by the 4 o'clock train, and that he came to see you next day?—Yes.

441. You told him the persons you had suspicions against?—Yes.

442. Of course, you do not know what efforts Christie made to bring these people to justice?—No.

443. For anything you know, he may have been making the best inquiries he could; and endeavouring to find them?—I heard otherwise, but I cannot swear to it.

444. You were not with Christie all the time?—No.

445. Then, you admit that Christie ultimately told you that the police could not take the case up, and that you ought to lay an information?—Yes. I believe it was in Mr. Stewart's office, or about it.

446. Did he not say that the evidence at his disposal was not sufficient for the police to take up the case, but he wanted you to lay the information?—I did not understand it in that way. I thought the law did not allow him to take it up.

447. Did you not gather that he himself would not like to lay the information as a constable, but that he wanted you to lay it?—I will tell you what I understood: that probably the law did not allow him, and that he wanted me to do it.

448. Did he not tell you that?—Yes.

449. That he himself would not lay it as a police constable, but that he wanted you to lay it?—Yes.

450. And you said it would be somewhat expensive to you, and you wanted the police to do it?—Yes; but I was frightened of my witnesses too.

451. You admit that the witnesses were not very reliable?—Yes.

452. A good deal of feeling existed at the time?—Yes.

453. There were two factions, and a good deal of feeling was displayed, and you and Christie came to the conclusion that the evidence was not very reliable, and that probably the witnesses

would go back on you?—With reference to the two factions, I believe Constable Christie will say I have always acted independently of both, and I do now.

454. We are not insinuating a word against you, and we do not say you did anything that a respectable citizen should not have done; but you admit it was doubtful how the evidence would come out?—Yes.

455. And under those circumstances Christie said he would not lay the information, but that if you would lay it he would go on with the case?—Yes.

456. So you think he should have laid the information, and not asked you to do it? That is your grievance, is it not?—I have no grievance against the constable, but I have a grievance against somebody. It is well known in the Clutha that I had a good deal of private sympathy, but the people were afraid to show it. There is a gentleman in this room now, Mr. George Thomson, who said at the time that he would subscribe towards the prosecution of those who insulted me.

457. You heard what Mr. George Thomson said at Balclutha—that Constable Christie had made efforts to find the offenders?—Perhaps he said it; I do not remember.

WARD GEORGE WOHLMANN, examined on oath.

458. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Ward George Wohlmann. I am a third-class constable stationed at Dunedin.

459. I understand that a meeting of the constables of the district was held in Dunedin recently at which you were deputed to make certain statements to us?—Yes. Two delegates were originally appointed, but, as the men have given me precise instructions as to what to say, one may put forward their wishes as well as half a dozen. They also wish me to say they hope that the sending of only one delegate will not prejudice their case in any way before the Commissioners.

460. Certainly not?—Thank you. I would also like to say that all the resolutions adopted at the meeting were carried unanimously.

461. The whole Force was not present?—No.

462. Have you reason to believe that among those who were absent there were dissentients?—I have spoken to all I have come in contact with since, and they all agree with the propositions I intend to put forward. Our first resolution is: "As the present compulsory insurance only affects one class of the New Zealand Police Force, we are of opinion that it is arbitrary and unfair, and recommend that it be abolished, and that, in its stead, the Government bring in a pension scheme as in the other colonies." In discussing the matter, the men used certain arguments, among others, and I would like to put forward our views, as follows: We are insured under a table which makes the policy payable at sixty years, or at death if prior. The probability is against a considerable number of us reaching sixty years of age. According to the latest actuarial tables, a healthy man of twenty-three years of age is only expected, on an average, to reach the age of sixty-two years and a half. Of course, a considerable number will fall short of the average. We are therefore insured under a table which renders it unlikely that a considerable number of us will in any way benefit from this deduction of from 8s. to 16s. 4d. a month from our wages. It is problematical whether many of us will be in the Force at sixty years of age, even if we all lived to that age. Many will probably be discharged as unfit before sixty, even if we do not leave for any other reason. If a man is retired as medically unfit at, say, forty years of age, his policy is almost useless to him, because, if he is unfit for police-work, the probability is he is unfit for any work; therefore to derive any benefit from his policy he has not only to live to sixty years of age, but this man, unfit for work, and therefore unfit to earn money, has to keep his premiums paid for another twenty years; so that, in all probability, a considerable percentage of these policies will either be paid to relatives of deceased constables or be allowed to lapse, and the Government will take possession of all those parts of our wages, called premiums, we should have received each month. A man joining the Force now, even if his life is already insured, has to insure again under this special table, even when they are insured under a table almost similar, causing annoyance and financial loss. This compulsory insurance only affects part of the Police Force. It is a lop-sided scheme, and gives great dissatisfaction to those men who are under it, because they see they are, instead of in a better, in a worse position than the men who are not affected by it. It has, however, one good point. The Government Insurance Department will rake in a goodly amount of premiums paid in on lapsed policies. In the event of compulsory insurance being done away with, we respectfully ask that the premiums we have paid in be either returned to us with interest at 3 per cent., or else that we be credited with it in the event of another scheme being substituted. We do not think it would be fair for us to lose the premiums we have paid in in the event of a new scheme being brought in. It was stated last night by Sergeant O'Neill that he thought a deduction of 5 per cent. from our wages would be acceptable to the men. All I can say to that is that in New South Wales there is a deduction of only 2d. a day, and they receive wages as high as we do here. In Western Australia 2s. 6d. a month is deducted from each month's pay.

463. Would your men accept a pension scheme which involved a charge on their income of 2½ per cent.—say, 5s. or 10s. a month?—Yes, I think so. I think 5 per cent. is rather high, unless there is a good retiring-allowance. A sliding-scale might be introduced. For instance, if a man retired at ten years he could receive so much in proportion, and if he retired at fifteen years he could get half as much again, and if at twenty the full amount.

464. Are you suggesting that in addition to a pension?—I am speaking of pensions only.

465. What is your suggestion as to a pension, and when should a man be entitled to get it?—We have not fixed on any amount, or on any age, except the general suggestion that it should be on a sliding-scale. The amount of pension should be regulated by the length of service, beginning with ten years' service, and in the event of any man leaving the Force before that age (not discharged) he should have a retiring-allowance, as he had paid in for a certain period. He should receive a

month's pay for each year of service in lieu of a pension. A proviso should be put in the scheme to the effect that, in the event of a constable dying within a year after he becomes entitled to the pension, his wife and family should be given a reasonable amount in proportion to the amount of the fund he would probably be entitled to if he lived to a reasonable age.

466. Would you leave it to a Board to determine what the amount of the compassionate allowance should be?—Yes.

467. How should that compassionate allowance be settled? You say the wife should receive something—what do you suggest?—It could be arrived at by the life tables. If a man is entitled to live to sixty they should make it proportionately so.

468. You take the actuarial value of his pension, supposing he was alive?—Yes. I think I may safely say that the men would be satisfied with the payment to the widow of the amount paid by her husband to the pension fund.

469. Will you proceed now?—I will take the next three resolutions together: "That the rate of pay at present existing—viz., £10 per month—be dispensed with, and that the old rate of pay (7s. per day) be reverted to. That house-allowance be granted to married constables. That police uniform be provided free." In support of these resolutions, I wish to say: In 1895 the pay of a third-class constable was reduced from £127 15s. a year to £120 (apparently), paid at first at the rate of 7s. a day, but after the reduction at £10 a month. In reality there was a greater reduction, because every constable joining after 1893 was compelled to insure his life for £200. The youngest age at which a constable can join is twenty-three years. The premium charged at that age is 8s. a month, which, deducted from the year's pay of £120, leaves actually £115 4s.; so that, of two constables joining in 1893, one receives £12 11s. less than the other. This is manifestly unfair, for it contravenes the just principle of equal pay for equal work, performed under precisely the same circumstances and conditions. No arrangement has been made, or, at least, communicated to a constable joining since 1895, as to what pay he should receive in the event of promotion. We do not know what we are to receive. Promotion appears to have been an unconsidered contingency. If he is to receive 6d. a day more for each step, as the "7s.-a-day men" are, part of his wages will have to be computed at so much per month, and another part of his wages at so much per day, care having to be taken to distinguish between a thirty-one, thirty, or twenty-eight day month; so one constable will actually receive two rates of pay, and each computed in a different manner. The wages of £10 a month actually creates a fourth class of constables. If a third-class constable gets 7s. a day, and another constable gets only 6s. and a fraction, is not the latter constable on a lower scale than the former, and fourth class is below third class. The only difference between one class of constable and another is the difference of pay. In any case £10 a month (less insurance premiums) is too small a wage. To a man joining at twenty-three years of age is given £9 12s. a month. A man joining at thirty years of age gets still less, because his premiums are higher; yet, although he pays a larger premium, he has no more chance of deriving any benefit from it than the man who joined at twenty-three; so that a married constable, joining at thirty years of age, probably with one or two children, receives less wages than the single man who joined at twenty-three. Constables have to provide themselves with uniforms for day and night duty, overcoats, macintoshes, gloves, shakos, boots, &c., and pay for their messing. House-rent is from 11s. to 14s. a week hire for a house suitable for a constable to live in. Uniforms run into about £10 a year, besides the other heavy items of expenditure. When we have deducted these amounts there is not much left out of the £10, not enough to make it wise for constables to marry. It is the hope of a country station, with its free house, and the opportunity of making a little money, that encourages constables to marry. While waiting for this station, however, is the time married constables especially find it difficult to keep out of debt. For the good of the Force it is a time of temptation that constables should not be subjected to. We consider the wages too small to keep a constable independent of the public. It is not desirable that a constable should be in debt to his grocer, baker, or butcher. How can he do his duty impartially to these men if he is in debt to them? The wages paid to all classes of workers in the colony are as high, if not higher, than those paid to workers in the other colonies. We think it would be only fair if our wages were as proportionately high as are received by the police in the other colonies. The cost of maintaining the Police Force in this colony is 2s. 7d. per head of the population; in New South Wales about 5s. per head; and in Western Australia 7s. per head—nearly three times as much. Surely this is a proof of the meagreness of the pay. A constable in New Zealand is expected to be always in possession of ready cash, for if he is sent on duty beyond his station, as he often is, he has to pay all the expenses he incurs out of his own pocket, and it may not be returned to him for a month or two afterwards. It will be seen it is not fair to apportion his wages by an ordinary standard. The wages paid to a recruit in the Dublin Metropolitan Police is £1 a week and everything found, which is, I suppose, equal to £1 10s. a week. An ordinary labourer in Ireland is well paid if he receives 2s. a day. So the constable receives twice as much as the labourer. We receive 6s. and a fraction a day, and a labourer 7s. I never heard that the Dublin Police were considered overpaid. In conclusion, constables in country stations are usually Clerks of Courts, &c., and considerable amounts of public moneys pass through their hands. It is not conducive to the efficiency of the Force that they should be in debt. The distressing case of Huddleston's, in Auckland, can be instanced. Regarding uniforms, a feeling of apprehension exists amongst the men that, in the event of uniforms being found us by the department, we may be served out with slop-made uniforms. As we wish to appear in well-made, well-fitting clothes, we respectfully suggest that each man's measure should be taken. The men as a rule prefer the shako.

Mr. Tunbridge: I think I have a better suggestion than that—that the men be supplied with the material.

Witness : The next resolution is : “ That the annual holiday leave be cumulative up to three years, when necessary ; and that said annual leave be increased to fourteen days.” In consequence of the Queen’s Jubilee last year, the Commissioner has kindly given us two days’ extra leave, to be taken within the twelve months following the Jubilee celebration ; so that this year we have fourteen days instead of twelve. It is a recognised fact in the department that on many occasions twelve days’ leave has been found quite inadequate to enable a constable to visit his friends or relations. If a constable in Otago or Southland has his home on the West Coast, or in any part of the North Island beyond Wellington, almost all his leave is expended in reaching his friends and returning, allowing him no time to spend with them. This applies with equal force to constables in the North Island whose homes are down here. So that it is necessary for a constable whose friends are a long way from his station to apply for an extension of leave, that may or may not be granted. We ask, then, that our annual leave be increased permanently up to fourteen days. We ask also that it be cumulative up to three years, when necessary. If a constable does not take his leave in any one year it is lost to him, and, if he is so far from his friends that it is useless for him to take only twelve days, he cannot visit them at all. Constables join the New Zealand Force from the other colonies. Would it not be fair to allow leave to accumulate, to enable these men to visit their friends sometimes ? It would be an advantage to the Force itself, and it would not interfere so much with the routine of work, if constables took leave less often and more of it. As long as a constable remains in the New Zealand Force he is prevented from leaving its shores. The department will not lose anything : they would only be giving the same amount of leave as at present, but, instead of giving it in three instalments, they would grant it in one or two. It would also reduce the changing about of reliefs, and extra work entailed in supplying substitutes for constables on leave, by 100 per cent., and it would be a special boon to constables in out-of-the-way stations. We have made our demands as reasonable as possible, because we can point to the Post Office and Asylum officials, who get three weeks, and our duties are quite as arduous as are theirs. I would also like to say that constables on duty who have to attend Court next morning are not allowed any time off on that account, unless they are exceptionally long at Court ; and it is very trying on a constable on night duty to lose his rest on two or three consecutive days. It tempts men to neglect their duty, because they will say, “ If I arrest that man—perhaps he is a drunkard—I will have to get up to-morrow again. I have been up two days already, and I am blessed if I am going to do it.” Also, when a man is on the beat from 5 a.m. to 9 a.m. he often has to attend the Court during his hours off, and if his case is near the end of the list he has to wait about, and will probably lose the whole of his four hours ; so we respectfully suggest that, if possible, it should be arranged that we get time off when attending Court. Another resolution is, “ That constables on leave be allowed to travel free on Government railway-lines.” Constables are always on duty. They are liable to be called on to perform their duty when on leave, and so lose part of their leave. Railway officials travel free when on leave and not on duty. A constable on leave may be called on to assist one of these officials on leave, but the railway official cannot be specially called on to assist a constable—that is, not more than an ordinary civilian. Instances can be given of constables losing part of their leave owing to being forced to perform police duty. On one occasion Constable James Fergusson, of Invercargill, while on leave, had to take charge of a drowned man, and thereby lost two days.

470. *The Chairman.*] Were they not made up to him ?—Not that I am aware of.

471. Would it be considered his duty, Mr. Tunbridge, if not called upon ?

Mr. Tunbridge : No, I should think not. It would be the duty of the relieving constable.

472. *Mr. Poynton.*] Would he be reprimanded if he passed by ?

Mr. Tunbridge : Certainly he would. Of course, any leave he lost would be made up to him, and any expense would be refunded to him. The circumstances were these : Constable J. Fergusson, of Invercargill, when on leave, and when near Nevis, which is thirty-six miles from Cromwell Police-station, had to look after the body of a man who had been drowned off a dredge, and lost two days thereby. The name of the drowned man was John Downing. It occurred on the 8th December, 1897.

473. *Inspector Pardy.*] The man did not complain, or he would have had the time allowed to him ?—At any rate, our point is that while in plain clothes a policeman should be allowed to travel free of cost, as he is still on duty.

Witness : The next resolution is this : “ That the present relieving-allowance is insufficient, as married men only receive 3s. per day and single men 1s. 6d.” Over a large area of Otago and Southland the tariff at hotels, where constables on relieving duty are forced to lodge, is 2s. each for single meals and beds, or from £1 10s. to £2 a week. As a rule, the lowest tariff that can be obtained in any respectable hotel in the colony is 1s. 6d. a meal and bed, and from £1 5s. to £1 10s. per week boarding and lodging. Our lodging is supplied free to single constables in head stations. Our messing costs about 11s. 6d. per week, so a single constable on relieving duty is out of pocket per week from 5s. to £1. We ask that the relieving-allowance be increased, and especially so in isolated country stations, and all over the goldfields, where the living-rate is very high. In both New South Wales and Western Australia constables when absent from the station receive 5s. a day as travelling-allowance. For myself, when I was at Ophir I paid £1 10s. a week for board and lodging, and I am entitled to 10s. 6d. The next resolution is, “ That some uniform system of promotion similar to that existing in the Colonies of Victoria and New South Wales be introduced into the New Zealand Police Force.” Our men are looking to the other colonies, where the men rise fast compared with their advancement here. In New South Wales, after a year’s service, the men are promoted one grade and given an extra 1s. a day. If a man is not competent to take that grade he is discharged. That is the rule. Then, in from three to five years a man of ordinary intelligence is promoted another grade, with 6d. a day. He is then a first-class or senior constable.

474. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think a similar system should prevail here?—We are very dissatisfied with the slowness of promotion in the ranks of constables. We think that up to the rank of first-class constable, supposing the present ranks are continued, a constable should be promoted at fixed periods. After one year's service he should be promoted a step, and after two or three years he should be made a first-class constable. As regards the sergeants, the most efficient men should be selected from among the constables. The next resolution is, "That the present system of long-service pay extended to certain members of the New Zealand Police Force be made applicable to all men in the Force." We desire that, or that we should be compensated in some other way. We do the same work, and are entitled to the same pay.

475. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Not taking into consideration the £120-a-year men: there are three grades at the present time?—Yes.

476. At 7s., 7s. 6d., and 8s. a day?—Yes.

477. With 1s. long-service allowance to men who joined prior to a certain period?—Yes.

478. What scale of pay would be acceptable to the men to begin with: what should he join at?—There are two ways—either at 7s. and get 1s. in one year if efficient, or, as a rule, if not efficient he should be discharged.

479. And what do you say should be the maximum?—Supposing we keep the three grades?

480. Do not trouble about grades. What should be the maximum pay the constable should receive?—It will depend on what the sergeants get. It should be 9s. at least.

481. How many years should a man serve before he should attain the maximum?—I suppose a constable would be at his best in about six years—five years after he had attained his first rise.

482. Would it be acceptable to the men to go on from six years' service, say, to thirty years' service without getting any rise?—If they had the 9s. they would be as well paid as they are now with their present chance of rise.

483. *Mr. Poynton.*] You think they would be satisfied to remain at that with their chance of promotion to sergeants?—Yes. It is acknowledged that promotion is blocked not only among the constables, but among the officers.

484. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you think the men would be willing to accept pay rising in the manner I will state: We will put it that the men start at a minimum of 7s. The maximum is 9s. They rise by eight annual increments of 3d. per diem from the minimum to the maximum, and they take eight years to attain the maximum?—I think that would be preferable, because they would be receiving an increase during half the period. If they received 8s. in four years, at five or six they would be receiving part of the extra shilling.

485. You think some scale of pay of that style would be acceptable to the men?—I think so. It would be a great improvement on the present system of a man not knowing.

486. It would be a great improvement on the present system of a man not knowing when he will get a rise?—Yes, because now, as soon as that feeling of dissatisfaction arises in a man, if he sees he can get another job he will take it, and it takes his mind from his proper work.

487. As to the relieving-allowance, what would you suggest that a man should be given per day?—I do not think it is fair to fix it arbitrarily. He should be refunded what he expends, as long as it is reasonable. He should support his vouchers by receipts.

488. Is that not what is done at the present time?—No. If a man expends £1 10s. a week he does not get it refunded.

489. Assuming in your case you paid £1 10s. at Ophir, had you been in Dunedin the messing would have cost you 11s. a week; that would leave a balance to you of 19s.? Would it be satisfactory to you if you got 19s.?—I think so, so long as I am not money out of pocket.

490. *Mr. Taylor.*] There has been considerable dissatisfaction among the men over travelling-allowances?—Yes.

491. How long have you been in the Force?—Two and a half years.

492. Have you heard among the men you have associated with that there has been a general feeling that political influence has had to be used in a number of cases?—I think I can say it is more than a general feeling. Formerly the men seemed to consider that it was necessary.

493. There has been a feeling that promotions and transfers have been influenced by it?—Yes.

494. Has that feeling undergone any change during the past five or six months, since there has been a change in control?—Yes, that feeling has changed.

495. As a matter of fact, are not the men now beginning to express the opinion that the old arrangement has been broken through?—The idea is that it has received a check, because probably those who were capable of using the influence are now afraid to do it.

WEDNESDAY, 6TH APRIL, 1898.

DAVID PINKERTON, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] I sent a summons to you, Mr. Pinkerton, because I thought that having been in the Lower House, and now occupying a seat in the Upper House, you might be able to give us some information as to the question of political influence exercised in the Police Force. Mr. Millar and Mr. Morrison have been before us representing the Lower House, and we would like to also have the evidence of a member of the Upper House. Do you think that political influence is used?—I have been waited on on different occasions by persons, police and others, who have asked for my assistance in various ways. You might call it political influence, but I call it human nature. They are only trying to better their position. Some of the police have asked me to get them removed from town to country, some of them preferring the country to the town. That has been the request in most of the cases. In one instance, a policeman who had served a number of years wanted to get his long-service pay.

2. In response to these applications have you endeavoured to assist them?—I have from time to time either written or wired to the Minister, and, perhaps, once or twice to Colonel Hume. I remember speaking to Colonel Hume once about a matter.

3. Do you consider that any result has arisen from your action?—I think that most of my applications were unsuccessful. Beyond presenting the matter I never pressed it. I did not know the working of the department, and did not think it was my duty to press. I simply stated as near as I could what the men told me.

4. Where have you been approached by members of the Force with a view to your taking this action?—Generally in my own house in Dunedin. In many instances the request did not come from the police themselves but from friends.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. To whom was the telegram addressed?—If my memory serves me right, it was addressed either to the Minister, or to Colonel Hume.

9. 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.

10. To what extent does this practice go on?—Not to a great extent, considering the number of men in the Force. I have not had a great many applications.

11. Are we to understand this is not an isolated case?—The case of a telegram of the same nature is an isolated one; but some of the men have asked me to use my influence to get them country stations, and in some cases their friends have come to me, as I said before. I also had an application to get long-service pay for a man.

12. *Mr. Poynton.*] What do you think of putting the Force under a head which is free from political control?—I am opposed to it. I would rather see the Force under the Government.

13. Have you any suggestions to offer for alteration of the present system?—No; I see no reason why the present system should be altered. I think that, so far as influence goes, it would be as much used under a non-political Board as under the Government.

14. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you receive these applications with good grace, or were you annoyed?—I received them with good grace.

15. May we take it that you encouraged them?—Oh, no. I did not show any feeling against their coming; but I never encouraged them.

16. Do you not consider that these applications, coming from men serving in your constituency, were rather embarrassing to you?—They might have been; but I was always careful to look after myself, and while looking after their wants I never unduly pressed a case.

17. So long as the Force is under a Ministerial head these applications are likely to be made to members of Parliament?—Yes, naturally, and they will be made under any other head. The influence might not be used through members, but it would be used all the same, as was the case when the Railway Commissioners held office.

18. I do not think that during the past six or eight months you have been approached, have you?—No.

19. Your applications were not attended with success in every case?—In many cases they were not.

20. Were there very many cases in which they were attended with success?—I think there was one—the case of Constable Walker, who was in the North-east Valley. There was some unpleasantness in the district, and one party of persons wished to retain him, and another to get him shifted. I spoke on behalf of getting him retained; but whether that would have happened without my interference or not I cannot say.

21. Is that the Constable Walker who is at Riverton now?—Yes.

22. In forwarding a request you do not inquire into the man's political opinions?—No. I never knew their political opinions, and never asked for them.

23. *Colonel Hume.*] As to this telegram of Mathieson's, did it have the desired effect?—I understand he is still doing street duty; that is, if he is the man who gave evidence at Balclutha.

24. Was the representation about Constable Walker from the inhabitants?—Yes, from a section of the residents.

25. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you discussed these telegrams of Constable Mathieson's with any one since you sent them?—I may have incidentally mentioned them.

26. Have you discussed the matter with Colonel Hume during the last few weeks?—No, nor with any member of the Commission.

27. What parties were interested in Constable Walker. I could not tell. The residents of the locality seemed to be divided on account of a certain report he was said to have made, but what the report was I do not know.

28. Who saw you about the matter?—Mr. Thomas Short, a contractor, I think, was the principal one. There may have been others in his company, but it was from him I got the information.

29. Have you ever had any conversation with publicans or brewers about the removal of men?—No, never. It was once rumoured that I was to blame for the removal of Sergeant Mulville, but, as a matter of fact, he was shifted before I knew anything about it. No publican has ever suggested to me the removal of any policeman.

29a. How did you bring the matter before the Minister?—In some cases I waited on him.

30. Is it not subservient to discipline that a departmental head should have no power over the men?—I never anticipated any feeling of that kind arising.

31. But is it not subservient to discipline?—No doubt it would be.

32. Do you regard conversations with men who see you as confidential?—Yes.

33. What was the second telegram about, that Constable Mathieson laid before you?—They were both on the same subject. I did not think it was right that a policeman or any other person should bring a telegram to me and ask me to sign it.

34. Why did you sign one?—Well, I was willing to oblige him in the one case.

35. You were more pliable the second time?—No; I could not say that. I think I was less pliable.

36. Did Constable Mayne ever see you?—No; I do not know him.

37. Pratt?—No.

38. Did not he see you in connection with a petition before the House?—No.

39. What kind of a reply did you usually get from the Minister?—It was often the case that nothing could be done; or, if the application was for a situation, the reply was that there was no vacancy.

40. But sometimes the Minister would give you a favourable reply?—I do not remember having got one. They were all the other way.

41. Were all your applications unsuccessful?—Mostly.

42. You would get a successful reply sometimes?—Sometimes; if there was an opening the Minister would say he would see what he could do. That was the nature of most of the replies.

43. In urging the claims of any policeman who saw you, had you any knowledge of the merits of the other five hundred men in the Force?—I had not.

44. *Colonel Hume.*] Since this Commission set out, have I talked to you or communicated with you either by letter, or telegram, or verbally?—No.

JAMES DANVERS LEECE, examined on oath *re* Mrs. Meikle's letter.

45. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—James Danvers Leece.

46. I sent you a letter from Mrs. Meikle for your perusal?—Yes, Sir.

47. Were you, during the imprisonment of Meikle, in the habit of being frequently on the premises of Meikle?—No, except on duty.

48. Tell us what duty took you there, and how often.—My duty was in the case of summons serving, and on the occasion of the boy's death, to see if an inquest was necessary, the boy having died somewhat suddenly.

49. How many times were you there to serve summonses?—A very few times; and on the occasion of the boy's death I was sent for.

50. Any other occasion?—I do not remember.

51. How long was Meikle in prison?—Five years, I think.

52. And you swear that during those five years you were there only on the occasions you mention—to see about the inquest and to serve the summonses?—Yes, and perhaps on other duties.

53. What other duties?—I cannot tell.

54. You ought to know.—Well, I would be collecting agricultural statistics once a year. I forgot about that. I was also Dog-tax Collector, and I was there to get the tax.

55. Can you call to mind any other occasions?—No, I cannot at present.

56. Have you in your mind an occasion when you spoke to Mrs. Meikle about selling mutton?—Yes. There was a rumour that she was selling mutton, and I went to see her, and cautioned her not to sell it without a license. It was said that she was selling mutton to the men who were making the bridge over the Mimihau.

57. How far is Meikle's farm from the nearest town?—About fourteen miles.

58. Was the bridge near their place?—Yes. The river ran past the corner of the farm. Frequently the butchers made complaints about this selling going on.

59. There is a suggestion in the letter, and I will ask you a question on it. Did you suggest to the neighbours that the woman was carrying on sheep-stealing?—No, never.

60. "He went round the neighbours, and asked if they had lost any sheep. He said that Mrs. Meikle was selling mutton"?—I never suggested it.

61. Do you remember taking a paper?—I do not.

62. Do you remember taking a paper to be signed when Mrs. Urquhart was present?—I cannot remember anything of such a nature.

63. Did she tell you she had not paid for the stock on the farm?—No. In reference to that stock I wish to say, I was coming from the Commission on Friday, and in the train after leaving Gore I met a man named James Mabin—it had been stated that the stock was sold to Mr. Mabin—and he told me he did buy it, but that, knowing Mrs. Meikle well, he gave the stock back to her for her interest and welfare.

64. Did you understand him to say he absolutely made her a present of it, or that it was for what he was owing to her?—He stated that he got the stock, and put it back on the farm for Mrs. Meikle; and Meikle said the stock was not on the farm when he was there. I may add that I never asked Mr. Mabin for the information which he gave to me.

65. *Mr. Tambridge.*] The principal part of Mr. Meikle's complaint against you is that in reporting to the Minister, you stated that you found certain stock upon his farm, and represented that stock as being the stock that was there prior to his incarceration?—Yes.

66. From what you now know, is it a fact that the stock you then saw on the farm at the time you made the report was the same stock?—It must have been.

67. At any rate, some of the stock you saw was the stock on the farm at the time of Meikle's incarceration?—Yes.

68. One visit you made to the farm, which you have not mentioned, was when you went to inquire about the stock?—Yes.

69. Another visit was when you went to inquire about a report you had to submit on the alleged state of destitution of Mrs. Meikle?—Yes.

70. It is no offence for a person to sell mutton?—No. The offence is in the slaughtering without a license.

71. Mrs. Meikle says she gave the mutton to the men who were making the bridge?—I do not think she was able to.

72. Was it about the same period that you went to inquire about the mutton that you also inquired about the condition of Mrs. Meikle and her family?—It would be about the same time.

73. And about the same time that the letter was sent to the Minister, stating that Mrs. Meikle and her family were in a state of starvation? According to Mrs. Meikle, she was then giving mutton to the men who were making the bridge?—Yes.

74. The letter you had to report on was a letter dealing with the state of Mrs. Meikle and her family from the time of Meikle's incarceration?—During the time of his incarceration.

75. *The Chairman.*] During the whole period?—I wrote the report in 1890, when I got the letter, and he was put in in 1887. They were then in a state of destitution according to their own statement. I left Mataura Station in November, 1890, for Ophir Station, to take charge.

JAMES DANVERS LEECE, examined on oath *re* complaint.

76. *The Chairman.*] Your name is?—James Danvers Leece. I am a second-class constable, stationed at South Dunedin. My letter of complaint is as follows:—

I would respectfully bring under the notice of the Commissioners that I have always endeavoured to advance myself while in the Force by the faithful discharge of duties entrusted to me; always bearing a character for sobriety and efficiency, and successfully passing the Police Force examination when required to do so. I notice that, notwithstanding this, some of the constables junior to myself have received promotion, whom, I consider, I could favourably compare with in merit and character. This makes it very discouraging, and has a tendency to make one feel apathetic for advancement. Further, that I have been put on street duty for nearly two years through circumstances over which I have no control—namely, being a widower. Although I have a family, I keep a woman to look after them and other household duties. I would suggest that where a man is left in a position of this kind, and his previous conduct has been good, that he be not treated according to the status of others who may have acted immorally, but that every constable be judged according to his own actions, upon which he should stand or fall.

77. With respect to promotion, what do you wish to say?—I have endeavoured to advance myself during my period in the Force—about sixteen years.

78. When did you join?—In May, 1882, I think.

79. Where were you stationed at first?—I joined at Wellington, and went to Invercargill, then to Mataura (where I had charge), then to Ophir (in charge), and then to South Dunedin, where I am now on street duty. While in charge of stations I have always discharged my duties faithfully, and no complaints have been made against me. I have always had a character for sobriety and efficiency; and at Mataura and Ophir I also did the clerical duties of the Court.

80. Do you say there were no complaints?—Only one—being on the platform without my uniform. When the Police Force examinations were on I successfully passed them, and when they were done away with there was nothing to fall back on but to attend to merit and sobriety.

81. In what year did you pass the police examinations?—In 1890. I notice that constables who were junior to me have been promoted over me. I have a list of them, and I think I can compare favourably with them in merit. They are Constables Norwood, McGill, Smith, O'Rourke, Marsh, Joyce, McIntyre, and Griffith. These men have been made first-class constables, while I am second. As regards being on street duty, I wish to say that I became a widower in January, 1896, and made application to get away from Ophir Station, where I had been over five years. I did not feel at all comfortable there, and I wished to get charge of another station, not thinking that I would be put on street duty; and I was very much surprised to find I was sent on street duty in South Dunedin, being told that as I was unmarried I would have to do street duty. I would suggest that constables left in that position—with a family as I have, and after so many years service, and if they are efficient and of good moral character—be still able to retain charge of a station notwithstanding their being widowers.

82. What family have you?—I have five, the eldest of whom was thirteen when I was transferred. I have now to pay a housekeeper 11s. a week to look after them. I made application to Mr. Tunbridge since he came to town, and his reply was, "It is an established rule that all constables placed in charge of stations must be married, and have their wives residing with them in case of any female prisoners being at the station. If, therefore, you have any suburban station, in which Constable Leece might be placed, I should be pleased to give it my consideration." This letter was addressed to Inspector Pardy.

83. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] With reference to your application to be in charge of a station, you know from my letter that constables must be residing with their wives?—Yes.

84. You are not in that category, unfortunately?—No, I am not; but I ask that the rule should be broken.

85. You were speaking about junior men being promoted over your head?—Yes.

86. When were you advanced to second class?—On the 1st June, 1890.

87. Do you know when Constable Forbes was advanced to second class?—I do not know anything about him. I see by the book you have given me that the date he was advanced was the 1st September, 1886.

88. Then, you say that these men have been passed over you. As a matter of fact the junior man in the second class was Forbes?—Yes.

89. And he was advanced to second class in 1886?—Yes.

90. And you in 1890?—Yes.

91. Well, how have these men been passed over your head, when they were advanced three years and three months before you?—I look at the numbers above me; that is what I go by.

92. Your complaint is that these men forged ahead of you years ago—not now?—They joined the service after me, and yet they are ahead of me.

93. But is not the junior some years senior to you in the second class?—Yes, but not in the service.

94. Your complaint, then, is not that they have been advanced over your head in the second class?—No.

95. But that they secured second class over your head?—Exactly.

96. Forbes is junior to the names you have mentioned in the second class?—Yes.

97. Therefore, the priority of these men whom you have mentioned dated from their advancement to second class?—Yes.

98. And do you know how the advancement came about?—No.

99. Was it not owing to the batches who were made under the Clerk of Court rule and the "one report" rule?—I was Clerk of Court in 1883.

100. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, your complaint about being passed over dates back to 1886?—Oh, no.

101. That is when these men were made second-class constables. Joyce was made second-class constable in 1885, and, therefore, your complaint about him dates back to 1885?—He went over my head then.

102. Then McIntyre's dates back to 1885?—Yes.

103. And Griffith to 1888?—I was not aware of that. These men are in charge of good stations and I am still on street duty.

104. And Marsh in 1883?—Then he must have been a second-class constable when he joined.

105. If you were passed over, it was years ago then?—Yes.

106. Are you aware that Norwood was specially promoted for saving life?—I was not aware of that.

107. *Mr. Taylor.*] In respect to McGill, do you know that he was fined for drunkenness?—I never heard of it.

108. Did you hear that he lost a prisoner, who was drowned in Wellington Harbour?—This is the first I have heard of it.

109. Well, if these things are true, and he was promoted to first class because he had been taken into an Inspector's office in New Plymouth, would it not create discontent in the Force?—I would feel discontent if I was kept under on that account.

110. It is said that McGill has been promoted to first class because he is engaged in an Inspector's office, and that he is not a first-class constable. Can you understand that?—No, I cannot.

111. If you had been gazetted first-class constable, you would expect to keep the rank?—Yes.

112. Is there any dissatisfaction in the Force in connection with promotion for saving life?—I do not know of it.

113. Do you know whether McGill was a Clerk of Court before he was promoted?—I may say that I was in Wellington when he joined the service. I was to be sent there, and McGill took my place, as he had been in the Force previously. I know he had been in the Force before, and I think he may have been Clerk of the Court at that time.

114. How far back have you gone in your search—further than 1896?—1896.

115. Have you had any experience of political influence in connection with police matters?—I was kept out of a good station once through some influence.

116. What were the circumstances?—I have a copy of the correspondence in connection with it.

117. *The Chairman.*] What station were you kept out of?—Lumsden. I was at Maitua at the time. The correspondence is as follows:—

Inspector's Office, Police-station, Invercargill, 13th May, 1890.

Transfer to Lumsden.

You will hold yourself in readiness for transfer to Lumsden very soon. Due notice will be given of the date of your transfer.
J. HICKSON, Inspector.

On the 14th of the same month I replied that I held myself in readiness. On the 3rd June, 1890, Mr. McGibbon wrote to the Inspector as follows:—

HEREWITH I hand you a small presentation, which the residents of Maitua wish to hand to Constable Leece previous to his departure, and, knowing that your department did not permit of such things unless with sanction, I trust, on behalf of the donors, that you will allow us this privilege, and make the presentation through your office.

Inspector Hickson on the same date wrote to Wellington:—

I FORWARD attached letter to the Commissioner, and beg to state that with it a gold locket has been handed to me for presentation to Constable Leece. Engraved on it is, "Presented by the residents of Maitua to Constable Leece, May, 1890." I beg to recommend that permission be given to Constable Leece to accept it.

On the 9th June, Major Gudgeon replied, approving of the gift being accepted. On the 14th July, Inspector Hickson wrote to the Commissioner of Police, Wellington, as follows:—

On deciding to remove Constable Griffith from Lumsden some two months since, I instructed Leece to hold himself in readiness for transfer there, as I thought he would be a very suitable man for that station. The residents of Maitua hearing of his leaving resolved to present him with a locket, which I have. Now that Constable Griffith is to be relieved by Constable Mackenzie, of Outram, Constable Leece will have to remain at Maitua, and under these altered circumstances I would ask your instructions as to what to do in the matter. I may add that Constable Leece gives every satisfaction at Maitua, and it was with a view of placing him in charge of a more important station that I chose him for Lumsden.

Commissioner Hume, on the 19th, replied:—

INSPECTOR HICKSON.—If donors have no objection, please retain presentation till Constable Leece is transferred to another station, which will probably be at an early date.

Inspector Hickson on the 25th July wrote to me as follows:—

ATTACHED correspondence relative to the proposed presentation to you by the residents of Mataura is forwarded for your information. I have written to Mr. McGibbon on the subject.

It was six months before I went to Ophir, but what influence was at work I do not know.

118. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you ultimately get the presentation?—Yes.

119. Was it largely subscribed to?—Yes; it was a good substantial one.

120. Who were the promoters?—Mr. McGibbon, and Mr. Mee, I think.

121. It has been said that publicans were very prominent in connection with presentations to policemen. Was any publican connected with yours?—No; not so far as I know. I received the locket from the Inspector himself.

122. These promotions produce apathy when out of order?—It discourages a man in getting on, or in endeavouring to place himself meritoriously before the department.

123. It destroys the spirit of emulation in the Force?—Yes.

124. You used an expression that men may have acted immorally. Do you suggest that the question of morality has not been a factor in making promotion?—I have no experience. I wanted the whole character of each man looked into, and treated on its merits, and if there had been any immoral men in the Force I do not want to be judged by them.

125. Ought not a man's whole character to be taken into consideration?—Yes.

126. *The Chairman.*] After your experience of country station-work, do you think it would be wise, or prudent, or right to put a single man or a widower in charge of a station where there is no other constable, and where they might have to take charge of women prisoners?—I look on it in this way: that where I have a family of growing girls and boys I have the family to study, and I am not going to put myself in the position of getting mixed up with women.

127. It would be a protection and a safeguard?—Yes. However, if I was a single man without a family I would not think it was a correct thing to do, and I would go on the street duty without any complaint at all. In my case, however, I have a family, and I have been morally correct and efficient, and I consider it a hardship to be put on street duty. People will think there is some reason for putting me on to do street duty—some reason not to my credit.

128. That arises from ignorance?—Well, if people hear of the complaints that have been brought against me they will say there is a reason for the change.

129. Do you know of a single case of a widower in charge of a station?—I do not.

ALEXANDER SAMUEL ADAMS, examined on oath.

130. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—Alexander Samuel Adams. I am a barrister and solicitor of the Supreme Court, practising at Dunedin.

131. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember Sergeant Mulville being in Dunedin?—Yes, I think he was stationed here in 1893–94.

132. Had you occasion, with other citizens, to wait on Mr. Seddon with regard to him?—I waited on Mr. Seddon with a number of other citizens in connection with another matter, and I mentioned Sergeant Mulville's case to him myself.

133. It was not the primary occasion of your seeing Mr. Seddon?—No.

134. Will you tell the Commissioners the circumstances, and what passed between the Minister and the deputation?—The circumstances were these: Sergeant Mulville had been stationed in Dunedin for a little under two years. Previous to that he had been for a short time in a suburban station. He had made an application for promotion, and during the time he was in the city he had brought a number of charges under the Licensing Acts. I think in every case a conviction followed on the prosecution—if not in every case, in almost every case. I may say there was a publication in Dunedin in the interests of the liquor trade, called the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, and about the month of April or May, 1894, a paragraph appeared in the paper drawing attention to Sergeant Mulville's activity in a sarcastic way, saying he had better be careful, or Mr. Seddon, the Premier, would find an outlet for his superfluous energies on the West Coast. Almost immediately after seeing that paragraph I heard that Sergeant Mulville was to be removed to Napier. I was aware that Sergeant Mulville had applied for promotion, but not for removal. On the occasion of Mr. Seddon's visit to the city, after the main business of the deputation had been discussed, I spoke to him about Sergeant Mulville. I said that, so far as I could gather, Sergeant Mulville was a man who was respected by the citizens as a man honest and reliable, and a man who had done his duty honestly and fearlessly. I also said that there were about thirty officers in the city, and that not more than three or four of them had attempted to enforce the provisions of the licensing law, and that Sergeant Mulville had brought a number of prosecutions, and had been very successful in obtaining convictions. Immediately following on the last of his prosecutions the paragraph to which I refer had appeared in the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, and that he had been ordered to remove to Napier. I pointed out that the sergeant himself did not desire removal, and that it was exceedingly undesirable and improper that any sergeant or constable should be removed apparently for doing his duty. Mr. Seddon made a remark that he was not aware of the paragraph, and that it was an improper thing to publish. I said, "Certainly it was, if officers and men were to be removed because of doing their duty." Mr. Seddon suggested that I had given good reason for Sergeant Mulville's removal, because he had shown undue activity against a certain section of the community. I replied, "That can hardly be said, because in almost every case of prosecution a conviction has followed, and that ought to be evidence that the man was doing his duty and no more." I referred pointedly to the fact that the inference was that the liquor party were moving; and Mr. Seddon said, "Well, at any rate, they do not want him at Napier." I said, "Who are 'they'?" and he smiled and said, "Well, at any rate, the Prohibitionists would not object." I was going North the following day, and, as I learned that Mr. Seddon was also going North, I took a copy of the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette* with me, and marked the paragraph. I saw Mr. Seddon on the platform at Palmerston, and I handed him the paper with the marked paragraph, drawing

his attention to it. Within a week Sergeant Mulville was removed to Napier, and within ten days of the interview I heard it suggested that the removal was entirely due to Sergeant Mulville's application for promotion; but I know that Mr. Seddon was made aware of the fact that Sergeant Mulville, having a family, some of whom were in situations and some at school, was exceedingly desirous of avoiding removal. That had nothing to do with me. My point was the apparent fact that Sergeant Mulville was being removed at the instance of the liquor party, and was being made the subject of improper pressure. The notice to Sergeant Mulville and his actual removal were within five or six weeks, at the outside, of the appearance of the paragraph in the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, and after I had drawn Mr. Seddon's attention to it, and supplied him with a copy of the paper. I cannot now resist the impression that that was so, and that it would have an undoubted effect on Sergeant Mulville and also on the Force generally.

135. To discourage them in the enforcement of the licensing law?—Yes.

136. Have you heard of any activity on Sergeant Mulville's part since then, as far as the enforcement of the licensing law is concerned?—I have heard that while in Napier he has displayed no activity whatever, but of course I cannot vouch for that.

137. In the absence of the paragraph in the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, would you have taken any action whatever in regard to Sergeant Mulville?—Certainly not.

138. You had no interest in his removal or retention?—Sergeant Melville was unknown to me up to that time. I may say that what I did was done with the representatives of the Press present—it was not done in a hole-and-corner fashion, but with the knowledge that the reporters were present. I should like it to be clearly understood that my object was to protest against what I thought was an unfair interference by the newspapers, and what seemed to be behind it.

139. Do you know the Clutha very well?—Yes, I know the district very well. I have spent a good time in the district, visiting among the people.

140. Were you professionally engaged in connection with any sly-grog cases down there?—Yes.

141. Where?—In Tapanui.

142. Was the action successful?—I appeared for the prosecution. I do not remember the year. There were half a dozen cases of police prosecution. I was engaged by the police, and the result of the cases was that each person prosecuted was convicted. I may say, in connection with those cases, I was very much impressed with the extreme difficulty that any person prosecuting would have in dealing with the evidence brought forward in such cases.

143. Do you think that is a difficulty that has confronted the police in these cases?—I think so. There is not a tenth part of the difficulty in other cases.

144. Do you think that Inspector Pardy has done all he could to enforce the law?—I think so.

145. From your knowledge of the Clutha, has the order and sobriety of the district improved much since the hotel licenses were abolished?—There can be no question about that. I have had several opportunities of testing the fact. In November, 1896, I addressed a circular letter to a large number of residents—merchants, agricultural men, Justices of the Peace, and farmers—in the Clutha district, saying something like this: "It is stated that since the "No license" vote there has been as much, or probably more, liquor sold in the Clutha district than before the taking of the vote, and that the result of the vote has been to injure business. Will you kindly say what has been your experience in the district?" I think that probably three out of four of the persons I wrote to were unknown to me, and I did not get a single reply suggesting either that there was so much drinking, or that there had been any injury to business. On the contrary, the replies very much exceeded my expectations. The replies I received were very much more favourable to the effect of the vote than I had anticipated, and convinced me that an enormous amount of good had been done as a result of the "No license" vote.

146. Is there not a feeling throughout the district that sly-grog selling in a district like the Clutha could be practically suppressed? Do you think more frequent prosecutions would do it?—Yes. I think there are about a dozen people in the Clutha, whom the police know very well, and who are supposed to be in the habit of carrying on a regular trade. If they were looked after more frequently, so that the fines over a year or a series of years would amount to more than would be paid under license, it would be a deterrent, and there would be a probability of the thing being stamped out. The fines imposed already would not amount to more than the license-fees that would have been paid. More frequent prosecutions would have a beneficial effect.

147. *The Chairman.*] One man at Balclutha said he had been fined £300?—I think that will be found to be incorrect. I would like to add that Mr. Seddon informed me that he was entirely responsible for removals of the police, and similar matters. As an illustration, when we waited on Mr. Seddon, in Wellington, as a deputation, and pressed on him that there were a number of improper removals, and lax administration, Mr. Seddon said, "What you want is not a Commission to inquire into the Force, but a Commission to sit on me."

148. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think the Police Force in the Clutha should be increased?—I cannot say that any facts have come under my notice to lead me to think the Force is not sufficient for the ordinary duties; but, in respect to the particular question of the enforcement of the licensing law, I think the local police are at a considerable disadvantage, because they are so well known.

149. Do you think that either the detective or the constable branch should be increased?—I have known detectives going by a train producing passes, and they are spotted by the guard by that fact, and the matter is telegraphed to the district, and the warning given. Or a man who is known as a constable out of another district is recognised, and his arrival is telegraphed. That has been done frequently in order to frustrate the efforts of the police to detect sly-grog selling. No doubt, in connection with that, it would be desirable that unknown men should be employed. I do not think it would be necessary to increase the Force, but to employ unknown men.

150. *The Chairman.*] Does not the remark you made as to the difficulty about witnesses and the character of the evidence apply to many other cases?—Perhaps it does; but it applies specially to the cases I have mentioned.

151. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you think more frequent prosecutions would probably stamp out this sly-grog selling?—It appears to me they would have a beneficial effect.

152. Do you know any instance where, the police having the required evidence, they have not taken the necessary proceedings?—I should not like to say that. We hear rumours, and I should not like to give them the strength of evidence.

153. Do you suggest that, from any rumours you have heard, the police, though possessing the necessary evidence to justify an information being laid, have not done so?—If I were put in the position of giving credence to statements that have come to me as hearsay, I would say, Yes; but I cannot justify those statements.

154. Was it on this rumour that has reached you that you based the opinion that more frequent prosecutions could take place?—No. I think it is a matter of general policy.

155. You do not profess to know what action the police have been taking?—No.

156. You think the detective branch should be strengthened in the Clutha?—Yes, by the periodical visits of unknown persons, who would have an opportunity of discovering breaches of the law.

157. You do not wish to suggest that you know the number of unknown persons who have been sent there by the police?—No, I do not suggest that.

158. You do not know but that at the present time there are men in the Clutha district, entirely unknown to the people there?—No. I know that persons have been there, and that convictions have been secured in that way.

159. Your evidence is to the effect that at the present moment there is a constable at Tapanui, another at Balclutha, and another at Clinton, and that that is the sum total of the police in the Clutha?—Yes.

160. If I say that in the last three years probably half a dozen men have been in the Clutha endeavouring to get evidence, do you say this branch should still be increased?—No. It is a question of method. That is a question that can only be discussed by those who have control of the district.

161. You say, then, that if the sum total in the Clutha district consists of three men only it should be strengthened?—Practically it comes to that.

162. You are basing your opinions on what you know, and on what is known outside?—Quite so.

163. *Colonel Hume.*] You have known Sergeant Mulville for some time?—I did not know him personally at all until this question arose. I knew that he was acting as Inspector for the Corporation here for some time. I do not think I had ever spoken to him until this matter cropped up.

164. You do not know whether he is a Prohibitionist or not?—I do not, but I do not think so. I should be surprised if it were so.

165. In giving evidence, you told us of two or three rumours, and you said it was suggested that Sergeant Mulville was removed because of the energy he displayed towards the publicans; now, I understand, when Mr. Tunbridge asked you about some rumours in the Clutha, you said you could not speak of rumours, although you had been speaking of rumours twice previously in your evidence in chief?—I think I said in each case they were rumours. I think I intimated in my evidence in chief that these were simply hearsay statements.

166. Now, as regards rumours, you would be surprised to hear that this sergeant has had several cases in Napier?—Yes; I am speaking merely from rumour. I do not pretend to have any knowledge of it.

167. And you would be still further surprised if he had to be removed from Napier for showing too much energy?—Well, that would not be a surprise if he were removed for such an alleged cause after the experience in Dunedin.

168. Are you in the habit of taking the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette* in?—I did then.

169. Is this the only reference you have ever seen to any sergeant or constable?—I do not know; it is years since it ceased publication.

170. Then, it is said in that, I understand, that Mr. Seddon would find an outlet for the sergeant's energies on the West Coast?—Yes.

171. But he did not?—But he did on the northern coast, at Napier.

172. Now, Sergeant Mulville took a very active part in carrying out the licensing laws?—He was active; but, I think, if Inspector Pardy were asked, he would say that Sergeant Mulville was an officer who did his duty, and did it fairly. I stated that in nearly every case, if not in every case, he secured a conviction, and that speaks for itself.

173. You will admit, from what you have seen of the police and know of the different towns, that it is important we should have the best sergeants in the big centres?—I would rather be excused from venturing opinions on police management, because it is not my *forte*.

174. You would not wish what we will call a "duffer" sergeant sent to a place like Dunedin?—Nor anywhere.

175. At the same time we must send him somewhere, if we have one?—To the right-about, I should think.

176. Now, in reference to this sergeant who was so particularly active in Dunedin in 1894, you would be surprised to hear, I suppose, that in August, 1891, he was reprimanded for neglecting to report a disturbance at the Provincial Hotel, I think in South Dunedin?—Yes, I would be surprised to hear that.

177. Then, you would be still more surprised to hear that on the 29th March, 1892, he was drinking in the St. Clair Hotel on a Sunday?—Then he was not a Prohibitionist. Of course, I cannot say.

178. Does that surprise you?—That you suggest it?

179. Would you be surprised to hear it appears on his defaulter's sheet?—I cannot speak of Sergeant Mulville's personal habits. I can only speak of the particular incident I refer to.

180. Do you know a gentleman named Mr. Hart, commission agent, at Anderson's Bay?—Yes, I fancy I know who you refer to. I do not know if he is in active business.

181. Would you be surprised to hear that in April, 1892, it is shown on the sergeant's defaulter's sheet that he was admonished for disclosing confidential information given to him?—I am prepared to say I do not think any one of these circumstances had anything to do with Sergeant Mulville's removal from Dunedin.

182. You know that Sergeant Mulville did get promotion?—I know he was removed to Napier.

183. And got promotion?—I do not know that.

184. Well, then, I understand Mr Seddon, in this conversation you had with him at Palmerston North, held himself entirely responsible for this move?—I had no conversation at Palmerston North. I met him at Palmerston South, and gave him the paper. It was the day before I had the conversation, and I am not prepared to say at that interview specifically Mr. Seddon held himself responsible; but he did more than once express himself so, and very specifically, to a deputation, of which I was one, which waited upon him in Wellington, in June, I think, of 1896. Now, it was on the occasion of the deputation which waited upon him, I think in June of 1896, that he said, after we had objected to these removals which seemed to be caused by the pressure of the liquor party, and objected to the pressure of any trade being allowed to influence removals, "Well, gentlemen, what you want is not a Commission to inquire into the Police Force, but a Commission to sit upon me"; and we assumed from that that he (Mr. Seddon) took the responsibility.

185. Then, if this sergeant's promotion was dated the same day as his transfer from here it would clearly indicate he was transferred on account of promotion?—I do not know. Of course it would show that his application for promotion had been granted. But it is clear, and you will be aware of it yourself, that if the promotion and removal were one act, Sergeant Mulville was very much disappointed, and very much objected to the removal, and would rather not have had his promotion with his removal. Therefore, the removal could not have been a reward for promotion.

186. *The Chairman.*] Can you suggest that he could obtain promotion without removal?—I cannot say that. I was not concerned with Sergeant Mulville personally, but with the effect on the Force; and what I pointed out to Mr. Seddon was, that it seemed to me if such pressure had not been brought to bear the removal would not have been carried out.

187. *Colonel Hume.*] Was it thought the Prohibitionists would not like him at Napier, or the publicans?—Mr. Seddon remarked at the close of the interview, "At any rate, I can tell you they do not want him at Napier." I said, "Well, who are 'they'?" and he said, laughingly, "Oh, at any rate the Prohibitionists would not object; you know that." I took it, therefore, that "they" referred to the liquor party.

188. Then, whoever sent him to Napier must have been acting in direct opposition to the wishes of the liquor party?—I do not quite see the inference; it might be so.

189. Is not that what Mr. Seddon said?—He may have said it.

190. He said the publicans did not want him?—He said "they"; and then laughingly added, "I suppose the Prohibitionists would not object."

191. Then "they" would mean the publicans?—I suppose so.

192. Then, notwithstanding that the liquor party did not want him there he was sent to Napier?—Yes, but Inspector Pardy was not in charge in Napier.

193. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where is the liquor interest strongest, in Dunedin or Napier?—Dunedin, certainly.

194. Is it not quite possible that the place where the interest is strongest would be the place most studied by any politician?—If I were a politician, and studying the liquor interest, I would say so.

195. Hence, the removal of Sergeant Mulville may be pleasing them in Dunedin and displeasing them in Napier?—I do not know for a fact whether the liquor party was displeased in Napier.

CHRISTOPHER CONN, examined on oath.

196. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Christopher Conn.

197. What is your rank?—Second-class sergeant, stationed at Dunedin.

198. *Mr. Taylor.*] When the Inspector was giving evidence in reference to an incident connected with a drunken policeman, that happened last Christmas Day, he quoted you as having gone for him, and used words to this effect, "That you wished him to come down, and see this drunken constable, as you were not safe with those men." I want to know what that meant?—It meant this: that the constable was drunk at Rattray Street corner. I called the attention of the man on the next beat to him, and asked him what he thought of him: did he consider him drunk or sober? The man seemed to hesitate in giving me an answer, and I said, "Come, now, I want an answer. If you were on your oath, would you say that that man was drunk or sober?" He said, "If you swear he was drunk, I would swear he was sober."

199. *The Chairman.*] Does that mean that he was satisfied of his being sober?—Yes, that he would swear he was sober. I said, "Very well; go on to your duty," which he did. He went up the street.

200. Who was it you were speaking to?—Constable Hannafin. As soon as I got the constable's back turned I went to Inspector Pardy's private house and told him the circumstances of the case. Mr. Pardy said, "You should have called the attention of the constable on the adjoining beat to him," and I said I had done so, and I told Mr. Pardy the result of his answer. Inspector Pardy then came at once with me to see the constable—Constable Macdonald—and on seeing him

he ordered me to get a cab and have the man conveyed to the station. This was done. Inspector Pardy then sent me to the street to bring in Constable Hannafin, which I did, and the Inspector admonished Constable Hannafin in the office for the conduct he had displayed in saying that the man was not the worse of drink.

201. *Mr. Taylor.*] As a matter of fact, Macdonald was fined for drunkenness?—Yes.

202. Did your remark mean that you feared the untruthfulness of Hannafin?—Yes; but I did not mean it to apply to other constables.

203. How long have you been in the Force?—Twenty-six years, in coming May. I would like to add that there are some reliable men in the Force.

204. Supposing you had joined the New South Wales Police Force, would your position be better to-day than what it now is?—Yes, much better.

205. Would you be entitled to a pension?—Yes, after twenty-five years.

206. What proportion of the wages would you be entitled to?—I see that some of the sergeants are retired on full pay after twenty-five years.

207. What is the standard of proportion?—The way it is proportioned there is this: the men appoint a Commissioner, and the Government appoint one; and when a man dies or retires the Commissioners meet, and if they cannot come to a conclusion they appoint a referee. I have been told by men who have been in the New South Wales Force that that is the way it is worked.

208. *The Chairman.*] For what purpose is the Commissioner appointed?—To look after the pension fund, and to hear claims that might arise.

209. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is not the absence of a pension fund here detrimental to the Force?—Yes, of course it is.

210. It discourages the men?—Yes. If it had not been for family circumstances I would have been out of the Force many years ago, but when one gets tied up with a large family it is not the best thing to do to shift about.

211. *The Chairman.*] When you joined the Force were you not aware that there was no pension fund?—I joined under Mr. Weldon, and he said that as a retiring-allowance I would receive a month's pay for every year of service.

212. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was that in writing?—It was an understanding at the time I joined. There is a circular in existence somewhere to that effect. It was in the provincial days.

213. As far as your experience extends, has it been a general feeling in the Force that political influence has had to be used at various points?—I have heard it talked about in all ways among the men; but what you find talked about among a number of men like constables is not always true.

214. What is your experience of men drafted from the Permanent Artillery to the Police Force?—They have been utter failures.

215. You consider that a training in the Artillery is bad for a policeman?—They do not make good policemen. The best man for a policeman is the man from the plough. That is my experience. The best are the men who have had no previous knowledge of artillery training. Men with that training are not suitable for police purposes.

216. Have you ever applied for a country station?—No; I applied to get from a country station into town on account of my family.

217. Is there a better feeling permeating the Force during the past six months—a more hopeful feeling?—I think so. The bad ones seem to be weeding out.

218. *The Chairman.*] To what do you attribute that better feeling of the past six months?—Well, if there is a discontented person among the men he makes others discontented.

219. But you say there is an improvement?—There is a better class of men. In Dunedin we have nearly all strangers.

220. They are not new men in the Force?—Most of them are new men.

221. Have some been in the Force less than six months?—Some of them have been less than that. In this station I think there are only three or four who have seen even a year's service. Some of the new men have been in the Force about six weeks.

222. Do you attribute the better feeling to the fact that a certain number of promotions have been made in the last six months?—The promotions never give satisfaction.

223. You do not attribute the improved state of feeling to the fact that a number of promotions have been made in the service during the last six months?—I do not think so.

224. You attribute it to what?—To the better class of men, who are more contented, and men with a little common-sense.

225. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has the alteration in control not had something to do with the change?—I do not think so.

226. Is it not recognised that the use of political influence will be less felt?—I do not think so.

227. Have you ever used it yourself?—No. The first complaint I made was to Colonel Hume, about eighteen months ago, when I did not get promotion. I looked to him for fair-play, and shortly afterwards I got my promotion. He acknowledged my claim to it, and I got it.

228. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] At the time Constable Macdonald was drunk, you thought that the evidence of Constable Hannafin and Constable Macdonald against your unsupported testimony would be too strong for you?—Yes.

229. That is the meaning of your expression that you did not feel yourself safe in their hands?—Yes. I had nothing to fear from anybody, but I had a feeling in that direction.

230. In cases of that kind cannot you call in a medical man to testify as to a man's condition?—Just then it would have been very inconvenient to get a medical man, and you want to see a man at the time, and not an hour afterwards, or more.

231. But it is the rule, in a question of a man being under the influence of drink, to call in a medical man?—Yes.

232. *The Chairman.*] What was the difficulty on this occasion?—Inspector Pardy was handier to me at the time, and I preferred to call him instead of a medical man.

233. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] In the absence of your Inspector or any other superior officer you would have had no hesitation in calling in a medical man?—No. I have no great faith, though, in medical certificates, even in that way. They are faulty, too.

234. There is a feeling among the constables, is there not, that one constable should not be called upon to give evidence against another?—Yes.

235. And, in a measure, you think it is rather a natural feeling, do you not?—Yes.

236. You would not care to be called upon to give evidence against a brother sergeant?—That is so.

237. As regards the New South Wales Force, have you any experience of that colony?—I have been in the country as a miner, but not as a policeman.

238. Would you consider the conditions of service in New South Wales more arduous there than they are in New Zealand, considering the climate, and so on?—No. New South Wales is a good climate. This is a most severe climate on a policeman—the most severe I know of, unless it is the Home climate.

239. As to the conditions of life in New South Wales, are they easier or otherwise than here?—From what I know of it I should say they are much the same. The men in the country stations have a better time of it than the men on the streets.

240. But there is a much larger percentage of men doing street duty in New South Wales towns than in New Zealand?—Yes.

241. You consider that men doing town duty are harder worked than the men doing the country duty?—Yes.

242. Therefore, taking the experience of this Force as a whole the conditions would be harder?—The conditions would be this way: Of course, it is a larger country. The towns are busier and the population is larger, and there are more men; and the night duty in this country is most severe in winter. There is not a harder life you could put a man to.

243. You are speaking more particularly of the men in the south?—Yes, of the men in Dunedin. Even Christchurch is a better climate than Dunedin. In Dunedin, the winter before last, I went out at the beginning of a fortnight with nine good strong young fellows, and before the fortnight was up I had only five, the rest having been laid up.

244. As regards the strength of the men here, have you sufficient?—No, we have always been short-handed as long as I remember.

245. Do you think your Force should be increased?—Yes.

246. Can you suggest what number would be adequate?—I think a night-duty section should have nine constables on the street and one in the watch-house.

247. How many have you at the present time, if full-handed?—I have only five sometimes.

248. But when you are full-handed?—Seven, as a rule, and the watch-house keeper.

249. And as regards day duty?—I think there should be five on each relief.

250. How many are there at present?—Sometimes we have two, sometimes three, and sometimes four.

251. What is the full strength when the men are available?—Four.

252. The numbers you have given are the numbers you would have if every man was available for duty?—Yes.

253. Are there not frequently on the night-duty section two or three men short?—Yes, and four.

254. The men were away in sickness, escort, relief, and other duties?—Yes.

255. Then, you would require a sort of reserve?—Yes.

256. How many?—Four or five.

257. Then, you would advocate about eight or nine men more?—Yes.

258. You do not require an increase in the number of sergeants?—No, there is a sergeant for each relief.

259. How many sergeants are there now?—Three for street duty.

260. Would it be an improvement to have a sergeant in charge of the station at night?—I look on it this way: From a quarter to 9 at night to a quarter to 5 o'clock in the morning the whole of the town is left in the charge of one man, and that is a large responsibility for the pay a man gets. I think there should be a first-class sergeant stationed in the barracks, so that anything of a difficult nature arising could be referred to him for his approval or otherwise. That has always been my opinion.

261. That sergeant could perform the duties of lockup keeper as well as general duties, and therefore it would be simply a sergeant in place of a constable?—Yes. I consider it is a big responsibility, where you have nine or ten young constables—some of them less than a year on the street—to be left on the street with them, and know that some of them whom you cannot well trust have to go a mile or more from your sight.

262. *Colonel Hume.*] You keep a pretty keen eye on the publichouses, do you not?—I do my duty to the very best of my ability.

263. Have you had any prosecutions?—Several.

264. Have you heard of any deputations waiting on Ministers to remove you on account of that?—No.

265. Have you heard of any influence being tried to remove you on account of that?—No.

266. Do you know the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*?—I have seen it.

267. Have you ever seen anything about yourself in it?—No. My attention has not been called to it.

268. Has anybody found fault with you for your action towards the publicans?—The publicans themselves have.

269. To you yourself?—In one case a publican reported me for undue interference. I applied through my officer to have the case heard before the Stipendiary Magistrate, and I came out all right.

270. *The Chairman.*] How long ago was that?—About six months ago.

271. What was the complaint?—Undue interference in my position as sergeant of police, and that I was harassing him in his business.

272. The charge was dismissed?—Yes.

273. *Colonel Hume.*] Has any influential person you know of been trying to get you shifted on account of your action towards the publichouses?—I do not think so. I have never been threatened in any way. Anything I have done I have done in the way of my duty, and I have done my duty when and where needed.

274. *Mr. Poynton.*] What is the opinion of the Force as to the head of it?—Do you think the head should be apart from public control?—One could not form an opinion on that from the men.

ROBERT ANGUS, examined on oath.

275. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Robert Angus.

276. What are you?—A labourer, residing at Balclutha.

277. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Robert Campbell, of Catlin's?—Yes.

278. Did your wife work for him?—No; she never worked for him.

279. Did she have an accident in connection with his farm?—Yes; she broke her leg on his farm.

280. Was she not working for him at the time?—She was working for him as an obligation. They came for her to help them to milk the cows.

281. And while there she broke her leg?—Yes.

282. What happened after that, as to a claim for compensation?—I wrote to Mr. Ryley, the owner of the property—Campbell was only the manager—and he said in his reply that he would pay me £15 as compensation.

283. Ryley was manager for Anderson and Co., millers?—Yes. He wrote: "Dear Madam,—I duly read your letter, and can say nothing until I see Mr. Campbell. I have had a letter from Mr. Campbell in which he says he will pay you £15. You will make a great mistake if you do not accept it, for I have looked carefully into the matter, and I believe you have no claim, inasmuch as you were not at the time Mr. Campbell's servant, but performing a service which of your own free will you rendered."

284. What followed? Did you get the £15?—No.

285. What was the next?—Mr. George Ford, of Owaka, blacksmith, came to me, and asked me if I would accept £11 11s.

286. On whose behalf did he make the offer?—On Campbell's behalf.

287. What did you do?—I spoke to the wife, and we agreed to accept the eleven guineas.

288. Did you get it?—No, I never received it.

289. Did you receive anything?—I received £3 from Constable Christie, who also paid £8 to Dr. Smith.

290. What for?—For setting the leg. That was the amount of the bill.

291. What do you say was the amount of the bill?—It was £11 11s., but I believe I brought it down to £8.

292. Do you know that he paid £8 to Dr. Smith?—Dr. Smith told me so, and that he had given a receipt for it.

293. What become of the 11s.?—I never received it.

294. Did you speak to Constable Christie about it?—I believe I spoke to him once or twice about it.

295. What did he say?—I really forget now.

296. Did he say he had received eleven guineas?—Yes.

297. Did he say he had kept the 11s.?—No.

298. What did he say about the 11s.?—I remember that at the station one day I said there was 11s. standing from Cambell's account, but I cannot tell the answer he made.

299. You have been talking to Constable Christie this morning?—No.

300. To whom have you spoken about the case?—To no one.

301. Will you kindly try to remember the details of the conversation you had with Christie at the railway-station?—Well, I remember I said there were 11s. standing from the account, and somebody came up and spoke to him, and he went away. That was the last time I saw him before he left Balclutha.

302. Had the 11s. been owing some time?—Since the accident.

303. When was the accident?—Three years ago last Christmas.

304. On what other occasion did you ask for the 11s.?—He paid the wife £3 in Catlin's River about a month before we came up.

305. Did the constable say what he was keeping the 11s. for? What did he say when he paid the £3?—He said he would give the balance again, that he had not the money on him.

306. How did Christie come to have the money?—I cannot account for that exactly.

307. Did he not see you about it?—Yes. He advised me to take the eleven guineas, and said he did not think I would get any more.

308. Did he not say he would get the £15 if you would allow him to collect it?—No. He said if I did not take the eleven guineas I would not get a sixpence.

309. How did he come to get the money?—I do not know. I gave him no authority to collect it.

310. But you had a conversation with him before he collected it?—Yes.

311. *The Chairman.*] When were the eleven guineas paid?—Mr. Campbell has the receipts.

312. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you get a receipt for the £8?—No.
313. Who got it?—Campbell; he was to pay the doctor.
314. Have you seen the receipt?—No.
315. Did you sign a receipt for the 11 guineas?—Yes. We accepted 11 guineas as full payment.
316. Has Christie ever collected any other amounts for you?—No.
317. What about £1 10s. from Mr. Ross, of Clarksville?—I cannot speak of that as a certainty, because I paid Christie 10s. of it myself, and the wife says she paid him £1.
318. Did you pay Christie 10s.?—I owed Ross some money, and I paid it to Christie.
319. What is Ross?—A blacksmith.
320. Had Christie asked you for the money?—Yes, and I paid him 10s. on account.
321. How much did you owe Ross?—£2 10s., I think.
322. Are you certain that you paid Christie 10s. on account?—Yes.
323. Where?—In Vial's hotel, at Owaka.
324. Were you having refreshments there?—I was working there at the time.
325. Have you had any correspondence with Ross about the payment?—Yes, and I saw Ross on New Year's Day.
326. Has Ross ever rendered you an account for £2 10s.?—Not since.
327. Not since when?—I can hardly tell you the date.
328. Is the whole of the amount paid now?—No.
329. How much do you still owe him?—I suppose it is £1.
330. Did you get a receipt for the 10s. you paid to Christie?—I do not think so.
331. Neither from Christie nor from Ross?—No.
332. Have you had a bill from Ross for £1 10s. or £1?—No.
333. Have you had any letters from Ross in connection with the matter?—No.
334. All by word of mouth?—Yes. I only saw him last New Year's Day.
335. Did your wife get a letter from him?—Not that I know of.
336. What did Christie say in regard to the 11s.?—I cannot exactly remember. As far as I remember, when I spoke to him about it at the railway-station he said he wanted it for his trouble.
337. *The Chairman.*] Do you swear that that is what he said?—It was to that effect, anyhow.
338. *Mr. Taylor.*] You have no doubt about the nature of the answer?—It was to that effect.
339. What did Christie say when you complained about the 10s. for Ross not having been paid?—I have not spoken to Christie about the 10s. I paid him on account of Ross.
340. You understood that Christie was Ross's collector?—No.
341. What did Christie tell you when he asked for the money?—That when he saw Ross in Milton he spoke to him about me owing him money, and that he asked him to speak to me about it.
342. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Did you authorise Christie to get the money for you?—I did not.
343. Did you authorise him to pay Dr. Smith?—Yes.
344. When did you authorise him to pay Smith? When he got the cheque, £3?—No, when he got the cheque, he asked me what he would do with the money, and I said, "You pay Smith £8, and bring the balance to me."
345. Did you see the cheque?—I did not.
346. When did he give you the £3?—In our house at Owaka.
347. Was it when he told you he had got the money?—No, about six or eight months afterwards.
348. Did he say he had given Dr. Smith £8?—Yes.
349. When he gave you the £3, did you ask him for more?—He said that was all he had, and that he would pay the balance again.
350. You are clear about that?—Yes.
351. Did he say how much he got?—I do not know how much he got, but I know I signed for eleven guineas.
352. But did he say how much he got?—Eleven guineas.
353. Did he tell you that?—He told me the cheque was for eleven guineas.
354. Did he say he got £11 11s. from Campbell?—He said he got a cheque for eleven guineas. Those were his words.
355. From Campbell?—From Campbell.
356. And he gave you £3, and said he had paid Dr. Smith £8, and that he would give you the balance again?—Exactly.
357. Then you spoke to him on another occasion, subsequent to that, at the railway-station?—Yes.
358. And he told you he wanted the 11s. for his trouble?—Yes. I told him there was a balance between Campbell and me, and he said he wanted it for his trouble. I wish to state now that I did not come here of my own free-will.
359. You were asked this morning about the 11s. Did I not ask you as a favour to go to Campbell, and ask him whether he had paid him £11 or £11 11s.?—Yes.
360. And you asked him in my presence?—Yes.
361. Then, I left you together?—Yes.
362. *Mr. Taylor.*] Whom did you speak to about this matter of Christie's, when you came to Dunedin this morning?—I think the first person I spoke to was Adam Paterson.
363. Is he a witness in the case?—No.
364. Did you see Mr. George Thomson?—Yes, I saw him this morning.
365. What passed between you?—I do not think that has any interest in the matter at all.
366. I will ask you whether Mr. George Thomson gave you 11s.?—I received it for a short time only.

367. *The Chairman.*] What does that mean; did you give it back?—Yes.
368. *Mr. Taylor.*] What was the interval between receiving the 11s., and paying it back?—About five minutes.
369. Did you speak with Mr. Campbell in the interval?—No.
370. Did you see Mr. Campbell in the interval?—No.
371. Whom did you talk to in the interval? A stranger?—Well, there were three or four, all there talking.
372. Who was it talked to you?—I do not know. He gave me the money, and about five minutes afterwards came back again, and in consequence of what he said, I gave the money back.
373. Has Dr. Smith been to see you about this case?—Not about this 11s.—only about his account—when he told me to give Christie £1 for his trouble, and advised me to summons Christie for 11s.
374. Have you had any conversation with Dr. Smith about Christie's case, and about coming up here to give evidence?—No, not that I know of.
375. Did Dr. Smith urge you to attend the Commission?—He did not.

GEORGE THOMSON, further examined on oath.

376. *Mr. Taylor.*] You know Robert Angus, of Balclutha?—Yes.
377. Did you give him 11s. this morning?—I did not. I proposed to do so, but he would not take it.
378. He did not take it?—No.
379. *The Chairman.*] Were you authorised by Christie to hand that to him?—No.
380. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was there not an interval of five minutes between the time of your handing it to him and getting it back?—No.
381. If Mr. Angus said that you gave him 11s., and he returned it in five minutes' time, he is stating what is untrue?—Yes, it is not true.
382. You offered it to him?—Yes. He wanted certain conditions, and I would not agree with them.
383. What conversation had you with Christie in respect to this 11s.?—Not one word. It was never mentioned.
384. Neither before nor after?—Neither before nor after.
385. Now, Mr. Macdonald says Christie saw you, and said you must not interfere with that 11s.; is that true or false?—It is false. Christie did not tell me.
386. Who saw you on Christie's behalf?—No one saw me.
387. Who told you from Christie not to interfere?—I was told not to interfere.
388. Who told you that?—I cannot tell you. It was a messenger, but I could not tell the man's name.
389. From Christie?—I do not know.
390. Who did he come from?—I cannot say.
391. If he did not come from Christie, how did you know he was a messenger from Christie?—I did not say he was a messenger from Christie.
392. Who was he from?—I cannot tell you.
393. You did not know the man?—I did not.
394. Was he a lawyer?—I do not know.
395. A lawyer's clerk?—I do not know. I do not know the man from Adam.
396. Why did you pay any attention to him if you did not know him?—I did not pay any attention to him.

JOHN CAMPBELL, examined on oath.

397. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A farmer at Cannibal Bay.
398. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you managing a farm there for Mr. Ryley?—I was.
399. Did Mrs. Angus milk the cows for you there?—No.
400. Was she milking there?—No.
401. Where was she milking?—The question I understand you wish to know is, how she happened to be present at milking-time. On this occasion I was away from the farm that day, and she came over to help the children with the milking.
402. Was her leg broken that day?—Yes, accidentally, by one of the cows.
403. Did she prefer a claim for damages sustained?—Well, I believe that was thought of, but it was never proceeded with.
404. There were some negotiations with regard to the payment of the doctor's bill, and so on?—Yes.
405. *The Chairman.*] Was Christie in any way concerned in the negotiations?—No.
406. *Mr. Taylor.*] Mr. Ryley said that Mr. Campbell offered £15, and he advised Mrs. Angus to accept it. Will you tell the Commission the nature of the negotiations for that payment—of that £15? Who saw you about the claim of £15?—I saw Mr. Solomon about the claim that was made. He was my legal adviser.
407. In Dunedin?—Yes.
408. And did you make her an offer?—I made no offer.
409. Did you make any payment to Mrs. Angus on account of her broken leg?—No.
410. Who did you pay it to?—I paid Dr. Smith's account.
411. What else did you pay?—Nothing else.
412. How much was Dr. Smith's account?—£11 11s. I paid £11, but not the odd shillings.
413. Did you pay by cheque?—No.
414. *The Chairman.*] Did you pay Dr. Smith personally?—No.
415. Who did you give the money to?—To Christie.

416. How much cash?—£11.
417. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who took the odd shillings?—He said he would take even money.
418. Did he say that to you?—Mr. Christie said that Dr. Smith did not want the odd shillings, so far as I can remember.
419. You did not pay by cheque?—No.
420. Did you get a receipt from Dr. Smith for the bill?—Yes.
421. Did you get a receipt from Mrs. Angus for £3?—No.
422. You got a receipt from Dr. Smith for £11 11s.?—Yes. It is as follows: “Mr. Robert Angus, *Dr.* to J. Gibson Smith.—To two professional visits to Catlin’s River, and advice Balclutha, Mrs. Angus’s fractured leg, £11 11s. Received payment.—J. GIBSON SMITH.—August, 20, 1895.”
423. When did you get this receipt?—I think it is dated the month of August, 1895.
424. When did you get it?—It was in the month of August, as far as I remember.
425. Who did you get this receipt from?—Mr. Christie carried it. I got that receipt when I handed over the money.
426. Was it receipted then?—Yes, as it is now.
427. And Mr. Christie got £11 11s. from you?—No, £11.
428. I find there is a pencil memorandum on the back as follows: “Account reduced per favour of Dr. Smith by 11s.” When was that written?—It was written some time afterwards. It is merely a pencil-mark I put on.
429. *The Chairman.*] Is that your writing?—Yes.
430. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you write that?—I cannot mind.
431. Did you write it within the last month as a reminder of what happened?—Yes, I did.
432. Why did you write it within the last month?—I did not mind but what I had paid in full, until my wife reminded me of it. It was my wife who kept me in mind that I paid £11 only, and, as I had the receipt before me, I just marked it on.
433. When was that?—Last night.
434. Did you pay this by cheque?—No, by cash.
435. Pound-notes?—Yes.
436. How far away from the bank do you live?—Somewhere about eighteen or twenty miles.
437. Had you any difficulty in getting the money to pay Christie?—I always get my yearly wage.
438. Had you any conversation with anybody last night?—Except my wife, No.
439. Did you within the last week?—No.
440. How did you know the question of the odd 11s. was coming up?—Well, of course I knew when a man is on oath he has to answer everything so far as he can, and in order to keep myself in mind of that 11s. I jotted it down on this receipt. I will put in this further document: “Owaka, 5th August, 1895.—I, Robert George Angus, of Owaka, labourer, do hereby agree to accept in full satisfaction of all claims that I have against John Campbell, of Owaka, farm manager, in regard to the accident to my wife on the 29th day of December, 1894, by the said John Campbell paying the amount of eleven pounds eleven shillings (£11 11s.).—ROBERT GEORGE ANGUS, CATHERINE AGNES ANGUS.—Witness, George Ford.—5th August, 1895.”
441. How is it you hold two receipts for the £11 11s., one from Dr. Smith, and one from Mr. and Mrs. Angus?—I got the second receipt from Mr. George Ford.
442. *The Chairman.*] And not from Christie?—No.
443. *Mr. Taylor.*] You gave the £11 to Christie, and got a receipt from Ford?—I got the receipt signed by the Anguses from Mr. Ford. He witnessed it.
444. How long after you handed the money to Christie did you get this from Ford?—Shortly after. I cannot say how long.
445. Would it be a year afterwards?—No, not a year.
446. Was it less than a year?—Yes, I think less than a year.
447. How was it you got a receipt from Angus for £11 11s. if you only paid £11?—It was the doctor’s goodwill not to charge me the extra 11s.
448. Do you know whether the doctor got £11?—I do not. I got the receipt; that is all I wanted.
449. You do not know whether Mr. Angus got any of it?—That I do not know.
450. You never had any correspondence with Mr. Angus direct about this matter?—Very little.
451. Did you ask for this receipt from Angus?—Yes.
452. Why?—Because I did not want to be making a payment without knowing what it was for.
453. How do you know Dr. Smith took £11?—I do not know whether he received the money or not.
454. Do you know why the doctor did not receive that 11s.?—Of course, I did not pay the 11s.; he only got £11.
455. He gave a receipt for £11 11s.?—Yes; the receipt was signed, and he said he did not ask for the odd shillings.
456. Have you a cheque-book for that period?—I have not; I paid it in money.
457. Who is this account you paid to Constable Christie made out to?—It is made out to Angus.
458. Who authorised the payment of this money to Dr. Smith?—The doctor sent the account to me to be paid, because I said I would pay Dr. Smith’s account, and hence I got that document from Mr. Angus witnessed by George Ford.
459. Do you keep a cheque-book?—No.
460. Have you got any banking account?—I may say I have not.
461. Had you then?—No.

462. Did you not draw cheques upon Mr. Ryley?—No.
463. Nor orders?—Never.
464. As a matter of fact, did you not give Christie a cheque for £10 10s. of somebody's and a sovereign in settlement of this account?—I never did.
465. Have you talked this matter over with Christie to-day?—No.
466. With Mr. Macdonald?—No.
467. With a solicitor's clerk?—No.
468. Who were you talking to in the next room when I came in?—There was a lady there.
469. Anybody else?—Mr. Paterson.
470. You have not seen Mr. Solomon's clerk about this?—No.
471. Now, this receipt of Angus's is dated the 5th August, 1895?—Yes.
472. Did you pay Dr. Smith's bill two months before you got that document?—That might be; as far as I remember.
473. Can you explain to the Commission how it is that this receipt of Angus's is dated the 5th August, and Dr. Smith's is dated the 20th August?—Well, I cannot give an explanation.
474. Was this document actually written only a week ago?—Oh, yes; it was handed to me the very day Christie took the money.
475. Can you explain that discrepancy?—No.
476. You see one document, which you say you received two months after paying the money to Christie, is dated the 5th August, 1895, and that account is dated the 20th August, 1895; you cannot explain that?—No.
477. Does it strike you now as being strange?—It appears to me odd.
478. Did you ask for this receipt from the Anguses?—Yes.
479. Who did you ask for it?—I believe it was Christie I asked for it.
480. What did he say to you?—I cannot remember.
481. Did he promise to get it?—I cannot say whether he promised to do so or not; I forget.
482. You did not get it from him?—I got it from Mr. Ford.
483. Did he bring it to you?—I got it in his blacksmith's shop.
484. Was there any conversation with Christie as to the amount to be paid to Angus?—I had no conversation.
485. You had a conversation with him about taking this £11 11s?—Yes.
486. What was the nature of it?—The nature of it was that I handed over the money to him to carry to Dr. Smith, as it was too far for me to go with it.
487. How did you arrive at the £11?—That was the fee the doctor charged.
488. Have you any idea how Constable Christie came to be mixed up in the matter?—Not the slightest.
489. What made you hand the money over to him without authority from some one?—It was to accommodate me, so that I should not have to go in to Balclutha.
490. *The Chairman.*] This receipt that you got was your authority for paying him?—Yes.
491. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you offer Angus £15 at any time?—No.
492. Did you know whether any part of this money was to be paid to Angus?—I did not know.
493. Did you authorise Christie to see Angus about the matter?—No.
- 493A. You did not ask him to see Angus?—No.
494. *The Chairman.*] Do these two receipts refer to one and the same sum?—Yes.
495. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Do you remember whether you saw Dr. Smith or Constable Christie at this stage first?—I cannot remember.
496. But you were led to believe that Angus would settle for £11 11s., that being the amount of Dr. Smith's bill?—Yes; that was my position.
497. And I understand you to say you gave £11 to Constable Christie to give to Dr. Smith?—Yes.
498. You knew that Dr. Smith's bill was £11 11s.?—Yes.
499. Was anything said between you and Constable Christie as to the odd 11s.?—Nothing. Constable Christie told me the doctor had knocked the 11s. off.
500. Did Constable Christie not ask you for the additional 11s. at one stage?—If he did, I do not remember.
501. Do you remember ever saying this: "I will not pay over the 11s., unless I am forced to"?—I do not remember it. I might have.
502. You said you understood Dr. Smith was going to take off the 11s.?—Yes.
503. And accordingly you gave Constable Christie £11, as you thought, to pay Dr. Smith?—Yes.
504. You understood that that other action was to be settled by the payment of Dr. Smith's bill?—Yes.
505. And up to now you never knew that Dr. Smith got £8, and Angus got £3?—No.
506. That was altogether outside you?—Yes.
507. As to that receipt of the Anguses, if Constable Christie said he never saw that receipt before, nor knew nothing about it, can you say anything to the contrary? Do you remember ever showing that to Christie, or speaking to him on the subject?—No.
508. You say you thought you got this receipt some time after?—It shows I must have got it after.
509. Have you no recollection of getting it from Constable Christie?—No; I got it from Mr. Ford.
510. So far as you know, Constable Christie had nothing to do with it?—No.
511. When you paid the £11, did Constable Christie hand over the receipt by Dr. Smith?—Yes.
512. What you understood was, that if you paid the £11 the doctor would knock off the 11s., and so the matter was settled?—Yes.

ROBERT GEORGE ANGUS, further examined on oath.

513. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you ever see that document, signed by yourself and Mrs. Angus and witnessed by Mr. Ford, before?—Yes.

514. Who did you give it to?—I gave it to Mr. Christie.

515. Was Mr. Ford present at the time?—Not so far as I know.

516. *The Chairman.*] When you gave this to Christie did you receive any money?—I never received any money until about six months afterwards.

517. Then, why did you sign the receipt and give it to Christie?—He said he would take the receipt over if I signed it, and get the money from Campbell. Those were the words he used.

ADAM PATERSON, examined on oath.

518. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A farmer at Catlin's River.

519. *Mr. Taylor.*] You know Constable Christie?—I do.

520. Did he ever collect any accounts for you?—Not for me.

521. In connection with a sum of £14 9s. 4d., did you summon any one for that?—Yes.

522. Who?—George Barrington.

523. When did you summon him?—I cannot tell you that.

524. What Court was it at?—Balclutha.

525. What year?—I cannot tell you that.

526. Cannot you get near it?—No.

527. *The Chairman.*] Who was Clerk of the Court?—Constable Christie.

528. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you recover the money?—Yes.

529. How long after you summoned?—A good bit; I cannot say how long.

530. *The Chairman.*] Who did you receive the money from?—Constable Christie.

531. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you get it from the Bank of New Zealand?—I got two cheques from Christie.

532. What for?—One for £6 odd, and another for £8, or £8 2s. I am not sure which, but I think it was for the latter amount.

533. Did you get them at different times?—Yes.

534. How long between?—Some time between.

535. How many letters did you write to him about it?—I think I wrote three.

536. Where was he when you wrote to him?—At Mosgiel.

537. Were both of these sums paid after he went to Mosgiel?—Yes.

538. Did you give a receipt for the money?—I do not recollect whether I did or not. The cheque was good enough receipt.

539. Do not you know that it is customary when you receive money from the Clerk of a Magistrate's Court to give a receipt on an official form provided by the Government?—I did not give one.

540. *The Chairman.*] Were both of these payments on account of Barrington?—No; they were: on account of Barrington, £1 19s. 4d.; and Wilson, £4 8s.

541. Who was the £8 2s. on account of?—Miss Mason, music-teacher.

542. These three people owed you money, and you summoned them?—Yes.

543. At Balclutha?—Yes.

544. Did you go to the Court at Balclutha to take out the summonses?—I saw Constable Christie at Catlin's River, and instructed him to summon them.

545. Were you a witness in the case at the Court?—They paid the money into the Court before the cases came on.

546. *Mr. Taylor.*] Then, how is it you did not get the money until after Constable Christie went to Mosgiel?—I do not know.

547. Have you copies of the letters you wrote to Christie?—No.

548. Did you get any letters from Constable Christie?—Yes.

549. Have you got the letters now?—No, I destroyed the letters.

550. Were these summonses all taken out at the same time?—No, at different times.

551. Now, if the money had not been paid into Court, would you not have had to go as a witness?—Yes.

552. You say the money was paid into Court before the case came on?—Yes.

553. *The Chairman.*] In all these cases?—Yes.

554. *Mr. Taylor.*] Why did you write to Constable Christie the second time?—The object was to get my money.

555. *Mr. Macdonald.*] I understand the gist of the matter is this: You instructed Constable Christie to act in some three transactions in connection with money owed you by some people?—Yes.

556. He got the money?—Yes.

557. You do not know the dates of these transactions?—No.

558. He left Balclutha without giving you the money, and you wrote to him and he sent you the money?—Yes.

559. There was no question of commission or payment?—No, nothing of the kind.

560. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you pay the costs of the summonses in these cases?—No; I got the money in full.

561. *The Chairman.*] Did you not pay the costs when you instructed the Clerk of the Court to issue the summonses?—I do not think so; I scarcely think I did. I handed him the bills, and asked him to summon the parties.

562. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you understand it was to summon, or collect it?—To summon.

563. Did you get any of the three amounts from the people named?—No, the whole from Constable Christie.

THOMAS GRIFFITH was examined on oath.

564. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What offices do you hold?—I am Clerk of Court, bailiff, Inspector of Factories, and Clerk of the Licensing Court.

565. Any others?—No.

566. If you were paid your out-of-pocket expenses by the department, would you be willing to give up the salaries and fees you now receive from these appointments?—I have thought the matter over, and this is what I think would be fair: If a constable in an out-station got £1 per month extra for these offices, which entail a great deal of extra work upon him, then all over and above that sum should be put into a pension fund. I think that would take away all the heartburning about good stations, because all stations would just be worth that extra £1 per month to the constables.

567. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think they would be satisfied?—I think they would, if the extra money was put into a pension fund.

568. *The Chairman.*] It would make the pay even all round?—Yes, for the extra work.

569. Then, would not trouble arise if a man had more work to do than another?—No, I do not think so.

570. What is the total of your present emoluments?—Roughly, about £26 per year. I would be willing that all over £12 should go to the pension fund. I would also suggest that half the fines from police prosecutions for sly-grog selling and licensing cases should also be added to the fund. It is done in Ireland, and gives great satisfaction. The temperance people consider also that this induces the police to take an active interest in the suppression of illicit trading, and that it makes the police more energetic in the enforcement of the licensing laws when half the fines go to their pension fund. And, I think, rewards for meritorious conduct should be done away with, and that constables should only get marks, and that these marks should count for promotion. I would also beg to suggest that there should be a sliding-scale for pensions. For instance, say a constable broke down in health after fifteen years of service he should be entitled to so much, and after twenty years it should be a little more, and after twenty-five years so much more, and at thirty years the constable should compulsorily retire. If that was the case, it would be a great improvement on the present system, and do away with all the heartburning, and it would create promotions as well, because the old hands would then retire. At present they hold on like barnacles to a rock.

571. Do you think that the age of an officer himself should have anything to do with it?—In the Royal Irish Constabulary they have to retire if they are as strong as any man in this room.

572. At what age?—After thirty years' service.

573. Is there any limit in the age at which they can enter the Force?—They can join from eighteen to thirty.

574. Can a man entering at thirty go on for thirty years' service?—Yes.

575. It is compulsory retirement on years of service, and not age?—Yes.

JAMES BENNETT DALES, examined on oath.

576. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a third-class constable, stationed at Dunedin. I joined the Force in November, 1889.

577. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been doing street duty?—I did three months' street duty.

578. What have you been doing since?—I was ordered by the then Inspector, Mr. Moore, into the district office, as assistant clerk at Dunedin.

579. Have you been there ever since?—Yes.

580. Did you ever apply for promotion?—I did.

581. What was the reply?—I applied about two years ago, and I was told that it was not possible, because there were so many senior to me. I pressed the special duties I had to perform, but I was told they would not be taken into consideration.

582. What are your wages?—7s. a day.

583. Do you get a free house?—No, I live in the barracks. I am a widower with one child.

584. You are constantly employed on clerical duties?—Yes; from ten to twelve hours per day—never less than ten hours. I have been working twelve hours per day steady since the 1st January.

585. Do you know Constable William McGill?—Yes; I have met him a few times in Wellington.

586. He is now district clerk at New Plymouth?—Yes.

587. Do you know that he was promoted from third-class to first-class constable?—Yes.

588. Because he was to fill that position as clerk?—Yes.

589. Have there been any complaints against you?—No, I have never been in front of a superior officer yet.

590. You have a clean sheet?—Yes.

591. Do you know McGill was fined for drunkenness?—I heard a rumour to that effect.

592. Do you know he lost a prisoner in Wellington Harbour?—Yes.

593. Do you think his special promotion from third-class to first-class constable is likely to discourage other men?—I looked upon it as a result of getting to be district clerk in New Plymouth.

594. Do you think the district and assistant district clerks should have a definite rank, that is to say, they should have some special recognition for their work?—I have no rank or allowance. The chief clerk gets a clerical allowance, and the assistant clerk gets none—at least in the Dunedin district.

595. Does the chief clerk get a house-allowance?—Yes, and a clerical allowance.

596. That is because he is a sergeant?—Not necessarily. The district clerk in Christchurch gets a house, and he is only a first-class constable.

597. Do you know what the Napier man gets?—I cannot say the amount.

598. Does he get a house-allowance?—It is the rule for all district clerks to get a house-allowance when married.

599. Have you, in moving about amongst the men, ascertained whether political influence is regarded by the men as necessary, or was in the past?—Well, in the past it was looked upon as being a very important factor in promotions. That is, speaking from generalities.

600. Is there a more hopeful feeling in the Force since the control was changed?—Yes; so far as I can see, there is a much more hopeful feeling. I may say when the districts of Dunedin, Southland, and Lakes were amalgamated in 1891, and taken over by Mr. Hickson, there were three clerks in the district office, until 1893, when constable—now Sergeant Wright—was transferred to Wellington, and instructions came from Wellington that his place was not to be filled; and from that time up to the present I have been doing the work of two clerks. When Wright was in this office he got a clerical allowance, and since he left I have got none. I hold the opinion that the work I have got to do entitles me to more than 7s. per day. When the chief clerk was gone on his holidays, and the Inspector went away to the Lakes, I have been virtually in charge of the office. I have been accountable for all the clerical work in the district, and records and money matters. I think the assistant clerk should at least get an allowance, or else have a corresponding rank. I think he should have at least 1s. per day, the same as the chief clerk.

601. *The Chairman.*] You feel that if an assistant clerk got 8s. per day he would be properly paid?—Well, 7s. is not enough to begin with.

602. What you are asking us to consider is, what would be the proper pay for assistant clerks?—I think after eight years' service that I should be entitled to rank as more than a third-class constable.

603. What extra pay do you say an assistant district clerk ought to get?—1s. a day; and it all depends on what rank you hold. Now, the assistant clerk in Christchurch holds the rank of first-class constable, and I am reliably informed that he draws a clerical allowance, and I think it is rather hard that I should not participate in the same privileges.

604. Is he as old as you in the service, or older?—He is older.

605. *Colonel Hume.*] You said that, in the past, political influence was looked upon as a very important factor as regards promotion. When did you allude to in the past?—In fact, pretty well since I joined the Force in 1889, and especially within the last five years.

606. Were there any promotions made during the last five years to your knowledge?—Very few. I should have qualified that statement also by saying influence in reference to getting out-stations. It is a well-known fact that there is a very keen competition for out-stations, and one is led to believe that very often those who have entered into the competition have resorted to political influence.

607. Are you speaking now more especially of the last five years?—Yes.

608. Your knowledge is more especially of Otago and Southland? Now, are you prepared to show that the seniors have been passed over by the juniors for out-stations during the last five years?—Well, in some cases.

609. Can you name one?—Well, for instance, Constable Mathieson was recently promoted to the rank of second-class constable, and was sent in charge of one of the most important out-stations in the district over the heads of just as suitable men who have been first-class constables for many years, and there was great dissatisfaction over that.

610. Who were the seniors in this district at the time who ought to have got that station?—I refer to the principle of first-class senior constables being in charge of small and petty stations. They consider that when better stations are opened, or become vacant, everything being equal, they should have the first right of appointment to such stations before junior men, who perhaps have never been in charge of a station before. They think the junior men should work up from the poor stations to the most important stations.

611. It means to say that they think there ought to be a double shift each time?—Yes.

612. Irrespective of the expense?—Yes.

613. But can you tell me, during the past five years more especially, of any country station having been unfairly given to juniors over the heads of seniors?—No, I do not say that.

614. Then, political influence during that time does not seem to have affected the selection of stations in the way of juniors going over the heads of seniors?—No.

615. But there have not been double shifts when really good stations were vacant?—No.

616. And you think political influence may have prevented that?—Well, to a certain extent.

617. Now, in regard to the subject of assistant district clerk: Did you ask for it?—No, I was ordered in there.

618. But you knew perfectly well you need not have gone in there unless you liked?—Yes.

619. And if you went out to-morrow you know there are a dozen ready to jump at it?—Yes.

620. It is a billet much sought after?—It is.

621. And when you went into it, were you under the impression you were going to get any pay or allowance for it?—Well, I was told by the Inspector that if I went into the district office it was a more responsible position, and strictly confidential, and that if I performed my duties properly no doubt I would get preference for promotion. I may say that, before I went in, a third-class sergeant was assistant clerk. Mr. Weldon thought it was a sufficiently important position to place a third-class sergeant in.

622. Who was there before you?—Sergeant Ross was there as assistant clerk.

623. Do you know of any case where any influence, whether political, masonic, publicans', or prohibitionists' influence has gained either promotion or station for a man?—Not to my own personal knowledge.

624. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Your duties in the district office are very responsible duties, and confidential duties?—Yes.
625. And you feel you ought to get some extra remuneration for it?—Yes.
626. Your hours are very long?—Yes.
627. You say, since the beginning of this year you have been employed on an average twelve hours per day?—Yes; I have to do it, to keep up with the work.
628. In Christchurch, you say, the assistant clerk has a clerical allowance?—I am told that.
629. What is it?—I am told it is 1s. per day.
630. Do you think if all assistant clerks were treated in that way it would be satisfactory to the men?—It would.
631. Do you know about the Auckland clerks?—No. I may say also it is very awkward sometimes for a third-class constable, acting as assistant clerk, perhaps to be approached by a senior constable for a little bit of information that you do not feel willing or consider it your duty to give. He may perhaps say, "You are not much use here, and you are not getting as much as I am getting," and sling out hints that make you uncomfortable.
632. You have never been asked about pensions or retiring-allowance? What is your opinion about that?—I think a pension would be more suitable, and more acceptable to the Force.
633. Personally, you would be in favour of a pension?—Yes.
634. In regard to these various outside offices held by police-officers, do they throw a lot of extra work upon the district office?—They do. In fact, half my work is in connection with the Public Trustee, the Otago Benevolent Institution, Industrial School, Inspection of Machinery, and several other departments.
635. Have you anything to do in connection with the Beer Duty Act?—Yes.
636. You say half your time is taken up in connection with work outside police-work altogether?—Yes. I would have very good hours were I just confined to police-work. But, now, after having to work steady all day, I have to start on this outside work at night. I also forgot to mention lunatic work. The Police Department have got to report periodically on all lunatics in the district, and also in reference to their maintenance.
637. Now, this question of good stations has caused a very great deal of jealousy in the Police Force?—Yes, there is a very strong feeling that when a large and important station becomes vacant, a first-class constable who is occupying a minor station, and who has good abilities, should get the preference of the better station, and that men perhaps just from street duty should go into the second-class stations to start with.
638. Now, if the emoluments derived from these good stations were taken from the individual who performs the work, and devoted to a purpose which would benefit the whole of the Force, do you not think it would be the means of removing a great deal of that discontent?—I believe it would; but the question then arises, Would the constable interested do his work, and give as much satisfaction.
639. What are the offices held by constables for which extra remuneration is given?—Clerk of Court, bailiff, inspection of slaughterhouses, Warden's Court work, licensing inspection, and Clerk of Licensing Committees.
640. Do you remember how many other offices there are?—There might be six or eight offices for which no money is paid.
641. Are the duties in connection with these unpaid offices neglected now?—No, I do not think so.
642. Then, where does your argument come in, that if the men do not receive remuneration for doing a particular work that that work would be neglected?—Well, many of these men are very hard worked, and the consolation they have is that they derive a little extra for it.
643. You see your argument was, that if the men did not receive any money for doing the work it probably would not be done; but you say there are six or eight offices for which no remuneration is received, and yet the work is not neglected?—The work in connection with these offices is not nearly so heavy as the work for which they are paid.
644. *Mr. Poynton.*] Have you ever done any bailiff work?—No.
645. Do you know that often in serving summonses a man has to pay money out of his own pocket?—Yes.
646. And has to get it back again according to the mileage?—Yes.
647. And if there was no mileage he would very often lose money?—Yes.

THOMAS GRIFFITH, examined on oath.

648. *The Chairman.*] You are a constable, stationed at Balclutha?—Yes.
649. And Clerk of Court?—Yes.
650. You produce the *plaint-book* at the Magistrate's Court, Balclutha?—Yes.
651. And the *judgment-book*?—Yes.
652. Do you find the three cases referred to in the previous evidence—namely: *Paterson v. Barrington*, *Paterson v. Wilson*, and *Paterson v. Mason*?—I find no entry of *Paterson v. Barrington*, or *Paterson v. Wilson*. I have only found *Mason*; *plaint* on the 4th February, 1896.
653. What does the Court record show in regard to that?—The Court record shows that on the 11th March it was settled out of Court.
654. *Mr. Poynton.*] What is the amount?—£8 2s. 6d., and costs 5s.
655. *The Chairman.*] Who was Clerk of the Court at that time?—Constable Christie.
656. When did he cease to be Clerk of the Court?—In August, 1896.
657. *Mr. Taylor.*] Can you find the case of *Barrington* in the book?—No.
658. There is no record in the book as to *Barrington* and *Wilson* ever having been summoned?—No.

JOHN GIBSON SMITH, examined on oath.

659. *The Chairman.*] What is your profession?—I am a medical practitioner at Balclutha.
660. *Mr Taylor.*] Are you on the Commission of the Peace?—I believe so.
661. Have the police done all they could do to enforce the licensing law since hotel licenses were taken away—I think they have.
662. You think they have been successful on the whole?—I think so, fairly.
663. Has there been an improvement in the sobriety and order of the people at Balclutha since the hotels were closed?—Very little. It never was a very drunken place.
664. You know Constable Christie?—I do.
665. Do you remember Mrs. Angus breaking her leg?—I do.
666. What was the amount of your account in connection with that?—£11 11s. I sent in.
667. Who did you render the account to?—I think I gave the account to Constable Christie and told him to forward it to Campbell. And, further, I told him, “In the event of your getting £11 that would be right.” I also said, “In the event of your getting the money I have arranged to give Angus £3.” I said he was very poor at the time, and that he could give him £3.
668. Did you not see the Angus people about it?—No. I spoke to the Angus people, but I knew very well I would never get a farthing out of them. They owed me a large sum before that.
669. You did not render an account to Angus?—No, because I thought it was utterly useless.
670. Did you receipt your bill?—I received £8 from Christie.
671. Did you give him a receipt for that?—Yes, I think so. £8 was the money I received.
672. Did you give him a receipt for £11 11s.?—I cannot say whether I did or not.
673. *The Chairman.*] You gave a receipt, but you cannot say for what amount?—No.
674. *Mr. Taylor.*] What instructions did you give to Christie, so far as Campbell was concerned?—I said, “In the event of getting the money from Campbell, knock off the 11s. and give me £8, and Angus £3.
675. Did Mr. Christie give you a cheque?—No, he gave me notes.
676. How much?—£8.
677. Do you know Mr. Ramage?—I do.
678. Do you know Henry?—I do.
679. Did you give Christie anything?—Not a farthing.
680. Did Christie retain anything?—Nothing from me.
681. Did you consider the collection of that money as part of his duties as Clerk of Court?—No; but what I did do was, I spoke to him about summoning. I thought if I could get the money out of Campbell there would be no use in summoning Angus.
682. But you do not regard it as part of his duty as Clerk of Court or constable to go and collect the money?—No.
683. Why did you ask him?—Because he was going to Catlin’s River.
684. Not as constable, or Clerk of Court?—No.
685. Was your account made out against Campbell?—I cannot say.
686. Who did you consider liable?—In the first place, I considered Angus liable.
687. You did not bill him?—There was no earthly use in billing him.
688. Did you tell Constable Christie that Campbell was liable for the bill?—I said I believed he was liable. There was an action going on, and Angus, I think, had consulted some solicitor; and it was talked about in the district that they thought Campbell was liable, and of course Campbell must have thought himself liable or he would not have paid me.
689. You say Christie did not retain anything from you?—No, nothing.
690. What did you give him?—I gave him nothing.
691. Did you return him a pound?—I returned no pound.
692. What reason had you for asking Christie to collect this money?—I thought he was a very useful man when he was going down there.
693. Did you know he was a police constable?—I did.
694. Did you know he had his duties defined?—I did.
695. Did you consider it part of his duty to collect accounts for private citizens?—I know nothing about that.
696. Did you arrange with Angus to give him £3?—I spoke to Angus and told him he would get something if I got the money.
697. Did you tell him how much he would get?—I think I told him £3.
698. Did you tell him what you were going to charge him?—I think I did.
699. How much was it?—Eleven guineas.
700. Did Angus get the £3?—I do not know.
701. Did you give it to Christie to give to him?—Christie kept it to give him.
702. Did you get a receipt for that?—No, I did not ask for a receipt.
703. Did you give a receipt to Campbell?—I do not know.
704. What did you do?—I suppose Christie gave him a receipt.
705. What other amounts has Christie collected for you?—Not a farthing.
706. Did you give him authority to collect this from Campbell?—I merely mentioned it verbally to him.
707. You thought that would be sufficient?—Yes.
708. Did you arrange with Campbell before Christie went?—I think I spoke to him about the account.
709. Did you arrange with him?—I do not think I did arrange with him how it was to be paid.
710. Had he agreed to pay at the time Christie took the account?—Yes.
711. Who to?—To him, I suppose.
712. When was the last time you spoke to him about it?—I do not remember.

713. When was the arrangement made?—I cannot tell you; I do not remember.
714. Then, Christie made the arrangement with him?—I suppose he did.
715. *The Chairman.*] Do you suppose he made any arrangement?—Yes, with Campbell, to pay me.
716. *Mr. Taylor.*] You had not made any arrangement with Campbell?—No.
717. Did you tell Christie you thought Campbell ought to pay any definite amount?—I do not remember.
718. Did you tell him he ought to pay £15?—I do not remember.
719. Did Christie get the money on the first application?—I do not know.
720. How long was it between the time you gave him the account and when you got the money?—I cannot say. My memory is bad, and I have too much to think about.
721. Had you any conversation with Christie at all when he paid the money over?—I do not remember.
722. There would be surely some conversation?—Very likely some general conversation.
723. Do you recognise that document, being your receipt for £11 11s., made out in the name of Mr. Robert Angus?—Yes.
724. Is that in your writing?—Yes.
725. Who is it made out against?—Robert Angus.
726. Well, now, when did you send that to Campbell?—I cannot tell you from recollection.
727. Are you sure you did not give that to Angus?—I cannot say.
728. Did you ever see that document, being a receipt given by Mr. and Mrs. Angus to Mr. Campbell in full satisfaction to all claims against him for damages on account of the accident to Mrs. Angus?—No, I do not think so.
729. You did not throw Christie £1 when this was settled up?—No. I told you before I neither threw him anything nor gave him anything.
730. *The Chairman.*] You did not give him anything?—Not one farthing.
731. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see Mr. Angus about this case?—I saw him on Sunday.
732. Did you tell him not to come up here?—No; I did no such thing.
733. Did you see Mrs. Angus?—I saw her at the door, but did not speak to her. I was in a hurry when passing.
734. You did not stop at all?—I stopped for a second. I spoke to Angus.
735. Did you see Mr. Campbell?—Not for months and months.
736. Have you seen Mr. Paterson?—I saw him this morning. I said "Good-day" to him. He said he was coming into Dunedin this morning.
737. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Did Angus tell you on Sunday that Christie had retained £1 10s. of this money?—Yes. I said, "Well, Angus, why don't you get the money from him?" and he said, "I have written to him, and cannot get the money."
738. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was not the name of Mr. Ross, Clarkville, mentioned with Mr. Angus the other day?—I do not know him.
739. Did he tell you at the same time this was money he had received from Ross?—No.
740. You are perfectly certain?—Yes.
741. You have a good memory?—Yes, for that.
742. Did he mention the name of Ross?—I cannot tell you. I was too busy to listen to any tattle about Ross.
743. If Angus says it was £1 10s. connected with Ross that Christie retained, will you contradict him?—I will not say.
744. Have you had a conversation with Christie to-day about this case?—No.
745. You remember the Vial prosecution on the 13th March, 1895?—I do.
746. You were a witness?—I was not subpoenaed. I volunteered to give evidence.
747. Do you remember Anderson's prosecution in August, 1896?—Yes.
748. Were you a witness in that case?—No.

WARD GEORGE WOHLMANN, further examined on oath.

749. *The Chairman.*] There are some suggestions, I understand, which you omitted to bring before us yesterday?—Yes; it is in relation to Sunday four hours' leave. I would not have alluded to the matter at all, only it was mentioned in evidence two nights ago. We informed our Inspector of our desire, and he very kindly assured us that if he found it practicable, and in accordance with the system that was employed in Wellington and Christchurch, he would be willing to give it to us. That would give us a day off every month. He assured us he would give it to us if he was satisfied; and we were satisfied with his assurance, but as the matter was mentioned in evidence the other night I thought I would like to make a remark upon it. It was stated that the eight most dangerous hours in the week were the four hours on Saturday night from 5 to 9 p.m. and from 5 to 9 o'clock on Sunday morning, because on Saturday night most people are about, and so most constables are required; and on Sunday morning no people are about and property is left unprotected. However, I would like to point out this fact, and I think I am well within bounds when I state that the arrests made on Saturday night are at least 300 per cent. above the arrests made on the supposed dangerous hours on Sunday morning, so that if the ordinary compliment of four policemen are sufficient to cope with the arrests on Saturday night, I think one-third at least should be sufficient to cope with the arrests on Sunday morning. But to give a margin of one-third for safety, half the number of men should be sufficient to cope with the crime on Sunday morning, so that it is not unreasonable for us to request that half the men should be allowed off, so as to get a full Sunday once a month.

750. What is the excess of arrests on Saturday night?—At least 300 per cent., and I consider I am well within the mark. Constables are transferred here from Wellington and Christchurch, and they come down and tell us how much better off they are in those centres, and that things are

not equal, and, of course, it is liable to make the men a little dissatisfied. I wish also to speak about the pay of plain-clothes constables. I am requested to do so by the members of the Force. I would like to state that the majority of their work is carried on out of the station. They have to incur a great deal of expense in travelling about, which is not refunded by the department. It is reasonable to suppose that they must mix with the majority of the people, and they must associate with criminals, and, if necessary, spend a few shillings over them, so that in their ordinary avocations of following out crime and so on they incur a great deal more expense than do ordinary constables. Also, although it is not pleasant to have to state it, I think it is agreed that there is a certain kind of information that can only be obtained by paying for it. It is a great temptation to a constable who only receives £10 per month and who is on plain-clothes duty to buy information, if by that means he can get it without infringing the law and so help to bring himself under the notice of his superiors and get himself promoted. They are at a disadvantage in this respect. First, second, third, and even fourth-class detectives receive much higher pay than these plain-clothes men, who are paid only as ordinary constables. In their anxiety to obtain notice and get up a good case they will frequently run themselves very short of money, if they think that by the judicious use of a little "palm-oil" they can get information to complete their case. If they are to be of any use at all they must obtain information, and, as I said before, one class can only be obtained in that way; therefore we suggest that a special allowance should be granted to constables doing plain-clothes duty. They have very long hours, and no fixed hours, and may work twenty-four hours a day. Their time is never their own, and if they are married men they have to leave their homes unprotected perhaps for weeks while they are away on special duty. They are continually associated with the lowest stratum of society; and for these reasons we respectfully suggest that they receive favourable consideration for their request, and that a special plain-clothes allowance be given to these men.

ERNEST BINGHAM, examined on oath.

751. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A third-class constable, stationed at South Dunedin.

752. In your letter you say, "The pay of the average daily labourer has been from 7s. to 8s. per day wherever I have worked for daily wages, therefore I think that in asking for an increase to that amount I need not be considered unreasonable." What class of labour averages 7s. to 8s. per day?—The class of labour I was engaged in.

753. What was that?—Sawmilling; all kinds of work almost in connection with sawmilling.

754. When was it when you say your wages averaged that?—All the time I was engaged in it.

755. What did you join the Police Force at?—£10 per month.

756. Did you think you were joining at a lower pay than you were earning?—I was earning 7s. per day.

757. Then why did you leave to join the police?—I joined the police because I thought it was steady employment.

758. Has it proved so to you?—It has proved steady.

759. What causes your dissatisfaction?—The expenses are higher than I imagined.

760. Is it on account of finding the expenses higher than you anticipated that you ask that the rates should be increased?—Partly.

761. Will you make any observation you wish in regard to these suggestions of yours?—Another reason I ask for an increase of pay is that men working together should have more equal pay, in my opinion. It causes better feeling amongst the men in my opinion.

762. When did you say you joined the Force?—In February, 1897.

763. You think there should be more equality of pay?—Yes, where the work is the same.

764. Do you not recognise that long service should entitle a man to an increase of pay?—Yes.

765. Where would the equality be?—I am working alongside men who are earning a higher rate of pay.

766. Supposing a man has been longer in the service than yourself, ought he not to have a higher rate of pay?—He joined at a higher rate.

767. Do you suggest that the fact that the arrangement made with him at a higher rate of pay was an injustice when you entered into an arrangement at a lower rate?—It was no injustice to me.

768. But you think there should be equality?—I think there should be equality when men have the same work, making due allowance for the number of years of service.

769. You mean equality at the time of entry, with a rising pay for length of service?—That is a matter I have not gone into.

770. What do you suggest in the case of these men who have entered at a rate which, by their agreement, is higher than the rate at which you entered?—Certainly not to reduce them, because the pay for them is not too high. I wish to point out that the payment I receive I scarcely consider high enough, the expenses being higher than I imagined.

771. That is, the rate you agreed to serve at; but you find the expenses higher than you anticipated, and therefore you think that fact should be taken into account?—Yes.

772. What are the expenses you find heavier than you anticipated?—The expenses of living.

773. Are you a single man?—No.

774. Where were you living at the time you joined?—In Southland, at Winton.

775. Do you find it more expensive living where you are now stationed than where you were living?—Yes.

776. Have you quarters?—No, I pay rent.

777. How much?—About 6s. per week at the present time. I have paid higher.

778. You have a small family?—A family of one.

779. Were you married when you joined?—Yes.

780. What were you paying in rent when you joined?—I was paying 2s. 6d. for a four-roomed house with a good garden attached to it.

781. Your letter contains several other suggestions, and you suggest there should be house-allowance for married constables; you are speaking of all married constables?—Yes.

782. And you continue: "As to the former, I desire to say that I think it should be granted, for the following reasons: Sergeants receive it; constables in charge of stations receive it; some married constables who are not in charge of stations receive it; all single constables have barracks, fuel, and light provided them at the country's expense. Married constables have to provide all the above out of a pay that I think will be admitted is not too high for the single men. For myself, although I have only a small family, I find that after paying my just debts at the end of each month, and living with the strictest economy, there is nothing to put by as a nest-egg for old age, or in case of sickness to pay a doctor." You say that is so?—Yes.

783. And you wish us to take that on oath?—Yes.

784. And all the rest of your statement contained in this document you wish to be taken on oath?—Yes.

785. You go on to say: "By the terms of Regulation No. 209, married constables are to reside in the locality selected by the Inspector. That being so, I submit that that alone is sufficient to justify married constables in asking for this concession, as it may not always be to the convenience of the pocket or otherwise of the constable to have to reside where the Inspector directs; but, together with the previously-mentioned facts, I think that a case is made out sufficiently strong to justify the Commissioners in seriously considering it in their report. In regard to the pay, I beg to point out that it does not, to my mind, appear just that there should be the inequality that at present exists in the remuneration given to men doing the same work. To explain: third-class constables, who may have joined nine or ten years ago at 7s. per day with no reduction for enforced insurance, those who may have joined one or two years ago at 6s. 8d. per day (£10 per month), less reduction for enforced insurance, and, it may be, second-class constables with their fourteen or fifteen years' service, having received a higher pay from the first, 6d. a day with their grade, their long-service pay, and no reduction for enforced insurance—they all do duty together, have the same duties, the same hours, and the same responsibilities; in fact, are equal in everything but the pay. I do not say that I think the senior men are receiving too high a pay, but I submit that where men are doing the same duty, after making due allowance for a number of years of faithful service, the remuneration should be more equal. Regulation No. 28 provides that no member of the Force will be allowed to engage in any business or trade, either by himself or his wife. That regulation, if it is to be enforced, provides a sufficient reason for asking for an increase for the lower-paid men, as it prevents them or their wives doing anything to augment their pay in any way. To adjust the foregoing, I beg to suggest the following: Raise the pay of those who joined at £10 per month to 7s. per day—not an extensive rise; permit constables' wives to engage in any little business on their own account; and provide for a rise in pay or grade every five years if the defaulter's sheet reasonably permits of the same." That is the suggestion you wish to make in addition to the one I have already referred to about the pay?—Yes.

786. *Colonel Hume.*] In the sawmilling trade, you say, the men get from 6s. to 7s. per day?—From 7s. to 8s., and some get 9s.

787. What do you consider they earn a month; how many days do they work on an average? According to the master.

788. Not according to the weather? You cannot work in all weathers?—Well, under one master I only lost about two or three days in three or four months. I believe the most I have lost is five or six days in a month.

789. Then, you cannot give us any average?—No, not so far as my experience goes.

790. *The Chairman.*] You consider you improved your position by getting your present appointment at 6s. 8d. per day?—In some ways, but not in all. Although I did not earn so much money before I joined the Force I could save more. The expenses of uniform and other things eat all I could save.

791. Did you earn £10 per month at the saw?—No.

792. *Mr. Poynton.*] You had no temptations such as are in the way of policemen in your sawmilling career?—No.

793. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Have you formed any opinion as to which you think preferable, a retiring-allowance or a pension?—So far as I have thought it out I would prefer a pension to a retiring-allowance.

794. Assuming a pension system were adopted, you would not be called upon to keep up your life-policy; and would you, then, be prepared to contribute towards this pension?—That would depend. Supposing a system were adopted, would the money that had been deducted for life insurance be put to the pension fund?

795. You would not be compelled to keep up your life-policy, and would probably get a surrender value. I mean, if a pension were granted it is improbable that the Government would continue to insist on your keeping up your life-policy?—I would understand that the department would not oblige me to keep it in force.

796. Then, that being so, would you be prepared to contribute towards a pension?—Certainly.

797. As regards pay, would you prefer the present system of classes to go on, or would you prefer to rise by small annual increments?—That is a matter which has not been brought under my notice, and I have not thought it out.

798. The men who did not join under the £10 per month system received when they first joined 7s. per day?—I understand so.

799. And their maximum is 8s. per day?—Yes, as a first-class constable.

800. Would you prefer to remain under that system, with a chance of getting your class at certain periods, or would you prefer to rise by a series of small annual increments, say of 2d. a year, and gain your maximum in six years?—I would prefer to rise by the small amount.

801. And do you think it would give more satisfaction to the men?—Yes, because probably there are some who would not qualify to be classed as second-class constables for a great number of years.

WILLIAM STONE PARDY, examined on oath.

802. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have been in charge of the Dunedin district ever since Prohibition was passed for Clutha?—Yes.

803. And all arrangements for carrying out the prohibition law have been in your hands?—Yes.

804. Now, will you kindly state briefly the number of persons who have been employed in connection with the detection of sly-grog selling since the Act came into operation—I mean special persons, outside the constables stationed at the three stations in the Clutha district?—I must have had fully thirty different persons at different times.

805. Police and others?—Yes, and private persons.

806. The number of prosecutions, I believe, is seventy-nine?—Yes, and twenty-six convictions.

807. What is the aggregate amount of fines imposed?—£645. That is for the Clutha district, solely in connection with sly-grog selling prosecutions. In addition to that there are all the Court fees.

808. Throughout the whole of this period of three years and eight months, has there been any lengthened time without special endeavours being used?—No. I am always working at some part of the district. But, you see, after a conviction in one part of the locality they would be on their guard, and it is only after some considerable time that we are able to get hold of them again.

809. Have all the suggestions you have made to the department been readily acceded to by the head of the department?—Yes.

810. And have you invariably given the fullest possible consideration to suggestions made to you by the constables at the various stations?—Yes, and where practicable I have carried them out. Of course, constables have not the experience I have had, and some of their suggestions have been crude.

811. Have you not endeavoured to your very utmost to stamp out this sly-grog selling?—I have devoted my whole brain-power to it. For hours and hours, when I ought to have been sleeping, I have been studying and thinking how I could plan to circumvent these sly-grog sellers. In fact, during that time my life has not been worth living.

812. Has the department at any time curtailed you in any way in money expenditure?—In no way whatever. On one occasion even, I incurred expenditure in employing men without authority.

813. Briefly, it has been a pretty considerable tax on the department for the special payment of men acting as spies, and special allowances to the police?—Certainly. I can say no Prohibitionists have shown more zeal in the matter than I have.

THURSDAY, 7TH APRIL, 1898.

JAMES HOGG, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you, and where do you reside?—Watchmaker, residing at Balclutha.

2. *Mr. Macdonald.*] How long have you been residing in Balclutha?—About twenty-seven years.

3. Did you know Constable Christie while he was there as police-officer?—I did.

4. Did you have an opportunity of seeing how he performed his duties as police-officer?—Yes.

5. I understand you live in a central part of the town?—I do.

6. What is your opinion as to the way in which he performed his duties?—I have frequently formed the opinion that Christie performed his duties in a very excellent way, and seemed to be very painstaking.

7. Do you remember an incident when Mr. Henry had some rotten eggs thrown at him?—I do.

8. It was about New Year time, I understand?—Yes, New Year's eve.

9. Can you say whether Constable Christie at that time made any efforts to discover who it was that perpetrated that outrage?—Yes. As far as I could judge, he used the most strenuous efforts to find out who the culprits were.

10. We were told there was a large crowd there, and some people were suspected, but that there was not evidence sufficient to identify them?—Yes. The suspected ones, of course, tried to throw the blame on other shoulders, and the difficulty seemed to be to find out who were really guilty.

11. *The Chairman.*] What facilities did you have for knowing what steps Constable Christie took to discover the offenders?—The facilities I had of knowing were that Constable Christie questioned me very closely on the case, and with reference to these people: "Had I seen them?" and he also cross-examined my boy, who was playing in the band at the time.

12. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Do you know whether he made any inquiries up and down the town, and did his very best to find out?—Yes.

13. Do you remember the incident about Ramage?—Yes, I remember that clearly.

14. That was, I believe, perpetrated by some larrikins about New Year's time?—Yes.

15. There was a crowd there, and the difficulty in that case was to identify who had done it?—Yes. It was even more difficult than in the case of Henry.

16. Do you know whether Constable Christie made active inquiries with a view to finding out the perpetrators on that occasion?—Yes, I have reason to believe he made very active inquiries.

17. Do you know whether there was really a difficulty in finding out who they were?—I should say there was a great difficulty.

18. *Mr. Taylor.*] What do you know of your own knowledge about the difficulties of discovering the culprits in this case?—I know that these people backed each other up in conniving and throwing the blame on others.

19. Who backed each other up? What people?—I do not think it is fair to mention names.

20. Were certain names mentioned to you?—Certainly.

21. Who told you them?—It was a general topic of conversation in town.

22. As to who the suspected men were?—Yes.

23. Outside of that, do you know anything of the efforts Christie made—did he tell you what steps he was taking to discover them?—No.

24. How do you know he took any steps at all?—I simply know by his making inquiries.

25. Of other people?—Yes. I know he made inquiries of other people.

26. They told you?—Yes.

27. Were you very friendly with Christie when he was in Balclutha?—Well, yes; not altogether very friendly. I may mention one thing: he succeeded in getting a conviction against my son once for breaking some railway-carriage windows.

28. As a matter of fact, were you not very friendly with him—were you not in the habit of meeting him and having a chat?—Oh yes, certainly.

JAMES O'NEILL, examined on oath.

29. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am a Catholic priest at Milton.

30. *Mr. Macdonald.*] I understand, Father, that your duties frequently take you to Balclutha?—Yes; Balclutha is my district.

31. You are frequently there?—I am frequently there.

32. Did you know Constable Christie while he was stationed at Balclutha?—Yes.

33. Did you have opportunities there of seeing how he comported himself as a constable, and attended to his duties?—I had considerable opportunities of seeing the way in which he discharged his duties.

34. Did you form an opinion?—I formed an opinion that, considering the exceptional circumstances of the place, he did his duties in a very efficient manner.

35. Active and obliging?—Always active, as far as I could judge, and always attentive to his business.

36. Now, do you remember being at Balclutha while an incident occurred about rotten eggs being thrown at a man named Henry?—I was in Balclutha a few days after that incident.

37. I understand, in a country place like that, it was a topic of conversation?—It was talked about a good deal.

38. And we have been told there was a difficulty in identifying the offenders?—So I understand.

39. Can you say whether Christie was making inquiries with a view to discovering who the offenders were?—I recollect seeing Christie after this, and I was given to understand that his purpose in visiting the place where I stayed was to make inquiries regarding this offence.

40. So that he was apparently doing his best to find out the offenders?—As far as I could judge, he was doing his best to find out the offenders.

41. Do you remember also on another occasion, I think about twelve months before or after, that incident which happened to a man named Ramage, who had some windows smashed in?—I heard something about that.

42. Do you know whether the constable made inquiries with a view to bringing these people to justice?—In reference to that case I have no definite knowledge of Christie having done anything, but I conclude from my general knowledge that he on that occasion did his duty as he did on other occasions.

43. I suppose you are frequently at Balclutha?—Well, perhaps about twice a month—sometimes more, sometimes less.

44. And while there, I suppose, you are brought into contact with all classes of people?—I meet all classes of people. When there were licenses in the district I stayed in a licensed house, and continued to stay there when it was converted into a boarding-house; and sometimes I have seen Christie go there in the performance of his duties. I have had occasion once to call his services into requisition to obtain an article that was stolen, and I found he was very diligent and made every effort to secure the article, which had been stolen from our bazaar.

45. Was that an offence that arose at Balclutha?—It was committed at Balclutha. It was the stealing of a flag connected with a bazaar that was on at the time. Some person stole it out of a lark, and Christie made diligent efforts to sheet the offence home. The flag was returned to me; and Christie told me when next I saw him that, suspecting the offenders, he had warned them, and on that account the flag was sent back to me.

46. *The Chairman.*] Was there any prosecution?—I did not want any prosecution.

47. *Mr. Macdonald.*] You did not want a prosecution?—I did not want a prosecution. I only required to get the article back, and I instructed him to that effect. I instructed him not to take legal proceedings to get the article back.

48. You say that, being there as frequently as you are, generally speaking, he performed his duties to the satisfaction of the public?—I have never known him, to my own personal knowledge, to be deficient in any way in the performance of his duties.

49. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where were you staying when Christie called upon you in connection with the outrage to Mr. Henry?—At McCorley's Railway Hotel.

50. It was not a licensed house then, was it?—I fancy not.

51. Did Christie call on you there?—He did not call on me specially. He happened to be in the house making inquiries, and I was told the object of his visit.

52. When were you told?—On the same occasion.

53. That very day?—Yes.

54. You referred to exceptional circumstances in connection with the performance of police duty. What exceptional circumstances do you refer to?—The exceptional circumstances that I refer to are the state of feeling that has been aroused by the exceptional legislation under which Balclutha is at present suffering.

55. Suffering?—Suffering.

56. Do you mean the legislation that the people of the Clutha district have adopted?—I mean that, in general, the circumstances of the Clutha are such as to make it very hard for any policeman to do his duty with satisfaction to all parties.

57. He asked you to give evidence in this case?—I was summoned by the Commission.

58. Have you been interviewed on the matter?—No, I have not.

59. Had any discussion with Christie on it?—No discussion.

60. Or Mr. Macdonald?—Or Mr. Macdonald.

61. How often do you go to Balclutha?—My regular visits were once a month, but I have occasion to go in the intervals—on the occasion of sick calls and other duties.

62. Did you see Christie every time you went?—I dare say I did not.

63. How long did you stay there when you went?—For parish purposes I generally went on Saturday and returned on Monday. There was a time when I used to go regularly twice a month.

64. On an average three days a month you stopped there?—I should say more than that. I should say four days in the month.

65. That is, forty-eight days out of 365. You have no knowledge of what Christie was doing the rest of the year?—I have seen him in other parts of the district. Catlin's River is also part of my district, and I have frequently seen him there.

66. Did you give him instructions not to prosecute in connection with the recovery of that flag before or after the recovery?—Before the recovery and after.

67. It was stolen from some bazaar?—Yes; it was stolen from a line across the road.

68. Do you remember what part of McCorley's Christie was in when you saw him?—I cannot say that. I have no distinct recollection as to what part of the house he was in, but, generally speaking, there was a room where I most frequently saw him. There was a little room facing the south.

69. How frequently did you see him there?—Well, I cannot say that I have seen him there very frequently, but whenever I did see him it was in that room; and on that occasion, as far as my recollection serves me, it was in this room he was consulting the people of the house regarding this outrage.

70. On other occasions what was he doing there?—Doing his business, I expect.

71. Did you see him there before the license was taken away and after?—Yes, I believe I have seen him a few times.

71. *Mr. Macdonald.*] With regard to this flag, you say you did not want to prosecute?—I did not.

73. Was it really an act of stealing, or was it done by larrikins in the nature of a "lark"?—I had reason to believe afterwards it was meant for a "lark," but Christie did not know that then, nor did I. I was very angry at the time, and I went to him at once and told him about it, and he set himself at once to find out. He made various suggestions as to who would be the likely ones to do it. There were some parties there from Kaitangata that day, and he suggested some of those were the guilty parties, and, as far as his knowledge of the people went, those who were likely to do such a thing. He said he would hunt the thing up. I told him I did not want to prosecute. I only wanted the flag, because I wanted to return it to the owner.

74. You came to the conclusion it was not intended as an act of theft?—I came to that conclusion, Yes. I had reason to know afterwards it was entirely a "lark."

75. That had something to do with your instructions not to prosecute?—Yes. I had reason afterwards to believe it was a "lark" from the very first. Christie warned those he suspected, and the flag was forwarded to me at Milton by some unknown person.

76. I understand you to say that the general circumstances of Balclutha make it very difficult for a constable to perform his duties satisfactorily?—Yes.

77. I suppose what you refer to, Father O'Neill, is this: Owing to "No license" being carried there are two factions in existence—the extreme temperance people, and what are called the moderate people?—The Prohibitionists and the moderate people.

78. There is no doubt whatever these two factions exist in the town and surrounding district?—They cause a very large amount of uncharitableness and a large amount of bad feeling, which, in my opinion, makes it very hard for a policeman to do his duty.

79. One of the duties of the policeman is to keep clear of both factions, and do his duty by everybody?—I consider one of the duties of a policeman is to keep both sides from having reason for finding fault.

80. If he is friendly with the Prohibitionists the other side does not like it, and *vice versa*—in fact, there is a very strong feeling on the drink question up there?—Yes. I am in a position to know that it has been the source of a considerable amount of uncharitableness and bad feeling.

81. Although the Prohibitionists are in the ascendant and carried this vote, a very big minority have a very strong feeling of dissatisfaction at the existing state of affairs?—A very big minority are

very dissatisfied with it; and the travelling public, who are much inconvenienced by it, are very dissatisfied with it. Most people that I have spoken to on the subject say it is a decided hardship.

82. I believe the feeling goes as far as this: A great many who actually voted at that time for Prohibition would vote the other way if they had the opportunity?—Several have told me so.

83. And you say, whenever you saw Constable Christie at any of these hotels it was in the performance of his duty as a constable?—Yes, in the performance of his duty, not in the performance of my duty. I have always, as I have said, found him a most efficient and obliging officer, and whenever I had occasion to speak to him to have anything done he was always energetic and courteous.

84. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is he a member of your congregation?—No, he is not, and never was, as far as I know, a member of my congregation.

85. *Mr. Macdonald.*] When Christie went into this hotel, and you saw him there, he was making inquiries, as a constable should do, about matters connected with the town?—Yes, that is my meaning. The proprietor occupied responsible public positions, and was consulted by Christie.

JAMES HOGG, further examined on oath.

86. *Mr. Macdonald.*] You heard Father O'Neill state that the existing state of affairs in Balclutha made it very difficult for a police constable to perform his duties there, owing to this "No license" being carried?—That is distinctly my opinion too. It makes it very difficult.

87. May I ask which faction you belong to?—I belong to neither faction. I did take a prominent part at the time Prohibition was carried in Balclutha; since then I have had reason to change my ideas.

88. *The Chairman.*] What part did you take?—Prohibitionist.

89. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Since then you have changed your ideas?—Yes. I do not think it is a success.

90. Is it not a fact that a very large minority of the people are very dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs?—Yes.

91. And the result has simply been to create two factions in the community—the Prohibitionist, and the moderate party?—Yes.

92. And a very strong feeling exists, the one against the other?—Yes.

93. And the result of that is, it makes it exceptionally difficult for a constable to perform his duties to the satisfaction of the entire community.

ANDREW CHRISTIE, examined on oath.

94. *The Chairman.*] You are a second-class constable stationed at Mosgiel?—Yes.

95. You were a constable stationed at Balclutha, between what dates?—From 1891 till 1896.

96. And when was "No license" carried?—1894, I think.

97. *Mr. Macdonald.*] Is it a fact that there was considerable feeling between the factions up there at the time this "No license" was carried?—Yes.

98. Did that feeling continue to exist during the whole time you were there afterwards?—It did.

99. Can you say that there is a great portion of the community there dissatisfied with the existing state of things?—That is so.

100. And I suppose the effect of that would be, it makes it exceptionally difficult for the police to suppress sly-grog selling?—Yes.

101. As a matter of fact, the sympathies and feelings of a large portion of the community would go to thwart the police in the performance of their duty in suppressing sly-grog selling?—Yes.

102. I suppose you had cases of sly-grog selling while you were there?—I did.

103. Did you not find it exceptionally difficult to get witnesses to go to Court and give evidence against these people?—Yes.

104. It was more difficult to get witnesses to give evidence than in any other class of case you had to deal with?—That is so.

105. Caused entirely by the sympathy of a large portion of the community with these people?—Yes.

106. Is it not a fact that a police constable, in discharging his duty efficiently, as far as sly-grog selling is concerned, makes himself obnoxious to a large portion of the community there?—Yes.

107. Incurs their displeasure?—Yes.

108. Was this not your experience in getting up evidence in these cases? Frequently witnesses refused to give evidence?—Yes; they did so.

109. Pretended not to know anything about it?—Yes.

110. And in some cases they gave you statements, and when you got them to Court they gave entirely different statements?—That is so.

111. That was not your experience in cases of theft, or in any other class of case you had to deal with—not to such a degree?—Oh, no.

112. I believe after you had had some experience in this way you adopted the course of taking written statements from witnesses when you could get them?—Yes.

113. It was difficult to accomplish that many times?—It was, very.

114. Did it not happen that you had a great deal to contend with in witnesses departing from their written statements, and giving entirely different evidence in the Court?—It did.

115. On various occasions?—On various occasions.

116. In fact, the community looked at a sly-grog case in an entirely different light from any other class of offence?—They did.

117. And the great portion of the community endeavoured to screen them as much as they could?—That is so, yes.

118. Notwithstanding that you were fairly successful in getting several convictions?—I was, I had seven or eight cases altogether.

119. There was one man named Moir you had how many convictions against?—Four.

120. And I think the total amount of his fines came to about £300; is that correct?—It is correct.

121. His cases were fought very desperately, and I think one of them went to the Court of Appeal?—It did.

122. He stated that while you were at Balclutha you used to go to the Farmers' Arms Hotel and get your whiskey regularly?—It is false. I never drank in the man's house in my life. I never drank in Moir's house in Balclutha.

123. As a matter of fact he has a strong feeling of revenge against you over those cases?—That is so. He passed me in the street, and never spoke to me.

124. He was one of those who came in after "No license" was carried?—Yes.

125. I think Mr. Hawkins fined him £80 and costs on the last occasion?—Yes.

126. Do you remember any other convictions for sly-grog selling you had besides these?—Yes. I had a conviction against a man named Anderson.

127. I think he was fined £50 and costs?—Yes. I also had another one against people named Guest.

128. As far as Anderson's case was concerned, I think the Magistrate made some strong observations—that he was determined to put sly-grog selling down if he could manage it, and he fined him £50 for the first offence?—He did.

129. As a matter of fact, did not the Magistrate inflict very severe fines wherever the evidence justified him, as far as you can say?—He did.

130. In some cases, owing to conflict of testimony, the cases were dismissed?—Yes.

131. By the way, in that very case of Anderson's, did you not incur a good deal of odium by bringing some of the most prominent citizens of Balclutha before the Court as witnesses?—That is so.

132. Some Justices of the Peace and others?—Yes; three Justices of the Peace.

133. But you did your duty without fear or favour to anybody?—I did.

134. You also had another conviction, I understood you to say?—Yes, against people named Guest. Guest said, "It was not me; it was the wife that sold it." The wife was charged, and she was fined £6.

135. There was this peculiarity about Guest's case: he was a very strong Prohibitionist?—Yes.

136. And a storekeeper there?—Yes.

137. So that was out of the ordinary run of cases with which you had to deal?—Yes.

138. He was one of the leading Prohibitionists of the town?—Yes.

139. So that you distributed your favours both on the old hotels and sometimes on the Prohibitionists, if you found they were infringing the law?—Yes.

140. I suppose the result in that case was not to get you into very good repute with the Prohibitionists; there was a very strong feeling about that case amongst the Prohibitionists at the time?—Yes.

141. By the way, did Mr. Adams, who gave evidence yesterday, ever prosecute in any sly-grog case while you were there?—No.

142. Did you have any other convictions, as far as you remember, besides those you have mentioned?—There were two others at Catlin's.

143. Do you know of your own knowledge, in addition to the convictions you obtained and in addition to your own efforts, that people were sent out from the town with a view of catching these people?—Yes; a number were sent out.

144. On various occasions?—Yes.

145. The result was this: The more convictions you got the more cunning these men became?—Yes. They were more on their guard; in fact, if a stranger came into the town they would watch him all over the place to try and find out who he was.

146. As far as you and the Inspector were concerned, you were doing everything in your power to suppress this evil, both by your own efforts and by importing strangers into the district with the object of catching these people?—Yes.

147. And you found it a very difficult task; and, even after you got cases, you found it very difficult to get convictions?—That is so.

148. I suppose as a constable you find it very difficult to hold the balance evenly between these two factions?—That is so.

149. How does your defaulter's sheet stand?—It is clean. The merit-sheet is as follows: "8th May, 1889: For services in connection with the detection and prosecution of Walter Gibb, convicted for illegally shooting pigeons; £1 reward. 6th November, 1889: Services in the detection and prosecution of David Whytoch, for sly-grog selling; £2 reward. 2nd May, 1894: Obtaining a conviction against William Guest, at Balclutha, on two charges of sly-grog selling; £2 reward. 13th November, 1895: Obtaining the conviction of William Moir for sly-grog selling; £3 reward. 18th March, 1896: Obtaining a conviction under the Animals Protection Act; £1 reward. 2nd September, 1896: Obtaining convictions against William Moir and J. Anderson for sly-grog selling; £8 reward."

150. How long have you been in the service?—Thirteen years and six months.

151. There was a suggestion made by Mr. Taylor, when Mr. Dunne was being examined as to the way he had boasted about getting you removed from Balclutha. Did you ever hear of such a thing?—I never heard of such a thing.

152. As far as you know, there is no truth in it?—That is so.

153. You heard the charge made against you by Mr. Henry?—Yes.
154. Well, he admits that you made certain inquiries, and that you ultimately told him you had not sufficient evidence, but if he wanted to lay an information you would do the best you could for him?—That is so.
155. Did he tell you the persons whom he suspected?—He could not say who he suspected. One or two he named.
156. He said there was a large crowd there, and he suspected some persons in the crowd?—Yes.
157. Was there a difficulty in identifying any of them?—He told me he could not identify any of them.
158. The evidence he himself possessed was not sufficient?—No, it was useless.
159. And the result of your inquiries did not enable you to get sufficient evidence?—No.
160. Did you invite him to lay an information, and tell him you would give him all the assistance you could?—I did.
161. As to the Ramage case, you heard about his complaint—that he got some of his windows smashed in?—Yes.
162. Had he any evidence sufficient on which to lay an information?—None whatever.
163. Did you make inquiries with a view to discovering who the offenders were?—I did.
164. Did you ask him to lay an information?—I did.
165. Did he decline?—Yes, he declined. He said he would not lay an information.
166. And the evidence you had at your disposal was not enough to secure convictions?—No.
167. Did you tell him that?—I did.
168. You heard what Ramage said: that on one occasion he gave you 2s. as commission for recovering a bad debt?—It is a falsehood.
169. Did he offer you 2s.?—I do not remember. I do not think he did.
170. At all events, you are clear about this: he never gave you 2s.?—I never got a sixpence from him.
171. But you are in doubt as to whether he offered it to you?—Yes.
172. But you are quite clear you never got it?—Yes.
173. By the way, did Henry ever make a charge against you, notwithstanding the long time that has elapsed from the time this thing happened until now?—No, I never heard of it before.
174. Or in Ramage's case?—No, neither.
175. Have you had other charges brought against you by the inhabitants of Balclutha, with these two exceptions, although you were stationed there about six years?—No.
176. As far as this charge of Anderson's is concerned: you have heard what Mr. Campbell said—that he only paid you £11: is that correct or not?—That is correct.
177. He only paid you £11?—That is all—£11.
178. You paid £8 of it to Dr. Smith, according to arrangement, and £3 to Mr. Angus?—That is so. That is how the money was disposed of.
179. That was in pursuance of an arrangement entered into between Dr. Smith, Mr. Angus, and Mr. Campbell?—Yes.
180. I believe Campbell lived about twenty-five miles off?—Yes; at Owaka.
181. And at that time the place was inaccessible by railway?—Yes, there was no railway there.
182. I suppose you, in the ordinary course of your duties as constable, made periodical visits to this place?—Yes.
183. And it was on one of these occasions that Dr. Smith asked you to get this money for him?—Yes. He asked me if I would oblige him by getting this money from Campbell—to save him a trip.
184. *The Chairman.*] Did you go specially to get this money?—No, I was on my police duty.
185. Had you anything to do with effecting a compromise, or was it effected before you were asked to collect the money?—It was effected before I was asked to collect the money.
186. Had you anything to do with making arrangements?—No, I had not.
187. *Mr. Macdonald.*] How much were you asked to get?—£11. The doctor gave me a receipt. He said, "You give that to Campbell, and you will get eleven guineas; but," he said, "never mind the eleven guineas, fetch me £11 even money." Campbell met me at the boarding-house where I was staying. He said, "Here is £11 for Dr. Smith."
188. Was it in cheque or in money?—Money.
189. Did you ever tell Angus you got a cheque?—Never did.
190. In giving Angus £3, did you tell him you would pay him the balance by-and-by?—No; I had no balance to pay.
191. Did you ever tell him on a subsequent occasion at the railway-station that you were going to keep the 11s. for your trouble?—No, certainly not.
192. You had no balance in your custody?—No. I never spoke to the man about it, nor he to me.
193. *Colonel Hume.*] You collected this debt for this man Ramage, did you not?—No, I did not collect it. Mr. Burley met me in the street, and he said, "Christie, Ramage is going to summon me. You had better pay it for me, and I will pay you again."
194. This was in Balclutha?—Yes.
195. The man had only got to walk a few yards to do it himself?—He had not the money to pay it.
196. Yesterday, it was stated, there was considerable delay between the time judgments were given and the time the amounts were paid to the different people: can you account for that?—When any money was paid into Court I paid it the next day.

197. What was the delay in paying in cases that were settled out of Court?—There was no delay. I paid the money immediately I got it.

198. As regards this place where Campbell resides, is there no bank or post-office?—There is a post-office—no bank.

199. A money-order office?—I do not think there is a money-order office.

200. I understand you to say you have never taken commission at all?—Never.

201. Never taken a present for collecting money?—Never.

202. What was your object in collecting these debts?—I did not collect any debts.

203. You virtually collected from Campbell?—No. Dr. Smith gave me a receipt, and asked me if I would oblige him by fetching this money.

204. What was your object in mixing yourself up in money matters with any of the people in your district, apart from the cases which came into your hands as Clerk of the Court?—I only did it to oblige Dr. Smith. It is twenty-five miles to the place, and he asked me if I was going down to Catlin's. I said I might be going down during the week. Then he asked me to do this.

205. Had you no supposition you would be paid for that?—No.

206. Or, did you intend to take anything if it had been offered?—I would not have taken anything supposing the doctor had offered it.

207. As regards sly-grog selling at Clutha, were your suggestions to the Inspector usually carried out?—They were.

208. And you were not thwarted in any way?—No; Inspector Pardy gave me every assistance.

209. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the case mentioned by Mr. Paterson, what do you say to that?—I deny that I retained the money in my hands; and Mr. Paterson, since he gave the evidence, admitted to me he had made a mistake.

The Chairman.] In his evidence at Invercargill, Constable William Walker requested that his defaulter's sheet should be examined. He was under the impression there were only two minor offences recorded against him. His defaulter's sheet now being produced shows that he was charged on the 10th October, 1878, with being absent from duty for four hours, and insubordinate conduct towards Sergeant Hannon, for which he was cautioned. On the 24th October, 1889, he was charged with misconduct in entering a house and attempting to take liberties with a woman therein. He was reprimanded for the entering, and found not guilty of taking improper liberties. In April, 1891, he was charged with slandering prominent residents in the North-east Valley, and was severely reprimanded, and cautioned as to future conduct. His merit-sheet is a very satisfactory one.

The following letters from Sergeant John Dwyer were handed in:—

SIR,—

Police Office, Clyde, 31st March, 1898.

In giving evidence before the Police Commission on the 26th instant, the question was raised that I was wanting in experience as a police sergeant in conducting cases in Court.

As I have brought several cases before you during the time I have been stationed in your district, I shall esteem it a great favour if you will kindly say how I have brought these cases into Court, and conducted them there.

I have, &c.,

S. E. McCarthy, Esq., Stipendiary Magistrate, Queenstown.

JOHN DWYER, Sergeant of Police.

SERGEANT DWYER, Clyde,—

Magistrate's Office, Queenstown, 1st April, 1898.

I am in receipt of your letter of the 31st ultimo enclosed herewith. In reply, I have to state that I have found you quite competent to conduct cases before the Magistrate on behalf of the police. You have always acted in an impartial manner, and yet not forgetting that the accused has his rights as well as the prosecution.

I have also further to add that, since your advent to the district under your care, there has been a marked change for the better in the administration by the police of the Licensing Acts in that portion of my district.

S. E. MCCARTHY, S.M.

OAMARU.

WEDNESDAY, 13TH APRIL, 1898.

THOMAS O'GRADY, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank in the Force?—I am a first-class sergeant, stationed at Oamaru.

2. When did you join?—In 1862.

3. Where were you stationed when first joining?—In Canterbury.

4. When were you first stationed at Oamaru?—In 1887.

5. What rank did you hold then?—Second-class sergeant.

6. Were you then in charge of the station?—I was not till four years afterwards.

7. Who was in charge of the station?—Ex-Inspector Andrew Thompson.

8. How long did you remain in that position?—About five years.

9. And then what happened?—Mr. Thompson then retired, and I got charge of the sub-district shortly afterwards, being promoted to first-class sergeant.

10. What force had you under you then?—Eleven men in all, in the sub-district—that is, including Ngapara, Kurow, and Hampden Stations.

11. How many at Oamaru?—Eight, and one each at Hampden, Kurow, and Ngapara.

12. That was in the year 1892?—Yes, at the end of 1891.

13. Have you remained in charge of this station ever since?—I have.

14. What force have you now?—I have eight men, all told, in Oamaru. That includes the gaoler, the plain-clothes man, and the mounted man.

15. Have you charge of these other stations?—Yes.

16. Do you find that force sufficient for the work of your district?—It is quite little enough. The population is about fifteen thousand in the sub-district of Oamaru. I mean the Oamaru Station.

17. Is it enough, or is it not enough, to work your district as you would consider satisfactorily?—At present I consider it enough.

18. What is the actual district?—It comprises the town and suburbs of Oamaru. It extends fourteen or fifteen miles. It extends to the Waitaki, to the Awamoko, to the Otepopo, and to Enfield.

19. Coming to the men stationed here, what rank do they hold?—Constable Joyce, at Hampden, is a first-class constable, and Constables Graham and Bradshaw are second-class constables. They are at the other two stations.

20. What ranks do the men hold in the towns?—Constable Greene is a first-class constable; Constable Christie is a second-class constable; Constable Madden is a second-class constable; Constable Trehey is a third-class constable; Constable Hunt is a third-class constable; Constable Cotter is a third-class constable; Constable Mayne is a third-class constable.

21. You say you consider these men numerically sufficient?—Yes.

22. Are they efficient: that is to say, are they of an age and physically equal to do the work required?—Yes.

23. Do you call them efficient constables?—There are two of them young constables who are learning their position very well. So far I consider them efficient.

24. How long have they been in the Force?—One about two years and six months, and the other about twelve months, I think.

25. And as to the others, do you consider them efficient men?—Yes.

26. Have you had any complaints from them: I do not mean their position in the Force so much as the conditions under which they live?—Constable Hunt has represented for some time the necessity for getting a house, having to pay house-rent. He is a married man.

27. Is he the only married man with you?—The gaoler and Hunt are the only two married men on the station. The gaoler has quarters.

28. What is the gaoler's name?—Constable Madden.

29. What quarters have the other men?—They live on the premises, at the station. Two of them are at present living in the gaol, and three in the station.

30. Where do they mess?—They are boarding at an hotel.

31. What hotel?—Some at the Globe, and some at the Queen's.

32. Why do they not mess at the barracks?—There is not accommodation for them at the barracks.

33. How long has this gone on?—It has existed for several years. The matter had been under the consideration of the Commissioner for some time, and the difficulty arose that there was no respectable boarding-house convenient to the station where the men could procure their meals.

34. How long has this practice been going on?—Since I have been on the station.

35. You found it in practice when you came here?—Yes.

36. Do you consider it a good practice?—I do not. I have always had an objection to it personally.

37. You have brought it under the notice of the Commissioner?—Yes. It has been considered at various times for several years—by Inspector Pender, Inspector Broham, and Colonel Hume. I may say that when stationed at Lyttelton some years ago the same practice prevailed there, and then it was decided that a cottage should be rented by the hotelkeeper, where the men had their meals, outside the hotel.

38. Are you aware of any feeling in the Force with respect to the present compulsory insurance system?—No, I have heard no objection to it since it has been initiated.

39. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is there anything else you would like to say about the Force?—I have heard the matter of pension *versus* retiring-allowance talked of, and I think the majority of the men are in favour of the pension.

40. *The Chairman.*] At the cost of a deduction from their pay?—Yes, at the cost of a small deduction from their pay, with a contribution from the Government.

41. Does that involve in your mind the cessation of the present compulsory insurance system?—Yes, I should say so.

42. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think the men should get their uniforms free?—I do. I may say that some years ago a Board of Inspectors recommended that. At that time the detectives only were paying for their clothes. The other men received their uniforms, and the detectives were allowed a certain consideration in consequence of having to provide their own clothes. Shortly afterwards, the free uniform was dispensed with, and they have had to pay ever since for their uniforms. It is a very expensive item, especially to mounted men.

43. Have you thought about the rates of pay?—I have no suggestion to make with reference to that.

44. Do you think married men should be allowed house-rent?—I think married men should receive consideration; and I think mounted men should receive consideration, because their uniform is more expensive. The only other matter that impresses me with reference to the service is that I am a very old member of the service. I have a good deal and materially assisted in the working of the department for many years, and, I am happy to say, been an active member of the service ever since I joined. I have been complimented by the Hon. Mr. Bryce and several Ministers for my zeal and activity in the service, and I would say one thing: I think, after mature consideration, for

years the unfortunate grievance or cause of complaint in the service was the fact that the head of the department did not understand police matters. My severance from the police will probably occur in a short time. I do not intend to die in the Force. I have been trying to make some other provision for myself in the last few years. I may say the control of the service was at first held by Colonel Moule. I am quite satisfied he knew very little about it. Then followed Colonel Reader and Colonel Whitmore, and though Colonel Hume has made big strides in trying to do good for the service—and I believe he has done his utmost, and I have no reason to find fault with what Colonel Hume has done—the others, I find, knew very little about it. The control of the service was simply left in the hands of nurses—the chief clerks in the department. If the department had been worked by an officer who thoroughly understood police matters, the police now would have very little grounds for complaint. This complaint has existed for many years, especially amongst the older members of the Force—the department being controlled by men who really knew nothing about it.

45. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is that your own opinion, or is it an opinion held by the men?—It has been felt by the older members of the service, both in Otago and Canterbury, with whom I have come in contact for years.

46. Have you formed an opinion as to the head of the department being independent of Ministerial control?—I am very strongly of that opinion. The Police Force cannot be properly managed without the head of the department has full control.

47. *Mr. Taylor.*] You have been here about ten years?—Yes.

48. How often have you been ordered for removal during that time?—Once.

49. Last year?—Yes.

50. Who did you see about removal?—Personally I used no influence to counteract any order of the Government. I had a reason for not going to the station where I was ordered. I stated, and have always said so, that I considered it my duty to obey the orders of my superiors, and go wherever they thought proper to send me. In this case I had a reason: my manhood would prevent me going to the station where I was ordered to go, under the circumstances.

51. What was the reason?—It is a personal matter between an officer of the service and myself that I must decline to state, with the sanction of the Court.

52. Did you report your reason to the Commissioner?—To the Commissioner?

53. Yes?—No.

54. How did it bear on your non-removal?—I cannot tell you. I do not know.

55. Who did you tell about your objection to be removed?—My objection is known to some members of the Force for many years.

56. Who did you tell about it?—I do not remember telling anybody—not any one in authority.

57. What Oamaru man did you tell about it?—I really cannot say whether I told anybody. I may say it is a personal matter of honour between myself and another officer.

58. Did you make any objection at all to the removal?—No, except this: I think I mentioned to Mr. Duncan one time, my sons—if Mr. Taylor wishes an explanation I have no hesitation in giving it—my sons have taken up some land near here, about twenty miles from here. They are young, and they are struggling to start the thing, and my advice I looked upon as very essential for their being successful in their efforts. I was glad when the matter of my removal did not take place. I said then, and I have said since to the department, that at any time my services would be required I was only too happy to carry out their instructions, in any part of the colony they were disposed to send me. That is the reason why I was anxious to remain.

59. *The Chairman.*] Did you bring directly to the notice of the department the fact that your removal from Oamaru would be unpleasant and unsatisfactory to you?—I did not.

60. Not directly?—Not directly.

61. *Mr. Taylor.*] You said it was a question of honour. Is that what you refer to?—Well, I say it was a question of honour between myself and another member of the service.

62. You objected to go to Invercargill?—Under the present circumstances, if my objection would be good, I would object to go to Invercargill. I do not deny it either, for reasons of my own. I may say with reference to Mr. Duncan, it was after the transfer was stopped that I mentioned the matter to him. Mr. Duncan, previous to the order being cancelled, took no steps, neither did I communicate with him in any way.

63. Who did you communicate with before your removal?—I did not communicate with any one. I did not ask any influence whatever to prevent my going.

64. What did you say to Mr. Fitzgerald, or Mrs. Fitzgerald?—I cannot say that I ever said anything to them about it. I am quite satisfied, as far as my memory goes, I never used an expression to Mr. or Mrs. Fitzgerald on the subject of my transfer.

65. Did you not discuss the question of your objection with them?—Never.

66. What other publicans did you discuss it with?—None. If you imagine I am a man of that sort you are very much mistaken.

67. Now, who did you discuss your removal with?—I cannot tell you. As far as my memory goes, and I am on oath, I do not remember having discussed or mentioned the matter to anybody in particular.

68. Have you discussed it generally with the people of Oamaru?—I did not.

69. Did you get your instructions to go by telegram?—I believe the first intimation I got was by wire. I think that was so; but it was not to go hurriedly—it was to hold myself in readiness.

70. Did the countermanding order come by telegram?—No. I think it was a memorandum—that it was to be held over for the present. I understood the sergeant at Invercargill had made arrangements; I do not know.

71. You understood it was done at Invercargill?—Yes.

72. Who did you learn that from?—I could not tell you; it was a matter of comment.

73. Did you not write to the department at all about the matter?—I did not.
74. Neither on the receipt of the original telegram nor the second one?—I did not.
75. Is it not customary to acknowledge telegrams?—No.
76. Do all of your men fall in at the same time on Sundays—say, at 9 o'clock in the morning?—No. You mean fall in?
77. I mean, take the men who are to do street duty at 9 o'clock on Sunday?—No, they do not. I am late out myself on Saturday night. It is the only day I have a bit of rest. I am on from 9 in the morning till 12 at night, principally in the office, very seldom in the street. There is only one man going on at 9 in the morning.
78. What is the ordinary number who go on street duty at 9 o'clock?—One man.
79. Is he allowed grace sometimes?—He is. The 9 o'clock man is not, but occasionally the relief, between 1 and 5 o'clock, have a portion of their time off if the town is quiet.
80. How many men does that include?—That was the practice initiated by Mr. Hickson in Dunedin, and he suggested it to me—that the men might have a portion of their time off on Sunday if the town is quiet. On some occasions, if there are many people in town, I would not give them that concession.
81. As a rule, you would not interfere with the men attending Church, if it broke into their regular hours a little?—They have sufficient time to go to Church, if they are so disposed. Of course, I have nothing to do with that.
82. As a matter of fact, do not some of the men get half-an-hour's grace to go to Church on Sunday?—They do not. This is the first time a matter of the kind has been intimated to me. For the first time I have heard it since I have been in charge of the station.
83. If a man reported himself as half-an-hour late, would you keep a record of that?—I would not, if he gave a reasonable and proper account of himself.
84. What would you consider a good reason?—If he was detained on any police duty. There are various things I would take into consideration from a common-sense point of view, and a small thing of that kind I have always dealt with myself.
85. Supposing he said he had been to Church, would you consider that a good reason for late attendance on duty?—Yes, I would. I say if a man wishes to go to Church he has a right to go; but he should let me know first. I am sorry to say a great many of the police do not go to Church.
86. Are you aware of any instance where a man has been fined in the Force for being five minutes late?—I am not.
87. Would you consider that a very severe penalty?—As far as the surroundings of this case are concerned I could not tell you. I do not know of it myself.
88. How would you treat a case like this: Supposing a sergeant found a man off his beat for half an hour, or an hour, would you treat him in the same lenient way?—I look upon the matter of a man leaving his beat, where he is entrusted with the control of the beat and the charge of the property on that beat, as a very serious breach of the discipline of the service.
89. Have you any instance on record of men having left their beats on night duty?—There is one instance that has been inquired into, and it is the subject of a case before the Commission now.
90. Is that the only instance since you have been in charge?—Yes, since I have been in charge. I may say there was an instance in Mr. Thompson's time. I reported the man myself, and Mr. Thompson himself dealt with it.
91. Have you got any men here who have not done any police duty—any recruits?—Yes, I have two. They had a little experience before they came to me. I think Trehey was in the Permanent Artillery, and Cotter was a few months in Christchurch.
92. Are the men instructed in police duties in any way?—Yes; they are instructed when they are going on duty, as often as I can find time to give them instruction.
93. You have no regular instruction class?—I have not.
94. Did you get a circular the year before last with regard to instruction classes being held?—I looked upon that as a matter where, if police duties interfered, the instruction would have to give way, and, there not being a sufficient number of men to fill in the gaps on this station, there is very little time afforded to give instruction—I mean those regular classes.
95. What proportion have you now on the station of Protestants and Roman Catholics on this station?—There are five Roman Catholics, I think, and three Protestants.
96. Are there not six Roman Catholics?—I think it is five.
97. Do you know the publicans of Oamaru well?—Well, I inspect their houses quarterly.
98. Do you know the men who run the houses?—I do.
99. You do not go there, except once in every three months?—Yes, I do; whenever I think it is necessary to do so in the execution of my duty. I have done so all my life, fairly and honestly.
100. Do you know whether the big majority of hotelkeepers in Oamaru are Catholics?
The Chairman (to witness): Do not answer the question.
101. *Mr. Taylor.*] What duty does the gaoler do in Oamaru?—He is, by order of the Inspector of Prisons, in charge of the gaol, and takes charge of the prisoners. He does escort duty when he has no prisoners, and generally attends to the premises.
102. When did he do escort duty last?—About three weeks ago, I think.
103. Where was that to?—Dunedin and Seacliff.
104. On an average, how often would he do escort duty in the course of the year?—Very many times. There are prisoners to escort between here and Studholme Junction, and *vice versa*; prisoners to the Seacliff Asylum and Dunedin.
105. Does he take them all, or do some of the other men take them occasionally?—If he has prisoners he is generally not interfered with by the department. If he has no prisoners I make use of him whenever I require him.

106. If he has no prisoners does he do street duty?—No. When necessary I have sent him out on the street at night in plain clothes. I have frequently done that. I may tell you at once the gaoler is paid by the Prisons Department.

107. *The Chairman.*] He does not do street duty?—He does not.

108. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you any brothels in Oamaru?—No.

109. None?—None.

110. Do you consider it is within your power as a police officer to take a woman or a girl from a brothel?—I would consider it my duty as a police-officer to act in any way in the matter of humanity, or, if I could do good, to assist in removing young girls from the precincts of bawdy houses. I consider it the duty of a policeman, and I would do it.

111. Have you legal power to do it?—I would take that upon myself, for the benefit of society.

112. Have you taken a girl from a house in Oamaru at any time within the last year?—I did not actually take her. I did not use any force in taking her. The circumstances were these: The mother and relations of a girl came to my office and reported to me that the girl had left her home and gone to Wellington, and they were afraid she would get into bad company. I telegraphed to Mr. Pender, and asked that inquiries be made as to her being there. She ultimately came back, without her being found in Wellington, and she was in Oamaru for about a week or ten days, I think. I then was told by her relations she was in a house, which is not a brothel, in Oamaru. I took Constable Madden, the gaoler, with me, and went to the house about 9 o'clock at night. The girl was in the place.

113. *The Chairman.*] What age was she?—Nineteen, I think. I inquired of the owner of the house if the girl was there, and she immediately admitted she was. I got the girl into a room, Constable Madden and the woman being present, and I told her what her friends had done, and the steps they were taking to get her back. I advised her to come, and she did, and I sent her to her relations that night. She was a day or two afterwards sent to the Magdala Home in Christchurch, where she is at present.

114. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who took her there?—I think her relations.

115. No police constable?—I really forget. I do not remember.

116. Did Madden, the gaoler, not go with her?—I cannot tell. My impression is her relations took her. He may have gone. He would only go as far as Studholme, and be met there by a constable from Christchurch, if he did go.

117. *The Chairman.*] Under what circumstances did she go—voluntarily, or by order of the Court?—Arrangements were made by a clergyman in Oamaru with the authorities in Christchurch that she should be sent to the Magdala Home.

118. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who was the gentleman in Oamaru?—I think it was the Rev. Father Howard.

119. Was it Father Howard who saw you about her first?—He did not.

120. Did he see you about it afterwards?—No. I saw a telegram, which was shown to me by the mother of the girl, about having made arrangements with the authorities at Magdala.

121. *The Chairman.*] She went voluntarily?—Yes.

122. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say the house she was in was a perfectly respectable house?—I would not go so far as that.

123. Did you threaten to summon the woman in charge of the house for keeping a brothel?—Not in the present circumstances; some years ago I did.

124. Not in connection with that particular circumstance?—No; I did not.

125. Do you remember visiting the Queen's Hotel, any night within the last twelve months, and finding men there card-playing?—I do not.

126. Did you visit the Queen's Hotel at all?—I visit the Queen's Hotel frequently, and I visited it the last night of the races, and compelled the licensee to turn out the people at four minutes past 11.

127. On a previous occasion did you not find men there card-playing?—Some two or three years ago two clergymen in the town reported to me that there was card-playing going on in the Queen's Hotel. It was then kept by a man named Johnston. I went as far as the hotel with them, and I said, "Well, it is usual to have two men to enter a hotel together. I will see if I can find a constable. I will not be a moment." Then a thought struck me. I said, "Well, if you wish to go in with me, I will go at once, without the constable." This they refused to do. Sergeant Dwyer turned up immediately afterwards, and we went in. We found three boarders from Waimate and Waihao, and two highly respectable citizens of the town. There was no drinking, and we saw nothing else. They were just sitting down talking.

128. Who keeps the house now?—Mr. Kelly.

129. Do you know Mr. Moss, the jeweller?—Yes.

130. Do you know Mr. Matheson, the tailor?—Yes. He is not here now.

131. Do you know Mr. Probert, the tobacconist?—Yes.

132. Do you ever remember going in there, and finding card-playing going on there?—Never.

133. *Colonel Hume.*] Did you ever receive any instructions that the gaoler was not to be put on street duty?—There is a written memorandum to that effect.

134. Do you know what the date of the memorandum is?—I do not.

135. Do you know who it is signed by?—Major Gudgeon, I think. Yes, it is Major Gudgeon.

136. Does it simply say street duty?—It simply says he is not to be employed on police matters except in the immediate vicinity of the gaol and premises.

137. Then, there is no order that he should not be put on duty in front of the gaol, for instance, is there?—The object of the order, I take it, was this: that at any moment a prisoner may be brought into the office or lockup, and it is essential the lockup-keeper should take

charge of prisoners. I understood at the time the order was issued that that was the meaning of it.

138. Have you put him on every police duty that you considered would not interfere with his duty as gaoler?—I have.

139. *The Chairman.*] How many men have you on street duty at night in the town?—I have two men on it. They take eight hours each. The day reliefs have four hours, and the night reliefs have eight hours. They go on at nine and come off at five.

140. Are there two men on the beat all day?—There is only one man all day, and two at night.

141. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is this list of the religions of the men on the Oamaru Station correct?—Yes. I made a mistake just now.

142. *The Chairman.*] Of the eight men now in the Force here, six are Catholics and two are Protestants?—I believe that to be so, but I have never had experience of it in any way, either in conversation with the men or otherwise. I believe six of the men profess to be Catholics. I believe they are.

143. Do you find any inconvenience arising in the Force, or affecting in any way the efficiency of the Force, in consequence of the religious state of any portion of members of the Force?—I have not.

144. Have you found any religious hostility or religious animosity arising in connection with the matter?—I never heard it before brought up. I may say that, personally, I respect and admire a man who will openly and manfully say he is of a certain religion. I prefer that. I do not care what religion he professes, as far as I am individually concerned, or as a police sergeant, and I consider it mean to attribute anything of the sort.

145. Do you find it conflict in any way with the harmonious working of the Force?—I never have. I never heard it uttered.

MICHAEL HANNON, examined on oath.

146. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A publican.

147. Licensee of what house?—The White Hart Hotel, Oamaru.

148. Will you tell us now what your complaint is?—On the morning of the 4th of March, at 1 o'clock, I was annoyed by two men rapping at my door. I asked them what they wanted. They told me they wanted a drink, which I refused. I would not open the door for them. I went round the back of the premises, and unlocked the gate to know who was there. After I went round the back, knowing one of the men by the name of "Mick," I asked him what he wanted? He said he wanted a drink. I told him to go away home. I made to go round the back a bit, and he followed me part of the way. When I saw he was determined to follow me, I returned to the front door. He partly followed me inside the door, and I put him out. A man named McCarty was told to go for a constable by my wife. He volunteered to go for a constable. When he was about a quarter of an hour away I went for one myself. I went out to see whether I could find a policeman. I was not far from the house when I met McCarty coming back. I asked him if he had seen a policeman, and he said he had not. I said to McCarty, "You go with me; you take this side of the street, and I will take the other." He took the west side and I took the east side. I told him to meet me down at the bridge at the south end of the town. When we met at the bridge I asked him if he saw anybody. He said, "No." We turned back then on the east side of Thames Street for about 100 yards. Then we crossed over to the west side, and crossed back to the east side. We went up as far as the Queen's. We could not see any policeman. Then I said to McCarty, "We will go over to the police camp, and see if we can find a policeman." When we went over to the police camp I went round to the back door, and the police office was open. I went into the passage, and McCarty came after me. I saw a bedroom door which was partly open. I sung out in a moderate voice, "Anybody here?" I heard no reply. The room was quite dark inside. While I was in the passage I could not see anybody in the room, it being dark. I struck a match and looked in, and I saw a man lying on the bed with his feet towards the door. I said, "Get up"; and I repeated that remark twice. I did not know then who the policeman was that was lying on the bed. I kept striking matches while I was there, to show light. I had a match in my right hand, and I went in towards his head. I said, "I will go and see who you are, now." Then, when I looked, I saw it was Constable Greene. When I saw it was him I could see he was fast asleep, and I put my hand right across his breast on to his shoulder and shook him. I told him that I wanted him up at the house, to arrest some men who were kicking up a row. When he made to get up he gave a bit of a stumble, and his handcuffs fell on the floor.

149. *The Chairman.*] Was he dressed?—Oh yes, in uniform. He had everything on, bar his hat, and he was in bed. We got outside on to the passage. He was putting the handcuffs on my left hand, in a funny sort of way.

150. Who was?—Constable Greene. He was putting them on my hand, and I turned and smiled at McCarty. He smiled and said nothing. I said "Come on, there is no time to delay."

151. Intended for fun was it, putting the handcuffs on your hand?—Yes, I took it that way. McCarty and the constable and I went up to the house, and about 25 yards off we met this man. I told the constable to arrest him. He refused to do so. When he refused to arrest him I went inside, and he and this man went down the street again. I saw no more of them that night. I cannot say any more.

152. *Mr. Lee.*] He refused to arrest this man Connelly, did he not?—Yes.

153. Then you got very annoyed, did you not?—I was not annoyed.

154. You recollect there were two charges laid against Connelly?—Yes.

155. He was charged with entering your licensed premises and refusing to quit them?—Yes.

156. And he was charged with being drunk and disorderly?—He was.

157. You remember both these cases were dismissed, were they not?—I know they were.
158. They were tried by Mr. Wray, the Stipendiary Magistrate?—Yes.
159. When you got up to the gaol that night, you say, it was pretty moonlight?—It was bright in the atmosphere.
160. Was it moonlight?—I could not swear to that.
161. Have you not already stated before Inspector Cullen it was moonlight?—I said it was partly moonlight and partly starlight.
162. What time was it?—A quarter to 2 in the morning.
163. Do you know the moon set that night before 12 o'clock?—I am not aware of that. I think the moon set at about 2.30 o'clock.
164. It was the night of the races?—It was the morning of the 4th.
165. The races were on the 3rd?—Yes.
166. Your house was lighted up when Connelly came along there?—Yes.
167. It was lighted up after 12 o'clock at night?—There was a light in the passage.
168. And a light in one or two of the windows?—There were lights over the door, not parlour windows.
169. You are quite sure McCarty went to the gaol with you?—I can swear to that, and back from the gaol to the house too.
170. He was a boarder in your house at that time?—He was.
171. And so was Murphy?—Yes, Murphy was a boarder that night, and the night before.
172. You say Connelly was drunk that night?—He was not sober.
173. You said he was drunk?—Yes; and I swear to it now too.
174. Do you remember all the other witnesses, including the constable and McCarty, swearing Connelly was not drunk that night?—They swore that.
175. Do you remember the Magistrate finding there was no sign of Connelly being drunk that night at all?—Of course, he may have done so right enough.
176. How is it that that night, you say, Connelly entered your house, when all the witnesses on the occasion say Connelly did not enter your house at all?—They were not there at the time. They were round the back. He followed me in.
177. There has been an inquiry, has there not, before Inspector Cullen—all this evidence has been taken before Inspector Cullen?—My evidence was taken, and so was McCarty's.
178. Were you present when McCarty made his statement to the Inspector?—Of course I was; but he made no statement. He said he came as far as the Globe, and no further; but he came with me all the way.
179. This is what McCarty said before Inspector Cullen: "He," that is, speaking of you, "asked me to go for a constable. I walked up the street past the police-station. I saw no constable. I went down the street again, and met Mr. Hannon coming towards the police-station. He asked if I had seen a police constable. I replied not. I walked up the street as far as the Globe Hotel with him, and I returned to the hotel. I do not know what took place afterwards. I went back to Hannon's Hotel. I saw Murphy, and, I believe, Connelly. Connelly was at the front, and Murphy at the back."
180. *The Chairman.*] Do you admit on your oath that is true?—That is not true.
181. *Mr. Lee.*] This is what McCarty said that night?—Yes.
182. To put it shortly, McCarty denies what you say about him being at the gaol?—Yes, before Inspector Cullen; but he is not prepared to swear that on oath, and I challenged him to do so. Only for a mistake that was made, I would have him here to-day.
183. Have you sent a letter saying you were not going on with the case?—I sent a letter right enough when I could not find McCarty, and, the case being heard by Inspector Cullen, I did not see it was any use proceeding further with it. I would like to know where McCarty is this last week.
184. What is he?—A working-man.
185. Where does he work generally?—He is here, there, and everywhere. Sometimes he is in Canterbury, and sometimes in Sydney.
186. You know him well?—He stopped with me this last three or four years, whenever he came from the other side.
187. Who brought him before Inspector Cullen?—I asked him if he would come.
188. The first information you gave about this to the police was the wrong man altogether, was it not?—It may be the wrong name. I did not know Connelly by his name. I only knew him by the name of "Mick the Slipper."
189. Did you not tell the sergeant the man who had been there was Condon, not Connelly?—Condon, or Connelly.
190. You know Condon very well?—Yes; I have not seen him this long while.
191. Did you tell the sergeant next morning it was Condon, not Connelly?—I did not. I said his name was either Condon or Connelly.
192. If you see Michael Condon about you know him to be Michael Condon?—Yes; if I saw him I would know him.
193. And you knew Michael Condon by name that night?—I did not know but this man's name might be Condon too.
194. You thought there might be two Michael Condons?—Yes.
195. Is it not this then: You do not remember well what took place that night?—I could not made a mistake.
196. Do you remember there were two informations laid against Condon?—I was not aware of it till two days afterwards.
197. That Condon was the person who was summoned in the first place?—I was told so.

198. Do you know in the first instance the wrong man was summoned?—When I found out the mistake I told the sergeant he had made a mistake.
199. The sergeant's mistake was it, not yours?—Yes; not mine, that I am aware of.
200. How is it the sergeant happened to pick out Condon, who was a prohibited person; did you tell the sergeant he was a prohibited person?—I did not.
201. Did you know Condon was a prohibited person?—I did.
202. How was it the sergeant proceeded against him for being a prohibited person?—That is more than I can tell.
203. *The Chairman.*] Did you know that Condon's name was Michael?—Yes.
204. And Connelly's too? Did you know both were Michaels?—Yes. I know Connelly six years back. I never knew his surname. I only knew him as "Mick the Slipper."
205. *Mr. Lee.*] How was it you told the sergeant it was Mick Connelly if you did not know his name?—The next morning I was told his name was either Condon or Connelly; that is why I told the sergeant that.
206. You are quite sure about Greene putting on the handcuffs?—Yes.
207. Which hand?—The left hand.
208. Did he lock them?—He did not.
209. How long were you at the station altogether?—Between four and five minutes.
210. He was sound asleep?—Yes.
211. And you had to use a bit of force to waken him?—I had to shake him by the shoulder. I could not do it by calling him.
212. When he was thoroughly awake, what did you tell him?—I told him there was a man down at the house that I wanted to give in charge.
213. Did you say anything about searching for him any time?—No, I did not—not to him. I told him to come quickly to the house.
- 213a. I suppose, when he did get up to the house, if he had arrested Connelly and taken him off to the station, you would never have said another word against Greene at all?—How do you know?
214. Would you or would you not?—I am not going to tell you that.
215. Supposing Greene had arrested Connelly, and taken him off to the station, should you have lodged any complaint against Greene at all?—I would.
216. Even if he had arrested Connelly?—Yes.
217. When he got up there, and would not arrest Connelly, you told him the law in Sydney was very different—that over in Sydney he would have been arrested?—I did not tell him that.
218. Who told him that?—The missus.
219. Connelly was not going on with the row when the constable came along?—He was away from the house.
220. He walked away with the constable?—Yes.
221. And you did not get any further annoyance from Connelly that night?—No, I did not.
222. The constable saw him away from the place, at any rate?—He did.
223. What is your complaint against Greene fully—not being on the street?—Yes.
224. Nothing else?—Being asleep, and not doing his duty.
225. Anything else?—Not being quite sober, according to my conscience.
226. You draw a very fine line between a man who is drunk and when he is sober, being a hotelkeeper?—I can tell whether a man is drunk or sober, or any the worse for liquor.
227. You considered Connelly was the worse for liquor?—I did.
228. Did anybody else?—That has nothing to do with me. If he was sober he would not be there over an hour calling people names.
229. Did you mention anything to McCarty about Greene not being sober?—McCarty told me himself he would swear he was drunk.
230. Did he say that before Inspector Cullen?—He did not.
231. What did he say there?—He said he did not pass the Globe with me. I say he did. He was with me all the way.
232. Did you meet anybody else, you and McCarty?—No; we saw one man. We went across the street to see if he was a policeman. When we saw he was not we went across on the other side.
233. Was there any conversation at all with McCarty at the police-station?—No.
234. McCarty said nothing there?—When Greene was putting the handcuffs on me I looked at McCarty, and McCarty smiled at me at the folly of him doing it.
235. Where was McCarty standing then?—In the passage, inside the back door.
236. McCarty could see into the bedroom?—McCarty could not see into the bedroom. When I went into the bedroom he stopped outside. McCarty never went into the bedroom.
237. Was there anybody else there except you and McCarty?—No; I saw nobody, at any rate.
238. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did any one see you about withdrawing this charge? Who did you talk it over with?—People might come to me and say I was doing a rash thing.
239. Did you talk it over with Greene at all?—I have not spoken to Greene at all about the matter.
240. Talked it over with the sergeant?—No.
241. Who did you talk it over with?—I cannot say—I talked it over with anybody.
242. Why did you withdraw it?—Because McCarthy was not here to come and give evidence on oath. Nobody came to me to withdraw the charge. I made inquiries about McCarthy, and I could not find out where he was.
243. *Mr. Tumbidge.*] You complained of the constable the following morning, did you not, to Sergeant O'Grady?—I did.

244. At what time in the morning?—It might be about half-past 10 o'clock.
 245. You went to the police-station and made a complaint against Constable Greene to Sergeant O'Grady?—Yes.

MICHAEL GREENE, examined on oath.

246. *The Chairman.*] What rank do you hold in the Force?—First-class constable.
 247. How long have you been stationed at Oamaru?—Since the 6th February, 1897.
 248. *Mr. Lee.*] You were on duty on this night when Hannon came to see you, were you not?—Yes.
 249. Where did you first see Hannon that night?—I saw him in the passage at the police-station.
 250. What were you doing when you saw him?—I was just coming out of my room.
 251. You were on duty that night?—Yes.
 252. What had you been doing in the room?—I was changing my socks and shoes.
 253. *The Chairman.*] What time was it?—It would be about a quarter to 2 in the morning.
 254. *Mr. Lee.*] Why had you been changing your socks and shoes?—They were damp that day and a portion of the night, being very wet.
 255. It was a wet night?—Very wet for a portion of the night.
 256. How long had you been in the room before Hannon arrived?—It would be about a quarter of an hour. It could not be more. It was thereabouts.
 257. When you were on beat at night do you look in at the police-station occasionally?—Yes, it is part of my duties, in the event of any prisoner being inside at night.
 258. *The Chairman.*] There is a watch-house keeper?—Not at night, only the man on duty.
 259. Which man was in charge of the watch-house that night?—I was.
 260. *Mr. Lee.*] You met Hannon?—Yes.
 261. Who was with him?—No one.
 262. Do you remember whether it was a light night or a moonlight night?—There was no moon after 12 midnight. It was a pretty bright, starry night.
 263. Could you see it was: could you recognise him?—No; not in the passage. Of course, when I heard his voice I thought it was Hannon. He spoke to me, and he told me there was a man at his hotel wanting to get in to have drinks.
 264. You heard him say he found you asleep on the bed, and he gave you a good shaking to wake you up?—That is utterly untrue. It must be wilfully untrue.
 265. And this little incident about the handcuffs: is that true?—No.
 266. *The Chairman.*] You say it is untrue that you were lying down on your bed when Hannon came to you?—Entirely untrue.
 267. *Mr. Lee.*] Had you any conversation with Hannon in the passage?—No; except the remark he made to me that there was a man at his hotel wanting to get in, and he wanted me to accompany him up there.
 268. You went away with him?—Yes.
 269. Where did you go?—Along Thames Street, in the direction of his hotel, until we reached there. It was on the left-hand side from the station.
 270. There was no one with Hannon when you went out?—No, Sir.
 271. *Mr. Lee.*] What state was Hannon in?—He was excited.
 272. *The Chairman.*] And he told you a man had been kicking up a row at his place?—Yes; wanting to get in to have a drink.
 273. *Mr. Lee.*] You went along to the hotel with him?—Yes.
 274. Who did you see when you got there?—I met a man named Michael Connelly a little this side of the hotel on the footpath.
 275. What was Connelly doing?—He was coming towards us at the time.
 276. Did you stop?—Yes. Hannon said, "There he is, there he is; take him away."
 277. *The Chairman.*] How far from the hotel did you meet him?—Perhaps about 15 or 20 yards, roughly. The wife was standing in front of the door at the time. She was also excited, and she called out, "There he is; take him away." There were two men standing at the corner of the street at the time.
 278. *Mr. Lee.*] What did you do?—I spoke to Connelly, and asked him what was the matter here. He said he wanted a bed, and a drink for his mate, and he was refused. He was very quiet, and had no appearance of drink.
 279. Did you hear any row at all while you were there?—No, except Mr. and Mrs. Hannon were excited; in fact, I spoke to Mrs. Hannon and asked her not to speak so loud, that she might be heard by some of the neighbours close by. She did not keep quiet then.
 280. What did they say about arresting Connelly?—I said to Hannon that Connelly was quiet, and I could see him doing nothing wrong, and if he had done anything wrong he might be summoned; that I would not arrest him. He said if I did not arrest him he would "take the jacket off" me. He also remarked, when I said the man was quiet and sober, "I know he is not drunk, but I am not going to have him here." I said, "The man is going away quiet." His wife also said something about if I was in Sydney I would have to take him.
 281. You saw Connelly away from the premises, did you not?—Yes. I told him to go away home, and if there was a charge against him he would be summoned. I also said to Hannon I would see him to-morrow and get further information about it, and see if a charge could be established against him.
 282. You took care to see that Connelly left the place?—Yes, he went away.
 283. While you were on the scene there was no annoyance by Connelly?—None by anybody, except that Hannon and his wife were very excited. As to what took place before, I cannot say.
 284. Hannon made some complaint about you to the sergeant, did he not?—Yes.

285. And on that complaint you asked the sergeant if he would have an inquiry held?—Yes.
286. An inquiry was held before Inspector Cullen at your request?—Yes.
287. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you make an entry in the watch-house book about the complaint of Hannon?—No. It is not customary to enter it in the watch-house book. There are no entries except when there are prisoners.
288. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you first saw Hannon in the passage outside your bedroom door?—Yes.
289. Was your door open at that time?—No, it was closed.
290. Was your gas lighted or out at that time?—It was alight up to the time I came out of my room.
291. When you saw Hannon?—It was out.
292. Hannon was never inside your bedroom?—Never inside: he was in the passage.
293. He was quite unable to see you inside?—He could not see inside. The door was closed, and I had the gas alight up to the time I heard a knock outside. When I did I turned the gas off. I first said, "Come in," and Hannon being deaf did not hear. I turned out my light, and opened the bedroom door, and found Hannon in the passage.
294. When you saw Hannon in the passage your bedroom was quite dark?—Yes, the light was turned out. When I was leaving the room I turned out the light and opened the door and walked into the passage.
295. Can you tell me how it is Hannon properly describes the position of your bed, when he was never in your room, or never saw inside?—He was there at the last inquiry before the Inspector.
296. He has seen inside your bedroom since the inquiry has been held?—It is quite possible he might.
297. Do you know at all?—I have seen him in the passage.
298. You have heard him properly describe the position of your bed?—Yes.
299. And your suggestion is, he may have seen your bedroom since the inquiry has been held?—I think he has stated he has been in the station several times before, and also in the bedrooms.
300. His story that he struck matches in your room; that he saw you lying on the bed; that he had to shake you; and that you attempted to put the handcuffs on him, is wholly imagination on his part?—Wilfully untrue.
301. You say McCarty was never with him at the station?—Yes.
302. That is untrue?—Yes.
303. You said you went to change your boots and shoes because they were wet?—Yes.
304. You said it had been a wet night?—A portion of the night I said it was wet.
305. What time did you go on duty?—Nine o'clock.
306. Will you swear there was heavy rain after 9 o'clock?—Yes, there was a little between 9 and 10 o'clock, not much. It began to clear off.
307. *The Chairman.*] At a quarter past 2 you went to change your socks?—Yes.
308. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You went on duty at a quarter to 9: had you been using your boots that you had been wearing all day?—No.
309. If your boots and socks got wet it must have been after you went on duty?—Yes.
310. There was no rain, or a little rain, after 9 o'clock?—It was clearing off. My boots were not good ones.
311. Do you remember when Inspector Cullen first held an inquiry, on the 30th of last month—the first day he was at Oamaru to hold this inquiry?—I do.
312. Do you remember Inspector Cullen speaking to you in the presence of Sergeant O'Grady as to calling the witness McCarty on your behalf?—I am not certain.
313. Or to give evidence?—I understood he was to be called by Hannon.
314. Do you remember Inspector Cullen speaking to you as to calling McCarty?—I do not.
315. Do you not remember that they said you ought to endeavour to find McCarty?—I do not recollect there was anything said about it.
316. Will you swear there was not something said about it—that it was to your interest to have the matter cleared up, and it was to your interest to have McCarty?—Yes; but I understood he was to be summoned by Hannon.
317. You remember something being said about McCarty?—I do remember that it was understood that Hannon would have McCarty summoned.
318. Did not McCarty disappear at that time—he left Oamaru on the 30th of last month, when Mr. Cullen first opened the inquiry?—I heard he was working somewhere up near Waitaki with some man named Ross.
319. Was not the inquiry adjourned because McCarty was not present to give evidence?—Yes.
320. McCarty was not present at the first inquiry?—No.
321. Did not Mr. Cullen say to you, or words to this effect: "You should interest yourself in endeavouring to get McCarty to attend"?—I recollect there was something said, but not in that way. He said something about McCarty—that the inquiry would be adjourned until McCarty would appear; and he asked me if I would summon him. I said it was understood he was to be summoned by Hannon.
322. Did you not say also, "I do not want McCarty, because he is sure to state what Hannon has stated"?—I do not think I stated that.
323. Will you swear you did not?—To the best of my belief I did not.
324. Nor any words to convey such a meaning?—No, that is my belief.
325. You quite understand the question—that you did not wish McCarty, because you were sure he would say the same as Hannon had stated?—I do not think I said I was sure. I may have said, as far as my memory serves me, that he was Hannon's witness, and probably would state the same as Hannon. I do not think I stated he was sure to.

326. You thought it probable he would say so?—Yes, that was the rumour.
327. Instead of that, he said he was never inside the police-station?—Quite so.
328. You thought McCarty would come and corroborate Hannon to the effect that he was with Hannon in the police-station that night?—That was the rumour about—that he would swear with Hannon.
329. That was your reason for saying you did not want him called—because you thought he would swear the same as Hannon, notwithstanding that you knew McCarty was never in the police-station at all?—That is so.
330. Knowing that McCarty was never inside the police-station at all, and not knowing anything of the man, do you think it reasonable you should come to the conclusion that the man would be prepared to swear to a thing that was absolutely untrue?—Sometimes witnesses say what is untrue.
331. If there had been three witnesses present who had been called to say what took place that night, would you wish him called now, or not?—I would be very glad.
332. You would not think he would say the same as Hannon?—It is not likely. Hannon stated at the inquiry that it was a bright moonlight night at a quarter to 2; and the moon set at 12 o'clock that night. McCarty stated also at the inquiry that he was going to be rewarded by getting board and lodging from Hannon as an inducement, and so on.
333. Had you seen McCarty before the first part of the inquiry was held by Inspector Cullen?—No, I had not.
334. Therefore, you did not know what he was going to say?—Only by rumour. It was mentioned all over the town.
335. What was mentioned all over the town?—That he was Hannon's witness. That is all.
336. Not what he was going to say?—From that they concluded he would be favourable to Hannon.
337. Up to that time you had not seen McCarty?—Except when he was a witness in the charges against Connelly. That is the first time I saw McCarty.
338. You saw him subsequent to that?—Yes.
339. Where did you see him?—I saw him in Thames Street, one night about 9 o'clock, when I was on duty.
340. Do you know what date?—I think it was the night after the first inquiry. I saw him in Thames Street, opposite the Fire-brigade Station.
341. Had the Inspector not gone back to Christchurch?—I do not know. I think he would be in Timaru that day.
342. How did you come to see McCarty that night?—I was coming along from the station when I met him there. He bailed me up, and asked me when this inquiry was coming on. I said it was adjourned till Monday, and it would come on then.
343. What else took place?—That was all. Just about that time—we had only passed a word or two—Mr. Hannon passed with some other man.
344. Anything more take place?—Mr. Hannon asked him if he was going up to his place. He said, "Yes." Hannon said, "Come on, then," and then went away.
345. Do you swear there was no conversation between you and McCarty that night, as to the evidence McCarty was going to give?—I swear positively there was not a word about evidence.
346. If McCarty says there was a conversation between you and him, he will be speaking an untruth?—Certainly.
347. You know the witness Murphy?—Yes.
348. Do you know he and McCarty had been together?—I could not say. I did not see them together.
349. Did not Murphy approach McCarty on your behalf?—No. If he did so, he has never been asked by me to do so.
350. When did you last see McCarty?—At the last inquiry at the police-station.
551. Have you no idea where he is now?—No. I heard he had gone towards Ngapara.
352. When did you hear that?—It would be some days after the inquiry.
353. How far is that from here?—About twenty miles.
354. You say you were in your bedroom about a quarter of an hour on this night?—About a quarter of an hour.
355. Changing your boots and socks?—Yes.
356. You say it is part of your duty to go into the station occasionally at night?—Yes.
357. It is not part of your duty to go to your bedroom, is it?—No, it is not.
358. Would it take you a quarter of an hour to change your boots and socks?—Oh, no; I could dress in less time than that. I am only speaking roughly.
359. You never made any report on this matter until you were called on by Sergeant O'Grady?—That is so.
360. After Mr. Hannon had made his complaint?—Yes. I was in bed at the time that Mr. Hannon came. I reported in the usual way. Perhaps it would be well for me to explain the usual way. Generally, when anything occurs, the man on night duty, except it is something very important, mentions it to the sergeant the following day, and then he gives instructions what to do—to report it, make further inquiries, and so on. The following day, when I got up at the usual time, between 12 and 1, the sergeant happened to be away at the races, and he returned between 6 and 7 in the evening. At that time I had returned from tea, and gone to rest as usual—that is, done my turn in bed—from 6 to 8. Then, at about a quarter to 9 o'clock I mentioned to Constable Cotter, when about to go on duty, that I would mention to the sergeant what took place last night. I asked the sergeant if Hannon had mentioned to him what took place last night at his hotel. He said, "I know all about it. I do not want to hear anything more about it just

now." I may say there is no foolscap available except in the sergeant's office; and the sergeant being away, there was none available.

361. Your excuse for not making a report is that there was no foolscap?—Yes; and that the usual custom of reporting matters was followed.

362. As a matter of fact, you made no report until the 6th March?—The sergeant gave me a report to reply to, and I had to reply to it.

363. On the 6th March?—On the 6th. But when going on duty at 9 o'clock the next night I mentioned it to him, and he replied that he knew all about it, and he did not wish to hear anything more about it at present.

364. When were you first called on to make a report?—The following day the sergeant gave me a report to reply to—a statement from Mr. Hannon to reply to.

365. Did not O'Grady say he did not wish to talk over the matter then, and you would require to report on it?—He said nothing of the sort. The words he made use of were that the matter had been reported to him, and that he knew all about it, and he did not wish to hear anything more about it.

366. *Mr. Lee.*] You say, as a matter of fact, that you had no knowledge of this charge of Hannon's against you until the second day after, when the sergeant supplied you with Hannon's report?—That is so.

367. The only thing you really had up to that date to report to the sergeant was the fact that you had been called out of the station to Connelly, and you intended to report to the sergeant what you had seen in reference to Connelly?—Yes; report verbally as usual.

368. *The Chairman.*] Did you recognise it was your duty to report in the morning what occurred during the night?—Yes, if there was foolscap available.

369. *Mr. Lee.*] Is it customary in trivial matters of that kind to make a written report to the sergeant, or merely a verbal report?—Just verbal.

370. *The Chairman.*] When you come off police duty in the morning you go to bed without leaving any record of what occurs during the night?—It is the custom, except in an important matter.

371. *Mr. Lee.*] You say you had no opportunity of seeing the sergeant, owing to the fact that he was away at the races, until somewhere about 9 o'clock at night?—Yes.

372. And you then told him about Connelly's matter?—Yes.

373. You reported the matter to him, and he said he wished to hear nothing further?—Yes.

374. In matters of that kind it is not the practice here to report them in writing at once next morning to the sergeant?—The matter is explained to the sergeant; and then, if he thinks it is necessary, he gives a sheet of foolscap, and instructs you to make a report on it.

375. *Mr. Poynton.*] Mr. Hannon made a statement that you were not sober: what do you say to that?—I was perfectly sober. I had no drink.

MICHAEL HANNON, further examined on oath.

376. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Have you ever been inside Constable Greene's room?—I was.

377. When?—I was in his bedroom at a quarter to 2 on the 4th March.

378. On any other occasion were you there?—I passed it by one day, about six or seven months ago. I had a gallon measure, and I was going to get it measured by the sergeant. Going through the back I saw him sitting on the bed.

379. Did you have the opportunity of seeing the position of the furniture in the room, when you passed out on that occasion?—I saw a bed on the left-hand side of the door, and he was sitting on it.

380. On the morning of the 4th March was the bed in the same position?—It was on the left-hand side, and his feet were just facing me.

381. The same position as it was in when you saw it six months ago?—I think so. That is, according to my opinion.

382. *Mr. Lee.*] Have you been in that passage or room since this night you speak of, when you woke Greene, as you say?—On the Monday night when you went to see Inspector Cullen I went round the back, and I went into the passage and out again.

383. As to this room, what is the size of it: is it 10 ft. by 6 ft.?—Well, I did not measure the room.

384. Is it 12 ft. by 8 ft.?—I cannot tell the size of it.

385. What size do you think it is?—It might be 10 ft. by 12 ft.

386. It is a very small room?—Well, it is not a big one.

387. You cannot fail to see the whole of that room as you walk through the passage, when the door is open?—If a man looks sharp enough he might.

388. How long were you in the passage that night you speak of, during the inquiry?—I do not think I was a minute altogether.

THOMAS O'GRADY, examined on oath.

389. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] On the morning of the 4th of last month did Mr. Hannon come to the police-station?—He did.

390. And made a statement to you?—Yes.

391. You took that statement down in writing?—I put it in writing, Yes.

392. And you subsequently called on Constable Greene for a report?—I did.

393. When did you call on the constable for a report?—I was at the races on that day. I was preparing to go to the races at the time Mr. Hannon came to my office. It was 11 o'clock, or a little after. He made a statement to me, which I reduced to writing. I went to the races. Constable Greene was in bed at the time. I called on the constable the following morning.

394. I believe the following night, when the night-duty men were parading, something was said about Mr. Hannon's complaint, was there not?—Yes. I believe the constable did say something, but the exact words I am not positive as to; I cannot quite remember them.

395. Which constable?—Constable Greene. He made some allusion to it.

396. Do you remember what you said to him in reply?—I cannot give the exact words. I think I said that Mr. Hannon had made a report.

397. Do you remember what else you said?—I cannot.

398. Did you say anything which would lead Constable Greene to suppose there was no more notice to be taken of it?—I did not. I could not have done that, because I had it in writing at the time.

399. On the morning of the 5th, you say, you handed to Constable Greene Mr. Hannon's statement, and directed him to report in answer thereto?—Yes.

400. And on the 6th did you receive his report in answer thereto?—I think it is dated when I got it. It is marked in pencil. I did not get it for some days afterwards.

401. Is that the report?—Yes, that is the report. I got it two days after I had given it to him.

402. That was the first report you received from the constable?—That was the first report.

403. Or anything in explanation of Mr. Hannon's statement?—That is the first I got.

404. As regards constables making reports when coming off duty, what is your practice?—The practice and rule of the service has been, as long as I have been in it, that if anything special occurs during the night, the constable, before retiring in the morning, makes a report of it. It is as well known to every constable in the service as it is to me. I have made no rule to the contrary.

405. With reference to not getting foolscap paper?—It has been the practice always here for the men to obtain a supply from the drawer of the watch-house table, where they make their reports as a rule, and, apart from that, the weights and measures room is open also, where the men write their letters frequently, and where they could obtain paper.

406. Was there paper there at the time that they could have used?—There was paper in the watch-house drawer. When I heard it mentioned, I went and found paper in the drawer of the watch-house table. Of course, I could not positively say whether it was there that night, but I found it when I went there.

407. What time did you return from the races?—I think it would be about 6 o'clock. I did not look at my watch, but I stayed in the station for a time after I came home. The races finished about half-past 5 o'clock.

408. Had Greene desired to make any report he could have come to you for paper after you returned from the races?—As to the excuse he makes with regard to paper, the watch-house keeper has the key of my office, and the watch-house keeper was at home the most of that day and could have given him a supply had he asked for it. I never refuse the men paper. Any time they want it they always get it. They all know that.

409. Do you remember the 30th of last month, when the Inspector held an inquiry?—Yes.

410. Do you remember yourself, and Inspector Cullen, and Constable Greene being together after the inquiry was adjourned?—Yes.

411. Can you state what took place with reference to the attendance of the man McCarty in the presence of Constable Greene?—The Inspector wished particularly the attendance of McCarty, and he asked me if I knew where to find him. I said, No, I did not. I spoke to the man, and told him there was some expenses coming to him, and asked him where he would be to receive his expenses. He said he did not know where he was going to. The Inspector impressed on me the necessity of obtaining the presence of McCarty. I saw Mr. Hannon with the view of ascertaining where McCarty was, and I wired the result to the Inspector. There was a general conversation—a good deal of conversation—between the Inspector and Constable Greene in my office. There was a good deal of conversation.

412. With reference to the attendance of McCarty?—Yes. He said in the constable's presence the attendance of McCarty was indispensable—that it was necessary McCarty should be there.

413. Did Greene make any reply to it?—I do not remember whether he did or not. They had a general conversation, and I was in and out of the office for a portion of the time.

414. Was there any suggestion made that Greene should seek to get him?—Yes. The exact words the Inspector made use of I could not say, but he said, in effect, that it was to the constable's interest that the man should be brought to the inquiry.

415. And did Greene make any reply to that?—He said he thought he was Hannon's witness.

416. Anything more?—I do not remember any more.

417. Did you receive any report from Constable Greene as to McCarty's return to Oamaru?—No, I did not.

418. Did you hear Constable Greene say this morning he met McCarty on the night of the 30th, after the inquiry?—Yes.

419. Did he ever mention that to you?—He never mentioned it to me. Hannon mentioned it to me.

420. Although he knew you were seeking to find out where McCarty was?—Yes. I first heard of it at the second inquiry.

421. Was Greene present when it was brought up, will you state?—Mr. Hannon gave evidence at the inquiry, and stated that when going to look for McCarty, he discovered Greene and McCarty in conversation at the corner of the Fire-brigade Station: that he asked McCarty, in the presence of Greene, if he was coming up, and McCarty promised him to come up. That was the evidence given by Hannon.

422. But Greene made no statement to you that McCarty was in town?—No, he did not.

423. *Mr. Lee.*] You said just now that the officer on night duty would next morning report anything special which had taken place during the night?—Yes.

424. What would you call anything special during the night?—Well, a row occurring at a hotel at 2 o'clock in the morning—men knocking at the door and disturbing the inhabitants—I would consider a constable would report that.

425. If he saw anything of that kind?—Yes, especially at 2 o'clock in the morning.

426. Supposing Constable Greene, on his arrival at the hotel, had merely seen Connelly there, found the man was not the worse for liquor, heard no row at all, and took steps to see Connelly off the premises, promising Hannon that the matter of Connelly's conduct would be inquired into—do you think such steps as those ought without any doubt to be returned to you in writing the first thing in the morning, or would it be too late if he reported that to you some time during the next day?—In order to save himself, a constable with Greene's experience should have reported the threat made by Hannon. Hannon threatened to "take his jacket off," and, in order to save himself he should have reported the matter. I would consider it his duty.

427. Do the police, as a matter of practice here, report in writing all those cases that occur at night?—Oh yes, frequently. It has been the habit ever since I came here.

428. At what time of day after the night duty do they make these reports?—Sometimes during the day. If they are not of a special nature I would not ask them to come out of bed and make a report; but any cases coming before the Court I would require information as to them.

429. I suppose in cases which you would have to investigate, as to what proceedings you would have to take, some time during the next day would be a reasonable time to make a report?—Yes, if it is not coming before the Court.

430. At what time did you see Greene that night?—I saw Greene at ten minutes past 11 at night, and he was then perfectly sober, and all right on his beat.

431. The next morning, when did you see him?—I did not see him until I came back from the racecourse.

432. How was it you did not see him during the day?—He was in bed, and I was at the races.

433. The first opportunity you would have of seeing him without making special arrangements would be when you came back from the races?—Quite so.

434. You say there was a conversation between you and Greene that night about Hannon?—I have stated I think there was. Greene stated something. I am not quite sure about it. I cannot positively say what it was.

435. You then had, of course, Hannon's report in your possession?—Yes.

436. Have you that report?—No.

437. Where is it?—The Commissioner has it, I think.

438. You had some conversation, I suppose, with Hannon in the morning about this case—that was the morning after the occurrence?—Mr. Ralfe, the Clerk of the Court, was in my office at the time. Whatever conversation occurred was heard by Mr. Ralfe.

439. Did Hannon say anything, at that time, about who was at the station with him when he went for Greene?—He did not.

440. He did not tell you there was another man with him when he went for Greene?—He did not. I did not ask him, and he did not say it.

441. It does not appear in the report?—No.

442. *The Chairman.*] Did he say he was alone?—He did not. He simply said he went to the station, and entered by the back door.

443. *Mr. Lee.*] Having that statement, of course, you were somewhat in possession of the facts of the case in the morning?—Yes.

444. Did you mention the fact to Greene in the evening that you had a statement by Hannon?—I told him Hannon reported the matter.

445. I may take it that, whatever conversation took place between you and Greene, Greene knew at that stage you had some report from Hannon on the matter?—Quite so. I should fancy he would, at all events.

446. Greene says, when he was proceeding to speak to you about the case, you wished him to say nothing about it in the meantime—that there was a report on it by Hannon, and in the meantime you did not want any further particulars, or something to that effect?—The matter was mentioned on parade, and that was not the place to have the matter talked of at all. I was in the office from 6 o'clock that evening until the parade, and there was no application made to me on the subject.

447. But when this conversation did take place, did you say something to that effect—that there would be some further inquiry, or something of that kind?—I may have; I cannot remember the exact words.

448. In any case, Constable Greene knew you were in possession of the facts of the case from Hannon?—Yes.

449. I suppose, then, there would be no occasion for a report at that stage from Greene unless you asked for it; did you ask him to give a formal report?—Not verbally, I did not. Next morning I asked him for a written report.

450. *The Chairman.*] The parade you refer to was the parade at 9 p.m. on the 4th?—Yes.

451. *Mr. Lee.*] There are some matters which may come under the notice of the police which they would bring before you by word of mouth and not by writing?—I have always made an effort to have my men in my confidence, and I in their confidence; and I think anything that would arise during the night interfering in any way with the police should be mentioned to me. I think that should be done, in order to keep the men safe themselves.

452. Do you recollect who mentioned the matter first—whether Greene was the first to mention it or you?—I may tell you this: I was somewhat indignant at the fact of getting a report

n the first instance from Hannon, before Greene, and, as sergeant of the police I was a bit annoyed at not having received it from Greene, and I think, as far as my memory carries me, I said, "What about that affair of Hannon's?" or something to that effect.

453. Greene says when he first saw you he reported the matter to you; and your memory, as far as it serves you, leads you to the belief that you first spoke to him?—My recollection of the thing is: after I came home from the races I met the constable coming out of the yard, and I said then to Greene, "What about that case of Hannon's—what is it?"

454. Have you ever known Greene on his duty to be the worse for liquor?—Oh no; he was perfectly right when I saw him and perfectly straight at ten minutes past 11 that night.

455. And to your knowledge he is not a man given to liquor at all, as far as you know?—I should say not—not the abuse of it.

456. Did Hannon allege that Greene was drunk, or the worse for liquor at all?—In his first complaint to me he did not.

457. But subsequently he did?—Yes. He did to the Inspector, when the inquiry was going on. He replied that he made no direct charge.

458. Hannon was very much annoyed, was he not, when Greene did not arrest Connelly?—Yes, in the first instance: and in a second conversation I had with him, after he made the report, he said he thought Greene had a right to arrest Connelly. I then told him that the constable, not having seen anything that occurred, and the man being known, would be perfectly justified in not arresting him; and Hannon seemed to take it for granted that was the correct view of the thing then.

459. Then Hannon named the wrong man, did he not, at first—he said the man who had been annoying him was Michael Condon?—He gave the name of a man named Mick Condon. The other man's name was Connelly.

460. *The Chairman.*] Did he name one or two?—He only named one man in the first instance, and I took it for granted it was Condon he referred to.

461. *Mr. Lee.*] Acting on that, of course, you laid informations against Mick Condon?—Yes, an information was laid that morning against Mick Condon, and during the day the real person's name transpired, and the information was subsequently withdrawn against Condon and Connelly was summoned.

462. There seemed to be a doubt about the real person's name?—I think it was Constable Hunt who first told me about it.

463. What did Hunt know about it?—He was the man I sent to lay the information.

464. How did he know Condon was the wrong name, and Connelly was the right man?—I think he had some conversation with Hannon. I could not tell you.

465. Have you had any complaints at all against Greene in the way he carries out his duties?—No.

466. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you remember what the weather was on the night of the 3rd?—It was fine when the men went out. It was raining during the day. It ceased to rain about half-past 8.

467. And from that time onwards was it dry?—Dry until I retired to bed, at nearly 12 o'clock.

HENRY GEORGE HUNT, examined on oath.

468. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a constable, stationed at Oamaru?—Third-class constable, mounted, stationed at Oamaru.

469. You recollect the matter of this change of name from Condon to Connelly?—Yes.

470. Will you tell the Bench what you know about that?—On the Friday morning, the second day of the races, the 4th, I was ordered by Sergeant O'Grady to go to the Courthouse and lay two informations against Michael Condon—one for being a prohibited person and being on licensed premises, and the other for disorderly conduct. I laid them, and asked the Clerk of the Court to leave them in the sergeant's office for service. They were given to me by Sergeant O'Grady on the Saturday morning to serve on Condon, which I did.

471. Did you find there was a mistake then?—Condon protested, when being served, that he was not the man; and on returning I mentioned the matter to Sergeant O'Grady that he had protested, and there was nothing more on the matter till the Sunday evening about 7 o'clock, when I was coming down on duty, and Hannon was standing outside his hotel. I believe Hannon spoke first; I am not quite sure. He said "Good night," and I believe he said "This is a nice affair." I then took the opportunity of asking him if he was sure it was Condon. He said it was Mick the Slipper, that works at Eveline, and I knew at once there had been a mistake. I knew Mick the Slipper that he referred to was Michael Connelly.

472. Did Hannon explain how it was he had made a mistake?—No, he did not.

473. Did you ask him?—I did not.

474. *The Chairman.*] He did not say he had made a mistake?—He did not. He simply said it was "Mick the Slipper."

475. *Mr. Lee.*] Did you tell Hannon that Condon had been summoned?—I said it was Condon the information had been laid against.

476. Did he not ask how the information had been laid against Condon?—He did not.

477. He expressed no surprise at all?—No; he did not express any surprise. He simply said it was not the man, and he would see the sergeant.

478. How long have you been in the Force?—Since 1891.

479. Any matters which come under your notice, where you think the probability is the police will act, to whom do you report them?—The sergeant in charge.

480. By what method?—The usual method.

481. What is that?—On foolscap.

482. Do you report sometimes by word of mouth?—I am situated somewhat different to the foot men. When I am sent out to make inquiries by the sergeant, on my return I mention the facts to him. He will say, "Make a report of it," if he thinks it is necessary.

483. Have you ever known the police to start proceedings in cases when you have not made a report?—I cannot say I have.

484. Will you swear the police have not started proceedings in such an event?—I would not; because I do not think there was a written report made when an information was laid against Condon.

485. Have you known of the police taking proceedings before you had made a report?—Yes, I think there is one case. In the last case I had before the Court I do not think I made a report.

486. What case was that?—It was the case of Peebles.

487. Peebles's Hotel?—Yes.

488. It was a case of gambling?—Yes.

489. You made no written report?—I gave the information to Sergeant O'Grady. He took a note of it. After I arrested the prisoners and returned to the station I mentioned to Sergeant O'Grady verbally the circumstances of the case.

490. *The Chairman.*] When you give information verbally, you would supplement it by a written report?—As a rule.

491. *Mr. Lee.*] But not always?—In trifling cases, where the sergeant does not think it necessary to act, he does not ask for a report.

492. There was no written report in that case?—I did not make a written report. Sergeant O'Grady made notes of it.

493. Do you know anything about stationery—whether it is obtainable easily by the constables?—It is kept in the sergeant's office.

494. When the sergeant is away that room is locked?—Yes.

495. Do you know any other place where you can get stationery when the sergeant is out?—The gaoler has a key to the sergeant's office.

496. If the gaoler and the sergeant are away you cannot get in?—No.

497. *The Chairman.*] Is it kept, as a rule, in the drawer?—I do not go to the watch-house. I usually go to the weights and measures office, and do my work there. I get foolscap from the sergeant's office when I require it. Sometimes he is there, sometimes he is not.

498. *Mr. Lee.*] Have you had to wait sometimes?—Yes. If I have to report on any matter when the sergeant is absent, and the Courthouse is open, I walk in there and get a sheet of foolscap. If it were not an important matter I would wait for the sergeant's return.

499. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Who did you understand made a mistake as to the man's name?—I could not say. I was not present when Hannon made his report to the sergeant.

500. When you spoke to Hannon on the Sunday night, did he tell you at once who the right man was?—No, he did not. He said it was "Mick the Slipper."

501. He had no doubt as to who the man was—the man he meant?—No; he had no doubt himself as to the man he meant.

502. What is "Mick the Slipper's" name?—Michael Connelly.

503. And the other man who was summoned was Michael Condon?—Yes.

504. From what you know of the case, Hannon had never confused these two men?—I could not say. As far as I know he did not. The reason I spoke to him was on account of Condon protesting he was not the man, and could prove he was not there, and, that being the first opportunity of meeting Hannon, I mentioned the matter to him, and he said it was "Mick the Slipper," and, of course, I knew then the wrong man had been summoned.

505. As regards making reports: if you had to report a matter, would you wait twenty-four hours simply because you were not able to get foolscap?—If it was urgent I would get it somewhere, I think. I would find some if it was an urgent matter, I think.

WILLIAM CHRISTIE, examined on oath.

506. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank in the Force?—Second-class constable.

507. *Mr. Lee.*] Did you come home from the races on the night of the 4th with the sergeant?—Yes.

508. Did you meet Constable Greene, either of you, while you were together?—No.

509. Where did you leave the sergeant?—At the station.

510. Where did you go then?—I went to my tea.

511. Can you say, as a matter of fact, whether the sergeant saw Greene on that occasion or not?—No, I do not think the sergeant saw Constable Greene at all.

512. Why do you think that?—Greene was out at his tea when I went there.

513. It is possible then, if the sergeant saw him, it would be later in the day than that?—Yes.

514. Was Greene on duty that evening?—He was on night duty.

515. On at 9 o'clock?—Yes.

516. You are on night duty sometimes, and when anything crops up during the night that is not in your opinion of a very serious nature, when do you report it to the sergeant?—I tell the sergeant in the morning when I get up.

517. Do you put it down in writing and leave it for the sergeant before you go to bed, or do you wait till you get up?—I wait till I get up.

518. *The Chairman.*] What time do you get up?—About 11 o'clock.

519. *Mr. Lee.*] I suppose at 11 o'clock on the 4th the sergeant would have been away at the races?—The sergeant and I went out together about 11 o'clock to the races.

520. Was Greene up before you left?—No.

521. How do you report these little things that occur during the night—by writing, or word of mouth?—I have had hardly anything to report since I came here on night duty. Things are very quiet at night here. I reported a fire.

522. Have you reported anything else to Sergeant O'Grady in writing except this fire?—No.

523. Have you reported anything by word of mouth?—If the sergeant met me during the day he would say, "Anything fresh during the night, Christie"? I would say, No.

524. Have any cases arisen out of any reports you have made?—No.

525. When you went to report, where did you get foolscap paper?—From the sergeant.

526. Is there any other paper procurable without getting it from the sergeant?—No.

527. *The Chairman.*] You are not aware of any being kept in the drawer of the watch-house table?—No.

528. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As a matter of fact, since you have been here you have had no occasion to make a written report to the sergeant?—No; only one morning.

529. Did you go to bed and report that when you got up?—I went up to the sergeant's house, and told him.

530. That is the only occasion you have had to make a written report?—Yes.

531. *The Chairman.*] On the only occasion that you had anything to report you did report it before you went to bed?—I went to the sergeant's house, and told him there was a fire.

532. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What do you mean by saying you would wait till you got up in the morning?—The sergeant would ask me in the morning if there was anything startling during the night. I would say, No.

533. Do you remember what the weather was on the night of the 3rd?—It rained on the night of the 3rd.

534. Do you remember up to what time it was raining?—It was raining in the afternoon, and up till 6 o'clock.

535. Do you remember whether it was raining late at night?—I have no distinct recollection of what time it cleared off.

536. *Mr. Lee.*] Were you in the station that night when Hannon came along for Greene—were you sleeping there?—Yes; I was sleeping in the next room to Greene.

537. Did you hear any conversation, or anything going on?—No.

538. Are you a light sleeper?—I am pretty easily wakened up at times.

539. Did you see Constable Greene that night at all? When did you see him last?—I could not say.

540. What time do you think it was?—About 9 o'clock.

541. At that time was Greene sober?—Yes, perfectly sober.

EDMUND CHARLES TREHEY, examined on oath.

542. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable.

543. *Mr. Lee.*] How long have you been in Oamaru?—About two years and a half.

544. Can you speak as to the system of reporting matters which occur during the night—what has been your practice here? Supposing, for example, you were called upon during the night to arrest a man, and you found no cause to arrest him, and promised to have the matter seen into by the police, what would you do next morning?—When I got up, I would explain to the sergeant, and ask him if it was necessary to make a report. If it was anything important, I would make a report.

545. Say, a matter of that kind?—In a matter of that kind, I suppose I would make a report. I would go into the sergeant's office when I arose in the morning, and explain the matter, and ask if it was necessary to make a report.

546. You would not write a memorandum of that before you went to bed at night, and leave it for him. No, unless I thought it was an important matter.

547. A man clearing out, or anything of that kind, I suppose you would leave a note for him, or see him?—Yes.

548. Do you know of any case where the police have prosecuted on your report to the sergeant by word of mouth?—No, I cannot call to mind any case.

549. Have there been any such prosecutions without any written report?—I do not know of any. I cannot speak for other constables. I am speaking for myself. Personally, I do not know of any.

550. You cannot say one way or the other—whether there have been, or have not?—No.

551. Have you had many cases in which you have given written reports since you have been here?—I think I remember two cases.

552. You remember only two cases in which you have supplied written reports?—Yes.

553. There must have been a number of other cases in which you have not supplied written reports?—Yes, but there have not been many cases since I have been on duty here.

554. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did these two reports arise out of your night duty?—No. I think one arose when I was on day duty.

555. And the other?—The other case, was, I think, a case of fire. I am not sure now whether it was day or night duty.

556. Do you wish it to be understood if this fire had occurred during the night you would have waited till you got up next day and then report it?—No, I would have reported a case of fire.

557. Since you have been here you have not had occasion to report a matter that has arisen during night duty?—No, I cannot call to mind any occasion. I may have, but I cannot call to mind reporting anything. In this case I am not sure whether it was on night duty.

558. What duty were you on on the 3rd March?—I was on day duty.

559. Do you remember what the weather was that night?—No, I cannot call to mind what the weather was.

PATRICK COTTER, examined on oath.

560. What rank do you hold in the Force?—Third-class constable.
561. *Mr. Lee.*] You were on duty with Constable Greene on the night of the 3rd March, on the No. 2 beat?—Yes.
562. Did you see Greene on and off during that night?—Yes.
563. Was he drunk or sober?—Sober.
564. Did you see him and Sheard together that night?—I saw them about from a quarter to half-past 2.
565. What is Sheard's occupation?—A barber and tobacconist.
566. Was Greene the worse for liquor at all?—Not at all.
567. Did you know that anything had cropped up at the White Hart Hotel that night?—Not till then.
568. When?—At half-past 2 o'clock.
569. When you met Greene?—Yes.
570. He told you then what had occurred?—Yes.
571. Do you know when he reported this matter to the sergeant?—I was with him at the time.
572. When?—At 9 o'clock, going out.
573. The following night?—Yes.
574. What took place between them?—He asked the sergeant if Hannon had spoken to him about what happened at his hotel that morning.
575. Had you seen the sergeant that day?—Yes.
576. When?—I saw him out at the races.
577. What did the sergeant say to that?—The sergeant said: Yes, he had seen Mr. Hannon, and that the less said about it now the better.
578. Was Greene reporting to the sergeant then, or what?—Yes; he asked the sergeant if Hannon had spoken to him about it.
579. You say he was stopped then from saying anything further about it?—Yes.
580. Have you had any cases arising while on night duty—any matters for report to the sergeant?—No.
581. On day duty?—Yes.
582. How have you reported those—by writing?—I spoke to the sergeant, and he told me to make a report.
583. You speak first to the sergeant, and then he tells you to make a report?—Yes.
584. Have you ever made a report in the first instance to the sergeant, before you have spoken to him?—No.
585. How many cases do you think you have had in which you have given written reports?—I have only had one report.
586. I suppose you have had a good many verbal reports?—No, very few.
587. And on these verbal reports have cases come before the Court?—No.
588. On only one occasion has a case come before the Court on your report?—No; I just reported the matter to the sergeant.
589. Was there any case?—No.
590. Have any cases ever arisen out of your reports at all?—None.
591. Did you see Greene that night earlier than when he told you about Hannon?—Yes.
592. Did he say anything to you at all?—About a quarter past 1 o'clock he said he was going to the station to change his boots, as he was wet.
593. What sort of weather was it that night?—All day it was very wet, and the roads were very mucky and bad.
594. From the time you went on at 9 o'clock was there any rain at all?—It was just ceasing when we went on at 9 o'clock.
- 594a. Do you think the state of the roads would be such that he would be likely to get his feet wet that night?—Yes, if he had not very strong boots.
595. *The Chairman.*] Did you find it necessary to change your boots that night?—No.
596. *Mr. Poynton.*] You had strong boots?—Yes.
597. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Where did you meet Greene at the time he said he was going to the station to change his boots?—At the Bank of New Zealand corner.
598. How far is that from the police-station?—About five minutes' walk.
599. Did Greene go towards the police-station when he said that?—Yes.
600. That would be a quarter past 1 o'clock?—A quarter past 1.
601. When did you next see Constable Greene that night?—About half-past 2 o'clock.
602. Did you hear the evidence taken by Inspector Cullen—Hannon's evidence?—No.
603. Where was Greene when you saw him next?—At the corner of Coquet and Thames Streets.
604. When he spoke to you about Hannon's affair, what did he say?—He said there was a light in the place, and I had better go with him.
605. That it was just over?—Yes, I understood it was just over.
606. It would be about one hour and a quarter from the time you saw him coming to the police-station to change his boots, and the time when he said there had been a disturbance at Hannon's?—Yes.
607. How long would it take to go from the police-station to the White Hart Hotel?—I suppose about twelve minutes.
608. You say it was not raining after you went on duty?—No, it was just ceasing.
609. The streets here are well paved, are they not?—They are very muddy when it is raining.

610. But the pavements?—Oh, no; the pavements are dry.
611. Policemen do not usually walk on the streets?—Occasionally you have to walk across the road.
612. Is a man likely to get his feet wet walking on the pavements?—Oh, no.
613. Do you swear Greene ever made any such statement as this at all to you on this particular morning?—Yes; I swear on my oath he said he was going to the station to change his boots.
614. Had he any occasion to change his boots?—I do not know.
615. Had you any occasion to change your boots?—None whatever.
616. Do you think that any man on duty four hours would have had occasion to change his boots?—I do not know. I did not have to change mine.
617. Do you think any other man would?—Not if he had such strong boots as I had.

JAMES ALBERT SHEARD, examined on oath.

618. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a hairdresser at Oamaru?—Yes.
619. Were you out and about on the race-night—the night of the 3rd, or say, the morning of the 4th?—Yes.
620. Do you remember seeing any police-officers that night?—Yes, I saw Constable Greene.
621. No other?—No. I did not see any other constable, not just then. I saw one later on, a few minutes after Greene walked along the street. I think there was one came up and walked along the street then.
622. Do you know him by name?—I could not tell which one it was.
623. Was Greene drunk, or the worse for liquor, when you saw him?—No, he was quite sober as far as I could see.
624. And you were too?—Oh yes, I had been working up till 2 o'clock.
625. What time was it when you saw Greene?—About 2 o'clock.
626. And the other constable, was he the worse for liquor?—I could not say. I never spoke to him.
627. *The Chairman.*] How many of you were together at a time?—Myself and Constable Greene; and this other constable came up just as I was turning to go home.
628. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Where did you first see Constable Greene that night?—Just crossing Thames Street opposite my shop.
629. Which way was he going?—He was going on to the other side.
630. From the White Hart way?—No, he was somewhere near the Girl's High School corner.
631. Was he alone?—Yes.
632. Did you hear anything of the disturbance at the White Hart?—No.
633. Did Greene say anything to you about it?—He said he had been called to the White Hart to take a man into custody; and he said he was called to take a man who was quite sober, and he could not do so.
634. You are not able to fix the time he was down at the White Hart?—No, I could not say.

EDMUND CHARLES TREHBY, examined on oath.

635. *The Chairman.*] Your rank is that of a third-class constable?—Yes.
636. I believe you have some suggestion to make on behalf of the members of the Force stationed at Oamaru?—Yes. These are the suggestions: "As the present compulsory insurance only affects one class of the New Zealand Police Force, we are of opinion that it is arbitrary and unfair, and recommend that it be abolished, and that in its stead the Government bring in a pension scheme as in the other colonies. That the rate of pay as at present—viz., £10 per month—be dispensed with, and that the old rate of 7s. per day be reverted to. That house-allowance be granted to married constables. That police uniforms be provided free. That the present relieving-allowance is insufficient, as married men only receive 3s. a day, and single men 1s. 6d. That some uniform system of promotion similar to that existing in the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales be introduced into the New Zealand Police Force. That the present system of long-service pay extended to certain members of the New Zealand Police Force be made applicable to all men in the Force."
637. Do you as a body express a preference for the pension system as against the present compulsory insurance system?—Yes.
638. Are you prepared to support a pension system which involves deductions from your present pay?—Yes.
639. Do you realise that in order to secure a pension system the whole of the funds might have to be derived from the pay of the members and other sources within the Force?—Yes.
640. Such as rewards; do you think you would approve of that—that all the present money rewards should go into a pension fund?—I have not talked the matter over with my fellow constables. I do not know what their opinion is on that subject.
641. Have you considered to what extent their pay would bear charging for the pension fund?—No, we have not.
642. You say the pay should be raised to 7s. a day?—Yes.
643. Do you mean that as the standard pay for one class, or all classes, or what?—No; I mean that constables joining should start at 7s. a day.
644. In addition to that, you think there should be long-service pay?—Yes.
645. To what amount?—On the same conditions as the constables who joined some years ago—6d. a day, and 1s. a day after ten years.
646. That is the extent to which you ask long-service pay?—Yes.
647. Have you any suggestion to make or any opinion to express with regard to the different classes in the Force? I will put it to you in this way: Have you considered whether it would be to

the advantage of the Force to do away with the system of classes, and, say, fix a rate of pay for all constables joining the Force, with annual or periodical rises of pay. How would that be received?—Yes, that would do.

648. Suppose you start at 7s. a day?—Start at 7s.

649. With a rise at certain intervals?—With a rise of 6d. after twelve months. I have not gone fully into this. I think it should be something after the Victorian style. I think there, after the first twelve months, they get 6d., and—though I am not sure—then they go on for two or three years.

650. When you refer to the system of promotion, is that independent of the question of pay?—Well, pay goes with the promotion, I think. We are in favour of something on the lines of the Victorian system. When a constable joins he should get 7s. a day, and after he has been in the Force, say, twelve months, 6d. a day extra; and after he has been in a further stated period he should get a rise of 1s. a day—say, after ten years he should be getting 1s. a day extra; so that a third-class constable, after ten years' service, would be drawing 8s. a day; whereas now a constable with £10 a month gets no long-service pay, and until he gets promoted he is only drawing not quite 7s. a day.

651. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think the Police Force should be removed entirely from political control—that the heads should be made independent: has that been considered?—No, we have not considered that matter. I have a suggestion of my own. The suggestion was that all constables joining the Police Force should do at least six months' duty in large centres, and no constable on joining the Force should be sent straight away to a small town.

652. *The Chairman.*] How long have you been in the Force?—About two years and a half.

653. What training did you have before you were put on street duty?—As regards the police, I had no training whatever.

654. No training in police duties?—No training in police duties. Oamaru was my first station.

655. How have you acquired any knowledge of your police duties?—What knowledge I have is what I have read out of my regulation book, and little "ins and outs" I have gathered from men who have been in large centres.

656. Have you attended any lectures on police duties?—No. I have had no lectures here on police duties.

657. Do I understand you to say that immediately you were appointed you were sent to Oamaru and put on street duty?—Yes, sent to Oamaru and put on street duty. That is why I make the suggestion, because I think it is unfair for a constable to be sent straight on street duty, especially in a small town. It is unfair he should be put on duty without any instructions whatever. If he gets into trouble he is responsible himself. If a constable is in a large centre, he has the Inspector and the sergeant to instruct him on his beat, and he would not be so liable to get into trouble. In small towns there is a lot of responsibility on you. The sergeant is not always at hand, and therefore I would suggest that a constable on joining should have at least six months in a large centre.

658. There has been no system of lectures here?—No, no system of lectures.

659. Have you had any training in first aid to the wounded?—No.

660. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you know during the last twelve months of any other constable who has been taken on and sent direct to a country station, like you were sent?—No, I do not know of any. There have been none sent here.

661. Do you know to any other part of the colony?—No, I cannot call to mind any case.

662. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you made any reports to the sergeant since you have been here?—Yes; I remember reporting a fire at Smyth's stables when I was on night duty.

663. Have you been very heavily worked since you have been here?—No.

664. It is a pretty quiet town?—Yes; fairly quiet.

665. And the police duties are light?—Well, you cannot call them heavy.

666. Where are you boarding?—I board at the Queen's Hotel.

667. Have you boarded there ever since you came here?—No; I boarded at the Globe Hotel first.

668. Did you not board at a private boarding-house when you first came here?—Yes.

669. Why did you leave it?—The reason why I left the boarding-house was that I found the hotel closer to the station for me. The boarding-house was too far away from the station.

670. Did you discuss it with any of your officers?—No.

671. Are you the only police-officer at that house?—No, there are three of us.

672. Did you not have a conversation with the sergeant before you shifted?—No, I had no conversation with the sergeant.

673. Have you made any suggestion that you should have a mess at the police camp?—Yes; I sent in an application to the Police Commission, pointing out the cost of living here compared with Christchurch.

674. The cost between being compelled to live at an hotel and boarding at the camp?—Yes.

675. Have you not suggested to your officers you should be allowed to mess at the camp?—We have just talked the matter over, and said it would be better if we had a mess here.

676. You came from the Permanent Artillery?—Yes.

677. Has it not been a matter of common talk amongst the men that political influence is necessary if they wish their interests served in the Force?—I have heard in some places of political influence, but I cannot say I have heard of it in all places.

678. In some places amongst the men?—Yes.

679. That political influence was necessary if they wished to get favours?—Yes.

680. Have you ever known of a case?—I cannot call to mind a case.

681. Has there been any change of feeling amongst the men during the past six months—any improved feeling in the Force?—Yes. The men seem to think that things are on a better footing

They seem to be better satisfied with things. They do not growl so much, and they look to the future as bringing better results than there have been in the past.

682. Have you had any licensing prosecutions since you came here?—No.

683. Have you had any since you have been in the Force?—No.

684. How many cases have you had altogether since you have been here?—If I said six I do not think I would exaggerate.

685. Six cases in two years and a half: does that include “drunks”?—No, that does not include “drunks.”

686. You have arrested a number of “drunks”?—I suppose I have arrested about thirty here.

687. Has it ever been a matter of conversation between yourself and any other policeman in the town that the men scarcely know how to put in their time?—I have heard the men say their duty was very small compared with large centres.

688. There has been a general feeling that they have been over-manned for the work that is done?—I have heard some of the constables say the station is over-manned.

689. *The Chairman.*] You desire to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that there is no police mess at Oamaru, and in consequence you have to board at an hotel?—Yes. I wish to point out there are no boarding-houses—I do not know if I should say respectable boarding-houses—but there are no boarding-houses fit to live in convenient to the station. There are some places where I do not think they would care to have a constable living.

690. Is there no restaurant?—There are some places of that kind, but I should not care about living in some of them.

691. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you know what the mess costs at Christchurch?—I am under the impression it runs to about 10s. 6d. a week, sometimes less.

692. Have you formed any estimate as to what it would be likely to cost you here in Oamaru with four or five of you?—No, I have not formed an estimate.

693. Do you think if you had a mess instituted here the men would be prepared to do their own cooking, or provide a cook?—I do not know. With our small body of men, I may say now I do not think it would be possible to make any saving by having a mess here.

694. Do you think if you had the necessary conveniences here you would be able to provide a mess at less cost than you are paying now at the hotel?—I do not think so. I do not think we could live any cheaper, with our small staff, than we do now at the hotel.

695. *The Chairman.*] Having regard to the question of cost, is it still your feeling there ought to be a police mess here?—It would be more convenient. It would be on the station. It would save dressing, and then it would not be necessary for you to board at an hotel. Some of the outside public take objection to policemen boarding at hotels. Of course, we have to board there. It is the only place we can get, convenient and respectable. What I wished to point out was that a constable sent to a country station was under more expense than a constable in a large centre.

696. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What do you suggest should be done to remedy this?—Well, I do not know. The only thing I can suggest would be that Government should make an allowance to constables on country stations. When there are so few men on a station it would not pay to run a mess.

697. *Colonel Hume.*] When you were in the Permanent Artillery did you ever do temporary police duty?—No.

698. You say you think there is a better feeling in the Force now. Can you account for that in any way?—The only way I can account for that is, the men seem to think there is better hope for them in the future. They think the Police Force is on a better footing, in the first place, and they think it will be on a far better footing in the future. There seemed to be some complaints—that a lot of promotions were very unfair in the past, and that in the future things will be on a more uniform scale, and men will be treated more on their merits.

699. Is not one of the reasons that they think there will be some good result from this inquiry?—That is one, but it is not all.

700. Is not another reason that they think they have now got a political friend in Mr. Taylor?—No, I have not heard that. I do not think all policemen are friends of Mr. Taylor.

701. But they think they have got a political friend now in Mr. Taylor?—I do not know if you would call Mr. Taylor a friend. Some of them think they have got somebody to expose them, I think.

GEORGE DASH, examined on oath.

702. *The Chairman.*] What are you, and where do you reside?—I am a coachbuilder, living at Waimate.

703. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you lived in Waimate?—Roughly speaking, about twenty-two years.

704. How many licensed houses have you there?—Four.

705. Do you think the licensing law is enforced there by the police?—By no means.

706. Have you any prohibited men in Waimate?—Yes, several.

707. Have you ever seen any of them drunk on the streets?—I have seen them drunk on the streets on more than one occasion.

708. Whilst the orders have been current?—Whilst the orders have been current. One prohibited man came into my own premises within the first month of his prohibition order so intoxicated that he could not articulate.

709. *The Chairman.*] Within what period?—Certainly within a year back. The order is still in force.

710. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was that in the day-time?—In the day-time: in the afternoon. He had a bottle in the cart in which he drove to my place.

711. Have you seen other prohibited men in a state of drunkenness?—Yes. I have seen two prohibited men standing in the street within sight of the police-station, drinking from a black bottle, both apparently under the influence of liquor.

712. Have you known of any prosecutions of any persons in Waimate for supplying prohibited persons with liquor?—There have been a few.

713. Recently?—To the best of my belief, not recently.

714. Can you remember any cases within the last two years of prosecutions for supplying of prohibited persons?—Yes; I think I remember only one case.

715. How many prohibited persons have you in Waimate, about?—Well, I could not say exactly, but roughly speaking, about six now.

716. *The Chairman.*] You are confining your statements to what period?—Within the last twelve months.

717. And you say this prosecution was within the last twelve months?—Yes, I think it was within the last twelve months.

718. *Mr. Taylor.*] You think the police authorities take little or no action in regard to these prohibited persons?—I think so; and I base my opinion on the fact that they are very often seen drunk on the streets.

719. With regard to Sunday trading, do you think Sunday trading goes on to any extent in Waimate?—I think so, to a considerable extent.

720. Can you tell the Commission on what facts you arrived at that conclusion?—I base my opinion on the fact that I myself saw no less than seventy persons enter one of the licensed premises—enter by the side door and the side gate. Twenty-eight of those persons were to my knowledge residing within two miles of the house; thirty of them I did not recognise. It is quite possible for some of them, none the less, to be residents, because I do not undertake to recognise all residents. I recognised four legitimate boarders, and I did not count the publican, or his family, or the barman. One man went in in the morning, and made five trips during the day, and the last trip he was in the house a considerable time—I should say from half an hour to an hour—and he staggered in passing up the street. That man lives within a quarter of a mile of the house, and is as well known to the publican as I am.

721. Did any other residents show signs of drinking?—Yes. One other individual made three trips, and on the last trip, from the way in which he acted when he came out, I considered he, too, was under the influence of liquor.

722. He was a resident?—He was resident within a quarter of a mile, I think—certainly not half a mile—of the place.

723. And you base your opinion that the police are negligent, so far as enforcement of the licensing law is concerned, on these facts?—On these facts. I may say on other Sundays I have noticed, without taking any special pains, people entering hotels—people who were residents.

724. With little or no restraint?—Little or no restraint.

725. *The Chairman.*] What was the date of your observation, when you counted these people?—It is within the last month.

726. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you any other grounds for thinking there may be reason for the inactivity of the police?—I think the police are—how shall I put it?—too friendly, or too much mixed up with the publicans. I may say one constable, on his arrival in Waimate—the constable is there now—was for some months living with his family in the upper storey of a publican's sample-rooms, while the house at the police-station was vacant. On several occasions I have seen constables driving about in a publican's buggy. I have seen a constable taking his wife and family out in a publican's buggy, and the same constable paddocked his cow in a publican's paddock while he had a cow. These things tend to show there was undue intimacy—intimacy that would not tend to the carrying out of the law.

727. Do the police enforce the law in regard to the larrikin nuisance in Waimate?—Yes. I may say they are very energetic in that matter, particularly in the matter of moving persons on.

728. *The Chairman.*] How many constables are there at Waimate?—Two.

729. Are their quarters near to the hotel of which you have been speaking?—About 100 yards, roughly speaking.

730. Do you see any constable about on Sundays or any other time?—Oh, yes; I see them about.

731. On Sundays?—I cannot say with regard to Sundays, because I am not very often in the streets on Sundays. On the Sunday in question I may say I only saw one constable once—not in uniform.

732. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Can you give me the date of that Sunday?—It was last Sunday—Easter Sunday.

733. The name of that house?—The Waimate Hotel.

734. Between what hours?—Between the hours of 8 in the morning and 5 in the afternoon.

735. Were you watching from the street?—No.

736. Where were you watching from?—From a building adjoining the street.

737. What building?—A store.

738. What building?—It has no particular name. It belongs to Mr. Manchester.

739. Is it a house?—No, it is a shop.

740. What kind of shop?—It is now used as a saddler's shop.

741. Has Mr. Manchester any other shop?—He owns all the building down that street.

742. You say it was a saddler's shop from which you were watching the hotel?—Yes.

743. Which door did those people enter and leave by?—The side door in High Street. I think I also said that some of them entered by the gate. I may say, too, that some of those persons came out of either the side door or the side gate without going in. There are other approaches to

the hotel, and I want to make it plain to you that all those people did not go in at the side door, but certainly either went in or came out of the side door or the side gate.

744. *The Chairman.*] You have given the numbers of those people you saw enter?—Enter, or leave.

745. There may be some persons counted twice then?—No; I knew the people.

746. If you did not see them enter they must have entered before 8 o'clock in the morning?—Oh, no; there are other entrances.

747. Which entrances had you in view?—The High Street entrances.

748. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Does this gateway lead you to a back entrance of the house?—Yes.

749. About what number do you suppose entered by the side door as against the gateway?—According to the notes I took, there were twenty-one persons entered or left at the gate, but did not enter or leave the side door—twenty-one separate persons.

750. Twenty-one persons left by the gateway?—Entered or left by the gateway.

751. And how many by the side door?—Twenty-seven whom I knew to be residents; add to that, nineteen strangers.

752. How many?—Forty-six, by the side door.

753. You say one man went in five times during the day?—Yes.

754. And was visibly under the influence of liquor?—Yes.

755. What was that man's name?—McLeod.

756. Christian name?—William.

757. Where does he live?—He lives at the back of a butcher's shop, which faces on Queen Street, and on a street the name of which I do not know.

758. He is the proprietor of this shop?—Yes.

759. The name of the man who entered three times?—George Johnson.

760. Where does he live?—He lives, I think, in Maud Street.

761. Do you know his occupation?—He is a horse-trainer.

762. Will you give us the names of some other people who were going in and out? Were there any who entered twice on this particular day?—There was a man named Larry Thyne who entered twice.

763. Have you anything to fix about the times of these visits?—Yes. In the case of the first man, McLeod, the five times were distributed, I think three times before dinner and twice after, or thereabouts. His first visit was made early in the morning, I should say about 9 o'clock, and his last visit was made between 4 and 5 o'clock.

764. Another name of a person who entered twice?—Another man's name was Sole. His Christian name I am not so sure about. There are several brothers.

765. Do you know this man's occupation?—I think I should call him a labourer. There are three brothers; and it is not John, and it is not William.

766. Where does he live?—I think he lives in High Street. He entered twice in company with George Johnson.

767. Any other who entered twice?—I have no further note of any others who entered twice.

768. Will you give us the names of some who entered once, if you please?—I did not make any notes of them, but I could tell you all the same. One man's name was Hobbs. He entered three times in the morning. He lives about a mile from the hotel.

769. Do you know his Christian name?—I cannot bring it to mind for the moment, although I know it.

770. What is he?—His name is Charles. You might call him a foreman of County Council labourers. I think he ranks as a sort of foreman amongst labourers.

771. Now, I would like to know the names of about half a dozen?—A man who left the side gate without my seeing him enter at all was named Finn. He is an accountant.

772. Is there a watering place down this side gate?—I believe so.

773. These persons whose names you have given me, did they enter by the side door or did they enter this gateway only?—All with the exception of the last one went in at the side door.

774. Is there more than one Finn in this place?—Yes. He is the senior. I do not know his Christian name.

774A. Did you observe signs of liquor on others?—Only on the two I have mentioned.

775. I think you have given us six names. Do you know the names of the others?—I could bring some of them to mind.

776. Twenty-eight persons lived within two miles of the place to your knowledge?—Yes.

777. Do you know the names of those twenty-eight persons?—I do not know the names of the twenty-eight persons. I could bring to mind, with a little thinking, the names of some of them.

778. Can you remember any more just now?—Not just now. I have been trying to think them out.

779. Now, as to these prohibited persons, the two men who were drinking in the presence of the police?—I did not say in the presence of the police. I said within view of the police-station.

780. They were drinking from a bottle. Of course, you had no means of knowing where they had procured this drink?—None.

781. And in the case of the man who came to your shop under the influence of liquor?—There was a bottle in his dray—in his cart.

782. And there again you had no means of knowing from whom he had obtained this drink?—None.

783. Were you watching with any other person?—No.

784. Did the owner of the premises from which you were watching have any knowledge you were there?—No.

785. Is he also occupier as well as owner?—No.

786. The occupier had a knowledge of your presence there?—He knew I might be there, but he did not know I was there.

787. Does he live on the premises?—No.

788. Simply uses the place as a shop?—Yes. He is a brother of mine. I may say, in a small town like that the publicans have so much influence, that I desire to say he was not aware of the purpose for which I had gone there, and would hardly have allowed me to be there.

789. Have you ever reported to the police about these prohibited persons being supplied with drink?—No.

790. Why have you not done so?—For one thing I did not think it would be much good. I thought if I saw them, and I so seldom on the streets, they must know of it.

791. But one came to your place of business, I understand?—Yes. I am not positive from this distance he had a son with him. If the boy was with him there on that occasion I do not exactly remember.

792. How old would the boy be?—I should suppose about ten.

793. Capable of driving the dray in the event of his father being drunk?—Yes.

794. Did you see him go away from your place: was he driving the dray?—That I do not remember. I am inclined to think the boy was.

795. How long ago was this?—I should say about nine months ago.

796. What was his name?—Alick Price.

797. Does he live in Waimate?—Yes. He is an expressman.

798. The names of the other two?—George Johnson was the name of one. The name of the other I do not know.

799. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was that the same George Johnson you saw going into the hotel?—Yes.

800. Is he prohibited now?—No, I think not.

801. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] How long ago is it since you saw these men drinking from a bottle?—I should say about nine months.

802. For all you know it may have been tea they were drinking?—Yes; but men of that class do not usually stand in the street and drink tea from a bottle.

803. Are you a teetotaler?—Yes.

804. Supposing I saw you drinking out of a black bottle, would it be fair for me to suggest or suppose you were drinking spirits?—No, I should not say it would be fair, provided you knew me as well as I knew them.

805. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were not the men referred to under the influence of liquor?—That I could not say. They were distant from me a matter of 300 yards perhaps.

806. Could not all this information elicited from you have been collected by the police in the same way as you have collected it?—Oh yes, much more easily than I could.

807. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you think your brother would be inclined to lend his shop to the police to watch there?—I have no hesitation in saying, if the police asked for the loan of his shop they would get it.

808. *Mr. Taylor.*] You have no personal fear of the consequences of coming here?—None; but I do not want to involve anybody else. If they could have done me any harm, they would have done it long ago.

THURSDAY, 14TH APRIL, 1898.

DAVID HANNAFIN, examined on oath.

1. *Mr. Lee.*] What is your rank?—I am a third-class constable, stationed at Port Chalmers.
2. You were stationed in Dunedin about Christmas time?—Yes.
3. What is the date of this day of which you are going to speak?—The 25th December last—last Christmas Day.
4. You went on duty at 1 o'clock, mid-day?—At a quarter to 1, mid-day.
5. Who went on duty with you?—Constables Hickey, McDonald, Ferguson, and Sergeant Conn, who was in charge of the section.
6. Before you left the station you all stood to "Attention"?—Yes. Sergeant O'Neill inspected the parade.
7. And who inspected you?—Sergeant O'Neill.
8. And passed you out?—Yes.
9. The four of you, with Sergeant Conn?—Yes.
10. That was, from the Dunedin Police-station?—Yes.
11. The sergeant then dropped each officer at his respective beat?—Yes.
12. Who was the first officer dropped?—Constable Ferguson.
13. He was dropped where?—Close by the station.
14. The next constable was who?—Constable Hickey.
15. Then the next?—Constable McDonald.
16. Where was he dropped?—At the corner of Rattray Street and Princes Street, near the Grand Hotel.
17. Where were you standing when he left you?—I was standing in Princes Street, at the Bank of New Zealand corner.
18. McDonald had to go across the road to the Grand Hotel?—Yes.
19. And where was your beat?—Princes Street.
20. How long would have elapsed from the time you left the station until McDonald was sent on his beat?—About five minutes.

21. Did Sergeant Conn draw your attention to anything?—Yes.
22. When?—He drew my attention to Constable McDonald, as McDonald was crossing over the intersection of Rattray and Princes Streets to go to his beat by the Grand Hotel.
23. What did Sergeant Conn say to you?—He said, "Hannafin, what do you think of him? I think he is drunk."
24. Speaking of McDonald?—Yes.
25. Well?—And I replied and said, "I should not like to say he was drunk."
26. What did Sergeant Conn say to you then?—He said then, "You b——, I thought that was what you would say."
27. Did you notice whether McDonald was, in your opinion, drunk?—I would not swear him drunk.
28. Did you notice him staggering in his walk, or anything of that kind?—No.
29. Then, did Sergeant Conn allow McDonald to go on his beat in that condition which he said he was in?—Yes.
30. And you went on your beat?—Yes, in Princes Street.
31. Was that the only occasion on which Sergeant Conn drew your attention to McDonald?—Yes, the only time.
32. Shortly after that some man came up and spoke to you in the street?—Yes.
33. Was he a stranger to you?—Yes, quite a stranger.
34. Did he express some surprise about the language which the sergeant had used towards you?—Yes.
35. Have you found out since who he is?—Yes.
36. What is his name?—Mr. Robert Gowie, baker, in Russell Street, Dunedin.
37. You say he was unknown to you at the time?—Yes.
38. How did you happen to find out his name?—I saw him a couple of days afterwards in the street, and asked him his name.
39. What time of day was it when your attention was drawn to McDonald's state?—About eight minutes to 1 o'clock.
40. Were you called off your beat that afternoon?—Yes.
41. About what time were you called off the beat: can you fix it definitely?—About 2.30 p.m. I was called off the beat.
42. Where were you called to?—To the station.
43. Did you see McDonald there?—Yes.
44. What state was he in then?—He was drunk.
45. In a very different state to when you left him on the beat?—Yes, quite a different state altogether.
46. Do you think from the condition McDonald was in that he could have stood to "Attention," and walked up the street then, without anybody noticing it?—No, certainly not.
47. You say, then, he had taken liquor after leaving you?—He must have, from the appearance of the constable.
48. There was some inquiry before Inspector Pardy?—Yes.
49. And what was the result of that inquiry?—He asked me what state McDonald was in when Sergeant Conn drew my attention to him, and whether he was drunk or sober. I answered that he was not drunk. The Inspector then accused me of being untruthful, and told me to make out a report as to what state Constable McDonald was in when Sergeant Conn drew my attention to him.
50. You made out a report?—I went into the watch-house and wrote out a report. I saw Constable McDonald there drunk when I went in to write out the report.
51. Since then you have spoken to Sergeant Conn about this in the presence of some other constables, have you not?—After writing the report out I handed it to Inspector Pardy, and I was marched back to my beat again under Sergeant Conn. Going along lower High Street, Constable McKenzie overtook us.
52. What time would that be?—About a quarter to 3 in the afternoon.
53. How long had you been in the station then?—I may have been a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes.
54. What conversation was there?—I said to Constable McKenzie, "I have been up before the Inspector"; and Sergeant Conn then said, "I know the b—— I have to deal with now. I shall make him do his whack in future." I answered and said, "I always do my duty, sergeant." Constable McKenzie was close by at the time, and he left then.
55. You noticed a report in the *Star* of some evidence given before the Commission by Sergeant Conn?—Yes.
56. And I believe you asked for an inquiry in Dunedin?—Yes.
57. How long before the Commission left did you ask for an inquiry?—I applied the next morning, after seeing it in the *Star*.
58. How many days would that be before the Commission left Dunedin?—The Commission closed the following day, in the morning.
59. So your case did not come on there?—No.
60. Where were you when you saw this report in the *Star*?—At Port Chalmers.
61. Where you were stationed?—Yes.
62. *The Chairman.*] Did you make any report as to the conversation that passed between you and the sergeant?—Yes; I spoke to Sergeant O'Neill about the matter. I reported it to him.
63. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you report it to him in writing?—No.
64. You only spoke to the sergeant?—Yes, verbally.
65. *Mr. Lee.*] Sergeant O'Neill was one of the witnesses you were asking for to-day?—Yes. When I went off duty that day I went and saw Sergeant O'Neill, and I asked him to

take me before the Inspector to lay a charge against Sergeant Conn for making use of the language mentioned. The sergeant said, "I will take you before the Inspector; but you lay a serious charge against Sergeant Conn, and if you are not able to prove this charge you will be dismissed. Your word against Sergeant Conn's is no good." I then saw Sergeant O'Neill the next morning, and told him I would let the matter drop.

66. At that time you had not dropped across Mr. Gowie, the witness?—No.

67. Subsequently to that you met Mr. Gowie?—Yes, and ascertained his name.

68. *The Chairman.*] You believe the witness Gowie heard the language of the sergeant which you complain of?—He asked me why the sergeant made use of such language towards me, when he saw me afterwards.

69. Do you suggest that Constable McKenzie heard the second sentence which you complain of?—He was close up, and could have heard it.

70. Has he communicated with you as to whether he did hear it?—Yes, he said he heard it.

71. You have reason to believe he did hear it?—Yes.

72. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have a pretty distinct recollection of what took place that day?—Yes.

73. You still say there was no sign of drink on McDonald when he marched out?—I admitted he had had drink when I was before the Inspector.

74. Do you still say the constable displayed no signs of drink when he marched out on duty?—I said he was not drunk.

75. Did you not say, in answer to your counsel, that Constable McDonald could parade and march out without attracting any attention?—I did not notice him.

76. You say in going out at 12.45 he stood to "Attention" and marched out without attracting attention; is that what you still say?—He attracted my attention, and I noticed he had had a drink or two; but the man was not drunk.

77. You noticed he had been drinking, but he was not drunk?—No.

78. Now, as regards your report to the Inspector: what did you say in your report to the Inspector?—I said the man appeared to be under the influence of drink; that he had had some drink.

79. At what period?—When marching out on duty.

80. This is your report, I believe:—

Central Police-station, Dunedin, 25th December, 1897.

REPORT of Third-class Constable D. Hannafin, No. 694, *re* Constable McDonald.

I respectfully beg to report that I went on duty at 1 p.m. this date. I noticed Constable McDonald stagger going out when going towards his beat. He seemed to be under the influence of drink. He was under the influence of drink at the time.

DAVID HANNAFIN, Third-class Constable, 694.

Yes, that is my report; but I am not swearing to that on my oath now. I was not on my oath when I wrote that report.

81. You mean, when you wrote that report it was not true?—It is true so far, that I noticed the man had signs of drink on him. He did not stagger.

82. *The Chairman.*] Now, you say he had been drinking when he went out on duty, but you did not had consider him drunk?—Yes; I noticed he had had a drink or two.

83. Was the man staggering?—No, I did not notice him stagger. I put that in the report because I was threatened with dismissal, and I did not want to show any leniency.

84. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you mean to say you reported in this form within an hour or an hour and a half of the occurrence, and that you then reported what you knew to be untrue?—I mean to say that when I put in the report that he staggered, I am not prepared to swear that he did stagger.

85. At this period you are not prepared to swear that?—Yes.

86. But, within an hour or an hour and a half of the occurrence you were prepared to write he did stagger, and you did write?—Yes, the man was absolutely drunk then.

87. You wrote this report within an hour of the occurrence, and you then reported you saw the man stagger going out to his beat; now, four months afterwards, you come here and say the man did not stagger?—He may, for all I know, but I could not swear to it.

88. You report, "I noticed Constable McDonald stagger going out when going towards his beat. He seemed to be under the influence of drink. He was under the influence of drink." Now, this report you made on the afternoon of the occurrence: is this a true report, or is the statement you are now making a false one?—The statement I make at present is correct.

89. And this is a false report?—Not what I stated, that he appeared to be under the influence of drink.

90. But as to staggering?—That is incorrect, so far as I know. He may have done so, but I cannot swear to it.

91. Now, Sergeant Conn, according to your statement, had used this improper language towards you before you made this report?—Yes.

92. Why did you not mention that in the report?—I did not. I thought I would wait until I came off duty. I was detailed off to make a report on the state of Constable McDonald, and I intended to make out another report in regard to the language Sergeant Conn made use of towards me. I did not want to connect the two reports together.

93. Were you brought from the Artillery to the police?—Yes.

94. And are your reports when not on oath generally made as this one was?—Yes.

CHRISTOPHER CONN, examined on oath.

95. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a sergeant, stationed in Dunedin?—Yes.

96. And you were on duty there on Christmas Day last?—Yes.

97. You took out the men on duty at 1 o'clock—the four men mentioned by the last witness?—I did.

98. Amongst them was Constable McDonald?—Yes.
99. Had you any knowledge then, when you took the men, as to what had been McDonald's state during the morning?—I had.
100. What did you know then as to McDonald's state during the morning?—When coming off duty at 9 a.m. I called Sergeant O'Neill's attention to McDonald, who was then under the influence of drink.
101. That was to say, he was under the influence of drink while on duty?—Coming off duty.
102. Then, of course, he would have been under the influence of drink while on duty?—I noticed him in Princes Street and took him down a back way.
103. That was early in the morning?—Yes, about a quarter to 8.
104. What did you report to Sergeant O'Neill?—I said he was under the influence of drink.
105. Did you say drunk?—He was not exactly drunk; he was under the influence of drink and staggering.
106. You draw a bit of a line yourself between drunk and being under the influence of drink?—A little.
107. Did I hear you say just now he was drunk?—Yes.
108. Did you report him as drunk?—Under the influence of drink. He was so drunk that Sergeant O'Neill found it necessary to send one of the constables home with him to his private house. Sergeant O'Neill took off Constable Hickey to take him home.
109. If you found him drunk, can you explain why he was not arrested and charged with drunkenness?—There are degrees of drunkenness as well as anything else. Another thing, placing a man under arrest causes a scene, and I did not want to make a scene.
110. And when he got to the station he was sent quietly home to recover himself?—Yes, and I reported the matter to the Inspector.
111. Notwithstanding that, at 1 o'clock McDonald was trotted out on beat again?—Yes.
112. Was that usual, where a man had been found drunk a few hours before on beat, to be sent out again at 1 o'clock?—I cannot say.
113. Have you ever known of such a thing before?—I do not think that such a drunken constable has come under my notice for many years, and I have been twenty-six years in the Force.
114. Knowing that, and seeing you had charge of the beat, you would take some notice of McDonald's condition before you took him out on beat?—Well, the man was loitering about the watch-house before going on beat, and I could not very well tell until I got them on the march in front of me.
115. But there was a special reason to see whether McDonald was sober or not, seeing he was drunk at 9 o'clock; did it not strike you as necessary to see whether that man had sufficiently recovered himself?—I took particular "stock" of him; but he was sitting down on a bench in the station, and I could not very well tell.
116. I suppose you would not knowingly take him out under the influence of liquor and put him on beat duty?—I would not.
117. What would you do in such a case?—Every case has different circumstances.
118. If you had thought McDonald was under the influence of liquor then, would you not have reported him to the sergeant?—I would have called the sergeant's attention to him.
119. You did not do that?—No.
120. I take it you thought him sufficiently sober to go on beat?—Yes, until I watched him on the march out.
121. Was he in a worse state, when you say he was under the influence of liquor in the morning, than when he went out on beat?—He was much improved when we were going out on the beat.
122. If you say he was under the influence of drink in the morning, he was not so much under the influence of drink when he went out on beat?—No, he was a good deal sobered up.
123. And he was not absolutely drunk in the morning?—He could walk after a fashion.
124. When you took him out on the beat, when did you first notice any signs of his being under the influence of liquor?—I noticed on the way up the street he was staggering, and I called Constable Hannafin's attention to him. He was marching immediately before me.
125. Where was this?—About Sargood, Son, and Ewen's.
126. And had you dropped any officers up to that stage?—Yes, Constable Ferguson.
127. And there were three officers left—McDonald, and two others?—Yes.
128. You drew Constable Hannafin's attention to McDonald then?—Yes.
129. Who was the other officer on the beat with you then?—Constable Hickey. He was in front.
130. Did you draw his attention to McDonald's state?—No, he was in front.
131. What did you think yourself? Did you think McDonald was fit to go on the beat or not?—I did not think he was fit to be on the beat.
132. Would not Constable Hickey have heard you calling Hannafin's attention to his state?—No, because McDonald was between Hickey and Hannafin, and I spoke in an undertone and said, "Do you see the condition of that man?" and Hannafin made no answer then.
133. Did you ask him again?—I did. I said, "He will be down directly," and Hannafin then told me he thought the poor man was right enough.
134. You went on then and dropped Hickey, did you not?—Yes, he went off at his own beat.
135. That leaves you with McDonald in front, and Hannafin?—Yes, alongside of me.
136. And you go on to the Bank of New Zealand corner?—Yes.
137. Then, McDonald made across the street towards the Grand Hotel?—Yes.
138. Did you notice anything about McDonald then?—He was not walking steady.
139. In your opinion, was he fit to be on beat?—No.

140. What did you do?—I watched him for some time.
141. But before Hannafin went off on his beat?—I spoke to Hannafin about it.
142. What did you say?—Well, so far as my recollection serves, the exact words I used were these, "This is a nice state of matters, seeing the way we have been shown up lately."
143. How "shown up lately"?—There was a bit of an inquiry into the working of the police, and there was some talk about this Commission being set up.
144. And what did you then say to Hannafin?—He told me he thought the man was right enough.
145. Did you ask him?—Yes.
146. What did you say then?—I do not know that I replied to him at all. I walked away towards the telegraph office, I think, and I told him to go on his beat.
147. Did you see Hannafin again?—Yes.
148. Is this the first time you have said you spoke to him on two occasions?—No.
149. When did you say otherwise?—I cannot tell. I made a report, and my report is there.
150. Does your report show that you mentioned these two conversations?—I cannot say.
151. Would you mind looking at your report to see what you did say?—I did not mention twice.
152. In your report do you mention twice?—No.
153. Then, in your report you did not mention that you had two interviews with Hannafin about McDonald's state?—I do not think so.
154. You have heard what Hannafin said you replied to him in the presence of this witness, Gowie?—Yes.
155. Is that true or not?—It is a falsehood; and there was no one near us if I had used the words. But I never used any such language in my life.
156. And you mean to say you did not use the words complained of?—Certainly not.
157. At that stage you expressed no surprise that Hannafin refused to say McDonald was drunk?—Not at all, because I knew what he would say before I asked him.
158. You did?—Pretty well.
159. Why?—There were other circumstances.
160. What are the circumstances?—Perhaps it would be better not to hear them.
161. *The Chairman.*] What did you know before that?—Previously, when I first spoke to him, he cut me very short, and said the man was right enough. I wanted some one to substantiate as to whether the man was drunk or sober, and as he was there I thought he was the best witness to ask. I never like to ask any outsider as to any matter affecting a policeman.
162. You say, then, he cut you very short: when was this?—At the first interview.
163. I do not quite distinguish between the two interviews?—The first was when we were coming up from the station. The other was afterwards, when Hannafin had been a little time on his beat. His beat comes down to McDonald's beat.
164. What interval was there between the first conversation on the march up to the section?—Perhaps fifteen or twenty minutes.
165. That was when you said, "This is a nice state of things"?—Yes.
166. *Mr. Lee.*] You parted with Hannafin then, and McDonald went to his beat; where did you go?—I hung about in sight of him. I went down to the telegraph-office, and I think I went down as far as the Terminus Hotel.
167. In your opinion, at that time was McDonald in a fit state to be on his beat?—Certainly not. I was taking steps to take him off it.
168. And you say you wanted to get a witness to bear that out?—Yes.
169. Did it not occur to you that you could better do that by walking McDonald down to the station and letting the sergeant see him?—The sergeant was not there.
170. Was no one there?—The watch-house keeper.
171. When you found him to be drunk on his beat, why did you not walk him back to the station where some one else could see his condition?—I used my own discretion.
172. Do you think it was a proper thing to allow a man to be on his beat under the influence of liquor?—There was no use taking him away when the man would swear he was not drunk.
173. What would be the value of that evidence, against the evidence of the officers at the station that the man arrived back under the influence of liquor?—It was half an hour afterwards.
174. You could have walked him back in five minutes?—There was no one there.
175. Was there no one in the Dunedin watch-house at 1 o'clock?—Only the watch-house keeper.
176. Where was Sergeant Shirley?—In bed.
177. Was the matter not important enough just to rouse him to have a look at McDonald?—I had my own reasons for that.
178. What were your reasons?—I had better not tell.
179. You have given it to us this way: that you left McDonald on the beat under the influence of liquor?—I did not leave him; I was taking steps to have him removed.
180. When did you next see Hannafin: how long afterwards?—About twenty minutes. I went for the Inspector and brought him down, and I then took McDonald to the station. The Inspector then sent me on beat again.
181. This occurred before you saw Hannafin again?—Yes.
182. How do you explain, if you did this and took the man down to the station, that you drew Hannafin's attention to him on a second occasion?—This was afterwards.
183. I asked you when did you next see Hannafin?—About twenty minutes after going out.
184. Where did you see him?—At the corner, a little above the Bank of New Zealand.
185. How far had Hannafin gone before you got back again?—Down to the corner of the Octagon, and back again.

186. And when he comes back to the corner of the Bank of New Zealand again you have a second conversation with him?—Yes.

187. Where was McDonald at that time?—Standing against the corner.

188. Which corner?—Corner of Rattray and Princes Streets.

189. Was he standing erect, or how?—He was leaning against the wall.

190. It so happened that just as McDonald is at his corner Hannafin gets back again to his corner?—McDonald stood there some little time.

191. What did you say to Hannafin again?—I asked him what his opinion was.

192. Did you point him out across the road?—Yes.

193. And again asked Hannafin what his opinion was?—Yes, and he said he could not say. I said, "Now, I want an answer—Yes or No. If you were on your oath would you swear that man was drunk or sober?" He said, "If you swore he was drunk I would swear he was sober."

194. What was McDonald's condition then? Was it worse than when he left Hannafin?—Yes, he was worse.

195. You would say, then, that McDonald in the interval had obtained liquor somewhere?—I think so; or he had taken liquor immediately before leaving the station, and it had not taken effect.

196. But his condition was worse than when he left Hannafin on the first occasion?—Yes.

197. Was he at that stage drunk?—Yes, to my mind.

198. Had you been near McDonald at all or close to him?—No.

199. Did you watch where McDonald went to in the interval?—I tried to.

200. Do you know where he went?—Yes.

201. Where?—I found him in the office of the Grand Hotel.

202. Was this before Hannafin saw him?—No, afterwards.

203. I mean in this period, between the first and second conversations with Hannafin; did Hannafin know whether McDonald had been in the hotel?—I cannot say.

204. Had you been watching him?—I had been down to the Terminus Hotel, and that was the only time I was out of sight of him.

205. What did you do after the second conversation with Hannafin?—I was waiting until Hannafin would go out of the road towards the Octagon, so that I could get round to the Inspector's house without Hannafin seeing me.

206. Why?—I had an object.

207. What object?—I had an idea that if I lost sight of McDonald he would be spirited away in the meantime, and that I would not get him when I came back.

208. You really thought Hannafin would go and spirit McDonald away in a state of drunkenness?—I had that idea.

209. What was your reason for that?—I do not know.

210. Why did you not order Hannafin to take him into custody and take him to the station?—Not under the circumstances.

211. But there would be no doubt, when you got McDonald to the station, as to his condition?—How did I know what they would give him to sober him, when my back was turned at the station.

212. You thought that when you got him to the station they would have drugged him to make him sober?—Yes.

213. Then, you went away for Inspector Pardy?—Yes, as soon as I saw Hannafin out of the road.

214. What time do you think it was when Hannafin saw McDonald again at the station?—It might be ten or five minutes to 2 o'clock. I cannot tell exactly. It was somewhere between 1 and 2 o'clock. Between them, they had given me so much trouble that I did not look at the time.

215. You deny that you made use of that language in the presence of Gowie or McKenzie?—Yes, undoubtedly. It is an utter falsehood.

216. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Immediately you got Hannafin's back turned you went to the Inspector's house?—That is so.

217. How long did it take you to get to the Inspector's house?—About three minutes. I do not think more.

218. Did you find the Inspector there?—I did.

219. Did you return at once with him?—Yes.

220. How long was it, from the time you left the neighbourhood of the Grand Hotel to fetch the Inspector, to the time you returned with the Inspector?—I do not think more than five or seven minutes elapsed, because the Inspector said, "Let us go on quick."

221. When you arrived there, did you see Constable McDonald?—Yes.

222. Immediately you arrived there?—He was in sight as we came down the street.

223. Then, what did you do?—The Inspector ordered me to get a cab, and I got one, and put McDonald into it.

224. When was he in the Grand Hotel?—I left him in it after my conversation with Hannafin. McDonald went out of my sight, and went round the corner, and I knew he had gone nowhere else, and I went into the hotel and found him hiding in the office.

225. Did you frame a report against Constable McDonald?—Yes, I made a report of the whole circumstances.

226. Will you look at this report on the defaulter's sheet, and say if it is correct, namely: "Being drunk on duty, and found secreting himself in the Grand Hotel, Dunedin, at 1.30 p.m. on the 25th December, 1897"?—I did not frame that.

227. *The Chairman.*] What interval of time was there from your last seeing McDonald on his beat and your going with Inspector Pardy and seeing him in that condition outside the hotel?—Probably about twenty minutes.

228. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Look at your own report, and tell me what time you state there that McDonald was drunk, or under the influence of drink?—1.30 p.m.

229. Was that the time?—That would be about the time.

230. And then how many minutes after that was it that you had the constable down at the station?—I should think about twenty minutes might have elapsed.

231. That is, the whole thing was over and the constable at the station before 2 o'clock?—Yes, I think so.

232. When you submitted your report against Constable McDonald, did you consider it necessary to repeat in that report the number of times you had spoken to Hannafin on the matter?—Not at all.

233. And therefore you did not report that?—No. I only reported Constable Hannafin verbally to the Inspector. My mentioning the matter to the Inspector occurred in this way: He said, "You should have called the attention of the man on the next beat to him," and I said I did so.

234. Were you present when Constable Hannafin was brought down to the station and placed in the presence of Constable McDonald?—I was. The Inspector sent me for him.

235. Did the constable then deny that McDonald was not drunk?—Yes. He still persisted he was not drunk.

236. And it was only after the Inspector had cautioned him to be careful of what he was saying that he then admitted McDonald was drunk?—Yes.

237. And then did the Inspector tell him to go and make out a report?—Yes, of the whole thing, and he was away in the office until he had finished it and submitted it.

238. Where did the constable go to to make out the report?—To the watch-house.

239. There was no one with him to coerce him in any way?—McDonald was there, and the watch-house keeper.

240. No non-commissioned officer?—No.

241. And you have seen the report which he handed in?—Yes.

242. *Mr. Lee.*] Was that report, do you say, made out by Constable Hannafin without any coercion or suggestion of any kind?—No suggestion in any shape or form that I know of.

243. Were you not in the Inspector's office when the Inspector asked Hannafin to add something to his report?—Yes.

244. Then, how do you make out that the report was written without a suggestion of any kind?—He did not finish it. After the Inspector wanted him to say something more he still persisted in saying the man was not drunk.

245. *The Chairman.*] While he was writing that report?—He had finished all but the last line, but he would not say even in the report that Macdonald was drunk, and the Inspector said, "You must know whether the man is drunk or sober"; and Hannafin said, "Well, he is under the influence of liquor now." Then, the Inspector said, "Well, sit down and add that to the report." That lower line of the report, namely, "He was under the influence of liquor at the time," was not in Hannafin's report when he brought it into the Inspector's office. When he brought the report in Inspector Parry said, "This is unsatisfactory; I must insist that you say whether he is drunk or sober." He still, at that stage, persisted in saying the man was sober.

246. *Mr. Lee.*] That the man was sober when?—Any time.

247. *The Chairman.*] Do you say actually that whilst writing this report, and before he handed it in, he still persisted in saying McDonald was not under the influence of liquor?—Yes; Hannafin reported, "I noticed Constable McDonald stagger going out when going towards his beat. He seemed to be under the influence of drink."

248. And do you say the Inspector said, "I must insist on having it from your own lips and having it in this report what you think of him now," and then Hannafin added, "He was under the influence of liquor at the time"?—Yes, the Inspector required a direct answer from him.

249. *Mr. Lee.*] Did he require Hannafin to say whether the man was drunk then in the station, or whether the man was drunk when you spoke to Hannafin up the street?—I cannot tell you.

250. Do you say that Hannafin said the man was not drunk after he had seen him at the station?—He still persisted in saying the man was right in the station.

251. At that time, in the station?—Yes, he persisted in saying that, till he was almost forced into saying the man was drunk.

252. *The Chairman.*] You say Hannafin still persisted in saying the man was not drunk until he was forced into saying he was drunk?—Yes, after the Inspector threatened him.

253. *Mr. Lee.*] And this is the report that was made without any coercion of any kind?—Yes; you may call it coercion, but it is only true.

254. What did the Inspector threaten him with?—He said he would suspend him if he did not tell the truth.

255. *The Chairman.*] What did the Inspector threaten the constable with?—He said he would suspend him. He said, "If you swear the man is sober you are liable to a punishment for perjury."

256. Are those the words the Inspector used? He said he had a good mind to suspend Hannafin?—Those are the words he used. He said, "You see the state the man is in now?" and Hannafin said "Yes."

257. The whole question in my mind is this, as to Hannafin's conduct in describing the condition of the man on the beat; I gather from your last answer that he persisted up to the last moment in saying that, so far as his opinion went, McDonald was not drunk?—He would not admit he was drunk in the station.

258. *Mr. Lee.*] But the Inspector really never asked him if he was drunk; what the Inspector wanted to get out of Hannafin was whether McDonald was drunk on the beat at the time you spoke to him?—I cannot say what the Inspector thought.

259. What did he ask?—He asked his opinion.
260. As to the man's state when he was on the beat?—And in the watch-house at that time.
261. But, so far as that report is concerned, all the Inspector asked to have inserted in the report was that McDonald was under the influence of liquor at the time he was on the beat?—The Inspector said the report was unsatisfactory.
262. In so far as it did not state that the man was under the influence of liquor on his beat when you spoke to Hannafin. Did that report satisfy the Inspector as altered?—Yes, by the addition.
263. Did the addition satisfy the Inspector?—Apparently.
264. He did not ask for anything more?—No.
265. You first heard about this witness Gowie this morning?—Yes.
266. Were you told what he was coming up to say?—No. I know nothing about it.
267. Who spoke to you about Gowie? Did Commissioner Tunbridge speak to you about Gowie?—No.
268. Did he tell you Gowie was going to be called as a witness?—He said some one was coming up to be called, but did not say who.
269. Did he say that this witness was going to give evidence as to a conversation that passed between you and Hannafin; and did you not think it was then necessary to have two interviews?—I do not care how many witnesses he brings. There was no man heard me speak, not even the constable who marched up in front of us to the beat, because I spoke in an undertone so that McDonald would not hear me; and Hickey could not have heard, because McDonald was between him and Hannafin.
270. But there was no reason for an undertone when McDonald was across the road by the Grand Hotel?—Certainly there was. I do not speak at the top of my voice in the street about police matters.

HENRY RICHMOND, examined on oath.

271. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am librarian of the Oamaru Athenæum.
272. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you had occasion at various times to complain of the larrikin nuisance in Oamaru?—Yes.
273. Kindly tell the Commission how and when?—A great nuisance is created in the front of the Athenæum by the congregation of youths and elderly persons in the day-time, and especially in the evening. I have asked them to remove; and they have done so, by going a few paces along the pavement away from the building. This has been going on now, I may say, for a number of years. Finding that I could not suppress the congregation of these men, I have applied to Sergeant O'Grady to assist me in the matter, by taking the thing in hand himself. He has done so in a manner that has only given temporary relief, for say, two or three days or evenings. The crowd would be perceptibly smaller than previously; but after that they would commence to congregate as usual. I may say, the nuisance arising from this is in this manner: the language from these people is not of a very nice character, and complaints have been made through me by both males and females of the language used when they have been passing the Athenæum. Well, this state of affairs has been going on now for a number of years, without any definite result until Monday, the 4th of the present month. I then went down to the crowd that congregated there, and told them to "move on." Some of them then commenced jeering at me, and not having time to bandy any further words with them, I retired, and reported the matter to my committee.
274. When did you see the police about it?—I cannot tell the last time, but I may say that for this ten years past I have complained at least twice or thrice, or four times.
275. *The Chairman.*] When did you complain last?—About six months ago.
276. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you not write letters on behalf of the committee of the Athenæum?—No.
277. Did you see Inspector Cullen about it when he was down here?—I did not.
278. Do you know whether anybody saw him from the Athenæum?—Yes.
279. Who saw Inspector Cullen?—The president and secretary.
280. Now, you know of your own knowledge that the Inspector from Christchurch was interviewed?—Yes.
281. What has been the result since?—The result has been that the place has been free both by day and evening since.
282. *The Chairman.*] When was this?—Monday, the 4th April.
283. And you say during the last ten days the nuisance has been removed?—Perfectly so.
284. *Mr. Taylor.*] What results followed your previous complaints?—Only temporary relief.
285. Have you ever had so much relief as you have had now?—Never.
286. Have other citizens complained to you about the larrikin nuisance in Oamaru?—Yes.
287. The language you refer to was an annoyance to your lady subscribers?—Yes.
288. *The Chairman.*] You say, on former complaints you had only temporary relief for a few evenings, and now you have had relief for ten days; is that a longer period than you ever had before?—Yes.
289. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever had complete relief before?—Never.
290. *Mr. Lee.*] How many days would this previous relief, after your complaints, extend to?—Three or four days.
291. Did these complaints you made to the sergeant appear in the public prints, or would you just go to the sergeant yourself?—They appeared in the public prints.
292. When you went and saw the sergeant would it be notified in the newspapers?—No.

293. But this fact, that the committee had gone before Inspector Cullen was notified in the newspapers, was it not?—Yes.

294. And do you attribute a cessation of the nuisance to the fact that it appeared in the papers at all?—I attribute a great deal to the notice in the papers, because any comments that have been made upon that subject in the papers have always been of great service in clearing away the crowd.

295. Then, it may be said that on account of the papers having taken the matter up the larrikins have been away for such a lengthened period as ten days?—Yes.

296. When speaking on this question of larrikinism, you are confining yourself to the larrikinism outside the Athenæum, and not speaking generally of larrikinism all round the town?—Oh, no.

297. Do you remember on how many occasions you have brought this matter before Sergeant O'Grady?—I cannot tell. A great many.

298. You do not know the dates at all?—No.

299. Are you aware recently of a case in the Police Court brought against a larrikin for loitering about the street-corners?—Yes; we received relief then.

300. What was the result of that case, do you remember?—I think the decision went against the police, so far as my memory goes.

301. From the fact that the case was on you received a little relief?—Yes.

302. Without any complaint at all?—Yes; I found it a relief in this way: that, after that case, when I moved the crowd on, they did not jeer, inasmuch as they moved one-third away from the building, and then said they had as much right there as I had.

303. *The Chairman.*] When you speak of a crowd, is it a large crowd?—Sometimes I have counted as many as twenty-five, smoking, spitting, and using very peculiar language.

304. What is the particular attraction in that locality?—I do not know, I am sure.

305. Do they use the library?—No.

306. *Mr. Lee.*] There is a free reading-room?—Yes.

307. *The Chairman.*] Do some of the men use the free reading-room?—Yes.

308. *Mr. Lee.*] The Athenæum is straight on to the footpath, is it not?—Yes.

309. A good wide footpath?—Yes.

310. Generally speaking, how many larrikins would there be about there; twenty-five is an exceptional number?—The average would be about ten or twelve. On special occasions they increase in numbers.

311. Have you any record of any obscene language used? Can you particularise any incident?—No.

312. You are speaking generally?—Yes.

313. You are pretty zealous in keeping the place clear?—Had I not been so I do not believe patrons would have been able to get into the Institute at times.

314. In these conversations you had with the sergeant, has he undertaken to attend to the nuisance?—He has; and I have also seen him on one occasion order them off, and seen him also threaten them on another occasion.

315. Some of these people are pretty tough customers?—Oh, yes, very tough cases indeed.

316. *Mr. Taylor.*] As a matter of fact, has it not been notified in the public prints on more than one occasion that the Athenæum Committee made complaint about this nuisance?—Yes.

317. *The Chairman.*] At what time of the day is this nuisance greatest?—In the evening it is greatest. They commence to gather from 6 to 6.15 p.m., and by 7 p.m., when I return to duty again, there is a crowd around.

318. *Mr. Poynton.*] How long do they stay there?—Until 10 o'clock; until the lights are out.

319. *The Chairman.*] You are in the institution, I suppose?—Yes, unless I go down, which I do specially when a complaint is made. I very often go down and move them away.

320. Do you think the police can do anything more than they have done to keep this particular spot free from gatherings of this sort?—Yes; I think if the police on duty, when they see a crowd congregated there, would cross over and move them on, I think in due time we should get rid of the nuisance. The police on duty usually walk along on the other side of the street.

321. That is, the shop and populous side of the street?—Yes; the Athenæum is on the less frequented side.

322. Do you know how many men are on duty in the town during the evening between 6 and 10 p.m.?—Two, I think.

323. And do you think two men are sufficient to parade the streets and to prevent the gathering of groups of lads and men?—I do not. I believe firmly it would take one man to keep that Athenæum corner clear.

324. Knowing what you do of the town, and that only one man is on duty between 6 and 10 p.m., do you think that one man could keep the streets clear?—No, I do not.

325. Do you attribute the state of things you describe to negligence on the part of any police officer?—I would not say direct negligence; but I say if, when a constable was passing down the street and saw a crowd, he passed over and moved them on, it would relieve the nuisance very much.

326. But you do not allege it as negligence on the part of any officer; you see, it is alleged as neglect of duty on the part of Sergeant O'Grady?—No, I do not. I believe myself, according to the force he has at his command, he has done his best in the matter, because he has asked me after I have made a complaint if I had any trouble with the crowd, and I have said, "No, not at present." He said, "Well, I have put them off time after time, and they are back again as soon as my back is turned."

327. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have they come back during the last ten days?—No.

328. Has there been a policeman there during the past ten days?—No.

ERNEST PAGE LEE, examined on oath.

329. *The Chairman.*] What is your profession?—I am a barrister, practising at Oamaru.

330. *Mr. Taylor.*] You are secretary of the Athenæum?—Yes.

330A. Has the question of the nuisance referred to by the last witness been discussed by your committee?—Yes.

331. What was the result?—The result was that it was brought before the committee when Inspector Cullen happened to be in town, and it was the opinion of the committee that if a deputation there and then waited upon Inspector Cullen and brought the matter before him, and gave publicity to the thing in the papers, it would have a tendency to abate the nuisance.

332. Did you wait upon the Inspector?—I did, with the president.

333. What did you complain of?—We drew Inspector Cullen's attention to the fact that the librarian complained of the larrikins congregating outside the building, and we asked him if he could do anything in the matter, and he said he would give it his attention. We were in his company I should say about a minute.

334. Did you tell him that you had previously made an application for an abatement of the nuisance?—No.

335. No reference made to it at all?—Not that I remember.

336. Did he not tell you it would be attended to?—Yes.

337. Has it been attended to?—I cannot say at all, any more than the librarian reports.

338. Have you previously made complaint to the police yourself?—No.

339. Has the committee?—I do not think so. I may say the matter is brought up sometimes in the committee for the purpose of getting it in the papers.

340. Has it been previously reported in the public press?—I think it has, but I cannot say positively.

341. Do you write the reports of your meetings for the newspapers?—No, I do not write the reports for the newspapers.

342. Your committee had not previously communicated with the sergeant of police about this matter?—I cannot tell you. I have not been on the committee indefinitely.

343. How long have you been on the committee?—Eight or nine years.

344. You did not complain to Sergeant O'Grady at any time?—We may or may not. My recollection does not serve me. I did not know I should be called to-day or I might have tried to refresh it.

345. Have you taken any steps to ascertain whether the nuisance has been abated since you went to the Inspector?—None.

346. You relied entirely on the Inspector?—We did not rely at all on the Inspector. We did what the committee wanted us to do.

347. Was it reported to your committee that Sergeant O'Grady had been complained to by the librarian on any occasion?—The committee were aware that the librarian had spoken to Sergeant O'Grady.

348. Did you think you would get more attention by applying to the Inspector than to the sergeant?—It was considered, when the Inspector happened to be in the town, it would be well to go to him for the sake of the publicity. I may say if Inspector Cullen had not been in the town the matter would not have come before him but Sergeant O'Grady.

349. Has not publicity been given to the matter before?—Occasionally, and I understand the nuisance has abated.

350. But you got no permanent relief?—No; and there is no guarantee of it at present.

351. *Sergeant O'Grady.*] You know the Athenæum fronts on the footpath?—It does.

352. And the main frontage is on the footpath?—Yes.

353. The library and librarian's rooms are a considerable distance away from the front?—Yes, upstairs.

354. Could expressions used by young fellows in the street be heard either in the library or librarian's office?—They would have to be very loud to be heard upstairs. I should say in the free reading-room they could not be heard.

355. The Volunteer Hall is a short distance away from the Athenæum?—Yes, it might be a matter of 150 yards—round by the cricket-ground.

356. And the Volunteers going there have to go round by the side of the Athenæum?—Yes.

357. And when returning pass again?—Yes.

358. Now, are you aware of your own knowledge whether Volunteers actually stand at that corner before going to the Volunteer Hall?—I have seen Volunteers standing about there.

359. And bandsmen?—Yes.

360. It is immediately before proceeding to the hall?—Yes.

361. I think Mr. Richmond, the librarian, is pretty jealous of his position?—I think he is a good officer, and he endeavours to keep the boys away.

362. What is the width of the footpath there?—I suppose about 12 ft. or 14 ft.

363. *The Chairman.*] I would like to know whether the committee has expressed any opinion on the conduct of the local police in connection with the matter?—It has not.

364. Have you any opinion to express yourself?—No. Of course, speaking professionally, I know the difficulty of the law in the matter.

THOMAS EDWARD TAYLOR, examined on oath.

365. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the House of Representatives?—Yes, representing Christchurch.

366. *Mr. Lee.*] What is your occupation?—I am a land and estate agent.

367. Have you stayed in Oamaru before this occasion?—I have.

368. Have you ever resided here?—I think I stayed here for a week once.

369. In what part of the town did you stay when here?—I stayed at the Criterion, and Star and Garter, and with two or three friends, amongst whom were Mr. Milligan and Mr. Dewdney.

370. Speaking personally, have you any knowledge yourself of this larrikin nuisance of which you lay the charge?—I think for a town of its size there are a great many larrikins on your streets.

371. You think so?—Yes. On the first occasion I was in Oamaru I saw a most disgraceful exhibition of larrikinism on the part of scores of young men at a public meeting.

372. *The Chairman.*] How long ago?—It will probably be the first occasion I stayed in Oamaru. It may be six years ago. There was practically a riot at the meeting of the Salvation Army. Rotten eggs, and stones, and other missiles were thrown.

373. *Mr. Lee.*] Were you on the platform?—No, among the audience.

374. Have you ever been on a public platform when there have been similar scenes and rows anywhere?—No. I was never on any platform when such an exhibition of larrikinism occurred.

375. Everything perfectly quiet?—There have been the ordinary vocal interruptions.

376. Eggs about?—I think I have seen a few eggs inside the building.

377. Do you know that as a matter of fact there was a conviction in this case you spoke of?—I do not.

378. Would you say there was no conviction?—I would not.

379. Do you not know that a man named Morgan was convicted?—No.

380. You keep a fatherly eye on these things?—No.

381. When you say there is more larrikinism in Oamaru than other towns, what towns do you speak of?—Ashburton, Timaru, Balclutha, Clinton, Tapanui, and a number of towns in the North Island.

382. You have resided in all of these towns?—I have stayed in them all.

383. For what length of time?—In some cases one night, and in some two and three nights.

384. Although you laid this charge, that the sergeant failed to suppress larrikinism, all the evidence you could fish up was that of Mr. Richmond's?—I did not fish any evidence up. It was a matter of public notoriety, and Mr. Richmond was a man of public repute and I called him.

THOMAS O'GRADY, examined on oath.

385. *Mr. Lee.*] You are the police sergeant in charge at Oamaru?—Yes.

386. You have heard all this evidence in reference to larrikinism?—Yes. I may say, first of all, that the population of Oamaru proper is very nearly six thousand, and the larrikin element is probably no worse nor as bad as in many other towns of its size.

387. They are not a particular product of Oamaru in any way?—No. The youths of the town are amenable, and as soon as they are spoken to they move away. They work in factories during the day, and after tea they go out on the footpaths and walk and talk together in groups of four, five, or six, as the case may be. At one time the practice was for them to congregate at the doors of the post-office and old post-office, the Church of Christ, and Athenæum, and various other localities where the doorways afforded them shelter. It then was a matter of some importance, as they spat on the footpaths, and used, no doubt, language that was not proper. Immediately that was discovered, I took prompt steps by instructing the men on every parade when going out to be sure to pay attention to it, and especially to the Athenæum. I pass the place three or four times a day going to my home and returning to my office at 8 o'clock every evening. I often find a number of the bandsmen—young fellows of twenty, and some of them more—waiting and talking at the corner of the Athenæum. As soon as I approach they move on and walk away. I invariably speak to them, and point out how wrong it is for them to be congregated on the footpath. As they are sons of respectable people I always give them a word of advice. On special occasions men have been employed in plain clothes with a view to preventing the nuisance. I have had three cases brought under the Police Offences Act before the Stipendiary Magistrate, Major Keddell. The evidence of the police was that they saw loiterers on the footpath for some time before approaching them, and that on approaching them and telling them to move off the footpath they went to the side of the footpath, immediately off the concrete portion, and stood there. Viewing that report, I considered it loitering, in my mind, and I brought the case before the Stipendiary Magistrate. The case was dismissed on the ground that if they moved on when requested by a proper officer they complied with the law. The law was defective. I know of no law in force in Oamaru to enable me to bring a case before the Court for standing on the footpath and moving off when requested to do so. Mr. Richmond has complained to me, in some instances, of these youths congregating in front of the Athenæum, and on all occasions I have promised him to attend to it; and I have done so by instructing the police to pay attention to it. The principal time of the offence is when these young fellows are going to the Volunteer Hall, and that would be only of short duration. They stand at that particular corner. The same force and the same efforts have been made by me for some years past as has existed within the last fortnight. Mr. Cullen spoke to me about it when these gentlemen interviewed him, and I told him I had made the same efforts for some years, with a view to preventing it. I do not think that the larrikin nuisance is any worse than in other towns, or as bad.

388. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the language used by these people on the footpath, has it come to your knowledge that offensive or obscene language has been used?—It has not. Had it come to my knowledge I would have taken steps to prosecute, and bring the matter before the Court. There have been no special instances reported to me of any particular offence being committed in the vicinity of that building.

389. You have had no complaints brought to your knowledge by the librarian of obscene language in front of the Athenæum?—No, I have not. I have not heard it until I heard Mr. Richmond say so just now. He has mentioned spitting.

390. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you parade the men after Inspector Cullen spoke to you about the matter?—Only the usual parades.

391. Did you speak to the men about the matter on parade?—I have.

392. When?—I think the night after the Inspector was interviewed.

393. You spoke to the men on parade about this larrikin nuisance?—Yes.

394. What did you tell them?—I said that a complaint had been made about the larrikins congregating at the Athenæum, and my instructions were to the effect that larrikinism should not be allowed in the vicinity of the hall, or any part of the footpath, and that if they saw anything of the kind they would stop it. The men all know very well that I have given these instructions repeatedly.

395. Do you know whether the nuisance has been abated during the past ten days?—I do not think it is any different than it has been for years. If you ask my opinion, I do not think the nuisance there is as bad as Mr. Richmond suggests.

396. Have you always held the opinion that Mr. Richmond exaggerates?—I hold the opinion that his duty is upstairs in that hall; and it is only when he gets cross with the boys that they turn round on him. I know he loses his temper sometimes when speaking to them.

397. Do you find them congregated at the Athenæum?—In front of the Athenæum. But Mr. Richmond will not allow them to stand in front on the footpath even.

398. Did you tell Inspector Cullen about the difficulties of the law?—Mr. Cullen had a conversation on the subject of the law in reference to larrikinism, and the Police Offences Act, and the Borough by-laws were considered.

DAVID SMART, examined on oath.

399. *The Chairman.*] Where are you living?—I am farming down at Ardgowan.

400. *Mr. Lee.*] You are an ex-constable?—Yes.

401. Stationed in Oamaru under Sergeant O'Grady, for how long?—About four years.

402. You would be on duty in Thames Street on and off?—Yes.

403. Can you speak of your own knowledge as to whether there was more larrikinism about Thames Street than in other places during that time?—No. I did duty in Wellington, Christchurch, Timaru, and Ashburton; and Oamaru is just similar to other towns as regards larrikins.

404. *The Chairman.*] Up to what time were you in the Police Force here?—Two years last November.

405. *Mr. Lee.*] Have you ever received instructions from Sergeant O'Grady about larrikins?—Yes.

406. What would they be?—He would tell us, when parading to go out on duty, to look after these places.

407. Any special reference to any place in particular?—As regards the Athenæum, the worst time for larrikins was from 6 to 8 o'clock, and I used to go and chase them away. I never heard complaints from Mr. Richmond during the four years I was here. He never complained to me.

408. You did not look upon the larrikin nuisance, while here, as anything particularly serious?—I did not.

409. Did you ever lay a charge against any, or apprehend any?—No. If I told them to go away they went away.

410. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you in the Police Force in Ashburton?—I was.

411. What did you leave Ashburton for?—I was transferred from Ashburton to Timaru.

412. For what?—I had a dispute with the jockey club, at the races there.

413. Did you refuse to arrest some men there?—I did.

414. Do you hold peculiar views as to what constitutes larrikinism?—I hold that a policeman must use his own discretion.

415. As a matter of fact, did the department think you were wrong in that case?—They did not.

416. Why did they shift you?—It was brought before the Court, and the case was dismissed.

417. And you were shifted?—I was eleven years and a half in Ashburton.

418. And you were transferred soon after that?—It was eight months after that.

419. You have never laid a prosecution for larrikinism against anybody?—Yes.

420. Here?—I do not remember; but I have in Ashburton.

421. Did you win the case?—Yes, I got a conviction.

MICHAEL GREENE, examined on oath.

422. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a police officer, stationed at Oamaru?—Yes.

423. Have you been here long?—A little over twelve months.

424. Have you noticed since you have been in Oamaru that larrikinism is worse than it is in other towns?—I have not noticed anything unusual, more than in Invercargill or Dunedin. I never thought larrikinism bad here. I have heard the sergeant mention on parade that complaints had been made of the crowd about the Athenæum, and instructing us to get rid of them. I do not think the nuisance is as bad as it used to be. They do not seem to congregate there as much as they used to do.

425. Do you notice if they have any particular spots for assembling up and down the streets?—At one time they used to assemble near the Athenæum, but I have not noticed them so much lately as on former occasions, since they have been spoken to.

426. When you are on duty do you keep an eye on that side of the street as well as the other?—Yes.

427. Have you at any time had particular instructions from the sergeant about the Athenæum?—Yes.

428. Recently, or from time to time?—From time to time, and also recently. In fact all the men in the station have been spoken to by the sergeant to pay particular attention on Saturday nights and Sunday nights, to see that larrikins are removed, and not allowed to congregate.

429. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you receive your last instructions?—Close on a week ago, or thereabouts.

430. After the Inspector's visit?—Yes.

431. What were the instructions?—That we were to pay particular attention to larrikins, and to see that they did not congregate about the Athenæum or street corners.

432. What have you done since then?—I have done my part. If I saw them while on night or day duty I spoke to them and warned them away.

433. Have they gone?—I have not seen many about. In fact, my opinion is that larrikinism is not very bad here. I have seen them worse elsewhere.

434. Were they worse before the sergeant spoke to you last?—No, they appeared to be pretty well the same. About six months ago I think they were far worse than they have been since.

435. Was it mentioned to you on parade?—Generally on parade.

436. Was it mentioned this last time on parade?—I think both on parade and in conversation.

437. Since the Inspector was here you have been instructed on this matter: how long before that was it last mentioned to you?—I cannot say exactly, but I know it has several times been mentioned to the men on the station since I came here during the last twelve months.

438. Have you always had a keen eye on larrikinism?—Yes; and very often they have a keen eye on us, when in uniform.

439. Have you not got into trouble yourself through larrikinism?—I cannot say that I have.

440. Have you been fined for it since you have been in the Force? Have you not been fined for striking your superior officer in the Force?—There was a charge to that effect in Dunedin.

441. You were convicted for it?—Yes.

JANE ISABEL YOUNG, examined on oath.

442. *The Chairman.*] Are you married?—Yes.

443. What is your husband's name?—Alexander Young.

444. Where do you reside?—North Street, Oamaru.

445. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you report the loss of a watch to the police?—Yes.

446. About when?—The 13th, last month.

447. When did you discover the loss of the watch?—On the 4th March.

448. Who did you see about it first?—I think it was the gaoler. I do not know the police very well. I saw the man to-day, Constable Madden.

448A. *The Chairman.*] Was it a constable you reported the matter to?—Yes.

449. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did he take your complaint down in writing?—Yes.

450. Did you give the number of the watch?—Yes.

451. What is the number of the watch?—3,763.

452. Did you hear anything from the police about it?—Yes.

453. Did they come and see you immediately after that?—I had to go to them.

454. Who did you see the next time you went?—I saw the gaoler again?—I met him on the street.

455. What did he say to you?—I asked him if he had heard anything of my watch, and he told me it was in a pawnshop in Christchurch, and the number.

456. Did you tell the police whom you suspected of taking it?—Yes.

457. Did you give them the name?—Yes, they know the name.

458. Did they tell you who put the watch in the pawnshop?—I do not mind if they did.

459. You are sure they said it was in a pawnshop?—Yes; Sergeant O'Grady told me.

460. Where did you see him?—I went to his office after I was told that by the gaoler.

461. What conversation took place between you and Sergeant O'Grady; do you remember the date you saw him?—No; it was some days afterwards, when they told me it was in the pawnshop.

462. Well now, what happened after you saw the sergeant?—Well, he said he had written up about it, and that there was another girl with her. Sergeant O'Grady told me that a friend of the girl whom I suspected of stealing the watch had seen her in Christchurch, with the watch on her.

463. Now, what next took place?—That is all the information I got from Sergeant O'Grady.

464. Was that at his office?—Yes.

465. What took place after that: did the girl come back to Oamaru?—Yes; I saw her getting into the train with me for Dunedin.

466. How long after you had reported the loss of the watch to the police?—It was the day before the Otago Jubilee, the 22nd March.

467. Have you seen the girl since then?—I saw her here one night.

468. Here?—It was before the Jubilee, in Oamaru, after she had returned from Christchurch.

469. After you had reported the matter to the police?—Yes.

470. And after the police told you the watch was in a pawn-shop in Christchurch?—Yes. But they told me afterwards the watch had been taken out.

471. Who told you that?—Sergeant O'Grady.

472. What did he say to you then?—I told him it would be found out through this girl who was with her in Christchurch; and I said she would destroy the watch because her friend would most likely write down to her and tell her it was known to the police.

472A. And you thought that to get rid of the police she would get rid of the watch?—I have heard no more about it. The sergeant told me there was a girl watching her on the street.

473. With a view to finding out something about the watch?—I suppose so.

474. When did you see anybody else about it? Did you see the police after that?—No. I have not seen any to speak to since.
475. Did you not say that if the police did not act promptly you would take some steps?—Yes.
476. What steps?—I told the gaoler I would put the matter before Mr. Taylor, and before the Commission.
477. Do you mean before the Police Commission?—Yes.
478. What happened?—I have heard no more about it.
479. After you told the gaoler that would happen?—The sergeant came up the next day.
480. To where?—To my house.
481. Had he been to your house before?—No.
482. What did he tell you then?—He said there was a girl looking after her on the street, and he asked me if I had seen her since; and I said, No, that I was not much out.
483. Did you tell him you had seen her on the streets of Oamaru before that?—Yes, I told him about that. That was at the time of the Jubilee.
484. Have you got the watch yet?—No.
485. *Mr. Lee.*] When do you say you first gave information to the police?—I told you before, on the 13th March.
486. Where would the gaoler get his information from on the 11th about it?—I cannot say about the date of the 11th.
487. Why do you say the 13th? What makes you fix on the 13th?—That is the day I gave the information.
488. What day of the week was it?—On a Friday, the 13th March.
489. The 13th March was a Sunday; was it a Friday, or Sunday?—They will have the dates themselves if I have made mistakes.
490. *The Chairman.*] Was it Sunday?—No, on a Friday.
491. *Mr. Lee.*] You think you have made no other mistakes in this statement you have just made to the Commissioner?—I do not know if I have made any mistakes, but I do not think I have.
492. What was the last day on which you saw the sergeant?—I do not know. I have not looked at the dates.
493. Was it on Good Friday? Do you remember him going to you on Good Friday?—It may be; I cannot remember.
494. Now, the last time the sergeant called upon you, did he not say something about your laying an information in order that a search warrant might be issued? Was not something said about that?—He asked me if the girl had had a box; and I said she had no box in my house.
495. Did he say something about a search warrant?—He said he would go and see her box in her father's house.
496. But did he say nothing about a search warrant?—I do not mind.
497. Did he ask you to lay an information?—Before that, of course.
498. But on Good Friday?—No, no more was said.
499. You are quite sure he did not ask you to lay an information?—No.
500. Did not the sergeant say you were to go down to the Court after the holidays were over; that you were to go when the Court was opened again on Wednesday?—No, he never mentioned such a word.
501. But did he say anything about the Court being closed?—He spoke of the Clerk of the Court being away on his holidays.
502. Did he say nothing about your going to the station to see him again?—No.
503. Are you sure about that?—Yes.
504. What did he say: that he was going to let the matter drop?—It looks very like it.
505. Was anything said by you about the girl's parents being respectable people?—Yes.
506. Something was said by you to the sergeant about the girl's parents being respectable people?—Yes.
507. And was not something said by you that, on account of that, you did not wish to prosecute?—I said that at the very first. They said they had found the watch in a pawnshop, and had got the number of the watch.
508. Did you not say something to the sergeant on Good Friday, that you did not care to prosecute because the girl's people were respectable people?—No, it was before that. I told them I wanted the watch.
509. When did you make up your mind that you would prosecute?—When I was told about the watch being in Christchurch.
510. Do you say the police told you they had found that the watch had been pawned, and taken out of pawn again, in Christchurch?—Yes; the sergeant told me after the Jubilee that it had been taken out of the pawnshop.
511. And they told you that a friend of the girl's had seen this particular watch in the girl's possession?—Yes.
512. Or was it that some friend of the girl's had seen her with a silver watch? Which was it?—That was what the sergeant said.
513. That a friend of the girl's had seen her with a silver watch in Oamaru?—No, in Christchurch.
514. Did not the sergeant tell you that some one had seen her with a silver watch?—Yes.
515. Did he say that some one had seen her with the exact watch that was lost?—He read a letter to me that he had received from Christchurch, saying this girl had been in company with her, and saw her with a lady's silver watch.
516. Did you not raise an objection to laying an information against the girl on Good Friday?—I never mentioned it.

517. Supposing you were asked by the police, would you lay an information against her now?—Yes; I want the watch.

518. Will you lay an information against the girl charging her with the theft, so that a search-warrant may be taken out against her?—Yes; I did that before.

519. But will you lay a sworn information, so that the girl may be arrested and searched?—I would never have given an information if I had not mentioned it.

520. Did not Sergeant O'Grady tell you that you would have to go down to the station and lay an information—that is, sign a paper, so that he might proceed to search the girl?—Yes, they told me so; but that was all said before.

521. Did you not understand you would have to go back to the station again?—He did not tell me so.

522. Are you sure you did not refuse to sign anything like that because the girl's people were respectable?—I never refused.

523. Do you remember telling the sergeant to hold the matter over until after the Jubilee?—I asked him if I could get away down to the Jubilee, and he said "Yes," and I called again when I came back, and he said the watch had been taken out of the pawn-shop.

524. Well now, understand this: that the girl may be arrested and searched if you would sign a written information: now are you prepared to do that, so that the girl may be arrested and searched?—Yes. I would not bother about it if I had not wanted it done.

525. You did not call at the police-station after the Easter holidays?—I ran after them until I was tired.

526. I suppose you thought it was quite sufficient to tell them that you had lost the watch, and get it back again the next day by telegram?—Oh, no; quite different.

527. What grounds have you for thinking that this girl in question had stolen the watch?—Well, she was in my house, and no one was in it but her.

528. Did you wear that watch out of doors?—No; the chain was taken off the watch and left behind.

529. Used you both to be out of the house together?—No, never.

530. When you missed the watch the first day did you say nothing about it to the girl?—No, I was warned about her.

531. How long did you keep her in the house after you missed the watch?—She went away the next day, on the 5th March.

532. You did not report the loss till Friday, the 11th March?—No.

533. When she left your house on the 5th did you suspect her?—Yes.

534. Why did you not go to the police there and then?—I think it is time enough, after all they have done so far.

535. Why did you not go to the police there and then when you suspected her, and she had left your house?—I do not know.

536. You did not want to prosecute her, did you?—I told them if they could possibly find it without prosecuting the girl I would prefer that; and they said they could not do that, and I told them to go ahead.

537. *Mr. Taylor.*] You are quite clear that you did not decline to sign a search warrant?—No, they never asked me.

538. Are you perfectly clear when you say there was a letter in the possession of the police stating that the watch was in Christchurch?—Sergeant O'Grady read me a letter saying he had a letter from a friend of the girl's, who had been in company with her, and had seen a silver watch on her.

539. When you went to the Jubilee, you did not ask the police to wait until you came back, but simply asked if you could get away?—Yes; and when I came back the sergeant said the watch had been taken out of the pawnshop.

540. *The Chairman.*] When you went away to the Jubilee you did not say the matter should be held over?—I asked if there was any objection to my going.

541. *Mr. Taylor.*] And they told you when you came back that the watch was out of the pawnshop?—He did, and he had a letter from this girl in Christchurch, saying she had seen this girl wearing it.

542. Was not the delay due to your husband? He did not want the matter pushed?—Yes.

543. But you were determined, after you had reported the matter to the police, to see it through?—Yes.

544. *The Chairman.*] What was your reason for not laying this information for a week after you missed the watch, and after you suspected the girl? Why did you not give the information at once?—Well, I was acquainted with her people, and I did not like to summon them.

545. That was your reason for not taking action?—Yes.

546. And you waited until she was away for a week before laying an information?—Yes. I did not know she was away until I was told she had gone to Christchurch, and then I told the police.

547. *Mr. Poynton.*] You said you wanted the watch found without the girl being prosecuted?—Yes.

548. Did you inform the police that you wanted the watch back without her being prosecuted?—Yes, when I first went to them; and during the next two or three days they told me they could not.

THOMAS O'GRADY, examined on oath.

549. *Mr. Lee.*] When was this matter first brought before your notice?—By this report, which was made on the 11th March. It is as follows:—

H.M. Prison Gaol, Oamaru, 11th March, 1898.

REPORT of Second-class Constable Michael Madden, *re* the theft of a watch.

I respectfully state that at 3.30 p.m. on this date a woman named Mrs. Young informed me that on the 18th of last month a young woman came to stay with her, and remained until the 4th of this present month. A couple of days before she left, Mrs. Young missed her watch, which is a ladies' open-faced Geneva watch, No. 3763, value £3 10s. When _____ left she stated she was going to service at _____, of _____, but did not go, and went to Christchurch instead, at which place she was seen wearing the watch, and is now believed to be back in Oamaru again, as her people reside here, and her father works at _____.

M. MADDEN, Second-class Constable No. 552.

On the receipt of that report I wrote the following memorandum on the 12th: "Constable Hunt.—Please try and locate this girl, so that a search warrant to search her box may be obtained.—T. O'GRADY, Sergeant of Police." Constable Hunt reported on the 13th March, and it was he who informed me about the watch having been pawned in Christchurch, and the name of a young lady residing about four miles from Christchurch is mentioned as having been with the suspected girl when she pawned the watch. That was the nature of Constable Hunt's report.

550. What did you do on receiving that?—On receiving that I sent the following telegram the same day:—

Inspector Cullen, Christchurch.

Mrs. Jane Young, of Oamaru, reports an open-faced Geneva watch, No. 3763, stolen from her house between the 14th February and the 4th March of this year; _____ a domestic servant, who was in the house, suspected. This girl is said to have recently pawned a watch in Christchurch, a _____ attendant at _____ being present. Please cause inquiry with a view of ascertaining if the watch pawned is Mrs. Young's. The suspect is here.

T. O'GRADY, Sergeant of Police, Oamaru.

That is the girl who was supposed to have stolen the watch. She has returned from Christchurch to Oamaru.

551. What is the date of that telegram?—The same date as Constable Hunt's report—the 13th March.

552. What was the outcome of that telegram?—It was referred to the detectives in Christchurch for a report, which is dated the 21st March, and is as follows:—

REPORT of Detective Fitzgerald *re* attached telegram.

I beg to report that on this date I went to _____ and saw _____ there, the person referred to in the attached telegram. She states that she knows _____ of Oamaru, but that she never saw her in Christchurch, and she was never present at any place when _____ pawned a watch; but she is just back from spending her holiday at Oamaru, and while there she called on _____ who is living with her parents. She then saw a lady's silver watch in _____ possession, but cannot say if it was a Geneva watch, neither can she say whether _____ has pawned it.

GARRETT FITZGERALD.

553. Now, is that the report you read to Mrs. Young?—Yes.

554. Do you recollect when you gave that information to Mrs. Young? Was it before she came back from the Jubilee or after?—It was before she went to the Jubilee I read that report to her. I may say that the Inspector, not being satisfied with the detective's report, sent the matter to the Detective Department again, and asked, "Have inquiries been made in Christchurch as to whether the watch was pawned there?" And Detective Fitzgerald replies on the 23rd March: "I have made inquiries in all the pawn and second-hand shops, but can find no trace of the watch."

555. Mrs. Young says you told her that the watch had been pawned in Christchurch, and that you had found out that it had been taken out of pawn again?—I never uttered such an expression in my life.

556. She must have misunderstood you?—Yes, certainly.

557. What did Mrs. Young wish done at that stage?—She reported to me that the family of the girl were friends of hers, and that the father was an intimate friend of her husband's; that he was a respectable man, working in a certain place in Oamaru. She said she wanted to get her watch back again; and I said, "Well, Mrs. Young, we will have some difficulty in finding your watch, and in order to obtain it we will require a search warrant. It is evident from the correspondence I have just read to you that it has not been pawned. It is quite possible she may be hiding it or have it in her possession, in which case it will be necessary for you to lay an information and obtain a search warrant to search her box." Mrs. Young then said, "She had no box." I said, "Oh, well, she has a room, and she will have the watch in her room, or amongst her clothes, and a warrant must be obtained in order to make a search." She "hummed and hawed" for some time, and talked about the respectability of the girl's parents, and subsequently said, "I want to go to the Jubilee, and will it do when I come back?" I said, "I do not know whether the girl has gone to the Jubilee or not; but if you are disposed to lay an information you can do so, and the police will make a search for the watch." She said she did not like to lay an information, because of the girl's father being a respectable man and a friend of her husband's, and she said she would wait until she went to the Jubilee, as the girl might be down there at her brother's wedding, which was to take place at that time, and she might see if the girl had the watch there. She went to the Jubilee; and the next thing I heard of the matter was that she had called at the station in my absence, and had asked if anything had been done. This was reported to me by the gaoler, and I went down the following morning to her house and saw Mrs. Young, and told her I was sorry she did not let me know she was back. She said she was just back. I asked her if the girl had been at Dunedin; and she said she had heard that the girl was at her brother's wedding. I said, "You have not seen her?" and she said, "No." I then said, "You cannot state whether she has your watch?" and she said, "No." I said, "Are you quite sure she has the watch; are you sure you have not made a mistake?" and she said she did not think she had. "Well," I said, "the Court is closed now for the Easter holidays, but Mr. Ralfe, the Registrar, will be back again on Wednesday, and we will lay an information and have a search warrant executed with a view to obtaining your watch if the girl has it." That was so arranged on Good Friday, and the next I heard of the thing was the charge laid by Mr. Taylor before the Commission in connection with Mrs. Young's watch. That

is my whole connection with the matter, and I am satisfied that if Mrs. Young had signed an information in the first instance the watch would have been discovered before this. Now, I am quite satisfied that since Mrs. Young has talked about the matter there will be a little trouble in discovering the watch. I may say I told all the pawnbrokers not to take the watch. I warned them by means of stop notices.

558. *The Chairman.*] When did she say she would not lay an information?—Shortly after I received the reports—about the 22nd or 23rd March.

559. Has she laid an information up to the present?—No.

560. *Mr. Lee.*] The Court was closed until the 13th instant?—Yes, until yesterday; but as the woman had been summoned as a witness before this Commission I did not speak to her. I have refrained from speaking to any witness brought into the Court.

561. In the meantime the conduct of the prosecution has been handed over to Mr. Taylor?—I understand so. The first intimation I had of the matter having gone to Mr. Taylor was when the gaoler told me that Mrs. Young said she would go to Mr. Taylor when he came here.

562. And you had this charge laid against you yesterday for neglect of duty?—Yes.

563. I suppose it is needless to ask you whether you have been guilty of any neglect?—I certainly say I have done what I think a police-officer should do under the circumstances. I may say at once I would not, on the evidence of the theft of the watch from Mrs. Young, lay an information myself for a search warrant.

564. *Mr. Taylor.*] After you heard that Mrs. Young threatened to go and see Mr. Taylor about it what did you do?—The following day I saw Mrs. Young, having heard she was back from Dunedin.

565. Did you go to her house?—Yes.

566. Had you been to her house before?—No; she had been to see me.

567. But you had not personally been to her house?—No.

568. You moved pretty promptly after that?—No.

569. The next day is not prompt?—No; nothing more than ordinary zeal was displayed.

570. Yet she reported the loss of the watch on the 11th March, and you did not go to see her before Good Friday?—I had several conversations with her. She came to my office.

571. But you found it necessary to go to her house on Good Friday?—I found it necessary to see Mrs. Young, with a view to seeing whether she would lay an information or not.

572. Were you certain up to that time?—No; and I am not now.

573. As a matter of fact, when did she point-blank refuse to lay an information?—In the first instance, when she came to my office. I am not sure whether it was on the first or second visit—they were pretty close to each other; but she refused to lay an information on the ground that she and her husband had known the girl's father for many years, and that he was a respectable man and working in a respectable position in Oamaru.

574. Do you remember Mrs. Young being told that the watch had been in a pawnshop?—The information that I have read to the Commission was read to Mrs. Young. She being the person complaining nothing was reserved from her.

575. Then you did tell her the watch had been in a pawnshop?—I told her I had information that the watch was in a pawnshop. I could not tell her it was in a pawnshop.

576. Who said that?—Constable Hunt, in his report.

577. Have you investigated that?—It has been investigated by the detectives in Christchurch.

578. Was Constable Hunt misinformed?—He may have been.

579. Do you know if he got his information locally?—I really do not know.

580. Yet he reported on the 12th, and the information was laid on the 11th?—His report is dated the 13th.

581. He did not go to Christchurch in the meantime?—No.

582. Did you investigate the correctness of the statement he made?—Yes, by sending it immediately to Christchurch.

583. When you read this report to Mrs. Young, did she not say then that the matter was to be proceeded with, and the watch recovered?—No, she did not. Even if she had said so, I would have had to use my own discretion in the matter.

584. Have you ever laid an information on your own motion in matters of this sort?—Sometimes. A good deal depends on the antecedents and character of the person suspected. I do not lay an information unless I am thoroughly satisfied that the suspect is a bad lot, and that the ground for my acting so is perfectly genuine. Otherwise I would not lay an information. I would throw the responsibility on the person complaining.

585. If Mrs. Young says she gave you instructions to prosecute when you read Constable Hunt's report to her she is saying what is untrue?—Mrs. Young, like many other people unversed in law, would go to a policeman and report the loss of her property and think that was all she need do in the matter. A policeman is guided by facts and circumstances as to the mode of procedure to be followed.

586. I am asking you whether, if she says she gave you instructions to proceed in the ordinary way to recover that watch, when you read Constable Hunt's report, is that true?—She is not right.

587. I would like to ask Sergeant O'Grady whether he has a conviction against him on his defaulter's sheet for lying?—The reference that is made to my character is that I am a "bad Irishman." A charge of that nature was made against me in the Grey district some years ago, and investigated by Major Keddell, but whether it is entered on my defaulter's sheet or not I cannot say. The charge in its infancy was that I had stated that the Land League had given £150 to Mr. Guinness for the purpose of defending a man named Donoghue whom I had arrested for murder, and who was subsequently hanged in Hokitika. I denied that I had done so, and the inquiry resulted in Major Keddell recommending my removal from the Coast on the ground

that my countrymen and myself could not agree. If that charge was entered against me as a charge of lying, it is false. I have made a statement of what occurred, and I will stand by it till I die.

588. What is the second conviction on that sheet: is that not for making false statements?—It reads: "Oamaru, on various dates between 1st and 21st April, 1887: Neglect of duty in not parading the 9 a.m. day-duty reliefs; falsely certifying that he had paraded the foregoing reliefs." This is one of the peculiar instances of police administration that has forcibly come under my notice for many years. I admitted the charge, when Mr. Thompson said I had not paraded the relief, because there was only one man going out. Mr. Thompson came into the station just as the relief constable was going out of the door, and he called the constable back. He immediately met me and asked me if I had paraded that man, and I said, "No." I said, "Do you wish me to parade one man?" and he said, "Yes." I said, "I have not been in the habit of doing so. The constable, as you will observe, is properly clothed and neatly dressed for duty." That was the end of the matter so far as I knew, and I never knew until this moment that such a charge had been entered up against me; and Major Gudgeon is the very man who allowed the thing to be put in my charge-sheet without me knowing anything about it. The second charge is, "Falsely certifying that he had paraded the foregoing reliefs." I said I had paraded the reliefs; and I certified that the parade went out in the morning at the usual time. And I say so now.

589. Now what is this next conviction?—It reads: "Greymouth, about April, 1884: Circulating false reports regarding the Greymouth Irish National Land League, and general mendacity as officer in charge of police at Greymouth; making certain false statements regarding one Samuel Gilmer, and one Felix Campbell, in his explanation of the above." This was the charge I referred to, and Mr. Gilmer was one of the parties who reported me to the Government. Mr. Gilmer was keeping a hotel in Greymouth. I may say these are incidents in my life which I hoped I would never have to refer to again; but as they have been mentioned, I will be glad to take this opportunity of explaining them. Mr. Gilmer was keeping a hotel in Greymouth at the time, and during my time, and I looked upon him as a very respectable man. He went to Wellington, and his brother William managed the house. About this time a constable named, I think, Palamontain reported to me finding a lot of men playing "yankee-grab" at 2 o'clock in the morning in the house, and amongst them was a cab-driver, whose wife also made a complaint. I laid an information against Gilmer for allowing gambling to be conducted in his house, and the Inspector in charge of the district wished me to withdraw it, but I refused. I had three or four letters and telegrams from him, asking me to withdraw the information, as the Gilmer family were very useful, and good friends of the police. I acknowledged that, but I declined to withdraw the information; and the Inspector attended the Court, and gave the Gilmers an excellent character, which I supposed they deserved, and Gilmer was fined 10s. When this case of arson cropped up at Maori Gully, when I arrested two men named Malloney and Hughes for burning a store, the matter was investigated before two Justices at Hokitika. A second investigation was held, and his Honour the Chief Justice decided that if the insurance companies wished to go on with the case they could do so, but that the Government would not go on with it; and the prisoners were admitted out to come up when called upon. When they were released, they brought an action against the insurance companies, and Mr. Girdwood represented one company, and Mr. Bonar the other, in Hokitika. The action was heard before the Chief Justice in Hokitika, and £700 was the amount sued for, and I had to proceed to the trial with the paraphernalia that I had dug up in the vicinity of the burnt store, and which I had retained in my possession for over two years, pending these inquiries. The result of the case was that his Honour the Chief Justice gave a decision in favour of the insurance companies. Shortly after my return to Greymouth this charge was brought against me, that I was a "bad Irishman," and that I stated that the Land League had given £150 to Mr. Guinness to defend Donoghue. I immediately resented it and denied it, and I was suspended—and suspended for a month on the *ipse dixit* of a grocer, a shoemaker, and a carter—well-known men in Greymouth. I was then reinstated, and a Royal Commission was applied for to inquire into these statements. The Royal Commission was appointed, and consisted of Major Keddell. He then decided that the Court was to be closed, and that we should be allowed to retain lawyers. The matter was threshed out for four or five days, and I succeeded in showing that I had simply done my duty in the arson and murder cases referred to. However, Major Keddell reported to the effect, as I have already stated, that it would be more satisfactory to myself and for my countrymen that I should be removed from the Grey on the grounds that we did not agree. I replied to that, and said I had every confidence in being able to do my duty with my countrymen, against whom I had no ill-feeling, and I asked that I should not be removed. I was left there for about six or seven months and then I was removed. These are the charges, and I am very thankful to the Commission for giving me this opportunity to explain them, as I never had an opportunity before. I say now, I simply did my duty; and if I returned to the Coast to-morrow, I am quite satisfied there is no respectable man on the Coast but would say, "Well, O'Grady, you did your duty honestly."

590. I would like to ask whether on the 6th September, 1886, at Napier, you were not degraded to the position of second-class sergeant for "being untruthful, unreliable, negligent, and careless of your duties"?—I now find, for the first time, that these charges are entered upon my defaulter's sheet, and I will explain the circumstances. The charges were made by a madman named Bullen, who was in the service, and who died in an asylum, and whom I had reported as being insane while in charge of the police at Napier. In 1886 I was removed from the Grey—first of all to Masterton, and on arrival at Wellington the order was changed and I was sent to Napier. I asked and begged the then Commissioner of Police not to be sent to Napier, as I did not want to come in contact with Inspector Bullen, whom I had previously known. However, I went to Napier, and three or four days after my arrival there Mr. Bullen thought proper to keep a black-book against me. He amalgamated fifty-one charges against me in six months, and then referred these charges to Colonel Whitmore, and, without calling upon me for any explanation, I was reduced from senior

sergeant-major in the service to the rank of second-class sergeant, without being allowed to defend myself in any way. Of course, immediately after receiving that intimation I went into Mr. Bullen's office and asked him if he had the charges or a copy of the charges which he submitted to Colonel Whitmore. He said, "I do not want to hear anything more about it." I said I would take other steps to get them, and I requested that I should be supplied with copies of the charges made by Mr. Bullen to the department, but my request was refused on all occasions. I then asked for an inquiry, either before a Justice or a Commission, and I was refused that. The public of Napier, finding, as they generally do, what was the matter, took the matter up and held a very big meeting in the Town Hall and passed resolutions asking the Government to give me an inquiry. I got an inquiry before Captain Preece, as Commissioner, with certain conditions, namely: that if Mr. Bullen proved his charges against me I would be dismissed from the service, and that if I did not substantiate the charges that I made or based my inquiry upon I should also be removed from the service. I accepted the inquiry under those conditions, and I asked for some witnesses; and I was refused them by Mr. Fox, who was then Clerk in the Commissioner's Office in Wellington. The refusal was not even signed by the Commissioner himself, but by Mr. Fox, the Clerk, on each and every occasion. It ended in this: that I had to bring witnesses, at my own expense, from Gisborne, and from Christchurch, and from Wellington to Napier. At the first examination—and I think it will be shown in the evidence—Mr. Bullen applied to have forty-nine out of the fifty-one charges made against me withdrawn, leaving standing one charge of going into the side door of a hotel on a Sunday, instead of going in by the back-door, to catch any Sunday trading, and another charge of failing to collect fines sent from Masterton to Napier for collection. I distinctly cleared myself in both of these cases. I caught the publican, a man named Waterworth, for supplying liquor to two men whom we saw standing in front of a window drinking. However, these two men went into the box and swore that they had never ordered any liquor, and that Mr. Waterworth had made them a present of it; and the case was dismissed. In the other charge, I proved that Mr. Bullen had £1 of the £3 fine to be collected in his safe in the office, and I proved this by a man named Donovan, and that the Inspector had forgotten about it. And that was the second charge preferred against me. The outcome was that I was removed to Oamaru, but I was never restored to my rank, nor given the slightest satisfaction during the whole of this period. I applied to Colonel Hume, but he said, "I have nothing against you, further than that I disapprove of the rank of sergeant-major." I said I did not care for the rank so long as I got the pay. The pay was my consideration. I reported Mr. Bullen for being out of his mind. At dinner in Napier one day he threw two glasses at two well-known people in a hotel. Both came up to the station and reported the matter to me, and it was submitted to the Government, but there never was any investigation. And this is the man who brought these charges against me—a man who died in a lunatic asylum, and was insane for years! There is no man in the Police Force worse off than I am; but I would not have uttered a word about it had I not seen these charges now.

591. Then, I understand all these three convictions are false?—I say so unhesitatingly.

592. And no man in the Police Force has been so badly treated as you have been?—That is my opinion, and I give it for what it is worth.

WILLIAM SMYTH, examined on oath.

593. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A baker by trade.

594. Where do you reside?—Thames Street, Oamaru.

595. *Mr. Taylor.*] You know Sergeant O'Grady?—I do.

596. How many years have you been in Oamaru?—Twenty-four, I think.

597. Do you remember seeing him at any time during the past six months?—Yes, every day.

598. Did you see him at your shop once?—Yes.

599. Under what circumstances?—I saw him pass the door the other day.

600. Did you see him on any particular day in any particular condition that attracted your attention?—Yes; I suppose you refer to the case before the Court, of drunkenness. I see him pass by from time to time.

601. Did he ever call at your shop on a particular Saturday, for instance?—Yes.

602. Can you fix the date? Was it within the last year?—Twice within the last six months.

603. What did he call about?—He called on two Saturday nights—say, the first Saturday in November, and the last—that would make a month between.

604. *The Chairman.*] Was it in November?—I cannot say.

605. Were the two calls within a month?—About a month apart.

606. *Mr. Taylor.*] What did he call about?—I was sent for to my bakehouse, as I was absent from the shop when Sergeant O'Grady called. I was informed on going into the shop that the persons then in the shop could not understand what he said.

607. Did you go in?—Yes.

608. Did you see him?—Yes, he was standing outside the door and I went out to see him.

609. What passed?—Sergeant O'Grady could not make himself understood.

610. *The Chairman.*] By you?—Yes; he could not make me understand anything, except—

611. What time was this?—10 o'clock at night.

612. *Mr. Taylor.*] What night?—Saturday night.

613. You said he could not make you understand anything except?—Except that I should not have the lights burning, as the Early Closing Association would take action against me for having my shop open.

614. On Saturday night?—Yes.

615. Is there any law to prevent you keeping your shop open on Saturday night?—I am not aware of it. As a matter of fact, it was not open.

616. What was his condition?—His condition was absolutely drunk, as far as I understand it.

617. He was not incapable?—Incapable of doing anything except standing up.
618. Did he talk nonsense of any kind to you?—Yes. I saw him leave there.
619. Which way did he go?—He went across the street diagonally to some empty sections.
620. Did you see him go on to the empty sections?—I saw him bundle himself through the fence in a helpless state of drunkenness. He became lost to my view there.
621. *The Chairman.*] Explain what you mean by bundled through the fence?—He got through it somehow. It was a loosely drawn wire fence.
622. *Mr. Taylor.*] You did not follow him?—No.
623. On the second occasion you refer to, what passed?—He came again to me about having a light burning on Saturday night.
624. *The Chairman.*] A second time?—Yes; the same person was in the shop who reported to me he could not understand him on the first occasion.
625. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who was that?—Mr. Cross.
626. What was his condition on the second occasion?—I would not say there was anything wrong with him then, and he was able to talk intelligently.
627. What did he talk about then?—About the shop being lit up at that time of night.
628. Did you discuss the question of your right to keep your shop open with him?—I told him he was evidently giving me trouble through his nonsense and incapacity; that he had troubled me before, and that if he repeated it I would certainly send the item on to Mr. Taylor, Prohibitionist.
629. Has he troubled you since?—I never saw him again.
630. *The Chairman.*] How long is it since this last visit?—I cannot speak with certainty, but I would say the first visit was about six months ago, and the other about five months or thereabouts. I only spoke of it as a joke.
631. *Mr. Taylor.*] You are very clear of the facts though?—Yes.
632. You had no occasion to make a note of the dates?—No.
633. Had you any thought that it would ever come before a Court?—No.
634. *The Chairman.*] You say he was all right on the second occasion, in regard to his sobriety?—Yes.
635. *Mr. Taylor.*] You have not volunteered to come here?—No.
636. I forced you?—Yes.
637. *Mr. Lee.*] Mr. Taylor forced you here on summons?—Yes.
638. You had a little interview with him before you came here?—He came and had a little interview with me.
639. And a little conversation?—Yes.
640. And you told him all this?—Yes.
641. Did he force this out of you?—Not exactly.
642. You knew he was here on the Police Commission business: but you did not think of the Police Commission business when talking of that?—We talked jocularly over the counter.
643. When was he in your shop?—Just a few nights ago.
644. When?—I have never thought of it since.
645. *The Chairman.*] Yes; but if it was a few nights ago, you can fix it?—I should say since Sunday.
- 645A. *Mr. Lee.*] Mr. Taylor came on Tuesday?—I should say the night before last.
646. You have a very good memory about six months ago, but not about two nights ago?—I did not say even six months ago; I could not fix the exact date.
647. Did you know before you saw Mr. Taylor that the Police Commission was coming to Oamaru?—Yes.
648. And did you know that Mr. Taylor would be here on Police Commission business?—Yes.
649. Then, you had this conversation with him in your shop?—Yes.
650. And told him these facts about Sergeant O'Grady?—Yes, the facts were known to him before he came. He told me the facts.
651. You had forgotten them, I suppose?—I had dropped thinking of it as if I had never known it.
652. Had you any correspondence with Mr. Taylor that he was coming here?—No.
653. No letter?—No.
654. Did you know he was coming to your shop?—No, I did not.
655. Did you know who he was when you saw him?—No, he had to be introduced.
656. Are you a Prohibitionist?—In principle I am.
657. In practice?—I do not know what you mean by practice.
658. Well, are you a Prohibitionist?—If it came to a vote between license and no license I would vote "No license."
659. Have you had any little bother with the sergeant about registering your factory?—No.
660. You have had no bother with the sergeant about your bakehouse?—None at all.
661. *The Chairman.*] Have you had to make any alterations at his direction?—No.
662. *Mr. Lee.*] Did he, as Inspector of Factories, instruct alterations to be made?—Not as an instruction to me. He pointed out that certain things would be an improvement, and I recognised that what he suggested was correct, and had them done.
663. Have you had any disagreements at all?—No.
664. Have you had no disagreements with him over the question of your observance of the half-holiday?—Never of any kind. He spoke to me about it.
665. Has not the sergeant spoken to you once or twice about breaches of the Act, and if you kept your shop open?—Yes.
666. And did you take any notice of the instructions he gave you?—Yes, in so far as I replied that, while a certain shop near mine remained open, mine would also remain open until it closed.

667. You had some little disagreement with the sergeant about the question of shop-closing?—This was not a disagreement, so far as I was concerned. Since that I have closed, although the other shop has remained open.

668. This first Saturday night you speak of, was the Sergeant in uniform?—If I must answer Yes or No, I would favour Yes.

669. When you say he was drunk?—Yes.

670. How far were you from him on that occasion?—As near him as his breath would allow.

671. Were you outside the shop or inside?—Outside the door.

672. Did you see him inside the shop that night?—No; I cannot say whether he was in before I came up.

673. You did not see him in?—No, I did not.

674. Were you able to understand him, do you say?—I could not understand “association,” and “early closing,” &c.

675. How was it supposed that you had a special faculty for understanding the sergeant when other people could not? Why did they send for you?—I could understand his complaint against me, and those in the shop would not decide for or against without bringing me on the spot.

676. There was a complaint against you?—Yes; he was complaining, and they could not understand what he was driving at. That is what I understood from them.

677. Did you understand?—Oh, yes; he made himself intelligible to me.

678. About this crossing over the road when he left your shop: how long was he in your company before he crossed the road?—I should say not more than two minutes altogether.

679. Had he a stick in his hand?—I believe so, but I cannot say exactly. I am not sure about it.

680. What sort of a section did he go over?—The section has a large lagoon in it, and the sections are usually known as “Sidon’s sections.”

681. How are they fenced?—Wire-fencing of some kind.

682. Barbed wire?—I cannot tell you.

WILLIAM CROSS, examined on oath.

684. *Mr. Taylor.*] What are you?—A salesman.

685. How long have you been in Oamaru?—About fourteen years.

686. Do you remember being in Mr. Smyth’s shop on any occasion?—I do.

687. Did Sergeant O’Grady call there?—Yes.

688. How long ago do you think it is?—About the end of the year, some time; I cannot exactly say when.

689. It is certainly within the last year?—Oh, yes.

690. Were you in the shop when Sergeant O’Grady called?—Yes.

691. Did he come into the shop?—No.

692. What happened?—He knocked at the door.

693. Did you see him?—I just opened the door a little, and he asked for Mr. Smyth, and I called Mr. Smyth out.

694. Where from?—From the back.

695. Sergeant O’Grady asked for Mr. Smyth?—Yes.

696. Did he say anything to you at all?—No; just asked for Mr. Smyth, and they went outside together on to the street.

697. Was any one else in the shop with you?—Not that I remember.

698. Why did you call Mr. Smyth?—Because the sergeant asked for Mr. Smyth.

699. Did you ask him inside?—No.

700. What was the sergeant’s condition?—I really cannot say, because I was some distance away from him. I was at the counter, and he was outside, and I could not see him very well. The door was half ajar, and I really could not see him.

701. What exactly passed between you? You were close to him when you opened the door?—I had to reach over to the door.

702. Was the sergeant sober?—Well, I cannot say very well whether he was or not, because I was not near enough to him.

703. *The Chairman.*] Were you in a position to see his condition as to sobriety?—I cannot say whether he was sober or not, because I was not near enough to him.

704. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you not expressed an opinion on the matter previously?—No.

705. Did you see him on any other occasion?—Yes, something similar occurred.

706. Did he come into the shop on that Saturday night?—No.

707. Where was he?—Just at the door, as on the other occasion.

708. What was his condition then?—He was no better.

709. What exactly happened on the second occasion?—The sergeant came to the door as on the first occasion and asked to see Mr. Smyth, and I called Mr. Smyth, as I did on the first occasion.

710. What were the exact words he used?—I really cannot say; I never expected to hear anything of this again.

711. So far as you can remember, what were the exact words?—The sergeant asked for Mr. Smyth; and I called Mr. Smyth, and he went out to him.

712. Where did the sergeant stop while you were going for Mr. Smyth?—Outside the door.

713. On the first occasion where did the sergeant stay?—Outside.

714. Did you shut the door while you went to call Mr. Smyth?—It was not wide open.

715. Has it not a spring?—No.

716. Does it close of its own accord?—No.

717. Exactly where was the sergeant standing?—Just outside the door.
718. Tell us exactly what words passed between the sergeant and yourself?—He asked, “Is Mr. Smyth in?” and I said, “Yes.”
719. Could you understand all he said?—That was all he said, and I understood that.
720. Anybody else there?—No, not that I am aware of.
721. Has your memory got bad since yesterday morning?—No.
722. Can you remember what you said yesterday morning?—Yes.
723. A week ago?—I think so.
724. You are perfectly clear, supposing you had a conversation yesterday morning, you could remember the details of it?—It all depends on what it was.
725. Had you a conversation about this matter yesterday morning?—Yes, with yourself and Mr. Dewdney.
726. Where did you go to call Mr. Smyth?—On the first occasion I had to go to the second door. There is a door leading down to the bakehouse. The second time I had not to go out of the shop, because he was just going through the door.
727. How did you call Mr. Smyth?—I said the sergeant wanted to see him.
728. About what?—I had nothing to do with it.
729. What did you tell him?—I said the sergeant wanted to see him.
730. On what?—The sergeant did not tell me what he wanted to see him about.
731. Do you remember what you said about that yesterday morning?—I said nothing about that.
732. Did Mr. Smyth go out at once?—Yes.
733. What did you do then?—I was standing at the counter waiting to be served.
734. How long was Mr. Smyth outside?—I cannot say.
735. An hour?—No.
736. Two hours?—No. I would not say more than a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes.
737. Might he have been outside only five minutes?—Possibly.
738. Or a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes?—Yes.
739. You cannot remember?—No.
740. What time was it?—Between nine and ten at night.
741. Have you discussed this matter with anybody during the last twenty-four hours except myself?—No.
742. Did you have a chat with Mr. Mollison?—No.
743. Nor anybody else?—No.
744. *Mr. Lee.*] Is it a fact, Mr. Cross, that on the occasion of the first Saturday night that you called Mr. Smyth to see Sergeant O’Grady, you could not understand what Sergeant O’Grady was saying to you, or what he wanted?—No. He just called me and said he wanted to see Mr. Smyth. That is all, and I understood that.
745. And you did not tell Mr. Smyth that you could not understand what he said?—No.
746. Can you recollect whether the sergeant was in plain clothes or in uniform, or was carrying a stick?—I cannot say that.

JOHN BARCLAY, examined on oath.

747. *The Chairman.*] Where do you reside?—Eden Street, Oamaru.
748. What are you?—A stonemason.
749. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in Oamaru?—About thirty-six years.
750. Do you know Sergeant O’Grady?—Yes.
751. Do you remember seeing him on any night three years ago, that you remember particularly?—I remember seeing him one night about three years ago.
752. Where was it?—I was walking up Eden Street towards Thames Street, and when I got to the corner of the two streets, Sergeant O’Grady was at the opposite corner coming up from the south. I made a little bit of a sketch-plan of the locality in case there might be any confusion.
753. Were you close to the sergeant?—Yes, quite close.
754. Did you speak to him?—Yes.
755. What did you say to him?—I asked him a question about a dog.
756. Had one of your tenants complained to you about a nuisance caused by a dog?—Yes.
757. And were you looking out for it?—Yes.
758. You heard it that night and went out to see if you could locate it?—Yes.
759. You asked about a dog?—Yes.
760. What did he reply?—He said he had not seen it.
761. About what time at night was this?—12.30 o’clock.
762. What was the sergeant’s condition?—Well, I would consider his condition was that he was drunk, but not incapable.
763. You mean he could walk?—Yes.
764. Did you consider him in a condition to discharge his duty?—Well, if he was going to do heavy manual labour; but for the position of a man in trust, I would not consider he was in a proper condition.
765. Are you certain he was under the influence of liquor?—I was thoroughly convinced then, and I am thoroughly convinced now.
766. Did you talk to him long?—No, not above a minute.
767. Then what happened?—Sergeant O’Grady went up the street.
768. Which way?—To the north.
769. Did you see him stop?—After he went up about a chain he stopped, with his face up to a fence. I do not know what he was doing, or whether he was looking over the fence.

770. What did you think he was doing?—I thought from the position he was making water, but I cannot say for certain.

771. Did you return to your home then?—Yes.

772. Is that the only occasion you saw him in that condition?—Yes, and I was very much surprised when I did see him.

773. *Mr. Lee.*] What is this dog business you were down about?—Well, a lady, whose husband was away, came to me and complained about a dog which was annoying her the night previous, and she came and asked me if I heard the noise, and to see if I could put it away. That is what fetched me out of bed. I could see no dog. It was clear moonlight, and after looking round about where this house was, I walked up to Thames Street, and that is where I met the sergeant.

774. Is this house where this lady lives next to yours?—No, the second house from where I live.

775. Is she a married woman?—Yes.

776. Was her husband at home?—No.

777. What was it got you up in the middle of the night? Did you hear a noise?—Because I heard the dog making a noise.

778. Did the dog annoy you in any way?—It did not particularly annoy me. It was a considerable distance away from my place, but I could hear it.

779. And you wish to say you interested yourself sufficiently to get up in the middle of the night in order to get rid of a dog that was annoying your neighbours?—Yes.

780. What month was it; winter or summer?—About April or May, but I am not sure.

781. What did you expect would be the result of your getting hold of a police-officer? Did you expect he was going to catch this dog?—I did not look for a police-officer. It was the dog I was looking for. I was quite able to manage the dog myself.

782. But you could not manage the sergeant?—No; but he was pretty well able to manage himself too.

783. Were the lamps lighted?—Well, it was such clear moonlight that there was no occasion for the lamps to be lighted at all.

784. Then, when you got down to the corner of the street, Sergeant O'Grady was on the opposite side?—Yes.

785. Was he in uniform?—He had a cloak on—an overcoat.

786. Had he his helmet on, or a plain hat?—I cannot exactly tell.

787. Had he a stick in his hand?—I could not be sure. When he saw me he made a halt, then turned down Eden Street a few paces; then he altered his mind, and came across the street to me.

788. *The Chairman.*] To see who you were, standing there at that time of night? Did he know you?—Yes. I think he knew me.

789. *Mr. Lee.*] He might have been surprised to see you at that time of night?—Quite possibly.

790. You are not often out at that time of night?—No.

791. After you left the sergeant where did you go?—I went to bed.

792. Did you not go after the dog?—I was not going to hunt all over the place for a dog. So long as the dog did not make a noise, that was sufficient for me.

793. Why did you not go through the fence to try and get the dog?—Because I could see through the paddock where the dog was in the habit of going, and I was not going through strange sections hunting after a dog.

794. What was your object in going out of your house?—I was going to hunt the dog away.

795. You were not going to shoot it. Had you a gun?—No. I had nothing in my hand at all.

796. Are you a Prohibitionist?—Well, I prohibit myself; but I am not very violent in prohibiting other people.

797. Do you take liquor at all?—As a medicine.

798. Do you take it as a beverage?—No.

799. Did you at that time?—No.

800. You had none on that evening?—Not for about fifty years. I joined a Band of Hope in 1849 as a boy.

801. You were quite wide-awake?—Yes, just as much as I am now.

802. When did you first make a report to any one of seeing Sergeant O'Grady like that?—I told some private individuals.

803. Who were these private individuals you told?—I told the lady who asked me to look for the dog.

804. What is her name?—Mrs. Dewdney.

805. The wife of the Rev. Mr. Dewdney?—Yes.

806. Living at the back of you?—In the same street.

807. You told Mrs. Dewdney you saw Sergeant O'Grady in this state?—Yes.

808. When?—Immediately after the occurrence.

809. Did you tell anybody else?—I told Mr. Richards, the fruiterer.

810. When, the next day?—Not exactly the next day, but within a few days.

811. Did you tell anybody else?—There are a few more I told occasionally. I was not going to make any particular noise of it.

812. What did you tell them?—Just the same as what I told the Commission now—that I had seen the sergeant the worse of liquor, in my estimation.

813. Are you a member of the Rev. Mr. Dewdney's congregation?—No; I am a member of no congregation at all.

814. Not any?—No.

816. You have known O'Grady ever since he has been here?—Yes.
817. Have you ever seen anything of this kind of thing before or since?—No; and he resided in the same street with me for a considerable time, during which I never saw anything of the kind.
818. Were you surprised to see him in this state the other night?—Yes, I was, because I was not aware that he took liquor to excess.
819. You know, I suppose, what a serious charge this is to make against a police-officer?—I do. I thought I made a very serious charge too, because at that time I saw a local in the newspaper when I was up-country to the effect that there was going to be a libel case with two individuals in the town, and I thought Sergeant O'Grady had got hold of my statement and was pulling me up for libel.
820. You thought there was a chance of an action for libel against you?—Yes, at that time.
821. You would not like a verdict for damages against you?—No, I would not. It is very hard to prove a thing like that.
822. If your story was not true?—But it is true.
823. At one time, you say, you anticipated there was going to be an action for libel against you?—I thought it might be this case that was referred to.
824. Why did you not report the state of Sergeant O'Grady's condition to the police authorities?—It was not my business.
825. Why was it your business to report the matter to Mrs. Dewdney?—I told her I would look after the dog; and it was quite natural, when telling her I could not find the dog, to tell her I found the sergeant.
826. Have you been having a conversation recently with Mr. Taylor about this?—He just merely asked if I had seen the sergeant.
827. He called on you?—Yes.
828. When?—One night this week.
829. Who was with him?—Mr. Dewdney.
830. And then there was a conversation about this case?—Very little conversation.
831. Did you know the Police Commission was sitting here?—I knew by the papers it was going to sit.
832. Did you know they were questioning you so that you might give evidence before the Police Commission?—I did not want to go before the Commission.
833. Did they tell you they were going to bring you?—He told me he would issue a summons for to fetch me.
834. You say the sergeant was able to walk upright?—I told you he was drunk, but still he was capable of getting along.
835. Did you have a conversation with him?—Yes; he was as close to me as you are now.
836. What did you ask him?—I asked him if he had seen a dog.
837. What did he say to that?—He said he had not seen a dog.
838. What did you say then?—I took it from his tone of voice and his speech that he was under the influence of liquor.
839. Sergeant O'Grady did not say anything about you being drunk, in asking if he had seen a dog in the middle of the night?—No; I do not think he asked that.
840. *Mr. Taylor.*] sI Mrs. Dewdney a tenant of yours?—Yes.
841. She occupies one of your houses, and you busied yourself because you did not want to lose a good tenant?—I would have busied myself whether she had been my tenant or not.
842. Was Mr. Dewdney away at a conference?—Yes.
843. And Mrs. Dewdney said she was ill, and that this dog annoyed her, and she asked you to abate the nuisance?—Yes.
844. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand you to say that it was the tone of his voice which led you to think Sergeant O'Grady was in a state of intemperance?—Both the tone of voice and his general appearance.
845. You are hard of hearing?—Yes; I can hardly hear at all sometimes.
846. Do you think you were suffering from anything of that kind on the night in question?—I could hear quite well at the time.
847. Can you say whether he was unsteady in his gait or walk?—He was not particularly unsteady.
848. Kindly be particular, because here is a man whom you have known for years, and whom you say you have never seen in a condition to suggest intemperance before or since, and you say on that occasion, at 12.30 midnight, you met him, and his voice was such as led you to believe he was intemperate; and what else did you notice?—Unless there had been something very unusual about Sergeant O'Grady I would not have paid any attention to him.
849. What was unusual?—It is very hard to describe what was unusual. I have seen a good number of drunken men in various stages of intoxication, and I should be able to give an opinion as to whether a man was intoxicated or not, even though I would not exactly say whether his walk was not straight. All the same, in my opinion, he was intoxicated.
850. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Was he staggering about the street?—No, he was drunk; not staggering about the street, but I think he was that sober that he was aware that he was "pretty tight."

MICHAEL MADDEN, examined on oath.

851. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a second-class constable, and I am gaoler at Oamaru during the past thirteen months.
852. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been here?—Since November, 1889.
853. Have you a clerk in the office here?—No.
854. Who acts as clerk?—Sergeant O'Grady.

855. So that any complaint as to the sergeant's intemperance would not be made to any one but himself?—I do not think so.
856. Have you seen the sergeant every day you have been on duty since you came?—Not every day.
857. How often have you seen him?—Almost every day.
858. Have you seen him at different times, day and night?—Yes.
859. Late at night sometimes?—Up to 11 o'clock.
860. What is his condition usually?—Sober.
861. On any special occasion, when have you seen him under the influence of liquor?—I remember none.
862. Has he always been absolutely sober when you have seen him?—In my opinion he has been.
863. You have not noticed him under the influence of liquor sometimes?—I have already expressed my opinion on that matter.
864. I do not ask whether you have seen him incapable, but whether you have seen him in such a condition as to know he was under the influence of liquor?—No; I may state this: that the night Detective O'Brien left Oamaru for Dunedin the men on the station made him a small presentation of a silver-mounted stick, and there was a bottle of whiskey in the room and some ginger ale, and the sergeant had a couple of glasses of whiskey that night. He may have had two or three.
865. I suppose he was jolly, the same as the others?—I had no whiskey on that night.
866. He had two or three glasses?—I said he might have had two or three.
867. You cite that, then, as a case where you noticed he was under the influence of liquor?—I would not say he was under the influence of liquor through having a couple of glasses of whiskey.
868. Did you notice on any other occasions any signs of his having had two or three whiskies?—When I come to recollect, I think when he got promotion some time ago, and when I was in plain clothes on the street, about 9.30 or so in the evening, I met him, and he told me he had got promotion, and I congratulated him on the fact, and we went in and had a whiskey together.
869. Where?—At the Club Hotel.
870. What time?—About 9.30 p.m.
871. Was he in uniform?—No.
872. Were you in uniform?—No.
873. Would Sergeant O'Grady be on duty then?—A policeman is supposed never to be off duty.
874. Did he seem then as if he had had two or three whiskies?—No.
875. How many did he take?—One glass.
876. *The Chairman.*] The question was, whether you had seen signs of his having had two or three glasses of whiskey?—I cannot remember.
877. Do you mention this one occasion, when he had this glass of whiskey?—Yes.
878. *Mr. Taylor.*] What other sergeants have you served under before Sergeant O'Grady?—Sergeants in the Armed Constabulary.
879. None in the Police Force?—No.
880. You cannot say whether it is customary for sergeants to drink with their men in public-houses? What does Regulation No. 55 say?—It says, "On no pretence will any member of the Force frequent publichouses except in the execution of his duty, nor will he accept drink from any person when on duty or in uniform."
881. Was Sergeant O'Grady on duty?—He was in plain clothes.
882. Was he on duty? Did you regard him as being on duty?—I regarded myself that if anything cropped up, I was bound to act.
883. Do you often wear uniform?—Not for the last twelve months I have not.
884. During the last twelve months how often have you had it on? You had it on when the new Commissioner came down?—Yes.
885. But you may be in plain clothes and still be on duty?—Yes.
886. You cannot remember any similar instance where you have gone into a hotel with the sergeant to drink?—No.
887. The sergeant has never shown any signs of liquor when he has come into the police-station at night?—No.
888. These are the only two instances you can clearly remember?—Yes.

PATRICK COTTER, examined on oath.

889. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Oamaru.
890. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been here?—Three months.
891. Have you seen the sergeant every day since you came?—Yes.
892. Were you here when a presentation was made to Detective O'Brien?—No.
893. Have you ever seen the sergeant with signs of intoxication on him?—No.

THOMAS MAYNE, examined on oath.

894. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Oamaru.
895. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been here?—Since the beginning of December, 1897.
896. Were you here when Detective O'Brien went to Dunedin?—No.
897. Have you seen much of the sergeant since you came?—Yes.
898. Pretty well every day?—Yes.
899. Do you see him much at night-time?—Yes; up to 11 o'clock.
900. Have you been with him in any hotels at night-time?—Yes.

901. Which hotel?—I was in the Royal with him one night. That is the only hotel I have been in with him.
902. What happened there?—He went in to have a look at the house, and he met me in the street before going in, and asked me to go in with him.
903. What time was that?—About 11 p.m. It might be a few minutes after 11 o'clock.
904. Did you stay in there long?—We just walked through the place and went out.
905. Had you any refreshments?—None whatever.
906. Have you, during the four months and a half you have been here, noticed any signs of liquor on the sergeant at any time?—Never.
907. Were you here when the sergeant got promoted?—No; I think not.

EDMUND CHARLES TREHEY, examined on oath.

908. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Oamaru.
909. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in Oamaru?—Two years and a half.
910. Do you see Sergeant O'Grady pretty well every day?—Yes, every day.
911. Have you ever visited any hotels with him?—Yes, I have, one or two.
912. What time would it be?—It was in the evening, after 9 o'clock.
913. What happened?—We went into the hotel to inquire about a man's swag which the larrikins had been knocking about. We took the swag inside, and the sergeant told the landlord to look after it until he found an owner for it.
914. You put the swag in charge of the publican until the publican found an owner for it?—Yes.
915. What hotel was that?—The Royal.
916. Do you know if an owner was found for it?—I do not know.
917. Did you leave together?—Yes.
918. What other hotel?—I think I went into the Criterion one night.
919. What time would that be?—I was on night duty too. There had been a ball or something on that night.
920. After 9 o'clock?—Yes. Some fellows were knocking about, and I think the sergeant went in to see if the hotel was closed.
921. Did you leave together?—Yes.
922. Did the sergeant have any refreshments?—No.
923. Were you here when a presentation was made to Detective O'Brien?—Yes.
924. Were you present?—Yes.
925. Had you any refreshments?—Yes, there was some lemonade and ginger ale and a bottle of whiskey.
926. Did the sergeant have some drinks of whiskey?—I think he had a couple. I cannot say how many.
927. *The Chairman.*] Where was this festivity held?—In our bedroom in the police-station.
928. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever noticed any signs of liquor on the sergeant?—I do not remember seeing signs of liquor at night.
929. Well, on what days?—Nor in the day-time.
930. *The Chairman.*] Have you ever seen any signs of liquor on the sergeant?—No.
931. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever noticed signs of liquor upon him?—A man would have to be intoxicated, in my opinion, before he would show signs.
932. Has the sergeant always been absolutely sober when you have seen him?—Yes, to the best of my knowledge he has always been absolutely sober. I cannot say otherwise.
933. How often have you been in doubt about the matter?—I have never been in doubt. I think I am a pretty good judge of when a man is under the influence of liquor. I have had a little experience of hotel life.
934. What experience?—I was born in a hotel pretty well; and I have been employed in hotels.
935. You are a good judge?—I think I can tell with any outsider, barring a medical man, when a man has liquor in him. Of course, I know the sergeant, and I think I would be able to tell.
936. You never saw any liquor in him?—No. Of course, on that night of the presentation I knew he had a little in him, but he showed no signs of it.
937. Have you ever had any complaints about the sergeant drinking?—No. I cannot call to mind any complaints. I think if any had been made to me officially I would have remembered them.
938. "Officially" do you say?—Yes.
939. Then, you have had complaints?—No.
940. Neither officially nor unofficially?—No.

MICHAEL GREENE, examined on oath.

941. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—First-class constable, stationed at Oamaru.
942. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been here?—A little over twelve months.
943. Were you here when Detective O'Brien was shifted to Dunedin?—Yes.
944. Do you remember the presentation?—Yes.
945. Was there any liquor at the celebration?—Yes, there was some small quantity of liquor—a bottle of whiskey and some lemonade.
946. Did you see the sergeant take any refreshment?—Yes.
947. Have you seen him take refreshment at any other time?—No; that is the only time I have seen him taking any refreshment in my company.
948. Have you seen signs of liquor on him at any time?—Never.

949. Have there been any complaints from citizens about him?—No.
 950. He has always been absolutely sober when you saw him?—Yes.
 951. Would you consider a man intoxicated if he was capable of looking after himself and of walking upright?—If I noticed any signs of drink on him, of course I would.
 952. What do you call a sign of drink?—A man who smelt of drink, or a man who staggered about, or appeared incapable in any way.
 953. Under that definition you have never seen Sergeant O'Grady in that condition?—I have not.

GEORGE WILL, examined on oath.

954. *The Chairman*] What are you?—A grocer.
 955. *Mr. Taylor*] Have you been in Oamaru long?—Twenty years.
 956. You know Sergeant O'Grady?—Yes.
 957. See him pretty often?—Yes, about the street.
 958. Do you see him at night-time sometimes?—Yes, if I happen to be about.
 959. Has his condition ever attracted your attention?—I cannot say that it has.
 960. Well, now, how often have you seen him at night-time?—I would not like to say.
 961. Do you remember seeing him at the police-station one night?—Very possibly I have.
 962. Did you see him?—Not at the police-station; No.
 963. Did you see him near the police-station any night?—Yes, repeatedly.
 964. Did you see him inside the police-station, or gaol, any particular night?—I cannot say; you must bring the occurrence to my memory.
 965. Do you remember seeing him one night when you were in company with James Milligan, of Ngapara?—Yes.
 966. Where was he?—I believe he was inside the gate of the police quarters.
 967. Had you any conversation with the sergeant that night?—Yes, I believe we spoke to him going past.
 968. Did you talk about fishing?—Very likely.
 969. Now, as a matter of fact, did you not talk about fishing?—Quite probably.
 970. *The Chairman*] Can you call to mind what your conversation was?—We simply stopped a moment or two, and fishing was mentioned.
 971. *Mr. Taylor*] What was the conversation that you remember?—It was so long ago that I do not recollect anything of it. I forgot about that until it was brought to my mind.
 972. By whom?—By you, yesterday.
 973. You were very reluctant to come here?—Certainly I was.
 974. You did talk about fishing?—Yes, I believe it was mentioned.
 975. Who mentioned it?—I would not say; we were all speaking of it.
 976. Did the sergeant mention it?—Yes, I believe so.
 977. What was the nature of the conversation?—Just what I have referred to—about fishing, possibly.
 978. And who talked about fishing first?—That I cannot say. I cannot remember who it was.
 979. Did you make any contradictory statement to that yesterday?—I cannot tell.
 980. You say you cannot remember who opened the conversation about fishing?—No.
 981. Any boasting as to the expertness of any of them?—It is like any conversation; every one is a good fisher and shooter.
 982. Did the sergeant say he was a good fisher and shooter?—Possibly he may have done so.
 983. Did he say anything else?—I cannot tell.
 984. What was his condition at that time?—I cannot exactly tell.
 985. Did you think he was exactly sober?—I would not like to swear he was.
 986. *The Chairman*] Would you swear that he was not?—I would not.
 987. *Mr. Taylor*] Did you consider him sober?—Well, in my opinion, he may have been a little merry, but I would not say anything else.
 988. Was he maudlin?—Not at all.
 989. Was he a bit merry?—Yes.
 990. Do you think he would appear in Court in that condition?—I have no opinion on that.
 991. *The Chairman*] When you say "a bit merry," will you suggest the cause of his merriment?—No.
 992. *Mr. Taylor*] Did you not tell me yesterday that he was drunk?—No, I did not do that; I contradict that.
 993. Did you say yesterday it would injure your business to come here?—Possibly I may have done.
 994. Did you say it?—Yes. I made the remark that I was very reluctant to come, and that I did not like to be mixed up in the thing at all.
 995. If you knew nothing about the sergeant's condition, why were you reluctant to come?—Does any one want to come?
 996. Who was with you on the occasion referred to?—Mr. Milligan.
 997. What time?—I cannot tell.
 998. Was it after 8 o'clock?—Yes.
 999. Was it after 10 o'clock?—I think so; but I would not say within an hour what time it was.
 1000. Did you think the sergeant could have appeared in Court to take charge of a case?—I would not say that.
 1001. Would you be surprised to see him in Court in that mood?—I have no idea how he should appear in Court.

1002. Did you see him on any other occasion at night-time when he attracted your attention?—No, not to attract my attention.
1003. Did you ever speak to him on any other occasion at night-time?—Yes. I have passed the sergeant and bid him “good night.”
1004. He never attracted your attention?—No.
1005. Did you not make a contradictory statement to me yesterday?—No.
1006. Will you swear that?—I will swear nothing.
1007. Did you not tell me yesterday, in the presence of other persons—Messrs. Dewdney and Milligan—that on another occasion the condition of the sergeant attracted your attention?—I believe I did.
1008. *The Chairman.*] Did you or did you not?—Yes.
1009. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did I see you this morning?—Yes.
1010. Did you on any other occasion than the night you were with Milligan see the sergeant in a condition that attracted your attention?—I cannot say that he attracted my attention. I saw him one night and spoke to him in passing.
1011. What was his condition then? Was he merry then?—I simply spoke to him.
1012. Was he merry?—Well, of course, being alone, he was not merry.
1013. What causes you to remember that special occasion amongst all the other times you have seen the sergeant?—Well, I cannot altogether tell you what caused it.
1014. If not altogether, tell me a little bit of what caused you to remember?—I thought within my mind he had a little drink.
1015. Was that because of his manner?—Just the way he spoke to me.
1016. Did you think it was not the way he would speak to you if he was absolutely sober?—I do not suppose I would think so, or I would not have taken any notice of it.
1017. Do you remember what time of night?—I cannot tell.
1018. How long ago?—About twelve months ago; I cannot say.
1019. Where had you been that night?—At work.
1020. On that other occasion, where did you see the sergeant?—Inside the gate.
1021. Was he leaning across the fence?—Not at first.
1022. Afterwards, what was he doing?—He came forward to the fence.
1023. And then did he lean over the fence?—He leaned on the fence.
1024. In a very merry mood?—Pretty merry, that was my impression.
1025. Was he very drunk on that occasion?—No, I would not say very drunk.
1026. Would you say he was drunk?—Just in the state I refer to, in a sort of happy condition.
1027. Was he in a state that you would expect to find a police-officer in in a public place?—I do not know if I am a judge of what they should do.
1028. Are you not a judge?—No.
1029. Do you think, for instance, his condition was one that you, as a citizen, would expect to find a police-officer in?—No.
1030. Have you discussed this matter over with Mr. Milligan to-day?—I have just mentioned it.
1031. Did you talk to many people about the condition of Sergeant O’Grady on that particular night when he was inside the fence talking about fishing and shooting?—I cannot say I did. It was a good while ago—from three to five years.
1032. You had no occasion to make a noise about it at the time?—No.
1033. Did you ever think it would come up again in a Court?—No; certainly not.
1034. What else did you talk about?—Nothing else that I am aware of.
1035. Did you make any special remark to him or to your companion about the matter?—I do not know. I may have remarked to my companion that I thought the sergeant was merry, or something like that.
1036. *The Chairman.*] The conversation with the sergeant when Milligan was present was three or five years ago?—Yes, somewhere thereabouts.
1037. When was the other occasion when you passed him in the street?—About twelve months ago. I cannot say definitely at all.
1038. *Mr. Lee.*] This time you speak of—about three or four years ago—were you all laughing and talking together over the fence?—Yes.
1039. You joked with one another, as a matter of fact?—Yes.
1040. You were all jolly together, you may say?—Yes, we were, I believe.
1041. Would you say that the sergeant’s happy expression was entirely due to liquor, or to the fact that you were having a jolly conversation between yourselves?—My impression for the moment was—in fact, I made the remark—that the sergeant had had a little liquor.
1042. What led you to talk to him?—Well, going past, Mr. Milligan heard somebody, and thought it was Sergeant Dwyer, and spoke, and Sergeant O’Grady came forward to the fence.
1043. How long did the conversation go on?—I cannot tell.
1044. Was it a rational conversation, so far as the sergeant was concerned? Was he joking and talking rationally?—Yes.
1045. It was not the conversation as a drunken man?—No.
1046. You could understand each other?—Perfectly.
1047. Was the sergeant staggering about, and falling off his feet, or anything of that kind?—No.
1048. Was he in uniform?—I would not swear to that.
1049. And on the second occasion, was he in uniform?—I would not swear he was, because it was a dark night.

1050. Do you remember whether he had a helmet on?—I would not swear.
 1051. What has caused you to think of this again after this length of time?—It has been brought to me.
 1052. How brought to you?—By people speaking to me about it.
 1053. Who?—Mr. Taylor and Mr. Dewdney.
 1054. When was this?—Yesterday morning.
 1055. Were you aware they were coming in to talk to you about this matter?—No, I was not.
 1056. And you gave them your recollection of it, so far as you are aware?—Yes, I may have.
 1057. Was it fresh in your memory, or had you to look to think how things were?—It was not fresh in my memory; it is not even now.
 1058. You had to consider for a minute or two what really took place, and what did not?—Yes; I have thought a good deal over the thing since.
 1059. Since yesterday?—Yes.
 1060. I suppose Mr. Taylor put you under a very severe examination yesterday?—No; I would not say that.

FRIDAY, 15TH APRIL, 1898.

JAMES COATES MILLIGAN, examined on oath.

1. *Mr. Poynton.*] What are you?—A grocer, residing at Oamaru.
2. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been in the district long?—Yes, I suppose about thirty years.
3. Do you know Sergeant O'Grady?—Yes.
4. Have you seen him on many occasions?—Yes.
5. Night-time as well as day?—Yes.
6. Do you remember seeing him any night he specially attracted your attention?—No, nothing remarkable.
7. Do you remember seeing him one night when in the company of Wills?—I do.
8. How did he strike you then?—Oh, nothing remarkable at all.
9. Where were you?—I was coming home, about half-past 11 o'clock.
10. Where did you see the sergeant?—I think it was in the Courthouse grounds, as far as I can remember.
11. Did you accost him?—Yes, I spoke to him.
12. Have a conversation?—Yes.
13. What was the nature of it?—About fishing and what not—ordinary conversation.
14. Did shooting come into it?—I think it did. I could not say exactly.
15. Was the sergeant in the same condition then as he usually was when you saw him?—I think so. There was nothing remarkable about his condition.
16. Have you not remarked upon his condition to a number of people?—No.
17. What made you stop that night?—I do not know. I sang out. I thought it was Dwyer. I wanted to speak to him, and O'Grady came over.
18. Did you have a merry conversation?—We had a conversation. Yes; as I told you, it was about fishing and shooting.
19. Was it you who was boasting about fishing and shooting?—Yes. I had a talk to him about fishing and shooting.
20. Did he also boast to you about it?—Yes.
21. Claimed that he was an expert?—I cannot remember that.
22. What was his attitude on that occasion? Was he standing erect, or leaning on the fence, or on the grass?—I could not say. I think he was standing erect.
23. Was he not leaning over the fence part of the time?—He may have been, part of the time.
24. Was he?—I cannot remember whether he was or not.
25. Have you made a different statement to this on other occasions?—No.
26. Did you very frequently see the sergeant on other occasions?—Yes.
27. Very frequently talked to him?—No.
28. Did you ever talk to him before?—I dare say I have had conversations with him before; just casual conversations.
29. How many?—I could not remember.
30. Did you talk to him twenty times?—Possibly I did.
31. Can you be certain as to how many times?—No, I could not.
32. Is it a common thing for you to talk to him?—No, it is not.
33. Is it a fact that conversation with him was sufficient to impress it upon your memory?—I told you I thought it was Dwyer. It happened to be O'Grady.
34. *The Chairman.*] Have you ever seen him in a state of intemperance?—No, I have not.
35. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever seen him when he was not absolutely sober?—No, I think he has been sober when I saw him.
36. Did you consider him absolutely sober on that occasion?—Yes, as far as I could judge.
37. *Mr. Lee.*] It was a long time ago when this conversation took place?—I suppose it would be about from three to five years ago.
38. Have you had any reason for thinking of the conversation since then?—No, I have not.
39. Are you quite certain the sergeant spoke to you about fishing—that he fished at all? I suppose you do not recollect exactly what the conversation was?—I think it was fishing and shooting. We had a sort of competition between Dwyer and myself, and we were talking over that matter.
40. O'Grady is not a fisher, but he shoots?—Yes.
41. And Dwyer is a fishing man?—Yes.

JAMES ALLAN, examined on oath.

42. *The Chairman.*] What are you, and where do you live?—I am a carpenter, living in Halse Street, Oamaru.

43. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been here many years?—About thirty-four years and a half.

44. Do you know Sergeant O'Grady well?—Well, I have seen him and spoken to him sometimes.

45. Do you remember any particular occasion when his condition attracted your attention?—It attracted my attention once, I think it is over twelve months ago, coming up Severn Street.

46. What was his condition then?—Well, I saw him staggering on the street as I met him coming towards his own home.

47. Did you consider him intoxicated at the time?—I did.

48. Which direction were you coming in?—I was coming down towards the town.

49. And which direction was he coming in?—He was going towards his own home, I suppose.

50. *The Chairman.*] What hour was it?—I could not be positive as to the hour. It was in clear daylight.

51. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you very surprised to see him in that state?—Well, I took particular notice.

52. *The Chairman.*] Can you fix the date at all more exactly?—It is over twelve months ago, I could not fix any date.

53. Can you fix the period of the year—summer or winter?—I could not say any particular date.

54. Can you fix it within how many months?—I should say about eighteen months, as far as I can recollect.

55. Not more than eighteen months ago?—I do not think so.

HUGH McLAREN, examined on oath.

56. *The Chairman.*] How long have you been in Oamaru?—I have been thirty-three years on the 16th June coming.

57. Tell us what you are?—Well, I have been a contractor, and different things.

58. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know O'Grady well?—Yes.

59. Were you the contractor for lamplighting in the borough for some years?—Yes, for three years.

60. Did your work take you about the streets late at night?—Yes. I was sometimes up till 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning. Of course, I would not be so late every night.

61. Did you see O'Grady very often?—No, not very often.

62. Sometimes?—Yes, sometimes.

63. Did his condition ever attract your attention on any of these occasions?—Oh yes, more than once.

64. Let us have one occasion?—The first I remember was when he commenced to ask me, when I was putting out the lights, what time I should put them out. At the time my instructions were to commence at 12 o'clock to extinguish them. I told him my instructions were to commence at 12 o'clock to extinguish them. That was in 1895. They were altering the time.

65. Did you express any surprise that he should put such a question to you?—There was one night I was coming down putting them out, and I saw him coming, walking backward and forward on the street over to the Empire, and he called me back.

66. Was he staggering?—Yes. He said, "Now, you have put those lights out, and it is only half-past eleven o'clock." I thought a little, and then I said, "You see, there are all those lamps to put out yet, and my instructions are to put them all out by 12 o'clock."

67. Was the sergeant under the influence of liquor?—Well, he looked like it. From all appearance I believe he was. He was staggering backwards and forwards all the while he was speaking.

68. On any other occasion have you seen him when his condition attracted your attention?—There was another night. I was going to put out the lights about 12 o'clock, and when I came to the bridge on the Oamaru Creek he was leaning against it, and he spoke to me and asked me how were the lamps doing—were they breaking them? I said, "No."

69. What was his condition that night?—He was leaning against the bridge, and I do not think he could walk right. He was leaning against the bridge when I met him, and I left him in that position.

70. Do you consider he was under the influence of liquor then?—Well, in my belief he was.

71. *The Chairman.*] What reason have you for thinking so?—Well, he was standing all the while he was speaking. I spoke to him, "Good night," and I saw a lady coming down the road. I said, "I am going away." He said, "Do not go yet." She went 2 or 3 chains towards the mill. Then she turned back again, and she commenced at him. Of course, I can believe she was his wife. She commenced to ask why he was so late, and I walked away. Then, when I was 3 or 4 chains up, I heard a female's voice crying "Coo-ee," three or four times, and I went on. I said to myself, "I will have nothing to do with it."

72. *Mr. Lee.*] You say you are a labourer and contractor?—Well, I tried everything; I was a farmer, and I was a butcher.

73. And amongst other things you have tried letting houses of ill-fame?—I did not know whether they were or not. I had a lot of houses, and I was letting them.

74. To all and sundry?—To any one that would give me good rent.

75. Will you say on your oath you have not been in the habit of letting houses to persons of ill-fame?—There was one that came, and said she was married, and I let the house to her; and any one I ever let a house to, it was only in that way I let it. When any one came to me for a house, I would inquire what they were, and when I got satisfaction that they were good I would let

the house to them. One woman came, and said she was married, and I let her the house. She paid a month's rent in advance.

76. Did you not go to Dunedin on one occasion and bring up two women named Clarinbould?—No.

77. Have there been any convictions against you?—No; not since I came to New Zealand.

78. Not since you came to New Zealand?—Not since I came into the world.

79. Was there not a case before the Court here, in which you undertook to have them cleared away, and Mr. Newton was appearing for you?—No. There was a case I was summoned for here—for letting a house to one, but not in that style you were saying.

80. You say you did not undertake to clear her away from the town?—No. They were away before that.

81. Why did the police prosecute?—Well, of course, I was summoned by the police.

82. Sergeant O'Grady has had a great deal of trouble with you in this matter of letting these houses from first to last?—I do not think it, unless it was coming from himself.

83. Has he not had several conversations with you about it?—Not that I know of. Of course, there was one conversation. That was the first woman up there. There was another house let before that, and when she got in I could not let the houses so well, and she said to me that O'Grady had said if I would fence the place with 6 ft.-palings she could stop there. She asked me to come down and see O'Grady about it, and I did.

84. Was this in South Oamaru?—No.

85. Where was it?—In Isis Street.

86. Who took your house in South Oamaru—Clarinbould and Turnbull?—Well, they were in it, but I do not know what time you mean.

87. How long were they there?—I forget how long they were in.

88. Who turned them out?—They went away themselves.

89. Did not the sergeant turn them out of that house?—No.

90. He had nothing to do with turning them out?—Not to my knowledge. I consider neither him nor any one else put them out.

91. You say the sergeant did not interfere in the matter?—No.

92. Did he interfere with them?—I do not think so.

93. You cannot say he did not?—To my knowledge he did not. He did not speak to me.

94. Do you drink at all?—Well, I will not take more than one glass at a time. I think for ten years I would not take from any man but one glass.

95. Just limit yourself to one glass?—Yes, and very seldom I would take that. Neither you nor any one saw me drunk.

96. You know what it is to be drunk?—No, I do not. I am telling you I was never drunk.

97. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see O'Grady about fencing that house round?—Yes. I went to him, and I told him that I would fence it that way. He said he would go up and see, and if he was satisfied they could stop there.

98. Did you fence it?—I fenced it, and he came up and had a look at it.

99. And he allowed this woman to stop?—Yes. As long as I did not sell it, he did not interfere with it.

100. After you had fenced this property to the sergeant's satisfaction, this woman of immoral character was allowed to remain?—Yes.

101. Did he withdraw the prosecution against you?—There was no prosecution.

102. Was there not a charge laid?—Oh, yes; but that was a long time after.

103. What was done with the case?—As far as I know it was dismissed.

104. Was it tried: did it go into Court?—Well, I was standing there, but there were no questions put to me.

105. Was the case called?—Yes, it was called.

106. *Mr. Lee.*] Did you bring the Clarinboulds to Oamaru yourself?—I am saying I did not.

107. You did not?—I did not.

WILLIAM SMYTH, further examined on oath.

108. *Mr. Lee.*] Do you say that you could see from your shop-door what the sergeant did across the road?—Yes, I said that.

109. How far is it across the road?—I understand Thames Street is 2 chains.

110. Then, he went across the road diagonally?—Yes, slightly.

111. That would be more than 2 chains?—It would be, of course.

112. You say that frequently you saw the sergeant and spoke to him: did you come to the conclusion he was under the influence of drink?—When it was forced upon me I did.

113. What do you mean?—When I could not understand him, and I knew I could understand him if he was all right.

114. It was after conversation with him?—Yes; he began it.

115. But you said yesterday that you got as near as you could to him, seeing he was under the influence of liquor: one would understand from that there was a terrible smell of liquor about him?—That is correct.

116. Did you not smell that immediately you got in front of him, before the conversation?—The conversation, as far as the sergeant was concerned, commenced immediately I opened the door, and before I got on the street.

117. How far off was he?—Just the steps down. The sergeant was waiting outside the door, and I stepped out to him to see what he wanted.

118. Did you understand from the witness Cross that the sergeant was under the influence of liquor when he called you?—I cannot remember exactly what he said in respect to that, but that he could not understand him.

119. Did he say why he could not understand the sergeant?—If I were asked to decide between the two questions—whether he did or whether he did not say that—I believe he did say the sergeant was drunk. I would not swear he actually did say it.

120. Was there any conversation between you and Cross after the sergeant had gone, as to the sergeant's condition?—There may have been some words passed, and a little chaffing regarding his condition.

121. Supposing Cross says he cannot say the sergeant was under the influence of liquor, what would you say to that?—I would say Mr. Cross says what he believes to be absolutely true, no matter how you would examine him.

122. You have every confidence in Mr. Cross's statement?—Yes.

123. Notwithstanding the fact that you and Mr. Cross talked about the sergeant's condition afterwards?—Yes.

124. Can you account for the fact that Mr. Cross did not consider the sergeant under the influence of liquor?—I do not know anything about it, any further than that.

125. Seeing a man had been in conversation with O'Grady and had not understood the sergeant, should not that person have known the sergeant was under the influence of liquor?—You and I would think so.

126. Would you not have thought, seeing the sergeant was in the condition that you describe, and the sergeant having spoken to Cross as he did to you, Cross must necessarily have known as well as you the exact condition of the sergeant?—He may not have addressed himself to Cross, but come into the shop.

127. But, it was Mr. Cross who came to you and said he could not understand him?—I beg your pardon, it was not: it was my son.

128. Do you say O'Grady was in the shop?—That was the statement they made, but I did not see him in the shop.

129. But you said just now, not a minute ago, that you saw O'Grady in the shop later on?—I beg your pardon, I could not have said that. I did not see him in the shop. It was opposite the door that I saw him.

130. Was he in uniform, or was he not?—I could not tell you; I do not remember.

131. Do you not remember saying yesterday he was in uniform?—If I said that he was in uniform yesterday I would certainly have forgotten myself, for I cannot remember whether he was in uniform.

132. And, I suppose, you have forgotten yourself in one or two other things?—I do not think I have.

133. *Mr. Taylor.*] Mr. Cross was in the shop on both occasions when the sergeant called, was he not?—Yes.

134. Did your son call you on both occasions or only on one?—I do not remember whether I was called on the second occasion, or whether I was in the shop, at the time the sergeant called.

135. You saw the sergeant both times?—Yes.

136. Did you hear Mr. Cross's evidence yesterday?—No, I did not; and, further, I wished to avoid hearing it.

ELIZABETH ELLEN DEWDNEY, examined on oath.

137. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember Mr. Dewdney being away from home some time ago, at Conference?—Yes, about Easter, three years ago.

138. Was it a short time before your child was born?—About nine or ten weeks.

139. Were you annoyed during your husband's absence by the howling of a dog on the section adjoining?—I was very much annoyed by the howling, not only on the adjoining section, but on our own section.

140. Is Mr. Barclay your landlord?—Yes.

141. Did you complain to him?—Yes.

142. Did you ask him to stop the nuisance?—Yes.

WILLIAM CHRISTIE, examined on oath.

143. How long have you been in Oamaru, Constable Christie?—About sixteen months.

144. Have you visited any of the Oamaru hotels on inspection since you have been here?—Yes, with the sergeant once or twice.

145. What were the hotels you visited?—I visited the Queen's Hotel, for one.

146. Who is the landlord of the Queen's?—Mr. Johnston was landlord when I came here.

147. Who is now?—Mr. Kelly.

148. What time did the visits usually take place?—Oh, about 11 o'clock.

149. Night or day?—Night.

150. Do you remember going into the Queen's on one occasion and finding any men playing cards in a room there?—No, I never saw any men playing cards in the Queen's Hotel.

151. Do you remember any men complaining about being disturbed when they were playing?—No. The sergeant went into the hotel one night, and he came out again. Mr. Moss was there, and I forgot the other gentleman's name.

152. Was there a man named Probert in there?—I do not remember.

153. What happened with Mr. Moss?—He came out to me and told me the sergeant had told him to go out of the hotel.

154. Did he say anything else?—No.

155. *Mr. Lee.*] Was the sergeant present?—No.

156. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where was the sergeant?—He was in the hotel.

157. Where were you?—Outside.

158. Were you not inside the hotel that night?—I was in the passage.
 159. Is that where you spoke to Moss?—No, I was outside.
 160. Did the sergeant leave the hotel with you?—No.
 161. Where was he?—He was talking to Mr. Kelly in the passage.
 162. Did they stay in the passage, or did they go into a room?—He stopped in the passage talking to Mr. Kelly.
 163. What time would that be?—About ten minutes past 11 o'clock.
 164. Have you been frequently visiting in a similar way?—Yes.
 165. With the sergeant?—Yes.
 166. What times?—After 11 o'clock.
 167. Has the sergeant always been in his usual condition?—Yes.
 168. You never saw him drunk?—No, I never saw him drunk.
 169. When have you seen him under the influence of liquor?—I never saw the sergeant under the influence of liquor.
 170. What do you call under the influence of liquor: how do you regard it? Do you make any distinction between being under the influence of liquor and being drunk?—I could not say as to that.
 171. You cannot say as to whether you make any distinction between a man being under the influence of liquor and being drunk?—When a man is drunk he staggers about the street, and when he is sober he will not stagger at all.
 172. Were you present at any presentation to Dwyer?—Yes.
 173. Any refreshments there?—Yes, I believe there was.
 174. What was it?—A bottle of whiskey.
 175. Did you have any of it?—Yes.
 176. Did the sergeant?—I believe he did.
 177. How many?—I think one.
 178. You cannot say?—I cannot say.
 179. If any police-officer said he had two or three you would not contradict him?—No.
 180. Were you here when the sergeant got his promotion?—No.
 181. Have you ever noticed signs of liquor on him?—No. I could not say I have.
 182. Have you had any cases since you have been in Oamaru?—Yes.
 183. Arrested any drunks?—Yes.
 184. Were they always staggering?—Yes, staggering or lying down.
 185. Have you not made a different statement to this to-day?—No, I have not.

HUGH McLAREN, further examined on oath.

186. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you take a contract from the Oamaru Borough Council for lighting the lamps?—Yes.
 187. When?—On the 14th March, 1895.
 188. Did you employ any labour?—One boy.
 189. Did you engage him under misrepresentation from himself?—Yes. He represented himself to be one Morrison, who was lighting lamps for the previous contractor.
 190. You did not know him personally?—No, I did not. I knew the name of the other boy.
 191. What did his name turn out to be?—Barry.
 192. Did he start with you in March, 1895?—He started on Thursday the 14th.
 193. How long was he with you?—I think about six weeks.
 194. Did you dismiss him then?—He went away and left me.
 195. Had you any lamps broken during the time he was with you?—No, not many during the time he was with me.
 196. Had you any?—I do not remember that I had one.
 197. What happened soon after he left?—The first night there was another boy named McGregor went on in Barry's place there was one lamp broken.
 198. Any other breakages?—There were breakages pretty often. My day's wage would not pay for the breakages.
 199. How long did that extend over?—I think about four or five months.
 200. You were annoyed the whole time?—Yes.
 201. Did you report it to the police?—To both O'Grady and Detective O'Brien.
 202. Did you go to the station to report it?—I went on a Monday to O'Grady; and then he said to me, "Did you sack Barry?" I told him he took the sack himself.
 203. What did O'Grady say to you?—O'Grady said, "But did you sack Barry?"
 204. Did you see him again about it?—I saw Detective O'Brien about it.
 205. Did you see O'Grady again about it?—I did not go straight to him, but I have seen him, and spoke to him on the streets about it.
 206. Did you get any satisfaction?—No, not from him.
 207. What did you do ultimately?—I was advised to go to the priest.
 208. Did you go?—I did.
 209. Were there any more breakages after you saw the priest?—Very little.
 210. Did the breakages practically stop?—Well, so far as they were working against me they stopped.
 211. You had no further complaints to make?—No, not for breaking the lamps.
 212. Have you made written complaints to O'Grady about the loss of property?—Yes.
 213. You complained in writing about the loss of poultry and other property?—Yes.
 214. Did the police discover it?—They did not attempt to discover it. There were six fowls poisoned, and I went to see O'Grady about it. He promised to come, but he did not come.

215. Had you any fowls stolen?—Yes, they were stolen at different times; but there was one night, the 2nd May, 1896, there were over forty stolen.
216. Did you report it to the police in writing?—Yes.
217. Did they come to see you about it?—No.
218. Who did you address the letter to?—Sergeant O'Grady. I registered the last letter, which was dated 22nd July, 1896.
219. *The Chairman.*] Was that about the forty fowls?—Yes.
220. And registered it?—Well, I registered one after that one.
221. *Mr. Taylor.*] You wrote other letters complaining about this?—Yes; I wrote one on the 16th May, about the fowls that were stolen.
222. And in spite of these complaints there was no attention paid?—No attention, No.
223. *Mr. Lee.*] Had you any idea at all who stole these fowls?—Yes, I had.
224. Some of the women living in these houses?—Well, not in my house.
225. Just around your place?—A little bit away from my place.
226. You do not think any of your tenants took some of them?—No, I do not think they did. There was one thing: there were none of that kind about me at the time.
227. What kind?—The women you alluded to.
228. What makes you think these other people took them?—I was told so by the neighbours.
229. Did you give to the police the names of the parties you thought had taken them?—Yes, to O'Grady, but not in writing.
230. Why did not you put them in writing?—I am not a lawyer, and I could not put everything in.
231. You say O'Grady took no notes of it at all?—I considered it was his place to find out the names of the people.
232. You would not assist even if you did know the names?—I would, as much as I could.
233. You say O'Grady did nothing at all in the matter?—No.
234. You are quite sure?—I am certain of it. When I spoke to him and told him the names, he said, "I suppose the girls cooked them."
235. When did you report these lamps as being broken—when was the first time?—When the first lamp was broken I went on the Monday morning.
236. What year was it?—1895.
237. What month?—About April, I think it was.
238. When was the next time?—Well, there were many times afterwards.
239. You can give me no dates when you went to him at all?—I said about April, 1895, was the first time, and that was the only time I went direct to him. He was not my friend.
240. After that you never went to O'Grady at all?—I met him more than once on the street.
241. Did you speak to him at all about the lamps?—Yes; I spoke to him about the lamps at different times.
242. How long after this April was it before you went to the priest?—It would be about four or five months.
243. About August, 1895?—Somewhere about that.
244. After that you never complained to the police at all?—The breaking of the lamps stopped then.
245. Since you went to the priest have you complained to the police?—I told you already I did not go straight to him, but I spoke to him in the street.
246. Since you went to the priest have you gone to the police?—Well, I was speaking to O'Grady.
247. Since then?—Yes.
248. How is it, if the breakages stopped after you went to the priest, you had to complain to the police afterwards?—They were lighting them on moonlight nights, and putting them out sometimes.
249. *The Chairman.*] The matter of which you complained to the police, after you went to the priest, was not the breaking of the lamps but the lighting of them?—They were lighting them in the moonlight.
250. Some unauthorised persons were lighting them?—Yes, they were. There was one lamp which was regularly lighted for a full week, and the police could have caught them if they liked. The larrikins, too, were throwing stones at me, and they were stopped too.

THOMAS O'GRADY, examined on oath.

251. *Mr. Lee.*] I will examine you first with reference to Mr. Smyth's evidence: you heard the evidence given by Smyth and Cross?—Yes. I may say I am Inspector under the Factories Act, and I had occasion about two years ago to visit Mr. Smyth's premises in Thames Street. He has a baker's shop. I found the bakehouse in a very dirty condition, and ordered certain alterations. Mr. Smyth was very indignant on the subject, at having to do anything of the kind, and I had a good deal to do to convince him that the law was such that he would require to do it.
252. Mr. Smyth is a very obstinate man, is he not?—He is.
253. Particularly obstinate?—Yes.
254. Have you had difficulties on other occasions with reference to his bakehouse?—I had two or three visits after that, and though he made some improvements he had to do a little more. I had two or three difficulties with him on the subject of the bakehouse.
255. Any difficulties with him in reference to the registration of the place as a factory?—After some considerable time he registered the factory. It was only a shilling. He threw it at me on the street one day. I refused to take it, and told him he would have to come to the office with it.
256. Any difficulties with him in reference to closing?—He has two shops—one in Arron Street near the show-grounds, and one in Thames Street. I occasionally visited both shops,

especially on the half-holiday. I have had complaints that his shop in Arron Street is kept open, and I had to visit him two or three times, and on approaching his place I found the door slammed to. I would not be admitted. In respect to his shop in Thames Street, the Early Closing Association had reported to me—some of the members—that Mr. Smyth was keeping his shop open till 11 and 12 at night, especially on Saturday night, and they had written and requested him to abide by the rules of the association. I saw Mr. Smyth on the subject, and he declined to do anything of the kind. This was other than the half-holiday, Thursday being the half-holiday.

257. Do you look upon Mr. Smyth as a man opposed to you in any way?—I look upon him as opposed to the law, especially with regard to the Factories Act and Shops Act. He was very indignant when spoken to on either of the subjects.

258. And seemed annoyed with you personally?—His grievance seemed against me, not against the law—my trying to enforce the law.

259. Do you remember going to his shop on a Saturday night?—Yes, I do; about twelve months ago.

260. Was Cross there?—Cross was sitting inside the shop. The shop was alight, and the front door was ajar.

261. Were you in uniform?—I was not.

262. As a matter of fact, do you wear your uniform in the evening?—I do not.

263. Never?—Never.

264. From what time?—I reach the office at 8 o'clock.

265. And you are not in uniform then?—I am not.

266. Did you speak to Cross?—I asked Mr. Cross where Mr. Smyth was. He said he was at the back, and he would go and call him. When Mr. Smyth arrived he commenced by saying, "What do you want? What are you bothering me for?" I said, "I came to tell you about your shop being open. I saw some people coming out of it a while ago." He said, "What the devil has that got to do with you?" I told him I was Inspector of Factories, and complaints had reached me about his keeping his shop open. This was about a quarter to 11 o'clock.

267. What time do the shops close on Saturday night?—Nine o'clock. I reasoned with him for a time. He then said, "Well, you mind your own business, and I will mind mine. I close my shop when I like. I am compelled only to close it on factory day."

268. He says you were under the influence of liquor so much that he could scarcely understand you?—I paraded the men at 9 o'clock, and I walked about the town, and to the best of my belief I had a glass of beer between 9 o'clock and the time I visited Mr. Smyth's place—the only one during the day.

269. When you left Mr. Smyth's where did you go?—I reasoned with Mr. Smyth in my usual way. I said to him, "Well, Smyth, there is no use your fighting against the law. The best thing you can do is to abide by the law in the same way as the others do, and close at 9 o'clock. I hope you will think better of it." With that I walked across the street and down the other side of the street to the station. He threatened me on the second visit by saying if I came near his place again he would report me to Tommy Taylor. It would be about eleven months ago. I cannot positively say.

270. Coming to Barclay's matter: Mr. Barclay says he saw you one night on the corner of Eden street, about half-past 12 o'clock. Did you see Barclay?—I remember seeing Mr. Barclay, and the occasion is fresh in my memory.

271. What were you doing that night in particular?—I may say, your Worships, the Charitable Aid Board were issuing aid to certain persons living in the immediate vicinity of where I met Mr. Barclay, and they had requested me, or their secretary had, to discover if the place was frequented by people who were supporting her otherwise than by charity. I was loitering about the place at the time, and Mr. Barclay came along, and as near as I can remember—it is about three years ago—Mr. Barclay is not very far wrong in his statement of the conversation in what he said. He did mention to me about a dog, and asked me if I had seen the animal. I said, No, I had not. I asked for a description of the dog, and he said it was a retriever. He did not mention who it was annoying. He asked me if the police would look it up and let him know. I said, "If the police find a strange dog, they will let you know." I said further to him, "It is rather a remarkable thing that you should be out at this hour of the morning." He is a very respectable man. Knowing his habits, as I did, I thought it was extraordinary he should be on the street. I then said, "Good night; if I hear of the dog, I will let you know." I went on to the front of the road across the fence, and stood there for some four or five minutes, perhaps, and Mr. Barclay went home. That was all the conversation I had with him. I gave him nothing to understand that I was either drunk or mad, or anything else.

272. Were you under the influence of liquor at all?—I may have had a glass of drink. I could not say: it is a long time ago.

273. Had you taken drink so as to be under the influence of liquor?—Certainly not. I specially laid myself out for the duty I had on hand—the discovery I was going to make.

274. From that day to this have you heard anything of such a charge?—I never heard a word uttered about the thing until I heard it yesterday from Mr. Barclay. Only for knowing Mr. Barclay, and the particular incident of the dog, I would not know anything about it now. I was there more than one night, and later than half-past 12 in the morning.

275. Had you a uniform or a cape?—I was in plain clothes; I had a cape on, and my stick.

276. Was there any light there at all?—No light at that time.

277. Was it moonlight?—No, it was not. It was a starlit night.

278. How far would you be from Mr. Barclay before you recognised him?—I did not recognise Mr. Barclay until I got right up to him and spoke to him.

279. *Colonel Pitt.*] What month was it?—I think it was in February.

280. *Mr. Lee.*] You recollect having a conversation with Mr. Milligan and Mr. Wills over the police fence?—I have no recollection whatever of the conversation. I have no doubt it did occur, in view of the respectability of the parties. Mr. Wills is a very respectable man, and so is Mr. Milligan. The only thing I can say I remember at all is the fact that I was somewhat surprised to hear of fishing, because I never fish. I occasionally do shoot, but I never fish. Dwyer, the sergeant in the gaol at the time, is a fisherman.

281. Coming to the second occasion when Wills says he met you, some years ago?—I have no recollection of it. I know Mr. Wills very well. He has been employed in various places where I am usually brought into contact with him. I have known him for a long time. I do not believe Mr. Wills would wilfully trump up anything against me.

282. Have you spoken to Mr. Wills on and-off, and Mr. Milligan too?—I have, daily almost, and I never heard a word uttered about this matter.

283. You do not recollect any particular instance?—I do not. I may say I do not pose as a Prohibitionist or a teetotaller. I am neither. I take my glass of liquor as long as it is necessary, and I hope I will do so as long as I live.

284. But you do not take it to excess?—No.

285. Do you know Mr. Allan?—I know Mr. Allan very well. He is an epicure. He is a man who lives entirely by himself. He is a bachelor, living all alone, and he is considered a very peculiar man in his living.

286. He is known to be of eccentric habits?—He is, particularly so with reference to church matters and that sort of thing. He will have his own way. If there were hundreds against him, he would still believe he was doing the correct thing.

287. Is he a quiet-going sort of man?—Oh, yes, a very good citizen, but peculiar in his habits.

288. Do you remember seeing him any particular time?—I have no knowledge of seeing Mr. Allan; but if he says he saw me staggering in the daylight he must be perfectly wrong, because I make it a rule not to take anything during the day.

289. Your house is at the head of Severn Street, and to get to your house you do not walk up the road?—I do not.

290. You walk up over the bank?—I do.

291. That bank that you walk up is very irregular?—It is irregular, because the footpath is not formed; but it is the shortest way to my place, and I use it.

292. Would it not be so that a person walking up there would not walk as steadily as when walking up Severn Street?—Quite so. I say distinctly I would be very glad for Mr. Allan to afford me the opportunity of convincing him he is wrong, because I look upon Mr. Allan as a respectable man. If he says I staggered from the effects of liquor in the day-time I say he is positively wrong, because I never drink in the day-time.

293. This is the first you have heard of such a thing, and you know nothing whatever about it?—That is so.

294. You had no notice of these charges particularly?—No notice—nothing of dates, or years, or anything else.

295. With regard to McLaren?—I have known McLaren for the last eleven years as living on the proceeds of prostitution. He has been a propagator of prostitutes in this district since I have been here.

296. And a perfect source of trouble to the police?—He owned a section on the junction of Severn and Isis Streets, one portion of which he sold to a woman named Bendall, or Jane Lawson, a prostitute, for years known to everybody. He then occupied a section in South Oamaru. He had a cripple of a son. He let the house he was living in to prostitutes—known prostitutes—and he and his boy lived in a tent on the section.

297. *The Chairman.*] What period are you referring to?—That would be about eight years ago.

298. *Mr. Lee.*] In what manner has he appeared before the Police Court?—At South Oamaru, after some time, I received several complaints about his place, and I then went and told him that if he did not get the women away from the place I would have to bring him before the Court. I went, always accompanied, and visited the house several times, and discovered without doubt it was a brothel. I then cautioned the girls who were there, gave them a month's notice, and they left. It was before the Criminal Code came into force. Subsequent to that he built a house on the section next to Mrs. Bendall, or Lawson, which he let to a woman named Grace Henderson, a prostitute. That house was occupied by several women for a number of years, and several convictions were recorded against them for sly-grog selling. Two prosecutions took place, in which Mr. Pender came down from Christchurch against these women for keeping brothels, over this house of McLaren's. The Magistrate held the law was defective, and they got out of it, but promised to leave the house. There have two convictions against women named Andrews who occupied the house McLaren is living in now.

299. *The Chairman.*] Did it belong to him at the time?—He had some control over it. I do not know whether it was his property. She was fined in one case £20, and in another case £40.

300. *Mr. Lee.*] When he says his occupation is a labourer, or a contractor, what do you say to that?—I never knew him to do a contract other than the lamplighting since I have known him.

301. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you taken proceedings against himself?—He was charged on the 10th November, 1894, with being the owner of certain premises, to wit: a disorderly house, situated in Severn Street, in the Borough of Oamaru. Mr. Newton represented McLaren. He visited my office some days before, and told me McLaren was anxious that the prosecution should not be gone on with, as he would remedy the nuisance. I said to Mr. Newton, "Well, the object I have in view is to prevent the existence of brothels in Oamaru. I will have a talk to the Magistrate (Major Keddell) about it. I will not promise, but I do not suppose I will

force the matter." I had a talk with the Magistrate, and he said if the nuisance was removed, probably it would be all right. However, the case came on before the Court, and I left the matter to the Magistrate. Having this promise from Mr. Newton, on behalf of McLaren, the Magistrate dismissed the case, McLaren promising he would remove the nuisance. On the same day a woman named Clarinbould was summoned, charged that she was on the 10th November, at Oamaru, the occupier of a certain disorderly house, to wit, a common hawdy-house. This was the same house in which McLaren resided, and his own property. She was convicted, and fined £5 and costs.

302. *Mr. Lee.*] Anything else?—There were several convictions against other women who lived in the house. I may say McLaren went to Dunedin shortly before these Clarinboulds entered the house in Severn Street, and on returning from Dunedin the two Clarinboulds came up in the same train that he did at night, from Dunedin, and occupied his premises the same night. He has been a source of annoyance to the police all the time he has been here, and every person in the town at all who knows him knows he has been living on prostitution.

303. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you say how many prosecutions there were in reference to these houses of ill-fame in which he was concerned altogether?—The houses were his property at the time.

304. Well, either against him or the tenants?—There were four. There were two women committed for trial. With reference to the time he met me, I admit at once that McLaren did report to me two lamps being broken, and that he reported to me on one occasion that the lights were lit when they should not have been. Myself and Detective O'Brien made inquiries, and in one instance we, no doubt, sheeted the case home to some children who were about five years old—a lamp broken in Reid Street. The reference to the matter of the priest would apply to the children who were attending the Catholic school. Detective O'Brien made particular inquiry himself, and he will, no doubt, be able to inform the Court of the exact circumstances. The other lamp was in Chelmer Street. I made inquiries into that myself, and failed to discover who was the culprit. I believe it was broken by children. There were only two occasions on which he mentioned to me anything about lamps, except the occasion of mentioning the fact of lamps being lit when they should not have been.

305. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you make any inquiries to see if you could prove any offence against the boy Barry?—When he mentioned the matter he said he suspected the boy Barry of having done it.

306. What did you do on that?—I may say Barry and his family have resided here for, I suppose, seventeen or eighteen years, and were as well known to McLaren as I am. I went to Barry and I talked to him myself, and Barry positively denied ever having anything to do with McLaren's lamps.

307. Did you get any evidence at all?—I got no evidence. I believe Barry was a decent lad.

308. *Mr. Lee.*] Did you get a registered letter?—No. I do not remember getting a registered letter.

309. About the fowls?—The prostitutes' houses I have referred to were in the immediate vicinity—on the same section where McLaren put up the fowl-house, and his fowls were running about there. The prostitutes also kept fowls, and McLaren's fowls mixed with them. When he reported the matter to me, I went to the place myself and saw Mrs. Lawson, and she showed me the whole surroundings, and how the fowls mixed together. She said, "Whether they are stolen or not, we may have eaten them, as well as we have eaten our own"—apparently admitting they were common property between them—and, she added, "McLaren knows it, too." I saw McLaren afterwards, and said there was no doubt these fowls had been eaten by these women, but the difficulty was to prove it. I told him then he should repair the fence, and keep his fowls in a proper place and condition. I told him he should keep them in a place where these women could not get at them. He subsequently removed them to the house he is at present living in.

310. You say, then, you could get no information on which you could take proceedings?—I could not.

311. You have heard what McLaren has said against you: that on one occasion he saw you under the influence of liquor, and on another occasion you were leaning against the bridge, and he seems to think you were then under the influence of liquor?—On both occasions I spoke both distinctly and accurately, and I remember distinctly what occurred.

312. And you were not under the influence of liquor?—I was not. I do not say that I had not had a glass of grog.

313. It did not affect you in any way?—It did not. I may say, further, I went to the Council, knowing this man, and the way in which the larrikins used to run after him and pull his horse's tail, and that sort of thing, and asked them not to let the house to him which he is at present living in, because I knew he was intending it for the purposes of prostitution. Some of Council decided, however, that they would rent the house to him, as his offer was the best.

314. Since Mr. Taylor has been proceeding with this charge, I understand a number of citizens have come to you and expressed a wish to be called to give evidence as to your general character, have they not?—That is so.

315. Have you gone out to see them, or have they called on you and offered their evidence?—They have offered their services.

316. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever had a prosecution against Mr. Smyth in your capacity as Inspector of Factories?—No.

317. Then, he never did anything that brought him within the pale of the law?—He remedied the neglect he had been guilty of, at my suggestion.

318. You say he was opposed to the law?—I say he is like the proverbial Irishman—"agin it."

319. Did he not comply with the law?—After a time.
320. Did he comply with the law?—He did.
321. You say Smyth's grievance seems to be more against you than against the law?—I attribute that to the fact that he is an ignorant man, and does not understand the law, and he thinks that I, in carrying out the law, am tyrannising over him. That is my impression.
322. Coming to that particular Saturday night you refer to: you paraded the men at 9 o'clock?—I did.
323. How long ago is it?—I think it would be twelve months. I always parade the men at 9 o'clock.
324. You had a glass of beer that night?—Yes.
325. You remember it?—Yes.
326. What makes you remember that particular glass of beer?—I remember the conversation I had with Mr. Smyth; in fact, there is very little that occurs between myself and Mr. Smyth that I do not remember. It is not very often it does occur. When I heard of this charge I brought my memory to bear on the occasion, and especially with reference to the intemperance portion of the charge.
327. And you remember the glass of beer?—Yes.
328. You are sure it was not a glass of whiskey?—On the night in question it was not. I do take a glass of whiskey.
329. You remember it was a glass of beer on that particular night?—To the best of my belief it was a glass of beer.
330. You detailed the whole of the conversation that night?—As far as I remember.
331. You remember exactly in what direction you went across the road?—I went across the road from Smyth's corner to the opposite corner.
332. Have you ever had occasion to take Smyth before the Court on any charge?—I have not.
333. Is he an honest man?—I look upon him as such.
334. The second visit to Smyth was about eleven months ago?—I think so.
335. Did you ever threaten to sue him since as Inspector of Factories?—Yes. He has not registered his factory yet, and I spoke to him about it some three weeks ago.
336. Where?—On the street.
337. Have you ever been to his shop since?—It was close to his shop that I met him.
338. Have you ever been to his shop as you went before?—No, I do not remember it.
339. On the second occasion he said he would refer the matter to me?—He said he would report me to Tommy Taylor.
340. And you have not been since?—I may have. I cannot remember it.
341. You know Mr Barclay?—Mr. Barclay is a very respectable man.
342. You met him three years ago, or thereabouts?—Yes, about three years ago.
343. That family whose premises you were inspecting, what was their name?—Well, the woman is alive and her children are living in the town, and, I may say, in receipt of charitable aid at present, and I do not think it would be wise to mention the name.
344. Where were they living then?—In Eden Street.
345. In the same street as Mr. Barclay?—Yes, a portion of the street.
346. Is that between Thames Street and the bridge?—No.
347. In the other part of the street?—Yes.
348. How far away from the house were you when you saw Mr. Barclay?—About 200 yards.
349. It was not a moonlight night?—No, as far as I remember it was starlight. I will not swear positively.
350. If he says it was Easter week, and a moonlight night, you will not deny it?—I do not think it was Easter week. To the best of my recollection it was February.
351. Did you promise Barclay if the police came across a stray dog they would tie it up?—They generally do that sort of thing, especially if they are of any value.
352. Do you say it is customary to tie up stray dogs?—I do not say it is customary; it is the usual practice of the police if a dog is brought to them, and the owner is not in the immediate vicinity of the station.
353. When do you think you had one tied up in the yard last?—About a month or six weeks ago.
354. *The Chairman.*] Was your recollection of the conversation sufficient to say what took place, or are you prepared to admit what Mr. Barclay says?—I am prepared to admit what Mr. Barclay says, for I do not think he would misrepresent it; but I am under the impression the dog was loose.
355. *Mr. Taylor.*] You may have had a glass of liquor that night?—I might.
356. You cannot recall that so vividly as the other?—No.
357. You have no recollection of the conversation with Mr. Wills and Mr. Milligan?—No recollection whatever.
358. If you were talking of fishing and shooting, it would be an uncommon thing?—Fishing, I never did.
359. If they both say you talked about fishing and shooting?—I will not contradict them, they are both respectable persons.
360. You said you did not take liquor to excess?—No, not that I know of.
361. Have you never been fined for drunkenness?—Never.
362. Have you been charged with it as a police-officer?—I may have had a charge against me at Oamaru by Mr. Thompson, the Inspector of Police, and I am not at all reluctant to give you full explanation.
363. *Mr. Lee.*] Was this matter investigated by Inspector Thompson?—Yes.

364. You were charged by Inspector Thompson?—I was. I was never fined one penny during the whole of my career in the Government service.

365. Was that charge investigated that you referred to?—Mr. Thompson inquired into it. It was a visit to my own house when I was ill—an unmanly, unwarranted, and ungentlemanly visit ordered by Mr. Thompson to my private house when I was ill in bed, and Detective O'Brien and Sergeant Dwyer, who saw me, reported I was not drunk. I have never seen an entry in my defaulter's sheet.

366. Come to Allan's case: you say if he saw you in the day-time staggering he must have been mistaken as to your condition?—I should say positively he must be mistaken, because I do not touch anything in the day-time.

367. You do not drink at night-time?—I do not say that.

368. Do you remember McLaren coming to see you about the fencing of some property belonging to him?—I do not, and I do not think he ever did.

369. *Mr. Taylor.*] Will you swear he never came to see you about the fencing of the property?—I swear that what he has stated here to-day with reference to the fencing of that property is utterly false.

370. You say you never knew McLaren to do any contract work except lamplighting?—Yes.

371. Do you remember a contract for fencing: there was some question about the loss of a cheque over it?—I do not.

372. Do not you remember McLaren reporting the loss of a cheque?—He never reported the loss of a cheque to me.

373. Do you remember some fencing contract he had involving a sum of about £16?—I do not.

374. Never came to your knowledge?—No.

375. No record in your office-books about it?—No, not in my books, not about fencing.

376. You say McLaren lived with some of these women at the time they were convicted?—Yes.

377. In the house with them?—Yes, and up till recently he has been living with a prostitute. Every one in the town can tell you that.

378. Do you remember his seeing you at the bridge that night?—I do; and I remember the conversation with McLaren with reference to the lights being lit.

379. Do you remember the woman he refers to speaking to you?—Yes, I met my wife.

380. At that time, half-past 12?—It was not half-past 12. I was in bed before 12.

381. Were you leaning up against the bridge?—I was filling my pipe with tobacco, and my side was up to the bridge as it is now to this box. You will find me very often, if you travel the same road, in the same position late at night.

382. *Mr. Poynton.*] You say there was some talk between yourself and Mr. McLaren about fencing—about keeping his fowls in?—I stated that I recommended McLaren to fence his section and build a proper fowl-house, and not allow his fowls to be going amongst the others.

383. Is that the only talk you had about fencing?—I do not know anything of other fencing.

384. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you not remember an action in this Court between McLaren and Parker in regard to a fencing contract?—I remember a civil action that occurred. I was not present in the Court, but I have heard it from others, and I saw in the paper that he sued for a cheque.

385. In connection with a fencing contract?—I could not tell you what it was for. I could not remember.

386. Do you remember it was Parker that was summoned?—Yes. Which Parker do you mean—there are several Parkers?

387. Do you know a station-holder named Parker?—I may say McLaren sued a Mr. Parker in this Court for a cheque that was supposed to be sent to Oamaru, and the Court was satisfied the cheque was cashed in Oamaru, and McLaren knew more about it than he liked to tell the Court.

388. Had that to do with a fencing contract?—If you ask me, my impression is it had to do with a contract, but I do not know of my own knowledge.

THOMAS BROHAM, examined on oath.

389. *Mr. Lee.*] You are Inspector of Police at Christchurch?—Yes.

390. You have control of this district?—Yes.

391. How long have you known Sergeant O'Grady?—For nearly thirty-five years.

392. How long would he have been under your control—about?—He was for some years under my control in Christchurch, and he has been for the last five years under my control here.

393. You have heard these various charges against him for intemperance and general neglect of duty?—Yes.

394. Will you tell the Bench what has been your opinion and knowledge of the officer during the time he has been under your control?—I have never heard him accused of drunkenness before. During the five years I have had charge of this district he has conducted his duties in a most satisfactory manner. The station is a model of cleanliness and order. Everything is properly attended to here, as far as I can see from visiting the station.

395. Any one complaining of crime have had their complaints properly attended to?—I would be inclined to accept that, most decidedly.

396. From your knowledge of communications received from O'Grady—telegrams, correspondence, returns, and that sort of thing—would you say he was a prompt officer?—Yes.

397. And in your opinion is an officer well qualified to have the position he holds at present?—He has always shown himself as such.

398. Is that Mr. Pender's statement?—It is his writing.

399. His signature?—Yes.

400. Who was Inspector Pender?—He had charge of this district before I came here. The document reads as follows :—

New Zealand Police Department, Inspector's Office, Christchurch,
5th January, 1893.

Memorandum for Sergeant O'Grady.
I REGRET to say that I shall not have time to visit Oamaru before leaving for Wellington. I therefore wish to convey to you and the members of the Force in your sub-district my appreciation of the manner in which the duties have been performed since I took charge, and the very excellent conduct and discipline maintained throughout.
P. PENDER, Inspector in Charge,
Canterbury and North Otago Districts.

401. That was Inspector Pender's opinion up to the time he left the district; and up to the present it is yours?—Yes, it is mine.

402. *Mr. Taylor.*] How often do you come to Oamaru?—Every three or or four months.

403. About four times a year?—Yes.

404. Do you stay here long?—Sometime three or four days, sometimes two days.

405. Not more than two or three days on the average?—No.

406. Then, these are the only opportunities you have of personally observing the sergeant's habits?—Personally; that is so.

407. Has there not been a general reluctance in any department—say in the Police Department—for one officer to bear testimony against another?—What do you mean?

408. I mean there is a feeling of comradeship that prevents one officer giving evidence against another?—I am not aware of it in connection with any superior officer being called on to give an opinion with regard to his subordinate.

409. With regard to the rank and file, do you not find the rank and file hold with each other?—In favour of each other, Yes.

410. *The Chairman.*] Have you ever had any complaints as to the conduct of Sergeant O'Grady in the performance of his duties?—No.

411. Never?—No, Sir.

412. *Colonel Pitt.*] I take it, from your evidence, you have had frequent opportunities of observing how the sergeant performs his duties?—Yes.

413. Are you satisfied he performs them efficiently?—Perfectly satisfied.

JAMES CRAIG, examined on oath.

414. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a timber merchant, and also a Justice of the Peace at Oamaru?—Yes.

415. You have been in Oamaru a good many years?—Yes.

416. You know Sergeant O'Grady?—Since I came here.

417. You have met him often?—Very often.

418. At night-time?—At night-time.

419. Are you out sometimes at night, say between 11 and 12 o'clock?—Yes. I may say my business place and my residence are right opposite the Court door, and there is no business-man in Oamaru has better chances of seeing O'Grady than I have.

420. Have you ever seen him about at night-time?—Very often.

421. Continually?—Yes.

422. Have you ever seen him at all the worse for liquor?—Never.

423. Speaking as a Justice here, would you say he is an efficient officer?—I should say there is none more so.

424. I suppose you are surprised to hear of these intemperance charges being brought against him?—I must say I am.

HEBER NEWTON, examined on oath.

425. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a barrister, practising in Oamaru?—Yes.

426. You are the senior member of the bar here?—Yes.

427. Have you known Sergeant O'Grady since he has been in Oamaru?—Yes.

428. There have been various business matters between you and him?—Naturally.

429. And you have seen him from time to time about the streets?—Practically every day.

430. What would you say from your knowledge of him as an officer?—I have always found him courteous, and civil, and attentive to his duties.

431. You volunteered to give this evidence for him, seeing the charges made against him?—I did. I had seen the charges, and I volunteered to give evidence.

432. You have seen him conducting cases in Court, and his method of working up cases?—Certainly.

433. And you say that the sergeant is an efficient officer?—I should say so.

434. *The Chairman.*] Will your own observations enable you to say whether his duties are energetically or negligently performed?—I should say his duties have been efficiently performed, as far as my knowledge extends, and that is considerable.

435. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Mr. Barclay, of Eden Street, stonemason?—By sight, yes.

436. Do you know his reputation?—No.

437. How long have you been in the town?—Nineteen years.

438. You move in different circles?—Exactly.

439. As far as the sergeant is concerned, do you know him socially?—No.

440. Ever had any refreshments with him?—I have.

441. Where?—It would be difficult to say; not very often—once or twice.

442. Some hotel? It would probably be in Oamaru?—I could not say for certain, but I think not in Oamaru. I think once or twice I had refreshments with him.

443. In a hotel?—It would probably be in a hotel.

444. He would probably be there on duty?—I cannot say that. I should think not.

445. You cannot remember any particular instance?—No.

446. You are pretty friendly with him any way?—I would not say that—no more friendly with him than I am with any other member of the Police Force.

447. You cannot call to mind any particular instance in Oamaru when you had refreshments together?—I cannot.

448. Or how many times you have had them together?—I should say, at the outside, three times since he has been here.

HENRY HAWTHORNE GRANT RALFE, examined on oath.

449. *Mr. Lee.*] You are Clerk of the Magistrate's Court at Oamaru?—Yes.

450. And as such you have business dealings with Sergeant O'Grady?—I have.

451. How long have you been in the department?—Twenty-one years.

452. Have you had an opportunity of seeing other sergeants in their work?—Yes.

453. Numerous sergeants?—Yes.

454. In Dunedin and elsewhere?—Yes, I was thirteen years in Dunedin.

455. What would you say of O'Grady, as to the manner in which he carries out his duties, as compared with other sergeants?—I should say he carries out his duties very efficiently.

456. Have you ever seen him the worse for liquor?—Never on any occasion.

457. Have you seen him frequently?—Several times a day during the last two years.

458. In the evening?—Yes, in the evening.

459. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you volunteer this evidence?—I was asked if I would come in this morning.

460. Who asked you?—O'Grady asked me if I would come in.

461. *Mr. Lee.*] What was the message to you just now?—He asked me if I would kindly come into the Court.

462. Not another word?—That is all.

THOMAS YOUNG DUNCAN, examined on oath.

463. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a member of the House of Representatives for this district?—Yes.

464. Do you know Sergeant O'Grady?—Yes.

465. Thoroughly well?—Fairly well.

466. You have had a good deal of dealings with him in the matter of the labour question, have you not?—Yes.

467. As member?—Yes.

468. How has he carried out any duties which he did, as far as you know?—I considered he carried them out most excellently.

469. Worked hard?—Worked hard; and I always found him night or day when I came to the office.

470. Ready for duty?—Ready for duty.

471. Have you seen him about continually at night, and by day?—Yes; I have seen him frequently.

472. To your knowledge, is he a man of intemperate habits at all?—No.

473. Would you be surprised to hear it alleged against him that he was a man generally of intemperate habits?—I have heard these charges, and I have been surprised to hear them.

474. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Mr. Barclay?—I do.

475. Known him long?—For twenty years, I think.

476. Is he a man whose word you would accept?—Yes.

477. Do you meet O'Grady often in a friendly way?—Well, generally on business. I have not much time for anything else when I come to town; and since this Labour Bureau has been established, I have been constantly meeting him on business connected with that.

478. Have you ever met him socially?—No.

479. Never had any refreshments with him?—Not that I am aware of.

480. Cannot remember?—I do not think so.

481. Will you swear you have not?—Well, I do not know if I can, because I have met him in so many places outside the town; but I can swear, as far as the town is concerned, I have had none with him.

482. Will you swear you have not had refreshments with him outside the town?—Not that I remember. I may have. If we were away on the road or coming home I may have. That would be with others, but not specially with him.

483. How often do you come in at night?—Not very often.

484. Once a month?—Yes; perhaps more sometimes. I may be in two or three times a week on special occasions.

485. Many things might happen at night-time that you know nothing about?—Oh, yes.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, examined on oath.

486. *Mr. Lee.*] You are a detective, at present stationed at Dunedin?—I am.

487. You were in Oamaru for a number of years?—I was.

488. Both when Mr. Thompson was Inspector, and afterwards when Mr. Pender took charge?—Yes; and Mr. Broham afterwards.

489. O'Grady was sergeant during that time?—Yes.

490. You saw the witness McLaren here to-day?—I did.

491. What sort of a man is he?—Well, he is a rather eccentric man in the first place.

492. Did you hear the statement made by him about the Clarinboulds—that he did not bring them up—is that a fact?—All I can say is this: the two prostitutes, Clarinboulds, and McLaren, arrived in Oamaru by the same train from Dunedin. On arrival of the train here McLaren helped

the two women with their luggage from the railway-carriage to a cab. That cab proceeded to South Oamaru, conveying the two women and their luggage, and they went to live in a house owned by McLaren.

493. Does the sergeant go out in uniform at night, or plain clothes?—I do not think I have ever seen the sergeant in uniform after 8 o'clock in the evening. He generally goes home to tea about 6 o'clock, returning to the office about 8 o'clock, in plain clothes, and continues then in plain clothes till bed-time.

494. While you were here, did you find he carried out his duties properly?—Yes, as far as I could see. I have never known him to fail in the execution of his duty in any way.

495. And as to those matters that McLaren has complained about—the loss of these fowls and things?—I know nothing about the loss of fowls. I know something about the complaint as to breaking lamps.

496. Did the police take all the necessary steps to ascertain the offenders?—I did so myself.

497. Would you say there had been any neglect of duty on the part of the sergeant in this respect?—I do not think so.

498. I suppose you cannot always find the offenders?—Not always, No.

499. You brought this matter of the lamp-breaking home, did you not?—The only two cases of lamp-breaking brought under my notice were one in Chelmer Street, into which I made inquiries and failed to discover by whom it was committed; and the next one was in Reid Street. I immediately inquired into that, and discovered that two boys had been seen in the vicinity of the broken lamp throwing stones. I saw one of the lads. He was very young; I think about seven years old, and he told me he had been at the place with another boy, who threw a stone and broke a pane of glass in the lamp. I saw the boy that he named, and questioned him about the matter. He denied having done it. The only proof I could get was the evidence of this little boy of between six and seven years, which I considered was insufficient to bring the case into Court. I told the accused boy's father of what I had learned in connection with the matter, and advised him to question the lad himself, and if he found he had committed the damage to pay McLaren for the glass, which would be somewhere about 6d. or 9d. for the pane. He told me afterwards the boy still persisted in denying that he had committed the damage. I may state that at that time the shanghai nuisance was somewhat prevalent about Oamaru, and a complaint reached me that three boys had been shooting at a horse with their shanghais. I had these three boys brought before the Court, and they were each fined 10s., and that nuisance discontinued after that period.

500. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember a case in which McLaren sued a person named Parker?—I do.

501. Did he construct a certain amount of fencing for that man Parker?—I do not know. Parker lives at a place called Elephant Hill, in the Canterbury District.

502. Do you know whether McLaren did any fencing for Parker?—I do not, of my own knowledge. I know he was supposed to have done some fencing, and he sued Parker for some balance.

503. Do you not know the action was in connection with a fencing contract?—I do.

504. If Sergeant O'Grady says the only contract McLaren ever had was the lamplighting contract he is in error?—I should say so, Yes.

505. Did you see the sergeant very often during the time you were here?—Very frequently.

506. And he was always sober?—He has been, Yes.

507. Night and day?—Night and day.

508. Never saw him with signs of liquor on him?—I do not know that I have.

509. Have you ever had refreshments with him?—I have.

510. Where?—At the Globe Hotel.

511. Where else?—At the Imperial Hotel.

512. Where else?—I think at the Star and Garter.

513. Where else?—And at the police-station.

514. Who paid for it at the hotels?—Well, I could not tell you exactly who paid for it on each occasion. I know one of us paid for it. Myself, on one or two occasions, and the sergeant at other times.

515. Would he be in uniform?—No.

516. At night-time?—At night-time.

517. He would be on duty?—This was between the hours of 10 and 11 o'clock. When the hour of 10 o'clock arrives I consider the duties of the day are done, unless something special crops up. I should say the sergeant was virtually off duty after 10 o'clock at night. Of course, if he was called upon to act in relation to anything it would be his duty to act.

518. You mean to say you never had refreshments with him except between 10 and 11 o'clock?—That is so.

519. Could not possibly be between 9 and 10 o'clock?—No.

HENRY AITKEN, examined on oath.

520. *Mr. Lee.*] You are agent for the Union Steamship Company in Oamaru?—Yes.

521. And you are Mayor of the borough?—Yes.

522. You have been Mayor for how many consecutive years?—I am on my third term.

523. Previous to that you were councillor for many years?—Two or three years before that.

524. You know Sergeant O'Grady?—Yes.

525. Would you say he is a good officer?—As far as I know, I should judge him to be so.

526. You have several matters that the Council wished to be investigated by the police from time to time?—Not exactly investigated.

527. He would have to give attention to matters connected with the Council from time to time?—Yes.

528. Always done these things properly?—Yes.
529. Have you seen him about day and night?—Yes.
530. Have you ever seen him the worse for liquor?—No.
531. You have come across him on the question of the Labour Department?—Yes.
532. Done all his work in connection with that properly?—I think he does. He appears to take great pains to pick out the most needy men.
533. Speaking generally, he is a respected officer in the town?—Oh, yes.
534. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you volunteer to come?—No, I was sent for.
535. Just now?—Yes.
536. How often do you see the sergeant at night-time—once a month?—I really could not tell you. I see him often. How often I could not tell you.
537. Do you see him on the average once a month after 8 o'clock?—I fancy, more often than that; but I really could not tell you how often.
538. You say he has always been without any signs of liquor on him?—I have never seen him the worse for liquor.
539. Have you ever noticed signs of liquor on him?—I do not know. What would you call signs of liquor?
540. In any other than an absolutely normal condition?—I have always found Sergeant O'Grady, whenever I saw him, perfectly right.
541. Intelligible?—Perfectly.
542. Have you always considered him to be absolutely sober?—I cannot tell you that. You give me a definition of sobriety.
543. *The Chairman.*] The man's ordinary appearance was such as to lead you to the conclusion that he was able to perform his duties thoroughly?—I have no hesitation in saying that his appearance was such that he was able to attend to his business.
544. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you ever meet the sergeant socially—in the way of having refreshments with him?—Yes.
545. Where did you have refreshments?—In a hotel.
546. Which hotel?—I cannot tell you, I am sure.
547. A number of them?—No, not a great number.
548. Who paid for the drinks?—Generally myself.
549. Would they be whiskey?—Well, sometimes.
550. Would the sergeant be in uniform?—Sometimes, sometimes not.
551. Where was this—in Oamaru?—Yes.
552. Do you know Mr. Barclay, the stonemason?—I do.
553. Would you accept his word ordinarily?—I think he is an honest man.
554. Do you know anything about the evidence that has been given here during the last day two?—What I have seen in the paper.
555. Could not all these things have happened without your knowing anything about them?—Oh, they may.
556. *The Chairman.*] Are you aware that Barclay is deaf?—I am not aware of the fact.

THOMAS YOUNG DUNCAN, further examined on oath.

557. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the House of Representatives?—Yes.
558. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know a constable named Foley?—Yes, I believe I do, in Wellington.
559. Did he write to you some time ago about a matter?—No; he has not written to me about any matter.
560. Did he not write to you about an injustice he thought he had done him in connection with the Manners Street Police-station in Wellington?—He did not.
561. If he says he did he is wrong?—Yes.
562. You never had any letter from him on any matter at all?—Not on any matter at all. I had interviews with him.
563. Where did the interviews take place?—In Wellington.
564. Do you remember the nature of them?—I do.
565. Was it in connection with some matter that he had got on his defaulter's sheet?—Yes.
566. Did you see the Minister of Defence about it?—I did.
567. What did you arrange with him?—I did not arrange anything. I simply said if Foley did not get an inquiry I would bring the matter before the House.
568. Did you bring it up in the House?—No.
569. Why?—Well, I understood that the thing had been gone into with Foley in some way, and the matter was settled between him and his officers.
570. Foley told you that?—Foley told me that.
571. Who settled it?—It was settled as far as the scoring out of this matter.
572. Did you see the Commissioner of Police about it?—I did not.
573. You went straight to the Minister?—I did.
574. Did you not think it was a matter for the Commissioner to deal with?—I did not. I thought if I wanted an inquiry I should go to the Minister I knew best.
575. As a general principle, do you think the Minister should deal with these matters, and not the Commissioner?—I do not think he would act on his own motion. It would be his place to see the Commissioner, and get an explanation of the matter from him.
576. In what other instances have you had to act on behalf of police-officers?—None that I can recollect.
577. Were you consulted about the removal of O'Grady last year?—No.
578. Not interviewed by any person about it?—Well, it was general talk in the place that he was going to be shifted.

579. Do you know if there were any steps taken to stop it?—I do not know if there was. I can tell you this: I wrote to the Minister on my own responsibility—it was settled, I believe, at that time—but I did write, and I stated this: that I saw O'Grady on the matter, and I knew personally and from what he told me that his son, with his money and his support, had taken up a farm at Maerewhenua, and it would be inconvenient for him at the time to leave. I stated that his savings for years were invested in this property, and if he went to a distance it would perhaps prejudice his interests very much, and, further than that, in a very few years from now he would possibly retire; and if they would only leave him alone a little while it would suit him very much.

580. Have you never been appealed to by policemen at other times in connection with removals or transfers?—I think on one occasion, yes.

581. What was that?—Constable Lemm.

582. That is the only other instance you can remember?—Yes, that I remember.

583. *Colonel Hume.*] Mr. Duncan, as far as Constable Foley's case is concerned, you knew, of course, from what he told you that I was the person that had dealt with the case?—Yes. He had copies of the correspondence.

584. Which he showed you?—Yes, and I showed them to the Minister.

585. And consequently, you considered, as I had dealt with the case, the Minister was the proper person for you to go to?—Yes.

586. As regards the removal of O'Grady, you merely, I suppose, as member for the district, considered that you ought to put this fact of the son having taken up land before the Minister?—Yes. Of course, I would do that for any one. I consider it my duty to do so.

587. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is it not a fact that members of the House consider that it would be *infra dig.* for them to consult the head of the department, and that they have a right to go straight to the Minister?—Most certainly. It is the Minister that a member should go to.

588. And a member always does go to a Minister?—Yes. In my case, at any rate, it is so.

589. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand from you that in no other case have you been appealed to for political support or interest to be used on the part of any officer of the Force?—I believe there was one case about a constable mentioning to me casually, in conversation with two or three others about police matters, that he had been a long time without getting any promotion, and I wrote to inquire why.

590. Have you been asked to use this influence as a member, or has the fact of your using that influence been used in any way either to your benefit or prejudice as a politician?—I do not believe it has been to my benefit or prejudice in any way. I consider it my duty, if any one in my district has a grievance, to hear what they have to say, and if it is a proper thing to represent to the Minister I do so.

591. Have you at the time of elections used this influence, or have you been applied to to use it?—Never.

WILLIAM McLEOD, examined on oath.

592. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a master butcher, residing at Waimate?—Yes.

593. Do you remember last Sunday?—Yes.

594. Were you at the Waimate Hotel last Sunday?—I was.

595. What were you doing there?—I was there having my dinner. I usually go there for my dinner on Sunday.

596. How many times were you there last Sunday?—I might be on business once or twice there on Sunday. People from the country come there, and I go to see them.

597. For what purpose?—Buying stock, and paying them money that I owe them.

598. On matters of business in connection with your butchering business?—Yes.

599. Do you remember how many times you were there last Sunday?—No, I do not.

600. Were you there five times?—No, I do not think I was over twice there on Sunday.

601. How many meals had you in the hotel?—I had my dinner there.

602. Only?—Only, on Sunday.

603. Are you in the habit of having your dinner there on Sundays?—I am, and sometimes tea too.

604. Do you take your meals there any other day in the week?—No. My men are married, and they go home on Sundays.

605. Had you any drink in the hotel?—Only a glass of beer for my dinner.

606. On any other occasion that day had you any drink?—No.

607. Can you tell me the names of any persons who were there?—I went with Larry Thyne. I went there to settle about a mare for the horse that he was travelling with.

608. Why did you go to the hotel to see him?—Because I wanted to square up with him for this mare.

609. Was he at the hotel?—Yes.

610. Why was he there?—That I do not know.

611. Why did you go there to see them?—I followed him up there. I caught him before he went there.

612. You went to the hotel with him to settle this business?—Yes.

613. Why go to the hotel to settle business?—Because it is the most convenient place.

614. What did you do when you went to the hotel door: were you admitted or what?—Yes, we were admitted at the side door.

615. Were you asked any questions?—No.

616. What did you say?—Said nothing, but squared what we had to do and then left.

617. Who did you see when you went to the hotel—any one connected with the hotel?—No.

618. The landlord, or any of his servants?—No. We went into a by-room.

619. Will you swear that you had not something to drink there?—Yes.
 620. You had nothing to drink that day except a glass of beer at dinner?—Yes.
 621. What did you pay for your dinner?—1s., as I always do.
 622. And you were only at the hotel twice?—That is all I can remember—only twice that day.
 623. Did you see any other persons in the hotel while you were there besides Thyne?—No.
 624. What time was it when you went in to settle this business?—As far as I can remember it would be between 2 and 3 o'clock. I would not swear to that.
 625. Were you in there at 9 in the morning?—No.
 626. You say the only times you were there were when you went in for your dinner? At what time was that?—Between 12 and 1 o'clock.
 627. And again at what time, when you settled about the horse?—Between 2 and 3 o'clock.
 628. Those were the only times you were in that hotel during the day?—Yes.
 629. Were you under the influence of drink at all on Sunday last?—No.
 630. Not towards the evening?—No, not towards the evening.
 631. *Mr. Taylor.*] How far from the hotel is your shop?—About 200 yards.
 632. And yet you swear the hotel was the most convenient place to meet your customers?—Well, I met this gentleman at Dooley's stables, and we had only to go across the road to do this business.
 633. What part of the house did you see the landlord in in the morning?—I did not see him at all.
 634. Did he not follow you in at 10 o'clock?—No.
 635. Did anybody go in with you at 10 o'clock?—No.
 636. Who did you go in with at 10 o'clock?—I did not go with anybody at 10 o'clock. I did not go in till I went to my dinner.
 637. Did you lodge there that night?—No, I did not.
 638. You do not lodge there?—No, I do not.
 639. Did you see the landlord outside the house?—That I could not say.
 640. Was he not on the footpath?—No.
 641. You swear he was not on the footpath?—No.
 642. *The Chairman.*] You did not see him?—No.

GEORGE JOHNSON, examined on oath.

643. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a horse-trainer, living at Waimate?—Yes.
 644. Were you at the Waimate Hotel last Sunday?—Yes.
 645. How many times during the day?—Once or twice.
 646. Once, or twice—which?—I would not be sure on that point.
 647. At what hours were you there?—Different hours. I would not answer the hours like.
 648. You would not, or cannot—which do you mean?—Well, I can.
 649. Do please?—I was in in the forenoon.
 650. What time?—Between 9 and 10 o'clock.
 651. What were you there for?—On business.
 652. With whom?—No one.
 653. What kind of business?—It was private business.
 654. *The Chairman.*] Who was it with?—Well, if it comes to that, for a glass of beer.
 655. Did you get it?—No, Sir.
 656. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are sure you did not get it?—I am sure.
 657. Who did you see in the hotel?—I saw Mr. Dooley.
 658. The landlord?—Yes.
 659. Where did you see him?—In a private room.
 660. What did you say to Mr. Dooley?—I asked him if he would give me a drink.
 661. What did he say?—He said, No, not to-day.
 662. He refused to give you a drink?—Yes.
 663. How long were you inside the hotel on that occasion?—No time. I walked out after those words.
 664. Did you see any one else going into the hotel while you were there?—Not at that time.
 665. What time were you there again?—I think it was later on in the afternoon.
 666. Some time in the afternoon?—Yes.
 667. Can you fix it nearer?—Some time in the afternoon; I could not say the time.
 668. What did you go there on that occasion for?—Oh, the same.
 669. You went there to get a glass of beer?—Yes; and he again refused.
 670. How did you get inside the house?—At the entrance going to the dining-room. It is always open, I think.
 671. Was the side door of the hotel open?—I opened it.
 672. And walked in?—Walked in the house.
 673. Was there any person watching at the door, or keeping guard over the door?—No. I walked in myself.
 674. The second time, you say, you saw Dooley?—Yes. I met him, and he asked me what I wanted. I asked him for a glass of beer. He said, "No; I have refused you once, and that is quite enough."
 675. Did anything take place in the hotel?—Not to my knowledge.
 676. Did you see anybody else?—I did not.
 677. How long were you in the hotel?—I was no time, once I was refused.
 678. Any other time did you go to the hotel?—No, not that day.

679. Did you see the witness McLeod at the hotel that day?—I did not.
680. You were twice only in the hotel; you went on each occasion to get a drink, and it was refused by the landlord?—Yes.
681. Was it your habit to go there Sunday after Sunday?—I do not make it a habit. I was out at work, and I did not feel very well overnight as I came in on the Saturday, and I thought of getting a glass of beer.
682. Were you under the influence of liquor at all during last Sunday?—No, I was not.
683. You are sure of that?—Not to my knowledge. I was not.
684. *Mr. Taylor.*] “Not to my knowledge,” what do you mean?—Well, that is quite enough. I say I was not.
685. Did not you use the expression, “not to my knowledge”?—Not to my knowledge. Well, a man might be. I did not get a chance to be the worse for drink.
686. Did you use those words—to your knowledge?—Well, I say I was not.
687. Who was the swagger that you went in the back gate with on Sunday afternoon: what was his name?—I could not say. I never went in with a swagger.
688. Did you go into the back gate?—I never did, with a swagger.
689. I do not say swagger: he might be a labouring man?—I never went in the back gate. I went in by the side door.
690. Did you see the landlord on the footpath walking up and down?—Well, he may have been.
691. Did you?—He may have been. I could not say; but he was in a private room when I went in. I do not know that I did. At least, I did not look. I went in on business.
692. You did not go into the back gate with anybody?—No, not to my knowledge.

LAURENCE THYNE, examined on oath.

693. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a groom?—Yes.
694. Do you live at Waimate?—Yes.
695. Where?—I live in the Town of Waimate just now.
696. Where?—In Leonard Street.
697. How far from the Waimate Hotel?—About a quarter of a mile or so.
698. Where were you living last Saturday night?—At Makikihi.
699. How far is that from Waimate?—Twelve miles.
700. When did you come into Waimate?—On Sunday morning.
701. Have you been working at Makikihi?—Yes.
702. What time did you arrive at Waimate from Makikihi?—To the best of my belief, 9 o'clock.
703. Were you at the Waimate Hotel on Sunday last?—Yes.
704. How many times?—I think about twice.
705. What did you go there for?—I went there once to get my dinner, and I happened to be going across the street down to another part of the town when I met Mr. McLeod, and we had some business to do, and he asked me if I would mind going over into Dooley's to settle the business with him in regard to some mares I had off him for a horse that season. We went over into a private room and settled the business.
706. What was the nature of the business: had any papers to be signed, or anything of the kind?—He was giving me some money.
707. Did you give him a receipt for it?—No.
708. Where was the necessity to go into a hotel?—He thought it was the best thing, being Sunday, to go over there.
709. Did you have any drink?—No.
710. Were you questioned by any one when you entered the hotel as to why you were going in?—No.
711. *The Chairman.*] You did not go into the bar at all?—No.
712. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What time was this, when you went in on the second occasion?—I cannot remember what time it would be.
713. Roughly?—I could not swear. It might be 3 o'clock or so.
714. Did McLeod have drink?—No; not when he was in my company.
715. You are sure of that?—Yes.

EDWARD SOLE, examined on oath.

716. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a cook?—Yes.
717. Have you been working at Bluecliffs?—Yes.
718. How far is that from Waimate?—About twenty miles.
719. Is your home in Waimate?—Yes.
720. When did you go to Waimate—on Sunday last?—Yes.
721. Were you there on Saturday night?—Yes.
722. Where were you living on Saturday night?—At my own place.
723. Were you at the Waimate Hotel on Sunday?—I was in the backyard, not in the hotel.
724. What were you doing in the backyard?—I went to the private place—the urinal.
725. Are you sure of that?—I am sure of it.
726. Did you see anybody else there?—No, I did not look for other people.
727. How many times were you there, on those premises?—Twice in the backyard.
728. At what time were you there?—I never kept what time. I think it was in the morning.
729. Both times in the morning?—I think so.
730. Did you not go there in company with George Johnson?—I went there, but I never went into the house with him.

731. Which way did Johnson go into the house?—He went in the back gate, I think. I am not sure whether he did or not.

732. You are sure you were never in the house during the day?—Yes.

733. You had no drink on the premises?—No, not at Dooley's.

734. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say you went to the hotel twice with Johnson?—Only once.

735. Where did you pick Johnson up?—In the main street of Waimate. He picked me up, and he said he was going into the backyard of Dooley's. He never asked me to have a drink with him or anything. I left him at the gate. He never followed me.

736. He did not go into the urinal with you?—No, he did not.

737. Was that in addition to the twice you went in the side door with Johnson on Sunday?—I never went in.

738. Did you see the landlord at all on Sunday?—I did not see him.

739. Did you see him on the footpath?—No. He was outside, I dare say.

740. Was he outside?—I could not say. I did not watch the man.

741. Did you see him outside?—I may have seen him. I am not sure.

742. *The Chairman.*] Did you see him or did you not?—Well, I did see him.

743. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you speaking to him?—No.

744. Did you pass him?—I did not pass him. I was on the other side of the road.

745. Are you in the habit of speaking to him?—Oh, I know him. If I want a drink I go in.

746. You did not have a drink on Sunday?—No, I did not.

747. *Mr. Lee.*] Is this backyard open to the public?—Yes.

CHARLES HOBBS, examined on oath.

748. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you road foreman for the Waimate County Council?—Yes.

749. Where are you working?—I was working at the Otaio, thirty miles out of Waimate.

750. Last Saturday?—Yes, and yesterday.

751. Did you leave your work on Saturday and go into Waimate?—Yes.

752. What time did you arrive in Waimate?—About 5 o'clock in the evening.

753. You slept at Waimate on Saturday night?—Yes.

754. Were you at the Waimate Hotel on Sunday last?—Yes.

755. How many times?—Twice.

756. What times?—I do not know. Perhaps the man that informed will tell you.

757. You do not remember?—No.

758. How many times were you there?—I think I was there twice. I went for a letter, and Mr. Dooley was not home.

759. The first time you went, you say, you went for a letter?—Yes.

760. For whom was that letter?—A man named McCarty. He asked me to go and see if there was a letter for him.

761. How long has McCarty been working with you?—On and off for about twenty years.

762. Has he been in Oamaru some time lately?—I do not think so. I do not know that he ever was in Oamaru.

763. Did you get the letter?—No.

764. Whom did you see?—I saw the barman first. Mr. Dooley was not there, and I had to call again and see Mr. Dooley.

765. What took place between you and the barman?—Nothing. I asked him if there was a letter there, and he said he did not know, and that I should see Mr. Dooley.

766. Did you have any drink in the house?—No.

767. You are sure of that?—Well, I should think I ought to know whether I had a drink or not.

768. Did you see any other persons in the house besides the barman?—I did not.

769. The second time?—I went in and asked Mr. Dooley if the letter was there. He told me, No.

770. Did you have any drink that time?—No.

771. Did you see any other persons drinking there?—No.

772. Which way did you enter the hotel? By the door. Which way would you go—down the chimney?

773. Which door?—There is only one door open that I know of.

774. Is it the side door?—I do not know whether you would call it the side door or the front door.

775. You did not go round the back?—No.

776. You were not in the third time?—No, I was not. I went twice.

WALTER FOSTER FINN, examined on oath.

777. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you live in Waimate?—Yes.

778. Are you clerk to Mr. McLeod, butcher?—Yes.

779. Were you in the Waimate Hotel last Sunday?—Yes.

780. What time of the day?—Some time in the morning; I could not say.

781. What were you doing there?—I was looking for a friend of mine that stops there occasionally.

782. What was his name?—Gunn. I transact business with him occasionally.

783. Did you find him there?—No.

784. When did you last see Gunn at the hotel?—I could not say that. I might see him every time he is in town perhaps.

785. Give us some idea: a year ago or a week ago?—I generally see him every week.

786. You generally find him there every week?—I could not say. It may be a fortnight sometimes.

787. Where does Gunn live?—About five or six miles in the country.

788. What is the name of the place?—I do not know that it has a name.

789. What is Gunn?—A farmer.

790. In which direction does Gunn live from Waimate?—Above the bush.

791. Is it a place called the Hook?—Yes, it is in the Hook district.

792. What brings Gunn into Waimate on a Sunday?—His own business, probably; I do not know.

793. Is he in the habit of coming in on a Sunday and stopping at the Waimate Hotel?—He stops there; when he is in Waimate he usually stops there.

794. You thought he might be in Waimate last Sunday?—Yes; I wanted to see him on business.

795. What business did you want to see him on?—A matter of business.

796. What business?—Perhaps have a yarn with him.

797. You did not see Mr. Gunn?—No.

798. Whom did you see in the hotel?—No one; the bar was locked up.

799. Did you not see any one at all?—No. There may have been some servants about.

800. How did you know Gunn was not in the hotel?—Because I could not see him in any of the rooms. I looked in two or three rooms.

801. You had no drink there?—I did not.

802. You were only there once?—I think I looked in twice; I am not sure.

803. Still looking for Gunn?—Just so.

804. Could not find him?—No.

805. Had no drink?—No.

806. Nor saw any one else drinking there?—I saw no one drinking; the bar was locked up.

GEOFFREY SELWYN MATTHIAS, examined on oath.

807. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a bank manager, living at Waimate?—I am manager of the Union Bank, living at Waimate.

808. Is your bank immediately opposite the Waimate Hotel?—Yes, directly opposite it.

809. Were you at home last Sunday?—Yes, I was at home all day on Sunday.

810. Were you in a position during the day to see what was going on at the Waimate Hotel?—I was about the corner of the street, and also in the upstairs rooms, and could see everything that was going on, off and on. I do not say I was there the whole day.

811. Did you see many people going in and out?—No, I did not.

812. Did you observe any people under the influence of drink about the hotel?—I did not.

813. Any sign of drinking at all going on, as far as you could see?—As far as I could see there was not. I saw people going into the hotel in the morning, but the majority of them were people from the country who came in to attend the Catholic Church in the morning, and who lived a big distance off.

814. You know most of the people of Waimate?—Yes.

815. You can say, from your own knowledge, the people you saw going in and out were country people?—I can confidently say that.

816. Living what distance away from Waimate?—From five to six or seven miles. From Waihao to the Hook.

817. You saw no sign of drinking going on?—No.

818. Or any sign of people under the influence of drink?—No.

819. Have you, from your observations, any reason to believe the law is infringed?—No, I have not.

820. Have you ever seen people under the influence of drink about the place on Sundays?—I have never seen people under the influence of drink coming out of the Waimate Hotel on Sundays.

821. I mean inhabitants of the town?—No. I do not think I have ever seen a drunken man on Sunday in the street, but if I have it is a very exceptional thing; in fact, I can say I have not seen one for a long time.

822. *Mr. Taylor.*] Last Sunday were you at home all day?—Yes, I think so. Perhaps I was out for a walk for an hour or so in the afternoon.

823. Were you out in the morning?—No; I was at home all the morning.

824. How long were you walking round the corner of the bank?—I was walking up and down the footpath for some time.

825. How long were you on the footpath?—I was walking up and down, having a smoke.

826. For half an hour?—More than that. I was walking round the corner before breakfast, and also up till half-past 11 o'clock.

827. After breakfast?—Just after—in and out.

828. Those people were country residents?—What people I saw were country residents.

829. Did you see a man named Sole go in?—I did not.

830. Did you see McLeod go in?—I did not.

831. Thyne?—No.

832. Johnson?—No.

833. They might have gone in without you knowing?—Yes, it is possible.

834. Scores of people may have gone in without you knowing?—Not that number, because I would have noticed them.

835. Did you see Dooley that day? Was he not walking up and down the footpath?—I could not say.

836. Was he not on the footpath opposite your place? Did you see him walking up and down?—That I could not say. I could not say whether he was walking up and down or not. As a rule, he walks up and down.

837. Do you generally see him there on Sundays?—I generally see him on Sundays.

838. Do you know what the expression means: "A man on the door," in connection with public-houses on Sundays?—Yes. I believe it means on the lookout for a person.

839. Do you think it has the appearance of the landlord being on the lookout for anybody on Sunday?—No; I do not.

840. Just walking up and down?—Yes, probably for the same reason that I am walking up and down on the street at the corner—just to have a smoke.

841. Probably the same motive?—Probably.

842. *Mr. Lee.*] How long have you been in Waimate?—Very nearly seven years.

843. I suppose you know most of the people by sight, and the country people especially?—Yes.

844. There are a number of Catholics in and around Waimate?—Yes.

845. And a great many come in on Easter Sunday?—Yes.

846. Apart from the country people, who would be in and out of the Waimate Hotel on that day, do you think there would be something like twenty-eight or thirty people in and out on that day?—No. I should be bound to have seen these people going in, if they had been going in, or anything like that number.

847. Would you say, in your knowledge, the licensing law is badly administered in Waimate?—No, certainly not. There is very little drunkenness to be seen in the streets of Waimate.

848. Do you see many men about under the influence of liquor, or is it a rare thing?—It is a rare thing to see them about, for the simple reason that, I believe, when they are under the influence of liquor they are taken up to the police-station straight away, and not allowed to be seen in the town.

849. You think the police-officers, as far as you know, do their duty there?—Yes, I think I can say that.

FRANK STANLEY PARKER, examined on oath.

850. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Second-class constable, stationed at Waimate.

851. *Mr. Lee.*] Are you the senior constable stationed at Waimate?—Yes. There are two constables, and I am the senior one.

852. How long have you been there?—Two years and nine months.

853. You are not a Catholic, are you?—No, I am not.

854. Speaking on the question of the administration of the licensing law there, have you had any cases under the Licensing Act since you have been there?—Yes; there have been in two years and nine months twelve prosecutions, and, I think, either eight or nine convictions.

855. Is that the list of them?—This is the list of them:—

Oamaru Police Station, 15th April, 1898.

REPORT of Second-class Constable F. S. Parker, No. 415, *re* breaches of "The Licensing Act, 1881," and amendments:—

I respectfully report that during the time I have been in charge of the Waimate Police Sub-district—two years and nine months—the following prosecutions have taken place:—16th January, 1896: Henry Middleton, Sunday trading, two informations; dismissed. 27th February, 1896: James Tutter, fined £10 and costs, for supplying a prohibited person (Philip Richards) with liquor. 27th July, 1896; Patrick Reid, a prohibited person, being on a licensed premises; dismissed with a caution, the order only having been taken out that day. 17th December, 1896: Walter Wilson, fined £2 and costs, for supplying George Johnson, a prohibited person, with liquor. 17th December, 1896: F. P. Harris, charged with supplying George Johnson, a prohibited person, with liquor; case dismissed. 18th March, 1897: William Watson, licensee, Makikihi Hotel; fined £5 and costs, for permitting an unlawful game in his house. 18th March, 1897: William Watson, licensee, Makikihi Hotel; fined £5 and costs, for serving drunken man with liquor. 28th October, 1897: Edwin Burrell, fined £5 and costs, for serving George Johnson, a prohibited man. 28th October, 1897: Edwin Burrell, fined £5 and costs, for serving Thomas Hogan, a prohibited man. 28th October, 1897: Thomas Hogan, being a prohibited person, did procure liquor; dismissed. 6th January, 1898: Alexander Price, a prohibited person, found on licensed premises; fined 10s., and 7s. costs.

I beg to state that for two years and nine months previous to me taking charge of the district three prosecutions for breaches of the Act took place: (1.) Publican charged with trading after hours; fined £5 and costs. (2.) Publican keeping open after hours; withdrawn. (3.) Publican charged with trading after hours; case dismissed.

The Commissioner of Police, Oamaru.

F. S. PARKER, Second-class Constable 415.

856. Do you keep an eye on the hotels?—Yes. I visit them when I think it is necessary.

857. With your junior officer?—Yes, we accompany each other, especially on Sunday.

858. On Easter Sunday there are a number of country people who come in to Waimate, are there not?—Yes. They come in to the Catholic Church there.

859. And the Catholic Church is nearer to this hotel than any other, and they make that their headquarters, and stop there?—Yes.

860. And the landlord is a Catholic?—Yes.

861. You might say it is a Catholic community?—Yes, it is pretty well a Catholic community.

862. Were you about last Easter Sunday?—Yes. From 9 to 10 I went through the main streets; and from 10 to 1 o'clock I was at the Hook, making inquiries about a fire.

863. Where was the other officer?—He was on duty from 7 to 8, and from 2 till 5 o'clock and I was also on duty from half-past 2 till 5 o'clock. He went on duty at 6, and remained on duty till 10, and I joined him from 8 to 10 o'clock.

864. Do you know the backyard of the Waimate Hotel?—Yes, there is a galvanised-iron fence round it. It has a urinal in it. It is largely used by the public. There is no public urinal in Waimate to my knowledge.

865. Were you past the Waimate Hotel at all on Sunday?—On the opposite side of the street. I passed Manchester's and went down to a yard where there was a search going on with some other police-officers from Timaru. I saw nothing unusual—just two or three country people standing

there. There was a man named McMorris, who resides about four miles away, and who met with an accident in connection with a bicycle, which ran into him, and he was complaining about it to me. I saw him right opposite Dooley's Hotel underneath Manchester's verandah.

866. When you have complaints handed in to you by any one, do you pay attention to them?—I always do.

867. Do you know Mr. Dash?—Oh, yes.

868. Is he a sort of figure-head in Waimate—is he an important person there?—Yes.

869. Is he a Prohibitionist?—Yes.

870. A leading one?—Yes.

871. Has he ever made any complaints to you about licensed houses?—Never, neither in writing nor verbally.

872. Never a word?—No.

873. If he made any complaints to you would you attend to them?—Certainly I would.

874. Did he tell you he was coming down to this Commission to make these statements?—No, he never told me. It is not their custom to tell people beforehand what they are going to do.

875. Do you know this shop Mr. Dash was in?—Yes, it belongs to his brother. It is about 100 paces from the back of Dooley's Hotel.

876. The sort of place you would select for a hiding-place on a Sunday to keep an eye on an hotel?—No, I would not. As a police-officer I would not think of doing it.

877. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you know George Johnson, who is a prohibited person?—I do. He is not prohibited now.

878. When was he prohibited?—From the 16th October, 1896, to the 16th October, 1897.

879. During the time he was prohibited were any persons prosecuted for supplying him with liquor?—Yes. On the 28th October, 1897, Edwin Burrell was fined £5 and costs for supplying George Johnson, a prohibited person, with liquor; on the 17th December, 1896, W. Wilson was fined £2 and costs for supplying George Johnson, a prohibited person, with liquor; on the 17th December, 1896, F. P. Harris was also charged with supplying Johnson with liquor, but the case was dismissed.

880. Alexander Price was also a prohibited person?—Yes.

881. Was he prohibited from the 24th March, 1897, to the 24th March, 1898?—Yes, that is so.

882. Was any one prosecuted for supplying him during the period of his prohibition?—He was prosecuted himself on the 6th January, 1898, for being found on licensed premises, and fined 10s. and costs.

883. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was Price found on licensed hotel premises or wholesale premises?—Wholesale premises.

884. Where did you come from?—Tapanui.

885. As a matter of fact, how often have you had the loan of Middleton's buggy?—I never had the loan of it yet. I have hired a buggy. He lets it on hire.

886. You used to hire his paddock?—Twelve months ago he had a paddock in which he used to take stock. I placed my cow there; and after he got rid of the paddock I had to get rid of my cow. It was the only convenient place for me to have it, and Mr. Dash used to feed it over the fence for me. I was not the only one that ran stock there. There were others.

887. You know Mr. Dash very well?—Yes.

888. Have you ever had any charge against him?—No, there has been no charge against him. There was a charge against the brother.

889. Have you got "a down" on Prohibitionists generally?—No, I have not.

890. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You paid Middleton for grazing your cow in the paddock?—Yes, I paid him, with others. It was used by others besides myself.

891. Is Middleton a publican?—Yes.

892. And his paddock was grazed by your cow and others, and you paid for the grazing of your cow?—Yes. That was over twelve months ago.

893. In each case in which the buggy of the publican has been engaged have you paid for it?—Either myself or the Police Department. If it was on police business the Police Department would pay for it. Dooley and the other publican keep livery-stables, and have done so for years.

894. And they are the only people you can get a buggy from?—Yes, they are the nearest to the station.

JOHN MANCHESTER, examined on oath.

895. *Mr. Lee.*] You carry on a general store business in Waimate?—Yes.

896. You are in a large way of business at Waimate?—Yes, pretty large.

897. You have lived in Waimate many years?—Yes.

898. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

899. Do you know Constable Parker well?—Yes.

900. Speaking generally as to the administration of the law in Waimate by the police, would you say it is properly administered; do the police do their duty there?—I think Constable Parker is a very good officer. It seems to me he discharges his duties with ability and intelligence.

901. And gives satisfaction generally?—I would not say he gives satisfaction to everyone.

902. Have you noticed any improvement in police matters since Parker has been there at all?—I think he is as good an officer as has ever been stationed in the district.

TIMARU.

THOMAS LIVINGSTONE, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a second-class detective, stationed in Timaru.
2. You are temporarily in charge of the sub-district?—Yes, of the South Canterbury sub-district.
3. How long have you been in charge?—About two months.
4. What is the ordinary local Force?—The strength of the Force in Timaru is one first-class sergeant, one second-class detective, two second-class constables, and five third-class constables.
5. Of these, how many are married and how many are single?—Eight are married and one single.
6. How are the married men housed?—Four of the married men—the first-class sergeant, myself, the mounted man, and the gaoler have free quarters.
7. Which rank is the mounted man in?—Second-class constable (Robert Crawford).
8. How are the other married men housed?—They are paying house-rent.
9. And the single man?—He is living in the barrack-room.
10. Have you any mess?—No.
11. Are any amongst the present Force here new recruits?—There are three of them have two or three years' experience each, and one has nine months. The single constable has not been in the service more than nine months, but he was previously a district constable in an outlying district of North Canterbury.
12. Do you find this Force sufficient for the working of the district?—At present it is about sufficient to carry on the police work the public require in Timaru.
13. *Colonel Pitt.*] Including escort duty?—Yes, with prisoners to the Lyttelton Gaol.
14. *The Chairman.*] What do you say as to the efficiency of the men stationed here under you?—The men stationed here at present are respectable, sober men, with whom, so far as I know, the public are thoroughly satisfied. I have been stationed here over eleven years myself. I have twenty-three years' service, a broken period of five days excepted. I joined the Otago Police in provincial times, and our pay commenced in Dunedin as second-class constables, because there was no such rank as third-class constables then. We had 8s. per day, and 1s. per day house-rent for married constables, and 8d. per day for clothing for all ranks. When the General Government came into force on the 30th June, 1877, the 1s. per day and the 8d. per day were taken away from the members of the Force, and a few men in Otago left on account of that.
15. *Colonel Pitt.*] The single men, I suppose, were messed in barracks?—Yes. Since I have been in the Police Force I have been transferred eleven times.
16. *Mr. Poynton.*] Had you a family?—I have now a considerable family, but I have been left here for a very long time.
17. *The Chairman.*] During the first twelve years of your service you were transferred eleven times?—Yes. In provincial times I may state we had only one head, and that was the Superintendent of Police. My experience was that it was useless to speak to anybody else when we wanted redress. I have got on satisfactorily in the Police Force since I have been in it. I was always content to do what I was told, and took an active interest in my work, knowing that I was paid for it. I was appointed detective in 1879, and was stationed in Oamaru for some considerable time, until I took an attack of typhoid fever, and I was advised to shift. I was appointed second-class sergeant in 1884, after two years as acting-sergeant, previous to coming here. There are one or two matters I would like to mention. I think we ought to have some kind of pension scheme instituted for the benefit of the men who have devoted their whole life to the police.
18. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you formulated a scheme?—No, I have not.
19. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that a pension scheme would commend itself more to the men than a retiring-allowance?—I think it would. For my part, I think it would.
20. What is your idea as to the opinion of the Force generally on the point?—So far as I am aware, members of the Force who have any service are in favour of a pension.
21. And would be prepared to contribute towards it?—Yes, I am prepared to contribute my long-service pay of 1s. per day towards it.
22. That would not support a pension fund? Do you think the men in the Force would be willing to suffer a deduction from their pay for the purpose of a pension fund?—I can speak for two other members of the Force here besides myself. We would be satisfied to contribute towards a pension fund.
23. Do you think it would be a good thing for the Force generally that all members should contribute?—It would be very satisfactory for members of the Force to think that if they are seriously hurt when on duty they have a small pension to fall back on.
24. But would they be prepared to sacrifice some of their pay to secure that; say, instead of a compulsory insurance, would they be willing to contribute a certain percentage of their pay towards making a pension fund?—Any members of the Force I have spoken to who have a number of years of service are satisfied to contribute towards it. There are six out-stations attached to Timaru, namely: Temuka, two constables, first-class and second-class; Geraldine, one first-class constable; Waimate, two second-class constables; Pleasant Point, one first-class constable; and Fairlie, one second-class constable. There are troop-horses at each of these stations.
25. Each of these are mounted men?—Yes, there is a mounted man at each place. Some years ago, when I was a mounted man, I often thought that more care should be exercised in the purchase of troop-horses. I used to think that a veterinary surgeon should make a periodical inspection of Government horses, and all horses that might be selected to be purchased by the department for the use of the police.

26. How are they purchased now?—On the recommendation of the local police, after being carefully examined by the Inspector in charge of the district.

27. You think a veterinary surgeon should be employed to purchase horses?—I think so. I could give instances of carelessness, and things which occurred through inexperienced persons purchasing horses. Some years ago the sergeant of police at Ashburton came down and selected a horse at Studholme Junction. The horse was only four years old, and he was purchased for the mounted constable at Geraldine, and was sent there. I think £30 was the price. The bones of the horse on account of his youth were not properly set, and he got a heavy man on his back, with the consequence that his limbs shrunk, and for a time he was apparently useless. The sale of that horse was ordered by the department. He was sold for £8, and now that horse is worth £40. He is thoroughly sound. I was vexed to see that horse leave the department. We have a district order in reference to horses having their rations reduced during the summer where there are paddocks. There are a number of paddocks in South Canterbury, but the paddocks during the last two years, owing to dry seasons, have had very little grass upon them, and it is rather neat work to make the forage-allowance for the horses do.

28. What is the forage-allowance?—I have not got the amount. I think it is not sufficient, on account of the shortness of grass in the summer months. What I maintain is that this order should not be permanent, and that it should not always be in force through dry seasons. The rations are not altogether stopped, but are cut down to half.

29. *Colonel Pitt.*] If there is no grass for the horses, do you give rations?—Yes. The district order is that where there are paddocks they should go on half rations during the summer; and sometimes the constables have to make up the rations themselves.

30. Are the rations reduced to one-half during a fixed period of the year?—Yes, I think so. There is another matter I would like to mention that I experienced some years ago. I think some efforts should be made to induce the local authorities to provide morgues for the reception of dead bodies. The practice of bringing bodies to hotels is, I think, objectionable.

31. Is there no morgue here?—No; there is a morgue at the hospital, for the use of the hospital only. It is not a public morgue.

32. And you find there is an inconvenience in the practice of taking dead bodies to hotels?—Yes. I have seen great difficulty in the back country in getting the thing conducted with any kind of decent order.

33. Do you suggest that there should be morgues up country?—I think there should be a morgue wherever there is a police-station.

34. In the vicinity of each police-station?—Yes, or Courthouse. Very recently a constable had a dead body in a lockup in this district; and I consider that is very objectionable. There is just one little matter further. I think that it should be compulsory on the part of sergeants and constables for them to attend a place of Divine service as often as possible. I do not find any section in the Police Regulations compelling members of the Force to attend a place of Divine service. In the Irish Constabulary it is compulsory for the members to attend the different places of worship to which they belong. That is my opinion.

35. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Will you read paragraph 159 of the regulations in reference to forage for horses?—It is as follows: "At every station where practicable the officer in charge will turn out the horses to graze, issuing only half rations, or such other forage, if any, as may be necessary, due regard being had to their being kept in serviceable condition."

36. Do you not think that paragraph meets everything you have put forward here to-day?—Yes, I should think that would meet it.

37. Well, to your knowledge, has not that regulation been carried out?—There is a district circular in the books in reference to turning them out, and it says distinctly only half rations are to be given.

38. It says that at every station where practicable the officer in charge shall turn out the horse to graze, issuing only half rations, or such other forage, if any, as may be necessary, due regard being had to their being kept in serviceable condition?—That is carried out.

39. Do you know of any case where a constable has had to provide forage out of his own pocket?—Constables have complained to me, but whether through ignorance of that police regulation or not I cannot say.

40. Has not every constable a copy of these Police Regulations?—Yes.

41. You said you have no police morgue in Timaru; do you know of a police morgue anywhere else in the colony?—There was one in Christchurch.

42. A police morgue?—A morgue, I understand, which was the property of the police in Christchurch.

43. I suppose you know that the local authorities are the persons who have to provide morgues?—I am aware of that. That is why I said I think some efforts should be made to induce the local authorities to provide morgues.

44. Where was this body put in the lockup?—In Geraldine.

45. Was there no other place in which it could have been put?—In the hotel.

46. Was there no shed or other place?—There was a hotel close by.

47. *The Chairman.*] Why was the body not taken there?—I understood the constable to say that the publican refused.

48. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you not know he is liable to a penalty if he did? The law compels a publican to house a dead body if brought there?—Yes, I understand so.

49. *Mr. Poynton.*] Have you given any instructions to constables about their duties?—I do not give them instructions. I walk our streets with them, and I think that is the best instruction they can get. I talk matters of duty over with them, search the town, fossick the rights-of-way, and teach them general police duties. I think, if the sergeants throughout the colony did the same

thing the men would become good watchmen and good public servants. They want a sergeant to go with them; that is my opinion.

50. *The Chairman.*] You think street training is better than depot training?—I think a sergeant of police with recruits is better than depot training. I know it from experience. I was in charge of a night-duty section in Dunedin from 1882 to 1884. I had nine or ten recruits there, and through working them hard at night for the first twelve months in the service, I found that all, except one or two, turned out well. There is one in this Court now, and there is one at Waimate. They turned out good useful public servants.

51. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do not you think it would be a good thing to have a central depot for the whole colony for training recruits?—Well, if you crowd young men who are going to join the Police Force together, one bad man will make a dozen others bad also.

52. *Mr. Poynton.*] Will one good man improve the same number?—Yes; but young men generally yield to bad advice.

53. *Colonel Hume.*] Do I understand you to think there should be a veterinary surgeon attached to the Force?—No. I think the Government veterinary surgeons pay periodical visits throughout the various districts to examine cattle and such like, and I do not see why they should not examine horses as well as other stock.

54. Then, you think that would have prevented this particular horse you mention being sold?—I do not say that, but I think they would be able to instruct constables, and make suggestions as to how to treat horses.

55. Well, then, do you happen to know that this particular horse was inspected by a veterinary surgeon before being sold?—I cannot say.

56. Do you know it is the custom wherever a veterinary surgeon can be got in the colony always to get a veterinary surgeon's certificate where we buy horses?—I know instances, some years ago, where it was done.

57. Do you know what the custom is at the present time as regards veterinary surgeon's certificates being got for horses purchased for the Force?—I do not know the custom.

58. Are you a Prohibitionist?—I am not.

59. Are you in the habit of attending Prohibitionist meetings at all?—No. I have been in Prohibitionist meetings on duty. As a detective I attend every place I can possibly get into where there is a public meeting or anything in the nature of it.

60. Well, then, has the Licensed Victuallers' Association said you were taking a prominent part with the Prohibitionists against them, and said you were not fair?—I have answered that charge on two occasions. I have been reported by the secretary of the South Canterbury Licensed Victuallers' Association for being a Prohibitionist, but I denied the charge.

61. That was my object in bringing the matter forward; that you might deny publicly what you were accused of?—Yes.

62. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you anything to do with the enforcement of the licensing laws?—While in temporary charge of this station I consider I have to do that, but I have seen no reason to take action against a publichouse during the last two months.

63. Do you mean that is the time you have been in charge?—Yes; as a detective I have not taken an active interest in the enforcement of the Licensing Act.

64. Can you say whether the licensing laws are satisfactorily observed here or not?—They are, so far as I can see. We have as licensed publicans in Timaru some men who are as respectable as any in New Zealand. They could not be better; but there are a few houses that are perhaps not up to what they ought to be. There are twelve licensed houses in the borough, with the railway refreshment-rooms.

65. Do many of the police in this district hold offices outside their police duties, such as Clerks of Court, and anything like that?—Yes, the constables at Waimate, Fairlie, Temuka, and Geraldine hold offices outside of the ordinary police duties.

66. Do you think the constables generally in the Force holding such offices as these would be willing to surrender the emoluments attached to these offices in order that they might go towards the establishment of a pension scheme?—I cannot say. Most men in the Police Force—I think all the men in the Force—have their lives insured. I have my life insured for £500 and pay £1 3s. 4d. out of my salary into the Government.

67. *The Chairman.*] What is your pay?—12s. per day.

68. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you willing to allow your long-service pay to go towards a pension fund?—Yes.

69. And do you know that the men drawing long-service pay on this station are also willing to do so?—They are; they have signed a document to that effect in my presence.

70. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say, during the past two months you have had no occasion to find fault with the hotels in Timaru?—I have had no reason to summon them. I have seen nothing to cause me to issue a summons against them.

71. What did you see at all?—I saw that they observed the law satisfactorily so far as I was aware.

72. You do not often go into them on Sundays?—If there was any cause I would.

73. Do they keep men on the watch here on Sundays?—I have not noticed any.

74. At none of the hotels?—I cannot prove that they did. I have noticed men walking in front of one or two hotels, but I cannot say for what purpose.

75. Will you swear it is not customary for some one to be on the watch at hotels on Sundays?—I would not say it is not customary for one or two of them, but there are very few of them would resort to anything of the kind.

76. How many hotels are there in Timaru?—We have fourteen licensed places, including the railway refreshment-room.

77. And you say only one or two keep a watch on Sunday?—That is all I have noticed.
78. How long have you been in Timaru?—Over eleven years.
79. Have the members of the Force who have been with you during that term been sober men?—Well, they have been fairly sober.
80. How many have been fairly sober?—I cannot exactly say. I have not been in charge of the place all the time.
81. But still you have been here, and can see what is going on, and can say what percentage of the men have been addicted to drinking so that you could see it on them?—There have only been one or two members of the Force addicted to drink.
82. Have you ever seen a sergeant here noticeably under the influence of drink pretty often?—Well, of course, I cannot charge any one with having —
83. I am not asking you to charge any one; have you not seen a sergeant of police here frequently under the influence of liquor?—No, I have not seen him frequently.
84. I mean not drunk, but under the influence of liquor so that it was observable?—I do not remember seeing any sergeant of police incapable through liquor.
85. I do not ask a question as to incapability; have you not seen a sergeant of police here who has been frequently under the influence of liquor?—I have not seen a sergeant of police who has been frequently under the influence of liquor. I have known a sergeant of police here to take a little drink, but not very frequently, to my observation.
86. Have you ever instituted any prosecutions against hotels?—I have, upwards of twenty.
87. As a detective?—Yes, during the absence of the sergeant, and while I was in temporary charge some years ago.
88. When doing purely detective duty you take no notice of hotels?—Very little notice. Of course you have to go in and out of hotels, but I do not think it is to the interest of the Detective Department to enforce the Licensing Act. We live by these people, in the way of getting information, and it is not to the interest of detectives to be continually quarrelling with them.
89. Do you mean the police generally get information from hotelkeepers?—No; the detectives depend on the publicans for a certain amount of information to carry on the work of the department.
90. Why is that? Do the criminal classes frequent hotels largely?—They do. The drunken portion of the criminal class frequent hotels.
91. Have you had any instructions as to your duty in this matter since the new Commissioner came?—I have seen instructions, but not directly from the head of the department.
92. What instances of political interference have you known since you have been in the Force?—I cannot prove I have known any instances at all.
93. Has there been a general feeling that political interference was rife?—There has been a sort of idea in the minds of some members of the Force that they could gain by having a little political influence.
94. Has it not been common talk?—Yes, it was common talk, of course, some years ago; not during the last six or twelve months.
95. Now, as a matter of fact, has there not been an improvement in that respect during the past six months, since the change in control?—There has been an improvement; the men have lost the feeling that it is any good trying it on, so far as I can see.
96. Do you remember Constable Weathered being ordered for removal from Timaru?—Yes.
97. Did the men regard his remaining here as being due to political influence?—I was not here. I was up on duty in Christchurch at the time.
98. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] If you observed any breaches of the licensing law, would you consider it your duty to report it?—I would.
99. You do not consider it your primary duty as a detective to search for breaches of the licensing law?—No.
100. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you always reported breaches of the licensing law that have come under your observation as a detective?—Generally I have.
101. How is it, then, that you said you did not consider it advisable to take notice of these things?—Except that it was a very extreme case. There are very few men in the colony who have paid as much attention to the licensing law as I have. Detective or no detective, I take action and report when I think it necessary, and the records will show my action in reference to licensed houses where I have been stationed.
102. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say you have instituted twenty prosecutions; how many convictions have you obtained?—I have upwards of twenty in Timaru, but I cannot say the number of convictions except I look up the records. There are a considerable number.
103. Have you any opinion as to the appointment of permanent police surgeons to the Force by the Government?—I cannot express any opinion as to that. I think members should retire from the Police Force at the age of sixty. I am under the impression that no man should do active detective duty after he is fifty-five years of age. I consider a man's memory for faces and names becomes defective after fifty-five years of age. I forgot to state the fact that in South Canterbury, between the Rangitata and Waitaki Rivers, the population would be something like twenty thousand, and there are sixteen constables stationed in that district.
104. You think that sufficient?—I think they are sufficient to cope with the work in the meantime.

MARTHA GILMOUR, examined on oath.

105. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Wife of Adam Orr Gilmour, licensee of the Gladstone Hotel.

106. Where are you living?—Fairlie.

107. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been there very long?—Yes.

108. How many years?—Fourteen years.
 109. Have you been in the hotel very long?—Yes.
 110. Are there other hotels in Fairlie?—Yes.
 111. What is the name of the other one?—Fairlie Hotel.
 112. Do you remember the constable who was there before Constable Mullany?—Yes, Constable Hilliard.
 113. Was there any prosecutions against your house by Hilliard?—Yes, one.
 114. Did you take any steps to get him moved?—No.
 115. Has there been any prosecution of your house by Mullany?—No.
 116. Do you hold dances at your hotel sometimes?—No, I do not think so.
 117. No private dances?—Very rarely.
 118. But on some occasions you do?—If it was a birthday, or a case of a wedding, we might.
 119. What was the last occasion when Constable Mullany was at your place at a dance?—I never knew him to be there at all at a dance.
 120. Are you about the hotel always?—Yes.
 121. What other social gatherings have you there?—Not any, I do not think.
 122. No district meetings of that kind on any occasion there?—No, they hold them at the hall generally.
 123. Not at your hotel?—Very rarely.
 124. Do you remember the date of the last general election?—No.
 125. You know there was a general election in December, 1896?—Yes.
 126. What did your "boots," Fleming, take across to the police-station that day?—Nothing that I was aware of.
 127. How often does Constable Mullany come to your house?—I do not know, indeed. I am sure I do not notice him at all.
 128. Does he come once a week?—I do not know. He comes in inquiring and asking after one thing and another, but I do not take any notice.
 129. You do not take any notice of him?—No; perhaps he inquires for Mr. Gilmour, or somebody else.
 130. Do you know if there has been any prosecution of any hotels since the constable has been up there?—Yes, of the Fairlie Hotel.
 131. *The Chairman.*] Do you know how long he has been there?—I cannot say how many years.
 132. Has he been there more than one?—Oh yes, three or four years.
 133. Since that there has been one conviction against the Fairlie Hotel?—Yes.
 134. And the one against your house was prior to his arrival, by Constable Hilliard?—Yes.
 135. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember Fleming being in your employ?—Yes.
 136. Do you swear you have no knowledge of his taking a case of grog to the police-station on election day?—I am quite sure he never did.
 137. How are you quite sure?—Not from me, nor anybody in my house.
 138. How often does the constable come to your house?—I do not take any notice of when he comes. He is always welcome to come.
 139. How often have you personally served him with liquor?—Never.
 140. You have never given him drink in the house?—Never.
 141. Have you ever seen him getting drink there?—Never.
 142. Do you visit his house at all?—Very rarely.
 143. Do you visit his house?—Yes.
 144. *The Chairman.*] Has he got a wife?—Yes.
 145. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you at any time driven out together with his family?—I do not think so.
 146. Try and remember?—No; I never drove out with them.
 147. Do you think he has been in your hotel once a month since he has been there?—I think oftener than that.
 148. And you never saw him having refreshments there?—No, never.

MARGARET JANE HAMILTON, examined on oath.

149. *The Chairman.*] You are a married woman?—Yes, wife of James Hamilton.
 150. What is he?—A carpenter, at Fairlie.
 151. You are a daughter of the last witness?—Yes.
 152. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you live at your father's hotel before your marriage?—Yes.
 153. Did you help in the business when there?—I did a little work.
 154. Sometimes serve in the bar?—No, never.
 155. How often did Constable Mullany come to your house when you were there?—I very seldom saw him there.
 156. Did you see him once a month?—I cannot say; he may have been.
 157. How often did you serve him with liquor?—Never.
 158. You never served him?—No.
 159. Did you ever see him having refreshments in the house?—No.
 160. What part of the house would he usually be in when you saw him?—In the hall.
 161. Always?—Yes.
 162. You never saw him anywhere else?—Not that I remember.
 163. You never saw him anywhere but in the hall?—I do not think so. No, I did not.
 164. Have you seen him in the house fifty times?—I suppose I have.
 165. Always in the hall?—Yes, each time I saw him.

166. Do you remember him being at any social gathering there?—No; I never saw him there.
 167. At no birthday party?—No.
 168. No dance?—No.
 169. Never saw him there?—No.
 170. Did you ever have a social dance there?—Yes.
 171. Did the general public go to it?—No; just a few invited guests.
 172. Will you swear Constable Mullany was not there?—No, he was not there.
 173. And you never served him with drink in your life?—Never.
 174. Did you ever see him being served with drink?—Never.
 175. Did you ever have any conversation with him in the house?—I may have said, "Good morning," or whatever time of day it was.
 176. That was all; you never went beyond that?—No.
 177. Do you remember the general election of 1896?—Yes.
 178. Do you remember a case being sent over to the police-station from your hotel?—No.
 179. Do you remember anything being sent across?—Not to the police-station; no.
 180. Where did it go to?—I do not remember anything being taken away. I just remember the election.
 181. Who used to serve in the bar when you were at home?—Sometimes my brother and sometimes my father.
 182. You never served?—No.
 183. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Used the constable to visit your house on Sunday mornings?—No.
 184. To see if any illegal trading was going on?—I was never at home on Sunday mornings.

ADAM ORR GILMOUR, examined on oath.

185. *The Chairman.*] You are a hotelkeeper at Fairlie?—Yes.
 186. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been there?—Fourteen or fifteen years.
 187. Have you ever had a conviction against your hotel?—Yes; I was once fined.
 188. What constable was there at the time?—Constable Hilliard.
 189. Have you had any convictions since Constable Mullany came there?—No.
 190. How often have you been in the habit of seeing Mullany?—Twenty times a day sometimes.
 191. In your house?—No.
 192. How often in the house?—I cannot tell you.
 193. Once a day?—No.
 194. How often?—Four or five times a week. He might come in one door and go out at another. I cannot tell.
 195. What does he go for?—I do not know. It is not very nice to have to go and ask him his business.
 196. Do you remember the day of the last general election?—Yes, very well.
 197. Did you send anything over to the police-station that day?—No.
 198. Who was your "boots" then?—That I cannot tell you.
 199. Was there a man named Fleming?—Quite possibly; I had a man named Fleming.
 200. Do you remember sending anything to the police-station by him?—No, I do not.
 201. Have you ever served the constable with refreshments in your house?—I do not remember having served him. I may have done so; but it will be a long time ago. I do not remember.
 202. What took place, as a rule, when he came into your house?—He walks in one door, and out of the other. Perhaps he comes to ask me some questions. I do not know.
 203. Can you tell us how often he visits your house? Once a day on an average?—No; if you like I will keep a tally.
 204. I ask you what he has done?—I have not kept a tally.
 205. I will ask whether you would see him twenty times a day?—If I like to look at him as often as that I could see him, when he is passing to and from the railway-station.
 206. You could see him twenty times a day if you liked to look for him?—Yes.
 207. He is very much on the street?—He is there pretty often.
 208. How often does the constable attend social evenings at your house?—I do not understand what you mean.
 209. You have sometimes a reunion or social gathering at your place; how often has he been to your parties?—I do not remember ever having seen him there on an occasion of that sort.
 210. Do you ever visit his house?—I cannot remember that I have. I may have been once or twice on different matters. I have been to his garden, and looked over his fence; but I never was locked up, or anything like that.
 211. Do you ever visit his private dwelling-house?—I cannot remember that I have ever been there. I may have been there once or twice, but I do not think I have been there oftener. I was only there about five minutes, and then out again.
 212. You say on all occasions when the constable has visited your house he has come through one door and gone out at another?—Yes, pretty well.
 213. Have you ever seen him in the rooms?—Yes.
 214. Have you ever seen him sitting down?—I may have.
 215. Have you ever served him with refreshments?—Never, so far as I remember.
 216. Have you ever seen any one else do so?—I do not think so.
 217. Do you know?—I know pretty well that it is impossible; he does not drink.
 218. Have you ever seen him served with refreshments in any room in your house?—I do not remember.

219. But you cannot swear you have not seen him?—I do not remember ever having seen him. if it was, it was a long time ago. You cannot keep a tally of every man you serve.

220. You would have occasion to remember a policeman, as compared with an ordinary customer?—No, I do not say I would. I would take a sixpence from a policeman as often as any one else.

221. Have you ever taken a sixpence from this constable?—I do not remember a single sixpence, or threepence either.

222. When was he last in your house?—I do not know. He might have been in this morning, but I cannot remember.

223. Did he go in through one door and out at another this morning?—I do not know. I did not see him.

224. Was he in yesterday?—I do not know.

225. Was he in the day before?—Quite possibly he was; and I think I saw him go through the house.

226. *Colonel Pitt.*] When did you last see him in the house?—I cannot tell. I met him the day before yesterday.

227. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you talk this matter over with him?—No.

228. Have you discussed this charge against the constable with the constable?—I asked him what was the meaning of my being summoned.

229. *The Chairman.*] Did he give you the summons?—No, I met him and asked him what was the meaning of it.

230. *Mr. Taylor.*] What did he tell you?—He said he did not know.

231. Was that all that passed?—No, it was not all that passed.

232. What else passed?—I told him I was very anxious to know, because I did not know what to say.

233. Did he tell you what to say?—No, he did not. He said he did not know.

234. Has the constable ever found any fault with your house since he has been there?—You must ask him yourself for that. He has never brought any charge against me. He has complained of some little irregularities once or twice, but I do not remember what.

235. Cannot you remember the character of any of them?—No, I cannot.

236. Would it be in connection with the hour of closing?—It might have been. I cannot remember.

237. In connection with a drunken man?—No, I do not remember anything of that either.

238. Would it be in connection with alterations to the building?—It might have been that.

239. Did you make any alterations to the building?—No alterations that I remember.

240. Do you think the constable is a very vigilant officer?—Yes, I think so.

241. You have had no occasion to find any fault with him?—I do not know. I suppose he knows his own business.

242. *The Chairman.*] So far as you know, have you had any fault to find with him as officer in charge of the district?—No.

243. *Mr. Taylor.*] He has complained about odds and ends, but has never prosecuted you?—No.

244. *Constable Mullany.*] Have I ever visited your house on Sundays, or after closing hours on other days?—No; I do not remember ever seeing you.

245. In connection with my duty, have I called at your house for the purpose of calling your attention to anything irregular?—I can remember you speaking to me several times of particular things, but I cannot particularise what they were.

246. Have I ever visited your house on Sundays, and had a look through the house to see what was going on there?—It is possible you may have walked through on Sundays. I fancy I have seen you there within the last week or two.

247. Do not you remember me ever walking through the house and having a look through generally?—Yes, I see you very often.

248. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember a prosecution against a publican named Sullivan up there?—Yes.

249. How long ago was that?—I cannot tell.

250. Five years?—No; about two years, or four years.

251. You can tell pretty nearly. Did you discuss that with Constable Mullany?—I do not remember ever speaking to him on that subject. I never talk to him on the subject of the opposition man.

252. Then, you did not discuss it with him?—I do not think so.

253. You do not know?—I am almost certain I did not.

254. Did Constable Mullany never tell you that complaint had been made about his drinking and dancing in your house?—He may have. Quite possibly he did; I cannot remember.

255. Can you remember what he said about it?—No, I do not; my memory is not that good.

256. Try and tax your memory. As a matter of fact did not the constable say that complaints had been made to headquarters about his drinking and dancing in your house?—He may have done.

257. Did he not tell you complaints had been lodged against him on that very score?—I cannot answer that. I cannot remember whether he did. I fancy that he did say something like that once, but of the particular time or occasion I cannot remember.

258. Cannot you remember what he said to you?—No.

259. Would you not consider that a strange complaint to lodge against him, in view of your sworn testimony that he was never at a dance in your house?—No, I would not.

260. You would not think it strange?—No, I would not.

261. You would not think it strange to charge him with drinking and dancing at your house if he had never been there?—There are men capable of doing anything.

262. You would not think it strange?—I would not.

263. Can you fix the last occasion when he was at a dance at your house?—I never saw him at a dance there or anywhere else.

264. Did you ever see his wife at a dance there?—I never saw her at a dance there or anywhere else. I do not know whether she can dance, and I do not know whether he can dance. I am not a dancing man myself.

265. You do not remember discussing Sullivan's prosecution with the constable?—I am quite certain I never did.

266. Before or after?—I never did before; I am certain of that part.

ELLEN GILMOUR, examined on oath.

267. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Daughter of Adam Orr Gilmour, of Fairlie.

268. *Mr. Taylor.*] Can you remember on any occasion when Constable Mullany has been at your house at any social gathering?—No.

269. Never saw him there?—No.

270. Cannot you remember any dance at your house at any time?—Yes.

271. How often?—Not very often.

272. Once in three months?—No, I do not think so.

273. Do you have them in the winter time?—Sometimes.

274. Two or three in the winter?—About one or two, I think.

275. Was Mrs. Mullany there?—On one occasion, I think, she was there.

276. Do you think only on one occasion?—I think so; that is all I can remember.

277. Was the constable there at the same time?—No, I do not think so.

278. Was she by herself?—Yes.

279. How often have you seen the constable at your house?—I cannot say.

280. Have you seen him twice a day?—He may be in, but I would not see him.

281. How often have you seen him?—I do not know; I may see him once a day.

282. Where would he be usually when you saw him?—In the hall, I suppose.

283. In any of the rooms?—I have never seen him in any of the rooms.

284. You never saw him in any of the rooms?—I do not think so; I cannot remember.

285. How often have you seen him getting refreshments in your house?—Never.

286. He has never been served with drink in your house?—No.

287. *The Chairman.*] You have not served him yourself?—No.

288. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever seen any one else serving him with liquor?—No.

289. Do you remember the last general election, in December, 1896?—Yes.

290. Do you remember a case being sent over to the police-station?—No.

291. Have you ever visited the constable's house?—Sometimes.

292. The two families are on pretty friendly terms?—I do not think very friendly.

293. *The Chairman.*] You have visited the house?—Yes.

294. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is the constable ever at the hotel on Sundays?—Yes, sometimes.

295. Where did you see him on Sundays? Standing in the hall?—Sometimes in the hall.

296. Sometimes where on other occasions?—I do not know.

297. On Sundays, where else have you seen him besides in the hall?—I have not seen him anywhere else.

298. Always in the hall?—Yes, I think so.

299. *Mr. Poynton.*] And about the front?—Yes, and about the front.

300. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say you do not remember the constable being at any social gathering at your house on any occasion?—No.

301. Has he ever come to fetch his wife away?—He may have come to fetch his wife away, just for a few minutes.

302. For a few minutes?—Just to take his wife away.

303. He did not bring her?—No.

304. But he may have come to fetch her away?—Yes.

305. Have you ever seen him in the bar?—No.

306. Never?—No.

307. Have you ever seen him in the room adjoining the bar?—I have not.

308. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you have occasionally visited the constable's house to see his wife?—Yes.

309. Do you ever visit the minister's house?—Yes, I have been there.

310. And other people in the town, I suppose?—Yes.

311. *The Chairman.*] There is not a large number of people in the town?—No.

312. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Your sister, I believe, plays the organ in the church?—Yes.

WILLIAM JAMES COMRIE, examined on oath.

313. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Licensed Presbyterian minister at Fairlie.

314. *Constable Mullany.*] You have been there four years?—Yes, nearly.

315. During that time you have had ample opportunities of judging whether I frequent licensed houses, and whether I discharge my duties efficiently, or whether I conduct myself in a manner as to interfere with the efficient discharge of my duties. Will you kindly state to the Commission your own opinion on the matter?—During the time I have been in Fairlie I do not recollect ever seeing Mr. Mullany in a licensed house, and I never saw him the worse for liquor, and I never saw him taking any liquor. So far as his conduct has been concerned, I have seen nothing inconsistent with the right discharge of the duties of his office there.

316. Do you think it would be possible for that state of things to exist without your having some knowledge of it, or hearing of it in one way or another?—I think it is exceedingly unlikely.

317. Now, do you think, speaking generally, that the hotels in the Fairlie district are as well conducted as in any other district you know?—Well, it is not an easy thing to make comparisons; but I think the hotels in the Fairlie district are not worse, to say the least of it, than the hotels in other districts I have been acquainted with.

318. Well, then, have you had any occasion to think that I have favoured any one hotel more than another in the district?—No.

319. *Mr. Taylor.*] How often are you in the hotel?—I cannot say how often. I may be in it twice in a week and not in for the next month.

320. Is the average about once a month do you think?—Possibly once a month.

321. Have you any knowledge of your own as to how often the constable goes there?—I have no direct knowledge of my own, but if the constable had been in the habit of going there it is exceedingly likely I would have known of it. I pass the hotel very frequently. I pass the constable's residence every day when I am at home, and I see him frequently.

322. *Colonel Pitt.*] Are the Gilmour family members of your church?—They are adherents of the Presbyterian Church, that is, using the strict term. Mrs. Hamilton is a member.

323. Do you go there to visit them?—Occasionally.

324. *Mr. Taylor.*] To the Gilmour's?—Yes, and also to the Hamilton's.

325. Never had occasion to find fault with the way the house is conducted, yourself?—No.

326. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is Constable Mullany a member of your church?—No, he is not.

327. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever had occasion to feel that the house is not properly conducted?—My own opinion is that the house is conducted better than the average publichouse is conducted.

FRANCIS ROBERT GILLINGHAM, examined on oath.

328. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A farmer, residing at Fairlie.

329. *Constable Mullany.*] You are also a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

330. You are also a total abstainer?—Yes, I am a Prohibitionist.

331. During the time I have been at Fairlie you have had ample opportunities of seeing how I discharge my duties, in your capacity as a Justice of the Peace and otherwise, and you have had also plenty of opportunities of judging of my conduct generally speaking?—Yes, that is so.

332. Will you kindly state to the Commission what is your opinion as to the way I discharge my duties, and also as to my general conduct?—Well, my opinion is that Constable Mullany is an exemplary constable. I have heard no complaint whatever against him. I have never seen him in a licensed house, and I know for a fact that he is a teetotaler. I have heard him refuse to take a drink when invited, and I have always understood he was an absolute abstainer. So far as I know, nothing can be said against him. I frequently see him. I am frequently in the township, in and out, and I do not think it is likely anything could be going on without my hearing something about it, if it was anything that would compromise the constable.

333. Do you think I favour any one hotel more than another in any way?—No, I have no reason for thinking or saying so.

334. I suppose if such was the case you would be bound to hear something of it?—Yes, I think so.

335. *Mr. Taylor.*] How do you know the constable is a total abstainer?—I only know from his own statement.

336. When did he tell you that?—I heard him say so soon after he was stationed at Fairlie.

337. Did he tell you so since then?—Not since then.

338. Was that statement made yesterday or to-day?—No.

339. If one of the Gilmour family says that the constable has probably been in there on an average once a day, would you contradict that?—I would not contradict it, because I have not sufficient knowledge to do so, but I question it very much. I am in and out of the township very often myself, and I have not seen the constable going in or out of the house.

340. Still, you would not contradict the people who are in a position to know?—No, certainly not. They are living there, and I am not.

341. *Mr. Poynton.*] What is the total population there?—Not being a borough we have no knowledge of the exact number in the township. I would say about three hundred people within a radius of a mile.

ALLAN HUGH McLEAN, examined on oath.

342. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am a sheepfarmer, and Justice of the Peace at Fairlie. I am also a Prohibitionist.

343. *Constable Mullany.*] During the time I have been at Fairlie you have had ample opportunities of seeing how I conduct myself and discharge my duties; will you kindly state to the Commission your own opinion on the matter?—I consider Constable Mullany is a perfectly satisfactory constable; a very exemplary man, straightforward and upright in all his actions.

344. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you had ample opportunities of observing him?—Yes; I am in the township nearly every day.

345. How long?—I have been in the township before he was, and I am in the hotel about twice a week.

CHARLES FRASER, examined on oath.

346. *The Chairman.*] You are sergeant of police, stationed at Timaru?—Yes, in charge of this station and sub-district.

347. What rank do you hold?—I am a first-class sergeant, and at present I am on leave of absence.

348. How long have you been here?—About thirteen months and a half at this station.

349. In your opinion, is the Force at your disposal sufficient for the requirements of this sub-district?—I hardly think it is sufficient.

350. In what respect do you consider it wanting?—I think some of the outlying places of this town should be patrolled occasionally; but at present that can hardly be done, as the Force at my command is only about sufficient to patrol the town, and very frequently there is always a constable going on escort duty. Frequently a man is away through sickness, and sometimes a man is on leave of absence. For the purpose of patrolling the outlying places, and making provision for the contingencies I have mentioned, more men are wanted. With the present Force it would be almost impossible to patrol properly the outlying suburbs, which contain a very large population—a large scattered population.

351. You think you have sufficient men for town duty—for ordinary day and night beat duty?—Yes, I have about sufficient.

352. How many men are on beat duty during the day?—There is always one man on beat at one time during the day. It commences at 5 in the morning and ceases at 9 at night.

353. Is he on duty the whole time?—Oh, no. He does eight hours.

354. What is the beat?—All over the town, with instructions to visit the railway-station on the arrival and departure of trains. It extends from the one end of Stafford Street to the other end.

355. What is the length?—Almost half a mile long; and then he has got to also take in some of the back streets, and the railway-station, and all other places where there might be a crowd. At night-time there are two men on beat from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m.

356. Have you any representations to make to us in connection with the local Force, or the Force generally?—No, I have nothing very particular. I have for a long time considered that if there was a pension fund provided it would in a variety of ways be a very good thing, because at present we have nothing whatever to look forward to when we go out of the service. I may here say I have been in the service over thirty-two years, and I believe if I should be invalidated out now, or be discharged, or got rid of in any way, it would be only a matter of grace that I might receive a year's pay. I do not think there is any right in the matter, because I have heard it said—and I do not know anything different—that it is merely a matter of grace.

357. *Colonel Pitt.*] You believe in a pension scheme?—Yes.

358. And do you approve of it being a charge against the pay?—I think a portion of it might be, and the other should be supplemented by the Government.

359. What percentage of the pay?—I should say up to 4 per cent, or 5 per cent. I do not think that would press heavily against any member of the Force.

360. Is there any further suggestion you would like to mention besides the pension scheme?—No, I do not think so.

361. Do you consider that the men having to find their own uniforms is a hardship?—Yes, I think it is.

362. Or attended with any disadvantage?—Yes, I think it certainly is. The uniform is a livery, and is a badge of servitude; and I hardly think the members of the Force should pay for their livery.

363. As to the rate of pay, what do you think is a reasonable rate of pay for the Force?—I believe the present pay is about the ordinary pay of the other colonies.

364. You have never given it your attention?—No, I have not taken any great trouble to ascertain the pay existing in any other colony.

FRANK STANLEY PARKER, examined on oath.

365. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a second-class constable, stationed at Waimate.

366. You were formerly at Tapanui?—Yes; I was four years and a half there, during the time licenses were in force. During the first twelve months of Prohibition there were four convictions obtained for sly-grog selling.

367. *Mr. Poynton.*] Had you anything to do with those cases?—Colonel Hume and Inspector Pardy visited the district in 1895, and they acted on suggestions made by me. I proposed the thing, and men were sent into the district as detectives, and these four convictions were obtained. The paragraph I complain of is a statement in Dr. DeLautour's evidence, where he said that a rumour went about that I had informed one ex-publican of the intended raid by the police. That was set forth by Dr. DeLautour, whose son I had occasion to prosecute for putting night-soil in a tank.

368. Do you know of your own knowledge that he set the rumour afloat?—I cannot say that.

369. Is there any truth in the rumour, so far as you know?—No; it is absolutely false.

370. *The Chairman.*] Did you ever hear the rumour at the time?—Yes; and I asked Inspector Pardy to go into it.

371. And you say there is no foundation for it?—Absolutely none whatever.

372. Do you swear on your oath that you did not in any way communicate that information?—That is so. And I would draw your attention to the fact that Inspector Pardy said in evidence he was not in the habit of trusting anybody. And if he was not in the habit of trusting anybody, how was I in a position to know what was going on.

373. Dr. DeLautour refers to a rumour, and now we want the facts; what are the facts?—I say I did not inform; and I say he is biased against me.

374. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you inform Simmonds, the ex-publican, or anybody else?—Never.

375. *The Chairman.*] Did you ever put him on his guard in any way?—No, in no way. I think the conviction I obtained against Dr. DeLautour's son just previous to my leaving the district biased him against me.

376. You do not know he set the rumour about?—No.
377. You said he said there was a rumour?—Yes.
378. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you give the Commission any information as to how the knowledge travelled about Clutha that detective officers were being sent from Dunedin?—Yes, in connection with the first raid that was made. On that occasion six or seven police constables, with a detective and the Inspector of Police, left Dunedin for Balclutha and Tapanui and Wyndham on the one day. There had been races in Dunedin the day before, and there were three publicans returning from the races at Dunedin by the same train; and when they got off at Balclutha, seeing the Inspector of Police there, and all these constables and detectives, they thought something was wrong, and I was informed that the wires were set going then, and when the police got out to the various districts there was nothing to be found. That was on the first day.
379. You heard that yourself?—Yes, and I have reason to believe it.
380. There were six men?—Yes, and a detective and Inspector of Police.
381. In the one train?—Yes.
382. And you say three publicans were returning from the races at Dunedin at the same time?—Yes; travelling with them.
383. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who were the publicans?—I think McCann, Collins, and Dunnett.
384. Who told you of it?—It was common rumour.
385. Which of these men told you?—Neither of the three.
386. Who did tell you?—It was common rumour. I was told by the people who came up in the train.
387. You do not remember who it was?—No; it was common rumour. They seemed to brag about it.
388. *Colonel Pitt.*] That is on one occasion?—Yes.
389. It was stated at Balclutha that it was always known when any person was coming up to try and detect sly-grog selling: can you give the Commission any idea as to how such information as that would be obtained?—No; I cannot. I only know of the one occasion.
390. Not generally?—No.
391. *The Chairman.*] It was suggested that when a constable went up, even in plain clothes, the people could always pick him out: have you heard that?—They watch very carefully every stranger that comes into the district.
392. Do you know how the information came from Dunedin?—No; I cannot tell you that.

JOHN JOSEPH WEATHERED, examined on oath.

393. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a second-class constable, stationed in Timaru for the past seven years and five months. I am also gaoler, and watch-house keeper.
394. How long have you been in the Force?—Fourteen years and eight months. I would suggest an improvement in the recruiting of the Force. I think that the taking of married men into the Police Force should be the exception—that is to say, there should be some special recommendation for their being taken on.
395. Do you know of any Force where married men are not taken on?—Oh, yes. In the Royal Irish Constabulary they take single men only.
396. *Mr. Poynton.*] What is your reason for objecting?—He wants more pay than a single constable. I think members of the Force should have at least three years' service before having permission to marry; also that they should be stationed in one of the four centres of population, or some town of importance, to learn their duties prior to being allocated to a small town for duty. They should have training in a depot.
397. *The Chairman.*] How long?—Not less than three months for drill and school instruction. I think there should be a lecture master in charge—an experienced member of the Force who could speak and illustrate to the men cases that had come under his notice, and how detections were made. I think this master should be subject to the Commissioner of Police, and responsible for how he turns the men out.
398. You suggest then, a course of lectures at a depot by a qualified man?—Yes, and physical drill too, of course. I think that these men should be examined personally by the Commissioner of Police before being allocated to a station for duty.
399. *Colonel Pitt.*] What about the Inspector?—I think the Commissioner is the best man. He is on the spot, and most capable. The recruits would be responsible to the instructor, and eager to learn. They would be practically probationers. I think there should be a Police Manual for them to learn and be examined on.
400. Is not the present Manual sufficient?—No, it is not. It is not lucid enough. The Manual should be like questions and answers.
401. If the men are trained at a depot properly, will they still require a Manual?—Yes, as a part of their training, and that Manual would be a subject of their examination. The Manual, of course, will consist of police duties, and how to detect crime, and so forth. I think men should not be sent to a county or district where they have immediate relatives. It is a risk that these relatives interfere with the performance of their duties.
402. Do you not know that is the present rule—that men should not be sent to stations where they have relatives?—I do not know; it is not in the regulations.
403. But you know that is the practice?—I know of one case recently where a constable was stationed near to where he was brought up.
404. *The Chairman.*] What is your next item?—I think more careful inquiry should be made regarding the character of the woman and her immediate relatives whom a constable applies to marry.
- 404A. Who is going to report on the subject?—The police in charge of the district where the woman resides.

405. Who do you mean by the police?—The constable, sergeant, sergeant-major, or Inspector, as the case may be.

406. Then, you say the officer in charge of the district should inquire into the character of a woman whom a constable applies for permission to marry?—Yes; at present such inquiry is not sufficiently particular.

407. What is your opinion as to the rate of pay?—I think the rate of pay should be 6s. for a recruit when in the depot, and 7s. per day when allocated to duty. Of course, then, a recruit would read up, and make himself efficient to get a rise in pay.

408. What is the present rate?—You join at £10 per month. I think the reduction was a ridiculous piece of cheeseparing, and the pay is quite insufficient. There are many details in connection with this school which I have not entered into.

409. *Colonel Pitt.*] What, in your opinion, ought the pay to be?—I think it should start at 6s. per day, and remain so while the recruit is in the depot, and then 7s. per day when he is allocated to duty.

410. *The Chairman.*] Do you say the pay should rise from 7s. per day?—Certainly. At present the number of ranks I think very proper.

411. What is the pay to rise to, from 7s. per day?—7s. 6d. to second-class constables and 8s. to first-class constables; and I think the long-service pay, instead of going to the constable, should go a pension fund. I think a man should be made a second-class constable whose conduct is respectable after six years' service, and first-class after twelve years' service. Some suggestion has been made about a pension scheme brought in by Mr. Hutchison. I disagree with his method of excluding old men, say, after fifty-five years of age. I think all men in the Force when the pension scheme is brought in should be included.

412. Do you think the Force would be willing to give up the long-service pay to go to a pension?—I would.

413. Do you think the Force generally would?—I do not think you would get the Force generally to agree to anything.

414. Do you think the majority would?—I think the majority would, but it is "grab-all" with some of them. This pension scheme I think is of greater importance than any subject that can be brought before the Force.

415. You say you believe a majority of the men who draw a shilling a day as long-service pay would forego that shilling a day and let it go into a pension fund at their present rate of pay?—I do, if there were alterations made in other respects.

416. What other respects?—I should suggest that members of the Force should get house-rent—7s. per week house-rent, and in each of the four large centres 10s. per week—no matter what his rank. You will see now if a man is given free Government quarters he is practically in the same position as those who have long-service pay, and he is just able to pull through. He will be no worse off. These free quarters are a great cause of discontent in the Force, and of wrangling and scrambling, and are a temptation to work outside influence to push a brother officer out of his station. Another matter I would bring under your notice is the question of compensation to widows and families of members of the Force. I would hand in a copy of a circular, No. 24, of 1897, as follows:—

Circular No. 24/97. Police Department (Commissioner's Office), Wellington, 2nd December, 1897.
INSPECTORS in charge of districts are directed in future, before recommending the payment of a compassionate allowance to the widow and family of a deceased member of the Force, to ascertain as accurately as possible the pecuniary condition in which such widow and family are left, with the object of assisting the Government in coming to a decision.
J. B. TUNBRIDGE, Commissioner of Police.

I should say, irrespective of the position of the deceased's widow, the compensation should be given as a right, not as a matter of compassion at all. The word "compassionate" should be put out of it.

417. You think it should be a right?—Yes. I think this compassionate allowance should extend to a month's pay for each year of service, up to fifteen months' pay as a maximum. In the matter of pensions, I think a pension should commence at fifteen years' service. If retiring before fifteen years' service I think the retiring-allowance should be on a similar scale; that is, one month's pay for each year of service up to fifteen months' pay. I think a reasonable pension for members of the Force under the rank of Inspector should commence at 2s. per day, with a rise at eighteen years, twenty-one years, and twenty-five years' service, which would make a maximum of 3s. 6d. per day. I do not advocate asking a large pension, or to live in affluence after retiring, but to keep them from want. I may state that I am in favour of the present ranks, except that of acting-sergeant.

418. You would have that abolished?—Yes.

419. What is your next item?—I think the retiring age after a pension is granted should be sixty—that is to say, compulsory retirement.

420. For all ranks?—Except Inspectors; and I do not think any limit should be put on that rank provided they are able to do their duty properly, and it should be left to the opinion of the Commissioner of Police and the Government. Now, in respect to fines, I think that is a source of heart-burning to the police. I think after ten years' service, with five years clear of a fine or reprimand, a man should have a clean sheet; at twelve years' service, four years clear; and at fourteen years' service, three years clear.

421. Supposing a man after ten years' service has five years with a clean sheet, you think all his defaulter's sheet should be rubbed out?—Yes.

422. Fines and everything else?—Yes. I wish to suggest in regard to awards for merit, that instead of money awards you should substitute a record of merit—first, second, and third class—in accordance with the merits of the case, and these should be reckoned with amongst other things for promotion, also it might be taken as a counter effect in the case of a man who has the misfor-

tune to be fined for a trivial offence. Now, as to promotions, I think all promotions should be gazetted. It is provided by the regulations that promotions should be gazetted where merit is shown, and where promotion is under exceptional circumstances; but what I want is that all promotions should be gazetted, so that the whole Force will know when a man is promoted. I think a seniority list of the Force should be gazetted annually, as is done in connection with non-commissioned officers. Section 61 of the Police Regulations provides for this exceptional gazetting as at present, but it is not always done in accordance with that regulation. I think the Armed Constabulary service should not count in the police service. I know a sergeant who left the Armed Constabulary and was made a first-class constable in the Police Force, although he had never done any police work, and he was placed over my head, although I joined for the Police Force exclusively. Speaking of political influence, I had ample opportunities of working that, but I do not say if I had tried I would have been successful. I was well acquainted with Colonel Whitmore's intimate friends, but I never approached them for promotion or any other advantage.

423. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you know any one who has?—No.

424. *Mr. Taylor.*] What were the circumstances of your being ordered for removal last year, and the cancellation of that order?—On the 3rd February, 1897, I was going to Christchurch with a prisoner on escort duty, and just when leaving Timaru the sergeant-major informed me he had received a telegram stating I was transferred to Methven. I had made an application for forty-eight hours' leave in Christchurch, and while down there I saw Inspector Broham, and informed him that I was utterly unfitted to take charge of a troop-horse, not being able to ride, and that I intended placing the matter in writing as soon as I returned to the station. He advised me to do so before I left for Timaru, and I did so, and he said he would telegraph to the Commissioner of Police what I stated, that I was unable to ride a troop-horse, and wanted to stop in Timaru. I received notice a few days afterwards from the sergeant-major that the transfer was postponed until further notice.

425. That is all you know of the reason?—I understand your question is this, Did I use any other means besides that of the department? and I say I did. I do not say that I was successful, or that that was the means of my being stopped.

426. *Colonel Pitt.*] What did you do?—I wrote a letter to the Hon. William Hall-Jones, from Christchurch.

427. Was that before you got notice that the order was suspended?—That was on the following morning after arriving in Christchurch. I told him I was transferred to Methven, and described to him in ordinary language how unfitted I was for this work, and that I preferred the office I held at the present time. I said I would certainly run the risk of breaking my neck on a troop-horse.

428. When were you ordered for transfer?—On the 3rd February, 1897.

429. Did you get any reply from the Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones?—That letter was never answered.

430. *The Chairman.*] After you wrote the letter, you were informed that the order was suspended?—Yes, some days afterwards. When I was so well received by Inspector Broham I was sorry I had written a letter. Those are the circumstances in connection with that. In continuation of my evidence, I should like to say I do not approve of the competitive examinations, so called, which attracted so much attention in the Force, and I do not approve of Inspector's clerks putting their fingers into criminal investigation cases. I also want to refer to an entry in my defaulter's sheet, which reads, "Neglect of duty in failing to provide and have in attendance the necessary witnesses at an inquest upon the body of one Joseph Williams, at Clive, causing the coroner and jury to wait an hour in consequence." That was put in, and I was fined, at the instance of the late Inspector Bullen. I regret to have to speak about a dead man, but it was a well-known fact that he was not responsible for his actions at the time. I was not to blame, as the papers will prove; and I wish to draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that the Inspector makes a false entry when he says I pleaded "guilty." I did nothing of the sort. I lay my papers before you because I want that record erased, and, if erased, then I ask to be put in my proper place in the list which that record has kept me from.

431. *Mr. Taylor.*] Are you in charge of the gaol here?—I am.

432. How long have you been here?—Seven years.

433. Can you remember how many occasions your attention has been called to police-officers who have been in a state of intoxication?—I cannot.

434. Can you remember any of them?—I cannot.

435. Do you remember a police-officer being brought into the gaol drunk one night?—No.

436. Did you not see him?—I never remember any such incident since I have been gaoler.

437. Can you remember any police-officer being under the influence of liquor?—Yes.

438. When was that?—I do not know the date.

439. Within the last three years?—It might be. It is not within the last twelve months.

440. What were the circumstances?—The circumstances were that I saw signs of intoxication; that is all, and I thought no more about it.

441. Was he brought in by two gentlemen?—No, he was not.

442. Where did you see him?—At the police-station.

443. In one of the rooms?—He was in the watch-house and out again. The man was walking about; he was not lying down.

444. He was not incapable?—No, not physically.

445. On other occasions have you seen him in a similar condition?—I saw him two or three times, I believe.

446. The same man?—Yes; I did not think it concerned me in any way.

447. He was your superior?—He was.

448. He was not bad enough to warrant you in making a report?—I would not report him if he was lying in the street.

449. Too big a risk?—Other men might, but I would not; I would mind my own business.

450. How many times have you seen him like that? Half a dozen times?—I never took any notice of the number of times.
451. Have you seen him half a dozen times?—I would not say I had not.
452. *The Chairman.*] Is he in the Force now?—He is.
453. Is he in the local Force?—He is not.
454. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say he is not in the district now?—No, nor in Canterbury. I may say I feel very indignant at being dragged in to give evidence as to the condition of my superior officer.
455. *Mr. Taylor.*] On other occasions where did you see this man?—Mostly about the police-station. I never saw him in such a state but that he could conduct his correspondence, if he had any.
456. But if he had been drunk to prostration you would not have reported him?—I would not.
457. *Colonel Hume.*] In addition to gaol duties, you act as watch-house keeper, and do various police duties?—Yes.
458. You do not go on street duty?—Not since Sergeant Fraser came.
459. Did you ever go to Oamaru?—Yes.
460. Did you see the gaoler there?—Yes.
461. Did you have a talk together?—Yes.
462. Did you talk anything about promotion?—Yes, I congratulated him on rescuing a man from the harbour, and he said he had had a conversation with you about it, and that you had asked him what he wanted, and would he go on duty and take the confirmation of his rank as acting-sergeant, and he said he would prefer the money reward, and to stop where he was. He told me you told him that at any time you would confirm his rank as third-class sergeant, but you would not while he stopped as gaoler.
463. You are perfectly positive that conversation took place?—Yes.
464. You cannot have made a mistake?—Not the slightest, and I thought it a most remarkable thing when I saw in the papers that Sergeant Dwyer was laying a claim to further promotion.
465. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say promotions have not always been gazetted. Have any promotions been made by me without appearing in the *Gazette*?—No.
466. *The Chairman.*] But promotions used to be made without appearing in the *Gazette*?—Yes.
467. But it has not been so during the last six months?—Not since Commissioner Tunbridge was appointed.
468. *Colonel Hume.*] Will you put in the report you are going to furnish to the Commissioners, the names of the men who have not been gazetted?—Yes.

WILLIAM GILLIES, examined on oath.

469. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A Presbyterian clergyman, stationed at Timaru.
470. What is it you wish to bring before us?—I wish just to state that, during twenty-three years' residence in Timaru, I have very strong grounds, I think, for saying that until quite recently there was no attempt to enforce the licensing laws.
471. What do you mean by quite recently?—Since, perhaps, the last five or six years. About five or six years ago there was a considerable agitation, and since then that there has been an attempt, but only an attempt, to enforce the licensing laws. I suppose I had better give some facts in support of that statement.
472. Of course you will understand that our attention is more particularly directed to the existing state of things than to past history, so that if you can give any evidence that will be valuable in that respect we shall be pleased to hear it?—Yes, the facts I have will lead up to that. I may state that one of the facts I have to bring before you, for instance, is that, in despite of the law, a gentlemen's club was maintained in one of the hotels, and allowed to exist for nearly twelve months, until I myself brought the matter before the public, although it was well known to the police. It was not until I took the matter up that it was declared illegal, and stopped, but that was not by the police.
473. How long is that since?—About six years ago. At a more recent date, about three years ago, there existed a door communication between a licensed house and a public sale-room, and I believe that place was used on some occasions, and drink was carried through contrary to the Act. That went on for several years until I discovered it, and reported it. I brought it up at a licensing meeting, and before the police could get down from the licensing meeting the door was barricaded up. Another door was opened after that at a different place, and that also was reported upon, and I think Inspector Broham came down and looked at it, and ordered it to be shut up. Another matter that shows how things went on in this district is, that when there was an illicit manufacture up in one of the country districts, and when the police had made up their minds to make a raid, that fact was quite well known in town before the raid was made, and a man rode out ahead of the police, and warned the people concerned.
474. Do you know that, or is it only a report?—I know it.
475. How long since?—About five or six years ago. I took no notes, and therefore have no dates. I know further, there were common rumours and reports of policemen being drunk upon their beat; and at a public meeting, I, myself, made a statement which was never challenged, and which was printed in the public prints at the time, that a policeman who should have been off his beat at a certain hour did not turn up until two hours later, in a printing-office, where he made a lot of "pie."
476. Was this within your own knowledge?—It was common report. I personally did not see it, but I made this statement at a public meeting, and it was never challenged.
477. Did you make any report to the Inspector, or officer in charge of the police?—The Inspector of Police was in town at the time of this meeting.

478. Did you bring it under his notice?—Not personally; not that case. The man had to be taken to the station in a cab.

479. Do you know if it was brought by anybody under the notice of the officer in charge?—It was the office of the Chairman of the Licensing Bench the policeman entered, and made "pie" out of a lot of type. A report of the affair appeared in the public print of the 23rd June, 1892, as a statement made by me at a public meeting, when the whole of the Police Force was present, and Inspector Pender was outside the building at the time. I was never made aware that any notice was taken of this case at all.

480. A meeting was held here?—Yes. It was often reported to me, by parties, of policemen being drunk; but I never could get the parties to come forward, because they said they would be marked in the community. There is another matter: There is not one hotel in this town but has more than one bar, although they only pay for one bar. It is, of course, a question as to the definition of "bar."

481. The question of what constitutes a bar is a matter for the Courts to deal with. Do you suggest that the police have not taken a case of that kind into Court with a view to testing it?—Yes; and I am going to tell you of a case where they did not, although I brought it under their notice, and which brought me into correspondence with the Inspector and the Commissioner of Police. It was the case of one hotel—the Criterion—where there was a door opened out of the end of the hotel on to a staircase which opened on to the pavement. Up that staircase there was access alone to that bar, and to no other place in the hotel; and that was the second bar opening to the street. I brought the matter under the notice of the police, but they would do nothing.

482. You say the staircase led only to the upstairs bar?—Yes; I brought the matter under the notice of the Licensing Bench. They made an examination and stated that decidedly it was a breach of the law. That was a place where selling had gone on for over a year.

483. What was the year in which you brought it before the notice of the Committee?—I suppose in 1893 or 1894. It had been opened up to that time. The police took no notice of it. I wrote to Commissioner Hume upon the matter, and he wrote in reply, promising me a prosecution, or that he had ordered a prosecution. I did not keep the papers, unfortunately, so I am speaking from memory as to these details. I waited a long time for this prosecution, but heard nothing of it; and I wrote again, and Commissioner Hume said he had received a report from the Inspector that it was not a case for prosecution, or something to that effect. I cannot pledge myself to the literal words, because I destroyed the correspondence.

484. *Mr. Taylor.*] You remember the purport of the correspondence perfectly well?—Yes, perfectly; and I remember it waxed very warm between us, almost to threatening me with a prosecution for libelling the police. These are the facts in regard to the correspondence, and I suppose the correspondence can be produced in Wellington. That state of matters exists in the hotel to the present day, with the simple addition of two swing doors which the Licensing Committee say puts it within the Act; but it has never been tested by the police before the Court.

485. You have not thought it worth while yourself to bring it forward?—No. I did not think it my duty. I think it is the duty of the police, most decidedly.

486. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say the Licensing Bench say it is all right?—But they are not judicial authorities to decide that. I wish also to state that the manner of conducting cases here by Sergeant McDonald—

487. *The Chairman.*] If this is a charge against Sergeant McDonald, he must have notice of it?—It is not a charge. I wish to state that I brought this matter under the notice of the department, that he was utterly unfit to conduct such cases. So far as that charge is concerned it is in writing in the hands of the police. The Commissioner got it, and the Inspector got it. I think legal assistance should have been provided in these cases when there was such a strong Bar on the opposite side. As an illustration of how these things were done, I may say I wrote to the department offering to provide legal assistance for the police in some cases, but the offer was declined.

488. Can you say in what case that was?—I cannot exactly say which case. They, no doubt, have my letter, because I was told that the terms in which I had written concerning this case were almost libellous; and I told them they had better prosecute me.

489. *Mr. Taylor.*] You feel pretty sure of your facts?—Yes; and to show how in other cases much easier than this legal advice was provided, and not in the one I have mentioned, I may say I was present in this Court when the police were provided with legal assistance for the prosecution of a butcher for not giving a pig a drink in the yard.

490. *The Chairman.*] Perhaps the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals provided it?—Well, I want to bring that out—that they were allowed to provide legal advice, and I was not.

491. Cannot you remember the title of the case, and the name of the house in which you were so interested that you were prepared to provide legal assistance?—There were several cases, but rather think it was the case against the Timaru Hotel.

492. *Mr. Taylor.*] That will be in the correspondence?—Yes, the correspondence with Inspector Broham. He will remember the matter. I do not know whether I am in order in saying it, but I would like just to say that I do not lay the whole blame upon the police in these matters, for public conscience for many years did not support them, and neither did the Bench. They were discouraged rather than encouraged; though still, at the same time, they ought to have done their duty.

493. *Colonel Hume.*] Can you give us the name of this man who rode out ahead of the police when they went to find the illicit still?—No. I know it, but I am not at liberty to give his name.

494. Well, can you go any further, and tell us how he got the intelligence?—No, I cannot get behind that, but he must have got it from the police.

495. But you tried to find out, but could not?—I did a little, but not much. It was not my duty to act as a detective.

496. Then, you made a statement, which was published in the papers, you say?—Yes.
497. And that was taken no notice of?—Yes.
498. And I suppose that is not the only statement published that has not been taken notice of?—Most of mine on that subject have been taken notice of, and very much taken notice of.
499. You then wrote letters, which almost amounted to libel?—So I was told. I did not think so. I thought it was the honest truth.
500. Then, you did not want to be prosecuted for libel?—I did not care.
501. But you did not want to be, and you did not write that letter with that object?—No; not at all. I simply wrote with the object of bringing the truth before the authorities.
502. Then, did the Licensing Bench close that second bar after you drew their attention to it?—No; they advised the publican to put on two folding-doors to evade the law.
503. Then, in another place, they had a door that led into a sale-yard, and they used to take liquor through?—Yes.
504. How do you know they took liquor through?—It was a matter of common report.
505. Is that all you have to go on?—But perfectly true, nevertheless.
506. Even you do not blame the police altogether, notwithstanding these tremendous letters you wrote?—Not altogether, because the public was partly to blame.
507. And I think you will admit that if the police lose a case, it does a great deal more harm than if they won two or three?—Not at all.
508. You believe in going for them whether there is a case or not?—But if you have a case, go for it; and if you lose it, that will not do any harm. It will do good, and has done good—every prosecution.
509. But still, you say, do not go for a case until you have got one?—Yes; but get up your evidence properly.
510. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you any reason to think the licensing laws are enforced now as thoroughly as they should be?—I do not think as thoroughly as they should be. But they are decidedly better enforced than previously.
511. Do you see any drunkenness on Sundays in Timaru?—Not recently, from my own knowledge, but I used to see plenty of it.
512. Do you think the improved state of affairs is due to improved public opinion, or the activity of the police?—Both.
513. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You state that the second bar still exists in this hotel?—Yes.
514. Of course, as a minister of religion, you have a very strict regard for truth?—Yes.
515. And you will be exceedingly surprised to hear that that bar has ceased to exist for close on twelve months?—I am very much surprised. I have seen people going in.
516. Do you know the house changed hands some years ago?—I know it changed hands after a prosecution.
517. How long ago?—I cannot give the date.
518. Roughly?—Within the last twelve months, I suppose.
519. Do you not know that the new landlord at once cleared the place away, and the bar does not exist even in the imagination of a clergyman?—If he did, that only proves my contention that it was illegally there. But I know people are going in and out at the present time.
520. You do not know the bar has been abolished for nearly a year?—No.
521. You said the bar was still in existence?—The door is still there, and I always understood the bar was there still. It is news to me to know it is closed.
- [At this stage the witness, having completed his evidence, retired from the Court. He returned shortly afterwards, and asked permission to tender further evidence.]
522. *Witness:* I have been down to the Criterion Hotel, the hotel referred to in my evidence in chief, and I find that bar is open, and there is a table there at which was purchased this bottle of spirits. The bar is not closed.
523. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you know when it was reopened?—I have no knowledge when it was reopened.
524. Did you know it was reopened last Wednesday week?—No. I know it is open now, and I know that within the last few days I saw parties going in and out.

ARTHUR HUME, examined on oath.

525. *Constable Weathered.*] During the time I have been gaoler in Timaru have I discharged my duties satisfactorily?—Yes, very satisfactorily.
526. Do you consider it an important office which I hold?—Yes.
527. It reflects credit on the department, I suppose, to select men of integrity and ability who faithfully discharge their duty and do not allow prisoners to escape?—If I said “Yes,” I suppose I would be reflecting credit on myself.
528. *Colonel Pitt.*] You were satisfied he was fit to do his work?—Yes.

ROBERT CRAWFORD, examined on oath.

529. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Second-class mounted constable. I have been fifteen years and a half in the New Zealand Police Force, and I had a year's previous experience in the Armed Constabulary. I have never been brought before my officers, nor been found fault with for any misconduct. My defaulter's sheet is as clean as the day I joined the service. I wish to bring before the Commission the fact that I was stationed in Dunedin in 1884, and I was there recommended by the late Inspector Weldon for the rank of second-class constable, as a reward for the arrest of a man for theft. If the Commission does not mind, I will just read a copy of his recommendation:—

SIR,—

Police Station, Dunedin, 17th September, 1884.

I beg to bring under your notice Constable Crawford for favourable consideration. Not alone in his conduct is he most exemplary, but the lively interest he takes in the performance of his duty and the ability he exhibits in the discharge thereof is such as in my opinion to call for special reward. Hence I recommend his advancement to the rank of first-class constable. Attached hereto are briefs showing in a most marked manner an example of what I refer to. Thus, without any information, but through vigilance, judgment of character, or, in a word, perspicacity, the constable overhauls two men in the street at 11 o'clock at night, detains them, and finds they have committed a theft, arrests them, and finally they are each convicted and sentenced to seven days' imprisonment. Although the theft is inconsiderable, yet on the part of the constable is manifested thorough police ability worthy of imitation.

T. K. WELDON,

Inspector of Police, Dunedin.

This is minuted: "Constable Crawford will be promoted to second-class constable the first vacancy that occurs in the Dunedin district.—H. READER, Commissioner of Police, Wellington." Well, from the year 1884 till four years ago several men who were not in the Force at that time have been promoted over my head to second-class, and I never got this expected promotion.

530. You were a third-class constable at the time of the recommendation?—Yes. After my transfer from Clinton to Timaru, on the 9th June, 1891, I made an application for the rank of second-class constable, and I reminded the department of the promise made to me by the late Colonel Reader. Well, the reply that was sent back to Inspector Pender, and which was shown to me, was, "Please inform Constable Crawford that there are forty men on the list senior to him for promotion."

531. Are you still a third-class constable?—No; I got second-class rank four years and a half ago, and I am getting on for sixteen years' service. Considering that the Commissioner of Police in 1884 had promised me the first vacancy of second-class constable, I consider I have been defrauded out of 6d. a day for about five years.

532. What was the date of your promotion to second-class?—In October, 1893. I consider, gentlemen, when Colonel Reader, the then Commissioner of Police, promised me the rank of second-class constable for meritorious conduct in 1884, that after he left office his successor should have given me that rank. There are men who were not in the service then who were promoted to second-class constable before I was; and I consider it is a great hardship on me, considering I distinguished myself, and the Inspector saw his way clear to recommend me, and the Commissioner to promise me the rank of second-class constable. There are men junior to me by years in the service who are senior to me in the seniority list of second-class constables. I served under the late Inspector Weldon, Inspector Thompson, Inspector Pender, and I am now serving under Inspector Broham.

533. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you brought these facts before your Inspector or the other Commissioners of Police since Colonel Reader was Commissioner?—I did not bring the facts forward until June, 1891, when I represented the matter to Colonel Hume. I may say I have been stationed in the City of Dunedin seven years and a half, and I was then sent in charge of the Clinton Station. As Clinton did not agree with me, I changed with the mounted constable here by mutual consent, and I paid my own expenses to Timaru. Since my arrival in Timaru I have had 265 convictions for theft, vagrancy, and so on.

534. Do you mean prosecutions instituted by you?—Arrests effected by me. I have eight convictions under the licensing law, and I have only three hotels to look after. In addition to 265 convictions on arrest, I have had 260 convictions on summons; making 525 in all. I have also received numerous rewards for meritorious conduct since my arrival in Timaru. I would like to say that in the provincial days, I understand, a mounted constable got 6d. or 1s. a day more than a foot constable.

535. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think a mounted constable ought to get more than a foot constable?—Yes; and my reason for stating so is this: a mounted constable's uniform and total outfit is about three times as expensive as a foot constable's. It costs about £15 for a proper turn-out to start with; and it is a well-known fact to all horsemen that a mounted man wears out more uniforms than a foot man.

536. You are in favour of constables getting their uniform free?—Yes, I am.

537. And in the event of your not getting them free you think you should get an allowance for them?—Yes.

538. *The Chairman.*] How much will it cost a year?—It will cost about £10 a year. At the very least in riding trousers I wear out two pairs a year.

539. How much do you pay for riding-boots?—£3 per pair. That is the only grievance that I have. I have been unjustly treated, and I think when Colonel Reader promised me promotion I should have got it, and I should now be senior constable on the list of second-class constables for promotion. In fact, if I had my rights, I should have been first-class constable years ago. I do not know of any other service where a man with a clean record as I have would be still a second-class constable after sixteen years' service.

540. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has there been considerable discontent in regard to slow promotion in the Force?—There has been.

541. Has there been a general feeling that political influence was necessary to secure any particular justice or attention?—Yes; it has been the feeling until the new Commissioner took office.

542. Are you about the township much?—No; my work is principally in the suburbs and country.

543. How frequently are you at the police watch-house?—Not there very often. Sometimes I am away through the night, and sometimes from 9 o'clock in the morning until 7 and 8 at night.

544. Have you on any occasion seen a police-officer under the influence of liquor?—No, I have not.

545. Has it been common talk, to your knowledge, that such has been the case in Timaru?—No, it has not.

546. Have you not heard it?—No, I have not.

547. Has it not been common talk?—No. I am not much about with the other men, because my work is principally in the country. Probably I do not have a conversation with them for a week at a time.

548. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the change of control, you say there has been an improvement since the arrival of the new Commissioner?—Yes.

549. What I want to get from you is this: do you attribute the fact of an improvement in the feeling of the Force to the fact that the new Commissioner shortly after his arrival made a large number of promotions?—Probably that had something to do with it.

550. After promotions had been stagnate for years he promoted sixty men straight away?—Yes.

551. Do you attribute the improvement to that fact?—Yes, it has something to do with it, but I heard it said in Dunedin it was no use constables trying to use outside influence because it had been knocked on the head.

552. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you patrol the country?—Yes, for a distance of about twenty-eight miles.

553. How often do you patrol the suburbs and country about Timaru?—As frequently as my duty permits. I would like to say, in regard to the pension scheme, that I for one am quite willing to forego my long-service pay. I think it would be a splendid thing for the Force if a pension scheme were started.

CHRISTCHURCH.

MONDAY, 18TH APRIL, 1898.

THOMAS BROHAM, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] You are the Inspector of Police at present stationed at Christchurch?—Yes, Sir.

2. How long have you been stationed here?—For five years.

3. What force have you under your control?—The total strength of the district is 105, all told.

4. How many of those are in the city and how many in the country?—There are forty in the city, exclusive of the suburbs, and the remainder are at the outlying stations, of which there are thirty-six.

5. Will you name the stations?—Oamaru, Timaru, Ashburton, Lyttelton, Sydenham, Sheffield, Kaiapoi, Rakaia, Papanui, Southbridge, Rangiora, Hampden, Phillipstown, Geraldine, Little River, Temuka, Leeston, Addington, Lincoln, Woolston, Oxford, Amberley, Pleasant Point, Kaikoura, Akaroa, Bingsland, Waimate, St. Albans, Kurow, Culverden, Fairlie, Ngapara, Methven, Coalgate, and Cheviot.

6. How many district constables are there?—One, who is stationed at Cheviot.

7. Have you anything to say with regard to the subdivisions—are they sufficient for the efficient working of the district?—The subdivisions are not sufficient.

8. What do you recommend?—I have already recommended to Mr. Tunbridge the formation of several other sub-districts. I think, for instance, that there should be a northern sub-district with its headquarters at Rangiora.

9. Where are they now?—At present everything is directed by myself. I further recommended that a sub-district should be formed at Lyttelton—that Lyttelton should be united with Little River and Akaroa, under the charge of a sergeant at Lyttelton. I also recommended that the stations at Sheffield and Coalgate should be added to the charge of the Ashburton sub-district.

10. With regard to the numerical strength of the Force, is it sufficient for the efficient control of the district?—I think it is totally inadequate.

11. Where is it weakest?—The Police Force of this district has been starved for years. When I first came here twenty-one years ago there were fifty men stationed in Christchurch, and the population then was just half what it is now.

12. Was that force beyond the requirements of the place?—I am not prepared to say that it was. I know that the present Police Force is totally insufficient. Six of the forty men I now have been added within the last eighteen months; before that, I had only thirty-four men.

13. *Mr. Poynton.*] Are they recruits of only eighteen months' experience?—They are six additional men who have been sent to Christchurch.

14. *The Chairman.*] To what extent is it necessary, do you think, to increase the town Force?—I think it should be up to the strength of fifty, which would be equal to the Police Force in other towns in the colonies, so that it might deal effectually with crime and disorder. Twenty years ago there were five police-officers in the district of which I have charge now.

15. With regard to the efficiency of the men, as to knowledge of their work, ability to perform it physically, and so on, what have you to say?—During the whole five years I have had a large number of men physically weak. They had often to go on the sick list. A large number were not of sufficient intelligence to satisfy me, and a large number were in no way fitted for the police duties they had to perform. There were men, too, who had no sense of duty, and in them there was no spirit of obedience. The powers of Inspectors have been very much curtailed of late years. Formerly Inspectors had authority to remove within their own districts all sergeants and constables from station to station. That power was taken from them. They have not been consulted of late years regarding promotions, nor as to the transfer of men under their charge. They know nothing whatever of the transfers until the men were told to go to different places, everything being controlled from Wellington. The constables knew that the

Inspectors' powers were largely curtailed; they knew that it was not by steady attention to their duty that promotion was to be obtained or advancement given, and they sought promotion and advancement by political influence. This system directly bred insubordination and the spirit of disobedience throughout the Force. The men ceased to look to their officers for advancement. The men are now appointed to the Force without the Commissioner of Police or any officer of the police seeing them. The Commissioner of Police knows nothing of the men he appoints to the Force. He does not see them, and no inquiry is made by anybody connected with the police regarding the character of the men who are appointed to the Police Force. It seems to me that there is nothing required more, than that the men should be seen by the Commissioner, or by some person deputed by the Commissioner, before they are appointed to the Force. I believe retrenchment has been carried out in the Police Force more than in any other branch of the Government service. Eighteen years ago, out of a Force of twenty-three officers, twelve were either discharged or reduced to the rank of sergeant. The Superintendents—the senior officers of the Force—were reduced to the rank of Inspector, and £100 a year was taken off their salaries. The sergeant-majors were reduced to first-class sergeants, the first-class sergeants to second class, the second class to third class, and the third class to constables, and a large number of constables were dismissed. Reductions on a large scale have been carried out once or twice since. The colony has gone in for having the cheapest Force in all the colonies, and the colony has got that. By the last returns I see that the Colony of Victoria has thirty-three officers, forty-nine first-class sergeants, fifty second-class sergeants, and 141 senior constables, who rank with our third-class sergeants, with a total strength of 1,403. New Zealand has seven inspectors, twenty-three first-class sergeants, twelve second-class sergeants, and nine third-class sergeants—against 141 in Victoria—and the total Force is 500. The population of Victoria is 1,200,000, and of New Zealand 740,000.

16. *Mr. Poynton.*] Can you tell us the proportion of police to the population in the colonies?—New Zealand has 1 to 1,461 of population, Victoria has 1 to 832, New South Wales 1 to 692, South Australia 1 to 1,041, and Queensland 1 to 579. I believe the New Zealand is the only Police Force in the colonies that receives no pensions. Formerly, the men in New Zealand received a free issue of clothing, and when ill a medical man attended them free; but they were deprived of these advantages. Clothing comes hard on some of the men, and so does medical attendance when they have to go on the sick list. The first step necessary to the improvement of the Police Force is, as I have already stated, that the candidates should be seen by the Commissioner of Police before enrolment, or by some officer deputed by him, and, further, that the Commissioner should have complete control of the Force.

17. *The Chairman.*] What do you mean by complete control?—No Ministerial interference. It seems to me that the police districts as at present constituted are far too large. I have already said that I have charge of a district which was once under the care of five officers.

18. What is the length of the district?—It is between two hundred and fifty miles and three hundred miles long. I think that wherever two constables are stationed one should have a stripe on his arm, and should either be called senior constable or third-class sergeant. That is the case in Victoria, and I believe in all the other colonies except New Zealand.

19. *Colonel Pitt.*] When the five Inspectors were in the district was the railway service the same as it is now?—It was.

20. *The Chairman.*] When there were five officers was the district divided into five?—There were not five districts, but there were five officers.

21. And how many districts were there in the district that is now one district?—There was one sub-district at Kaiapoi, Timaru was another, and there were two officers in Christchurch, and a Sub-Inspector was stationed at Oamaru. I was the Inspector, and in addition there were four Sub-Inspectors.

22. What is your opinion as to the rank of Sub-Inspectors being re-established?—I think that in the large centres there should be Sub-Inspectors.

23. Would you give them the charge of the sub-districts?—Yes. I also look on the reward system now in force as most demoralising to the men. I believe this is the only colony that has such a system. It induces the men to go for the money, and it breeds jealousy and dissension and all manner of disagreement among the men. For doing the most trifling things men are now continually applying for rewards. I think the pay the men are receiving is far too low. I would be glad to see the men entitled to pensions after spending their lifetime in the Police Force.

24. Do you think it would have a beneficial effect on the Force?—Yes, I am satisfied it would have an excellent effect.

25. *Colonel Pitt.*] At what age do you think the men should retire from the Force?—I think sixty is quite old enough. In Victoria, until lately, they retired at fifty-five, but they have now extended it to sixty.

26. Do you think they should be allowed to remain till they are sixty?—I think so.

27. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that as a rule men are efficient up to that age?—I think so. I think sixty should be the age.

28. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your opinion as to the appointment of a central depot for training?—It is absolutely needed. I have felt the want of it very much. At present men are brought here and go straight on duty without any training whatever. The wonder to me is that things go on so smoothly, considering the want of training on the part of the men who are sent to do police duty.

29. What instruction do the men get in the district?—The new men are under the charge of the sergeant on the beat all the time, and there is weekly instruction given to them—a school.

30. Does that school apply to the old members of the Force as well as the new?—At the headquarters they are nearly all new third-class constables; the older hands are sent to the out-stations.

31. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider that the depot training would be better than the present weekly training that they get?—Well, the number of men we have is so small that they are absolutely necessary; we must have the men. The depot, I think, is absolutely necessary to teach them some knowledge of their duties before they go on the street in uniform.

32. You spoke about the Inspector having power to transfer men?—Yes; up to within six or eight years ago the Inspector had the power of removing all the men in his district.

33. Under that system, is there not a chance of junior men getting stations, unless men from outside are transferred to the vacant stations?—At that time transfer outside a district was very unusual. Men were kept pretty much within their own district. I know it is heresy to say it, but I am very much opposed to the frequent removal of men. I think it places the police out of touch with the public. Formerly, when the provincial Force existed, there is no question that the men were of a higher standard than they are now. As it is now, the men are like so many shadows—they come and go—and nobody knows who they are. They are not in the district for any time. The public require to be familiar with their men and to know them. I think the transfer of a detective is a serious matter. A detective should never be transferred unless there is absolute and very pressing need for it.

34. You think that the information acquired by a detective in a district is greatly lost when he goes to another district?—Yes. He has to commence anew, and it will take him at least a couple of years before he gets hold of the threads of things.

35. *Mr. Poynton.*] You say that the constables knew that the Inspectors' powers were largely curtailed, and that it was not by steady attention to duties that they would get promotion and advancement; and that they sought promotion and advancement by political influence. Is that generally the case, do you think?—I cannot cite a particular instance, but it is a matter of public notoriety in the Police Force.

36. Many of your men have other offices—Clerk of Court, and so on?—Yes.

37. Do you think that detracts from their efficiency?—I think that the less duty they have outside their police duties the better it is for the Force, and the more efficient constables they are likely to be.

38. Have you had instances of that effect, or is it just a general idea?—I cannot say that I have any particular instances to quote.

39. Some of the outside offices take up but little time?—Well, the office of Inspector of Factories takes up a considerable time.

40. *The Chairman.*] Is there not something beyond mere time—does it not give the constable a wrong impression of his duties?—Yes.

41. *Mr. Poynton.*] On the other hand, does it not make him more familiar with the people?—He is likely to come into very disagreeable contact with the public, especially as Inspector of Factories.

42. But, as Clerk of the Court, will he not get information that he would not otherwise get?—Yes; but I would prefer to see the police constables merely, and not Clerks of Court.

43. But you cannot give an instance of where it interferes with his duties?—No, but I know that a Clerk of the Court is often inclined to think he is above police work.

44. Would you substitute anything in lieu of special activity and zeal?—Yes, promotion.

45. Would you give promotion by a system of marks, or what?—I would give advancement in rank. The present system is the worst possible system. It has a most demoralising effect on the men, and I have condemned it during all the years of its operation.

46. What do you think would be a fair rate of pay?—I think the old rate of pay with a pension added would be fair—7s., 7s. 6d., and 8s.

47. Would you recommend that married men get house-allowance in towns?—That would amount to a considerable sum. I should be glad to see it done, but I know it would be a considerable sum; and if these expenses are multiplied to any great extent it might tend to prevent the establishment of a pension fund, which I would like to see.

48. *The Chairman.*] When you say that the men should start at 7s., do you at the same time recommend an increase of pay on length of service without regard to merit?—No. I believe in the advancement to rank. I believe a man likes to see himself advanced in rank.

49. It has been suggested by some witnesses that the ranks of constables should be abolished, but that there should be an increase of pay, rising with seniority?—Well, I think there should be at least two ranks of constables—perhaps three are not necessary.

50. Would you give the same pay to all the members of each rank, or would you increase the pay with length of service?—I would give the same pay to all members of the same rank.

51. *Colonel Pitt.*] Irrespective of service?—No.

52. *The Chairman.*] Then, there would be no long-service pay?—No. I am now supposing that the men would be entitled to pensions.

53. *Mr. Poynton.*] What about leave?—Formerly the men were not entitled to leave at all; now they get twelve days a year.

54. Do you think it should be allowed to accumulate, to give the men an opportunity of visiting their friends in Australia or other places?—I would be very glad to see that.

55. *The Chairman.*] Do you think it would be injurious to the service?—I do not think so.

56. *Colonel Pitt.*] What should be the maximum of accumulated leave?—A couple of months, I think, should be the restricted limit.

57. What do you consider should be the minimum standard of height?—5 ft. 9 in. at least, and not exceeding thirty years of age. It is forty now, which is too old. I think a man is quite stale at forty.

58. *Mr. Poynton.*] What is your opinion about recruiting from the Artillery?—I think the most woeful mistake was made in recruiting from the Artillery.

59. Do you think the training is not suitable?—It is utterly unsuitable.

60. You will get a better body of men if you select them from the whole colony?—Yes, naturally; you have a wider field.

61. *Colonel Pitt.*] In your experience, and in your opinion, has there been much malingering among the Police Force in your district?—I cannot say much of malingering. I have had a number of men of weak physique, and the duty here in winter time is very severe on a delicate man. From 9 at night till 5 in the morning is a great strain on a man's constitution, and some of them have succumbed to it.

62. *The Chairman.*] Can the hours of night duty not be reduced?—No. The only thing I can recommend is that stronger men be employed for the night duty—the stamp of men who were in the Force in the provincial days.

63. What do you think about the advisability of appointing a medical officer for the Force in each centre?—That was the custom formerly, and I should be glad to see it revived. It is a very important matter, and I have more than once recommended it to the head of the department.

64. Is there any training given to the men in first aid to the wounded?—Yes; nearly all the men have gone through it.

65. Do you find it beneficial?—Yes; certainly.

66. What is your opinion as to the Force exercising the franchise?—I think it is highly injurious. It makes politicians of the men.

67. *Colonel Pitt.*] If you take the vote away from the men, you would have to take it from their wives too?—That opens up a new question. I presume that would have to be done too.

68. *The Chairman.*] In the course of your experience have you had reason to form the opinion that the exercise of the franchise in any way interferes with the efficiency of the men, or their mode of doing their work?—In every way it has been injurious to the efficiency of the Police Force. Formerly the police had no politics at all, but now most of them are politicians.

69. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you any views as to a necessary amendment of the licensing laws to enable the police to more efficiently enforce them?—I think it is absolutely necessary that the law should be amended, so that the New Zealand law should be the same as the English law, with regard to persons found in licensed houses on Sunday, and after hours.

70. What is the practice in your district as to police-officers cautioning or not cautioning persons before they are actually accused of a crime when seeking for information?—When a crime is committed the police make all the inquiries they can.

71. But is it the practice to caution them before they are actually charged?—They are never cautioned, not even after they are arrested. Some of the men make it a practice to caution, but it has been held by some Judges that it is not necessary. The men listen to a voluntary statement without cautioning the person who makes it.

72. *The Chairman.*] You have probably seen it stated that a certain police-officer considered it within his course of duty to suggest a falsehood, with a view to arriving at what he thought was the truth. Do you think that is legitimate?—Certainly not.

73. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have advocated the appointment of Sub-Inspectors. Where do you think they are absolutely indispensable?—I think that if Invercargill is to be constituted into a district it should have a Sub-Inspector; and I think there should be one at each of the four large centres; but, as I have already stated, the districts are too large.

74. If you had a Sub-Inspector in Christchurch it would give you a free hand to go about the district?—Yes, it would lighten my labours very materially. At present I cannot see some of the stations more than once a year.

75. Owing to the duties that keep you in the station at Christchurch?—Yes.

76. Do you know that at present recruits are recommended by at least two responsible persons?—I do not know who are responsible persons. Members of the House?

77. Ministers of religion. At any rate, you do not consider those recommendations sufficient?—I know that one can get recommendations for nearly everything in this colony. No matter what you want, you can get people to recommend anything in the world. I look on those recommendations as utterly worthless.

78. As regards the strength of the district here, you say you ought to have fifty men?—It was that twenty-one years ago, and there was then only half the population.

79. Do you think fifty is the minimum number?—I should be glad to see it. We would not be over-manned.

80. At present the strength is forty?—Yes.

81. Is that Christchurch proper?—Yes.

82. Not the suburban stations?—No. And you have always to take some men off. There may be two on Court duty, two on escort, and one on leave, and there may be others on special duty. Nearly every week there are some men away, so that you may reduce the number I have given you by five.

83. You would want a reserve, then, of about five men?—Yes.

84. To keep the beats full?—Yes.

85. *The Chairman.*] Are the beats of proper size?—If you reduce the number of men you have to extend the beats.

86. Are they too large?—The number of men I have now are insufficient for the number of beats.

87. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You think the beats are not too large?—No.

88. Provided they each had a man?—That is so. They are laid out for ten men on night duty, but as a matter of fact we have more frequently five than ten.

89. You consider that an augmentation of five men at least is indispensable?—It is absolutely necessary.

90. You also spoke of the powers of Inspectors having been curtailed by taking away the right of transfer?—Yes, and they are not consulted about promotions and advancement.

91. Do you think the Inspectors should have power to transfer men in their own district?—The Inspectors were able to do formerly what Ministers of the Crown are not able to do now. When the Inspectors removed sergeants and constables nobody interfered; but now, the Commissioner of Police and the Minister at the head of the department are unable to do it, apparently. I am judging now of the reports that have appeared from time to time.

92. Have you read the proceedings of the Commission, so far as appearing in the newspapers?—I have read a good many of them.

93. Have you noticed that serious complaints have been made as to the arbitrary action of Inspectors, prior to the time when they were deprived of the power of making transfers?—Yes. I have noticed that, and complaints will also be made of what is being done now.

94. Do you think there was no foundation for those complaints?—On the whole, I think things were managed very well.

95. Speaking more particularly of Southland, have you read in the papers the accounts of the proceedings there before the Commission, in which it was alleged there was a serious abuse of the power?—I have not seen that in the papers.

96. You say you were never consulted with reference to promotions and transfers. Does that apply to the present time?—No, it does not apply to the present time; but it was the rule in the Force for some years, and until a few months ago.

97. Were you consulted about the last promotions?—Yes. What I have stated was the rule until within the last six months.

98. What do you consider the minimum pay of a constable should be?—I think the pay should be 7s., 7s. 6d., and 8s., and a pension in addition.

99. And at what period of service should a man attain his maximum pay?—I think he should receive it within fourteen years.

100. Would you have fixed periods of service when a man should receive advancement in class?—I think that within the first five years he should get a step up, if he has conducted himself properly.

101. At that rate he would get the maximum in ten years?—Yes.

102. Do you think the men would be satisfied to continue on from, say, ten years' service up to thirty years—as it would be in some cases—without advancement in pay?—Well, if he was a smart man he would get promotion.

103. Your experience tells you that at ten years a man is as good as at any other time?—Yes.

104. And when he is ten years in the Force he should receive the pay of a first-class constable?—Yes.

105. Do you not think that sixty is too high?—It is the age in other Forces.

106. Can you point to any men under you of the age of sixty who are competent to fill the rough-and-tumble duties of a constable?—It used to be the rule that the young men were kept in the towns, and the stale men went to the country. A constable, if a strong man, would do well in the country up to sixty years of age.

107. Have you any men in your Force now who are sixty years of age?—I know I have one, at any rate.

108. Where is he stationed?—He is now the watch-house keeper.

109. Do you consider him fit to go out on a beat?—No, he is not.

110. And what is the age of the man next to him in years?—There are a number of men up to fifty.

111. Does not that rather go to show that at sixty a man is past doing constable's work?—Of course, there are many places where a man of sixty would be useful. The more active and bustling a district the more youthful a man must be. I suppose the sergeant-major of the Force is sixty, and he is a man fit for any duty—strong and vigorous.

112. You say that uniforms should be provided by the Government?—Yes.

113. Do you think that men not provided with police-quarters should be given lodging allowance?—Yes; I would like to see them get it.

114. Is it not the cause of a good deal of dissatisfaction on the part of men who are not receiving house-allowance?—Yes.

115. And that anomaly would still exist if there was a pension?—Yes; but I am anxious to see the pension.

116. *The Chairman.*] If single men are provided with lodging, and married men are not, does it not tend to discourage marriage?—Well, I find that the men in the Force get married very quickly.

117. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You think that the present reward system is demoralising?—Yes.

118. Will you explain that fully?—For years now I have had men making application to me for rewards. A man in a petty larceny case thinks he is overlooked if a man in Auckland has got a reward for a case of the kind, not knowing anything of the facts. I have complained to the Commissioner of that state of things.

119. If you do not recommend the reward, does the man get it?—No; and then he appeals to the Commissioner.

120. And has the Commissioner acceded to the request?—No; that has not been my experience. This sort of thing, then, creates dissatisfaction and a sense of injustice, and for years and years I have condemned the system. Men look for rewards, instead of doing their duty from a sense of duty.

121. You would recommend that the rewards should go to the pension fund?—Yes.

122. And that no money reward should be given at all?—That is so. I would give promotion to a man if he did anything deserving of special recognition.

123. Is it not a fact that men who are lucky enough—as it is considered—to get good stations are the cause of a great deal of dissatisfaction among the men who are not so fortunate?—Yes.

124. If the salaries and emoluments gained by men for performing extra offices were paid into a pension fund it would do away with jealousies?—Yes, and that is what I would like to see done.

125. Do you think the men would be inclined to give up their long-service pay to the fund?—I do not know. The long-service pay is, of course, becoming smaller year by year, as the men are leaving the Force. I really would not like to express an opinion on the point. I should be sorry to see the men deprived of it. I suppose that in ten years all the men who are now getting it will be out of the Force. In other colonies the Governments have made grants for the purpose of establishing pension funds, and that is what I would like to see the New Zealand Government do. In New South Wales they gave £80,000 for the establishment of such a fund, and there the police at thirty years' service are entitled to retire on full pay. Here all that the men get after thirty years' service is £150 or £160.

126. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you make any suggestions to the Commission as to the improvement of the Detective Force?—No; I think the Detective Force should do its work well and properly.

127. *The Chairman.*] One suggestion you have made is that they should not be frequently removed?—That is so. I think they should not be removed except in very special cases.

128. *Colonel Pitt.*] Should the office of chief detective be retained?—There is no need of the office. I do not know why it was ever established.

129. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think there are sufficient detectives in your district?—I think it is short. There were six detectives here twenty-one years ago.

130. How many would you recommend?—It was reduced to two, but now it is increased to three. I do not think it would be over-manned if we had six.

131. *The Chairman.*] What ranks would you have in the detective branch?—I think they are right as they are.

132. Would you have ranks at all?—Yes.

133. How does the first-class detective rank with the first-class sergeant?—He is under the sergeant-major.

134. But if there is no sergeant-major?—The sergeant would be in charge of the station, and in the case of a difference, in the absence of the Inspector, the detectives are under the direction of the sergeant in charge.

135. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is any amendment of the law relating to gambling desirable?—There is a clause in the Gaming Amendment Act with reference to "tote" betting, and I think it is unfortunate that it makes the person betting punishable as well as the man who induces him to bet. I think that stands in the way of convictions.

136. *The Chairman.*] It creates secrecy on both sides?—Yes, exactly. We have found that very much in the way of getting convictions under the clause.

137. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is there any other amendment in reference to gambling that suggests itself to you?—No, I have nothing else to suggest.

138. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is there much Sunday trading going on in Christchurch?—No, I do not think so. The hotels are as well conducted here as in other places in the colony.

139. Are there any other classes of Sunday trading?—I think that, altogether, Sunday is well observed here by the public.

140. Do you think the licensing law requires amendment, to strengthen the hands of the police?—Yes.

141. Are you familiar with the provisions of the English Licensing Act?—No, but I have seen it referred to, and I should like to see it the law here.

142. Would it strengthen the hands of the police?—Most materially.

143. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you think the office of chief detective is unnecessary?—Yes.

144. Do you not consider that there should be a detective in charge of the other men?—Well, at first there was a detective for the colony, and then it came to be the chief detective for each centre.

145. But, do you not consider that the detective office should be in charge of the chief detective?—Naturally the first-class detective would be in charge.

146. You would put him in charge?—Yes.

147. So it is merely a matter of title that you would alter?—Yes, it is the title; it crept in somehow. I remember the man who was first given the title. He is not in the Force now.

148. The chief detective gets no extra pay?—No.

149. And if he lost the title of chief detective he would still have the same functions to perform?—Yes.

150. Would you advocate that plain-clothes men should receive an allowance?—Yes; they did so long ago.

151. They are out of pocket a good deal?—Yes. I have often represented that to the head of the department.

152. What should they receive?—2s. a day more than they are getting, I think.

153. *The Chairman.*] That would bring them up to the rank of third-class detectives?—Yes, I really think they should get some allowance.

154. What is the pay of a fourth-class detective?—9s.

155. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you not think that the laws with reference to street betting are rather defective?—I do not think we have much in that way here. We see nothing of it at all worth mentioning.

156. At present the police cannot take action against a person in the street for betting "tote" odds unless that person causes an obstruction?—That is so.

157. Does not that require remedying?—In some places I have seen swarms of men on the street, but I have not seen that here.

158. You have had experience of Auckland as well?—Yes.

159. And do you think that in places where the evil exists the law is not strong enough to cope with it?—That is my opinion.

160. And that it requires strengthening?—Yes, I think so.

161. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do the police do their duty in Christchurch in reference to houses of ill-fame?—I think so. It is specially attended to here. Since the passing of the Indictable Offences Summary Jurisdiction Act the police have no difficulty at all with such a matter as that.

162. *The Chairman.* Do you consider that the evil is kept well under control?—Yes, thoroughly. It is not a growing evil here.

163. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you any reason to suppose that there is much undetected crime in your district?—There is more than I could wish.

164. To what do you attribute that?—To the fact that the police and the detective branches are numerically weak. They have always been so here, which must directly result in the immediate increase of crime.

TUESDAY, 19TH APRIL, 1898.

ALFRED STANTON, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] Your name is Alfred Stanton?—That is my name.

2. Your present rank is what?—First-class constable, New Zealand Police Force, stationed at Christchurch.

3. You are district clerk, are you?—I am, Sir.

4. I have the letter you have addressed to the Commission, making reference to certain matters that you wish to bring before us. Will you state them now?—The letter states as nearly as possible what I wish you to consider.

5. Then I will read the letter. Before I do that, tell us how long you have been in the service?—I joined the service for the second time in June, 1885, having been out of the Force then for about eight or nine months.

6. Now, you say in your letter :—

In January, 1896, I was appointed district clerk, which appointment I have held continuously since. In 1890 I made an application for the same clerical allowance as other district clerks were in receipt of. I was told by the then Commissioner (Colonel Hume) that it was his intention to remove the district clerks in the large centres who were sergeants—three of them first-class, and the fourth second-class—and replace them with constables, who would not be granted clerical allowance. This was not carried out in any part for a long time afterwards, and has never been carried out in its entirety, as one first-class sergeant is now a district clerk. I was satisfied with the Commissioner's explanation, and thought no more of the matter. In March, 1893, I was sent to Christchurch as district clerk, *vice* First-class Sergeant Lanauze, retired on compensation. To my intense astonishment, I found, on taking over the duties in Christchurch, that the second clerk in the district office, and my subordinate, was drawing clerical allowance, having been awarded it in September, 1891—over twelve months after the refusal of the Commissioner to grant me the same consideration for fulfilling a much more responsible office—*i.e.*, chief clerk—on the grounds hereinbefore stated. The reason I did not bring my grievance before the department is this: I thought it probable that if I did it might have the effect of causing Constable McClelland's allowance to be discontinued, and I would rather do without the allowance, to which I consider I am justly entitled, than be the cause of an injury to a comrade. The present Commission, having been set up to inquire into and redress all grievances suffered by members of the Force, I think I may safely approach the Commission without any danger of being an instrument of injury to a fellow-constable.

Does that really embody your complaint?—Those are the straightforward facts.

7. Have you anything to add to what is contained in the letter?—Nothing, Sir.

8. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you made any application to the Commissioner since you have been appointed to Christchurch, in reference to this allowance?—I have not, for the reasons stated in my letter.

9. Do you know of any other stations where first-class constables are doing duty as district clerks?—I cannot say. I do not know whether the district clerk in Auckland is a first-class constable or not.

10. Do you say that at all other places the clerical allowance is paid?—It was at that time.

11. But is it now?—I cannot say. I know it is in Dunedin.

12. *Colonel Hume.*] You stated that there is a first-class sergeant a district clerk somewhere?—Yes.

13. Where is that?—In Dunedin.

14. Do you know of anything special about him? Has he always been in the police?—Yes, I think he has.

15. You do not know that he was taken over from the Provincial Government as a Civil servant?—I know that he was a constable in Dunedin years ago.

16. But you do not know that he was taken over as a Civil servant, do you?—I do not.

17. Do you get clerical allowance now?—No.

18. Do you get house-allowance?—Yes.

19. Do you know the district clerks in the other places in New Zealand beside Auckland?—I knew Constable Hendry, when he was at New Plymouth.

20. Was he a sergeant?—No.

21. Is the district clerk now in New Plymouth a sergeant?—No.

22. The district clerk at Napier?—No.

22A. At Greymouth?—No.

23. Then, in fact, there is just the one sergeant, and the man recently promoted in Wellington—Wright?—When I was refused there were Sergeant Bulford, Sergeant Ellison, Sergeant Bell, and Sergeant Lanauze.

24. They are all dead or removed now except one?—Yes.

25. Have I not visited Christchurch a good many times since you were appointed district clerk here?—Yes.

26. I have seen you on each occasion?—Yes; I think so.

27. And you never represented to me anything about this?—I did not.

28. Who is the assistant clerk here?—Constable McClelland.

29. Does he get any special allowance?—He gets a clerical allowance of 6d. a day.

30. Any house-allowance?—No.

31. Then, if anybody came before the Commission and said he was getting 1s. a day clerical allowance, he would be stating what is not the fact?—Yes.

32. You pay him, I suppose?—Yes.

33. *Mr. Poynton.*] What house-allowance do you get?—10s. a week.

34. *The Chairman.*] Do you get anything beyond your payment as a first-class constable?—Nothing, except house-allowance. House-allowance has been granted to district clerks for years past; and at the time sergeants were drawing a clerical allowance of 1s. a day they were also getting a house-allowance. I consider that 10s. a week is not sufficient for house-allowance.

35. In what cases is clerical allowance granted to clerks?—I do not know, but probably the only one now getting it is Sergeant Bell, of Dunedin.

36. *Colonel Pitt.*] There is Constable McClelland?—Yes, that is two.

37. *The Chairman.*] You feel dissatisfied at not receiving this clerical allowance?—Not so much that, Sir; but there is the fact of another constable being granted clerical allowance after I was refused.

38. That is the grant to McClelland?—Yes.

39. *Mr. Poynton.*] What is McClelland's rank now?—He is a first-class constable.

40. *The Chairman.*] And at the present time you, as chief clerk, are receiving a less wage than the assistant clerk, excepting only the house-allowance?—That is so.

41. *Colonel Pitt.*] You have always had house-allowance?—Yes.

42. *Colonel Hume.*] You say that McClelland gets 1s. a day?—No, I did not say that. I said it was 6d.

43. Do you remember the circumstances of his getting it?—I was not here at the time.

44. Why do you say it is given to him as clerical allowance?—He said so, and it goes down to that in the pay.

45. What rank did you hold when you were transferred here?—I was a third-class constable.

46. You got a rise of 1s. a day by coming here as district clerk?—Yes.

47. What rank do the men hold now who joined when you did—in June, 1885?—Most of them are second-class constables. I may say that the men who are now second-class constables are doing beat duty, and do not hold the responsible position that I do.

48. *Mr. Poynton.*] I suppose you have to live near the station?—About a mile from it. A decent house costs 14s. a week, but I am getting one cheaper than that. I am living a long way out.

49. *The Chairman.*] Are you a married man?—Yes.

50. As a first-class constable, you are not entitled to house-rent?—No.

51. If you held the rank of sergeant you would be?—Yes. The district clerks have always received house-allowance. I may mention that, though I have been in the Force only twelve years, I have five or six years' previous service. I may also say that I joined the Colonial Forces when I was sixteen years of age, at the time active service was going on. I am a native of New Zealand.

52. *Colonel Hume.*] Why did you leave the Force at the end of five years?—For private reasons.

53. You were not reduced?—No.

54. *The Chairman.*] Apart from your complaint, have you any suggestions to make to us with respect to the position of the Force, and the conditions under which the men serve in the Force?—Yes, I have.

55. We would be very glad to hear them?—In the case of recruits, I think the educational standard of the ordinary recruit is far too low. I am certain that a great many of them could not pass the Fourth Standard, or anything like it. The reports of some of the members of the Force are absolutely painful to read. I also think there should be some scheme for a pension.

56. At the cost of the men's pay?—To a certain extent; they might contribute something. Perhaps the outside emoluments, which now go to individual constables, might be put into a fund, which would in the aggregate amount to a good deal.

57. You refer to rewards, and the pay attached to extra offices?—That is my idea.

58. In expressing that opinion, do you give it as your own individual opinion, or do you feel justified in giving it as the opinion of any section of the Force?—I think the Force are unanimous in thinking there should be a pension, but a good many of them would object to give up anything. Of course, I cannot say that positively, but it is natural that they should.

59. At present there is a compulsory system of insurance?—Yes.

60. Assuming it was abolished, would the contributions to it be willingly or unwillingly given to the pension scheme?—I could not say.

61. What is the amount of premium on his life insurance paid by a man who joins at thirty?—Most of them join at less than thirty. A man joining at thirty would pay about 13s. a month, I think. I am estimating that at the monthly deduction from some of the men here. But, now I come to think of it, for £200 I do not think it would be that amount. I think it would be about 11s. a month.

62. That would be a little over 5 per cent. Do you think the men would be willing to contribute to the pension fund from their pay to the extent of 5 per cent.?—I do not think they would. A constable on £10 a month has as much as he can do, if he has a family, to scrape along and pay his insurance.

63. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you think the rate of pay is sufficient?—I do not.

64. What should it be, do you think?—I think that, on joining, a constable should not get anything under 7s. a day, and then the class promotion should be more rapid than now, so that a man might get a rise within a reasonable time, say within four or five years. As a matter of fact, there are men now in the Force with twelve or fourteen years' service, who are only third-class constables.

65. *The Chairman.*] Your remark, that the men would not willingly contribute 5 per cent., applies to the present pay, and not to the pay if fixed at the rate you have named?—I think, if the pay is fixed as I suggest, they would contribute the 5 per cent. Under those circumstances, I would pay myself.

66. Then you are speaking for yourself?—Yes.

67. Do you think the increase of pay should depend on the class a man is in, or his length of service?—All things being equal, it should go by seniority; but if that rule was rigidly adhered to the Force would become a mass of useless men.

68. You were present on parade yesterday when I intimated to the men our desire that they should appoint delegates and consider these questions, and express their opinions to us?—Yes.

69. Probably we are anticipating too much, then, in taking your individual evidence until you have held that meeting and made your selection of delegates?—As a matter of fact, the meeting was held some three weeks ago, but these questions, as we are now going into them, were not discussed. There were four delegates appointed, of whom I was one.

70. May I take this from you as suggestions made by you in your capacity as delegate?—No. I would like to confer with the other delegates before I appear in that capacity.

71. You heard me say yesterday that we wanted not only to hear the opinions of the majority through delegates, but also the opinions of the minority in the same way?—Yes.

72. We will leave your evidence now until you can speak as a delegate?—Very well.

73. *Colonel Hume.*] You stated that you do not think a good many of the recruits have passed the Fourth Standard? Will you give me the name of a single recruit who has joined within the last seven years who has not passed that standard or a higher one?—I do not know one; but I would like to see them pass it now. I did not know that it was compulsory on them to pass.

74. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you base your opinion on the nature of the reports?—Yes.

75. *Colonel Hume.*] Can you name a single man who has joined in the last ten years who has not passed the Fourth Standard or a higher one?—I do not know whether any man has passed the standard.

76. Can you name a man?—No.

77. You would be surprised to find, then, that the men have passed that examination?—I should be intensely surprised to find that they had.

THOMAS BROHAM, examined on oath.

78. *The Chairman.*] Your name is?—Thomas Broham.

79. You are the Inspector stationed at Christchurch?—Yes, Sir.

80. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you a record of the beats occupied by the men on various duties?—Yes.

81. Can you tell me who was on duty on the night of the 12th August on the beat between the Bank of New Zealand and the Cashel Street and High Street corner?—That is, the Triangle?

82. Yes?—Constable Barrett was on that beat. It is called "No. 1," or the "Triangle beat."

83. Who was on the beat running from Walker's corner down to Black, Beattie, and Co.'s?—Constable McKenzie. That is called "No. 3 beat."

84. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Had you any complaint about anything that these two constables are supposed to have done on the night of the 12th?—I had a complaint, but I cannot say the exact date. It was about that time.

85. What did you do?—I made all the inquiries I possibly could.

86. Through what channel?—In the ordinary official manner.

87. Who was your medium?—Sergeant Wilson made the inquiry.

88. Did you have any complaint about Sergeant Wilson not doing his duty in that inquiry?—No, he is a very careful sergeant.

89. Did you get a report at the time?—Yes.

90. Have you got the reports?—They were sent to the Commissioner's office.

91. Have you not seen them since?—No.

92. Do you know if they are in Court?—I do not know. I might say it was not a report with special reference to these two constables. It was surmised that these were the two constables. It was really a complaint made against two constables without naming them.

93. The complaint originated with Mr. Taylor, did it not?—Yes.

94. And now that he substitutes the names of two constables, have you any reason to suppose that there were others?—No, I have not. Mr. Taylor did not name any constables.

95. But you hear now that he names these two constables?—Yes; I have not heard him name them before.

96. And you know that his complaint at that time had reference to these two?—I do not know what he meant at the time. He refused to mention the names of the constables. He said he did not want to injure them, and he refused to name them; so it was represented to me by Sergeant Wilson.

97. Were you satisfied in your own mind at the time, after full inquiry, that the charge was not sustained?—Perfectly.

98. *The Chairman.*] You did not make any personal inquiry?—No, I did not.

99. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You had also the reports of others before you?—Yes, I had the statements of different individuals whom Sergeant Wilson saw. I had statements of all that they could prove.

THOMAS EDWARD TAYLOR, examined on oath.

100. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—Thomas Edward Taylor. On the night of the 12th August, 1897, I came into Christchurch from my home. It was the night following a race-meeting. In consequence of information received I met several friends in town about half-past 10 p.m., and we strolled round the streets for about three hours altogether. There were large crowds on the streets up to half-past 11. Just before 12 o'clock Sergeant Wilson spoke to two constables near the corner of High and Cashel Streets. He then passed up the town towards the Bank of New Zealand. These two men were standing on the footpath at the corner near Myers, the dentist's. They were both smoking for some time after Sergeant Wilson left them.

101. And at the time he was speaking to them?—No; at the time he was speaking to them they were not smoking. Just before the clock struck 12 they left the corner of the street together, and passed over to the cabstand opposite the D.I.C., where they spoke for a second or two to some cabmen, whom I could not identify. They then passed down Cashel Street until they came to the entrance to the Café Hotel. They stopped there close up to the door, and a few seconds afterwards the door opened, and they passed inside. I remained on the footpath opposite the Café entrance, on the opposite side of the street, with a friend, and I posted another man at the back door of the hotel. About a minute before half-past 12 by my watch one part of the door of the Café opened, and a man in his shirt-sleeves, apparently one of the servants, stepped out on to the footpath. He looked up and down the street, and then turned round and made a motion to some one inside the house, and the two constables came out.

102. You were on the opposite side of the street?—Right opposite the door. Between 12 and half-past 12 Detective Maddern came down Cashel Street towards the police-camp, and I bade him "Good morning." He stopped and I spoke to him. A few minutes after the men came out of the hotel I met Sergeant Wilson, and a constable, whose name I am not sure of, near Ballantyne's. I spoke to the sergeant. After the men came out of the hotel they went to the corner of High and Cashel Streets, to the crossing between Walker, the tobacconist's, and Myers, the dentist's. I passed up there with those who were with me, and the men were then talking to Detective Benjamin and Acting-detective Fitzgerald. Constable Barrett went up High Street and was standing opposite Shaw, Robinson, and Co.'s old premises—the Hall—when my two companions and myself passed him. Constable McKenzie had turned in the direction of south High Street. Detective Benjamin and Acting-detective Fitzgerald moved away from the point after the conversation. There was no disturbance at the hotel so far as one could see from the outside, either before or after the men were there.

103. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Who were your companions?—Mr. Robson and Mr. Hoddinott.

104. What is Mr. Robson?—He is a bootmaker.

105. And Mr. Hoddinott?—I think he is a blacksmith. He works at a foundry as far as I know.

106. Are they like you, Prohibitionists?—Yes.

107. Had you remained in Cashel Street, opposite the Café, for any length of time?—Do you mean prior to the men entering?

108. Prior to the occurrence you speak of?—We brought up there when the men went in.

109. Then, of course, your man stationed at the back knew nothing. He could see nothing?—He went there after the men had gone in.

110. Where were you when the men went in?—As near as I can remember, I was opposite the entrance to the Bank of Australasia—perhaps the space of a chain and a half away.

111. You had not passed the men there?—Yes, I had.

112. In walking round?—Yes; in walking about the town.

113. What kind of night was it?—A very fine night.

114. A moonlight night?—So far as I can remember, it was; but I would not be positive. My impression is that it was a very fine night—very pleasant.

115. With the moon shining from a northerly direction?—I cannot say. I will not say that it was shining at all. I was not studying astronomy that night.

116. You will not say it was all moonshine, will you?—No, I will not.

117. I suppose you were determined on a conviction of some sort that night, if you could get it?—I was not. I was there as a citizen, as I had every right to be; and I will do it again if I wish. The police are the public servants, and as a citizen I have a perfect right to know what they are doing in their hours of duty.

118. What races were on the day before?—I am not a racing man, but I think it was a steeplechase meeting. I am not sure. I remember it was a race-day, and there was a good deal of noise and horse-play in the town that night.

119. Had you any other time about this period watched constables on the beats?—On one occasion, subsequently, I was in town for an hour and a half for the same purpose.

120. With the same companions?—No, different ones.

121. Do you mean to say, then, that it is only on two occasions that you have been indulging in this spirit of espionage?—It is only on two occasions that I took means to satisfy myself as to the truth of certain charges made against the Force, as to their habits at night.

122. It is only on two occasions that you have taken means to have personal satisfaction?—Yes, that is so.

123. And on those two occasions of hearsay, you base your general charges?—On those two occasions I gained a great amount of accurate knowledge.

124. There are only two occasions on which you were spying, and the rest must be hearsay; and I suggest it is on what you saw on these two occasions that you base your general charges?—No, you are quite wrong. I have a tremendous amount of information, apart from those two occasions.

125. But you did not see it yourself?—I have seen a great deal that warrants me in making the charges.

126. But it was only on two occasions that you have watched personally?—For the specific purpose of seeing whether the constables frequented bars at night.

127. Did you on the second occasion find that they had visited this bar?—Yes.

128. They did?—Yes.

129. But you made no charge?—No. The evidence was not conclusive. There were not sufficient witnesses.

130. Were you not sufficient yourself?—That is a matter of opinion. I think I have a shrewd idea of what evidence is required.

131. You do not think your own evidence is sufficient?—No; not where two or three other men are concerned.

132. You have found it so before now?—No. My evidence I think is pretty keen.

133. At any rate, you cannot say it was moonlight or from what quarter the moon was shining?—I am under the impression it was a moonlight night, and I suppose it was shining in the usual direction that night.

134. You will not contradict me if I say that the shade of the Café fell across Cashel Street?—I think it is almost certain it did.

135. Now, the bank entrance is not quite opposite the hotel, is it?—No.

136. Is it about 50 or 100 yards away?—It is from 20 to 50 yards.

137. And in that event, does it not appear to you that it would be doubtful whether you could tell who it was that went into the Café from where you were standing?—I know the men perfectly well.

138. If that is so, then, why did you not disclose their names at the time? You refused to tell Sergeant Wilson who it was?—Yes.

139. You said you did not want to do them an injury, did you?—I gave no sentimental reason at all for not disclosing the names. I told Sergeant Wilson about the matter, and it was then the duty of the police to look after their own men. They could investigate the matter themselves.

140. You did not distrust Sergeant Wilson?—No. I have no particular reason for saying I distrust him.

141. You found him rather assiduous in his suppression of drink, and obtaining convictions against licensees?—I am not prepared to say that.

142. He was not assiduous enough, to your mind?—I would not describe my knowledge of his action in licensing matters in those terms.

143. He would not be so keen as you would be?—I do not know sufficient about him to answer that.

144. You made a complaint without mentioning names, although you knew the names, then?—Yes.

145. Did you find that Sergeant Wilson went immediately and made inquiries?—He left me and went towards where we had left the men.

146. Did you find afterwards that what Inspector Broham said is correct—that his inquiries satisfied him that there was nothing in your charge?—I do not think the Inspector made inquiries himself.

147. Well, that Sergeant Wilson's inquiries satisfied him that you were mistaken in your charge. You found that, did you not?—No. What I found was this: I saw the Inspector about it subsequently, and some of the men were paraded for inquiry as to their movements that night. Inspector Broham said, in conversation with me, that the report was to the effect that Sergeant Wilson could not ascertain who the men were, and that Detective Benjamin and Acting-detective Fitzgerald said they had not spoken to them at the corner; and he also said, in reply to a remark of mine, that "the men would swear anything." Speaking of Detective Benjamin, and Acting-detective Fitzgerald, I understood him to say that these men would swear anything.

148. Did he mean to say that these men would commit perjury?—He referred to Detective Benjamin and Acting-detective Fitzgerald. He said it in a jocular manner, as if it was a common thing to find that wrong statements were made by the men.

149. Are those his words?—I said to him, "It is impossible for them to say they did not speak to the two constables at the corner of the street." And in reply to that he said, "Oh, they will swear anything." I am prepared to swear that he said there were men in the Force who would swear anything. It afterwards turned out that it was another corner that was in question.

FREDERICK ROBSON, examined on oath.

150. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Frederick Robson.

151. What are you?—A bootmaker.

152. Where do you live?—Montreal Street, Sydenham.

153. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember being in town on the night of a race-meeting in August, last year?—Yes.

154. Whom were you with?—With yourself.

155. Do you remember seeing two police constables in High Street?—Yes.

156. Were they smoking?—Yes.

157. What did they do after the sergeant spoke to them at the corner of the street?—They stood there for a while smoking, and then crossed over to the cabstand.
158. And from there, where did they go?—They stood talking to the cabmen for a moment, and then went towards the Café Hotel.
159. Did they go into the Café?—Yes.
160. How long did they stop there?—Nearly half an hour.
161. Did you see them after that?—Yes.
162. Where were they standing?—At the corner of High Street and Cashel Street. They came out of the hotel and went there. Then they parted—one of them going up High Street towards the bank, while the other, I think, went down High Street.
163. To whom were they talking at the corner of High and Cashel Streets?—They spoke to some one, who was not in uniform, and I do not know who it was.
164. Do you know Detective Benjamin well?—No.
165. Do you know Acting-detective Fitzgerald well?—No.
166. Did some one come out of the Café door before the men came out?—Yes.
167. Was he fully dressed?—He had his coat off. One could see his white shirt-sleeves.
168. How long after he stepped out did the men come out?—Just a moment.
169. Where was Mr. Hoddinott while they were in the hotel?—He had left us and gone down the right-of-way at the side of the hotel.
170. Did you see Serjeant Wilson after the affair?—Yes.
171. Where was he?—In Cashel Street, near Ballantyne's.
172. What constable was with him?—I do not know.
173. Did he take a statement down?—Yes.
174. Did he take the names and addresses?—Yes.
175. *The Chairman.*] Was any one with you when he took the names down?—Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hoddinott.
176. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember speaking to any one while the men were in the hotel?—Yes, to Detective Maddern.
177. Were you interviewed by the police afterwards?—No.
178. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Where did you first meet Mr. Taylor that night?—At his office.
179. By appointment?—Yes.
180. For detective purposes?—No, Sir.
181. What for?—To look round the town.
182. What were you going to look at?—The people in the streets, and what we could see.
183. Did Mr. Taylor tell you what you were going to try to see?—I do not know what you mean.
184. Did Mr. Taylor tell you what you were going out to try to see?—We had arranged to go out and see the town, and see what it was like on a race-night.
185. In a general way?—Yes.
186. Merely for educational purposes?—More than that.
187. What was the rest, if there was anything more?—We went for the purpose of looking round the town, and to see if the police were in any way connected with the hotels.
188. If they ever took a drink?—We could not tell whether they took drinks or not.
189. But you wanted to find out?—We wanted to know if they visited the hotels.
190. That was arranged beforehand, and that was what you went to Mr. Taylor's office for?—Yes.
191. What time did you get there?—Between 10 o'clock and half-past, I should think.
192. Do you know the two constables, Barrett and McKenzie?—I did not know them before that.
193. You never knew them at all?—I had seen them in the street, but I did not know them.
194. There were a great many people about that night?—Yes.
195. Walking in twos and threes, and in crowds?—Yes.
196. Were you standing with Mr. Taylor at any particular spot opposite the Café?—Yes. We were under the grocer's verandah on the other side—Taylor's, I think.
197. Where were you when the constables are supposed to have gone into the hotel?—By the bank, or between there and the grocer's—somewhere near the D.I.C.
198. Who was the third member of your party?—Mr. Hoddinott.
199. What is he?—An engineer, I think.
200. A Prohibitionist too?—Yes.
201. What are you?—A bootmaker.
202. Where do you work?—At Mr. Duckworth's.
203. Have you been there constantly?—Yes.
204. How long?—Three years or more.
205. How long did you stand with Mr. Taylor nearly opposite the hotel?—Nearly half an hour.
206. Was there much drinking going on in the town that night?—I should judge so by the state of the people as they were going home.
207. Did you see other people go into the hotel that night?—No.
208. There was a lot of drinking going on, and it was a race-night, and yet you saw no one go into the hotel?—They were all going out of the hotel, and this happened after the hotels were supposed to be closed.
209. Was there not a soul went either in or out of the hotel except these two men?—That is all I noticed.
210. How were they dressed?—In uniform.

211. What do you call uniform at night? Had they overcoats and mantles?—They had overcoats and shakos.
212. Were there other people about with overcoats?—Yes.
213. I suppose the men went in at the front door?—Yes.
214. There is a right-of-way leading from Colombo Street?—Yes.
215. Supposing these two constables going down the street passed two other men at the right-of-way, so far as you could see, might you not be mistaken in thinking that these two men were the constables you had previously seen?—No.
216. You understand the position? You know the right-of-way?—Yes.
217. Is that the only time you have been watching?—No.
218. You have been watching at other times?—Yes.
219. With whom?—I was out one evening with Mr. Hoddinott.
220. Anybody else?—We saw Mr. Thompson during the evening.
221. Did you see anybody else?—No.
222. This is the only occasion on which you were out with Mr. Taylor?—Yes.
223. You meet in the Prohibitionists' rooms and arrange these little things?—I said we met at Mr. Taylor's office.
224. Now, you see the position. Cashel Street runs east and west. You were on the east of the Café. On the east side of the Café there is a right-of-way running from Colombo Street?—Yes, just so.
225. If you were near the Bank of Australasia you would be how far away?—Between 50 or 100 yards, or less than that.
226. What kind of night was it?—Moonlight.
227. Then, as I say, if they passed two men coming through the right-of-way, or if they went through the right-of-way themselves, might you not be mistaken as to whether these two men went into the hotel or not?—I was not mistaken on this occasion.
228. You say positively that you were not?—Yes.
229. Do you mean to say it was impossible for you to be mistaken?—On this occasion, yes.
230. Though you were 50 yards away and you were in the shade? You must see yourself it was possible for other men to pass them at that spot?—But I watched the two men go right along.
231. And you went there with the predetermination to convict, if you could?—No.
232. What did you go out for—not for fun?—No; but we did not go out for a conviction.
233. Did you see them come out?—Yes.
234. Where were you?—With Mr. Taylor.
235. Was any one else there besides Mr. Taylor?—In the street?
236. You say you saw a lot of people; but did you see anybody whose duty it was to see what was going on?—What do you mean?
237. Did you see Mr. Paget, the night-watchman?—Yes.
238. Where?—I think he was in High Street.
239. Where about?—I think it was near Lichfield Street. That was earlier in the evening.
240. Did you not see him in High Street?—I may have.
241. You do not remember whether you saw him in High Street, near Cashel Street, or in Cashel Street?—I do not remember.
242. What kind of man was it you saw come out in his shirt-sleeves? Would you know him again?—No.
243. Why not?—I only saw him for a moment.
244. But you saw him as closely as you saw the constables?—Oh, no.
245. You saw him come out and look about, and it was a bright moonlight night?—I did not say it was bright moonlight.
246. Do you say it was not a bright moonlight night?—No, it was not.
247. It was a dull moonlight night, then?—Yes.
248. Does it not strike you that 50 yards away it would be difficult to tell who was going in and out of the door?—Not on that occasion.
249. Your eyesight was pretty clear on that night?—We watched the men go right along.
250. And you saw no one else you knew but Paget?—We saw Detective Maddern.
251. But any one else beside Maddern and Paget?—That is all.
252. How long have you been in Christchurch?—I was born in Christchurch.
253. And, of course, you know a great many people in Christchurch?—A fairly good number.
254. And on that night how do you account for seeing so few people you know?—Perhaps it is because my friends do not keep such late hours.
255. As you do?—Quite so.

ALFRED THOMAS HODDINOTT, examined on oath.

256. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Alfred Thomas Hoddinott.
257. What are you, and where do you reside?—I am a machinist, residing in Christchurch.
258. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember being in town on the 12th August, 1897?—Yes.
259. What time did you come in?—Just before 9 o'clock.
260. Were you subsequently with Mr. Robson and myself?—I was.
261. Do you remember seeing police constables in High and Cashel Streets that night?—Yes.
262. Did you see them report themselves to the sergeant?—Yes.
263. Where were they standing afterwards?—At the corner of Cashel and High Streets, opposite the concrete tank.
264. Were they smoking?—Yes.

265. Chatting and smoking?—Yes.
266. They were in uniform.—Yes.
267. Had they overcoats on?—I would not be positive.
268. Do you remember what they did after the sergeant left them?—Yes.
269. What time would it be?—A little before 12. They walked directly to the cabstand, opposite the D.I.C., where they spoke to one or two cabmen. They waited there half a minute. They then went to the Café, and stood outside the door for a second or two, and the door was opened and they went inside.
270. Were they near enough for you to hear them make any sound on the door?—Yes.
271. Did they make a sound on the door?—Yes.
272. *The Chairman.*] Where were you standing at the time?—At Walker's, the tobacconist's. I had crossed over from Inglis's buildings.
273. *Mr. Taylor.*] It was a pretty loud sound?—Yes, quite loud enough to hear from Walker's.
274. A quiet night?—Yes.
275. Were there many people about at that time?—Not so many people as there had been previously. It was a busy night after the races.
276. Was the door closed after the men went in?—Yes.
277. What did you do then?—I went across to you, on the other side of the street. You were under the verandah of Mr. Taylor, the grocer. From there I went to the right-of-way, to the back entrance of the Café, to watch it. I remained there about five minutes, and then went back to Mr. Taylor. He suggested that I should find the sergeant, and I went to Colombo Street for him, but I did not get him there. I returned to Mr. Taylor and told him the result. From there I went to the Colombo Street corner, and from there watched the back and front entrances of the hotel.
278. How can you watch both entrances? Are both exits of the right-of-way visible from that point?—Yes.
279. You cannot see the front door from there?—No; it is let in a bit, but you can see where it is.
280. Then, what happened?—About a minute before the half-hour some one came out of the hotel in his shirt-sleeves.
281. You saw him plainly?—Yes. He was followed by the two constables. They then walked to the Grain Agency building, and I went to Mr. Taylor. The three of us then went to Walker's, the tobacconist's. One of the constables was then talking to Detective Benjamin and some one in plain clothes. I lost sight of the other constable after passing the Grain Agency building. After that we walked to the Beehive corner, and down High Street to the Bank of New Zealand. We then saw the other constable in front of the old hall. He was standing close under the building.
282. Do you know him by sight?—Yes; I know them both.
283. Did you see Sergeant Wilson after that?—We went about two shops further on than where the constable was, and then returned to Walker's and down Cashel Street. We then agreed that, as we had not seen the sergeant, we should try and meet him; and we met him in front of Sandstein, the jeweller's. We there laid the charge, and Sergeant Wilson took the names of the witnesses.
284. Sandstein's adjoins Ballantyne's?—Yes.
285. Did you come into town that night by arrangement?—Yes.
286. Was the object of your visit in town to ascertain whether there was any truth in the statements as to the police frequenting hotels?—Yes.
287. And you satisfied yourself of that?—Yes.
288. *The Chairman.*] How long were you on the watch?—From 9 o'clock, when the police came out, till half-past 12.
289. *Mr. Taylor.*] And did you see anything else to confirm you in that opinion, except in the visit of these two men?—Nothing particular—not on that night.
290. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] I understand you were at Walker's corner at the time you heard the knock on the front door of the Café?—I was.
291. That must be at least 100 yards away?—I could not say the distance.
292. You know the width of the street is a chain?—Yes.
293. And Taylor, the grocer's, is directly opposite?—Yes.
294. And you pass the Bank of Australasia, the D.I.C., and Wardell's?—Yes.
295. And several other shops?—No.
296. And then, near the corner of Walker's building, there is a draper—it used to be Barker and Tribe?—Yes.
297. It must be about 100 yards?—I do not think it is.
298. They must have knocked loud and fearlessly then?—It was a very quiet night.
299. Notwithstanding all the people about, you heard it?—There were not many people about.
300. What was the time?—The town clock struck 12 o'clock as the door opened.
301. You went there for a particular object?—Yes.
302. And you thought you had accomplished it?—I did.
303. Now, the right-of-way would be only 5 yards or less from the front entrance?—I could not say the width of the building. The door is in the centre.
304. We will take it that you were standing at the corner of Cashel and Colombo Streets, or about 100 yards away?—I would not say the distance.
305. The right-of-way is a thoroughfare from Colombo Street?—Yes, and from Cashel Street.
306. You have gone through yourself?—Yes.
307. How can you tell that the persons you saw did not come through the right-of-way?—It was such a bright night there was no mistaking it.

308. Was it a very bright night?—Yes, it was almost full moon. There was a slight shadow on the Café side of the street.

309. The moon would be shining from a northerly direction to throw the shade of the building into Cashel Street?—Yes, it was a very slight shadow.

310. How long were you away from the time that Mr. Taylor directed you to find the sergeant?—Five minutes at the outside. I ran all the way.

311. How do you know the men did not come out in the meanwhile?—I could not answer that.

THOMAS BROHAM, recalled.

312. *Mr. Taylor.*] You remember my seeing you a week or two after this affair; I was in company with Mr. Thompson?—I remember you saw me once or twice about it, I think the next morning.

313. At your office?—Yes.

314. You remember Mr. Thompson being with me on one occasion?—No.

315. *The Chairman.*] What Mr. Thompson?

316. *Mr. Taylor:* Mr Frank Thompson; he will be a witness. (To witness): Do you remember getting Detective Benjamin and Acting-detective Fitzgerald in your room to interrogate them as to whether it was at the Grain Agency corner or at Walker's corner they had spoken to the men?—Yes.

317. Prior to that, do you remember saying they denied speaking to Barrett and McKenzie?—Yes, at the Grain Agency corner. You said then, "If Detective Benjamin said so, then he is saying what is absolutely false."

318. And what did you reply?—I acquiesced in what you said; at least, I said nothing. You alleged that I said he was capable of committing perjury, and that he would swear anything, but I never said anything about any detective under my charge.

319. I took it for granted that you meant Benjamin and Fitzgerald. Did you not say, without mentioning names, "Oh, they will swear anything"?—You said I referred to Benjamin and Fitzgerald.

320. I said I understood you to refer to those two men. Did you say that they would swear anything?—I may have said that the men would say anything. I told Mr. Taylor that the constables denied having been in the hotel; and I may have said that they would say anything. That is, referring to the charge made against them.

321. Did Benjamin and Fitzgerald admit speaking to the men at Walker's corner?—I believe they were asked about the Grain Agency corner.

322. But they admitted speaking to them at Walker's corner?—They said they saw them at Walker's corner. I believe the papers in connection with the case are in Court.

323. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You produce the reports made at the time, including Sergeant Wilson's report?—Yes.

324. *The Chairman.*] What is the date of Sergeant Wilson's?—The 13th August.

The report was read by the Chairman, as follows:—

At twenty minutes past midnight this morning Detective Maddern informed me that Mr. T. E. Taylor, M.H.R., wanted to see me at once, and that he was waiting my arrival in Cashel Street. In company with Constable Cotter I proceeded to the place, and, when near Mr. Bishop's chemist shop, met Mr. Taylor and two men named Alfred Hoddinott, Railway Fire-brigade, and Fred. Robson, Montreal Street, Sydenham. Mr. Taylor stated that he and his two companions saw two constables enter the Café at midnight, and they stayed in the hotel until twenty-seven minutes past that hour. They then came out and spoke to Detective Benjamin, who was at the corner of the Grain Agency buildings. Mr. Taylor or his companions could not name the constables, but state they can identify them. I went to the Café, and after ringing the bell was admitted by Mr. Beauchamp, licensee. The bars were all in darkness, and there were only two young men, boarders, on the premises. I told Mr. Beauchamp that I was informed that two constables had been in the hotel from midnight till twenty-seven minutes past. I asked their names. Mr. Beauchamp stated that there had been no constables in his house at the time stated. He subsequently stated that there were two young men from the country who came in about midnight and claimed to be travellers, but he would not serve them. They were both very tall and, he thinks, wore overcoats. I beg to state that I saw Mr. Taylor at twenty-three minutes to 1 a.m., Mr. Beauchamp sixteen minutes to 1 a.m., and Detective Benjamin at five minutes to 1 a.m., in lower Madras Street. I also made inquiry from Constables Barrett, McKenzie, and Andrew, but they deny being in the hotel; and Detective Benjamin states that he was not at the Grain Agency corner at the time stated, and did not see or speak to Constable Barrett, who was on No. 1 beat, before 1.20 a.m.

GARRETT FITZGERALD, examined on oath.

325. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am a detective, stationed at Christchurch.

326. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember 12th August of last year—race-night?—Yes.

327. Do you remember speaking to Constable McKenzie on the crossing near Walker's, the tobacconist?—Yes.

328. Who was with you that night?—Detective Benjamin.

329. Was Constable Barrett standing there?—No, he was not.

330. Do you know where he was?—I afterwards saw him in front of Kenneth Matheson's shop.

331. That used to be Shaw, Robinson's, known as the Hall?—Yes.

332. *Colonel Pitt.*] I understood you saw McKenzie at the corner?—At the corner of Cashel and High Streets.

333. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] That would be on the junction of No. 1 and No. 3 beats—Constable Barrett's beat?—Yes.

334. Were you about there for any considerable time?—No, we were not—just came there.

335. You and Detective Benjamin?—Yes.

336. Did you see Constable Barrett and Constable McKenzie together at all?—No, I did not.

337. You were asked about this almost immediately after the alleged occurrence, were you not?—Some days afterwards we were asked something about it. I cannot say how many days afterwards.

338. By whom, do you remember?—By the Inspector.
339. Did you see Constable McKenzie at all that night?—I saw him at the corner of Cashel and High Streets.
340. That would be on his beat also?—Yes, No. 3 beat.
341. Do you remember the time at all?—It was after 12 o'clock. I should think it would be 12.15 or 12.20.
342. And what was Constable McKenzie doing, do you remember?—Simply standing at the corner.
343. Did you see him do anything after he stood at the corner?—He went away with Detective Benjamin.
344. Did you see him later?—No, I did not. I then came to the station.
345. Did he perform any duty immediately after you saw him, to your knowledge?—Well, he went away to lock up a drunken man that was lying down the street.
346. That is to say, about a quarter past 12, when you saw him, he went away for that purpose?—Yes; Detective Benjamin and myself saw this drunken man lying there.
347. Was it in consequence of what you told him in relation to some drunken man he did go away?—Yes.
348. Do you remember he was the prosecutor and witness against some drunken man next morning?—He was.
349. *Mr. Taylor.*] It was a quarter-past 12 o'clock?—As far as I remember.
350. If any other witness swore it was twenty minutes later, you would not contradict that?—No, I would not.
351. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are not absolutely sure about the time?—No, I am not. I know it was after 12 o'clock. I cannot say how much.

FRANK THOMPSON, examined on oath.

352. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—House and land agent.
353. *Mr. Taylor.*] In business in conjunction with myself?—Yes.
354. Do you remember on one occasion being in my company when I saw Inspector Broham?—On several occasions.
355. Do you remember one occasion when I made reference to certain constables having been in Arenas's hotel?—Yes.
356. Do you remember the question cropped up as to certain statements these men had made?—Yes.
357. Do you recollect my saying the men could not possibly be telling the truth?—I do not recollect you saying that.
358. Do you remember any special remark Mr. Broham made which struck you at the time?—The conversation was relating to the position of the two constables after they were supposed to have left Arenas's hotel. I think they were talking to a detective at the time, and there was some confusion as to the position they were in, and Mr. Broham said, "They will swear anything." But it subsequently transpired that the men were correct—that there had been a misunderstanding as to the position.
359. Whether it was the Grain Agency corner or Walker's corner?—Yes.
360. They had denied being at the Grain Agency corner?—Yes.
361. *Colonel Pitt.*] It transpired that the constables were correct as to where they had been?—Yes.
362. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Have you any clear recollection yourself as to what took place between Mr. Taylor, Mr. Broham, and yourself?—I have a fairly clear recollection of the conversation.
363. "Fairly clear," what do you mean?—Well, I recollect the remark distinctly which I have already mentioned, because it struck me at once as being a peculiar admission for an Inspector of Police to make as to his men.
364. It would strike you that it was rather an admission, indicating mental weakness?—On the part of whom?
365. On the part of the Inspector?—No.
366. Iniquity, I suppose, then?—It struck me his opinion of the men under him was not very high.
367. And yet he was unwilling to do anything to displace them—that would strike you also, I suppose?—I do not know that he expressed any unwillingness: there was no definite charge at that time.
368. What date was it you went to see him?—I do not recollect the date.
369. Were you not in partnership then with Mr. Taylor?—If I was not in partnership with him I was working at his office.
370. You were thinking of the partnership?—No, I was not.
371. Try and be a little more particular, and give us in the first person the detailed account of the conversation?—I think the first part of the conversation was relative to "tote-shops," and then the other question cropped up subsequent to that.
372. It was "tote-shops" you were after, then?—That was one of the objects of the visit.
373. Tell us then, particularly, in the first person, what the conversation was: in this way, who said one thing, and who said another?—I cannot recollect the details of the conversation to that extent. I did not anticipate it was ever coming up again, or else I might have taken full notes.
374. You did not attach very much importance to it?—Except as to that particular statement of the Inspector.
375. Have you had any conversation with Mr. Taylor about it since?—Yes, I have.
376. More than once?—Yes.

377. Of course, Mr. Taylor's statement is the same as yours?—I do not know what his statement is.

378. You do not know what he said?—I was not in the Court-room when he gave his evidence.

379. Have you not been in here all the morning?—I came in while Mr. Robson was giving his evidence, and Mr. Taylor beckoned me up. I did not know I was wanted in this case.

380. In the course of further conversation with Mr. Taylor, you say he never stated to you that Inspector Broham said, "Oh, they will swear anything." Mr. Taylor never said that to you?—Never repeated the statement?

381. Yes?—He did. When we came out of the Inspector's room he referred to the statement.

382. Not since?—Not to the particular statement—to the incident.

383. Tell us the conversation. What led to it? Try and tell us particularly, in the first person?—I cannot swear to a statement in the first person. The general impression of the conversation I recollect distinctly, and I recollect the statement of Mr. Broham.

384. Was it, then, from your general impression of the conversation that you arrived at the conclusion that the Inspector thought the men would swear anything?—I recollect almost his exact words.

385. Then you mean deliberately to say the Inspector said that; and when he denies it he is committing perjury?—I say distinctly that he said it.

386. Do you remember the men about whom he said this?—No. I did not know the names of the men then. The Inspector asked Mr. Taylor to mention the names, and Mr. Taylor said that the sergeant in charge of the relief must be perfectly aware of the names of his men, and at that stage he declined to make prosecution of the men. It was not individual members of the Force he was aiming at.

387. You are quite sure, if the Inspector made use of such a phrase, he did not refer to Mr. Taylor or yourself?—No, he referred distinctly to the policemen.

388. Any two policemen whom Mr. Taylor might mention—there was no names mentioned, and, as far as the Inspector knew, he did not know what men he was speaking about?—No. We were referring to the two men who were supposed to have come out of Arenas's hotel.

389. But the Inspector did not know what men you were referring to, because Mr. Taylor refused to let him know who the men were?—But the Inspector knew, I think, from the report of his men as to that night. He evidently had had conversation with both the detective and the two men.

390. So far as you know now—you know, in fact, Mr. Taylor refused to tell the Inspector the men whom he was talking about?—He did at that time.

391. And Inspector Broham asked him, otherwise Mr. Taylor's refusal would not have come out, would it?—I think he had asked him.

392. Did that not imply, to your mind, the notion that Inspector Broham did not know what two men Mr. Taylor was talking about?—No. The impression on my mind was that Inspector Broham wanted Mr. Taylor to father the charge against the two men, instead of the department taking it up.

393. Instead of the department at large, I suppose?—Instead of the Police Department, and the authorities. Mr. Taylor would not father the charge at that time. He said he was not proving charges against individual members of the Force at that time. He said the sergeant must have known perfectly well who the men were.

394. Mr. Broham asked who the men were; Mr. Taylor refused to tell him; and then you tell us that the Inspector asserted that they—whatever two men it might be—would swear anything?—The two men whom the Inspector and Mr. Taylor were talking about.

395. You have already told us that Mr. Broham asked who they were, and Mr. Taylor refused to tell him: was that a false suggestion on Mr. Broham's part, that he did not know what men they were talking about?—I repeat that they were talking about the two men that were supposed to have come out of Arenas's Hotel.

396. Was it they, then, who would swear anything?—The two men who were supposed to have come out of the hotel, and the detective at the corner.

397. Then, the whole lot would swear to anything?—According to Mr. Broham, they would.

398. Are you a Prohibitionist?—Certainly I am.

399. Do you meet at Mr. Taylor's office at midnight?—When?

400. On any occasion—to see what you can find out?—I was not out with him on the occasion that is at present being investigated.

401. Have you been out on other occasions?—Yes, I have.

402. How many times?—Once.

403. What night was that?—It was subsequent to that. I do not know what night it was.

404. Where did you meet—at the office?—No, we did not meet at the office.

405. At midnight?—No, it was not at midnight.

THOMAS BARRETT, examined on oath.

406. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.

407. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] How long have you been at Christchurch?—A little over seven years.

408. Do you know Mr. Taylor?—Yes, I know him very well by sight.

409. How long have you known him?—These last five years.

410. Do you remember the night of the 12th August last?—Yes.

411. Did anything happen to draw your attention to it particularly?—Yes. A report that Sergeant Wilson gave to me. He asked me if I had visited any of the hotels that evening, or had gone into any of the hotels.

412. Do you remember what time that would be about?—About twenty minutes past 1 o'clock.
413. Had you been in a hotel?—No. I replied to him that I had not.
414. You say, as a matter of fact, you had not been in a hotel?—I had not been in the Café.
415. Were you in Constable McKenzie's company?—No, not that evening.
416. Did you see Constable McKenzie anywhere that night, and if so, when?—I saw Constable McKenzie at 1 o'clock, in High Street. He was then in company with Detective Benjamin.
417. And did you see what he was doing?—Yes, they were arresting a man for drunkenness.
418. *The Chairman.*] Was that the first occasion you had seen McKenzie that night?—That was the first occasion.
419. You are quite clear about that?—Yes.
420. From the time you went on duty?—From the time I went on duty.
421. *Colonel Pitt.*] You saw him when you went on duty at 9 o'clock?—Yes, we marched out together.
422. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see nightwatchman Paget that night?—Yes.
423. Where?—In High Street. It would be about midnight the first time I saw him.
424. Whereabouts in High Street?—Near the Hereford Hotel corner.
425. What is your beat? What was your beat that night?—No. 1 beat.
426. What is the extent of it?—It starts from the Cathedral, along Colombo Street to Cashel Street, along Cashel Street to High Street, and then up High Street to the starting-point—the Cathedral.
427. When you came on that night, which street did you come down?—Colombo Street.
428. Then you went up Cashel Street, to what corner?—High Street and Cashel Street corner.
429. What constable were you talking to at High Street corner?—I did not meet any constable that night.
430. Did not meet any constable at all?—No.
431. Did you come from the Armed Constabulary into the Police Force?—Yes.
432. *The Chairman.*] You say you did not meet any constable at High Street corner?—No, I met no constable that evening.
433. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you say what time it was when the "drunk" was being arrested?—Close on 1 o'clock.
434. Do you know the time nearer than that at all?—Not within half-an-hour—between 12 and 1 o'clock. It might be nearer 1 o'clock—probably was nearer.

DONALD MCKENZIE, examined on oath.

435. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.
436. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] How long have you been in Christchurch?—About fifteen or sixteen months.
437. Did you go, as is alleged, into the Café with Barrett on the night of the 12th August last?—No, I did not.
438. Do you remember the date?—Yes, I remember the date referred to.
439. Did anything occur to draw your attention to it?—Early the following morning, or the following night, Sergeant Wilson mentioned the matter to me—about Mr. Taylor's report.
440. So that your attention was particularly drawn to what occurred that night?—Yes.
441. Had you been in company with Constable Barrett?—No.
442. *The Chairman.*] Not during the night?—Not during the night. I remember seeing Constable Barrett going along his beat about 11 o'clock.
443. Where?—In High Street, going along towards the Cathedral.
444. Where were you then?—I was at the corner of Cashel and High Streets.
445. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] On your beat?—Yes.
446. And he was on his?—Yes.
447. Were you wearing overcoats, do you remember?—Yes.
448. Both of you?—Yes.
449. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember speaking to Detective Benjamin that night?—Yes.
450. What time would that be?—It would be after 12 o'clock—about a quarter past 12, I reckon.
451. Where did you report yourself to Sergeant Wilson that night?—I do not remember where it was. I remember where I reported to him once.
452. At midnight?—I think it was on High Street, near Tuam Street.
453. Will you be certain of that?—No, I will not be certain.
- 453A. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you know the time?—It must have been twenty minutes to 1 o'clock. Judging from the time I was at the police-station afterwards, it must have been twenty minutes to 1, or half-past 12.
454. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where was Barrett standing when you saw him about 11 o'clock?—He was not standing at all.
455. Where was he?—He was walking along near the hall.
456. Where were you?—I was at the corner of Walker's, the tobacconist.
457. And you saw him near the hall: how far is the hall away?—I could not say exactly; it would be about 80 yards.
458. Will you swear that the hall is not 120 yards away from Walker's corner?—I will swear nothing of the sort. I never measured it.
459. You saw him about 11 o'clock?—I do not know what hour it was. I do not remember.
460. Do you not remember it was race-night?—No; not particularly.
461. Would there be many people about at 11 o'clock?—Not on an ordinary night.
462. On that particular night were there many people?—I could not say. I do not recollect.

463. Do you not remember the night, seeing your attention was called to it afterwards?—Yes; but as to the number of people I do not remember.

464. Could you distinguish Barrett from Walker's corner as far away as the hall?—I could not distinguish Barrett, but I could see it was a policeman.

465. Do you think you would be able to distinguish a policeman at the entrance to Arenas's hotel if you were under the verandah opposite?—Yes, I might.

466. Where were you when Benjamin spoke to you that night?—At the corner at Cashel Street.

467. Were you on the footpath or the road?—I cannot say exactly whether I was on the footpath or the road to an inch. I was about that corner.

468. What did he say to you?—He told me there was a drunken man lying in Tuam Street.

469. Did you go and arrest him?—Yes.

470. Would that be about twenty-five minutes to 1?—It would be hardly that time, because when I got to the police-station it would be about 1 o'clock.

471. What part of Tuam Street was the man in?—Between High Street and Manchester Street.

472. Did you walk him up, or take him in a cab?—I walked him up.

473. It would take a quarter of an hour, perhaps?—It would take more than that with a drunken man.

474. Twenty minutes?—More than that.

475. Would that make up the time between twenty minutes and half-past 12, when you were speaking to Benjamin?—Well, going down there would take ten minutes or a quarter of an hour.

476. *Colonel Pitt.*] Does the watch-house book show that the man was arrested at 1 a.m.?—Yes.

477. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you happen to be standing at that corner when these two men, Benjamin and Fitzgerald, came up?—Yes, I was standing there about a minute or two before they came up.

478. What direction did you come from?—Up High Street.

479. How many minutes would it take you to walk from there to where this drunken man was?—Between five and ten minutes.

480. From Walker's corner to Tuam Street?—Yes.

481. How long would it take you to walk to the station from the corner—ordinary walking—five minutes?—No, about ten minutes.

482. Is that point half-way to the station?—More than that.

483. How much more?—I did not measure it.

484. Is it five yards more?—More than that.

485. Do you say that you could not go from Walker's corner and pick that man up and put him into the lockup within half an hour?—No, I could not, the state that man was in that night.

486. Did you have any assistance?—Yes, part of the way.

487. Who helped you?—Detective Benjamin helped me part of the way.

488. *Colonel Pitt.*] What does the time entered in the lockup book refer to?—The time when the man was locked up.

489. Does that refer to the time he gets to the station, or the time you arrested him in the street?—The time he is brought to the station.

490. Do you smoke?—Yes.

491. Does Barrett?—Yes, I think he does.

492. *The Chairman.*] Do you smoke on beat occasionally?—I do, late at night.

493. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know of a list having been sent round to defray the expenses of this defence?—The first I have heard of it.

494. Has a list gone round the barracks?—No, not to my knowledge.

495. Never been presented to any of the men?—No, not that I know of.

496. If any constable says a list has been presented to him to defray the expenses of this defence, is he stating what is untrue?—I do not know.

497. *The Chairman.*] It has not been presented to you?—Never been presented to me.

CLAUDE ALFRED MANNING, examined on oath.

498. *The Chairman.*] What are you, and where do you live?—My address is Opawa; I am an assistant barman.

499. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] In August last you were, I think, assistant barman at the Café?—Yes.

500. Do you know the two constables, Barrett and McKenzie?—Yes.

501. Did anything occur to draw your attention particularly to the night of 12th August? Do you remember inquiries being made about constables being in the house that night?—Yes.

502. Did any one see you about it?—No.

503. But you heard of the inquiries?—Yes.

504. It has been said that Constables Barrett and McKenzie were in the hotel about midnight on the 12th August. Is that true?—No, not to my knowledge.

505. *The Chairman.*] Were you about the house that night?—Yes, I was on duty that night.

506. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] What was your duty, after 11 o'clock, we will say?—My duty after 11 o'clock was to see that all boarders were in. Those who were out I was to wait up for them.

507. And at what door did you admit them?—The front door always.

508. Did you admit Barrett or McKenzie, or both, that night?—No, I did not.

509. Do you remember any people coming in after 11 o'clock, or about 12?—Yes, I do. There were two gentlemen came in—came to the door rather.

510. *The Chairman.*] What time?—I cannot exactly say the time. It was a little after 12 o'clock.

511. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are quite clear they were not Barrett and McKenzie?—Oh yes, I can swear that.

512. *The Chairman.*] Did you say the two men came into the house?—They rang the bell. I went to the door, and Mr. Beauchamp admitted them.

513. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long after 12 was it when these two men came in?—It was a little after 12 o'clock when they came in.

514. Did you not say just now they came to the door?—Yes.

515. Do you intend, then, to say they came in further?—Yes, they were admitted, but not by me.

516. Where does that bell go to from the front door?—It goes nowhere: just above the door.

517. Where were you when you heard it?—In the hall.

518. Do you stay in the hall?—Yes.

519. Until what time in the morning?—Until such time as all boarders are in the hotel.

520. What time do you start in the morning?—Half-past 6.

521. And what time do you finish?—According to what time they are all in.

522. On the average, what time do you finish?—Sometimes at a quarter-past 11, and at other times it is 3 o'clock. There is no night porter.

523. Were you there long?—I was there nine months.

524. Are you there now?—No; I left.

525. When did you leave?—New Year's morning.

526. Where was Mr. Beauchamp that night?—He was in the office.

527. Anybody else in the house?—At that time they were all in bed.

528. No one up except yourself and Mr. Beauchamp?—No.

529. What time was it?—A little after 12 o'clock.

530. Would it be half-past 12?—I would not swear to it. I would not swear to a few minutes.

531. Were you in and out of the house that night?—No.

532. For no purpose?—No.

533. You had your coat on?—Yes.

534. Did Mr. Beauchamp have his on?—Well, I could not say whether he had his coat on or not.

535. Will you swear that Mr. Beauchamp was not in his shirt-sleeves?—No, I will not.

536. What became of these two men when they came in: where did they go to?—They went nowhere. They were simply admitted by the door, and they stayed for about three or four minutes, I suppose, and then they went out again. They were in company with another gentleman at the time. When they came to the door the bell was rung. I answered the door. There were three of them. One gentleman said, "I have brought these two; they want beds." With that I called Mr. Beauchamp. He admitted the two gentlemen. Mr. Beauchamp sent me upstairs to see if there were any vacant rooms, as two beds were required. I came down, and said there were no spare rooms at all, and they went out again.

537. How do you know it was after 12 o'clock?—I heard the clock strike myself. I am generally watching the time.

538. Before or after these men came in?—Before the men came in.

539. You are sure it was not 11 o'clock?—I ought to know, when I shut the hotel myself.

540. When did you first hear of this question of Barrett and McKenzie?—The same night.

541. Who from?—Mr. Beauchamp.

542. Where?—At the Café.

543. Had you been to bed?—No, I had not been to bed.

544. Do you know it is contrary to the regulations for policemen on duty to go into hotels except in the execution of their duty?—Yes.

545. Supposing they had been there, would you be reluctant to state the fact?—Well, if they had been there, of course, it would be my place to say so.

546. Were you there when Sergeant Wilson called?—No, I was upstairs taking the numbers of the rooms.

547. What time would that be?—Well, it was about a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes after these gentlemen went out. It would be about twenty minutes. I would say about a quarter to 1 o'clock.

548. Do you think it would be about 1 o'clock when you were taking these numbers?—No, it would be about a quarter to 1, as far as I can remember.

549. Did you see Sergeant Wilson there?—No, I did not.

550. How long after he came was it, do you think, before you saw Mr. Beauchamp?—They had not gone above three or four minutes when I came downstairs. Mr. Beauchamp spoke to me then.

551. He told you that the sergeant had been in inquiring about two constables that were supposed to have frequented the house?—Yes.

552. You always admit lodgers by the front door?—Yes.

553. Admit anybody by the back door?—Never.

554. No one ever comes in by the back door?—Never. There is no back entrance at all.

555. *The Chairman.*] Is there a side entrance?—Yes.

556. Is that in use?—No; it is locked up at five minutes to 11.

557. And it is not used during the night?—Never. All boarders come in by the front door. I may say I left Mr. Beauchamp with the two gentlemen. He spoke to them for one or two minutes, informed them there were no rooms, and he opened the door and let them out.

558. What became of you then?—I was in the passage-way.

559. Where were you when the sergeant called?—Upstairs.

560. How did you come to go upstairs?—I was round taking the numbers of the rooms.

561. *Mr. Taylor.*] What does that consist of?—It consists of this: there is no night porter in the house, and before we can retire to bed, we have to see what boarders are in and what are out. The only way we can find out whether the boarders are in or not is by trying the doors.

562. What was the result of your visit that night?—There was one out—No. 29.

563. Was every room in the house occupied that night?—There was a large double room.

564. You did not offer that to these gentlemen?—No. They wanted single rooms.

565. Did you stop up for that one boarder?—Later on we went to bed. He rung the bell at a quarter-past 2, and Mr. Beauchamp got up and let him in.

566. You do not always stop up?—Yes, always.

567. How was it you did not stop up on that occasion?—One of us stops up.

GEORGE BEAUCHAMP, examined on oath.

568. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] What is your occupation?—Manager of the Café, Christchurch.

569. Are you now manager of it?—Yes, now. I was licensed at the time of this complaint.

570. You were manager last August?—Yes.

571. Do you remember the night of the 12th of August?—I do.

572. I think your attention was particularly drawn to that night because of the inquiries of Sergeant Wilson?—That is so.

573. Do you know the two constables, Barrett and McKenzie?—I do.

574. Were they in the hotel that night?—They were not.

575. Did any two men come to the hotel on or about the time it is alleged these constables came?—What time would that be?

576. Did any two men come to the house about midnight?—Yes, a little after midnight, I think.

577. What kind of men were they?—They were tall, stalwart men—tall in appearance, rather stoutish. They were men of bigger stature than myself.

578. How were they dressed, do you remember?—There was one of them, as far as I remember, dressed in an overcoat. I could not say whether they were both dressed so, but one, I noticed, had an overcoat.

579. What did they come for?—Accommodation for the night. They came from Mr. Warne's, fishmonger, by whom they were introduced.

580. *The Chairman.*] Did Warne accompany them?—Yes, he rang the bell.

581. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Did they get any accommodation at the hotel?—No.

582. How long, do you remember, did they remain?—Well, I had to ask them inside until I ascertained whether there were any vacant rooms or not.

583. You found there were none?—I found there were none, and I told them I could not accommodate them. I suppose the time would be about ten minutes or a quarter of an hour.

584. During which they were there?—Yes; they were inside in the hall of the house that time, with closed doors.

585. Of course, you know these two constables, Barrett and McKenzie, very well, do you not?—Well, I cannot say I know them very well; I know them personally.

586. But I mean, as constables on their beats?—Oh, yes.

587. There can be no mistake in your mind as to whether they were there or not?—There is not the slightest mistake.

588. They were not there?—They were not there.

589. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were all your rooms full that night?—Yes, they were.

590. All of them?—All of them.

591. With no exception?—No exception whatever.

592. *The Chairman.*] Is that a fact within your own knowledge—that all the rooms were occupied?—Quite so.

593. You examined them?—Oh, yes; they were examined that night before retiring.

594. By yourself on that occasion?—By myself, also my assistant.

595. Are you swearing it as a matter within your own knowledge, or was it received only from your assistant?—From my assistant in the first case; from my own afterwards.

596. He has told us there was a double-bedded room not occupied?—I think not, because all the rooms are numbered before we retire. There was no room vacant to my knowledge. Had there been any rooms vacant these gentlemen would have got them.

597. *Colonel Pitt.*] Suppose they wanted separate rooms?—If they wanted separate rooms they could not possibly have got them.

598. *The Chairman.*] Can you say if there was any conversation as to this being the class of room they wanted?—I could not say.

599. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you say whether a double room was offered to them or not?—I could not say that.

600. How many double-bedded rooms have you?—Six.

601. *The Chairman.*] So far as you know, there was no unoccupied room?—No unoccupied room in the house.

602. And you have no knowledge of a double-bedded room being offered to these men?—No, Sir.

CLAUDE ALFRED MANNING, further examined on oath.

603. *The Chairman.*] You told us, Manning, that one of these double-bedded rooms was unoccupied?—Yes.

604. And you have said, further, that these visitors desired single-bedded rooms?—Yes.

605. Did you yourself hear any conversation on this subject?—I told them myself that there was a double-bedded room, I think. I could not swear to that. I said to Mr. Beauchamp, "There

is a double room ; I opened the door." He said, "I do not think so." "Well," I said, "I opened the door. There is no one in it." Doors are generally locked.

HENRY PAGET, examined on oath.

606. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] What are you?—I am a nightwatchman in Christchurch.
607. And have been?—For five years nearly.
608. Do you remember the night of the 12th August last?—I cannot remember the date.
609. Do you remember a race-night—I suppose it would be the Grand National meeting?—I remember the incident of this inquiry.
610. Do you remember some complaint against the two constables, Barrett and McKenzie?—Yes.
611. Did you see Mr. Taylor that night?—I did not.
612. Were you in Cashel Street?—I was, at various places.
613. *The Chairman.*] Is the night clear in your memory?—Yes.
614. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Were you anywhere near the Café about 12 o'clock?—A few minutes past 12. At five or ten minutes past 12 o'clock I was at the boot-shop corner at the intersection of Cashel and Colombo Streets.
615. And were you there for any length of time?—Two or three minutes, perhaps.
616. Did you see any persons going into the Café?—No, not until some time afterwards I saw Sergeant Wilson going there.
617. Did you pass along opposite the Café, past Taylor's, the grocer?—Not on that side.
618. Were you on the Café side then?—Yes.
619. Did you see anybody at Taylor's, the grocer?—I have no recollection of it.
620. Were there many men about?—No. For race-night, or anything like that, it was a remarkably quiet night.
621. Can you say how long, with some degree of accuracy, you were within view, say, of the front door of the Café?—Oh, perhaps only a few minutes. I went round the Triangle.
622. Do you remember where you saw Barrett that night?—I saw him just about 12 o'clock. It would be about two or three minutes of 12. I could not say whether it was before or after the clock struck.
623. Do you remember where he was?—He was then standing immediately opposite the Hereford. I met him just by Kenneth Matheson's. That would be a quarter of an hour afterwards.
624. In High Street?—Yes; immediately at the back of the Triangle.
625. That would be on his beat in the ordinary way?—Yes.
626. Did you see Constable McKenzie arrest a man?—Oh, some time previous to that he took in a prisoner.
627. *The Chairman.*] Previous to you seeing Barrett at the Hereford?—Yes, Sir; it would be a good bit before that, because I saw him coming out again.
628. Was Detective Benjamin with McKenzie when you saw him?—No; he was by himself when I saw him returning after taking the prisoner. That was some time previous—an hour, I should think.
629. Prior to you seeing Barrett at the Hereford?—Yes.
630. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Who did you see first—Barrett at the Hereford corner, or McKenzie returning from having taken a prisoner to the lockup?—I saw Constable McKenzie returning to his beat some time previous to Constable Barrett being at the Hereford corner.
631. Do you know whether Constable McKenzie arrested more than one man that night?—Oh, yes; I saw him taking in some one some time after that—perhaps, two hours: it may have been an hour afterwards.
632. You kept no record of the times?—No.
633. What you do say, then, is that for a very considerable time during that night and early in the morning you saw both constables in the ordinary way, and doing their duty?—Yes. I next saw Constable McKenzie at the top of his beat. I was very near the bank. That would be just previous to my seeing Constable Barrett in High Street, the second time.
634. Were any inquiries made of you soon after?—Yes; by Sergeant Wilson.
635. You told Sergeant Wilson what you have told us here to-day?—Yes, something similar. He asked me more questions.
636. *The Chairman.*] You say you saw Constable McKenzie on two occasions, going to or returning from the lockup?—No, Sir. I saw him returning from taking a prisoner, and the next time he was taking some one in.
637. Was he alone on the second occasion?—No, there was some one with him.
638. It appears by the records that he locked up a woman at half-past 10, and a man at 1 o'clock?—Yes, that would be about the time.
639. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember where you were when the clock struck 12 that night?—As near as I can say, immediately opposite Mr. Gunderson's. I was going up High Street when I saw Barrett at the Hereford corner.
640. If any person was at the front door of Arenas's hotel could you see them?—Oh, no.
641. Do you remember where you were at twenty-nine minutes past 12?—I was standing close on the half-hour near the bank—Wardell's right-of-way.
642. Exactly on the half-hour where were you?—I could not say precisely. I did not take the time.
643. Might you not, within three or four minutes of the half-hour, have been round the corner at the White Hart?—Oh, no, because Sergeant Wilson asked me the question.
644. What time did you see Sergeant Wilson?—I saw him come down and go into the hotel.

645. How long were they there?—Not many minutes—three or four minutes. I saw some men some time previous to that.
646. At half-past 12 exactly, can you swear where you were standing?—Not to a minute or two.
647. How long would it take you to get round the corner to the White Hart?—I did not go round the corner. I went across to the big lamp.
648. How long would it take you to get to the big lamp?—Well, it is only about 66 ft.
649. Would you get there at an ordinary pace in one minute?—Oh, yes.
650. Could you remember to the minute, when Sergeant Wilson asked you, where you were the hour before?—I go by the time it would take me to go to the various places.
651. Could you remember exactly where you would be at any minute during the hour previous to Sergeant Wilson speaking to you?—I did not take the time. I could not swear to positive time, within a minute or two.
652. How long would it take any one to walk from Arenas's to Walker's corner?—If it would take me a minute to walk to the big lamp, it would take me three or four to walk the other distance. If I was walking on business I could walk it in a minute and a half.
653. Is it not possible for a person to have come out of the front door of Arenas's and gone as far as Walker's corner about midnight, without you having seen it?—They may have done, but not at the time specified. I may state, I saw Detective Maddern hurrying down Cashel Street, and looking back, and I thought there was something on, and I hung about there.
654. Where were you?—At the boot-shop corner.
655. Where was he at the time?—He passed the A 1 Hotel and along by Lonargan's.
656. You could see him all that distance?—Oh, yes; the moonlight was on that side of the street.
657. How far is it from the A 1 to the boot-shop corner?—The width of the street, a chain.
658. Where did you come from at that particular moment?—I came from High Street.
659. Did you see any one between the A 1 and the Bank of Australasia?—I did not. I do not remember.
660. A good many things might happen between 12 and 1 o'clock that you would have no cognisance of at all?—Oh, yes.
661. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you pass the Bank of Australasia that evening on the footway?—No, I stood there.
662. Which way did you go after?—I went across to the big lamp. I saw two men come from the Café, and I crossed to see who they were.
663. If you were standing opposite the Bank of Australasia, could there be any one on the footpath within 20 yards each side of you without your seeing them?—Oh, in the doorway, or anything like that.
664. *The Chairman.*] Did you know these men?—I did not know them.
665. Were they constables?—No. I thought they were at first.
666. *Colonel Pitt.*] What made you think that?—They had big black coats on, but I found they were wearing waterproofs, if I remember aright.
667. *The Chairman.*] Will you swear they were not constables?—Oh, yes. I was as close to them as I am to you when they passed me.
668. And about what time was this?—It must have been close on the half-hour, I think—about twenty minutes past 12.
669. *Mr Taylor.*] What time would that be?—It must have been well on for the half-hour.
670. Was it a fine night?—A beautiful night.
671. Had it been raining?—I do not think so. It was a beautiful night. The shadow was on that side of the street, and the moon shone very brightly on the other side. I think it was just about its height, as far as I can say.
672. Are you an ex-policeman?—I am.
673. When did you leave the Force?—I cannot remember just now.
674. Was in the New Zealand Force?—Yes.
675. Did you resign?—I did.
676. *The Chairman.*] Are you a constable now?—No, Sir.
677. *Mr Taylor.*] Had these men shakos on?—No.
678. *The Chairman.*] How long since you left the Force?—It must be sixteen years; I could not say precisely.
679. *Mr Taylor.*] Will you swear they were waterproofs these men were wearing?—They wore dark coats. I believe they were waterproofs.
680. Were they cape coats?—Yes.
681. Did you see any other men with cape coats on?—Yes, plenty of them; I had one on myself.
682. Did you see any other men with them on?—I could not say; I cannot say from memory.
683. Try and think?—It was simply through Detective Maddern's actions, and seeing Sergeant Wilson going there, I wondered what was going on. Detective Maddern was walking very quickly and looking back, and that is what led me to go along there.
684. *Colonel Pitt.*] After 12 o'clock that night did you patrol the footpath, on the side on which the Bank of Australasia is, from corner to corner?—Not from the A 1 to the bank. I went along Arenas's side, and I crossed over to the bank, and stood there.
685. When you were walking down on Arenas's side from corner to corner did you see any one on the other side of the road?—I did not notice any one in particular.
686. Did you notice any one by the boot-shop?—No; I had just left there.
687. Did you notice any one standing there between 12 and half-past 12?—No. There was some man standing at the other corner. I have no recollection of seeing any one there.

688. Could he be there without your seeing him?—I may not have noticed him. I would not swear there was not a man standing there, but I did not notice any one.

689. *The Chairman.*] Where did you cross when you met these two men whom you assumed to be constables?—From the bank, or Wardell's right-of-way, to the big lamp.

MAJOR CUNINGHAM, examined on oath.

690. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are a life-insurance agent, and reside, and have for many years resided, in Christchurch?—Yes, I have resided here for forty-two years.

691. Do you know the two constables, Barrett and McKenzie?—Yes, I know them.

692. What can you say as to their general reputation for sobriety and steadiness?—I look upon them as two very excellent constables—men of the first water, I should say, in their particular line of business. I am not intimately connected with them, mind you.

693. Do your observations lead you to that conclusion?—Certainly, beyond a doubt.

694. *The Chairman.*] What opportunities have you of knowing?—My business leads me into the street. I am always in the street. I have little official work to do beyond canvassing, and I am continually running against constables; and not only that, I have insured a great many of their lives for the Government. I know them all fairly well, but I am not on intimate terms with them.

WILLIAM ROBINSON, examined on oath.

695. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are a business-man in town; you have a shop in High Street: what is your business?—Boot and shoe shop.

696. You know Constables Barrett and McKenzie?—Yes.

697. How long have you known them?—I have known Barrett between five and six years, and the other constable about twelve months.

698. I think where your shop is you have a very good opportunity of observing the movements and doings of constables?—Yes, I have seen every constable for the last fourteen years passing my shop-door.

699. What can you say as to their character: you heard what the last witness said? Can you support what he says?—Well, I have known Barrett intimately, passing by the shop every day when he has been on the beat, and for my part I think he is one of the best there is in the Force for sobriety, steadiness, and straightforwardness, and I think the same of the other gentleman. I have never seen them the worse for liquor, or anything indicating that they took intoxicating liquors. I have always seen them obliging in every way to the people passing by the shop. They are never offensive to any one to my knowledge, and I think the two men are a credit to the Police Force in Christchurch—and I have the opportunity of seeing these policemen as much as any tradesman in the city, and that is my opinion of the gentlemen in question.

GEORGE BEAUCHAMP, further examined on oath.

700. *The Chairman.*] In the report furnished by Sergeant Wilson, he says: "Mr. Beauchamp stated that there had been no constables in his house at the time stated. He subsequently said that there were two young men from the country who came in about midnight, and claimed to be travellers, but he would not serve them. They were both very tall, and, he thinks, wore overcoats." Is that a correct report of what you said to Sergeant Wilson?—Well, possibly it may have been. I could not remember so far back as to the actual words—about being young men from the country.

701. But here you appear to have stated that these young men from the country represented themselves as travellers, and that you would not serve them. Now, you say, they were men introduced to you by Mr. Warne?—That is correct.

702. And you could not give them beds?—They did not ask for anything to drink.

703. How do you reconcile your present statement with this?—I would not be responsible for the sergeant's report.

704. *Colonel Pitt.*] That is a note the sergeant made at the time, when it would be fresh in his memory?—Quite so. I would not swear as to the words being used by myself.

705. *The Chairman.*] You have an opportunity now of corroborating your statement by calling Mr. Warne, who, you say, introduced these young men?—I do not think he has been subpoenaed on the case at all.

706. Where is he?—He lives at Sumner. He has sold out of his business. My assistant could prove Mr. Warne rang the bell and introduced these gentlemen.

STEPHEN MAITLAND KELSO, examined on oath.

707. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Second-class mounted constable, stationed at Christchurch.

708. When did you join the Force?—I joined in July, 1881.

709. When did you get your first promotion?—I was not promoted to second class until March or April, 1892.

710. Where were you stationed when you first joined?—In Wellington.

711. Then?—Then at Hokitika, Greymouth, Westport, Reefton, Wellington again, and Christchurch.

712. How long have you been at Christchurch?—I have been at Christchurch seven years and six months.

713. You say in your letter to the Commission that seventeen constables, your juniors, were promoted from second-class to first-class in February, 1897, and February, 1898?—Yes.

714. And you ask for reasons for these men being promoted over your head?—Yes.

715. Did the reasons not appear in the *Gazette*?—None of the promotions appeared in the *Gazette*, with the exception of one man, Patrick Joyce, who was promoted on the 6th August, 1885, for extinguishing a fire. That is the only one that is gazetted. He is a junior to me.

716. Have you your defaulter's sheet here?—No. There is only one fine of 5s. against me.

717. *Colonel Pitt.*] How long ago?—About fifteen or sixteen years ago.

718. *The Chairman.*] Anything on your merit-sheet?—Yes. It is as follows: "18th June, 1890: Awarded £2, in recognition of services in connection with the prosecution of John Sterling, fined £20 and costs for sly-grog selling; and of John Smith, fined £2 and costs, and the forfeiture of three casks of beer, for keeping liquors for sale on unlicensed premises. Smith was also fined £10 and costs for withdrawing beer from a cask without destroying the duty stamp. 16th July, 1890: Award £1 10s., in recognition of services in connection with the prosecution of John Smith, convicted for a breach of 'The Beer Duty Act, 1886.' 11th February, 1891: Awarded £3 in recognition of sagacity and exertions in obtaining convictions for sly-grog selling at Reefton. 20th May, 1891: Awarded £1, in *re* conviction of Ellen Harding for sly-grog selling. 29th July, 1891: Awarded £4, for arresting a deserter from Her Majesty's ship "Curaçoa." Awarded long-service medal for good conduct in July, 1895." I would like to mention that I have been recommended for promotion on three different occasions: On the 26th August, 1884, by Inspector Emerson; on the 20th November, 1886, by Inspector Emerson; and on the 15th October, 1890, by Inspector Goodall. I will read what the Inspector wrote on that occasion: "In accordance with your verbal promise of to-day, I beg leave to submit this application and to recommend it to your most favourable consideration, the constable being a thoroughly good, energetic, and intelligent man, and well deserving of promotion." That was on the 16th October, 1890.

719. *Colonel Pitt.*] How do you explain these promotions never being gazetted?—The promotion from third to second class was never gazetted. The only promotion that has been gazetted was second to first.

720. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You admit now, do you, that the promotions I made were gazetted?—Certainly—the ones made in February of this year.

721. And you think you were passed over by a certain number of the men then promoted from second to first class?—Yes; there were twenty-five second-class constables promoted then to first-class, and out of those twenty-five fifteen were junior to me.

722. You were advanced from third to second class on the 15th March, 1892, were you not?—Yes.

723. Are you aware that the junior man in the second class who was promoted on the date your name was advanced from third to second class on the 1st September, 1886?—I believe that is so. I believe they had been longer second-class than I have.

724. The difference between 1st September, 1886, and 15th March, 1892, is six years, is it not?—Yes.

725. As a matter of fact, then, the junior of those men that were promoted this year was six years in that second class before you were?—Yes, I believe that is so.

726. And yet you think you were passed over?—Yes.

727. If a passing-over took place, it took place in the promotion from third to second class, not from second to first?—That is so.

728. *Colonel Hume.*] In other words, your grievance is in 1886?—Yes, when these men were made second class before I was.

729. Do you happen to know who was Commissioner then?—I could not say now.

730. You do not know?—I could not say from memory.

731. You say these promotions were not gazetted: you are certain of that?—Yes, with the exception of one man, Patrick Joyce.

732. You have let twelve years elapse since an injustice has been done to you, and you have never said a word until now?—No, I have not; I had no means of knowing these men were made my seniors.

733. How did you find it out?—Because I saw their numbers in the *Gazette*.

734. And yet, with all these transfers you have had, you have never come across one of these men: you did not know there were some sixteen or seventeen men who had been improperly promoted over you? Is that what you say?—Well, I have come across men my juniors according to length of service—an odd one here and there—that has held the rank of second class, though my junior in the service; but for one or two I did not think it was worth while taking action, but when it came to such a number as this I thought it was only right that I should bring the matter forward.

735. There may be a great many more, for all you know?—Certainly, there may be.

736. This is the first complaint you have made about this?—Well, I made it officially in a report here.

737. To this Commission?—I reported here on the 15th October, 1890: "In submitting this application, I would most respectfully bring under the notice of my officer the fact that many men, my juniors as regards length of service, have held the rank of second-class constable for some time past." This went to Inspector Goodall, and was then forwarded to Colonel Hume.

738. What was my answer?—"Please inform Constable Kelso there are a considerable number of third-class constables before him on the list for promotion, and I can see no special grounds for promoting him over the heads of his seniors."

739. There you let the matter rest?—I did not see that I could do any more.

740. It did not strike you the next time I came round you could see me, and ask me how these men got over your head?—No, it did not strike me, certainly.

741. Is not that the proper way to act, if you have got a grievance? What do you think the Commissioner goes round for? Is not that one of the things he has got to find out—whether a man has a grievance or not?—I reported the thing in the usual manner.

742. Have you heard I was in the habit of jumping on people when they came to me?—No, I have not heard that.

743. Have you heard I was always prepared to listen to any fair grievance?—Yes, I have heard that.

744. And yet you did not think it was good enough to come to me?—I certainly thought that would end the matter. I did not see it would be any good going further with it. The principal reason that makes me come up now is that I see so many men going over me.

WEDNESDAY, 20TH APRIL, 1898.

JOHN JOYCE, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the House of Representatives?—Yes, for Lyttelton.

2. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you been often applied to in connection with police matters as a member of the House?—I do not think any more than before I entered the House. I think I made more recommendations before I entered the House, because I was at one time a member of the New Zealand Police Force.

3. Have the men in the Canterbury District not seen you pretty often on police matters? I do not suggest any unfair recommendation, but simply if the men have gone outside the recognised channels in order to get attention in police matters?—That has been my experience, I have not noticed it.

4. How many men have seen you, since you have been a member of the House, on police matters?—I could not tell you.

5. Can you form any idea as to the number?—No, I cannot.

6. Have they pretty frequently interviewed you?—No.

7. Cannot you recollect any particular case?—Nothing out of the ordinary.

8. Did you ever have any interview with Detective Fitzgerald about a complaint he had?—Yes.

9. What was the nature of the matter?—He had been reprov^d, and removed from Lyttelton to Christchurch, and he thought he had been unfairly dealt with.

10. Was that in connection with a dispute between his sergeant and himself?—Yes.

11. Do you remember if he complained of the treatment he had received at the hands of the Inspector?—Yes.

12. Did you make any representation to the Minister of Justice in connection with his case?—I am not sure; but I recollect seeing Mr. Broham about the matter, and I went to him more because I had been an ex-police-officer, pointing out that I thought he had been unfairly dealt with, and I afterwards told Fitzgerald to wait patiently and no doubt the trouble would work out, that the officers would see he was a good constable and that he would get back his service and his position.

13. When did you join the Police Force in New Zealand?—1861.

14. And retired?—I resigned in November of 1862, and I was not relieved until May or June of 1863.

15. You retired to enter your present profession of law?—No, I was transferred into the law-courts. I had previously been in the Victorian Police.

16. Do you remember the case of a man named William Haydon?—Yes.

17. Did you recommend him for the Police Force?—I did.

18. How long ago is that?—I suppose two or three years ago.

19. Has he been in the Force all that time?—No.

20. When did he get in?—He joined either about the end of December last or the beginning of January this year.

21. Did you make any representation to the Minister of Justice on his behalf?—Only in a general way.

22. Did you see the Minister about him?—Very likely I did.

23. Did you know what his character was before he joined?—I did not, but I know he is a first-class constable in conduct.

24. Did you know what his character was before he joined?—No, except that it was good.

25. Had he a Police Court record?—I should be surprised to hear it.

26. Now, generally speaking, have men, so far as you know, by force of circumstances been compelled to seek political assistance?—Well, I will answer you in this way: I think the whole system of the Police Force is imperfect.

27. And of your own knowledge have not the men been under the impression that their only course to get recognition was to get political assistance?—I do not know that, but I imagine it would be so, because of the imperfect organization of the Force.

28. Would you approve of the suggestion that the Commissioner of Police should be independent of the Minister of Justice, and responsible to Parliament?—Yes, only to Parliament.

29. You approve of that suggestion?—Yes.

30. That the power of the Minister of Justice should be limited?—Yes.

31. You think that would put the Force in a better condition?—I think so. If that had been adopted under Colonel Hume's management there would be no necessity for this present Commission.

32. Have you inquired into the character of all the men you have recommended for the Force?—Yes.

33. Always?—Yes.
34. Do you remember a man named Michael Cassin?—I do not remember the name.
35. Do you remember any other particular instances where you made recommendations?—No, not unless you bring them to my memory.
36. They have been fairly numerous?—As numerous before I entered Parliament as since, simply because I am an ex-police-officer.
37. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commission as to ways by which you think the Force could be improved?—I think there should be a system of cadets, the same as in Victoria in the early fifties; that young men of good physique, moral character, and well educated should enter at the age of about seventeen. Their duties for the first two years should be clerical, and they should have technical training, and have a knowledge imparted to them of their police duties, and then legal knowledge; that for some time they should not be alone on the streets, but they should be in company with an experienced officer. I think there should be a pension; no money awards for any particular act of bravery or any marked ability shown in any case. There should be some honorary reward. Prior to the abolition of the provinces the police management throughout the provinces of the colony was very much superior than that since abolition. I think the efficiency of the service throughout the colony has degenerated in consequence of the militarism imparted through men coming from the Armed Constabulary and from the Permanent Artillery—not that the men were bad in themselves, but the system of their training militated against their police duties. I also think a police constable should be so instructed, that his conduct should be such that he should receive as much respect in carrying out his duties as the highest legal functionary in the colony. I do not know that I have anything else to say.
38. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you give us any ideas about a pension scheme?—I thought it out some years ago, but I have not the papers with me. I think the pay of the police is not sufficient.
39. *The Chairman.*] Up to what standard would you fix the pay?—Not less than 8s. per day. That should be the minimum.
40. Would you fix it in respect to any other rates of wages paid for other classes in life?—I entered the police service in Victoria in January, 1855, so it is a long range from that time to the present, and I think 8s. per day as a minimum is as little as a police-officer can manage to keep himself on, free from any monetary difficulties, and there should be a hope that he would get higher pay, with good conduct and attention to his duties.
41. In expressing that opinion of 8s. per day, are you governed by any such principle as that to which I have referred—the rate of wage paid for other manual or skilled labour?—No, it is only what it would cost a man to live decently and pay his way. I know what it is to keep a family. I have had 8s. per day in the police, and I have had 10s. in Victoria, and I received my appointment from New Zealand to organize the branch of the service at Port Chalmers, in 1861.
42. Do you think that married men in the Force are entitled to any special consideration?—Yes; I think they should have a house-allowance.
43. Do you think, with a view to the efficiency of the Force, that marriage should be encouraged or discouraged?—Encouraged. The married men attend to their duties much better. They feel the responsibilities of the position, and are generally more reliable.
44. With regard to uniform: do you think that the men should provide their uniform, or that it should be provided for them by the State?—I think that the men should pay for their own uniform, but there should be a contract, and they should pay the minimum amount for the cost of the production and making.
45. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you know of any Force outside New Zealand where the men pay for their own uniform?—In Victoria we paid for our own uniform; and before the abolition of the provinces the police also paid for their own uniforms.
46. Did they not get an allowance for uniform?—They did not when I was a member of the Force in 1861. Of course, in that answer you must take it that they should have a pay that would enable them to provide uniform like an ordinary civilian. Having a fair pay, they would have to provide their own clothes in any service, and, therefore, the uniform should not be provided for them in the police service.
47. *The Chairman.*] There is a new matter, arising from the present condition of things, on which I should like to have your opinion: do you think that the use of bicycles should be encouraged amongst the men?—I think so.
48. And do you think the department should provide the machines?—Most certainly. Any means of locomotion that will enable a constable to get to the nearest point of his duty should be provided by the Government.
49. Would you suggest the use of bicycles in all out-stations where they can be conveniently used?—Yes.
50. *Colonel Pitt.*] How long have you lived in Christchurch?—I have been here over nineteen years—that is to say, in the suburbs of Christchurch for six years, and the rest of the time at Lyttelton.
51. Having regard to that, and your former police experience, can you give us your opinion as to whether the force of Police in the Christchurch district is sufficient?—Well, I do not think it is, and my reason for giving that opinion is that for two years I was Mayor of Sydenham—from 1882–83 to 1883–84—and complaints were frequently made as to the insufficiency of the police protection, and in later years the people of Sumner have frequently complained of the want of police protection, and I have made representations to the Government on that question.
52. *The Chairman.*] Is there no police constable resident at Sumner?—I think, during the last twelve months, a man has gone down there during certain hours of the day. I know Colonel Hume, when Commissioner, tried his best to send men there, but I do not think the Government favoured the proposition on the score of economy.

53. You are not aware of any one being stationed there permanently, nor at New Brighton?—No.

54. *Colonel Pitt.*] What age do you think men should retire from the Police Force at?—Well, that depends. Some men are unfit at sixty, and others may go on till seventy-five. I know if I were a police-officer I should reckon to go on till seventy-five.

55. Do you think there should be a maximum age in the interest of the Force?—I do not think it. I am nearly sixty now, and I think I am as good in physique as I was at thirty.

56. *The Chairman.*] Putting questions to you, Mr. Joyce, and assuming you take a special interest in the Force from your earlier connection with it, do you think that depot training for youths and young constables is a desirable thing?—I think it is an absolute necessity.

57. You think a central depot for the training of youths or young constables would be in itself beneficial?—No, I would have one in each of the four large centres of the colony.

58. Would that not involve considerable additional expenditure?—No, it would not, with the technical instructors as we have them in each of the four centres. The expenditure would not be increased.

59. Do you consider that first aid to the wounded should be one of the subjects of instruction for constables?—Yes; and, as you are on the question of technical knowledge, I think upon entering the service a constable should look forward to some day attaining to the highest position, at any rate, on the Magisterial bench, as well as any position in the Civil Service.

60. *Mr. Poynton.*] You say you have been in the Court work?—Yes, I was Clerk of the Bench from 1863 to the end of 1867.

61. You know that a number of our constables throughout the colony hold such positions as clerks, bailiffs, &c.?—Yes, and they did so in Victoria in the early fifties.

62. Do you think it detracts from their efficiency in any way?—It does, owing to the dual authorities. I think it is a mistake that the Police service is under the Minister of Defence.

63. You think it should be under the Minister of Justice?—Yes.

64. I mean to say, as to the efficiency of a policeman: do you think it interferes with his duties as a policeman?—No, it does not, supposing there is no dual authority.

65. You think the dual authority is objectionable, but not the extra duties?—No, they are an aid to his efficiency.

66. Do you think that the increased knowledge of the inhabitants of the district that he gets, through being Clerk of the Court, and bailiff, &c., adds to his efficiency as a policeman?—Yes.

67. And would you be in favour of taking the emoluments away from him, and putting them, say, to a pension scheme?—Yes, I think all a constable should receive should be just the rate of pay of the grade to which he belongs, and any emoluments should go towards a pension fund.

68. Do not you think that would discourage him?—Nothing should discourage a constable in the discharge of his duty. He should look forward to attaining a higher position in the service of the colony.

69. Do not you think it would interfere with the civil business, supposing a constable got nothing for serving a summons, if the £1 which would otherwise go to him went to a pension fund?—That is one of the things which I think has tended to destroy the efficiency of the service: the fact that a constable can make 5s. or 10s. outside his ordinary pay, brings about jealousy and discontent amongst the various constables. I think, if a constable has certain hours for duty, it does not matter what he has to do, he should do it as his duty, and for the love of it.

70. Do you think a summons would be served as quickly and efficiently without the emolument as with it?—I think so. It is my experience of the men when I was in the service. It was simply a matter of duty, and how quickly the same could be discharged.

71. *The Chairman.*] If there was a neglect of duty it would be a subject for punishment or dismissal?—Yes; only in the present case it is a dual authority that destroys that part.

72. *Mr. Poynton.*] What about transfers? Do you think there should be periodical transfers?—Yes, absolutely.

73. What period, roughly, would you give?—I think constables about five years, and officers seven years. I think all the officers in the colony should have periodical transfers. It would tend not only for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the colonists generally.

74. *The Chairman.*] Do you extend that remark to the detective branch?—To all branches. I think the detectives should be transferred every seven years.

75. With respect to pay, you have given us an expression of opinion which I should like to get developed: do I understand you to say that the minimum should be 8s. per day?—Yes.

76. What should govern the rate of pay? Would you give a progressive pay for length of service?—No; I would not. The pay should be governed by rank.

77. Would you give the right to promotion after a certain period of service, provided always there was a clean defaulter's sheet?—Well, promotions, of course, must be governed first by efficiency and qualifications.

78. You think efficiency first, and not seniority?—No. I would assume that under a new management justice would be done to all the men: that if a man was senior in the service, and some one else was promoted over his head, he would feel that it was a right thing to do. I have known some men who were good constables, but who would never make good sergeants; and, referring to that question put to me just now, as to length of service governing the pay, I have been associated in the same service with men, some receiving 8s. per day and some receiving 10s. per day; and there was great discontent and dissatisfaction. Of course, under the cadet system that difficulty would not arise, because when a cadet passed his cadetship he would then become a constable and receive the minimum pay of 8s. per day, and rise up the scale as his merit entitled him, and, as I previously suggested, after a course of years he would grade into the law-courts, and so on.

79. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think the present number of ranks too many?—I think they are insignificant. I cannot understand this one stripe, and two stripes, and so on; and senior constable, and third-class detective, and so forth. I think it is unnecessary. It is cut up into too many classes.

80. How many ranks and classes would you have?—Simply constable and senior constable, and second class sergeant and sergeant. That was found to work very advantageously in Victoria in the fifties.

81. About Inspectors, would you have any officer between the rank of Inspector and sergeant?—Yes, a Sub-Inspector. There should be a Sub-Inspector for a district like Canterbury. It is too much to ask one officer to do all the duties.

82. Do you think one Sub-Inspector would be sufficient in this district?—I think so.

83. Would you have competitive examinations amongst the men?—Yes.

84. After becoming officers?—Yes, periodically. I should like to see the organization of the Police Force such that it would be an honour for any one to get into the service, and, when, in the greatest honour to remain in the service. And if I were a member of the Force I would head a petition to ask to have the parliamentary franchise taken away.

85. *The Chairman.*] Do you suggest competitive examinations for promotions from class to class?—Yes, and that would do away with the feeling of favouritism.

86. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is it a bad thing, in your opinion, for the police to have parliamentary franchise?—No. I simply give you what I would do if I were a member of the Force.

87. *Mr. Poynton.*] Not being a member of the Force, you do not care to give your opinion?—Quite so.

88. Did you give any attention to the competitive examination system when it was in force?—It was not brought under my notice, but I have always looked upon the organization as so imperfect. In fact, I have been trying to get a Royal Commission upon that subject for some years past.

89. You know it mainly broke down owing to jealousy amongst the men themselves, because those men on beat in the towns had not the leisure that the country men had, and had not the same access to books, and so on?—I can quite understand that.

90. Can you suggest a way of getting over that difficulty?—The whole question would disappear if there were cadets. It would take some time to work out the matter in a way that would be advantageous.

91. You think that could be got over?—Oh, yes; easily.

92. *The Chairman.*] There have been some suggestions made that I should like to take your opinion on: do you think that the efficiency of the Force would be assisted by placing it under local control instead of general control; that is, really falling back to a certain extent to the principle of the old provincial control, and making each separate police district complete in itself under its own immediate superintendent?—I should oppose that, for this reason: that after a few years the local bodies would have to pay for the cost of the police, as in England.

93. Would you not put them under the municipal authorities?—No; for the reason that the cost, ultimately, would fall upon the municipalities.

94. Then, another suggestion I would like to take your opinion on is: If the Force were placed under the Justice Department instead of the Defence Department, do you approve of the suggestion that the local Stipendiary Magistrates should be placed in a position to control it?—Well, from experience, I found it advantageous to be able to consult the Magistrate upon matters of detail and the ministerial work of his office—of course, not in regard to any individual case, but on matters of details—and it worked admirably in Victoria, as well as in Otago, when I was in the Police Force there.

95. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you not think it would weaken a Magistrate's position, and give rise to his decisions being misinterpreted, if it was understood that the police had a right to consult him specially in connection with a case coming before him?—I can only speak from experience. Such a difficulty did not occur either in Victoria or in Otago in my own experience.

96. What is the minimum age at which you think a man should be allowed to go on active police duty?—I do not think a constable should be allowed to have charge of a beat until after he has attained to the age of twenty-one years. They should enter at seventeen, and do certain duty, say, from 8 to 12 at night, at certain times in company with an experienced officer or constable, so as to learn their duties; that after being in the service four years they would have sufficient knowledge and judgment to take charge of a beat. I was only twenty-two when I was appointed to take charge and organize a branch of the service in Otago.

97. You would put men on police duty as early as twenty-one?—Yes; and that is assuming he had been a cadet for some time before that, and had been in company with an experienced officer on beat duty.

98. *The Chairman.*] You would give them four years' training, from seventeen to twenty-one, before putting them on street duty?—Yes.

99. Have you thought that matter out, and has it not occurred to you that it is a very long preliminary training?—No, because there are times at night when two men are necessarily together, and therefore the cadet could be one.

100. I mean, training as from seventeen years of age?—But they are on duty the whole time. They have work to do; there is plenty of work in police-offices in districts like Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin.

101. They could be out on beat?—No, there are office duties—they should learn everything. For instance, there are duties performed by constables now, and these constables could do other duties. You will know from Inspector Broham that I suppose he has two or three men, and sometimes four men, such as watch-house keepers and clerks. Well, all these duties the cadets would

learn; and then there would be a certain amount of patrol duty in company with an experienced police-officer.

102. Referring again to your experience as a police-officer: we understand that the hours of night duty are from 9 p.m. until 5 a.m., that is, eight consecutive hours, no matter what the weather is?—It is too long.

103. Can you make any suggestion to improve that matter?—I think not more than six hours' continuous duty should be done.

104. We are informed that eight hours' night duty is the system even in London; do you think that conditions are at all similar in that respect?—Well; I do not know anything about the police duties in England, but I may tell you that the gloomiest part of my police experience in Victoria was, once in every three months, having to discharge twelve hours' night duty for a week, from 6 at night until 6 in the morning. It came to my turn once in every three months, and that experience I shall never forget—those long wretched hours. Of course, we had to do eight hours pretty frequently; but, I do not think a constable should be asked to do more than six hours continuous duty. There is this further reason, that a man on night duty is frequently called out through the day to attend the Court, or some ceremonial parades, or inspection parades, or other things. The hours are, therefore, too long at present.

105. As a matter of fact, is it necessary for constables who have been on duty for eight hours during the night, and who go off at 5 in the morning, to attend the Court frequently at 9.30, or earlier, for Court purposes, and to keep in attendance until the case has been disposed of?—Yes; and, if the case is at all difficult, he would have to be at the police-office before 9.30, so as to give the information necessary to secure a conviction, or to have the case properly tried.

106. *Colonel Pitt.*] Could that night duty be reduced from eight hours to six without materially increasing the strength of the Force?—Very easily, with the cadet system.

107. *Mr. Poynton.*] About how long do you think the leave should be accumulative? At present a constable has twelve days in the year only, and if he does not take that one year he is not allowed to take it the next: do you think it should be cumulative up to a certain number of years?—I think so. Of course, it would have to be under proper regulation.

108. It has been suggested that the leave should be allowed to accumulate up to twenty-eight days?—I was going to say thirty-six days—three years' leave.

109. *Colonel Hume.*] You stated you considered the whole system of the Force imperfect, and that, I take it, is of some years' standing?—Yes, from 1875, from the time when the Force became amalgamated with the Armed Constabulary.

110. Can you point to any case where you think this imperfection has been aggravated, say, within the last ten years?—Well, yes, in the case of the men taken out of the Permanent Artillery. I think good men have been spoilt. They would have been splendid men to have remained in the Permanent Artillery, but their training in the Artillery unfitted them for police duties. This artillery spirit has got right through the service, and so unfitted them for police work.

111. You stated that men sometimes went to you with complaints, and that you recommended men sometimes for appointment to the police: is that exceptional in the police? Supposing a railway man had a grievance, would he go to you?—Certainly.

112. And you do not think it exceptional in the police?—No.

113. And do you know of any service it is not done in?—Well, it was done in Victoria when I entered the service, in January, 1855, and it has been my experience ever since. As I said to Mr. Taylor, I think I made more recommendations before I became a member of the House than since.

114. And if you thought a man in a Government department had a genuine grievance you would not hesitate to bring it before the Minister?—No, indeed, I would not.

115. I would like to get your opinion as to how you think defaulters' sheets ought to be treated?—Well, of course, that would depend upon the offence committed. I have known men to be punished for the most trivial things.

116. Should Inspectors, first of all, have powers to punish?—For certain offences, certainly.

117. And then the next power, in your opinion, would be only the power of the Commissioner?—I think the only reference to the Commissioner should be in the case of dismissals. All other punishments should be meted out by the Inspector in charge.

118. It has been suggested to the Commission that there should be a Board: do you agree with that?—No, I do not. In fact, a Board would not be required under the suggestions I have made. The education and training of the men under the cadet system would be such that the offences would be very few. Education would step in, and so save a lot of trivial grievances.

119. Well, you have seen a good deal of the Force at both Christchurch and Lyttelton: do you consider that at the present moment the Force is an efficient Force?—Well, I consider its organization is bad. The men themselves are a fine lot of men, and I think they have tried to do their duty, but, with our imperfect licensing laws, and other conditions, they have not a chance. Of course, you must bear in mind my opinion is that it is due to their imperfect training; and all the years I have been in the colony constables have generally had the idea that they must not do very much with the licensing laws. That, of course, I have disagreed with.

120. As you have touched upon the licensing laws, you and I have had a good many conversations from time to time on the licensing laws?—Yes.

121. And, from any remarks that have ever fallen from me, have you gathered that I was not most anxious to carry out the liquor laws?—I believe you have ever been anxious to do your duty to the colony generally and to the Force under your command.

122. Did you ever think there was a power above me that was trying to prevent me?—No.

123. No remark I have ever made would have induced you to think that?—No.

124. There was once an examination: did you ever see the paper of questions that were submitted to the constables to answer on that occasion?—No.

125. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Speaking about cadetships, I think in Victoria that system of cadets applied to young men about to become officers in the police?—That is all.

126. Not to the constables?—No.

127. *The Chairman.*] Do you suggest it in the same restricted way?—Oh, no. That is why it was so imperfect in Victoria and broke down.

128. You know it has been abolished for many years in Victoria?—It was abolished before I left.

129. Do you not think if there was a central depot in which young men could go for a period of training, that would meet the requirements?—No, absolutely. I should fight against it tooth and nail.

130. Why do you think one depot would not be sufficient?—Because there is technical knowledge required here that cannot be had in Wellington, and, in the same way, certain knowledge can be obtained in Auckland and Dunedin not to be procured here or in Wellington.

131. Do you think in the four centres of population the conditions are so very different that the constables would require to be trained specially for each particular district?—Yes; and in the rotation of removals they would acquire a knowledge of the various centres of the colony.

132. Do you not think, if that were so, it would very much hamper the action of the police authorities in moving the men from place to place?—No.

133. Do not you think it would render it almost impossible to remove a man from one place to another?—They would only be trained here in a knowledge of this place, and then they would acquire general police duties in Wellington. It is technical knowledge I mean. They would get better technical knowledge in Christchurch than in Wellington; there are greater advantages, scholastic and otherwise, here than in Wellington, and the same may be said of Dunedin. Indeed, there are greater advantages in Dunedin in some things than in Christchurch.

134. But the laws of the colony are the same all over the colony?—Quite so.

135. The only variation is the by-laws of the different places?—Yes, the technical instruction to be obtained. I think Wellington is ten years behind Christchurch in technical knowledge. But you have some advantages in Wellington we have not in Christchurch.

136. Do you think that applies to the duties of a police constable?—Oh, the mere duties of a police constable may be learned in about a month.

137. Do you not think all the constables might be properly taught in one depot and not in four?—I do not see the advantage. They could be taught here without any extra expense.

138. But you would require an extra staff at each place?—I do not think so, for police duties. I think Mr. Broham could set papers for each day in about five minutes for cadets, and he could train them without any additional staff. But it is technical knowledge I most refer to in my previous evidence.

139. What do you consider the maximum age should be for men joining the Force?—Thirty.

140. At present are you aware it is forty?—I am not aware, but I should not be surprised, because at present the whole thing is so imperfect.

141. As regards monetary rewards, you would abolish them?—Yes.

142. You would have some record of merit?—Yes.

143. Would you give the men what are termed "merit badges"?—Well, whether merit badges, or something engrossed on vellum, it should be something they would be proud to look upon.

144. Are you aware there are such things as merit badges in some Forces?—I am not aware.

145. Do you think it would be acceptable to the men?—It depends on the form. It should be something that would look nice.

146. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You advocate competitive examinations?—Yes.

147. Well, now, has not your experience as an old police-officer, and your experience of the law since, proved to you that the man who can express himself on paper is not in practice the best police-officer?—Well, a part of the competitive examination would be oral.

148. But is it not known that a man who can express himself on paper can generally also express himself orally?—Yes, but the examiners would be experienced in police duties, and would take all the conditions into consideration.

149. Have you not realised that a man who had not the advantage of a good education might be all his life a third-class constable?—That would not arise under my system. They would start at seventeen years, and I would have it a condition that they should have a certain standard of education before they entered; and they should look forward some day to taking the highest positions in the colony. The constable should look forward to taking as a reward the highest position in the department.

150. Do I understand you to say that Stipendiary Magistrates should have power over the police?—No, certainly not, but that the police should be under the same department as the Stipendiary Magistrates.

151. As a matter of fact they are now?—I understand not.

152. They are under the Justice Department?—I thought under the Defence.

153. You say you think the hours of night duty too long?—I am sure of it; that is, bearing in mind the hours a constable may have to give the next day attending the Court, and ceremonial and other parades.

154. Do you know of any other Police Force where the night duty is not done in one term of eight hours?—No, I do not, but I always thought it too long.

155. You do not think the climatic conditions are any more telling on a constable here than in Australia?—No, but I think we could improve on the other colonies. I do not think that the Government should see how many hours and how much work they can get out of a man, but that they should try and elevate every constable into such a position that they may get the best possible work out of him, mentally, physically, and otherwise.

156. Do not you see if you were to break up what might be termed the hours of night, you might rather be inclined to create a difficulty in fixing the responsibility?—Not the slightest.

157. Of course, you are aware that the hours of burglary are from 9 at night until 5 in the morning; if you were to put various constables on the same beat during the hours of night, would you not find some difficulty in fixing the responsibility, assuming a burglary had been committed at a place, it would be a question as to the time when the burglary took place?—Yes; but as you regulate the hours now for beat duty, so you would under the new system.

158. When do you think night duty should begin and end?—I think at 10 p.m., and end at 4 a.m.

159. Well, throughout the greater part of the year there are several hours of darkness after 4 o'clock in the morning?—Yes; and therefore you would have these young cadets patrolling under experienced police constables up to 10 o'clock.

160. Briefly, you think eight hours too long?—That is, if you want to have a first-class constabulary, and to get the best possible work in every sense of the word.

161. Of course, you realise that to carry out your ideas it would mean a tremendous increase of expenditure?—I do not think that should be considered; and I do not think there would be such a tremendous amount of expenditure. I know thousands are thrown away in every colony on objects far less worthy of consideration than that of which we are now speaking.

162. You consider the provincial Forces were very much superior to the present one?—Yes.

163. And, as a matter of fact, it was very much more expensive?—I do not think so. The rates of pay for working-men were higher in the sixties than they are to-day.

164. For instance, in this province there were in those days no less than five or six officers?—I do not know.

165. At present there is one?—I do not know.

166. Well, take in Otago: what is now the Otago district, with but one officer, there were five or six officers?—Yes; there were three or four officers.

167. Well, that, of course, would mean increasing the expenditure up to 200 or 300 per cent.?—Well, if you apply that to other departments, I think law and order should be the first consideration for the government of a country.

168. As regards transfers, you are advocating periodical transfers of ranks?—Yes.

169. Do you not think it is a mistake to transfer detectives?—No, I do not, and I will give you this reason: they become too well known for one thing. A detective is supposed to move about, and not be generally known.

170. Do you not think that a detective is practically useless unless he knows the people to whom he can go for his information?—I have known a lot of the detective service. I have had detectives under my control, and they cannot do very much without information; and, no matter where they are, they have to fossick it out, and they can do it in a new district as well as an old one.

171. But until they know the persons from whom to get information they are not of much use?—Supposing, there are three detectives in Christchurch. Well, at the end of seven years, the time for a removal, you are not going to remove the whole three of them at once. You would only shift one at a time, and then the remaining two would have all the information necessary, and could impart what information was necessary to the new arrival.

172. You think they would do it in a mutual spirit?—I am assuming that the Police Force under the new organization would think of duty first and themselves last.

173. *The Chairman.*] According to your system, jealousy between the individuals would pass away?—Yes; there would be a spirit of emulation, with each one trying to get into a higher grade of the service.

174. That is the ideal?—Yes. Why should they not look forward to becoming Police Magistrates? They would make splendid Police Magistrates.

175. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You think the present licensing laws are not sufficient to enable the police to cope with the evil?—It is impossible.

176. Have you any suggestion to make in which way they could be strengthened?—I could talk about that in another place.

177. Do you know the Imperial Act, where it makes it an offence for a person to be found on licensed premises during prohibited hours?—Well, I think a man who enters a licensed house should be punished quite as much as a publican.

178. Are you familiar with the Alcoholic Liquors Sale Control Act Amendment Act of 1895?—I know something about it.

179. I will read you the last part of section 22, subsection (5a): "It shall be lawful for but not obligatory upon a licensee to sell liquor at any time to any person being really a lodger living or staying in the licensed premises, or a *bona fide* traveller seeking refreshment on arriving from a journey: Provided that the liquor so sold is personally consumed on the premises by such traveller and by no other person." Do you not think it would materially strengthen the law if the words "or lodger" were inserted, after the words "by such traveller," so as to make the clause read, "Provided that the liquor so sold is personally consumed on the premises by such traveller or lodger and by no other person"?—I think I had better give an opinion upon that idea when I get to the House.

180. Still, you know, the question as to lodgers is a very serious one?—Yes, the licensing laws are very imperfect.

181. *The Chairman.*] You have expressed the opinion that persons found on licensed premises at illegal hours should come within the law?—Yes.

182. With regard to defaulters' sheets: we have had many instances of constables complaining that, after a lapse of ten or twelve years, some record for a minor offence is brought

up against them: do you suggest that it is desirable that records on defaulters' sheets for minor offences, such as absence from parades, or late on parade, should be cleaned off after a period of clean service; that is to say, if nothing is marked against him for five years, should he have a clean sheet?—Yes, I should have suggested five years; and, further, that no record should be made without notice being supplied to the constable.

183. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Then, if your idea with reference to five years were carried out, do you not see that a constable who had been the whole of his service a well conducted man, with no report against him, would be placed on an equal footing with a man who, perhaps, had been reported several times?—A man who had been reported several times would, I think, be unfit for the service.

184. I mean for trivial offences?—Then, probably, you should have something against the officer, because the officer is as much to blame as the man.

185. Do you not see that a well conducted man might very well complain that he was in no better position than one who had been reported on several occasions?—I think that after a number of years a man who had committed a trivial offence should be able to redeem his character absolutely.

186. *Mr. Poynton.*] You say that an Inspector should punish for all offences, and that only in cases of dismissal should the matter be referred to the Commissioner?—Yes.

187. Would you give a constable the right to have his case tried before a Stipendiary Magistrate instead of his Inspector, if he wished it?—I have always thought that that procedure was not only a reflection upon the police administration, but also on the police generally. I think he should have the right of appealing to a Magistrate.

188. I do speak of an appeal; but when a charge is brought against a constable, would you give him the right to have that tried by a separate tribunal?—I would have it that it should not be heard in open Court, because I think it is a reflection upon the police administration to have the administration made public.

189. Well, it could be heard by the Magistrate in *camera*?—Quite so; I think that would be an improvement.

190. *The Chairman.*] Would you give that, as a right of appeal from the decision of the Inspector?—Yes; but to be heard in *camera*.

191. Would it not tend to create a very unsatisfactory feeling, as between the officer and the constable, if the constable was called upon at once and said, "I decline to be tried by you; I shall be tried by somebody else"? Would it not be better for a constable to submit to be tried by his officer, and then, if he felt aggrieved at the decision, to elect to be tried by some other tribunal?—That amounts to the same thing. He could elect to have his case tried afterwards.

192. But the election would amount to a suggestion that he would not receive justice from his officer, and that would necessarily create a bad feeling when there was no occasion for it?—The colonists of Australia have been educated up to this right of appeal, and to take it away at the present time would, I think, be very unwise. I think it was a pity it was ever introduced; but, as it has been in force so long I think it would be a great pity to alter it at the present time. I think in the course of years with a different organization there would be no necessity for it. Of course it never existed when I was in the service, either here or in Victoria.

193. I am not asking you about taking away the right of appeal, but whether it would not be better to have his case tried by the Inspector first, and give him the right of appeal afterwards?—That is what I intended to say; to be tried first by the Inspector, and then the right of appeal *in camera*.

194. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You know the men have the right of appeal at the present time from the Inspector to the Commissioner?—Yes; but that is only from "Philip drunk to Philip sober." I would not put the Commissioner in that position, because he is bound to stick up for his officers.

195. Do not you think it is going to undermine the authority of the Commissioner?—Not a bit.

196. Where would you let the Commissioner come in?—He would remain outside altogether; and if he thought the Inspector travelled beyond his bounds he could "sack" him.

197. You know the Commissioner has no power to "sack" an Inspector?—Well, under the new arrangement you would have all power.

198. Would you say the Commissioner should have power to stop an appeal to the Stipendiary Magistrate?—Certainly not.

199. Assuming the Commissioner was dissatisfied with the decision of the Stipendiary Magistrate, would you give the Commissioner power to review that decision?—Not a bit of it.

200. Then, I see, you shut out the Commissioner altogether?—Not a bit of it; you could discharge the man if you liked.

201. That would be reviewing the decision?—No, because Parliament might come down and "sack" you. What I should like to do is to raise the status of the Inspector between himself and his men.

202. *The Chairman.*] We have had cases before us showing that, where appeals have been made from the Inspector to the Commissioner, the Commissioner has over and over again said, "I will take the opinion of the Inspector as against that of yours, or twenty like it"?—Yes.

203. And to avoid that you suggest the right of appeal should be given to the local Stipendiary Magistrate?—Yes. I have not been unfortunate enough to be a delinquent in that respect, but I have worked with seventy or eighty comrades in the Water Police service, and I have known men to be punished, and apply to the Inspector for a rehearing, and the Inspector has upheld the decision of the intermediate officer.

204. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You referred to minor offences: would you consider drunkenness a minor offence?—It just depends. I should consider drunk on duty a very serious offence.

205. Then, you would not give the Stipendiary Magistrate power to deal with that case?—That would depend on your instruction to your Inspectors. If you told your Inspectors there were certain offences they might deal with, and other offences which they must report to you; and if drunk on duty was one of the offences they must report to you, you would have the control.

206. Do you not think that would be likely to cause very great dissatisfaction with the men?—I should not think it, because I am assuming you will do justice to all men.

207. Do not you think there would be a good deal of force, if a constable were to reply to this effect: If I am caught gossiping on duty—a minor offence—I have the right to go to the Stipendiary Magistrate, an independent authority altogether, to have my case heard; but, if I am being charged with being drunk, which is practically the most serious charge which can be brought against a policeman, I have not the right of that independent appeal: do you not think there is a good deal in that argument?—Of course, drunkenness is a crime under the statute.

208. But there are degrees of drunkenness: a man may be under the influence of liquor so as to render him incapable of police duty, but not drunk enough to be locked up?—In any answers I have given I have assumed you are going to do justice to all parties, and that in issuing your instructions to the Inspectors you will do so advisedly, so that there may be no friction between constables and Inspectors. Of course, you could raise fifty questions as to what may happen, but is not likely to happen.

GEORGE BOWRON, examined on oath.

211. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A leather merchant.

212. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember an incident in connection with a policeman in July, 1896, which happened in Manchester Street?—Yes. During one day in that month I was going home at dusk, and I saw a policeman reel about the street from one side to the other.

213. *The Chairman.*] In what street?—In Worcester Street, near Manchester Street. When I came opposite to the constable he accosted me, and talked a lot of nonsense, and finally wound up by threatening to run me in. I wanted him to do that, but he cried off. I then went to the police depot and reported the matter to the officer in charge, and I believe that the matter was dealt with by the authorities here. I was called to give evidence at some inquiry.

214. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you act as chairman of a committee in 1895 with a view to ascertaining whether the police were enforcing the licensing laws, or keeping an eye on the conduct of the business generally?—I did not act as chairman; I was a member of the committee.

215. Comprising various citizens?—Yes.

216. Can you remember the names of any others on the committee?—The Rev. Mr. Watson, and Rev. Mr. Erwin.

217. Did the committee collect a considerable amount of evidence?—We had several meetings lasting one or two hours each, and had a good many witnesses in.

218. Do you remember any immediate result of the inquiry?—No; I cannot say.

219. Was not one result of the inquiry that a petition was lodged against the renewal of the license to Coker's Hotel?—Yes, that possibly would be a direct result of it. I did not remember that.

220. Do you know if the evidence taken was brought before Bishop Julius in any way?—Yes, and I think as a result he either headed or signed the petition in reference to closing Coker's Hotel.

221. What opinion did you form, as to the way the police inspected and controlled licensed houses in Christchurch, as a result of that investigation?—The only conclusion any man could come to would be that the supervision by the police was extremely lax, both as regards the hotels and brothels in the city. I think quite as much as regards brothels as regards hotels, if not more so. The evidence given as regards the conduct of brothels and some two or three constables was simply abominable. Of course, this was not given as evidence against the Force as a whole, but simply against two or three constables.

222. One direct result was that there was strong representations made by prominent citizens to the Licensing Committee in reference to a number of hotels?—Yes, and Coker's Hotel specially.

223. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is that hotel still licensed?—It is.

224. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you think the enforcement of the licensing law is any better than it was then?—That is rather a big question. I have not been taking any active part in the matter, so I would not like to express an opinion.

225. *Colonel Pitt.*] Within your own knowledge, were any of the licenses of any of the hotels complained of taken away in consequence of representations made to the Licensing Bench?—Not that I am aware of.

226. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Representations were made to the Licensing Bench, I presume?—Yes.

227. Not to the police?—No, not as regards these complaints.

228. And you are aware, of course, that the police have no control over the Licensing Committees? I am perfectly well aware of that.

229. *Colonel Hume.*] You gave us to understand that this constable who accosted you in the street was not altogether sober?—I said he was drunk.

230. Is he now in Christchurch?—That I cannot say. I do not keep an eye on all the constables in Christchurch.

231. Do you happen to know whether he was punished for that at all?—I cannot say. I only know it by hearsay, and I am told hearsay is no good.

232. Your committee came to the conclusion that the police neglected their duty as regards hotels?—Yes.

233. Can you tell us how they neglected their duty?—What I know myself is this: I am passing about through Christchurch in the ordinary course of my business, and I am constantly seeing drunken men going into hotels, and if I take the trouble to wait I do not see them come out again.

234. *Mr. Taylor.*] You are speaking of the present time?—Yes; it is a thing I am constantly seeing. The men have been absolutely drunk, and they go in and stop in these hotels, and I have waited sometimes ten minutes with friends to see if they came out.

235. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, you are in the habit of doing a little bit of detective work yourself?—No.

236. Then, why wait at these hotels for ten minutes?—I am a member of the public, and I like to see if these laws are enforced.

237. Well, then, it was on account of the committee hearing that drunken men were in the habit of going into hotels and not coming out again, that led to this petition being set up?—I did not say that. It was in consequence of evidence which this committee took, and which they considered probably as correct, that this petition was got up.

238. Now, so far as your own particular knowledge is concerned, the only irregularities you have seen have been drunken men going into hotels and not coming out again?—That is so.

239. You cannot give us any information about Sunday trading?—Not of my own personal knowledge, except that I often see drunken men about on Sundays, and you can form your own conclusion about that.

240. Nor can you give us any information about the sale of liquor after hours?—No.

241. As regards brothels, can you give us any information about them of your own knowledge?—No; I do not frequent them.

WILLIAM WILCOX TANNER, examined on oath.

242. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the House of Representatives?—Yes, for Avon electorate.

243. *Mr. Taylor.*] With regard to the alleged political influence in connection with the Police Force, can you tell the Commission anything in connection with that?—Of my own knowledge, I am not really aware of political influence being used. It is a subject to which I have paid very little attention.

244. You have not personally been troubled much by men in that connection?—Not by policemen; but I have by applicants who wished to enter the Police Force, or the Permanent Artillery.

245. You have had numerous applications of that kind?—I should not say numerous. I suppose during the last six or seven years the total number may be possibly a dozen.

246. Have any men, or has any man, applied to you with a view to getting exceptional treatment?—Yes, a member of the Permanent Artillery and a member of the Police Force—one of each.

247. Have you declined to interfere?—Most certainly. I ignored the request, and burnt the letter.

248. In regard to the enforcement of the licensing law? Of your own knowledge, can you say anything on that score?—Well, I am in a peculiar position in regard to that. I have made given statements in my place in the House, under a sense of public duty, on matters of which I made myself cognisant at a given time, but I had no idea of ever giving publicity to that statement, and I should not have done so had not things in the House been somewhat strained and exceptional.

249. On that occasion you mentioned that you visited certain hotels on Sunday night, and saw the licensing law openly defied: I think that is the character of your statement?—I am not prepared to renew that statement here at the present moment.

250. I propose to ask you what hotels you visited on a Sunday night in Christchurch?—In that case I decline to give evidence which recapitulates what was stated in the House.

251. I will ask you whether the statement you made in the House is correct?—Most certainly.

GEORGE JOHN SMITH, examined on oath.

252. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the House of Representatives?—Yes, for Christchurch City.

253. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you had any applications from members of the Force with a view to securing exceptional treatment for-themselves through political influence?—I have had applications both for transfers and promotion.

254. How did you deal with them?—As a rule I saw Colonel Hume, to see what the position was.

255. Have you ever used your political position specifically for the purpose of getting exceptional treatment for any man?—No.

256. Have you had any applications from men who desired to enter the Force?—Yes, a number.

257. Have you recommended them?—In general terms. If I have known the man to be of good character I have stated so, but I have not attempted to use any political influence to get him into the Force.

258. Have you taken no special steps?—Not beyond a letter of recommendation, the same as I would give to any other employer of labour.

259. Have you known them?—Yes.

260. Have you any personal knowledge as to whether the licensing laws are efficiently administered in Christchurch?—I would like to know what would be considered personal knowledge. I do not frequent bars.

261. The result of your own observations?—My own observation has led me to believe that the licensing laws are not as stringently enforced as other laws.

262. Do you think the laws in regard to the Gaming and Lotteries Act have been enforced in Christchurch?—No, I should say not.

263. Have you waited on the police in connection with the licensing or gambling laws?—Yes, I saw the Inspector in Christchurch in reference to the licensing laws, and once in connection with the gambling evil.

264. When you waited in connection with gambling, what was the question?—"Tote-shops." As a matter of fact, I was asked to wait upon Inspector Cullen—who was in charge of the district then—quite recently, within the last fortnight. I knew, from hearsay evidence, of course, that there existed one or two "tote-shops" in Christchurch, and we waited upon the Inspector and urged him to take steps to cope with the evil. I see by a report in the newspaper that a raid has been made since then on two "tote-shops."

265. Has a raid been made on either of the shops named to the Inspector?—On one. I do not know the other one by name.

266. Then, the assumption that it was a "tote-shop" would appear to have been pretty well founded?—Yes.

267. Have you on any previous occasions urged that the "tote-shops" should be dealt with by the police of Christchurch?—I do not think I have made special representations on the matter.

268. Do you think there is any reason why the Licensing Act should not be enforced by the police, if vigilant?—No reason why it should not be. I believe there is an opinion in the Force that the licensing laws are not to be administered with "undue harshness." In fact, that was stated by the Premier in the House, and the members of the Force will understand what a statement of that kind from the Premier means.

269. You think a statement of that kind from the Premier would influence members of the Force?—Undoubtedly.

270. Do you feel that the Commissioner of Police should be made amenable to Parliament only, and not to the Minister of Defence?—I think it would be a distinct improvement if the Police Force were taken out of the control of the Government altogether. This applies to all Government departments.

271. You would make the head of each Government department subject to Parliament finally, rather than to the Minister?—Yes. So far as the administration of the licensing laws is concerned, it may interest the officers of the department to know that on several occasions, so far as houses in Christchurch are concerned, I have seen men going in and out of hotels on Sundays.

272. *The Chairman.*] You are aware that that is not an offence?—Yes, I am quite aware of that. That is one of the difficulties, of course, of proving breaches of the law.

273. Do you think it is desirable that the law should be amended to meet those cases?—Yes. I was going to add that if I volunteered a statement, or endeavoured to get evidence, Colonel Hume might suggest I was acting as a private detective.

274. I understand your remark with respect to Ministerial control to apply to all the departments; that you would take all the departments out of Ministerial control?—Yes, and appointments to them.

275. You would make the heads of the departments immediately responsible to Parliament?—Yes.

276. *Colonel Pitt.*] Without the intervention of any Civil Service Commissioners?—I would prefer the intervention of a Board of Commissioners and the appointment of a Board of Appeal. I suppose you would term them Civil Service Commissioners.

277. *The Chairman.*] You told us that, as a result of your own observation, you think the licensing and gambling laws are not enforced as strictly as they might be?—That is so.

278. Are you able to give us any instance beyond what you have already given us in respect to gambling, where the law has been flagrantly broken in respect to either licensing or gambling?—I cannot give evidence as to my own knowledge, and therefore a matter of opinion I have gathered from conversations is not evidence the Commission could accept.

279. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know the Empire Hotel?—Yes.

280. Does anything special happen there on race-days?—There is the usual congregation of betting-men.

281. Is the footpath absolutely blocked on race-days by betting-men?—Yes.

282. *The Chairman.*] Do the police not keep the people moving?—These men do not move. I recognise it is a very difficult thing to keep them moving.

283. *Mr. Taylor.*] As a matter of fact, do they not overflow on to the road, and form a solid block there?—Yes, on the footpath, and half-way across the road. I think these men are of the racing fraternity.

284. *Mr. Poynton.*] You know it is not an offence to bet in the street?—So I understand.

285. Do you not think the law should be altered, to get at that?—I think it is of great importance.

286. *The Chairman.*] You think it is not the fault of the police?—I think it is not the fault of the police that the men do the betting on the street, but I think it is the fault of the police that they are not kept moving on. I have seen officers of the Force coming out of hotels in uniform, but they may have been there in the execution of their duty.

287. Is that a matter of frequent occurrence?—No, not frequent. I have seen one or two coming out of the same Empire Hotel by a back door.

288. In uniform?—Yes.

289. *Colonel Hume.*] I suppose, as a member of Parliament, you have had applications for advancement, and transfers, and appointments, in other departments than the police only?—I do not think to the same extent.

290. But you have had them?—Yes.

291. For the Customs, and young ladies for the Telephone?—Yes, lots of applicants for the Telephone.

292. And I suppose you treated them in the same way as you did the applications for the police?—Yes.

293. You say you think that the opinion of the police is that the licensing laws should not be too rigorously enforced?—Yes; amongst the men and through the Force generally. That is my impression, practically gathered, as I say, from the statement made by the Premier, that the law was not to be enforced with undue harshness. I think those were the words used.

294. Can you tell me of any Act you would advocate being carried out with undue harshness?—I would advocate it being enforced.

295. Would you advocate carrying it out with undue harshness?—If you enforce a law, you enforce it. If a man commits a theft, I think it is the duty of the police to arrest him, and have him punished if possible; and, if the licensing law is broken, I think it is the duty of the police to enforce that law, and obtain a conviction if possible.

296. Then, you can only explain the expression as to not using undue harshness by saying it is the Premier's statement?—The Premier made that statement in the House, and that is the only reason I can see for the licensing law not being so strictly enforced as other laws.

297. You and I have talked about this before?—Yes, frequently.

298. Did I point out to you how that difficulty could be got over?—Yes.

299. Did I go so far as to give you a particular section of the English Act?—Yes, I think so.

300. And I asked you to use your endeavours to get it passed in the House?—You did, and the amendment was submitted to the House, I believe.

301. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You stated that you saw Colonel Hume on one or two occasions, in reference to complaints received from constables?—Yes.

302. Have you ever used your influence to approach the Minister of Defence in the interest of a police constable?—No.

303. Do you know of any instance where it has been used?—Not of my own knowledge. It is a matter of common repute that political influence is used.

304. You recognise the distinction between political influence and Ministerial influence?—Ministerial influence and political influence are both bad. For instance, I get a complaint from a constable in Canterbury who thinks he has not had fair treatment. If I happen to be in Wellington I go and see the Commissioner, and ask him to let me have a look at the papers, and to tell me the position; and I find two or three men are his seniors. I write back and state so, and tell him he will have to wait his turn.

305. You recognise there is a distinction between political and Ministerial influence?—Yes, but they are both bad.

306. You have no evidence of anything which you could properly classify as Ministerial influence?—No, not of my own knowledge.

307. As regards not carrying out the licensing law: are you aware that last year there were twenty-three prosecutions in Christchurch?—I was not aware of the number.

308. Fourteen against publicans, and the remainder against prohibited persons?—I was not aware of the number.

309. That, of course, shows you there is not an absolute neglect on the part of the police to enforce the laws?—I would not make that statement at all.

310. If the police have been influenced by the words of the Premier, how is it, then, that some of them have taken action?—Because some cases are so flagrant that the police could not overlook them. That is my opinion.

311. Will it surprise you to hear that out of those fourteen prosecutions only seven convictions have resulted?—It would not surprise me at all.

312. If these were all flagrant cases you would naturally suppose convictions would follow?—It depends whether there is a desire to obtain a conviction on the part of the police.

313. But you do not suggest that the police have not put forward all the evidence available?—I do not think they are as keen in hunting up evidence in regard to liquor cases as in other cases. That is only my opinion, of course.

314. You recognise the difficulty?—Yes, under the existing law.

315. And you know, of course, that the fact of seeing a person going into a hotel is not sufficient to justify a prosecution?—That is so.

316. The police have practically to prove a sale?—I think they are required to prove too much. There is another thing I would like to say. For instance, while the Inspector of the district for the time being may desire to make a raid on the hotels to see whether the licensing law is being observed, unfortunately the fact that he is going to make a raid very often leaks out. That is only hearsay, but I have been frequently told that has happened.

317. Information leaks out from where?—I cannot say where it comes from.

318. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think solicitors should be employed in prosecutions against hotels? You say you do not think the police get up the cases with sufficient energy?—I do not think the employment of a solicitor would get over the difficulty.

319. Do not you think the police should have the benefit of a solicitor, seeing that a solicitor is always engaged on the other side?—I think the Inspector should have the discretionary power to employ them whenever he thinks necessary.

FRANK WHITMORE ISITT, examined on oath.

320. *The Chairman.*] You are a minister of the Wesleyan Church?—Yes.

321. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you taken any steps, at any time, to ascertain whether the licensing laws and the laws affecting gambling are enforced in the city?—I do not remember any specific attempt to find out about the gaming laws, but specific action in regard to the licensing laws dates back from 1886.

322. Do you consider it your duty and right as a citizen to do that?—Quite so; and our first effort, speaking of 1886 or 1887, was to prove to the citizens that there was every reason to suppose that the laws were flagrantly violated.

323. What steps were taken?—We appointed people who would watch a large number of hotels on a given Sunday.

324. Have you that evidence in detail now?—It was printed in detail in the various daily papers. My memory would serve me to say that there was, striking an average, reason to suppose that at least four thousand breaches of the Licensing Act occurred on a given Sunday. We assumed in this way, that if a couple of hundred people visited a hotel on a Sunday, it was not probable they went for milk.

325. *The Chairman.*] You think they all went for something to drink?—Most of them did; that was the assumption. I would like to say we were careful not to disclose the names of the hotels when we reported the matter to the Licensing Committee. We did not want to institute prosecutions, but to draw general attention to the law-breaking.

326. *Mr. Taylor.*] Now, on any other occasion have you assisted in obtaining specific information regarding Sunday trading?—Never personally, except by arranging with those willing to do it.

327. Do you remember the committee of investigation referred to by Mr. Bowron?—Perfectly well. I submitted to them a great deal of the evidence of other people.

328. Can you remember who was on that committee?—I think the Rev. Doke, Rev. Watson, and the Rev. Scorgie, although I am not perfectly sure about the latter. We tried to get the whole of the ministers to have evidence submitted to them to show them the necessity for action, and a very large number responded.

329. Was a protest against the renewal of Coker's license a result of that committee's investigations?—Yes, distinctly.

330. Was a deaconess of the Church of England a witness before that committee?—Yes, Sister Edith.

331. Did the Bishop consider the evidence sufficient to warrant him taking action?—He did not attend, but the petition to the Licensing Committee was submitted to him and he signed it. The petition was signed by Bishop Julius, Canon Knowles, Dr. Elmslie, and many others.

332. Of your own knowledge, are the licensing laws in Christchurch enforced?—Well, I have a good deal of knowledge that is not evidence. I see a great many persons visiting hotels during prohibited hours, but that is not evidence.

333. Have you at any time taken steps to have your suspicions confirmed by prosecutions?—Yes.

334. Do you remember interviewing the authorities in regard to the reported flagrant defiance of the law by the Central Hotel?—Yes.

335. Did they act?—Not at first.

336. Well, then, what followed?—So far as my memory serves me, the Central Hotel was the one that was named to Inspector Broham.

337. Did any prosecution follow that?—No.

338. What subsequently took place?—Some of us then took advantage of Commissioner Hume's presence in the city to interview him.

339. Was any action suggested to him as likely to secure a conviction?—Yes; he suggested difficulties which we tried to meet.

340. Did the department ultimately work upon the suggestions you gave them?—Yes.

341. With what result?—They secured convictions. I think they secured two convictions against one hotel if I remember aright.

342. Have you as good grounds for thinking the law is defied by other hotels as in connection with the Central Hotel?—Undoubtedly.

343. Do you think, if the police were as vigilant in that as in other matters, convictions would follow?—Yes, unless there was a great amount of deliberate falsehood a great many hotels would be convicted. I would like to mention a conversation I had with a constable. I told Inspector Broham that one of his men had said to me that if he had a free hand he would run in a dozen publicans any Sunday.

344. What followed that interview with Inspector Broham?—He swore for many minutes.

345. Did he give the information that he desired the men to enforce the licensing law?—He said if he knew the man he would have him out of the Force. He told me that.

346. Where did that interview take place?—In Inspector Broham's office.

347. Was the Inspector very passionate?—He was in a very violent rage indeed.

348. You say the Inspector swore: do you mean that he used ordinary coarse or obscene language?—Well, he said, "D— and b— him; I would have him out of the Force if I knew who he was. I would have him out." I replied, "You will most certainly not know who it was from me; and no one else knows."

349. Did you ever interview Inspector Broham in regard to the lax administration of the licensing laws anywhere else; at Cheviot, for instance?—Yes.

350. What preceded that interview?—I think it was in 1894. I may say so many of these things come to my knowledge that it is very difficult to specify correct dates. A series of Methodist ministers were visiting the Cheviot at intervals to hold services, and on their return they told me, one after another, of circumstances which rendered them suspicious that there was sly-grog selling both at the Cheviot and at the stopping-place, Te Papa.

351. As a result of these representations did you wait on the police?—I waited first on Inspector Broham, on my own responsibility, in consequence, I think, of what the Rev. Dawson told me. He said he could do nothing.

352. Did he complain that he had no man he could entrust?—Not at that time.

353. Did he say so subsequently?—I had a second interview, after conversation with another minister, and urged the Inspector; and he said he had neither men nor money for the work.

354. What did you understand, when he said he had neither men nor money? How did you understand the reference to the men?—I think it arose through the difficulty of employing men who were not well-known constables. He had no money, nor men who could do the work.

355. Did anything follow that interview?—Yes, I reported it to the League, and they determined that the matter should be laid before the public, and before the House of Representatives, that there was reason to suppose there was sly-grog selling at Cheviot, and as to the inaction of the police.

356. Well, now, was that decision of the Prohibition League conveyed to Inspector Broham?—Yes, you were appointed to convey it to Inspector Broham.

357. Were you present?—I urged that first he should be given another chance to do his duty. I was deputed to accompany you.

358. What took place at that interview?—I told the Inspector exactly the position; that the League were growing impatient, and would not stand this sort of thing any longer, and I urged him to take action.

359. Did you get the same answer as before?—No, he promised it should be done, and it was done.

360. Do you mean convictions followed?—Yes, prosecutions were instituted, and convictions followed.

361. Was there any successful prosecution for perjury arising out of that sly-grog case?—Yes.

362. You think Inspector Broham was apathetic in regard to the enforcement of the law at Cheviot?—Well, he was inactive prior to that time.

363. Have you ever successfully applied to him in regard to the enforcement of the licensing law in Christchurch?—I have applied to him, when he seemed to be very cordial over the matter; but I never remember any instances in which prosecutions resulted.

364. Except in connection with the Central Hotel, which was suggested by yourself to Colonel Hume, and Cheviot, where a certain amount of pressure was used?—That is so.

365. Have you any reason to think that the licensing laws are being enforced to-day in Christchurch?—I have every reason to believe they are not; not from my own immediate knowledge, except from the numbers I see frequenting hotels as I pass them on Sundays.

366. *Inspector Broham.*] You referred to this constable whom you mentioned to me: did I not tell you most clearly and distinctly that every constable had as free a hand as they possibly could have to carry out the Licensing Act?—I think you told me that before I told you.

367. Did I not reiterate that every constable had a perfectly free hand in the enforcement of the Licensing Act in Christchurch?—Yes.

368. And I repeated it to you?—Yes.

369. Have I not on several occasions told you that?—I do not remember more than one occasion.

370. Have you not on more than one occasion told me that certain statements were made to you by police constables who reported they had not a free hand?—I do not think so. I do not remember doing so on more than one occasion.

371. You say I used strong language about it. Was I not incensed with the constable for telling you what was a gross untruth?—You were very much incensed with him.

372. *The Chairman.*] A gross untruth?—In reference to what the Inspector called an untruth. He was very much incensed with me for repeating to him a statement the truth of which he denied.

373. *Inspector Broham.*] Was there not a strong feeling amongst the Prohibition party that the police were not doing their duty about licensed houses?—There was, and is.

374. Did I not assure you that everything I could possibly do was done to enforce the Licensing Act?—You did.

375. Did I not impress it upon you, and assure you everything was being done?—Yes, you said so.

376. Everything about me led you to believe that I, at least, was doing all in my power to enforce the Act?—So far as promises were concerned; but we waited for the fulfilment.

377. You thought the promise was one thing, and the performance another thing?—There was no action in Cheviot.

378. You think I did not do all in my power with the men at my command to enforce the licensing law at Cheviot and Christchurch?—Yes.

379. You believed the policeman, and not me?—I believed you could get a conviction.

380. And that his hands were tied, and that he could not act?—I did not know what the difficulty was. I believed he could get a conviction; yet for some reason he could not, and I do not know what the reason was.

381. Do you believe that the man had a free hand, or do you disbelieve that the man had a free hand?—Well, so many men in the Force told me that they were not allowed to act that I did not know what to believe.

382. You were inclined to disbelieve the Inspector, then?—I was; Yes.

383. I believe that, last year, you and your party have done all you possibly could to persecute me in my official position here?—No; my feelings were ever most friendly.

384. Have you not said publicly, at open meetings, that your party would prosecute me for perjury?—I have not.

385. Did you not complain to the Premier at Wellington, at a deputation, in reference to my conduct in connection with licensing cases here, and did you not tell him your party was going to prosecute me for perjury?—I did not. I was a member of a deputation which waited on the Premier in regard to general police matters, and the question of your having committed perjury in

the Coker's case was brought up, and I asked whether it was not better that a Police Commission should be set up than that such steps should be taken. I said it in friendship to you. I was very much annoyed at your conduct in the Coker's case.

386. You did mention to the Premier that your party was going to prosecute me?—The prosecution was mentioned to the Premier, but not by me; and I said, Would it not be better to have a Commission than to allow the prosecution to take place.

387. But you know it has been stated in a public meeting here, not personally by you, but at least by one of the leaders of your party, that I should be prosecuted for perjury?—It was suggested. It was a result of your absolute denial at the Coker's trial that we had interviewed you three times concerning Cheviot.

388. You say I have a strong bias against all Prohibitionists?—Undoubtedly, you showed it at Coker's trial. You asked the most trustworthy men if they were Prohibitionists, as if that discredited their whole evidence.

389. Did I conduct the Coker's Hotel case?—Mr. Wild did, but you examined witnesses.

390. I examined witnesses?—Some witnesses.

391. In the Coker's Hotel case?—Before the Licensing Committee. Mr. Wild conducted the case for the licensee, and Mr. Broham asked witnesses questions; and I asked him if he assumed that no Prohibitionist could tell the truth, because of his offensive attitude towards witnesses.

392. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did the constable ever tell you in what way his hands were tied?—No, his expression was, "If I had a free hand I would get a dozen convictions."

393. And beyond that they never expressed themselves?—No; the one I refer to never expressed himself.

394. You said other constables?—Other constables over the colony have told me they were not expected to prosecute publicans.

395. *Colonel Hume.*] Was there any delay in the Central Hotel case after you saw me?—There was no delay after you had been seen.

[The Commission at this stage adjourned for luncheon.]

396. *Witness:* I wish to amend my evidence in one detail, with regard to Inspector Broham at the Coker inquiry reflecting discredit on the Prohibitionists. It was not, I believe, in the examination of witnesses, but in his own evidence, that he so distinctly assumed that every Prohibitionist was biassed, practically biassed beyond belief. With regard to the inactivity of the police I do not know whether you would take a statement concerning the King-country from me here.

397. *Mr. Poynton.*] Were you there?—I visited that country.

398. If it is anything that refers generally to police administration we will hear it?—After receiving many reports I visited the King-country in company with the Rev. Mr. Gittos, missionary, I think, in March or April, 1897. The statements of several prominent Natives satisfied me that sly-grog selling was being pursued there, and nothing was done, practically, notwithstanding representations to the police, until we waited on the Minister of Justice (Mr. Thompson).

399. Can you give the time of that deputation?—I think it was as early as June. We had to stir up the minds of the people throughout the colony to the facts before anything was done. I should like to say that I believe the local constable was doing his utmost, but that a man wearing uniform, whose movements were watched by the sly-grog people, had not the slightest chance. Although he did succeed in securing some convictions, he had no chance to grapple with the thing vigorously and effectively. It was not until after pressure had been brought to bear on the department, through the Minister at the head of it, that any really vigorous action was taken.

400. *The Chairman.*] You attribute that vigorous action to the employment of constables outside the local Force?—Yes. Of course, my whole contention is that the Police Force as a whole has not taken action until pressure has been brought to bear upon them with regard to breaches of the licensing law. I should like to add the unfairness of this, as bearing on the private citizens. When they take action they are sneered at as "detectives." The legal profession habitually address them as "Prohibitionists," with a suggestion of unreliability.

401. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] That does not reflect on the police?—I am pointing out that the inactivity of the police subjects the citizens to unfair reproaches, and that we have reason to complain of it. The police have not done the work, and when private people have done it they have been subjected to this contempt. They have even been subjected to contemptuous reference from the Christchurch Bench.

402. *Mr. Poynton.*] You think the police ought to do the work?—Yes, and so save private people from the contempt that they incur when they do it.

403. *Colonel Hume.*] Are you certain that it was in June that the deputation waited on the Minister?—No, but I could fix the date by turning up correspondence.

[Further examination adjourned.]

THOMAS BROHAM, examined on oath.

404. *Mr. Taylor.*] In giving evidence the day before yesterday, you said it was a woeful mistake to recruit from the Permanent Artillery. Will you explain why?—It introduced into the Force men who are in no way fit for police duties.

405. Does that refer to their educational or their moral training?—To their training in the Artillery. A number of them seem to be men with no sense of duty and no spirit of obedience.

406. As to their moral character, were they all high-class men, taking the average, or have they been a source of trouble?—They have been a source of trouble to me.

407. Do you know that from 1890 to 1896 the recruiting from the Artillery was approved of year by year by the Commissioner in his annual report?—I believe that at the time it was introduced it was approved by the Commissioner.

408. And did he not approve of it year by year?—I do not recollect that.

409. What has been your policy in regard to "tote-shops" in Christchurch? You are reported as saying, "He did not know if we had much street betting." Is that an accurate report?—It is.

410. Do you know the Empire Hotel?—Yes.

411. Do you know the condition of the street there on race-days?—Yes.

412. Are there not scores of betting-men lounging about there when race meetings are on?—The 'buses start from there, which is a thing I have continually complained of. It is a place where 'buses arrive and start, and that causes a large number of people to gather there.

413. The Riccarton bus only?—They come and go, and people gather there.

414. Have you not seen the footpath and the road practically blocked on the occasion of race meetings?—The attention of the police has been drawn to the matter again and again, but I have never seen it blocked to any great extent, except on occasions like the Jubilee, or on Saturday night, when the whole place is blocked with people.

415. I refer to the day immediately preceding race-day, and race-day itself. Is that not the condition of the street?—Not to any extraordinary extent—not for a town like this, with thirty or forty thousand people.

416. Who has complained?—The local shopkeepers have complained.

417. Have they had relief?—Yes, so far as I could give it.

418. What did you do?—I told the constables, and they take the names of people, but it is often found that the name has been given wrong. A man will say he is John Smith, of Sydenham, and it is subsequently found that he does not reside there at all. The only power the police have is to take the names.

419. Has a prosecution for loitering there ever been laid?—Repeatedly.

420. I should like a return, then, for a period of five years?—The return would be for loitering in the public streets in Christchurch, and I do not know that it would show that particular place. But I know that repeated prosecutions have taken place in Christchurch. Of course that return would not show the number of persons against whom proceedings have been taken, because, as I say, a number of them could not be found.

421. In the crowd opposite the Empire Hotel, on ordinary race-days, do you think that your men do not know a large number of them personally?—I think that a large number of my men know very few of them. As I have already said, a number of my men are here for not more than a few months sometimes. I have already mentioned the fact that the police are continually being changed.

422. How long has Constable Barrett been here?—He is one of the few who have been here for a long time—five years, to my knowledge. Three-fourths of the men have been here for only a few months.

423. How long was Constable Christie here?—For some years.

424. How long was Constable McCormack here?—He was before my time.

425. How long has Detective Benjamin been here?—He has been here five years, to my knowledge.

426. And Detective Marsack, prior to his late removal?—Five years. He also is engaged on detective work.

427. There are a number of officers who have been here, then, for a period of five years and upward?—Yes.

428. And you still say that your men have frequently been deceived by false names?—Certainly. It occurs in a third or a fourth of the number, certainly a fourth.

429. Have you ever recommended the removal of a constable on account of his gambling habits?—I am not aware of it.

430. Have not a constable's gambling habits come into consideration when recommended for removal?—I have not been in the habit of recommending removals. They are made from Wellington.

431. As a matter of fact, have you not found fault with the gambling habits of any of your men?—I do not recollect.

432. Have you had any of them reported to you for frequenting "tote-shops"?—No.

433. Do you know of any "tote-shops" in Christchurch?—Yes.

434. How long have you known of them?—One reputed one has been there for two years.

435. Have you done anything in the direction of suppressing it?—Yes.

436. Did you succeed?—Yes, I think so.

437. When?—I think I succeeded nearly the whole time in shutting it up effectually.

438. What shop do you refer to, and where is it situated?—It was reported to me about two years ago and I took steps, and I believe it has been closed until lately. I have had no evidence until lately that it is open.

439. Is it in the Triangle?—Yes.

440. Is it the shop facing Shaw, Robinson's?—If the Commissioners desire it I will give the name.

441. Do you know a shop kept by Mr. Martin Taylor in the Triangle?—It has been reported to me frequently.

442. Have you taken any steps?—There is a prosecution pending now.

443. Has complaint been made to you about that shop?—Yes.

444. For how many years?—Not many years.

445. Two years?—No, in the last six months.

446. Did you personally take any steps?—Yes.

447. Was the recent raid not arranged by Inspector Cullen, who is at present in charge of the district?—It was done during the time I was absent on leave.

448. Has complaint ever been made to you about 79, Hereford Street?—No.

449. Did you not know there was a betting-office there?—No.

450. Is it one of the places raided recently?—No.
451. What was the location of the second place raided?—In High Street.
452. In the Triangle?—Yes.
453. Do you know of the existence of an office next to Kinsey and Co.'s?—No.
454. None of the officers ever reported it to you?—No.
455. Were the present prosecutions the result of your own individual motion? Were they not arranged while you were away holiday-making?—The detectives had instructions with regard to these places—Taylor's within the last six months, and the others within the last two years.
456. When I and others have waited on you, have you not said that you had the greatest difficulty in getting convictions?—Yes.
457. Do you know of any other "tote-shops"?—No.
458. Do you know any tobacconists' shops which are "tote-shops" in disguise?—No.
459. None have been reported to you?—No.
460. Do you remember seeing Mr. Louisson about one of his bars at any time?—Yes.
461. It was said to be an illegal bar?—Yes.
462. What was the point in dispute?—It was reported that it was an illegal bar. I think you reported it.
463. Probably. And what was the result?—I was informed that the bar had been used for ten years.
464. Was the bar closed?—Yes.
465. Did you prosecute?—No. I believe that fact has been made public for the last four years again and again. It promises never to die.
466. Do you consider that you had power to interfere with a prosecution of that kind?—Yes, under such circumstances. I believe the man was acting in ignorance of the law.
467. Do you remember a series of prosecutions against grocers in Christchurch for selling ginger wine?—Yes.
468. Do you think they had been in ignorance of the law for over twenty years, and that they had been selling it in ignorance of the law?—No.
469. Did you prosecute?—Yes.
470. Get convictions?—Yes.
471. Why did you prosecute in the one case and not in the other?—It was virtually selling sly-grog in the one case, and prosecutions for the same thing have been instituted over and over again. It is well known to the public that ginger wine is a spirituous beverage.
472. Do you remember a charge against Sergeant Mulville?—Yes.
473. Did you investigate it?—The Court investigated it.
474. What part did you take?—I investigated it myself.
475. What officer did you employ to make a report?—Chief-detective Henderson.
476. And, on the strength of that report, what was your decision?—The charge was not sustained.
477. You did not suspend Sergeant Mulville?—No.
478. Was the case taken to another Court?—Yes.
479. And what was the result?—Sergeant Mulville was punished.
480. And subsequently transferred?—Yes.
481. Was Chief-detective Henderson's report upheld in the Magistrate's Court?—No.
482. It was successfully impeached?—Yes; but I do not hold the detective in any way responsible for that. I found that the witnesses stated one thing to the detective, and swore another thing in the Court. We often find that.
483. Was the statement not made in the Court that suggestions had been made to the witnesses as to what they should say to the detective?—No.
484. With a view to screening Sergeant Mulville?—I am not aware of it.
485. Do you know Constable Murray in Christchurch?—Yes.
486. How long was he on street duty before he was made a plain-clothes constable?—A few months, I think.
487. How long has he been in the Force?—Not many months.
488. Did you make him a plain-clothes constable on your own motion?—Yes.
489. Without consulting headquarters?—Yes.
490. You had no suggestion as to employing him in that capacity?—Certainly not.
491. Had he any experience of police duties before coming into the Force?—I am not aware of it. I found him a smart man. I may say he was only temporarily employed in the capacity.
492. What is he now?—Watch-house keeper.
493. Is he the most entitled to the position?—Yes, by his intelligence. We do not go by seniority.
494. Who was displaced to make way for him?—No one.
495. Who was acting prior to him?—Constable Cummings, who is now on the sick-list.
496. Who acted before Constable Cummings?—Constable Leahy, who is now at Oxford.
497. How long was he in the position?—About eight or ten years.
498. Did any of your men ask for the position when Murray was appointed?—I have no recollection. I chose the best man.
499. Is it regarded as being better work?—Some of the men would not have it at any price.
500. And some men covet it?—I am not aware of that. It is not a pleasant office.
501. How long has Constable Cummings been in the Force?—Not long.
502. How long has he been on the sick-list?—About four months.
503. Has he not been on nearly six months?—I am not aware of it, but he has been on about four months.

504. Is he incapacitated by accident?—He was kicked by the prisoner.
505. Was the prisoner prosecuted?—No.
506. Why?—Because the constable only discovered the injury some time afterwards.
507. He discovered he had been kicked?—No, he discovered the injury. He did not feel the injury at the time.
508. Have you medical certificates in connection with the case?—Yes.
509. Are they forwarded to headquarters every month?—Yes.
510. What is the nature of the illness?—I cannot tell you, but the man received serious injuries on the upper part of the thigh.
511. If a man has been sick for six months, what is the rule?—If a man is sick for twenty-eight days it is reported to the Commissioner.
512. And, if sick for six months?—That is in the discretion of the Commissioner.
513. Is it not customary to discharge him?—I am not aware of it.
514. Is there any regulation on the matter?—I am not aware that it is compulsory to discharge him at any time. Particular cases require to be dealt with in particular ways.
515. He is drawing full pay?—Yes.
516. Have you any idea when he will return to duty?—I have been told he will be back in a month.
517. How long will he have been away then?—That will make it five months or more.
518. Have you made any effort to prosecute the man who kicked him?—No.
519. Why?—There is correspondence about it; but, so far as my memory serves me, the constable could not tell positively that the man did it deliberately. The man struggled when being searched, and kicked out right and left, and the constable believes that this was the time he received the injury.
520. Do you know the man?—I do not remember him.
521. Did you know him at any time?—I think I saw the name, but I cannot tell it to you.
522. What is the duty of the police so far as the compilation of the jury list is concerned? Are you responsible?—It is done under my direction every year.
523. What is the method of compilation?—The most intelligent of the constables are chosen to get the names.
524. How does he do it?—By visiting the premises.
525. Of certain businesses?—Of the people within the locality.
526. Take Christchurch. How is the list compiled here? Is it absolutely within the discretion of the constable whom he will put on and whom he will keep off?—The constables receive specific instructions, and a clause of the Act is quoted in connection with those instructions. All good men and true under sixty years of age who have a legal right to be put on the jury list are taken. We do not find that the people are at all anxious to go on the list; on the contrary, they do all they can to keep off it.
527. Do you remember an inquest at the Star and Garter Hotel some years ago?—Yes.
528. Do you remember making a statement as to any class of the population that you thought should be disqualified from going on the jury list?—One of the jurors summoned was not there, and Mr. Wake, one of the leaders of the Prohibition movement, wanted to force himself on the jury.
529. He was on the jury, was he not?—He may have been, but he wanted to force himself on it.
530. What is the position you took up in respect to it?—The Prohibitionists object to any one connected with the liquor trade appearing in such a case as that, and I thought the same rule should extend in both directions, and that pronounced Prohibitionists like Mr. Theo. Wake should not be summoned on coroners' juries; and I also held that a man like that should not be put on a jury where a possible charge against a publican was involved.
531. Should that apply to all juries?—Certainly not.
532. Do you remember an inquest at the Caversham Hotel on the bodies of two men who were burned?—I was not there, but I remember there was an inquest.
533. Do you remember the foreman?—I cannot recollect him.
534. Was it not Mr. McGaffney, the licensee of the New Zealander Hotel?—I do not remember; but if it was, it was a stupid blunder to put him there.
535. A blunder by the constable?—By the constable who summoned the jury.
536. Did any correspondence pass over your attitude over coroners' juries and Prohibitionists?—There was, in connection with the Star and Garter Hotel.
537. What was the result of the correspondence?—No result, that I remember.
538. Did the Commissioner not tell you that you were in the wrong?—I am not aware that he did, and I may say that I hold the same opinion on the matter now as I did then.
539. Do you still hold that no Prohibitionist should go on a jury?—Not where a possible charge against a publican is involved. The publicans, by direction of the authorities, are not allowed to appear on coroners' juries in such cases.
540. And if a Magistrate happened to be a Prohibitionist, would you disqualify him from dealing with a licensing case?—I do not know of any Magistrate being stopped.
541. Would you disqualify him?—Certainly not.
542. Do you regard your conduct as consistent in the two cases?—Certainly. I draw a wide line between a well-trained Magistrate and a man of a class who has no advantage, and who has received no education.
543. Do you remember an article in the *Lyttelton Times* of the 23rd April, 1897, having reference to the men under your control?—I do not remember.
544. Do you remember that it was stated that some of the men were little better than the chronic "drunks" they were supposed to look after?—I remember those terms.

545. As a result of that article appearing, did you not investigate the whole matter?—I do not remember.

546. Did you make any inquiry about it?—Of course, in all cases where there are accusations against the police of drunkenness I have made most particular inquiries.

547. In that case, what inquiry did you make?—I do not remember the particular case you allude to.

548. *The Chairman.*] Was your attention called to the paragraph?—I do not remember. Was any charge made against a particular constable?

549. *Mr. Taylor.*] It was in reference to a state of drunkenness among your men in barracks?—I remember that.

550. Did you wait on the newspaper editor in regard to the matter?—I believe I did.

551. Did you have an investigation afterwards?—Yes.

552. What did you find?—I could not find any proof at all.

553. Was there any correspondence with the Commissioner over the article?—I think there was.

554. Then I ask for the correspondence. Can you remember what followed your investigation?—I could not prove anything.

555. Did you not find there had been drunkenness in the barracks?—I was led to believe there had been, but I could not prove it.

556. Did you not mention some names to the Commissioner in connection with the article?—I believe I did.

557. What names were they?—I could not tell you.

558. They will be in the correspondence?—Yes.

559. Did you recommend any man for removal last year, because of his drunken habits?—A body of men?

560. Any one or more?—I do not think so. The removals and transfers have been made from Wellington, without consulting me.

561. How many men were there implicated in the charge of drunkenness made by the *Lyttelton Times*—four or five?—Oh, no, I believe there was only one I thought was guilty of the charge.

562. And it was not proved against him?—No.

563. Was Constable Howell moved on your suggestion last year?—No.

564. Where did the suggestion come from?—I have no idea.

565. Was Constable Sinclair moved on your suggestion?—No.

566. Constable Macdonald?—No.

567. Sergeant-major Mason?—No.

568. Were they mixed up with this suggested drunkenness at the barracks?—I do not know. I think one of the constables would be.

569. Did you discover that any constable had tried to hush the matter up, by making presents to other constables?—I did not find that out.

570. Have you ever had complaints from Oamaru about the habits of the sergeant there?—I never heard anything detrimental to the sergeant at all, as far as the charge preferred against him the other day is concerned, until the charge was made.

571. You never had a report of any kind?—I never had anything to show that the man was given to drink.

572. Did you recommend the removal of Constable Denis O'Leary?—No; but I reported him for his conduct.

573. Have you any malingering in Christchurch?—I am not aware of it. I had a number of men who were not very strong—men who were often on the sick-list.

574. How frequently was Constable Koster sick between 1894 and 1897?—I see by the returns that in 1896 he was sick for two days in September, two days in July, nineteen days in June, and three days in January. He was also sick in December of the same year, but the number of days is omitted.

575. Was Constable Macdonald on the sick-list in 1896?—He was sick for thirteen days in November.

576. What was he sick from?—Influenza.

577. Was he sick at any other time in the year?—From the 26th October to the end of the month.

578. What was the matter with him?—Influenza.

579. Was he sick any other time that year?—That is the lot.

580. Do you remember Constable McGill being sick for many months?—Yes, he was sick for a long time.

581. What was the nature of his illness?—Influenza.

582. Had you a knowledge of his condition yourself?—Yes, I know he was wasted to a shadow.

583. Do you think that the medical certificates in respect to the men's sickness are always reliable?—I must accept them.

584. But do you think they are reliable? Have you had suspicions of them at any time?—I have not always been satisfied with them.

585. Would not a police surgeon be an improvement?—I have always recommended that. It was so, long ago; and I would be glad to see the appointment made now.

586. Have you ever had a suspicion that the men were malingering?—I have told you I have had a number of weak men, and I could not be sure whether it was malingering or not. The night duty is too much for some of the men in the winter time.

587. You would not think of trying to get behind the certificate?—I would if I could, but I do not see how I could. If I could show clearly that the men were malingering I would do so.

588. What is the rule with the detective officers? Do they report all matters to you in writing?
—Yes, on all matters touching crime.
589. Do they give a report of their doings day by day in writing?—Their diary shows that.
590. Do they show it to you every morning?—I inspect the diary every week.
591. How long does it take them every day to write their report?—Do you mean to describe their duties?
592. Do they make out a written report?—They enter their duty every day in a diary, which is under the supervision of the chief detective, and I examine it every week.
593. Do you see the men every morning?—I see the chief detective every morning.
594. Not the other men?—No.
595. Do the other detectives and the acting men report in writing?—Yes, and submit it through the chief detective.
596. Do you find that there is jealousy existing in the Detective Force, as to the priority in making investigations?—I have not found a difficulty in that way.
597. Is there a regulation or instruction that the men are to see the Inspector every morning, to save the necessity for lengthy written reports? Is there correspondence on the matter?—From whom?
598. From the Commissioner?—Yes.
599. There is a circular?—Yes.
600. What is the purpose?—It is with the view of curtailing the correspondence as much as possible.
601. How long ago was it issued?—I think it would be about seven or eight years ago.
602. Has it been observed in Christchurch?—In most instances it cannot be observed. In several matters it can be observed, but in others it cannot. Where crime is concerned it has to be written.
603. An undue portion of the time of the detectives is not taken up in making reports?—No.
604. Is your detective staff capable?—I think so.
605. Thoroughly efficient?—So far as they can be in a small number, but I think that three men are quite insufficient to deal with the crime of the place.
606. Do you think that if all the men were thoroughly capable you would require more men?—I think that even with thoroughly competent men they are numerically weak. We have been so for years.
607. Do you think they are first-class men?—I think, as detectives go, they are very competent men. I do not say they are Sherlock Holmeses, but I do not know if any other men in the Force would be an improvement on them.
608. Have you many complaints of sheep-stealing?—Not many of late. I think the police are dealing very successfully with it.
609. Have you had prosecutions?—Yes.
610. When?—There are a couple at Timaru now.
611. Any in North Canterbury?—In the last few years there have been several heavy cases there.
612. Have you had any complaints from Mr. Fleming, of Port Levy?—Yes.
613. Any from Mr. Buchanan?—I do not know of any.
614. How many cases of horse-killing have been reported here in the last year or two?—There have been nineteen cases within the last three years reported. For fifteen months of that not one was killed.
615. Has there been any conviction of the offenders?—No, not of the offenders, but we believe it to be the one offender all the time.
616. The Detective Force has not succeeded in arresting any one?—No.
617. Do you remember making a report to the Commissioner with respect to Detective Henderson's habits?—There was a charge made against him, and in reporting on it I made some remarks on his general habits.
618. Did you report him as being of drunken habits?—No, I did not.
619. What did you say?—I said he was addicted to drink.
620. Is that not equivalent to saying he was of drunken habits?—No, they are very wide apart.
621. How do you define that?—I have seen many a man in a responsible position addicted to drink, and yet able to carry on his work.
622. Did you say this in the nature of a suggestion that he was not fit for the position he was then occupying?—No. It was to let the Commissioner see that he still continued the habits that I was led to believe were notorious in him. It was a matter of notoriety that he was addicted to drink before he came here, and I expressed regret that I saw no improvement. He had been a good officer in the Force, and I was sorry to have to report in those terms.
623. It was a matter of notoriety that he was addicted to drink before he came here?—So I was told.
624. You do not consider that it interfered with the discharge of his duties in any way?—I never saw him in an unfit state to do his duties. I saw him at 9 in the morning and at the same hour at night, and in the day-time too.
625. Were his habits such as were likely to make him an inefficient officer?—If continued they would, no doubt.
626. How many years was he under you?—About two years and a half.
627. And he had been of those habits the whole time?—Most of the time. I spoke to him about his habits. He had a wife and a family, and I urged him to give these habits up, and after I spoke to him he would abstain for a time.
628. This report was separate from the charge dealt with by the Magistrate?—The Magistrate afterwards made an inquiry into the same charge. My report was made long before that.

629. Mr. Beetham heard the charge?—Yes, he was deputed to hear it.
630. *Colonel Pitt.*] But what Mr. Beetham inquired into is not what you have been telling us about?—No.
631. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you not think that the presence of a man of such habits in the Force was likely to demoralise the other men?—Certainly, his influence would not be for good.
632. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you say that Henderson was a good officer?—I said he had been a good officer. When he did his work with me it might have been better done.
633. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was the report you made apart from the report in connection with the Provincial Hotel?—No, it was part of the same report.
634. What is the practice with men doing night duty? They go on at 9 o'clock and do duty till 5?—Yes, eight hours.
635. Do they get refreshments during that time?—No.
636. Does the sergeant in charge come into the barracks?—He has instructions to come into the barracks to see that all is well at the lockup, and the constable on his post at the lockup.
637. Does not the sergeant invariably get refreshments at the barracks, or at his own home?—He must not go to his own home.
638. Is there anything provided in the barracks?—The men may have refreshments there.
639. Do the men not get refreshments there at 5 in the morning?—I think the men coming off duty get coffee at 5 in the morning.
640. Do you ever see the men at that hour?—No.
641. Have you ever seen them at that hour since you have been in charge?—I do not know that I have, except in the case of fires.
642. Would it be impossible to make provision for the men to come in to get refreshments?—It would be impossible. The men must not leave their beats.
643. Is not a long beat like that calculated to make the men infringe the regulations?—I have heard it suggested that the hours at night should be less, but that would give more to the day men. It often happens that there are only five men on night duty.
644. Would it not be possible for the sergeant and the watch-house keeper to relieve them?—The watch-house keeper must not leave the watch-house.
645. But the other men would then be in the watch-house?—It could not be done, and I do not think the men would approve of a change of hours—nine in the day-time and six at night. I think the men would vote against that.
646. When the men come in at 5 o'clock they go to bed?—Yes.
647. When do they get up?—If they have to attend Court in connection with an arrest they have made they must rise at half-past 9, to be in the Court at half-past 10 o'clock.
648. Have they to make a written report?—Yes.
649. Does that arrangement not make the men defiant of the regulation not to take refreshment in hotels?—That rule has been observed here all the years I have been in Christchurch, and it is the rule in Victoria, and at Home.
650. What is your opinion as to the effect on the men? Is it not a big inducement to them to go to the hotels?—I am not aware that it is.
651. Do you think it is?—I have not heard of it before. Formerly we had stronger men in the Force, who could bear the work better than can many of the men we get now. I have always looked on the night duty as heavy.
652. Do you think the policemen physically are deteriorating?—I think we are getting a weaker class of men now.
653. Did you recommend the recent promotions of sergeants?—Some of them I did.
654. Did you recommend Sergeant Scully?—I did.
655. Was he the officer who was before the Court within the last fortnight in connection with a charge of soliciting prostitution?—He was.
656. Did the Magistrate severely reprimand him?—I saw it stated so.
657. Did you not have a report?—I was not in charge then.
658. *Mr. Poynton.*] How long have you been away from Christchurch?—I have been away three months on leave.
659. *Mr. Taylor.*] You do not know anything about Sergeant Scully in that particular prosecution?—No.
660. Do you remember Constable Sinclair being ordered for removal about three years ago?—He was ordered for removal.
661. Was the order cancelled?—Yes.
662. Do you know why?—I do not.
663. Does that pretty often happen?—I do not know; it has happened several times in the five years I have been here.
664. Orders have been cancelled without your being acquainted as to the reason?—Yes.
665. Do you remember a circular about instruction in classes for the men?—Yes.
666. Has it been complied with?—Yes.
667. Since it was issued?—I believe so.
668. Have you taken any steps to ascertain whether the weekly classes are held?—I give my instructions to the sergeant-major, and I have no reason to believe that he disobeys me.
669. You have not attended any of them on week-days?—Yes.
670. Besides the monthly classes?—No, not on week-days; I have not time.
671. You have simply given instructions regarding the weekly classes to the sergeant?—To the sergeant-major.
672. Have you taken any steps to ascertain whether they have been carried out?—I am satisfied they are carried out.

673. You expect them to be carried out?—Yes. I have not time to look after the classes.
674. And sometimes you cannot find a day a month on which to hold your monthly class?—That is so.
675. In that event, the class would not be held that month?—No.
676. It would be held only once in two months?—Yes.
677. Have you any idea as to the nature of the instruction given at the weekly classes?—Yes.
678. How do you learn that?—From the sergeant-major.
679. He has to report to you?—Yes. Several times I have spoken to Sergeant-major Ramsay and Sergeant Mason about it.
680. Are you an Inspector under the Licensing Act?—Yes.
681. Are any of your men also appointed?—All above the rank of constable.
682. Do you ever personally inspect any licensed houses?—Yes, every year, until the last year.
683. As a rule, do you find all the provisions of the Licensing Act complied with?—As a rule, I do.
684. Do you remember the prosecutions at the Central Hotel?—Yes.
685. Were they on your motion?—No. Of course, efforts had been made to detect those people, and they were unsuccessful. Two men were sent from Wellington to Christchurch in connection with them, but the men had to stop at the place a week before they were successful.
686. Were you in charge of the Force in Christchurch last Sunday?—I was not on duty. I came back on Saturday night.
687. Inspector Cullen would know what happened on Sunday, then?—Yes.
688. Do you remember the licensee of the Star and Garter dying—Mr. Touvey?—Yes.
689. Do you remember that a temporary transfer was granted to Mr. Storey?—I do not remember.
690. What is the usual practice when a transfer is granted? Is it confirmed at the next licensing meeting?—As a rule, it is.
691. Would it be the duty of the police to see that it is confirmed?—Before a man can get a temporary license, the police report on his fitness to hold it, and if the report is satisfactory he gets it. As a rule, any objection by the police is made before the temporary transfer is granted.
692. Can you remember the details of this case?—No.
693. The matter was not brought before the Bench?—I think so.
694. I would ask the Inspector to find out whether Storey's temporary transfer came under the notice of the Licensing Bench at all. Was Storey not allowed to hold a temporary license for a time, until the owner put a man into possession, to avoid trouble and expense?—That is, that they did not comply with the law, to save trouble and expense?
695. *Witness*: I would like to make a remark concerning the statement of Mr. Isitt, that when he came to me I got terribly angry when he said that a constable had stated that if he had a free hand he could run in twelve publicans every Sunday, and that if I could find out who that constable was I would get him "sacked" at once. I wish to say that, so far as my memory serves me, I have told Mr. Isitt over and over again, and told him most earnestly, that I had done all in my power to put an effectual check on Sunday trading.
696. *The Chairman*.] At that interview?—At several interviews. He has seen me frequently about the matter. Over and over again I have instructed the men to use their best efforts to put a stop to Sunday trading. When Mr. Isitt told me that the constable had told him such a thing, I did not for a moment suppose that Mr. Isitt could think I was in league with the publicans, and that I would do all in my power to dismiss a man who would do his duty if he could. I was angry at the time to think that any constable should make such an abominable statement, and I said I would use my best efforts to put a stop to Sunday trading. I also said that every constable in the Force knew that I had done so. If I were capable of doing what Mr. Isitt imputes to me, I would be utterly unfit for the Police Force, and should not be a single day kept in the Force.
697. You wish to remove an impression that people might have gained from Mr. Isitt's words?—Yes. Mr. Isitt led you to believe that I was angry with the constable because he would do his duty if he could; but I was angry with the constable because he had stated a gross and wilful falsehood.
698. *Mr. Tunbridge*.] In the watch-house book, under the date of the 10th August of last year, is there a charge against a man named Guest?—Yes. It was a case of theft.
699. Is he further charged on the same date?—Yes, with resisting Constable Cummings in the execution of his duty.
700. And there is a still further charge?—Yes, of wilfully destroying a shako.
701. Is that the man who caused the illness of Constable Cummings?—I believe it is.
702. You produce a report from Sergeant-major Ramsay on the injuries received by Constable Cummings?—Yes, at the hands of William Guest. It is as follows:—

Christchurch, 6th December, 1897.

On the 10th August last a man named William Guest was arrested by Constable Fitzgerald on a charge of theft, and while he was being searched in the lockup by Constable Cummings (who was watch-house keeper) he attempted to escape. Constable Cummings closed with him, and in the struggle the constable got kicked in the groin. He did not feel much hurt at the time, and said nothing about the matter, but a couple of weeks after he felt a pain in the right leg, and a small lump appeared on his right groin. This lump grew and spread till it became as large as a saucer. The constable consulted Dr. DeRenzi and Dr. Stewart, who ordered him to go to bed at once, and the constable, who is a married man, went home on the 26th October and remained at home attended by Dr. DeRenzi till the 1st December, when he was removed to the doctor's private hospital in Bowen Street, where an operation was performed upon him by Dr. DeRenzi and Dr. Stewart on the 3rd instant. Since the operation was performed the constable has been getting on very well, but Dr. DeRenzi states that it will be three months before the constable will be in a fit state to resume his duties.

On the 5th March, 1898, the Commissioner wrote to Inspector Cullen: "I suppose nothing can be done but wait. Please report at the end of the month, or sooner, if the constable resumes." On

the 7th April, Inspector Cullen wrote to the Commissioner: "I have seen Constable Cummings to-day, and find a great improvement in his condition. He is now able to walk about, and the wound, although still open, is healing up rapidly, and the discharge from it is greatly diminished. I think he will be in a fair way towards being able to resume duty in another month's time." Then, from the Commissioner, on the 14th April: "Please report again in a month, or sooner, if the constable resumes duty."

703. Have you any doubt that the constable was suffering from a very serious injury?—Not the slightest. The man is an excellent constable.

704. Is it customary to discharge a man from the Force if he is ill for a long period from injuries received in the execution of his duty?—I am not aware of any case of the kind.

705. If the man is likely to resume after a period he is allowed time?—Yes. I do not remember any man being discharged under those circumstances.

706. Do you think it would be right, or wrong?—I think it would be very wrong.

707. I should think so. Now, did you hear the evidence of Mr. Bowron in reference to a constable whom he reported for being under the influence of drink?—Yes.

708. Was not the result of the report the sending of the man out of the service?—Yes.

709. Immediately?—Yes, and I think he was fined as well.

710. Mr. Bowron said there was an inquiry, and that he was examined. Was that an inquiry before you?—Yes.

711. With reference to the men on night duty, the hotels are not open at 5 in the morning?—No.

712. Therefore, the suggestion that the constables are likely to go to the hotels through their long hours of night duty does not stand good?—I have not found the constables so inclined.

713. There would be no difficulty in the way of constables getting refreshments on coming off duty?—No.

714. The police cook would give it to them?—Yes. I believe they all get it now—the men going out and the men coming in.

715. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was a prosecution instituted against Guest for the injuries received by the constable?—He was charged with resisting.

716. But, was he charged with resisting the police constable?—I do not think he has been charged since; but he was up for resisting, and he was discharged.

717. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] The charge against the man was resisting a constable?—Yes.

718. As a matter of fact, the assault was not a serious one?—No.

719. But the after effects were?—Yes. It was a fortnight after that the constable discovered the nature of the injury.

720. It is not usual to charge a man with assaulting a constable unless it is a violent assault?—That is so.

721. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was the case dismissed because the constable stated that it was not intentional?—I do not know, but I presume that was the reason.

FRANCIS WHITMORE ISITT, recalled.

722. *The Chairman.*] Have you the date now, Mr. Isitt?—Yes. It was on the 3rd October, 1896, that I went to the King-country. On the 25th June, 1897, a deputation waited on the Minister of Justice, and between those dates a considerable agitation at public meetings had taken place, demanding that action should be taken in the King-country. I think I am right in saying that it was in September or October, 1897, that the raid on the sly-grog sellers in the King-country was made. It was not until three or four months after the deputation waited on the Minister of Justice.

723. *Colonel Hume.*] You said that you interviewed the Minister of Justice on the 25th June, 1897?—Yes.

724. And you said on your oath that nothing was done until after that interview?—Nothing to my knowledge.

725. Did you say "to your knowledge"? Did you not say that nothing was done until the deputation waited on the Minister?—I cannot recall my exact words, but I meant to my knowledge.

726. You knew of nothing that was done. Do you think it would add in any way to the likelihood of our getting convictions in that locality if you or any one else had been told what we were doing?—I think you had better not press that question.

727. You complained that you were not told what was being done?—I complained that things were not done.

728. You say at one time that nothing was done; and at another, that as far as you knew nothing was done?—I mean, no prosecutions. I was aware that Inspector Hickson sent some Armed Constabulary men, but it would not be evidence for me to say what I know about that ridiculous fiasco. I would be prepared to go into that, however, if I could. I do not call that anything. It was worse than nothing.

730. If I can prove to the Commissioners that I had people travelling in the King-country for a considerable time before you went with this deputation to the Minister, you will admit that you are wrong?—I will admit that something was being done.

731. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you aware who it was that was successful in getting prosecutions in the King-country?—From general information, I know it was Sergeant Cullen.

732. Where did you get that information?—From the newspapers. Cullen has never told me anything about it himself.

733. You are aware, then, that Cullen carried out the raid?—Yes.

734. Did he display any ability?—I think he displayed admirable ability.

735. Did well?—Yes.

736. He is not in league with the sly-grog sellers at all?—No.

737. Do you think that Cullen is a good police-officer?—I should dub him first-class. It may not be an expert opinion, but that is my impression.

738. You do not think he is likely to wink at any breaches of the law?—I think he is an efficient, straightforward officer.

739. You also know that Cullen has had charge of the Christchurch Station for the past three months?—Yes.

740. How do you reconcile your statement of this morning about the police neglecting to carry out the laws with your present statement about Sergeant—now Inspector—Cullen?—I know from general information that the publicans are breaking the laws on Sundays. Inspector Cullen may have been too busy to look after the matter, or he may have had difficulties that I know nothing of; but, while he did display great efficiency in the King-country, the other fact remains that the law is being broken here. I cannot reconcile the two facts.

741. You admit that Inspector Cullen was an exceedingly good officer in the King-country, but not in Christchurch?—I have seen him in various parts of the colony, and I have formed a good impression of him; but I do not know why the law is not enforced in Christchurch. He may have had difficulties with his subordinates for all I know.

742. Or with the law?—Yes, he might have a great deal of difficulty with the law.

743. You say that private citizens are placed at a disadvantage through acting as detectives, and that they are subject to a great amount of ridicule?—Yes, and worse than ridicule.

744. By the other class of citizens?—Yes, and by the newspaper press, and generally.

745. I suppose you think the other citizens have a right to some police protection?—Yes, quite so.

746. Do you not think that at present and for some time past a very great deal of police attention has been paid to breaches of the licensing laws?—I could not say that. My point is this: that informations laid against publicans for breaches of the law involve private citizens in reproach, but catching "the horse fiend" would bring them great honour.

747. But do you not think that that feeling on behalf of the public has a great deal to do with what you call the violation of the law?—It may have.

748. Do you not think it also hampers the police very much?—Doubtless it does. The people want educating.

749. But you are only able to get at the police, and you do it as much as you can?—We have had very grave reason for getting at the police. We have had grave cases of neglect of duty.

750. You are not bringing any grave cases, are you?—Well, there is a difficulty about it. At any rate, my general point is that we have an immense amount of information, which is not actual legal information. We know of many cases of careless or ineffective attempts to deal with the publicans, sometimes indicating sympathy with the publicans on the part of the police; but these things are not evidence unless I produce the men. So it is difficult to answer the question.

751. You mean the police-officers?—The persons who can give the information.

752. What is the difficulty?—We could not get a policeman to say he gave a publican notice, and we know how useless it is to produce publicans and their witnesses.

753. You admit that it is difficult to get at the truth?—Yes.

754. In cases where publichouses are concerned?—Undoubtedly.

755. You have had that difficulty yourself?—Yes.

756. And, do you not think the police experience an equal difficulty?—Yes; but the police authorities frequently attempt to secure convictions through men in uniform, and fail. Inspector Broham has said, according to the newspapers, that he could not catch a publican because the publican had sentinels. With all respect to him, I wish to say that if I were the Police Inspector I should try to be smarter than the man who has a sentinel. I think the police might contend with the cunning of the publican and outwit him, and not depend on the men in uniform.

757. That is your recommendation?—That is my attempt to answer your question.

758. Do you not know that that has been resorted to—that men in plain clothes have gone round to the publichouses?—Yes. We have sometimes had to suggest means that have been adopted.

759. But, I mean, without your suggestions?—Quite so; but in some cases we have had to suggest it, and it is not creditable to the Force that we should have to suggest.

760. Some attempts have been made?—Yes, undoubtedly, a section of the police are trying to do their duty.

761. *The Chairman.*] You know there are many other crimes on the statute-book which are equally difficult to put down?—Some.

762. What about smuggling? Will that ever be stamped out, although there is a special body of police devoted to it?—So far as my observation goes, smuggling is not in it with sly-grog selling—selling during illegal hours.

763. But the ingenuity of the evaders of the law make the bringing home of the offence equally difficult in both classes of cases?—Yes. Probably there would be more ingenuity on the part of the drink-sellers. My reading lies in this direction: that all over the world the liquor traffic is defying the law. I do not know any English-speaking country where that is not the case, judging by the newspaper reports, and there are great difficulties for the police to contend with.

764. If so, do you press your indictment against the police as far as indifference in enforcing the law is concerned?—I say that a section of them are doing their duty, but we are compelled to the conviction that a large number are not.

765. Looking at it as a large question, do you consider that the Force as a whole is doing its duty fairly well in the matter of enforcing the liquor laws?—I could not say it is.

766. Do you impeach the whole Force?—A very large proportion of the Force; and I am glad the conviction has grown up that reform is needed. Policemen have told me here and in the other colonies that the way to bar their promotion was to touch the liquor trade or the gamblers.

767. You have been told that by policemen in this colony?—Yes.

768. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You believe that assertion?—I think the men who told me told the truth.

769. Can you point to any case where a constable, or any police-officer, has been debarred in promotion through activity to the liquor trade?—They have told me repeatedly they have been removed, but I cannot point to a case where they have been barred.

770. You know that Inspector Cullen was very active in the King-country?—Yes.

771. He was sergeant, and now he is Inspector?—Yes.

772. Has it barred his promotion?—No. We were delighted to see there was one case where a man went up when he did his duty.

773. In your speeches, which are very many, you attribute the inactivity of the police in a great measure to the capital at the command of the drink party, and the influence they exert in politics?—Yes.

774. To the inactivity of the police?—Yes.

775. That is frequently the thing you hold up more particularly?—Yes.

776. Perhaps you would tell the Commissioners what proof you have of it? It is a serious allegation to bring against the police. It means that the police-officers are either directly bribed for not performing their duty, or that some other power is brought to bear on them to prevent them from doing their duty?—I have made it a rule to talk to every policeman I can talk to, and I am satisfied there is an impression in the minds of the rank and file of the Force that if they vigorously enforce the licensing law they would be subjecting themselves to the disapproval of the very highest authorities in the land.

777. *Mr. Poynton.*] Can you suggest a remedy?—It would very largely be cured by the removal of political influence. I have never heard anything said that indicated that the men meant their Inspectors, at least not of late years. I have been told by a constable that his instructions were to take no notice of what went on in any publichouse unless there was an absolute row. That does not refer to any one now in office. All recent communications with policemen tend to the belief that influence would be brought to bear on them if they touched the trade actively.

778. Do you think the Force should be removed from political control?—I should recommend it, and I would like to see the whole control of the Police Force removed from the absolute control of the Minister.

779. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you mean that Parliament should be a final tribunal?—Parliament, instead of the Minister of Justice, or the Defence Minister.

780. *The Chairman.*] Do you suggest that the head of the department should be responsible only to Parliament?—I am out of my depth. I have never tried to determine what should be done to reform the police. I have found it more than enough to expose the abuses of the liquor trade and the Police Force. I should like to see the Force removed from the present position of Ministerial control.

781. That is, apart from the individuality of the Ministry?—Yes.

782. As a representative Prohibitionist, familiar with the provisions of the licensing laws, can you suggest any amendment whereby the police could more effectually deal with offences?—I have not much hope. I find that the liquor traffic is not controlled in any part of the world, and it deepens my conviction that the only thing to be done with it is to get rid of it. I have no doubt it would help them somewhat if it was an offence for persons to be in a house in prohibited hours, or if, as in New South Wales, the man who drinks in illegal hours was prosecuted as well as the publican who supplies him. But though they have that law there, there is probably more illegal sale in New South Wales than here. From all my reading and observation I have never yet seen a possibility of controlling the traffic.

783. You think there is no possibility of controlling the traffic?—I think so; but I think some of the flagrant abuses might be checked.

784. *Colonel Hume.*] You said that the party to which you belong do not think it is their place to make suggestions to the police?—That was, as to the whole mode of controlling the Force.

785. *Mr. Poynton.*] You said it was degrading to the Police Force for you to make suggestions to them?—If the suggestion made were an obvious one, I felt it would not be creditable to the Force that we should have to make it, instead of it originating with themselves.

786. *Colonel Hume.*] You have made several suggestions to me?—Yes.

787. And they have always been well received?—Yes.

788. And some good has come out of it?—Yes.

789. Do you not think that if there was a confidence established between the head of the police and the prominent members of the party to which you belong, something good would come out of such advice?—I think it would be an admirable thing if the Commissioner of Police were a member of the Prohibition League. We want more sympathy between the Prohibition party and the police than we have had, and the indication of the reverse has seemed to us a very serious thing.

790. Do you think that that can possibly be established by constant meetings of the Prohibition party at which it is said that the police are not doing their duty, and that they will not do it?—We think we have had too much reason for it. First rebuke a man, and then help him up. I am sure there is no unfriendly feeling towards the police in the mind of the Prohibition party.

JOHN CULLEN, examined on oath.

791. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember Mr. G. J. Smith and myself waiting on you about a fortnight ago in regard to "tote-shops"?—Yes.

792. Did you promise to take some action in the matter?—Yes; I promised to try what could be done.
793. Have you cases pending in the Court now in connection with "tote-shops"?—I believe so. I may say I had spoken to the detectives on the matter some time before that.
794. Since you relieved Inspector Broham?—Yes. We had discussed the matter.
795. Was the matter of the reprimand administered to Sergeant Scully sent to the Commissioner?—Yes.
796. In connection with your recent visit to Oamaru, do you remember a deputation waiting on you from the Athenæum?—Yes.
797. What was their complaint?—About larrikins congregating at the Athenæum corner.
798. Did they say they had previously complained to the local police?—They said they had mentioned the matter to Sergeant O'Grady, but that, although the nuisance complained of was abated for a while, it appeared again to come back to the old state.
799. Did you give special instructions about it?—I told Sergeant O'Grady what the representations were that had been made to me, and I told him to see that the nuisance was abated.
800. Can you tell the Commission anything about the extent to which political influence has been used in connection with police matters?—No, I cannot. I have no personal knowledge on the point.
801. Can you tell the Commission anything of the way in which publicans have threatened the police for doing their duty? Have you any instance in your mind where a police-officer has been threatened by the publicans with removal?—I have heard of it.
802. Within your own knowledge, do you know a case?—There is an instance in which I was concerned myself. I was transferred from Timaru at the instance of a section of the publicans there. That was in 1886.
803. *Mr. Poynton.*] Who was the Commissioner of Police then?—Colonel Whitmore.
804. *The Chairman.*] What rank did you hold then?—I was a second-class sergeant, and I was in charge of the station, under Inspector Broham.
805. *Mr. Taylor.*] Had you any doubt as to the direct influence they brought to bear on your removal?—It was pretty well known that they were the cause of it.
806. Was that the result of your endeavours to enforce the licensing laws?—Yes; Inspector Broham and I were trying to suppress Sunday trading.
807. Were you successful?—Pretty successful.
808. *The Chairman.*] What reason have you for saying you were removed at the instance of a section of the publicans?—I was told by the solicitor who was acting for one of the parties moving in the matter that they had approached the Commissioner of the Police to remove me. I was told of that in confidence.
809. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was it long before your removal?—About three weeks.
810. Was there any other cause for your removal?—No.
811. How long had you been there?—Four years and a half.
812. *Mr. Taylor.*] What towns have you served in since joining the Force?—Blenheim, Havelock (Marlborough), Dunedin, Timaru, Christchurch, Napier, Wanganui, and Greymouth, where I am stationed now.
813. Have you been uniformly successful in your efforts in enforcing the licensing law in the different places?—I have done my best.
814. On the average, have you found that the publican was more than a match for you, personally?—Of course, one will bring cases that will not be successful.
815. You succeeded very well?—I think I did, on the whole.
816. Have you ever known of any open sympathy on the part of police-officers with law-breakers?—How do you mean?
817. For instance, in prosecutions under the Licensing Act, or under the Gaming Act? Have you ever noticed any open sympathy as between the officer in charge and the accused?—No open sympathy.
818. How long did you serve in Hawke's Bay?—Three years.
819. Who was the Inspector?—There were several.
820. Did you serve under Inspector Emerson?—Yes.
821. Do you remember the prosecution of certain spielers in the Napier Court?—We had several times prosecutions against spielers.
822. Do you remember a man named Robinson?—A man known as "Murrumbidgee," do you mean?
823. Yes?—He was the man who took action against the Town and Suburban Racing Club.
824. Well, in connection with the prosecutions, do you remember an Inspector showing open sympathy with the accused—sympathy that could be remarked by the public?—I think if this is a charge against Inspector Emerson it is not fair that I should be asked about it.
825. I ask as a general question: have you ever seen an Inspector prompting an accused man's counsel as to what his defence should be, and openly prompting him?—Do you mean that to refer to Napier?
826. I will leave Napier out of the question?—I drew an inference myself, and I know that others have drawn the same inference, as to what occurred on a certain occasion.
827. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] With reference to Sergeant Scully, since you have been here have there been numerous complaints respecting prostitutes in the streets?—Yes, frequent complaints; particularly from Manchester Street.
828. Complaints from the citizens?—Yes.
829. Have you endeavoured to do all you can to abate the nuisance?—Yes; I gave instructions on parade on several occasions, especially to the night-duty men.

830. Have several prostitutes been charged with soliciting there?—Yes.
831. And convicted?—Yes.
832. Has Sergeant Scully been active in trying to suppress the nuisance?—Yes, very much so.
833. What is your opinion of Sergeant Scully generally, besides his action with reference to suppressing this particular nuisance?—He has done his duty well while I have been here. He has been an energetic man.
834. With reference to the charge which brought about the complaint from the Bench, you do think the sergeant acted indiscreetly?—Yes.
835. He showed a want of tact?—Yes, that was it.
836. Do you think that, beyond the want of tact, there was anything to complain of in the sergeant's conduct?—No, nothing.
837. As a matter of fact, the woman who was charged was a prostitute?—Yes, a noted prostitute.
838. You know that the department has considered the matter?—Yes, it has been dealt with by the department.
839. By punishment being inflicted?—Yes.
840. Which punishment has not taken effect yet?—No.
841. *Colonel Hume.*] Who was Commissioner when you were transferred from Timaru?—Colonel Whitmore.
842. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you given special instructions for the inspection of hotels on Sunday since you came here?—They were in existence when I came here, and they have been carried out in my time.
843. Were there inspections last Sunday?—Yes.
844. Who were the constables?—Sergeant Mackay, and a constable. The sergeant, in his report, gives the number of hotels he visited. I can say that, during the three months I have been here, the hotels have been as well conducted as they are in any other town in the colony.
845. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] With reference to the state of the Force, you say that in 1886 you were transferred from Timaru owing to the action of the publicans?—Yes.
846. What is your opinion as to the condition of the Force during the past seven years, and their condition prior to that period?—I do not see much alteration for the last eighteen or twenty years.
847. Prior to 1890—the system of dealing with constables and so on—were they not practically at the whim of the Inspectors?—They were to some extent. Do you mean for transferring them about?
848. Transferring, and inflicting punishment?—Yes, the Inspectors had greater power than they appear to have now, and I think it was a great mistake to take away those powers. They have lost power, and their influence with the men is not so great as it was.
849. Then, your opinion is that the state of affairs that began prior to 1890 was calculated to undermine the authority of the Inspectors?—It began long before 1890, in my opinion.
850. You think the undermining of the Inspectors' powers began before that?—I think it began when Major Gudgeon came into office.
851. Would you prefer going back to the state of affairs that has been proved before this Commission to have existed in the last decade?—I do not know what has been proved before the Commission, but I know there is little difference in the Force now in the matter of organization to what there was ten or fifteen years ago.
852. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is it as efficient as it was ten or fifteen years ago?—I do not think there is such a good class of men coming in.
853. Is that due to recruiting from the Artillery?—I think it is recruiting from the wrong direction to recruit from the Artillery.

WILLIAM JARVIS HARKER, examined on oath.

854. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—William Jarvis Harker.
855. What are you?—An independent gentleman.
856. Where do you reside?—Holly Road, Papanui Road, St. Albans.
857. You desire to give evidence as to the general organization of the Police Force?—Yes. I wish to say that I came to Christchurch seven years ago from Hawke's Bay. When I first came here the police were disorganized, and naturally the hotel-keeping was also disorganized. At that time, with the exception of two or three publichouses, you could get drink on any Sunday or at any time after hours.
858. Is that within your own knowledge?—Yes.
859. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you ever get it?—Yes, seven years ago; but that state of things has been entirely reversed since that time. At present, so far from being able to get it at every house but two or three, it is at only two or three houses that it can be got. The police at that time were frequently in the habit of going to publichouses, but it is a very rare thing to see a constable in a publichouse now.
860. Did you ever see them in the publichouses before?—Scores of times. I take the *Prohibitionist*, and I vote prohibition. I have no interest in the liquor trade, and whatever I say is merely in the cause of justice. I have only the cause of truth to serve. On my arrival in Christchurch the police had fallen into a state of disorganization, and they were not a thoroughly capable body of men, and reliable men. I say this from my own knowledge.
861. *The Chairman.*] What facts have you to support it?—I knew all the men. They were in the habit of going into all the hotels, and they would smoke on their beats. What I desire to do is to point out the difference between then and now. At the present time they are as fine a body of men as you will find anywhere in the world; indeed, they have been

brought to such a state of perfection that the Prohibitionists have no need to quarrel with them. What I say of the Christchurch hotels applies to the other hotels throughout Canterbury. I travel about, and I say that from my own knowledge. I would also say that what I say of the Christchurch police applies also to the police of the Canterbury District. Regarding the whole question, I wish to say that I think a wrong perspective has been put on it. Too much has been made of little things; molehills have been made into mountains.

THURSDAY, 21ST APRIL, 1898.

EDWARD MACKAY, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Second-class sergeant, stationed at Christchurch.
2. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where have you been stationed since you joined the Force?—In various places. I have been round the Hawke's Bay District.
3. *The Chairman.*] Where were you stationed when you first joined?—Wellington.
4. And then?—I went to Lake Taupo, from there to Tarawera, and from there to Auckland.
5. When did you join?—I joined the service on the 14th May, 1877.
6. Is that the Police Force?—Well, it was police duty I was doing there. I was taken on for the Armed Constabulary. but I was doing police duty up there.
7. When were you taken on to the strength of the Police Force?—I was transferred from Taupo about seventeen or eighteen years ago. I joined the Armed Constabulary in 1877.
8. When were you first in the Police Force?—I was sent to Auckland about seventeen years ago. I cannot recollect the date exactly. It was on the 5th September, 1881 or 1882, that I was sent to Auckland and put into the Police Force.
9. *Mr. Taylor.*] What was your next station?—From Auckland I was sent to Dunedin.
10. And after that?—Lawrence.
11. And then?—Christchurch.
12. Have you within your own knowledge any information as to outside influence being used in connection with the police for securing transfers or promotions or removals?—I have heard a good deal of it. I have heard that influence has been used.
13. Of your own knowledge? Can you tell the Commission any instance where political or other influence has been used to secure the removal of a man for the performance of his duty?—Well, I really could not answer that question, further than that I have been threatened by the publicans of Dunedin that I would be removed, or that they would have me removed.
14. *The Chairman.*] You were actually threatened in Dunedin?—I was told that they had influence, and that they would use it on me.
15. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you have a prosecution of the Shamrock Hotel in Dunedin?—I did.
16. Was it successful?—Yes.
17. *The Chairman.*] When was this threat made?—I could not give the exact date. It would be in the year 1896.
18. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who did you hear that from?—Several of them had threatened me, but Mr. Palmer, of Wain's Hotel, in particular. He used to stand at the door; in fact, every time I passed his house he would threaten me. He was the licensee of Wain's Hotel.
19. Did Palmer not make a boast in the City of Dunedin he would have you shifted?—That would be hearsay. He did not tell me that. I did hear so.
20. How long after that before you were shifted from Dunedin?—I should think about three weeks or a month. I think it would be about that time. I did not take any particular notice of it.
21. Where did you go to?—I was transferred to Lawrence.
22. *Mr. Poynton.*] How long had you been in Dunedin then?—One year and eight months.
23. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you remain in Lawrence long?—Just about the same period—one year and eight months.
24. Did you have any licensing prosecutions in Lawrence?—No.
25. Have you had considerable success in connection with licensing prosecutions since you have been in the Force?—Yes. I have been very successful in those brought before the Court.
26. Did any such experience happen to you in any other station?—As regards my removal?
27. Yes?—Yes.
28. Where was that?—Lawrence.
29. *The Chairman.*] What happened there?—I was told when visiting hotels that I had been shifted from Dunedin for being too meddlesome at the hotels, and that I would be shifted again.
30. Who told you that?—Mr. Webb, licensee of the Masonic Hotel.
31. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long after that statement did you leave Lawrence?—I should think about sixteen months.
32. Has any similar experience happened to you anywhere else—in Auckland?—No. I was not threatened in Auckland in any way.
33. Do you think the laxity in administering the licensing laws is at all due to the supposed political power of the liquor party?—It has not interfered with me personally. I carry out my duties in every town I go to.
34. Do you think it has any influence on the actions of other constables?—Well, no; I would not think so, as to the manner in which they perform their duties when with me.
35. Is there a feeling in the Force that the liquor party do use political power, and use it freely? As a matter of conversation have you heard it?—No, I have not heard that conversation.

36. Have you known at any time of refreshments being supplied in the barracks to men on night duty—upon their coming off night duty, by the cook at the barracks?—What sort of refreshments are you referring to?

37. Coffee, tea, or anything of that sort—I do not mean alcoholic liquors?—In Dunedin, the men had coffee coming off in the morning.

38. Who provided it?—Themselves.

39. Did the cook at the barracks provide it?—He did not. The watch-house keeper made the kettle boil, and the coffee was ready for the men when they came in.

40. Is that the practice in Christchurch?—I do not know much about the practice in the Christchurch barracks, because when my duties are done I go straight home.

41. Do you know whether the men coming off night duty have had refreshments of that character?—Well, the last fortnight I have noticed when they came off they would go into the mess-room—whether for refreshments, or not, I could not say. I did not watch to see.

42. Prior to that, have you known they got refreshments after coming off night duty?—Well, no; I do not take any notice when they come off night duty, because I am anxious to get home myself.

43. Have any men complained to you about the strain of the long night duty without refreshments?—Yes, there were one or two spoke about it—that they thought them rather long hours without having something to eat.

44. Do you think a spell of eight hours is not calculated to induce men to take refreshments from outsiders?—I would not think so. I do not feel it so much.

45. You are a particularly strong man: to the average policeman is it not an inducement—a stretch of eight hours in all weathers—to take refreshments from outsiders?—Eight hours at a stretch is a long time, but I can only give you what I do myself when I was doing it. I used then to take a piece of bread in my pocket, and have that.

46. Do you think it is possible to have a break with the view of letting the men go in by detachments to have refreshments?—No; I do not think it could be done, because it would leave so many beats vacant, and offences might be committed in their absence.

47. Did you accompany officers on Sunday last in visiting Christchurch hotels?—I did.

48. What hotels did you visit on Sunday?—I visited a great number—some twice. I would like to say when I was first promoted to the rank of acting third-class sergeant I received instructions from Mr. Broham, in Auckland, when going on duty, that I would have to visit these hotels during my hours, and to submit a report giving the times I visited these hotels. I have continued to do that since I have been in the Force up to the present date.

49. *The Chairman.*] Did you have any special instructions last Sunday?—That is the standing order.

50. Did you have any special instructions last Sunday?—No. I had no special instructions. It is a standing order. I understand, if I do not do that, it would be disobedience of orders.

51. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you in uniform last Sunday?—I was.

52. Was your fellow-officer in uniform?—Yes.

53. Did you enter by the front or the back doors of the hotels?—Mostly by the front. There was one I went in at the back one visit, and the other visit I went in at the front.

54. Which hotel was that?—That was Tattersall's Hotel.

55. Do you intend laying informations in connection with your Sunday visit?—No. I do not think it necessary. My report would not justify doing so.

56. Do you think there is much Sunday trading going on in Christchurch?—Well, it is no worse than other cities, as far as my experience goes.

57. Tattersall's Hotel on Sunday: did you find any visitors there?—Yes. I found four men in a sitting-room, and they were represented to me as boarders by the licensee. I asked them personally whether they were boarders. They told me they were. I had no reason to doubt them. They were sober and quiet.

58. Did you visit the Railway Hotel in Manchester Street?—I did.

59. When you say you do not think Sunday trading is any worse here than in other cities, that does not quite answer my question. Do you think there are numerous breaches of the licensing law as far as Sunday trading is concerned?—That I could not say, because I have not seen any. I visit the hotels, and I have not seen any. I could not say there was not.

60. When you were stationed in Dunedin were you in charge of the night relief at all?—Yes.

61. Did any of the men frequent Speight's brewery to your knowledge?—I never saw any of them near it. I heard when I first went there some of the men frequented the place, and when I got them on night duty I cautioned them against it, and I never found any of them going there—not to my knowledge.

62. Was it not a matter of common talk in the barrack-room that such was the practice?—I am not in a position to say whether it was or not, because when my duties are done I go home. I do not stop about the station.

63. *Colonel Hume.*] When were you transferred from Dunedin to Lawrence?—I was transferred on the 24th February, 1896.

64. When were you transferred to Christchurch?—I landed in Christchurch on the 3rd November last.

65. Your being transferred from Dunedin to Lawrence was promotion, or, rather betterment?—I would not think so.

66. You got a free house?—I did, such as it was.

67. And you had charge of a station?—I had.

68. No beat duty to do?—Yes, I had. I would consider it unsafe on account of the larrikins in the place for a policeman to be off duty on the street. I made it four hours for myself and four hours for the constable.

69. You made it yourself?—Had I not done so I would not have been able to keep peace and order in the township.

70. Does not a sergeant or a constable consider it betterment to have charge of a station and be his own master?—I would not think so. I am just as pleased to do my duty under a master as being my own.

71. You were promoted out of your turn?—No.

72. Made third-class sergeant out of your turn?—No; you represented I was, but I was not.

73. Were you at the top of the list when you were made acting-sergeant?—I knew there were other constables promoted over me who were junior to me, so that I could not consider I was promoted out of my turn if that was done to me.

74. Were you at the top of the list of first-class constables when you were promoted?—That I could not say. I saw juniors passed over me, and I made application for promotion.

75. If other constables came up and said you were promoted over their heads, that is not correct?—I would not say that. When I see juniors promoted over my head then I reckon it is my turn for promotion. I have cause for complaint then in my mind.

76. You do not know whether you were promoted out of your turn or not?—I could not say. All I can say is, there were junior men promoted over me, and I applied for promotion.

77. You do not know you were promoted over men?—I may have been.

78. How were the hotels conducted in Lawrence?—Very well.

79. When you first went to Lawrence, were they well conducted?—They did not close at proper hours. The first night I went round I found them open at 10 o'clock, and I cautioned them. I explained to them, if they committed a breach of the Act, I would report them to my superior.

80. And when you came away they were closed at proper hours?—They were.

81. We may conclude you had done the duty you were specially sent to Lawrence for? Specially sent?—I was not sent specially for that.

82. You do not know what you were sent there for? At any rate, when you went there the licensing laws were not properly carried out, and when you came away they were?—They were open when I went down the first time. I do not know whether they were taking advantage of me as a stranger, or whether it was customary for them to do that when the other sergeant was there.

83. When you came away they were closed at the proper hour, and the liquor laws were properly carried out?—Yes.

84. How long were you third-class sergeant?—About four years—going on for five.

85. That is fairly quick promotion, is it not?—I would not consider so, the way I was harrassed about.

86. *The Chairman.*] Where?—Shifted from Auckland to Dunedin, from Dunedin to Lawrence, and then down here.

87. When were you removed from Auckland to Dunedin?—I am not sure, but I think it was on the 18th May, 1894.

88. And from Dunedin to Lawrence?—24th February, 1896.

89. And from Lawrence to Christchurch?—3rd November, 1897.

89A. Which is the particular period you refer to as being harrassed?—The whole way I was shifted about. While others were allowed to remain at stations I was shifted away, and it smashes one's furniture to such an extent that it is next to useless to one.

90. *Colonel Hume.*] If the promotion-book shows that you went over the heads of upwards of sixty constables when you were promoted to third-class sergeant, would you deny it?—No, but it would show there had been junior constables promoted over me.

91. I asked you just now if you were promoted out of your turn?—I do not think so, according to the way promotion was given.

92. *The Chairman.*] Do you think you had a right to promotion simply on the ground of seniority?—No.

93. *Colonel Hume.*] Is it not rather a short time to be third-class sergeant, four years?—Others have had promotion.

94. But has not the average been for the last fifteen years much longer than four years for a third-class sergeant before he is promoted to second-class?—Yes; at least, I think so. With regard to the promotion spoken of by Colonel Hume, I was stationed in charge of the Water Police for a time in Auckland. During the time I was on the wharf I saved a number of lives—swam into the harbour and rescued them. I had saved six or eight. Those I never took any notice of until I found out that promotion was given to every man who had performed this duty—that they were promoted immediately. It was then I made application, after saving life, for which I hold certificates from the Humane Society. I then applied for promotion. Commissioner Hume was then in charge of the Force. He went against my promotion, and I reported and asked him to reconsider his decision in the matter, and pointed out that others had got it. He wrote back and told me his decision was final. There were a large number of people on the wharf at the time I performed this duty of taking this boy out of the water. When they found out that I had not been recompensed in the same way that others had been, they interested themselves on my behalf, I believe, with the result that I was promoted to acting-sergeant. My promotion was confirmed on the 1st February, 1894, and I was transferred to Dunedin. It was only because others had been promoted for performing the same duty that I thought I had a right to this.

95. *The Chairman.*] When were you promoted from third to second class?—On the 15th February last. I am quite satisfied within the last six months with the way I have been treated.

96. What made you not satisfied with your position before that?—I did not feel altogether safe in my position in the Force, because of the manner in which I was treated by Colonel Hume

on parade in Dunedin. He came on parade, and walked up and down through the men, and when he passed me he said, "Yes, a lot of men have been promoted out of their turn for jumping into the water, the same as any of us would do if we had been there." I took it as a slur on myself, because, as far as I knew, I was the only one that had done anything of the sort.

97. In consequence of that, you felt your position was imperilled?—I asked to see the Commissioner in the office, and when I went in he said, "What do you want?" Well, I could see there was an ill-feeling, and I fancied if there was a possible chance of my making a slip it would be taken notice of.

98. Do you claim to have made special effort to bring persons guilty of breaches of the licensing law before the Courts?—I have made no speciality of it. Any breaches of the law I see I deem it my duty to make a report, and submit it for the consideration of my superior officer.

99. Do you feel you have any reason for supposing activity in that respect has in any way prejudiced your position in the Force?—No, I have no reason to believe that.

100. You referred to two threats made to you by hotelkeepers. The last, you say, was at Lawrence; and you mentioned you were there for sixteen months after that threat was made?—Do you connect your removal with that threat?—No, sir, I do not.

101. In the other case, you say a threat was made by Mr. Palmer, of Wain's Hotel, Dunedin, and you were removed; about how long after that?—Three weeks after.

102. Do you in your mind associate your transfer to Lawrence with the threat made by Mr. Palmer?—Well, it may have been. I would not say it had anything to do with my removal.

103. Have you any reason for associating one with the other?—I think that was the cause of my removal. That is my opinion. Whether it is so or not I could not say.

104. In connection with that, you consider your transfer to Lawrence and being placed in charge of a station there, with a free house, was not promotion?—I do not consider it so.

105. Had you ever before been placed in charge of a station?—No, further than having charge of the Water Police in Auckland.

106. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You were made acting-sergeant on the 1st January, 1890?—Somewhere about that time, I think. I am not quite sure on the point.

107. Do you consider yourself to be senior to Sergeant Dwyer?—Yes, I do.

108. Have you read the evidence given by Sergeant Dwyer before the Commission at Dunedin?—No, but I heard Dwyer made use of my name.

109. If it should be decided that Dwyer should be placed before you on the list, should you consider that you had been fairly dealt with?—No, I should not.

110. You were promoted to third-class sergeant on the 1st January, 1894?—Somewhere about that date.

111. Do you remember when Dwyer was promoted?—Never knew he was promoted at all. Never heard anything of it.

112. Do you not know he was promoted on the 1st February, 1897, to third-class sergeant?—I remember his promotion was confirmed then.

113. Do you claim, then, that you are senior to Sergeant Dwyer by just over three years?—Yes, I do.

114. As regards Sunday trading, owing to your being transferred from Dunedin, has that in any way influenced your conduct with reference to breaches of the Licensing Act?—In no way whatever.

115. It has not been the means of making you lukewarm in that respect?—In no way whatever. I do my duty wherever I go, independent of what they may do.

116. Have you, since you have been in Christchurch, been as energetic in that respect as you were in Dunedin?—Yes.

117. *Colonel Hume.*] As to this remark you say I made on parade at Dunedin, about jumping into the water, who did I say it to?—Mr. Pardy was walking behind you.

118. I was walking by myself?—Yes.

119. What did I say?—You said "There are a lot of men who have been promoted out of their turn just for jumping into the water, which any one of us would have done if we had been there."

120. Who did I say this to?—I could not say. I thought you were speaking at me.

121. *Mr. Broham.*] How long have you been on duty here?—I have been on duty here since November last.

122. In your experience, as far as breaches of the licensing laws are concerned, have the same exertions been put forth here as in Dunedin—the suppression of trading after hours and on Sunday, and so forth?—Yes.

123. Just the same?—Just the same.

124. You were under my charge also in Auckland?—Yes.

125. Were the same exertions used there to detect Sunday trading?—Yes.

126. Just the same?—Just the same. Every effort was used to suppress it.

127. Do you know whether other men had a free hand to report cases of the kind if they wished, or if they had any cases to report against the publicans?—Yes. There is only one thing: Constables were warned not to go in by themselves in case they would be outdone. Those were the instructions.

128. There were very good reasons for these instructions?—There were indeed.

129. Every constable must have been aware of the fact that he had a free hand in such cases?—Well, if they were to say they had not, I would not believe them.

ARTHUR CASTRIOT DERENZI, examined on oath.

130. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are a fully qualified medical practitioner, practising at Christchurch?—Yes.

131. I believe Constable Cumming has been under your charge?—He has.
132. Since October last?—Yes.
133. Will you kindly tell the Commissioners the cause of his illness?—He was suffering from extensive disease of the back part of the hip and the joint, where the hip joins with the spine. He was admitted to the hospital, and an operation was performed upon him, after consultation with Dr. Stewart. A large abscess near the spine was opened.
134. *The Chairman.*] Without going into full details, will you kindly tell us what was the cause of this trouble?—It was due to injury, probably some violent injury.
135. Of what character?—A fall, or a blow.
136. Could it have been brought about by any other cause?—No other cause whatever. There was no mark on the surface of the body to show there was anything the matter with him whatever. The abscess, which contained about a gallon of matter, was deep down on the spine.
137. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Might the condition you saw the constable in have been brought about from injuries received a few weeks before?—Yes.
138. Injuries that at the time might have escaped anybody's notice?—Yes.
139. Is it possible that this man's case has in any way been aggravated by vicious habits, or any other cause?—Not the slightest. There is no mark, or appearance, or suggestion that such a thing could possibly have anything to do with it.
140. Is the constable still under your charge?—Still under my charge.
141. His condition at the present time?—Very much improved, but, of course, from the nature of the case, progress is slow. His life was in very serious jeopardy at the time he came under my care first. After consultation it was thought he would not recover.
142. Is he likely to be able to resume duty within a reasonable period?—It is impossible to say, from the nature of the case, how long it will be, or whether he will ever be able to do police duty again.
143. Would you be able to form an opinion as to whether he would soon be fit to resume duty?—It would be hazarding an opinion, which nobody can venture with any degree of confidence.
144. Do you remember, in 1895, attending Constable McGill at Addington?—I do.
145. You gave certain certificates as to the constable's condition at that time?—I did.
146. The certificates I now show to you are those?—Yes.
147. The certificates you then gave, did they correctly describe the cause of the man's indisposition?—Absolutely.
148. Was he under your charge for a long period?—For several months, I think; I saw him off and on.
149. What was the cause of his indisposition?—He was suffering from the after effects of a very severe attack of influenza, which had completely shattered his nervous system.
150. Was his illness in any way brought about, in your opinion, by vicious habits?—I could not say that it was brought on by vicious habits. It would be impossible to say that.
151. Did you observe anything at the time he was under your charge?—I heard at the time that he was addicted to drink, and I cautioned him as soon as he came under my care against drink in any shape or form.
152. And throughout his illness?—Throughout his illness I saw no effect of drink on him whatever—after he came under my care.
153. *Mr. Taylor.*] How often did you see Constable McGill whilst he was under your charge?—It would be impossible to say how many times.
154. Once a fortnight?—Sometimes every day in the first part of the illness.
155. He was ill for very nearly six months: do you think on the average you would see him once a week?—The first month, especially, I saw him a great deal more often than that. After that period, not very often. Towards the end of the time he used just to come and see me in the consulting-room.
156. You really do not know what his habits were in between?—When I visited him at his house, I came at times he could not possibly know I was going to call, and I never saw then any effect of liquor at all on him.
157. Would the space of a fortnight elapse sometimes between your visits?—Well, latterly, as the case went on, it would have; but in the first part of the case, when he was actually ill, I saw him much more frequently.
158. If he was ill for six months, during the last four months you would not see him so frequently?—Not so frequently.
159. You had no means of observing closely what his habits were, for, say, some three months?—If I did not see him I would not know what he was doing.
160. Would not drink aggravate his complaint?—Excessive drinking would.
161. Would it not have induced it to some extent?—No, it would not have induced it. It would have made the attack worse when it came on him.
162. Do you attend many policemen?—I attend some of them.
163. Do you know there is a suggestion that the men should be deprived of the right of choosing their own medical man?—I have heard that.
164. *The Chairman.*] Do you approve of that?—No, I do not. I approve of everybody having their choice in that matter. I think, perhaps, it might be well for a Government purpose to have some one to give authorised certificates, but I do not think that ought to preclude choice of treatment.
165. Do you think that would stop in a measure malingering?—It would tend that way.
166. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was Constable Cumming's condition, when you first saw him, consistent with his having received injuries during trouble with a prisoner—a kick?—Yes, it was—quite.

JAMES GANTLEY, examined on oath.

167. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.
168. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] How long have you been in Christchurch?—About fourteen months; two years next February.
169. Where did you come from when you came here?—Oamaru.
170. How long had you been in Oamaru?—About ten months.
171. Where were you prior to that?—Stationed at Wellington.
172. How long had you been in Wellington?—About six years.
173. Do you remember the date when you were shifted from Wellington to Oamaru?—I was shifted in 1896—about two years ago.
174. Why were you shifted, do you know, from Wellington to Oamaru?—I do not know.
175. Was any reason given to you at all for being shifted?—No. I made application afterwards, but I got no satisfactory reply.
176. *Colonel Pitt.*] Made application as to what?—I made application to know why I was transferred from Wellington to Oamaru. I sent it through Inspector Broham.
177. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] That would be after you reached here?—After my arrival in Oamaru.
178. You received no intimation as to the reason for your removal?—No intimation whatever.
179. Before leaving Wellington, were you called upon to answer a charge of exhibiting filthy or indecent pictures?—No; never heard of such a thing.
180. We are informed by a witness who has given evidence on this Commission that “my recollection is that Colonel Hume wrote a memorandum asking why Constable Gantley was showing a photograph in a public bar; and the constable explained it was the photograph of a criminal, and the matter dropped.” Tell the Commissioners if there was any suggestion of your misconduct in that connection at all, or of any misconduct?—I distinctly deny ever having done anything of the sort.
181. Were you charged with that?—I never heard of it.
182. And you also deny having done it?—I distinctly deny it.
183. That suggestion, as far as you are concerned, is entirely false?—Untrue—positively untrue. I am prepared to prove it is untrue.
184. Did you ever have in your possession or show to any one any pictures, filthy or otherwise?—I never had an indecent picture in my possession in my life but once, and that was when I arrested a man for that offence in Napier with Inspector Cullen.
185. And to this date?—And up to this date I never had such a thing.
186. And to this day you really do not know the reason why you were shifted from Wellington to Oamaru?—No, I do not.
187. *Colonel Hume.*] Is it usual to tell constables why they are shifted from one place to another?—No.
188. You asked, did you not?—Yes.
189. Do you remember the date of your application to know why?—Yes.
190. Was it the 26th June, 1896?—Yes.
191. You got an answer, did you not?—Yes.
192. Do you know what is the date of the answer?—I think it was about a week after I put in the application. I know what the answer was.
193. Have you any complaint to make about your being shifted, or what is the complaint?—I never made any complaint.
194. If you knew it was not usual to inform constables the reasons for their removal, why did you make the application?—The reason I made the application was I was performing plain-clothes duty in Wellington. When I received intimation of transfer to Oamaru, I was never told whether I was to be transferred in uniform or plain clothes, and on my arrival at Christchurch Mr. Broham was the first to inform me I was transferred to Oamaru to replace Constable Marsh. I felt aggrieved at that, without being charged with any offence, or any complaint against me. I consider I was harshly treated. I consider that I should have been charged, or reported, or complained of; but without anything of that sort, or without any reason being given to me, I was shifted. I was simply told I was transferred to Oamaru by the first boat, not knowing I had to revert to uniform. That was all my grievance as far as that was concerned, and I consider I had a perfect right in asking for the reason. If they had any complaint against me, they should have charged me with it; and if I could not have vindicated myself, I would have suffered the punishment the department would give me.
195. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was there no inquiry in Mr. Pender's office, in Wellington, in connection with your removal?—Not to my knowledge.
196. Just immediately preceding your removal?—Not to my knowledge.
197. If Sergeant Wright says he has a distinct recollection of such an inquiry before the Inspector, would he be stating what is incorrect?—Perfectly.
198. Quite incorrect?—Yes.
199. What was the nature of the reply you got from the Inspector?—I do not think I am bound to tell you that.
200. I think the Commission would like to know?—“Inspector Broham.—Constable Gantley was employed as a plain-clothes constable in Wellington, but I considered it advisable to transfer him away, and to give him a turn at beat duty. I cannot see that he has any just cause for complaint. The fact of a constable doing plain-clothes duty gives him no right of tenure to that office.—A. HUME, 25/6/96.”
201. Did you join the Police Force from the Armed Constabulary?—Yes.
202. Do you remember what officer received orders to leave Wellington the same day as you did?—I do not.

203. Do you not remember if there was an officer who left the same day as you left?—I do not remember any one going. I came South.

204. If Inspector Pender said there was some question in connection with your removal that you had been exhibiting photographs in the hotel bars of Wellington, would he be wrong?—Yes.

205. Quite wrong?—Yes; and you are wrong, too, for saying it.

206. Photographs of criminals—that would be wrong?—Yes, perfectly wrong.

207. How long elapsed between your getting orders to leave and your leaving Wellington?—I think it was three or four days. I got two or three days' leave.

208. You say there was no inquiry of any kind, and no charge of any kind made against you?—No, there was not.

209. All the time you were doing duty?—No.

210. Your record is perfectly clean?—Yes.

211. And you were not present at any investigation of any charge against you in the Inspector's office?—No.

212. If the Inspector and the clerk say so, they are wrong?—Yes.

213. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you say, during the time you were in Wellington, you did not exhibit the photograph of a certain criminal who was wanted for arrest, or had been wanted?—No.

214. I do not suggest it was an indecent picture in any way: if any one has said you exhibited the photograph of a criminal, not an indecent picture, would that be right?—No.

215. Or any man wanted for arrest?—No.

216. That would not be right?—No, it would not.

217. *The Chairman.*] You know, perhaps, it was said it was not an indecent picture, but the portrait of a criminal who was wanted?—I did not know until I saw it published as evidence given before the Commission.

218. Do you deny ever exhibiting a photograph of a criminal who was wanted?—Positively, I deny ever showing the photograph of a criminal who was wanted outside the police-station.

219. *Colonel Pitt.*] And there was no inquiry in Wellington as to its having been alleged that you had exhibited indecent pictures, and it was found it was the photograph of a criminal who was wanted?—No.

220. You did not attend or hear of any inquiry in connection with such a charge?—No.

221. You have no knowledge of anything of that kind at all?—No, no knowledge.

222. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] The only knowledge you have of such a charge is what you have gathered from the report of what has taken place before this Commission?—That is so.

223. Is it an unusual thing for a constable, without complaints against him, to be removed at a couple of days' notice?—Well, I could not say. They might deem it advisable to transfer a man away at any moment. I was five years and three months stationed in Napier, and I was only given a day's notice to leave there.

224. Is it within your knowledge that constables are frequently removed without any substantial notice to them?—I could not say that. I speak for myself.

225. *The Chairman.*] I understand you are aware that men are moved without any notification being given to them as to the reason?—Yes. We can always get leave for two or three days before we leave.

CHARLES HENRY PRATT, examined on oath.

226. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.

227. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you in company with Sergeant Mackay last Sunday visiting hotels?—Yes, I was.

228. How many houses did you visit?—If I remember rightly, I think we visited somewhere between twenty-five and thirty in the morning.

229. Some more in the afternoon?—And more in the afternoon.

230. You were in uniform?—I was.

231. Did you make the usual signal at the front door: when you entered by the front door, did you knock?—Yes.

232. The same at the back door?—In some cases.

233. Did you find any one apparently on the watch?—No, not last Sunday.

234. Nobody on the door of the hotels?—No, not last Sunday. I did not notice anybody last Sunday.

235. Did you find anything to cause you to institute a prosecution for breaches of the law?—No. I think myself—in fact I made the remark—that during my time I had never seen the houses so well conducted as they were last Sunday. I think in only one house out of all that we visited were there any persons on the premises at all.

236. Supposing you knocked at the front door, do not you think people in the house would have time to get out by the back-door before you got through the house?—In some cases last Sunday the doors were open, and we had not to delay at all, but walked straight in.

237. Do you think constables in uniform are likely to obtain information as to breaches of the Sunday-trading clauses of the Act? Do you not advertise yourselves hundreds of yards sometimes before you reach the house?—Yes, that is so.

238. Did you go into Tattersall's Hotel?—I did.

239. How many people did you find there?—There were four men, I think it was, in the front room.

240. Were they travellers or lodgers?—Well, they were represented to us as lodgers, and Sergeant Mackay asked the men themselves if they were, and they said, Yes. There was no sign of Sunday trading, and, of course, we believed what we had heard.

241. Do you think there are many visitors to hotels on Sunday in Christchurch?—I cannot speak from experience for the last few months, because I have not been doing street duty.

242. Last Sunday, do you think there would be many at the average hotel?—As I said before, I think last Sunday was an exceptionally good Sunday.

FRANK THOMPSON, examined on oath.

243. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—House and land agent, at Christchurch.

244. *Mr Taylor.*] Were you collecting information last Sunday as to the number of visitors to a certain hotel?—I was.

245. What house?—Tattersall's Hotel.

246. Who was with you?—Mr. Hoddinott was with me in the afternoon. I was by myself in the morning.

247. From what hour did you start in the morning?—Twenty-five minutes to 10.

248. Until what time in the evening?—I was about half an hour off in the middle of the day for lunch. I think I went away at about half-past 1. I was there up till twenty-five minutes past 5.

249. How many people entered the house during that time?—Two hundred and fifty-five.

250. Does that exclude the half-hour?—That excludes the half-hour, Yes.

251. Could you command a view of the urinal?—Yes, I could. I should explain I did not see them actually enter the house. My point of view was obstructed at a certain point. I saw them leave the right-of-way, and then for a short while my view was obstructed by a building, and then they appeared again, and came towards the back entrance of the house.

252. Did you see them walking: did they stand in the yard at all?—Very few.

253. How many went into the urinal?—I did not count any more than a dozen.

254. Did many go in by the front door?—I did not see any. My view did not command the front door.

255. Did you see the police enter?—I did.

256. What time?—It would be about 11.40 by my watch.

257. Were there two officers in company?—Yes.

258. How long were they in the house?—About five minutes.

259. Did they go in by the back way?—Yes, they did.

260. What did they do when they came out?—They apparently entered on a piece of paper the result of their visit, and went away.

261. Did they stand in the right-of-way to make the entry?—Yes, they stood in the right-of-way, and made the entry, and then, as they came towards Cashel Street, they met two men going in the right-of-way, and they turned round and watched the two men, but the men went on to Hereford Street, and waited at the end of Hereford Street, and, when the policemen had gone, they came back again and went in.

262. Did the police approach in the ordinary way—no secrecy, no attempt at concealment?—Yes.

263. No precautions to prevent their being seen in their approach?—No, as far as I could see. I would not be able to see them until they came nearly opposite the house. My attention was attracted by a young fellow who preceded them by about two minutes. He ran down the right-of-way and gave the warning to the person stationed at the gate.

264. *The Chairman.*] Did you see anybody stationed at the gate?—There had been persons stationed at the gate on and off throughout the day.

265. *Mr. Taylor.*] At the back gate?—At the back gate, Yes, and the right-of-way—sometimes a male and sometimes a female.

266. You saw the person?—Yes, I did. At the time the young fellow went towards the gate the sentry had stepped inside the gate—he was not in view, but he beckoned with his hand.

267. Did any one come to him?—No, they did not come to him, but they ran across the yard.

268. You could not see them enter the house?—No, I could not.

269. How long after that before the police came?—I suppose about two minutes.

270. Did the majority of these people seem to be different persons? Did the same person enter time after time?—The majority of them were different persons, but some of them entered more than once.

271. Did you know any of them?—Yes, I did.

272. Did you see signs of liquor on any of them?—I did not see signs of liquor on any one who came out of the hotel.

273. On any one who went in?—No. I saw a drunken man come out of the stable—the stable entrance on the right-of-way. A considerable number of the visitors to the hotel had come from the stable gate.

274. *The Chairman.*] Did you see an exodus of persons from the hotel, after the signal was given which you referred to?—Yes, and after the police entered one young fellow ran out.

275. *Mr. Taylor.*] Into the right-of-way?—Yes.

276. You could not see the front door of the hotel?—I could if I had wished. They had that door locked.

277. *The Chairman.*] You tell us your position did not command the front door?—If I had wished I could.

278. It was not in your view?—I could if I had wished. If I had shifted my position I could have seen it. My attention was particularly centred on the back portion of the house.

279. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did the police seem rather amused when they came out—were they laughing?—One of them smiled a bit.

280. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I do not quite understand your position: were you standing or sitting, or where were you?—I was sitting in a room in Inglis's buildings.

281. In whose occupation is this room?—I think it is rented by various societies.

282. Which floor is it?—The top floor.
283. Are there any other windows in this particular room than the one you were looking out of?—Several.
284. Which one were you looking from?—I was looking from the one nearest the east corner of the building.
285. Of the room in which you were?—Yes. It was a double window, and I was looking out of the second portion. It was the first window from the eastern side, and I was looking out of the second portion of it. I was looking from the portion furthest away from the eastern end of the room.
286. Are there any other rooms occupied by various persons in this particular building? Is this room easily identified?—There are various offices in this particular building. The room is easily identified.
287. By what means?—It is the room at the eastern corner on the top floor.
288. You say you could see the people before they got on to the licensed premises?—I could.
289. Where were these people at that time?—Sometimes they came from Cashel Street, and passed down the right-of-way, and at other times they came from Hereford Street.
290. How far from the entrance to the yard would the people be when they were lost to your view?—The distance from the entrance of the licensed premises to the point referred to would be about half a dozen yards.
291. *The Chairman.*] You had a view right down the right-of-way?—Yes.
292. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are there any buildings between the hotel and the corner of the right-of-way?—There are; but I could see over the top of those buildings.
293. You could see over the top of those buildings: and how far could you see what was going on?—I could see over the top of them into the yard; but, as I said before, one of the buildings obstructed my view for a short distance.
294. And you could see over them?—Yes.
295. Is there a second right-of-way leading out from the right-of-way running from Cashel Street to Hereford Street?—I do not think so. I think it is just an entrance into the back of the hotel; but it may be a right-of-way, for all I know.
296. You could distinctly see people from your point of view, when they passed to the back of the hotel premises?—Yes, I could.
297. Could you see the hotel back-door?—No, I could not.
298. What you say is, then, you saw the people go on to the hotel premises, not enter the house?—That is so.
299. You have a return there: can you say if you saw any persons enter the hotel about the time of the police visit?—You mean, enter the premises?
300. Yes?—At 11.30 according to my watch, which I found afterwards was ten minutes fast, making it actually 11.20, four men went in together, and then they were followed by two.
301. Was that before the police came on the scene, or after?—Before the police came.
302. How long before?—Well, the police came at 11.50 by my watch; that would be 11.40.
303. Had you seen six persons leave before the police came on the scene?—I could not say. There were eight had gone out after 11.20, and before the police went in.
304. Can you form any idea of the number of persons that were on the premises at the time the police entered?—I should imagine there were two or three.
305. If the police say there were four men in the room when they went there, would you be inclined to dispute that?—No, I would not. There might have been four.
306. Up to the time of the police going there, how many people had you seen?—A good many.
307. Can you say what number had entered the premises before you were accompanied by Hoddinott?—Yes, I think so.
308. *The Chairman.*] When did he join you?—About twelve minutes past 2 o'clock by the right time. There were eighty-two up to that time.
309. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Between that and 5.25 would be the difference of the 255?—Yes; it ought to work out at that.
310. Those numbers that you have there include all persons who went on the premises?—They do.
311. How did you count them?—I had two columns—one of those who went in, and one for those who came out.
312. How do those columns compare?—They compare exactly. I was surprised when I totalled up, because I was absent for about half an hour, and when I went some were just coming out, and when I left some had just gone in.
313. You have no means of ascertaining how many times the same person passed in or out?—I know of some persons the number of times they went in.
314. At what point did you count these persons—when they were passing the long building which obstructed your view, or when they entered the right-of-way?—I entered them as a rule when they left the right-of-way, but I waited to see them pass the buildings and go towards the back portion of the hotel, generally speaking.
315. And when they left, where did you count them?—I counted them as they entered the yard from the back portion of the hotel, and, of course, as they came out of the gate, I checked them again.
316. *The Chairman.*] No risk of their being put down twice?—Absolutely none.
317. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] In one case only did you see any sign of drink?—Yes.
318. And that was a man who came from the stable?—Yes.
319. Had you see him pass into the hotel at all?—Not that I could recognise him.
320. Did you keep that list yourself?—I did.

321. After Hoddinott came did you continue to keep the list?—Yes.
322. Did you count the police among the persons who entered on the premises?—I did not.
323. You do not know where this second look-out was stationed, I suppose?—Which second look-out?
324. Where the one who ran down the right-of-way gave the alarm was stationed?—No. He came from the intersection of Cashel and High Streets.
325. And did the policeman come from that direction also?—Yes.
326. You saw one person only leave the premises at the time the police came?—He had followed the police. He entered just after the police had gone in, and he ran out again.
327. You did not see any other persons come out from the hotel, apparently alarmed by this young man running down?—No, I did not.
328. You say you knew some of these persons?—Yes, I did.
329. By name?—I think I knew one by name.
330. What was his name?—I think his name is Frank Reeves.
331. Do you know what he is?—He was at one time a grocer's assistant, I think.
332. That is the only one you knew by name?—That is the only one I knew by name. I recognised several of the young men, whose names I have tried to ascertain since—men whom I know to be Christchurch men.
333. *Mr. Taylor.*] How far from the back-door of the hotel would these people be when you lost sight of them in approaching the hotel?—I have never been into the yard. I should imagine about half a dozen yards.
334. Did Hoddinott not make any of these notes?—No, he did not.
335. He simply assisted in the observations?—He made his own notes.

ALFRED THOMAS HODDINOTT, examined on oath.

336. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A machinist, living at Christchurch.
337. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you assisting last Sunday in getting information as to the number of visitors to Tattersall's Hotel?—Sunday afternoon I was.
338. Did you see the police enter in the afternoon?—No.
339. How many people went into the house while you were there?—Seventy-eight; and 116 came out.
340. *Colonel Pitt.*] What time did you go on?—At 2.10. I left again at 5.30 p.m.
341. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you know any of the visitors?—Only one, by sight.
342. You do not know his name?—I do not know his name: he is a tailor.
343. Could you see the back-door of the hotel?—Not the back-door. We could see the back-yard only from where we were.
344. You made your own notes?—Made my own notes.
345. Did you notice liquor on any of the visitors?—One only.
346. Was he going in?—No, he was coming out. That was about 5 p.m., or shortly afterwards.
347. Was anybody on the watch at the hotel?—There were the three daughters, and Mrs. Conway, I believe.
348. At intervals?—One was at the back gate, and the other two daughters were at the top windows at the front of the building. They took turn about. One daughter would be at the back, while the others would be at the window at the front.
349. Could you see the front door from the window you were watching at?—Quite distinctly.
350. Did you pay special attention to the back entrance?—The back entrance, yes.
351. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you keep a record of the times when they were watching at the particular places?—No, I did not. The only record I got was when Mrs. Conway came from the front door and went round the back with one that went in at 4.47 p.m.
352. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did Mr. Thompson take a note of any that went in that you did not see?—I believe there were one or two he did not see. He was away at the library for a minute or two.
353. What is the total on that sheet: add the figures up carefully?—One hundred and three, I make it, going in.
354. Did you not miss twenty odd out?—I must have missed twenty; that is so.
355. *The Chairman.*] You were in error in saying seventy-eight?—Yes.
356. Is the number you have given as coming out correct?—One hundred and sixteen is correct.
357. With regard to the watching, you say there was a system of watching, and it was carried on by Mrs. Conway and her three daughters: how was it carried on?—Well, the only time I saw Mrs. Conway was at the front door. She came to the front door three or four times, opened the front door, closed it again, and bolted it after her. I never saw her outside, with the exception of once going down the right-of-way. She followed a man down the right-of-way, and went round the back with him.
358. What about the girls?—As to the girls: there was one, I believe, almost all the time at the back gate. The other two were at the front bedroom windows and at the front door—a portion of the time at the windows, and a portion of the time at the door.
359. From their position at the windows, did they appear on the watch?—Yes. They were looking up and down the street, first one way and then the other.
360. *Colonel Pitt.*] Were the windows shut or open?—Open at the bottom.
361. From where you were, you could see the front door?—Quite distinctly.
362. And Mr. Thompson?—Yes, he was sitting within a yard of me.
363. *The Chairman.*] Did you see anybody enter or leave by the front door?—Nobody.

FRANK THOMPSON, further examined on oath.

364. *Mr. Taylor.*] With regard to the numbers you have given, you wish to make a correction?—There were 149 up to the time Mr. Hoddinott joined me going in, and 106 I counted after Mr. Hoddinott joined me. You will find the total will be practically the same, but I had one sheet in its wrong place.

365. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What number going out?—One hundred and forty-two.

366. Was that before Hoddinott joined you?—Yes.

367. And after?—I make it 112.

368. Will you tell me how you know these sheets are in the right order now?—By the time.

369. Have any of these pencil-marks been added since you left the place on Sunday?—Yes, the additions in indelible blue pencil.

370. No others?—No others, with the exception of a ring round one entry.

371. *Colonel Pitt.*] How many people left the hotel between, say, a quarter to 2 and a quarter past 2?—I was not there at a quarter to 2 o'clock.

372. What time did you leave?—I got back about twelve minutes past 2. I was away for lunch. I left at twenty-seven minutes to 2 o'clock.

373. How many went in between a quarter to 1 and a quarter past 1?—I have divided up my sections into hours—from 12 to 1 o'clock, and from 1 o'clock to twenty-seven minutes to 2 o'clock.

374. From 12 to 1: give us that, then?—From 12 to 1 there were forty went in and thirty-four came out.

375. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did they stay long on the average between 12 and 1?—No. Some of them stayed perhaps ten minutes, others fifteen minutes.

376. *The Chairman.*] That is an average for the day, is it?—Yes, Sir.

ALFRED THOMAS HODDINOTT, further examined on oath.

377. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say Mr. Thompson could see the front door from where he was sitting with you?—Yes.

378. Can you say whether he was watching the front door or not?—He was at times.

379. Were you watching the front door?—At times. We could not be off seeing both the right-of-way and the front door from where we were.

380. Can you say Mr. Thompson's position was such that he could not be off seeing it?—Well, he was more sheltered than I was.

381. But you say at times he was watching the front door?—Yes.

382. He did not tell you he was watching the front door?—Well, he called my attention to Mrs. Conway at the front door.

383. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You were not able to see the people actually leave the building?—No.

384. You saw them crossing the yard?—Crossing the yard.

385. And the same applies to entering?—Yes.

386. You are pretty clear as to the number who went in—you took them down at the time?—Took them down at the time.

387. Would it be possible for you to have made a mistake at all?—No. I may have missed one or two when I was away from the table just for a moment. I do not suppose I was away two minutes altogether.

388. You might have missed one or two?—Or a few. I am not certain as to the number.

389. You saw the landlady and her daughters?—Yes.

390. Do you know the daughters?—No; Mr. Thompson told me who they were.

391. You say there was one watching at the gate: would she be the oldest, or the youngest daughter?—The youngest daughter, I should say; the shortest one of the three.

392. Is Mrs. Conway licensee of the hotel?—I believe so.

393. Were there any men about the place, apparently employed there?—There was one man a good portion of the time about the back gate, with a straw hat on. I thought he was employed there. I would not be sure.

394. Was that the only man who seemed to be employed about the place?—That was the only man.

395. Any other women besides the four you have mentioned?—No, none whatever.

CHARLES ROSE, examined on oath.

396. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Head stableman in Mr. Delamain's employ.

397. Are Delamain's stables next to Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes.

398. *Mr. Conway.*] Will you tell the Commission what you are in the habit of doing on Sunday, and every day in the week?—My business is this: I am employed taking charge of people's horses and traps when they are left in the stable.

399. How many men are employed at the stable?—About four men in the yard, and three cabmen.

400. Does that include yourself?—Yes. Of course, there is the clerk; there are five in the stable with the clerk.

401. There are two Mr. Delamains?—Yes.

402. You have no conveniences—water-closet, urinal, &c.—in your stables?—No.

403. When you wish to go to a water-closet where do you go?—We always go to Mrs. Conway's, Tattersall's Hotel.

404. How many people do you put up as a rule on a Sunday, from the country?—They vary a great deal; sometimes there might be fifty, or thirty, or twenty; and sometimes three or four people come in the same conveyance.

405. Last Sunday, about how many were there?—Last Sunday, speaking roughly, I suppose there were about thirty or forty. It was not an extra day, but just a medium sort of day. Of course, I did not count.

406. If they wished to go to a water-closet where did they go to?—I always referred them to Tattersall's Hotel.

407. I suppose a lot of them go in and have refreshments?—Yes, people from Kaiapoi and Rangiora.

408. Have you ever been in with them?—On occasions I have been with them.

409. Have you been served?—I have been refused.

410. In what other ways do you use our house, on Sundays as well as on week-days?—On several occasions we use it for hot water and such like things, in case of a horse being sick, or a bran mash being wanted, or something of that kind. In fact, two or three Sundays ago we had four horses sick, and Mr. Brown, the veterinary surgeon, sent me in half a dozen times for hot water.

411. *The Chairman.*] Do you refer to last Sunday?—No.

412. *Mr. Conway.*] Last Sunday, how many times were you on our premises yourself?—Perhaps three or four times. I cannot say for certain. I do not think any more than that.

413. You know if hot water or anything else is required for a bran mash, or for horses under the care of Mr. Brown, you or some of your stablemen come to our place, and you also recommend any travellers or people driving into your stables who wish to use the water-closet, or to obtain refreshment, to our place?—Yes.

414. *The Chairman.*] Did you refer any of the people who came to the stable with horses last Sunday to Tattersall's Hotel for any purpose?—Yes, I probably did. I think I referred some people from Kaiapoi and Rangiora there.

415. Did you refer any in there last Sunday?—Yes.

416. Why did these thirty or forty people come to the stable?—That is not my business. They may have come in from the country for a drive, or to see their friends, and they come with their horses to the stable for accommodation.

417. *Mr. Conway.*] Have you two drags plying on the Fendalton Road?—Yes. On occasions, too, I get my meals at the hotel when I have no time to go home for them.

418. And usually on Sundays; and last Sunday, were there not about eight or nine passengers came by one of the coaches to the stables?—Yes, I think there are sometimes twenty or thirty from Rangiora.

419. I mean on the Fendalton coach last Sunday?—Yes, I think there were.

420. You came with them to the back door, and did I refuse you liquor?—Yes, I was refused.

421. *The Chairman.*] How many, with you?—I think four, altogether.

422. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] From your stables, you can overlook the yard of this hotel?—If we go to the back door of the stables, we can see into the yard.

423. Now, you are there every Sunday?—Well, I am there as a rule perhaps seven or eight Sundays running. I am supposed to be there about three Sundays, and then one off, but generally there is something at the stables that brings me there every Sunday. I am away perhaps one Sunday in ten.

424. You have a good chance of observing the yard going into this hotel?—Of course, I can see what goes into the yard near the hotel, but I cannot see unless I go to the door.

425. You were there last Sunday three or four times?—Yes, not more than five.

426. That gives you an opportunity of seeing what is going on?—Yes.

427. From what you know of the hotel, is there an extensive Sunday trading going on?—I cannot say.

428. Have you seen it?—I have not seen it. When I go in I go on business; I go in for accommodation, and the like of that. I have taken people in there, either for the conveniences or for whatever they might want to drink as travellers. I have never taken any one else except travellers in.

429. You went there last Sunday with three or four people with the idea of getting them drink?—Yes; they were travellers.

430. But they were refused?—Yes.

431. You believed these people were travellers, and you took them there with the idea of getting them something to drink?—Yes, and the place was closed.

432. Did they knock?—Yes; at the gate.

433. What time of day was this?—After 9 o'clock in the evening.

434. But during the day?—Well, it was in the day that I was there.

435. What is your experience in the day-time?—My experience is this: I simply go in for the conveniences, as I have said, for hot water and such like.

436. Hot water takes you inside the house?—Into the kitchen.

437. And, from your observations, what do you say about Sunday trading?—I know nothing about Sunday trading.

438. You have never seen it?—No.

439. If it had been going on to any great extent would you have seen it?—I think I should.

440. I mean, people who are neither lodgers nor travellers; have you seen them get drink?—I have not—only those I have been in with.

441. And they have been travellers?—Yes; I have always asked them that question before taking them there.

442. *Mr. Taylor.*] How often did you go in with the other men working in the stables last Sunday?—I do not know that I went in with any one working in the stables.

443. You went in three or four times—up to five times, I think you said?—Yes.

444. Did you go alone each time?—No.
445. Who did you go with the first time?—Well, I am not prepared to say who I went with the first time.
446. I want to know?—Of course, this has come very suddenly on me.
447. *The Chairman.*] Do you remember going in with anybody the first time you went to the hotel on Sunday last?—I cannot remember if anybody was with me.
448. Can you remember if nobody was with you the first time you went in the hotel on Sunday last?—I cannot remember anybody in particular.
449. Did you not go in on some of the three or four times with some of the men with whom you work?—I do not remember. I remember going in with people who came to the yard to put up their traps. I do not remember going in with any one with whom I was working.
450. How often did you go in with people who came into your yard?—About four or five times.
451. Did you go in with one, or two, or three or more, the first time?—It might have been two; it would not be more than two.
452. And what happened; did you go into the closet, or the bar?—I believe into the closet first.
453. Did they go in?—I do not remember them going in; they might have.
454. Did you go into the house with them afterwards?—I went into the house.
455. Well now, what happened; did you go into a room at the back of the bar, or into the bar?—I went into the kitchen.
456. No further?—No.
457. Did they go into the kitchen too?—Yes.
458. Did they stop there?—As long as I did.
459. What happened?—Nothing.
460. Did you get any liquor?—I had a glass of beer.
461. Did they have liquor?—Well, I was in a hurry to get back again. I think they had some.
462. Do you remember who they were? As a matter of fact, were they not men working in the stables with you?—No.
463. Did not one work in the stable with you?—I do not remember one coming in with me.
464. Did not one of these men work in the stable?—I do not think any man from the stable went into the kitchen and had a glass of beer with me.
465. Did they go into any other room?—I did not notice any one going into another room.
466. You had a glass of beer?—Yes.
467. Who paid for it?—The travellers with me.
468. Who were they?—Some gentleman from Kaiapoi; I do not know his name. I know the customers casually by sight.
469. Do they put up at your stables?—Yes.
470. Do you keep a record of the customers?—Of course, we know some of them. We do not take any notice of those who pay cash, but we put down the people who book, and we know them.
471. Did they pay cash?—Yes.
472. Now, the second time, was that liquor paid for before you left?—I do not know whether it was paid for or not.
473. You took no notice whether it was paid for or not?—I swore it was paid for by the travellers because they asked me to have the drink with them.
474. *The Chairman.*] You assumed that?—I supposed they would; but they might have been friends of Mrs. Conway's.
475. *Mr. Taylor.*] The second time, who went in with you?—I do not remember who went in with me.
476. Where did you go the second time?—I am not prepared to answer all these questions. I went in for hot water, I know.
477. What did you want it for?—For a sick horse.
478. Did you have a veterinary surgeon to it?—No.
479. Not on this occasion?—No.
480. What people went in with you on the second time?—I do not remember any one going in with me.
481. Who did you see when you went in the second time?—I think Mrs. Conway.
482. How many of the daughters did you see during the day in the course of your visits?—I saw one of the daughters.
483. No others?—Of course there were the domestics there, I remember seeing.
484. Now, on the third visit paid, who went with you then? Any man from the stables?—I do not think so. I do not remember any man with me.
485. Did none of your fellow-workmen go in with you that day?—I do not remember.
486. Will you swear they did not?—No, not with me.
487. Did one of them follow you in?—I never noticed; one might have followed me in.
488. Did you see him inside?—No; I do not remember seeing him inside.
489. What happened the third time you went in; what did you go in for?—I went for my lunch too. That might have been the second time or the third time; I am not positive.
490. Were many people having lunch that day?—Yes, several.
491. How many, three or four?—Yes. I think more than that.
492. Would there be five, perhaps?—Yes, quite five.
493. What time was that?—I cannot say the time.
494. How long does it take you to get luncheon?—It does not take me more than half an hour as a rule.

495. How many was the table set for?—I should think about twenty could sit down there comfortably.

496. It was only partly used that day?—That I do not know anything about.

497. After luncheon, who did you go in with?—I do not remember going in with any one after luncheon.

498. Had you your coat on or off when going into the hotel?—Generally, it is my habit to keep it off. I may have gone in with it on that day on one or two occasions.

499. After lunch, who did you go with?—I do not think I went in with any one.

500. What did you go in for after lunch?—I went into the closet again after that.

501. How long elapsed between these two visits to the public conveniences?—Well, I do not think I went in again until the evening.

502. At 9 o'clock?—Yes.

503. Who went in with you then?—I do not think any one was with me then.

504. Where did you go to—inside the house?—Into the kitchen.

505. What did you go for?—For some hot water.

506. For the same horse?—No, for a mash.

507. Did you go again later on?—I went about 9 o'clock, I know that.

508. With some people?—Yes.

509. Did you try the front door?—I went round to the front door afterwards. I referred them to the front door, but they could not get in.

510. Neither back nor front?—No.

511. How many traps came into your place on Sunday? Will you swear that more than five traps came into your place on Sunday?—Yes.

512. I mean outside your own vehicles, how many came into your place on Sunday?—I could not tell you. You could inquire at the stables; they would probably tell you.

513. Is there a record kept there?—Yes.

514. Were you in charge all day?—Yes.

515. And you do not know how many came? How many were there?—More than five I should say.

516. Will you swear there were more than six?—I would not swear there were more than six; but I should say there were probably more over six than under.

517. The number might be over or under six?—Yes.

518. And might be under?—No, I do not think so.

519. How many put up their traps on an average?—The clerk will be better able to inform you on that question than I can.

520. Where does your Fendalton coach start from?—From the stables.

521. What is your public starting point?—I think they go from the stables to the Square.

522. Is the Square not the recognised starting-point for the Fendalton coach?—I believe it is. It is marked on the time-table from the Square.

523. Where does the Fendalton coach drop its passengers according to the time-table?—I do not know anything about the stopping-places.

524. *The Chairman.*] The time-table gives the time of departure from the Square?—Yes, and from Fendalton.

525. *Mr. Taylor.*] Does your time-table give the time of the arrival of the coach at the Square from Fendalton?—No, it does not; it only gives the time it starts from the Square and Fendalton.

526. How many vehicles came in after 5.30 p.m.?—I could not tell you.

527. Were there any?—Yes, some.

528. Out of the number you quoted some came in after 5.30 p.m.?—Yes.

529. *The Chairman.*] Some half-dozen you named?—Yes; I think one or two came in after 5.30 p.m.

530. *Mr. Taylor.*] The clerk can give a record of those who came into the yard that day?—Oh, no. Sometimes four or five would come in one trap, and sometimes two. It is not my business to know who the persons are, but I generally look after the man who pays the cash.

531. Do I understand you to say you always recommend customers to Tattersall's Hotel if they want refreshments, or anything?—Yes, if they ask.

532. Is that done with the knowledge of Mr. Delamain?—Of course, Mr. Delamain never gave me any privileges to recommend people to hotels, or anything of the kind. They simply ask me for a place of accommodation, and I refer them there.

533. What do you pay for lunch at the hotel?—If Mrs. Conway chooses to give me lunch it is her business. I have paid her a shilling on different occasions.

534. But sometimes it is a gift?—I did not say anything about gifts.

535. Is it sometimes a gift?—No; she has never given me one.

536. What do you mean by saying, "If she chooses to give you?"—I have had lunch there all the same; not on a Sunday, though.

537. Was Mr. Delamain senior at the stables on Sunday?—Well, he was for a short time. He looks in there occasionally. I remember he was there.

538. For a short time?—He is in and out. He might come in several times, and I would not see him.

539. Did you say there are no conveniences at your building in the way of closets?—No.

540. At Pine and Co.'s?—I do not know.

541. How long have you been there?—I have only been in Pine's office once.

JAMES ARMISHAW, examined on oath.

542. *The Chairman.*] Where are you living now?—In Wellington.

543. What are you?—Kilnman, in Tonks's brickyard, Wellington.

544. You were engaged as assistant at the A 1 Hotel?—Yes; I started on the 23rd September, 1896, and left on the 1st June, 1897.
545. *Mr. Taylor.*] I will ask you whether, whilst working at the A 1 Hotel, it was customary for police constables to frequent the house?—Yes.
546. Do you remember the men?—Yes.
547. What was some of their names?—Tom Barrett; McKenzie was another one, and others.
548. How many other names can you remember besides those two?—Four others.
549. Can you remember whether Barrett came in occasionally or frequently?—Occasionally.
550. How often should you think?—I cannot say. The others used to come in as well.
551. Would there be one on an average a night?—It was not in the night.
552. When was it?—The 6 o'clock relief in the morning.
553. Would they be in uniform?—Yes.
554. Were they in plain clothes on any occasion?—I have seen them in plain clothes.
555. *The Chairman.*] At that time, at 6 o'clock in the morning?—No.
556. At 6 o'clock in the morning they came in uniform?—Yes.
557. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you seen any in between 9 p.m. and 6 o'clock the next morning?—I would not like to swear.
558. Was after 5 o'clock in the morning the usual time?—Yes. I do not know whether they were on duty or not.
559. I will ask whether you remember what class of refreshments they used to have?—Tom Barrett and McKenzie generally had a cup of tea.
560. No alcoholic refreshments at all?—No, not that I saw.
561. Where did they go for it?—Into the kitchen.
562. The other men used to have spirits?—Some of them.
563. Did Barrett or McKenzie ever visit this house without your seeing them?—I cannot say. I used to give them a cup of tea, and go away again to my work.
564. Did they sit down for it?—No; they would stand and drink it and go out.
565. Did they seem to have much nervousness about going in?—No; they walked in the same as anybody else.
566. Are any of the other men you remember in the Force now?—Two are in the Force, I believe.
567. And two have been dismissed?—Yes, two are out.
568. Did the landlord know they used to frequent the house?—I cannot say.
569. Had you any instructions from the landlord in regard to giving these men refreshments?—I was always told not to take any money from them.
570. Was there some mistake in the evidence you gave in Wellington which you wish to rectify?—I rectified it, and sent it back to the Commission.
571. Before you signed the evidence?—When I signed it.
572. Have you been in any other hotels except the A 1?—I was at the Grosvenor Hotel at Timaru.
573. Used the police to visit there?—No.
574. Would Barrett and McKenzie go in sometimes together?—Sometimes, and sometimes not together.
575. Can you remember distinctly if they ever came in together?—I cannot remember that.
576. *Colonel Pitt.*] Where is the A 1 Hotel?—At the corner of Cashel Street and Colombo Street.

EMMA GORDON, examined on oath.

577. *The Chairman.*] Are you married?—No.
578. Where do you reside?—Springfield Road, St. Albans.
579. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you engaged last Sunday in ascertaining how many people visited the Railway Hotel in Manchester Street?—Yes.
580. What time did you start in the morning?—About 7 a.m.
581. What time did you finish?—We left about 8.30 in the evening.
582. Who was with you?—Miss Roberts.
583. Did the position you occupied command a view of the main entrance?—Yes, a perfect view.
584. Could you see the back entrance at all?—The side entrance I could see.
585. You could not see the back door?—No.
586. How many people visited there during the day?—One hundred and eighty-three.
587. Have you your notes with you?—Yes; one hundred and thirty-three before 5.30, and fifty afterwards.
588. How could you see after 5.30; it was getting dark?—There was a lamp right opposite the door.
589. A very fine lamp opposite the door?—Yes, and it was left burning all day.
590. Did these people enter by the front door or side door principally?—By the front door, almost every one. There is a bar door, but they did not enter by that. That was perfectly closed, and I never saw a soul go in by it.
591. They went in by the private door leading to the residential part of the hotel?—Yes.
592. Did you know any of the people?—I know one by name; I know him personally.
593. Did any of the visitors show any signs of intoxication?—One later on in the day did; he had been there so often he was getting excited any way.
594. Do you know his name?—No, he is a cabman.
595. Is there a cabstand quite close to the hotel?—Just round the corner.
596. *The Chairman.*] You say he entered more than once?—About half a dozen times.
597. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where was the point of your observation?—Right opposite the hotel.

598. There is a boarding-house there?—Yes.
599. Did you engage rooms there?—I did not myself.
600. Did a friend of yours?—Yes, and paid for them.
601. Did you see the police enter the house during the day?—Yes, I did.
602. One or more?—Two policemen.
603. How long were they in?—About five minutes.
604. Did they go in by the door you refer to?—Yes.
605. Did they ring the bell?—No, the door was open.
606. Was any one on the watch outside the hotel?—In the morning, a person whom I took to be the woman of the house came out and looked about; and several times a man whom I thought was the publican came out and looked about.
607. *The Chairman.*] You do not know them personally?—I thought they were the woman of the house and the publican.
608. What time was this?—A little after 7 in the morning.
609. *Mr. Taylor.*] And in the afternoon the man whom you took to be the landlord?—Most of the customers came to the door and knocked three times. I got to know that knock very well, and we noticed unless the people knocked in this particular way they did not get in so quickly. Once this man came and looked out of the bar parlour window. After 8 o'clock the people knocked, and withdrew to the kerb, and they seemed to look up at one of the upstairs windows. We saw some movement at one of the windows as though somebody was there, but we could not see who it was.
610. The door was usually open after that?—No.
611. You suspected this was part of a signal?—Yes.
612. *The Chairman.*] Was not the door open?—When anybody came and knocked, the man would go to the door and open it and let them in, usually about five at a time, and he would lock the door very carefully after them.
613. *Mr. Taylor.*] It was kept shut except when the people knocked to be let in?—Yes, nearly all the time it was.
614. How did you know the door was locked?—I could hear it; it seemed to make a good noise. It made quite a noise down the street.
615. *The Chairman.*] Do you mean to say you could hear the key in the lock, or the bolt go to?—I believe it was the key.
616. *Mr. Taylor.*] You could hear the movement of the lock?—Yes.
617. Was any one refused admittance that day?—There was some one who came up just as the police were crossing the road from the hotel, and he was not admitted. He was the only man I saw who was not admitted.
618. Was the door closed after the police left?—No. This man stood about and had a good look.
619. Was the door closed after the police left?—Not until after the next customers came.
620. Then some customers went in, and the door was closed?—Yes.
621. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you keep any memorandum?—I did not; my friend did.
622. Have you it?—Yes.
623. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you present when the entries were made?—Yes.
624. You are prepared to certify to the correctness of them?—Yes.
625. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say the people knocked at the door before they were admitted?—As a rule.
626. Did any conversation appear to take place after the door was opened?—Yes, sometimes. Sometimes a man would peep out of the door, and then shut it.
627. Not always?—No; not when they knew the knock, I thought.
628. Usually, or not?—A good many times he peeped out.
629. Was there any conversation before they were let in?—Sometimes there was.
630. Was it usual?—No.
631. Would he shut the door before the people were admitted?—He did once or twice. He looked out, and shut it, and then waited a minute or two, and let them in.
632. Did he appear as if he asked them something?—We thought the people upstairs were looking; that is what we thought they were doing.
633. The man was not upstairs and down at the door too?—No.
634. I am asking you about the man at the door; did the man at the door who admitted the people into the house appear as if he asked them something when he opened the door?—I do not think he did.
635. You cannot say if he did not?—No, I did not hear.
636. You could hear the bolt shut?—Yes, it made a great noise.
637. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand you to say there was a conversation?—Sometimes there was. The publican sometimes came out and spoke to them.
638. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you saw two police-officers enter the hotel?—Yes.
639. What time?—Half-past 12 o'clock.
640. Were any outside people in the hotel when the police entered, so far as you know?—I do not know. I saw two men whom I thought were lodgers come behind the police and look out after the police, when they went out.
641. Did you see any enter the hotel just before the police entered?—Yes.
642. Did you see these people leave again?—I do not remember.
643. What is the name of the man you knew?—Charles Armstrong.
644. What is he?—A blacksmith.
645. Do you know where he lives?—Yes.
646. Where?—He lived in Peterborough Street.

647. What time did he enter?—About 9 a.m.
648. Was he alone?—Yes; his name was not put in our notes, but just a note to show he was recognised.
649. What was the note by which you recognised him?—Just a note, "Recognised."
650. Is he the only man you know as a resident of Christchurch whom you saw going in?—I cannot swear to any names, but I know a number of the men by sight. I have seen them since.
651. This entry in your book, "Young man admitted by girl; three minutes; recognised," is the one that refers to Armstrong?—Yes; a young girl let him in.
652. A girl of about what age?—She looked about seventeen; I cannot tell, really.
653. A young women, then?—Yes.
654. Did there appear to be any commotion before the police arrived?—No, I do not think there was.
655. No one watching?—Two women returned to the hotel just after the police, and the door was open, and they walked in.
656. *Colonel Pitt.*] Returned or came?—They returned; I think they were boarders.
657. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you see them at the hotel before?—I think so. We thought they were boarders, because when they entered like that the man did not go in with them.
658. People like that, he admitted, apparently, without asking any questions?—Yes.
659. This hotel is very close to the railway-station?—Yes.
660. Trains were arriving at pretty frequent intervals from Lyttelton and other places?—Not many on Sundays.
661. During the day, about how many trains were there?—Four or five. I do not know really. There was less trade at the hotel when trains came in than at any other time. There was less people going in then.
662. Have you got the time in your book when the people entered?—Yes, pretty well; each hour was put down.
663. Did this man, the blacksmith, enter more than once during the day?—No, not that I saw.
664. Did you observe the same people going in and out?—Yes, one man went in five or six times.
665. He would not be a lodger?—No.
666. Do you know he was not a lodger?—He was a cabman.
667. He went in five or six times during the day?—Yes.
668. Of course, you counted him as many times as he went in?—Yes.
669. Can you give us any information which would lead to that man's identity?—Yes. I can give you another man—a cripple—who went three or four times. I think I would know him anywhere. He is a man with a crutch, and a stick, and a short leg.
670. Where do you usually see him about?—I never saw him before this day. He is a youngish man, who seemed to bring other customers to the hotel.
671. A sort of tout?—That is what he gave me the idea of being.
672. You say the lamp was alight all day?—It was not turned up strong, but it was alight.
673. Was it turned up at 9 at night?—Yes.
674. And that enabled you to see quite plainly?—Yes.
675. Can you tell me from your book, now, the number of persons who entered the hotel between 1 and 2 p.m.?—About twenty-one.
676. How many entered between 10 and 11 a.m.?—Not so many; five or six, I think.
677. How many entered between 6 and 7 p.m.?—We did not put the numbers down when they entered then. We counted up till 5.30, when 133 had entered, and then we stopped taking notes.
678. Did you not say you watched up till 8.30 p.m.?—We just counted them, and did not put them down.
679. And between 5.30 and 8.30 there would be fifty persons?—Yes.
680. *The Chairman.*] You have no record of these?—No detailed record.
681. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Will you give the number who went in between 2 and 3 p.m.?—We do not seem to have put down 3 o'clock; so far as I can see it is between 2 and 4 p.m.
682. What was the number then?—An awful lot. My friend added up the numbers between each hour.
683. *Colonel Pitt.*] Where were you and your friend stationed?—In a boardinghouse opposite the hotel.
684. How far from the front door?—Just across the road.
685. Is the road pretty wide there?—I think one chain wide.
686. Were you indoors?—Yes.
687. Were you looking through a window?—Part of the time we were looking through a window, and part of the time we had the window up.
688. How long was the window up?—Some hours in the evening, mostly because we thought they might see us in the day-time.
689. Do you remember what time you opened the window?—It was open at the top all the time.
690. And what time did you open it at the bottom?—Some time in the evening; I cannot be quite certain of the time.
691. You could hear the lock or key of the door a chain away?—Yes; it was quite amusing to see the effect the turning of the lock had down the street.
692. What do you mean by the effect?—As soon as they heard the lock turning, the people came up, and once or twice there was quite a regular rush for the door.

693. And you could hear it?—Yes, it made a lot of noise; and the man must have opened and shut the door a lot of times.

694. You say you could hear the key and lock turning in the door at that distance plainly?—Yes.

695. *The Chairman.*] Which floor of the house were you on?—The second floor.

JANE ROBERTS, examined on oath.

696. *The Chairman.*] Are you married or single?—Single.

697. Where do you live?—No. 17, Livingstone Road, Linwood.

698. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you assisting last Sunday in ascertaining how many people visited the Railway Hotel?—Yes.

699. What time did you start in the morning?—We started about 7.15 a.m.

700. And what time did you finish?—8.30 in the evening.

701. Did you take details the whole time, or up till 5.30 only?—I took details from about 7.15 until 5.30. I took none after that. I wish to state that when I mention times I should say about, because I had no means of ascertaining the time exactly, except when the town clock struck.

702. Is that the memo. book you used?—Yes.

703. How many people entered the hotel during the whole time you were making the observations?—One hundred and eighty-three; that is under the number. There were two or three who entered, or more, that I did not take count of.

704. Why?—Well, there were two women who entered who are not down there, and I think there were a few men entered after it became dark that I did not enter, because I was not positively certain.

705. Was there not a very fine light over the front door?—It was dim; it was not a bright light.

706. Was that lamp lit in the day-time?—Yes, all the time.

707. Was it turned up higher at night?—I should say so a little, but very little.

708. If you had some doubt as to some who entered after 5.30, how do you know that any entered?—I could tell they entered; but sometimes, when men were coming out and men were going in, and one or two were passing by, you could not be quite sure whether some of those passing entered or whether they did not. But I could be quite certain of every one of the fifty that entered between 5.30 and 8.30 p.m.

709. Did you notice any signs of intoxication on any one visiting the hotel that day?—Yes, on one particularly I noticed it.

710. Did there appear to be any watch kept on the hotel by the landlord or any other person?—I think they were watching in the morning.

711. Who were watching?—I cannot tell. There was somebody watching from one of the upper windows, and sometimes from one of the lower ones, and from the lower window I concluded it was the man who kept opening the door.

712. You do not know what his position in the house was?—I cannot say.

713. *The Chairman.*] You observed some one at the window continuously?—Yes, at the upper window; there were faces coming and going, but I could not say if they were there always.

714. *Mr. Taylor.*] Could they see who was down below?—Yes; but they did not see them if they stood close to the door.

715. If the people outside went away to the kerb, could they?—Yes; and some of them, after knocking, did that, and looked up at the upper windows.

716. *The Chairman.*] From this window they could see down below?—I should say so; I cannot say positively.

717. *Mr. Taylor.*] You think at that angle a person standing on the kerb would come into view of the upstairs window?—Yes, I think so.

718. What time did the police enter?—At 12.30.

719. Did they stay long?—About three or four minutes; hardly five.

720. Were any apparent lodgers about there that day?—Yes, I should say there were half a dozen; I cannot be quite sure of the number.

721. How did you judge they were lodgers?—There were four or five who left the hotel between 9 and 10 a.m., and they seemed to return about dinner-time, and they stayed in the hotel for about half an hour, and then went out again, and I concluded they were boarders.

722. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Can you tell me from your book the number of persons who entered the hotel between 2 and 4 p.m.?—I cannot tell you between 2 and 4; I can tell you between 2 and 5 p.m. I did not mark the hours from 2 till 5 p.m.

723. Have you counted them up?—Yes.

724. Can you tell me from memory?—No.

725. Will you from your note?—From 2 to 5 the number who entered was fifty-seven.

726. Well, perhaps you can give me the numbers during the various hours throughout the day?—Yes, from 8 to 9 there were ten entered; from 9 to 10, nine entered; from 10 to 11, five entered; from 11 to 12, twenty-one entered; from 12 to 1, eighteen entered; from 1 to 2, thirteen entered; from 2 to 5, fifty-seven entered, and from 5 o'clock up to 8.30 we counted fifty.

727. Then, from 11 a.m. there was a pretty steady stream, and there was very little difference between the various hours?—Very little.

728. So, if the last witness says at the time when the trains arrived there were fewer people entered the hotel than at other times, she is not correct?—I cannot say what time the trains arrived, but we noticed sometimes cabs passing, and we concluded the trains were in then.

729. Did you know any of the people yourself?—I did not know any one; but I would recognise some of them if I saw them now.

730. Was the door kept shut generally?—Yes.

731. When a person came to the door, can you give us an idea of what took place?—They generally came to the door and knocked, and most of them gave a peculiar knock.

732. What was the peculiarity?—They gave three distinct knocks. There were two or three who came and knocked loudly; there was nothing peculiar about their knock. They knocked just as if they wanted admission, and did not mind if anybody heard them or not. Then I concluded they were travellers.

733. But they were quite the exception?—Quite.

734. After the knock, what took place?—The landlord opened the door generally, and as he admitted one lot he let another lot out. That was general all through the day.

735. Did they appear to scrutinise the people at the door before they let them in?—Only a couple of hours before the visit of the police; he did then. He opened the door cautiously, and looked at them, but admitted them at once.

736. You are not able to say whether he asked them any questions?—I cannot say, but I was under the impression he did not.

737. What was the difference between the landlord's behaviour before the police arrived and after? You say throughout the whole day the door was kept locked, and these people were admitted in batches when other people were let out?—That is so.

738. Was that the system pursued throughout the whole day?—Yes.

739. Well, what was the difference between the action of the landlord before the police entered and after?—He opened the door more cautiously before the police entered, and looked out for a second before admitting any one, and, on one or two occasions, before he let them in he looked up and down the street before he let the people out.

740. Did he continue to do that throughout the day?—No.

741. What did he do afterwards?—He let them in and out with a great deal less caution in the afternoon.

742. Did you see him refuse to admit any one through the day?—I only saw him what I thought refuse admittance throughout the day to one man. He would not allow him to enter the hotel, and I think the man wanted to go into the hotel.

743. Was there anything peculiar about this man?—There was nothing peculiar about him that I noticed. He carried a horse's head-stall on his arm.

744. Is your eyesight pretty good?—Fairly good.

745. When the door was opened or closed did any peculiarity about the door strike you in any way?—No, nothing struck me as peculiar about the door. During the day it was opened and closed slightly; that was all I noticed.

746. Did anything seem to attract the attention of the people standing near the door as soon as the door was opened?—There was one occasion on which that happened. Some men had been knocking at the door for admission, and were going away, evidently thinking they would not get in; and three more came up and knocked, and the door was opened, and as they were entering one of them whistled to the other men who were going away, and they returned and entered together. That was the only time I saw anything to attract one's attention.

747. So far as you know, not one person entering the hotel that day were not what is known as *bonâ fide* travellers?—One man who entered the hotel knocked at the door, and knocked loudly, and he looked like a traveller. He was admitted, and stopped an hour. Another man came whom I should say was a traveller too. He returned a second time; I saw him in the hotel twice.

748. From your own knowledge you do not know that any of the persons entering the hotel last Sunday were not *bonâ fide* travellers?—I cannot know of my own knowledge, because I knew none of them.

749. You are quite sure there was nothing about the door that attracted your attention?—No.

750. Nor the opening or shutting of it?—No, it was opened and shut very quietly during the day.

751. Very quietly?—Yes.

752. *Mr. Taylor.*] I would like to ask whether your hearing is good?—Fairly good.

753. Would you hear with your eyesight or ears?—With my ears.

754. Did you hear the door close or open?—I heard it close more at night. There was a kind of bolt or chain attached to it at night. I could always hear the sound of it.

755. Could you hear the sound of the bolt during the day?—Not so much during the day. I noticed it more particularly at night.

756. Why were you and Miss Gordon elected to observe the Railway Hotel? What was the special reason?—Well, one reason was because we could get a room that had a full view of the hotel.

757. What do you think about the general administration of the licensing laws in Christchurch; do you think it is lax or rigid?—I think it is exceedingly lax.

758. *The Chairman.*] Was this your first actual watch?—Yes.

759. Had you any opportunities of forming an opinion as to how the law is observed?—Yes; that is, from general observation.

760. *Mr. Taylor.*] And your opinion is that the administration is lax?—Exceedingly lax.

761. Have you seen evidences of drunkenness on the streets on Sundays?—Yes, several times.

CHRISTINA CAVERHILL, examined on oath.

762. *The Chairman.*] Are you married or single?—Single.

763. Where do you live?—Linwood, Christchurch.

764. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you assist in getting information on Sunday last as to the visitors to certain hotels?—Yes.

765. What houses?—The White Swan Hotel, and afterwards the Royal George.

766. Is the White Swan in Tuam Street?—Yes.

767. How long were you there?—About ten minutes.
768. Standing on the street?—Yes, on the opposite side.
769. How many people visited the hotel in that ten minutes?—Six men, one woman, and two policemen.
770. What time?—11 o'clock.
771. Were you there from 11 a.m. until ten minutes past?—Yes.
772. Were any of these people there at the time the police were in?—Yes, some of them were.
773. Was the woman inside, do you know, when the police were there?—I really do not remember.
774. But some of them were there?—Yes; I think the woman must have been in.
775. How do you come to that conclusion?—I remember the policemen came out just as we turned away, and the woman had not come out.
776. Did you know any of these people?—No.
777. Did you see any signs of intoxication on any of them?—No.
778. Did there seem to be anybody watching the hotel?—Two lads were watching.
779. How did you gather they were watching?—Because they looked up and down the road as though expecting somebody.
780. Did they make any signs when the police approached?—No.
781. Did they not go inside?—I do not remember noticing that they did; but I know that a man gave them to understand that we were watching the hotel, and they went in then.
782. How do you know?—Because he came and motioned across the road, and pointed to us.
783. How long was that before the police came in?—That was after the policemen had been and gone.
784. How long did the police remain in the house?—About three minutes.
785. When did you go to the Royal George?—About twenty-five minutes past 11 a.m.
786. It is on the East Belt?—Yes.
787. How long were you there?—We watched that hotel from 12.15 till 2.25 p.m.
- 787A. How many people entered the Royal George?—Thirty-three went in; and eight came after the gate was shut and locked.
788. Did anything attract your attention before the gate was closed. They went in without any hindrance before the gate was closed. The gate was left open.
789. And did not the eight you refer to, get in?—No.
790. Did they try?—Yes.
791. Any response to their knocking?—No.
792. Have you any idea why the gate was closed and locked?—I cannot tell you.
793. Did you see the police at that house?—No.
794. Was there any sign of intoxication on any of the customers?—No; the general run of them seemed to be such men as usually loaf about hotels.
795. And you took them to be residents?—Yes.
796. You have no proof of that, of course?—No.
797. Was there any watch kept on the house?—Yes, there was a man standing at the corner of Queen Street all the time watching, and another stood at the gate with a man whom we took to be the owner of the hotel.
798. Did the men you thought were watching pass in and out?—Yes, constantly, but most of the time they were standing in the gateway.
799. Did they speak to people going in?—Yes.
800. Were you watching from the street on that occasion?—Yes.
801. Were you not observed there?—Yes, they seemed to think we were watching them. They kept watching us all the time.
802. *The Chairman.*] Where were you standing?—On the opposite side of the East Belt; we walked up and down.
803. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you think your being there had anything to do with the gate being closed?—It may have; I do not know.
804. Did any of these people carry any vessel, or bottle, or kit?—No, not that I saw.

HARRIET FIELD, examined on oath.

805. *The Chairman.*] Are you married?—Yes.
806. What is your husband's name?—John Field.
807. Where does he live?—Lower High Street, Christchurch.
808. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you in company with Miss Caverhill last Sunday?—Yes.
809. What time did you visit Tuam Street West?—About 11 a.m.
810. How long were you there?—About ten minutes.
811. Were you watching the White Swan Hotel?—Yes.
812. How many people did you see pass in?—I was speaking to a man at the back, and I did not see any one go in. I saw two policemen come out.
813. You saw no one enter during that time?—No.
814. Did you subsequently go with Miss Caverhill to the East Belt?—Yes.
815. What hotel did you view there?—The Royal George.
816. Did you see any persons pass in there?—Yes.
817. What time were you there?—About 11.25. While standing between Barbadoes Street and the Belt we saw six men enter.
818. How long did you remain there?—Just a few minutes. We saw some come out while standing there.
819. What time did you leave?—We then walked on down St. Asaph Street, and then turned along into Creek Street.

820. When did you cease making observations in the afternoon?—It was nearly 3 o'clock when we left off.
821. How many people altogether entered the hotel during that time?—Thirty-two.
822. You said just now that you stood there just a few minutes?—We went further down the street, and came on to the Belt.
823. Was anybody watching the hotel, apparently?—Yes.
824. Did the person seem to watch the entrance to the house directly?—He seemed to stay at the gate, and to be on the watch; and he was a man, I suppose, of about twenty-eight years of age, and he had a fawn-coloured Chesterfield coat.
825. Did any other person appear to be on the watch?—Yes, two others. One seemed to be watching at the end of Queen Street.
826. Did he go into the house at all?—He seemed to go back and forwards to the gate.
827. Did any police visit there?—No.
828. Did any people carry kits or bottles?—No.
829. What class of people were they?—They appeared to be residents.
830. How did you judge that?—One man in particular we noticed going back again. He was one we saw going out at 11.25, and he came back again between 1 and 2 o'clock. We could tell him by his suit of clothes.
831. Have you had opportunities of noticing whether Sunday trading is carried on extensively in hotels in Christchurch?—Yes.
832. Which hotels?—The New Zealander, and the Caversham.
833. You live near these houses?—Right opposite to them both.
834. Your house is on the junction of two streets?—Yes.
835. And these hotels are on the opposite corners?—Yes.
836. Do you think the Sunday-trading clauses of the Licensing Act are observed in Christchurch?—No, I do not; I think they are broken every Sunday.
837. Have you seen much drunkenness in the streets of Christchurch on Sunday?—I have seen several occasionally.
838. And from your opportunities of making observations you think there are breaches of the licensing laws on Sundays?—I am sure there are round where I live.
839. If the Inspector of Police says that generally the law is well observed, do you think he knows anything about it?—I cannot think he does if he says that. I have seen one policeman walk down to the corner of our street, but he does not enter the hotels. He just looks round to see if everything is quiet. I do not see how they can say there is no Sunday trading going on unless they enter.
840. *The Chairman.*] You know it is not a breach of the Licensing Act for a man to enter a hotel on Sunday?—I suppose it would be a breach if he went in to get drink.
841. You are aware it is not a breach for a man to enter a hotel on Sunday?—Yes.
842. When you say you consider the law is broken, do you mean by people going into the houses?—Yes.
843. And what else?—I conclude they go in to get drink.
844. You conclude they get it?—Well, I often see them coming out wiping their mouths. Men are frequently there whom I do not think would consider ginger-ale strong enough for them.
845. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you live opposite the two hotels?—Yes.
846. The police do nothing to check Sunday trading there?—I have not seen them do anything. I have repeatedly seen them just go down to the corner and look round and go back again.
847. Do you happen to know that the licensee of the New Zealander Hotel was convicted on a charge brought up by the police?—Yes, I read of it.
848. Does not that rather alter your opinion, that the police have done something?—I did not see them go in.
849. You say you read of that conviction; and yet, just before, you said you did not believe the police were doing anything?—I have seen men go in since on a Sunday.
850. Yes; and these men, so far as you know, may be *bona fide* travellers, or have been lodgers, or represented themselves to be such?—They may.
851. How long had you been watching this second hotel?—It was twenty-five minutes past 11 when we first saw six men go in; and it was nearly 3 o'clock when we left.
852. You were watching all the time?—We left about twenty minutes.
853. You saw these six men, you say, since you were in the neighbourhood of the hotel?—Yes.
854. Are these six part of the thirty-three?—Yes.
855. Then, if Miss Caverhill says she saw twenty-three enter the hotel between 12.15 and a little before 3, she is not correct?—I suppose Miss Caverhill meant those going in to the White Swan. It was twenty-five minutes past 11, first of all, because I looked at the watch.
856. *The Chairman.*] Did you see the gate shut?—Yes.
857. What time was that?—About 1.30 p.m.; and then men came and knocked at the door several times, but it was not opened for them; but we saw three or four let out.
858. Did any one go in after 1.30 p.m.?—Not to my knowledge.
859. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Really, then, these thirty-three people entered before 1.30 p.m.?—Yes.
860. By what means did they enter?—The back gateway.
861. And left in the same way?—Yes.
862. This back gateway opens where? On to St. Asaph Street?—Yes.
863. The front of the hotel—where?—It faces the Belt.
864. You were standing on the Belt, looking down St. Asaph Street?—Yes.
865. Where were you standing when you saw these six men?—In St. Asaph Street.
866. Did anything appear to be said to the people going in?—No.

867. You do not know, of course, if they were going to the back premises in the yard, or where they went?—No.

868. *The Chairman.*] Could you not see any door leading into the house?—No, because it opens into the back-yard.

869. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you think that fourteen convictions in the year for sly-grog selling on Sunday will deter the forty odd publicans from breaking the law on the other fifty-two Sundays?—I do not think so.

870. *Colonel Pitt.*] You complain, apparently, that the police do not do what they ought to suppress Sunday trading?—I think if I were a policeman I should get some one else to go with me, and I am sure I could have got a conviction against the Caversham Hotel before now.

871. Would you be prepared to help the police?—Both my husband and myself when we first went to live there four years ago, saw the law being broken, and we went and spoke to the landlord about it.

872. In what way, in your opinion, should the police go to work to get a conviction?—If two men could not do it I think four should go.

873. *The Chairman.*] How much better would four be than two, if there was a man watching on the gate to give the signal: how could they cope with that?—If they went in they would find men in the house.

874. But that is not breaking the law?—Well, I think the law should be amended. I think the only way to cope with this breaking of the Licensing Act is to have women policemen. I think a woman would do it better than a man.

875. Supposing if you had women hotelkeepers, then?—I think we could manage the women hotelkeepers too.

JOHN CONNELL, examined on oath.

876. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a third-class constable, stationed at Lyttelton.

877. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in the Force?—Over four years.

878. Where have you been stationed?—In Christchurch and Lyttelton.

879. Have you had any prosecutions under the licensing law?—Yes.

880. In Christchurch, or Lyttelton?—In Lyttelton.

881. Have you ever known of any political influence or other outside influence to interfere with a policeman in the discharge of his duty?—On the 11th May last I was interfered with.

882. Who by?—By the Rev. Father Salvadore.

883. *The Chairman.*] How interfered with?—It was a case in which I laid three informations against Mrs. O'Brien, who keeps the Lyttelton Hotel. I might state I was on night duty on the 5th May last at Lyttelton, and at ten minutes to 1 a.m. I heard a fight going on in the Lyttelton Hotel. I knocked at the door, and nobody answered. In about five or seven minutes I gained admittance. When I got into the hotel I proceeded to a back room, and there were four or five men there, and one was knocked about. His shirt was torn, and he was cut on the face. I told Mrs. O'Brien I would have to make a report about the conduct of the house. She said I could report away, as she did not care for me. She is a widow. There was a great noise in the house before I went in. Of course, they made everything pretty well square before they admitted me; and, after I left the house, the man whom I had noticed inside so knocked about came out. He was drunk, and Mrs. O'Brien let him out. He said, "Let my mate out, or I will smash every damn window in the house," and with that he broke a window. I arrested the man on a charge of being drunk, and damaging property, and he was brought before the Court the same morning, and convicted on both charges. It followed that three charges were laid against Mrs. O'Brien for keeping a disorderly house, permitting drunkenness on licensed premises, and refusing to admit the police. The summonses were served on the 7th May, and the case was set down for hearing on the 12th May. About 10 a.m. on the 10th May I was asleep, as I had been on night duty, and I was awakened by a row at the door of my house. It was the Rev. Father Salvadore. He knocked very loudly, and woke me up, and my wife let him in. He said, "I come to tell you I am going to have you out of here, because you have brought a charge you had no right to bring against Mrs. O'Brien, licensee of the Lyttelton Hotel. I am not a common man here; I command about four hundred votes, and Colonel Hume is my friend, and will do anything I wish him." He also said, "The Hon. Mr. Thompson, Minister of Justice, is coming here to day, and I am going to see him, and out of here you will have to go." He made use of these words in so loud a tone that they could have been heard out on the street by anybody passing by. He was inside in the passage, at my bedroom door. I made a report about this affair to my officer.

884. Who was the Inspector then?—Inspector Broham, and I reported it to him. He, of course, told me I should have ordered him out when he came to my house.

885. Did the cases go to Court?—Yes, the next day the cases came before the Court.

886. What was the result?—The whole three charges were dismissed. I forgot to mention that, when at my place, he said he would appear at Court next day and give evidence against me.

887. Did he?—He was at the Court, but he did not give evidence.

888. And the cases were heard and dismissed?—Yes.

889. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were the cases heard by the Stipendiary Magistrate?—Yes.

890. Has Father Salvadore interfered on any other occasions?—No.

891. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did he interfere then; were you shifted?—No; he used threats, but he did not frighten me in the slightest. Nothing has happened to me that I know of.

892. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know that in the month of October last there was a change in the control of the Police Force?—Yes.

893. Have you heard any of the men in the Force mention the question of political influence? Has it been a matter of common talk amongst the men that it was necessary to use it?—It has never interfered with me. I have never tried to use it.

894. Have you heard the men conversing about it?—Not that I remember.

895. *Colonel Hume.*] Were you moved from Lyttelton?—No.

896. You have never been since?—No.

897. Then, Father Salvadore had no effect on you?—No.

898. I suppose, in your experience of five or six years in the Police Force, you have been threatened before?—I have been threatened by publicans in this way, that if I interfered it would mean a shift.

899. Have these threats ever been carried out?—No.

900. They did not influence you, I imagine, in the performance of your duty?—Not the slightest.

901. Is it not a common thing for a constable when arresting people, or when locking them up, to be told that they "will get the coat off your back"?—Yes.

902. *The Chairman.*] Have you ever heard such threats, not only by the liquor people but by the other party—the Prohibitionists?—Yes; often when arresting a man for drunkenness he will say, "It means the sack for you."

903. These are made irrespective of party?—Yes.

FRIDAY, 23RD APRIL.

JAMES MEADE CONWAY, examined on oath.

1. *Mr. Cresswell.*] Your name is James Meade Conway?—Yes.
2. You are a son of the licensee of Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes, the eldest son.
3. You are the manager of the hotel?—Yes.
4. Were you at the hotel on Sunday last?—I was.
5. All the day?—Yes, with the exception of from 9.30 in the morning to 10.40, and in the evening from 8 to 10.
6. While at the hotel you had the key of the bar?—Yes.
7. When you were away, who had the key?—In the morning my mother had it, and at night I had it.
8. That is, the public bar?—Yes.
9. There is also a private bar?—Yes.
10. Who had the key of the private bar?—There is no key to the private bar itself, but shutters go over the liquor-case; and I had the key of that, and the key of the beer-tap.
11. So that, except during the short time you were away from the hotel, it would be impossible for any drinks to be supplied without your knowledge?—That is so.
12. Did you supply any drinks on Sunday last?—I did.
13. How many?—I must have served about fifty altogether.
14. Did you serve any one but boarders and *bonâ fide* travellers?—I did not.
15. When drink is asked for on a Sunday by any one not a boarder, what is the custom?—I ask him if he is a *bonâ fide* traveller, and, if he says "Yes," I ask him where he slept the previous night. When he replies, I use my own discretion as to whether he is a *bonâ fide* traveller or not.
16. And if you think he is not a *bonâ fide* traveller, what do you say?—I refuse him.
17. Did you refuse any drinks on Sunday?—Yes, perhaps thirty or forty.
18. How many boarders had you on Sunday?—Fourteen were in the house on Saturday night.
19. How many had you in to lunch on Sunday?—Seventeen.
20. Do you remember the witness Rose coming to lunch on Sunday?—Yes.
21. What time did he come in?—Late. He had lunch when I had it—after the family and the boarders had finished.
22. Did he see all the people who had lunch there on the Sunday?—No, he did not.
23. You have the usual conveniences in your yard?—We have a urinal and three closets. One closet is for the family, one that is locked for the boarders, and one that is open for the public; and the men from the stable have a key for the one used by the boarders.
24. Is that Delamain's stables?—Yes.
25. Do the men from the stables avail themselves largely of their privilege?—Yes; and their clients too.
26. Do men from the street come to the yard for the purpose of using the conveniences there, without going into the hotel?—Yes, dozens of them.
27. Was that the case on Sunday last?—Yes, it is the case every day.
28. How do the boarders gain access to the hotel on Sundays?—By the right-of-way and through the yard, unless any one happens to be at the front door and sees them, which is very unusual.
29. The building is a two-storied one?—Yes.
30. And there are two rooms on the top story, in the front?—Yes.
31. What are those rooms?—Private sitting-room and general sitting-room.
32. Is it true that a look-out was kept, or that any members of the family were on the watch on Sunday?—It is not true.
33. I presume that a person looking at the hotel from a window in Inglis's building would be able to see the members of the family in the private sitting-room if they were near the window?—Yes.

34. And any one that might be in the general sitting-room?—Yes, if they were near the window.
35. How many brothers and sisters have you?—Three single sisters and two brothers.
36. All living at the hotel?—Yes, and one of my sisters is a child of twelve years of age.
37. Some members of the family were ill and confined to bed on Sunday?—Yes, my youngest sister, and my brother next to me.
38. Did you have any friends in to see them?—My brother did.
39. A number?—Four or five.
40. Did any of the boarders have friends in to see them?—Yes. The barman was also in bed with a poisoned hand, and he had friends to see him.
41. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you often see the witness Rose in the house on Sunday?—I could not say. I heard his evidence yesterday.
42. You heard his evidence?—I examined him.
43. Cannot you remember how often you saw him in the house on Sunday?—No. I might have been upstairs when he was in.
44. What refreshments had he?—He had a glass of beer in the kitchen.
45. How many drinks were served on Sunday altogether?—Between sixty and seventy.
46. Single drinks?—Yes.
47. What books do you keep in the hotel?—What do you mean?
48. Do you keep a record of the daily takings?—No.
49. No book at all?—Yes.
50. What book?—A general cash-book.
51. Will that show the takings day by day?—No.
52. What does it show?—The six days' takings. We always put Sundays into Mondays. I attend to the books myself, and I bank two or three times a week, according to the takings.
53. Have you any other evidence other than your word as to the takings?—I think my mother knows.
54. *The Chairman.*] She would know from you?—Yes.
55. *Mr. Taylor.*] You put the seventh day's takings into the six days' cash?—Yes.
56. In the cash-book, do you not show the takings for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and so on?—Not always.
57. Do you at all?—Sometimes. I only keep the book roughly. At the end of the week, if the takings are £70, I know what stock has been used in both bars, and I know what it costs me, and what profit I get.
58. Have you that book with you?—No.
59. Is it obtainable?—The profits?
60. The cash-book?—I do not intend to show that. I am not going to exhibit my business to the public at large.
61. I want to know what you put down last Sunday?—I made an entry in the cash-book on the Monday.
62. What time on Monday did you make the entry?—On Monday night, when I was making up Monday's takings.
63. Can you tell how much was taken on Monday, and how much on Sunday?—I remember the Sunday's takings from memory. I would not remember the amount some weeks further on.
64. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say that the lodgers go in and out the back way?—Yes.
65. What is the object in compelling them to go in that way?—If you left the front door open it would be made a thoroughfare to the urinal.
66. You served seventeen lunches?—Yes.
67. That is not counting the members of your own family?—Yes.
68. Does the seventeen include the lodgers in the hotel?—Yes.
69. You had fourteen lodgers?—Some of them had not lunch.
70. How many lunches did you serve to outside people?—I could not say.
71. Is there any drink supplied with the lunch?—Yes, either a glass of beer or a cup of tea.
72. What is the price of the lunch?—Is.
73. That covers the drink?—Yes.
74. You say that Rose had a glass of beer on Sunday morning?—Yes.
75. Who paid for it?—A traveller who was with him.
76. Did you know the traveller who was with him?—No; I did not see him.
77. What did the traveller have?—One had a whiskey and ginger ale, and the other beer and ginger beer.
78. Were there two?—Yes, to the best of my recollection.
79. And the travellers paid for the three drinks?—Yes.
80. Did you see Rose drink the beer?—No.
81. You drew it?—Yes.
82. Knowing it was for Rose?—The servant came and said the mater wanted three drinks, and I asked "Who are they for?" The servant said the mater had stated that it was all right, and I gave her the drinks.
83. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was the money paid to you?—Yes.
84. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] It was the servant who paid you?—Yes, the servant brought the money to me.
85. What is the servant's name?—I did not notice particularly what one it was.
86. How many servants have you?—Three. There are two regular, and one that helps occasionally, and it was one of the regular servants who brought the order.
- [Examination adjourned.]

LEITH CARTER, examined on oath.

88. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Leith Carter.
89. What is your occupation?—I am a clerk, at present out of employment.
90. *Mr. Cresswell.*] On Sunday last you were a boarder at Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes.
91. Were you at the hotel all day?—Yes, till after tea.
92. Were you at lunch?—Yes.
93. How many did you see having lunch?—About fifteen or seventeen.
94. You did not count?—No, that is just a guess.
95. Did many people come to the hotel that day?—I saw hardly any one inside, but I saw a few in the yard.
96. Is it a usual thing for people to go into the yard and go away again without going into the hotel?—I have several times seen people come into the yard in the week-time, and use the conveniences, and go away again.
97. *Mr. Taylor.*] What time were you up in the morning?—About 9 o'clock, I suppose.
98. You had breakfast?—Yes.
99. Who were with you?—About ten when I was having it. I did not know any of them.
100. How many were boarding there that night?—It seemed pretty full. There were about fourteen, I suppose.
101. And seventeen were at lunch?—Yes.
102. Have you discussed the number of boarders and lunchers with the last witness?—No.
103. Did you count them on Sunday?—No.
104. And yet you say there were fourteen boarders and seventeen at lunch?—I am judging by the number of rooms in the house.
105. Were all the rooms occupied?—They seemed to be all occupied, but I could not swear to it.
106. What did you do after breakfast?—I was about the house all day.
107. In what rooms?—Upstairs, the top of the stairs, the yard, and downstairs.
108. In the bar?—No.
109. Were you near it?—I was past it two or three times.
110. In the kitchen?—No.
111. Did you have refreshments?—A glass of beer at dinner.
112. Did you see any one else having it?—No, except at dinner-time.
113. Did you see any liquor served at all?—I did not.
114. You say you sometimes see people come into the yard to use the public conveniences?—Every day.
115. How many were there on Sunday?—I suppose there were about thirty in the yard, and some went to the hotel and were refused admittance, and some went in.
116. You did not see what happened when they went in?—No.
117. How far is the public urinal away from the hotel—the City Council urinal?—I do not know.
118. Do you know the urinal at the cabstand?—Yes, but I did not know it was the City Council's.
119. How far is it from the hotel?—About 50 yards.
120. What time did you have dinner?—About 1 o'clock.
121. How many people had it?—Fifteen or seventeen.
122. How long were you at the table?—I could not say—half an hour, I suppose, or twenty minutes.
123. And that number had dinner in the time that you had dinner?—Yes.
124. What time did dinner start?—I do not know. I did not look at the time.
125. Were all the boarders present at dinner?—I do not know the boarders at the hotel.
126. How long have you been at the hotel?—A fortnight on Sunday.
127. Did they all sit down at once or did they come in now and then?—They were coming in and going out.
128. What did you do after dinner?—I was about the hotel, reading, most of the time.
129. You saw no drinks being served?—No.
130. To nobody?—No.
131. Do you know the stableman at Delamain's?—By sight.
132. Did you see him there on Sunday?—No.
133. *The Chairman.*] When you say you saw no drinks served you do not refer to the luncheon table?—No.
134. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long have you been in Christchurch?—About a fortnight.
135. Where did you come from?—New Plymouth.
136. Have you been in the colony long?—About two years and a half.
137. Did you come from England?—No, Australia.
138. You had a glass of beer on Sunday at lunch?—Yes.
139. When did you leave the hotel?—After tea.
140. And you saw no one in the hotel from breakfast-time till tea-time, except the boarders and some others having lunch?—That is so.
141. *The Chairman.*] You saw no one in the hotel all that time?—Except the people I saw enter the yard.
142. *Mr. Taylor.*] But you did not see those people in the house?—No, but I saw them come into the yard.

WILLIAM JAMES HUSSEY, examined on oath.

143. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—William James Hussey.
 144. What are you?—I am a driver to Delamain and Co.
 145. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You had lunch at Tattersall's Hotel on Sunday last?—Yes.
 146. How long were you at the hotel?—I was in and out several times.
 147. How often?—Three or four times.
 148. Were you in and out before lunch?—I did not go in before lunch.
 149. So far as you recollect, how many did you see having lunch?—I should say there were about fourteen or sixteen. The table was fairly full, but I did not count them.
 150. Did you see the man Rose, from Delamain's stables?—He was not having lunch when I was in.
 151. Did you sit down as soon as the lunch was brought on?—Yes.
 152. Did you see many people about the hotel?—Only those I have mentioned.
 153. Did you see any people go into the yard at the back of the hotel?—No.
 154. I think the conveniences in the yard at the back of the hotel are used by the stablemen at Delamain's?—They are the only ones they have got.
 155. And also by their clients?—Yes.
 156. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you drive for Delamain?—Yes.
 157. Do you drive a coach?—Yes.
 158. What one?—Fendalton.
 159. Did you drive on Sunday?—Yes.
 160. How many trips?—Seven.
 161. What hours did you leave town?—The first was about 9.55, and we kept on till 9.30 at night, when we left Fendalton.
 162. What time does the next coach leave after 9.55?—They run at intervals.
 163. What is the next one?—I could not say.
 164. Have you a time-table?—Not on me.
 165. Do you run to time-table?—Yes.
 166. How long have you been driving?—That was my first Sunday. The line has only been going a week.
 167. You drove all day on Sunday?—Yes, every trip.
 168. You do not remember what times you left?—I started at five minutes to 10.
 169. Did you get back in an hour?—Yes, and then went off for an hour.
 170. Then, your next trip?—About five minutes to 12, I suppose. After that I took the horses out and put them in the stable, and had lunch.
 171. You had lunch then?—Yes, I waited about for it for five or ten minutes.
 172. And cannot you say exactly how many were in at lunch?—I do not remember exactly.
 173. You gave us a number?—I said about fourteen or sixteen. The table holds about sixteen or seventeen, and it was moderately full.
 174. The table would be full then?—Pretty full, not quite; but I was not looking to see whether it was full or not. I was having my dinner.
 175. How many times did you go into the hotel?—About four.
 176. What was the first time?—When I went in to lunch.
 177. At 1 o'clock?—Yes.
 178. And after that?—When I had a spell I went in to put in the time.
 179. What did you go in for the second time?—To have a spell, and I sat before the fire.
 180. What did you go in for afterwards?—To get tea.
 181. How many were at tea?—I did not sit down to tea. I had it in the kitchen.
 182. What did you go in for after that?—I went in no more.
 183. Who went in with you?—I do not think any one went in with me.
 184. You were alone each time?—Yes.
 185. Do you know Mr. Carter at the hotel?—No.
 186. Do you know any of the boarders?—Yes.
 187. What are their names?—I only know one, Thomson. He was shepherding at Methven.
 188. Did you see him on Sunday?—I cannot say I did.
 189. Outside those at lunch, how many did you see at the hotel?—I think I only know one who was sitting at lunch.
 190. Who was that?—A son-in-law of Mrs. Conway's, I think.
 191. Was Mr. Conway there?—I do not think so.
 192. Who was at the head of the table?—No one.
 193. Who carved?—It was brought in to us.
 194. And did Mr. Conway not have lunch?—I do not know.
 195. Do you know him well?—I know him as a publican.
 196. And cannot you remember whether Mr. Conway had lunch on Sunday last?—I cannot remember. I know he was in the room, but whether he was sitting down or not I could not say.
 197. While you were in, whom did you see about, apart from those you saw at lunch?—When I went into the commercial room once there were three or four there.
 198. Any one in the yard?—There were two or three, who were strangers to me.
 199. Did you see any of them refused admittance?—No. I went straight in at the back door.
 200. Did you see any of the members of the family at the back?—Yes, the Misses Conway.
 201. Where were they?—One was near the gate, and one near the clothes-line.
 202. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What did you pay for your lunch?—1s.
 203. What drink did you have?—A glass of beer.
 204. On the other occasions you had no drink?—No, but I had tea.

205. Are you in the habit of getting your lunch there daily?—The coach has only been going a week.

206. Where do you live?—At 156, South Town Belt.

JANE SOPHIA FRANCES CONWAY, examined on oath.

207. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Jane Sophia Frances Conway.

208. Are you the licensee of Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes.

209. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You have been a licensee in Christchurch for ten years?—Yes.

210. During that time you have been a widow?—Yes.

211. Your husband was a licensee for fourteen years before that?—Yes; for fourteen years in the Woodend district.

212. Has your license ever been indorsed for an offence?—No.

213. Or a conviction?—No; nor have I ever been reprimanded by the Inspector of Police.

214. The police reports have been uniformly favourable?—Yes.

215. Who keeps the key of the public bar on Sundays?—My eldest son; and when he is out I have it.

216. It is always in the possession of yourself or your eldest son?—Yes.

217. Was he out on Sunday?—He went to the half-past 9 o'clock mass, and returned home about twenty minutes past 10, I think.

218. With that exception, was he in the house all day?—In the house all day.

219. Did you serve any drinks while he was away?—Eight or ten, at the outside.

220. Did you serve any one but *bona fide* travellers and boarders?—Certainly not.

221. Did you have to refuse any applications for drinks?—Several. They did not satisfy me when I asked them if they were travellers. They said they were always travelling; and I said, "That won't do me"; and I refused them. I also refused several men who asked for cigarettes, as I never keep them.

222. Did you see any one on or about the premises on Sunday drinking?—I did not. I saw one drunken man, but he was not on the premises. He came only as far as the right-of-way, and I went to the gate and told him to begone. He went to the head of the right-of-way and put his head round the corner. I told my son to go and see what the man was doing, and I also said, "If Sergeant Mackay comes round he will swear he was inside the house." Those were the words I used.

223. He was not in the house?—I saw him through the window, and when I ordered him off he gave me "cheek." I stood at the gate till I saw him into Cashel Street. He stood with his head round the corner, and I sent my boy after him to send him off, because, I said, if Sergeant Mackay comes he will swear the man was inside the house. Sergeant Mackay has harassed me for the past few months.

224. Have the police been vigilant?—Sergeant Mackay is not satisfied with searching the bottom floor, but he sometimes goes through all the rooms, even the bedrooms. He asked to search my own bedroom, and I said to him, "Come on, then, sergeant, here it is. You can search it."

225. You think the police are vigilant in the discharge of their duties?—I should say they are. The likes of the police for the last few years I have never seen; but Sergeant Mackay caps them all.

226. How often did the police visit your place on Sunday last?—About three or five minutes to 9 o'clock, Sergeant Scully and Constable Dalton came in. It was very near the stroke of 9.

227. Was a second visit paid?—Yes; some time after 11. It may have been half-past 11 or a quarter to 12. Sergeant Mackay came in with Constable Pratt. The sergeant rushed through the house, and if I had had men in the house getting drink I could not have got rid of them, seeing the way he rushed through. Even my kitchen is not exempt from him.

228. On the second visit, did they go upstairs?—He searched the bedrooms upstairs. I did not go with him. I generally go, but, as I was not well, my son went with him.

229. Did he scrutinise the carpets and the floor?—One Sunday he saw some wet on the floor. Last Sunday it was raining, and I saw him looking at the floor, but he said nothing but "Umph."

230. At any rate, he made a close and careful inspection of the house?—He could not do it more closely if he was looking for a criminal. The last time Sergeant Mackay was in there were four boarders in the house, and he made the usual inquiries, and looked at them with suspicion. I said to him that they were boarders.

231. What time was that?—I think it was about half-past 7 o'clock.

232. That was another visit?—Yes, that was the second visit he had made, and it was the third visit by the police.

233. Who came with him on that occasion?—Constable Pratt, I think, but I am not sure.

234. At any rate, you are sure that two police-officers came on the third occasion?—Yes.

235. And Sergeant Mackay was one of them?—Yes. They both went upstairs.

236. Did they look at the bar?—They always look at the bar, even the private bar.

237. Is it a fact that the private bar was never opened on Sunday?—My private bar shutters are never opened from 11 o'clock on Saturday night until 9 o'clock on Monday morning, when my daughters open them.

238. Were your daughters or any one else in the hotel posted to keep watch on Sunday?—They kept no watch, as it is not necessary. The sergeant keeps too good a watch on me. I had my two daughters in the house that day, and the third one was not well, and did not go outside the door.

239. You have three sons?—Yes, and on Sunday one of them was in bed.

240. Did any friends come in to see the one who was in bed?—Four or five. My barman had a poisoned arm, and, as they had not room for him at the hospital, he came back to the hotel, and on Sunday four or five men came in to see him. They had no drink. They only asked if they could go up and see Willie Topham.

241. The boarders and the members of your family were in and out of the hotel several times?—All the day. I have one boarder who has stopped with me every Saturday night for the last three years, and he pays twelve or fourteen visits every Sunday.

242. You and the members of your family are Good Templars, are you not?—I never take drink unless I am recommended to do so by the doctor. One of my children has never tasted it, and my eldest son never tastes it unless recommended. Two members of my family were ill once, and took it when recommended.

243. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Rose, in Delamain's?—I do not know him by that name, but now I see him in Court I recognise him as "Charlie."

244. How many times was he in the hotel on Sunday?—Four or five times, for boiling water.

245. Did he get it from you?—No.

246. How do you know what he came for, then?—I always help the cook on Sundays.

247. Did you see him get the water?—Yes.

248. How many times?—I think he came three times, and once for washing-soda. He also came in to his dinner.

249. Four times?—I cannot swear the exact number of times; but he got boiling water, and he also came in with two men to get a drink.

250. Where were you?—In the kitchen. The two men were from Kaiapoi. They asked me for drinks, and handed me 1s. 6d. I said I would "shout" for Charlie, and I sent the servant for the drinks.

251. If Charlie says the visitors paid for the drink for him he is wrong?—He did not see what money I got. They handed me 1s. 6d., and I gave them back the 6d., and said I would not charge for Charlie. I said that under the Licensing Act a traveller cannot "shout" for a townsman, and one of them said, "Oh, bother the Licensing Act." A policeman once told me that a visitor could not "shout" for a townsman.

252. What does Charlie pay for his lunch?—1s.

253. You never give him a lunch for nothing?—Once.

254. When was that?—On Christmas Day. I never charge a man for his Christmas dinner in my house.

255. Did the police enter by the back door?—I do not think they did. As a rule Sergeant Mackay comes in at one door and plants a man at another door to see that no one goes out.

256. How did they go in last Sunday?—Sergeant Scully went to the front door, and I think that Sergeant Mackay came in by the front door one time.

257. Did Sergeant Mackay go in by one door and the constable by another?—That is generally the way he does it. Last Sunday they both came in together, whatever way it was.

258. What door was it?—Once by the front door, but I could not say how they came in the second time.

259. What time did your son get up on Sunday?—He was in bed all Sunday, and he did not get up till Monday morning to go to his work.

260. He was in bed all the day, then?—Yes; and the barman was also in bed, also my daughter.

261. Do you know the names of the visitors?—No.

262. Do you know Frank Reid?—I remember he came to the house, and spoke to my eldest son. The second time he came in he asked for a packet of cigarettes, and I refused him, and he said, "Oh, my God!" That was about 5 o'clock, when I was in the yard. He was not inside the door.

263. Is he the only man you knew?—Bless you, no; I knew a man who came from Lincoln.

264. Was he the only Christchurch man you knew?—The man I turned from the gate was a Christchurch man.

265. The drunken man?—Yes.

266. Did you know any others?—No. Am I supposed to tell his name because I said he was under the influence of liquor?

267. I ask you to tell his name?—You might want his name, but I will leave it to the Commissioners to say whether I am to give it.

268. *The Chairman.*] Tell us his name?—Morris, a fish man. I do not know his Christian name. I would not say he was drunk, although he was under the influence of liquor.

269. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know where he lives?—I do not.

269A. Did you see a man in your house several times on Sunday with his face drawn on one side as if it had been scalded?—Do you mean a tailor man?

270. Probably?—He came to see my son Jack, who was getting a suit of clothes.

271. He came to get an order for a suit of clothes on the Sunday?—No, he came to see if he was going to get it.

272. What is his name?—You ask me more than I can tell you.

273. Do you not remember the names of any other visitors on Sunday?—No. I do not pay any attention to their names. Yes, I can tell you. There was a man from Belfast, and a man from Islington.

274. What are their names?—Albert Kerrison, from Islington.

275. And the Belfast man?—His Christian name is Arthur, but I do not know his surname.

276. What books do you keep in connection with your business?—I keep a book that shows how much is given out of each bar, and it shows the takings. Sunday takings are so small that they are put in with Monday. My son keeps the books.

277. Do you ever see them?—Yes.

278. The takings for Sunday and Monday are put together?—Yes.

279. And the takings for Tuesday are shown?—Yes.

280. And Wednesday, and so on?—Yes.

281. That is, six altogether?—Yes.
282. You see them entered in a book?—I do not see them entered. It might be a week before I see the books.
283. There are six entries every week?—Did I not say so?
284. I want to get it definitely?—Yes. There are seven days combined in six.
285. If your son says they are entered in a lump sum, what do you say?—It might be done at race-times if we are busy.
286. You take some cash on Sundays, and he takes some?—I only take it when he is at church.
287. How many people were at lunch on Sunday?—Seventeen.
288. Have you a record?—No.
289. Were you at the table?—No; but I always carve in the kitchen.
290. But were you at the table?—No, but I know how many dinners were sent in.
291. You carved for seventeen?—Yes.
292. Did that include Rose?—Yes; but he came in late.
293. How many people boarded with you on the Saturday night?—Fourteen.
294. Did they all lunch on Sunday?—No; and only nine were for breakfast: seven of the boarders and two strangers.
295. How many people entered the house on Sunday, do you suppose?—That is a very hard question to answer, because the house and the yard are different things. I should say that eighty or ninety entered the house, and that from two hundred to two hundred and fifty might have come into the yard.
366. *Mr. Poynton.*] That includes those who came into the house?—Yes. I often see people go to the offices in the yard.
397. *Mr. Taylor.*] They go into the yard to get into the house, or to go to the public conveniences?—Yes; and some come in for cigarettes.
298. Did some come in on Sunday for cigarettes?—Yes.
299. The same men?—No. When I tell a man that I do not sell cigarettes he does not come again. Dozens come in some days for cigarettes. There are no tobacconists' shops open.
300. They come to you as if you had a tobacconists' shop?—Yes; and they might go to others in the same way. I only speak for myself.
301. Are the conveniences all together?—There are four together—public, boarders, private, and another.
302. Is there a second block of conveniences?—Yes.
303. Are they touching?—No. There are three together; then comes the front gate, and then the other convenience.
304. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is it 10 yards away?—It is more than 10 yards. It is the breadth of the yard.
305. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you keep a closet for the public as well as a urinal?—Yes.
306. Is it locked?—No.
307. It is open all day?—The boarders' one is locked, and it has two keys, one of which the stablemen have.
308. How often were you at the back of the hotel on Sunday?—I was often there. Sometimes we go into the right-of-way. We have no other place to go to.
309. Did you put in any time in the front?—When the Salvation Army is there, or the tram is passing to Sumner, I generally go to the front door. I go to the door too if the Volunteers are about.
310. How long before the police came did you know they were coming?—I did not know at all. I was going upstairs to see my son when the knock came at the door.
311. You were not warned?—No.
312. A young man did not come in and make a signal to you?—No.
313. Did some one not tell you that the police were coming?—No.
314. Did you go to the front door when you knew the police were coming?—How could they come in at the front door unless some one opened it.
315. Did they knock at the back door?—No. The police have no occasion to knock there. Generally Sergeant Mackay rushes through the children's room and through the dining-room as if he was going to catch some one.
316. Does he come in with great speed?—Yes. I call him the "steeplechaser."
317. Has Sergeant Mackay ever got a conviction against you?—No. On the first day that Sergeant Mackay came to my house, he told me, "I am going to do my duty without fear or favour; and if I catch you or any other publican in Christchurch I will bring you before the Licensing Bench."
318. And with all his energy he has not succeeded in catching you?—I have said I have not been convicted.
319. Do you remember a series of Sunday trading prosecutions that were successful?—It was said they were.
320. Were there not a number of convictions?—If I were you I would forget about that, seeing the way it was done. It was not creditable to anybody.
321. But they were successful?—Yes; but they had dirty tools to work with.
322. Where were you when the police came in?—In the house.
323. Did you go through with them?—No; I told you before that I did not go upstairs, as I was tired. The sergeant went up, and my son went with him.
324. How long was Sergeant Mackay in the house?—He was in the house longer the last time than the first time, because the last time he went upstairs. He would be in for about five or seven minutes.

325. One of your boarders was in and out fourteen times?—I said twelve times.
326. What is his name?—Pat Cunningham.
327. Is he in Christchurch?—He is in Fendalton.
328. Is he working there?—Yes, he is not a monied man.
329. And he boards with you?—He sleeps at my house every Saturday night, and has done so for the last three years.
330. Did he have any refreshments that day?—He did.
331. What did he have?—I served him with one beer.
332. Did he pay for it?—Yes, he paid 3d.
333. And he slept at the house on the Saturday night?—Yes.
334. He does not sleep there on Sunday nights?—He goes away by the 9 or half-past 9 coach every Sunday night.
335. Did he have any friends with him on Sunday?—No.
336. Do you keep the names of your boarders in a book?—No. I have never kept a record of my boarders since I have been in business, unless they owe me money.
337. Does Cunningham always pay cash?—Sometimes he owes me for two beds, but he always pays me.
338. Did he pay on Sunday?—He paid on Saturday night before he went to bed.
339. You say you served Rose with a drink?—He and two travellers came in.
340. Was that the only drink he had?—I think he had a glass of beer at dinner.
341. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Your experience of the police last Sunday was that they were rather lively?—They always are.
342. You received three visits?—Yes.
343. And they were not just perfunctory visits but visits that looked like business?—When Sergeant Scully came in the first time he went all through the lower house, except one room; and when Sergeant Mackay came in he went through the bottom floor thoroughly, and on his second visit he went through both floors.
344. You say that Rose had a drink for which the travellers offered to pay?—They offered me 1s. 6d., and I took the 1s., and said I could not take for Charlie.
345. What did you do with the shilling?—I put it in my pocket, and gave it to my son when he came home.
346. He was in charge of the bar when Charlie had a drink with the travellers?—I think so. I sent the servant for the drinks.
347. And you put the money for the drinks in your pocket?—Yes.
348. What was the name of the servant who went for the drink?—Mary O'Neill.
349. Did she not take the money to your son?—I took it myself. The men gave it to me.
350. If your son says the servant gave the money to him, he says what is not true?—I think he makes a mistake.
351. If your son says the servant brought in the money for three drinks he makes a mistake?—He did not get the money for the three drinks, because I would not take the money from the traveller for Charlie. I took for only two.
352. Do you know the names of the travellers?—One is Thomson, of Kaiapoi. At one time his sister was in service with me.
353. Which of the travellers paid the money?—I could not say. I did not pay such attention as to be able to tell that.
354. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You spoke of a book in which you say your son enters the takings day by day, except Sunday, that day's takings being entered on the Monday?—Yes.
355. Is there another book, in which the takings, week by week, are entered?—I do not think so.
356. Is there a book you call the profit-book?—Yes.
357. Does it show the takings week by week?—Yes. It shows how much is put into each bar every Monday morning. Then on the following Monday my son takes stock, and in that way can tell what the profit is.
358. That book shows the weekly takings, then?—It shows the profit of the two bars.
359. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do travellers often "shout" for Charlie?—No, they do not, because I would not take the money from them. I know it is contrary to the Act.
360. He always gets drinks free?—No, he does not get much. He is a very temperate man. Whenever he gets dinner at my place he gets a glass of beer, because I charge 1s. for dinner, including beer.

CHARLES ROSE, recalled.

361. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You said yesterday that you went to Tattersall's Hotel with two travellers?—Yes; and yesterday again.
362. The same two yesterday?—No.
363. Do you know the names of them?—No. I know them by sight.
364. To what part of the house did you go?—I went to the kitchen.
365. And the travellers also?—They went through the kitchen.
366. Where were you when the drinks were brought?—I only saw my drink.
367. Did you hear the drinks ordered?—I cannot say I did. The travellers said, "Give him a drink, and let him get away to wash the horses down."
368. And a drink was brought?—Yes.
369. Who brought it?—Mrs. Conway.
370. Are you sure?—Yes; and if I remember rightly she put it on the kitchen table.
371. What was it?—Beer.
372. Did you see the travellers pay for the beer?—No, I did not see any money pass.

373. Was Mrs. Conway with you in the kitchen?—She was there at one time, but I do not know if she was there when I drank the beer. I think she went back.

374. Did you hear Mrs. Conway say anything to the travellers about your drink?—No. She put the drink down on the table, and I drank it and came out.

375. Was it Mrs. Conway or the servant girl who brought the drink to you?—I am almost certain it was Mrs. Conway.

376. Do you know what drinks the other men had?—No.

377. They were not present when you drank your beer?—No. They were in the house, but not in the kitchen.

378. *The Chairman.*] Where were they?—I think one was at the doorway talking.

379. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Talking to whom?—I think it was to one of the girls.

380. Did those people drive into your yard with a trap?—Yes.

381. Do you know if there is any entry made in the books about the trap?—No, they paid cash.

382. Did you pay for your dinner last Sunday?—Yes.

383. How much?—A shilling.

384. What drink had you with it?—A glass of beer.

HELEN COCKAYNE, examined on oath.

385. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Helen Cockayne.

386. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You are a boardinghouse keeper?—Yes.

387. And your boardinghouse is in High Street, not far from Tattersall's Hotel?—Close to it. The right-of-way is a continuation all the way through.

388. *The Chairman.*] Do your premises open on the right-of-way?—Yes, and Mrs. Conway's too.

389. *Mr. Cresswell.*] That right-of-way is extensively used?—Very.

390. Were you at Tattersall's Hotel on Sunday last?—On Sunday morning.

391. You went to see Mrs. Conway?—Yes.

392. Did you see her?—Yes, and I was speaking to her.

393. You chatted with her for a time?—For a few minutes.

394. How long?—Perhaps ten minutes.

395. Where were you chatting?—In the yard.

396. Did many people come into the yard when you were there?—A crowd came to the door, and some went inside. Mrs. Conway spoke to them, and they went away, but what she said I do not know.

397. What became of the others?—They all went away.

398. Did you hear Mrs. Conway refuse drinks to any one?—I could not hear what she said.

399. They got no drink?—No. They went away at once, and I saw no more of them.

PHŒBE CONWAY, examined on oath.

400. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—Phœbe Conway.

401. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You are a daughter of Mrs. Conway, the licensee of Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes.

402. Were you at the hotel on Sunday?—Yes.

403. Did you go out at all?—Not at all on Sunday.

404. *The Chairman.*] You did not leave the premises?—No.

405. *Mr. Cresswell.*] Were you watching at all during the day?—No. I have no reason whatever to watch for anything.

406. Was any one posted to watch for the police?—Not so far as I know.

407. Were you in the private sitting-room at the front of the building upstairs?—Yes. I was upstairs part of the day, and I was also in the back-yard, in the kitchen, and all over the place, and in and out. As a rule, I am upstairs on Sunday, looking after the rooms with the housemaid.

408. Were you at any time during the day standing for any length of time at the gate leading into the right-of-way?—Yes, and I was in the right-of-way, and in the back-yard talking to my mother and my sister.

409. But were you standing at the gate for any length of time?—No.

410. How long were you about the gate and the yard?—For five or ten minutes, or less.

411. Were you frequently at the gate, or about the gate, during the day?—No, I do not think so.

412. How many times do you think you were in the yard during the day?—Three or four times, but I could not say exactly.

VICTORIA CONWAY, examined on oath.

413. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—Victoria Conway.

414. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You are a daughter of the licensee of Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes.

415. Were you at the hotel on Sunday last?—Yes.

416. All the day?—Yes.

417. Going about different parts of the house?—Yes.

418. Were you in the yard?—Yes. I am in the yard every Sunday.

419. Were you in the right-of-way?—Yes.

420. Were you in the yard or the right-of-way for the purpose of watching for the police?—No, just to please myself. We are always in the right-of-way on Sunday, as we have no other place to go to. We walk up and down the right-of-way every Sunday; it is nice and sunny.

421. Was any watching done at the hotel last Sunday?—No.

EDWARD MACKAY, examined on oath.

422. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—Edward Mackay, Sergeant of Police, stationed in Christchurch.
423. *Mr. Cresswell.*] You made an official visit to Tattersall's Hotel on Sunday last?—Yes.
424. In company with Constable Pratt?—Yes.
425. What time did you go on the first occasion?—At 11.35 in the morning.
426. On that occasion what did you do?—I entered the hotel by the back door, and went through the kitchen and the dining-room, and into the passage where the bar is. I then went into the bar-parlour, and all the other rooms on the lower floor.
427. Did you find anything wrong?—I saw nothing to complain of. There were four men sitting in the small parlour who represented themselves as boarders.
428. Did you pay particular attention to the floor to see if there were any traces of recent drinking?—I examined the ledge where the drink is placed from the bar, and found it clean and dry.
429. You saw nothing to arouse your suspicions?—No.
430. Had you any reason to suppose that the licensee, or any one in the hotel, expected the visit?—I had not, because I came in along the passage, and went sharply in the back door and the kitchen, and right through the house.
431. You did not see any one whom you supposed to be watching?—Not on this occasion.
432. You paid another visit to the hotel on the same day?—Yes, at 6.55 in the evening.
433. Was that also a surprise visit?—As far as I know.
434. Who went in company with you?—Constable Pratt.
435. What did you do on that occasion?—I went through the lower part of the house—the dining-room and the smaller parlours on the lower floor—and upstairs to the sitting-rooms.
436. With what result?—I saw nothing to complain of.
437. Did you see anything to lead you to suppose that any one was watching the police?—No. If any one was watching I did not see them.
438. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you always visit the hotels in uniform?—Yes.
439. Is that fact not likely to render that kind of inspection futile, as a rule?—If a watch is kept, it is.
440. What has been your experience? Is the watching system not pretty generally followed by the publicans?—I have seen it in every centre I have been in.
441. In Christchurch, have you seen hotel hands or any one connected with the hotels watching to see what men were coming on beat?—Yes. I have seen them standing at the corner when the men came out, but what it was for I do not know.
442. What hotels were they connected with? Have you seen any one connected with Tattersall's?—Yes.
443. Watching the men coming out of the barracks?—I have seen them at the corner, but what they were there for I do not know.
444. *The Chairman.*] Whom have you seen?—I saw one of Mrs. Conway's sons standing at the corner of the street once.
445. When?—I cannot mention the particular Sunday.
446. Do you mean frequently, or regularly, or on one occasion or more?—I have seen him on two or three occasions in different parts of the vicinity. He is a small boy.
447. Did you see him last Sunday?—No.
448. *Mr. Taylor.*] When the police have come out, has he gone off on his bicycle or on foot?—If I went in one direction he remained where he was, and if I went another way he got in front of me. He would go on the other side of the street, and walk faster than I did. I did not think for some time that he was watching for the hotel, and I am not sure now that that was his object.
449. What was the weather last Sunday?—A damp, drizzly day.
450. Such a day as young ladies would parade up and down the right-of-way in the sunshine?—I would not think it a good day for that.

JAMES MEADE CONWAY, recalled.

451. *The Chairman.*] Have you the book?—Yes.
452. We want to see the entry about last Sunday only?—[The book was handed to the Chairman.]
453. Does the Monday's entry combine Sunday's receipts?—Yes.
454. *Mr. Poynton.*] These entries cover many days?—From the first of the month up to Wednesday.
455. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is that the book kept in connection with the hotel?—Yes. We have a cash business, and I only keep books for my own calculation.
456. Your mother says there is a book in which entries are made week by week?—That is the book I keep. I have also a book to show my profits.
457. Is that the book your mother keeps when you are away from home?—Yes. I get one of them every month.
458. *The Chairman.*] There is another book referred to by your mother, called the "profit-book." Is this it?—No.
459. *Mr. Taylor.*] The book you now produce is the book your mother refers to as the cash-book?—Yes, it is.
460. *The Chairman.*] Is there any other book in which you have an entry of the takings of Sunday last?—No.

461. And this entry shows the combined takings of Sunday and Monday?—Yes.

462. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you transfer those figures to any other book?—I do not need to. I know what amount of grog goes into the bars. If forty pounds' worth of grog goes in, and the takings are £70, I know, of course, that my profit is £30.

MARY O'NEILL, examined on oath.

463. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Mary O'Neill.

464. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a servant at Tattersall's Hotel?—Yes.

465. You remember last Sunday?—Yes.

466. You remember Charlie Rose coming into the house on Sunday morning?—Yes; I remember I served three drinks, but I do not know who they were for. I got them from Mr. Conway at the public bar.

467. Do you know Mr. Rose?—No.

468. Do you know Charlie at the stables next door?—I think so.

469. Was he not one of the three?—I am not sure.

470. Were the other two persons known to you?—No.

471. Do you remember what the drinks were?—No.

472. Where did you take the drink to?—I took it to the side room between the kitchen and the dining-room.

473. Where the men were?—Yes.

474. Were the three men there?—Yes; or in the passage, leading from the kitchen to the dining-room.

475. Did you hand one drink to each man?—Yes.

476. Did they take it while you were there?—Yes.

477. Did you receive the money?—A shilling.

478. Only a shilling?—Yes.

479. From whom?—I could not tell you exactly.

480. From one of the men?—Yes.

481. What was the price of the three drinks?—A shilling.

482. What were the drinks?—Two "shandies" and a beer, I think.

483. What is the price of a "shandy"?—3d., I think.

484. And beer is 3d.?—Yes.

485. And, if you got a shilling, the third drink cost 6d.?—Yes.

486. Just think a little. Three drinks at 3d. would not be 1s.?—No.

487. Was there a beer at 3d. and a shandy at 3d.?—I do not understand the price of drinks, but I know I got 1s.

488. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you know what charge is made for drinks?—No.

489. *The Chairman.*] Do you serve in the bar?—No.

490. What is your business in the house?—General servant.

491. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You understood that you received full value for the three drinks?—Yes.

492. And you took the money to Mr. Conway?—I do not know whether I gave it to Mrs. Conway or to Mr. Conway.

493. Did you hear any remark made about the payment of the drinks?—No.

494. Are you sure you do not know what you did with the money?—I am sure I do not.

495. *The Chairman.*] Do you not remember what you did with the money?—I think I gave it to Mrs. Conway.

496. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Where was she?—Upstairs.

497. You took it to her?—Yes.

498. Can you tell us where she was?—In her bedroom.

499. Why did you take the money to her?—She had the best right to it.

500. What is your custom when you receive money for drinks? Do you not take it to the bar?—No, I give it to Mrs. Conway.

501. She was not present when the drinks were ordered?—No.

502. Nor when they were taken?—No.

503. You are quite sure on the point?—Yes, I am quite sure.

504. Mrs. Conway did not tell you how much money you were to receive?—No.

505. Did Mrs. Conway see the men at all?—I do not think so.

506. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you serve any more drinks that day?—No.

507. Only those three?—Yes; I did not serve them; Mr. Conway gave them to me.

508. Did you give Charlie his drink?—I am not sure.

509. Where was Charlie?—He was with the other two.

510. *The Chairman.*] In the passage?—I think he was in the passage between the kitchen and the dining-room.

511. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where were you when they asked you to get the drinks?—I first saw them getting water at the pump.

512. When did they speak to you?—I could not tell you.

513. When did they ask you for the drinks?—About 10 o'clock.

514. You do not remember where they were?—They were between the kitchen and the dining-room.

515. In the passage?—Yes.

516. You got the drinks for them?—Yes.

517. And brought them back?—Yes.

518. Three of them?—Yes.

519. And gave one to each man?—Yes

520. In the passage?—Yes.
 521. You took the shilling for it?—Yes.
 522. Who gave you the shilling?—I do not know.
 523. Did you know the other two men?—No.
 524. Were there any sick people in the house that day?—Mr. Conway and another young man.
 525. Only the two?—One of the young girls was also sick.
 526. Are you the cook?—Yes.
 527. How many people had dinner on Sunday?—About fifteen or sixteen.
 528. How many boarders were there the night before?—About that number.
 529. Did you see many people about the house on Sunday?—No.
 530. Did you see any other people getting refreshments?—No.
 531. Did you ask the men their names?—No.
 532. Do you know where they came from?—No.
 533. You did not ask them?—No.
 534. Did Mrs. Conway have a conversation with the three men?—I could not tell you.
 535. At the time the drinks were ordered, did she have a conversation with them?—No.
 536. She was not there?—No.

GEORGE WILLIAM PEARCE, examined on oath.

537. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—George William Pearce.
 538. What are you?—A publican.
 539. What house?—The Railway Hotel, in Manchester Street.
 540. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You remember last Sunday?—Yes.
 541. Were you at home?—Yes.
 542. Who were assisting you in your business?—My wife and the servant-girl.
 543. Had you customers at your house on Sunday?—I had boarders.
 544. How many?—About twenty-four or twenty-five.
 545. Do you know?—I am not positive, but it was about that.
 546. What other persons were in your house on Sunday?—Some friends of those boarders called.
 547. Any others?—I think there were one or two travellers.
 548. A traveller or two?—Yes, two or three.
 549. Two or three only?—That is all.
 550. Who attended the front door?—My wife and I did.
 551. Have you any other doors by which people enter or leave?—No.
 552. Had you as many as 185 people in your house on Sunday?—I am very doubtful if we had that number.
 553. You will not swear there were not?—I could not say, of course, how many times the people went in and out.
 554. Do you know a man named Armstrong, a blacksmith, living in Cambridge Terrace?—Yes.
 555. Was he there?—I did not see him.
 556. Will you swear he was not there?—Not in my presence.
 557. During what hours were you at the door?—From about 9 o'clock in the morning. I was not up much before that.
 558. How is your door fastened?—With a lock.
 559. An ordinary lock?—It is an ordinary bolt with a chain.
 560. What is your practice when the door is secured?—To secure it by the bolt and the chain.
 561. I mean during the day-time?—On Sunday?
 562. Yes?—I always bolt it, and if a boarder wants in or out I open the door.
 563. The door is never open?—No.
 564. And no boarder can get in or out without being allowed in or out by you?—Occasionally they might go in or out if there was no one there to close the door after them.
 565. *The Chairman.*] But as a rule it is kept bolted?—Yes.
 566. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Is there any particular signal used by persons coming to your house on Sundays?—No.

CHARLES ARMSTRONG, examined on oath.

567. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you a blacksmith?—Yes.
 568. Living in Cambridge Terrace, Christchurch?—The shop is there. I am working there.
 569. Do you remember last Sunday?—Yes.
 570. Do you remember going into the Railway Hotel?—Yes.
 571. What time?—About 9 o'clock, as near as I can remember. It might be a few minutes past.
 572. What did you go there for?—I went to borrow a gaff-stick off Mr. Pearce.
 573. For fishing?—Yes. I was going down by the half-past 9 train to Port.
 574. Did you get the stick?—No, he was not up.
 575. Did you go inside the house?—Yes.
 576. Who let you in?—The girl there.
 577. What did you say to the girl?—I asked if Mr. Pearce was in. She said he was not up.
 578. Did you tell her what you wanted?—No. I said I wanted to see him—that was all. He has lent me a stick before when I forgot mine.
 579. Where was your gaff-stick?—I left it at home; I forgot it.
 580. Where do you live?—Kilmore Street.

581. Did you have anything to drink in the house that day?—No.
 582. Quite sure about that?—Positive about that.
 583. Were you in the house more than once that day?—No.
 584. Only once?—Only that once.
 585. And you were going to catch the half-past 9 train?—Yes. I caught it too.

THOMAS BARRETT, examined on oath.

586. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] What are you?—A third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.
 587. You know Constable McKenzie, who is also stationed here?—Yes.
 588. Is it true that you and he at any time went into the A 1 Hotel and obtained refreshments there?—It is not true.
 589. Of any kind?—Not of any kind, at any time.
 590. Then, if this witness, Armishaw, says you used to go about 6 o'clock in the morning, in or out of uniform, and obtain refreshments, it is not true,—tea or coffee, not liquor?—It is not true.
 591. The suggestion is, Constable Barrett, that you are in league with the hotelkeepers, particularly this one, and others, I suppose: Is there any truth in such a suggestion, that you at any time have been in league with any hotelkeeper—that is to say, you have sought to assist him in evading the law?—Certainly not. I have never been in league with any hotelkeeper.
 592. You told the Commissioners before that you had been stationed here about seven years, so that, in the nature of things, you must well know the working of the various hotels. What time was the A 1 Hotel opened usually in the morning, do you know?—At 6 o'clock.
 593. What door of the hotel would be open then?—The public bar door leading on to the street.
 594. There were two other entrances to the hotel, were there not, from the front—that is, there was the public bar door on the corner, and then entrances from Colombo Street and another from Cashel Street, were there not?—That is so.
 595. What time in the morning, do you know, were the doors of these private entrances, as we will call them, opened—private entrances we will call them, to distinguish them from the other entrance?—I should say about 7 o'clock.
 596. You remember the witness Armishaw being employed at the hotel?—Yes, I remember him.
 597. Who was there besides himself, do you know?—There was a man named Stewart.
 598. Did he sleep in the hotel, or go there early in the morning?—He opened up in the morning, I believe.
 599. *The Chairman.*] Do you know if he slept there, or away?—No, I do not. I have seen Stewart opening the bar door in the morning on one or two occasions.
 600. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever had a prosecution against the A1 Hotel?—No.
 601. Have you ever instituted a prosecution against any hotel in Christchurch?—No.
 602. Have you ever of your own motion instituted a prosecution?—I have assisted.
 603. How many years have you been in Christchurch?—Seven years.
 604. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] In these prosecutions wherein you have assisted, the sergeant has had charge of the affair?—That is so; the sergeant has been in charge.

DONALD MCKENZIE, examined on oath.

605. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You know the last witness?—Yes.
 606. Have you ever alone, or in his company, had any refreshments at the A 1 Hotel early in the morning?—No, never.
 607. Either intoxicating or otherwise?—No.
 608. In company with Barrett, or alone, do you say?—I was never there in company or alone at that time of the morning.
 609. You say, “at that time of the morning.” Do you mean to say when you have had a right to be there you have sometimes been in. You are not a teetotalter, I suppose?—No.
 610. Do you know a man named Stewart who used to assist in the working of the A 1 Hotel?—Yes.
 611. By the way, how long have you been here?—About sixteen months.
 612. Do you know this man Armishaw?—I have seen him, I believe. I saw him here to-day.
 613. And about the hotel?—Yes.
 614. Do you know whether or not he had any kind of control early in the morning in the working of the hotel?—No. I do not know anything much about that hotel. I was very seldom in that part of the town.
 615. There is a suggestion, Constable McKenzie—I suppose you are involved in it with others—that you were in league with hotelkeepers, and the understanding was you could get refreshments or drinks for nothing from hotelkeepers. Have you ever had any such understanding, or such treatment from any hotelkeepers?—No, never.
 616. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand your denial to extend to tea and coffee in the hotel?—Nothing whatever.
 617. And you never received gratuitous refreshments of any kind?—Never.
 618. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever initiated a prosecution against a publican?—I am not certain as to that. I know on the morning you refer to—the morning the information was laid—I laid a few informations that morning. As to the information against the A 1 Hotel, I am not sure.
 619. What morning?—The morning you refer to.
 620. What morning?—About the prosecution of the A 1 Hotel.
 621. I say or ask, have you ever laid a prosecution against any hotel?—No. I may have sworn an information.

622. *The Chairman.*] What is the distinction? You may have sworn an information, but you never initiated it: what does that mean? When you have sworn an information, who has initiated the prosecution?—I understand Mr. Taylor to say where I laid the information.

623. He asks whether you ever initiated a prosecution against any hotel?—This morning that the information was laid against the A 1 Hotel I laid informations against several for by-law cases.

624. When was that?—On the morning the information was laid against the A1 Hotel.

625. When was that?—That was about March or April of 1897.

626. Did you initiate those prosecutions, or did you lay the informations by direction of your superior officer?—I cannot exactly say. I do not remember. I might have laid the informations by the instructions of Detective Maddern.

627. *Mr. Taylor.*] What time do you say the hotel used to be open in the morning?—I cannot tell you. I was very seldom down in that direction at all.

628. Were you ever on the hotel premises in the morning?—Never.

629. Do you know the premises at all?—No, I do not know much about the hotel premises. It is a hotel I very seldom go into.

630. Do you say you never went into it?—On duty, I say.

631. You never went in on duty?—Never.

632. When did you go in off duty?—I cannot say. I cannot remember now. I might have been several times in the hotel off duty.

633. What part of the hotel?—The bar, I suppose.

634. After you have been relieved from duty?—Yes.

635. Had you your uniform on?—No.

636. Never?—Never.

637. Do you live at the police-station?—Yes.

638. Do you remember the Stewart that has been referred to?—Yes.

639. Where did you use to see him?—I saw him one morning when I was passing the A 1 Hotel.

640. Only once?—Well, as far as I recollect; I might have seen him a dozen times.

641. *The Chairman.*] What opportunities did you have of knowing the man?—I had several opportunities of knowing the man. I may have been in that hotel during the day in plain clothes. I may have seen him then.

642. *Mr. Taylor.*] What part of the hotel did you enter?—The bar.

642A. Do you know whether there is a right-of-way to that hotel?—I believe there is.

643. Where does it lead from?—From Colombo Street.

644. Is that the only right-of-way?—As far as I know, it is.

645. Do you know Sorenson's saleyards?—No.

646. How long have you been in Christchurch?—Sixteen months.

647. Do you know the Singer machine-shop?—In Colombo Street? Yes.

648. Do not you know the right-of-way running behind all those shops?—I believe there is one.

649. Have you seen that more than once?—I expect I have.

650. Do you find it very difficult to remember it?—I cannot say that it is a right-of-way made use of by the public into that hotel.

651. Do you not know there are hundreds of people use it from those saleyards to the urinal? I do not.

652. As to Stewart: you say you saw him one day; what makes you say that?—Nothing in particular. I may have seen him there on this morning; I do not know.

653. How do you know his name?—I saw him again frequently after that.

654. Where?—In the hotel.

655. You saw him frequently?—Several times, yes.

656. Frequently, or several times?—Well, I have been in the hotel several times, and seen him there.

657. What was he doing?—In the lobby, working.

658. How do you know his name?—I have heard his name since.

659. Did you stop talking to him?—No.

660. How do you know Armishaw's name?—I know his name now. I have known of it through seeing his evidence in Wellington in the paper.

661. *The Chairman.*] Did you know the man by name when he was in the hotel?—No.

662. *Mr. Taylor.*] You did not know Stewart by name when he was in the hotel?—Yes, I did.

663. Did you know it was Stewart the first time you saw him?—It was two or three months after I saw him at the door that morning that I knew his name was Stewart.

664. Do you know how the kitchen of the hotel stands in regard to the passage from Colombo Street?—No. I do not know that there is a kitchen at all there.

665. What is the only room you say you have been in there?—The bar—the private bar.

666. The bar off Colombo Street?—Yes, or off Cashel Street.

667. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] When you have been in the house in plain clothes have you paid for the rinks you have had?—Yes.

668. Sure of that?—Certain of that.

669. You have not had drinks you have not paid for?—Never.

670. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you talk Gaelic?—No.

671. You never have?—No.

672. Can you?—No.

673. Did you know the cook at the A 1 Hotel?—No.

674. Never knew the cook?—No.

675. Never talked Gaelic to the cook in the kitchen?—No, never.

JAMES STEWART examined on oath.

676. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] What are you?—I am employed at hotel work.
677. And were, I think, formerly employed at the A 1 Hotel with Mr. Collier?—Yes.
678. Just tell their Worships, please, shortly, what were your duties?—I had to open the bar at 6 o'clock, and had charge of the bar till 7, when I was relieved by the barman, and then I had other duties to do about the place—cellar work, and so forth.
679. When you say you opened the bar at 6 o'clock, do you mean the front bar?—Yes, the public bar—open the two doors, the door on Colombo Street and the door on Cashel Street.
680. There was a third door, was there not, opening on Colombo Street, leading to the private bar?—Those doors were not open till 7 o'clock—that was, leading to the private part of the house.
681. It has been said that constables used to go in there about 6 o'clock in the morning, in uniform, to obtain refreshments?—No, I have not seen them go in.
682. Who was in charge after you arrived there? You say Armishaw was employed there at the same time?—He was employed as day porter. I had charge of the bar for an hour while I was there—from 6 to 7 o'clock—when I was relieved, and I did not leave the bar at all during that hour.
683. Did you sleep in the house?—No, Sir.
684. You arrived there in the morning about 6 o'clock?—Generally a few minutes before 6, in time to open the bar at 6 o'clock, as the town clock struck.
685. Where did you get the keys from?—From Mr. Collier. I would go up to his room and get the keys.
686. Do you know the two constables, Barrett and McKenzie?—Well, I know them by name.
687. You have seen them here to-day?—Yes.
688. Did you ever supply them with refreshments about 6 o'clock in the morning?—No.
689. Or at any time?—At any time I did not supply them.
690. Had Armishaw any right to give any refreshments or drink of any kind to anybody, to your knowledge?—Not that I am aware of.
691. *The Chairman.*] You say you did not supply constables in uniform at any time?—No.
692. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Were you informed by Mr. Collier that you had at any time any right to supply constables for nothing?—We had no right to supply them more than any other person coming in. I had no instructions to supply any one gratis. I was supposed to get paid for everything that I supplied.
693. Do you know whether these constables at any time obtained any refreshments other than intoxicating liquor in the hotel?—No, I do not.
694. Supposing they had been there for such a purpose, were you not almost bound to know?—Well, I think I should have seen them. If they came in through the front door I would be bound to see them.
695. You were there, were you not, for the purpose of having charge of the house?—I had principal charge of the bar, and, of course, other parts of the house as well. That was for the hour from 6 to 7.
696. If any men, either two or three, or even one at a time, made it a practice to go into the house for refreshments, were you not almost bound to have known and seen that such was the case?—Yes; I must have seen them.
697. *The Chairman.*] Were tea and coffee supplied at that time—in the early morning?—There was no tea or coffee supplied anywhere that I know of. Even in the bar we did not supply tea or coffee.
698. You are not aware it was supplied in the early morning at all?—No, except to the servants in the house at 7 o'clock. At that time we used to get a cup of tea, but it was sometimes after 7.
699. *Mr. Taylor.*] What time did you use to get up in the morning?—I always used to be there from a quarter to ten minutes to 6 o'clock.
700. Did you use to find the door open when you went?—No; I had a private key to go in with.
701. Which door did you go in by?—The iron gate in Colombo Street.
702. Was anybody about, as a rule, when you went in?—There was nobody about except the servants. There was one servant, Armishaw, cleaning the passage and doing ordinary work.
703. Was it Armishaw's duty to open the private bar after he had cleaned his passages?—He used to clean the private bar out.
704. He would open up the bar to clean it out?—Certainly.
705. What was your further work?—I took charge of the bar till 7 o'clock.
706. What became of you?—I had to go on with my ordinary work about the place.
707. What was that?—Helping to do the cleaning.
708. In the morning, say, at ten minutes to 6, what part of the hotel would you go into?—I would go straight up to Mr. Collier's room and get the keys, and open the bar, and remain there till 7 o'clock.
709. Could you see into the smoke-room from the public bar?—Yes, if the door was open I could see in. I could not see from the bar unless I went and looked purposely.
710. Is there a sliding window to serve drinks there?—No, it is a door that opens.
711. At 7 o'clock, what would you do?—I would clean out the front bar, and go on with my ordinary work.
712. Did you have your breakfast at the hotel?—Yes, later on—about half-past 8 o'clock.
713. Did you go into the kitchen before breakfast usually?—Sometimes; very seldom.
714. You very seldom went into the kitchen before half-past 8 o'clock?—No, unless I wanted a bucket of water or anything.

715. Would you know who was in the kitchen under those circumstances?—Yes.

716. Although you were not there?—I mean, if I was passing through I would know who was there.

717. Would you know, under those circumstances, who was in the kitchen until you went into it?—No, certainly not.

718. Could those constables not have been in the kitchen without your knowing it?—They could not come in until after 7 o'clock, because the side doors were shut.

719. Do you swear these doors were never open before 6 in the morning in the summer?—I would not swear that.

720. As a matter of fact, were they not open sometimes before 6 o'clock?—Not that I know of.

721. I refer to the Cashel Street entrance: Do you swear the Cashel Street door was never opened before 6 in the morning?—I never saw it open before 6 in the morning. The passage doors were not supposed to be open till 7 o'clock.

722. Will you swear these doors were never open till 7?—I never saw them open, but I will not swear they were not open.

723. Were they ever open when you went there?—Not to my knowledge. I do not believe they were. I never saw much of them. I never noticed these doors, because I always went in by the iron gateway.

724. Did you know Constable Howell when he was stationed in Christchurch?—I have seen him.

725. Where?—On duty.

726. In the smoke-room of the hotel?—No, I never saw him there.

727. Have you seen any constable in the smoke-room of the A1 Hotel?—I have not seen any constables in there when they were on duty or in uniform.

728. In any part of the house?—No.

729. At any time?—Not at any time, unless they were on business.

730. What time would they be in on business?—Well, if they came in inquiring for some one that was wanted, or men for the jury, or other business.

731. Do you remember who used to come in on that kind of business: Did Howell ever come in?—Several of them came in.

732. Did Barrett go in on that business?—I do not remember.

733. Did you see McKenzie?—No; I have not seen him.

734. Did a good many go in on that kind of business?—Not so many. They used to come in on ordinary business. I do not know what their business used to be. They used to come in and ask to see the proprietor. I did not ask what they wanted.

735. Where did they use to come in and see the proprietor?—They would come into the passage.

736. And, then, where would they go?—They would wait there till whoever they wanted to see would come.

737. Did they go into any of the rooms?—No, I never saw them go into the rooms.

738. If Armishaw says these constables used to get tea or coffee in the kitchen before 7 in the morning, will you swear they did not?—I swear I never saw them do it.

739. Will you swear they did not? Are you in a position to swear they were not refreshed there of a morning, before you went into the kitchen at all?—I could not swear to anything I did not see.

740. *The Chairman.*] What means of access is there to the kitchen from outside, in the morning, between 6 and 7?—The Colombo Street door would have to be open. It is nearest to the kitchen.

741. If it is not open, what access would they have to the kitchen?—The Cashel Street door would have to be open.

742. How was that with respect to the bar of which you were in charge?—It was situated between them, on the angle.

743. Could they go in by that door without you, in the bar, seeing them into the kitchen?—They could not come in very well without my seeing them.

744. There would be a passage not connected with the bar, but facing on the bar?—And a door opening into the bar, sometimes open, sometimes shut—a door on the spring. It was generally open.

745. Could anybody have passed by that entrance to the kitchen without your seeing them, under ordinary circumstances?—No, not under ordinary circumstances.

746. Under what circumstances could they do it?—If the door between the passage and the bar was shut.

747. Was it usually shut or open?—It was usually open.

748. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Armishaw had charge of the private bar; did he?—Well, partly charge; he had the cleaning of it out; but there was no drink supplied there till 9 o'clock, when the barmaid took charge.

749. Had he access to the drink if he wished to get it?—Certainly.

750. What time would the private bar be open for Armishaw to clean it out?—From 7 o'clock; perhaps after 7.

751. Before 7 o'clock?—He may have had it open before 7 o'clock if he wanted to, but it was generally after 7.

752. Did he ever come to your bar for drink for a policeman?—No.

753. You were never instructed by the proprietor to supply drinks to policemen free?—No; I never received instructions to supply drink to any one gratis.

754. Who prepared the tea and coffee in the kitchen?—I would get a cup of tea about 7 o'clock, or perhaps after 7.

755. Who would prepare it?—The cook would be up about that time—about half-past 7.
756. Was there tea to be had at 6 o'clock in the morning in the kitchen?—No. I never had tea at 6 o'clock. Sometimes the fire was not lighted at 6 o'clock.
757. What was the rule—was it usually lighted at 6 o'clock?—There was no one supposed to get up before 6 o'clock except the day porter to do his cleaning.
758. At 6 o'clock there was no tea or coffee to be had?—No.
759. Not until 7 o'clock?—Not until 7 or after. At least, I never had it before that time.
760. As far as you know, there was no tea or coffee to be had at 6 o'clock in the morning?—No.
761. Did Armishaw used to come to you for drink in the morning without your knowing who it was for?—I would generally know who it was for. If he paid for them I would never ask any questions.
762. You used to serve them to him early in the morning?—I served them when I got paid for them, unless it was for himself.
763. You used sometimes to serve Armishaw with drinks to be taken to other parts of the house?—He might take them to boarders upstairs.
764. You used to supply them sometimes for people in other parts of the house?—Yes. I always used to know where they were going if I did not get paid for them. If I did not get paid for them I used to put them down on the slate.
765. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know whether tea used to be made over the gas jet in the kitchen sometimes?—No. I know nothing about how it was made.
766. You cannot swear it was not made before 7 o'clock in the morning?—I cannot swear it was not made.
767. *Mr. Kippenburger.*] You said just now that Armishaw used to get drink for himself?—Yes.
768. Is that a fact—that he at times had drink when he wanted it?—Certainly, if he wanted it he would always get it.
769. Did he?—Yes.
770. You remember that?—I remember that.
771. A "pick-me-up" in the morning?—He did not drink anything intoxicating. He would have lemonade and ginger wine, or something of that sort.
772. He was not a drinking man?—No. I know he did not take spirits. I never saw him touch spirits.
773. You were asked as to his taking drinks to other parts of the house: did you ever give him those drinks free to take to other parts of the house?—No, unless I knew who they were for.
774. If you did give them without getting the money, you would satisfy yourself whom they were for, and you would put them down on the slate, would not you?—Yes.
775. Who was longer at the hotel, you or Armishaw?—I was.
776. How long were you there before Armishaw came?—I was there about a couple or three months, I expect.
777. Were you there when he left?—Yes.
778. Who was cook from, say, September, 1896, until June, 1897, or about that time—during the time he was there?—A woman cook was there. Her name was Mrs. McLaren. I will not say she was there all the time Armishaw was there, but she was there at the commencement, I know.
779. *The Chairman.*] Do you know any other cook who was there while Armishaw was there?—I could not be sure whether that cook left before that or not. She either left before him or soon afterwards.
780. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Where is she now?—When she left there she went to Wellington. Where she is now I do not know.
781. *The Chairman.*] Who had charge of the keys of these Colombo and Cashel Street doors?—They were only bolted; there were no locks. They were fastened from the inside.
782. So that anybody inside could open them?—Yes, anybody inside.
783. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you used to do any Sunday work there?—No. I had nothing to do with the bar on Sundays.
784. Did you do anything on Sundays?—No.
785. Never walked up and down outside the house?—No, not to my knowledge. When I had done my work on Sundays I used to go away.
786. Did you stroll up and down with Armishaw at all?—I may have stood talking to him when we were going out. We both had done our work at the one time.
787. What bells were there in the house?—There was a number of bells for the different rooms, but they were principally out of repair.
788. Did you know a bell at the corner under the window-sill?—No, there is no bell there.
789. There used to be a bell there when you were there?—There was a bell, but it was not there for any time.
790. At the right-of-way entrance, where that iron gate was, do you know whether there was a bell there?—Yes, there was a bell there.
791. Was it where bells usually are, on the wall? Where was it situated?—It was behind the door.
792. Up in the archway?—It was brought down through the ceiling.
793. How did you ring the bell—with a knob or a cord?—It was on a cord.
794. Was there another bell in the kitchen?—No; there was a bell on the front door.
795. Did not those bells ring into the kitchen?—They would be rung where all the ordinary bells rung. There is a bell also on the Colombo Street door.

796. *The Chairman.*] Were those conspicuous bells: could anybody see them? Were they exposed so that everybody could see there were bells there, or were they concealed bells?—Well, the one at the side door was just like an ordinary bell.

797. As to the one under the sill?—Nobody could see that unless they knew it was there.

798. About the bell at the right-of-way?—Any one could see that one. You could see it from the street. You could see the cord.

799. *Mr. Taylor.*] What was the cord fastened to?—Fastened at the top.

800. Fastened to what?—To a hook or a ring—I could not say.

801. If the cord was not hanging down in the corner you could not reach the bell?—No, of course not.

802. *The Chairman.*] Was it usually hanging down?—Generally hanging down. Sometimes it was turned up.

JOSEPH KNOTT, examined on oath.

803. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A traveller.

804. Where do you reside?—At present, in 46, Ward Street, Addington.

805. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you residing on the East Belt for some time?—I was.

806. Were you within view of the Royal George Hotel?—Yes.

807. What is your opinion as to the manner in which the licensing laws have been enforced by the police?—I think they have been enforced very badly.

808. *The Chairman.*] During what period did you live within view of the Royal George Hotel?—About six years.

809. Up to when?—Up to the last nine months.

810. *Mr. Taylor.*] What evidence have you in support of that opinion?—From time to time I saw large numbers of people going in and out of the back-yard door on a Sunday.

811. Any of them showing signs of intoxication?—Oh, frequently. I was stopped one Sunday just as I was passing the door by a crowd, who got hold of me, and I had a little difficulty to get out of their grasp.

812. Have you ever complained to the authorities about it?—I have.

813. Who to?—Well, I went to the police-station. I could not remember who I saw just now.

814. Any action follow?—Yes; but previous to that I had seen so many people go in and out on a Sunday, that I set myself to watch the house one Sunday.

815. What was the result?—There were over one hundred and eighty passed in from 8 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock at night.

816. Do you think they were different people?—Well, several passed in several times.

817. How many separate persons, do you think, passed in during the day?—I should think a hundred and sixty, perhaps.

818. Was this state of things continuous whilst you were living on the Belt?—Yes.

819. Was there any break in it at all?—Scarcely any.

820. Have you had any opportunity of observing any other Christchurch hotels as carefully as you had that one?—No, not as carefully as that one.

821. What was the result of your appeal to the police-office?—It was arranged that a couple of constables should go down in a few weeks. They did come down on the Sunday morning in plain clothes, and I do not think they had been there five minutes before they caught a woman coming out of this back door with drink. The case was brought into Court. I believe, I am not sure, the defence was that the drink had been bought and paid for on the Saturday, and the woman had simply called for it on the Sunday.

822. Then, there would be no conviction?—No conviction.

823. Have you travelled all over the colony?—I have.

824. Into nearly every township?—I have.

825. What has been your experience with regard to the enforcement of the licensing law?—I think in the principal centres of population it is very badly enforced, but in the back country districts—in the bush districts, on the goldfields, and on the gumfields in the North Island—the licensing law is practically a dead-letter.

826. Have you had ample opportunity of judging of that?—I have. I have been three times all over New Zealand.

827. Into every township?—Very nearly every township.

828. Do you think the police have done what was possible under the existing law to enforce it?—No. I do not think all has been done that could have been done under the existing law.

829. At the present time have you any reason to think that matters are better than they have been for years past, in respect to the enforcement of the licensing law?—I have not so good an opportunity of judging the last six months.

830. You have not been travelling?—I have not been travelling.

831. As a citizen of Christchurch—as an ordinary citizen—you have had opportunities of making observations?—I have noticed very little improvement.

832. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You say you are a traveller?—Yes.

833. In what do you travel?—When I was travelling over the colony I was lecturing, and exhibiting a magic lantern.

834. You are not a traveller representing any firm?—Just now I am in Christchurch, the last three months.

835. But when travelling over the colony?—I was lecturing.

836. *The Chairman.*] What on?—Principally temperance.

837. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As a matter of fact, you are a temperance lecturer, are you not, or were up to a certain period?—Yes.

838. Were you a paid lecturer?—No.
839. Did it voluntarily?—Yes.
840. From what did you derive your income?—From collections, and charges made to my meetings.
841. Received no salary, but had collections?—Yes, and charges.
842. You say, from your observations while travelling, the licensing law is practically a dead-letter?—In the back country districts the sights I have witnessed were simply appalling.
843. In what way?—Drunken people—especially on the Sabbath day.
844. *The Chairman.*] You are speaking of country districts?—I am speaking of country districts.
845. Can you particularise?—I can particularise—any quantity. I am thinking for the moment of a case at Rahotu, Taranaki, that impressed me as a special case on account of the large number of Maori women, young and old, who were positively lying about the roadside.
846. Is there a licensed house there?—Yes, there was at that time. I think I saw, recently from the papers, there had been an action brought against that house for supplying drink to the Maoris. I spent a Sunday there, and the sight was simply appalling.
847. How long since is this?—About two years.
848. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Were you staying at the hotel?—No. I was stopping close by it.
849. Have you any other of those appalling incidents in your mind?—There was another on the gumfields, between Auckland and Helensville. That was not on a Sunday though, but I saw a sight there that was perfectly horrifying.
850. Was it on licensed premises?—On licensed premises.
851. What is the name of the place?—It is a Maori name. I forget it for the moment. There were seven or eight men and two women. I think they were pretty well all gum-diggers. You know, up there the women go gum-digging. They were in a room. Well, you could scarcely call it a room, and there was a little trap-door opening into the bar where the drink was put through. These men and the two women were very drunk. One woman was about sixty years of age, and the other would be about forty, I presume. The only seats in the place were just fixed seats round the room, and the floor was covered with sawdust; and the women were too drunk to stand. However, there were two men in the far corner, and they evidently had a bottle of drink, and the old woman, who was in another corner, wanted to get it. She made an attempt, but as soon as she got from her seat she fell on the floor, and then she crept on her hands and knees until she came to where the men had the bottle. She made a grab at it and missed it. The sight was something that could not be described.
852. It was a very disgusting sight, of course?—Yes.
853. You were horrified with it?—Yes.
854. Of course, you reported it to the police immediately?—No. I have seen any number of cases I would have reported, but I was moving about from place to place, and therefore I could not stop to see the cases through.
855. Do you remember is there a police constable stationed at this particular place?—No, there is not. That is one of the great difficulties. A constable has a wide district—perhaps forty or fifty miles of a district—and he cannot possibly visit these places frequently. I saw another case at Kawakawa. It was about two years ago last October—the end of October, or it might be the beginning of November. I was there on a Sunday. I saw four or five men come out of a hotel drunk, and commence fighting in the street. The landlord came out and joined in the fight. Then, his wife came out and got hold of him, and brought him away. Then a constable came on the scene, and arrested one of the men engaged in the fight. I saw the constable, and I said, “Why on earth do not you go and arrest the publican, who has made these men that they do not know what they are doing?” However, the man was brought before the Court, and he was sentenced to either three or six months’ imprisonment, and his wife and children in the meantime would have to be provided for out of charity.
856. *The Chairman.*] Do you suggest the policeman did not do his duty in that respect?—I do, because he did not take steps against the publican, although the men were drunk, and there was a fight in the public streets.
857. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is the law enforced at Denniston?—That is another case altogether. I spent a Sunday at Denniston, from three to four years ago. In that case I had to stop in a hotel, because there was no other place in which I could put my head. On the Saturday night I was not able to sleep for the rows at night. I came down on Sunday morning about 8 o’clock, and went into a little room close to the bar. There were five or six men drinking. One of them had an old jacket on, but he had no shirt on. There was a terrible row on the Saturday night. There had been some boxing-match there the night before, and it had been pay-night at the mine, and the sights on Sunday morning were sights to be remembered. I went to the policeman and complained to him. I told him a number of things I had seen. He asked me to report to headquarters at Westport, which I did. I was asked by whoever was in charge there if I would commit to writing what I had said. I did commit it to writing, and sent it to him by post, as I had to leave the place, and that was the last I heard of it.
858. *The Chairman.*] Do you know if a prosecution followed?—I do not. I have on several occasions been asked by the constables if I would stop and appear before the Courts, but my engagements were such that I could not stop.
859. Taking your experience, do you think the police are ready to take advantage of any information given to them as to any disorder or crime in respect of any existing laws?—Well, certainly, whenever I have spoken to them they have, I think, done all that I could have expected of them. They, of course, have complained that they have been handicapped in a variety of ways.
860. As to that handicapping you refer to, did you understand it was internal to the Force, or external?—Well, both, I think. A number of the police have complained to me that, when they

have brought cases, the witnesses for the defence—the hotelkeeper, and his barman, and the number of people that he brings—swear, well, almost anything. The constables have complained to me that the evidence of these people is taken, in many cases, by the Bench as outweighing their own evidence, and consequently convictions are very difficult to obtain.

861. That would be a cause arising outside?—Yes, outside.

862. Can you give us any instance where the handicapping has been in matters internal to the police?—No, I cannot.

863. *Colonel Hume.*] As to these appalling scenes you have told us about, they are ancient. Can you give us any appalling scenes that have come under your notice more recently?—Yes. I have been to the West Coast again, about a year ago, and I saw a number of things then. Well, at the very same hotel at which I stopped on the previous occasion, at Denniston, I did not stop there this time. I had such an experience before that I could not. I simply consented to take a shake-down on a couch in a place just opposite this hotel. Again, at midnight, there was a fight in the street—so much so that the lady in the house where I was staying was, as I thought, going into a fit. She was perfectly alarmed at the fight.

864. Is that the only appalling scene you can tell us about?—If I just think I can bring up any quantity.

865. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did anything follow upon that by the police?—Not that I am aware of.

866. *Colonel Hume.*] If this lady was so very much alarmed on that occasion, it evidently was not an everyday occurrence—that was quite clear?—According to what I know it is a fortnightly occurrence, any how, on pay-night.

867. This happened to be another pay-night you were there?—I could not say.

868. You have not been to Denniston since?—No.

869. Do you happen to know who this constable was that was stationed at Denniston?—No.

870. Do not even know his name?—No.

871. You would not know his name if I were to mention it?—No. I will give you another instance further up the line. You must understand that, as a rule, I drove a horse and van, and I slept in my van; but, as there was no road up there, I had to leave my van at Westport, and take shelter in the hotels. At a hotel further up the line—at Seddonville—I was stopping, and had an opportunity to see what was going on. I had hired the hall in connection with the hotel. I saw a good deal of drunkenness, but I was especially impressed with one man who was very drunk, and the landlady refusing him drink. He followed the landlady about from place to place, begging of her to give him a drink; but she told him he had had enough, and she would not give it to him. I just thought my presence had something to do with it, and I went away. I came back, and I found he had got a drink before him. Later in the day, again, he was begging of her for drink. There were two young fellows—respectable-looking young fellows—and they asked for drink. This other man stood in the corner; he was being refused.

872. Because he was drunk?—Because he was drunk. The other two were being supplied. He came forward, and swore at the landlady, and he said, using an oath, "Refuse them. If you had refused me when I was like them, I should not have been like I am to-day."

873. You said you are of opinion the police have not done all they could under the existing laws in the centres: I understand you to include Christchurch?—I do not think they have done all they could in Christchurch, or any other place.

874. Will you give us an instance where they have not done all they could?—There is such an alarming amount of Sunday trading going on in this city, as well as other places.

875. I want an instance?—There is the instance I have given you, of the Royal George Hotel.

876. I want to know how they have neglected their duty?—The readiness with which people can go into hotels indicates to me that if constables were to go in disguise or plain clothes, or if constables unknown in the place were brought from other places, they could very readily walk into these back-yards and into the hotels, and get information that would enable them to secure a conviction, I think.

877. You do not suppose that has ever been tried?—I cannot think it has been tried to the extent the exigencies of the case demand.

878. With regard to other crimes, housebreaking, for instance, do you notice the police, in looking for burglars, are not doing as much as they might?—No.

879. That is a trivial offence; it does not matter?—I believe it is a more trivial offence than the extent to which drunkenness goes on. Far more people lose their lives in this colony through drunkenness than through housebreaking.

880. *The Chairman.*] But the stopping of selling on Sunday would not put an end to the drunkenness?—No.

881. You say your travelled experience in the colony does not enable you to give an opinion as to whether the police are negligent in the matter of enforcing the laws of the colony other than the one you refer to—that is, breaches of the Licensing Act?—Breaches of the Licensing Act.

882. That is the only one to which your attention has been directed?—The only one to which my attention has been directed.

FREDERICK ROBSON, examined on oath.

883. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you, on any occasion recently, make observations as to the number of people visiting Tattersall's Hotel on Sunday?—In September last I did.

884. What day in September?—The 5th, I think.

885. What time in the morning did you start?—Eight o'clock.

886. What time did you knock off?—Half-past 1 o'clock.

887. Who was with you?—Mr. Turner.

888. How many people did you see enter the premises?—I saw a hundred and forty leave the right-of-way and go towards the house.
889. Could you see into the yard of the hotel?—Yes.
890. Could you see the urinals from where you were?—No.
891. Do you know whether you could or not? Do you know where the urinals are?—Yes.
892. And could you see them?—I could not distinguish them amongst the other buildings.
893. Did any people enter by the front door?—No.
894. All went in by the right-of-way into the back yard?—Yes.
895. Could you see the back door?—No.
896. You simply saw them pass towards the back door?—Yes.
897. Did you see them going into the out-buildings at all?—No.
898. Where were you stationed?—In Inglis's buildings, on the top floor.
899. Which window were you looking out of?—The corner window.
900. The eastern window?—Yes.
901. Could you see the front door of the hotel?—Yes, if I had looked.
902. Did you pay special attention to it, or to the back?—No; I paid special attention to the back.
903. Was there anybody on the watch there that day, or appeared to be?—No, I never noticed anybody.
904. Did you see any police enter?—No.
905. Any of the people show signs of intoxication?—There may have been one or two early in the morning—say, between 8 and 9 o'clock.
906. Did you know any of the people?—No.
907. Not personally?—No.

ALBERT TURNER, examined on oath.

908. *The Chairman.*] Where do you live, and what are you?—Tinsmith and plumber, living at Rangiora.
909. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you in company with Mr. Robson on the 5th September, 1897?—I was.
910. What time did you go with him?—It was 8 o'clock.
911. And you knocked off when?—Half-past 1 o'clock.
912. How many people did you see enter the back of Tattersall's Hotel?—A hundred and forty.
913. Go across the yard?—Yes.
914. Did any of them halt and enter any of the back premises at all?—They seemed to go behind the back buildings.
915. Behind?—Yes.
916. Towards the door?—Towards the door.
917. Towards the main building?—Yes.
918. Did you notice if any of them showed signs of intoxication?—No, I did not.
919. Did there seem to be any watch on the house?—I did not notice any.
920. Did you see the police enter that day?—No, I did not.
921. Do you remember if the front door was open that day at all?—I do not think it was.
922. And the people seemed to enter by the back?—By the back door.
923. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you see them in the yard after they passed the buildings?—Yes.

HENRY GEORGE ELL, examined on oath.

924. *Mr. Poynton.*] What are you?—Salesman, living at Spreydon, near Christchurch.
925. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you had any opportunities of judging as to whether the licensing laws are enforced as they should be?—Yes.
926. What has been your experience?—Well, my experience, so far as Christchurch is concerned, goes back to twelve years. Twelve years ago I was employed at the *Press* office, chiefly at night-work, and I was not then a total abstainer, and we were in the habit of getting liquor for the men working in the establishment from hotels in the city. I have frequently gone into the City Hotel and got liquor without any hindrance whatever.
927. After 11 o'clock?—After 11 o'clock? Yes; and 2 and 3 in the morning. The room in which I used to get liquor from the night porter was a room which apparently did not show any light from the street. The liquor was kept in a cupboard. I have seen as many as twelve and fourteen people sitting there drinking.
928. *The Chairman.*] What time?—Various hours. I have been there at 12, and at 1 o'clock.
929. After legal hours?—Yes.
930. *Mr. Taylor.*] You were on night duty?—I was working at night. I was some four years in the *Press* office. Unfortunately, one of our men was addicted to drink, and, to stop him getting into trouble, we frequently had to go out and search for him. I went to a certain hotel in this city. I knocked at the door, and the night porter admitted me. I went inside. There was a blanket hung up across the window, and there were quite forty people in that room. There were two men behind the bar serving liquor.
931. *The Chairman.*] What hour was this?—This was on a Sunday night, somewhere about 11 o'clock. This man should have been on duty. On one occasion, in one hotel—
935. *The Chairman.*] This blanket was to obscure the light?—Obscure the light, undoubtedly.
933. Do you suggest any negligence on the part of the police in respect of that?—If the police had gone there, and forced their way in, they could easily have got evidence of illegal trading.

934. Was there anything about the appearance of the hotel to attract the attention of the police—to suggest anything irregular was going on?—No, but I am satisfied that the conversation inside could have been heard outside distinctly.

935. You think it ought to have attracted attention?—Yes.

936. There was noise enough?—Yes.

937. *Mr. Taylor.*] Of a recent date, do you think there has been any marked improvement in the administration of the licensing laws—do evidences on the street lead you to any conclusion of that sort?—I have had ample opportunity, moving as I do constantly about the streets, of seeing what is going on, and having visited hotels here I have also had opportunities to see what is going on inside. With regard to the streets, I have seen more drunkenness about Christchurch, particularly during this last five or six months, than for any similar number of months for some years past, and I say that as one constantly moving about the streets of Christchurch. I will give one or two instances which will suffice as an illustration. About a fortnight since a man, apparently some forty years of age, and a young fellow, apparently some seventeen or eighteen years of age, were drunk—so drunk, indeed, that, in order to get along the street, the young fellow had his arm round the other man's waist, and the older man was clinging on to the young fellow's clothing. In that way they went along Cashel Street, the one helping the other. That was in broad daylight, in the afternoon of a Saturday. Some time during the day, within the last two or three months, I saw in Lichfield Street a young fellow, about seventeen—not more than seventeen—and one about twenty-two or twenty-three, both in a state of intoxication. They were passing by the warehouse of Ross and Glendining. As far as I can remember, it was about mid-day. This happened within the last fortnight. About six or seven months ago, while seated on a coach to go to my home, the tram had arrived at the junction of Cashel Street and Colombo Street, a policeman in plain clothes staggered off the footpath, and when half-way between the footpath and the tram, when he was about to enter, he reeled and stopped to steady himself. He then went to reach out, to get, evidently as soon as possible, the hand-rail and enter the car.

938. *The Chairman.*] Was he known to you?—Yes, well; but I cannot mention his name, for the people whose attention I called to it, I think, will not stand by it, and it is useless mentioning the man's name here. Of course, he would deny it, and I have no other witnesses. However, that is the fact.

939. Does that mean they are not of your opinion?—Oh, no. They remarked it in my presence, and called attention to it; but I do not think they will come forward and give evidence. This happened within the last six or seven months. Within these last three days I saw a man—evidently a countryman—cross from the Gas Company's offices in Morton's block to the Bank of New Zealand corner and go in the direction of High Street, in an advanced stage of intoxication. That happened between 4 and 5 o'clock. Yesterday afternoon I was in the Farmers' Co-operative Stores, and a man came down the right-of-way which leads from Cashel Street to Hereford Street, accompanied by a younger man. The young man assisted him along the street to the Queen's Hotel. He went in there, and remained there some five minutes. He came out again, and he was assisted again, and he went to another hotel lower down. I think it was Tattersall's Hotel; in fact, it must have been, because there is no other hotel about there. I was talking to a friend at the time.

940. If you are not quite sure which hotel it was, how do you know he went into one?—I saw him go in the door.

941. What hotel was it?—Tattersall's Hotel. Some short time after this I saw a constable, and called his attention to it. He went in immediately to make inquiries. Whether he discovered the man, or the young man had taken himself to bed or not, I do not know. He is a married constable, living off Durham Street.

942. You do not suggest that as a case of neglect?—No; the constable acted most promptly. I think, perhaps, that will be quite sufficient to illustrate what takes place in our streets; there is no need to multiply instances.

943. In these cases, do you give them to us as isolated cases or as specimen cases?—Specimen cases.

944. Do you say there are many of such?—It is a frequent occurrence; and I say that as one who is constantly moving about Christchurch. I may remark that, judging by the fact that one rarely meets a constable in Christchurch, the Police Force is very much under-manned indeed. With regard to the very improper language—disgusting language—which is used by young fellows, especially on Saturday nights and on Sunday nights, in "doing the block," as it is termed, it seems to me that could be modified in a great measure if more constables were put on the street. It is absolutely impossible for the constables to deal with this disgusting practice effectually unless there are more of them. I wish now to give some information with regard to what I have seen inside hotels.

945. *The Chairman.*] You say it is impossible for the police to deal with these street nuisances?—Yes, such as using disgusting language and so on.

946. They are not numerically strong enough?—Not numerically strong enough. I believe some reference has been made to street betting. There is very little doubt that street betting is carried on to a considerable extent. I have frequently seen young fellows approach book-makers, well known to me by sight, and must be well known to the average pedestrian about Christchurch, and enter up bets apparently. That goes on openly in the streets, and must be seen by any man who has got his eyes open.

947. *Mr. Poynton.*] Are you aware that is no offence?—Well, in one town, I know, in the Old Country it is a breach of the law, but I will not be quite certain whether it applies here or not. It would be a very good thing if it did, at any rate. With regard to the inside of hotels, the practice, so far as my observation has led me—and that is in a number of hotels—is this: people are regularly supplied with liquor whilst under its influence. In a certain hotel there was a mother and a

father, both in a state of intoxication. The man is a working-man in this town. There was a boy, I should imagine about twelve or thirteen years of age, and a girl about fifteen years of age, waiting there for their parents to go home with them. The father was standing up with a glass of beer in his hand, drinking, in a state of intoxication. The mother was also in a state of intoxication, though she did not have a glass of beer in her hand.

948. *The Chairman.*] You are careful in the use of that word "intoxication"—no doubt about their condition?—No doubt about their condition. I am not very young, and I have seen a good deal of hotel life. The young girl was sitting on a settee in this particular part of the building. A man in a state of intoxication was endeavouring to put his arm round the girl's neck, and she was pushing him off. I merely mention the incident to show the demoralising effect of intoxication. I saw on one occasion come out of a hotel a young mother under the influence of liquor, and I should imagine it was her mother-in-law that was with her, carrying a young baby.

949. *Colonel Pitt.*] How long ago were these occurrences?—These have happened within these last two years.

950. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you see them go in?—No, I did not see them go into the hotel. A woman came out of the same hotel drunk. She is the mother of a large family in the vicinity of Christchurch. On another occasion I saw a man in another hotel supplied with liquor while under its influence. In the same bar, and at the trap-door leading into the bar, stood a young woman—a married woman, I should imagine, by the wedding-ring she was wearing. She was half drunk, and drinking a glass of beer. On the other side there happened to be a school-mate of mine, who was half drunk, and standing drinking a glass of beer. At another hotel a man had just called for a drink. I went into the bar and called the landlady's attention to the fact that she was not to supply anybody under the influence of liquor, and she did not do it. In that very bar there was a seat alongside the wall, and a man was lying there on his back with his head hanging over the end and with his mouth open, snoring in a drunken sleep, and his hat lying on the floor, and one arm lying on the ground. What I have just mentioned might have been seen by any constable, who could have gone in without any hindrance whatever. It has occurred to me that if the constables—the police in Christchurch—did their duty in the inspection of licensed houses with a persistency and fearlessness that our local Inspector of Factories shows, we should have less drunkenness occurring on the premises, and we should have less flagrant breaches of the Licensing Act. The constables could go in and see the scenes I have seen without let or hindrance. During the visits I have mentioned I have never met with a constable in a hotel. They are in the streets.

951. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you any idea how many convictions for drunkenness there have been during the last twelve months in Christchurch?—For the last four or five months, I think, there are somewhere about eighty or ninety. There is a considerable increase in the drinking habits of the people, particularly these last six or seven months.

952. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever had occasion to call the attention of a police constable in Christchurch to indecent prints?—Yes.

953. What happened?—Some twelve months ago—it might be 14—my attention was attracted by an abominable picture exhibited in a small tobacconist's shop-window in Colombo Street. The demoralising influence of such pictures may be at once shown when I describe what it was. The letterpress description showed what it was: a man in a state of drunkenness lying on a bed in a brothel, and a young woman in a half-naked condition escaping with his watch and chain down a trap-door. I noticed two or three young boys looking in this window, with a morbid imagination, I suppose; and it occurred to me, as a citizen, to endeavour to suppress such publications as that. I made a report to the President of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, as they had taken steps which had resulted in the conviction, some time before that, of a person selling the *New York Police Gazette*. However, no action was taken, and I then met, some week or two after this, a constable—No. 46 is his number. I asked him whether he was not aware of the fact that a prosecution had been entered against a man in Christchurch for exhibiting the *New York Police Gazette*, and a conviction secured. He said he had not been in Christchurch long, and he was not aware of the fact. I said, "Of course you are aware of the fact that there is an Act for the purpose of suppressing indecent publications—pictures." He thought there was some such Act, but he seemed to be very much in doubt about it. "Well," I said, "you know these are exhibited in windows." I named a number of shops. I named this one in particular—described it as I have described it to you. He said, "Yes, I have seen worse than that." "Well," I said, "it occurs to me, if you were to take steps to procure a copy of a paper——"

954. *The Chairman.*] Was this in a newspaper?—Yes. The *Police Budget*, it was called. I said, "If you took the trouble to procure a copy, and went to the station with evidence of an indecent publication, you ought to merit some reward." And at the same time he would have had power enough to do it. "Well," he said, "I am not supposed to do that. If you report anything to me, I am supposed to take a note of it, report it to the sergeant-major, and I receive my instructions." With respect to that, it occurs to me that the common-sense way would be for a constable to proceed to get evidence, where he sees it right in front of his face, and then take it, and report it with the evidence he had procured. To use the man's own words, he said, "We are simply puppets."

955. Did you take any steps yourself to vindicate public purity by proceeding against the man in respect of that exposure?—No. I think I had done sufficient by reporting it to the constable. He told me he would take a note of it and report it. I heard no more about it. Noticing little children frequently in the streets, in the company of prostitutes known to the police of Christchurch, and considering the fearful immoral atmosphere they were growing up in, and likely to prove detrimental to them through life, it seemed to me something ought to be done in the matter, and I stopped a constable in Manchester Street, just after having left Gill's confectionery shop in Manchester Street, where I had seen two prostitutes with a little boy, about five or six years of age. It

occurred to me there ought to be some provision in the law, providing that these children should be put under better care.

956. Are you aware there is such a provision in the law?—I thought so—either the Infant Life Protection Act or the Industrial Schools Act. I called the attention of this constable to the matter. He made inquiries as to the name of the woman. I said I had been told that she was a woman bearing the name of Kate White. I described her to him, and he said, “Yes, that is Kate.” He asked me where I had seen her, and I told him. I asked if he could not do something in the matter—if there was not an Infant Life Protection Act or Industrial Schools Act under which he had power to act. He said he believed there was some such Act, but he did not seem to know the existence of any law under which he could proceed. From the conversation I had with him, it occurred to me he showed a great want of knowledge of the law he had to administer. I have heard the remark made in the course of the Commission—I think, by one of the Inspectors—that it would be well if the constables received more instruction in regard to their duties; and from the conversation I had with this constable there is undoubted wisdom in that remark. The man seemed to be lamentably ignorant of the laws he had to administer.

957. Do you suggest that the law is such that he could have gone at once and taken this child from the woman you thought was a prostitute?—No; but he did not seem to know what steps could be taken to have this child taken from her at all. I gave three instances to him, and I have heard no more of the matter since.

958. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you not report it to the sergeant, or any one above this constable?—I did not. I reported it to him.

959. *Mr. Tumblebridge.*] How long ago is it since you spoke to the constable about Kate White?—Within three months.

960. It might be a little longer, might it not?—It might be a week or two more than that.

961. Did you know Kate White had a child of her own?—No, I am not aware of that.

962. Perhaps you would be surprised to know that child was her own, and the child was not living with her?—I saw the child with her.

963. And it would not be any offence for the woman to take the child into a confectioner's shop and give it food, the child being her own?—I am not aware of that.

964. Will you kindly give me the name of the constable you saw staggering in the street?—It would simply be my word against his.

965. Oh, no; there were other people present?—There was the coachman of the Willow Bank coach.

966. The name of the constable first?—Constable McGill, in my district—Addington.

967. Who were the other people you spoke to about him?—The coachman of the Willow Bank coach. He goes by the name of Bill. The other man that remarked on it is a salesman in Ballantyne and Company's establishment. I could pick the man out, but I do not know his name. He was sitting alongside me on the seat of the coach.

968. About when was this?—It might be six or seven months ago.

969. You advocate more police, you say?—Yes.

970. The instances of drunkenness you saw on the street did not occur on a Sunday?—No. I rarely go into the town on Sundays.

971. They are instances of drunkenness on week-days?—On week-days.

972. You have no means of saying where these people procured the drink?—I have no information with regard to that. All I can say is, I saw them under the influence of drink.

973. And you suggest there is neglect on the part of the police that these people should be on the street in that state?—It seems to me it could be prevented if there was a similar instruction to the police as there is in the Old Country. At Home, if a constable sees a drunken man approaching the entrance to a hotel he is supposed to prevent his entrance, and, should he succeed in getting in, it is his duty to go in and warn the hotelkeeper that the man is under the influence of liquor, and he should not supply him.

974. As I understand you, with the exception of two cases, these people were not seen to go into hotels by you?—The instances of drunkenness I speak of were in the hotel. I did not see them go in. They may have been drunk before they went in. I stated in my evidence that I saw them drunk in the hotel.

975. Do you suggest that a constable should be in and out of a hotel to see what was going on inside?—Undoubtedly.

976. Do you not think going in and out of a hotel would have a wrong construction put upon it?—I do not think so.

977. Do you suggest the way the licensing laws are carried out in England is more effective than in this colony?—I was born in this colony. I have never been to England.

978. Do not returns show more drunkenness in the large towns in England than in this colony?—Yes.

979. Notwithstanding that the law is more effective at Home?—I do not say the laws are more effective, but it seems to me they would be more effective here if there was a similar provision to that which I have mentioned as being in force at Home.

980. Regarding that picture, were the two figures in the picture nude?—No.

981. Were they dressed? What clothing were they shown as having on?—The man, according to the picture, was fully dressed, the woman in a half nude state, with petticoat and stays on.

982. Partly dressed?—Partly dressed. It was an indecent picture, calculated to do harm to young boys.

983. Do you suggest that would be an indecent picture, under any law in existence in this colony?—I think so, judging by the character of the pictures in the *Police Gazette*, in which case a prosecution was successful against a man here.

984. Was not this picture more suggestive than indecent?—It was more suggestive, of course, than indecent.

985. There is no law under which you can take action in respect of any suggestion in a man's mind?—No.

986. You do not suggest that pictures with figures that are fully clothed, or nearly fully clothed, can be indecent?—No.

987. These figures were clothed, were they not?—Yes. There was one clothed, and the other in a half nude state; but the whole idea, it seemed to me, was a most abominable suggestion.

988. If there was anything wrong it was in your mind, and not in the picture?—Well, a man taking a common-sense view would know pretty well the influence a picture of that character would have on the mind of a young boy.

SATURDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1898.

HENRY GEORGE ELL, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] You wish to add to your former evidence?—Yes. Yesterday, after the suggestion I made with regard to constables visiting hotels more frequently, in order to detect breaches of the licensing law, the Commissioner of Police ventured the opinion that an improper motive might possibly be put upon their actions in entering hotels. Since that I have had a conversation with a constable, who informs me that upon the request on some occasions of a wife whose husband was known to be in a hotel drinking, he has entered and requested the publican not to supply the man with liquor, whenever such complaint has been made to him. Also that on different occasions when he has seen a man under the influence of liquor enter a hotel, and has suspected in his mind that the man was perhaps likely to be supplied, he has entered and instructed the publican not to supply that man with liquor.

2. You do not find fault with him for doing that?—No, the constable is to be highly commended for it; only the Commissioner of Police yesterday thought an improper motive might be attributed to a man for doing that. I think, judging by what the man said, and by the estimation in which he is held, that no constable would suffer whatever by openly entering a hotel in the discharge of his duties. The constable, further, ventures the suggestion that a constable should be at liberty at any time, either in private clothes or in uniform, to visit hotels if he suspected that the Act was being violated in any way.

3. *Mr. Poynton.*] He says he has not the power? Do you not know that the law gives him authority to enter at any time, or demand entrance, if he suspects breaches of the Licensing Act?—The impression abroad in the public mind in regard to that is this: that on account of special raids being designed on hotels, policemen have no general instructions in regard to entering licensed houses.

4. *The Chairman.*] Have you anything more to say?—Yes, it seems to me that marriage should be more encouraged amongst the police. It would be far better, generally speaking, if we had more married men in the Force. I have been given to understand that in the Old Country preference is given to married men. Whether that is correct or not I do not know.

5. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you not aware that in some of the Australian Colonies married men are ineligible?—I do not think that that is conducive to the well-being of the Force.

6. Are you not aware that in some of the Australian Colonies married men are not eligible for the Police Force?—I am not aware of that.

7. Are you not also aware that in the Royal Irish Constabulary no married man is taken on, and that he must remain a single man for seven years before he gets permission to marry?—I am not aware of that.

8. Are you not also aware that the Royal Irish Constabulary, as a Police Force, is, in the estimation of many people, considered to be the most perfect body of men in the whole police world?—I am not. I have heard this opinion expressed, that they are a fine body of men physically speaking, but I have not heard it in any other direction.

9. You quite realise that it is necessary to have men easy of access in the Police?—Yes.

10. Do you not see the advantage of having single men living on the station premises?—A certain number of them; but I think the number should be reduced to the minimum amount. I am taking it this way: I was a single man until I was twenty-six years of age, and I mixed from the time I was a young fellow of nineteen, when I joined the Armed Constabulary, with single men, and lived in camp with them, and know their conversation and habits of living and so forth. I have been a married man for seven years, and have mixed a great deal with married men, and I think this, that every man who gives an open opinion must make this confession, that the average character and living of a single man will not come up to the average character and living of a married man.

11. You are drawing your conclusions from the Armed Constabulary?—Not only that, but from my experience on sheep stations and other places.

12. *The Chairman.*] What you say is, that single men are more likely to be irregular in their habits than married men?—Undoubtedly; and for that reason I think it is desirable to have more married men.

DAVID JACKSON, examined on oath.

13. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a third-class constable, stationed at Rangiora.

14. What do you wish to suggest?—I wish to say, with regard to the pay when relieving on out-stations, that one guinea per week is far too little for a constable.

15. That is the allowance for relieving?—Yes, after the first six days; and, as I have been relieving myself, several times, I will give you an instance of what occurred to me. I went relieving to the Methven Station. I asked the hotelkeeper his terms, and he said £1 5s. per week and £1 per week; he had two different tables. I could go in and get my meals in the rough place, as he called it, for £1 a week; but I said I would not. I did not want to go messing with men I might have occasion to arrest shortly afterwards. He would not take less than £1 5s., so I told him I would be away several days from the station on out-patrol duty, and I arranged to give him one guinea a week over all. I consider it is not right for a constable to have to make terms with an hotelkeeper.

16. *Colonel Pitt.*] How much ought it to be?—I think the department should revert to the old scale of 6s. a day for the first week, and £1 15s. a week for the remaining time. It ought to be at least that.

17. *The Chairman.*] You think you were the more likely to meet men you might have to operate against at one table than the other?—Certainly.

18. Why?—Because there are always two classes in these places, and they generally put the rough into one table; and a constable does not like to mess with that class.

19. Was it because you were more likely to meet men you had to operate against, or because your pride would not permit you to mix with them?—No, not at all; I have no feelings that way.

20. Was there no other convenient place you could have lodged at than the hotel?—No other place. I think a constable should have a fair allowance when relieving in that way.

MAURICE ROCHE, examined on oath.

21. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—First-class constable, stationed at Amberley.

22. When did you join the Force?—In 1881.

23. What do you wish to offer as a suggestion?—First, as to doctor's fees: We are not allowed doctor's fees except it is the result of an accident, or an assault, or something of that description. I have only been on the sick-list once during my time in the service, and the Commissioner had to refuse my doctor's expenses, although I thought it was caused by excessive duty at the time. The illness was congestion of the lungs. The Commissioner said he was very sorry, but he could not allow it; and I believe he was.

24. You thought this resulted from excessive duty; but did anybody else think so besides yourself? Did the doctor think so?—The doctor was not asked about it; in fact, I got ill attending the Timaru Supreme Court sittings.

25. What is the next point?—We ought to get a free uniform. I think we are the only Force wearing Her Majesty's livery who do not get it. I would also say that married constables in the towns ought to have a house-allowance. I have paid as high as 14s. a week for a house in Wellington, in the Tinakori Road, and, with a lot of children and other expenses, the pay will hardly reach it. I heard the evidence of Mr. Ell, who remarked that marriage ought to be encouraged in the Force. I would like to say something about that: My opinion is that leave for marriage should not be given so easily, and that more attention should be paid to the character of some of the women who marry police-officers. I am speaking generally; I have known a few instances where marriage was not desirable.

26. You think it should not be given without some inquiry as to the character of the wife?—Not that; a searching inquiry.

27. *Mr. Poynton.*] You do not object to marriage?—No, I believe marriage is a success. I think the police could find wives very early, if they want them.

28. There is no necessity for them to get hard cases, then?—No. It is not the fault of the officers that these things occur, because they have to take the reports of sergeants, and so on, given to them.

29. *The Chairman.*] What is the next point?—In the event of the police not getting free uniforms, I think the price might be considerably reduced. Our shako costs 11s. 6d., and that is really more than the marketable value of it, if it was not for the peculiar make. The cost of the mounted men's uniform, in particular, is very expensive. I cannot tell you the whole cost, taking everything together.

30. Have you ever made out an estimate?—No, never. I have never got the lot together; I get one at a time, as it is worn out.

31. What does it cost a country man on an average a year?—About £9 or £10.

32. Do you give that as the cost of the mounted men's uniform in the year?—I hardly think it would cost that; a country man has to keep both uniforms. The boots alone range from £2 10s; up to £4 I have seen paid for them.

33. Then, you say, in the country stations, the men have the ordinary foot uniform, as well as the mounted uniform?—Yes, but that only means the blue trousers.

34. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you go to Eketahuna?—In 1887, I think.

35. When were you transferred to Amberley?—In April, 1893.

36. Were you pretty frequently threatened, whilst you were at Eketahuna, that political influence would be used to secure your removal?—Up to the end of 1890 I had peace; they let me alone.

37. After the end of 1890?—Then I was threatened continually.

38. Will you tell the Commission the nature of the interference?—Well, the interference was that I had to take action as regards some hotels. The cases were not before the Court, but before the Alfredton Licensing Committee, at Eketahuna; and a petition was circulated for my removal, and sent to the department at Wellington. The petition was returned to me by the Inspector for the district, and I replied to it. I heard nothing more about the petition, and I thought it was done away with.

39. Who circulated the petition?—A man named Frank White took it round the first day. He is now a resident in Christchurch. About six months afterwards the other constables surrounding me were appointed Clerks of Court; and I made inquiries, and found out there was an order for my appointment in the Justice Department as Clerk of Court at Eketahuna, which was followed by an order countermanding it, and stating that a constable would be sent to Eketahuna who would be appointed Clerk of Court. I knew then the petition had not been dropped.

40. *The Chairman.*] You knew, or suspected it?—I suspected it. I was in possession of pretty good information on the subject. Then it stopped again. I saw letters that were written to some people at Eketahuna, some one way and some another; and I saw a piece of a letter signed by the Minister of Defence then, and I thought they were paying too much attention to me. Well, that agitation stopped again, and I heard rumours of petitions nearly every day, some against and some for me, and in the latter case I always tried to stop it, because I told them if I had to remain there on petition I could not do my duty. At this time Mr. Reeves, a civilian from Pahiatua, was Clerk of Court. He used to go from Pahiatua to Eketahuna for the Court. That was followed by a lull in the agitation. I thought things were settled, but in February, 1893, Sergeant McArdle, of Masterton, visited Eketahuna, and he showed me a letter dated the Minister's Office, Wellington, 1st February, 1893. I can give you the words, or very near it. They are as follows:—

DEAR MR. HOGG.—I am sorry I cannot accede to your request as to the promotion of Constable Roche, as no special reason is shown for his promotion. Possibly if he was transferred to another district it might lead to his promotion.—Yours truly,
R. J. SEDDON.

The sergeant showed me the letter, because he was always telling me Mr. Hogg was a friend of mine, and I told him I would not believe it. The sergeant asked me what I thought of the letter, and I plainly told him I thought it was written to order, and to be shown to me; because I asked him, "Why do they not let me alone; I do not want promotion, I am satisfied." But I told the sergeant to tell Mr. Hogg I was ready to go, because I had had enough of it. I met Mr. Hogg two days after in Eketahuna, in company with the Hon. Mr. Seddon and Sir Patrick Buckley. Mr. Hogg told me he wanted to see me before he went back, because the Ministers were going on by coach towards Woodville. I met him before he returned to Masterton, and he asked me if Sergeant McArdle had shown me a letter; and I told him he had, and that I was ready to leave. At the same time, I told Mr. Hogg I was quite satisfied to go, because "I had given him a good run for his money." He asked me then if there was any particular station I wanted. I told him, No; I did not want any man out of a station. Then he asked me if I wanted any particular district, I answered him "No," and he asked me again; and I said I should take Auckland, Wanganui, or Napier, for choice, "but that need not stop you." I think it would be about a fortnight or three weeks afterwards I received a letter appointing me Clerk of Court at Eketahuna. The mail came in at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and I left at 2 o'clock with a prisoner for Wellington. When I arrived at the police-station, Inspector Pender informed me I was transferred to Amberley. I gave up charge of Eketahuna, I think, on the 3rd April, 1893, to Constable Nestor, who was transferred from Amberley. I was also interfered with by a man who was Secretary of the Knights of Labour, at Eketahuna. Of course, I am only giving you this on what I heard. I believe it was true. I took charge at Amberley on the 6th April, and I have been there ever since; I was promoted to second-class soon after reaching Amberley, I think in July; and last year I was promoted to first-class.

41. *Colonel Pitt.*] What time last year were you promoted to first-class?—On the 28th April, 1897, I was promoted for the arrest of the murderer Sheehan, at Amberley. Since I came to Amberley I had to deal with sly-grog selling at Cheviot, and I have had no trouble, I may say, with the public nor with my officers, except that the Rev. Father Treacy reported me to the Commissioner. I was called on for a reply, and there was no further proceedings taken in the matter; and I do not think that injured me in any way.

42. *The Chairman.*] Was there any inquiry consequent on that report?—No; not beyond my being asked for a report; that settled it. He called me some bad names, but that was nothing.

43. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has the Rev. Father Treacy often threatened you with removal?—He has to others, I believe, but he has not spoken to me since the day he interfered with me first.

44. *The Chairman.*] That is only what somebody else told you?—Yes; that is common report.

45. What did he speak to you about?—I arrested a man the day before, by order of Mr. Bishop, S.M. This man was very violent, and I got him to the lock-up with assistance. That afternoon I telegraphed to Inspector Broham to send me a constable, for service in the Court next day, as the man might behave in the same way again. Inspector Broham sent Constable O'Leary. I met the constable on the platform of the railway-station, and Father Treacy stood behind me on the platform, and asked me if I had sent for the constable to take this man down before he was convicted. I told him I did not. Well, he replied that I had; and I denied it again. Then he asked me if I had telegraphed; and I told him I had, but for another purpose; and I asked him what it had to do with him, and why he did not mind his own business, and, if he interfered with me I should lay an information against him.

46. What for?—For interfering with me.

47. Do I understand that you think a man asking you a question is sufficient for taking proceedings against him?—No; I do not mean that. I mean, he came up and asked me why I had telegraphed.

48. What interference was that? Was it an interference asking you a question?—Yes, in the tone and way it was asked.

49. You think the tone would have justified you in doing—what?—In bringing him before the Court; however, I did not intend to do it, all the same.

49A. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did he tell you how he knew you telegraphed?—He saw me going down with it the day before. He lives close to the railway-station. Up to this we were very good friends; but I have not spoken to him since.

50. *The Chairman.*] You say he subsequently reported you for this conduct to your officer?—Yes; Colonel Hume visited Amberley in May of 1896, which was subsequent to this occurrence. I was away at Cheviot; and I believe I was reported to him verbally then, but that I cannot say.

51. You were called upon to explain?—I was asked for a verbal report.

52. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did any of Mr. Hogg's employes take any part in the Eketahuna interference?—Yes, a man named Murdoch.

53. Was Murdoch an employe of Mr. Hogg's while you were in Eketahuna?—Yes, he was employed on the *Wairarapa Star*.

54. Do you know whether he made a wager that he would have you shifted in a fortnight?—I do. He bet £1 that he would get me removed in fourteen days. I locked him up that night.

55. *The Chairman.*] How long after that was it before you were removed?—That was in 1892.

56. What did you lock him up for?—For drunkenness. He boasted that he had a document in his pocket, and that he was betting on a certainty for my removal. I wanted to get the document, but all I found on him was a pawn-ticket.

57. Was that why you locked him up, to get the document?—No, for drunkenness.

58. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was he convicted?—Yes.

59. *The Chairman.*] You were not removed in fourteen days, then?—No; he lost the bet. He wanted to get it back again, but he did not.

60. *Mr. Taylor.*] As it is relative to your experience in connection with the licensing laws, do you think that the licensed victuallers' trade interferes to any extent with a constable's vigilance at any point?—They use their influence against a constable.

61. Do you know if there was a feeling amongst the men, so far as your knowledge is concerned, that anything like activity in enforcing the licensing law would be prejudicial to their position in the Force?—Undoubtedly it is.

62. Has that interfered with your duty?—No, nothing has stopped me; but I have not the slightest doubt I was shifted from Eketahuna through the influence of the publicans, over the liquor business.

63. *The Chairman.*] What reason have you for that?—Well, the petition was concocted by them.

64. I thought you said it was all quiet?—Yes; but the agitation was kept going the whole time.

65. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you done any duty in cities at all?—Yes.

66. Where?—In London, New Orleans, and Wellington.

67. Do you know whether, in Wellington, there was any system of watching, or other precautions taken by licensed houses?—Oh, yes; in all the places, I dare say: but I am aware of it in Wellington.

68. Whereabouts in Wellington?—I know of two hotels in Wellington which, in my time, were supplied with electric bells. One bell was in the door, and you had to put a pencil in to ring it.

69. You knew that?—Yes, I have done it myself—to give them an alarm. There was another one where the bell was located in the sill of the window on the street; and a man used to sit on it, and all he had to do was just to press his finger, as soon as ever a sergeant or a constable appeared when making their Sunday visits.

70. *The Chairman.*] When was this?—In 1884 or 1885.

71. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you think it would be possible to enforce the existing law?—Yes.

72. How do you account for this lax enforcement in many points?—It could be done in one way: Place the Commissioner in the same position as the Auditor-General, and you would have the Licensing Act enforced.

73. You mean, take the Commissioner away from political control altogether?—Yes; and the police altogether; and pass an Act that any member of Parliament should get six months' hard labour who interfered with the police.

74. Have you heard amongst the men any general impression of opinion as to political influence being used by policemen?—There is no doubt about the impression as to political influence being used.

75. Has there been any change in the feeling of the Force during the last six months?—Yes, undoubtedly there has.

76. How do you explain it?—The men seem more secure, and go for their duty more—in fact, I do myself. I ventured so far as to lock up a publican for being drunk on the 10th March.

77. *The Chairman.*] Would you have done that prior to that date?—I would.

78. *Mr. Taylor.*] I will ask whether, before five months ago, you would not have expected such action to be followed by an agitation for some interference with you?—It would have followed, I believe; that is what I mean.

79. Do you think the danger of such interference has passed away now? Is that the feeling in the Force?—Yes.

80. *Colonel Hume.*] What influence do you think led to your removal from Eketahuna?—Mr. Hogg, M.H.R.

81. You mean political influence?—Yes.

82. He was a long time trying to work it?—He was, indeed.

83. How do you account for that, in any way?—The newspapers were taking my part; the whole of the Press in Wellington and Napier took it up.

84. Then, you had a fairly good spell at Eketahuna before you were transferred?—Oh, yes; the man on the next station was there before I went to Eketahuna, and I believe he is still there.

85. What next station?—Tenui. I might tell you I do not at all object to be shifted if you give me an order; I would go anywhere. But I did not want to be shifted, because they said they would do it.

86. *The Chairman.*] You would not suggest, because somebody made a remark that you were to be shifted, that the Commissioner's influence was to be coerced in any way, and that he had to keep you there just to defy these people?—Nothing of the kind.

87. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, who do you blame for keeping you out of the position as Clerk of Court for a certain time?—The same party.

88. The result was that, with all his power, he could not get you out altogether?—No, he did not do it at the finish. But I really only had it for six or seven hours.

89. But you had it?—Yes.

90. Then, the next attempt at political influence entirely failed for nearly two years to get you removed, and failed entirely to get you kept out of the position as Clerk of Court?—Yes.

91. You have always done your duty very conscientiously?—Yes, I have.

92. And you have never spared any publicans at all that you thought were breaking the law, nor anybody else?—I have not made a set on publicans.

93. You would just as soon worry a Prohibitionist?—Yes, I have done so.

94. Notwithstanding that you have always conscientiously performed your duties, you have got on fairly well in the Force?—I have in a way, but not, I think, to what I was entitled to; my juniors were promoted.

95. Do you know one man in the Force who thinks he has got what he is entitled to?—I agree with you there.

96. You were appointed in 1881?—Yes.

97. And made second-class, when?—In 1893.

98. That is twelve years?—Yes.

99. At the present state of promotion, are men getting their second-class in twelve years? The last man promoted had been senior sixteen years; then twelve years in the service?—I do not know who he was, but I know men were promoted before that, and were not gazetted.

100. Then, you were very rightly promoted for distinguished services last year?—Yes.

101. Then, with all the powerful political influence against you—with the publicans, a powerful body, against you—you have got on still in the service?—I have, fairly well.

102. And neither of these influences have told against you in any way?—They have not injured me in any way. I believe I ought to have got second-class, and others would not have got ahead of me.

103. You are probably speaking of Clerks of Court?—Yes; if you go back on the file, you will find a letter from Commissioner Gudgeon, approving my action concerning the arrest of a man in Auckland on my information, and allocating me £20 as a special reward for it.

104. And did he say you would get the next vacancy?—No, that never occurs.

105. And then you came to Amberley?—Yes.

106. And there you had some difference of opinion with the Rev. Father Treacy?—Yes.

107. I suppose you know Father Treacy is a personal friend of mine?—I have heard him say so.

108. You know I went to his house when in Amberley?—Yes.

109. Well, in April, 1897, Father Treacy wrote to me, making certain complaints against you; you knew that, because you had to reply to the letter?—Yes.

110. Now then, notwithstanding the powerful influence of Father Treacy, and more especially as he was a friend of mine, he has not yet succeeded in getting you removed?—No; I knew he would not. I never suspected you of anything of the kind.

111. You were satisfied I would give you fair play?—Quite satisfied on that point. I might say I have no complaint at all; but I object to be ordered or interfered with by anybody outside the Police Force, unless it is a Stipendiary Magistrate.

112. Now, you say, you have known cases of constables being molested by publicans because they do their duty in enforcing the liquor law?—No; threatening them to have them removed.

113. Has it ever come under your notice that constables are sometimes threatened by Prohibitionists for not doing their duty towards licensed houses?—I have been actually threatened myself.

114. One side is pretty well as bad as the other, in your experience?—They are pretty hot, too; there is no doubt about that.

115. Well, then, the man you locked up for drunkenness at Eketahuna: you locked him up because he was drunk, and he was convicted?—Yes.

116. You did not tell us what he was?—He was a reporter of the *Wairarapa Star* and *Pahiatua and Eketahuna Mail*.

117. And consequently he had that powerful organ, the Press, at his back?—Only the *Wairarapa Star*; I had the rest of the Press of the district with me.

118. Notwithstanding that, he staked money to the extent of £1; even the Press did not see him through it?—He lost his bet.

119. You did not get the document you wanted?—No, I did not; I only got a pawn-ticket on him. He said he had the document in his pocket, and was betting on a certainty; but he did not have it.

120. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Cheviot, I believe, is in your district?—Yes.

121. There have been some complaints of sly-grog selling there, some two years ago?—Yes.

122. Did you receive instructions from Inspector Broham with reference to that?—Yes.

123. Did you take every possible step you could, with a view to detecting it?—I took every step I could; I have ridden to Cheviot twice in a week, and, so far as instructions from Mr. Broham, they were not instructions, he was forcing me to do it.

124. Driving you to do it?—Yes, driving me more than I liked. He sent up another man, and we got a case.

125. It is not correct to say nothing was done up to the time special men were sent?—No, I was at work all the time; the second night before I seized the whiskey, under a warrant sent by the Inspector, I slept in Scott's house, and I did not pretend there was anything going on, but I knew there was.

126. You have had experience of political police and non-political police?—Yes.

127. You served in the London Police?—Yes.

128. Is that political, or non-political?—It is non-political.

129. You served in the New Orleans Police?—Yes.

130. Is that a political body?—It is, undoubtedly, everything in it.

131. Of your experience in these two Forces, what do you say as to the ability of a constable to carry out his duty under the different systems?—Of course, there is no comparison whatever; in London a constable is not interfered with at all, and in New Orleans he goes out principally as the politicians go in and out.

132. In New Orleans a constable simply does his duty to order?—Undoubtedly.

133. They have no desire to carry out the law?—He does not care about law so long as he pleases the party in power. In London, of course, you have to do it?

134. Having this practical experience of the two systems, you feel very strongly that the Police Force should be entirely non-political?—I feel that as soon as the Police Force becomes political it becomes useless.

135. You are pretty comfortable at Amberley?—Yes, I have a splendid house.

136. You have a splendid family, as well as a splendid house?—I have.

137. And the house pretty well fits your family?—Yes, I have plenty of room.

138. Therefore, in going to Amberley you are not in any way prejudiced?—I am not injured in any way in going to Amberley.

139. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say you have been interfered with by publicans and Prohibitionists?—Yes.

140. On the part of the publicans, was it because you did your duty?—Yes.

141. And on the part of the Prohibitionists: was the complaint that you had not done your duty?—Yes, that I was not doing my duty to suit them.

142. That you were not active enough?—Yes.

143. Not that you were too active?—No; they believe if they see a man going into a hotel that it is a breach of the Licensing Act; whereas a constable who knows his business knows perfectly well that it is not.

144. The complaint in one instance was because you had done your duty, and in the other because you had not?—That is what it amounted to.

145. In regard to the hotels you referred to in Wellington, were they first-class, or second-class, or third?—One was a very fair hotel, but it was rather what you would call a sporting house, and the other was on the low side.

146. *The Chairman.*] Your answer to Mr. Taylor is that the one party complains that in their opinion you do more than you ought to do, and the other party complains you do less than you ought to do?—That is so.

147. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you say the publican parties said you do more than you ought to do?—That is the inference drawn.

148. As a matter of fact, was not their complaint that you interfered with them at all practical?—That would be the complaint; that was the feeling at Eketahuna, undoubtedly.

149. In regard to Cheviot? Did you succeed in getting a conviction in uniform, or not until you had the assistance from plain-clothes men?—No.

150. Had you not been there a good many times before you secured a conviction?—Yes, but very rarely in uniform.

151. But you were well known?—Yes.

152. But it was not until you had the assistance from plain-clothes men that you secured a conviction?—Yes, after that.

153. Generally, do you think that a constable stands much chance of obtaining convictions for sly-grog selling or breaches of the Licensing Act, under the terms of Sunday trading or after hours, when in uniform?—I do not think he has.

154. You think that work could be done successfully by plain-clothes men?—Of course, if I was going to detect any other offences I would not go openly and knock at the door and wait until they let me in. A publican who got caught like that I would take to be a fool.

155. *The Chairman.*] Has it not occurred to you that there is another way of recognising a constable than by his uniform?—Certainly, I am known in my own district.

156. And is it not generally understood that there is something in the gait of a constable that marks him?—I think so.

157. *Mr. Tambridge.*] It simply means that you find that unless the police adopt subterfuge it is impossible to bring home the breaches of the law, particularly in their detective duty?—Yes.

158. And, unless that is done, are they likely to succeed?—They would not succeed.

159. You find that general?—I do.

160. If he went openly to a man and told him his intention, is it likely he would get evidence?—No. And I find, in my own experience, when making inquiries, that you do not get the information with the same willingness if you are in uniform, as you would if you went in plain clothes, and made yourself at home with the people who have the information to give.

161. *Colonel Pitt.*] What do you say to the rate of pay in the New Zealand Police Force?—It is too low for a man joining.

162. What ought it to be?—I should say 8s. to start with.

163. How should it be increased?—There should be two classes of constables, first- and second-class.

164. What should the first get?—I would give them 1s. more; and that is what it is now with the service-men.

165. Do you think sergeants are paid sufficient?—No; I think there ought to be a bigger difference between the pay of sergeants and constables.

166. What is the difference now?—6d. between third-class sergeants and first-class constables.

167. What do you think it should be?—I think 1s. should be the difference, any way, because the more the man over you is paid, the more you look up to him.

168. Would you divide the sergeants into three classes and the constables into two?—I would only have two classes of sergeants, making second-class sergeants 10s., and first-class sergeants 11s.

FRANK WHITE, examined on oath.

169. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Silversmith, living at Addington.

170. Have you a shop of your own?—I am manager of a shop.

171. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you leave Eketahuna?—Four years next August, in 1894.

172. Was Constable Roche there when you were there?—Yes, I was in Eketahuna before he was there, and after he left.

173. Did you take a petition round for signatures asking for his removal?—Yes.

174. What date?—In November, nearly two years before Constable Roche left.

175. Who employed you to go round with it?—Certain publicans.

176. Were you paid for it?—Yes, I was engaged to do it.

177. So far as your knowledge of Constable Roche goes, do you regard him as a good officer?—Certainly.

178. Very vigilant?—Certainly.

179. Do you know why the petition was in circulation?—From what I could hear, and from certain observations, it was on account of one publican not getting a license for a house which had been burnt down; and the constable reported one place dirty, and one place very low, to the Licensing Committee.

180. Do you know a man named Murdoch at Eketahuna?—Yes.

181. Was he pretty active in trying to secure Constable Roche's removal?—He was pretty active in trying to mess anybody's business but his own.

182. Do you know whether he was directly connected with this agitation?—I expect he was. Not with that one petition, but with another agitation.

183. *Colonel Huine.*] Did many people sign this petition?—I only took it round half a day.

184. How many signatures were there during that half-day?—About six, I think.

185. What became of it?—I saw no more of it. I took it back, and told them they had better go round with it themselves, as the roads were none too good.

186. They did not give you "the sack," but you gave them "the sack"?—Yes, I turned it up.

187. You really do not know why this was got up?—I was told by the publicans themselves, and they were supposed to know.

188. You do not know what became of it after you dropped it?—I know this, that one of the publicans took it round.

189. How long after that was Constable Roche removed?—About two years afterwards.

190. *Mr. Taylor.*] After that petition?—That was the only petition in connection with Constable Roche I had to do with.

191. *Mr. Poynton.*] How many hotels are there at that place?—Four.

DAVID JACKSON, further examined on oath.

192. *The Chairman.*] You are a constable, stationed at Rangiora?—Yes.

193. When did you join the Force?—5th April, 1892.

194. Where were you stationed first?—Christchurch.

195. And after that?—Ashburton.

196. And then?—Oamaru.

197. And where are you now?—Rangiora.

198. Have you any knowledge of political or other outside influence being used in connection with the transfer, or other matters affecting police-officers?—So far as I am concerned, I had no reason to suppose political influence had been used in my case.

199. At what point was that?—Ashburton.

200. To affect your removal?—Yes. I had heard about three weeks before my removal that I was to be removed soon.

201. *Mr. Taylor.*] From the department, or from outsiders?—Outsiders.

202. Before any intimation was conveyed to you by the department?—Yes.

203. Was it only reported in the towns?—I believe it was afterwards, but I did not hear it then.

204. Did you know that any interference was made?—I could not say.

205. Had you been active in enforcing the licensing laws there?—There was a case where threats had been used.

206. As to your removal, did the publicans say you would be removed?—Yes, I believe so.

207. How long after that case was it before you were removed?—I think the case came off on the 6th May, 1897, and I got notice on the 22nd July; but I do not put it down to that exactly. I thought so at the time, but I think now it was due to other influences.

208. Do you think that had partly to do with it?—I really do not.

209. But you were still told it had?—Yes, I have been told.

210. What other influences do you think were at work?—Well, two constables were ordered for removal previous to me; one was under orders to hold himself in readiness, but he was allowed to remain, and I had to go; in fact, both remained there after I left.

211. Was he under orders before you were?—Something like a month.
212. And he was allowed to remain, and you were shifted?—Yes.
213. Was he remaining in Ashburton before it was actually accomplished?—I did not hear that.
214. Generally speaking, do you think publicans are active in interfering politically with constables?—It is a general opinion in the Force—that, and political influence.
215. *The Chairman.*] Is that not what you mean by “political influence”?—I mean members interfering.
216. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you any other knowledge of that character—of removals being cancelled?—Well, there is a notice of removals in the newspapers, and you will find that the order has been cancelled; it has been done times out of number.
217. Does that not create a feeling in the minds of the men that there has been a force superior to the Commissioner’s?—Yes; it creates a very bad feeling amongst the men.
218. Has there been a better feeling in the Force in the last six months?—Yes.
219. A feeling of more security?—Yes; and the men seem to be more together in many ways.
220. You think there is not as much prospect of political influence being used now as before?—I have known of it.
221. *The Chairman.*] Do you apply that to petition, that neither publicans nor politicians have anything to do with the Force now?—Yes.
222. How long has that feeling existed?—Since Commissioner Tunbridge took office.
223. Why should that have anything to do with it?—I consider the Government, as head of the department, has not interfered in the same way.
224. Is it not from the fact that as soon as he took office there have been a great many promotions in the Force? Has not that brought about a better feeling?—I cannot say. I think before the promotions took place the feeling began to die away; there was a feeling then that interference was about to be done away with.
225. *Mr. Taylor.*] Has not the agitation in Parliament and in the country during the last year given men this feeling?—That is what has given the men this feeling, no doubt. This political influence has caused a lot of feeling in the Force which is now passing away.
226. The attention directed to the Police Force last year, you think, would have the effect of stopping this feeling?—Yes.
227. *The Chairman.*] And you attribute the better feeling to the fact that the matter has been ventilated in Parliament?—Yes.
228. You know there is always a feeling on the part of men—of any body of men—to praise and adore the rising sun; and it is suggested that the new Commissioner is going to do wonders, and that this feeling is due to his arrival; and it is a reflection on the old Commissioner, and I want to know whether this better feeling has been brought about by the publicity given to the matter in the country and in Parliament?—Yes, I think it is due to that.
229. *Mr. Poynton.*] Are you a married man?—Yes.
230. And were you married when you had these other shifts?—Yes.
231. Have you any family?—Yes.
232. *Mr. Taylor.*] These were more frequent removals than usual?—Yes, considering I have known men to be in one station for nineteen years without a shift.
233. *The Chairman.*] Do you think it is beneficial to the Force that men should be removed? Not without cause, and then they should know the cause.
234. Are you in charge at Rangiora?—No.
235. Have you ever been in charge of a station?—Yes.
236. What is your experience of constables in charge of stations at country districts? Do you think it is beneficial to the Force, or to the execution of their work, that they should remain for a lengthened period, or that they should be removed periodically?—I think they should remain.
237. How long do you suggest?—I think the transfers should take place every seven years.
238. With regard to pensions. Is there a feeling in favour of a pension amongst the men, so far as you know?—Yes, generally, but not with all the men; there is a feeling that a pension would be a very good thing.
239. Are those in favour of a pension prepared to sacrifice a portion of their pay for the purpose of securing it?—I cannot say; I have not been amongst the town men, or had any conversation over the matter; I for one would be.
240. *Colonel Hume.*] How long had you been in Christchurch before you went to Ashburton?—About a month.
241. When you went to Ashburton, was it to be a temporary arrangement?—Yes.
242. I suppose you know there is an order in force in the service that constables should not be stationed at a place where their parents reside, or where they have been brought up?—Yes; my parents lived twenty miles from Ashburton, and I know of other constables who have lived closely to their parents, and no exception was taken to it; and I think that order should apply also to constables’ wives.
243. In your application for appointment as constable, did you show you lived at Ashburton, or twenty miles away from Ashburton?—I showed I lived at Ealing.
244. In your application, where did you state was your place of residence?—Washdyke, near Timaru.
245. You will swear you did not put your place of residence at Ashburton?—I do not think it.
246. Now, when you were at Ashburton, a man was brought in from an out-station because he had not conducted himself very well?—Yes.
247. That meant there was one supernumerary man at Ashburton?—Yes.
248. Consequently, somebody had to be removed from Ashburton?—Yes.
249. In due course, you got orders to move to Oamaru?—Yes.

250. Did you use any political influence not to go?—No; it was used, but not to my knowledge; I heard of it.

251. From a man named Jackson?—No.

252. Do you mean to say that a man named Jackson did not try to work Major Steward?—No; Major Steward, so far as I know, was never asked.

253. Then, you are perfectly certain you never used any political influence yourself to stop there?—No.

254. Never saw any Justices of the Peace?—No, I never attempted to see anybody. I asked to be sent to any other station but Oamaru, for a certain reason, and I was willing to go to any station I was ordered to.

255. Is this report correct or not correct: "No. 622, David Jackson: Residence of parents or relatives in the colony, Ashburton"?—That is wrong.

256. Consequently your own application, from which this is taken, must be wrong?—My application stated my own residence was Washdyke, near Timaru; in my application it was put down as Ealing.

257. Who was this publican who told you you would be removed?—He did not tell me; it was rumoured, and I heard of it.

258. Who was the publican you had the case against?—Shaw.

259. Did you lay the information?—No; Constable Ede laid it.

260. What do you know of it?—I got the man with the bottle of grog on him, when on night duty.

261. Why did you not lay the information?—I was up all night, and Constable Ede for a certain reason had to get some witnesses before 8 o'clock in the morning, and he carried it through.

262. Did the publican threaten Constable Ede?—I do not know.

263. Has he succeeded in getting Ede removed?—No, he is there still.

264. Do you think the publican had anything to do with your removal?—I do not; I thought at first, some considerable time ago, that he had, but not latterly.

265. Then your removal from Christchurch to Ashburton, which was a temporary arrangement, and to Oamaru, were the only removals you have had under my control?—Yes.

266. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You said you received house-allowance: I suppose you mean you lived in a Government house?—Yes, I am living in a free house.

267. Your last removal was made at your own request?—Yes, I made application to be removed.

268. You did not complain about that transfer?—No.

WILLIAM WILCOX TANNER, examined on oath.

269. *Mr. Taylor.*] You remember a statement you made in the House of Representatives about Sunday trading in Christchurch?—Yes.

270. How many houses did you visit?—Five; that is, we went on the premises of four, but were unable to gain admission into the fifth.

271. Did you have any difficulty in getting access to the houses?—Not the least.

272. Did you notice any one watching at the houses outside?—All the houses we entered were approached by side entrances and back entrances, and in only one case did I notice a person who might apparently have been on the watch. We passed him at the gate; he said nothing to us, and we said nothing to him.

273. You had no difficulty at all in getting in?—No.

274. Were the men with you in the habit of going for refreshment into licensed houses?—I imagine they were, but I cannot say.

275. You were not?—I have never been in the habit of anything of the kind.

276. Was any question asked as to whether you were *bona fide* travellers?—Not the least; there was no time to ask questions in most cases.

277. They were too busy serving?—I never saw anything like it.

278. *The Chairman.*] What period is this?—It is impossible to fix the time accurately; it was some months before the session of 1896, either the end of 1895 or the beginning of 1896.

279. *Mr. Taylor.*] How many people would you estimate there was in the first house you went into?—There were a number of people; I did not look round to ascertain actually the number. I had but one object in view, and that was to see whether the liquor was sold. I was taking little notice of details.

280. What time of the day was it?—Between 9 and 10 o'clock on Sunday evening; it was summer time, and the weather was warm and dark, and threatened rain.

281. Was the liquor paid for without hesitation?—Oh, yes.

282. And no questions asked?—Not in the least.

283. What number was in the second hotel; were there more visitors than in the first?—I do not know what trade is done in a hotel, so it is impossible to fix a standard. I should say, from the number going out, and the general understanding—that was, an unspoken understanding which seemed to exist between all the men we saw—everybody seemed to know everybody's business, and perfectly to understand. I seemed for a moment in a room in which there was a great unspoken conspiracy.

284. Then, you gathered from that, that the men there were frequenters of the hotels?—They certainly gave me that impression.

285. Was there any hesitation to take payment for the liquor at any of the four hotels?—Not the least.

286. And there was the same freedom from interference on entering each of the hotels?—We were not in any way challenged; but I did notice in one of the places, when we were up by the

front of the bar, that some of the men exchanged significant looks, which I supposed referred to my presence. They seemed surprised to see me; they did not seem surprised to see the other two men.

287. Do you think the police, if proper steps were taken, so far as the selection of men in plain clothes was concerned, would have much difficulty in getting evidence in Christchurch?—When on our way to the last house, proceeding southwards, we met two men I considered to be policemen, about a hundred yards from the house. One of my companions remarked, "We are all right." The policemen were walking in the direction away from the house that we were going to. It seemed incredible that these men could have passed that hotel without noticing the hum of conversation that was taking place, and without knowing that something was on. I am not prepared to say they did pass the house; we met them a hundred yards or so from the house.

288. Do you think, as a result of your experience, that the police ought to have much difficulty, if the men who are selected were in plain clothes, in getting convictions for Sunday trading?—I cannot say what difficulties the police meet with in the execution of their duties. I think they are not sufficiently numerous; and I am under the impression, and have been for years, that the police are under some restraint in regard to licensed houses. I am not in a position to prove that, but it is a very widespread feeling.

289. Is there a hesitation, so far as the police are concerned, in enforcing the licensing law?—Something more than hesitation.

290. Do you think, as a result of your observation, there should be much difficulty in securing convictions for Sunday trading?—It may be that the preparations of the police are met with counter-preparations on the other side.

291. But speaking of your own observation?—I think from my own observation on that Sunday night that any average intelligent policeman who had a free hand might have convicted four houses.

292. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you and your companions arrange what you would do in the event of the police coming in and finding you on the licensed premises?—Not in the least; the whole affair was not prearranged in any way. It was purely the result of an accident my being there.

293. What would you have done had the police come in?—I cannot say; take the consequences, I suppose.

294. Would you willingly have informed them you had drink and had paid for it?—I did not say I had drink. Drink was sold, and was freely paid for. In the last house we visited, the man whose name was painted over the door was drawing beer as fast as he could possibly draw it, and it would have been an easy matter for any new-comer to take up a glass of beer and drink it without paying for it. The man scarcely knew who he was taking the money from.

295. You say you were in the midst of a conspiracy?—There was a sort of freemasonry between them.

296. Did it lead you to understand that if the police came in they would get no blame attached to them? Is that the truth?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with it; I was only in the whole affair about an hour.

297. You are acquainted with the present laws affecting the liquor traffic?—Yes.

298. Do you think they should be strengthened?—It is a very difficult question to answer; at present they are openly broken.

299. Do you think that the people whom you saw in these hotels should be amenable to the law as well as the hotelkeepers?—Undoubtedly they should.

300. At the present time they are not, unless they falsely describe themselves to be *bona fide* travellers?—I never heard a question asked about travellers the whole night.

301. You think the law should make those people amenable?—They should not be allowed to go in these houses. The very fact of a man being allowed to go into licensed houses is an inducement to the landlord to supply them with liquor.

302. If that is the law at present, you think it should be altered?—Yes, in some way.

303. You spoke about the police apparently being under some sort of restraint?—I said that was my impression, and that it was widespread.

304. How can you reconcile that statement with the fact that last year over twenty prosecutions were instituted by police under the licensing law in Christchurch?—I should imagine last year was a successful year; it was not for want of opportunities that there were not forty prosecutions.

305. Do you think if your suggestion was carried to a logical conclusion, that instead of there being twenty prosecutions there would have been none at all?—It is a very difficult subject; I cannot say at all. I may say there is a determination on the part of a class of the population to obtain drink on Sunday; they know if they do so they are breaking the law, but they are under the impression it is not a moral wrong.

306. And you realise that, in any legislation to which a great section of the public is opposed, it is always very difficult to carry it out, is it not?—Yes.

307. And that applies more particularly to the licensing laws?—Yes. My opinions were very considerably modified by my experience on that Sunday night. I saw more difficulties than I ever thought of before.

308. You do admit of difficulties in the way of the police carrying out the laws?—Yes.

309. Of course, you take it that these conditions prevail up to the present?—I can only speak of that particular Sunday night. I am not speaking of anything previous or since.

310. *Colonel Pitt.*] How long have you resided in Christchurch?—Nearly twenty years.

311. As a result of your observation, are you of opinion that the Police Force is numerically sufficient in Christchurch?—I think it is miserably insufficient in numbers. I say that, because I have had continual representations from local bodies in my own electorate, and in the vicinity, asking me to see the Minister of Defence with regard to stationing a constable here, and a constable there, and complaining generally that they wanted a larger measure of protection than they received. There are not enough policemen. I always refer these matters to the Minister.

312. *The Chairman.*] I would like to know whether your present observation was limited to that night?—Yes, altogether.

313. Now, with regard to other breaches of the law. Our attention has been so much directed to this one particular statute affecting the liquor traffic, and the men telling us were of your opinion. Is the work of the police not done in as efficient a manner with regard to the Licensing Act as it is with any other offences which are upon the statute-book?—Outside the question of licensed houses, I should say that the police generally do their work in an efficient manner, so far as I know, and it should be taken into account that the duties of the police have been considerably increased by legislation in late years. That is often lost sight of. We are putting more work upon the police, and not increasing their numbers.

314. I understand there is no constable stationed at Belfast, nor at New Brighton?—I have had bitter complaints from New Brighton, and Sumner.

315. The resident population at New Brighton is many times greater than the resident population at Sumner?—There would be a difference of opinion between New Brighton and Sumner on this. The population of New Brighton by the last census was about nine hundred or a thousand; but it is largely increased daily by visitors.

316. Do you happen to know what is the population of Belfast?—The population of the actual census district, in which Belfast was included at the last census, was about six hundred.

317. We were informed it was 3,000?—That would take in a fairly wide district.

318. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you tell me whether the larrikin element is a nuisance in Christchurch, to your knowledge?—I may say, with regard to that, that I think there is a large section of the young people of both sexes who are in a state of demoralisation, and that they are becoming something little short of a public nuisance.

319. Do you think that the Police Force requires to be strengthened in numbers in Christchurch to cope with that?—Not only with that, but with other subjects.

320. *The Chairman.*] In your opinion, the Force of the city and out-stations requires numerical increase?—Yes.

321. *Mr. Taylor.*] You referred to one particularly busy hotel; can you give us an estimate of the number in it?—It was particularly crowded, and I should say there were fully one hundred persons present, and probably more in the passages and the bar. We had to force our way through to get to the counter.

322. *The Chairman.*] Was that any special Sunday?—It was in the summer time, and the weather was warm.

323. Any festival on that Sunday?—No, it was not a holiday.

324. *Mr. Taylor.*] It was not for want of opportunities there were not forty prosecutions, you say; do you not think there could have been four hundred, if the police had been vigilant, in a city of this size?—Well, I should not like to say that, because there are about forty or fifty hotels within the limits of Christchurch, and four hundred convictions would mean eight prosecutions of each house in the year, and they would not expose themselves to that extent.

325. There are fifty-two Sundays in the year?—Yes; I suppose there are fifty-two opportunities to sell liquor.

326. Is not your use of the number "forty" quite figurative?—I suppose it is; I wish to keep under the limit.

327. Have you any objection to give the names of these houses?—I would not give the names of the hotels, nor of my companions.

JOHN WILLIAM SIMMS, examined on oath]

328. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Printer, residing in Christchurch at present.

329. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you not in the North Island in 1894?—Yes.

330. Where?—In Wellington I was stationed.

331. Were you arrested by Sergeant McArdle?—At his instigation.

332. On a warrant from Masterton?—Yes.

333. At McArdle's instigation?—Yes.

334. Were you remanded to Masterton?—Yes.

335. What took place when you got to Masterton?—It was a case of the larceny of a coat, which was sold to a second-hand dealer; and he took me in front of the sergeant and told him distinctly that I was not the man who sold the coat, and, in the face of this, the sergeant went on with the proceedings. The case was ultimately dismissed.

336. *The Chairman.*] You suggest the sergeant should have discharged you on the man making that statement?—I thought that was sufficient grounds.

337. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was the case heard before a Magistrate?—Yes.

338. And were you discharged?—Yes.

339. Did the Magistrate make any comment on the case?—Yes; he said that the evidence had completely broken down, and that it was a case of mistaken identity; and he dismissed the case, at which there was some applause in the Court.

340. Did you suffer any loss by it?—Yes; it meant a matter of between £50 and £60 I estimated my loss, as I was to go to work; and, in having to go to Masterton, the man would not wait for me and I lost the employment.

341. Did you petition the House for redress?—Yes.

342. What was the result?—They allowed my travelling and legal expenses that I had incurred.

343. Is this a copy of the report of the Petitions Committee in the House? It is as follows?—

ABSTRACT of Report of the Public Petitions M to Z Committee of the House of Representatives on the Petition of John William Simms, of Wellington.

THAT the attention of the Hon. the Minister of Defence should be drawn to the action of Sergeant McArdle, of Masterton—in pressing the prosecution of petitioner at Masterton, on 11th May, 1894, when the Stipendiary Magistrate, after hearing the evidence, dismissed the case—and check the evident over-zeal of the police, which in this case has resulted in great loss and injury to the character of the petitioner, which loss appears to this Committee to be without any remedy.

5th September, 1894.

GEORGE FRIEND,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

344. I would like to ask whether you have been in any hotels in Christchurch at the same time as police-officers have been there?—Yes.

345. Will you tell the Commission under what circumstances?—It was off a passage between the *Lyttelton Times* office, in Gloucester Street, and the Central Hotel.

346. The passage runs from Gloucester Street to the Square?—Yes, and the passage from the right-of-way runs up towards the river.

347. Was it on a week-day or a Sunday?—It was near midnight, either on a Saturday or Sunday.

348. When?—In the autumn of 1893.

349. Tell us exactly what happened?—I was invited with a friend to go in and partake of liquor. I was taken into this hotel. I did not know my way there, and I found myself in an underground bar; and to my surprise, when I entered this bar, I saw two police-officers at the bar. I went back, not knowing what was wrong, and informed my friend, who had stopped for a moment to speak to some one just outside the door. I told them that there were two police-officers in the bar. He came in to look, and then we both went in.

350. Were they at the bar?—Yes, during the whole time we were there.

351. Did you order drinks?—Yes; and we retired and left them there.

352. *The Chairman.*] What were they doing?—They were drinking.

353. You saw them?—I saw glasses in front of them, but I did not see them put them to their lips.

354. *Mr. Taylor.*] They were quite at home there?—Yes; there were several people there.

355. Were these men in uniform?—Yes, decidedly, or else I would not have known them.

356. They did not seem so nervous of you, as you of them?—Not at all.

357. Have you on other occasions seen police-officers in a state of intoxication?—Yes, in Wellington. I was going ashore one night from the steamer "Brunner," from Nelson.

358. What date?—About 1890, as near as I can remember. At the bottom of Cuba Street, or where Manners Street intersects Cuba Street, I was stopped by two policemen, who wanted to know what my luggage contained, and one of them was well on in the first stage of drunkenness.

359. *The Chairman.*] What time was this?—About 1 o'clock in the morning. I opened up my luggage; and the one who was sober could see what it was, and I was allowed to pass on after giving my name, and stating where I lived, and all particulars.

360. One of these was evidently in the first stage of drunkenness?—Yes, he had been drinking.

361. And the other was sober?—Yes.

362. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Who gave evidence against you at Masterton?—Well, if you could call it evidence.

363. Witnesses were called, were they not?—Yes.

364. Who was that?—The man who sold the overcoat.

365. Was not the owner of the coat called?—No.

366. Who was the owner of the overcoat?—That I cannot tell you now. He was a farmer in one of the outlying districts outside Masterton.

367. You mean to say he was not in the Court?—Not to my knowledge.

368. He was not called to give evidence?—No.

369. Not to prove the loss of it?—No, I did not see him there, nor hear of it.

370. Did you hear the evidence taken?—Yes, all of it.

371. And do you say, or is your memory defective, that the only witness called in the Court was the man by whom the overcoat was sold?—No, another man, the cook of the hotel where I was staying, he was called.

372. What was the nature of his evidence?—He stated when I came to the hotel where he was cook, and when I went away.

373. Was there any evidence proving that the coat had been stolen?—Yes.

374. Who gave that evidence?—I understand the man who lost the overcoat laid an information to the police.

375. Was not that man there to confirm that evidence in your presence?—Not to my knowledge. He was not up in the witness-box while I was there.

376. How did the sergeant open the case to the Magistrate? Did he tell him it was a case of mistaken identity, or that he had reason to believe it was a case of mistaken identity?—No, he went right through with it.

377. Then, a sworn information was laid by the man who lost the overcoat?—I suppose he reported the loss of his overcoat at the police-station, and they went to find out where the overcoat was, and found it at the second-hand dealer's.

378. You mean to say there was no evidence of the loss of the coat given when you were there?—I did not know the owner of the coat.

379. Is your recollection of the case so clear that you are satisfied now he was not called to prove the loss; or might he have been called, and you have forgotten it in the confusion of the time?—That may be so; I have no recollection of it.

380. At any rate, you are clear there was a warrant issued?—I had papers given to me by a detective, who came to my house at 10 o'clock.

381. You said you were arrested on a warrant?—No.

382. As regards these two constables you saw in an underground bar, do you know the names or numbers of these two constables?—No; I did not take as much notice of them as that.

383. When did you first make any reference to this to any person?—I do not know; I have not disguised the matter from any one who asked me.

384. Can you say to whom you first made any statement which has brought about your attendance at this Commission?—I have told my mother and father about it, for one.

385. Did they tell Mr. Taylor?—No.

386. Who told Mr. Taylor?—I told him about it.

387. When?—About a month ago.

388. Did you at the same time tell him about the constable who was in the first stage of drunkenness, in Wellington, in 1890?—I told him that too.

389. Then, you allow this thing to go on for about seven or eight years, and then bring it up?—I did not think it was of any importance; otherwise, if I had thought it was important, I should have divulged it sooner.

390. You are about a good deal at night?—No, I am not.

391. You are connected with the newspaper trade?—I am a jobbing printer.

392. Does your business not take you out much at night?—Certainly not.

393. You have come here now and given your experience of the drinking habits of the police?—Yes, one.

394. How long have you been in the colony?—Since 1857.

395. And the sum total of your experience, as given to-day, are these two cases?—Yes.

MONDAY, 25TH APRIL, 1898.

GEORGE SPENCER FLEMING, examined on oath.

1. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—George Spencer Fleming.

2. Where do you live?—Port Levy.

3. You are a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

4. How long have you been in the colony?—Forty-seven years.

5. *Mr. Weston.*] You possess a large stake in the country?—Yes.

5A. *Mr. Weston:* Before going into the specific charges you have made, I would like you to address the Commissioners on your views in regard to the administration of the Force, and the conduct of the police, and so forth, generally.

Witness: I wish to say that I think the police should be on the same footing as any other labourer. The policeman is a labourer when he first enters the Force.

6. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you mean he should be on the same footing as regards pay?—Yes. The Chairmen of the County Councils and Road Boards should be consulted as to what they pay labouring men, and the police should receive the same wage; and as they go on in the service they should be given increases in pay.

7. *Mr. Weston.*] What do you think should be paid to start with?—We only pay 5s. to a labourer in the country, and that does not carry with it any doctor's attendance, any pension, or any free clothes, and some men getting that are able to save £40 a year. I can mention two or three men who are putting that sum by.

8. As the police prove their efficiency, you would advocate promotion, with increased pay?—Yes.

9. Do you think 7s. would be sufficient to start with?—I say the pay should be 5s., 6s., 7s., and 8s. That is what the labouring men all over the colony get.

10. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that pay should be general throughout the colony?—Yes.

11. What class of labourer is paid 5s.?—County Council and Road Board laborers get that. At Port Levy we can get hundreds at that rate.

12. *Mr. Weston.*] If that was sufficient for men in the country, what should be given to constables in town, where the expenses are heavier?—Well, I think that in town a house might be got for almost nothing now. They are not so dear as they were some years ago.

13. As regards marriage, do you advocate the appointment of married men or single men?—I think single men should be employed in some cases; but at Little River, for instance, where Constable Ryan is, it would be better to have a married man. In Christchurch, I think, single men should be employed. As far as age is concerned, I think fifty should be the limit of service.

14. In your opinion, as a man of observation, do you think there are enough constables in the Canterbury district?—I think one should be appointed at New Brighton. Christchurch has sufficient, I think. In Inspector Broham's evidence he said there were more police some years ago for half the number of the present population; but it has to be remembered that in the old days there were "lags," or ticket-of-leave men, about who wanted looking after. Twenty years ago at Akaroa five hotels were burned down, and two were set on fire, and one of them set fire to again; but no offence was proved against any one, although one man was arrested. This man was discharged. I do not think that that shows that the police were better in those days than they are now.

15. The perpetrators were not discovered?—No. The principal thing they did in those days was to look after the runaway sailors, and now they look after the publican and the prostitute. As for changing, I believe in the country constable being changed every five or seven years. He does not like to arrest a man of whom he has made a friend. In towns I do not think it is necessary to change the police unless they make enemies. The Inspector and the chief detective should stay in the one place as long as possible.

16. Are the country constables likely to be prejudiced through their associations with the people around?—I have not found it in my district. Constables Ryan and Lamb were in my district, and we could not have had better men.

17. You think they maintained the true and right position that a constable should assume?—Yes, I think so. I think they were a little careless, perhaps, when I lost my sheep. I do not think they took the trouble to find them that they should have taken; but that is the fault of the system, and not of the policemen.

18. Have you had occasion to complain of the absence of energy on the part of the police department in this district?—Christchurch?

19. The whole district?—Perhaps in some cases they are too vigilant.

20. But in other cases?—They are a little careless. I mean that they would not follow up a case. In the Akaroa case, for instance, which I have mentioned, they should have followed it up to the present day.

21. In sheep-stealing cases do you think they have shown an absence of energy?—I think so. Out of some thousands of sheep that have disappeared in the last few years they have suspicions of no one, so far as I know. I lost some sheep myself, and I reported the matter to Constable Ryan and also to the station, but I do not know that any inquiries were made about the matter.

22. Does that apply exclusively to your own sheep, or to the sheep of others?—To others as well. Randall's cattle were stolen about two years before mine, and I am frequently losing sheep. I lost five hundred one year, and eight hundred another year. Buchanan lost a thousand sheep, and Menzies lost the same number. I afterwards saw one of my stolen sheep in the Addington saleyards. It had peculiar hind-legs, such as I had never seen before, and I knew it by that; but I did not have it registered.

23. Do you think that with a capable Force the perpetrators of these offences would have been discovered?—I think so.

24. *The Chairman.*] These losses extended over what period?—About four years. Every time I leave sheep at Addington I lose some. At one time it was a common thing to leave them a day or two, and I always found I was a couple short. When I spoke to the Inspector he thought it was impossible to steal sheep off the Peninsula, but it is not.

25. Who was the Inspector?—Inspector Broham.

25A. How would you proceed to bring home the crime?—There are several ways. In some cases sheep are lost through people sending a man to the wrong paddock for their sheep; and perhaps the man is at Timaru before you find out that you have lost them. In another case a dog might cut a dozen sheep out of your flock, and you would not miss them; or a man might go into any paddock and take out some sheep, and there is nothing to show that they are stolen. The owner might think it was his own men who had taken some away.

26. What action should the police take to prevent that?—I think police vigilance would stop it.

27. If a policeman had been on duty at the paddock from which the man took the wrong sheep how would he know the man was going to the wrong paddock?—He would not know; but the thing would leak out. For instance, I lost some wire netting some time ago, but I would not put the matter into the hands of the police, yet I found out who stole it. I will tell you how I found out. A servant of mine told me that two men suspected of the offence had been drinking in a hotel, and they had a row, and one man said to the other, "I will split on you about that wire you stole from Cashmere." Detective O'Neill was working the case up, and although he was satisfied it was my wire he could not bring home a case against the men.

28. Do you suggest that that was negligence?—No; but I say that if a policeman had been drinking about the hotel he would have heard that statement. I think the Government should offer a good reward for evidence as to the sheep-stealing, or a free pardon to the offender. If the Government will not do that I will give £500 myself, and I am sure that within three months there will be some one forward with Queen's evidence. I think the only way the "horse fiend" will be caught will be through a servant-girl. He must have used a hair pin, or a wire, because he stabs the horse near the heart.

29. What do you suggest that the police should do to discover the perpetrator of that crime?—I think £100 ought to be given to the servant-girl who will give evidence as to the wire.

30. If the girl gives the information that leads to a conviction she will get the reward of £500 now offered?—But she might be frightened, and think she will get the wire stuck into her.

31. Do you think the Force should be increased to enable the police to deal with these crimes?—No. I think that in my district, for instance, Constable Ryan is enough.

32. *Mr. Weston.*] When you missed the sheep, you saw Inspector Broham. How did he receive you?—I thought he was rather arrogant and bounceable. I will own that I made a mistake when I went to him. I told him I had no shepherds; although I have 20,000 sheep, and 7,000 acres. I call them all "labourers," but we are really all shepherds on the estate. Inspector Broham then said, "I expect you wish me to shepherd your sheep."

33. Is that your sole evidence for attributing arrogance and bouncefulness to Inspector Broham?—Yes. He also said that people were always going to him about sheep-stealing. In my case I did not report my loss to him until the following year.

34. Now, there is another point about which you wish to address the Commissioners—as to the hats the constables wear?—Yes. I am not good at detecting the number on a detective's hat, and I think the number should be put in the front, where it will be seen, so that if any one is having a row with a constable, he will be able to detect the number.

35. You have recently been Home, have you not?—Yes, and I think the London Police are the smartest I have seen in my life.

36. What do you think of the physique of our police?—I would have any of our population as police?—There is George Robertson, weighing 17 stone, and, although he threw Donald Dinnie, a man of 10 stone threw him.

37. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that small men would be of use in the Force?—Yes, I weigh 14 stone, and I know that there are 10 stone men who can thrash me. I can tell a policeman a mile away from my place, just on account of the upright way they walk, and on account of their size. If you had a little fellow, however, about 10 stone, and standing 5 ft. 6 in., you would not suspect him of being a policeman.

38. You think there should be some variety among the police?—Yes; any man, as long as he is strong.

39. *Mr. Weston.*] What is your opinion with regard to the franchise?—I believe in a free country, and in every man doing as he likes. I would allow every policeman to have a vote, and his wife too.

40. What is your opinion about the detective service?—I think a detective should be a long time in a place, as it takes a long time to get up to the run of the ropes. There is no man in Christchurch knows the run of things better than Detective Feast.

41. Do you think that the Detective Force generally is sufficient?—I think the detectives ought to have brought home to the offenders that case of mine as to the wire-netting, seeing that the man admitted it. It could have been got out of him in some way.

42. What do you say about the detectives stationed at Christchurch?—I do not know them. I think that as a constable Fitzgerald was good. As to the statements written by the detectives, I think the party charged should himself write it, and not the detective. The plain facts would then be written, whereas the detective might make it appear as something very different.

43. In other words, the practice of taking down evidence is objectionable, as the constables might write more than the witness had stated?—Yes, and add a little more.

44. Have you anything more to say about the Detective Department?—I do not know all the detectives, but I think they should be smarter than they are. It is a business that is born in a man.

45. As to night duty, do you think that the eight hours' work is too hard on a man for fourteen nights in succession?—I have never tried it.

46. But do you think the eight hours' duty is too much without relief?—No, I do not think so. On a wet, cold night it is perhaps not a pleasant job, but there are worse things. I would like to say that I would not object to a constable having a "nip" on a cold night. I believe it prevents a man from taking cold.

47. *The Chairman.*] Do you know they are not prohibited from taking a drop of whiskey at night if they carry it with them?—I think it would do them good to go to the public-house.

48. But the houses are closed?—I understand they can get in by giving the policeman's knock.

49. *Mr. Weston.*] You think that up to the hour of closing a constable should be allowed to occasionally enter a publichouse?—I think it is the only way you can get to understand the public-house. That is why the temperance people do not understand the publichouse question, because they never go to them.

50. What are your views in regard to the administration of the licensing laws? Have you found excessive drinking on Sundays in the hotels?—I have travelled pretty well all over New Zealand, and I have never seen a bad house yet. I have seen men drinking, but it is hard to say whether a man is a traveller or not.

51. Are the hotels in New Zealand managed properly and creditably?—Yes. I would sleep in any hotel in New Zealand, and feel safe.

52. Have you seen much Sunday trading?—I have seen some, but the persons drinking might have been travellers.

53. As an old settler, and as a Justice of the Peace, do you consider that the Prohibitionists are rather extravagant in regard to their views, as to the management of hotels and Sunday trading?—Yes, I think so.

54. *The Chairman.*] Do you say the police watch the hotels to the exclusion of other duties?—Yes. They might watch the hotels less, and other things more.

55. *Mr. Weston.*] And you think the police should enter the hotels occasionally, to see that the law is not infringed?—Yes.

56. In regard to gambling among the people, do you consider there is any occasion for further legislation, or further interference on the part of the police to prevent it?—I never gamble, and I never see it. I have seen people playing cards in a publichouse, but that was only in passing through. I do not know to what extent it was carried on, and they may not have been playing for money.

57. What is your view in regard to the manner in which the police deal with larrikinism?—I think it is better now than it was four or five years ago. I know that, on one occasion, a policeman saw a larrikin spit on a girl's dress, and follow her along the street, still spitting on it, but he did not arrest him.

58. As a matter of fact, the police admitted that the larrikin followed the girl?—Yes; it was in Hereford Street.

59. When was this?—About ten years ago—when Jonathan Roberts escaped.

60. What about larrikinism in the park?—I do not know anything about it.

61. As a Justice of the Peace, do you think that a policeman should be permitted to act as Clerk of Court?—If he has nothing else to do, he should.

62. Would it be interfering with his duties as a policeman?—I do not think it would. Constable Ryan, in my district, understands the Police Offences Act, and could act with advantage. Where the people are quiet, a constable might take up the duties. The offices of Inspector of Slaughterhouses and Dog-tax Collector might also be given to him, as it would assist him to find out things about the country. It leads him into places that he would not otherwise go to.

63. So that, notwithstanding what the Prohibitionists or any one might say to the contrary, you advocate the occasional if not frequent entrance of the police to the publichouses?—Yes; and if he took to drink he could be dismissed.

64. I believe you entertain very strong opinions in regard to the manner in which the police treat the unfortunate women of the town?—I think they are too hard on them; and I think they do not know the law on the matter, not even Inspector Cullen. They think a policeman can go in at any time without a warrant, but that is not so.

65. What are your views, and what complaints have you to prefer, against the administration in that respect?—I think the unfortunates are few, and if they wish to protect themselves against the police they would need to employ three or four “chuckers-out.”

66. You think the police should not enter the house without warrant?—No; not unless there is a disturbance going on.

67. As a matter of fact, do the constables enter these houses without warrant?—I have seen them, and I could bring forty women to say so.

68. It is generally understood?—Yes.

69. *The Chairman.*] You say it is unjustifiable, and that your view is supported by a legal opinion which you have received?—Yes.

70. *Mr. Weston.*] Are these unfortunate women, in your opinion, unduly interfered with in the public streets?—I have not seen it; but there are cases coming before the Commission to show that.

71. Do you think the police give proper attention to the public sales, and are sufficiently represented there to keep order?—At Darfield I saw a sale as large as a sale at Addington, and there was no policeman there. I know a man who was there who gets drunk with one glass of drink, and two drinks will make him fall off his horse. Some men of that kind want more looking after than they get. I believe a policeman was at Darfield part of the day, but not all the day. In the interval he may have been away on other duties. At picnics there is apt to be a disturbance sometimes, and I would like to see a policeman go with every picnic party. In Constable Ryan's district it would be better for him to be at any picnic than at a place like Little River. He should go anywhere where there is a big gathering of people.

72. As a matter of fact, Port Levy is a favourite resort for picnics?—Yes, Port Levy and Purau.

73. You think the police should be at public picnics?—Yes; and I would like to see them at private ones as well.

74. Do you complain of Constable Ryan's absence from public gatherings at Port Levy?—No. I have asked him to come to large gatherings at my place, and he has failed to come. There was a gathering once at which a man was stabbed, and I thought after that that the police should be there.

75. Is there any other point on which you wish to address the Commissioners?—I do not know whether it is lawful for bicyclists to go on the wrong side of the road, but it is very annoying to citizens.

76. You think the police should see that the rules of the road are observed by bicyclists?—Yes.

77. Do you consider that the police should be supplied with bicycles?—I think they should. It would mean that they would do twice the amount of work that they do now.

78. Is there anything else you wish to speak about?—I think that in front of Tattersall's the people should be moved on on a Saturday night. It would be better. In some places the police are too vigilant, and do not use any discretion between dealing with the citizen and the larrikin, as they should.

79. You have reason to complain?—Yes. Once I was going into Burke's Hotel with a little bag in my hand, and a policeman asked me what I had in it. This was at night. I said he could look and see. He looked, and found there was nothing but a pair of boots, which I had had on at a dance that night. I spoke to him pretty freely, as to what I thought of his conduct, for treating me like that.

80. Is that the only occasion on which they were too vigilant with you?—On another occasion when I could not get in at the door of the hotel—it was bolted, by mistake, inside—a policeman spoke to me; but I satisfied him that I was one of the lodgers of the house, and I had no trouble with him. On another occasion, after a party at Hobbs's Buildings, I was taking some liquor to the hotel from the building, and three policemen asked me what I had.

81. *The Chairman.*] You do not find fault with them for doing that, do you?—No; but what I say is that if I thought a man was a burglar I would follow him, if I was a policeman.

82. Do you not know that men are often caught in that way with stolen goods in their possession?—Yes, that is so; but if the men had been followed, the whole nest of them would have been found.

83. *Mr. Weston.*] In these complaints you have indirectly made against the police you are not actuated by any ill-feeling?—No; I do not know one of them, except Fitzgerald.

84. Now, have you anything more to say about your charge against Constable Ryan—that he failed to be at the gathering at your place in accordance with promise?—I understood that, as a Justice of the Peace, if I ask him to come he is bound to come.

85. *The Chairman.*] The usual course, and the proper course, if a Justice of the Peace considers it necessary to have the attendance of a constable anywhere, is to communicate with the Inspector, who will direct that a constable should be there?—Yes. I only wish him to arrest any man at the gathering if there should be a disturbance.

86. *Mr. Weston.*] Is that all you have to say in regard to that charge?—Yes.

87. Then, what have you to say against Constable Ryan for vexatiously requiring you to make unnecessary alterations to your woolshed?—It might have been under the Act that he acted, but the house was better before it was altered than afterwards.

88. *The Chairman.*] The complaint was against the accommodation?—Yes.
89. *Mr. Weston.*] Before you received the notice what was the accommodation?—It is a building 30 ft. by 40 ft., and there were store-room, dining-room, and kitchen. There was another room for the Maoris to sleep in and to have their meals in. Upstairs there were three rooms where the shearers slept. A room in the centre did not have a window, and I got notice to put a window in it. We had to take all the partitions out of the upstairs part and make it one large room.
90. *The Chairman.*] Did you appeal to the Magistrate against the orders he gave you?—No.
91. You know that was the proper course?—No, I did not know. There were some men in occupation of the shed that year, and I thought I was not liable. The men did not complain.
92. *Mr. Weston.*] Then, you charge the police with neglect about two years ago in discovering those people who stole 2,000 of your sheep depasturing at Kaituna; a number of sheep belonging to one Hugh Buchanan, at Little River; 300 cattle belonging to one Randall, of Akaroa Heads; and 1,000 sheep belonging to Mr. Menzies, of Macintosh Bay. About two years ago you had a flock of sheep on your place, had you?—Yes, it was about three years ago.
93. What was the size of the flock?—I think that, with the lambs, I had 20,000.
94. Did you miss any sheep?—Five hundred in the first year.
95. Did you report the loss to the police?—I am not sure whether I did or not.
96. The next year you lost—how many?—Eight hundred, and I reported it to the police.
97. Whom did you see?—I saw Inspector Broham, at Christchurch.
98. What did you tell him?—I told him that I had lost some sheep.
99. How did he receive you?—He seemed to get rather out of temper, and said that it was impossible to steal the sheep.
100. Was he bounceable and arrogant?—Yes; but it was to some extent my fault, as I said I had no shepherd.
101. What was the result of your visit?—Constable Ryan came to my place soon after to see about the sheep.
102. When Constable Ryan came to you, what was done?—We arranged to meet on the ground at Mr. Field's, where the sheep were, and when we met there we went over the ground looking at the fences. Then, we met at Field's house in Kaituna.
103. What then?—We did not know what to do, and nothing definite was done. Then I went home.
104. Was anything heard after that of the police inquiry?—I heard of nothing. I went to Leeston, and saw Constable McCormack, thinking the sheep might have been driven through that district.
105. And the matter was allowed to drop?—I think so.
106. At any rate, that is your view of the case?—Yes.
107. And that is the ground of your complaint?—Yes. I think if the police took as much trouble about a case of that kind, as they do about the publichouses, they would find some of these sheep-stealers. I refer now to the country police.
108. Did you report the third loss to the police?—I was not so sure about it. I had some sheep, including cull lambs, on Mount Herbert, and among them was this peculiar sheep.
109. *Colonel Pitt.*] How many did you lose?—Three hundred or four hundred were short when I got them in; but, of course, I could not say how many had died.
110. *Mr. Weston.*] How many were stolen?—I think about three hundred; but sheep always come in short.
111. When you found this peculiar sheep in the auction yard, did you communicate with the police about it?—Detective Benjamin went to the yards every day after I made my report to the police.
112. *The Chairman.*] That was something that was done, then, in consequence of what you stated to the Inspector?—Yes.
113. *Mr. Weston.*] From that time to the present have the police communicated with you in any way in regard to the losses you have referred to?—No. I have received nothing official.
114. And further inquiries have not been made from you?—No. As to the peculiar sheep I saw at Addington, I may say the reason I did not follow it up was that it did not have my registered earmark on it.
115. Then, you have another complaint against Constable Ryan—that on the 25th May, 1896, at Port Levy, he did not take sufficient trouble to investigate a charge made by you to him against one Spain, for drawing a knife and assaulting a man named Janson. What have you to say about that?—It was a big disturbance, but it came to nothing. I swore in special constables.
116. What were the circumstances?—The trouble arose at my woolshed.
117. You had a large party there?—Yes. I invited the people to come on the night before the Queen's Birthday and have a dance, to be followed next day by a picnic and shooting party, and there were about two hundred came. Five of us got up the affair—it was a kind of bachelor's ball. I had a case of whiskey, and a neighbour brought eight bottles of whiskey, and there might have been half a dozen of wine. All the rest of the drink was temperance drink.
118. Was there a disturbance that evening?—Towards morning the man Spain got a bit rowdy. He was not supposed to be there at all; but, as there was a misunderstanding among the men I had arranged to do the waiting, they did not come, and when Spain offered his services I took him, and he did very well. He had evidently been at it before. It was to be a sort of a "swell" dance that night, and on the next night the men were to have a dance of their own. I was not there when Spain made the disturbance. The window of the store-room was broken in, and later on the door was burst in. Well, at 3 in the morning Spain got rowdy, and some of the men asked him to be quiet. I would like to say that the dance was all right on the first night. It was the men's night that was rowdy. I was actually on my way to the

place when I was met by a boy, who told me there had been a row among the Russian Finns at the woolshed, and that one man had drawn a knife. There were English, Irish, and Finns, and others in the crowd. Before I went in the building I swore in a Finn as a special constable, and told him he had the power of a constable to arrest. I also swore in a Maori and an Irishman. I did not go through any form with them; I did not know it. I simply said to them that they would act as special constables.

119. Now, tell us what Spain did?—Spain went quietly away from the building, and I put the lights out. Next morning I saw Constable Ryan, and Spain was arrested by him for breaking my furniture.

120. Did Spain draw a knife?—I do not think he did.

121. You charge Constable Ryan with not taking sufficient trouble to investigate a charge made by you to him against Spain, for drawing a knife and assaulting a man named Janson?—Then, perhaps, I should only say assaulting Janson; but I will leave it to the witnesses to say.

122. What became of Spain?—There was a case in the Magistrate's Court next day, and he was fined £1. I was so disgusted with the small amount that I paid it myself.

123. And what do you blame Ryan for?—He did not think the case was serious, and he did not think the man was a bad character.

124. But Ryan had him punished? Do you say that Ryan should have preferred a graver charge against Spain, or that he should have preferred an additional charge against him of breaking your property?—I do not know how the law stands.

125. *Mr. Poynton.*] You told the whole story to the Justices, and they fined him £1?—Yes.

126. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think that Constable Ryan failed in his duty in not working up a case on a graver charge?—Yes, that is what I want to show. The man was taken away from my place late at night, and was tried at 10 o'clock next morning.

127. *Constable Ryan.*] Do you remember when you reported the case to me?—Yes.

128. Do you recollect the report you made?—I tried to explain the matter as well as I could.

129. Did you say that a knife was used?—I will leave that to the witnesses to say.

130. *Mr. Poynton.*] Have you any recollection of saying that Spain used a knife?—I said there was a row among the Finns; and he understands them as well I do. He knows they are very quarrelsome, and that they will kill a man as soon as look at him.

131. *Constable Ryan.*] But you will not say you told me that a knife was used?—I will not say I did.

132. What did the damage amount to?—It was not much. The amount was 8s.

133. You explained the matter in your evidence before the Justices?—Yes.

134. Do you remember that at the hearing of the case you showed a certain amount of animus against the man?—I thought I was rather in favour of the man than otherwise.

135. Were you not rebuked by the Magistrates for the way you were pressing the case?—No. I felt rather sorry for him, and that is why I paid the fine.

HUGH BUCHANAN, examined on oath.

136. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Hugh Buchanan.

137. *Mr. Weston.*] You live at Little River?—Yes.

138. You have a large station?—Yes.

139. You are a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

140. And an old resident?—Yes.

141. Have you at any time lost sheep from your estate?—Yes; but, as far as the police are concerned, they know nothing about it.

142. You have not made a complaint?—No. I employed my own labour to find out about it.

143. *Constable Ryan.*] Do you remember attending the Court in the case against Spain?—Yes. I will state the facts of the case to you. I think the charge was drunkenness, and breaking property to the extent of 8s. The case was heard at Little River, before Mr. Coop and myself. Mr. Fleming gave a good deal of evidence in the case. To save time I may say at once that, during the hearing of the case, he never mentioned that a knife had been drawn. Mr. Fleming impressed on the Bench the necessity of inflicting imprisonment for the offence, and I think he was told by the Bench that he was nearly as much to blame as the man himself. I think Spain was fined £1, but I am not sure about the amount.

144. *Colonel Pitt.*] Why did the Bench think that he was as much to blame as the man?—Because the liquor was practically left in charge of Spain, who was one of the waiters.

JOHN HENRY MENZIES, examined on oath.

145. *Mr. Weston.*] What is your name?—John Henry Menzies.

146. Where do you live?—At Macintosh Bay.

147. You are a sheep-farmer?—Yes.

148. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—I am.

149. Some time ago, I think, you lost a number of sheep?—About two years ago.

150. How many?—About 750. That is to say, I was short that number out of 2,000. It was a remarkable case, because they were wet ewes. The lambs were separated from the ewes, and the ewes were taken away. The 2,000 ewes had 2,000 lambs, because all the dry ewes had been taken out. They were then put into three paddocks, and when they were counted the lambs were there, but the 750 ewes were gone.

151. On missing these sheep, did you make a complaint to the police?—I communicated with Inspector Broham.

152. By letter?—Personally. It was some time after the loss that I saw him. The time of the loss was uncertain. It was when culling that the loss appeared.

153. What did the Inspector say?—He could say very little, as far as I could see. If I remember rightly, he told me that his force of detectives was at a very low ebb, and I was sorry to hear it; but he said he would do anything he could. He did all he could for me.

154. In what way did he act?—I cannot tell you. It was more or less in the nature of a secret inquiry.

155. *Mr. Poynton.*] Have you reason to be dissatisfied with the action he took?—No. I took strong action myself as well, by placing a man on the spot, and since then I have lost no sheep.

156. *Mr. Weston.*] So you think that the sheep-farmers can to a large extent protect themselves?—No, I think not. I think that our position is this: We are being robbed daily. Other people are being robbed now. A few bullocks and 50 sheep are constantly being taken away. I think that an organized gang, living probably some distance from the Peninsula, came in considerable numbers, and took the sheep away when there was no one there.

157. *The Chairman.*] Do you say it continues?—I have lost none, because I have a watch constantly on the spot.

158. Do you think it is continuing?—I think it is. From what I hear there was an idea that the proper course was to say nothing—to grin and bear it; but that was not my opinion.

159. What steps do you think should be taken by the Police Department to cope with this evil?—As far as we are concerned, if possible a watch ought to be placed at Little River. Every driver who is not a well-known man ought to be inspected. If possible, every driver who is employed by dealers should carry some kind of character with him, or some notice, and if an unknown man is seen driving sheep he ought to be questioned.

160. Does not every driver have a driver's certificate?—I cannot tell you. Numbers of owners drive their own sheep; but the greater number of the sheep are driven by dealers. If I met a man with a certificate I would have every confidence that those sheep were driven fairly.

161. Should the Police Department take specific action to meet the difficulty?—If urgently needed, detectives should be employed; and the local police should have means of keeping an eye on people they do not know. It is a crying evil, and it is going on now, and the loss is considerable. In my own case it was a loss of over £300.

162. *Mr. Weston.*] As a Justice of the Peace, apart from your calling as a sheep-farmer, do you consider that the Police and the Detective Forces are sufficient in number in this district?—I do not know anything about the Detective Force except what Inspector Broham told me, but I consider that the police in our district are just as good and no better than the police in most other places. As a rule, they have no special knowledge of sheep, and cannot, therefore, be expected to understand the question in the same way as a man who has. If a detective is employed, he should be a specially adapted person. In several cases the Inspectors of sheep have done a good deal of good, and have detected sheep-stealing in consequence of being experts.

163. Would you advocate the swearing-in of specialists in some cases?—It might be useful in some districts. But I should especially look on the drivers of sheep as the persons who ought to be inspected.

164. Is there any other matter on which you would like to express an opinion?—I think not.

165. *Mr. Poynton.*] Have you ever, as a Justice of the Peace and as a representative man in the neighbourhood, either by yourself or in company with others, represented to the Police Department the necessity of taking measures to cope with the evil?—I have spoken to Inspector Broham. I do not look upon the local police as men who would be of much use in the question. I do not complain of the police at all. I receive every civility from them.

166. *The Chairman.*] You think there would be more efficiency if there was a class of detectives expert in sheep matters, whose attention should be directed to the sheep-stealers?—And certain doors through which the sheep go. For instance, there is the Rakaia Bridge, over which the sheep must go. There should be a note taken of the drivers and the sheep taken through. I believe a great many of the stolen sheep go south. The dangerous period is at one time only—in the autumn. It is exceedingly difficult for people to deal with sheep in the winter time, and any one driving sheep over strange country in wet weather would be detected, as the marks would be plain. During cocksfoot time a great deal of ground is shut up, and that would be an obstacle. The same road leads to Little River, and it is through that that the principal sheep and cattle stealing is going on, I believe, now, in small quantities. We depend more on the earmark than on the brand, and in this district of Canterbury a man has a certain earmark in his own district; but a man in another district not far away may have the same mark, so that in Canterbury there may be three or four men with the same mark. I have tattoo branded all my sheep under 6-tooth on the tail, so that I have not only my own mark on the ear but also the tattoo mark under the tail. These tattoo brands can now be registered, and it is the duty of every one to do as I can do.

167. *Mr. Weston.*] In the event of your selling sheep with the tattoo mark, how would you get over the difficulty? Your brand would get into other flocks, and if you missed your own sheep it would be hard to say that the sheep you missed were not among the sheep you had sold?—There is that question, certainly; but a sheep having my earmark and not the tattoo mark would not be mine. It might be so planned that the tattoo brand should be my special mark.

168. *Inspector Broham.*] You left a long memorandum with me for the local constable?—Yes.

169. Containing suggestions?—Yes.

170. That is two years ago?—Yes.

171. It was for the constable at Little River?—I do not know what use was to be made of it.

172. Did the local constable communicate with you?—Yes, he came to me and took down a detailed memorandum of the facts I had already given you.

173. Have you lost many sheep since then?—No; but I attribute that to my having a careful watch.

174. You thought you had lost the sheep in the previous six months?—I could not say when they were lost, but it may have been six weeks or two months previously. They were lost at the dangerous time of the year—the autumn.

HUGH BUCHANAN, further examined on oath.

175. *Mr. Weston.*] You have heard Mr. Menzies' evidence in respect to the system for preventing and detecting the stealing of sheep. Do you indorse his remarks?—Yes, generally speaking, I can agree with them. Certainly something is necessary.

176. *The Chairman.*] Do you think the suggestion is practicable?—I think some one should be appointed having a special knowledge of sheep, and also of the district.

177. What is the rule with regard to drivers' certificates? Are they only required when passing from one Inspector's district to another?—I think that is so, but I am not sure about it.

178. If it was necessary to have driving certificates from the time they leave the station, would it be an advantage?—I do not think it would, as there are such a number of people on the Peninsula who drive their own sheep.

179. But should they not have drivers' certificates to fix the identity? Would it not facilitate the discovery of stolen sheep?—Yes; but it would be difficult to manage it. It would be very vexatious.

180. At present the drivers' certificates say that the sheep are clean?—Yes, that is all. I am certain they would never be required inside the Peninsula.

JOHN RANDALL, examined on oath.

181. *Mr. Weston.*] Your name?—John Randall.

182. Where do you live?—In Christchurch.

183. You have a station at Akaroa Heads?—I had.

184. You have sold it?—Yes.

185. A cattle-station chiefly?—Sheep and cattle together.

186. Do you recollect losing a mob of cattle?—Yes.

187. When?—About three or four years ago.

188. How many did you lose?—I do not know; but I reported the matter to the police.

189. Did you report it personally, or by letter?—Personally.

190. Whom did you see?—Inspector Broham.

191. What did he say, and what was done?—I cannot remember what he said; but I think he did all he could.

192. What were the circumstances of the loss?—I lost some cattle, but there were no particular circumstances.

193. When you mustered you missed a number?—Yes.

194. You think the police did everything they could to discover the offenders?—I think so.

195. Could nothing have been done, do you think, that was not done to detect the offender?—No, I do not think so.

196. Can you suggest any method by which that class of crime can be brought to the perpetrator?—No.

WILLIAM BOWES CLARKSON, examined on oath.

197. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—William Bowes Clarkson.

198. *Mr. Weston.*] You are a dealer and grazier?—Yes, a sheep- and cattle-dealer.

199. Your business is a very extensive one?—Yes.

200. Did you hear the evidence given by Mr. Menzies, confirmed by Mr. Buchanan?—Yes.

201. Do you also confirm the method which Mr. Menzies laid down for preventing and detecting the stealing of sheep?—Yes, I think it would be all right.

202. *The Chairman.*] Is it a method that can be carried out by the police, or by the Sheep Department?—I think the Sheep Department could carry it out better than the police.

203. *Mr. Weston.*] Can you explain to the Commissioners how the thefts of sheep can be made?—I cannot understand how these sheep could be stolen and taken clean away—Mr. Menzies', for instance. It is one of the most inaccessible places on the Peninsula. How any one could draft the ewes from the lambs and get them clear away I do not know.

204. Seeing the place is so inaccessible, do you think the perpetrator of that crime could have been discovered?—It seems a very difficult thing, so far as the police are concerned, if they are not told until four months afterwards. The police cannot be blamed.

205. Mr. Fleming wishes me to ask you, How can sheep have been removed from his own place?—To take them out of the paddock and drive them away at night; but they could not be taken away frequently without some one on this side of the Peninsula seeing them.

206. Are there cases of sheep-stealing at Addington?—Yes; frequently a few sheep are stolen.

207. How is that done?—By some one taking what is not his own.

208. But how can it be worked without the owner knowing it?—I suppose the sheep are lifted over the fence.

209. *The Chairman.*] Can you make any suggestion by which the police can deal with sheep-stealing better than they do now?—If all the sheep-stealing was done on the Peninsula you could pretty well stop it by giving the police authority at Little River to examine all sheep. It is a gateway that all the sheep must pass through.

210. Have you reason to believe that sheep-stealing is a prevalent form of crime in the colony, or even in the southern part of this island?—We do not hear much of it, except from the Peninsula; and, although there has been sheep-stealing there, I do not think it is as extensive as the owners have thought. There are other ways of accounting for the losses.

211. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Would it not be almost impossible to get a lot of ewes away from the lambs in the state described by Mr. Menzies?—I think it is impossible. I do not doubt Mr. Menzies' word, but I do not understand it.

212. Especially in so isolated a place?—Yes; the parties would have to deliberately yard the ewes.

213. Ewes in that state would be practically unsaleable?—They would be saleable as breeding ewes.

214. But they would be no use for killing purposes?—No. Another thing against them would be that they would make a great noise for the first day in travelling.

215. *The Chairman.*] And how would the lambs be kept away?—They would make a noise, too; but there are not many people there to hear them. I look on Menzies' loss as very nearly impossible.

216. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What would be the effect on ewes with milk taken away from their lambs?—It would not make much difference.

217. At any rate, they would be unsaleable except for stock purposes?—Yes.

218. Do people steal sheep to sell or to kill?—I could not say.

219. You are a large dealer?—Yes.

220. One of the largest in New Zealand?—Yes.

221. You deal in thousands of sheep annually?—Yes.

222. Can you suggest any means of identifying sheep?—As far as the Peninsula is concerned, it would be possible to detect sheep-stealing by seeing that every man with a mob of sheep has a pass. It would be arbitrary action, but it would be effective.

223. But can you suggest any system of marking by which sheep could be more easily recognised?—No. Of course, if an owner goes to a factory he can see whether his mark has been registered there within a certain time.

ROBERT SHANKS, examined on oath.

224. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Robert Shanks.

225. *Mr. Weston.*] You are a commission agent?—Yes.

226. And a friend of Mr. Fleming's?—Yes.

227. Were you at Mr. Fleming's dance and picnic on the 24th May, 1896?—Yes.

228. Did you see a man named Spain there?—I do not know his name.

229. Did you see some one who made himself obnoxious?—Yes.

230. That was at the dance?—Yes.

231. What state was Spain in?—He was a little the worse of liquor.

232. Did you see Spain commit himself by assaulting any one?—No.

233. You had left?—Yes.

234. How was the dance conducted?—Very well conducted indeed, while I was there. There was nothing objectionable in any shape or form.

235. As a matter of fact, the drinks were more of a temperance order than anything else?—I did not see much liquor of any kind.

236. Did Mr. Fleming in any way induce annoyance or trouble?—No.

237. *Constable Ryan.*] Which dance do you refer to?—The dance on the first night, which was given to the strangers from Christchurch.

238. That was not the men's dance?—No; I did not see the dance among the men on the second night.

PATRICK RYAN, examined on oath.

239. *The Chairman.*] What rank are you?—First-class constable, stationed at Little River.

240. What is it you wish to tell us in connection with this matter?—With regard to the first complaint preferred by Mr. Fleming—that I failed to keep an appointment at Port Levy on a certain date—he called at my place in the morning, and asked me to go, as he intended to have a dance at his place that night. I promised him I would attend. Between 6 and 7 o'clock in the evening I made preparations to go to Port Levy, and in consequence of a change in the weather—it commenced to rain, and it was very dark, which would cause the track to be impassable between Little River and Port Levy—I did not go. I was influenced in my actions by the fact that about twelve months previously Mr. Fleming had asked me to go to a similar affair—a dance in the woolshed. I went there, and on arrival I found about half a dozen young ladies and about eight young men enjoying the dance in the woolshed, so that I thought this would be something after the same, and there would be no need for my services. I was pretty well satisfied there would not be. That is all I have to say regarding that. With regard to the complaint that I failed to investigate a charge of assault against a man named Spain, I may say there was no such complaint made to me in any shape or form as that Spain drew a knife. Mr. Fleming simply complained to me, when he called at the Little River Station on the 25th May, 1895—not 1896, as was stated—that on the previous night this man Spain, whilst under the influence of drink, had damaged some property of his—some crockery of his. This is the note taken from the police diary of the complaint made by Mr. Fleming on the 25th May, 1895: "At 9 a.m. Mr. Fleming reported that on the previous night a man named John Spain damaged property of his valued at 8s. Constable Ryan arrested the offender." That was the complaint. I arrested him on the same day, and brought him to Little River. It was on the Saturday, and he was tried on the Monday, the 27th.

241. He made no other charge?—He made no other charge. The offence with which he was charged was damaging property of the value of 8s. He was fined 20s. and costs by Messrs. H. D. Buchanan and W. Coop. I have only to add that was the only charge preferred in any shape or form by Mr. Fleming against Spain. It may have come out in the evidence that Spain, in being ejected, offered some resistance, but there was nothing said as to his using a knife.

242. *Mr. Poynton.*] It did not come to your knowledge that there was a knife drawn?—Never heard it mentioned. With regard to the sheep, I recollect getting two memoranda from Inspector Broham at different times regarding sheep being stolen belonging to Mr. Fleming. The first occasion, as far as I remember, the sheep were supposed to have been stolen some considerable time; and Inspector Broham forwarded the correspondence to the Akaroa police, and from them I received it to be noted, and I made inquiries into it. Later on I received another memorandum from the Inspector to the effect that Mr. Fleming had lost a large number of sheep from Kaituna, and instructing me to make inquiries. I went first to Port Levy and I saw Mr. Fleming, and got all the particulars from him that I could; and I also visited Kaituna, where the sheep were supposed to have been stolen from, and made all possible inquiries.

243. With any result?—No, Sir. I also circulated crime reports all round the district stations, with a copy to the *Gazette*, which would be supplied to all constables all over New Zealand. Mr. Fleming in his evidence said that McCormack knew nothing about it. McCormack would have been apprised by the crime report the same as other constables.

244. *Mr. Weston.*] As a matter of fact, you act as Clerk of the Court?—Yes, I do.

245. And as Clerk of the Court, I suppose, you saw Mr. Fleming when he laid the information in respect of the destruction of his property?—Yes.

246. Did you advise him as to the course he should pursue?—I took steps myself on his report.

247. Did you tell him what information he should lay?—Yes.

248. When you advised him as to the information he should lay, were you aware that there had been an assault committed at his place?—No, certainly not.

249. Did he not tell you that there had been an assault?—No. Had he done so I should have advised him to lay an information.

250. All he told you was that his property had been damaged?—Exactly.

251. Did he not tell you the circumstances under which his property had been damaged?—Yes.

252. What were the circumstances?—I understood there was a board which laid on the top of some oil-drums along the table, and that made the seat. This man took up this board, and brought it down on the table.

253. Did it not transpire that there had been an uproar?—Nothing more than that he had done this. Before he had time to make a second blow, some men who were present said they would not allow the boss's property to be damaged, and bundled the man outside. I spent several hours—in fact, a day—in Port Levy inquiring into the matter, and I was conversant with all the facts exactly as they occurred from several parties I inquired from. Mr. Fleming took me to the parties who he thought could supply me with the information.

254. With regard to the sheep, when you received information as to the sheep being lost you advertised the loss in the *Police Gazette*?—Yes; and I also sent a crime report to the district stations.

255. Nothing more was done?—I inquired all I could.

256. As a matter of fact nothing was done—no substantial action taken beyond what you have told us?—Of course, there would be the police on the look-out all round, through the crime reports they had received.

257. But, as a matter of fact, nothing more was done beyond what you have told us?—Nothing more.

258. In a case of such importance as the loss of so many hundred sheep, do you not think that every effort should have been made to find out the perpetrator of the crime?—Every effort was made, as far as I know.

259. Yes, by mere inquiry in the neighbourhood?—I did all I could.

260. I am not reflecting on you; but you just inquired round the neighbourhood as to whether John Brown or Thomas Smith had stolen sheep?—The chances were very remote of finding out the criminal, considering the time that had elapsed between the time that the sheep were supposed to have been stolen and when information was given to the police.

261. *The Chairman.*] As a constable, can you suggest anything else that could have been done?—I do not see what more could have been done.

262. *Mr. Weston.*] Did you go further afield than the immediate neighbourhood of your own station?—No, I did not, but I circulated reports throughout the country.

263. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You circulated information throughout the whole colony of New Zealand?—Yes.

264. Full particulars?—Full particulars—the brands, and earmarks, and sexes of the above sheep, as reported to me.

265. And the approximate date when they were stolen?—Yes, according to Mr. Fleming's report.

266. And every possible particular you could gain?—Yes.

267. As a matter of fact, when you went over to Mr. Fleming's place, he had discovered some of these sheep?—Yes, he had; I think there were some seventy-five found on the track between Port Levy and Kaituna. They had strayed from the mob, and got into the scrub.

268. *The Chairman.*] You learned this from Mr. Fleming?—Yes. I think it was from Mr. Fleming's brother.

269. *Mr. Weston.*] Had you any reason to doubt that the sheep were lost by Mr. Fleming?—I could not doubt Mr. Fleming's word.

270. The questions of the Commissioner of Police simply amounted to this then: that whereas Mr. Fleming said there were so many lost, it turned out that there was that number, less seventy-five, which were subsequently found?—Yes. That number, reported as stolen, was afterwards discovered.

271. You have no reason to discredit Mr. Fleming's statement that the sheep were lost?—No.

272. *Inspector Broham.*] You received communications in both these cases from me?—Yes, the memoranda are as follow :—

CONSTABLE RYAN,—

George and Arthur Fleming, of Port Levy, complain that in June last they missed 300 sheep from a paddock of 200 acres, and when shearing lately they also missed 300 more sheep, but they think the whole 600 were gone in June last. They think they were driven to Christchurch by Little River, and they suspect one ———, a man well known at Little River, of being the offender. They say he goes about with sheep-dogs, though he has no business with them. Please pay every attention to the persons engaged in sheep- and cattle-dealing in your district, with a view to ascertain who the offenders are in this case. I feel assured there is more than one. Following so closely on the complaint of Messrs. Randall and Musgrave, it is evident that sheep- and cattle-stealing is being carried on largely on the Peninsula.

Please copy this and post it quickly to Constable Scully for his attention.
6th December, 1893.

T. BROHAM, Inspector.

Copied and forwarded to Constable Scully.—P. RYAN, Constable 232.—10/12/93.

Copied and respectfully returned. Every attention will be given to the above, and also sheep and cattle at Duvauchelle's sale-yards.—P. SCULLY, Constable.—12/12/93.

CONSTABLE RYAN,—

Mr. Fleming, of Kaituna, states that about the 16th March he placed 2,300 sheep in a paddock of 300 acres, (Urgent.) rented from one Field, and on the 16th April, when he counted them, he missed 500—300 of them two-tooth and 200 lambs, all crossbred. Please attend to case at once, and, if you want the services of a detective, telegraph.
2nd May, 1894.

T. BROHAM, Inspector.

The Inspector.—Report attached.—P. RYAN, Constable 232.—9/5/94.

273. *Mr. Weston.*] Upon receipt of those communications from the Inspector, did you ask for a detective?—No, I did not.

274. Why did you not ask for the services of a detective?—I suppose I came to the conclusion there would not be much gained by it.

275. Why?—Because I could make all the inquiries myself that were necessary.

276. In the immediate neighbourhood?—In the immediate neighbourhood. By the crime-reports which I sent out the matter went into the hands of all officers outside my district.

277. If you were engaged in a case of murder, would you content yourself with just simply making inquiries in the immediate neighbourhood?—No.

278. If sheep-stealing be an important case, why should not you strive to bring the offender to justice, as in a case of murder?—Inquiries were made by other constables.

279. Upon receiving those letters from the Inspector, were you requested to come to Christchurch to confer with the Inspector?—No.

280. So that no communications other than those two letters passed between you and the Inspector?—Oh yes. There is a full report. That report will show what I did, no doubt.

281. Do you expect that we at this table could possibly suppose that crime could be brought home to anybody by the passing of these memoranda between you and the Inspector?—I told you already that I circulated reports through every station in New Zealand.

282. And so you expect crime to be brought home by the passing of memoranda between two or three people?—Exactly. I do not think you could walk from one station to another and give information.

283. Have you been in the habit, in cases of crime, of conferring with your superiors in authority?—Yes, I always do.

284. That is the universal practice?—Yes, I always do.

285. Why was not this practice adopted in this case?—You will see it has been adopted, if you look at the correspondence.

286. You told me just now the only correspondence between you and the Inspector were these very memoranda which were placed in evidence?—No, that is a mistake.

287. Did you see the Inspector on the subject?—No doubt the Inspector has mentioned it to me.

288. Have you been called to meet the Inspector to consider this case seriously, and devise means between you and the Inspector of discovering the perpetrator of that crime?—No.

289. As a practical man, in an important case do you not think that you should have been sent for to confer?—No, I do not think so. There would be nothing gained by it.

290. Why not?—The Inspector had my report; and if he had anything to suggest, of course, he would have instructed me in regard to it.

291. In any case in which you have been employed to detect crime, have you been sent for to confer with the Inspector?—No, I do not recollect that I have.

292. Do you know of any constable whatever in this district who has been sent for to confer with the Inspector at any time?—I cannot remember. I dare say there would be, but I cannot remember any particular case. Personally, I have not. I may have conversed with the Inspector over this matter. When I have come into town, no doubt he has mentioned this matter to me, as he would any matter of importance.

293. How long after the case was reported did you engage yourself in trying to find out the person who stole those sheep?—I cannot tell you the time. I made repeated inquiries from sources I thought I would be likely to obtain information—men that had to do with sheep particularly. I wish to read the following correspondence in connection with the matter :—

Police Station, Little River, 9th May, 1894.

WITH reference to attached, I beg to report that on Sunday 6th last I went to Port Levy and made all possible inquiry, but could find no trace of any person being seen driving sheep about the time Mr. Fleming's sheep would be taken. On Monday I went to Kaituna, in company with Mr. Fleming and Mr. Field, and we made a thorough examination of the fences all round the paddock where the sheep had been running, but there is no sign of the sheep

having been taken through the fence. If the sheep were taken down the Kaituna Valley Road they would have to pass through Mr. Field's yard, and it is impossible for them to do so without been seen or heard by Mr. Field. The only other way for them to get out would be to get on to the Purau Track and along the top, through Mr. Gardiner's, to the head of the Bay, Lyttelton. Mr. Fleming states that he has made thorough search in the Purau direction, but has found no trace of a mob of sheep being driven that way. I have examined the Purau line, going in the Peninsula direction, but there has been no sheep driven through there for some months, as the grass is not beaten down.

It is quite evident that the thief or thieves, whoever they are, do not live far away, as they seem to watch the movements of Mr. Fleming, and are in a position to take the sheep when they know there is no likelihood of their being missed for some time. For instance, when Mr. Fleming placed those sheep on Mr. Field's land, it would be well known that he would not muster or count them for at least a month; and if they were taken straight away the thief would have a clear month's start, and in that time could have them down in Otago, and almost, for a certainty, be clear of detection. Mr. Fleming does not suspect any one in particular, although he is of one opinion with me as to the thief not living far away. There is a man named ———, living in the top of Kaituna Valley; he always keeps a couple of sheep-dogs, and I think he would be quite capable of doing a bit of sheep-stealing, only he would have a difficulty in disposing of them without he had a confederate, as he is a frightened sort of fellow, without any pluck in him; all the ——— family are a bad lot.

There is another man in the neighbourhood who, some people think, would not be above sheep-stealing, and who would have every facility for disposing of them, as he is making his living by driving sheep and cattle for the dealers, and knows every inch of this country, he being reared on it—that is ———; but I have not heard anything that would lead me to look to him as the guilty party. Mr. Fleming states he is going to have a thorough clean muster of his sheep this present week, and if the missing ones do not then turn up, it would be satisfactory to have inquiries made by a detective; he also states that he will offer a large reward for their recovery and conviction of the offender. . . .

The Inspector of Police, Christchurch.

P. RYAN, First-class constable No. 232.

Police Station, Little River, 22nd May, 1894.

REPORT of Constable P. Ryan, No. 232, *re* supposed case of sheep-stealing from G. and R. Fleming, of Port Levy:—

With reference to above, I beg to report that I have been to Port Levy and saw Mr. R. Fleming, and he informed me that they found ninety-seven of the missing sheep in their own and a neighbour's paddock, where they lost them on their way back from Kaituna. In the face of this, and the fact that they have made such careful search and inquiry without finding any trace of how the sheep went, they are now under the impression that the sheep are not stolen, but that they must have made a mistake in counting them, and that they are still on the run.

The Inspector of Police, Christchurch.

P. RYAN, First-class constable No. 232.

294. Notwithstanding the recommendation that you made, there were no detectives employed?—My memory has been refreshed by these reports. In my report I said if the sheep were not found it would be advisable for a detective to make inquiries. In this report, dated 22nd May, Mr. Fleming admits to ninety-seven sheep having been found, and they had doubts as to the others not being still on the run.

295. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As a matter of fact, from your last report, it was very doubtful if any sheep were stolen?—I had doubts when I made that report. That must have been my impression when I wrote that report. I expected that the sheep would turn up, as the others had done.

296. Under these circumstances you would not expect a detective to be sent down to find out whether the sheep were on the run or not?—No. I would not consider it necessary.

GEORGE SPENCER FLEMING, examined on oath.

297. *Witness:* With regard to these sheep, I may say that we thought for some time the sheep were on the run, and that is why we did not take steps in respect of the first lot. The second lot were put on a man's land, and counted as they were put on and taken off, so that we were certain as to the second lot being stolen.

298. *The Chairman.*] Do you say you never intended to convey to the constable that you were satisfied they were still on the run?—Well, that was my brother. My brother thought they could not be stolen; and I thought so for a good while.

299. *Mr Tunbridge.*] Do you make any allowance for deaths among your flock?—Yes.

300. What?—Two or three in the hundred.

301. How long were these sheep at Mr. Field's?—Six weeks, I think.

302. What allowance did you make for deaths?—Well, it was a place you could see all over. It was all clear ground, and we saw only one dead sheep.

303. You admit these ninety-seven were found?—Not in that lot. I think there was a mistake about that. I think they were from the other lot.

304. How many sheep did you place on this land at that particular time?—About 2,300.

305. How many did you get back?—Something under 2,000. There were 500 or more missing.

306. Of these, you found ninety-seven afterwards?—I think that was the former lot.

307. If these ninety-seven got out of the paddock, was it not possible for the others to have got out in the same way?—I think that was a case of dropping them on the road. In the first case we did not count them until we got them home; but in the second case we counted them into the paddock, and counted them out again, so that there could be no mistake in that case.

308. Have you anything to show the number of sheep you have on your run?—No, not here. I have the record at home.

309. How do you form an estimate of the number dying?—Two to three in the hundred as a rule. Of course, in exceptionally severe weather we lose a great many more.

ANNIE MURDOCH, examined on oath.

310. *Mr. Weston.*] Where do you live?—At 24, Armagh Street.

311. Do you know Constable Hill?—I do.

312. Did you meet him one day about three or four weeks ago?—No, I did not meet him one day three or four weeks ago.

313. When did you meet him?—I met him one morning about 3 o'clock.

314. Where?—Outside Bligh's boardinghouse in Victoria Street.

315. Did he speak to you?—I asked for a bed there. I was refused the bed.

316. Did you speak to Constable Hill, or did he speak to you?—He spoke to me.

317. *The Chairman.*] You say you were asking for a bed at the boardinghouse when you saw Constable Hill?—Yes.

318. *Mr. Weston.*] What did he say to you?—He said, “You need not be in a hurry to go for a bed: come for a walk.”

319. What else?—I refused. He ran after me and knocked me down in the middle of the road, between the bridge and the Salvation Army barracks.

320. What then?—He knocked me down; and he had a whistle, and he whistled for a sergeant—Sergeant Scully.

421. When he knocked you down, did he make any overtures to you in any way?—He had his hand over my mouth, and he knocked my mouth about. He used filthy language.

322. Did he want to do anything to you?—He held me down until he whistled for a sergeant to come. I was arrested and taken to the lock-up, and I got seven days’ imprisonment.

323. *Colonel Pitt.*] For being drunk?—Yes, and I was perfectly sober. I had just come down from the Cheviot.

324. *The Chairman.*] At 3 o’clock in the morning? How did you get down?—I was stopping at New Brighton, and I went to make my way out there, and I thought that was the place away down that way.

325. Did you only come in that day from the Cheviot?—No, I had been in town two or three days before that.

326. Where had you been living?—I stopped at Mrs. Hill’s.

327. You say Constable Hill caught hold of you and knocked you down?—He knocked me down and held me for about five minutes until Sergeant Scully came.

328. How long ago was that?—About three weeks ago. I sent for Mr. Donnelly in the morning and told him about the case, and he said he would appear.

329. *Mr. Weston.*] Constable Hill did not want to insult you at all?—Of course, you can make it out whichever way you like. He simply said, “You need not be in a hurry to go to bed; come with me for a walk.” When I refused to do that he knocked me down.

330. *The Chairman.*] Did it occur to you that was a polite way on the part of the constable of wishing you to accompany him to the lockup?—If I wished to evade him in any way I would not have walked up, because he was standing right opposite the door of the boardinghouse.

331. *Mr. Weston.*] What you mean to convey to the Commissioners is that if you had gone for a walk with him, there would have been no locking-up? I do not say that. I am just speaking of what happened. I am telling the truth, and you can make what you like out of it.

332. *The Chairman.*] You do not make any suggestion of that kind?—Not at all. I do not make any suggestion at all.

333. *Mr. Donnelly.*] Do you know Mr. Fleming, who is sitting there?—I do.

334. Has he called on you about this case—at your house?—No.

335. Did you seek Mr. Fleming out about it, or did he seek you out?—I sent for you at first.

336. But as to Mr. Fleming, how do you come to prefer this case against Constable Hill?—I know nothing at all about it. I was subpoenaed as a witness.

337. I want to know whether you went to Mr. Fleming and gave this information, or did he come to you?—I did not go to him. I knew nothing about it until he brought this subpoena to my place in a cab, or somebody brought it to my place. I was given this subpoena to appear in this Court. I had not seen him before about it.

338. If you had not seen him before, how did he know you had made a complaint against Constable Hill?—I never made a complaint against Constable Hill.

339. Do you make any complaint against him now?—No.

340. If you had not spoken to Mr. Fleming about it before, how would he know what took place between you and Hill?—I know nothing about Hill, or the police, or anything else. I never knew anything about it until I got the subpoena to appear here.

341. Do you mean to say you never told Mr. Fleming anything about this case?—Certainly not.

342. You did not give him the information which is embodied in this charge, that Hill insulted you?—Certainly not.

343. You did not tell Mr. Fleming that Hill arrested you on an imaginary charge, which was dismissed?—He did not arrest me on an imaginary charge at all, because I got seven days’ imprisonment for nothing.

344. For being drunk?—But I was not drunk.

345. The Magistrate held you were?—He may have held I was, but I was not drunk.

346. Did Mr. Fleming give you money to come here and give evidence?—I do not think he has given me any money, because I do not think he is sane.

347. What makes you think Mr. Fleming is not sane?—I know nothing about him at all. All I know is he has given me this subpoena to come here and give evidence, and I have come here. I have made no charge against Constable Hill at all.

348. Has Mr. Fleming given you, directly or indirectly, any money?—Certainly not. I wish he would. I wish he would pay me for coming here.

349. It was 3 o’clock in the morning when the constable arrested you?—Yes. Excuse me, Mr. Donnelly, I am subject to fits, and he may have thought I was drunk when I was in a fit.

350. You say he did not treat you in any way improperly in the street?—I simply say I do not make a charge against Constable Hill. That is sufficient, is it not?

351. Do you say Constable Hill did anything improper to you in the street that night?—I have given my evidence: that is sufficient for anybody to see. What he said to me you can take whichever way you like.

352. You do not suggest now that he at all insulted you in any way?—I do not suggest anything about it.

353. Have you a bit of a doubt now what he meant by that expression you say he made use of?—I suppose you can use your own discretion about that.

354. What the constable meant by going for a walk was an invitation to go to the police-station, was it not?—It may have been.

355. Just before that you were at Bligh's boardinghouse, creating a disturbance?—Have you got witnesses to prove that?

356. Just before the constable invited you to go for a walk with him, had you not been turned away from Bligh's boardinghouse for creating a disturbance?—No.

357. Do you deny that?—I do deny that.

358. You never made a charge against Constable Hill to the officers at the station that night, did you?—I made a charge next morning when I sent for you.

359. Did you make any complaint to the police-officers?—Certainly I did.

360. What did you complain of?—I complained of his arresting me illegally, when I was not drunk. He knocked me down, too. My mouth was all cut. When I was giving evidence next morning in the Court I made a complaint.

361. *The Chairman.*] The complaint you made was that he had arrested you when you were not drunk, and you had got your mouth cut?—Yes.

362. I think there are over twenty convictions against you on the police records of this colony?—No. I admit I have been convicted several times.

GEORGE SPENCER FLEMING, further examined on oath.

363. *Mr. Weston.*] So that my friend, Mr. Donnelly, may have the opportunity of cross-examining you, I will ask you formally, whether you preferred this complaint against Constable Hill?—I did.

364. From information you had received?—It was in the paper. I thought it rather unjust. I do not think she should have been sent to prison.

365. *Mr. Donnelly.*] You say you are a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

366. How long?—Nearly ten years.

367. Do you sit on the Bench?—No. Only once.

368. Did you go to see Annie Murdoch before you took out her subpoena?—I never saw her at the house until I took the summons. It took me half a day to find the house. The cabman and myself had a considerable hunt for it.

369. When you presented the subpoena to Annie Murdoch, did you ask her anything about the facts of the case?—Oh, yes, she told me the same thing that she has said to-day.

370. Did she tell you she had no charge against Constable Hill?—No, she seemed to think she was improperly arrested.

371. That is, she was arrested for being drunk when she was not?—Yes. She thought that asking her to come for a walk had rather a different meaning. She thought if she had gone for a walk, she would not have been arrested.

372. How many houses of an immoral class did you visit to get up evidence against the police?—Four, I think it is. I have been to three only to work up cases. I have been to hers, and another one, with subpoenas—that makes five. I have only visited three houses to work up cases.

373. Did Annie Murdoch tell you at any time she was acquitted of the charge?—No; I saw it in the newspaper.

374. Do you mean to say you saw in the newspaper what is alleged here—that she was acquitted?—No, I did not see all that in the newspaper.

375. Where did you evolve that from, then?—She told me herself in the street.

376. After the subpoena was issued?—No, before. I said something to her about the police being a little too hard on her; and she turned round, without any coaxing I may say, and told me about this case of hers. She said she was just then out of gaol.

377. Where, and at what hour, did you see her on the street?—About 9 o'clock at night, near Dr. Prin's place, in Manchester Street.

378. Did you accost her, or did she you?—She said, "Good evening."

379. How did you know her?—I did not know her at all. I never saw her before.

380. She said before the issue of the subpoena you had no conversation with her?—She may have forgotten that.

381. Did you have a conversation with her before you laid the charges before the Commission?—Yes, before I formulated the charges.

382. Did Annie Murdoch tell you then, in Manchester Street, that Hill insulted her?—Something to that effect. That is the way she took it—that going for this walk meant something rather different.

383. *The Chairman.*] Did she tell you that Hill had insulted her?—I think that what she said was that he wanted to have connection with her for nothing. He took her to the station because he could not get what he wanted. That is what I understood.

384. *Mr. Donnelly.*] Did she tell you she was acquitted by the Magistrate?—I thought so. I will not be quite certain which way it was. I may say I only saw her for a few minutes.

385. You do not know whether she told you whether she was acquitted or not?—No. The thing was in the paper.

386. Did you look at the paper?—Yes.

387. Did you see it reported in the paper that she was acquitted?—I cannot say.

388. Have you paid Annie Murdoch any money?—No.

389. Not a shilling?—No. I think I shouted for her that night. I did not go into the hotel. I gave her a shilling to go for a drink into the Forester's Hotel. There was a mate with her. It may have been the other one that I gave the money to.

390. Did you go in?—No. I did not care about going into the hotel.

391. Do you think that was proper conduct for a Justice of the Peace of ten years' experience?—I think so. They were perfectly sober.

392. Did you make any inquiry at the police-station of Hill's superior officers, to ascertain whether or not the girl's statement was true: that the charge was an imaginary one, and was dismissed, as is alleged in the charge which you have signed?—No, I took her word for it.

393. Do you think it is right for a Justice of the Peace to take the word of a common prostitute against that of a public officer, and formulate a charge against him before a Commission such as this without making any further inquiries?—Yes, I think so, because this Commission will see which is right, and the Magistrate takes the side of the policeman. I was told we could not go and examine the Court books.

394. *The Chairman.*] You said you knew she had just come out of prison?—I was not quite sure about the prison. I knew she had just been tried.

395. How did you happen to find out who she was?—Oh, she said, "Good evening." I said something about how did she get on with the police. She said she had been run in for nothing—just because she refused to go for a walk.

396. *Mr. Donnelly.*] Do you know a woman named Smythe you subpœnaed as a witness?—Yes.

397. Did you give Smythe money?—I gave them 10s. They said they were shifting, and they wanted to pay the carrier. I may say I went to her place with the summons, and that was the first time I had ever seen them. They told me they were just shifting. I gave them 10s. to pay the carrier.

398. These two young women are common prostitutes, and you gave them 10s. because they were shifting?—They were standing there, and they said they wanted 10s. to pay the carrier, and I gave it to them.

399. Did you drive one of the girls, Smythe, to the Carlton Hotel and give her a drink there?—Yes. I did not say I gave her the drink.

400. Did you pay for the drink?—The cabman paid for it.

401. Did you give the cabman the money?—Yes.

402. It was on that occasion you served the girl Smythe with the subpœna?—I served her there.

403. At the time you served her with the subpœna, did you give her a bottle of whiskey?—Yes.

404. What time was it when you gave this girl a bottle of whiskey at the Carlton Hotel?—Between 3 and 4 o'clock.

405. At the time you gave her the bottle of whiskey you were after paying for a drink for her?—No. Only a bottle of whiskey.

406. Was she very sober when you gave it to her?—Quite sober.

407. Do you think it is a proper thing for a Justice of the Peace of ten years' standing to give a girl a bottle of whiskey?—I think so. They need not drink it all at once.

408. You think it is a right thing?—Yes, I think it is. I think if a person has had a big drunk a bottle of whiskey will save their life.

409. Have you not left your card at a number of houses of ill-fame here?—Yes, I have given them a card.

410. At how many houses of ill-fame have you left your card, with "Mr. Fleming, J.P.," on it?—I think two—three, perhaps.

411. *The Chairman.*] Is there "J.P." on the card?—No. I did not put "J.P." on the card. I just left the card, and I will tell you why I did it. They thought I was a detective on the police side; and to try and prove that I was their friend, and ready to help them, I left my card.

412. You said, when you went there, that you were the man who was prepared to take up their cases?—Yes.

413. You say you gave the girl Smythe 10s.?—She asked me for 10s. first of all, and 2s. for her dinner, and coming back here she stuck me up for 5s. more.

414. How much money did you give them?—12s. and 5s.

415. Do you swear you have never given Annie Murdoch money?—I may have given the money for the drink to her mate. There were two together. I only gave them 1s.

416. Do you swear you have never given Murdoch or her mate more than 1s.?—Yes. I only saw them that one evening, as far as I can remember.

VICTOR AUSTIN HILL, examined on oath.

417. *Mr. Donnelly.*] You are a police constable, at present stationed at Christchurch?—Yes, a third-class constable.

418. You know the girl Annie Murdoch, who has given evidence?—I do.

419. What is she?—A common prostitute; one of the lowest type.

420. *The Chairman.*] How long have you been stationed at Christchurch?—About six months.

421. *Mr. Donnelly.*] You have only been six months in the Force?—Yes.

422. You remember this night you arrested Annie Murdoch?—In the morning about 3 o'clock.

423. Where did you arrest her?—Near Victoria Street Bridge.

424. Had you seen her before you arrested her?—I saw her in the distance, going to Bligh's boardinghouse.

425. What was her state when you met her?—Very drunk.

426. Did you arrest her on a charge of drunkenness?—I did.
427. What did she do?—Immediately I put my hand on her she laid down and started screaming.
428. Did you use the words she says you did, “Go for a walk,” or anything of the kind?—No, nothing of that kind whatever.
429. When she screamed, did you do anything?—I noticed Sergeant Scully coming along the street, and I whistled for him.
430. Did Sergeant Scully come up to where you were?—He did.
431. Did you tell him what you were arresting Murdoch for?—Yes.
432. Scully was your superior officer that night?—Yes, he was in charge of the relief.
433. Did he help you to take Murdoch to the lockup?—Yes, he did.
434. Did you enter a charge against her at the lockup?—Yes, of being drunk.
435. She was tried and convicted for that offence?—Yes, next morning.
436. Did you say or do anything to Murdoch that night beyond what was necessary in the exercise of your duty as a police-officer to bring her to the police-station?—Nothing more than arresting her, and taking hold of her arm to bring her to the station.
437. Bligh’s boardinghouse is how far from the lockup?—About a quarter of a mile from the lockup.
438. During the time you were taking her to the lockup did she make any complaint to Sergeant Scully of your ill-treatment of her?—None whatever.
439. Did she make any complaint of your ill-treatment when she was taken to the station?—None whatever.
440. You say you did nothing to her except what was necessary to take her to the station? Did she resist at all?—No, she laid down and started screaming. That is her usual way, when she is arrested, so I have been informed by other constables.
441. Have you seen the woman since?—I have.
442. She is on the streets every night?—On the streets every night.
443. One of the lowest prostitutes in town?—One of the very lowest.
444. *The Chairman.*] What was going on at the boardinghouse when you first saw her?—She was creating a disturbance there with the porter, because he would not let her in.

PATRICK SCULLY, examined on oath.

445. *Mr. Donnelly.*] You are a sergeant of police, and you know a woman named Annie Murdoch?—Yes.
446. What is she—a common prostitute?—Yes, she is of that repute.
447. You have not been long on duty in Christchurch?—No, not long.
448. How long have you been here?—I have been on duty here since about the 14th January, or thereabouts.
449. You know Constable Hill?—I do.
450. Do you remember him whistling for you one night about three or four weeks ago?—I remember him arresting Annie Murdoch. I cannot say as to the date.
451. Do you remember Hill whistling that night?—I do.
452. When he whistled, did you go to where the signal came from?—Yes.
453. What did you find?—I found Hill had this woman, I think it was, by the right arm. She was lying down, her legs stretched out, and her body partly raised. I assisted him to the station with her.
454. Was she drunk?—Undoubtedly.
455. Hill brought her to the lockup and entered a charge against her?—Yes, with my assistance.
456. She was convicted of it?—Yes.
457. Did Murdoch that night, when you came on the scene, or at any time before you put her into the cell, make any complaint or say anything as to Hill’s improper treatment of her?—Not a word.
458. Hill, in fact, whistled for you as his superior officer to come on the scene?—Yes. I was in charge of the relief that night.

WILLIAM HENRY SCOTT, examined on oath.

459. *The Chairman.*] You are a first-class constable?—Yes; stationed at Christchurch.
460. *Mr. Donnelly.*] Were you acting as lockup-keeper at the station three or four weeks ago?—Yes.
461. Do you remember the night Hill and Scully brought Murdoch in?—Yes.
462. Did Hill charge her with any offence?—She was charged with being drunk.
463. Was she drunk?—Yes, very drunk.
464. Did Annie Murdoch make any complaint to you or in your hearing, at the station, as to Hill insulting her in any way, beyond arresting her?—No.
465. How long have you been lockup-keeper at the Christchurch Station?—About two years and a half.
466. That was not the first time you had seen Murdoch there?—No.
467. Repeatedly before?—Yes.
468. For what kind of offences?—Vagrancy and drunkenness.
469. Is it an old plea of hers to say she was not drunk?—As a rule, they do plead so.

THOMAS MOORE, examined on oath.

470. *Mr. Donnelly.*] You act as night porter at Bligh’s boardinghouse?—Yes.
471. Do you know Annie Murdoch?—Yes.

472. Do you remember the night Constable Hill arrested her?—I remember the night. I could not give you the date.
473. What time was it?—It was between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning.
474. Had she been at your door before Hill arrested her?—Yes.
475. What did she do?—She came for a bed.
476. Did you refuse her?—Yes.
477. Was she drunk or sober?—She was drunk.
478. Had you any difficulty in getting her away from your door?—Yes.
479. She was abusive?—Well, she was when she was leaving, when she found she could not get a bed.
480. And immediately after that Hill arrested her?—Yes.
481. Hill arrested her close to your door?—Yes, between the house and the bridge.
482. Within 50 yards of your door Hill arrested her?—Yes.
483. She is a woman who has given you trouble?—Yes. She gave me trouble once before that.
484. *The Chairman.*] Has she been in the habit of sleeping in the house?—No. I would not allow her there.
485. *Mr. Donnelly.*] If the constable had not arrested her she may have given you some further trouble that night?—She may have come back again. I do not know; I would not swear to it.

ELIZABETH SMYTHE, examined on oath.

486. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you know Constable Hill?—Yes; I know him by sight.
487. Did you see him about three weeks ago?—No, I did not see him three weeks ago.
488. Has he come to your house at all?—He came to my house about four or five weeks ago—about five weeks ago.
489. When he came to your house, did he do anything to your house or to you?—I do not know what he did, or anything about it. I do not know anything at all about Constable Hill. I know him just by sight.
490. You have never had any conversation with him?—No, I have not.
491. He has never blackened your eye?—No.
492. Or assaulted you, or broken your window?—I could not say anything about breaking my window at all. He came to my house about five weeks ago, and he asked to come in, and I could not tell you if Constable Hill came to the door or window. I was that much excited I think he came in through the door, or somewhere like that.
493. You said just now you were excited. What were you excited about?—A little drop of drink, I suppose.
494. Hill did not do anything to excite you?—No, he did not. It was a friend inside with me.
495. You have no complaint against Constable Hill?—I have no complaint whatever.

JULE LELIEVRE, examined on oath.

496. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you have a station at Akaroa?—Yes.
497. You are one of the original French settlers?—Yes.
498. Where were you on the 9th or 10th March?—I was at the Foresters' Hotel, Christchurch.
499. Who were you in company with?—With Mr. Finnerty.
500. Who is Mr. Finnerty?—He keeps a boardinghouse.
501. At this boardinghouse, I think, you were boarding at the time?—Yes.
502. So that you and he were together in the hotel?—Yes.
503. When you were at the hotel, did Sergeant Scully come in?—Yes.
504. What time was this?—It was in the evening—some time about 8 o'clock, I suppose.
505. I think you knew Scully at Akaroa, did you not?—Yes.
506. He was stationed there?—Yes.
507. Quite recently?—Yes, until a couple of months ago.
508. As a matter of fact, he is very officious?—Well, I thought that night he was interfering with me.
509. When you were together at the Foresters' Hotel he came in?—Yes.
510. When he came in, what did he say to you, and what did he do?—Well, he asked me what I was doing here, or some words to that effect. I told him that I was all right, and I did not want him to interfere with me. Then, Mr. Finnerty and he had a word together about something. I do not know what it was. Mr. Finnerty said to him, "You want to get at me"; and then Mr. Scully said to the landlord to look after me. The landlord said I was all right, I could look after myself.
511. He annoyed you?—It annoyed me a bit at the time.
512. Did you give him any occasion to shepherd you in any way?—Nothing whatever that night—nothing whatever. We were in a room by ourselves, Mr. Finnerty and myself, and the sergeant walked in.
513. Then what followed, when you told him you could take care of yourself?—There were some questions asked, one way and the other. The fact is, I felt annoyed at him interfering with me, and so on. He went away, and as he went away he told me not to be up to any tricks down here. I said it was all right.
514. Are you in the habit of being up to tricks?—No, not that I know of—No.
515. I suppose you took it as an insult?—Yes. He said he would look after me; he would get me in a private place; and I said I was all right.

516. I think you told Mr. Fleming what you have just mentioned to the Commissioners?—Yes, I told him last Wednesday.

517. Have you told us all that took place?—Yes, all that took place in that house.

518. Was there anything more said when Scully was there?—No.

519. You have known Scully for some time at Akaroa?—For some seven or eight years.

520. Was that the first occasion upon which he made himself disagreeable to you?—Well, last Wednesday I was walking along the street ahead of him, and Scully called my name. I stopped, and said, "What is it, Mr. Scully?" He said, "Where are you stopping?" I said, "I do not see why I should tell you where I am stopping, or what I am doing here, especially after the way you interfered with me." That is, I did not care for the manner in which he had acted towards me. Then he said he meant good. He said he thought I had some money, and there was some *spielers* about, and he would have taken me to a private house, and looked after me.

521. When he interfered with you at the Foresters' Hotel, were there any *spielers* about?—Not that I know of. I was only with one gentleman in the room.

522. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider now that this conduct was reprehensible and wrong on the part of Scully?—I thought so at the time.

523. Do you think so now?—I would not like to say it was now. It would be hard for me to judge.

524. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Do you think Mr. Fleming is a better judge of the matter?—He knows nothing about the matter, only that I happened to be in Mr. Weston's office, and he was talking about the other *Lievres*—not myself—and that is how it happened. I said I thought that Scully should not interfere with me. I thought so at the time I said it.

525. I suppose it is true that sometimes you take a glass of beer too much, putting it mildly?—I do not think you should pass a remark like that, because I am putting the charge very mildly.

526. After mature reflection, you in your own mind do not know whether the charge is just or not?—I do not wish to force the charge, but I reckon it was wrong. I thought it was wrong at the time, and I thought so up to to-day.

527. You do not think so now?—Well, I give Mr. Scully the benefit of the doubt.

528. Wherein lies the justification for your charge of assault against him? Who formulated the charge, you or Mr. Weston?—No, I did not; but at the same time I reckon I was insulted—that I was interfered with, when there was no occasion to interfere with me.

529. You meant it to be "insulted," not "assaulted"?—Yes. I was insulted. I did not mean assaulted.

530. And he told you at the time he did it for your good. Was he in plain clothes, or in uniform?—He was in plain clothes. He told me, in Akaroa, when I would be up here he would look after me; but I do not know whether he meant it or not. I could look after myself. I was quite capable.

531. *The Chairman.*] You do not complain yourself of the conduct of Scully? You understood what I said?—Of course, I told that to Mr. Fleming; but after thinking it over, I should just as soon not have given evidence at all.

JOHN FINNERTY, examined on oath.

532. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Boardinghouse-keeper, in Colombo Street.

533. *Mr. Weston.*] I think, on the 9th or 10th March, you were with Mr. Lelievre at the Foresters' Arms Hotel, in a room together?—We were in a sitting-room of the hotel.

534. Nobody there but yourselves?—Only us two, that I remember.

535. Where were you when you met Scully?—Scully was passing by the door, and Lelievre said to him, "Halloo, Scully." He wanted the sergeant to take a drink. The sergeant said, "No"; he would not have a drink; and he asked the hotelkeeper, as Lelievre was a thoroughly decent man, to take care of him.

536. Scully did?—Yes.

537. Was there anything in the appearance of Lelievre at that moment to prompt that advice?—No. He had had some drink, but nothing to hurt him.

538. What passed then between them?—Scully spoke to the landlord privately. I could not say what passed between them.

539. Were there any *spielers* about?—None that I know of.

540. Any suspicious characters at all?—Not in the room with us.

541. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Has this man stayed with you before?—Yes; he has stayed with me several times.

542. And is he a man who sometimes takes a little too much liquor?—Yes.

543. You find it desirable there should be some one to take care of him, do you not?—Well, of course, I could not say that. The man was behaving himself.

544. You cannot say, if he does take too much liquor, it would be advisable to take care of him—keep an eye on him?—It would be if he took too much.

545. And he does take too much?—Yes, sometimes he takes too much.

546. *Mr. Poynton.*] From what you saw, did Scully do anything wrong?—From what I saw, the sergeant gave him very friendly advice, and I could see nothing else. I had the opinion at the time—in fact, I passed the remark to the sergeant—that he thought I may have been trying to do some wrong to the man, and he was taking me for somebody else. The sergeant did not know me, and I passed some remark to him. It was fatherly advice he gave him; and he said to the hotelkeeper, "Give him a bed, as he is a thoroughly respectable man, and is all right."

547. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say he told the hotelkeeper he was a thoroughly respectable man?—Thoroughly respectable man.

PATRICK SCULLY, further examined on oath.

548. *The Chairman.*] You are a first-class sergeant?—Yes. I may say I remember the occasion referred to. On the night in question I was going round Manchester Street, through the Terrace, in order to get the man who was on the night beat to call me in the morning. I was on the early morning relief. I went to the Foresters' Hotel, and saw Mr. Lelievre and Mr. Finnerty there. I said, "Mr. Lelievre, how are you, and how are all the Akaroa people?" He said, "Very well, thanks." He said, "Will you have a drink?" I said, "No, thanks." He had had liquor, apparently; and knowing him of old, and he having referred to his son getting married, I said, "Do not take too much on the strength of that." I said to the licensee of the hotel, "This is a very decent man, a friend of mine. You might look after him." He is a man who is in the habit of taking money about with him; and I said something to this effect, "You are not in German Bay, and you may perhaps get some thieves about you, to rob you, if you knock about." He wanted me to have a drink. I declined. I was off duty, and in plain clothes.

549. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You tell the Commissioners, then, that what you said and what you did was in a spirit of helpfulness and friendliness towards Mr. Lelievre?—There is not the slightest doubt of that; and I look upon him as a friend of mine, notwithstanding the charge that has been made against me.

TUESDAY, 26TH APRIL, 1898.

JOHN CONNELL, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Constable, stationed at Lyttelton.
2. *Rev. Father Salvador.*] When I spoke of Mrs. O'Brien's case, did I mention the name of the Hon. Mr. Thompson, and Colonel Hume?—You did.
3. Where did I speak to you about Mrs. O'Brien's case?—At my bedroom door.
4. Did I speak at all to you?—You spoke at me, if that is what you mean to get at.
5. Did I mention the names of the Hon. Mr. Thompson and Colonel Hume?—You did.
6. Were you on duty last Sunday week?—Yes.
7. Did you tell anybody that you would clip a wing out of Father Salvador?—I do not know.
8. Did I tell you I commanded four hundred votes?—Yes; you said, "I am the Government in Lyttelton, and I command four hundred votes."
9. Did I tell you that I would get you shifted from Lyttelton?—You did.
10. Have you been on the sick-list for months last year?—I was.
11. Did I bring you two priests from Christchurch to attend to your spiritual wants?—I did not ask you to do it; I did not know who brought them.
12. Did I come to you every day until your wife forbade me to do so?—I do not know anything about that. It was about the time I had a dead youngster in my house that you brought the case of Mrs. O'Brien up again. It was very aggravating.
13. When the case of Mrs. O'Brien came on, were you on night duty?—Yes.
14. When Constable Fitzgerald was transferred to Christchurch, did you send your wife to me with the object of getting the police-station house?—I did not.

D. MATHIA SALVADOR, examined on oath.

15. *The Chairman.*] You are a Roman Catholic priest?—Yes, stationed at Lyttelton. I have been for five years in New Zealand, and I always admired the organization of the police of New Zealand. I have been a traveller all over the world; and officers and the men of the Police Force of New Zealand have been always obliging, and bound to their duty, and very courteous to everybody, and I admire the organization of the Police Force in New Zealand. I wish to say, I never spoke to Constable Connell. I spoke to his wife only.
16. That is, on the occasion he referred to?—Yes, in reference to Mrs. O'Brien's case; and I was justified by the verdict of the Stipendiary Magistrate, because there was no evidence. I only went to see the constable for mercy's sake. He was sleeping.
17. Did you say what he said you did, or address it to his wife?—No. I said to his wife only, "Please tell your husband to withdraw the charge against Mrs. O'Brien." That is all.
18. Did you mention the name of the Hon. Mr. Thompson, or Colonel Hume?—No, I never did. I was not a fool, like him, to compromise the Hon. Mr. Thompson, and Colonel Hume.
19. This, you say, is what took place on the night after the trouble at O'Brien's?—Yes, the day after.
20. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you say anything to Connell, or to his wife, to the effect that you would have him moved from Lyttelton?—I never said such a thing. I never compromised myself.
21. Were you excited?—No.
22. Is it possible you may have forgotten you said it?—No, I never spoke to the man.
23. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You stated it was the morning after the disturbance in Mrs. O'Brien's that you called at the constable's house?—Yes.
24. Was it not the morning before the case went to the Court?—I do not recollect.
25. You are not sure it was not on the morning of the 11th, and not on the morning of the 5th?—I cannot tell the day. I had called at his house, and his wife told me that he was sleeping; and then I went into the parlour and I spoke to his wife, and I told her to take a message to her husband to withdraw the charge against Mrs. O'Brien on the side of mercy.
26. What did you know about Mrs. O'Brien?—I investigated the case; and the convincing fact that Mr. Beetham, S.M., dismissed the case, justified my doing so.
27. Did you see Mrs. O'Brien on the matter?—Yes.

28. Had she been to see you on the matter?—Yes; I went to see her, because she sent for me.
29. Mrs. O'Brien, I suppose, is very anxious the case should be withdrawn?—Yes, because there was no evidence.
30. You were speaking close to the bedroom door?—No, I was speaking in the parlour, but the bedroom leads out to the hall. It is opposite the parlour, and the door was shut.
31. You deny that you made use of the expression that you commanded four hundred votes?—I never did.
32. What is your congregation in Lyttelton?—I cannot tell the numbers; it may be one thousand, about one-fifth of the population. I never used such a term.
33. You quite realise you placed yourself in a false position in going as you did?—No, not at all. I did not complain of the Police Force in New Zealand. It is efficient and most obliging, both officers and men of the Force. It is the man I blame.
34. *Colonel Hume.*] You know the Hon. Mr. Thompson?—Yes; as a friend.
35. Are you in the habit of asking him to shift constables about the country?—I never did. I wish I could.
36. You and I are old friends?—Yes.
37. We visit each other's houses?—Yes.
38. Were you in the habit of getting me, when I was Commissioner, to move constables about the country?—I never did.
39. I suppose, now, you really command a great deal more than one hundred votes?—Yes, I do.
40. If you had been excited, you would not have under-estimated your influence in that respect?—That is right. I never said such a thing, about commanding any votes.
41. Though you and I have been friends for a long time, you have never used your influence or succeeded in using your influence with me?—I never did.

JOSEPH D. CROCKATT, examined on oath.

42. *The Chairman.*] You are an ex-policeman?—Yes.
43. What rank did you hold in the Force?—I was a third-class mounted constable, stationed at Christchurch. I was a first-class constable once.
44. When you were at Akaroa, what rank did you hold there?—Third class.
45. In what year?—About two years and a half ago; rather more.
46. What led to your removal?—I reported a horse which I had for some years as being unfit for service; and I wanted a remount. I applied to have a horse bought, which I knew on the Peninsula as being a serviceable horse. I wanted it bought as a horse bred on the Peninsula. Mr. Broham sent down, in reply, "I won't buy Mr. Lelievre's horse." He sent down a horse that I subsequently found out was bought at Southbridge. I had occasion to go out on duty, I think it was to Wainui; I had then to borrow a horse, as this horse was unfit to do the journey.
47. How far did you get before you found this out?—About six miles. I left the horse there, and borrowed a horse from the publican, Wilson.
48. What was the matter with the horse when you left him?—It was tumbling down. Constable Ryan was with me at the time. It was an old screw. I went on and did my work, and came back again and picked this horse up, and he was so bad that really I walked nearly all the way to my station. I reported the matter, and said distinctly in my report that the horse fell down and skinned his knees, and I took him to a paddock; I never rode him again, and I would not.
49. Did the horse fall down when you were going home?—No. The next morning, when I took him to the paddock, I made a report of the whole circumstances of the case; and the next thing I knew was that I was sent over to Hawera, in the North Island.
50. *Colonel Pitt.*] How long after you reported the matter were you removed?—Immediately.
51. What do you mean by immediately?—A day or two; it was done at once.
52. *Mr. Poynton.*] How long had you been at Akaroa?—For many years; about five years.
53. *The Chairman.*] Was nothing communicated to you by the department to lead you to suppose that there was any connection between your removal and your report as to the condition of the horse?—Not the slightest. I concluded that I was wanted to be got out of the way in connection with the horses, because other horses had been bought from the same place and had been frauds.
54. It was only your conclusion, without any evidence to support it?—Yes, and a very natural one, I thought.
55. *Colonel Hume.*] You say, in this letter to the Chairman of the Commission, dated Christchurch, to-day, that you were shifted from the station at Akaroa, which cost you inconvenience. What was the inconvenience?—It made me so ill that I had to go Home to the Old Country to recruit.
56. What, by the transfer?—Yes, I felt it a great grievance indeed to be transferred.
57. You had only been five years in Akaroa?—About that.
58. I suppose you expected to be fifteen years?—I know others who have been in stations for seven years, and I thought I had just as much right to be there as any others.
59. You were a bachelor were you not?—Yes.
60. And the inconvenience consisted in having to take up your portmanteau and having to go to Hawera?—I felt it very much, having to be shifted; I think it was an indignity. There was inconvenience, because I had some people coming down from Home, and they returned to Akaroa and found me gone. That was an inconvenience.
61. You said something about being a first-class constable?—Yes, I was once; I was taken down.
62. How did you get down to third class?—That does not relate to the case at all.
63. *The Chairman.*] You were reduced for some reason?—Yes.

64. *Colonel Hume.*] You say you were removed immediately after this correspondence?—Yes, I was.

65. Will you try and tax your memory and tell us what “immediately” means?—Shortly.

66. Will you take your oath you were removed within a month of that correspondence?—As far as I know I was removed a day or two afterwards—at once.

67. Then, if I bring evidence to show that it was over a month, will you admit you are wrong?—Certainly I will.

68. It was quite possible it may have been a month?—No, it is not possible it may have been a month; I do not think so.

69. Then, on your oath, you say it is perfectly impossible it could have been a month?—No, it was not a month.

70. Where were you before you went to Akaroa?—Ashburton.

71. How long were you there?—About nine months.

72. Have you suffered any loss by going to Hawera? Were you on foot, or mounted duty?—Things were in such a disorganized state there that the foot sergeant was riding the horse. I did not ride it; I never rode a horse there.

73. *The Chairman.*] Did you go there as a mounted man?—I was transferred there as a mounted man, and never did mounted work.

74. *Colonel Hume.*] Did you say to anybody, just at that time, you were too ill to remain in the service, and you intended to retire and go Home?—Yes, that is why I retired, through ill-health.

75. You retired from Hawera, and not from Akaroa?—I retired from the service when I was at Hawera.

76. How long had you been in Hawera when you sent in your application for retirement?—I really forget.

77. Had you been there a month?—Yes, more than a month.

78. Three months?—I cannot say.

79. Do you think you had been there three months?—I think so.

80. Then, your grievance is that owing to the disorganized state of the Force you were only allowed to remain five years at Akaroa, and then you were transferred to Hawera, and you were a bachelor?—Not in the slightest.

81. Then, you still maintain your statement that on account of having reported the condition of that horse you were transferred?—Yes. I have no antagonistic feeling towards you, neither have I towards Mr. Broham.

82. He told you you were removed on account of that?—No; but I drew my own conclusion.

83. Then, the whole of your grievance is drawn on a conclusion?—That is all.

84. No official ever told you, I suppose, that was the reason of your transfer?—No.

ARTHUR HUME, further examined on oath.

85. *The Chairman.*] At the period referred to by the previous witness you were Commissioner of Police?—Yes.

86. Can you give us the circumstances of the removal of this constable?—There was a vacancy for a mounted man at Hawera, and in looking down the list I knew that Crockatt had been at Akaroa for some five years—he said five years, but I think it was even more than five; and as he was a bachelor I thought he would be a very suitable man for Hawera. I recommended his transfer up there, and he was transferred. Any correspondence there may have been about this horse business did not influence me in the least, and, to the best of my belief, it had happened some month or six weeks prior to that. I saw him at Hawera about a fortnight after he got there, and he told me that his health was very bad and he did not intend to remain in the service, and was going to send in an application to be allowed to resign, which he immediately did.

87. You said the correspondence about the horse had nothing to do with that removal?—No; it was a month or six weeks afterwards, and, in fact, I had forgotten all about it at that time. I may state I do not blame him at all about the horse; he had sent the description of a horse down there which he wanted to buy, but I did not see my way to sanction that.

88. *Mr. Crockatt.*] You saw my correspondence regarding this horse?—Yes.

89. You also saw what I said regarding Reilly having raced the horse?—I am not going into the horse question.

90. *Colonel Pitt.*] Was Inspector Broham consulted about the removal?—No.

ARTHUR HUME, further examined on oath.

93. *Witness.*] I produce an entry from the record-book. On the 2nd June, 1894, I wrote the following memorandum to Inspector Broham: “Constable Scully is to be cautioned for not taking immediate action in this matter; and Constable Crockatt is severely reprimanded for putting his brother-in-law on as one of the jury. The entry will be made in Constable Crockatt’s sheet, but not in the case of Constable Scully. I will transfer Crockatt as soon as a suitable vacancy occurs.” That is dated the 2nd June, 1894, and the horse episode is dated the 6th February, 1896. It was a case of a single man and a mounted man’s vacancy that I had to find, and vacancies of that kind do not often happen together.

94. *The Chairman.*] When was he transferred?—On the 18th February, 1896—the same month as the horse episode. He left Akaroa for Hawera.

RICHARD MARSACK, examined on oath.

95. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Fourth-class detective, stationed at Christchurch.

96. What do you wish to bring to our notice? I understand you come as a delegate?—Yes, from the other detectives from Christchurch, to place before the Commission a suggestion that an

allowance should be made to ourselves towards the maintenance and repairs of bicycles that we use on public service. I may say that, during the past five years, myself and other detectives who have been stationed here have provided ourselves with bicycles at our own expense.

97. All of you?—Yes, and we really find we cannot get through the work without them; owing to the flatness of the city, and the extent of the suburbs, we cannot get on without them.

98. Since you have had them you find them indispensable?—Yes; I may say they are a saving to the department's expenses; we have often used them where otherwise horse-hire would have been incurred. I consider to a certain extent we are saving the department money in that way, and incurring expenses ourselves to save the department that money. It costs a matter of some £3 a year, roughly speaking, to keep each of these bicycles in repair; and I think I can safely say we have saved considerably more than that sum to the department, in what would otherwise have been expense for horse-hire. I have applied on one occasion to the department to have the cost of certain repairs paid by them. That was referred to the Commissioner and refused. The Commissioner stated it would be opening up too great a question for him to go into at that time. I think it should, particularly in Christchurch, when this arises. I do not know of any town where bicycles are so extensively used by police, or used at all. As detectives, we are always on duty, and are never using them for our own pleasure.

99. As a rule, is it advantageous to pass so rapidly through the streets and country as you would on bicycles? Is it only on exceptional occasions you want to make rapid passages?—No, it is very frequently. One particular bit of work we have to do is to inquire at pawn and second-hand shops for the recovery of stolen property; that used to take me a whole day, and now it can be done in two or three hours. We frequently also get reports of crime happening in the suburbs close about, and we can immediately proceed there on our bicycles; whereas, had we to wait for a tram or a coach, a good deal of valuable time would be lost.

100. What do the bicycles cost?—Mine cost £15.

101. Then I understand you to suggest, not that you should be provided with bicycles, but that the cost of keeping them in repair should be defrayed?—Yes. We do not want to ask too much.

102. If these are not for your own private use at all, but for use only on duty, how is it you are only content to ask for repairs, and not for bicycles?—We would sooner have "half a loaf than no bread."

103. *Colonel Pitt.*] Can you give us the benefit of your opinion as to bicycles being provided for the ordinary Police Force?—No, I really cannot see the necessity, except for suburban constables, and those who have to patrol out-districts. I do not think that the men in the city would require them.

104. How long ago is it since you represented this matter to Colonel Hume as Commissioner?—I think about twelve months ago I met with rather a serious accident to the bicycle, and incurred an expenditure of £1 10s., and I asked that that should be defrayed by the department.

105. *The Chairman.*] Referring to the previous question, and looking at the matter as a suggestion, do you think it would be practicable and useful to mount men for ordinary town work on bicycles?—Not the men on beat.

106. You think, in getting over the ground and paying all the necessary observation to what was going on, it could be done just as effectively and rapidly on bicycles as on foot? Supposing a constable had to arrest a drunken man, or something of that sort, what would he do with his bicycle?—I do not think it would be so effective.

107. *Mr. Poynton.*] It would be useful for patrolling the suburbs?—Most useful. In fact, most of the suburban constables have bicycles, which they have found themselves. I would like the Commissioner to ask Inspector Broham's opinion on this question.

THOMAS BROHAM, further examined on oath.

108. *The Chairman.*] You have heard the evidence of the last witness; will you give us your opinion upon it?—I have long advocated that the detectives should be supplied with bicycles. One detective with a bicycle is equal to two without one in this town.

109. At all events, if they cannot be supplied with the machines, you think they ought to be kept in repair for them?—I certainly think so. I should like to see them supplied with them. A man soon exhausts himself here if he is supposed to do his duty on foot. The detectives commence their duties at 9 in the morning and end about 2 o'clock the next morning.

110. Now, with regard to the question we have just raised, as to how far bicycles would be beneficial to the ordinary Police Force of the town: what is your opinion upon that subject?—I think the time has not yet arrived when, it appears to me, they should be supplied in towns to the men. By and by, I think, they will have to be supplied to the suburban constables. I would like to see them supplied to the suburban constables now, but it would involve a large expenditure.

111. Would not the expense in the towns give more efficiency to the number of men you have on your beats, or even justify a reduction in the number?—I cannot recommend their adoption in the towns; but I should be glad to see them given to the suburban constables.

112. This district is especially adapted for the use of bicycles?—Yes, the police being so numerically weak, there is all the more need for their being supplied with bicycles.

113. *Colonel Hume.*] You say you advocate bicycles. Have you ever recommended the men should be supplied with bicycles?—I have. I have recommended repairs. I have gone further, I have expressed myself that they should be also supplied with them.

114. You refer to the correspondence with Detective Marsack?—Yes, and Constable Flewellen.

115. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I believe I have sanctioned the payment of the cost of repairs to Constable Flewellen's bicycle?—Yes.

116. That is because the department recognised the use of it?—Yes.

117. In assisting the constable to get through from New Brighton?—Yes.
118. The other day you said the numerical strength of the Force in this district was totally insufficient?—Yes, totally insufficient.
119. How long has it been totally insufficient?—Certainly during the years I have been here. For the last five years.
120. Now in your report on the 1st July for the year 1895, you stated that “The three constables you sent here in February last have been a valuable addition to the strength of the Christchurch Station, which before their arrival was much undermanned.” Well, now, anybody reading that would infer that when you got these three men your Force was no longer undermanned?—When I got these three, the chances are I had been short of these three men for months before. One was taken away, and, I remember, I got no constable for ten months. It was a common thing to see men, both constables and sergeants, go away for three or four months without anybody coming to take their place.
121. Then, you went on to say the police in Christchurch had been starved for years?—Yes.
122. You referred to numbers?—Yes.
123. Then, you got an augmentation of six men last year?—I think it was last year.
124. You went on to say that you required five more men?—I said if the Force was up to what it was twenty-one years ago, fifty would not be in excess of the requirements of the place.
125. Then, supposing that there were five more men wanted here now: would you call five men short “totally insufficient”?—I am ten men short.
126. But you went on to prove that five men would be sufficient for it?—I am not aware I said that five men would be quite sufficient. I am aware I said if it was up to what it was twenty-one years ago it would not be in excess of the requirements. My reference to five, I think, was with regard to the men you might always count out as non-effective men.
127. Do you think that having more constables would prevent crime? Or do you want more constables to detect crime?—It would act both ways; it would prevent crime, and be the means of detecting crime.
128. When crimes occur now, have you anybody to attend to them?—Quite insufficient to attend to them—for instance, since this Commission commenced I have been short of half a dozen men over it.
129. When the Governor comes to Christchurch, do you furnish any men for him?—Yes.
130. How many?—I was not here the last time he was here.
131. Is it not usual to have one by day and one by night?—Yes; that means two men.
132. When the Minister comes you generally furnish him with men?—Yes; and there is generally a Commission sitting here.
133. And we have seen some four or five men in this chamber every day?—Yes.
134. Then, notwithstanding all this, and the shortness of men, you have managed to carry on the duties of the place?—I have had a most wearing and harassing office for the last five years.
135. Are not all police-officers harassed and worried?—They are. There is no class of men in the colony at the present time more hardly pressed than Inspectors of Police. The force is so very weak numerically.
136. When a man is likely to go sick for a month, have you no man at any out-station you could withdraw?—None whatever.
137. What about the man at Coalgate: could you withdraw him?—Certainly not; there must be a constable there; it is fifteen miles from another constable, and he has a large area to attend to. You cannot shut up the station.
138. Then, what about Southbridge?—As you know, the station has been shut up.
139. But you have got a man there now?—He has gone to Southbridge during the last three or four months.
140. You told me you had no men; and there is one, for instance?—I am not sure he could be brought in.
141. Then, you went on to say that during the last five years you had men physically weak, who had to go on the sick-list: now, do you think the men are physically weaker now than they were ten years ago?—I think so.
142. Now, you have had influenza in an epidemic form?—Yes.
143. That would account for a good many of the men going sick?—Yes.
144. Do you think that your sick returns, if you had them prepared now, would show a greater percentage of sickness on account of the influenza than occurred ten years ago, on the part of constables?—I cannot express an opinion on that.
145. Are you prepared to bear out your argument that they are physically weaker now than they were?—Yes, that is my impression; I say that a number of the men have been weaker men than they were ten years ago.
146. *The Chairman.*] You say you are not in a position to state whether a return of the sick-list would show that as many men were sick ten years ago as there are now?—I am not prepared to say.
147. *Colonel Hume.*] Have there been more cases of sickness during the past five years than in the five years preceeding?—I cannot say, because I was not here.
148. Then, you go on to say that a large number of the men are in no way fit for the work they have to perform; and that the men have no sense of duty themselves, and in whom there is no spirit of obedience. Were you referring to men from the Permanent Artillery, or outsiders?—From the Permanent Artillery mostly.
149. There were some good men from the Permanent Artillery, I suppose?—Yes, they were not all bad; I should be sorry to say that.
150. If you got men in whom there was no spirit of obedience or sense of duty, do you not think that a good deal of blame for that attaches to the non-commissioned officers placed over them?—

Ordinarily, that would be the case; but these were men who came into the Force by political influence.

151-52. When you make the statement that they came in by political influence, can you give us an instance?—I cannot charge my memory with it, but for the last five years it has been brought under my notice nearly every week of my life.

153. How brought under your notice?—By the conduct of the men, and what is reported to me by the sergeants of police, and what I have seen with my own eyes.

154. Then, you state that a large number had not sufficiently high intelligence to satisfy you?—That is so.

155. Have you made any official report of that?—To whom should I make it?

156. To the Commissioner?—The Commissioner was well aware of the class of men coming into the Force.

157. Have you made a report that these men were not sufficiently educated?—I have not made a report, but I was well aware that the Commissioner was as well aware of it as I was.

158. Is it not a fact that the recruits who join now are far better educated than those who joined ten years ago?—I certainly do not think so; that has not been my experience.

159. Then, you consider that the men you got ten years ago were more intelligent and better educated than the men you get nowadays?—In book-knowledge they may not know more; but they were more obedient, and more inclined to do their work; it is all play now and no work. Then it was real work.

160-61. I am talking from an educational point of view: are not the men better educated now than ten years ago?—They may be. They may have a certain veneration of education, but I should like to see it exercised in the way of duty. I do not see it exercised in that way.

162. Then they are intelligent, but their intelligence is not used in the right way?—Yes, that intelligence is not turned in the direction of their duties.

163. You went on to say the constables knew the Inspector's power was curtailed, and it bred a spirit of insubordination amongst the Force?—Yes.

164. You would not brook any insubordination now more than ten years ago?—No, I have done my best to keep the standard up.

165. How can you account for this return of offences committed by the men: in the year 1890 there were seventy-six offences recorded against constables, and the Force was then some fifty or sixty less than it is now; and in the year 1897 there were sixty-three offences. Can you account for them in any way?—Certainly; that would entirely depend on whether a sergeant did his duty with regard to the men. I do not believe for a moment you can judge of the character of the men by the return. That return counts for nothing.

166. Have you any reason to suppose that your sergeants are not dealing with the men properly?—This is how the matter stands: The number of sergeants has been reduced. A little time ago, I think, there were only a couple of sergeants doing the work of three, and we have often been short of two sergeants; and it is not likely constables will report each other—they never do. Then, the sergeants are men depending on the Force for a livelihood. They are dealing with a number of men whom they think have a lot of political influence; and when a sergeant looks at the matter in that light, it is not at all likely he will bring that constable or those constables up for a breach of duty as he would if he knew that the men simply had to do their duty, and that there was no political force at the back of the constables.

167. *The Chairman.*] You suggest that sergeants are deterred from doing their duty, under the impression that the constables have political influence at the back of them?—I think it is quite possible.

168. *Colonel Hume.*] Are we to infer that there was no political influence ten years ago?—No; there was political influence. The Force has been deteriorating for the last eighteen years; it commenced in 1880, when there were all these discharges.

169. Then, you think that the fact of only thirty-four constables being fined in 1890, and only fifteen in 1897, does not indicate that the Force is as well behaved now as it was ten years ago?—No, it does not; I think the figures count for nothing.

170. You went on to say that the Commissioner, or some deputed officer, should see all the men before they were admitted into the Force?—Yes, and that inquiries should be made into the character of the applicants before they were appointed to the Force.

171. Do you know what inquiries are made about the characters of them?—No inquiries whatever are made, so far as I know.

172. Have you ever made any inquiries?—Never.

173. Then you jumped at the conclusion that, because you have never made inquiries, no inquiries are made?—That is the impression, that there has never been an inquiry. A person comes and gets an application form, and fills it up; it is recommended by a Justice of the Peace, or a member of Parliament, or clergyman, and it is sent to Wellington; and nobody sees the applicant, and no inquiry is made as regards his character by any member connected with the department, so far as I know, and he is appointed to the Force without the Commissioner of Police seeing him.

174. Have you seen an applicant's form?—Of course I have.

175. Is there no inquiry there?—Not by anybody in the Force; so far as I am aware, the Commissioner of Police does not inquire into it, and the Inspector of Police does not inquire into it.

176. Has not the man to show there the last five situations he has been in?—I believe so; I know he has.

177. Then, has he not to show testimonials from the people who employed him at those five situations?—Yes; but I do not know what the worth of them is.

178. Then, considerable inquiry is made?—He produces certificates from these men; I do not know that anything more is done.

179. Well, if he saw the man, what would that do?—He would see the kind of man he was dealing with.

180. Would that tell him anything about his character?—He would have an opportunity of inquiring as to the character of the man.

181. Were you aware, then, that these people who employed him were asked about his character?—I knew he produced certificates from them.

182. Then, what is the Commissioner to do?—He should see the candidate, and there should also be a member of the Force to inquire into his character. It seems to me the first thing that should be done.

183. In fact, you think this application form is not searching enough?—I think it is utterly worthless.

184. *The Chairman.*] You think the certificates of the last five employers are utterly worthless?—He may have served only a few days with these employers. I would depend more on the officer of the police than on certificates.

185. *Colonel Hume.*] We have heard a good deal about political influence being used. Can you tell us now, from your own experience, about Masonic influence?—I cannot tell you anything about that.

186. It has never come under your notice?—No. I am not a Mason myself, and know nothing about it.

187. Then, you went on to say that you thought the pay of the men far too low?—Yes, I think it is.

188. And you think they ought not to get less than 7s. when joining?—Yes, and a pension; in my recommendations I always included a liberal pension, in order that a man might be kept in old age.

189. The pay when a man joins now is about 6s. 9d. a day?—About 6s. 6d.

190. Then, you advocate that leave might be cumulative up to a couple of months?—Yes.

191. How are you going to fill up the vacancies?—At the present time, as things go, we have no men; the department has been starved.

192. Then, if you got these extra men you would let your men go away for two months on leave?—I do not say that should be a rule; but in odd cases, where a man chooses to do so. It could be easily checked if the men were going to abuse it.

193. Then, you say, you have not been consulted in regard to promotions and transfers previous to the last six months?—No.

194. Are you quite sure that is a correct statement?—I have never been consulted in regard to promotions or transfers.

195. Did you not furnish me with a report stating whether men were fit to have charge of stations, and to go as Clerks of Court and as Clerks of Warden's Courts, and to do mounted duty?—Yes, that was a kind of general report; but it had no reference to any promotion and no reference to any transfer.

196. But what do you suppose was the object of my getting the return?—I am sure I do not know; you never consulted me in regard to the transfers while in charge of this Force, you never asked me about a promotion or a transfer.

197. Is not the first column of the return I referred to, to show whether the men were fit or unfit to take charge of stations?—You got this general return, but I never saw any result from it.

198. Did you see men put in charge of a station whom you said were not fit to be put in charge of a station?—No; but I once saw that. I saw a man placed in charge of a station when better men were not placed in charge of stations. I never wrote to state that any man was not fit to take charge of a station, because I was never consulted.

199. You have not put in this return men who were unfit for charge of a station?—My recommendation was for men who were fit to have charge of stations.

200. *The Chairman.*] I understand you were not consulted in any individual transfers, but you were consulted as to the suitability of men for transfers?—No. I think I only sent in a return of that kind once, and that is quite recently.

201. *Colonel Hume.*] Did not the first column of the return say "whether fit or unfit for charge of station"?—Yes, I believe so.

202. First of all, what was the return called for?—I have not the slightest idea. I know there was a column for men fit for stations, and men fit to go as Clerks of Court.

203. Did not the return give the names of all men serving under you who were not in charge of a station?—Yes, I believe so.

204. You do not look on that as a recommendation? Have you sent in a return to me stating the men fit to have charge of a station?—Well, I could not always say what a man's conduct would be, perhaps, in a couple of years after that.

205. Did you report to me every month as to conduct?—I sent you in a list, and that would show the list of defaulters; but then other things might arise, that do not appear on the defaulter's sheet at all.

206. *The Chairman.*] Were the reports as to men fit to have charge of stations, and men fit to go as Clerks of Court and Wardens' Courts, sent in monthly?—No; I think only once during my five years. But in any particular transfer, or transfer in this district, I was never consulted.

207. *Colonel Hume.*] Now, you told us the other day that you did not agree with this system of taking transfers away from the Inspector, did you not?—No, I did not—not in that way. I said that formerly Inspectors had that power. I said I was not consulted regarding transfers now.

208. Do you approve, or do you not approve, of taking away the power of Inspectors to transfer?—I think, as matters stand now, that Inspectors should be still consulted in regard to transfers in their district, because if that is not done you will only find wrong men in charge of stations. I do

not know how the Commissioner can know of the individual merits of the constables without consulting the Inspector; it seems to me extraordinary that such a thing could be supposed.

209. Then, your idea is to rank each district as a provincial Force?—Certainly not. In the provincial days the men were appointed to the police within the province, and had their duty within the province, and did not go outside of it; and no one can say that the Police Force now is up to the same standard it was in the provincial days.

210. *The Chairman.*] Do you mean it cannot be compared in regard to efficiency?—Yes.

211. As discoverers of crime, or maintenance of peace?—General ability. Of course, the provincial system was a more extensive system; but this I say, the department has been starved of late years.

212. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, you went on to say that the provincial system was much more efficient?—Yes, I say so.

213. Is it not within your knowledge that the whole stagnation of promotion that has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction, if there is such in the Police Force, has been caused by the state in which they found the Provincial Police when they took over office?—No, they have gone and reduced the Police Force in every possible way, numerically, and they have reduced the men in rank, and have done everything to discourage the men.

214. When the General Government took over the Canterbury Force, the Force consisted of six officers, twenty-two sergeants, and sixty-seven constables?—Yes.

215. That is, twenty-nine officers and non-commissioned officers, for sixty-seven constables?—Yes.

216. Do you think that is a fair proportion?—I do not think it was over-officered or over-manned at that time. I may say, there was one officer at Kaiapoi, but that is a matter of opinion. I do not know much of the officer at Kaiapoi, but that is the only place I should say an officer was not wanted.

217. You knew something about Westland?—I had been there.

218. In Westland, I find, they had three officers, one sergeant-major, seven sergeants, and twenty-one constables. Do you think that was a fair proportion?—In the busy times, when I was there, there were two Inspectors, myself and another; that was the strength of it then.

219. In Nelson, we find two officers, three sergeants, and eight constables?—I do not know anything about that district.

220. But you seemed to think this provincial system so good, or was so good?—Of course, they may have gone to a slight extreme in that direction. We have gone to the other extreme; we have gone in for a cheap Police Force.

221. One officer told us that, when the General Government took over the Provincial Police Force, Inspectors who had no class at all were made first-class Inspectors, and put over the heads of some others, who suffered thereby. Can you tell us something about that?—I remember something of the kind; that was so, I believe, in Otago.

222. For instance, taking Inspector Pender: Was he a senior or junior to you?—He was Inspector before me, at the time we were both in Canterbury; but then, I had independent charge of Westland, and semi-independent charge in Auckland, after that.

223. And when the amalgamation came on you went over his head?—Yes, but I do not expect Inspector Pender has complained of that.

224. Do you think it likely, or possible even, that constables have entries in their defaulters' sheets that they were never informed would be entered there?—I should be amazed to find such a thing done. The Inspector who did that would do what was very wrong indeed; I should say he was quite unfit for his office.

225. Your experience has been the other way?—Certainly.

226. Constable Mathieson told the Commissioners that he was unfairly dealt with by you in Auckland, in 1881, by being fined 2s. 6d. for being absent from his beat, and he did not know it was entered on his sheet?—Of course, so far as saying he did not know the thing was on his sheet, that must have been absurd; he must have known. I cannot remember the circumstances. Of course, he must have seen that the amount was deducted from his pay; he must have been well aware of that.

227. But there would be no papers about it?—I do not think so.

228. And, as you say, the 2s. 6d. was deducted from his pay, therefore, he must have known that part of it?—Yes.

229. And you cannot believe that any constable who has served under you has had an entry made in his defaulter's sheet that he did not know of?—I can conscientiously say he could not possibly make that mistake.

230. Can you tell us if it has come under your notice, or if you know of any constables occupying subordinate positions who have served with ability and distinction, whilst others, with nothing to recommend them but political influence, were placed in positions they were utterly incapable of filling properly? Has a case of that sort come under your notice—as this was a statement made, I think, in the House of Representatives, and therefore I ask the question?—Well, I have long concluded that unless a man exerted himself politically to get advancement he had a very small show in this Force. I cannot say that is so in the terms in which the question is put.

231. *The Chairman.*] With reference to that remark, you have long concluded that unless a man exerted himself, and so on: what period do you cover by that expression?—For some years.

232. Can you give us anything more definite; is it a matter of ten years or twenty years?—Within the last ten years.

233. *Colonel Pitt.*] What do you base that opinion on?—From my every-day experience in the Police Force.

234. Well, what has been your experience?—Dealing with men every day, I have an intimate knowledge of what is going on in the district.

235. You have said that the sergeants would not enforce discipline because they knew that the men had political influence, or they supposed that they had it; but you say here now, that “I have long concluded that unless the men exerted themselves politically to get advancement they have little chance of getting it.” What is that founded on?—It is founded on my daily experience in the Police Force.

236. Can you give us any instance?—I cannot charge my mind with any particular instance.

237. *Colonel Hume.*] The two biggest appointments given in the last ten years in the Force were given to a man named Pratt, who, I think, served many years under you; and a man named Cullen, whom I think you know. Now, do you think these two men exerted political influence to get them?—I am not aware of it, but I know the appointments were given to the right men.

238. You were not aware they exerted any political influence, but you know the appointments were given to the right men?—I know that.

239. Does that bear out the answer to the question immediately before?—Not in this case.

240. And these are the two biggest appointments for some time in the Force?—They are.

241. Have you known constables to be given stations which they were not competent to take charge of?—I do not know I have known many of them. I have known one particular case.

242. Was that long ago?—A few years ago.

243. Was it in my time?—Yes.

244. Can you give the name of the station?—Waimate Station.

245. And had the man concerned been in charge of a station before he went to Waimate?—Yes, some time before.

246. Then he was probably in charge of a station before my time?—Yes, he was.

447. Now, is there any disorganization in the Force in your district that you know of at the present time?—I am not aware of any disorganization, but I would like to see the Force more effective, and numerically increased.

448. Is the Force in your district efficient?—I should like to see it much more so.

449. *The Chairman.*] Does that mean that the present Force is inefficient?—The present Force is numerically very weak.

450. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, in your opinion, its only inefficiency consists of its numerical weakness?—I have said more than that; I have said some men were weak in physique, and do not possess a high intelligence, or intelligence to suit me.

451. Now, have you been directed by me from time to time, or at any time, to carry out the liquor laws vigorously?—Most certainly, over and over again.

252. Have you been deterred in any way, either by written or verbal instructions, in carrying out the liquor laws?—Certainly not.

253. You said the other day that you thought your district too large?—Yes.

254. Is there any station you could not get to in a day from Christchurch?—Most of them I can get to in a day, but the district is very large.

255. Has there been any important case that you have not been able to attend to, owing to your being in some other part of the district?—Well, most of these stations I am only able to visit once a year, and I only see the men for one or two hours in the year.

256. And you think they ought to be oftener visited?—Yes. I think they should be regularly inspected.

257. Who takes charge of the district when you go away from Christchurch?—The sergeant-major has charge.

258. What does your district clerk do?—District clerk's work.

259. Supposing a telegram comes for you: who opens it?—In my absence the chief clerk opens it.

260. And if it is anything about crime he hands it over to the sergeant-major?—Yes.

261. But you would not say, if anybody asked you, that the district clerk was in charge of the district while you were away?—Certainly not; the sergeant-major is next in seniorship, and he takes charge.

262. When the fire-bell rings, what men of yours are supposed to turn out? Of course, the men on duty are; but are any others supposed to turn out?—Yes; if the fire-bell rings at night all the men turn out, excepting those for the early morning relief.

263. Is that in accordance with the instructions you received from my office?—I am not aware of any instructions to the contrary.

264. Did you get instructions some time ago to say that half the men not on duty were not to turn out to the fire?—I do not remember that.

265. But, if there is such a circular it is acted up to in Christchurch?—Certainly. I do not remember such a circular, but somebody must attend to fires; if there are eight or ten thousand gathered at a fire, it would not do to leave the whole place in the hands of the two or three men who are on duty in the town.

266. I have a circular here, No. 8, published in the *Gazette* of the 27th February, 1896, headed, “Police attending Fires,” to the effect that only half the men not on duty are to turn out? Do you remember that circular?—I do now.

267. That is acted up to in Christchurch?—Certainly; it must be.

268. *The Chairman.*] It is carried out?—Certainly; the duty is extra heavy on the police here with regard to fires, because we have a larger number of false alarms here than anywhere else, on account of the system.

269. *Colonel Hume.*] Has anything come to your notice with regard to transfers, promotions, or admittance of constables, that you could trace to political or Masonic influence?—No; I have

never troubled myself in these matters at all. I have never gone out of my way to ascertain how the men get promotions, or anything else. I cannot charge my memory with any case of the kind. I know Freemasonry influence is new to me. I had not heard of it before.

270. Has it come to your notice that political influence has been used to secure promotions, reductions, or removals of the men in the Force?—Yes; frequently I have heard that stated.

271. Has it come to your knowledge by report? Can you put your hand on a case?—I cannot.

272. Then, it has come to your knowledge?—It has come to my knowledge. I have heard statements made, but I cannot give a case. There was a widespread belief in the Police Force that without political patronage no man stood any chance of advancement.

273. Did you ever yourself feel that?—I cannot for a moment suppose that all I have heard is all baseless.

274. Supposing a publican thinks a constable is unduly zealous in the performance of his duty in watching his house, and considers that constable would be better somewhere else, have you known him to go to the member of the House for that district to get that man removed?—Personally I have never known a case of the kind. But the case alluded to by Inspector Cullen the other day was reported to me at the time it occurred. He believed he was removed from Timaru for a case of that kind—that is known; and he was transferred.

275. Then, do you believe in recruiting men from certain districts or certain localities?—No; I said already I believed in recruiting from the whole colony.

276. But if you find you could get a better stamp by recruiting from Stewart Island?—It is a limited population.

277. Is it your opinion that those recruits should be got irrespective of districts altogether?—Yes; I believe in recruiting from the whole colony: but I should be very sorry to see it confined to one district where the field was better.

278. Do you believe in giving a man who has committed a serious fault a second chance?—Certainly. I have seen excellent men make serious mistakes, and recover themselves again.

279. And you are not prepared to say that a man who has been dismissed should never be brought back again?—The less that was resorted to the better. Of course, a serious mistake might have been punished without a man's dismissal; but I take it for granted that the Commissioner of Police would not lightly dismiss a man. But, having dismissed a man, I cannot understand your taking him back again. I take it he would inquire into all the circumstances before he dismissed him, and make all allowances for his previous good character.

280. Can you remember recommending a man who was dismissed from the Force not many years ago, and who was brought back?—Yes, I do.

281. Then, you did not make it a hard-and-fast rule?—Well, there again, you see, that man need not have been dismissed, to commence with; why he was dismissed and reappointed I do not know. If the man had borne a good character before, I do not know why he was dismissed.

282. He was dismissed?—Yes.

283. And you recommended that he should be brought back?—I did.

284. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you think he ought not to have been dismissed?—No, I do not; I had only said I had a long experience of the man, and that he had shown himself to be a good man.

285. *Colonel Hume.*] Then, you went on to say you did not believe in periodical transfers?—Yes.

286. Is it not a fact that several times you have recommended men for transfer?—I have recommended very few for transfer. I do not think I have recommended half a dozen during my whole time here. I recognise the fact that it was all done from Wellington.

287. You have probably recommended half a dozen?—I do not think I have recommended half a dozen.

288. How came you to recommend them if you do not believe in transfers?—These were very special cases. What I complain of is that the men were so short a time in the place that they could not come into touch with the public; they never had an opportunity of knowing the public, nor the public of knowing them. It takes a constable a couple of years to know much about the locality he serves in, and the people he is dealing with; and again, in provincial days, when I say the Force was a very efficient Force, the whole of the officers were appointed in the district and did not go outside of this district.

289. You stated the other day that a crowd was in the habit of collecting in front of the Empire Hotel, and that it was due to the fact that a couple of Riccarton 'buses started from there?—The 'buses generally start from there, and it is owing a good deal to that fact that the crowd collect.

290. And up to the present time the 'buses still start from there?—They still continue.

291. I think I called your attention to that crowd when I was Commissioner, and asked you to clear the streets?—Yes.

292. Can you account for the fact that since that evidence was given, three or four days ago, the crowd has disappeared altogether?—We are immediately after the Easter holidays, and that is the cause of it. The town is always dull after the holidays.

293. You have taken no extra precautions since you gave your evidence?—No.

294. You also stated in your evidence that the younger men were kept in the city, while the older men were sent to the country stations?—That was the rule that used to be observed. I do not know whether it is the case now or not.

295. Do you not think it is a right rule?—Yes.

296. You also said that the men here had been in the city only a short time?—Yes.

297. Now, have you not twelve men who have been here over two years?—The senior constables are on special duty, and not on the town duty.

298. But are there not twelve men who have been here over two years?—There may be, but most of them are on special duty.

299. Cannot you say whether there are or are not a dozen men here who have been in the city for two years?—There may be, but I cannot say.

300. But you are not prepared to say there are not a dozen?—No; but if there are, most of them are on special duty.

301. As to the older men being in charge of stations, you say that used to be the rule?—Yes.

302. Are you prepared to say it was the rule when I became Commissioner?—No, but I find aged men coming into the town now on duty.

303. Married men?—Married sergeants.

304. We are not talking about sergeants?—Well, they form part of the Force. I think it is cruel to keep them doing eight hours' duty on the streets.

305. I want to get at this: Have you got old and senior constables in town who are married men, when their juniors are out in charge of stations?—No, that is not the rule.

306. Was it not very often the case that these older men were out on street duty and younger men were in charge of stations in the time when Inspectors had the power to transfer?—No, Sir, it was not.

307. Are you now speaking for the colony?—I am speaking of my own experience, and it was not the rule in my experience.

308. Let us suppose a case: A station was vacant, and you recommended a third-class constable for it. He would probably be the senior man in your district without a station, and in your opinion would be fitted for it. In another district there was a second-class constable, much his senior. Do you think it would be right on the part of the Commissioner to send your man?—I know cases will occur when it will be necessary to send a man from other districts; but the rule—and it was a wise rule—was that men should not be sent out of a district.

309. Then, if the Commissioner did not send the man you recommended, would you not consider you had a fair grievance?—What I state is that I was never consulted at all, and I do not mention it as a complaint but as a fact.

310. I am endeavouring now to show that you cannot run the Force by districts. Was not the competency of men for the charge of stations determined by a return furnished by the Inspectors?—I do not know that. I do not know whom that rested with. I furnished a return, but whether it had anything to do with the choice of constables I do not know. I know I furnished that return once.

311. You say that you require six detectives for Christchurch?—I think so. I think that with six efficient men the detective branch would be sufficiently strong.

312. And as each detective has a bicycle, and you told us that a detective with a bicycle was worth two without bicycles, you think that twelve detectives are required for Christchurch?—No. You actually reduced the number to two, but I think that was playing with the crime of the place. It seemed to me farcical to run Christchurch with two detectives.

313. Now, in your annual report of 1894, you say, "A comparison of the various kinds of crime committed during the last two years shows but a very slight difference in the totals for both years. No crime calling for special remark was committed during 1893"?—Yes. I think that is easily explained. I meant to say that there was no murder, or highway robbery, or aggravated crime.

314. Notwithstanding that the place had been denuded of detectives?—They were not reduced to two in 1893. We had three then.

315. When were they reduced?—About twelve or eighteen months ago.

316. Then, in your report of 1897, dated 1st June, 1897, you say, "Beside the remains of the murdered man a swag was found, containing such articles as are usually carried by swagsmen. Every possible effort has been made to elucidate the mystery surrounding the case, but, so far, without success. No other case of crime requiring special mention occurred here during the year." That is correct?—Yes. I brought under your notice repeatedly the fact I have stated to the Commission—that twenty-one years ago there were fifty men in the Force in Christchurch, and that, although the population had since doubled, the Force is less now than it was then.

317. And what was my answer?—That the circumstances had changed, and that I had not now the class of men to contend with that I then had.

318. And did I not also say that you now had as assistance the telephone, the telegraph, and the bicycle?—We had the telegraph formerly.

319. Does not assistance from those directions alter the position, then?—Yes; but it has to be remembered that the population has doubled, and that alters it also. I did not ask to have double the number of men that we had in the early times, but that the number should be at least what it was twenty years ago.

320. You also said in your evidence that crime is not detected to your satisfaction. What is the particular class of crime that is going undetected?—I could not confine my remarks to any particular class of crime. I think that, all round, the number of arrests should be larger than they are at present. For instance, there are complaints from the Prohibitionists.

321. I suppose they would still complain if there was a large Force?—Well, with two men in the town on Sunday it is too much to expect that we can give the attention to forty-six public-houses that some sections of the community think should be given to them.

322. Do you think that if you had two hundred men the complaints of the Prohibitionists would cease?—If there was a man at the front door and a man at the back door of every hotel, I do not know if even that would satisfy some people.

323. You served in Auckland for a considerable time?—Yes.

324. And if you require six detectives for Christchurch, how many would you require for Auckland?—I think Auckland would require as large a number.

325. Would it not require a larger number? Is Auckland not in direct communication with San Francisco, Sydney, and Melbourne?—The detectives in Auckland were reduced to a merely

nominal number, and crime at once became marked. The criminals saw that the Detective Force was weak, and they flocked there immediately, as they will.

326. But how is it that you consider that Christchurch requires the same number of detectives as a place in direct communication with the other colonies and outside places?—As a matter of fact, I believe there are eight or ten detectives and plain-clothes men in Auckland doing detective work at present.

327. But your power of making plain-clothes detectives is not limited, is it?—If I appointed two or three plain-clothes detectives I would have to take men off the street, and there would be a complaint about that.

328. If the Governor comes and takes two men there are no complaints about the streets being denuded, are there?—Somebody must do the work of those two men.

329. Did you ever have Sergeant Mulville under you?—Yes.

330. How did he perform his duties?—I cannot say he gave general satisfaction. I think he did his best. He is a man growing in years, and a man whom I would be glad to see in a country station. I think that is the best place for him.

331. Would you put him in charge of a large town district?—To act alone?

332. Yes?—In his present state of health I do not think he is fit for it.

333. What about his tact and discretion? Is that sufficient to warrant his being put in charge of a town district?—I do not know. I had him with me only a few months.

334. Do you know of the existence of oyster saloons and tobacconists' shops where young lads and girls are induced to bet?—I do not.

335. Do you think there are any?—It might be done in a small way, but not in a way that will attract the notice of the detective police.

336. You would know of it, if it was done?—If it was done in a marked manner.

337. Do you recollect the examinations that were once held? One lot was held for testing constables' qualifications for promotions, I think?—Yes.

338. Did you see the papers set on that occasion?—I do not recollect, but I know that papers were set.

339. Mr. Stratford was the examiner?—Yes.

340. Do you believe in those examinations?—I think, if they are carried out in the manner that they are in Victoria, they would be useful in sharpening a man's faculties, and would result in the men acquiring a knowledge of the law.

341. You do not believe in military men for Commissioners of Police?—I was not asked the question.

342. But I ask you now?—As a matter of fact, military men have had charge of the Force from the first.

343. They had charge of the Force in Victoria before you came here?—Yes.

344. Then, you do not wish to express an opinion one way or the other?—The Police Force in Victoria was looked on as the first in the colonies, and a military man was at the head of it. Military men have had charge of the New Zealand Force since it was instituted, and it has not been a success.

345. Were not your requests and suggestions given effect to by me when I was Commissioner?—On the whole, they were.

346. Whenever you had a case you thought doubtful, or in which you required the assistance of counsel, you always sent me a telegram?—Yes.

347. Were you ever refused the assistance of counsel?—No, it was always approved.

348. What is your opinion as to the powers of the Commissioner? Ought he to be responsible to Parliament alone, or be under Ministerial control?—He should be under Ministerial control, but not as regards the appointment and the dismissal of constables. I could give an instance that occurred in the Victorian Force. Captain McMahon established the Police Force there shortly after the goldfields broke out. He had one Captain Dana serving under him, stationed at Geelong. This man wanted to come into Melbourne. Captain McMahon refused to take him into the town, and Captain Dana went to the Premier, Sir John O'Shannessey, who appointed him to Melbourne over Captain McMahon's head. Captain McMahon then resigned the Force. That is a marked case. That is the attitude Captain McMahon took up; he was the man who established the Police Force in Victoria and made it what it was. He would not allow any interference whatever. That is the position the Commissioner of Police in New Zealand should have.

349. Then, the only fault you have to find with my administration is that I had not power enough?—It seems to me that was the state of things.

350. Can you tell me the number of Protestants and the number of Roman Catholics you have in the Force in Christchurch?—No. I do not know the creed of scarcely a single man. I do not know the creed of the sergeant-major. I have never inquired about it.

351. If I say there are thirty Protestants and twelve Roman Catholics, you will not contradict me?—No.

352. Did Sergeant Wilson ever serve under you?—Yes.

353. What sort of a sergeant was he?—Very good.

354. Did he apply for charge of a station?—Yes.

355. And was he given one?—Yes.

356. Do you recollect anything about his forage returns at Akaroa being wrong?—He was at Christchurch when I came here.

357. It was not in your time, then?—No.

358. You recommended him for removal to the station?—Yes, I did.

359. Do you know the A1 Hotel in Christchurch?—Yes.

360. How many convictions have you had against the house?—Two or three within the last eighteen months.

361. Were they brought by the police?—They were.
362. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the beat duty, the day is divided into three periods of eight hours?—Yes.
363. How many men, as a rule, go out on the morning beat from 5 a.m. to 9 a.m.?—Two or three is the usual number. The next relief, also of two or three, is from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. It might happen at times that there are more than two or three. The next relief is from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., and usually the same number go out. The next is from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., and the same number go out. The next is from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., and at present sometimes about five men go out for that beat. The beats are formed for ten men.
364. There are ten beats?—Yes.
365. And these ten beats are occupied by from two to three men?—In the day-time the men do not go all over the ground, but confine themselves to the more thickly populated parts of the town.
366. When do they go over the ten beats?—At night.
367. These ten beats are served by ten men at night?—Sometimes. Occasionally, but rarely, we have the ten.
368. Do you say the number is sometimes less than five?—It is down to five, but I do not think there is less than five.
369. When do the men who serve from 5 a.m. to 9 a.m. again go out?—They serve again from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., and the men who come in at 1 p.m. go out again at 5 p.m. till 9 p.m.
370. According to that, the whole of the day duty would be performed by four to six men?—Yes, occasionally.
371. If you have a total of forty men, how is it, then, that you are short of men, when only six men are required for the whole of the day duty?—Included in the forty there are myself, three detectives, the sergeant-major, three watch-house keepers, two clerks, three sergeants, the Court orderly, the Inspector of Weights and Measures, two mounted men, three or four attending Courts, two escort men, perhaps two men on the sick-list, and perhaps two men on leave.
372. That reduces the effective force to ten or fifteen?—Yes.
373. Can the staff of men holding special duties be reduced in any way?—It is utterly impossible. I want another man for clerical work. At present, I have only two for this huge district.
374. The number of men you have for street duty is about ten or eleven?—About ten, occasionally.
375. And that number ought to be increased by how many?—I have more than ten, but the full number is continually being reduced.
376. I am speaking of those you have available for police duty in the street?—I sometimes have ten men for night duty, when it happens that they are not on sick leave, or on escort duty.
377. You consider, then, that you are 50 per cent. short of effective men for ordinary duty?—To have the Police Force here up to its proper strength I should have ten more men.
378. *Colonel Hume.*] Have you a constable named Gantley?—Yes.
379. Have you employed him on plain-clothes duty?—During my absence on leave, he was on plain-clothes duty.
380. Is he still on that duty?—I think he is just returning to street duty.
381. Do you think he is likely to make a good detective?—I think he is more fit for street duty than detective work.
382. *Colonel Pitt.*] I do not know if we are to take your evidence literally, but I would like to call your attention to this statement: "The men are less inclined to work now than formerly. Now it is all play and no work." Does that accurately describe the condition?—No, not in that manner; but up to lately that was the case. I might have said, "Of late years."
383. For how long back has that state of things existed?—For some years. I would narrow it down to the last seven years.
384. What do you think was responsible for that?—I think that, in the main, politics were responsible for it.
385. Did you make any representations about it?—No, I made no representations about it.
386. Not in your annual reports, or in any other way?—No.
387. Was it not the business of the Inspector to represent that the men were not working, but playing?—That was generally my experience; but I knew it was a new system that had been introduced into the Force, and I carried it out to the best of my ability. It was right-about face on the old state of things, and I was not going to oppose the whole thing and say that I was wiser than those in authority over me, and that I knew better than they did. I saw, however, that the whole thing must lead to inefficiency in the future.
388. Do you think that that state of things existed in other districts than your own?—I am certain it did. I read of an Inspector having stated before the Commission that a detective had told him he had more power than the Inspector; and I can only conclude from that that the same state of things existed in other districts.
389. But do you wish us to understand that the necessary work of the Force was not done? What do you mean by saying it was not work, but all play?—I meant it was the disposition of the men. Their thoughts were not bent on work, and they had no sense of duty or discipline. They received their pay, and they did as little as they possibly could. They did their work in a perfunctory manner, and did not put their hearts into it.
390. Is that the condition of the Force now?—No. Public attention has been drawn to the matter in a very marked manner for many months past, and the Commission has been set up, and I think there is a great change in the Force; but how long it will continue I do not know.
391. *Colonel Hume.*] What is the new state of things you speak of? What is the new system that was introduced?—I do not think there is the political influence at work that there was once.

392. But you said you saw there was a new system introduced which must come to grief. What was it, and when was it introduced?—I think it was a lax system, that did not keep on the lines that formerly existed in the Force.

393. What was the change? You have evidently led the Commissioners to understand that I made the change?—I said there was a change from 1880. That was the first of it, but as years have gone by it has been more marked.

394. *The Chairman.*] You limited the time to seven years?—I referred to the more marked effects of the change.

395. And what was the new system?—The political system.

396. *Colonel Hume.*] You said it had been in existence for many years?—The men had not votes for some years ago—say, twelve or sixteen years ago. It has been since they got votes that the system has commenced.

397. There has been no change in the management of the Force for the past seven years that you think has done any harm at all?—I think the change has become more marked within the last seven years. When the Permanent Artillery men were introduced, they would leave their mark quickly on the Force. They were mostly men who came into the Force with political influence. They all had the idea that they should each be Commissioner of Police, and I do not know if their ambition would have been satisfied even then.

398. You can only speak of the men who came to your district, I suppose?—That is so.

399. And you cannot prove, can you, that they were political appointments, or that they were made through political influence?—I cannot prove it, but I am satisfied of it.

400. You made up your mind about it?—Certainly not. I have had very bitter experience of it, as you very well know that I had. I have frequently complained to you about it.

401. *Colonel Pitt.*] In what way can the unsatisfactory state of things to which you have alluded be remedied?—The first essential is to have the Commissioner of Police independent of all political control as regards the appointment and the dismissal of men. He has the power of dismissal now; but I believe he has in every case to submit dismissals to the Minister. I do not know whether I am correct in stating that.

402. Anything else?—Recruiting from the whole colony would also help. I think these are the essentials.

403. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You remember Constable Pascoe being dismissed?—He was dismissed while I was on leave.

404. I may say the witness is wrong as to my power of dismissing men. I have power to dismiss men, and do not refer dismissals to the Minister. The regulations give me the power, and I exercise it.

405. *Witness:* I am glad to hear it.

406. *The Chairman.*] Had Colonel Hume that power?

407. *Colonel Hume:* No.

408. *The Chairman.*] As to the men in the Force who were specially concerned in looking after licensed houses, were they encouraged to do their duty efficiently by taking action in such cases as they thought necessary?—Most decidedly.

409. Do you think that in matters of police offences there should be an appeal from the Inspector to the Commissioner?—I think the Commissioner should have the complete control.

410. You would not go from the Commissioner to the Minister with an appeal?—No.

411. Has the enforcement of the licensing law been satisfactory to you since you have held office?—The enforcement of these laws has been carried out in the same manner in which all other laws have been enforced.

412. How is it there have not been more convictions?—There are more difficulties in enforcing the licensing law than any other law on the statute-book.

413. Have prosecutions been instituted in all cases in which you felt justified in proceeding?—Yes.

HARRY FEAST, examined on oath.

414. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Harry Feast.

415. What are you?—I am a general commission agent.

416. Do you live in Christchurch?—Yes.

417. At one time you were in the Police Force?—Yes. I joined the police in London, in 1854. I joined the Metropolitan Police, and was in the C division for two years. Subsequently I joined the City of London Police, and served with that Force from 1857 to 1862. I then came to the colonies. I followed the diggings all over New Zealand for three years, and joined the Canterbury Police Force in 1865. I joined as a detective, and held that office till the General Government took us over. I then had charge of the West Coast for three years, with my headquarters at Greymouth.

418. What was your rank?—I was a first-class Inspector. I may say that I held the rank of Inspector in the Provincial Force, having been appointed Inspector in 1875. I was in charge of the detective branch of the Provincial District of Canterbury in the provincial time. I was responsible for the detection of crime in the whole of the province. I had a man stationed at Lyttelton, and another at Timaru, and one or two assisted me in Christchurch. The Commissioner at the time was Mr. Shearman. If my men did not suit me I reported to that effect to him, and other men were appointed. I found that that worked remarkably well. Of the crime that was reported to me there was scarcely any of it undetected. My system was to make every man feel that he had an interest in the department, and that whatever part he played he would get credit for it, no matter whether he made the arrest or not. For some time the police in New Zealand have been in a disorganized state. I speak from what I have seen.

419. *Colonel Pitt.*] In what way are they disorganized?—We read in the papers of a number of robberies and burglaries; and it is not creditable to the police to allow that sort of thing to be

done. Gangs of thieves have run through from Auckland to the Bluff, some of them breaking into offices and carrying off safes to a distance of half a mile in some cases to open them. Yet these men have not been detected. I think that is the result to a large extent of the bad system, and to the fact that detectives are often employed to do work that they should not be called on to do, instead of sticking directly to the detection of crime, which is their proper work.

420. *The Chairman.*] Such as?—Such work as breaches of the Licensing Act would cut the ground from under a detective's feet.

421. Do you find the licensed houses a good source of information?—Yes, I did. I think a deal of mud has been thrown at the police, and a lot of it they do not deserve. Their shortcomings have been magnified by the Prohibitionists.

422. Do you say that the police are so much taken up with enforcing the Licensing Act that they are unable to perform more important duties?—I am not speaking of the general police, but of the Detective Force, and what I say is that they have no right to be employed in any shape or form in publichouse or sly-grog selling cases. I had a direct order in my time that the detectives were not to do that work; otherwise they would not get about to do their proper work. It is impossible for a man to get about to do his work if he is suspected.

423. You think it interferes with their usefulness?—Yes, it ties their hands.

424. You think it does not allow them to get information from the hotels?—Yes. In my time I owed an immense deal to publicans, who helped me to carry out various duties I had to perform. I think, too, that a great deal of the disorganization of the Force has been caused through political influence.

425. Have you known any of it?—I know it for myself.

426. In what way?—When the reduction of officers took place, some years ago, a circular telegram was sent round saying that six Inspectors were to be retired. I was in charge of the West Coast at the time. Three of the Inspectors managed to retain their positions, while three of us left. I was too proud at the time to take a reduced position. From what I have read in the evidence given before the Commission, I think there must have been political influence at work.

427. In favour of what?—Of those who were retained.

428. Do you know of any recent cases in which political influence has been used to the prejudice of the Force?—No. I do not know any cases within my own knowledge.

429. *Colonel Hume.*] Your knowledge of what you call the disorganization of the Force is gathered from what you have read in the newspapers?—The business I have been doing since I left the Force shows me a good deal of what the police are doing.

430. Do you speak of Christchurch only?—Yes.

431. You spoke a little ago of the whole colony?—Well, I assume that what happens here occurs throughout the colony.

432. You also spoke of what you read in the papers about robberies. Do you, as an old officer, believe all you see in the papers?—Well, we hear of robberies and thefts, and we see no results following.

433. You do not believe all you read in the papers, do you?—If I read in the paper that a place has been broken open and a safe carried away I would believe it.

434. Do you think that all the newspapers say is correct?—No.

435. You also said it was an error to put detectives to detect licensing cases. That cannot account for any disorganization now, because it is only recently that that has been done?—I do not know what is going on in the department now.

436. You have formed that judgment after having read what has been said before the Commission?—Yes.

437. Do you think there is much undetected crime?—I am positive of it.

438. In what line?—All sorts. I hear a lot that is never reported to the police. I believe there are robberies nightly.

439. I suppose you are ready to assist the police all you can in the detection of crime?—Yes. In what I am saying I do not wish to throw any discredit on the Force. I would like to see the Force what I think it should be, and that is my object in speaking.

440. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You do not know, of your own knowledge, that the detectives are employed to watch for breaches of the licensing law?—I know they were employed here some time ago for detecting an oyster-saloon.

441. How long ago?—About a couple of years ago.

442. Is that the only instance you know of?—I do not know, personally, of any other.

443. Have you seen it stated in the papers that detectives would be employed for the purpose?—What I say is that they should not be. They have been employed for many years to do "tuppenny-ha'penny" things that a detective, who has to cope with the class of criminal that exists now in the colony, should not be asked to do. The detective should be above that class of thing.

444. Then, with the exception of the time they were employed to detect an oyster shop, they have not been employed in this way?—I read in the papers that detectives were employed to bring up a case against a woman who lives in a house—not a brothel, in a sense, but a house in which she received gentlemen. A detective should not be asked to do that class of work.

445. *The Chairman.*] You express the opinion, as an old detective officer, that it is not advisable to employ detectives upon such matters as breaches of the licensing laws and in proceedings against prostitutes, unless it is for crime of a special character?—Yes. If you want a Detective Force for the publichouses, you should have a revenue detective force, irrespective of the Detective Force proper.

446. You regard breaches of the licensing law as breaches of revenue?—Yes. I have known Christchurch for thirty-three years; and, although there has been a lot of it, the evil has been terribly overdrawn.

WEDNESDAY, 27TH APRIL, 1898.

SAMUEL FLEWELLEN, examined on oath.

1. *Colonel Pitt.*] What are you?—I am a second-class constable stationed at Richmond, or Bingsland, as it is officially called.

2. *The Chairman.*] What is the matter you wish to bring under our notice?—I would like to say that I was a sergeant of police in the Royal Irish Constabulary. I resigned from that Force while I was holding that rank, which my papers in the Commissioner's office will show. I resigned in 1879 for private reasons. I thought I would do better, but I made a mistake.

3. You came to this colony when?—I came to South Australia in 1880, and joined the Force there, and was in that Force for about nine months. I considered the climate of South Australia too warm, and I came to this colony and joined the Force here in November, 1881. I was sent to Christchurch from Wellington, and when I was here about ten months Mr. Broham sent me in charge of the St. Albans Station. I was at St. Albans Station for thirteen years, and I have been at Bingsland Station now for about two years and six months. I was appointed second-class constable in September, 1886. Since then I have got no other promotion. I have several favourable records, and I have no unfavourable ones. During all the years I was in charge of a station I gave satisfaction to the public, and I think I also satisfied my Inspectors—Inspectors Broham and Pender. I never on any occasion asked any one to do anything for me in a political sense—to advance my interests in any one way. I consider a constable that does that can hardly be called an honest man, because he is trying to do a comrade an injury by endeavouring to get over him. I consider him dishonest. I might mention that I could do my duty as well the day I left St. Albans, after thirteen years' service, as I could the week I went there. Though it has been said by public men and by newspapers that it is a mistake to leave a constable a long time on a station, I desire to express the opinion that that only applies in some cases—it is not a general thing at all. At any rate, that has not been my experience. I found I got on better the longer I was in a station.

4. Does that mean you could do your work more efficiently?—I could, your Worship. I am quite sure about that. There is another thing I might mention, that I am not under a farthing's worth of obligation to any man in or around Christchurch in all that time. Now, I would like to refer to the promotions that were made. The first promotions I would like to refer to would be the promotions of Constable Smith and Constable O'Rorke, who were promoted in February, 1897. I saw in the *Gazette* these two men were promoted, and I made some representations to the Commissioner of Police at that time. I told him I was senior to either of them, and I asked him, as that was so, if he could see his way to promote me also. He replied to that by saying that there were special reasons for promoting Smith and O'Rorke, and he saw no reason why he should promote me out of my turn. The thing remains so ever since. In that report which I made I referred to the fact that I did not know the date they were promoted second-class constables, and in a marginal note on Colonel Hume's communication I found that O'Rorke was appointed second-class constable in 1892 and Smith in 1890. I was promoted to second class in 1886. I would like to see the records of Smith and O'Rorke. I want to see the merit-sheet and the defaulter's sheet of these two officers. There are two other constables named Patrick Joyce and John McIntyre. These two men, though I am senior to them in service, were promoted specially for extinguishing a fire.

5. Where?—I do not know. The *Gazette* does not say that. They were promoted to second class on the 5th August, 1885, and I was promoted in September, 1886. I would like to see the records of these men, and, if you think this is a proper time, I would like to bring under your notice records of that description. I would like to allude to the matter of promoting men for such duties as that. My opinion is that a man ought not to be made senior to another man unless it is in the prevention or detection of crime. A man might be a very poor constable, but he might extinguish a fire.

6. You hold that extinguishing a fire should not be made a ground for promotion?—That is so. It should be made a ground for reward, not promotion.

7. Do you apply that to saving life?—I do. My experience of police matters is this: Promotion always goes for the prevention or detection of crime, and rewards follow acts of bravery and courage, and anything of that description. The man who should be promoted is the man who shows ingenuity and tact in the prevention and detection of crime. There is another man named Nicholas Marsh. I see he was promoted in 1883 as second-class constable, and I see no reason for his promotion at all in the *Gazette*. He must have joined only one year before that. I have just seen the sheets of Smith and O'Rorke, and I claim that my merit-sheet is as good as either of theirs; in fact, I claim that my record of merit-sheet is better than that of Smith. With regard to Marsh, I do not know anything about Marsh at all, but I wish to call attention to the fact that he was promoted over me.

8. It would appear from the papers that Marsh joined in 1870, was dismissed on the 21st February, 1883, reinstated on the 12th July, 1883, in consequence of the charge which brought about his dismissal having been dismissed in a Court of law?—I know nothing about that.

8a. It would appear also that he was reinstated to his former rank?—I know nothing about that. I see from the papers that Joyce joined on the 2nd August, 1883, and McIntyre on the 1st September, 1883. I have nothing to say to that, because they were gazetted according to the regulations, and I cannot object to either Joyce or McIntyre. The only objection I have is that which I have stated—as to the manner in which they were promoted for services that should not gain promotion, but reward.

9. *Mr. Poynton.*] You object to the system; you say they should not be promoted for a thing of that sort?—I do. I would like to call attention to some cases that I found on reading the Wel-

lington papers. Colonel Hume in his evidence, in reply to questions put by Mr. Taylor, referred to a constable named McGill, who joined the service in 1882. There is no *Gazette* notice of this man's promotion at all. He was promoted from third class to first, according to the evidence of Colonel Hume. A man named H. P. Kennedy joined in 1895 on transfer from the Permanent Artillery, and he is now a first-class constable, according to the printed reports in the papers.

10. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you not know that he joined in 1895, and is still a third-class constable?—The newspaper report makes him appear as first class. There is a sergeant named Greene, who was reduced to third-class constable in 1890, and in 1891 he was promoted again to first-class constable. I am referring to these because none of them were gazetted. I notice also from the Wellington papers, and from Colonel Hume's evidence, that a sergeant named Carlyon was reduced to third-class constable, and was promoted again to second class in 1894, and to first class in 1896. The promotions were not gazetted. Then, there is a sergeant named Wright, who is a clerk in the Inspector's office in Wellington. He was promoted to second class in 1890 for a good examination. That was gazetted, but there was no *Gazette* notice when he was promoted to first class at all, and I see he is a sergeant now. I notice another man named John Ryan, who was in charge of a station at some place outside Auckland, and I see he was brought up on six different charges and tried, and convicted on two. The paper does not say whether he was reduced or not, but it says he was brought into Auckland and lost the charge of a station. Colonel Hume reported he was entirely unfitted to have charge of a station. I would expect, seeing that that man was within four months' service of me, that such a record would not entitle him to be advanced over me. He was promoted to first class in the last batch of promotions. I claim that I had a much better right than either Smith or O'Rorke to be promoted, and also with regard to the men whose names I have mentioned as being reported in the papers. Marsh's case is a bit doubtful, he being reinstated as second class; and, as for Joyce and McIntyre, they were promoted to second class the year before me, and they were gazetted, and I do not want to make any comment on that at all.

11. *The Chairman.*] It appears there is nothing on your defaulter's sheet, and you think the records on your merit-sheet rank higher than those shown upon Smith's sheet?—I do.

12. Looking at that merit-sheet of yours, do you suggest there was anything special, anything out of the ordinary course of duty performed by you?—I look upon two of those cases as good ones. One is with regard to a starving child on the 18th December, 1889, and the other is in connection with an abortion case in 1888. I do not look on the others as anything special. Any one would do what I did in the other cases.

13. Those are the two cases you consider of special merit?—Yes. I can tell you one of them baffled the detectives for years in this town, and I got credit from the Press and the public for what I did. That was the abortion case. Apart from the question, I may say I was well treated in the Force otherwise. I was nearly all my time in charge of a station, and when I wanted to leave St. Albans Station I applied to Colonel Hume for a transfer. I mentioned that I had a boy that was delicate, and I thought a change would be good for him, and Colonel Hume at once granted the application. I never had an opportunity to thank Colonel Hume for that transfer, but I do so now.

14. *Colonel Hume.*] You served in the Royal Irish Constabulary and South Australian Police Force?—I did.

15. And the head of those Forces was guided by the Acts and regulations pertaining to each Force strictly?—Yes.

16. You told us you did not think people should be promoted for distinguished service outside the prevention and detection of crime: do you know how the regulation reads?—I do.

17. Do you not think, if a man jumps into the water and saves life, that that is valuable service?—I think it is valuable service; but I say, if you take the history of Police Forces in England and Ireland, you will see that men are promoted for police service only, and I do not consider saving life or extinguishing fires as deserving of promotion, though they are certainly deserving of reward.

18. Do you happen to know Smith was an officer in the Force before you ever saw the colony at all?—I do not know that. I do not know that he deserves any credit for that.

19. In the Forces you have served in previously, have you ever known a man's grievance inquired into after fifteen years by any tribunal?—No.

20. Why did you not bring up this grievance before, then?—Because I did not know of it. I brought it up as soon as I knew of it. I reported the matter to you.

21. And when I did not promote you you let it rest?—I did, of course.

22. Why?—I could not appeal to any higher authority than you.

23. Could you not have seen me on my next visit, and pointed out your grievance?—Well, Sir, my way of doing business is on paper as a general rule. I do not care about interviewing men. I always work on paper.

24. And you expect now that grievances which are supposed to have occurred in Colonel Reader's time are going to be righted?—I do not expect that at all.

25. Why do you come here, then?—Because I was invited by the Commissioners to ventilate anything that I desired. I have no ill-will to any one. I know you have been very kind to me in the Force.

26. Have you used political influence in the Force?—Never.

27. Are you a Mason?—I am.

28. Have you used any Masonic influence?—Not in the slightest degree.

29. Notwithstanding that, you have got on pretty well in the Force?—I did. I was not annoyed at all in the Force.

30. Then, as far as you are concerned, neither political nor Masonic influence is necessary to get on?—I cannot tell you that. That would depend a good deal on the man who used it. I am

speaking only for myself. If a man wants to be bolstered up by political influence he can use it. He is quite right to use it from his point of view if he likes to do it. He cannot stand on his own merits, and he has to be bolstered up. Those sort of men I consider dishonest men—in fact, they should be dismissed from the Force, because they evidently tell lies to the men they go to.

31. With regard to Kennedy?—Well, I thought from the paper reports he was a first-class constable, but I see he is still third class.

32. You admit there is nothing in that?—I do. Of course, I take the Commissioner's word for it.

33. You will admit you are not in a position to know whether these promotions were right or wrong, the only objection you have is that they were not gazetted?—They were not gazetted.

34. Do you say they were improperly made?—Yes, I say they were improperly made. I say there was no authority for their being promoted at all over me, being equal only in point of merit, and I six years their senior.

35. Are you at the top of the list now?—I do not know how I stand, but the Commissioner tells me I am eighth on the list.

36. *The Chairman.*] The fact which you wish to impress upon us is that you joined the Force in 1881, and since then you have received only one step?—That is all. I maintain that in the ordinary discharge of my duty I was as efficient a man as there was in Christchurch.

37. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Your principle object in coming before the Commission was to see these men's papers, so as to get information about the men you consider were advanced over your head?—Not to see their papers. That was not my object.

38. What was your object, then?—To bring before the Commissioners the fact that men were promoted over me.

39. Have you not heard that O'Rorke was specially advanced because of his zeal and ability in arresting felons and others passing through Otaki?—I see on his merit-sheet he did so, but I do not think that is a special reason why he should be promoted over my head.

40. And these special promotions are very objectionable, do you think?—Oh, no. If a man shows detective ability and special tact in unravelling cases he should be promoted. That is not an objectionable practice, at all events.

41. Do you consider you have shown that ability?—I think I have.

42. As displayed on your merit-sheet?—Yes.

43. Do you suggest that you have displayed detective ability, and so on, on which you might reasonably base a claim for special promotion?—No. I never asked for special promotion. I claim that two men who were my juniors were promoted over me, and they have never done anything special at all. If they did special services they were not gazetted, and the special promotion that I see is what would be expected of a constable in the ordinary course of his duty.

44. You think your merit-sheet compares favourably with O'Rorke's?—I do; and then I am taking into account that I was six years his senior in class.

45. Do you not consider that special promotions are objectionable?—Well, they are rather objectionable.

46. Are they not the cause of discontent?—They are, because there are special promotions made for things which they should never be promoted for; but I maintain if a man shows ability in the detection of crime, and unravels a case, there is no objection to that man being promoted. That is the case in other services.

47. If men got their advancement by class—by periods of service—do you not think that would do away with this feeling?—I do think it is the best way. I do not think there is any necessity for classes of constables at all. The way I would do would be this: I would give a rise of pay at stated periods, and then the men would have something to look forward to with certainty. There should be no classes of constables at all, only seniority, and when a man had served a certain period he should have a rise of pay.

48. You were saying men were not promoted for saving life in England?—Yes; they get rewards and medals.

49. Are you clear about that?—I am not positive about England, but it is done in Ireland.

50. Would you be surprised to hear that men, we will say, in the Metropolitan Police are invariably promoted for that?—No. I cannot speak as to the system in vogue in England.

51. The Royal Irish Constabulary get advancement by length of service?—Yes, seniority.

52. *Colonel Hume.*] You read the newspapers very carefully?—I do.

53. And I suppose you read my reports?—Yes; I have read them.

54. Did you ever see a recommendation in my reports about putting this Force on the same lines as the Royal Irish Constabulary?—Yes.

55. You know I have recommended that?—I saw something about it in your reports.

56. You quite agree with that?—I do. I say it is the best system. It would prevent political interference. If it was known that a man could not get beyond a certain stage before a stated period it would destroy this political power.

57. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say you are in favour of promotion going by length of service alone?—I call it increase of pay. I do not recognise such a thing as promotion.

58. Increase of pay according to their service, and no classes as constables?—Yes.

59. In that case, what encouragement would there be to a constable to be zealous, because the drones would get their increase of pay just as soon as the zealous men?—Give them rewards. Show the man by rewards that he is appreciated by the department.

SIDNEY DAY, examined on oath.

60. *The Chairman.*] You write to us that on the 2nd August, 1896, your house was broken into, and jewellery to the value of £25 stolen. Just state the facts that you wish to bring

before us. First of all, where do you live?—Colombo Road, Sydenham. On Sunday, the 2nd August, 1896, between the hours of 7 and 9.30 p.m., my house was broken into, and about twenty-five pounds' worth of jewellery stolen. I sent for the local police at the Sydenham station, but could not find them. I sent to both the station and the junior constable's residence. They were out. I telephoned to Christchurch, and told them that my place had been broken into and a considerable amount of jewellery stolen. I was asked what I lost. I told them it was impossible for me to say through the telephone, and that they had better send down an officer—a detective. The reply was, "We have no detectives here. They have all gone home. You had better look up your local men. I dare say they will be round presently." This was about 9.45 p.m. I told them I had sent for the local men, and they were out. About 10.30 the local constables came, took particulars, and went away. About 9 o'clock next morning, or a little after, a detective came, took particulars, went away, and I have never heard anything of the matter since from that day to this, barring a conversation I had with one of the police. He said the man that was suspected lived close by. They asked me if I suspected any one. I said, "Not a soul." They searched this man's house on the Sunday afterwards—a week afterwards. There were three burglaries, I may say, within forty-eight hours—one on the Saturday night and two on the Sunday night. It was said that the man who was suspected was seen in the vicinity that night by the constables. I think that is all I have to say about that matter.

61. *Colonel Hume.*] What is the constable's name?—Constable Duggan. Now he has been removed again.

62. *Colonel Pitt.*] How did he deal with it when he came back?—He was sent back especially to stamp out the larrikin nuisance, and he did it most effectually.

63. *The Chairman.*] The nuisance has been abated?—Yes.

64. How long was Duggan there before he was removed?—I do not think he was there more than twelve months.

65. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know of anything in connection with police matters in Sydenham that in your opinion is calculated to interfere with the efficiency of the police?—Only what I have stated already to the Commission.

66. Is it a matter of some notoriety there that the police are indebted to the tradespeople?—During my twenty-five years' experience there have been some who paid their way, but the others have been very hard to get money out of.

67. You mean that they do not all pay cash for their purchases, but are under obligations to tradespeople?—They are not exactly under obligations. I believe it is on record. I think you will find, on looking up the books of the Court, that some constables—one in particular—has his name figuring as being summoned on two or three occasions.

68. There have been constables stationed at Sydenham who have been sued in the civil Court for debts?—Yes.

69. That is within your own knowledge?—Yes.

70. Do you say a constable stationed at Sydenham, or more than one?—One to my knowledge. This was within the last twelve months.

71. Do you take it upon yourself to make a general statement that it is common amongst the Police Force to be indebted to an unreasonable extent?—No. I do not mean it is a general thing. I only know this one party.

72. That is the only case that has come within your knowledge?—That has come to my knowledge. I know from tradesmen that some have gone away in debt, and they have had to send pretty sharp letters after them.

73. *The Chairman.*] What is your occupation?—Butcher.

74. *Colonel Hume.*] Do you know of any constable or constables in Sydenham now who owe you any money?—No.

75. They have within the last ten years owed you money?—Yes.

76. Have you ever sued for it?—Yes.

77. How many times?—Once.

78. Only one constable once?—Yes.

79. How long ago was that?—Within the last twelve months.

80. This was the case you were referring to?—I was one who did sue him. There were others who sued the same man.

81. Is this constable you are referring to the only one you know of as being indebted to tradesmen in Sydenham?—I have heard of a great many.

82. *Colonel Pitt.*] But do you know of them?—I have heard of them at times, but I forget.

83. *Colonel Hume.*] Has any other constable owed you money, yourself?—No. In fact, I never had much to do with the constables in my business.

84. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Have you got the money that you sued for?—Yes.

85. Have the other tradesmen got their money that they sued for?—I think so.

86. As far as you know, the constable is not in debt at the present time?—As far as I know, he is not.

87. As regards the burglary, you complain of the action of the police?—I complain of being told there were no detectives at half-past nine at night, when three burglaries had been committed within forty-eight hours.

88. Within an hour of the time you discovered the burglary at your house there were two constables there?—Yes.

89. By what means was the entry effected to your house?—The side window.

90. No traces left by which you would be able to identify the persons who entered?—No; not to my knowledge.

91. What do you suggest a detective officer could have done at 10.30 on Sunday night?—I

think by having an officer up there they might gain information as to the burglars. The man who was supposed to have committed it was known to the police. He was seen in the vicinity the same night.

92. You do not know how soon that knowledge came into the possession of the police—the fact that that man was seen about there that night?—He was seen by the police that night. The man had worked for me, and he had been in the hands of the police. When the two constables came the junior constable said, "That is so-and-so. I saw him down here to-night with another man."

93. Constable Duggan was there at the time?—Yes.

94. Your had a fair amount of confidence in Duggan, did you not?—Yes.

95. And now you complain of him?—I do not complain of him. I complain of things in general. There was a laxity in there being no detective officers available, as they said, when there had been three burglaries committed within forty-eight hours.

GEORGE HASTIE, examined on oath.

96. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Second-class constable, stationed at Lyttelton.

97. What do you wish to bring under our notice?—About being left for eighteen years before I was made a second-class constable.

98. When did you join?—July, 1879.

99. Where were you stationed when you first joined?—I joined the Armed Constabulary. I was stationed at Cambridge, Waikato.

100. When did you join the Police Force?—I was five years and three months in the Armed Constabulary. I joined the Police Force in October, 1884.

101. Where were you sent to then?—Dunedin. I was transferred from Dunedin last August. I was in Dunedin from the time I joined the Police Force until last August, when I was transferred to Lyttelton.

102. When were you made second class?—In February, 1897.

103. What is it you wish to bring under our notice?—I wish to bring under your notice the fact that there were a lot of men who were junior to me put over my head. There were three batches of men, and numbers of them were junior to me, and they were all put over my head. Some of them were six or seven years my junior. There were about ten men promoted about four years ago because they were Clerks of Court in country stations.

104. Were they all your juniors?—Two of the men, to my knowledge, were; I did not know the whole of them, but these two were about six years my juniors. There were two more batches of men promoted after that. The first batch was promoted because they had clean defaulters' sheets and seven years' service, and the second batch was promoted because they had only one mark on their defaulters' sheets and seven years' service. I was put out of that because I had three marks on my sheet; but, still, my sheet was clean longer than some of these men were in the service altogether. There were some men promoted also for passing a good examination. They got special promotion because they made high passes in examinations. As soon as I passed the examination—made a good pass—that was stopped; nobody got promoted at all for that. I passed seventh on the list in the second batch. I did not stand the first time. I consider eighteen years is too long to be in the service without promotion.

105. What were your offences on your defaulter's sheet—trivial or serious?—There was only one 5s. fine in the three. The others were simply cautions. Through my being kept so long without promotion and juniors put over my head it has practically put me out of getting any promotion in the service at all, because I am junior second-class after eighteen years' service. If I had been promoted in my turn I would be eligible for a first-class constable soon. That alone has done me out of a good few pounds of pay. I have the long-service and good-conduct medals.

106. *Colonel Hume.*] I understood you to say you joined the service in October, 1884?—Yes. I believe that was the year.

107. And yet you say you have nineteen years' service: how do you make that out?—When I joined, the Armed Constabulary and the police were under the same head and the same regulations and everything.

108. And you consider the original date you joined the Armed Constabulary should count for the police?—It has been done with every other man that joined then. They carried their service with them.

109. Name one?—Constable Patterson in Dunedin. He joined the same time that I did. Constable Gleeson: he carried his time into the police.

110. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you carry the same number with you?—Yes, carried the same number with me into the police. I also carried my long-service pay with me. I also desire to lay the following complaint before the Commission:—

SIR,—

Police Station, Lyttelton, 6th April, 1898.

I respectfully request to submit the following complaint for the consideration of the Commissioners.

In November, 1893, I applied for twenty-one days' leave of absence on full pay, pointing out in my application that I had no leave of absence for, I believe, at the least four years. The leave was granted, but I would only get twelve days on full pay, and no pay for the other nine days. I took the twenty-one days as I could not do with less, and when I returned to duty I made an application for to be paid for the nine days, as I considered I had been treated unfairly, as some other men in the same district as I was in had got extended leave on full pay. My application was refused, and shortly after a circular appeared in the *New Zealand Police Gazette*, 1893, page 194, to the effect that twelve days' leave a year would only be granted, and if not taken it would not be cumulative. This circular has been broken on several occasions, and men have got an extension of leave on full pay, and I believe that my case is an isolated one, where a constable's pay has been stopped when he has gone on leave. I respectfully request that if the Commissioners find my statement to be correct that they will recommend a refund to me of £3 12s., the amount of nine days' pay at 8s. per day, which was the rate of pay I was receiving at the time this occurred.

GEORGE HASTIE, Second-class Constable, No. 311,

The Secretary of the Police Commission, Christchurch.

111. *The Chairman.*] Can you give us the names of those who you say had this pay granted to them beyond the twelve days?—Constable Thomas Ward. He is dead now. He got six weeks, I think, or about that period. Constable James Dale got a month. They got extended leave on full pay, I have every reason to believe.

112. Prior to your application, or afterwards?—Prior to mine, I think.

113. All this was prior to the circular being issued?—This was about a month prior to the circular being issued.

114. You say the terms of the circular have been broken: can you give us an instance?—I can give two. Sergeant Mackay, of Christchurch, got three weeks after that, and Constable Broberg got three weeks, I believe—at any rate, it was over twelve days.

115. On full pay?—Yes. I believe it was on full pay.

116. Your pay for the nine days would have amounted to £3 12s., and that is what you consider yourself entitled to be repaid?—Yes.

117. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you remember whether Ward's leave was sick-leave, or not?—No, it was not sick-leave.

118. Where did he go to?—He was supposed to have gone to Sydney.

119. Where did you go to?—I went to Masterton.

120. Ward, then, was granted, you think, some privileges because he went to Sydney, and you wanted a similar concession to go to Masterton?—I had no leave for three years before that, and twelve days was not enough.

121. You did not apply for your annual leave, or else you would have got it?—Oh, I would have got it.

122. In the case of Dale, was it sick-leave?—It was not sick-leave.

123. Where did he go to?—To Blenheim, I think.

124. In the case of Broberg and Mackay?—They both went to Auckland.

125. From Dunedin to Auckland is four days' journey, and to Masterton forty-eight hours' journey: you recognise there is a good deal of difference?—Oh, yes.

126. Do you think you ought to have full pay?—I think I was entitled to it as much as the other men.

127. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think leave ought to be made cumulative?—I think it ought to be cumulative for two years, any way.

128. *Colonel Hume.*] How many entries have you on your defaulter's sheet?—Four.

129. Some of them pretty serious ones, are they not?—I do not think so. A 5s. fine is all I was fined out of the four.

130. That was in 1884. Was there not another serious one in 1885?—There was a reprimand for being ten minutes late off duty, and a caution for being absent out of barracks without leave at 2.30 in the morning.

131. If there had not been those entries on your defaulter's sheet you would have got promotion when the others did?—Yes, so you told me.

132. Your contention is that the last offence was committed prior to these men getting into the service who were promoted over your head?—I say I was longer in the service with a clean sheet than those men that were promoted were in the service altogether.

133. I take it from that, you think that after a certain lapse of time defaults should be wiped off?—I think if a man has a clean sheet for ten years, he should have his defaults wiped off. After a certain number of years they should be wiped off.

134. You have never been in charge of a station?—No.

135. Through no fault of your own, except that you do not choose to take a wife?—That is so.

LILY BROADWOOD, examined on oath.

136. *The Chairman.*] Are you married?—Yes.

137. Is your husband in Christchurch?—Not that I know of.

138. Where are you living?—In Salisbury Street.

139. *Mr. Taylor.*] Had you any occasion to sue your husband for maintenance?—Yes.

140. Can you remember what date you sued him?—It would be about October last year. I am not sure of the date.

141. Did you get an order?—Yes, for £1 per week.

142. Did your husband comply with the order?—He did for four weeks, and then he got four weeks in arrears, and we had him up again; and the Magistrate, Mr. Beetham, gave him two days in which to pay the money.

143. When was he before the Court in connection with the arrears?—On the Tuesday before Christmas Day; and Mr. Beetham gave him until Thursday.

144. That would be the 23rd?—Yes.

145. Now, what happened two days later—on the Thursday?—I went up to the Court, and my husband did not appear; and Mr. Flesher, when the case was called, told Mr. Beetham that my husband was packing up his box to go away. Mr. Beetham said, "Oh, is he; he is sentenced to a month's imprisonment with hard labour."

146. Had you told the police previously that he was leaving the place?—Yes, on the Friday, after we got the summons out.

147. That was the week before Christmas week?—Yes; I went to the police-station and told them about it, and they said they did not know anything about it there, and that I was to go to the Court. I went to the Court and told them; and next morning, before 8 o'clock, a policeman was at my house with a summons and gave it to him.

148. Did you see any of the police on the 23rd December?—No, I did not.

149. Do you remember what date it was you met constables in the street?—The day before Christmas Day—Friday.

150. Did you speak to them about it?—I asked them to tell me whether my husband was in gaol, because I did not feel very safe if he was out. The constable pulled a paper out of his pocket and said it was a warrant for him, and that he was looking for him. He said he wanted a description of my husband, and I gave him a description as well as I could. They never came to the house to look for him or ask if he was there.

151. What was the last day your husband was at home?—Thursday, the day he ought to have appeared at the Court. When I went home he was there with a carrier, preparing to take some furniture out of the house.

152. That was the last time you saw him?—Yes. I went straight home from the Court then. He said, "What is it?" and I said, "A month's imprisonment with hard labour." He said, "That is your fault," and when he got inside he got his hands on my neck and squeezed me tight and threw me on the bed, and then he went outside the house and I never saw him since.

153. Have you seen the police since then?—I have been to the police-station to ask, and they told me several times they knew nothing about it. The first time I went, I asked an elderly gentleman sitting behind a desk if he could tell me whether John Broadwood was in gaol or not, and he said, "Who is he?" and I said, "He is my husband, and I want to know whether he is in gaol or not?" He said, "This is not the gaol;" and I replied, "I know it is not, but I thought it was the place to inquire whether he was in gaol or not," and he said he did not know anything about it. I asked where I was to inquire, and he said, "Telephone to the gaoler at Lyttelton." I did not know how to go about it, so I just went away, and did nothing more.

154. Did you go again?—I went up with you some time after Christmas. I think it was the Friday week after Christmas.

155. What was the result of your visit on that occasion?—We went in, and you stated what the visit was about; and he said, "I am just writing out a warrant now." He had a piece of blotting-paper over it, and just lifted it up to show us, and said he was writing it out now.

156. Did they promise to do anything on that occasion?—We went upstairs, and somebody up there said they would telegraph to Auckland. I told them my husband's people lived in Auckland; and he said he would find out whether my husband was there or not.

157. Have you heard anything more?—No, I have heard nothing of him since.

158. Have you, as a result of that, had to go to the Charitable Aid Board?—Yes; I have two little children, and one is quite a cripple and will never be able to walk.

159. Was your husband well known in Christchurch?—Yes, he was very well known. He was a compositor, but gave up his trade to go book-making. He is well known to the police.

160. Was he before the Court in connection with a betting shop in Christchurch?—I do not know whether he was before the Court.

161. Was his partner before the Court?—Yes, he was before the Official Assignee.

162. *The Chairman.*] Do you know anything of your husband's present whereabouts?—I do not.

163. Have you known anything about his whereabouts since the 23rd December?—No, nothing at all.

164. *Inspector Broham.*] Do you know what date the warrant was issued?—No more than they told me at the police-station.

165. What did they tell you at the police-station?—That they were writing out the warrant then.

166. Do you know what date it was issued; you know the police could not act until the warrant was issued?—He was sentenced on the 23rd December.

167. Well, the warrant was issued on that day; did you see him after that day?—Yes, he was at home when I went straight from the Court.

168. Did you see him after that?—No; that was about 11 o'clock in the morning.

169. When did you next see the police in reference to him?—I met them in Colombo Street, and I asked one of them if my husband was in gaol, and he asked me to give him a description.

170. Who was that constable?—I do not know. I did not know either of them.

171. Was that on the Friday?—Yes.

172. Was it Constable Barrett, who is here in the Court now?—Yes.

173. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was there more than one?—Yes, two.

174. *Inspector Broham.*] You gave them his description?—Yes, I did.

175. And you called at the police-station afterwards?—Yes.

176. When?—I think on the Wednesday between Christmas and New Year's Day.

177. On the following Wednesday?—Yes.

178. Who did you see there?—An elderly gentleman sitting behind a desk.

179. What did the sergeant-major tell you?—What I said before, in answer to Mr. Taylor's question.

180. He did not tell you the warrant was issued?—No, not at that time.

181. And you do not remember that it had been issued?—I do not remember exactly. I said my husband has been sentenced.

182. That is all that occurred between yourself and the sergeant-major?—As well as I remember.

183. You suspected he had gone to Auckland?—His people were living in Auckland, and I thought he might have gone to them there.

184. Do you know inquiries have been made in Auckland regarding him?—I heard they had.

185. Were you at the Court that morning?—Yes.

186. You know that some hours generally elapse between the time the order is made and the warrant is issued?—Yes.

187. *The Chairman.*] How long after you got home did he leave the house?—A few minutes; perhaps twenty minutes after.

188. That is, he left the house about half an hour after the sentence was passed?—Yes, I think so; about that.

189. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you say he was removing furniture when you got home?—Yes, out of the bedroom into the passage.

THOMAS BARRET, examined on oath.

190. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.

191. *Mr. Taylor.*] You know Mr. John Broadwood?—Yes.

192. Had you anything to do with a warrant issued for his arrest?—Yes.

193. Did you see Mrs. Broadwood at the time she says she saw you?—I have no recollection.

194. You do not remember seeing her?—I remember seeing her once. I called when I had occasion to make inquiries. It was during the time the summons was out for him, before the warrant was issued.

195. Did you make a report on the question of the man's whereabouts?—I got the warrant to execute, and I had it for a day. I made inquiries about town as to the whereabouts of this man.

196. Will you read your report?—Yes, it is as follows: "Sergeant-major Ramsay.—On making inquiries for this man Broadwood I have been informed on good authority that he left here for Wellington yesterday, the 22nd instant, to attend the race-meetings up there, as he is a book-maker.—THOMAS BARRETT, Constable.—23/12/97."

197. Did you have the warrant when you wrote that report?—Yes.

198. When did you get it?—I think I got it on the day I wrote the report. The warrant was handed to me in the morning, and I handed it in again with the report.

199. Who did you give it to?—To Sergeant-major Ramsay.

200. Did you try to execute it?—Yes.

201. Where did you go?—I made inquiries about town.

202. What did you learn?—I had reason to believe he had gone to Wellington.

203. Who did you learn that from?—Broadwood was a book-maker, and I made inquiries among the book-makers.

204. What time on the 23rd did you see Broadwood?—I did not see him at all.

205. Will you swear he was not in your company on the 23rd?—I can swear that.

206. When did you last see him?—I believe it was in Court, when he appeared on the information laid by his wife, in answer to his summons.

207. Who did you learn from that he had gone to Wellington?—One or two sporting characters. I did not know who they were.

208. That he had gone to Wellington to attend the races?—That he had gone to Wellington.

209. On the 23rd?—I do not remember what date it was.

210. Did you find out if a steamer had gone to Wellington that day?—No, I did not take notice; I did not look it up.

211. Did you go to the Shipping Company to see whether he had booked for Wellington?—It was not necessary; I had the warrant to execute, and I made a thorough search throughout the city.

212. You did not think it necessary to go to the Shipping Company's office to check the statement that he had gone to Wellington?—It was late that day when I sent in my report, and the offices were closed in the evening.

213. How long had you the warrant?—From about 10 o'clock in the morning.

214. Would it not have been possible to go between 10 and 5 to see if he had booked for Wellington?—I did not get any information that he had probably gone to Wellington until late in the evening.

215. At what hour in the evening did you hand in your report and the warrant together?—Before 5 o'clock.

216. When does the Shipping Company's office close?—I have no idea.

217. Who said he had gone to Wellington?—I made inquiries amongst several book-makers.

218. Can you remember who?—One or two gave me reason to believe he had gone to Wellington. I also met another man who said that Broadwood wanted to borrow some money from him the previous evening for the purpose of going to Wellington.

219. You did nothing at all to check the statement by making further inquiries?—No, I did not go to the Shipping Office.

220. You just took the warrant back at 5 o'clock and handed it back?—It was handed out the following day for somebody else to execute. I think the sergeant-major handed it to another constable the following day to try and execute.

THOMAS BROHAM examined on oath.

221. *Mr. Taylor.*] Can you tell the Commission what became of that warrant after it was returned by Constable Barrett?—It was given into the hands of Constable Field, I see by the correspondence.

222. Immediately afterwards?—I think so.

223. What did Field do with it?—He kept it until the 6th January, when the sergeant-major asked him for it.

224. Did he try to execute it?—He told me he did.

225. What does the report say as to what passed between the two of them when the sergeant-major took the warrant back?—I have the statement here.

226. Does he not censure Constable Field for his remissness?—Yes he does, as follows:—

Sergeant-Major Ramsay states: I gave the warrant for Broadwood's arrest to Constable Field on the 24th December. I asked him for the warrant yesterday morning, as Mrs. Broadwood came to the police-station asking if her husband was arrested. I got the warrant from Constable Field, but received no report from him as to what steps he took to effect the arrest. Cross-examined by Constable Field: I have no recollection of you telling me what steps you took to make the arrest. I cannot recollect asking you to keep the warrant some time longer. I sometimes tell constables in making reports to keep the correspondence a little longer, to see and get the required information.

D. RAMSAY.

227. Did you censure Constable Field for his remissness?—I did.

228. Was he punished in any way?—I severely reprimanded him for his negligence in not executing the warrant, or reporting to the sergeant-major what he had done with the warrant.

229. Was that put on his defaulter's sheet?—No; the man bore a good character, and I did not wish to put it on.

230. You heard Constable Barrett's evidence?—Yes.

231. Do you think he took all the steps a policeman ought to take to check the accuracy of the statement?—I heard your questions. It would have been quite right and proper that he should have made all those inquiries.

232. Do you know whether any inquiries at all were made as to whether Broadwood was in Wellington?—I am not sure. I know they were directly I heard of this. A crime report was issued, and the thing was gazetted.

233. What is the custom in a matter of this kind; when should the crime report issue?—In a case like this it should issue immediately.

234. The same time as the warrant?—Yes: directly there was any doubt as to the man being in Christchurch a crime report should have been issued and sent to the various stations.

235. When was the crime report issued?—Not until the 7th January.

236. So Broadwood had a start of thirteen days?—Yes. Of course, that was owing to Constable Field's neglect.

237. *The Chairman.*] As soon as the man was not found in his usual quarters a crime report was issued?—Yes; in such a case, directly it was known he was not to be found.

238. And the delay in this case was due to Constable Field not returning the warrant?—Yes.

THOMAS EDWARD TAYLOR, examined on oath.

239. *The Chairman.*] You wish to make a statement in connection with Mrs. Broadwood's case?—Yes. Mrs. Broadwood complained to me that an order had been made for her husband's arrest for the non-payment of maintenance moneys for herself and children. She told me the circumstances, and I went with her to the Christchurch Police-station to see whether there was any prospect of the warrant being executed. We saw a constable in the lower office, but I do not remember his name.

240. What was the date?—I think on the 6th or 7th January—the latter date, I think. I understood the constable to say that he was then making out the warrant. I may not quite have caught his words; but, at any rate, he raised a blotting-paper with some writing under it, and pointed to a document, and said that it had reference to Broadwood, whatever the document was. I gathered from him that the warrant was not executed, and I went upstairs to make inquiries. There we were told it had not been executed, and they made inquiries then as to where the man was likely to be. Mrs. Broadwood told him he was likely to be in Auckland, and that she had previously told them this. The clerk said the police would immediately telegraph to Auckland to this man's relatives, and subsequently I saw that telegrams had passed. I saw Inspector Cullen, who was in charge then, and he expressed regret that such negligence should have been shown in executing the warrant, and stated the matter would be attended to departmentally. But so far nothing has been heard of this man's whereabouts. I bring the matter forward because this woman has now been thrown upon the Charitable Aid Board with her children. The man was so thoroughly well known to the police as a bookmaker in the city that I think the warrant should have been executed without any difficulty, especially as Mrs. Broadwood can prove he was in the town the day after. Constable Barrett's report says he went to Wellington.

LILY BROADWOOD, recalled.

241. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you tell the police prior to that date that your husband had expressed his intention to leave you?—I told them when I went to the Court that he was packing his box to go away. I told the clerks in the Court.

242. Had you previous to that told the police he had threatened to leave you?—I do not think so.

243. Did you not say that when you went to sue him for the money you told them he intended to leave?—No; Mr. Flesher did.

244. Are you sure you saw Constable Garrett?—Yes, quite sure I spoke to him.

245. On the Friday, the 24th?—Yes; near Manchester Street bridge. It was a very hot day, and he asked me to go into the shade by a building while he spoke to me.

246. What building?—An old hotel building. There was another policeman with him at the time. The three of us stood together, and I told him all I knew. Every question he asked me I answered.

GIDEON HENDERSON, examined on oath.

247. *Mr. Weston.*] What are you?—A farmer.

248. Where?—At Diamond Harbour.

249. Now, I think in June last you sold a draught horse to Mr. Fleming?—I did.

250. What was the age of the horse?—Three years, entering four.

251. She had not been long broken in, I think?—No, only about a week.
252. Was she in good condition?—Yes.
253. And without a scratch?—Yes.
254. I think Mr. Fleming left the horse for a time with you?—Yes.
255. As a matter of fact, while the horse was with you, and before you delivered her to Mr. Fleming, a man named Thomas took the mare from your farm?—Yes.
256. Out of your paddock, indeed?—Yes.
257. When the horse was taken out of your paddock was she in good condition?—Yes, in splendid condition.
258. Now, was that horse brought back to your paddock?—Yes.
259. When?—About a month or three weeks afterwards.
260. *The Chairman.*] Was she taken out without your permission?—No.
261. *Mr. Weston.*] You thought Thomas was a messenger from Mr. Fleming?—Yes; I thought he was authorised by Fleming.
262. You saw the horse?—Yes.
263. Now, just state to the Commission what condition the horse was in?—She was in poor condition when she came back; her shoulders were sore, and she did not look like the mare at all.
264. She had been, I think, between two other horses ploughing?—Yes.
265. Her shoulders in particular, were they in a bad state, or in a very bad state?—A very bad state.
266. Had she been ordinarily used or cruelly used?—By the appearance of the mare she had been badly used, but I was not there to see the animal worked.
267. Would you like one of your horses treated that way?—Not at all, if I could help it.
268. Did you mention the matter to Mr. Fleming?—Yes; I told him the first opportunity to take the mare away, because she was in a pitiful state when I saw her.
269. And when you explained to Mr. Fleming the state of the horse she was in the condition you have just described?—Yes, exactly so.
270. The paddock was about a mile away from your house?—Yes.
271. And I suppose it can be assumed that the horse was put in that particular paddock, and without your knowledge, so that you should not be aware of it at the time?—Yes; I had not the slightest knowledge of it.
272. *The Chairman.*] Is that the paddock she was taken out of?—Yes, the same paddock.
273. *Mr. Weston.*] Was it not a paddock near your house she was taken from?—No, the same paddock.
274. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You know Mr. Charles Wilson?—I do.
275. What had Mr. Wilson to do with this horse?—I do not know what he had to do with this horse.
276. Did you lend the horse to Mr. Wilson?—No, I never did.
277. Are you sure of that?—Yes, I am certain. Tom Thomas is the man who got the horse.
278. What is Mr. Wilson?—A farmer.
279. Did Thomas get the horse from your farm or Wilson's?—From our farm. He told us he was authorised by Mr. Fleming to get the horse.
280. What was the condition of the horse's shoulders?—They were sore by the collar, I suppose.
281. What did you see?—I saw the horse's shoulders raw and the skin off.
282. A deep-set wound?—Not exactly a deep wound.
283. Did they look as though the horse had been taken away from work immediately her shoulders became sore?—No; as if they had been sore some time.
284. If Thomas said that immediately the horse's shoulders became sore he returned her to you, is he correct?—Well, he might have. I am afraid the sore was there when she was working at the collar.
285. The shoulders of young horses become sore easily?—No, not if proper attention is paid to them, and if they are not worked more than two or three hours a day to begin with.
286. Was it not because the horse's shoulders were sore that Thomas brought her back?—Perhaps that was it.
287. Then, so far as you know, he did not work the horse after her shoulders were sore?—He put the horse back certainly, but she was in a bad state when she came back.
288. *Mr. Weston.*] Have you any doubt whatever, as a practical man, that that horse was worked when her shoulders were bad?—I think so.
289. Have you any doubt about it?—There is no doubt about it.
290. Did not the appearance of the horse, in every respect, show she had been badly used?—Yes.
291. Tell us the symptoms you saw that caused you to arrive at that conclusion?—I consider the horse was worked beyond what she ought to have been as a young mare. She ought only to have been worked an hour or two in the day, and then get a spell.
292. I want to know whether, in your opinion, that horse was worked after her shoulders were raw?—Yes, I fancy so.
293. Was not that horse thoroughly spoiled?—I have not seen her since, but it is my opinion she would never be the same horse again.
294. Was not that horse very much of a "heap," showing symptoms of having been unduly strained?—I think the horse had been worked "in block and tackle" between two others; as if she had been pulled along by two older horses. She looked as if she had been forced to work, whether she was able to do hard work or not.

JOHN ROBERT HENDERSON, examined on oath.

295. *Mr. Weston.*] You are a farmer living with your father?—Yes.
296. I think, as a matter of fact, you know the horse which is the subject of this particular inquiry?—Yes.
297. Do you recollect Thomas taking the horse from the paddock?—Yes.
298. Was the horse in good condition then?—Yes.
299. What were her shoulders like?—They were all right.
300. Was she in thoroughly good condition?—Yes.
301. How long was that horse away before she was returned to the paddock?—About a month.
302. Who returned it to the paddock?—I cannot say. I did not see who returned it.
303. Did you learn afterwards by whom that mare had been worked?—Yes; by Thomas.
304. I think you saw her in the paddock?—Yes.
305. What was she like when you saw her on her return?—In a bad state.
306. What were her shoulders like?—Very bad.
307. Showing evidence of good or bad treatment?—Bad treatment; hard work.
308. Were the shoulders in such a state as to require treatment?—Yes, they were.
309. And were the shoulders in such a state as to lead you, as a practical man, to suppose that that horse had been worked when her shoulders were bad?—Yes, she must have been.
310. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Were the wounds merely superficial wounds or deep set?—They were owing to collar-work; sore inside the skin a bit.
311. The skin rubbed off, and the flesh looked red?—Yes.
312. Quite fresh?—Yes.
313. Any blood running?—No; no blood, but big sores.
314. Then, the wounds were not down into the flesh?—Just inside the skin a bit.
315. Young horses usually get their shoulders pretty tender when first worked?—But not so bad as that.
316. Can you say whether or not the horse was worked after her shoulders were sore?—It looked like it.
317. Would you have expected to find a deep-set wound if the horse had been worked after her shoulders were sore?—No, not at once.
318. Do you know that if a horse is worked one day with sore shoulders they are very liable to get into a very bad state, and for the wounds to go down into the flesh?—Not altogether; it takes a little time.
319. We will assume the last day this horse went to work: are you prepared to say the shoulders of that horse were sore when she went to work that day?—I cannot say.
320. For all you know, the injuries might have been caused the last day she was worked?—They may have been.
321. Did Thomas return the horse owing to her shoulders being sore?—I suppose so.
322. Do you know how it was Thomas came to take the horse away?—He said Fleming gave him permission to take her away.
323. Have you any reason to suppose that Thomas took the horse away improperly?—No.

GEORGE SPENCER FLEMING, examined on oath.

324. *Mr. Weston.*] I think it is true that you purchased that mare from Mr. Henderson?—Yes.
325. Now, did you authorise Thomas to take that mare away from the paddock?—No.
326. Were you aware she had been taken away from the paddock?—No, not until she came back.
327. Did you see the horse with these bad shoulders?—Yes, several times afterwards; there was a sort of scab on them. I could see the shoulders had been rather bad.
328. In your opinion as a practical man, must that horse have been worked with bad shoulders?—It must have been worked for a week after her shoulders were bad, because when they first become bad the skin comes off, and that is the time to leave off work. It is better not to let them get into that state.
329. When you saw the horse did you consider that that horse had been badly treated?—It had been worked rather too hard. She was what we call “half-draught,” and she had had to take her share of work alongside old staunch horses. It was warm weather, and it is likely her hair would come off the first day she was worked.
330. I think you were advised by Mr. Henderson as to the state of this horse?—Yes, as I was passing through.
331. Did you then complain to any one at Lyttelton about this?—Yes; I think I told a policeman on the railway-station, just before the train was leaving for town. I think it was the sergeant of police, but I am not perfectly certain about it. I think it was on Show Day, or about that time.
332. What did you ask him to do?—To go over to Diamond Harbour and see the mare. I said he would see a good case of cruelty to animals.
333. What did he say?—That as he had not seen the horse working he did not think he could take the matter up. That is what he gave me to understand. I thought if he saw the horse he could get witnesses.
334. *The Chairman.*] Did you describe the horse to him?—I had not much time. I said he would see a horse in a bad state.
335. *Mr. Weston.*] Did he inquire into it?—Not that I know of. I never heard anything more about it. It was three months before I worked the horse again.
336. Now, in your opinion, do you consider the police authorities should have taken up that

case?—Well, it just depends whether they had power to do so. If they could not, I think the law should be altered so that they could.

337. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Thomas took this horse without your permission?—Yes; it would be horse-stealing, if you like to put it that way.

338. Was the horse damaged?—Yes.

339. Permanently damaged?—I had to give her three months' rest.

340. Did you take any action against Thomas?—No.

341. It was a very bad case of cruelty?—Not one of the worst cases, but quite bad enough to have had the man up for cruelty to animals.

342. If you had not seen Sergeant Rutledge on the platform of the railway-station would you have reported the matter to the police at all?—No, I do not think I would have taken the trouble.

343. The case was not of sufficient importance to have induced you to go specially to see the police?—I was rather busy at the time.

344. But if you had not seen the sergeant on the platform you would not have reported the matter to the police at all?—No.

345. Are you aware that the police did make inquiries?—No.

346. You do not know that a constable was sent off at once to see Mr. Wilson about the horse, and to see Mr. Thomas?—No; I think he ought to have seen the horse first and then got the witnesses.

347. *The Chairman.*] You did not take any steps to prosecute anybody in connection with it?—No.

348. Is there a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals in Christchurch?—Yes.

349. All you did was to bring the matter under the notice of the sergeant accidentally?—Yes.

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, examined on oath.

350. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are a sergeant of police stationed at Lyttelton?—Yes.

351. Do you remember if in November, 1896, Mr. Fleming made some communication to you?—Yes. I was on the railway-station, and Mr. Fleming came up to me just as the train was about to leave and reported about this horse. He told me at the time that the horse was at Thomas's, at the head of the bay, and he said, "I wish you just to have some inquiries made in reference to the horse's shoulders. It is in a bad state."

352. Did you cause inquiries to be made?—I sent Constable McCormack out that day or the day after, I am not sure. He made inquiries, and reported to me on his return. I might state that Fleming did not lead me to believe at the time that the horse's shoulders were bad.

353. *Mr. Weston.*] That was all you did?—Yes. I received this report:—

Police-station, Lyttelton, 21st November, 1896.

RE complaint of George Fleming, of Port Levy, against Thomas Thomas, of Teddington, for working his horse with sore shoulders: I respectfully beg to report that I saw Thomas Thomas at Teddington, and he states that he got a young horse from Charles Wilson, farmer, at Teddington, to work for some time to quieten him, Wilson stating that it belonged to George Fleming, and that he wanted him quiet when he wanted to do some work with him. I took the horse and worked him for about a fortnight, when I noticed his shoulders getting sore, which is usual for a young horse, so I would not work him any more, but took him back, as I would not work a horse with sore shoulders. My horses will be in Lyttelton next week, and any one can examine them and see their shoulders, and I have worked them all the winter ploughing. I made inquiries from several persons at Teddington, but they all state that Thomas would not work a horse with sore shoulders, nor did they know that he had a horse of Fleming's.

T. J. McCORMACK.

354. Constable McCormack visited this place?—So he stated.

355. You have no reason to doubt that he did?—None whatever.

THOMAS JOSEPH McCORMACK, examined on oath.

356. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] On the 21st November, 1896, did you receive instructions from Sergeant Rutledge to make inquiries about a horse?—Yes, at Thomas's.

357. Did you go there and make inquiries?—Yes.

358. And subsequently you reported?—Yes.

359. Is that the report which was read by Sergeant Rutledge?—Yes.

360. Is that a true report?—Yes.

361. *Mr. Weston.*] When you received instructions from the sergeant to investigate this case where did you go?—To Teddington, at the head of the bay, twelve miles from Lyttelton.

362. Did you go to see the horse first?—I understood the horse was there.

363. As a matter of fact, you did not see the horse at all?—No.

364. Who did you see at Teddington?—Thomas and Wilson, and other people.

365. Wilson really gave you little or no information, did he?—No.

366. Did he give you any information beyond that Thomas had the horse?—That is all.

367. You saw Thomas?—Yes.

368. And, to make a long story short, you relied upon what Thomas told you?—Yes; and other people there.

369. What did the others tell you?—They said that Thomas would not work a horse with a sore shoulder.

370. That is a matter of opinion; but, as regards the facts of the case, you relied on what Thomas told you?—Yes; the horse was not there.

371. Then, having found that the only evidence you could get was Thomas's own statement, did you think it right to go and find out the horse and see for yourself?—Well, of course the horse was not there. It was twenty miles away, at Mr. Fleming's place, so I could not have gone, and I did not doubt that what the people told me was true.

372. You relied entirely on what this man Thomas told you?—Yes.

373. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have been in the neighbourhood of where the horse was worked?—Yes.

374. And any evidence to prove this horse had been ill-treated would have been there?—Yes.

375. You required some evidence to prove cruelty?—Yes.

376. And not being able to get the evidence, could you bring the case into Court?—No.

377. Would you think it sufficient to produce the horse at the Court, and stand upon the dumb evidence of the horse only, and that some time before this horse was given to a man to work?—No.

378. *Mr. Weston.*] Can you give the names of the parties from whom you inquired?—Mr. Gibbie and Mr. Manson.

379. I suppose, as a matter of fact, they told you they knew nothing about it?—Yes.

380. So that, as a matter of fact, there might have been cruelty to the horse, and yet the neighbours know nothing about it?—Certainly; that is the reason I could not get any case against him.

381. But you never thought fit to go and look at the horse?—No. Mr. Fleming, after hearing the evidence, intimated he wished to withdraw the charge.

ALICE MATILDA WALLACE, examined on oath.

382. *The Chairman.*] Are you married?—No.

383. Where do you live?—Ensor's Road, Christchurch.

384. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.

385. Have you seen him lately?—Yes.

386. What was his condition?—He was rolling from one side of the footpath to the other.

387. When was this?—Easter Saturday.

388. Of this month?—Yes.

389. What part of the town did you see him?—At the corner of Colombo and Tuam Street—in Tuam Street.

390. That is near Nelson, Moate, and Co.'s?—Yes, just there.

391. Can you remember what time it was?—Between twenty minutes and a quarter to 8 in the evening.

392. How do you remember the time?—Because I asked two ladies in the street the time.

393. Can you express his condition in any other terms: was he sober?—I would not call him sober, because I had to get out of the footpath to let him pass.

394. What would you call him?—Drunk.

395. Did any one else witness the occurrence?—A gentleman and two ladies. I did not know either of them.

396. How do you know they witnessed the occurrence?—Because I knew Constable McGill personally, and the gentleman turned to the two ladies—I was not in company with them—and spoke to them.

397. Was the constable close enough to hear?—I did not speak to Mr. McGill.

398. How far away was McGill?—About a yard; he had just passed.

399. Have you any doubt in your mind as to the constable's condition?—Not the least.

400. How do you know it was Easter Saturday?—It was Easter time.

401. You remember the night?—Yes.

402. Was he in uniform?—Yes.

ANNIE WATTERS, examined on oath.

403. *The Chairman.*] Are you married?—Yes.

404. Is your husband living?—Yes.

405. Where do you reside?—113, Tuam Street, Christchurch.

406. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember the 16th of this month?—Yes.

407. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.

408. Did you see him on the 16th of this month?—Yes.

409. Where was he?—In Tuam Street.

410. What was his condition: was he sober?—Well, no.

411. What did he do?—I was sitting on my doorstep at a quarter to 8, and Constable McGill asked me if I was down. I did not know what he meant.

412. Your front steps abut on to the footpath?—Yes.

413. You live on the premises?—Yes.

414. What did you reply?—I made no answer. He spoke to me again and asked me what I was doing there. I made him no answer. Then he told me to get up or he would make me, and I thought it was time then to rise. I asked him if he knew who he was speaking to, and he told me to move on.

415. Was he in uniform?—Yes.

415A. Was he steady in his gait?—No; I had to put my hands up once to keep him from falling on top of me. I had been to the Christchurch Meat Company and to the D.I.C., and I had a heavy parcel as well as a basket.

416. What night was it?—Saturday night, at a quarter to 8 p.m.

417. You say you had to put up your hands to prevent him falling on you?—Yes. I told him who I was, and that I was waiting for my husband to let me in.

418. Did you put your hands against his body to keep his body away from you?—No; he fell against the woodwork at the corner of the door. It is a recess-door.

419. Were you alone?—Yes.

420. What did he do after?—When I told him who I was he said something, I could not exactly catch what, and he moved away towards Addington.

421. You still noticed he was unsteady?—I could not notice.
 422. *The Chairman.*] Did you hear what that remark was?—I know what I thought, but I could not say to speak truthfully.
 423. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was it a civil remark?—I cannot say, because I cannot speak truthfully.
 424. This was between Colombo Street and Durham Street?—Yes.
 425. Have you any doubt at all as to his condition?—I have already answered that question.

HENRY GEORGE ELL, examined on oath.

426. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.
 427. Were you a passenger by the coach to Addington some time ago?—Yes.
 428. How long ago?—About six months ago.
 429. Where did you see Constable McGill?—Coming out of the A1 Hotel.
 430. Which door?—The Colombo Street door.
 431. What was his condition?—He was drunk.
 432. Did he walk unsteadily?—Yes, staggering.
 433. Did you see where he went?—He crossed immediately in front of the horses' heads, and went into the Addington tram.
 434. Was he in uniform?—No, in plain clothes.
 435. Do you know the constable well by sight?—Yes.
 436. Have you any doubt as to his condition?—None whatever.

WILLIAM OSWALD, examined on oath.

437. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A salesman in the employ of Ballantyne and Co. I live at Sydenham.
 438. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember being a fellow-passenger with Mr. Ell on any occasion on the Addington coach?—I have been several times.
 439. On any of these occasions did you see Constable McGill?—I did.
 440. Was his condition such as to attract your attention?—It was.
 441. How long ago is this, do you think?—Several months ago.
 442. Can you speak any more definitely—whether it was six, seven, or eight months ago?—Not more than seven months.
 443. What was his condition?—I was fully impressed he was under the influence of drink.
 444. Was he unsteady?—Yes.
 445. Where did he come from?—The A1 Hotel.
 446. Do you remember if he was in uniform?—He was not.
 447. Where did he go to?—On to the tram for Sydenham or Addington.
 448. Have you any doubt as to his being under the influence of liquor?—Not the slightest.
 449. Have the police interviewed you about this matter?—Yes.

ROBERT WILLIAM JEWISS, examined on oath.

450. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Draper's assistant.
 451. Living where?—St. Martin's Road, Opawa, Christchurch.
 452. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Constable McGill?—I know him well by sight.
 453. Did he call at your house some time ago?—Yes.
 454. How long ago?—About January or February of this year.
 455. You are not sure of the month?—I am not sure of the date.
 456. Will you tell the Commission what happened?—I was going home one night between 11.30 and 12.30, and I saw a tall man in front of me, but I did not take any notice of him. I got inside, and lit a candle, and went upstairs, and presently a knock came to the door. I said, "Who is there?" and he said, "Police."
 457. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you know who it was?—I did not know who it was.
 458. *Mr. Taylor.*] What did you do when he said "police"?—I told him I would not open the door, and I said if he did not leave the place I should inform on him to the police.
 459. Did you know who it was?—I did not.
 460. What is your brother's name?—Arthur.
 461. Was he in the house when this call came?—He was in bed.
 462. *The Chairman.*] Was there any more knocking after you gave that answer?—No; in the meantime he went off the verandah and went towards the stables.
 463. Did you see him?—Yes; I opened the door.
 464. What did you see when you went outside?—I saw Constable McGill.
 465. You know it was Constable McGill?—I know it was, because I know him well by sight.
 466. *Mr. Taylor.*] What was his condition?—He seemed to be capable of managing himself when I saw him, although he seemed rather dazed when I asked him a question. I asked him what right he had to be on our place, because it was out of his beat altogether, and he said he could go anywhere, and I said I did not think so.
 467. How far is your place from Addington?—About two miles and a half.
 468. Did he leave the premises then?—He went towards the stables, and I told him to go back, and he came back and answered my question, and I told him to go out another way.
 469. Did he leave the premises then?—Yes.
 470. You say he was dazed?—He seemed dazed.

ERNEST TRIST, examined on oath.

471. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A tent-maker.
 472. Where do you live?—St. Martin's Road, Opawa.

473. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.
474. You know him by sight?—Yes.
475. Do you remember an occasion when you were driving down the Opawa Road?—Yes.
476. How long ago?—I cannot fix the date.
477. How long would it be?—Within the last twelve months.
478. *The Chairman.*] Can you give any nearer date than that—before or after Christmas?—I should say nine months ago.
479. *Mr. Taylor.*] Will you tell the Commission what happened then?—I was driving home, and I was stopped by a constable in uniform and asked if I was going towards Lincoln Road.
480. Which direction were you going at the time?—Along the Opawa Road in the opposite direction to the Lincoln Road.
481. What did you say to the man?—I said, “No, I am just home.”
482. What did he ask you?—That is all.
483. What was the man’s condition?—He was not sober.
484. What time was it?—In the evening.
485. Had you been driving some friends home?—Yes.
486. What hour?—It might have been 10 or 11; I cannot say. It would not be later than 11 p.m.
487. Did you meet Jewiss that night?—No, not that I am aware of.
488. Do you know Jewiss?—Yes.
489. Did you recognise the constable?—Not clearly. I did not see his face.
490. Would you require to see Constable McGill’s face to recognise him?—Well, I have not spoken to Constable McGill in my life that I am aware of.
491. Who was the constable?—I cannot swear who he was.
492. Was he a tall man?—Yes.
493. Was he a very tall man?—Yes.
494. Did you know his voice?—No.
495. Have you seen the same man since?—I cannot swear to it.
496. You are clear it was late at night when you saw him?—Yes.
497. Do you live near Mr. Jewiss?—Yes.
498. How far away?—A couple of hundred yards or more.
499. When you met this man was he nearest to your place or Jewiss’s?—To our place.
500. *The Chairman.*] Can you describe the man you saw?—He was a very tall man in uniform.
501. *Mr. Taylor.*] Had he a beard?—I cannot say.

THURSDAY, 28TH APRIL, 1898.

ANNIE WATTERS, further examined on oath.

1. *Witness.*] I desire to correct my evidence given yesterday. I said it was on the 16th April that I saw Constable McGill in Tuam Street, but I wish to say now that it was on the 9th.
2. *Mr. Cassidy.*] What is that piece of paper you have in your hand?—I refuse to answer, unless the Commissioners tell me that I should.
3. *The Chairman.*] Please answer?—It is a piece of paper on which I have noted down a few things.
4. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Did you have that paper yesterday when you gave evidence?—I had another piece of paper, which I produce [subpœna produced.]
5. In whose handwriting are the notes?—My own.
6. No one was with you when you made them?—No.
7. You now say you saw Constable McGill on the 9th April?—Yes.
8. Why do you change the date?—Because when I got home last night my family asked me what date I had given, and I said the 16th, and they told me I had made a mistake. When I came to think it over I saw that they were right.
9. Until you went home you thought it was the 16th?—I never thought anything farther about it till I got home.
10. Your family told you it was the 9th and not the 16th?—Yes.
11. Can you tell us of your own knowledge what the date was?—I know it was the 9th. I am positive.
12. Because your family told you?—No. I was in the D.I.C. and the Christchurch Meat Company on the 9th.
13. It is not unusual for you to be in the D.I.C., is it?—That is my business.
14. Could you not have been there on the 16th?—You know, Mr. Cassidy, that I am engaged every morning writing for my husband.
15. Do you think you cannot now be mistaken in the date?—Yesterday I answered too quickly. I thought it was the 16th, but I know now it was the 9th.
16. And what time of the night was it?—It was a quarter to 8.
17. You are sure of that?—Yes. I looked at my watch, and I could see the time by the light of the lamp which is near my door. I was sitting on the doorstep at the time.
18. It was dark, was it not?—Yes.
19. What were you doing on the doorstep?—I had been in town, and when I went back home I found my husband had gone out, and I sent my daughter to him to get the key. I waited at the door till she returned.
20. And the constable spoke to you in passing?—Yes.

21. It was too dark for him to see you, I suppose?—It was not dark when there was a lamp near the house.

22. If the constable saw a person sitting on your doorstep, do you not think he should have spoken to that person?—He has known me for many years, and it was peculiar that he should have spoken to me as he did.

23. Is Tuam Street not frequented by persons of a certain class of life?—I have nothing to do with that kind of life, and I know nothing of it.

24. But do you not know, as a matter of fact, that there are undesirable characters in that street at times?—I suppose bad characters have been in that street.

25. What did you say to the constable?—I told him I was waiting for my husband.

26. And then he went away?—Yes. He made an answer and then walked away.

27. Do you feel certain about his condition?—I have no doubt about it. He has known me for some years, and he would not have spoken to me as he did unless he had been in that condition.

28. I suppose you were incensed at the constable speaking to you on your own doorstep?—Well, he asked me if I was down, and he said something else.

29. What did he mean by asking you if you were down?—It is hard to say what he meant.

30. You have known Constable McGill for some time?—Yes.

31. Have you any ill-feeling towards him?—No. Why should I?

32. I might tell you. About twelve years ago you were living in Ferry Road, were you not?—Yes.

33. Do you remember a man named Young living next door to you?—I do not.

34. Did he live close by, or did he own a section in the vicinity?—No.

35. Was he living in the same road?—There was a man of the name lived much farther down the road, but what has that to do with the case?

36. He was committed to gaol, was he not?—Yes, but I had nothing to do with him.

37. Did you fancy that you were entitled to the man's property?—No, never. The deeds were sent to me from New South Wales, so that I might dispose of the property.

38. Do you remember the Public Trustee taking charge of the property?—I never knew he did, and I do not think he had anything to do with it. Mr. John Joyce will prove that the deeds were sent to me. The property was bought by Mr. Joyce. I do not know if it is twelve months ago that that happened.

39. Did you ever make a claim to the property?—No.

40. Did you think you were entitled to it?—Never.

41. Did you send to the constable for the key of the place?—I sent my son to the constable.

42. You thought you were entitled to the property, did you not?—No. I know I was not entitled to it.

43. Did you not have a grievance with Constable McGill over this matter?—No.

44. You knew him pretty well before that?—Only by seeing him up and down the Ferry Road.

45. Have you spoken to him since about the property?—No.

46. Did you not want to claim the property as the next-of-kin?

47. Are you not the sister-in-law of Young?—Yes. Young married my sister.

48. Were you not under the impression that you were entitled to the property on that account?—No.

49. And you made no application for it?—No, none whatever.

50. Did you not have a falling out with Constable McGill over this property?—No.

51. Do you know Miss Wallis?—No.

52. Is she a relation of yours?—I know one Mrs. Wallis.

53. *The Chairman.*] Do you know one Alice Matilda Wallis, who gave evidence yesterday?—I do not.

54. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Has she ever spoken to you?—She came to me yesterday and asked me if I knew to whom I was speaking, and I said No.

55. Did she discuss the case?—No.

56. *Mr. Taylor.*] As a matter of fact, is not Tuam Street a very decent street so far as the people are concerned?—I know that my own house is decent, and I do not know about other people's.

57. Are you pestered at all by bad characters?—There have been bad characters living in the houses on both sides off and on, and I believe the street has had a bad name.

58. *The Chairman.*] If any other woman than yourself had been seated on the doorstep, would you consider the constable did wrong in addressing her as he addressed you?—Certainly.

59. In what respect?—He could see I was not tipsy.

60. But if he was under the impression you were?—But he has known me so many years he must have known who it was.

61. But if he had thought it was a stranger, would you think he was wrong in addressing her as he addressed you?—Yes. I think he should have said, "You must not sit here. You must move away."

62. *Mr. Cassidy.*] How did you come to be called?—The subpoena was brought to me at ten minutes to 2 yesterday. I do not know who brought it.

63. Did Mr. Taylor see you?—No. I have seen him about no matter whatever.

64. Whom did you tell about the matter?—I spoke to Mr. Davis in Colombo Street about the matter.

65. Who is Mr. Davis?—He lives at the corner of Tuam and Colombo Streets.

66. *Mr. Poynton.*] Your hat was on when the constable spoke to you?—My bonnet was on.

67. Had you a veil?—No.

68. Had you a boa on?—Yes.

69. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are a Prohibitionist?—No, I am not.

ALICE MATILDA WALLIS, further examined on oath.

70. *Mr. Cassidy.*] What is your name?—Alice Matilda Wallis.
 71. Where do you live?—Ensor's Road.
 72. What is your occupation?—A machinist.
 73. Where are you employed?—At Mr. Pavitt's, in Gloucester Street.
 74. Are you a Prohibitionist?—Yes.
 75. Are you sure it was Constable McGill you saw?—Yes.
 76. Had you known him for any time?—For some time.
 77. Where?—In Phillipstown, when he was stationed there.
 78. How long ago is it that you saw him there?—A few years back, when I was a child.
 79. Did you see him after he lived at Phillipstown?—Yes, in different parts of the town—in Ferry Road and in Tuam Street just recently.
 80. At what time have you usually seen him?—At all times.
 81. Would you not be at work in the daytime?—Sometimes I am not at work in the day-time.
 82. Do you know that Constable McGill is stationed at Addington and not in town?—I have not seen him in town recently.
 83. What has he been doing in town when you saw him?—Walking along the street, sometimes in uniform and sometimes in plain clothes.
 84. In what part of the town have you seen him?—In High Street, and in other parts of the town.
 85. What were you doing up town that night? Was any one with you?—No.
 86. How do you know the date?—It was Easter time.
 87. Had you seen Constable McGill in town that afternoon?—No.
 88. You saw him at Nelson Moate's corner?—Yes, in Tuam Street.
 89. In what direction was he going?—West.
 90. Was he going down Colombo Street?—He was going along Tuam Street.
 91. You say you could not call him sober. Could you call him drunk?—Judging from the condition in which I saw him I should say he was drunk. He was staggering.
 92. Are you quite sure about that?—Quite sure.
 93. Was it dark?—It was moonlight.
 94. Did you recognize him clearly?—Very clearly.
 95. To whom did you tell this matter? Did you tell Mr. Taylor?—Not then.
 96. Did Mr. Taylor see you about it?—I spoke to him once afterwards.
 97. At a Prohibitionist meeting?—Yes.
 98. Was Constable McGill under discussion there?—No.
 99. What did you tell Mr. Taylor?—I told him what I told the Court yesterday.
 100. How did you know the time?—Because there were two ladies in the street whom I asked the time.
 101. You were looking out for evidence, then?—No; I wanted to know the time for my own satisfaction. I had no idea then that I should be called to give evidence. I have known Constable McGill for some time, and I was sorry to see him in the condition he was.
 102. Was he in uniform?—Yes.
 103. You are sure he was not in plain clothes?—Yes.
 104. You are quite positive?—Quite positive.
 105. *Colonel Pitt.*] This was on the Saturday after Easter Sunday?—It was the Saturday following Good Friday.
 106. *Mr. Poynton.*] Was there a moon?—Yes, it had just risen.

HENRY GEORGE ELL, further examined on oath.

107. *Mr. Cassidy.*] I think you are a Prohibitionist?—If you ask me relevant questions I will answer you.
 108. *The Chairman.*] You can answer that?—My views are well known, but I think the question is not relevant.
 109. *Colonel Pitt.*] It is a relevant question?—Well, I will say it is well known that I am a Prohibitionist.
 110. *Mr. Cassidy.*] And you have been so for twelve years?—No.
 111. How long have you been a Prohibitionist?—I have been a total abstainer for seven years.
 112. You are certain you do not take liquor yourself?—I ought to be certain about it.
 113. Have you not been in the Hereford Hotel drinking wine or any other liquor with people for twelve years?—I said seven years.
 114. You were a candidate for parliamentary honours?—Quite right.
 115. I think Constable McGill has been an object of prohibition attack for some time?—I am not aware of it.
 116. Your party have attacked him, have they not?—I am not aware of it.
 117. Has Mr. Taylor not attacked him repeatedly?—You may ask Mr. Taylor those questions.
 118. Can you give us a date for this matter you have spoken about?—Not more than I have said.
 119. You said it was six or seven months ago?—I cannot get nearer than that.
 120. What time of the day was it?—The 6 o'clock coach.
 121. And the place?—Opposite the Al Hotel. I was on the coach at the time.
 122. What part of it?—I sat immediately behind the driver.
 123. Was the coach full?—I think there were only a few passengers in the front.

124. Where did Constable McGill come from?—Out of the A1 Hotel—the side-door.
 125. When did you first see him?—When the coach pulled up he stepped out on the street.
 126. Were you going out of town?—Yes.
 127. Were you on the pavement?—No; I got on at the Cathedral Square.
 128. Was Constable McGill on the pavement when you noticed him?—He was on the point of stepping out of the hotel.
 129. What door did he come out by?—The side-entrance.
 130. You are sure it was not the iron gate?—Yes.
 131. You are certain he did not come along from there?—Yes; I am sure he came out of the door.
 132. Where did he go to?—He went to the Addington tram, which was drawn up in the middle of the road, where it usually stands.
 133. You are certain you could see him get on the tram?—Yes.
 134. Did you report the constable?—No.
 135. Did you tell Mr Taylor the facts?—I happened to mention the facts to Mr. Taylor.
 136. And he at once took steps?—As far as I understand, steps were taken on my statements before the Commission.

WILLIAM OSWALD, further examined on oath.

137. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name is William Oswald, and you are a draper?—Yes.
 138. Do you remember the date when you were on the tram with Mr. Ell?—No.
 139. Where were you sitting?—On the Willowbank coach.
 140. What part of it?—In the front.
 141. Who saw you in reference to coming before the Commission as a witness?—Mr. Ell called on me.
 142. When?—A few days ago.
 143. I suppose he fully discussed the matter with you?—No.
 144. Did he go into the question at all?—He mentioned it.
 145. What day did this thing happen on?—I do not remember, but it is not twelve months ago.
 146. Cannot you tell us any closer?—I am sure it is not ten months, but I am not sure as to the exact time.
 147. Did you notice Constable McGill or did Mr. Ell point him out to you?—I am not sure which of us pointed him out to the other.
 148. When did you see Constable McGill first?—I saw him coming out of the side-door of the A1 Hotel in Colombo Street.
 149. Where did he go?—He went to the tram.
 150. Was there any one within?—No, he was alone.
 151. Was he in uniform?—He was in plain clothes. I am sure he had not a uniform coat on.
 152. If any one says he was in uniform it will be a mistake?—According to my judgment it would be. He had a blue coat on, but there was no mark on it to distinguish him as a constable. He had blue trousers on.
 153. I suppose you did not pay much attention to him?—No.
 154. You were not hunting policemen down?—No.
 155. You said you were of the impression that he was under the influence of drink?—Yes.
 156. But you are not sure?—I am certain.
 157. Why?—From his walk.
 158. How far did you see him walk?—From the hotel-door to the tram.
 159. Are you a Prohibitionist?—Yes.
 160. And of course your sympathies are all against the police at present?—You are wrong.
 161. Well, against Constable McGill?—You are wrong.
 162. Have you ever heard Constable McGill attacked at any of your meetings?—I have never heard his name mentioned.
 163. You have not heard Mr. T. E. Taylor speak, then?—I have not heard his name mentioned by any one.

ROBERT WILLIAM JEWISS, further examined on oath.

164. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are a Prohibitionist?—No, I am not.
 165. Do you remember the date of this occurrence?—No, I cannot fix the day.
 166. Would it be after February?—I am not certain. I think it was about the end of January or the beginning of February.
 167. You say you did not know who was at the door?—I did not know.
 168. And you stated that you looked out and the person was quite capable of managing himself?—Yes. When I opened the door I saw he was quite capable of managing himself.
 169. So you could hardly call him drunk?—I did not say he was drunk. I said he was dazed.
 170. What time was it?—About half-past 11 or 12.
 171. Are you sure it was Constable McGill?—Yes.
 172. After he came out?—Yes.
 173. Can you swear positively it was he?—Yes.
 174. Who saw you about this matter?—Mr. Taylor. I do not know at all how it got about. I never mentioned it to a soul.
 175. What did he say to you?—He asked me if Constable McGill had been round at my place, and I said Yes.

176. *The Chairman.*] Did he tell you upon what business he was there?—No.
 177. Did he make any request to you?—He said the police were there, and asked me to open the door. I asked "What for?" and he made no answer.
 178. Did he indicate to you what he was doing there?—No.
 179. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you speak to him at all?—I did when I opened the door.

BENJAMIN THROP, examined on oath.

180. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Benjamin Throp.
 181. What are you?—Inspector to the Borough Council of Sydenham, which position I have held for eleven years.
 182. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you anything to do with regard to the by-law respecting storage of kerosene in the borough?—Yes.
 183. Did you arrange with Constable McGill to accompany you on an inspection of certain premises on one occasion?—Yes.
 184. Whose premises?—N. K. Bowden's. He is a storekeeper in Lincoln Road.
 185. Why did you intend to inspect them?—We had suspicion that Bowden was trying to evade the taking out of a license.
 186. Did you see Constable McGill?—I was verbally instructed by my Works Committee to arrange with Constable McGill, who lives next the store, to accompany me as a witness.
 187. Did he accompany you?—He arranged to do so, but did not.
 188. *The Chairman.*] Did you report that to the Committee?—Yes, and I also reported that the constable had imparted information to Mr. Bowden which prevented us from going on the search.
 189. Was any inquiry made in consequence of that report?—Yes. The Town Clerk was instructed to write to the police.
 190. *Mr. Cassidy.*] What authority to go to Mr. Bowden had you?—I was instructed. I am the Inspector under the Dangerous Goods Act for the Council.
 191. If the Town Clerk states that you acted on your own motion, what do you say?—I did not act on my own notion.
 192. Have you any ill-feeling towards Mr. Bowden?—No.
 193. You had several cases against Mr. Bowden, or you tried to get them?—I never had a single case against him.

THOMAS BROHAM, examined on oath.

194. *The Chairman.*] You are Inspector of Police for the Canterbury District?—Yes.
 195. You produce Constable McGill's defaulters' sheet containing an entry to this effect: "Imparting information officially received from Mr. Allison, Fire Inspector at Sydenham, to the person suspected of committing an offence—namely, by keeping kerosene on his premises without a license. Plea, Not guilty. Severely reprimanded.—Inspector BROHAM.—8/10/96"?—Yes.

THOMAS BROHAM, further examined on oath.

196. *Mr. Taylor.*] What is the custom in regard to obtaining reports from the police in connection with applications for publicans' licenses? Do you refer the matter for a report to the constable of the district in which the license is issued?—Yes.
 197. *The Chairman.*] Who refers it?—The Clerk of the Bench writes to me about any application, and inquiries are made by the department. Of course, different cases require different sorts of inquiry.
 198. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is it the usual custom to refer the application to the constable of the district?—If the application refers to the city the inquiries are made under my supervision.
 199. And if the application is for a suburban district does the constable in charge report?—Usually.
 200. If it is referred to the constable of the district is his report usually acted on, or do you get two reports?—Very often three or four reports from different police officers. If I have a case about which I have any doubt careful inquiry is made.
 201. Do you know anything about a case in which a man named Timothy Lyons applied for the transfer of the license of the Bower Hotel at New Brighton?—Yes.
 202. What course was followed in that case?—I do not remember. I know I did not recommend it, but it was granted.
 203. You opposed the granting of a license to the man for the New Brighton Hotel?—I did not recommend it, and I spoke of his unfitness. The documents I here produce refer to something that took place in connection with the hotel during my absence.
 204. Is there a report on Lyons's application from Constable Flewellen?—Yes.
 205. What does he report?—In Constable Flewellen's report the granting of the license is not recommended.
 206. The constable did not consider him a fit and proper person?—No.
 207. What was done afterwards?—It was referred to Detective Benjamin.
 208. With what result?—He speaks favourably of the applicant. He considers him a suitable person to be the landlord of a country hotel.
 209. Can you say why it was considered necessary to have a second report?—Probably the Inspector wished to have the constable's report supplemented by a person who knew more about the applicant.

210. Could any one know more about him than the constable for the district?—Lyons had not been at New Brighton very long. He had been in Christchurch before.
211. Would not Constable Flewollen know more about the applicant than the detective?—He had certainly had later experience of his conduct.
212. Can you tell the Commission at whose instigation the second report was obtained?—Inspector Cullen.
213. Can you say whether Constable Flewollen's report was submitted to the solicitors for the applicant?—I do not know.

SAMUEL FLEWELLEN, examined on oath.

214. *The Chairman.*]—Your name?—Samuel Flewollen. I am the constable stationed at Bingsland.

215. Is New Brighton within your sub-district?—Yes.

216. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you instructed to report on the application of Timothy Lyons?—Yes, by Inspector Cullen.

217. Had you known the applicant for some time?—Yes.

218. How long?—He had been at New Brighton for twelve months.

219. Had you plenty of opportunity of judging of his fitness?—A good deal.

220. What did you report?—I reported: "I have to report that Mr. Timothy Lyons has been the licensee of the New Brighton Hotel from January, 1897, to the 1st February, 1898. During that period the house has been well conducted, but the management of the house has devolved entirely upon a woman who went by the name of Miss Wilson. She is usually employed in the bar, but she has also the general management. Mr. Lyons did not appear to me to understand anything about the business of a publichouse, and he took no part as far as I could see in its management. Under the circumstances I could not report that he is a fit and proper person to have granted to him a publican's license."

221. Had you anything to do with his previous application for the New Brighton license?—No, but I had had occasion to report him.

222. What for?—For what I considered a breach of the Act.

223. *The Chairman.*] Did you prosecute?—No.

224. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you hear anything more from the Inspector about your report?—No, but I heard Mr. Martin read it at the Licensing Court.

225. And did you then learn that another officer had also reported?—No.

226. You were not consulted by the Inspector about a second report?—No.

227. And until the matter came up in the Court you had heard nothing of it?—I did not hear it mentioned in Court.

228. Was Detective Benjamin's report not read in the Court?—No. I heard about it yesterday from Mr. Taylor.

229. The fact that Detective Benjamin had made a report on top of yours was not brought under your notice?—No.

230. Do you consider a step of that kind as being an impeachment of the accuracy of your report?—It is, more or less.

231. Do you think that Detective Benjamin had as many opportunities of knowing the man's character as you had?—I think he had not much opportunity, and knew little about him.

232. Is it not customary for the report of the constable for the district to be acted on?—Yes.

233. Is it customary for another officer to be employed to report on that constable's report?—No.

234. And so far as you know no investigation was made by the detective as to the accuracy of your report? You were not consulted?—No.

235. *The Chairman.*] Have you reason to believe that the reports of constables are considered conclusive, and they are to be the final and absolute judges as to suitability?—No.

236. It is not the function of the constable to be the final judge as to the suitability of the applicant?—No.

237. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You were present before the Licensing Committee when the matter was considered?—Yes.

238. And the whole of the reports of the police were submitted to the Committee?—Mr. Martin read mine.

239. You did not hear the minutes on the back of the reports read?—No.

240. And so far as you know the Committee came to the decision on your reports?—I suppose they would. Detective Benjamin's report was not read in public, but of course the Committee may have seen it.

241. You have read Detective Benjamin's report?—No, I have never seen it. I see by the documents that Inspector Cullen writes: "Detective Benjamin.—I understand you know Mr. Lyons pretty well; please say whether, in your opinion, he is a fit person to hold a publican's license." Detective Benjamin replies, "I have known Mr. Lyons for some years, and consider him honest, and suited to be the landlord of a country hotel."

242. Then it appears that the whole of the police reports were before the Committee?—Yes.

243. You do not allege that Mr. Lyons was not an honest man?—Oh, no; I said nothing about his character.

244. You take exception to Detective Benjamin's report in which he says he considers Mr. Lyons is suited to be the licensee of a country hotel?—I do not think he is suited for that.

245. Then you take exception to that statement?—I do not agree with it. I know the way he has conducted the hotel at New Brighton.

WALTER MARTIN, examined on oath.

246. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Walter Martin. I am Clerk of the Licensing Committee for the Avon District.

247. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you receive a report from Constable Flewellen on Mr. Lyons's application?—I received it in the usual way from the Inspector. It appears in connection with the temporary transfer of a license from Pearce to Lyons.

248. Was the police report from Constable Flewellen?—Yes. I will explain the course which is followed. In the first instance, before the application is filed it is necessary for the applicants to produce a Magistrate's certificate. Among the papers is a letter from his solicitor to the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, asking him to sign this certificate. With the object of ascertaining the character and suitability of the person named that correspondence is forwarded to the police by the direction of the Stipendiary Magistrate. That was done in this case, and it was returned to me with the reports of Constable Flewellen and Detective Benjamin. Such a report is necessary so that the Magistrate may judge of the suitability of the applicant before he signs the certificate, which is a necessary step prior to the application being considered. The certificate was attached to the reports of the police, and on the 5th March the application came before the Committee.

249. When you received the police report did it have any indorsements?—It was as it is now.

250. Did you have it at all before it had Detective Benjamin's report upon it?—No; it came to me as it is now.

251. You had no interview with the solicitors of the applicant?—No, it was not necessary.

252. Can you tell us which report was regarded as being the police report?—Both, I take it.

253. One says he is not a fit and proper person, and the other says that he is?—That is not for my consideration.

254. But which report did the Committee consider the police report?—I cannot say what was in the minds of the Committee. The reports were put before them.

255. Was Detective Benjamin's report read out in the Court?—I think so. If I did not read it the Chairman would.

256. If Constable Flewellen says that only his report was read, would he be wrong?—I should say that he was wrong.

257. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you mean read aloud?—Yes.

258. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are in the habit of dealing with these applications for licenses?—Yes.

259. You have the police reports before you on all cases?—Yes.

260. Do you find it the custom to have reports from more than one police-officer?—It frequently occurs that reports are made by more than one officer.

261. What is the object: is it to furnish the Committee with all the information in the possession of the police about the applicant?—I think so.

262. If Detective Benjamin knew that the man had been convicted, that fact might not be known to Constable Flewellen?—That is so.

263. And he would have stated that fact?—Yes.

264. If more than one constable is able to speak as to the applicant there will be more than one report?—Yes.

265. *Mr. Taylor.*] On matters of this kind, do you frequently have reports directly contradictory from two police-officers?—It is unusual, but it has happened before.

266. Do you remember it to have happened before?—I could not say positively without searching the papers.

JOHN JAMES CASSELLS, ALFRED STANTON, THOMAS BOURKE, and CHARLES HENRY PRATT, examined on oath.

267. *The Chairman:* The following resolutions were passed at a meeting of the local Force:—

1. That the Government be requested to grant a house-allowance for all married members of the Force unprovided with Government quarters.

2. That the Commission be asked to recommend a uniform rate of pay for constables when joining the Force, not less than that provided for in the Appropriation Act.

3. That the Commission be asked to recommend that a scheme be formulated for more rapid class-promotion than has heretofore obtained in the Force.

4. That the Commission be asked to recommend that the Government give an annual free issue of uniform to police, or an allowance in lieu thereof.

5. That the Commission be asked to recommend the Government to formulate a scheme for a pension for members of the New Zealand Police Force, that Force being probably the only Police Force in the world unprovided with a pension fund.

6. That the Commission be requested to recommend the Government to adhere to the scale of travelling-allowance as set forth in Regulation 239, which has been for a length of time ignored, but has never been legally rescinded.

7. That the Commission be requested to recommend that the Police Department grant first-class fare by sea and rail for members of the Force and their families when on transfer.

8. That the Commission be asked to recommend that members of the Force, when on leave of absence, shall be entitled to travel free on the New Zealand railways.

9. The men complain that, after being on night duty, they are called upon to do extra duty in escorting prisoners to Lyttelton Gaol, besides attending Courts and doing fatigue duty on Saturday at barracks, and attending lectures on Thursday.

10. That Sergeant Bourke and Constables Cassells, Pratt, and Stanton represent the Christchurch Police at the sitting of the Commission.

268. With regard to the first resolution, do you wish to add anything to that?

269. *Constable Cassells:* I do not think there is anything much to add. In support of the resolution, I may say that the police-stations are centrally situated, and it is necessary to get a

house close to the police-station, and it is impossible to get a house close to the station without having to pay a high rent for it.

270. What is the rent here?—From 11s. to 12s. a week, and then the houses are not very handy—not within a quarter of an hour of the police-station.

271. That is, for a house of how many rooms?—Four rooms.

272. The next resolution is, “That the Commission be asked to recommend a uniform rate of pay for constables when joining the Force, not less than provided for in the Appropriation Act.” What amount do you recommend should be provided in the Appropriation Act?—Well, nothing less than 7s. a day to men on joining the Force.

273. *Colonel Pitt.*] How is it to increase?—With a rise of 6d. a day for three, seven, and ten years’ service, or something like that—on that scale.

274. Would you make a maximum, then, of 8s. 6d. a day for constables?—Yes.

275. *The Chairman.*] Do you recommend, then, there should be only one class of constables?—The general feeling is there should be one class of constables.

276. With progressive pay?—Yes.

277. It has been complained in some instances that men are doing duty side by side with men who are receiving a higher rate of pay?—That is so.

278. This proposal would not get over that difficulty, would it—you would still have junior constables doing the same duty as senior constables, but drawing less pay: do you think the fact of seniority would overcome the difficulty referred to?—Yes.

279. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is this rate of pay on the assumption that uniform is found or not found?—Uniform provided.

280. *Sergeant Bourke.* : I would like to remark, with regard to this resolution, that I think there should be a greater difference of pay between sergeants and constables than there is at present.

281. *The Chairman.*] What is the present rate for third-class sergeants?—Sixpence a day more than first-class constables. I consider that every first-class constable that is promoted to the rank of third-class sergeant is losing money by it. It is chiefly constables that are in charge of stations that are promoted to sergeants.

282. *Mr. Poynton.*] He loses his clerkship of the Court, and that sort of thing?—Yes; and besides that, in all out-stations a constable is able to keep a cow, which is of greater benefit to him than 6d. a day. I myself have lost at least £30 a year by promotion.

283. *The Chairman.*] The next resolution is, “That the Commission be asked to recommend that a scheme be formulated for more rapid class-promotion than has hitherto obtained in the Force.” Have you anything to say to that?

284. *Sergeant Bourke.* : I think the last recommendation would get over that—that the classes be abolished altogether.

285. But supposing the classes are not abolished, then you ask that there should be more rapid promotion than has hitherto prevailed?—Yes. At the time I joined the Police Force there was a rule—I cannot say it was written law, but it was a recognised law—that a constable, after being in the Force twelve months, would be entitled to second-class, and when he had been in the Force two years longer to first-class, constable. That was, in three years he would be a first-class constable. That was understood.

286. And acted on?—Yes, and acted on.

287. Was there anything to suggest such an understanding?—Yes. I joined the Force on the 7th November, 1877, and on the 1st November, 1878, I was made a second-class constable. Before the end of the second period—the two years—there was a reduction in the Force. All ranks were reduced in rotation down. From that time to the present the rule that I speak of has not been recognised.

288. The fourth resolution is, “That the Commission be asked to recommend that the Government give an annual free issue of uniform to the police, or an allowance in lieu thereof.” Have you anything to say in respect of that?

289. *Constable Cassells.* : It costs, on the average, 6d. a day for uniform.

290. How much does it actually cost you a year?—As near as we could get to it, it would be 6d. a day, or, say, £6 a year.

291. *Sergeant Bourke.* : I think £6 a year would cover the uniform. Some of the other delegates think not.

292. *Constable Stanton.* : The trousers we have made in store cost £1 2s. 6d., but the constables never get them at that price, because they are not sufficiently well made. They prefer to get the stuff, and have the trousers made themselves. It costs them then about £1 7s. 6d. The night great-coat costs £1 10s.; waterproof coat, £1 14s. 6d., and these coats are not very good—if they last a winter they do very well. The shako is 11s. 6d. The tunic costs about £2 5s. or £2 6s. Gloves will cost perhaps 5s. a year. The boots that the men wear are boots they have made for themselves, and cost about £1 10s. a pair. They will wear out two pairs in a year. A tunic will last two years with care.

293. As to the trousers, will one pair of trousers be sufficient for a year?—Well, scarcely. I was merely giving the items. I do not think one pair would be sufficient. They want one pair for night duty, and they want a good pair for day duty. I may say it is a well-known fact that the Prison Department gives a free issue of clothing to its men, and also the Postal Department and the Railway Department.

294. Do you know what is the custom in other countries with regard to the police?—No, I do not.

295. The fifth resolution is, “That the Commission be asked to recommend the Government to formulate a scheme for a pension for members of the New Zealand Police Force, that Force being

probably the only Police Force in the world unprovided with a pension fund." Have you anything to add to that?

296. *Sergeant Bourke*: I might add that the police are debarred in any other business. They have to devote the whole of their time and attention to their police duties, and they are shut out from embarking in any other kind of business by which they might hope to provide for old age. Even their wives and daughters, while living with them, cannot engage in any business. I cannot say it is a written law, but it is recognised amongst the police. The pay is no more than what they can live on. There is another thing: I think it interferes with the efficiency of the Force to allow old men to remain in it by compassion, when if there were a pension fund they would be retired.

297. You suggest there should be a scheme formulated: can you suggest a scheme?—I certainly cannot.

298. Do you think the Force would bear a scheme founded upon contributions from their pay?—I think not, because at present we say we have not enough to live upon, and therefore we cannot forego any part of our pay.

299. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you contribute to life assurance now?—We do. I do not know how the £10-a-month men can live and pay the rents that they have to pay. They certainly cannot go in for any luxuries.

300. If the rate of pay were fixed at that which has been suggested, starting at 7s. per day, with periodical increases, would the pay then bear a contribution to the fund?—I can only speak for myself. I cannot speak for the other men on that score. I would not be authorised by any other man to say that the pay would or would not stand it.

301. *The Chairman.*] Was it not discussed when this resolution was carried?—Yes, it was discussed.

302. Are you not prepared, then, to say what is the feeling of the local Force on the subject?—They felt they could not contribute.

303. When they expressed that opinion, did it refer to the present rate of pay or to the increased rate of pay?—I think it referred to the present rate of pay.

304. The men forming the meeting at which these resolutions were carried were not men having charge of stations—town men only?—Yes, and the suburban men.

305. In charge of stations?—Yes. The men had a sort of preliminary meeting, and we asked the Inspector to appoint a day, and give all the men, local and suburban, an opportunity to attend. The Inspector did so, and all the suburban men, I think, were there.

306. Can you tell us whether the suburban men who were present are the holders of any offices to which emoluments are attached, outside their police pay?—I think not.

307. *Constable Stanton*: There seems to be a feeling in the Force that the police, at the present rate of pay, could not possibly contribute to a pension fund. I really do not see how they could; but, of course, if the rate of pay is increased, perhaps they might be able to do so. They say they might just as well pay the insurance they are now paying as pay towards a pension fund.

308. Which do they prefer?—I think the most of them would prefer insurance, because, they say, in case of death their wives and families would get the insurance; but under a pension scheme, if they were to die, perhaps their wives and families would not get a compassionate allowance from the Government.

309. *Colonel Pitt.*] Would not a pension scheme probably include something for the wife after the husband's death?—No scheme has yet been formulated. They seem to think that the State, having received the benefit of their services in their young days, it should certainly do something for them in their old age. They have little or no chance to save except under exceptional circumstances—at country stations. The men who do the real work of the Police Force—the men in the towns—get nothing beyond their pay, and out of that they can save nothing.

310. *The Chairman.*] The next resolution is, "That the Commission be requested to recommend the Government to adhere to the scale of travelling-allowance as set forth in Regulation 239, which has been for a length of time ignored, but has never been legally rescinded." The regulation provides that "other members of the Force shall receive their actual expenses," and that has been altered by circular to "1s. 6d. per day for single men, and 3s. for married men on relieving duty."

311. *Constable Stanton*: There is no such thing as temporary transfer. When a man is away from home he is, to all intents and purposes, travelling on relieving duty. The amount now granted does not pay expenses.

312. The next resolution is, "That the Commission be requested to recommend that the Police Department grant first-class fare by sea and rail for members of the Force and their families when on transfer." What do you say about that?

313. *Constable Stanton*: I think a minority carried that resolution.

314. Do you know anybody else drawing 7s. or 8s. a day who travels first class by rail?—I do not.

315. *Constable Pratt*: The general feeling is that travelling by sea saloon fares should be provided, as the steerage is not a fit place for wives and children. As to rail, I would be willing, as most of the others would, to travel second class.

316. You would not think it fair to pay out of your own pocket the difference between first- and second-class fares by sea?—I would not.

317. *Sergeant Bourke*: In every case I know constables pay the difference between first- and second-class fares in steamers, when travelling on transfer, out of their own pocket sooner than take their wives and families in the steerage. I certainly would not myself go in the steerage, in view of the rough state I have seen it in. With regard to the railway, I should certainly say it was rather hasty to include that in the resolution, because I reckon the bone and sinew of the country travel second class on the railway.

318. The next resolution is, "That the Commission be asked to recommend that members of the Force, when on leave of absence, shall be entitled to travel free on the New Zealand railways." What have you to say as to that?

319. *Sergeant Bourke*: I think, your Worships, that is a very reasonable request considering that police, no matter whether they are on leave or in what position they are travelling, so long as they are in the Force, are deemed to be on duty. If anything happened they must attend to it the same as if they were sent there for that purpose. I do not think it would cost the Government anything. There is always plenty of room in the railway-carriages.

320. Do you know that the Railway Department has to be paid for those fares?—I think not. I do not see how they could keep a check on that sort of thing.

321. *Mr. Tunbridge*.] I may point out that the Railway Department is paid a fixed sum every year by the Police Department for the transit of constables on duty.

322. *Constable Stanton*: I may say, Sir, that the police are always on duty at holiday times, and they are debarred from taking advantage of cheap excursion-fares, or anything of that kind. They must take their leave when it is convenient for the department to let them off, and of course they have to pay ordinary fares.

323. *The Chairman*.] The next resolution is, "That the men complain that, after being on night-duty, they are called upon to do extra duty in escorting prisoners to Lyttelton Gaol, besides attending Courts and doing fatigue duty on Saturdays at barracks, and attending lectures on Thursdays." What do you say about that—that these extra duties limit the men's time for rest?

324. *Sergeant Bourke*: I think it does limit the men's time for rest.

325. Attending lectures?—I would not say attending lectures. I think the lectures are of great benefit to the men, and should be continued. I think the other duties they are called upon to do could, without very much trouble, be performed by the other men.

326. Are the men on night duty called upon to do escort duty?—Yes. They take their turns to take prisoners to the gaol. If there are many prisoners, more than one man has to go. The objection is this: It might happen that on the day on which it is a man's turn to escort prisoners to Lyttelton Gaol he may also have to attend Court to give evidence against some person or persons locked up during the previous night. This has occurred in connection with myself since I have been here. I have gone on at 9 o'clock at night, and come off at 5 next morning, attended Court at 10 o'clock, and gone to Lyttelton at 2 or 2.30 in the afternoon, and then again on night duty as usual at 9 o'clock at night.

327. *Mr. Poynton*.] Do you think, if there was an increase in the Force in Christchurch, escort duty could be done without bothering the night-duty men?

328. *Constable Cassells*: Yes, that would get over the difficulty.

329. *The Chairman*.] With regard to the night duty, do you think it could be so arranged as to have different men on night duty every night, instead of the present system of the same men going on for a fortnight?

330. *Constable Pratt*: We prefer the duty hours to remain as at present.

331. *Constable Stanton*: I do not see how any improvement could be made in that respect. The men prefer to go on for a fortnight, because the first two or three nights they do not sleep well, and by going on for a fortnight they are then able to get proper rest, whereas in the other case their rest would be continually broken.

332. *Sergeant Bourke*: The men on night duty want all the sleep they can get. I can tell a man who has been on night duty in the street always who has not his proper rest during the day. He has a heavy and drowsy look.

333. *Constable Cassells*: As far as fatigue is concerned, that difficulty could be got over by its being undertaken by the man on No. 4 duty. At present all the night-duty men come down and do fatigue-work. There is a man who always comes off at 7 o'clock in the morning, and that could be easily done by him. There is not a great deal to do.

334. *Sergeant Bourke*: I think if this man who does the beat round the station were on Saturday mornings to come in at 5 he could pretty well do the whole lot assisted by the watch-house keeper. I think they could clean up. Of course, some mornings the watchhouse keeper has a lot of work to do, and he could not then attend to it.

335. *The Chairman*.] Is there anything else you desire to put before us?

336. *Sergeant Bourke*: With regard to attending fires, the married men find it very hard to have to turn out to fires, and usually—pretty well in all cases—the fire is out by the time they get there.

337. Is there not some rule about that?—There is a rule that the night-duty men should not run out before 1 o'clock in the day.

338. *Constable Pratt*: If it so happened that all the married men were going on duty at 9 o'clock in the morning, every one of them would be expected to turn out if the fire occurred during the night previous.

339. *The Chairman*.] Has the circular which has been issued on the subject not been carried out?

340. *Constable Stanton*: Yes. It is understood so. For instance, suppose a fire occurs between 9 at night and 5 in the morning, the men that are going on duty from 5 to 9 in the morning do not turn out at that fire, but the men who are going on at 9 o'clock in the morning would have to attend that fire.

341. But, according to the circular, only half the men would have to attend?—That is the half.

342. *Constable Pratt*: The greatest objection the married men have is this: they are not called to attend the fires, as they are at the station, and, in the event of their sleeping in and not hearing the bell, they are apt to get themselves into trouble.

343. *Sergeant Bourke*: That is the chief trouble. Every man not turning out is subject to being dealt with and get an entry in his defaulter's sheet. Living, as some of them do, on the outskirts of the town, they may not hear the bell.

344. *Constable Pratt*: It happens here sometimes that they do not ring the bell very much. If they know exactly where the fire is they do no not give much of an alarm.

345. *The Chairman.*] What is your remedy?

346. *Sergeant Bourke*: I think the six or seven men on night duty, unless it became a very serious fire, would be sufficient to deal with it. Of course, if it became a serious fire, all hands should turn out.

347. *The Chairman.*] Do the men leave their beats to go to a fire?—Yes, with the exception of one man on the No. 1 beat—the Triangle beat. All the other men are supposed to go to the fire as quickly as they can get there.

348. *Constable Pratt*: It is impossible for us to hear the bell at all times.

349. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] *Sergeant Bourke*, you have been in Christchurch four months: how many times have you had to turn out?—I have not had to turn out at all.

350. *Constable Pratt*, how many times within the last six months, we will say, have you had to turn out?—I cannot exactly remember the times, but I have turned out several times. I may say I have turned out on three occasions to false alarms; in fact, I turned out to two in one night.

351. You have not been reported for not turning out?—Fortunately I have heard the alarms.

352. Have you turned out in every case when there has been a fire?—I believe so.

353. *Constable Cassells*, you have not been here long: how many times have you turned out?—The only time there was a fire I was on night duty. I have no complaint myself on that point.

354. *Colonel Hume.*] *Constable Stanton*, have you ever known any members of the Force who have not been paid their actual expenses for travelling when they have shown they have expended the money?—I cannot say from memory.

355. How long have you been in the office?—I have been here for five years. I have been twelve years a District Clerk.

356. And you cannot remember a single case where a man, when he has represented he has been out of pocket, has not been paid his out-of-pocket expenses?—Well, I have been out of pocket myself. I am making no complaint myself, however. I am here only as a delegate, not as an individual member of the Force.

357. You know perfectly well there are no cases?—No, I do not.

358. Can you tell us a case?—I cannot, from memory.

359. Do you think a case has ever come under your notice?—I think if I were to look up the books I could find some.

360. On the other hand, do you think you could put your hand on any cases where men have made money out of travelling under the old system?—Not amongst the rank and file.

361. It has never come under your notice?—Never come under my notice. I do not think it would have been possible.

362. What was the old system?—Six shillings a day, which is practically the same as it should be now.

363. What is it now?—According to that circular, if a married man is away he gets £1 1s. a week, and if a single man is away he gets 10s. 6d. a week. There is no such thing as temporary transfer mentioned in the regulations. A man is either travelling or he is on his station.

364. *Sergeant Bourke*, do I understand you to say, if a fire breaks out, we will say, on the Papanui Road, that one man would be sufficient to take care of the town during the time the fire was going on?—I think it is.

365. Is it not your experience, if there are burglars about, that is the very time they seize upon to break into a house?—It would be a good opportunity for them, but that is the rule.

366. *Constable Stanton*: There is one more matter I desire to bring under your notice. At the present time, in case, say, of a constable who had over twelve years' service, if he wishes to retire he cannot do so now. He has to resign, and thereby lose anything in the way of compensation he may be entitled to under the Police Force Act. Compensation is only given when a man is retired medically unfit. A number of the constables seem to think, pending the time when the pension fund is inaugurated, that some provision ought to be made for a constable retiring if he chooses before he becomes medically unfit. It is thought there ought to be some compensation given him if he resigns after a certain number of years' service, say, twelve years. At the present time men, if they wish to leave the service, become medically unfit some way or another. They retire as unfit for further service and receive compensation. A good many of them recover afterwards. A number of the constables seem to think that some provision should be made for the payment of compensation, after twelve years' service, to men who wish to retire before they are medically unfit.

367. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] *Constable Stanton*, you would prefer, then, that men should be allowed to retire if they wished after a certain number of years' service?—I do not advocate it at all. I was simply requested to place this matter before the Commission by some of the men who hold that opinion.

368. Have the men expressed any opinion as to the number of years they should serve before they should be allowed to retire?—I do not think they have any particular opinion; but yesterday evening a number of us were talking it over, and it was suggested from twelve to fourteen years.

369. Do you know of any men who have retired with comparatively small service, and, of course, received compensation?—I think I can mention one or two. I do not think *Constable Gaffney* had many years' service. Then there is *Constable Lewis*; he had, I think, thirteen years' service. Then there is *Constable Black*, of Rakaiā.

370. Do you suggest these men were not in a state of health which rendered them unfit for police-work?—I do not know. Some of the cases I do not know anything at all about.

371. Are you aware there is no such opportunity given as you suggest to men in any other Police Force?—No, I am not.

372. Constable Pratt, you have been in the Victorian Force?—Yes.

373. You had to provide the most of your uniform yourself?—Not all of it. We were supplied with overcoats, helmets, leggings, and capes.

374. Do you think one helmet a year, one tunic a year, two pairs of trousers a year, a great-coat every three years, a waterproof every year, and two pairs of boots a year would be sufficient?

375. *Sergeant Bourke*: Yes. With regard to medical certificates, we should have doctors free, and the men should be consulted as to what doctor they should have. There should be a vote of the men as to what doctor they should have. The men may get a doctor they have no confidence in.

376. *Colonel Pitt*.] Does that include free certificates?—I should certainly say so.

377. *Mr. Poynton*.] Constable Pratt, you are a Victorian: do you think three years' cumulative leave would be enough?—I think three years would be quite long enough.

378. Of twelve days?—I consider, myself, twelve days is not sufficient leave. We should have fourteen days. The Victorian police have fourteen days.

379. *The Chairman*.] You think they should have fourteen days a year, and the leave should be cumulative for three years?—At least three years.

380. *Mr. Poynton*.] Constable Pratt, was there a training depot in Melbourne?—Yes.

381. How long did you stay in that?—Four months.

382. Were you instructed in general police duties?—Yes.

383. And ambulance-work?—That was the only thing we were not instructed in there.

384. *Colonel Pitt*.] Did you do any street duty during that time?—Well, very little. Sunday was the only day we were allowed out at all.

385. *Mr. Poynton*.] What pay did you get while in the depot?—The same rate of pay.

386. Was general education attended to as well as the police?—Partly.

FRIDAY, 29TH APRIL, 1898.

JOHN TUCKER FORD, examined on oath.

1. *Colonel Pitt*.] What is your name?—John Tucker Ford.

2. *Mr. Cassidy*.] You are an auctioneer of long standing, Mr. Ford?—Yes.

3. You reside at Addington?—Yes.

4. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.

5. He is the constable in that district?—Yes.

6. You have seen him at the saleyards and such places?—Yes.

7. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—No.

8. Is he careful and attentive to his duties?—Very much so. I think he is very assiduous in carrying out his duties. I have never seen him intoxicated. I have not even seen him drink water.

9. That is the reputation he bears at the yards?—That is the reputation he bears with me. It is only within the last few days that I have heard complaints of his being intoxicated.

10. *Mr. Taylor*.] How often do you see the constable?—That is more than I can tell you.

11. Do you see him often at night-time?—I do not go prowling about at night.

12. But do you see him often at night?—No, I do not. I will not swear I have never seen him at night-time, but I do not see him frequently.

13. How frequently have you seen him in the day-time?—Whenever I have been at the markets and the yards where he is.

14. Is it once a fortnight?—More than that. I see him sufficiently often to say that I have never seen him intoxicated, and I have never known of his being intoxicated. At any time I have seen him he has been in the conscientious discharge of his duties.

FREDERICK TRENT, examined on oath.

15. *Mr. Cassidy*.] Your name?—Frederick Trent.

16. You are a merchant in Christchurch?—Yes.

17. You have been here for many years?—Yes, for twenty-eight years.

18. You are a member of the Licensing Committee?—Yes.

19. And you have been a Justice of the Peace for some time?—Yes, unfortunately.

20. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.

21. Have you seen him frequently in Christchurch about the Courts and other places?—I have known him for a number of years.

22. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—Never; and I may go further and state that I can conscientiously say that I have never seen a police constable under the influence of liquor during the twenty-eight years I have been in Canterbury.

23. The character Constable McGill bears is a good one?—I have never heard a word said to the contrary.

24. And you are a man who acts on the licensing bench, and as a Justice of the Peace, and you have seen a good deal of the police?—Yes, more than most people, because my business is near to the Court, and I have often done duty there when it was not my turn.

25. *Mr. Taylor*.] How often have you seen Constable McGill?—Not very often.

26. How often?—Perhaps I have not seen him for two or three months at a time. I saw him at the racecourse some time ago.

27. When did you see him last?—At the racecourse at the last races.
 28. Easter Monday?—Easter Tuesday, I believe, was the last time.
 29. Did you see him at the races in 1890?—I was not there. I have not been at races for thirteen years until last November.
 30. When did you see him prior to the races?—I cannot tell you. I meet him as I meet Inspector Broham or any of these gentlemen from time to time going through Christchurch.
 31. *The Chairman.*] Have you known Constable McGill for some time?—I am of opinion I have known him for fifteen years or longer.
 32. *Colonel Pitt.*] How long has Constable McGill been resident in Christchurch?—To the best of my judgment, I should say I have known him here for eighteen years, but I may be mistaken.

JOHN COX SOPP, examined on oath.

33. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—John Cox Sopp.
 34. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are a chemist?—Yes.
 35. And a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.
 36. Do you live at Addington?—Yes.
 37. How far from the police-station?—About 200 or 250 yards.
 38. Do you know Constable McGill, who is in charge of the station?—Yes.
 39. He has been in charge there for some time?—Yes, for three years.
 40. Have you seen him frequently?—Very frequently.
 41. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—No.
 42. As a Justice of the Peace you continually take declarations from him?—Yes, he is in to see me about two or three times a week.
 43. And you would also see him in the ordinary way, passing backwards and forwards, every day?—Yes.
 44. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see him on the 9th April?—No.
 45. Do you frequently see him after 10 o'clock at night?—No, I am generally in bed.

GEORGE BISSET, examined on oath.

46. *Mr. Cassidy.*] What is your name?—George Bisset.
 47. You are a journalist on the *Canterbury Times*?—Yes.
 48. You are the agricultural editor?—Yes, with other duties.
 49. Do you reside at Addington?—I resided there for two years—up to the 30th March last.
 50. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.
 51. Did you frequently see him at Addington?—Yes, very frequently.
 52. Being a newspaper-man, you frequently came into contact with him?—I came more in contact with him as a resident, but I have also known him in my capacity as a newspaper-man.
 53. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—Never. I have never seen him the worse of liquor.
 54. Do you know if he is attentive to his duties in the district?—As far as I know, he was.
 55. It is a rather difficult district to handle, is it not? It is too large for one constable?—Yes; the streets are tortuous, and there are a number of blind streets. The district is also broken and irregular. I was the unfortunate lessee of a house with an orchard, and I had to see Constable McGill about it a good many times in the fruit season. I have passed up the main street at Addington at all sorts of hours—from 7 in the morning till perhaps 3 the next morning—and at any time I have seen Constable McGill he has been in the discharge of his duties, except on one occasion when he was off duty on account of an assault that had been committed upon him. He was severely injured, and was off duty for two or three weeks.
 56. *Mr. Taylor.*] You say the district is a troublesome one on account of the blind streets?—Among other things.
 57. Will you name some of the blind streets?—Meredith Street.
 58. Another?—Dickens Street, opposite the Star Hotel.
 59. Can you name another?—No.
 60. Are there no more?—I do not know. The ones I have named are in my locality.
 61. Are those streets inhabited by troublesome people?—No, but troublesome people come into them—into Meredith Street, at any rate. The trouble arises from the fact that people who come into those streets can get away, and it is almost impossible to come upon them; in fact, they have come into my own place in broad daylight, and have got away without our being able to overtake them.
 62. Your street is not a blind street?—It is next the Domain.
 63. Did you see Constable McGill on the 9th April?—I do not think I did.
 64. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Did you see Constable McGill at the Lancaster Park races on the first day?—Yes; and also Constable Flewollen, I think. The meeting commenced at half-past 12 or 1 o'clock, and was continued till 6. I am under the impression now that I saw Constables McGill and Flewollen and another constable the last thing before I left the ground.
 65. *Mr. Taylor.*] Will you swear to that?—No, but that is my impression.
 66. *The Chairman.*] What time would that be?—About 6 o'clock or after.
 67. *Mr. Taylor.*] How frequently have you seen him at night-time?—Sometimes every night. I walk as much as I can, and sometimes I might see him twice at night.
 68. On the average, would you see him once a week—fifty-two times in the year?—Yes. I would say that I see him on the average three times a week at various times between 5 o'clock and 2 the next morning.
 69. Do you often see him after 10 o'clock at night?—Not often.

ASHTON WACHSMANN, examined on oath.

70. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—Ashton Wachsmann.
 71. You are an auctioneer in Christchurch?—Yes, salesman for Pyne and Co.
 72. Do you attend the Addington yards?—Yes, regularly for the last four years.
 73. You are continually up and down the road?—Yes.
 74. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes. I have seen him frequently for the last three years.
 75. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—Never.
 76. Is he careful and attentive about the yards?—Yes. The man who goes to the yards requires great tact. It is not that the men who go to the yards are addicted to drink, but the drink takes more effect on them. They sometimes get better prices than they expected, and they take a drink, which makes them jolly. Constable McGill has always done his best in cases like that, and does what he can to keep them steady.
 77. He is a success at the yards?—He is a success.
 78. *The Chairman.*] What times does he go there?—About 9, and he stays till the end of the sale. Sometimes it finishes at 3, and sometimes it is dark before we get away.
 79. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you often see Constable McGill at night?—Rarely.
 80. Did you see him on the 9th April last?—No.
 81. Would you consider it a bad thing for the reputation of the yards if men were arrested for drunkenness there?—No, I would not. I think the constable would be doing his duty.
 82. But you say he is tactful?—Quite true.
 83. Do you say these men get intoxicated and the constable does not arrest them?—He does not arrest them as long as they behave themselves.
 84. He does not interfere?—Very few people get drunk there, but they might get jolly. They do not quarrel.
 85. But, as a matter of fact, does he interfere?—If he sees a man getting jolly he tries to get him to go home.
 86. He is tactful with men with liquor on them?—Yes. I consider he has been a success at Addington.
 87. But is he tactful with men with liquor on them?—If he sees a man with liquor on him he does his best to get him to go home.
 88. I ask you again: Is he tactful with men with liquor on them?—Yes, he is very tactful with those men.
 89. *The Chairman.*] You mean men who may be excited?—Yes. He does his best to keep things going straight. If it is a hot day a farmer or anybody else who takes a couple of drinks of beer will get jolly.
 90. Does his tactfulness result in men going about in a state they ought not to be allowed to go about in?—No. Constable McGill would be the first to step in if a man went too far. I suppose I do not miss the Addington markets once a year.
 91. He is tactful of men who are excited with liquor, but he is not neglectful of those who are intoxicated?—That is so. No man does his duty better than Constable McGill.

FREDERICK HENRY PYNE, examined on oath.

92. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Frederick Henry Pyne.
 93. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are member of the firm of Pyne and Co.?—Yes.
 94. Do you attend the Addington Saleyards?—Yes.
 95. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.
 96. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—No.
 97. Is he careful and attentive to his duties?—Thoroughly so, as far as I know.
 98. You attend the yards regularly every Wednesday?—Yes.
 99. Do you see him on other days?—I have seen him about Christchurch for a long time.
 100. And that is the character you have formed of him?—I have the very highest opinion of him.
 101. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see him on the 9th April?—I think I was out of town on that day.
 102. Do you see him frequently after 10 o'clock at night?—I am not in town at night.
 103. Do you ever see him in the evenings?—Hardly ever.

JOHN CATHCART WASON, examined on oath.

104. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—John Cathcart Wason.
 105. You are a member of the House of Representatives?—Yes.
 106. You have been a resident in Canterbury for many years?—Yes.
 107. You take a great interest in stock and matters of that kind?—Yes, I am often at the saleyards.
 108. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes, very well by sight.
 109. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—No.
 110. Have you formed any opinion as to the way in which he carries out his duties?—I have seen no occasion for him to do anything.
 111. There is always an orderly crowd?—Yes.
 112. And the constable is always there?—Yes, he is always there moving round.
 113. Do you ever see him on week-days?—Yes, I think I have frequently seen him of an afternoon in Christchurch.
 114. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever seen him in the evening?—No, I am never out of an evening.
 115. Do you know the Addington district well?—Only by having to go to the saleyards.

116. Did you see Constable McGill on the 9th April?—I could not say.
 117. How often have you seen him—once a month on an average?—I have not been to the yards much lately, but before that I would see him every week.
 118. Do you ever speak to him?—I pass the time of day.
 119. You do not know much about him?—I know him through seeing him at the yards in the performance of his duties.

WILLIAM HENDERSON, examined on oath.

120. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—William Henderson.
 121. I think you are chairman of directors of the Addington Saleyards?—Yes.
 122. You are a sheep-farmer?—Sheep- and cattle-farmer.
 123. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes; he is the constable in the Addington district.
 124. And he attends the saleyards?—Yes.
 125. Where you attend yourself every Wednesday?—Yes, in the forenoon.
 126. Have you seen Constable McGill there frequently?—Yes.
 127. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—Never.
 128. What is your opinion of him as a constable?—I have always found him doing his duty, as far as I know. At one time we were troubled with sheep being taken away, and I asked Constable McGill to look round there at night. He attended to that, and I am glad to say there was no more trouble.
 129. He has long and weary work?—Yes; he is moving about there all the day.
 130. Do you ever see him at night-time?—I am seldom out at night.
 131. I suppose you see him sometimes during the week?—Three or four times every week. I pass up and down to town every day.
 132. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see him on the 9th April?—I did not.
 133. Do you often see him after 10 o'clock at night?—I do not come out at night.
 134. Taking an average week, do you see him for five minutes with the exception of the Wednesday morning at the saleyards?—I see him as I pass. I see him every Sunday religiously.
 135. Do you see him on Wednesday mornings?—Yes, up to between 12 and 1 o'clock.

JOHN WILSON STORRY, examined on oath.

136. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—John Wilson Storry.
 137. What are you?—A farmer, at present out of business.
 138. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are a resident at Addington?—Of Christchurch.
 139. You live close to Addington, do you?—Yes, just inside the Belt. I am within a quarter of a mile of Constable McGill's residence.
 140. Do you know Constable McGill well?—I see him almost daily. Sometimes I see him two or three times a day.
 141. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—I have never seen a sign of drink on him.
 142. Is he careful and attentive to his duties?—He always appears so to me.
 143. You are a teetotaler?—I am a total abstainer, and have been nearly all my life, certainly for twenty years.
 144. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever had occasion to seek the services of the constable?—Never.
 145. Do you know anybody who has?—No, I cannot say I do.
 146. Do you see him often after 10 o'clock at night?—No.
 147. Did you see him on the 9th April?—I cannot say I did, but I probably did.
 148. And you think you see him every day?—I do not say I see him every day, but nearly every day, and sometimes three or four times a day.
 149. You see him just as you pass?—I frequently talk to him. Sometimes I speak to him every day.
 150. Do you speak to him for a quarter of an hour?—Sometimes.
 151. How long do you usually speak to him?—Five or ten minutes.
 152. Quite long enough to know if he was drunk?—Yes.

MONTAGUE LEWIN, examined on oath.

153. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Montague Lewin.
 154. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You attend the Addington Saleyards?—Yes.
 155. You have been living in Canterbury for a long time?—Twenty-five years.
 156. Do you know Constable McGill well?—Very well.
 157. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—Never.
 158. Do you see him frequently?—Yes. I have to meet him in several official duties. I am clerk of the course for the Jockey Club, and I attend the races a good deal. I also have the clearing of the ground for the Agricultural and Pastoral Show.
 159. And you are a Canterbury Yeomanry man as well?—Yes.
 160. They camp at the show-grounds?—Yes, at the show-grounds.
 161. That is in Constable McGill's district?—Yes.
 162. Do you ever meet him at night-time?—Occasionally, when I have been going home from the Savage Club, or from some other meeting in town, I have met him at night.
 163. And you have never seen him intoxicated?—No.
 164. Is he a good officer?—He is the most courteous and unaggressive officer I have ever known in the Police Force.
 165. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you see him on the 9th April?—I may have. I cannot remember.
 166. Do you see him frequently after 9 or 10 o'clock at night?—Not very frequently. Occasionally when walking home from town I meet him.

SAMUEL FLEWELLEN, examined on oath.

167. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—Samuel Flewellen, constable stationed at Bingsland.
 168. Do you remember the Lancaster Park trotting meeting on the Saturday?—Yes, I was there on duty.
 169. Do you remember if Constable McGill was there?—He was.
 170. He was with you on the course till the proceedings were over?—Yes.
 171. Do you remember at what time he left?—About 6 o'clock.
 172. It was dark?—It was beginning to get dark.
 173. Was Constable McGill sober?—He was when I saw him.
 174. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where did you leave him?—I last saw him at the totalisators. I came home by myself.

EDWARD THOMAS BOSWORTH, examined on oath.

175. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—Edward Thomas Bosworth.
 176. *Mr. Cassidy.*] On Easter Saturday you were at the Lancaster Park races?—Yes, I was there on duty.
 177. And Constable McGill was there on duty too?—Yes.
 178. Did you stay until the last race was over and the crowd had gone away from the ground?—Yes.
 179. There was a big attendance that day?—A fairly big attendance.
 180. And it would be some time after the last race that the constables would leave?—Yes, about half an hour.
 181. What time did you leave the ground?—About half-past 6.
 182. *The Chairman.*] Did you leave alone or in company?—I left alone.
 183. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Was Constable McGill sober when you saw him at 6.30?—He was sober when I last saw him about 6 o'clock.
 184. And the crowd was then starting to leave the ground?—Yes.
 185. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where did you last see Constable McGill that day?—At the totalisators.
 186. You left him on the ground?—He left before me. It was about 6 when I saw him on the course.

JAMES GANTLEY, examined on oath.

187. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—James Gantley.
 188. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You were on duty at the Lancaster Park races?—Yes.
 189. On Saturday what time did you leave the ground?—After the people had left subsequent to the final race.
 190. That would be about half-past 6?—It would be later than that.
 191. The proceedings had been delayed that day?—A good number of people remained behind on account of the dividend on the last race.
 192. Was Constable McGill on duty that day?—Yes.
 193. Did you see him?—Yes.
 194. When did you see him last?—Constables McGill and Cullen were there at 6 o'clock, when the booths were closed, and Constable Field remained on the ground with me until the money had been paid out of the totalisator. At a quarter to 7 I saw Constable McGill standing at the gate.
 195. Was he sober?—Perfectly.
 196. *Mr. Taylor.*] You were the last constable to leave the ground?—I do not know if I was.
 197. Was Constable Bosworth there when you left?—Yes, he was at the gate.
 198. When did you leave?—About a quarter to 7. When I arrived in town it was 7 o'clock.
 199. Do you swear that the time was a quarter to 7?—I had to be at the station at half-past 7, and when I came into town I went to Fail's restaurant, and on arriving at the station it was 7.30.
 200. How long did you take over your tea?—Not long; I was in a hurry.
 201. You left Constable Bosworth at the gate when you came away?—Constables Cullen, McGill, Bosworth, and, I think, Flewellen were there. I came away with Constable Field.

GEORGE LAMBIE, examined on oath.

202. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name is George Lambie?—Yes.
 203. You are the manager for the Union Steamship Company in Christchurch?—Yes.
 204. You reside at Addington?—Yes.
 205. Do you know Constable McGill?—I do.
 206. You have known him for some time?—About three years.
 207. Have you ever seen him drunk?—No.
 208. That is the reputation he bears in the district?—I do not know about that, but I have never seen him drunk.
 209. Do you see him frequently?—Yes.
 210. Do you walk into town?—I come in by the car.
 211. And you go out by the car at night?—Yes, and the middle of the day as well.
 212. Do you ever see the constable at night-time?—Yes, frequently.
 213. *Mr. Taylor.*] What do you mean by "frequently"?—Half a dozen times a week.
 214. In the day-time principally?—Yes, and at night-time too.
 215. How often do you see him at night?—Perhaps three or four times a week.
 216. You are certain you see him three times a week after dusk?—Yes, after 6 o'clock.
 217. Do you often see him after 10 o'clock at night?—I am not out after 10.

218. He might be drunk frequently and you would not see him?—I do not know anything about that.

219. But, as a matter of fact, he could?—Well, anybody could.

220. *The Chairman.*] Are you able to express an opinion as to whether he is a man of intemperate habits?—I have never seen anything of it.

MARGARET BEVERIDGE, examined on oath.

221. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—Margaret Beveridge.

222. You are the matron of the Samaritan Home at Addington?—Yes.

223. Does it adjoin the gaol premises?—Yes.

224. Have you lived at Addington long?—Nearly two years.

225. You know Constable McGill, of course?—Yes.

226. Do you see him frequently?—Yes, almost every day.

227. Have you ever seen him intoxicated?—No.

228. I suppose you frequently see him on matters connected with the institution?—At times.

229. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you ever seen him under the influence of liquor?—No.

230. How often do you see him?—I could not say.

231. Try and say how often?—I really could not say. I often pass him going in and out and down to the garden.

ROBERT PARKER, examined on oath.

232. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—Robert Parker.

233. You are a private detective?—Yes.

234. Employed by the Canterbury Racing-club?—By various racing-clubs throughout New Zealand.

235. Do you attend the racecourse?—Yes, very frequently.

236. In connection with totalisator betting, and matters of that kind?—Yes.

237. Did you attend the Lancaster Park meeting?—Yes.

238. You had some men with you?—Yes.

239. You were authorised by the ground authorities to superintend the ground?—Yes.

240. Did you see Constable McGill on the Easter Saturday?—Yes.

241. You stayed till the last?—Till half-past 6.

242. Did you see Constable McGill at half-past 6?—Yes.

243. Where?—Inside the gate.

244. Was he sober?—Yes, perfectly.

245. You know him, and could not mistake him?—I have known him for a number of years.

246. You were in the lunch-room?—Yes, and I saw him refuse to take drink there, and also at the booths.

247. Did Constable McGill take any refreshment at the luncheon?—He took the ordinary refreshments, and tea instead of beer.

248. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you ever in the Armed Constabulary?—Yes.

249. When did you leave?—I could not tell the date.

250. What did you leave for?—That is my business, and not yours.

251. *The Chairman.*] Did you leave, or were you discharged?—I resigned.

252. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you not dismissed?—I resigned. Colonel Hume can tell you that.

253. What did you leave for?—Ask Colonel Hume that question.

254. Was it not a forced resignation?—I have given my answer.

255. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are employed by very many clubs in New Zealand?—Yes.

RICHARD WILLIAM SHEPHERD, examined on oath.

256. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—Richard William Shepherd.

257. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You were at the Lancaster Park races on the Saturday?—Yes.

258. Were you there till the end of the proceedings, and for some time after?—Yes.

259. Did you see Constable McGill there towards the end?—Yes; I spoke to him.

260. Was he sober?—Yes, perfectly.

261. *Mr. Taylor.*] What time did you leave?—About 6.

JOHN BRIDGMAN, examined on oath.

262. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—John Bridgman.

263. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Were you at the Lancaster Park races on Easter Saturday?—Yes.

264. You attended as an ordinary spectator?—Yes.

265. You were a constable at one time?—Yes.

266. Was Constable McGill there?—Yes.

267. What time of the day did you leave the course; was it after 6?—Yes, it was after 6. I happened to have a ticket on the winning horse, and I had to wait to get paid.

268. Did you see Constable McGill at that time?—Yes. On my way home I went into the Lancaster Park Hotel for a drink, and when I came out I saw Constable McGill and some other constables.

269. Was Constable McGill sober?—I did not notice anything wrong with him. I said "Good-night" to him, and he said "Good-night, Bridgman."

270. Then you got on the car and went home?—Yes.

271. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you dismissed from the Police Force?—Yes. You ought to know that; you took an active part in it.

272. You were dismissed for drunkenness?—No, I was not. I was never punished for drunkenness during the thirty years I was in the Police Force.

273. Was not drunkenness one of the charges against you?—No.

274. What was it?—For forcing my way into a brothel after an attempt had been made upon my life by a fellow throwing a stone at me. You ought to know that. You examined the woman, and you swore you saw a slight indent under her left tit.

EDWIN CICERO BERRY, examined on oath.

275. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Your name?—Edwin Cicero Berry.

276. You are a butcher?—Yes; in lower High Street, Christchurch.

277. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.

278. Do you remember Easter Saturday?—Yes.

279. You were pretty busy?—Yes.

280. Did you see Constable McGill after 6 o'clock?—Yes.

281. What time?—A little after 7 o'clock.

282. Where?—In front of my shop. I was talking to him.

283. Did he say where he had been?—I asked him, and he said he had been at Lancaster Park. He is stationed at Addington, and I wondered what he was doing in that part of the town.

284. Did he appear tired?—No.

285. You spoke to him for a few minutes?—Yes, and then he went up the street.

286. At what time?—A little after 7 o'clock. I had the gas alight.

287. Was he sober?—Yes.

288. *Mr. Taylor.*] You judge that it was after 7 o'clock by the fact that the gas was lighted?—Yes.

289. What time do you light your gas at this time of the year?—Before it gets dark.

290. What time was it dark that night?—I am not sure.

291. How do you know it was after 7?—I said it was about 7 o'clock.

292. Do you say he was perfectly sober?—Yes.

293. As sober as you are now?—Yes.

294. Did you know him when he was the constable at Phillipstown?—Yes.

295. How many years have you known him?—Fifteen or sixteen, or perhaps more.

296. Did you sign a petition asking for his reinstatement in the Police Force?—I did not.

297. Do you remember the petition?—No.

298. Do you know that he left the Police Force?—I did not know he left, but I know he was transferred from Phillipstown to Addington.

299. Do you not know that he was dismissed?—I heard that he was suspended, but I never knew he was dismissed.

300. Do you not know that for some time before he went to Addington he kept a publichouse?—No; I do not trouble myself about other people's business.

DANIEL FALVEY, examined on oath.

301. *The Chairman.*] Your name?—Daniel Falvey.

302. *Mr. Cassidy.*] What are you?—Bailiff; and commission agent, in Christchurch.

303. You have been here for some time?—Yes.

304. You are employed a good deal in connection with that class of work?—Yes.

305. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes, well.

306. Do you remember Easter Saturday last?—Yes.

307. Did you see Constable McGill on the night of that day after 6 o'clock?—Yes.

308. Where?—In Tuam Street.

309. About what time?—Between half-past 7 and 8.

310. Where did you meet him?—About four doors from Mrs. Watters's.

311. Did you speak to him?—I bade him "Good-night," and walked on.

312. Was he sober?—Yes; he was walking upright and fast.

313. You are certain he was sober?—He was sober.

314. Did you see Mrs. Watters?—Yes.

315. Where?—Standing in front of her door.

316. What was her state of mind?—She seemed to be very excited, and almost in a state of hysteria.

317. What was it about?—She said Constable McGill had challenged her about sitting on her own doorstep.

318. Tuam Street has not the best of names, has it?—The unfortunate class will wander down any street, and down that street particularly.

319. Would it not be a proper thing for a constable or any one else to ask a woman why she was sitting on a doorstep?—I think so; and I explained to Mrs. Watters that it was a reasonable thing to do, and that the constable had probably taken her for a woman who had no right there.

320. She was excited at the time?—She was upset about it.

321. Where did you go?—Straight up the street, home.

322. *Mr. Taylor.*] What did McGill say to you?—Only "Good-evening."

323. He was walking fast?—Yes.

324. Does he usually walk fast?—He seemed to have struck a wasps' nest that night, and when I saw Mrs. Watters I knew the cause of it. He was apparently wanting to get away from Mrs. Watters.

325. *The Chairman.*] Do you say he was excited?—No; but he was walking quick.
326. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you not say that he was excited?—No; I used that word in connection with Mrs. Watters.
327. What did he say when you said “Good-night”?—He said “Good-night,” and walked on.
328. You are sure he was sober?—Yes.
329. Judging by what?—He was walking upright and straight.
330. You thought he had struck a wasps’ nest?—I saw he had when I came on Mrs. Watters.
331. Did Mrs. Watters say anything to you?—Yes, she stuck me up.
332. Did she say the constable was sober?—She did not mention drink. She had a grievance about being stuck up on her own doorstep.
333. Do you know Manchester Street?—Yes.
334. Is it a recognised promenade for prostitutes?—Yes.
335. Is Tuam Street another?—No; but the drunken and the unfortunate wander down any street.
336. Where did McGill go to?—Up Tuam Street.
337. In which direction?—West.
338. Are you sure he spoke to you when you said “Good-night”?—Yes.
339. What did he say?—“Good-night.”
340. And he was walking very fast?—Pretty fast.
341. How do you know he was perfectly sober?—By his walking upright and fast.
342. He was not running?—No.
343. You are sure?—I am certain.
344. He was walking perfectly upright?—Yes.

RICHARD ROBERT BELL, examined on oath.

345. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Richard Robert Bell.
346. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You were in charge of Pastor Birch’s Samaritan Home for some time, were you not?—Yes.
347. I suppose you knew Constable McGill in connection with that Home?—Yes; I have known him for thirty-four years—before he went into the Police Force.
348. Did you see him frequently in connection with the Home?—Yes.
349. Did he bring men to the Home?—Yes; like other constables, he often brought men to the Home.
350. Do you remember Easter Saturday?—Yes.
351. Where do you live?—At Halswell.
352. Were you coming into town that night?—Yes, between 7 and 8 o’clock.
353. Did you meet Constable McGill?—Yes, at the Hospital corner.
354. At what time?—After 7 o’clock, but it was not 8.
355. Would it be a quarter to 8?—It might have been that, but it was not 8.
356. Did you speak to him?—Yes.
357. What did you talk about?—He said he had been at the races, and was very tired after the long day’s duty.
358. Was he sober?—Perfectly.
359. You left him there?—Yes; we chatted a few minutes and then went on.
360. You went to town and he to Addington?—Yes.
361. Was he then on his direct line home?—Yes.
362. *Mr. Taylor.*] Where was he when you saw him?—On the footpath.
363. You were walking and he was walking, I suppose?—Yes.
364. Were you leaning against anything?—I was walking. We met one another.
365. How long did you stop?—Three or four minutes.
366. What part of the footpath did you stand on?—At the lamp at the corner next the Presbyterian minister’s.
367. Was he touching the lamp?—No, he was standing in the middle of the footpath.
368. As sober as you are now?—Yes.

LEWIS EDMUND CROSBIE, examined on oath.

369. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—Louis Edmund Crosbie.
370. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.
371. You have been living in Christchurch for some time?—Yes, since 1885. I had frequently been in Christchurch before that.
372. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.
373. Have you seen him frequently within the last five years?—Yes.
374. He is stationed at Addington?—Yes. I lived at Addington for three years, and was in the habit of seeing him—and am still—at the Addington yards. I attend there every week.
375. You are Government valuator?—Yes.
376. What is the opinion you have formed of the constable’s general conduct?—I have always thought he was a steady, efficient officer, and I am still of that opinion.
377. Would you see him late at night occasionally?—Yes. I have met him walking around by Cashmere, and one place and another, and I have always found him sober.
378. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did you ever see a policeman drunk in your life?—No.
379. How often have you seen Constable McGill?—Often.
380. Once a week on an average?—Yes; quite.

GEORGE THOMSON, examined on oath.

381. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—George Thomson.
 382. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You are one of the Addington tram-drivers?—Yes. I have been driving for about five years.
 383. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes; ever since he came to Addington.
 384. Have you ever seen him drunk on the tram?—No; and I have never heard any complaint of his being on the tram in that state. If he had been I would have heard of it. We are not supposed to carry any one who is intoxicated.
 385. The guard would speak about it?—Yes.
 386. Do you often see Constable McGill?—Yes; I suppose I see him once a day, and sometimes three or four times a day. I am up that road nine or ten times a day—on the average, ten trips a day.
 387. *Mr. Taylor.*] When do you make the last trip?—At 5 o'clock from the Square, and 6 into the Square; and 11 o'clock on Saturday nights.

JOHN HOARE, examined on oath.

388. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—John Hoare.
 389. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Are you a tram-driver?—Yes.
 390. You and Thompson drive the Addington trams?—Yes. I start at 3.30, and drive up to 11 o'clock.
 391. Would you run the 6 o'clock car?—Yes. I have been running it for twelve months.
 392. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes. I see him nearly every day.
 393. Have you ever seen him drunk on the tram?—No, never since I have been on the road.
 394. You would have noticed it if he had got on the car in that state?—Yes.
 395. It is an instruction to the drivers to look out for any one of that kind?—Yes. We have to keep them off for fear of accidents.
 396. And the constable you would have noticed particularly?—Yes.
 397. *Mr. Taylor.*] How do you define drunkenness?—If any one is drunk the guard tells us.
 398. But what do you consider drunkenness?—I consider a man is drunk if he cannot walk on his feet.
 399. *Mr. Cassidy.*] If a man states that Constable McGill reeled and staggered on to the tram and blundered into it, would he be telling the truth?—I would reckon a man was drunk if he did that.
 400. You have never seen him reeling into your car?—Never.

GEORGE COLLIER, examined on oath.

401. *Mr. Cassidy.*] What is your name?—George Collier.
 402. You were at one time the licensee of the A 1 Hotel?—Yes.
 403. How long ago?—Fifteen months ago.
 404. Were you in the hotel three months ago?—Yes.
 405. You had charge of the hotel?—Yes.
 406. Do you know Constable McGill?—Yes.
 407. It has been stated that about seven or eight months ago Constable McGill reeled drunk out of the hotel about 6 o'clock at night?—I never saw it.
 408. You would have seen it if it had happened?—I think I would have been sure to see it.
 409. *Mr. Taylor.*] How often was Constable McGill in your hotel while you were there?—I do not know that I ever saw him there.
 410. When do you consider a man is drunk?—When he staggers about the street.
 411. Have you ever been charged with supplying a drunken man with liquor?—No.
 412. Have you ever been fined for breaches of the Licensing Act?—No.
 413. Your son was, then?—Yes.

PATRICK MCGILL, examined on oath.

414. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Patrick McGill. I am a police constable, stationed at Addington.
 415. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Do you remember being at the Lancaster Park races?—Yes.
 416. On the 9th April, on duty?—Yes.
 417. What time did you leave the ground: between 6 and 7?—It was close on 7 o'clock.
 418. Were you sober?—I was.
 419. Did you see the witnesses, your fellow-constables, who have sworn here that they saw you at the gate?—Yes. I was in charge, being the senior constable on the ground.
 420. Did you see Bridgman at the hotel?—Yes, and spoke to him.
 421. He says you wished him "Good-night"?—Yes.
 422. Where did you go then?—Up Ferry Road.
 423. Do you remember seeing the witness Berry outside his shop?—Yes. I went in that direction.
 424. What did you say to him?—I was talking about where I had been.
 425. What time was that?—Between 7 and 8 o'clock.
 426. Where did you go then?—I went up lower High Street, past A. J. White's corner, up Tuam Street, and across Colombo Street towards home.
 427. Do you remember seeing Mrs. Watters?—Yes.
 428. Did you know it was Mrs. Watters when you saw her first?—I did not.
 429. Was she sitting down?—Yes, on the doorstep.

430. Did you ask her any question?—I said, "What are you sitting down there for?" She got very excited.

431. Did she finally tell you anything about her husband?—I believe she said she was waiting for her husband.

432. Did you believe it was a woman that you had a right to attend to?—Yes.

433. Is Tuam Street a place where women of the unfortunate class go to?—Several houses there are in the possession of those women.

434. Was Mrs. Watters's house closed up?—Yes; it was in darkness.

435. Mr. Falvey says you then hurried away?—Yes; I spoke to him.

436. Where did you meet Mr. Falvey?—Close by.

437. Did you speak to him?—Yes, I bade him the time of night.

438. And you went home?—Yes, towards Lincoln Road.

439. Did you meet the witness Bell?—Yes, at the corner of the hospital.

440. Did you speak to him?—Yes.

441. What did you say to him?—He asked me where I had been, and I told him.

442. Do you remember telling him anything about your condition?—I said I was pretty tired after the races.

443. You were anxious to get home?—Yes.

444. Were you sober during that period?—Yes.

445. You heard the evidence of Mr. Ell and the other Prohibitionist?—I did.

446. Is it true?—No, it is not true.

447. Can you fix the day they refer to?—No, I cannot.

448. Are you positive that you never got on to the Addington tram while drunk?—I never did.

449. Or reeled about the street there, or staggered in the way they have described?—No.

450. With reference to the general charge of drunkenness, is it true or false?—It is not true.

451. As to the evidence of the witness Jewiss, is it true?—No. I was never there. Opawa is not my district at all.

452. *The Chairman.*] You do not mean, I suppose, that you were never there?—Not within the time stated.

453. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You were stationed there at one time?—Yes; at Phillipstown.

454. I think the Prohibitionists have devoted a good deal of attention to you?—Yes; particular attention. I am pretty well watched wherever I go.

455. Do you know of your own knowledge whether the Prohibitionists have taken petitions round about you to different places?—I cannot say of my own knowledge.

456. *The Chairman.*] How long ago is it that you were stationed at Opawa?—Seven years, as near as I can recollect. I was at Phillipstown.

457. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you dismissed?—Yes, I was.

458. What for?—For drunkenness; and I was wrongfully dismissed.

459. Did you walk very fast on your way home that night from Lancaster Park?—Not very fast.

460. Do you walk fast?—I do not.

461. Do you know Jewiss?—No. I never saw him to my knowledge till I saw him here.

462. Do you know Trist?—Only by seeing him here.

463. Do you remember meeting him on the Opawa Road?—No.

464. You do not know anything about the Opawa Road?—No; I was not there.

465. Did Mrs. Watters say anything to you about your condition?—No. When I saw who it was I went on, as we are not good friends.

466. Did you travel on faster than you usually do?—Probably my speed may have been accelerated.

467. Do you know Falvey?—Yes.

468. How long have you known him?—For some time, but I could not say how long.

469. Five years?—It might be that.

470. How often do you see him?—Sometimes.

471. Once a month?—Possibly I do.

472. Where do you usually see him?—Sometimes in town, and sometimes out Addington way.

473. Do you ever see him at church?—I do not go to church, or very seldom.

474. *The Chairman.*] Do you ever go to any other place of worship?—If I get leave from my superior officer.

475. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you ever visit the Star Hotel?—On duty.

476. Strictly on duty?—Only to make inquiries, and on business.

477. Do you go there on any other occasions?—I could not say.

478. You can say, surely?—No, I cannot. Sometimes I go to tell them to light their lamps.

479. Were you ever in the A 1 Hotel in your life?—Yes; years ago I was.

480. Within the last year?—No; but I have passed through on several occasions to the public convenience.

481. Do you visit any of the hotels in Christchurch?—Yes; I was in one this morning to see Mr. Cassidy.

482. Do you visit them on other occasions?—If I have business to do I go to them.

483. You are always on duty in them?—Yes.

ANNIE WATTERS, further examined on oath.

484. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know Mr. Falvey?—No.

485. Did any man speak to you on the Saturday night?—Yes. Two gentlemen passed me, and a gentleman then came up and tried to undo the door for me. They had not gone five yards when the gentleman came up who tried to undo the door.

486. Would you recognise the man again who tried to undo the door?—Yes; I have brought him with me.
487. Would you recognise the other two gentlemen?—No; I was so upset at what Constable McGill had said.
488. You spoke to them?—Yes.
489. Did either of them suggest that the constable had mistaken you for an unfortunate woman?—No; no one would do that in Christchurch.
490. Was it before or after you saw Constable McGill that you saw these gentlemen?—He was not five yards away when they came up, and they must have heard him speaking to me.
491. Were you in a state of hysteria?—No, certainly not, and I have a witness to prove it.
492. You were annoyed?—Yes, I was a little annoyed.
493. Did you see the constable when he had gone twenty yards from you: was he walking upright?—He staggered from one side of the street to the other.
494. Did the constable recognise you?—He was too drunk to recognise me.
495. He did not say he recognised you?—No; I told him who I was.
496. Do you think you would recognise either of the two gentlemen who spoke to you?—No. I cannot say I even looked at them. I was very much upset.
497. They were strangers?—Yes.
498. Do you think the fact of the constable being tired would account for his conduct to you?—No. He could not speak plainly.
499. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Who saw you this morning about this matter?—I do not know the gentleman's name.
500. *The Chairman.*] Some one came to your house?—Yes.
501. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Did Mr. Taylor see you?—No. I never spoke to Mr. Taylor in my life.
502. Do you know Mr. Ell?—I do not. [*Mr. Ell stepped forward.*] Yes; I saw that gentleman this morning.
503. Mr. Falvey is wrong, then, in stating that he told you — — ?—Yes; and God knows it, and he knows it.
504. Well, I am putting my question. He is wrong when he says he spoke to you, and said the constable might have thought it was a person who had no right to be sitting there?—He never used such words. One man said it was a shame the constable should speak to any one in that manner.
505. *Colonel Pitt.*] Who said that?—There were two gentlemen together, and I cannot say which of them it was.
506. *Mr. Cassidy.*] You cannot say it was Mr. Falvey?—No.

ISAIAH DAVID DAVIS, examined on oath.

507. *Colonel Pitt.*] Your name?—Isaiah David Davis.
508. What are you?—A furniture dealer, at the corner of Tuam and Colombo Streets.
509. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember Saturday, 9th April?—Yes.
510. Did you see Mrs. Watters that night?—Yes.
511. Where?—On her doorstep.
512. Did you try to open the door for her?—Yes. I took a key from my shop to try to let her into her premises.
513. Was she in a state of hysteria that night?—No; she was in her usual state.
514. Was she angry about something?—She seemed to be annoyed about something.
515. Have you ever seen a woman suffering from hysteria?—Yes.
516. You think there was nothing approaching that, as far as Mrs. Watters was concerned?—No. I think she was in her usual condition.
517. Do you think she was in a position to form an accurate judgment as to what had happened that night?—Of course she was.
518. *Mr. Cassidy.*] Was she upset?—She seemed very much annoyed.
519. But was she upset?—What do you mean by "upset"?
520. If she says she was upset, would she be telling the truth?—Yes; I should judge she was telling the truth.
521. But, as a matter of fact, was she upset?—She was very much annoyed about something or another.
522. Was she excited?—Not particularly excited.
523. What time was it?—About a quarter to 8 o'clock.
524. How do you know it was a quarter to 8?—I had watched the time carefully that night, as I do every Saturday night, as I look out for closing-time.
525. What time do you close?—Between 9 and 10.
526. Why would you be watching the time, then, at a quarter to 8?—Because between 8 and 9 o'clock I would begin to get the things in. I had looked at my watch only a few minutes before I saw Mrs. Watters.
527. *The Chairman.*] Did you see two men speaking to Mrs. Watters?—No.
528. *Colonel Pitt.*] Or any other person beside yourself?—No.
529. *The Chairman.*] Did you see Constable McGill that night?—I saw him a little ahead of me.
530. Where were you?—At Mrs. Watters's door.
531. What distance from him?—I suppose from 10 to 20 yards.
532. Was there anybody else on the footpath?—Not at the time.
533. How far are your premises from hers?—Some 2 or 3 chains.
534. Any houses between?—Yes, several.

535. How was your attention called to her?—Her daughter came to my place to ask for a key.
 536. And you took the key?—I went with a key to try to let them into their premises.
 537. Did you go in company with the daughter?—I did.
 538. And when you went you saw no one else on the footpath?—No.

JOHN COX SOPP, examined on oath.

539. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—John Cox Sopp. I am a Justice of the Peace, and I reside at Addington. Some two or three months ago a charge was made against the police of sending up reports to Justices of an accused person before the Bench heard the case, with the intention of prejudging it. I have always regularly taken my turn on the bench, and I can honestly say that the record is never put in until after the Bench has decided to convict.

540. *Colonel Pitt.*] You mean the record of previous convictions?—Yes. I have never found the police at all vindictive in their prosecutions in regard to prisoners.

FREDERICK TRENT, examined on oath.

541. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are a merchant, in business in Christchurch?—Yes.
 542. How many years have you been here?—About twenty-eight years.
 543. You are a member of the Licensing Committee?—Yes.
 544. And you have been a Justice of the Peace for some years?—For fifteen or sixteen years.
 545. For the last few years you have had ample opportunity of noticing the Police Force here?—Yes. I may say that in my case I have special reasons to be grateful to the Canterbury police.
 546. You are speaking now of some particular case?—Yes; of a case which I should like to have placed on record. Some years ago we had a very disastrous fire at Templeton, and the police, under Inspector Pender, were instrumental in saving our property to the value of fully £3,000.
 547. *The Chairman.*] Was that before the days of fire-brigades?—No, but it was too far out for the brigade to go, and the Inspector and his men went out at a trot, arriving in a marvellously short space of time.
 548. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You give them credit for intelligent helpfulness?—Most emphatically. They worked as I have never seen men work before. And it was not alone the value of the property saved, for it would have meant a suspension of our business for some time.
 549. What is your opinion as to the general conduct, sobriety, and morality of the members of the Force here?—I am firmly of the opinion that the Police Force here will compare favourably with any other body of men in New Zealand. I can conscientiously say that I have never seen a police constable or any member of the Police Force under the influence of drink. What other people may have seen is nothing to me.
 550. You have had ample opportunities of seeing?—Yes. My business premises are very near the Court, and I have been sent for in emergencies. When I was in the Commission of the Peace I used to sit more often than most Justices.
 551. Speaking still of them as a body, you find them honest and straightforward in the conduct of their business?—Yes; and civil and courteous.
 552. In fact, you think very highly of them as a body?—I do.
 553. In the course of your observation, and your long experience, can you refer to any instances of discourtesy on the part of the police?—No.
 554. You cannot call to mind an instance of any discourtesy on the part of any officer?—No, I cannot. There is another matter I should like to mention. It was our misfortune, about two years ago, to have our free store broken into by burglars, and my brother and myself were greatly impressed with the zeal and energy shown at that time by Detectives Marsack and Maddern.
 555. By the zeal and energy and intelligence of the staff?—Yes.
 556. On the whole, you have reason to be grateful for their helpfulness?—Very much so in the particular cases I mention.

JANE ELIZABETH PATRICK, examined on oath.

557. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your name?—Jane Elizabeth Patrick.
 558. Do you live in Christchurch?—At 50, Oxford Terrace.
 559. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember the 8th January last?—Yes.
 560. On what day did your father die?—The 8th January.
 561. Had you occasion to leave your house late the night before?—Yes; we had to go for Dr. De Renzi.
 562. Who was with you?—Mrs. Cooper. We left home a little before 12 on the night of the 7th, and were at Hesketh's when the hour struck.
 563. Where were you living at the time?—At 41, Lichfield Street East.
 564. Were you interfered with by any policemen?—Yes; at the corner of Madras and Lichfield Streets, after we had been to the doctor's.
 565. You were walking towards the policemen?—They came from Madras Street South, and we were going east in Lichfield Street.
 566. Did you pass close to them?—They arrived at Madras Street corner just before us, and separated as we got near them, and Mrs. Cooper went between them, and I went at the back of one of them.
 567. To get past them?—Yes.

568. Did one of the men put his hand on Mrs. Cooper?—Yes; the man on the south caught her by the shoulder.
569. Are you sure they were policemen?—Yes; it was a moonlight night, but drizzling.
570. Did Mrs. Cooper take the hat off one of the policemen?—Yes, to get his number, but he took it from her.
571. Did he not get hold of her roughly?—He disarranged her cape, but I do not know if it came off.
572. What did you do?—I cowardly ran away. I thought I would waken some of the neighbours, as I was very much frightened. The policeman followed Mrs. Cooper across the street.
573. Did you report the matter to the police?—Yes.
574. Was there any conversation?—Yes, between her and the policeman, but I took no part in it.
575. Where is Mrs. Cooper now?—At the Women's Convention, in Wellington. We reported the matter to Inspector Broham within a few days afterwards.
576. Were the police paraded?—Yes. We were told we had to identify the policemen, and Mrs. Cooper identified a man; but I could not identify him.
577. Were you told she had picked out the wrong man?—I do not think we were told anything decided.
578. You heard nothing more about it?—No. Mrs. Cooper heard something, but nothing material.
579. Were the men sober at the time?—I could not say; but they had been drinking, because I could smell the liquor as we passed.
580. *The Chairman.*] As you passed?—Yes. As we passed there was an odour of drink. I am positive about that. They did not touch me.
581. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did you understand that Mrs. Cooper had identified, or was said to have identified, the wrong man?—No. We were not told.
582. *The Chairman.*] Did Mrs. Cooper identify anybody?—Yes; she identified a man, but I could not tell.
583. Did you see the policeman put his hand on her shoulder?—Yes.
584. In what manner was it done? Was it done violently or rudely?—I think it was done rudely. We were walking home quickly and quietly, and thought we should not have been interfered with.
585. Was it done roughly?—No, I do not think so.
586. Was it done in such a way as a man would touch a person if he wished to call his attention to anything, or was it done more rudely?—It was done more rudely.
587. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Were you not told that the man Mrs. Cooper had picked out was a constable who could not possibly have been in the neighbourhood at all?—No. Indeed, I think I heard some one at the station that night say the man was in the neighbourhood.
588. You are not very clear as to what passed at the station?—I am almost convinced that that did pass. Some one was with Inspector Broham, and he asked us if we had identified the man, and I said I had not, and Mrs. Cooper said she had, and that she would like to know the name of the man.
589. How near were you to the men on the street?—I was quite close to them.
590. You say that Mrs. Cooper had separated from you?—No. The men separated, and Mrs. Cooper walked between them, and I walked at the back of one of them.
591. Did you not say that Mrs. Cooper crossed the road?—No; I crossed the road.
592. Did you run away immediately Mrs. Cooper was touched by the policeman?—Almost.
593. Had any words passed?—I think she asked him why he dared to put his hand upon her.
594. And what was his reply?—I do not know, because I made off.
595. When he put his hand on her shoulder did he pull her back?—He put his hand on her shoulder insolently.
596. Of course, it is rude for a lady to be touched in the street if it was wilfully done?—It was wilfully done.
597. You were going in the same direction?—They came from the south, and we were going east.
598. *The Chairman.*] Were they approaching you before they stood still?—No.
599. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] All the time they were in your view they were standing?—When I saw them first they were coming from the south. We saw them for several minutes before they came to us.
600. And before you reached the point at which you met they had stopped?—Yes; and as we approached they separated.
601. They separated to allow you to pass between them, I suppose?—I do not suppose anything.
602. They separated sufficiently to allow Mrs. Cooper to pass?—Yes.
603. And what did you do when you saw Mrs. Cooper touched by the man?—I ran across the street to waken some one.
604. Did you run immediately?—Yes. I saw he had a hold of her.
605. It would not take more than a moment for him to put his hand on her: then you ran away?—Yes; I was frightened.
606. Was it the constable nearest to you who put his hand on the woman?—Yes.
607. Then, his back was towards you?—Yes.
608. And the other constable was on the other side of Mrs. Cooper?—Yes. He was near the side channel.
609. And Mrs. Cooper was facing the constable?—Yes.
610. You said you detected the odour of drink when you passed behind the man, although you immediately ran away?—Yes. I detected it on the instant. I am convinced that I detected it.

611. It was brought to you on the night air. It must have been a strong odour?—Perhaps it had not long been partaken of.

612. Was the wind blowing?—No; it was a drizzling, moonlight night.

613. *The Chairman.*]—How far were you from the man whom you say touched Mrs. Cooper?—I was quite close to him.

JOHN MARTIN THOMPSON, examined on oath.

614. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are a resident of Christchurch?—Yes.

615. For how many years?—Nearly thirty-nine.

616. What is your business or calling?—I have been a professional musician. I am out of business now. I had a sewing-machine business in Christchurch.

617. You are also a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.

618. And I think I may suggest you have taken an active interest in the welfare of the place during your residence here?—Yes.

619. What has been your observation as to the general conduct, morality, and sobriety of the Police Force here?—I can only speak in the highest terms. I have always found them sober and attentive to their business, and energetic in it. At different times my business has kept me out late at night, and I have met them in all directions, and have always found them endeavouring to keep order and look after the welfare of the citizens. When I was in business, I may say, on several occasions when through carelessness our door has not been locked I have been acquainted of the fact by the constable at midnight. In every instance in which our door has been left open our attention has been called to it by the constable. As to their conduct, I have always had the highest opinion of them as a body of men.

620. As a body of men, you speak in the highest terms of their civility and ability?—Yes. I have always found them so, and I have been a bit of an observer. Feeling interested in the city I have naturally taken notice.

621. You have had ample opportunity of observing?—Yes. I may say I have had on one or two occasions to visit the Inspector on certain matters in connection with police duties, and I have always been treated with the utmost courtesy, and the utmost willingness has been shown to assist in any direction—in the direction of suppressing larrikinism and that sort of thing.

622. You have been president, I think, of the Working-men's Club here?—Yes, for four years.

623. Are you a drinking-man yourself?—I am a total abstainer. I am not a Prohibitionist. I am a man. I have been a total abstainer from boyhood. There is one thing which I think is worthy of consideration, and that is the necessity of putting a stop to the larrikin element. The police, through want of men, are unable to send policemen where I consider it is the duty of a policeman to be—that is, to places of amusement, where larrikinism is growing rather too rife. I do not think it is altogether cultivated at places of amusement. I think it is cultivated at public meetings outside; but it seems to be growing, and I think the police should be sent to attend places where there are congregated from six to eight hundred or a thousand people without having to be paid for it. I notice the police are stationed at the Salvation Army, and the Cathedral, and various other places where there are congregated numbers of people, but where there is not likely to be a disturbance; but when they go to places of amusement they have to be paid for it.

624. Has that not been stopped—that used to be the practice, but it has been stopped for some time, has it not—the payment of constables?—I am not aware of it. If it has it has not been stopped long. From observations now extending over thirty years of public entertainments, I may say it has been felt that the larrikins are pretty free at these entertainments, because there has not been a constable there except when he has been paid for it. I am not blaming the authorities for it. I think it is owing to their not having sufficient men to meet requirements.

625. It has been stated that that practice of payment of constables has been discontinued during the last two years: can you tell us whether, within your own knowledge, payment is now required?—I cannot. I can only say this: if that is the case, it accounts for a constable not being there on duty, but simply looking in from his street duty. I desire to say that the comfort of those who attend public entertainments ought to be considered, and it is in the interests of the public, and not in the interests of the man who runs the show, that I say a policeman should be in attendance at these entertainments.

HENRY BYLOVE SORENSEN, examined on oath.

626. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are an auctioneer in Christchurch, I think?—I am.

627. You have been here for a good many years?—About thirty-five or thirty-six.

628. I suppose your observation has been awakened during the time you have been here: what can you tell us as to the general conduct, sobriety, and morality of the members of the Police Force?—So far as my observation goes, I think they are fairly sober. There has been an occasional one, I presume, who has overstepped the bounds; but, taking the majority of them, they have been very good men as a body.

629. Have you had occasion to notice the manner in which they perform their duties when called upon—that they are energetic and intelligent?—Yes. On a good many occasions I have had to seek their services, and I have always found them prompt, attentive, and civil.

630. And intelligent?—Yes, with one exception, at any rate; and only one exception in thirty-six years is not much.

631. You speak of them in the highest terms?—So far as my experience goes, I have always found them willing and obliging.

632. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—No.

EDWARD SMITH, examined on oath.

633. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] What are you?—I am a boot and shoe dealer.
634. Have you lived in Christchurch for a long time?—About thirty-four years.
635. Have you worked in any public capacity in Christchurch?—I have been superintendent of the fire brigade for the last three years, and I have been connected with it for twenty years.
636. You are also a member of the Licensing Committee?—I am.
637. And a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.
638. Have you, particularly during your connection with the fire brigade, come into close connection with the police?—Very often—at each fire.
639. And where there was a fire or a false alarm?—Always come in contact with them.
640. To take the phraseology of this Commission, what can you say as to the general conduct, sobriety, and morality of the members of the Police Force?—I cannot speak too highly of them whenever I have met them.
641. In your capacity of superintendent, you would have the right of directing what should be done?—Yes; as Fire Inspector I have that right.
642. And in that relationship you assume control and authority over the police who come to the scene of the fire?—Yes.
643. Have you found them coming up promptly and doing their duty well?—I have found they are very attentive, and very prompt in coming to our assistance.
644. Have you ever seen them drunk?—I have never seen a constable drunk at a fire to my knowledge.
645. And speaking particularly of the last three years, can you say fairly and straight that your experience of them has been that they have been sober, intelligent, and helpful?—I can; in fact, they have been particularly attentive. Whenever I have asked them to do a job they have always done it, and always assisted the firemen in keeping the public back.
646. You have found them, then, fair and reasonable in the discharge of their duties?—I have always found them so.
647. And worthy of credit?—Yes, great credit.
648. Doing their duty, and doing it well?—Yes.
649. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen any deterioration in the character of the police or in the mode of performing their duties of late years?—Not at all.
650. Speaking from your general observation, you say the conduct of the Force has been—what?—Really first class, as far as I could see.
651. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Who was your predecessor as superintendent?—Mr. Turton.

EDWARD WALKER TURTON, examined on oath.

652. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] I think you are an employé of the firm of Ballantyne and Co.?—Yes.
653. You have lived here a good many years?—I have been at Ballantyne's for twenty-nine years.
654. Until three years ago, I think, you were the superintendent of the fire-brigade?—I was superintendent for about fourteen years, and before that I was a fireman. I have been connected with the brigade for twenty-five years.
655. What can you say of the police as to their general conduct, sobriety, and morality?—I have met them at all hours of the night at fires, and I have always found them up to their duty.
656. Helpful and civil?—Yes. At any time I have asked for their services they have always willingly given them at once.
657. Have you found them rolling up promptly and sober?—Yes. One or two have nearly always gone away with men with the engines.
658. As a general body, you think of them with very good notions—you think they are deserving of every credit?—I think so. I think they are rather heavily handicapped in not having sufficient men.
659. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen any individual cases of inebriety on the part of any constables on duty?—Never.
660. *Mr. Taylor.*] How many fire alarms do you average a year?—They vary a great deal. I have had them up to 108 and down to fifty.
661. They average about sixty a year?—Yes; a little over that.
662. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] Did your duties as superintendent of the fire-brigade keep you out pretty late at night?—Not unless there was a fire, but I was frequently through the town at all hours, and I have always found the policemen attentive to their duties on their beats.
663. Have you noticed any deterioration in the Force?—No.
664. *Mr. Taylor.*] Who asked you to give evidence?—I believe I was subpoenaed by Mr. Kippenberger.

THOMAS McCLATCHIE, examined on oath.

665. *Mr. Kippenberger.*] You are out of business, and have been, I think, for some years?—Yes.
666. You are a Justice of the Peace?—Yes.
667. And I think you have frequently taken your seat on the bench as a Justice?—Yes.
668. You were also, I think, a member of the Licensing Committee of Christchurch for some years?—Yes.
669. Have you had occasion to observe the general conduct, sobriety, and behaviour of the Police Force in Christchurch?—Yes, so far as it has come under my observation.

670. How would you characterize it?—Well, I always look on the police of Christchurch as an able body of men—men who do their work well, and do it efficiently. I have always found them civil, and helpful, and, so far as I know, sober.

671. Do you think they compare favourably with other bodies of men similarly placed in other countries?—I think so. I have been pretty well over the world lately, and I may say I look on the police of Christchurch as a first-class body of men.

672. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you subpoenaed to give evidence?—I was.

673. *The Chairman.*] Are you much about the city?—Yes.

674. Can you tell us whether you have observed much drunkenness about, or other disorder which is not looked after by the police?—So far as I know, there is very little drunkenness in Christchurch. I am not going to parts of the city where it has occurred, but in any part of the city I am in I see very little of it.

675. Have you seen anything at all which would lead you to consider there has been neglect on the part of the police in the suppression of disorder?—No. So far as I know, the police do their duty well.

THOMAS BROHAM, examined on oath.

676. *The Chairman.*] You are the Inspector of Police at Christchurch?—Yes.

677. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was a complaint lodged by Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Patrick to the effect that they had been interfered with improperly by police-officers?—Yes.

678. What date was the complaint lodged?—Sunday, 9th January, 1898.

679. What was the nature of the complaint?—I took it down at the time. It is as follows:—

Mrs. Jane E. Patrick, widow of Dr. Patrick, 50, Oxford Terrace, and Mrs. Ellen C. Cooper, wife of a tailor, Oxford Terrace, state they went to Dr. De Renzi's last Friday night, 7th instant, and when passing the corner of Madras Street and Lichfield Street, opposite Clayton's boot-factory, at 12.15 a.m., they saw two constables at the corner. One, the taller of the two, seized Mrs. Cooper rudely and roughly by the shoulder, and said, "What are you doing out here at this time of the night?" at the same time pushing her along the street for some distance. He smelt of liquor, though the women would not say he was under the influence of liquor. The other man looked on, but said nothing.—3.15 p.m., Sunday, 9th January, 1898.

Sergeant-major,—Please ascertain who these two constables were.—T. BROHAM.—10/1/98.

I gave it to the sergeant-major to report on.

680. What was the result?—They said they could identify these men. They came to the police-station, and, as I was told, picked out two men.

681. Did the sergeant-major report?—Yes, and the constables on that beat reported.

682. Who were the constables on the beat?—Constable McDonald was on No. 8 beat, and Constable Joyce was on No. 7 beat. They both denied having anything at all to do with it.

683. *The Chairman.*] Did the sergeant-major conduct the inquiry?—Yes. The sergeant-major was present when these ladies picked out the two constables.

684. *Mr. Taylor.*] Will you read their statements?—Constable McDonald says, "I beg to state that I was on duty on No. 8 on the night of the 7th January, and spoke to no women on the night in question." Constable Joyce says, "I respectfully beg to report that I was on duty on No. 7 beat on date mentioned. I assisted Constable Cassells to arrest a man for drunkenness in Manchester Street on date mentioned about 11.45 p.m. I helped the constable as far as the Triangle. I then returned to my beat, and did not leave it after. I spoke to no women on the night of the 7th instant." There is another report from Constable Cassells: "I respectfully beg to report that I was on duty on No. 7 beat on the night of the 7th instant. I arrested a man for drunkenness in Upper Manchester Street between 11.30 and 11.45 p.m. on that date. I returned to my beat about 12.30. I did not leave my beat that night or any other night, and did not have any conversation with any women." Sergeant Mackay reports: "I beg to state that I was in charge of the night-duty section on the night of the 7th instant. I spoke to no women on the night in question when going my rounds to visit the men on their beats. I found the men regular on their beats and attentive to their duty—as to the place and hour that the men were visited. I respectfully refer the Inspector to my sectional report on the night in question."

685. On which beat was this locality?—No. 8 beat.

686. What followed the sergeant's report?—These two ladies came, and were present when the men were paraded. The sergeant-major told me the men were on parade, and I saw the sergeant-major go with the ladies to see the men. The sergeant-major mentioned to me that Mrs. Cooper picked out two constables. The sergeant-major reported: "I saw Mrs. Cooper this afternoon, and she informed me that the two constables she saw had no overcoats on; that one was very tall and the other not quite so tall. She thinks she would know them again, and will call at the police-station at 9 o'clock to see the men before they go out. She also states that they saw another constable standing at the corner of the street a little after without a great-coat. The men on night duty all deny having spoken to or pushed any female on the footpath." Then, there is another report from the sergeant-major: "Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Patrick saw the constables on parade last night, but were unable to identify any of the men. Mrs. Cooper pointed out Constable Russell as being like the man that pushed her, but Constable Russell could not have been near the place at the time, as he was on No. 4 beat, and visited the station every half-hour till 12 o'clock, and after that time every hour till 5 a.m. Mrs. Patrick stated that she could not identify the men. I believe the ladies have made a mistake, as Mrs. Cooper thought the constables did not wear overcoats, and Mrs. Patrick thinks they did."

687. *The Chairman.*] Have you had any communication from either of the parties—Mrs. Patrick or Mrs. Cooper—since?—No. I see a memorandum here by Mr. Cullen, who apparently went further into the matter while I was away. He writes: "I have inquired into this matter and questioned all the constables who were on beat duty in the locality on that date; also interviewed

Mrs. Cooper, who is quite certain that the man who molested her was a constable, and that the other man who was present was also a constable. Mrs. Patrick did not have a good look at the men, as she ran off and left Mrs. Cooper with them, but she is also certain the two men were constables. However, neither of the women can identify the men."

JAMES McDONALD, examined on oath.

688. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Third-class constable, stationed at Christchurch.
689. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember the night of the reported assault on Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Patrick?—Yes.
690. What sergeant were you under that night?—Sergeant Mackay.
691. Where did you report to the sergeant that night?—Different places.
692. Give us the places?—I cannot remember them.
693. Have you no fixed place to report to him?—No.
694. He picks you up anywhere?—Yes.
695. Where did you see him?—I do not remember exactly where it was I saw him.
696. Where were you a few minutes after twelve that night?—I do not remember.
697. Were you on your beat?—Yes.
698. Where you not asked this question when there was an inquiry before your officers?—Yes, I think so.
699. Do you know how many times you saw the sergeant that night?—Perhaps four; perhaps five.
700. What constables did you see that night?—I did not see any.
701. Do you usually run the whole night without seeing any constables?—Sometimes one might.
702. *The Chairman.*] Is it an exceptional thing to pass the night without seeing another constable?—Yes.
703. *Mr. Taylor.*] You usually see them?—Yes, usually.
704. What constables did you see that night?—I did not see any.
705. That was an exceptional thing?—Yes. Well, on that beat I might go for a fortnight without seeing one.
706. *The Chairman.*] It would not be an exceptional thing then not to see another constable?—Not on that beat.
707. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you present at the barracks when the men were on parade?—Yes.
708. Did the women pick the wrong men?—I do not know, I am sure. I cannot say.
709. Will you swear you did not see two constables at the corner of Lichfield Street and Madras Street that night?—Yes.
710. If you saw two constables off their beat, would you report the matter to the sergeant?—Yes; I suppose I would have to.
711. Would you do it?—Yes.
712. Have you done it?—I have never had occasion to.
713. Do you say it was not generally known in the barracks that the wrong men had been identified?—I do not suppose anybody in the barracks knew the wrong men had been identified except their two selves.
714. Who were the two men?—I could not say, I am sure.
715. Would you consider it a serious reflection on the Force if the men's names were ascertained?—I suppose it would be.
716. Sufficient to justify a constable in concealing the names?—I do not know, I am sure.
717. *The Chairman.*] Would you think that sufficient to justify one concealing the names, if one knew them?—No.
718. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you not made contrary statements to men in the barracks?—I do not think so.
719. Have you not told the men in the barracks that it happened a few minutes before the sergeant saw you?—No. I think Inspector Cullen told me the sergeant reported that he met me a few minutes before or after it was supposed to have happened.
720. Do you know where it happened?—I do not know.
721. What was your beat that night?—From the corner of Madras Street to St. Asaph Street, along St. Asaph Street to the East Belt, up the East Belt to Cashel Street, along Cashel Street to Madras Street, and down Madras Street to St. Asaph Street; just the block.
722. Who was on beat on the Madras Street block, from the South Belt up to the corner of Lichfield Street, that night?—I do not remember.
723. Who were on No. 7 beat?—Constables Joyce and Cassells.
724. Do you swear you do not know of any constable being at the corner of Lichfield Street and Madras Street about midnight on the night these women refer to?—I do.
725. You do not know of it?—No.
726. *Colonel Pitt.*] Who did Mrs. Cooper identify?—Constable McLeod and Constable Russell.
727. Are either of these as tall as you are?—No.
728. Anything like it?—Yes, both are near it, I suppose.
729. What beats were they on?—Constable Russell was on No. 4 beat. I do not remember where the other one was.
730. Where is No. 4 beat with regard to No. 7 or No. 8—how far away?—Oh, a long way away; nearly the furthest beat from there.
731. Is Mrs. Cooper a tall lady?—Oh no; about the average height.
732. *The Chairman.*] How long have you been in the Force?—About four months.
733. When did you join?—On Boxing Day, 26th December.

734. Were you at once placed on street duty?—Yes. I was along with another constable for about a fortnight.

735. Were you still in the company of this other constable when this complaint was made?—No.

736. *Mr. Poynton.*] Who was the last constable you were with?—Constable Whatman, I think.

737. *Colonel Pitt.*] On the night Mrs. Cooper refers to you say there was nobody with you?—No, there was not.

738. Certain?—Certain.

JOHN JAMES CASSELLS, examined on oath.

739. *Mr Taylor.*] Do you remember the night of the 7th of January?—Yes.

740. Do you remember a complaint being made by Mrs. Cooper?—Yes. The first I remember was hearing of it on the following Sunday night when I come down to go on duty. I do not know who was the first I heard mention it; but I remember that was the time I heard it.

741. Do you know what men were on the northern part of the city that night?—I think I could pretty well name every man that went out that night and what beat he was on. Constable Fahey was on No. 1 beat; Constable Gantley was on No. 2, I think; Constable Dalton was on No. 3.

742. Which is No. 3?—It runs from the corner of the Triangle down to Gaffney's Hotel. Constable Russell was on No. 4; I think Constable McLeod was on No. 5—I am not sure; Constable O'Halloran was on No. 6; I was on No. 7, with Constable Joyce; and Constable McDonald was on No. 8 beat.

743. Which is No. 7 beat?—Starts from the pie-cart near Tattersall's Hotel, along to the Queen's Hotel, right up Manchester Street to the bridge, along to the Star and Garter Hotel, down Barbadoes Street to Cashel Street, and along Cashel Street to the starting-point.

744. Was Joyce with you the whole time?—No, he was not.

745. When did you leave Joyce?—As far as I can remember, it would be between 11.30 and 11.45.

746. Did you make an arrest?—Yes. As far as I can remember, I left him at the corner of Manchester and Hereford Streets.

747. How far is that from the corner of Lichfield and Madras Streets?—It is not far off; about two or three minutes' walk.

748. Where did you see him next?—The next time I saw him was about 1 o'clock. Sergeant Mackay met me at the opposite corner from the Queen's Hotel. I told him I could hear a noise going on in the Queen's Hotel, and it had been going on for some little while while I had been standing there. We went over to the hotel and knocked at the door in Manchester Street. We could not get in that door. They came to the door in Manchester Street, and I heard them call out. When we got to that door Joyce was just on the road opposite the door.

749. Would that be just off his beat?—No; he was on his beat. That was about 1 o'clock.

750. Did any explanation take place between he and the sergeant?—I believe the sergeant called him on one side, but I do not remember what he said to him. I spoke to him myself. I asked him where he had been. I said, "I told you to meet me here when I came back in Manchester Street." I said, "I have been right up Manchester Street looking for you, and I could not find you." He said, "I have been all round the beat. I have just come back now." I think Sergeant Mackay asked me where he was. I said I left him in Manchester Street.

751. Were you present when the men were on parade?—Yes.

752. Was there a general conversation afterwards as to the wrong men having been picked out?—No, I cannot say that. I heard that. I said myself if I knew who the man was I would very soon tell on him, because I myself was suspected, and I felt very sore about it. I may say I was in the station at about 12 o'clock, and met Constable Russell there. He is supposed to be there at 12 o'clock. I had a prisoner at 12 o'clock, and he came into the lockup. I had to go into the watchhouse and sign the book and property-sheets, and so forth. I went out again, and met Constable Fahey about 12.15, and also met Paget, the night-watchman, passing through the Triangle, and I then went to look for Joyce.

753. Did you see any other constable besides Joyce on your beat that night?—No, I cannot remember seeing any.

EDMOND MICHAEL JOYCE, examined on oath.

754. *Mr. Taylor.*] When did you join the Force?—I joined the Force on the 24th December, 1897.

755. How long before you were put on the beat yourself?—I was with a man for about a month afterwards.

756. When did you first go on the beat?—I went on beat on the 25th December. I had about a month or six weeks' night duty.

757. What part of the colony do you come from?—From Invercargill.

758. Do you remember a complaint being made by Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Patrick?—Yes.

759. Were you there when the men were paraded?—Yes.

760. Where were you at 12.15 on the night of the seventh?—I would be at Oxford Terrace.

761. Whereabouts is that?—It is just down the other side of the Foresters' Arms, the same side as the Foresters' Arms.

762. When did Constable Cassells leave you?—About a quarter to 12, as near as I can recollect.

763. Where did he leave you?—He left me in Hereford Street.

764. Did he tell you to meet him in Manchester Street?—He told me to go round the beat, and he would see me when he came back.

765. You swear he told you to go round the beat?—Yes, he did.
766. Where did you meet Constable Cassells again?—Just outside the Queen's Hotel.
767. Which direction did he come from?—I could not tell you. He was at the hotel when I arrived there.
768. Where did you arrive from?—I arrived from around my beat.
769. Where from?—Up Cashel Street.
770. Were you walking when you met them?—I came up, and they were there knocking at the time.
771. Which door?—At the door in Manchester Street, and then at the door in Cashel Street, and went in at that door.
772. Did you see them knocking at the door in Manchester Street?—I heard them.
773. How far round the other street were you when you heard them at the Manchester Street door?—I was just close to them.
774. Were you walking when you met them?—I could not say; I just came up to them. I just met them at the corner, I think.
775. Did you see the door of the Queen's Hotel open?—Yes.
776. Were they there when it opened?—They just came around the corner as I arrived there.
777. What did you do?—I went in with them and searched the house.
778. Was it opposite the door of the Queen's Hotel that you met them?—I think it was opposite. I would not be certain whether it was the door in Cashel Street or at the corner. The door opened as we got to it.
779. Will you swear the door was not opened before they came into Cashel Street at all—before you saw them?—I think it opened as they got there.
780. Where were you when it opened?—I was in Cashel Street, just about opposite the door.
781. You had seen them before the door was opened?—I cannot possibly say, now.
782. *The Chairman.*] In what direction do you say you were coming when you heard them knocking at the door?—Up Cashel Street from the East Belt side.
783. *Mr. Taylor.*] How far were you then from the corner of Madras and Lichfield Streets?—Just one block.
784. How long were you at Madras Street before you met Sergeant Mackay and Constable Cassells?—About five minutes.
785. Did you see any constables on the beat that night anywhere?—No.
786. Did you speak to any?—No; only to Constable Cassells.
787. Did you speak to Sergeant Mackay?—Yes.
788. Did you speak to Constable McDonald?—No; I never saw Constable McDonald.
789. Would you consider, if this offence were sheeted home to any constable, it would be a disgrace to the men here—that it would be a reflection upon them?—I do not know the ins and outs of the case.
790. Did you come from the Armed Constabulary?—I came from the Permanent Artillery.

EDWARD MACKAY, examined on oath.

791. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Sergeant of Police, stationed at Christchurch.
792. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember meeting Constable Cassells near the Queen's Hotel on the night of the 7th or morning of the 8th January?—Yes.
793. What time would that be?—I could not tell you exactly what time it was.
794. Did he call your attention to any noise in the hotel?—He did.
795. Which door did you knock at?—I first knocked at the Manchester Street entrance. They were rather long in coming, and then I went round to the Cashel Street entrance, and knocked there. I was admitted.
796. Where did you see Constable Joyce?—On the footpath in Cashel Street, in front of the hotel.
797. Was he standing?—I did not see him when I first went round. I knocked at the door, and when the door was opened I looked back to see if Cassells was close to me, and I saw Joyce was there too.
798. When you were knocking at the Manchester Street door did you hear any sound at the Cashel Street door—a sound as of the door opening?—No, I did not.
799. Was Joyce on the east side or west side of you as you stood at that door?—He was on the east side.
800. Did Cassells tell you he had told Joyce to meet him in Manchester Street when he returned from the station?—I do not remember if he did.
801. What conversation had you with Joyce?—I asked him where he was. He said he had gone round his beat. I had no reason to doubt him.
802. Did he enter the hotel with you?—Well, he may have done, because I did not look behind me until I went into a room, but I met him close to the door when I came out again.
803. He did not go into the room with you?—No, not the room I went into.
804. Where did you meet McDonald that night; do you remember?—I met him at several places.
805. Did you arrange to meet him at the corner of Madras and Lichfield Streets?—I did not.
806. Where did you meet him at midnight?—I cannot really tell you whether it was Madras Street or Lichfield Street that I met him.
807. Did he report to you he had seen any constables that night?—He did not.
808. Have you any occasion for thinking men were off their beat that night?—I have not. The men appeared to me to be very regular on their beats.

809. Is it customary for a man in company with another constable, as Joyce was that night, to do the beat in the absence of his companion?—It is.

810. Did you use every possible effort to find out what men, if any, had committed this assault?—I did.

811. You failed?—I did.

812. You are sure Joyce did not meet you at the corner of Cashel Street?—I am perfectly certain where I met him; it was in front of the Cashel Street entrance to the hotel.

813. And he was standing there?—I did not see him when I first came to the door; but after I knocked at the door I listened to hear if there was any sound coming from the door, and when the door was opened I looked behind to see if Cassells was close to me, and I saw Joyce was there too.

814. The next day, or whenever this matter was reported, did it not strike you as being irregular that you should find Joyce in the position you did that night?—No, I did not think so.

815. You would not think it was irregular?—No.

816. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Had you any suspicion that Joyce had been inside the hotel?—No, I had not. It occurred to my mind he had come round his beat up Cashel Street while I was knocking at the door.

817. As a matter of fact, he could not have come out of the hotel without your seeing him?—No; I do not think it was possible.

818. As he had been performing duty for upwards of a fortnight at this time, it was quite right he should go back on his beat and work it in the absence of Cassells?—Yes.

819. Had he gone to any particular point of his beat, and waited there an unlimited time for the return of Cassells, would you consider he would have done wrong?—I would consider he would have done wrong.

820. *The Chairman.*] If he had been told to do so by Cassells?—They receive their instructions from me, not from any other constable.

821. But the constable under whose charge he is?—They are not under the charge of any constable; they are under my charge.

822. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Were you present at the parade when Mrs. Cooper and Mrs. Patrick were there?—Yes.

823. Will you state to the Commissioners what took place there?—There was a lady came out first. I believe it was Mrs. Cooper. She walked up and looked at the men, and she picked out Constable Russell, saying she believed that was the man. She went in, and another lady came out. She picked out Constable McLeod. She said she thought he was the man. She stood looking at him for a few seconds, and then she said, "I do not think that is the man." She then went away.

824. There is a vast difference between Constables Russell and McLeod, is there not, in appearance?—Yes, there is.

825. Constable Russell was on No. 4 beat that night?—He was.

826. Can you tell us how far No. 4 beat is from the locality of this occurrence?—It is a good distance away—about a quarter of a mile.

827. Then for Constable Russell to have been at this place he must have been at least a quarter of a mile off his beat?—Yes.

828. As regards McLeod?—He was further away again. He was on No. 5 beat; very much further.

829. The only constables who were in that neighbourhood about that time were Constables Joyce and McDonald?—Yes.

830. Constable McDonald is a very tall, slight young man?—Yes.

831. Not the sort of man that a person seeing him once would be likely to forget?—I should imagine they would pick him out very quickly.

832. About what height is Joyce?—About 5 ft. 8 in. or 5 ft. 8½ in.

833. And McDonald?—About 6 ft. 1½ in.

834. Any one describing these two constables would not say one was as tall as the other, or very nearly so.—I should not think so.

835. *Mr. Taylor.*] How many men were on parade for identification?—Nine.

836. Were they the men who had been on duty on the night of the seventh?—Yes.

837. And no others were paraded?—No others.

838. What course was followed; was the whole onus thrown on the women?—No; the police made inquiries. I made inquiries myself, but I could get no information about it; and I do not think there was a man on the relief that night that would do such a thing.

839. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] It has been suggested you have fixed points to meet these men: is that so or not?—It is not so. I have no fixed points to meet them.

840. Nor have they any idea when you are likely to come back on to them?—No, I do not think so.

841. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do any two of these beats intersect or approach each other at the corner of Lichfield and Madras Streets?—No.

JOHN JAMES CASSELLS, further examined on oath.

842. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember where you first saw Joyce when you were in company with Sergeant Mackay?—I could not say exactly, but I think, to the best of my belief, it was between the corner of the hotel and the door in Cashel Street.

843. You saw him before you reached the door in Cashel Street?—Yes, I did.

844. Was he standing or walking?—I could not tell you that.

845. Was he on the footpath?—I could not say that.

846. Was the door open when you got round?—I am not sure about that, but I believe it was.

847. Did you tell Joyce when you left him to go round the beat?—No, I did not tell him that at all. Of course I did not tell him not to go. I told him I would meet him in Manchester Street when I came back.

848. How long did you expect to be away?—I expected to be away half an hour. The man gave me a lot of trouble.

849. Have you not heard in the barracks it is known who the culprit is amongst the men?—No, I have not.

850. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What did you expect when this man left you; did you expect he would go back and work his beat?—Yes.

851. He did exactly what you expected he would do?—Yes; I did not expect him to stand there and wait till I came back.

852. *The Chairman.*] Coming along Cashel Street from the direction of Madras Street, was that on his ordinary beat?—He was on his beat when I saw him.

853. How far is the intersection of Cashel Street with Madras Street from the intersection of Madras Street with Lichfield Street?—About 100 yards—between 100 and 150 yards.

CHRISTINA THOMSON, examined on oath.

854. *The Chairman.*] Where do you live?—Cambridge Terrace, Christchurch.

855. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you interfered with by a constable in the public street one night?—Yes. A little past 11 o'clock one night I had occasion to go from my private house to my place of business in Colombo Street to send a telephone message to Woolston.

856. Where did you see the police-constable?—I saw him standing at the A1 corner.

857. Did you speak to the constable at all?—No. When I got into the middle of the tram-rails the constable came in front of me, and demanded to know what I was doing out at that hour of the night.

858. Did he put his hand on you at all?—No.

859. What did you tell him?—I told him he was a disreputable, low, blackguard scoundrel to stop any woman in the street going to her place of business to send a telephone message. He threatened to arrest me and take me to the lockup. I took my umbrella and knocked his hat off. While he was picking up his hat I ran across the road on to my own doorstep.

860. Did you go into the shop?—No. I was frightened. He came right over after me, and threatened to arrest me again. I told him to do so, to take me to the lockup. I told him I did not think he was sober.

861. Did he do anything?—No. I told him to go to the lockup and I would go with him, and ten chances to one he would get in there first himself. He stood up at the verandah-post, and I left him standing there. I went next day to the police-station, and complained to Sergeant-Major Mason, and he said the man must have been drunk or mad to have done such a thing.

862. Was there any inquiry as far as you know?—No, not as far as I know. He said he would see into it.

863. Did the police not inform you as to the result of your complaint?—No; I never heard anything more of it.

864. *The Chairman.*] How long ago is this?—I could not tell you exactly.

865. *Mr. Taylor.*] Is it over a year?—Yes, I think it is over a year. I lodged the complaint at the police-office.

866. Did they take it down in writing?—Yes, he took it down in writing.

867. Have you found the police obliging and civil on other occasions?—Yes. I have never had to seek the assistance of the police.

868. Was this man in uniform that you are speaking of?—Yes, he was in uniform. Mr. Mason informed me he was a married man, and had not been long in the Force, and it might do him harm. I said, "You should teach him his duties, and not send him out on the streets like a roaring lion, insulting people."

SAMUEL SAUNDERS, examined on oath.

869. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Journalist, editor of the *Lyttelton Times*.

870. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you know of any matters in connection with the condition of the Police Force that would be of assistance to the Commission?—I really do not know. I observe, like other people do, the Police Force.

871. Do you think there are good reasons for the appointment of this Commission—necessity for it?—Yes; I should say there was necessity for the appointment of the Commission.

872. Of your own knowledge, is there any matter affecting the conduct of policemen—their character, their efficiency?—I ought to explain to the Commission, perhaps, a fact which they will readily understand: My information of the Force is not the result of my own observation. Necessarily the editor of a newspaper derives his information from sources which he could not possibly divulge to the Commission, and which the Commission would not probably desire him to. On that account, I presume, my evidence would be of no value at all to the Commission.

873. All hearsay evidence?—It is perfectly reliable evidence, and acceptable to me. I have methods of getting information, of course—through members of my staff and others.

874. Of your own knowledge, have you any knowledge as to the condition of the Force?—I have knowledge that I have derived in this way, but it is what you would describe as hearsay evidence.

875. As the result of your own observations, have you no knowledge?—Well, in what direction? Of course, I observe policemen about the streets; I occasionally see Inspector Broham, and so forth.

876. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen anything in their conduct, or do you personally know anything of the conduct of any individual member of the Force, which is inconsistent with their duty?—I know of it in the way I have described—from information I have received, but not as a result of my own observation. I mean nothing serious within a number of years.

877. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you taken any steps to induce those who have given you information during the last year on which you based your newspaper articles to come before this Commission?—No, I have not taken any steps to induce them to come here.

878. Do you of your own knowledge know anything about the character of the men who frequent the neighbourhood of the *Lyttelton Times* Office right-of-way?—Do you mean the members of the Police Force?

879. No; I mean the character and conduct of the public at that point?—You do not mean the patrons of the *Lyttelton Times*?

880. I mean the general public who frequent that right-of-way?—I should imagine, from my observation, they are extremely disreputable—a lot of them.

881. Do you think the police do their duty in regard to that class of people in the city?—Well, I scarcely feel able to answer the question. There are a lot of disreputable characters about. I do not know to what extent the police may interfere with them. We would all wish they were away, of course.

882. Of your own knowledge you have nothing to bring before the Commission?—No, I nothing to bring before the Commission.

883. *The Chairman.*] I have not had the advantage of regularly reading the *Lyttelton Times*, but I gather from the examination that the *Lyttelton Times* has expressed condemnation of the conduct of the police in some matters?—Yes.

884. And you have not taken any steps to get those from whom that information was derived to come before the Commission?—No.

885. Will you confidentially put the Commissioners in such a position as would enable them to get that information?—No; I am afraid I could not do that. I am afraid my sources of information would rapidly dry up if I did.

886. Can you help us in any way to put our finger on any spot in the organization or administration of the Police Force which requires attention—reform, if necessary?—I could only reiterate the opinions I have expressed in my paper, or the paper has expressed. They, of course, are public property.

887. *Mr. Poynton.*] If you have any opinion as to how the Force should be reorganized, we would rather take them now from you than read the newspaper articles?—I would rather that you took the back numbers of the newspaper for your perusal.

888. *The Chairman.*] Have you any suggestions that you can offer?—No.

889. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I suppose you take it that having called attention to any abuse or any neglect on the part of the police in your paper, it is a matter for the department to deal with?—I regard it that way; and, as a matter of fact, I know they have dealt with matters to which we have called attention. I judge, from what has come under my notice, there is some system by which newspaper articles reach headquarters, and they are acted upon.

890. You look upon it that expression of public opinion through the public prints is necessary to keep public bodies up to their work?—We do it with that purpose.

891. Acts, as it were, as a whip on a sluggish horse—keeps them up to the collar?—Yes, that is the idea.

JAMES WALKER, examined on oath.

892. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Tobacconist, residing at Papanui.

893. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you had occasion to complain about the police allowing crowds to congregate outside the Empire Hotel?—Not on my own behalf.

894. Who were you acting for when you complained?—At the request of other tradesmen.

895. Were they tradesmen in the neighbourhood of the Empire Hotel?—Yes.

896. Have complaints about the condition of the street there been pretty frequent?—They complained of rather a large crowd gathering in front of their premises.

897. They complained about it frequently to the police?—I have made no complaint to the police practically.

898. Who did you complain to?—I wrote a letter to you, asking you if you would bring it before the House. Last session I had been in communication with members of the House in connection with matters relating to the tobacco trade, and that being so, I was requested to mention this matter to you.

899. Is that your letter?—Yes.

900. Will you read it, please?—It is as follows:—

DEAR SIR,—

High and Cashel Streets, Christchurch, 6th October, 1897.

I have been asked by several of the shopkeepers in High Street, Christchurch, to write to you, asking if you would ask the Hon. Thompson if he will see that the police will do something to abate the nuisance caused by the bookmakers and speilers collecting in front of the Empire Hotel. You know yourself how they collect on the sidewalk and roadway, making it simply impossible to walk along with a lady. Whenever there is a race-meeting being held anywhere at a distance they collect there in very large crowds, and yesterday and Tuesday there were fully fifty or sixty persons there, all, or nearly so, of the racing-class. I believe there has been a petition, signed by a large number of the shopkeepers, presented to the City Council, asking them to take action; but they simply handed it over to the police, who they state have full power in the matter; but they have done nothing whatever in the affair. There is no doubt that it is a disgrace to the city that such a state of things should be allowed to exist in the very

busiest part of the town. Away from the fact that they damage the business of all those shopkeepers in the immediate neighbourhood, it is harbouring a class of people that are undesirable. I believe they have done something in the matter in Auckland, and also in Wellington; but here it is getting worse.

Trusting you will bring this matter up before the House, with the hope of some good results, and thanking you in anticipation,
I remain, &c.,
J. WALKER.

T. E. Taylor, Esq., M.H.R.

I may state that most of the facts were supplied to me.

901. You are within view of the place yourself?—Yes.

902. To that extent you can corroborate the main statements?—Yes; that crowds do congregate there.

903. Has not that been going on for years past?—Yes, for some years past.

904. *The Chairman.*] Has it been abated lately?—It has been considerably better of late.

905. Within what period?—Within this last month or two. There was a period during last year when it was considerably better. I believe that Sergeant Wilson was asked by one of the shopkeepers in the neighbourhood to do something in the matter; and whilst he was in charge he did something to keep them moving on. I do not think it is so much the fault of the police as the want of power on their part to deal with the people who congregate there. They made a number of arrests, and issued a number of summonses, and could not obtain convictions. That is what I am informed is the matter.

906. *Colonel Pitt.*] You understand they issued summonses, and could not get convictions?—I believe they have issued summonses and made raids on the crowd, but they do not seem to be able to get convictions.

HOKITIKA.

WEDNESDAY, 4TH MAY, 1898.

ALEXANDER McDONALD, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am acting sergeant-major, stationed at Hokitika.
2. When did you join the Force?—In September, 1869.
3. Where?—At Christchurch.
4. What have been your subsequent stations?—I have had about ten or eleven transfers altogether. I was sent from Christchurch to Selwyn; from there temporarily to Ashburton; from there to Timaru; from there to Christchurch; from there to Governor's Bay, near Christchurch; from there to Oxford; from there to Kaiapoi; from there to Christchurch again; from there to Timaru; and from Timaru to Hokitika.
5. You were in charge at Timaru?—Yes; I was in charge at the Christchurch station, and the sub- and suburban districts under the Inspector, and in charge of the Timaru sub-district.
6. And here you are also in charge?—Yes.
7. When did you come to Hokitika?—At the end of February, 1897.
8. What force have you here?—Three men at Hokitika.
9. And what other stations are in your sub-district?—Stafford, Kanieri, Ross, and Okarito—one man at each station.
10. Are any of these men mounted?—No.
11. What ranks do these men hold?—The man stationed at Stafford is a second-class sergeant, and the other men are first-class and second-class constables.
12. What offices do these men hold outside their police duties?—The sergeant at Stafford is Clerk of the Magistrate's and Warden's Courts, bailiff, and Receiver of Gold Revenue. I think that is all. The men at Ross and Okarito hold the same offices, and one of the constables on this station acts as bailiff here. The man at Kanieri holds no offices outside his police duties.
13. Do you find that Force sufficient for the discharge of the duties which devolve on you?—Yes, I think it is.
14. What is the conduct of your men?—They are very good and very well behaved and efficient constables.
15. Are they all men of some experience as constables?—Yes, they all have years' experience.
16. Have you received any complaints from any members of the community in regard to the conduct of your men?—No, I cannot recollect that I have; and I would be sure to take notice of it if such was the case.
17. Have you anything you wish to bring to our notice with regard to the local Force?—I think it would be useless for me to air my opinions before this Court, but I would like to say one thing that affects myself. The steamers plying to the West Coast have only steerage and saloon cabins, and there is no second class by which constables and non-commissioned officers of the Force are allowed to travel. So far as non-commissioned officers travelling on duty are concerned I have nothing to say; but it is a great affliction on a young family travelling on transfer to have to mix with such company as they find in the steerage of one of these coal-boats, particularly when they are about a week on the voyage. When I was coming here I could not possibly go with my young family into the steerage, on account of the crowded state of the steerage and the people that I saw there. The fore-part of the ship was crowded with cattle and sheep and a miscellaneous cargo, and it was almost impossible for a family, so I came saloon; and I had to refund £7 10s. of my passage-money, the difference between second class and saloon.
18. Is there anything else you would like to bring under our notice in connection with this Force?—Nothing, except that the rate of living on this Coast is 35 per cent. greater than on the other side in Canterbury. Some lines of the necessaries of life are 100 per cent. dearer.

19. Does that apply to the town here, or to all your stations?—I suppose it does. I have only lived here, and I can only speak as to this locality.

20. This has been your experience, coming here from Timaru?—Yes. I think I made a very correct computation when I arrived at these figures.

21. Do we understand from you that your men are sober, steady, and attentive to their duties?—Yes; I have no hesitation in saying that.

22. How did you find them at Timaru?—I had no fault to find with the majority of the men.

23. It was stated that some police-constables had become notoriously irregular, or, to put it plainly, intemperate. Was such conduct brought to your notice?—There was one constable that I heard complaints against, but he has been out of the service some time. I might say there were two constables who are now out of the service.

24. I may put something to you very distinctly now. The evidence given us at Timaru led undoubtedly to the conclusion that the person referred to was yourself. Do you wish to say anything in reference to that?—To-day is the first time I have heard my name mentioned, and I am very much astonished at it.

25. Are you not aware of any complaints in that respect while you were at Timaru?—I never had complaints made against me during all my years of service. I never stood before a tribunal, and I was never accused of the offence by any officer under whom I served.

26. Were you removed from Timaru at your own request?—I never got a transfer at my own request. I never applied for one.

27. Whilst at Timaru were you ever accused of intemperance?—I never heard it. As I said before, I was never accused, nor had a charge brought against me.

28. You were in charge of that district. Was any complaint made by the public to you, as the officer locally in charge, of your own intemperance?—No, never.

29. At Timaru there was a hotel where there were supposed to be two bars opening on to the public street. Can you tell us the circumstances under which one of these bars was closed?—It was never closed in my time.

30. Were any complaints ever lodged with you in reference to this house being allowed to run two bars?—I have had many complaints.

31. Did you take any steps in the matter?—I did not, because it was not necessary. There were not two bars within the meaning of the Act.

32. Was that your own opinion?—It was also the opinion of a good many others.

33. Did you ever test the question in any Court?—I did not.

34. Are you aware that the bar was subsequently closed?—It was closed for a time, and reopened, I understand. I reported the matter to my chief.

35. What was the name of the house?—The Criterion Hotel.

36. I understand the fact of these two bars being there, or which were supposed to be there, was the subject of public complaints, besides complaints to yourself?—It was not a public complaint; it was only the complaint of one man, who was always complaining of the same thing. I might mention that the Chairman of the Licensing Committee had a look at it, and he considered there was no infringement of the law.

37. So far as you were concerned you took no steps beyond reporting the matter, and you took your instructions from the department?—I certainly did not lay an information.

38. *Colonel Pitt.*] Was there any correspondence in the newspapers in Timaru accusing you of intemperance there?—Certainly not. I never saw it, and it never came under my notice.

39. How many licensed houses are there in your sub-district here?—There are twenty-two licensed houses in the Hokitika Borough.

40. And you have three policemen besides yourself?—Yes.

41. How is the law in reference to Sunday trading observed?—Well, I cannot see any Sunday trading, and I am about all day.

42. Are the hotels visited by you on Sundays?—Occasionally.

43. Who has been with you?—Constable Bennett has been with me on several occasions on Sundays and on other nights.

44. They are not regularly visited on Sundays?—No, not every Sunday.

45. You have spoken of the passages of officers on transfer. Have you anything to say as to the rate of pay of the police?—Well, of course, all the police think they ought to have more.

46. What is your opinion as to what should be the lowest rate of pay to a constable on joining?—I consider £10 a month is very little. I think it ought to be not less than 7s. a day and his clothing. In all other departments of the State they get free clothing.

47. How should the pay be increased?—According to the grades through which a constable rises there ought to be an increase.

48. *The Chairman.*] Do you think the pay should be increased with grades in the service, or after a period of service?—I believe a period of service would be better.

49. *Colonel Pitt.*] After what length of service should his pay be increased?—I have never gone into that. I do not know.

50. Do your men get any instructions here in their duties?—Not regularly; there are no orders for instructions.

51. Do you not give the men any instructions in police duty?—No; except in anything they ask about, or anything required to be done. It is only at the large centres that instruction-lectures are given.

52. Are any of your men Inspectors of Slaughter-houses?—No.

53. Are your men all married men?—Yes.

54. Have they free quarters?—All but one.

55. Why does he not get free quarters?—There is a man belonging to the Telegraph Department occupying his house.

56. Has that policeman to pay rent?—Yes.
57. Out of his own pocket?—Yes.
58. What rent does he pay?—I think 6s. a week.
59. You state you think the Force here is sufficient?—That is my opinion.
60. In your opinion, is there much reported crime in this district which is undetected?—No, there is not; and what is reported is of a very trifling nature.
61. What is the population of the borough?—Over two thousand.
62. Then there is little more than one licensed house to every 100 inhabitants—men, women and children?—Yes; that is the population.
63. Are there any betting-houses here?—No; I never heard it whispered that there were.
64. Or “tote” shops?—No.
65. *The Chairman.*] Are there any reported burglaries or larcenies you have not been able to bring home?—I do not think so.
66. Are there any houses of ill-fame here?—One.
67. Is that reported as a nuisance in any way?—It is not reported. There was another house of the sort; but I brought that before the Court, and they are away now.
68. In regard to larrikinism and riding bicycles on the footpath, and minor offences of that nature, do you take active steps to put a stop to these nuisances?—In regard to bicycle-riding no action has been taken here yet; but I caused an insertion in the newspapers the other day to the effect that every person found riding on the footpath in future would be prosecuted, and since then the nuisance has abated. We have not taken any action owing to the absence of a by-law on the subject.
69. Are you in a position to express an opinion as to the existence of Sunday trading without systematic inspection?—Yes, by parading the streets, and seeing who is about. If no persons are to be seen about the town on Sundays, it is quite evident there cannot be many in the public houses.
70. They may be all in the public houses?—No; because they must come out sometimes, and we would see them. There is always a man on beat.
71. Have there been any complaints to yourself since you have been in Hokitika, as to your own personal intemperance?—No; no member of the community has ever accused me of intemperance.
72. Has any one spoken to you about your personal intemperance?—No person has spoken to me about my intemperance, because I have not been intemperate. I can hear reports about different people which are not always to be relied upon, but no definite charge has ever been brought against me.
73. You understand the difference between a definite charge, and a general complaint being made?—I know there have been reports, and some person mentioned there have been.
74. You give a general denial to these reports?—I do.
75. Do I understand that no one has spoken to you about your personal intemperance?—I have said so.
76. Has the Rev. Mr. Ginger spoken to you of reported intemperance?—He has never accused me of intemperance, nor said any person had. I went one day to an hotel to see a farmer from the Kokatahi in reference to a Burnham Industrial School child that he had. I spoke to him in the hotel; and while I was speaking to him the Rev. Mr. Ginger came in and looked round the screen. I took no notice of him: and this gentleman came to me afterwards and said he had been asking him if I was drinking. I followed Mr. Ginger, and asked him by what right he had asked anybody if I was drinking, and there was some conversation between us. I told him I thought it was a very mean thing for him to do, and I told him I had had no drink for a couple of months before that. And Mr. Ginger then said, “Well, they say you do drink.” I replied, “I cannot help what people say.”
77. Did the Rev. Mr. Ginger suggest to you that if the report that you were addicted to drink was true, it was a very serious report; and that if it was not true, you had no right to lie under it; and that if he could move a finger to get you free from it he would do so?—I deny that. Mr. Ginger never said anything of the sort, so far as I remember.
78. Why did you go into the hotel to see the Burnham boy when your office was immediately opposite?—I just followed him to the bar-door, about noon, as I had just come from the post-office with a bundle of letters.
79. Why did you not take him to your office?—I had only two or three words to say to him.
80. Do you know if there is much gambling in Hokitika?—I do not know, but I do not believe much gambling exists.
81. Do you know of any house devoted to gambling?—No.
82. Why do you not take steps to suppress that immoral house you referred to: has anybody complained to you about it as a nuisance?—Never. If there had been a complaint, it would be a different thing.
83. No complaint has been made?—No.
84. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You recently had an addition of one man to your strength?—Yes.
85. That is the man not living in the police-cottage at the present time?—Yes.
86. The police-cottage is occupied by a telegraph-lineman. Are you not aware that his tenure of that cottage will expire in August?—I was told so by a memorandum from your office that he would have to leave on that date.
87. That is for the purpose of allowing the other constable to reside there?—I understand so.
88. I believe the report you furnished to-day shows there have been no charges of drunkenness on Sundays during the twelve months ending last month?—No.
89. When did you last visit the publichouses here on Sunday?—About three weeks ago.
90. Can you say how many you visited?—I went in just casually to see what was going on.

91. You saw no sign of Sunday-trading?—None at all.
92. You visit occasionally, although you have no systematic visitation?—Yes.
93. From the result of your visits to the hotels and from your observations on the street you believe there is practically no Sunday-trading?—I would not say there are no breaches of the law, but they have not come under my notice during my visits.
94. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen anything which in your opinion justified a prosecution?—No.
95. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As regards this alleged immoral house, from the information at your command, you are not in a position to justify you in laying an information before a magistrate?—No.
96. If you had that information you would lay an information before a magistrate?—Yes. I did so in the recent case, and the house was broken up and the parties have left the district.
97. You deny you are addicted to intemperance?—Decidedly.
98. You are not a total abstainer?—I am not, but I am very near it.
99. *Colonel Huime.*] Do you know the Rev. Mr. Gillies, of Timaru?—I do.
100. Has that gentleman ever stated at a prohibition meeting, or at a public meeting, or written to the newspapers to say that you were given to intemperance?—Not that I saw.
101. Have you ever seen anything in the papers to the effect that a person holding a higher rank than constable at Timaru was given to intemperance?—I never did.
102. Nothing that would indicate that you were the person referred to?—Nothing at all.
103. You never saw anything in the public prints at Timaru that would lead you to suppose that they were insinuating, at any rate, that you were given to intemperance?—I have not seen that.
104. You are perfectly certain of that?—Well, I have not seen it.
105. And you think you would have seen it had it appeared in the Press?—I think so. It would have been pointed out by somebody.
106. Then, if any man came before this Commission and said he had seen you reeling in the streets of Timaru late at night, he would be stating what was not fact?—He must be mistaken.
107. When you were transferred from Timaru you say you had to refund £7 10s. of the passage-money, the difference between saloon- and steerage-fares?—Yes.
108. Then you do not know it is the rule with the Union Company when a non-commissioned police-officer goes to them and says he is only allowed steerage-rates, to give him a first-class passage at steerage-fare?—I never knew that.
109. Have you got a constable here named Bennett?—Yes.
110. What sort of a constable is he?—He is a good constable.
111. He has been here some time?—Yes.
112. Have you ever heard any complaints against him?—No complaints have been made to me against him.
113. And you have no complaint whatever to make against him?—No.
114. He got into some scrape here some time ago?—Not to my knowledge.
115. Anyway he is a very good constable?—Yes. I have no fault to find as to the manner in which he performs his duties.
116. Have you never had any complaints here about this bicycle-riding on the footpaths?—Yes, there have been complaints.
117. Have you summoned anybody in connection with it?—No.
118. Why not?—It had been done before; but I have cautioned the people that if found after this they will be summoned. It is my intention now to have a test case.
119. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Have you any opinion on the subject of a pension scheme?—I have heard very little about it since I came here, and I have never gone definitely into the matter. I have no strong opinion to express. Of course, there is no doubt it would be a better service if there was a pension scheme. There would be more inducement for men to stick to the service.
120. *Colonel Pitt.*] In your opinion, what are the drawbacks or defects in the present system?—I do not know that the present system is so defective, or that it could be very much improved.
121. In what respect would it be better with a pension scheme?—The men would be induced to stop, and probably better men would join.
122. Have any instances of promotion owing to political influence come under your notice?—I have only hearsay evidence. I cannot say that men are using political influence; but there is no doubt that some people get a great deal of what they want.
123. Owing to political influence?—I cannot say it is political influence.
124. Can you give us any instance of it?—For instance, some men have got transfers, and the men, through some cause, have been allowed to remain. I have known instances of that in Canterbury. I cannot say it was political influence. I have heard a great deal of talk about it, but it has never affected me.
125. In your experience, can you say whether or not there is a feeling in the Force that constables are transferred or allowed to remain owing to political influence?—It is the feeling certainly, but I cannot give any instance or prove anything. I would like my defaulter's-sheet produced. I might mention I have only been twice reported for what I consider very trivial matters, and have two convictions for twenty-eight and a half years' service. One was for not noticing advertisements in the newspapers relating to consultations, and the other was in the matter of an account which I ought, perhaps, to have forwarded a little sooner; and then the punishment was only reprimands.

126. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I believe there are two records on your merit-sheet for having saved life?—Yes, in 1871; and another in 1897 for attempting to save life in Wellington Harbour. I jumped into the water on a dark night.

127. *Colonel Pitt.*] What reward did you get for that?—£5 money reward. I may state also I have been ten years in the grade I am in at present without any pecuniary advantage to myself.

128. *The Chairman.*] With regard to system of rewards, do you think that reward for actions such as yours should take the form of money or promotions in the Force?—For my part, I would much rather have promotion.

129. But looking at the welfare and efficiency of the Force, do you think they should be promoted by making rewards for special acts, or giving promotion?—I think a reward stimulates a man to further exertion. I think, however, it would be too much for a man to expect promotion for an act which another man might have done had the opportunity been presented to him. It is just a man's chance to be there at the time. I think if a man does a very meritorious action he should be rewarded in some way, but I am not prepared to say which way.

DANIEL HANNAN, examined on oath.

130. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am second-class sergeant, stationed at Stafford.

131. When did you join the Force?—In 1877, at Dunedin.

132. What have been your subsequent stations since?—I was stationed at Dunedin, Palmerton South, Balclutha, and Naseby, and then I served for some months in the Superintendent's office in Dunedin, under Mr. Weldon, doing clerical work. I was transferred from Dunedin to Hokitika to fulfil a similar position under Superintendent James. From Hokitika I was in charge temporarily for a time at Kanieri, then back to Hokitika, then to Kumara, and then to Hokitika. I think I was nearly three years then in the Inspector's office. From here I was transferred to Stafford, then to Otaki, then to Masterton, and back to Stafford.

133. What offices do you hold at Stafford?—Clerk to the Stipendiary Magistrate's and Warden's Courts at Stafford and Goldsborough, Receiver of Gold Revenue, Mining Registrar, bailiff, and Registrar of Births and Deaths.

134. As Clerk of the Stipendiary Magistrate's and Warden's Courts, who do you look to as your chief?—Mr. Macfarlane, S.M.

135. As Receiver of Gold Revenue, to whom do you look as your chief?—The Under-Secretary for Mines.

136. As Mining Registrar, who?—The same officer. Of course, primarily, Mr. Macfarlane is the chief officer.

137. And as bailiff?—To the Stipendiary Magistrate.

138. And as Registrar of Births and Deaths?—To the Registrar-General.

139. In respect to the performance of these several duties you take your instructions from the officers named?—Yes, and particularly, of course, from Mr. Macfarlane.

140. What have you to say to us in regard to the goldfields-allowance?—I consider, from my experience of the goldfields of Otago and the West Coast, that living on the goldfields at the present time costs a man from 40 to 50 per cent. more than in the principal parts of Canterbury and Otago, or the North Island.

141. You refer now to such towns as Hokitika, Stafford, Goldsborough, and such places?—Yes; everything has to be imported. I speak generally of the West Coast towns; in other places it is more.

142. Do you suggest that owing to this men should not be kept very long in these goldfields towns?—I think it would be very much to their advantage if they were not kept very long. Formerly they were in receipt of a goldfields-allowance of 1s. per day, but that was taken away in 1890 or 1891. I was receiving it until I left for the North Island.

143. How long is it since you were removed from Stafford to Otaki?—I think in January, 1891, and I came back in February, 1892.

144. How long were you away from Stafford before you came back again?—A little over thirteen months.

145. Do you know anything of the circumstances that brought you back to Stafford?—I do not.

146. Did you apply to be brought back?—No; I was ordered back.

147. Did you make any application to be brought back to Stafford?—No.

148. Who was at Stafford while you were away?—Sergeant O'Donovan.

149. What became of him after you came back?—He was to replace me at Masterton.

150. What is the extent of your present station?—About fifty miles inland and further north on the road to Kumara. The boundary runs to the dividing-range between Westland and Canterbury.

151. Are you a mounted man?—No.

152. How do you visit the outlying districts?—I have to hire a horse.

153. Do you find it necessary to visit the distant parts of your district frequently?—One time, before the railway was completed to Jackson's, I had to go once a month; but since then the man from Brunner goes up by train.

154. Has there been any disturbance amongst the men on the railway there?—As a rule, the men are orderly; I have had no occasion to summon any of them. The presence of a constable is sufficient to deter any demonstration of rowdyism.

155. How many licensed houses are there in your district?—Thirteen.

156. How are they conducted?—They are well conducted.

157. Have you had any prosecutions under the Licensing Act?—Not many.

158. Is there much crime in your district?—Very little; perhaps it is a district freer from crime than any district in the colony.

159. Is there any crime undetected?—No.

160. *Colonel Pitt.*] You have served in various parts of the colony. Do you find any difficulty or more difficulty in enforcing the observance of the licensing laws in goldfield districts than in any other parts of the colony?—I believe there is less difficulty in enforcing the Licensing Act on the goldfields.

161. Have you any reason to believe that sly-grog selling or illicit distillation is carried on in your district?—I have not.

162. Do you visit the hotels in your district?—I do.

163. On Sundays?—Yes; frequently.

164. Are they scattered?—Yes; there are only seven within two miles of me.

165. How far is the furthest off?—About fifty miles.

166. Do you visit them by yourself?—Yes; there is nobody else to go with me.

167. Supposing you are instituting a prosecution and want corroborative evidence, how would you get on?—I would have to depend on those present.

168. *The Chairman.*] Have you any suggestion to make to us?—Several men have asked me to state that they would like an increase of pay. They consider that 7s. per day is less than an ordinary labourer receives—in fact, men on the co-operative works would not be satisfied to work for 7s. per day. Constables have to be well conducted and well dressed, and fairly well educated. I would also like to make some representations about a pension scheme. The junior members of the Force consider there are too many old men in the service, and if there was a pension scheme it would enable a good many of these older men to retire. They would also like some representations made about getting free uniforms. It is the custom, I understand, in all the other Australian Colonies for the Governments to supply the police with free uniforms. I believe it is also the practice to do so in the gaols, and in the Post and Telegraph Department here. They also wish me to mention the question of fuel and light. At head-stations and in the large centres, fuel and light are allowed to the single men, whereas at the out-stations neither are allowed, and they think it is a privilege which should be extended to every man alike. I do not see why there should be any exception made. If a man at an out-station locks up a prisoner at night, or has to do any other duty at night, he has to supply his own light to do so. Fuel and light were done away with some years ago, on the score of economy. Then there is the question of transfers, and some better provision being made for married men and their families on board ship. When I went away it cost me £7 out of my own pocket to pay the extra fare between saloon and steerage.

169. You think you should have a first-class passage and not steerage?—Certainly; I think it is degrading a man to put him down into a coal-hole.

170. Do you mean that to apply to married men with families, or to all men?—I think to all men in the Force. I think they should be treated as mechanics and not as ordinary labourers.

171. *Colonel Pitt.*] What do you think should be the rate of pay?—I think the lowest rate of pay a constable should receive is 8s. per day.

172. On joining?—Yes.

173. How should that be increased?—By promotion, to my mind.

174. Not by length of service?—No.

175. You have spoken of a pension scheme: in your opinion would the members of the Force be prepared to submit to any reduction or stoppage from their pay as a contribution towards a pension scheme?—No; in my opinion they should not be called upon to do so, because other public servants are not called upon to do so.

176. Do any other services in the colony get a pension scheme?—I understand several services get compensation, or retiring-allowances.

177. Is your life insured in the Government Insurance?—Yes.

178. You have to submit to a reduction for that?—I insured myself before that system came into vogue in the Force.

179. Do you know that constables on joining now have to insure their lives?—Yes.

180. To assist a pension scheme, would you be prepared to agree to the emoluments you receive from these outside offices you hold going to help to form a fund for a pension scheme?—I would not. If I had anything to do with the conduct and regulation of the Force I would not allow a constable to hold any offices outside that of a police-constable. The men have to do this work almost in their spare time, and often late at night. As a rule the men in cities who have not to do these duties only do eight hours' work.

181. If the services of a policeman are at the disposal of his department for the whole twenty-four hours, how is your time more occupied than that of a city constable?—No department would expect to employ me the number of hours I am sometimes called upon to work as Clerk of Court, or in connection with my other offices. They would not expect me to do more than nine or ten hours' work.

182. I understand your present opinion is that a police-constable should not be called upon to do this work at all?—I do; and my opinion is that if there is not sufficient work for him to do without this work being thrust upon him the station should be closed.

183. *Mr. Poynton.*] You know nothing about political influence in regard to transfers?—I know of none.

184. Have you ever used any?—Certainly not.

185. Are you aware of any influence being used on your behalf?—No.

186. Or to retain the constable at Otaki whom you went to relieve?—No.

187. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] How many charges had you at Stafford this year?—Something like half a dozen: three for drunkenness and two for lunacy.

188. How many summonses?—Only one.
189. How many cases of larceny or other police-inquiries have you had to interest yourself in?—Not many.
190. Half a dozen, do you suppose?—Yes.
191. Roughly, the sum total of your police-work for the year has been five arrests, one summons, and about half a dozen other inquiries?—Yes.
192. Yet you think you ought to have fuel and light to help you to do that work?—I certainly think I should have light to accommodate any man who comes at night.
193. What do you get as Clerk of the Stipendiary Magistrate's Court and Warden's Court?—£30 a year, including travelling-expenses. I get mileage for serving civil summonses.
194. If the Justice Department had to employ a clerk to do the work, what do you suppose would be a fair remuneration for doing that work?—When I took over that work there was a clerk there at £200 a year, and a bailiff at £100.
195. Then the Police Department has to do the work in order that the other department may be run cheaply?—That is it, I suppose.
196. You do not think a man should be asked to contribute something towards a pension fund?—Not from the present pay.
197. Do you not know that in every other service where there is a pension fund the men have to contribute towards it?—I do not know.
198. Have you given this question of a pension fund any great deal of attention?—I have not.
199. You never made any application, either directly or indirectly, to be brought back to Stafford?—No.
200. Do you know why you were brought back here?—I do not.
201. Did you ever see any Minister about it?—No.
202. Did you ever communicate with one?—Certainly not.
203. *The Chairman.*] It has been plainly stated that you have, and you as distinctly deny that?—I do.
204. *Colonel Hume.*] When you were ordered from Stafford to Otaki, there was considerable delay before the transfer took place?—I think I was ordered away with a whole lot of others. I certainly was one of the last that left. I got the order on the 31st December, and I left on the 13th January.
205. Then you lost 1s a day by it?—Yes.
206. What rank did you hold then?—Acting-sergeant.
207. In December of the same year you were ordered back again?—Yes.
208. Are you a Freemason?—No.
209. Then no Masonic influence was used on your behalf that you know of?—No.
210. Then you were still an acting-sergeant?—I was.
211. Is it not somewhat unusual to have acting-sergeants in stations by themselves: have you known of a case anywhere else?—I have known a first-class sergeant to be stationed by himself.
212. Where?—At Hawera.
213. In the good old days, I suppose?—No; I think in 1896, or I am very much mistaken. In the Commissioner's report for 1896 there is mention of a first-class sergeant at Hawera by himself.
214. You are now a second-class sergeant?—Yes.
215. Has anybody used any political or Masonic influence on your behalf at any time to get you promoted?—No.
216. And you have not used it yourself?—No.
217. Has any clergyman of any denomination tried to use his influence on your behalf that you are aware of?—I am not aware of any.
218. *Colonel Pitt.*] You heard Sergeant-Major McDonald say that in his opinion the Police Force in this district was sufficient for the requirements of the district: do you agree with that?—Yes.

MICHAEL JOSEPH WILDERMOTH, examined on oath.

219. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a third-class constable, stationed at Hokitika.
220. When did you join the Force?—In 1892, at Greymouth. I was sent from Wellington from the Artillery.
221. Had you any previous police duty or experience?—Only temporary duty about four or five months in Wellington.
222. Street duty?—Yes.
223. Do you come here to give us your individual opinion or the opinion of the other constables here?—Of the constables here.
224. What is it you wish to bring before us?—I think constables on joining ought to receive 7s. per day; and that married men should get either house-rent allowed or free quarters; and constables coming to the Coast should receive at least 1s. per day more than a man in Canterbury, as living is very much dearer here. I know from my two years' experience in Wellington that I can keep my family £4 per month cheaper there than I can on the West Coast, including house-rent. I would also be in favour of constables getting free uniforms, as other departments give them. I would be strongly in favour of a pension scheme partly at the cost of the men.
225. To what extent would you agree to deductions from the pay?—From 3 per cent. to 5 per cent. There would be more inducement with a pension scheme for men to stay and earn promotion in the service. I think the pay should be increased by length of service; and I think defaulters' sheets should be taken into consideration also. I think that after joining at 7s. the pay should be increased every three years by 6d. at least.

226. Up to what maximum?—Eight shillings, as at present; that would mean a period of nine years, and then he might get a step up.

227. *Colonel Pitt.*] How many classes of constables would you have?—I think three, as at present.

228. What do you think should be the difference in pay in the different classes?—I think 6d. per day.

229. Do you know what is the opinion of the Force as to giving up the right to vote at elections?—I think they would be very much disinclined to give it up.

RUFFINO TAMINELLI, examined on oath.

230. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A sawmiller, living at Kanieri.

231. We have received the following letter from you:—

SIR,—

Kanieri, 4th March, 1898.

In pursuance of notice appearing in the *West Coast Times* of the 16th February last, I beg to forward to you for the consideration of the Commission the following complaint: (1.) That on New Year's morning in the year 1896, at about the hour of 4 a.m., certain persons wilfully removed a large wagon belonging to me from my stables at Kanieri and deposited the same in the Hokitika River. (2.) That I was ill on that day, and confined to bed, and was then unable to take steps to recover the same; and from the following day, the river being in high flood, the wagon became embedded in the river and could not be raised therefrom. (3.) That I subsequently employed labour and incurred great expense in endeavouring to recover the wagon, but without avail, and I suffered a loss amounting in the whole to about £120. (4.) That, after the wagon was removed from the stable and on the same day, Constable Stewart, of Kanieri, was present there and near the place where the wagon was deposited, but did not then nor at any time afterwards, although requested by me to do so, take any steps for the apprehension of the offenders, and treated the matter in a most indifferent manner, in spite of the fact that I supplied him with the names of the persons who I had been informed committed the above act. I, therefore, take this opportunity of humbly requesting that a full inquiry be made into the matter of this complaint.

I have, &c.,

Chairman of the Police Commission, Wellington.

RUFFINO TAMINELLI, Sawmiller, Kanieri.

Are these the facts you wish to bring to our notice?—Yes.

232. You lost the wagon in January, 1896?—Yes. I had the wagon in the shed, and during the night it was taken out and put in the river. I went down to the wagon, and Constable Stewart and a man named Bergman were standing on the bank of the river. I said, "This is a fine affair," and the constable said something in reply which I do not remember. I lost my temper and said, "At that rate, it was quite right to put it in the river." He said, "Oh, no; I am sorry. Go and get some men, and we will pull it out." I replied that I would not put my finger to it, and that those who put it in could pull it out. That is all.

233. *Mr. Beare.*] That is your case?—Yes.

234. In the first place, when did you first miss this wagon?—It was in the morning, between 4 and 5 o'clock, that I first saw the wagon in the river.

235. How long after that was it before you saw Constable Stewart?—It was either 4.30 or 5.30 in the evening when I saw Constable Stewart talking with Bergman.

236. Then Constable Stewart made an offer to get your wagon out of the river?—He told me to do it.

237. And you refused?—I said I would not put a finger to it.

238. You said you were ill in bed that day?—So I was.

239. How did you come to see Constable Stewart at 4.30 p.m.?—I was up in the evening.

240. In the next paragraph of your letter you say, "Incurred great expense in endeavouring to recover the wagon, and suffered a loss of £120." That is a nice claim against the Government?—I did not make it against the Government.

241. Do you reckon you are going to bring a compensation case against the Government for it?—Never you mind about that.

242. Do you remember an offer being made to you by some other person, for instance, during that day you were supposed to be ill in bed?—No.

243. Do you remember being in a hotel at Kanieri talking about the wagon being in the river?—After seeing Constable Stewart I might have.

244. You remember the conversation was in reference to your wagon, and do you remember some one offering to take the wagon out for you?—Yes, I mind a man saying he would go and put a rope on the wagon and pull it out for £10.

245. But for nothing?—Not that I know of.

246. Do you remember Mr. Hutchinson being there?—I do.

247. Do you remember him and others saying they would put a rope round the wagon and pull it out, and that it would cost you nothing, except a drink or so for the men?—No; Mr. Hutchinson told me he would take the wagon out if I gave him £10.

248. Was that not some time after you refused to give your consent to the wagon being dragged out, and after it had become embedded in the river, that Mr. Hutchinson wanted £10 to take it out?—No.

249. Did you request Constable Stewart to take this wagon out?—I do not know.

250. Did you request the constable to arrest anybody?—I told him the parties who put the wagon in the river.

251. Did you instruct the constable to arrest anybody?—I did not; I could not.

252. You did not know the names of the persons?—I did.

253. Name them now?—Not here. I told the constable at the time.

254. The persons who put this wagon into the river?—Yes.

255. Well, name them now?—Frank Singer, James McKenna, Mr. Chesterman, Robert Morris, Mr. Peek, and one of the young Wells. I do not say I could prove that they did it, but I was told.

256. You gave all these names to the constable?—I did.

257. When did you give these names to the constable as being the persons who put your wagon into the river?—It might be a couple of months after the occurrence.

258. Do you remember employing Mr. McKenna sometime after that?—Yes.

259. Do you remember remarking to him you only wished you knew who the offenders were, and that you would bring them to justice?—Yes.

260. If you knew the names of the offenders, why did you make that remark to Mr. McKenna?—If I do not make a mistake I made the remark to Mr. McKenna to try and pump him.

261. Why was it when you had an opportunity of having your wagon taken out of this creek that you refused the offer made to you?—I said I would have nothing to do with it myself. They could pull it out.

262. Is it not a fact that when they came to you and offered to do it you would not give your consent?—It is not correct.

263. Then, if anybody swears to that fact they will be swearing what is not true?—I suppose so.

264. *The Chairman.*] You never refused to allow anybody to get your wagon out gratuitously?—No.

265. *Mr. Beare.*] As a matter of fact you did employ somebody?—I did afterwards.

266. How long afterwards?—A couple of months afterwards.

267. What did you pay for getting this wagon out, or helping to get it out?—I paid 10s. a day for four men.

268. Is it not a fact that the constable, when you first came up to him, offered then and there to go and get men to get the wagon out and you refused?—He never did. He told me to do it.

269. *Colonel Pitt.*] When you told the constable these people's names what evidence could you give him that these people did it?—I could not give him any evidence, except that a man told me so-and-so, and that every boy in Kanieri knew it.

270. All you could tell the constable was that somebody told you?—Yes.

271. Did you expect him to lay an information on that?—I thought he could take some steps. It seems very strange that when there were so many connected with it he could not find out the parties.

272.* Could you find out?—I did find out.

273. Then why did you not lay an information yourself?—It would be very dangerous for me; if I failed to convict they might sue me for damages to character.

274. Did you want the police to take that risk for you?—They have authority to take that risk.

275. *The Chairman.*] Were there any other cases at the same time of the same kind?—Not so serious as that.

GEORGE STEWART, examined on oath.

276. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a first-class constable, stationed at Kanieri.

277. *Mr. Beare.*] You know Mr. Taminelli?—I do.

278. You remember New Year's Day, 1896?—I do.

279. You remember Taminelli's wagon being in the Kanieri Creek?—Yes; that night I was down at the Fire-brigade Demonstration at Hokitika, and it was about 1 o'clock in the morning when I returned to my station. I went straight off to my station on my return.

280. When did you first know about the wagon being in the river?—In the afternoon of New Year's Day, 1896. I was standing just opposite the wagon when Taminelli came up.

281. What was said?—I said, "I see your wagon is in the river. If you will allow me to get it out I will get plenty of men to pull it out." He said, "No; let those who put it in take it out, if they like. I will have nothing to do with it."

282. No names were given then as to the offenders?—No; he walked away in the direction of his stables.

283. If he had given his consent you could easily have got the wagon out?—Yes; there was another man named Bergman present and his brother-in-law.

284. As constable in charge of that district, did Taminelli afterwards come to you and make any complaint about his wagon being put in the creek, and did you take any steps in the matter?—I made inquiries at his request. He came to me many times and asked me to find the offenders, and I said I could not.

285. You made the usual inquiries?—I did.

286. And you were unable to illicit any information?—Yes. He got into a temper, or otherwise I could have got the information the next day. He threatened those people with a prosecution, and they would not give the information. The Inspector sent me orders to make inquiries, and I did so.

287. Did you send in a report in connection with your inquiries?—I did, as follows:—

Police Station, Kanieri, January 16th, 1896.

RESPECTING the attached complaint, I respectfully beg to report that on the 1st instant, about 1 a.m., I returned to Kanieri, after attending on duty the Fire-brigade Demonstration at Hokitika. I remained in Main Street, Kanieri, until 4 a.m. on the 1st instant. It was then daylight. I did not then hear of anything being done to Taminelli's timber-wagon. On the afternoon of the 1st instant I noticed the wagon in the Kanieri River. I was standing near the place, with others. I asked Taminelli, "Will you get the wagon out?" He replied, "No; let those who put it in get it out." I then said, "Allow the wagon to be taken out, and we will see if any damage has been done." He said, "No; let it stop there. It is an insult to me." There were a number of men on the spot who were quite willing to take it out at no cost to Taminelli, but he would not allow any one to get it out. I spoke to Mr. Owen McGuigan, a respectable resident, with a view to induce Taminelli to permit the men who were on the spot to take the wagon out, but he (McGuigan) came back to me and said Taminelli would not allow it. I may remark that I, myself, was quite unable to pull the wagon out, although Taminelli since said it was my duty to pull it out of the water. I have made all inquiries with a view of finding out the parties who put the wagon in, but it being New Year's Day no one

would give any information. I verbally reported the occurrence to Sergeant Fraser on the 3rd instant, and was instructed to continue my inquiries to find out the party who put the wagon in. Mr. Taminelli has the reputation of being a very contrary person in the locality. Up to the 4th instant the wagon could be secured or brought out of the water if he would permit of it. He took no steps whatever to secure it. If it occurred to any one else but Taminelli the wagon would be out on the afternoon of the 1st instant.

GEORGE STEWART.

288. Could you have done anything more to help Taminelli out of the difficulty, or to discover who were the real perpetrators of this joke?—I could not; I did what I could.

289. *Mr. Taminelli.*] Did you see me about 11 o'clock on the evening of New Year's Day?—No.

290. Did you not offer to strike me with a bullock-whip, and then threaten to handcuff me?—No.

291. Did Mr. Derwood tell you to go and apologize?—No.

292. *Colonel Pitt.*] Mr. Taminelli says that a couple of months afterwards he gave you the names of certain persons who he was informed had put the wagon into the river. Is that correct?—No, he never gave me the names of any person. The first I heard of them was when he mentioned them just now.

HENRY NICKLESS, examined on oath.

293. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Sawyer and wood-turner by trade, living at Flowery Creek.

294. What is your complaint?—My complaint is that Constable Bennett did not do his duty in serving a warrant to go and search for my stolen property. He gave the information that he was coming, so that they could make away with it, which they did. When he went out he only found one thing there.

295. You say he did not do his duty, inasmuch as he told somebody something. Who did he tell?—He told the Maori girls, and he told the coachman who drives the coach out, and the coach was full of people.

296. Is that coachman here?—No, in Ross.

297. What is his name?—James Thompson.

298. What do you say he told the coachman?—That he would be down at the Maori pa on Monday morning, as he was coming out there.

299. Did you make any complaint to the police on this matter?—I did.

300. How did you make it?—I made a complaint to Sergeant Fraser. I wrote a letter, and it was a hard job for me to get him to send it to the Inspector at Greymouth. I got this answer back from Sergeant Fraser:—

SIR,—

Police Station, Hokitika, 18th June, 1896.

I am directed by the Inspector of Police, Greymouth, to inform you, in reference to the complaint contained in your letter to him, that it is open for you to take any proceedings you may consider fit.

I am, &c.,

Mr. Henry Nickless, Flowery Creek.

CHAS. FRASER, Sergeant.

301. Have you done anything since in respect to that letter?—No; not until now. Mr. Seddon told me to lay it before the Minister of Justice, but I am no writer, and I neglected to do so.

302. *Mr. Lewis.*] It seems that you complained to Sergeant Fraser about something?—Yes.

303. What was the complaint you made to him?—That I was robbed.

304. By whom?—I did not say by whom, but I felt certain I knew, because I could trace the cart-wheels right down to their place.

305. Did you tell Sergeant Fraser that?—Yes.

306. What did he advise you to do, or did he advise you to do anything: did he advise you to lay an information against anybody?—No.

307. Did you not tell Sergeant Fraser that you suspected some Maoris in your locality had taken some of your property?—I said I believed the Maoris had it, and so I do till this day.

308. Did the sergeant tell you to lay an information against them?—No.

309. Are you sure?—Yes, sure.

310. What did he do then?—He sent out Bennett.

311. What for?—To search.

312. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you go before a Justice of the Peace and sign a blue paper?—No.

313. *Mr. Lewis.*] You swore no information against anybody?—No.

314. Then what do you talk about a warrant for?—He was armed with authority to search.

315. Constable Bennett went out to the pa?—Yes.

316. What did he do when he got there?—He went round, and all he found was the rest for a lathe. He brought it in.

317. What did you say to that?—I said nothing that I know of.

318. Did you say it was yours?—Yes.

319. Then what is your complaint about now?—I complain that the constable, when there was a supposed burglary committed, gave information of the fact that he was coming out, so that they could plant the property, or destroy it, or do whatever they liked with it to frustrate the ends of justice.

320. Did you write to Sergeant Fraser about this matter?—No, I did not. I read my letter to him, and got him to send it down to the Inspector at Greymouth, but I had great difficulty in getting him to do it.

321. What was the letter you read to Sergeant Fraser?—I do not know; I did not keep a copy of it.

322. Did you write him a letter asking him for £5?—I never said a word about £5. If I did I said I lost £5.

323. Are you sure you did not write a letter to Sergeant Fraser, asking him to get £5 from Constable Bennett for you?—I never did any such thing in my life; and it is an infamous lie, whoever concocted it.

324. You still assert the sergeant never asked you to lay an information against anybody you suspected?—Yes.

325. And do you to this moment suspect anybody?—I do not suspect any individual in particular.

326. Then, if you do not suspect anybody, why should you expect anybody else to do so?—The property went into the Maori pa; there is no doubt about that. I traced the cart-wheels down to their place, but as they had been fetching in wood and gravel the day before, I could not swear the wheels went into their place.

327. What was the property you lost?—Crowbars, small circular saws, and a lot of tools of different sorts.

328. Is it not a fact that the tools you are speaking about all belonged to the late Mr. Fowler?—No, they did not. They were all mine, and always were.

329. Did not Mr. Fowler have a mortgage over all your property?—Yes.

330. And is this the property you are speaking about?—Yes; I bought most of it long after that mortgage was executed.

331. *Mr. Poynton.*] You say that Bennett told others. You did not hear him tell anybody that he was going out?—No, I never did.

332. You were only told by others that he said something?—Yes.

333. Can you get these others here to-day?—No.

334. *Colonel Pitt.*] When these people told you that Bennett had said this; he was not there?—No.

335. You say your wife heard the coachman say so?—Yes.

336. Bennett was not there then?—No.

337. *The Chairman.*] You cannot produce either these Maori girls or Thompson either to-night or to-morrow?—I might produce the Maori girls in a week or two.

ALBERT BENNETT, examined on oath.

338. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—First-class constable, stationed at Hokitika.

339. *Mr. Lewis.*] You recollect the incident referred to by Mr. Nickless?—Yes.

340. Kindly give the Commission your statement in respect to it?—I saw Nickless in the police-station.

341. Was anybody else there besides you?—Sergeant Fraser was there. He was laying a complaint to Sergeant Fraser and not to me.

342. Were you present?—No.

343. Were you present when Sergeant Fraser saw Nickless?—Sergeant Fraser told me after he went away.

344. What instructions did you obtain from the sergeant?—Sergeant Fraser instructed me on Monday morning to proceed to the Maori pa to make inquiries about certain tools supposed to have been stolen from Nickless at Flowery Creek.

345. Did you have any warrant?—No. I arrived there by the train, and I found Mr. Nickless walking down the line towards the railway-station to meet me. Then he went with me to Philip George's place, and the first thing he put his hand on was a piece of iron in an outhouse, and said, "That is mine." I took charge of it, and we went round to see if we could find anything more. We could not find anything. We went up to Mr. Taiaroa's new house on the hill and had a look round there, and found nothing.

346. Before you went out did you intimate the fact to anybody that you were going on this particular business?—Nobody at all.

347. Nickless complains that prior to getting there you told some Maori girls and a coachman, named Thompson, that you were going out to the Maori pa for the purpose of discovering anything. Is the statement contained in that charge true or false?—I made no such statement to the Maori girls.

348. Did you make the statement to the coachman?—I met the coachman on the Sunday afternoon, and told him to tell Nickless quietly that I would be out at 7.30 a.m., and to meet me at the station.

349. Did you tell him what you were going out for?—No; the reason I told him this was because the train was going out earlier than usual, so that Mr. Nickless could meet me.

350. You deny having told the coachman the purpose for which you were going?—Certainly. There was nobody in the coach at the time I spoke to the coachman.

351. *Mr. Nickless.*] You say on your oath Mr. Fraser gave you instructions on the Monday?—Yes.

352. On the Saturday I say you gave information to the Maori girls, and on the Sunday you acknowledge yourself you told Thompson. How could you tell Thompson on the Sunday if you only got your instructions on the Monday?—I only mentioned it to the coachman; I never saw the Maori girls about this.

353. *The Chairman.*] Do you wish to correct your evidence, and to say it was on the Sunday you got your instructions?—Yes, on the Sunday; it was the last thing on Sunday night.

354. Do you say the last thing on Sunday night?—Yes, to proceed out on Monday. He reminded me the last thing at night.

355. What time on Sunday were you instructed by Sergeant Fraser to proceed to the Maori pa?—At noon.

356. When did you see the coachman?—At 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

357. And you had further instructions from the sergeant. At what time?—The last thing on Sunday night, to be sure and catch the train in the morning.

358. *Mr. Nickless.*] Is it customary for sergeants of police to give orders at noon in the day and then again at night?—We have several orders.

359. *Mr. Lewis.*] Did you ask Nickless to lay an information against anybody he suspected?—I told him when I found that piece of iron he better come in and lay an information.

360. And what did he say?—I cannot exactly remember whether he said he would or he would not, but he never came in.

361. Did you hear Sergeant Fraser ask him to?—Yes; he told him to go down to Mr. Barton and lay an information.

362. And did he ever lay this information?—He did not.

363. So you had no warrant at all?—I had nothing at all.

364. *The Chariman.*] When you suggested laying an information did you suggest anybody against whom he should lay it?—He suggested Philip George.

GREYMOOUTH.

THURSDAY, 5TH MAY, 1898.

JOHN CULLEN, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Inspector of Police, stationed at Greymouth.

2. When did you join the Force?—In July, 1876, I joined the Armed Constabulary, after serving seven years in the Royal Irish Constabulary.

3. And the Police Force?—On the 1st January, 1877.

4. And you were made Inspector when?—On the 20th September, 1897.

5. Will you kindly give the several localities in which you have been stationed?—I was transferred from the Armed Constabulary depot to Blenheim, and was there to August, 1880; then to Renwick, near Blenheim, for a few months; then back again to Blenheim; then to Havelock, in Marlborough, for about four months; then to Dunedin; then to Timaru; then to Christchurch; then to Napier; then to Wanganui; and on promotion to my present rank I was transferred to this district.

6. Will you just describe your present district?—It comprises all the Provincial Districts of Westland and Nelson; the headquarters of the district, of course, are at Greymouth.

7. What Force have you under your control?—The strength of the district is forty all told.

8. Where are they stationed?—The Greymouth sub-district comprises Greymouth, seven police; Brunner-ton, one constable; Ahaura, one constable; and Kumara, one constable. The Reefton sub-district comprises Reefton, a sergeant and two constables; and Lyell, one constable. The Westport sub-district comprises Westport, a sergeant and three constables; Denniston, one constable; Seddonville, one constable; and Charleston, one constable. The Nelson sub-district comprises Nelson, a sergeant and six constables; The Port, one constable; Spring Grove, one constable; Takaka, one constable; Collingwood, one constable; Richmond, one district constable; and Motueka, one district constable. Hokitika sub-district comprises Hokitika, an acting-sergeant-major and three constables; Stafford, one sergeant; Kanieri, Ross, and Okarito, one constable each. I have not been here all the time since the date of my appointment, as I left Greymouth on the 8th January, 1898, on relieving duty at Christchurch, and I did not return until the 29th April, 1898.

9. Considering that your time here has not been long, are you in a position to express an opinion as to the efficiency of the Force under your control?—Not generally, because there are many stations I have not had time to inspect, and there are many men I have not seen at all.

10. What is your report on those men you have visited and inspected?—Some of them are very good, and some of them, I think, are capable of improvement.

11. Are you referring at the moment to the stations or the members of the Force?—I thought you were referring to members of the Force; there are some very good men in the district and some indifferent, from what I have seen.

12. Since you have been in charge of the district have any complaints been made to you as to the conduct of members of the Force—either general complaint or particular complaint?—No.

13. No complaints from outside the Force?—No.

14. No complaints in respect to the conduct of members or the working of the Force?—No.

15. Are you able to give your opinion as to whether the present Force available is sufficient to cope with the crime and to preserve order in the district?—I think so. Probably Greymouth and Nelson might do with another man each if they could be got, but the other districts have sufficient.

16. *Colonel Pitt.*] There is no difficulty in getting them, is there?—It is a question of funds, I suppose. At times here and in Nelson, when men are away sick or on leave or on escort duty—and when a man is away on escort duty from a place like this he is away a good while—the station is often short-handed.

17. *The Chairman.*] How many of your men are mounted men?—The out-station men all keep horses, either Government or private horses.

18. Do you think there is sufficient provision in that respect?—I think so.

19. Have you any suggestions to make to us with respect to your district here?—Not particularly affecting the district here, but I have some suggestions to make with respect to the Force generally. I cannot speak with sufficient knowledge of the district yet.

20. With regard to the general administration and organization of the Force we shall be very glad to hear you?—I have written a statement embodying my views on the subject, as follows: The character and antecedents of every applicant for enrolment in the Force should be carefully inquired into through the Inspector in charge of the district where the applicant is best known before his name is placed upon the list of applicants. When an artilleryman applies for transfer to the police his character and antecedents before joining the Artillery should be similarly inquired into. This would prove the means of preventing undesirable men getting into the service. I have known one instance, in 1889 or 1890, where an artilleryman was transferred to the police, and it was subsequently ascertained that he had served a sentence of one month for assault, had been bound over to keep the peace for six months, and had been convicted of drunkenness, also of assaulting and resisting the police, prior to joining the Artillery. This man would have made an excellent fighting man, but was a most undesirable person to have in the Police Force. He is not in the service at present. I have known of several other undesirable men who joined the police from the Artillery. Married men should not be enrolled in the Force unless they have served in some other Police Force and can produce a satisfactory discharge from the service they have left. Candidates for enrolment who are over thirty years of age should be rejected. Every candidate upon joining, unless he has had some previous police training, should be drilled at the depot in Wellington, and be compelled to attend a police school of instruction there for at least two hours daily for, say, a period of three months, and should pass an examination in the theoretical knowledge of his duties before being allowed to leave the depot on transfer to a district. A manual of police duty suitable to the requirements of the New Zealand Police should be compiled, and one of the most experienced non-commissioned officers in the service should be appointed Police Instructor at the depot. Constables should not be allowed to marry unless they have four or five years' service. The present classification system of both sergeants and constables should be abolished, and a scale of pay substituted on the principle adopted in the London and Dublin Metropolitan Police and the Royal Irish Constabulary. This would do away with the discontent that has existed in the service owing to the length of time men have had to wait for advancement from class to class under the present system. Constables should not be paid less than 7s. nor more than 9s. per diem, but the pay might be computed by the year and not by the day. All members of the Force should be supplied with free uniform or an equivalent. All promotions should be made by the Commissioner from his personal knowledge of the qualifications of the men and the recommendations of the Inspectors in charge of districts. Inspectors should have authority to fine or reprimand subordinates, and should be empowered to take evidence on oath when holding any departmental inquiries. The present system does not allow them to do so. The Commissioner should have sole control of the department, and should make all appointments, transfers, promotions, discharges, and dismissals. He should also have authority to review, and if necessary reverse, punishments inflicted by the Inspectors. Constables recommended for promotion to the rank of sergeant should be compelled to undergo an examination of fitness for the proposed rank prior to being promoted. The examination should be merely a pass one and not competitive. If monetary rewards are to be continued to members of the Force, I think they should be paid out of the consolidated revenue; but my own opinion is that monetary rewards should be discontinued, and that a system of "favourable records" or "records of merit" should be substituted, and these "records of merit" should be taken into consideration when a man's claim for promotion is being considered. All members of the Force should be subject to periodical transfers, say, once every seven years. Of course, there would be exceptions to such a rule, when, for instance, a man was doing his work well and was well adapted for the duties he had to carry out. The service has always been undermanned, and most of the large towns suffer in consequence. Whenever a vacancy has occurred at a station there has been considerable delay in filling it. I think this should not be the case: a man should be ready to fill any vacancy as soon as it has been created. Presentations of all kinds to members of the Force, their wives, or other members of their families should be put a stop to. It is well known throughout the service that the majority of presentations to members of the Force have been initiated and largely subscribed to by publicans. A pension fund should be provided whereby men who had reached the age-limit could retire from the service and make way for younger and more energetic men. The question of ways and means would, no doubt, be the stumbling-block in the way of establishing such a fund, but I think this obstacle could be surmounted if the Government voted a sum of, say, £5,000 a year for a certain number of years, until the fund was established on a firm basis. When the Post and Telegraph Department was reclassified I understand the Government had to provide an additional £30,000, spread over a number of years. The present reward fund, which is said to amount to about £1,600, should be applied to the pension fund. All fines under the Licensing Acts, including fines for sly-grog selling, a moiety or percentage of all fines recovered in cases where the police were informants, and the salaries received by constables as Clerks of Courts should also go to the pension fund. As there are about eighty constables who act as Clerks of Courts, a sum of £800 per annum would accrue to the pension fund through this channel alone. A certain percentage should be deducted from the pay of all ranks and applied to the fund. The constables who act as Clerks of Courts would still be in receipt of mileage and bailiff's fees, and I think these should be sufficient remuneration for the extra clerical work they have to perform. The application of the £10 per annum to the pension fund would put a stop to a good deal of wire-pulling that constables have always resorted to for the purpose of obtaining a station where they would act as Clerk of Court. All fines inflicted on members of the Force should go to the pension fund. Men who resign, are discharged, or

dismissed for misconduct should not be allowed a refund of moneys deducted from their pay on behalf of the fund. I am satisfied the service will never be efficient until such time as a pension fund is established. If the present system is allowed to continue the Force will be always blocked with men who have passed the best years of their lives in the service, and who have arrived at a time of life when they cannot be considered energetic or efficient in the discharge of their duties. As, however, most of them, owing to the smallness of the pay, may have been unable to make any provision for their old age, they would either have to be allowed to remain in the service, and thereby cause stagnation in promotion, or be thrown out with a year's compassionate allowance, and as soon as this was spent they would, as a last resource, apply to the Charitable Aid Board for their future maintenance. I think it will be conceded that the police have to perform very fatiguing duties, and have to remain exposed to all weathers and run greater personal risks than any other members of the community. The four principal police districts of the colony are, I think, too large, and cannot be efficiently supervised under existing arrangements. Three additional districts should be created from the present Auckland, Canterbury, and Otago Districts. To effect this would necessitate the appointment of three new Inspectors or Sub-Inspectors, and bring the number of commissioned officers up to ten. One of these should be stationed at Invercargill; another should be stationed at Timaru, having charge of all stations between the Rakaia River on the north and Hampden on the south; the other should have charge of the Thames district and all stations in the Auckland District south of Mercer. The headquarters of the Nelson and Westland Districts should be removed from Grey-mouth to Nelson, and the Marlborough stations could then be taken away from the Wellington District and supervised from Nelson—the most central place for the headquarters of the enlarged district. The headquarters of the Wanganui and West Coast district should be removed from New Plymouth to Wangauui, the latter town being the natural centre of the district and double the size of the former. Palmerston North sub-district could then be taken from Wellington District and included in Wanganui district. This and the arrangement suggested respecting the Marlborough stations would, if carried out, relieve the Inspector in Wellington of a considerable amount of distant supervision, and allow him to devote much more time to the supervision of the duties in Wellington. The Inspectors in the four large centres cannot give proper supervision to the men under them owing to the size of their districts. The constables in the distant stations are not visited oftener than once a year, and the Inspectors have to trust to a supervision through the post-office for the rest of the year. Every station in a district should be inspected quarterly. Later on promotion to the rank of Inspector might be facilitated by the appointment of some of the most experienced senior Inspectors to the position of Police Magistrates at the four large centres, with limited jurisdiction that would allow them to deal with criminal and *quasi*-criminal cases, attend to the laying of informations, the issue of warrants and summonses, and they should also be appointed Coroners for their respective districts and hold all inquests therein. The police have been found fault with in certain quarters for alleged laxity in enforcing the licensing laws; but when the unsatisfactory state of the law on this subject is considered I do not think the police are so much to blame as they are represented to be. I am confident we will never be able to effectively enforce the licensing-laws until such time as section 25 of the English Act is incorporated with our Act. I would strongly recommend that an Amendment Act embodying the provisions of the section quoted be passed next session of Parliament. If this were done I think Sunday and night trading would very soon be put a stop to. The difficulties the police have to contend with in coping with the sly-grog traffic are very great, and are not likely to be lessened in the future, as local sympathy is nearly always on the side of the sly-grog seller. The only effective remedy for this traffic is for the Government to establish a place for the sale of liquor in the various sly-grog centres, or else grant a license. I am sure that the establishing of a proper place to sell liquor in would put a stop to the sly-grog traffic. The quality of the liquor sold by sly-grog sellers is usually the vilest and cheapest procurable. I know of one instance where a sly-grog seller procured a quantity of methylated spirits and brought it in a jar to a certain district; he then collected all the empty bottles he could procure, mixed the spirits with water, bottled it, and then sold it to shearers and station-hands for as much as £1 and £2 per bottle. I may say there were no police-stations within sixty-five miles of the locality where this transaction took place, and the facts were not known to the police until a long time after their occurrence. I merely refer to this incident to show that it would be better to have legalised the sale of good liquor in certain places, and so put a stop to illegal sales of what can be considered little better than poison.

21. *Colonel Pitt.*] No detectives in your district?—No.

22. Do you think any are necessary?—I do not think so.

23. What do you think of the condition of the Detective Force of the colony?—I think better selections could have been made at times.

24. Is it in your opinion at present sufficient?—Not in the large towns. In places, for instance, like Christchurch, Wellington, or Auckland I am certain it is not sufficient—at least, it was not in Christchurch, and it was not in Auckland when I was up there last year.

25. You can speak with some knowledge of the Christchurch district, having been in charge of it?—Yes.

26. But, as to efficiency, how is the Detective Force?—I think it was better there some years ago than it is now.

27. You have heard something of the appointment of the office of Chief Detective; what is your opinion as to that in the different districts?—I think it is immaterial what you call him; somebody must be in charge, and it does not matter whether you call him Chief Detective or Senior Detective. It is merely a name, and signifies very little.

28. You spoke of the Commissioner of Police having sole control; is that control independent of the Minister and responsible only to Parliament?—I think it would be better if he were only responsible to Parliament.

29. You said that instead of monetary rewards there should be records of merit, leading ultimately to promotion?—Yes; they should tell in a man's favour when his claim for promotion is being considered.

30. Do you think any records of merit other than for the detection of crime should go on a man's merit-sheet?—Detection of crime and cases of bravery. I think the extinguishing of fires should not count unless there is saving of life. There might be two classes of records of merit, as is the case, I think, in the Home services.

31. You think nothing should lead to promotion except the detection of crime or some special exhibition of bravery?—Well, length of service and experience in the service and success in a man's work would have to be considered.

32. Would you go so far as to say that jumping into the sea and risking a man's life should lead to promotion or be a matter of reward?—I think a matter for reward, because a man may be a very brave man and still be unfit for the rank of sergeant and Inspector.

33. You have said there should be transfers every seven years; how often do you think Inspectors should be transferred?—I think as often as other men. I think seven years is quite long enough for any Inspector, or sergeant, or constable to be in any place.

34. You spoke of the Force being undermanned; to what extent is the Force undermanned, in your opinion, throughout the colony?—I think Christchurch and about there could do with ten or fifteen extra men. I do not know about Wellington so well. I think in the City of Christchurch the full strength when I was there was forty-one all told, and that number was not sufficient.

35. Can you mention any other district that from your experience should be supplemented in numbers?—Wellington, I have no doubt, but I have no intimate knowledge of it. Auckland I should say, from what I saw when I was up there, was undermanned, but I cannot say to what extent, and they were nearly all junior hands at the time I was there. I think the most of them were under three years' service, and a number of them under one year.

36. *The Chairman.*] Have you many young constables in your district?—There are a few; not many. Two or three junior hands.

37. *Colonel Pitt.*] When speaking of the reconstruction of your district by including Marlborough, do you think that a district including Marlborough and Nelson could be satisfactorily worked without a Sub-Inspector?—Yes, decidedly, if you have good sergeants in charge of the sub-districts; the bulk of the population is in the Nelson District. I think the population of the Nelson Provincial District is thirty-five thousand, the Westland District fourteen thousand, and the Marlborough District somewhere about fifteen thousand.

38. Have you had time to examine the Nelson portion of your district?—No; only the Nelson station while *en route* by steamer from Wellington to Greymouth.

39. We have heard a good deal of political influence in reference to the Force; have you within your knowledge known any instances of that?—I have no personal knowledge; I have heard of it.

40. What is the wire-pulling you referred to?—That has been going on for these stations ever since constables were appointed to act as Clerks of Court, and that, I suppose, is fifteen or twenty years ago. Constables have always been trying to get to these stations where they would act as Clerks of Court.

41. Do you mean from members of the district?—Yes, and from others.

42. If a constable has an honest grievance do you think there is any objection to his asking the member for the district to represent it for him?—I do.

43. Why?—It is subversive of discipline. If he has a grievance he should submit it to his own officer, and let it go to the head of the department to be inquired into by the Commissioner. I think it would be a wrong thing to apply to the member of the district or to any person outside the department until he has failed to get redress from the department. Then, I think he should do it by petition openly, and not behindhand.

44. *The Chairman.*] During your charge in Christchurch was your attention called at any time to the existence of houses of ill-fame: I mean, was attention called to them by any outside complaints?—Not about houses of ill-fame, but frequent complaints have been made to me about prostitutes frequenting Manchester Street and importuning people going by. I do not think, in fact, there are many such houses as you mention in Christchurch. From inquiries I made I ascertained the women were living in private lodging-houses and went about the streets and importuned people.

45. So far as importuning is concerned, is there a proper watchfulness exercised by the police?—Yes; I gave special instructions on that subject on several occasions.

46. Have you ever known of any case of a private information laid by any person in regard to importuning?—No; private individuals, although they come and complain and tell you that such things are going on, will not give you sufficient information to enable you to bring them up as witnesses.

47. And the women are not likely to importune constables?—No; and it is a very difficult thing to catch them in the act of importuning a private individual.

48. And if the private persons do not object?—Then the police cannot do anything. That is not peculiar to Christchurch alone; it applies to all the other large towns. It is just the same with breaches of the Licensing Act.

49. That is one of the great difficulties to securing convictions for these matters, which are matters of common talk?—Yes.

50. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think the pay of sergeants is sufficient?—My idea is that, when a man is promoted to the rank of sergeant, there should be a difference of 1s. per day between his rank and the highest rank of constable. At present I think the margin of 6d. is too small.

51. Do you think married constables in towns should have free quarters?—I think so; but if men were not allowed to marry until they had been three or four years in the service there would be very few without quarters in the district.

52. Do you think that would get over the difficulty?—Yes; of course, there would be a few unprovided for who might be unfit for the charge of stations, or who might be brought in from out-stations on account of misconduct to be under the supervision of the Inspector.

53. Would you make an allowance in that case?—Yes, I think so.

54. In the matter of complaints against constables, would you allow a constable the right to appeal from the decision of an Inspector to a Stipendiary Magistrate?—I think his case should go to the Commissioner first.

55. Would not the Commissioner of Police be biassed towards the Inspector?—I do not think so. I may say this: that during my time in the service I have never known a constable to be unjustly punished.

56. You do not think it would be more satisfying to a constable?—I do not think it would. I think the department should be able to manage its own affairs without appealing to anybody outside, except in extreme cases. I know, for my own part, I have always been justly dealt with by the Inspectors over me, excepting one Inspector.

57. *The Chairman.*] Some men think their fate has been different to yours?—I have served under the strictest Inspectors in the service; I have been under Inspectors Weldon, Bullen, and Broham, and other strict men.

58. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think the age for retirement should apply to Inspectors as well as to others?—No, because their duties do not expose them so much to all weathers, and so on; it is more inside work.

59. This is a district where people are liable to accidents: is there anything about training the constables under you in ambulance work?—I do not think there is anything here of that kind.

60. Do you think that while in the depot they should be trained in ambulance work?—I think so, as well as in other work. I know there have been ambulance classes in other stations I have been in; the local doctors volunteer to give instructions to the police.

61. Do you think there should be police doctors?—Decidedly, because it would prevent men from malingering, and in any Police Force you will always find some malingerers.

62. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you think there is much reported crime undetected in your district?—No, I do not think so; there are very few undetected cases in the district.

63. *The Chairman.*] At what periods do you think a rise in the rate of pay should take place?—I think every three years up to, say, fifteen or twenty years. I would have the rise often, and every man should be in the possession of the full pay of a constable at the end of from fifteen to twenty years.

64. *Colonel Pitt.*] In your opinion, are the licensing-laws fairly looked after by the police?—I think they are, considering the great number of publichouses they have to look after on the West Coast.

65. Is there much Sunday trading?—Not to any great extent; no more than in other parts of the colony. I am sure of that. In my opinion, there are certainly too many licensed houses on the West Coast.

66. *Mr. Poynton.*] The population of the West Coast is remarkably free from crime?—Yes; the people are very orderly and very law-abiding, on the whole.

67. *Colonel Hume.*] You joined the Police Force in 1877?—Yes.

67A. Was it under the Provincial or General Government?—General; I think I was the first man transferred from the Armed Constabulary depot to the police after the General Government took over the provincial police.

68. When the provincial police were handed over to the General Government do you consider they were an efficient Force?—Some were efficient. For instance, Otago and Canterbury were certainly efficient. I think, from my experience, that Otago was the most efficient Force in the colony.

69. Then they were considerably over-officered, and there were too many non-commissioned officers?—Yes; before the abolition of the provinces the Provincial Council promoted almost every man under them to be either Inspectors or sergeants. I think about twenty-six Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors came under the General Government.

70. And consequently that has jammed up the promotion ever since?—Yes.

71. As regards these constables you have had from the Permanent Militia, I suppose you have had a good number of good ones?—Yes, some good ones. The majority that came from the Artillery some years back were not suitable policemen, and most of them have left the service. The principle of selection was bad, because they came into the Artillery on somebody's recommendation, and, once in the Artillery, they were thought good enough for the police.

72. How do you know what inquiry was made as to their characters before they got into the Artillery?—I do not know; but I think if there had been some inquiries some of them would never have got in.

73. Do you think the men are physically weaker now than they used to be?—I think a lot of the men in the service now are physically weaker.

74. But from the Permanent Artillery now?—Yes.

75. Do you think there are more cases of sickness in the Force now than there were ten years ago?—I think there are.

76. That is, genuine sickness?—I would not say it was all genuine.

77. We had no influenza in those days?—No.

78. That would make some difference?—Yes.

79. But you think, generally, the men are not as strong now as they used to be?—No; I think they are not up to the standard of the old hands. I think some excellent men have come from the Artillery.

80. Do you find a want of the spirit of obedience in those men recently joined?—Yes.

81. What do you attribute that to?—I do not know what to attribute that to. I have found such to be the case.

82. If you have found such to be the case, is the fault due to the Inspectors and non-commissioned officers under whom the men have been placed?—I do not know. I know in one instance I gave instructions to a constable and he resented it, and he told me either he or I would have to leave the station.

83. What happened then?—I reported the matter, and no result followed.

84. Who did you report to?—The Inspector in charge of the district.

85. Who was the Inspector in charge of the district?—He is dead now. I heard no more about the matter. I reported the man on another occasion to the same Inspector, and heard no more about it.

86. Taking the Inspectors generally in the Force that would not be your experience?—No.

87. From what you have seen of many of these Artillery recruits, do not you think they are just as capable of being licked into shape as other men in former days?—They have been spoiled before they came into the police; their loose style of living and habits have been carried into the Police Force.

88. Then, their Artillery training unfits them?—I think so; I think barrack-room life does not improve a man for police work. I think, though, every man should be drilled.

89. Do you think the recruits are as intelligent now as they used to be in the olden days?—I take Christchurch, for instance, and, comparing the men there at the present time with the men who were there when I was there in 1886 and 1887, I think the men there now are not as intelligent as a body as the men there in 1887, and they are not as good physically. One thing about the men in Christchurch at the present day is that they are certainly more sober than those there in 1886–87, but they are not as good constables.

90. Well, now, has a case ever come under your notice of a man having been prevented from doing his duty through ignorance of his duties?—That, of course, I do not know.

91. No case has come under your notice?—No, because something might come under a man's notice, and he might pass it over, and I might not hear that he had done so.

92. Then you said nearly all the hands in Auckland when you were there were junior hands?—I mean the men on the street; the older men were in the out-stations and offices.

93. Do not you advocate that men after a certain time should get charge of stations?—Yes; but you want to keep a percentage of experienced men in the town.

94. Were not these experienced men, for instance, in all the suburban stations around Auckland?—I do not know the suburban men in Auckland.

95. The junior men were given stations over older men some years ago?—Yes, in a few instances.

96. Have you known that to be done within the last seven or eight years?—No, I do not remember any instance of the kind within that period.

97. You say the liquor-laws have been carried out on the West Coast as well as most other places; have you ever been given to understand that they were not to be carried out rigorously?—No. On the contrary, I know when you were Commissioner you always encouraged me to see that the liquor-laws were carried out.

98. You have served under a good many Inspectors: do you know of any who may have been in the habit of bullying their men?—No. Of course, it has been said that Mr. Broham has done so, but I was for years under him, and I can say this: that I was never better treated by an officer than I was by him.

99. Then, if a constable came to the Commission and said he was so treated when serving under Mr. Broham you think he would be exaggerating?—I only speak of my own experience, and I may say this: that I never knew an Inspector who showed more consideration to married constables than Mr. Broham did.

100. Do you think it is possible for constables to have entries in their defaulters' sheets without them knowing of it?—I do not think it is possible.

101. Then, it is not possible for a constable to have been fined 2s. 6d. and an entry made in his defaulter's sheet without him knowing of it?—I do not see how it is possible, because the man must know at the end of the month that 2s. 6d. had been deducted from his pay, and unless he was a very careless man he would want to know what it was for.

102. You were talking about detectives: has it not come under your notice that jealousy very often exists amongst detectives themselves?—Yes; that has existed, I believe, and that was caused a good deal by this system of monetary rewards and the desire to obtain notoriety by getting their names in the newspapers.

103. I think, when in Christchurch, you told Constable Fleweller to inquire into the character of a man named Timothy Lyons, who applied for the Bower Hotel?—Yes.

104. I think you got a report (which was shown to the Commission in Christchurch), and then you ordered Detective Benjamin to make some further reports. Why did you want a second report?—I think something was told me about this man having held a license in Christchurch, or somewhere about Christchurch, before, and that he had not conducted the house very well. I have no distinct recollection of the correspondence. I believe the District Clerk told me Benjamin knew that Lyons did not conduct the hotel in Christchurch in a proper manner.

105. Then, it is nothing unusual to get in reports from different constables or detectives about men who want a license for a publichouse?—No; so far as I am concerned, I am very

anxious that no one shall get a publichouse license unless I am thoroughly satisfied he is a suitable man.

106. *The Chairman.*] Was any influence brought to bear on you to induce you to get the opinion of any other constable than Flewellen?—No. No one saw me or approached me on the matter at all. It was simply done on my own motion. The man was a complete stranger to me, and it was simply what appeared in Flewellen's report that induced me to do what I did. To my mind I think Flewellen is one of the best constables about Christchurch, and one of the most trustworthy.

107. *Colonel Hume.*] I understood you to suggest that the headquarters of this district should be moved to Nelson?—Certainly.

108. Nelson is fifteen hours' steam from Westport, and twenty hours' steam from Greymouth: would it not be very inconvenient if the Inspector was in Nelson and anything happened down on the coast?—I do not think so. It would be more convenient than up in the North, for instance. In Auckland it would take the Inspector a week to get to some of his stations.

109. If there is any disturbance in your district it is likely to be in either Westport or Greymouth?—It might be.

110. Well, how would you get here?—There is a steamer three times a week and a coach twice.

111. Do you think it would be inconvenient for the Inspector to be at Nelson?—No, I do not think so; and you could include Marlborough in his district, and so relieve the Inspector at Wellington. It would take some work from him and give the Inspector here more work.

112. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You think the pay should be by year and not by day?—Yes.

113. I should like to know why you mention that?—It would be more easily computed for one thing.

114. At the present time you have some men paid £10 per month and others 7s. per day?—Yes; and others have 1s. per day long-service pay, so that there are two or three systems of pay at the present time.

115. Generally you find broken periods cause confusion in reference to the men receiving £120 a year?—I do not think it causes much confusion.

116. You can recognise that daily pay would be more suitable?—It may be. I dare say it would.

117. Do you think there should be a reserve of men in each district?—I think there should be extra men in each district to relieve men on leave and in cases of sickness or escort duty.

118. I mean in districts generally?—In the larger centres there should be extra men I think.

119. In reference to prostitutes in Christchurch, while you were there you made extra efforts to stop this trouble?—Yes.

120. It resulted rather badly for one sergeant who was engaged?—Yes; he was rather anxious to put down the nuisance and acted over-zealously.

121. You found it very difficult to regulate this nuisance in the streets with the law as at present?—It is very hard; the prostitutes did not commit themselves in any way, or do anything that you could arrest them for. You simply saw them speaking to somebody, and if you asked the person who was spoken to what was said he might tell you they asked what time of night it was or something of that sort. You could not get them to volunteer evidence that would secure a conviction.

122. In regard to defaulters and the right of appeal: in the Royal Irish Constabulary there are Courts of inquiry, are there not?—Yes.

123. Who formed these Courts of inquiry?—Two commissioned officers constitute the Court and hear the charge. The Inspector in charge of the district does not hear it; he prosecutes.

124. These are police officers in no way concerned in the complaint?—They are not.

125. And they have power to take evidence on oath?—Yes.

126. Did you find that system to work well in the Royal Irish Constabulary?—Very well.

127. Do not you find that Stipendiary Magistrates are very likely, in dealing with police cases, to overlook the question of discipline and to look at the matter purely from a point of law—say, in the matter of a drunken policeman?—Yes; that is why I say the department should look after its own affairs.

128. Therefore you think the right to appeal to a Stipendiary Magistrate would be improper?—I think so. I think if the signs of liquor are at all apparent on a policeman it is a danger to the public to allow him out in that state, although he would not be what is termed legally drunk.

129. Do you not think, if a Court or Board could be set up with at least one police officer as a member, that that would be a much more satisfactory tribunal or Board of appeal?—I think a police officer should have a seat on any Board that may be set up.

130. In regard to recruits, do you think the best recruits for the police are drawn from the rural districts?—I think the better class of men come from the rural districts and from the small towns. You get some good men from the large towns, but the most of them contract bad habits before joining the police.

131. Your minute in regard to Lyon's Bower Hotel business was that you understood Detective Benjamin knew something of the applicant, and you asked him for a report?—I think that information came from the District Clerk.

132. Your only desire was to get the fullest information about the man?—Yes, because if Constable Flewellen's statements had been borne out I should certainly have opposed him getting a license.

133. With reference to districts being reduced in size, do not you think if there were Sub-Inspectors appointed at the four principal districts that that would meet the difficulty?—I am afraid not. I fear there would be friction between the Inspector and Sub-Inspector. I think it would be better to reduce the size of the districts and increase the number of Inspectors.

134. How could friction creep in if a Sub-Inspector is a subordinate under the Inspector?—Of course, in a strictly disciplined Force it would not occur; but in this Force discipline is not yet up to the standard it has reached in the Home service.

135. But in the Provincial Forces you had Sub-Inspectors running districts practically independent?—Yes, for a short time. I think they all worked to be made Inspectors, and succeeded.

136. On the appointment of Sub-Inspectors would not the Sub-Inspector be at the principal station under the Inspectors?—Yes; but the standing and duties of the Sub-Inspector would have to be clearly defined, so as to prevent friction between himself and the Inspector. I think it would be better to give him a district to himself.

137. The Inspector is necessarily often away from his district, is he not?—Yes.

138. Who deals with the correspondence in the Inspector's absence?—The District Clerk; and that is one of the anomalies of the service. He may be a third-class constable and yet take charge of the whole district while the Inspector is away, and issue instructions to the sergeant or sergeant-major, as the case may be. It is subversive of all discipline and against the regulations, and should be put a stop to without delay.

139. Well, if you had a Sub-Inspector in charge during the absence of the Inspector would not that difficulty be removed?—I do not see why it should not be removed at once by the sergeant in charge at headquarters taking the Inspector's duties, as laid down by section 31 of the Police Regulations.

140. I have a report here in regard to ambulance work; do you find in that report that five men in this district have received ambulance instruction?—Yes; three at Westport, one at Brunnerton, and one at Reefton.

141. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think, having regard to the extra cost of living on the West Coast, that there should be an allowance granted to constables?—I should reckon the cost of living on the West Coast is 25 per cent. dearer than in other parts of the colony. I do not know that an allowance should be made. I think the men should not be allowed to remain too long on the Coast. I think they should be transferred from the West Coast oftener than from other parts of the colony. I think that that would meet the difficulty. I also think no sergeant should be allowed to remain in a station by himself.

142. What is the objection?—He should not hold the rank if he remains in a station by himself. The rank of sergeant is for the purpose of supervising subordinates.

143. Do sergeants in charge of sub-districts inspect personally every station in the sub-district?—They should do so, but they have not regularly done so.

144. Have they not been instructed to do so?—There is no standing order directing them to do so.

145. Who does inspect these stations?—The Inspector.

146. But there is no systematic inspection by sergeants in charge of sub-districts of the stations in the sub-districts?—No.

147. How often do you think stations in charge of constables should be visited by a superior officer?—I think once a quarter at least.

148. Do you think the visit of the sergeant in charge would be sufficient?—I do not think so. I think the Inspector should visit once a quarter.

149. *Colonel Pitt.*] What do you think should be the minimum standard height?—Not less than 5 ft. 8 in.

150. *The Chairman.*] To which do you attach the most importance, the height measurement or the chest measurement?—Chest measurement.

151. You said something about the physique of the present Force; have you any reason to believe that venereal disease has anything to do with the condition of the Force?—It may have a little, but I do not think to any extent. Of course, some men in the larger towns may contract it, but I cannot say so from my own knowledge.

152. Have you any reason to believe that it exists to any great extent?—No, I have not.

153. Have you had any representations in connection with that?—No.

154. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You know I have endeavoured to create a sub-district arrangement?—Yes.

155. And in furtherance of that idea your district has been increased by one sergeant at Reefton?—Yes; that came into force immediately before I left for Christchurch last January.

156. As a matter of fact, it is scarcely in working-order yet?—No, I do not think the sergeants in charge quite understand the position yet.

157. You understand that the correspondence was to go through the sergeant in each sub-district, and that he was to have general supervision under you of that sub-district?—Yes.

158. Of course, it needs some augmentation to get the thing properly working?—Yes.

159. And unless Parliament sanctions it we cannot get the men?—No.

160. And so it has not been possible to put the thing in proper working-order yet?—No.

161. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is the difference between this system and the previous system?—Well, Reefton was not a sub-district.

162. Then, it is merely making more sub-districts?—Yes; and putting it on a more firm basis, as it were.

163. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] As a matter of fact, was the sub-district system allowed to lapse through there being no sergeants in charge of these districts?—Yes.

164. Do you not know that when I endeavoured to revive the sub-district system it was necessary, before I could put it into operation, to promote nearly twenty sergeants?—Yes, that was so.

165. So that there were sub-districts geographically, though they were not sub-districts because there were no sergeants to put over them?—Yes.

166. *The Chairman.*] So far as you know, is there much gambling in your district?—No, there is not.

167. Any “tote”-shops?—No.

168. Do you say that in your opinion the men should be confined to police duty?—I think they should as much as possible.

169. That outside offices should not be held by them?—Yes. While I was stationed in Napier I was Registrar of Electors, Inspector of Factories, Inspector of Weights and Measures, and something else, and I had charge of a very large sub-district; and it meant that I had to work from eight in the morning until midnight to keep things straight, especially when the general election was coming on. I got nothing for these extra offices.

170. Speaking of the position of many of the men in charge of stations who hold these outside offices, have you found that their duties as police officers have been interfered with by the performance of outside duties?—I cannot say; I cannot call a case to mind.

171. Notwithstanding that, you feel that it is an undesirable thing for men to hold these offices?—Yes.

172. You heard a witness tell us that he was accountable to various departments in connection with these outside offices. Do you think it is a right thing that a police officer should be communicating with any other department than that in which he is engaged?—I think it would be better if they had only police work to attend to. It creates a want of discipline if they hold appointments from other departments.

173. Do you suggest that the correspondence they receive from other departments should pass through their police superior?—I cannot suggest it should do so, because the district offices would be burdened with correspondence that did not concern us.

174. Do you think that police officers should hold offices under local bodies?—No, decidedly not.

ALFRED HASSALL KING, examined on oath.

175. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Are you Registrar of the Supreme Court at Hokitika?—Yes.

176. And are you Registrar of Deeds for that district?—I am District Land Registrar, and it is papers in connection with the District Land Registrar's office that I have been subpoenaed to produce to-day.

177. Do you produce the deeds named in the subpoena?—I produce the register; that is a duplicate of the original of the title. I presume Sergeant Hannan himself has the titles.

178. Does that deed refer to the transfer of a property at Stafford upon which the Excelsior Hotel stood?—It refers to a property at Stafford—No. 34—which is bounded by Church Street, on the right-hand side by High Street, but I do not know whether the hotel is built upon it.

179. Is there a memorandum of transfer from Miss Conway to Daniel Hannan?—Yes; that is the last memorial upon the title-deed.

180. What is the date of that?—This only shows the date of registration. It was registered on the 6th August, 1896.

181. Can you tell the date of the actual transfer?—I brought the transfer with me, and that is the transfer of the three sections. It is dated the 6th August, 1896.

182. Who is the transfer from?—Catherine Conway, Stafford, spinster, to Daniel Hannan, Stafford, police sergeant.

183. Who were the witnesses?—In the presence of Earlam J. Gibson, solicitor, Hokitika.

184. *Colonel Pitt.*] How is she registered—as proprietor?—She got it by transmission from Catherine Conway, who died on 3rd July,

185. Was she registered as executrix?—Yes.

186. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Does it give the consideration?—£45 for the three sections.

187. Will you kindly read the whole transfer describing what the property is: is it described beyond the three sections?—The transfer reads as follows:—

MEMORANDUM OF TRANSFER.

I, Catherine Conway, of Stafford, in the Provincial District of Westland, in the Colony of New Zealand, spinster, being registered as the proprietress of an estate of inheritance in fee-simple, subject, however, to such encumbrances, liens, and interests as are notified by memorandum underwritten or indorsed hereon, in all that piece of land situated in the Town of Stafford aforesaid, containing 9 perches, be the same a little more or less, being section numbered 34 on the map of the said town deposited with the Chief Surveyor of Westland, in the Land Office at Hokitika, in the Provincial District of Westland aforesaid, as the same is more particularly delineated and described in the books of the District Land Registrar for the Land District of Westland, vol. i., folio 103: And also in all that piece or parcel of land situated in the Town of Stafford aforesaid, containing 4 perches, be the same a little more or less, being section numbered 35 on the map of the said town, as the same is more particularly delineated and described in the books of the District Land Registrar aforesaid, vol. i., folio 104: And also in all that piece or parcel of land situated also in the Town of Stafford aforesaid, containing 3 perches, be the same a little more or less, being section numbered 36 on the said map, as the same is more particularly described and delineated in the said books of the said Registrar, vol. i., folio 105: In consideration of the sum of £45 paid to me by Daniel Hannan, of Stafford aforesaid, police sergeant, the receipt of which sum I hereby acknowledge, do hereby transfer to the said Daniel Hannan all my estate and interest in the said pieces of land.

In witness whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name this 6th day of August, 1896.

CATHERINE CONWAY.

Signed on the day above named by the said Catherine Conway, in the presence of Earlam J. Gibson, solicitor, Hokitika.

188. There is nothing there to show what buildings were on the land?—No.

189. Did the deeds show any?—No.

190. *The Chairman.*] Has that same property been subsequently disposed of?—No; Hannan is what I call the registered proprietor.

191. *Colonel Pitt.*] It appears from the memorial indorsed on the certificate of title that Catherine Conway, who sold to Daniel Hannan, took the property under the will of another Catherine Conway. Do you know whether her mother, or what relative?—No.

FREDERICK JOHN SIMON CHARLES HENNE, examined on oath.

192. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are a hotelkeeper, living at Stafford?—Yes.

193. On the 7th August, 1896, did you purchase the good-will and interest connected with the Excelsior Hotel?—On the 15th or 16th July.

194. Is this the deed of assignment, viz.:—

This deed, made this 7th day of August, 1896, between Frederick John S. C. Henne, of Stafford, in the Provincial District of Westland, hotelkeeper, of the one part (hereinafter, with his executors, administrators, and assigns, referred to as "the said purchaser"), and Daniel Hannan, of Stafford aforesaid, constable (hereinafter, with his executors, administrators, and assigns, referred to as "the vendor," of the other part: Whereas the said purchaser has agreed with the said vendor for the sale to him of all his interest, good-will, and the said chattels and things hereinafter mentioned and all now connected with the trade or business of an hotelkeeper carried on in the premises situate at Stafford and known as Excelsior Hotel, for the price or sum of £160 and the covenants herein contained: Now this deed witnesseth that, in pursuance of the said agreement, and in consideration of the sum of £160 to the said Daniel Hannan paid by the said Frederick John S. C. Henne immediately before the execution hereof (the receipt of whereof is hereby acknowledged), he, the said David Hannan, doth hereby sell, assign, transfer, and set over unto the said Frederick John S. C. Henne, his executors, administrators, and assigns, all the benefit, interest, and good-will of the late Catherine Conway in the trade or business of an hotelkeeper, and also the billiard-table, billiard-balls, cues, pins, and furnishings belonging to the said billiard-table, and all the right, title, and interest of the said vendor therein or thereto, to have, hold, receive, and take the several premises hereby assigned unto the said purchaser, his executors, administrators, and assigns absolutely; and the said Daniel Hannan doth hereby covenant with the said Frederick John S. C. Henne, his executors, administrators, and assigns, that the publican's license now in existence in respect of the hotel premises known as the Excelsior Hotel, at Stafford, shall be handed in for cancellation to the proper authority by the proper person, and that such cancellation in conformity with the Licensing Act shall be procured in the month of September, 1896: And the said vendor, for himself, executors, administrators, hereby covenants with the said purchaser, his executors, administrators, and assigns, that he will well and truly pay or cause to be paid to the said purchaser, his executors, administrators, and assigns, the sum of £100 if at any time after the date of this deed the hotel known as the Excelsior at Stafford, or any other building hereafter standing on the parcel of land described as Sections 38, 39, and 40, situate at Stafford Town, is used directly or indirectly by himself, his executors, administrators, and assigns as a licensed hotel or place for the sale of intoxicating liquors or a billiard-room, and the said vendor hereby further covenants that he hath good right to assign the said premises hereby assigned.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

D. HANNAN.

Signed, sealed, and delivered in the presence of Thomas V. Byrne, solicitor, Kumara.

That is dated the 7th August, 1896, is it not?—Yes.

195. You say you agreed to purchase before this date?—Yes.

196. Do you remember the date?—It was three weeks before this.

197. You agreed with whom?—I asked Mr. Hannan to buy it for me.

198. That was the sergeant?—Yes.

199. Will you state what took place between yourself and Sergeant Hannan?—I asked him to buy that hotel for me—the good-will.

200. How did it come about?—There was a general talk about business and one thing and another.

201. Where did this take place?—In the street.

202. How did he come to buy this for you?—I cannot tell you the reason; I have no idea.

203. From whom did the suggestion first come?—From me.

204. Did you know at that time that the house was going to be sold?—The mother of the girl who sold it had died about a month or three weeks before that, and the girl wanted to sell it; and I, being a publican, thought that perhaps I could get it cheaper if I got somebody else to buy it—to act as agent for me, and I asked Mr. Hannan if he would do that for me.

205. Do what?—Buy the good-will of the hotel and the billiard-table and what belonged to the billiard-table.

206. Not the building and the ground?—No; the license was about one month old, and I asked him to buy the license and the billiard-table, so that I could get the house and shut it up. The girl could do what she liked with the house and the section—I did not want them.

207. Was any amount agreed between you to be paid for it?—I told him he could go up as high as £150.

208. You were willing to pay for the unexpired term of the license, the good-will, and the billiard-table?—Yes.

209. What took place next?—She would not sell at that price.

210. Who said so?—Mr. Hannan. Mr. Hannan told me that she wanted £170.

211. This was later on; can you say about when?—Two or three days afterwards; and he said Miss Conway wanted £170, and I said I would not give it. I told him to go and offer £160, and that if she would not take that I would have nothing more to do with it.

212. Did you see Sergeant Hannan again after that?—Yes.

213. How soon after?—The same evening.

214. He came to you again?—Yes.

215. What took place then? Did he tell you the result of his negotiations?—He told me that she would sell it for £160.

216. To him?—Yes, it must be to him.

217. That she was willing to sell it to him for £160?—Yes, or anybody else; but she did not know I was going to buy it.
218. What did you understand this £160 was for?—For the good-will of the house, the license, and the billiard-table.
219. Did you understand from Sergeant Hannan that it was to include the house itself and the ground, as well as the good-will of the business and the license?—No.
220. Then, did you pay him a deposit?—Yes.
221. How much?—£20.
222. Do you know the date of that?—About the 16th July; it was three weeks before the deed of assignment.
223. When did you pay him the balance?—When that deed was signed—the 7th August, 1896.
224. What was the balance?—£140.
225. And the deed already put in is the deed of assignment?—Yes.
226. Well, now, did you know that Sergeant Hannan had purchased the house and plots of land?—Yes, before I signed the deed.
227. Did you know what he paid for them?—No; I was told, but it was only on hearsay.
228. Did he tell you?—No.
229. Did you know the amount you paid him included the purchase of the house and plots of land?—I did.
230. And you were satisfied not to have more than the good-will of the business?—I was satisfied, as I said; it was no use drawing back when I heard that, and I thought I might just as well stick to my bargain.
231. *The Chairman.*] Do you say you did ask him to buy it for you?—I said I only wanted the house shut up, and to take the billiard-table out of the house, and that the girl could do what she liked with the house so long as it was not opened up again as an hotel.
232. *Colonel Pitt.*] Then, he was not to buy the house and land for you?—No, only the good-will and the billiard-table.
233. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you pay any consideration to him for what he had done?—I did not.
234. Were you willing he should keep the house and land after the place was shut up?—I could not help it after I had bought it.
235. *The Chairman.*] Do you say now that Sergeant Hannan deceived you in this matter?—I would not say that.
236. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you understand that the £160 you paid included the purchase of the house and the land as well as the good-will of the business?—I did not know it when I paid the deposit of £20, but I knew when I paid over the balance.
237. And yet you were content to abide by the understanding between you?—I had to be content.
238. Was there any understanding between you and Sergeant Hannan as to the commission he was to get, if any?—I told him if he got it I would give him £10.
239. You did not give him £10?—No.
240. You thought he had enough by having the house and land?—No; he said he did not want it.
241. Did you believe when you paid the £160 that he had paid £160 to Miss Conway?—I did not believe it.
242. Did you know he had not?—I could not swear to it, but I did not believe it myself.
243. But he told you he had?—Yes, he told me it cost £160.
244. But you did not believe what he was saying was true?—I did not.
245. You thought he was making something out of it?—Yes.
246. Can you give the date when the house ceased to be carried on as an hotel?—The same morning that I paid the balance—the 7th August, 1896.
247. It had been carried on by Miss Conway up to that time?—Yes; she had three weeks to shut it up, from the time of the deposit.
248. Then, it was shut up from the 7th August?—Yes.
249. Was any other person present when this conversation took place between you and Sergeant Hannan?—One time there was.
250. Who?—Mr. Byrne.
251. What part of the conversation took place in Mr. Byrne's presence?—About the price of the house after it was bought.
252. Do you mean at the time you paid over the balance?—Before that.
253. Tell us what took place between you and Sergeant Hannan when Mr. Byrne was present?—We told Hannan he got the house cheaper than he said he did, and, of course, he said he had not, or something to that effect. I cannot tell the exact words, and he did not tell us what he paid for it. He did not say that much, but he did lead me to believe that he paid the same price as I was giving.
254. You were very anxious to get the house shut up, I suppose?—Yes.
255. *Mr. Hannan.*] You said you understood Sergeant Hannan did not give £160?—Yes.
256. And I think you made some complaint in Mr. Byrne's office; did you not make some complaint before you paid the balance of £140 whilst that document was being drawn up?—Yes.
257. And did not Sergeant Hannan state he had resold to you, and that if you were dissatisfied he would give you back the £20 deposit and keep the property himself, before you paid the balance?—He did.
258. And what did you say to that; you were agreeable to that?—At first I said, "Yes, I will take the deposit back," and then I thought over the matter, and I said that as I wanted the house closed up I would keep to my bargain.

259. At all events, he gave you an opportunity, if you were dissatisfied, to take your deposit back?—Yes.

260. And you were always agreeable to giving £150 first and £160 finally for the property you got in that deed?—Yes.

261. And you admit that before you paid that balance of £140 Sergeant Hannan included in his bargain the land and the buildings—that he would get these other matters?—Yes; I did not know what he paid for it, but I was sure he paid less for it.

262. You were quite sure he paid less than £160 and would also have that property for himself?—Yes.

263. And you were still agreeable to go on with the transaction?—Yes.

264. I think I understood you to say that in the several conversations Sergeant Hannan came to you and told you Miss Conway would not take £150, but wanted £170, and you said you would not give it, but authorised him to go to £160?—Yes.

265. But you also say he never at any time told you what he gave her for it?—No.

266. So he did not make any representation to you about the amount he paid her for it?—No.

267. But he told you on one occasion that she wanted £160, but he never told you what he gave her?—No; I was under the impression she got the money.

268. How do you reconcile your statement that you were under the impression she got this £160 when you have told us you were perfectly certain at the time of squaring up in Byrne's office that he was making a profit, and never had paid £160?—I told those gentlemen before that I wanted to close the house up, and that I had made a bargain and I stuck to it.

269. But you must be wrong in one or the other statement. You said you were certain he had not paid £160 at the time you completed the bargain, and now you tell me you were under the impression he did give Miss Conway the whole of the £160?—When I completed the bargain I knew very well that Miss Conway did not get £160, but when I made the bargain for the £160 I was under the belief that the money was going to Miss Conway, but afterwards when I paid the balance I found out she was not getting it.

270. So before you paid it you knew the money was going to the sergeant, and that you were purchasing from him?—Yes.

271. And I see by the deed that you got a covenant that he had to refund you £100 if that property was ever reopened as an hotel, so you knew you were dealing with him personally and not with Miss Conway?—Yes.

272. The building on these sections was very old and dilapidated, and, in fact, valueless as a building?—I did not care much about it.

273. Nor the ground either?—No.

274. You did not consider there was any value in either the land or the building?—Not much.

275. And I think immediately after this transaction was completed Sergeant Hannan commenced to pull the place down and put up a new place?—Yes.

276. I think you told us that immediately the transaction was completed the premises were closed and the license cancelled?—Yes.

277. So the sergeant never remained owner of it or used it as a publichouse?—No.

278. *The Chairman.*] How do you quite reconcile that with your statement that you asked him to buy it for you: if you asked him to buy it for you, what happened before you realised that he was vendor, and that you were buying from him: did you understand he was going to buy it in his own name and then sell it to you?—Not when the bargain was made I did not.

279. Did you suppose he would reveal your name as the buyer?—I told him not to.

280. In whose name did you suppose he would buy it?—I did not know.

281. You knew if he did not buy it in your name he would have to buy it in somebody's name?—Yes.

282. Then, do you find any fault with him for buying it in his own name?—I found fault with him at the first go off, but not now. I stuck to my bargain.

283. But do you find any fault with him for buying it in his own name instead of in your name?—I told him not to tell who it was for.

284. You knew he had bought in his own name, and, knowing that, you bought off him?—Yes.

285. *Colonel Pitt.*] How did the bargain about the matter commence; who suggested buying it first?—I did, after the girl's mother died. I heard she wanted to sell it.

286. What did you suggest to Sergeant Hannan?—To buy it for me, but not to let the girl know who it was for.

287. Was he to buy it in his own name for you?—I did not ask him; I did not tell him what name. I understood he was acting for me in the matter of the license and the billiard-table.

288. He was to give £160 for you?—Yes.

289. You are quite sure you spoke to him first about buying it, and not he to you?—I am quite sure of that.

DANIEL HANNAN, examined on oath.

290. *Mr. Hannan.*] You are sergeant of police stationed at Stafford?—Yes.

291. Will you just explain the commencement of this transaction?—I think in July, 1896, Miss Conway was desirous of disposing of the property she had at Stafford. She asked me to buy it, as I had bought previously to that some freehold property off her mother. I told her that so far as I could see I did not require it, and that she had better place it in the hands of an auctioneer or solicitor. She said she would not do that because she thought the expense would be too great, and that she would like to get whatever it brought intact, without having to pay any costs out of it afterwards. I advised her to remain in the place, as she might possibly make a living out of it and

to keep a relative of hers who was there with her. I may say that previous to this and before the death of her mother the license was transferred to a man named Glynn. She pressed me to buy, and said, of course, I could afford to pay the money, and she would rather give me the preference. I suggested she should sell probably to Mr. Henne, but there seemed to be some misunderstanding between them, and she did not seem desirous of having any transaction with him. I do not know why; perhaps because he was an opposition publican. After consulting my wife I decided on buying the business for a sister-in-law that I had, but on further considering the matter I abandoned that idea. I told her to consult her brother-in-law, who was in the neighbourhood, and her sister, and she told me she would consult Mr. Gibson, solicitor, who was also a friend of hers. She sent for Mr. Gibson to Hokitika, and he came up there in a trap, and in his presence I agreed to give Miss Conway £135 free of all costs of transfer and transmission.

292. Who was to pay these costs?—I was—all costs. In fact, it was understood I was to pay them and to buy the glasses and other things she had in the bar. Altogether it cost me £147.

293. When you made that bargain in the presence of Mr. Gibson was that for yourself?—For myself.

294. *Mr. Poynton.*] At that time you had abandoned the idea of buying it for your sister-in-law and bought it for yourself?—Yes.

295. *Mr. Hannan.*] Did you pay any deposit?—I gave her a cheque for £20 of a deposit in the presence of Mr. Gibson.

296. You heard Mr. Henne giving some evidence as to a conversation about £160: when did that happen?—Immediately after I paid the £20 deposit; I think that afternoon I told him I could sell him the good-will. I might mention he had often before that spoken to me about closing up the hotel. I told him then I wanted £170.

297. And what for?—For the billiard-table, for the good-will of the house, and, of course, the license to be cancelled at once. He said he would give me £150, and I think it was the next evening or the evening after that—at all events, we met again, and he said he would give £160.

298. Did you agree to accept that?—Yes.

299. Was any deposit paid?—Henne gave me £20 deposit.

300. Was any receipt given for that deposit?—Yes; I gave him a receipt in my own name.

301. Can you produce the block of your cheque?—No; but I can produce the receipt from Miss Conway for the £135. It is dated the 4th August, 1896, and is as follows: "Stafford, 4th August, 1896.—Received from Mr. Daniel Hannan the sum of £135 (one hundred and thirty-five pounds) sterling, being payment in full for purchase of Excelsior Hotel, billiard-table and furniture, section, &c.—K. CONWAY, executrix C. Conway." Here is another receipt from the solicitor for another £2 for costs of transmission.

302. Did you get any receipt for the deposit?—I did, but I could not find it on the file when I looked for it.

303. *The Chairman.*] You say you paid £20 by cheque; have you got the block of that cheque in your possession?—I must have it in my possession, but I have not got it here.

304. On the same day you say you gave the receipt for £20 to Mr. Henne?—Yes.

305. When did you get the receipt for the £20 paid to Miss Conway?—Some time in July, because the cheque was on the Bank of New Zealand at Hokitika.

306. Was the cheque drawn in July?—Yes; in addition to that there was another receipt for £5 which I could not find this morning.

307. *Mr. Hannan.*] You heard Mr. Henne say he paid £20 before the purchase was completed; is that about right?—Yes.

308. Then, your £20 deposit was paid a couple of days before you sold to him?—Yes.

309. Then, according to that receipt on the 4th August you paid £135 and took a receipt for the lot?—Yes.

310. Then, you received your money from Henne after your purchase?—Yes, on the 7th August, 1896.

311. Then, you completed all the purchase with your own money?—Yes.

312. And you resold to him afterwards?—Yes.

313. I see the transfer which was produced by the District Land Registrar purports to be for £45; was that an apportionment for the purposes of the Stamp Duty Act, or did you buy the lot for £135?—Yes.

314. Who fixed the sum of £45 as the amount to be mentioned in the transfer?—Mr. Gibson, in Hokitika.

315. And that was an apportionment for the purpose of the Stamp Duty Act?—Yes.

316. And after you completed your purchase on the 4th August you had an interview with Mr. Henne in the presence of Mr. Byrne; where was that at?—At Stafford.

317. Was anything said in regard to the price you gave to Miss Conway, or was any complaint made by him?—He said he wanted to get a guarantee from me of £100 that the place would not be reopened, and I said, "Certainly, of course," and I gave him a guarantee.

318. Do you recollect if there was some complaint in regard to the purchase-money or in regard to the property?—Yes; the same day Mr. Henne and Mr. Byrne came to me, and he said he was dissatisfied, and said he understood I bought it cheaper, and I said, "Yes; if you are dissatisfied I will give you back the £20 deposit," in the presence of Mr. Byrne. That was before the deed was completed. He said so long as the place was closed he was perfectly satisfied.

319. Did he know before he paid that balance of £140 that you had purchased the sections and buildings and other property?—Yes.

320. And he was not to get them?—Yes.

321. Were they of any value or of any use? How much would you say?—Practically valueless.

322. What did you do with the building?—I pulled it all down except a portion of the roof.
323. And turned it into a dwelling-house?—Yes.
324. The license was cancelled immediately you completed with Miss Conway?—Yes; it was cancelled before I signed that deed with Mr. Henne. There was an indorsement on the license by Miss Conway surrendering it for cancellation.
325. *Mr. Poynton.*] I thought you said it was in the name of another man?—So it was, but it was never registered to him. The transfer was prepared before her mother died, but it was never put through.
326. *Mr. Hannan.*] When you purchased in the first instance from Miss Conway you said you purchased it for yourself?—Yes.
327. And were you acting in the transaction in regard to that purchase for Mr. Henne as agent for him?—Certainly not.
328. You purchased it for yourself?—Undoubtedly.
329. *The Chairman.*] Had he requested you to buy it for him?—He spoke to me some time before that, but I told him she would not sell to him.
330. He said he asked you to buy it for him, and not to mention his name in the matter?—He did, but at the time when he asked me that I had the transaction almost completed in my own name.
331. Did you communicate that to him?—I did not.
332. Did you say it was subsequent to your paying the £20 deposit by cheque that he asked you to buy it for him?—No; but he had been speaking to me about buying it for him before that, and that he was anxious to buy it. He wanted to close the hotel.
333. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Then, Mr. Henne's statement is untrue when he says that he saw you first, and asked you to go and see Miss Conway before you had spoken to Miss Conway yourself?—I had certainly spoken to Miss Conway, and she had spoken to me before Henne did.
334. You heard what Mr. Henne said—that he asked you to go and see Miss Conway, and you went and saw her and told him the result of your visit to her?—I knew well from Miss Conway that she would not sell it to him.
335. Did you tell him that at first?—I did not.
336. Why?—Because I did not care about creating enmity between them.
337. Did you go back to him and say you had seen Miss Conway, and that she would not sell it under £170?—I did not say she would not sell it; I said it could not be bought under £170.
338. Bought from whom?—I did not say from whom.
339. *Mr. Poynton.*] That was after you knew it could be got for £135?—Yes.
340. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You said you would not care to deceive Miss Conway by making any untrue representation to her?—No, I would not.
341. You had not the same scruple in regard to Mr. Henne?—I do not know that I made any false representations to Mr. Henne.
342. He said you promised to go and act for him?—He may be under that impression.
343. Were you not misrepresenting the matter to Mr. Henne at that time?—I do not think so.
344. Did you not understand that Mr. Henne was of opinion that Miss Conway wanted £170, and not you?—I do not know what he might have understood. He did not ask whether she wanted it or I. I told him it could not be bought under £170.
345. You did not tell Henne you had purchased it and you would not sell it under £170?—I did not.
346. Then, in a measure you were deceiving Mr. Henne, or allowing him to deceive himself?—He may have been under that impression.
347. You say you saw him immediately after deciding to purchase from Miss Conway?—Yes.
348. Did you go and see him?—No; we often met on the street.
349. And you paid Miss Conway £20 the day before you got the deposit from Mr. Henne?—Yes.
350. And you completed the purchase with Miss Conway three days before Mr. Henne completed the purchase of the good-will with you?—Yes.
351. You say when you first bought this from Miss Conway you had an idea of buying it for your sister-in-law?—Yes.
352. If Mr. Henne had not taken this place off your hands, what should you have done with it?—I probably would have had to close it up.
353. You know perfectly well you would, or else have given up the Police Force?—I know that.
354. Then, you were prepared at that time to pay £135 and all costs for a place you might have had on your hands, and which was perfectly worthless?—I knew very well I could get a big portion of my money for the billiard-table and lamps. The billiard-table was probably worth £80 or £90.
355. Well, assuming the billiard-table was worth £80 or £90, where were you to get the balance of the £135 and costs from?—I would have to suffer the loss.
356. And you were prepared to do that?—Undoubtedly.
357. There was no previous arrangement between you and Mr. Henne, and you were prepared to run the risk of losing the difference between £80 or £90 and this £147?—I had to risk that.
358. On what terms were you going to allow your sister-in-law to take this place?—She might have paid me back any way she pleased, but, of course, when I came to consider that she was living there I saw it would be impossible for her to run the hotel.
359. It passed out of your mind as quickly as it came in?—Not quite as quick.
360. You know the licensing-laws, and that a policeman cannot have an interest in an hotel?—Yes.

361. Was your sister-in-law prepared to buy out your interest right off?—Yes.
362. Did you ever consult your sister-in-law?—I did.
363. What is her name?—Mrs. Fitzgerald.
364. Where does she live?—At Hokitika.
365. Is your sister-in-law married?—Yes.
366. Then, you were purchasing for her husband?—Yes.
367. Did you lead Miss Conway to understand she could not hold a license?—Never.
368. What age was she?—About twenty-three or twenty-four.
369. As a matter of fact, there would have been no difficulty in getting the license transferred to her?—I think so; a single woman cannot hold a license under the present Licensing Act.
370. Your belief is that a single woman cannot hold a license?—Yes.
371. But you say you did not lead her to believe so?—No.
372. Although you had it in your mind?—Undoubtedly, I knew it.
373. If she had asked your advice you would have told her she was not eligible?—She had better advice than mine; she had the solicitor's advice.
374. Where is that solicitor now?—I believe in Western Australia. I do not know where he is.
375. What do you consider the value of that land on which the house stood?—Practically nothing.
376. Is it worth £10?—It is not.
377. You pulled the whole building down?—Every particle except a portion of the iron on the roof and a portion of the front.
378. You do not mean to say you pulled every particle of the building down: what supported the roof?—The new studs, of course.
379. *The Chairman.*] Did you repair the building?—It was practically built afresh.
380. Then, it was never demolished?—Yes, except the front, which was about three years old. The flooring, walls, and ceiling were all pulled down.
381. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you think your position as a police officer is in any way prejudiced by your traffic in publichouse property in the place in which you are living?—I did not consider it was.
382. Do you now on reflection?—Perhaps if it was happening over again I would not do it, but certainly I saw no more harm in doing it than in buying land from her mother.
383. *The Chairman.*] This transaction with Miss Conway took place side by side with your transaction with Mr. Henne?—Yes.
384. You were living on good terms with Miss Conway?—Yes.
385. And you wished to do the best you could for her?—Yes.
386. Did you let her know what you were selling to Henne for?—No; I did not.
387. Did she know you were selling to Henne?—I believe she did, but not at the time I made the bargain with her.
388. And the result was she sold to you, and you sold to another at a profit?—Yes.
389. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say Mr. Henne told you in the first place he would like to buy the property after Miss Conway's mother's death?—Yes.
390. Did you agree to buy it for him?—No.
391. Did you see Miss Conway about selling it to him?—I do not know that I asked her if she would sell to him, but in the course of conversations I could gather from her that she would prefer not to sell it to him.
392. Did you ask her whether she would sell to him?—I suggested, I believe, in the beginning to sell to him.
393. Was that in consequence of his having asked you to buy it for him?—I do not know whether it would be before he spoke to me or not.
394. Does it not strike you as rather a coincidence, that he should want to buy the property, and that you should go to her and suggest that he would like to have the property?—I believe I did suggest it; but, as I told you, she would not sell the property.
395. Will you say whether Henne did or did not, at that time when you spoke to her, ask you to buy it for him?—I would not be able to say positively.
396. Was there any other deed between you and Miss Conway in reference to the other property, besides the land?—No, except the transfers and the receipt.
397. *Mr. Poynton.*] How long have you known Miss Conway?—About twelve or fourteen years.
398. Her mother was dead less than a month when this transaction took place?—Yes.
399. Are you sure she was twenty-three years of age?—I believe so.
400. You knew Henne was anxious to get this property before you made any agreement with her?—He expressed that opinion to me before I had any transaction with Miss Conway about it.

FREDERICK JOHN SIMON CHARLES HENNE recalled.

401. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What did you consider the value of the billiard-table you purchased?—I reckon between £40 and £50.
402. As a matter of fact, have you since sold it?—Yes.
403. And what did you get for it?—£45.
404. You think you got a very good price for it?—Yes.
405. *Mr. Hannan.*] You already had a billiard-table?—Yes.
406. This one was useless to you?—Yes.

ROBERT VINCENT MCGLONE, examined on oath.

407. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Reefton.
408. What do you wish to bring before our notice?—I wish to bring under your notice certain facts in connection with a fine, and indorsement on my defaulter's sheet, in consequence of the alleged ill-treatment and neglect of the troop-horse at the Greymouth Station in April last.
409. What do you wish to say about it?—I returned from Barrytown, which is situated twenty-five miles from Greymouth, where I had been on mounted patrol, in the evening, and I noticed that the horse was lame, and slightly puffed in the fetlock of the near fore-leg. I bathed the leg, and applied Elliman's embrocation to the joint. After doing the horse up for the night, I did not see him any more until the next morning, and then I found that the fetlock-joints of both near legs were very much swollen. I obtained a bucket of hot water, and after bathing both the affected joints I applied some more embrocation. At the time this was being applied there was a youth present, a prisoner named Arthur East, and he assisted me to apply the embrocation. About 3.30 the same afternoon I took the horse to the farrier to have him shod. Mr. Tanner, the farrier, was not there, but I left the horse in charge of his son, instructing him to shoe him. I went on beat duty, and returned to the station at a quarter to 5 o'clock, where I saw Sergeant White, who handed me a memorandum written by Mr. Inspector Pratt, calling upon me to explain how the troop-horse became lame, and also why I had failed to report the matter. Acting on these instructions, I furnished a report; and on the following morning I appeared before the Inspector in his office, where he had my report, and he asked me if that was all I had to say in the matter; and I replied, Yes. He then informed me that I was fined 5s. for failing to report the horse being lame, at the same time stating that he did not think I treated the joint as stated in my report, because he had rubbed his hands on the joint and after smelling them could not detect that embrocation had been used; and he informed me he would report the matter to the Commissioner on that charge. Some days later I was again taken before the Inspector, and he informed me that in consequence of his indorsement on my report the Commissioner had decided to severely reprimand me. I asked Mr. Pratt to explain how the Commissioner had arrived at that decision on the face of my report. I do not recollect what the Inspector replied. I then asked Mr. Pratt to allow me to see the correspondence, and stated my intention of asking the Commissioner to reconsider his decision. He declined to allow me to see the correspondence. On making a second request the Inspector at length consented to read his remarks which appeared on my report; and, amongst other things, it was stated that the farrier had said to Mr. Pratt that he considered that the injuries were the result of ill-treatment at my hands. I saw the farrier, and asked him if he had made that statement to the Inspector, and he denied it. I again waited on Mr. Pratt, and asked him if he would allow me the correspondence, so that I could ask the Commissioner to reconsider the punishment he had inflicted, and Mr. Pratt replied, "What I have already said is final; you cannot have the report." That is what I have to complain of. I consider I have been very unfairly treated in the matter, and, as Mr. Tanner is still residing in town, I would like him to be called; and I would also like, if possible, the boy East to be called.
410. *Colonel Hume.*] I fail yet to learn what your grievance is. Is your grievance that you were fined 5s. by the Inspector, or that you were severely reprimanded by me?—Both of them.
411. Then, we will take the fine of 5s. by the Inspector. Did you plead guilty before the Inspector?—I was never called upon to plead.
412. You will swear you did not plead guilty?—I will; and further, I was not called upon to plead.
413. When you came home you found the horse's leg was puffed?—Yes.
414. And you proceeded to put some embrocation on?—Yes.
415. And next morning you got a boy to help you?—Yes.
416. Where was the boy?—This boy was a prisoner confined in the lock-up; and in the morning when I went to the stable I passed the lock-up, and I asked him if he would like to come out and have some fresh air; and he said "Yes," and we went over to the stable together.
417. That was the morning after you came in?—Yes.
418. Did you report that night when you came in that the horse had swelled fetlocks and was knocked up?—No.
419. Why?—Because it was a very common thing for the horse to come in in the same way; and I always, when these occasions arose, applied the remedies which I have stated, and they usually had the effect of reducing the swelling. Therefore, on these grounds, I did not report the matter.
420. When did you send in this report to the Commission, that you wanted to come forward about this?—I did not send in a report.
421. You came forward just now?—Yes.
422. Did you ask Inspector Pratt to allow you to bring this farrier forward, after the farrier told you that he had not told the Inspector what the Inspector said?—I did not.
423. Why?—Because I did not think it was any use.
424. And I suppose you did not think it would be much use to see the Commissioner about it?—I had nothing to go on but my memory, and I did not think it was any use mentioning the matter.
425. I was down here a month after, and you did not think it a serious enough matter to bring before me then?—If it was not for the fact of this Commission sitting here I would never have brought it forward, because I knew it was no use my doing so. I was taken off mounted duty and placed on night duty. I resigned mounted duty because I did not think my position in the Force was safe.
426. *Colonel Pitt.*] Safe, in what way?—Because the horse was continually going lame.
427. *Colonel Hume.*] What were you fined for?—I do not know.
428. Neglecting to report the horse lame?—The horse was lame repeatedly.

429. And you should have reported it repeatedly, and as often as the horse went lame?—It all depends on the circumstances.

430. Then, you admit to the Commissioners that you neglected to report the horse lame?—I did not report him lame.

431. And that is what you are fined for?—Yes; and I consider in the face of my report I am unfairly dealt with.

432. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] How long did you ride the horse?—About twelve months.

433. Was the horse at Greymouth when you were first mounted?—It was in the station before I was mounted.

434. How long had the horse been here when you came?—About eight months.

435. What was the condition of the horse when you first took charge of it?—It was always weak in the joints.

436. On this occasion did you meet with any accident to the horse?—No. I might state that the road between Greymouth and Barrytown is without doubt one of the roughest roads in New Zealand.

437. Did the horse go lame from the first time you rode it?—I think he got injuries in the paddock, and was laid up; and then he cut his foot, and was laid up. This was a swelling in the leg.

438. *The Chairman.*] When did you first observe these joints swelling?—From the time I was mounted; off and on.

439. Did you at any time report the horse as lame up to the time of this punishment?—I did report him lame on one occasion.

440. Did you understand it was your duty as constable in charge of that horse to report to your sergeant when he did go lame?—This was the position: there was very little mounted work done on the station, and after every journey I used to notice the joints a little puffed and swollen, and I simply used to bathe them and apply embrocation. Then they were right again in a day or two. I did not think it was anything serious.

441. On this particular occasion it became very serious?—I did not notice him more than usually lame; but it transpired afterwards he was lame for some considerable time, owing to that swollen joint.

MICHAEL MCKEEFRY, examined on oath.

442. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Second-class constable, stationed at Greymouth.

443. *Constable McGlone.*] Do you remember about the 7th April last year?—I do not remember the date, but I remember the fine, and reprimand, and what occurred before that.

444. You might just state what you know about it?—I heard the evidence of Constable McGlone, and I can remember the morning that young East was in the lock-up. I went to give him his breakfast somewhere about 8 o'clock, and I found him in the stable with Constable McGlone. Constable McGlone drew my attention to the horse, and asked me if I thought it would be anything worse than it usually was, and he asked me if my wife had any hot water. I said Yes, and went across and got some for him. He bathed the horse's leg, and I think young East said he knew something about horses, and he said he would rub on the embrocation.

445. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did you see him rub on the embrocation?—Yes.

446. *The Chairman.*] Did you form any opinion as to the condition of the horse?—I said it looked very bad. I had known the horse since it was bought. After a journey it always went lame, or the next day it would be lame with puffed joints. He is a horse rather keen and light for the work required of him.

447. You saw the hot water and embrocation rubbed in?—I did. I waited to take young East back to the lock-up.

448. *Colonel Hume.*] What was your reply to McGlone, when he asked if the horse was worse than usual?—I do not remember saying it was anything worse than it used to be, but I said it looked bad.

449. You did not think it was worse than usual?—We had been used to him being bad.

450. Did you see Constable McGlone rub any embrocation on the horse?—No; I stopped there until the boy had finished, and then I took him back to the lock-up. I saw McGlone bathe the horse's leg with hot water.

EDWARD STERLING WHITE, examined on oath.

451. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—First-class sergeant, stationed at Greymouth.

452. *Constable McGlone.*] Were you present on the morning when I was taken before Mr. Pratt in his office in connection with this matter?—Yes.

453. Did you hear me ask the Inspector for the correspondence?—Yes.

454. And what was his reply?—I think he said "No." He said he would read it over to you, and he read it.

455. Had I to ask him more than once before he consented to read it?—I know when you asked him first he said "No;" and afterwards said he would read it, which he did.

456. And I did not get the correspondence?—No, not in my presence.

457. *Colonel Hume.*] Is that the usual way of dealing with matters of that sort: when a constable asks for the papers they are usually read to him?—Well, I have seen on many occasions where constables have asked for papers relating to themselves and they have been forwarded to them.

458. Is it usual for an Inspector when he has the papers in his hand for him to read them to the constable?—My experience of the matter is this: When a constable is before the Inspector the

charge is read out to him, and he is asked what he has got to say; and if he pleads not guilty to it then evidence is called.

459. Did he ask for the file of papers, or for what?—If my memory serves me right, all he said was that he would like to see the correspondence.

460. Do you consider it was a neglect of duty in his not reporting the lameness of the horse on this particular night?—As a rule at the station, I would consider it the duty of the constable to report any injury that occurred to the horse.

461. If the horse had been urgently wanted that night he would not have been in a fit state to go?—No.

462. Consequently there would have been great difficulty if he had been suddenly ordered out through the night?—Provided there was not another horse to be got.

463. Therefore it was a clear neglect of duty in not reporting the matter?—If he had brought the horse home unusually lame it was his duty to report it.

464. *Constable McGlone.*] Have I reported verbally to you on many occasions that the horse was slightly lame?—I know for a fact that the horse was not a sound one by any means.

465. Colonel Hume made some reference to the horse being able to go out again that night. As officer in charge of the station, and knowing that the constable had ridden that horse twenty-five miles on such a road as the Barrytown Road, would you order him out again?—It all depends on the nature of the case—if it was an urgent or serious case.

466. *The Chairman.*] Has the horse been reported to you on previous occasions as lame?—The horse was always more or less lame. I did not consider the horse to be a sound horse.

467. Was it within your knowledge that whenever he came off a journey he came off more or less lame?—As a rule he did.

468. Under these circumstances, did you consider it the duty of the constable who rode it to report every time he came in lame?—I do not think it would be his duty to do so unless there was something serious.

469. The normal condition of the horse was lame?—I never considered the horse a sound horse.

470. *Colonel Hume.*] You say you were present when this case was investigated?—Yes.

471. Were you present when this constable had to plead guilty or not guilty before the Inspector?—I cannot exactly tell you what occurred; but I know he was reported for it, and the Inspector had him before him, but I cannot say whether McGlone pleaded guilty or not guilty; but my impression is this: that if he had pleaded not guilty the matter would have been inquired into, and evidence must certainly have been taken.

472. *The Chairman.*] Was it the practice of Inspector Pratt in all cases to say to a man, "Do you plead guilty or not guilty?"—No; sometimes he would say, "What have you got to say to this?"

JOHN TANNER, examined on oath.

473. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A farrier, living at Greymouth.

474. *Constable McGlone.*] Do you remember my speaking to you, some time in April last, in connection with the troop-horse being lame?—Yes.

475. Had you a conversation with Inspector Pratt in connection with that matter?—Yes.

476. Will you repeat that conversation?—I had a look at the horse, and I told the Inspector that the horse was gone in the back tendons, and was inclined to be that way before the Force ever got him. In the first place, the horse had very large wind-galls in the fetlock; he had a little bit of an enlargement of the bone just below the fetlock; and I told the Inspector that the horse had no right to be in the service, and that he was not fit for the job. He has the same ailments to this day.

477. Do you consider he was at any time fit to be a troop-horse?—No.

478. Did you state to Mr. Inspector Pratt, in your conversation, that the injuries were the result of ill-treatment?—I do not remember ever saying that.

479. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider the injuries you have mentioned were the result of ill-treatment?—No.

480. *Constable McGlone.*] Does the horse show any signs of having foundered?—No.

481. Has he a splint on his leg?—It is hardly a splint; but he had a nasty enlargement of the bone, caused by tapping in the shoeing, before the Force bought him.

482. *Colonel Pitt.*] When the Government bought him, was that horse in a fit condition to pass a veterinary examination?—No, nobody would pass him as a sound horse.

483. *Colonel Hume.*] What was this horse doing before the Government bought him?—He belonged to a farmer up country, who sold him to Mr. Duncan McLean.

484. What work was he doing?—He used to come down once a month just walking behind cattle.

485. Did he go dead lame after going a mile?—I cannot say.

486. When did you first notice that he had these wind-galls?—It was when Mr. McLean had him that I first noticed them. I used to shoe him. The horse was bought before McGlone was in the Force.

487. Did you ever have any conversation with McGlone before you had this conversation with Inspector Pratt?—No.

488. So that it was at McGlone's request that the Inspector sent for you?—I went to see him on my own account, because I thought they might blame me for bad shoeing.

489. When did you have your last conversation with McGlone, yesterday or to-day?—I had none.

490. How did you come to the Court?—I was brought here.

491. But you have had no conversation with any one about the matter?—No.

492. You are perfectly certain you had that conversation with the Inspector?—Yes.

493. *Mr. Poynton.*] Knowing the horse as you do, and knowing the Barrytown Road, do you think that horse could be expected to carry a heavy man there and back or along that road without showing signs of lameness?—It is most likely he would show signs of lameness, because he was not a sound horse. A journey like that would soon knock him up, because he was not fit for the work.

ANTHONY ISEMONGER, examined on oath.

494. *Colonel Hume.*] You are District Clerk at the Greymouth Police Station?—Yes.

495. You enter offences in constables' defaulters' sheets?—Yes.

496. There is an offence entered against Constable McGlone on the 6th April, 1897, and it is stated in this sheet in your handwriting that he pleaded guilty. Is that so or not?—That is an entry made on instructions from the late Inspector Pratt.

497. You were not present at the interview?—No.

FRIDAY, 6TH MAY, 1898.

JOHN CULLEN, recalled.

1. *The Chairman.*] How many licensed houses are there in the district?—Twenty-two in the borough.

2. And in the outskirts?—There are none in the immediate outskirts.

3. Do you know what the population was at the last census?—3,090.

4. What is the nearest licensed house outside the borough?—Two or three miles out on the Hokitika Road. There is one thing which I omitted to say yesterday, and that is, that I think all members of the Force and their wives should be disfranchised.

5. Do you think disfranchisement would be willingly accepted by the Force?—I do not know about willingly, but I think it would be better for the Force if we were not allowed the franchise; and I would certainly include wives with their husbands. I have heard of one instance where the wife of a constable took a prominent part at a political meeting, by either moving or seconding a vote of thanks to the member for her district, when he addressed his constituents in her locality.

MICHAEL MCKEEFRY, examined on oath.

6. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—I am a second-class constable, stationed at Greymouth. I represent the men on this station; and the suggestions I would make would be: First, that free uniforms be supplied—namely, a tunic, two trousers, two pairs boots, two helmets, a mackintosh every two years, and a greatcoat and leggings every three years. I would suggest a change in the style from the present to something like a Norfolk jacket, with a belt of the same material, and bronze buttons and badges instead of the lighter metal, as the latter betray the presence of a policeman at night; also free quarters, and a lodging allowance of not less than 1s. per day be allowed to married constables. That would be similar to the amount allowed in the New South Wales Force at the present time. That saloon passages be allowed to constables travelling on small coastal steamers; that, if any, a small deduction be made annually from the men's pay to go towards a pension fund—I do not think more than 2½ per cent. at the very most. If a man is dismissed, he should be allowed the surrender value of his contributions as computed by insurance companies in the matter of insurance policies, and if he is discharged or resigns he should receive the total sum he has paid into the fund; and that length of service and not age should entitle a man to a pension. Now, at present, if a married constable goes relieving, he is allowed £1 1s. per week, and a single constable 10s. 6d. per week. The old circular, dated "5/91," allowed £1 15s. per week, I think. You cannot live on this coast under £1 per week. We think that leave of absence should be allowed to accumulate up to three years—that is thirty-six days; and that when a constable is on leave he should be allowed a pass on the Government railways the same as railway employes get now. Promotions at present are too slow, and give no encouragement to the men. Speaking as regards myself, at the rate of promotion I have experienced, a man joining at twenty-five, would be seventy-five when he attained to the rank of first-class sergeant, and he would be receiving then 9s. 6d. per day, and he would have served fifty years. I have only had one step in ten years.

7. How should promotions be made?—I think a man should get 7s. per day to start with, and he should not get less than 9s. when he attains to the rank of first-class constable. Less pay than that will not keep a man out of debt. I am in favour of rewards or records of merit being given for acts of bravery instead of promotion. I think a Government doctor should be provided, or that the doctor's expenses should be paid by the department in cases of sickness—that is, free medical attendance. In regard to the disfranchisement of the police, I do not object to be disfranchised so long as all other Government employes are disfranchised too; but I cannot see why constables only should be disfranchised. That opinion is shared by some members of the Force here, but I do not know about other parts of the colony.

8. *Colonel Pitt.*] What about the mounted men's uniform?—I think the same should apply to all. I think mounted men should get their uniforms free.

9. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that classes should be done away with, and that constables should be paid according to seniority instead of classes?—I think that would be better than at present.

10. *Colonel Hume.*] You say that constables ought to begin at 7s. per day. What class of persons would you place in the same position as constables—daily labourers or skilled mechanics?—Say labourers.

11. What does a labourer get a day?—Some get 10s. and some 9s., and some I know are making 13s. per day.

12. How long is he paid for?—Six days.

13. Then, of course, they do not get medical attendance or pensions?—No.

14. And are liable to be out of employment at any time?—Yes.

15. Does it strike you, or the other constables, what sum would require to be placed on the estimates if all these recommendations were carried out?—I have not gone into figures.

16. Does it strike you that there are five hundred applicants for the Police at the present rate of pay, and without pensions, and without the other things?—No. When I joined there were over a thousand applicants.

17. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You recommend Norfolk jackets with outside pockets?—Yes.

18. Do not you think you would be likely to have the pockets torn by drunken prisoners, and that they would get hold of the band?—No.

19. *The Chairman.*] Do you realise that a loose coat such as a Norfolk jacket would be inconvenient when dealing with troublesome prisoners?—I do not think so. I do not mean that the coat should be loose; I think a fairly tight jacket would be just as good as the present jumper.

WESTPORT.

SATURDAY, 7TH MAY, 1898.

HENRY GREEN, examined on oath.

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Second-class sergeant, in charge of the Westport Station.

2. When did you join the Force?—In December, 1874.

3. When were you made a sergeant?—In December, 1886, and second-class in February, 1898.

4. How many men have you under you here?—Six men besides myself in the sub-district.

5. In the town how many?—Three, one of whom acts as gaoler and who is not available when there are prisoners in the gaol.

6. What districts are there?—Three—viz., Charleston, Denniston, and Seddonville—with a constable at each station.

7. Have you any mounted men?—No.

8. Are there any district constables?—No.

9. Have you anything to report with respect to the condition or character of the men under you?—No, I have nothing to say respecting them.

10. Do they give you satisfaction?—Yes, generally. I consider them efficient. Speaking of one constable, an elderly man, he is scarcely physically fit for the work he has to do.

11. Is his duty outside duty?—He is stationed at Denniston.

12. The others you report as efficient?—Yes.

13. Have you any suggestion to make with a view to improving the efficiency of the Force or of the police administration here?—In my opinion, another constable is required in the town here. Owing to the peculiar formation of the town it is very difficult to do town patrol efficiently.

14. Have any complaints been made to you by any member of the public with regard to the conduct of the men?—No.

15. Have you any other suggestion?—With the present staff I cannot keep men on night duty. There are only two men I can depend on as available for town duty.

16. Have you any men on night duty?—Only until 1 or 2 in the morning.

17. Do your men do beat duty at the ordinary hours?—Yes, four hours at a time, but occasionally at night they do five or six hours.

18. Have you anything you think you would like to bring under our notice?—No, not locally; generally, as to the cost of living on the Coast, I should like it to be understood that it is considerably dearer than it is in South Canterbury, Timaru, Oamaru, Ashburton, and Otago.

19. What is the difference in the cost?—It must be at least 1s. per day. Everything has to be imported.

20. You know, probably, that in all other places in which we have sat we have directed inquiries with a view to ascertaining the feeling of the Force in respect to a pension scheme: have you any opinion upon that matter?—I think a pension scheme should be formulated, but I think members of the Force retiring should have the option of taking a lump sum or a pension.

21. You would give the option of taking either a retiring-allowance or a pension?—Yes.

22. Have you formed any opinion as to how that pension fund should be created?—I have not altogether, but I think the amounts earned by the police outside the regular pay, such as by being clerks of Court and emoluments of this kind, should go to this fund; and I think in the case of a man dying in the service his widow and family should be entitled to an allowance—a lump sum.

23. When would you make a constable entitled to his pension?—It would depend much on the condition of the man physically. He should retire, at latest, at sixty years of age, and before if he is not physically capable of doing his work. The retiring-allowance is at present very unfair, as a man serving twelve years gets as much as a man who has served thirty years.

24. Do you suggest there should be a varying allowance or a fixed sum for each man?—I think a month's pay for each year of service would be sufficient.

25. Without a limit?—Yes. A man may want to go into business when he leaves the service, and a lump sum would be more useful than a pension.

26. Have you thought out what you are suggesting—taking a man who retires broken down in health, and incapable of doing other work, at sixty years of age, or earlier, and you give him the option of a retiring-allowance of a month's pay for each year of service or a pension—you would give him?—That is what I would do. I would prefer a retiring-allowance to a pension.

27. *Colonel Pitt.*] How often do you think constables and sergeants should be transferred from one station to another?—From five to seven years. I would not leave a man more than seven years in a station unless under very exceptional circumstances.

28. In your opinion, should constables be all of one class or several classes?—Not more than two classes, at all events.

29. What rate of pay do you think should be given to a man on joining?—Seven shillings a day, I think, should be the lowest, and he should be found uniform in addition.

30. How should the pay be increased?—After service.

31. When should it be increased, and at what rate?—At the end of five years he should be entitled to 6d. a day, and 1s. at least in ten years.

32. What should be the maximum pay for a constable?—I think 8s. 6d. is sufficient, and he should receive that at the end of fifteen years—that is, 6d. for each five years of service.

33. Do you think members of the Force themselves will be prepared to agree to a reduction from their pay towards the pension fund?—I do not think they are at present. I do not think at the present rate of pay they could afford any deduction.

34. Supposing the pay was anything like what you have suggested?—Then they should be able to pay a certain percentage.

35. They are insured now?—Yes.

36. And have to submit to a deduction of pay for that?—Exactly.

37. *Mr. Poynton.*] Is there much crime in this district?—It is very free from crime of a serious nature.

38. It is like the whole of the West Coast?—Yes.

39. How many hotels in Westport?—Seventeen.

40. Do you get complaints about Sunday trading?—I have had no complaints.

41. Do you visit the hotels on Sundays?—I do.

42. Periodically?—Generally five or six on a Sunday. I do not go with any regularity, or anything like that. I find the houses well conducted at present.

43. How many hotels in the sub-district?—Ten in the immediate sub-district; in the whole sub-district there are fifty-four hotels.

44. You have had no complaints since you came here about alleged Sunday trading?—No, none to me.

45. How long have you been here?—Eight or nine months.

46. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you had any prosecutions during that time for Sunday trading?—I had one for keeping a house open on Sunday.

47. *The Chairman.*] How many prosecutions have you had for Sunday trading under the liquor-laws?—One for keeping a house open on a Sunday. The man was convicted for selling after prohibited hours, and another charge was withdrawn.

48. *Colonel Pitt.*] Have you had any trouble over larrikinism in this district?—Nothing serious. In reference to travelling on the Coast in small coastal steamers, I think some allowance should be made in the fare between saloon and steerage passages, especially for the wives and families of non-commissioned officers. Women in delicate health have to put up with a great deal of discomfort and inconvenience when travelling in the steerage, and if a constable or sergeant has to pay the difference out of his own pocket it costs him a considerable amount. I paid between five and six pounds coming here from Dunedin.

49. Have you much escort duty here?—No, about a prisoner a quarter, or one in two months, including the asylum and gaol.

50. Do you think a man should be promoted for acts of bravery, such as saving life or extinguishing fires, or should promotion be limited to detection of crime?—Promotion should be limited to the detection of crime, but men might be rewarded for acts of bravery. I think there is nothing like experience, so far as promotion in the service goes.

51. *Colonel Hume.*] You have got on fairly well in the Force; you have been made a sergeant in twelve years?—Yes, I could have been one before; it was offered before.

52. Have you ever used any political influence?—No.

53. Or Masonic or religious influence to get you on?—No.

54. Then, if a man came before the Commission and said, "In his opinion, men in the Force have no show unless they had a Minister behind them, or a clergyman behind them," that statement, so far as your experience goes, would be contrary to your experience?—Yes, but, still, I believe that has been the impression in the Force.

55. You think the Force on this Coast should get some remuneration because living is higher, but living in Westport is not as high as in Naseby where you came from?—Not quite.

56. Then, if remuneration was given here it would have to be given on the Otago Goldfields?—Yes, it is quite as necessary there.

57. You say you think there is a difference of a shilling a day between this place and Canterbury?—Yes, at some stations.
58. But coal is cheaper here is it not?—I think so.
59. And house rent?—I do not know; I do not pay house rent.
60. And constables here get gas free?—Yes, they do here.
61. Do they get light at Naseby?—No.
62. Then, so far as you know, it is exceptional treatment for constables to receive gas here and at Hokitika.—Yes.
63. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are an Inspector of Weights and Measures, Labour Agent, and Inspector of Factories, in addition to your police duties?—Yes.
64. Do you find these offices take up much time?—They do, for a month or two at the beginning of the year especially.
65. Do you fill any other offices?—No.
66. Do you get any extra remuneration for these offices?—No, nothing at all.
67. Does the department get anything for them?—I believe not.
68. You think no deduction should be made from the pay of the police towards a pension?—No.
69. I do not know whether you are aware of the pension system in force at Home or in any of the other services?—No.
70. Do you know that in every case a deduction is made from the men's pay?—Possibly they are paid better than they are here.
71. Have you any opinion as to whether a married constable should be provided with lodging-allowance if not provided with quarters?—I think it is only reasonable, as single men are provided with quarters. I think they should be provided with an allowance.
72. *Mr. Poynton.*] Do you think 6d. per day is a sufficient difference between the pay of a lowest-class sergeant and the highest-class constable?—I do not. Most of those promoted lately must have lost considerably by it; they have had to give up country stations and come to towns and lose their emoluments.
73. *Colonel Pitt.*] Is there a feeling in the Force that political influence has had to do with the men's promotion?—Yes.
74. Have you, within your own knowledge, any instance of that which you can lay before the Commission?—No.
75. Is that feeling in the Force now?—I have not been much in communication with the police since I have been here, but there is a better feeling I am given to understand.
76. What is the feeling?—That the men are more dependent on their ability and service for promotion than they were before.
77. What are the instructions of the police as to the enforcement of the licensing-laws? Are there any special instructions?—I received verbal instructions to enforce the licensing-laws when I came here. The annual leave is at present twelve days, and I think it should be allowed to accumulate for a month or six weeks.
78. *The Chairman.*] The Rev. Mr. Blamires wishes to put the following questions through me: "Have there been any cases of drunkenness among members of the Police Force known to the sergeant during his residence in Westport?"—No, none.
- 78A. "Has the sergeant known during his residence in Westport any case in which the police connected with the Force have been personally interested in sweeps that have been got up?"—Not to my knowledge; I do not know what sweeps are referred to.
- 78B. "I referred to sweeps in connection with races and gambling?"—Not to my knowledge.

EDWARD BROPHY, examined on oath.

79. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Westport.
80. *Mr. Harden.*] You were sent to Seddonville to temporarily take charge of the station there?—Yes, on the 27th May, 1895.
81. How long were you kept out there?—Six months and a day.
82. Did you incur any extra expense in living or otherwise during those six months?—Yes, it cost me a great deal more than usual.
83. How much more per week?—Fifteen shilling per week more at a rough estimate. I was living in the hotel.
84. Did you put down any further sum than 15s. per week?—No.
85. Did you make application to the department for this expense?—Yes, after being there three months I applied for a refund of expenses.
86. What reply did you receive?—I got a reply that they did not consider I was entitled to anything.
87. When you were in town you were provided with quarters and light?—Yes.
88. At Seddonville was there any other place to live at but the hotel?—I slept in the station and boarded at the hotel.
89. In Westport you would get a free house and light, and you pay your own board?—Yes.
90. Then what was the difference at Seddonville?—It cost more to live at the hotel.
91. *Colonel Hume.*] I should like to know on what you base your claim?—I understood under the regulations I was entitled to an allowance when relieving or temporarily in charge of a station.
92. But you were not relieving?—I was in temporary charge, and I understood I was to be there a short time.
93. Can you quote the regulation?—No.
94. You were given a house to live in?—Yes.

95. And not given light?—No.

96. And you have light in town?—Yes.

97. And the only grievance is that living is more expensive in Seddonville than in Westport?—Certainly.

98. Have you ever known men to get a special allowance because living was more expensive at one station than somewhere else?—I have known men when relieving or in temporary charge receiving an extra allowance when called away from their own stations.

99. And given a house to live in?—Yes, relieving at stations.

100. Quote a case then?—I have known constables to be sent from Wellington to Masterton where they have received an extra allowance when away from their station.

101. *Colonel Pitt.*] Who succeeded you at Seddonville?—Constable Baker, from Hokitika.

102. *The Chairman.*] You do not found your claim on any regulation, but rather on merciful consideration?—I think I am entitled to something.

103. But you have not founded your claim on any rule of the service?—It cannot come under the circular, but it ought to.

104. *Colonel Pitt.*] Are you a single man?—Yes.

105. Have you ever known of a single man put in charge of a station?—No; but I was afterwards sent to Denniston, and I was actually relieving there, but I did not make any claim for it after the Seddonville affair.

106. *The Chairman.*] Do you know there is a regulation entitling you to an allowance when relieving?—Yes, but I did not apply because I thought I should have been given the allowance in both cases.

107. *Mr. Harden.*] How long were you at Denniston?—About ten weeks. I went to Denniston on the 29th November, 1895, and I returned to Westport on the 5th February, 1896.

108. Were you relieving constable there?—I took temporary charge there until the other constable came.

109. What expense did you incur there over and above what you would have been put to in Westport?—Just about the same expense as at Seddonville.

110. Who were you relieving?—Constable Godfrey, transferred from Denniston to Hokitika.

ARTHUR HUME, examined on oath.

111. *The Chairman.*] How was it that a single man was put in charge of a station?—The reason that Constable Brophy was put in charge of the Seddonville Station was because we had no married men available at that time, and Seddonville is a place where there has never been a woman in the lock-up and never likely to be one, and it was considered quite safe to send him to a place of that sort.

112. Do you not think it quite reasonable that the constable, knowing the rule that only married men are to be put in charge of a station, should assume, through being in charge under that special circumstance, that he was entitled to the allowance asked for?—I do not think so. I have never been in the habit of giving it. If a man is given quarters we never board him under any circumstances, and the constable had free quarters—viz., the use of the station at Seddonville.

113. Are there any other cases where single men have been put in charge of stations?—Oh, yes.

114. Is there not a similar case to Brophy's where a man has been sent to take charge of a station temporarily and not received any allowance?—Yes.

115. Is there any case in which a man, under similar circumstances, has received additional monetary consideration?—Not under the same circumstances. In the case of a married man going on leave, the man who is said to relieve him would not be able to get into the station quarters, and in such a case he is given lodging-allowance. A bachelor has free quarters in town, and if we give him free quarters wherever he is sent to we consider that is an equivalent.

116. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say you can refer us to many cases where single men have been put in charge of stations?—Yes, for the twelve days' leave, in such cases as that.

117. That is relieving; but is this not a unique case if he is put in charge of a station for six months?—I suppose it is. I could give you the case of a man who was in charge of a station for a couple of years, as there was only one room, but as soon as the station was erected a married constable was sent.

GEORGE HENRY HARRIS, examined on oath.

118. *Mr. Harden.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Westport.

119. Can you give the Commission an instance where you were sent in charge of a station relieving?—I was sent the day before Christmas Day, 1893, to Pahiatua to assist Constable Cooper during the holidays. I remained there until the 5th January, 1894.

120. Did you stay in the police quarters?—No; in the hotel. The constable in charge and his wife occupied the police quarters.

121. Have you ever been sent to a station to relieve the constable in charge when his wife was away as well and you stayed in the police quarters and received an allowance for it?—I was sent to relieve Constable Nestor at Eketahuna for twelve days.

122. Where did you stay?—In the hotel. I had the use of his house if I chose, but I did not like to disturb the furniture.

123. Were you paid?—I was paid for my expenses at the hotel in both of these instances. I received 6s. per day for the first week, and after that £1 15s. per week; that was the allowance at that time. In regard to the annual leave, I think it should be allowed to accumulate up to two or three years. There is one matter which affects me personally that I would like to bring under the

notice of the Commission. I find there is an entry on my defaulter's sheet in which I am reprimanded and cautioned for overstaying my leave, which occurred owing to stress of weather and the boat being unable to get into port. I received no notification that the entry had been placed in my defaulter's sheet, and it is that which I complain of. I had not had leave for two years, and I went on a visit to the South Island, and on returning I left Wellington by the "Wainui," which was due in Westport about 3 or 4 in the morning, and I took it that my leave expired at 9 o'clock that morning, when I fully expected I would be able to report myself. However, owing to rough weather the steamer was unable to cross the bar, and had to lie outside for some hours, and I was unable to report myself until 1 p.m.; for that I was reprimanded and cautioned, but I was not notified that an entry had been made in my defaulter's sheet.

124. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Were you not allowed some privilege before starting?—I was allowed five hours extra.

125. What time in the day did the boat land you here?—One o'clock in the afternoon.

126. What time was she due to arrive?—About 3 or 4 in the morning.

127. Your time expired at midnight on the previous day; you knew very well that the boat had not time to arrive in time to enable you to report yourself when your leave expired?—I suppose that is it.

128. You will recognise that if the police authorities allow a man to regulate his movements to suit his own convenience the public are likely to suffer by it?—I did not regulate my movements according to my own convenience. I had to go as the boat took me, and I had to wait for the boat.

129. *The Chairman.*] We will turn up the papers relating to your case in Wellington, and go into the matter fully there: do you understand that?—Very well, Sir.

THOMAS PHILPOTTS, examined on oath.

130. *The Chairman.*] What is your rank?—Second-class constable, stationed at Charleston. I wish to make a complaint about an entry on my defaulter's sheet in reference to using indiscreet language towards a man named Anthony Marly, when I was charged with using threatening language. This case occurred when I was in Reefton. It was a trivial matter, and I think a reprimand does not always carry an entry in the defaulter's sheet, and I would like the Commission, in its leniency, to remove that entry from my defaulter's sheet.

131. *Colonel Hume.*] How long is it since this happened?—In May, 1896.

132. Have you seen me at Charleston since then?—Yes.

133. Did you say anything to me then about removing this off your defaulter's sheet?—No.

134. You did not think it worth while?—I did not think I would get any satisfaction as you made a record against me.

135. Did not the Inspector consider you had been indiscreet?—He may have thought so, but I was not charged with indiscreet language; I was charged with threatening language—a charge which ought to have been brought before the Stipendiary Magistrate and dealt with. I would like the Commissioners, if they would, to look up the papers in my case, in the hope that they may see their way to remove this entry from my sheet. I would like to refer to the regulation which prohibits, or almost prohibits, a constable who has been tried by a superior officer from appealing. If a constable appeals and his appeal is thought to be frivolous he lays himself open to punishment. Then the question crops up that the authority hearing the appeal may consider it frivolous and make an entry on his defaulter's sheet, and that keeps many constables from fighting for what they consider their just rights. I would suggest that the power of appeal should be set up as in the case of the Civil Service—independent of the Police Force altogether.

136. Before the complaint has been dealt with by the Commissioner or not?—No.

137. How long have you been in the Force?—Thirteen years.

138. Can you tell us of a single instance of the Commissioner being appealed to and holding the matter frivolous and punishing a man for it?—No, I cannot.

139. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You would like an appeal from the decision of the Commissioner or Inspector to the Stipendiary Magistrate or Board?—Yes.

140. Well, suppose you are dissatisfied with their decision, you would like another appeal above them?—No, I would be satisfied.

141. Do you think you would be any more satisfied to abide by the decision of the Stipendiary Magistrate or Board, if against you, than the decision of a Commissioner?—I think a constable would get a far more impartial hearing from anybody not connected with the Force than from anybody connected with it.

NELSON.

THURSDAY, 12TH MAY.

HENRY McARDLE, examined on oath.

1. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your rank?—First-class sergeant, at present in Nelson, and in charge of the sub-district of Nelson.

2. How long have you been in the Police Force?—I joined on the 28th December, 1865—thirty-two years ago last December.

3. What parts of the colony have you served in?—In Westland, Wellington, and Hawke's Bay since the abolition of the provinces. I was stationed in Masterton for six years in 1885, and I returned to Masterton in 1892.

4. How long were you at Masterton on the second occasion?—Four years and about two months.
5. And from Wellington you came to Nelson?—Yes.
6. How many men in this sub-district are there in your charge?—Seven in the city and five outside, exclusive of myself, and two of them are district constables.
7. How far does the sub-district extend?—It extends to Collingwood, and Owen, and Top-house, and half-way to Havelock.
8. Are the men that you have in the sub-district sufficient in numbers, in your opinion, for the duties they have to perform?—They are not.
9. How many more men do you think are required?—At the very least one more man is required in the City of Nelson, and, in my opinion, there should be a station between Lyell and Spring Grove, because it is a very long stretch of country.
10. As to the members of the Force, how many married men have you and how many single men in your district?—Two single men in the whole sub-district; they are in the Nelson Station.
11. In your opinion, are the men in your sub-district competent to perform the duties they have to discharge?—They are; they are good and trustworthy men.
12. Have you any fault to find with any of them?—No, I have had no occasion to report any man in the sub-district since I arrived two years ago.
13. How are the licensing laws enforced in your sub-district?—Strictly and carefully.
14. And have you instructions to the effect that they should be so enforced?—Yes, my last instructions from Colonel Hume were to that effect. My last instructions from the late Inspector Pratt were to that effect.
15. At the various places we have visited we have taken evidence as to a pension scheme for the Police Force: what is your opinion as to that?—I have written upon that subject in 1881, and my opinion is that without a pension scheme there can never be an efficient Police Force. I am in favour of a pension scheme.
16. What do you think should be the pay of the police?—I will say that the present rate of pay is the lowest that the police should be expected to accept if we are to have the men competent.
17. What do you think should be the lowest rate of pay for a third-class constable?—8s. a day.
18. How should it be increased?—I say by 6d. a grade afterwards.
19. How long, and up to what maximum?—Up to 9s. 6d., and it should be increased by competency and good conduct.
20. Do you think there should be an age-limit at which a man should be compelled to retire?—I do not think so. I think some men are as good at sixty as others are at fifty, and as competent to perform their duties at that age.
21. In your opinion, how many classes of constables should there be in the Force?—I think two, the same as in the Royal Irish Constabulary.
22. If the pay were at the rate you suggest, do you think the members of the Force would be prepared to contribute towards a pension fund?—I do believe they would; I would, for one.
23. If the pay were increased to the rate you suggest, should the men have free uniforms?—Yes; we are the only Force in the Australian Colonies that do not receive free uniforms.
24. How often do you think the police should be transferred from one station to another?—It depends. If the constable's conduct in the district in which he is stationed is such that he pleases his superiors and the general public I would say that he should not be removed until otherwise or for misconduct. A man has to be some time in a district before he becomes acquainted with the public and can do his duties as efficiently as when he has been a couple of years in it. I am two years here, and I am scarcely properly acquainted with the public in my district.
25. What is the lowest age, do you think, at which recruits should be taken into the Force?—I think from twenty-three to twenty-five; that is my opinion.
26. Do you think men should be promoted for acts of bravery, or merely for the detection of crime?—Well, I think men should be promoted for general ability in the performance of their duties.
27. And how should acts of bravery be rewarded?—As in the Royal Irish Constabulary, by medals.
28. Or money grants?—I will not say money grants.
29. How many men in your district hold office outside their ordinary police duties?—Four.
30. What offices do they hold?—The constable at Collingwood is Clerk of Court and Receiver of Gold Revenue and bailiff, and holds other minor billets that I cannot remember. Constable Knapp, at Spring Grove, is Clerk of Court and bailiff. The constable at Takaka is Clerk of Court and Receiver of Gold Revenue, and, I think, has lately been allowed to be Inspector of Abattoirs and bailiff. Constable Kelly, of Nelson; is Inspector of Weights and Measures and Inspector of Factories.
31. In your opinion, should any police in the colony hold office under local bodies?—No; I say it is altogether wrong for police to be placed in the position of Clerks of Court or Inspectors of Factories, or any such offices. It takes their mind off their ordinary police duties, and both must generally clash; and the men cannot perform both duties satisfactorily.
32. If the pension fund were established, do you think the emoluments from these outside offices should go to the pension fund?—I should say they should.
33. Do you think they would be willingly relinquished by the police-officers holding such positions?—No, I do not think so.
34. What is your opinion as to the members of the Police Force retaining the franchise?—I could scarcely give an opinion about that, because, for myself, I do not care about the franchise. I do not see that it would make very much difference whether they held it or not, because it is only an individual vote each man exercises.

35. Do you think it would be regarded as an injustice if it were taken away from them?—Yes; I think they would regard it as a very great injustice. It is very much interfering with the liberties of the individual.

36. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have been in the Police Force since 1865?—Yes.

37. Can you tell the Commissioners of any case of political influence by which men have attained promotion or advancement?—I have never known of any.

38. Of course, that includes yourself?—I have never sought it, nor asked for it; and I should never go outside my own department for what I want.

39. Does that also include other influences, such as religious or Masonic?—I never knew anything of that kind.

40. You do not know of men getting promotion or advancement from the influences I have mentioned?—Never.

41. Do you think if the men had the right to vote taken from them that that would relieve them of any suspicion of political influence?—I do not think it for a moment.

42. You do not see why the men should lose their votes more than other Government employés?—No; I think it would look like an insult to the general Force to take the vote from them while other Government employés were allowed to retain their vote.

43. Do you consider the licensing laws effective, or do they require amendment?—I have no reason to say they require amendment, because, under the present licensing laws, so far as the sub-district for which I have charge is concerned, we can manage the licensing laws very well.

44. That is, speaking of Nelson; but, from your experience in other parts of the colony, have you always found it so?—Yes.

45. Have you found any difficulty about the lodgers being on the premises and shouting drinks for men not lodgers?—I did find such in Hawke's Bay at one time.

46. Do you advocate that men found on licensed premises during prohibited hours should be made amenable to the law as well as the licensee?—Yes; if they were not actual boarders and people who had no right to be in the house: I advocate that amendment certainly.

47. Are you familiar with the English Act regulating public-house business?—No, I am not.

48. *Mr. Poynton.*] You lived on the goldfields for some time?—Yes; I have been in Hokitika, Greymouth, Picton, and Charleston.

49. Were you ever in Central Otago?—No; I was not stationed there, but I was there as a miner.

50. Of course, you know the cost of living is much greater on the Coast than in any other part of New Zealand?—Yes.

51. Do you think an allowance should be made to constables living there, having regard to that increased cost of living?—I do. When I lived there I had 1s. a day goldfields allowance, which I find has since been taken away.

52. Do you think the difference in the pay between the lowest class of sergeants and the highest class of constables should be higher than it is?—Yes; it is very small for the difference in rank.

53. Have you thought about a system of examination; I do not mean competitive examination, but that the men should pass an examination before they are promoted to the rank, say, of sergeant?—I believe myself it would be of great benefit if such were the case.

54. Do you think men should be examined as to their knowledge of law, &c.? Are you in favour of a training depot for constables when they join?—Yes, I think it is necessary.

55. Are any of your men instructed in ambulance work?—No.

56. That, of course, would be part of the training in the depot?—Yes; I would be in favour of that.

57. Do you think the class of men obtained from the Permanent Artillery is as good as the old class of constables?—No, I do not.

58. Are you opposed to exclusive recruiting from the Artillery?—Yes, and I always was.

59. *Colonel Pitt.*] You have served in various parts of the colony. Can you tell the Commission whether, in your own sub-district or in any other part of the colony, there is any feeling in the Police Force that members of the Force must look to political influence for their advancement? Is there such a feeling as that in the Force?—Not to my knowledge in any part I have served.

60. Have you any knowledge that such feeling exists in the Force that influence is brought to bear to procure transfers?—Yes, I have known such a thing as political influence holding a man in a station or shifting a man from a station. It has been reported, but I do not know anything of my own knowledge.

61. From your experience, can you say whether there is much reported crime undetected in the colony?—There is much less now than there was ten years ago, although the population is greater.

62. Is there anything you wish to say?—Yes, there are one or two things regarding myself. I find that when the Commission was sitting in Wellington I was accused of conspiracy in the matter of an orchard robbery in Masterton. I find again that the same gentleman accused me of a wilful arrest, or of being the cause of the wilful arrest of a man named Simms. I am prepared to satisfy the Commission upon these matters. As regards the man Simms, I think his case occurred in May, 1894. He was accused of stealing a coat from a man named Manson, of Tenui. At the time the coat was stolen it was a very wet day, and this man Simms came in to see me. I was acting on behalf of the Charitable Aid Board on this occasion, and this man Simms looked very much in need, and I took him to the Charitable Aid Board. I got him tea, bed, and breakfast; and he then asked the Chairman for a passage to Wellington, but was told he could not get one. I brought him back and took him to a

boardinghouse, and left him there. Later in the evening, about six o'clock, when it was dark, I saw him going into the Club Hotel, and that was where Mr. Manson was stopping. I saw him soon after come out, and walk up the street towards the boardinghouse. My reason for watching him in and out of the hotel was that I thought he was going to get a drink. The next morning the coat was reported to me as stolen from the Club Hotel. I went to the boardinghouse and asked where was Simms. They told me he had left very early in the morning—at five o'clock. There were three second-hand shops in the town, and in the third one I found the coat. I asked the dealer how he became possessed of it, and he said that a man I had recommended for the boardinghouse had sold it to him to get money to go to Wellington. I then issued a warrant, and had the man arrested in Wellington. When he left Masterton he had a very long head of black hair and straggling beard. When he returned he had his hair cut short and his beard trimmed close, and he had changed his clothes. When he was brought before the Court the next morning the second-hand dealer was produced, and he had a look at the man and said, "I would say this is the man; but he is so altered with his hair and beard cut that I cannot be sure." I told the Court that I could give evidence that it was the man. The Court said there was a doubt, and gave him the benefit of the doubt, and the case was dismissed. I considered I only did my duty.

63. It has been stated before us that in the Court the second-hand dealer said that Simms was not the man who sold the coat?—He did not.

64. Are you quite positive, that in telegraphing a description of the man, you did not state the man was clean shaved?—I did no such thing.

65. Did not the Magistrate make some remarks, in dismissing the case, to the effect that it should not have been brought on?—He did not.

66. *Mr. Poynton.*] When you brought the man back to Masterton, did you bring him to the second-hand dealer; and what did he say then?—He said that was the man, if his hair was not cut. You must recollect that the second-hand dealer bought the coat in candlelight. The evidence of three or four witnesses was taken in the Court.

67. Was the owner of the coat there?—Yes, he was there, and swore to the coat. I would readily say that, had I been present in Christchurch, Mr. Simms would have had much less to say.

68. Do you know at that time what his occupation was?—Yes, he told me he was a lithographer and printer. That is all I wish to say about that matter. As regards the orchard case, there were very great complaints about orchard robbery, and I took myself and two constables, and we each took a street to watch and detect who was committing these petty larcenies in orchards. We heard a loud calling out of "Thieves!" and the baying of dogs, and we ran in that direction, and when we got there, we met one man jumping over a fence, and he was arrested, and myself and another constable went inside and found another man. I then made a search and I found two bags of plums. I asked both prisoners if they had put the plums in the bags, and they said "Yes." I asked if there were any other persons with them and they said "No." I locked them up for the night, and brought them before the Court in the morning. When the case was before the Court they both pleaded guilty; but for some reason the Court delayed for some considerable time, until a lawyer named Beard came in, and said, "Am I late?" "Very nearly," said Mr. Hutchison. He asked what was the plea, and the Magistrate replied, "Guilty," and he said, "I want to withdraw that." The Court said, "Very well." And the plea of guilty was withdrawn. These two men were remanded, and, on their own recognisances, the case was adjourned for three days. At the end of three days Mr. Beard made a great speech, in which he said the police had conspired to catch these two men. I had never seen the two men before; they had only come to Masterton a little while before. I asked Mr. Beard to produce evidence to that effect. I found the Magistrate was much worse than Mr. Beard. The Magistrate said Mr. Beard was right. I asked, What evidence was there to that effect? and he ordered me to be silent. The result was he was going to dismiss the case, and I said, if he did I would arrest the men again outside the Court. After some conversation the Magistrate convicted the men. He disbelieved the evidence of the two constables and myself. These two men were total strangers to both the constables and myself. We knew no more about them than about any one in this Court just now, but we fully intended to put a stop to orchard robbery, which was very prevalent at the time. I felt very much hurt to know that there was afterwards circulated in the newspapers fully two or three columns regarding the conduct of the Masterton police, and upbraiding them for conspiracy.

69. That was the report of the case?—Yes; but the report of the case did not come out immediately after the case.

70. And in the Magistrate's summing up he made use of some remarks pointing in that direction?—Yes; and I then applied to the headquarters for an investigation.

71. Was there any inquiry?—No, none. I took a copy of the evidence, as given by the two constables and myself, and sent it with the application, and it was perfectly satisfactory as to the action of the police. What hurt me most of all was the action of a paper in Christchurch called the *Prohibitionist*. That paper had these reports circulated in it, and was sent right throughout the colony and posted to the various Stipendiary Magistrates and others.

72. Did you take any action in reference to that?—I did not. I could not take any action without authority.

73. Do you remember that, in the case of a young man who was arrested, one of the young men who was arrested for stealing apples gave evidence that he was in bed and refused to go to the orchard, and was ultimately persuaded to go by some relative of the landlord who was robbed?—Yes, I recollect that.

74. Did not Mr. Beard call the attention of the Court to the fact that it was a peculiar thing that on that Sunday night you and another member of the Police Force were in close proximity to that orchard?—No, he did not.

75. Are you sure of that?—Yes, I am sure of that, because on the Saturday night before I was not in Masterton.

76. You had no knowledge that this boy who was caught in the orchard was going to be there?—I had no knowledge.

77. Evidence was given that the persons there were induced to go there, and that the police knew some one was going to rob the orchard?—It is quite untrue. I wish to say that I think, through the action of the presiding Magistrate then, I was very harshly treated. He knew me perfectly well, and knew I would not exceed my duty, and that it was beneath me to be connected in such a manner in bringing a case before the Court.

78. In what way were you harshly treated?—In reference to the remarks that fell from the Magistrate's lips after he convicted the parties.

79. Had that case nothing to do with your transfer from Masterton?—No, my transfer from Masterton was at my own request.

ROBERT KELLY, examined on oath.

80. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your rank?—Second-class mounted constable, stationed at Nelson.

81. What is the matter you wish to bring under our notice?—I wish to speak as to the annual leave allowed to members of the Force. I think twelve days a year is not sufficient.

82. What do you think it should be?—I think members ought to get at least three weeks.

83. Do you mean in one year, or that the annual leave should be allowed to accumulate?—I think it should be allowed to accumulate, if a person does not want to take his leave in any year.

84. What you suggest is that the leave should be allowed to accumulate—up to how long?—I think the men ought to get three weeks.

85. How long leave should the men have each year?—I might say fourteen days; and if a man did not wish to have it, it should be allowed to accumulate up to three weeks.

86. Is there any other matter you wish to state?—Yes; I am an Inspector of Factories, and Agent for the Labour Bureau, and, of course, I am required to attend to the police duties besides, and a constable cannot attend to police duties and other duties.

87. Does it not appear to you that these outside offices held by constables interfere with their police duties?—Yes, I should say they must.

88. Is that your experience, that it does so in your case?—I cannot say that I have found it so; but I should say it would, because you would not be able to devote attention to police duties that you would otherwise. As a mounted constable here in Nelson for eleven or twelve years, I think it is hard that constables should come from other stations and take fees for the inspection of slaughterhouses which are all within two miles and a half of the town.

89. How does that happen?—Constable Knapp is Inspector of Slaughterhouses for all the principal slaughterhouses in the district. If there are to be fees for the inspection of slaughterhouses, and they are something considerable, I think the appointment of Inspector should be given to the constable at the station nearest to the slaughterhouses, and the mounted man especially.

90. The Inspector of Slaughterhouses is appointed by the local body?—Yes.

JOHN CULLINANE, examined on oath.

91. *Colonel Pitt.*] What is your rank?—Third-class constable, stationed at Nelson.

92. *Mr. Maginnity.*] Have you a full statement as to your case?—Yes; which I now produce, and wrote, as follows:—

To the Gentlemen constituting the Police Commission of Inquiry, &c., sitting in Wellington.
GENTLEMEN,—

Police-station, Nelson, 14th March, 1898.
I most respectfully beg to be allowed to place before you the following facts in contradiction to the untruthful statement made by an ex-constable, named Slight, and to lay before you the cause for which I was compelled to retire from the police in 1890.

Through an accidental injury in the discharge of my duty, I was laid up, and finding I was not recovering so soon as I anticipated, I thought in justice to the department I should retire, and did so. Upon my retirement I received my compensation, but in twelve months after I found myself sufficiently well to rejoin. I met the Hon. R. J. Seddon, Colonel Hume, and A. W. Hogg, Esq., M.H.R. for Masterton, in a room in the Parliamentary Buildings, and was allowed to bring my case, as to my rejoining again, before the Hon. the Premier, who asked me if I could pay back the compensation I had received. I replied, "Yes." The Premier said, "Very well, you can rejoin." I said, "Sir, am I to understand that my former service will be continuous and unbroken?" He replied, "Undoubtedly." Some time after, when I called at Colonel Hume's office, he informed me saying you must join third class. I replied, "If so, then I will lose £36 10s. per year from my former rank; also, loss of station, with free house, as I cannot get charge of a station again as third-class constable"; so I had to accept what I got. I am now six years and six months on as a third-class constable at a reduction of 2s. per diem, and doing duty equally the same as first class, during which period I have received £237 5s. less than I would have been paid had I been able to have remained on at my former rank, and had to pay £20 per year house-rent in Nelson, under which circumstances the country has not lost anything. If allowed to pay the compensation, £139 19s., back, I would have been in receipt of 9s. per diem instead of 7s., probably with free house, and my chance of promotion to sergeant. So that it will be seen, through my unfortunate accident which compelled my retirement, it is I who am the loser, and not the country, as now, if I am leaving, or whenever I may retire, I get nothing whatever. As to ex-Constable Slight's remarks, I most emphatically deny that ever myself and Constable Hattie had any conversation regarding the matter; in fact, I have never served with Hattie, neither have I ever written to him.

Through my unfortunate accident I am now in the unfortunate position of having lost my service, and still remain a third-class constable, which I trust the Commissioners will consider favourably and recommend me to the Commissioner of Police for some slight recognition. I should not have written but for the untruthful statements of ex-Constable Slight, as it might cause an impression to exist in the minds of my superiors and the public that I had wilfully, by some cunning device, robbed the Government.

I have nothing whatever to say against Colonel Hume. When I joined third class the probability is that he was giving me a chance of displaying my knowledge of police and detective skill to the best advantage; but Nelson is the wrong place, in consequence of its freedom from crime of a serious nature, only one case of breaking and robbery from a shop at night since my arrival, which is over five years.

The Officer in Charge Police, Nelson.

JOHN CULLINANE, Third-class Constable, No. 614.

GENTLEMEN,—I am now in this unfortunate position—First, Should I risk my life to save life and property, and succeed in saving same at loss of losing my life, my wife would have to pay burial expenses, &c., or if she was not in a position, the local authorities. Second, If disabled for life I would not get anything. Third, I am doing first-class duty for third-class pay. I am also willing to submit myself to medical examination to show that I received the injuries referred to, and that it would be injurious to me still to do constant mounted duty, but I can ride twenty miles occasionally, and have done so several times in Nelson. The injury does not affect me doing foot duty. I think I am deserving of some credit, and to be able to support five in family for the last five or six years on 7s. a day, reduced to 6s. by paying house-rent, or, in other words, 1s. 2^d. per day to each member of the family, with schooling, clothing, uniform and plain clothes for self, and all the other expenses so well known to all married people. In the absence of a commissioned officer in this district, and Sergeant White who is in charge at Greymouth not knowing me, I would respectfully ask the Commission to be good enough to call on Sergeant McArdle, who is in charge of this station, to say what he thinks of me as a constable, as this is my third time serving under him for the past fifteen or sixteen years.

In Slight's evidence he states that Hattie was one of a combination against him. How is it feasible that Hattie would tell Slight some time after how he succeeded in getting his compensation by unfair means.

JOHN CULLINANE, Constable.

93. I think you wish to amend that statement by stating that the periods should be six years and six months, instead of five years, wherever mentioned?—Yes.

94. Is that your discharge?—Yes, it is dated 27th May, 1890, and signed "J. G. Fox, for the Commissioner of Police," who was Major Gudgeon, at that time. It reads: "Conduct very good, and discharged on account of medical unfitness."

95. You stated in your report that you are strong and healthy for foot duty; that is your present condition of health?—Yes.

96. You are not able to do heavy riding?—No.

97. Is that the result of your former injury when in the service?—Yes.

98. *Colonel Pitt.*] You say Colonel Hume was present when the Hon. Mr. Seddon said that your service would be unbroken undoubtedly?—Yes.

99. When Commissioner Hume said to you, "You must join again as a third-class constable," did you call his attention to that conversation?—I did, by saying, "Colonel Hume, that would be very unfair. I cannot get charge of a station, and I lose £38 10s. a year by it."

100. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You were anxious to rejoin?—Yes.

101. And you know that an exception was made in your case?—Yes, I believe it was.

102. Do you know of any other instance, beside your case and that of Hattie, of men being allowed to rejoin?—I am not aware of them.

103. You made very great efforts, as a matter of fact?—Yes, I think I was justified in doing so.

104. And when you were readmitted to the service you knew you were going back as third-class constable?—I could not help myself; I had received the promise of the Premier to be taken back into the Force.

105. But you were not reappointed until you saw Colonel Hume? It was when you were about to be reappointed you were told you could only be appointed as third-class constable?—When I called in, about a week after the conversation took place between the Premier and Colonel Hume, the latter said I would have to join third class.

106. That is, before you were sworn in?—Yes.

107. And therefore, had you wished to abstain from joining the Force before you were sworn in as third-class constable, you could have done so?—Oh, certainly.

108. Is constable anything more than third-class constable?—I do not know.

109. Do I understand that you desire the Commissioners to consider whether or not you ought to receive another retiring-allowance when you again retire?—If allowed to pay in my former compensation, and my former service is to be continuous and unbroken, I would get compensation on retiring.

110. But you have never repaid it?—I have offered to repay it.

111. You said you were able to perform first-class duty?—Yes.

112. You are performing the ordinary duties of a constable?—Yes, nothing more.

113. A young constable taken on now would be performing the same duties as you?—I do not think so; a young man who had just joined and had received no training would not be able to do the work I do.

114. *Colonel Hume.*] You stated that I was present at an interview with the Premier, and Mr. Hogg, and yourself?—That is correct.

115. In a room in the Parliamentary Buildings?—Yes.

116. I understand you to say that the Premier said you were to be reinstated with an unbroken service, and as a first-class constable?—That is correct.

117. How long had you been out of the service then?—Fourteen or fifteen months.

118. Were you to pay back your compensation?—Yes.

119. And what did I say?—You said nothing there.

120. How soon after that were you appointed?—Four or five weeks, perhaps, afterwards.

121. And were you appointed a first-class constable?—I was not; I was appointed a third-class constable.

122. And did your service count?—No.

123. And did you make any complaint about that?—No.

124. Then, did you go to Mr. Hogg about it?—No.

125. You never sent in any protest, or anything at all?—No, certainly not.

126. Though the Premier had promised in Mr. Hogg's presence that you should join as first-class constable, you quietly submitted to join as third-class constable?—Yes.

127. Now, can you tell me a case where a man was brought back to the service and allowed to count his former service after he had been out of the Force fourteen months?—No.

128. Now, you have seen me very often after this happened?—Yes.

129. Did you ever bring this before me?—No, I did not. I was going to speak to you on two occasions to ask for advancement, but, for some reason or other, I did not do so.

HENRY McARDLE, further examined on oath.

130. *Mr. Maginnity.*] You are the officer in charge of the Nelson Police District?—Yes.
131. Constable John Cullinane is constable under your command?—Yes.
132. How long has he been under you?—I am here two years, and he was here before I came.
133. You have had an opportunity of judging his capability as a constable in the two years?—I had known him previous to coming to this district.
134. Where was that?—In the Wairarapa, at Masterton.
135. How long was he under you there?—About three years.
136. You have known him then as a subordinate of yours about five years?—Yes.
137. Well, now, during the last two years in Nelson, of course you have had ample opportunities of judging of his capability as a constable?—Yes, that is my business.
138. Will you tell the Commissioners if you have found him a competent officer?—I always found the constable a good officer.
139. He is a third-class constable?—Yes, at present.
140. Is the constable, from your knowledge, equal to the duty of a first-class constable?—He was a first-class constable when serving under me in the Wairarapa.
141. And, so far as you know, he is as good now as he was then?—Yes.
142. And is good in his duties?—Yes, he is a capable man as a constable.
143. He has made some important arrests in Nelson?—Yes, one or two in my time. There is one case in which the man is now awaiting trial. He is very smart in effecting arrests.
144. Have you found him good enough for plain-clothes duty?—Yes, I have detailed him for that work several times.
145. Have you found him competent and willing?—Yes, always.
146. You remember when Cullinane had to retire from the service?—I do, but I was then in Hawke's Bay.
147. He was not under you then?—No.
148. Can you tell the Commissioners what, in your opinion, were his chances of success in the service if he had not had to retire from the Force in 1890?—If he continued as capable a man as when he served with me in the Wairarapa, I would say he had big chances for promotion.
149. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What is the present case awaiting trial?—It is a case of forging and uttering.
150. Where was the man arrested?—In Nelson.
151. Was there any circumstance about the case showing any great ability on the part of the constable?—It was the manner in which he traced the man. If it had not been for the constable the person victimised would have known nothing about it; but the constable was keeping a surveillance over this party who is now committed for trial, and it was by the constable explaining something to the person who was victimised that he learned he had a cheque belonging to this man.
152. What were the antecedents of the man the constable had been watching?—Very bad.
153. He had been imprisoned very often?—Yes.
154. And was well known to every policeman here?—No, only to myself and Constable Cullinane.
155. *Colonel Hume.*] You told us Cullinane was a very good duty officer; but what about his physical abilities, has he been sick at all during the past few years?—Once.
156. What was the matter with him?—Influenza.
157. Then you consider that, so far as his physical qualifications are concerned, no mistake was made in bringing him back to the service?—No, I think there was no mistake made in that.
158. *Mr. Maginnity.*] Were you here when that arrest was made for house-breaking and robbery?—No, I do not think I was here.

ARTHUR HUME, examined on oath.

159. *The Chairman.*] I will read the passage in the complaint of Constable Cullinane which has been given as part of his evidence, namely: "Through an accidental injury in the discharge of my duty, I was laid up, and, finding I was not recovering so soon as I anticipated, I thought in justice to the department I should retire, and did so. Upon my retirement I received my compensation, but in twelve months after I found myself sufficiently well to again rejoin. I met the Hon. R. J. Seddon, Colonel Hume, and A. W. Hogg, Esq., M.H.R. for Masterton, in a room in the Parliamentary Buildings, and was allowed to bring my case (as to my rejoining again) before the Hon. the Premier, who asked me if I could pay back the compensation I had received. I replied, 'Yes.' The Premier said, 'Very well, you can rejoin.' I said, 'Sir, am I to understand that my former service will be continuous and unbroken'; he replied, 'Undoubtedly.'" Is that a correct version of the interview at which you were present?—No, it is not, so far as my memory serves me. In the first place, I saw Constable Cullinane as a civilian when I was in Masterton. We had a conversation there, and from what I saw of him I thought he was physically fit for the service, and he asked me to try and get him back into the service. I told him I would take it into consideration and would see what could be done. This interview afterwards, I think, did take place in the Cabinet Room in the Parliamentary Buildings, but I am perfectly certain that Constable Cullinane is making a mistake as to Mr. Seddon saying he would be reinstated as a first-class constable with unbroken service. I certainly cannot remember it.

161. Are you prepared, on your oath, to contradict the version which he has given of that conversation?—I think I am. Yes, it would be such an unheard-of thing that I would have said to Mr. Seddon, "That is impossible, and would establish a precedent."

162. Will you swear that it did not take place?—I would rather not do that. I would rather Mr. Seddon and Mr. Hogg spoke for themselves. For another thing, the result shows that this could not have taken place. If Mr. Seddon had given that order Mr. Cullinane must have been taken on as a first-class constable.

163. *Colonel Pitt.*] In the matter of refunding the compensation, did you understand that refunding the compensation was part of the bargain?—No, I did not understand he was to repay the compensation; as I explained to the Commission in Wellington, there is no such precedent of a man paying back his compensation. I think I showed the Commissioners papers, in Wellington, in which the appointment of Cullinane as a third-class constable was authorised by Mr. Seddon.

164. *Mr. Maginnity.*] That, of course, was after the interview in the Parliament Buildings?—Yes, some time afterwards, because Mr. Hogg wrote after that, and I replied to him and said there was no vacancy.

165. Then, it was possible the Premier changed his mind?—I should think very improbable.

166. Constable Cullinane swore positively to this statement that he has put in his application to the Commissioners. You say you cannot swear that Mr. Seddon used or did not use such words; did you think he did not?—Yes.

167. Can you swear, if the Commissioners wish it, positively, from your own knowledge, that Mr. Seddon did not make the remarks?—I think I can, because simply, in addition to everything else, I should have had to take him on as a first-class constable.

168. I do not mean from surrounding circumstances, but from actual facts; and Constable Cullinane has sworn positively to the statement he has made to the Commissioners. Now, you say you cannot swear positively, but you think his statement is wrong?—Yes.

169. Is it not more likely that Constable Cullinane, who is the most interested party in the matter, would be very much more likely to remember the true circumstances of the case than you?—I do not think so.

KATE CONWAY, examined on oath.

170. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You are a spinster?—Yes.

171. You are now living in Nelson?—Yes.

172. I believe in the year 1896 you obtained by probate on your late mother's will a licensed house at Stafford?—Yes.

173. The name of the house was the Excelsior Hotel?—Yes.

174. Will you kindly state to the Commissioners what took place between yourself and Sergeant Hannan in respect to the disposal of that property?—It was a business transaction between Sergeant Hannan and myself. He bought the house from me and sold it to another person.

175. Did you see Sergeant Hannan first on the matter, or did he go to you?—He came to me.

176. You are not able to give the date when he came to you?—No.

177. Did he suggest to you that you should sell the hotel, or what took place?—I really do not remember whether he suggested it, or whether he knew before that I wanted to sell.

178. Can you remember what took place at the interview: if you can, please state it in your own words?—I do not remember the whole facts of the case, but I know he told me he could find a person who would buy from me.

179. Did he mention the name of the person?—No; I never asked.

180. Did he say anything as to the price?—He asked me what money I would take.

181. Did you name any sum?—Yes.

182. What was the sum you named?—I think the first sum I named was £180.

183. Did you name any other sum at that time?—No, I did not.

184. Then, at that interview, when he left you, it was under the impression that you would accept £180 for the whole property?—Yes.

185. Was anything said to you by Sergeant Hannan as to whether you could get a license to carry on the hotel yourself?—No; I knew I could not get a license myself to carry on the hotel.

186. Did he say anything to you on the subject?—I do not think he did. I do not remember him saying anything.

187. Did you ask him the question about getting a license?—I really do not remember.

188. Then, you saw Sergeant Hannan again?—Yes, nearly every day.

189. What took place at the next interview?—I really do not remember what took place at every interview.

190. When you saw him again what took place as to the price?—I know he gradually beat me down to a much lower sum.

191. Did he say he would not pay you that sum, or that the person whom he thought would buy it would not pay that sum?—He represented to me that he could not get that amount for me, and I heard afterwards—I have no proof of it—that he got much more.

192. Did he say how much he could get you?—Yes.

193. What amount did he name?—I think he said he could get me £140. I am not quite sure of the amount now.

194. Did you consent to take that sum?—Yes.

195. What was the amount you ultimately received from him?—That was the amount; somewhere about that.

196. Did you pay any costs of the transfer, or did he pay all the costs?—I do not remember whether I paid some of them or whether he paid them all.

197. You have no documents at all relating to the transaction?—No; he has the documents.

198. If the document or if Sergeant Hannan on oath says he paid you £135 in cash, would you accept that as the right version?—Yes; I do not remember the exact amount.

199. You are quite clear that the sergeant represented to you that he was not able to get you any more for the hotel than that?—Yes; I am perfectly sure of that.
200. You understood from the beginning that he was not purchasing it for himself, but was acting as the agent for some other person?—Yes.
201. And that it was not his own money he was paying over to you?—Yes, although the cheques he gave me were in his own name.
202. Did he first pay you something on deposit?—Yes, £20.
203. And later on paid you the balance?—Yes.
204. In both cases cheques of his own?—Yes.
205. Did the name of Mr. Henne crop up in any way between yourself and Sergeant Hannan?—I asked him once if Mr. Henne would buy it, and he said, “No” distinctly.
206. You are sure of that?—Yes.
207. Then, it is not right if Sergeant Hannan says he suggested you should trade with Henne yourself, and you said you would not do so?—Sergeant Hannan distinctly told me that Henne would not deal with me at all.
208. *The Chairman.*] Did you ever tell him you would not deal with Henne?—Never.
209. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Did you desire to deal with Henne yourself?—Yes.
210. And were you dissuaded by the sergeant from dealing with him?—Yes; I was kept from him when I could have got a much better sum than I got.
211. You were kept from him by words used by Sergeant Hannan?—Yes.
212. Can you remember the words he used to dissuade you from going to Henne?—I think these are the words: I asked him if Mr. Henne would buy, and he said, “I would not bother about him; I know he would not buy.”
213. What did the £135 include: the hotel building, the land on which it stood, the good-will and unexpired term of the license, and billiard-table?—Yes.
214. Anything else?—No, nothing else.
215. Were there some lamps included in the purchase?—Yes, I think there were.
216. Did you give Sergeant Hannan a receipt for the money?—Yes, for the amount he gave me.
217. Is this the receipt you gave Sergeant Hannan for the money—viz., “Stafford, 4th August, 1896.—Received from Mr. Daniel Hannan the sum of £135 (one hundred and thirty-five pounds sterling), being payment in full for purchase of Excelsior Hotel, billiard-table and furniture, sections, &c.—K. CONWAY, executrix C. Conway.”?—Yes.
218. Did Sergeant Hannan at any time show any reluctance to take part in this matter at all?—None.
219. Did he advise you to consult a solicitor?—I do not remember his doing so.
220. You have no recollection that he did so advise you?—No.
221. *Mr. Fell.*] How was it you had this dealing with Sergeant Hannan? Why did you not go to some commission agent to sell this place?—Sergeant Hannan came to me.
222. I suppose you had known him as a constable?—Yes; I had known him for some time, and considered him my friend.
223. Then, did you in conversation ask him how to get rid of it, or how did the transaction commence?—After I mentioned the matter he promised to get a person to buy it from me. He was a friend of our family.
224. And you thought and supposed he was doing the best he could for you?—Yes. It was just about a week after my mother’s death, and I was not looking after business matters much then, and I may have done things at that time which I would not have done had I had time to think it over.
225. How long were the transactions going on?—My mother died on the 3rd July; I left the house about the middle of August. It must have been going on for about a month.
226. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand he promised to get the best price he could for you?—Yes.
227. *Mr. Fell.*] In this month did you speak to anybody else about the sale of this house, or did you take anybody else into counsel over this sale?—It was kept a matter of secrecy. Sergeant Hannan asked me not to say much about it. He said business matters were best kept to myself, and consequently I did not mention it to anybody. Nobody besides ourselves knew what was going on. I did not know myself until the day I left the house that the house was to be closed up.
228. Had you no other relations or friends in Stafford?—I had one sister living there.
229. Did you talk it over with her?—No. I had a cousin living in the house with me, and I do not think she knew anything about it.
230. Do you know your brother-in-law well?—Yes.
231. Did you ever speak to him about it?—No.
232. Is Sergeant Hannan a married man?—Yes.
233. When did you first suppose that Hannan was selling this place to Henne, or that the sale was really to Henne?—I did not know that Henne had bought anything of the house until the night after I left, or the night I left.
234. That is about a fortnight after the time you received the money?—Yes.
235. Did you not ever ask Sergeant Hannan who was the purchaser?—Yes.
236. What did he say?—At one time he mentioned the name of Mr. Carmine, living at Goldsborough, and this was spoken about in the place, but Mr. Carmine would never own up to buying it. When people mentioned it to him as having bought the hotel he said he had not.
237. The money was paid to you in two instalments by two cheques from Sergeant Hannan?—Yes.

238. Did it not occur to you at that time to ask him who was purchasing, and how it was you were being paid by Hannan's cheques and not by the purchaser's cheques?—It did occur to me, but I thought it was no business of mine to ask him.

239. Did you know at that time, or had you reason to suppose, that Hannan was buying it for himself or for somebody else?—I could not understand; it was a very mysterious transaction.

240. But you were quite content to take the £135 and sign the transfer?—I had to; but I was not exactly content to do so.

241. Why did you do a thing with which you were not satisfied?—After I had signed the first paper he had given me I almost fancied I had been wronged.

242. When did you first speak to anybody else about it; when did you first make any complaint to anybody about it?—It may have been two or three days or a week after I give up possession. It was not very long.

243. Then you found that Henne had got possession?—Yes.

244. And was that the first you knew of Henne being the purchaser?—Yes.

245. Did it not strike you as curious that if Hannan was not the purchaser you should have been paid in Hannan's cheques?—Yes.

246. And did you ask Hannan anything about it?—No, I do not think I did.

247. Do you remember the papers of transfer? You see the land was transferred by a separate document, and in that document the price was stated to be £45, and I presume you must have signed this in favour of Sergeant Hannan. Do you remember signing that?—No, I do not remember.

248. You received the whole of the purchase-money on the 4th August?—Yes.

249. But you had previously been paid £20, and received the balance on that day?—Yes.

250. Did you sign any instrument making over the billiard-table and other things, or were they just handed over without signing anything?—Yes, I think so.

251. And that transfer was signed to Hannan and not to Henne?—Yes; I signed nothing to Mr. Henne.

252. How long had you known Sergeant Hannan?—I had known him some years.

253. Have you ever complained to him that he treated you unfairly in this matter?—Yes.

254. How long after the transaction was it?—It may have been a week. I went to his place and asked him if it was true, and he would not listen to me.

255. What do you mean by would not listen to you?—He said I was informed wrongly.

256. And did he say what the correct version of the matter was?—He told me then it was bought from me and sold to another person.

257. Did he tell you the nature of the sale to the other person?—No.

258. Or how much he got?—No.

259. Nor who he was?—No, I do not think he did. Of course, it was known that Henne had bought it. I did now ask because I knew.

260. You did not know, I suppose, how much he had given for it?—Yes, I had heard the amount. I think it was £180 he got.

261. Did you tax Hannan with having done this thing?—Yes.

262. And with pretending to be your friend and having sold to Henne at a much larger sum?—Yes.

263. What explanation did he give?—The explanation was that he bought from me at one price and sold for another, and that he made a profit.

264. He admitted he made a profit?—He did not admit it exactly.

265. Did you leave the matter there?—Yes; I was going to see it through, but I did not care to, and I left it alone.

266. Have you ever seen him since?—Yes.

267. Have you ever spoken of this matter since; have you been good friends since?—No, we have not.

268. Have you been in the habit of visiting at his house?—Very rarely.

269. Have you been to his house since?—I went to his house twice, and that was to complain about what he had done.

270. Did you know his wife?—Yes.

271. Is she a friend of yours?—Yes; his wife was at my mother's deathbed.

272. Have you seen her since?—Yes, and she told me she knew nothing of the transaction whatever. She was very much surprised when I told her what her husband had done.

273. *Mr. Poynton.*] Did Sergeant Hannan advise you to consult a solicitor and your brother-in-law about the sale of the house?—No, not that I remember. I do not remember him advising me to do anything at all. I would not swear on that point, but I am almost sure he did not.

274. He also stated he advised you to consult an auctioneer or commission agent?—No, he did not.

275. He would be incorrect if he says he did?—Yes; I understood he was a friend of mine, and trying to do all he could for me instead of otherwise.

276. What was your age at that time?—Twenty-two.

277. Had your mother been ill long?—Yes, some time.

278. Were you under the belief at that time that a single woman could not hold a license, and in consequence of that you sold the place?—Yes, that was the main reason.

279. Had you known you could have held a license you would not have sold for that?—No.

280. *Mr. Fell.*] You knew you could not hold a license apart from what Sergeant Hannan told you?—Yes.

281. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You have never applied for a license here?—No, I have never applied myself. I understood a single woman could not hold a license, and I thought it was useless to apply.

282. You have never applied and been refused?—No.

283. You are not familiar with business transactions?—No.

284. And, your mother being just dead, you looked upon Sergeant Hannan as a friend?—Yes; and I thought it was a very good thing for me to have somebody to look after it for me.

285. And you thought right up to the time that the sale was completed that Sergeant Hannan was your friend?—Yes, I thought so.

286. And that he was acting honestly for you to get all he could for you?—Yes; and he misrepresented everything to me.

287. You have been asked what you said to Sergeant Hannan: what did you hear that he had made from the hotel transaction?—I think I heard he got £65 more than he gave me. Besides, I think if I had gone to somebody else I could have got a much better sum.

288. And when you went to see him you accused him of having cheated you, practically, out of £65?—Yes, and probably more which I might have got.

289. And what was his answer to that?—He said I had been wrongly informed. Then he half admitted that he made a good sale, or that it was a clever business transaction. That is what I understood from his words.

290. *Mr. Poynton.*] You said you had no desire to make a charge against Sergeant Hannan, and that you came here against your will?—Yes.

FRIDAY, 13th MAY, 1898.

HUGH CALDERS, examined on oath.

1. *Mr. McNab.*] You are Postmaster and Registrar of Electors at Nelson?—Yes.

2. At the last general election it was necessary that the Sounds should be visited by some officer on your behalf?—It was necessary for the purpose of purging the rolls.

3. Was Constable Jeffries appointed by the Government to fulfil that office?—I cannot say positively, but from hearsay, and from the memorandum I received from Mr. Stoney, the Registrar of Electors at Blenheim, he was appointed.

4. Did he do the work?—Yes.

5. So far as you were concerned, was the work satisfactorily done?—Yes.

6. You produced a list furnished by the constable to you?—The list which I have is one furnished by Mr. Jeffries to Mr. Stoney, Registrar of Electors for the Wairau Electoral District, who forwarded it on to me with the request to have the names therein stated inserted on the Nelson roll, as they were required to be removed from the Wairau roll, at the instigation of Mr. Jeffries, who had evidently visited the Sounds in the meantime.

7. Is it within your knowledge that the sitting member made any complaint about Constable Jeffries's conduct?—Not to me.

8. Do you know officially that a complaint was made?—I do not remember ever receiving any communication whatever intimating that Mr. Jeffries did not or had not performed his duty satisfactorily beyond what Constable Jeffries told me himself privately.

9. *The Chairman.*] What office did Constable Jeffries hold during the time he was visiting these places with a view to purging the roll?—He signs himself as John Jeffries, and I only knew him in that character, and that indirectly through Mr. Stoney, Registrar, to whom he reported.

10. *Mr. McNab.*] Was there any other person who was employed in a similar capacity to Constable Jeffries?—Yes; Mr. Hoddinott, late Clerk of Court and Registrar of Electors at Havelock.

11. Were there any errors that had to be rectified here?—There were some names that had to be removed from the roll, and several were placed on it.

12. In your official capacity you had to inquire whether it was Constable Jeffries or Mr. Hoddinott who was to blame?—I do not think any blame was involved in the question. The only thing that came up was that I wished to be very accurate and was careful in getting the names on to the various rolls, and I asked this Mr. Hoddinott to assist me in the meantime. I received instructions from the Under-Secretary of the Colonial Secretary's Department, informing me that Mr. Hoddinott, late Registrar of Electors at Havelock, would assist me in purging that portion of the Sounds which was transferred to the Nelson District, and in accordance with that I wrote to Mr. Hoddinott, and he rendered me every assistance he could. I think it is only fair to Mr. Hoddinott and Jeffries to state that this matter was rushed through, and that there was very little time given us to do the work, and that if mistakes had occurred they were certainly pardonable, because it was only by 2 o'clock of the morning before the election that I succeeded in getting all the rolls ready for the Returning Officer in Nelson.

13. Who had the Under-Secretary put the blame on?—When in conversation with Mr. Pollen, in Wellington—I do not know that it was direct blame—Mr. Pollen said, "Was not Jeffries sent down to purge the rolls?" and I said, "Yes"; and I said, "These names complained of having been removed from the Wairau list do not appear on my list."

14. Did Mr. C. H. Mills, the sitting member, lodge a complaint about Jeffries?—I do not know that he did beyond what Jeffries has told me. I cannot say positively that there was any complaint lodged.

15. Did you make an inquiry into a complaint that was lodged as between Jeffries and Hoddinott; did you not make an inquiry as to who was to blame?—At the instigation or on the inquiry of Constable Jeffries I examined the papers in my office, which I now hold in my hand, and I told him that none of the names he then supplied to me on a list appeared on the list which he sent to Mr. Stoney, Registrar at Blenheim, and which that officer had sent to me.

16. When you saw the Under-Secretary was there not a question as to who was to blame as between Mr. Hoddinott and Mr. Jeffries; did not the Under-Secretary ask you that?—I think not; not in that language; in ordinary discussion it came up.

17. Did you not express your opinion in very plain words to Mr. Pollen?—Yes; I remember stating in answer to questions put to me that so far as my roll was concerned Mr. Jeffries was not at fault.

18. You are prepared to say the same thing now—that Constable Jeffries was not at fault at all so far as your roll was concerned?—Not so far as my roll was concerned.

19. But about any complaint by Mr. Mills you know nothing at all, you simply expressed the opinion that Constable Jeffries's conduct, so far as your roll was concerned, was in every way satisfactory?—That is so.

20. *Colonel Hume.*] When did Constable Jeffries come to you about this?—Some time after his removal from Picton; after he came to Nelson.

21. Have you had any conversation with him since about it?—Yes; I think he has spoken to me about it since.

22. What did he say?—I really forget. Just ordinary conversation took place in regard to his being blamed, and I told him I was perfectly satisfied he was not to blame in regard to moving any names.

23. Did he tell you he was removed from Picton on account of this?—I do not remember, but I think he indicated to me on one occasion that that was the cause of his removal.

24. In your conversation with Mr. Pollen did Mr. Pollen give you to understand that he blamed Jeffries in any way at all about this roll?—Yes; I think that I inferred from his conversation that there had been a complaint to him that Jeffries was to blame.

25. He did not tell you who lodged the complaint?—No, he did not; he only indicated that a complaint had been made.

26. Since then you have had a conversation with Jeffries about this?—Yes, I have, I believe, when we have met. It has always been a matter of anxiety with him, and he has mentioned it.

27. Did he come and ask you to come and give evidence before the Commission?—Yes; he said he would like me merely to come and testify as to what I knew of this case, and I notified him I was quite willing to come if subpoenaed.

28. Did anything spring up then about the transfer at that conversation?—Not that I remember; I do not think so.

29. Then, so far as your memory serves you, you do not think you have had any conversation with Jeffries about this transfer since this Commission was under way?—No; not about the transfer, but about the rolls. Of course, Constable Jeffries always seemed to imply to me that he was removed from Picton in consequence of not having dealt correctly with the rolls.

30. Can you tell us the last time you had any conversation with him?—I cannot.

31. Had you any conversation in the last week or fortnight?—I really cannot say.

32. *Mr. McNab.*] I understand from the question Colonel Hume put to you that Mr. Pollen led you to believe that complaint had been made to him about Jeffries's conduct?—The conversation was not an official one, and he said some trouble had arisen in consequence of Mr. Jeffries having removed names from the roll.

33. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you mean improperly removed?—There was nothing improper about it.

34. *Mr. McNab.*] Did not Mr. Pollen lead you to believe that Jeffries had tampered with the roll?—That is what I inferred.

35. Was not the impression in Mr. Pollen's mind that Constable Jeffries had behaved improperly with regard to the rolls?—That is what I inferred from his conversation.

36. Of course, who led to that impression you cannot say; it might have been Colonel Hume or the sitting member as far as you know?—Quite so.

37. *Colonel Pitt.*] What was the complaint issued—that names had been improperly put upon the Sound's roll, or that names had not been put on the roll that ought to have been put?—No definite complaint whatever was made.

38. *The Chairman.*] From your conversation with Mr. Pollen did you gather that Constable Jeffries had failed to put people on the Wairau roll who ought to have been put on, or that he improperly took people off?—Nothing whatever was definitely stated; he only indicated that Jeffries had done something irregular; I do not know what it was.

39. *Mr. McNab.*] And you explained to Mr. Pollen that it was a wrongful charge against Constable Jeffries so far as the Nelson electoral roll was concerned?—Yes.

40. *The Chairman.*] Jeffries sent to you a list of names to put on the Nelson roll?—That is so.

41. Has it in any way come to your knowledge that any of these names were improperly taken off the Wairau roll?—No.

HENRY McARDLE, examined on oath.

42. *Mr. McNab.*] You are sergeant of police in charge of the Nelson sub-district?—Yes.

43. I believe Constable Jeffries has been stationed in the district some time?—He came here in July last from Takaka to the Port station.

44. How long has he been at the Port?—Since the 28th July last.

45. Of course, his station was the Port?—Yes.

46. When he came here what was the state of the police-buildings at the Port?—They were infested with cockroaches.

47. As a matter of fact, the building was not habitable?—It was not.

48. And in consequence of that Jeffries was for thirty-two weeks without a house and home?—Jeffries had permission from the Commissioner of Police to sleep at the police-station in Nelson.

49. For a period of thirty-two weeks he was practically without house and home?—Well, he was; he was not residing there, and his family were at Picton.

50. As soon as the building was completed Mrs. Jeffries and family arrived, but there was not proper accommodation in consequence of the uninhabitable condition of the building?—Yes, about that time. I might be allowed to state that there was a remuneration of £6 10s. made to the constable by the Commissioner of Police.

51. That is the allowance as from last January?—Yes.

52. *Colonel Hume.*] These quarters at the Port were not habitable when Jeffries went there?—They might do for a single man, but they were in a very dilapidated state.

53. How many rooms were habitable?—I think none.

54. How was the single constable to live there?—He might manage to live better than a man with a family.

55. Were none of the rooms habitable?—I dare say he might manage to live in one room.

56. Was there not a constable named Mackay there not long ago?—Yes.

57. Was he a bachelor?—No; he had a wife and three children.

58. Did he manage to live there?—Yes.

59. Then it was habitable?—He was complaining continually. He complained to Inspector Pratt, to my knowledge, at several times of the condition of the building.

60. Did he ever complain about the cockroaches?—He did, and the public complained to him about them also.

61. Will you swear that he complained about the cockroaches to Inspector Pratt?—I do, in my presence.

62. How long ago was that?—Fully twelve months ago come June.

63. Then, what did Inspector Pratt do?—He said he would see and have improvements made to the building.

64. Instead of complaining about the cockroaches, was it not to have a new kitchen put on the building?—That application was also made.

65. Was it ever said, or did you ever know of it being said, that the house was habitable because of a new kitchen. Would that improve the five other rooms?—No; but they were to put new paper up and fumigate in order to kill cockroaches.

66. *The Chairman.*] Has it been done?—Yes; now.

67. *Colonel Hume.*] Any way, up to the time Constable Mackay left the House apparently it was habitable because he lived in it with his family?—He had to.

68. When did he move?—I cannot remember; I think he left early in July.

69. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] You know that a vote was taken on last year's estimates for the carrying-out of these alterations?—Yes.

70. And it was expected these repairs and additions would have been effected long before they were?—Yes.

71. There has been some delay on the part of the Public Works Department?—Yes.

72. And that was the reason the repairs were not carried out sooner?—Yes; they were expected to commence every week, but they did not.

73. As regards the department admitting any claim, does it not arise from the fact that this undue delay had taken place in carrying out the additions and alterations, and so thought that the constable should receive some lodging-allowance owing to that delay?—That was so.

74. And it was thought in giving the lodging-allowance as from January last he would be fairly well met in the matter?—Yes; that is what I understood.

75. As a matter of fact, it was giving a lodging-allowance from the 1st January up to the time of occupation?—Yes.

76. How long has it been in occupation?—From the 23rd of last month.

77. *The Chairman.*] What lodging-allowance has been granted?—It was about 8s. per week, equal to the rent he was paying in Picton.

78. He himself has been living in a police-station here rent free?—Yes.

79. *Colonel Hume.*] Did Constable Jeffries, when he came to Nelson, tell you that Mrs. Jeffries and family were not coming over?—I have no recollection of it.

80. You do not know whether he told Inspector Pratt?—I did not hear him.

81. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] What is the number of Jeffries's family?—Seven children.

82. Of course, the family is a bigger one than Mackay had there?—Yes.

83. And the premises were not large enough for a man with so big a family?—That is so.

84. *Colonel Pitt.*] Are all the family with him?—There are only five at present.

JOHN BENNETT TUNBRIDGE, examined on oath.

85. *The Chairman.*] You are Commissioner of Police?—Yes; and an application was submitted from Constable Jeffries to me, I think, about three months ago for an allowance in lieu of house-accommodation. In support of this application he stated he had been unable to bring his wife and family to reside with him at Nelson owing to the condition of the police-buildings at the Port. I went into the matter, and learned that the Public Works Department had been instructed some six or eight months before to carry out certain additions and alterations to the buildings; but owing to, I think, some delay in passing the estimates in the House, it was not possible to carry out the work. The premises were not, as I gleaned from the papers, absolutely unfit for occupation, and might have been occupied by a constable, although the accommodation was probably not sufficient for the whole of his family. Under the circumstances, I considered that if the constable was given an allowance in lieu of quarters from January last it would very well meet the matter of his complaint, as I thought it was more a matter of his own convenience that he did not take his wife there than the fault of the building. I therefore directed that he should receive a sum equivalent to that which he was paying for his wife and family at Picton.

86. How did you fix that date, and on what grounds?—Because I felt that the delay in carrying out the alterations to the buildings was undue, and that the constable should receive some consideration in consequence.

87. Why did you fix the 1st January as commencing the period of the allowance?—Because I felt that the delay had not occurred up to that time—that the building should have been prepared for the man's occupation by that time, and that as it was not prepared by that time I thought he should receive some compensation. I may say it is not the rule of the department to make up to a constable who has an abnormal family any additional expense he may incur in housing that family. A constable is transferred to a station, and, as far as possible, is sent to a station that will accommodate his family, but owing to the very large families of some constables it has not been found possible in all cases to find stations suitable for them, and therefore in some cases the men have to go to additional expense; and it was acting on that rule that I assessed what I considered a fair amount to meet Jeffries's case.

88. *Mr. McNab.*] You allowed him thirteen weeks?—Yes. My opinion is that I allowed him so much a week until the place was fixed up.

89. What about the time between July and January, when the place was uninhabitable—of course, it was uninhabitable?—My opinion was that it was habitable.

90. Have you seen Inspector Pratt's report—namely, "The police-buildings at some stations are in need of repairs and alterations. I would add of the latter none more than the cockroach-infested building at the Port, Nelson"?—That does not say it is uninhabitable.

91. Was not the building in such a state that it was unfit for a constable to go in?—I never saw the place myself.

92. *Colonel Hume.*] This constable was given a room in the barracks in Nelson and allowed to sleep there?—Yes.

93. Then he was put to no expense as regards lodgings for himself?—No.

94. Did he intimate to the department that he wished to bring his wife and family over?—I am not positive on that point; I believe not.

95. *Mr. McNab.*] Are you acquainted with the police quarters at Takaka?—No; I have seen reports about them.

96. You are aware that they are a mile and an eighth from the lock-up?—I am aware they are some distance from the lock-up.

BLLENHEIM.

SATURDAY, 14TH MAY, 1898.

JOHN JEFFRIES, examined on oath.

1. *Mr. McNab.*] You are a first-class constable stationed at the Port in Nelson?—Yes.

2. I think some years ago you were stationed at Picton?—Yes; from the 27th February, 1891, until the 8th February, 1897.

3. When you went to Picton and took possession of the Police Cottage had you any conversation with Colonel Hume?—Some twelve months afterwards he visited the station.

4. Was anything said about repairs and improvements to be done by you to the station buildings?—Colonel Hume walked around the ground, and I pointed out some improvements I had effected, and he said he was very pleased to see them, and hoped I would continue to do so.

5. From his conversation with you did he lead you into making more repairs than you would have made?—I understood from him that if I carried out my duty satisfactorily it was likely I would continue there.

6. He said nothing about putting in a claim in writing under the regulations?—No; I thought from the conversation that I was likely to remain there some nine or ten years, and consequently I carried out improvements that were a convenience and benefit to myself and also to the Police Department.

7. When you left at the end of six years you were not paid any compensation?—I was not.

8. What, in round figures, did it cost you?—In money, between £20 and £30, not less than that, and then there was the labour; I cleared the place of blackberries and broom and gorse.

9. Shortly, you value that at £40?—Yes, at the very least.

10. You left Picton on what date?—I received instructions on the 8th February, 1897, that I was transferred to Takaka, and that I was to move with as little delay as possible.

11. That was after the general election?—Yes; the general election took place on the 4th December, 1896.

12. Did you go to Wellington to see the then Commissioner about your removal?—I did. I had an application for leaving just previous to this, and it was granted to me at that time, and I proceeded to Wellington to interview the Commissioner.

13. What passed at your interview with the Commissioner relative to your transfer to Takaka?—I made a memorandum the following day, as I intended, if possible, to get justice, if not from the Police Department, then I meant to go to Parliament. I am not certain of the date, but I think it was the 11th or 12th, and the memorandum I made is as follows:—

MEMORANDUM of what was said by Colonel Hume and myself, when in the former's office at Wellington, in February, relative to my being transferred.

On entering, I bid him "Good-day." He replied to it, and then said, "Well, Jeffries, what is it?" I said, "I have received orders of transfer to Takaka, and I have come to inquire what has brought it about; whether it arises from any fault of mine, as I am unaware of having been guilty of doing anything wrong." He answered, "Yes, you interfered in the last election." I said, "No, I did not, other than what I was instructed to do from the department—correcting the roll." He said, "Well, you are accused of it." He then read Circular No. 26/96, and Rule 24 of the

Police Regulations, and went on to say, "In order that no member of the Force should be unacquainted with it, he had gone to the trouble of having both the circular and rule published in the *Police Gazette*." I said, "Yes, I had seen them, but previously to their appearance I had made up my mind to take no part, and I had not even voted." He said, "That might be; there was nothing to stop you, and you ought to have voted. But what is complained of is that you disfranchised a number of electors, and a person that will do that is a political danger to the district." I replied, "I have not done so." He answered, "You are blamed for it, anyway." I said, "I know I am, but it is entirely wrong, and I can prove it, and therefore trust you will grant me an inquiry into it." He said, "No, there will be no inquiry granted." I replied, "Why, the greatest criminal that ever stood charged with an offence is given the opportunity of defending himself, and surely the same privilege ought to be extended to me, and if it is not it will be very unfair to me." He said, "I do not think you have much to complain about, as you have been a good time in Picton." I said, "I think I have a good deal to complain of, as I have not been in Picton quite six years; and I thought I had more than my share of transfers, as I knew of policemen that had been twenty, twenty-five, and even more than thirty years at one station." He said, "I am not going to discuss that with you." I was going to reply, when he said, "That will do, that will do," and I left.

JOHN JEFFRIES.

14. Mr. Mills, the member for Wairau, had asked for an inquiry into this matter?—I cannot say he had.

15. Is this not a copy of a document impounded in the Supreme Court?—Yes, as follows:—

DEAR SIR,—

Havelock, Marlborough, 19th December, 1896.

Will you kindly make inquiries how it was that all the names of settlers living in Admiralty Bay, Pelorus Sound, which is in the Wairau electorate, were either not enrolled when the applications were sent in, or otherwise struck off the Wairau roll and placed on the Nelson roll. Probably Constable Jeffries can explain.

Yours truly,

C. H. MILLS.

The Officer in Charge, Police Department, Blenheim.

Forwarded to Constable Jeffries for his explanation.—JAMES O'MALLEY, Sergeant.—21/12/96.

Sergeant O'MALLEY,—Am unable to furnish the desired information.—JOHN JEFFRIES, Constable.—22/12/96.

Inasmuch as I knew nothing whatever about it.

16. You were present when the Registrar of Electors at Nelson was examined?—I was.

17. At all events, you went to see Colonel Hume to get what you considered justice, and it did not come off, and you were shifted to Takaka?—Yes.

18. And these are all the documents relating to your claim at Picton?—I presume they are. They are copies of correspondence between myself and the head of the Police Department with reference to my claim for the improvements I effected at the Picton Police-station. The correspondence is as follows:—

Greymouth, 27th February, 1897.

Re your application for a refund of amount expended on improvements at Picton Station, the following copy of memorandum received from the Commissioner is forwarded for your information: "Please inform Constable Jeffries that, as these expenses were incurred without permission, I regret the department cannot pay any compensation."

Constable Jeffries, Takaka.

JOHN PRATT, Inspector.

Police-station, Takaka, 24th April, 1897.

Re First-class Constable John Jeffries, No. 36: Application for a refund of expenditure incurred by him in effecting improvements at Picton Police-station during the time he was stationed there, and for which the department declines to pay compensation.

I therefore hereby respectfully apply for permission to remove said improvements, as I can ill afford to be at an entire loss of same, which, although collectively valued at only £14 4s. 6d. by Sergeant O'Malley, who was directed to appraise them, nevertheless cost me considerably over £20, and, as several of the improvements in question were carried out within the last two years, it may safely be said I have received no commensuration for this outlay. Hence, under the circumstances, I trust the department may be good enough to grant the desired authority, for which I shall be thankful.

The Inspector of Police, Greymouth.

JOHN JEFFRIES, First-class Constable, No. 36.

Greymouth, 10th May, 1897.

Re application of Constable Jeffries for permission to remove certain improvements effected by him at Picton Station.

The following copy of the Commissioner's decision in this matter is forwarded for the constable's information, viz.: "As the materials, &c., referred to by Constable Jeffries are fixtures they cannot be removed."

Sergeant McArdle, Nelson.

JOHN PRATT, Inspector.

For Constable Jeffries's information.—Please note and return.—H. MCARDLE, Sergeant, No. 32.—Nelson, 12/5/97.

Received and noted.—JOHN JEFFRIES, First-class Constable, No. 36.—Takaka, 14/5/97.

Police-station, Takaka, 14th May, 1897.

Re First-class Constable John Jeffries, No. 36: Application, dated 24th ultimo, for a refund of expenditure incurred by him in effecting improvements at Picton Station, and the Commissioner's reply thereto, which says: "As the materials, &c., referred to by Constable Jeffries are fixtures they cannot be removed."

I hereby respectfully renew my application on the subject, and solicit that the Commissioner may be pleased to reconsider his decision and grant me some compensation, or in justice permit me to remove the articles and materials that cannot well be construed to be fixtures—the wash-house, £4; wood- and coal-house, £2; varnishing and papering, £1; and concrete drain from water-tap, 15s., might be classed as such; but the Venetian blinds, £3; clothes- and hat-racks, £1 10s.; shelving, £1 5s.; lamp-stand, 4s. 6d. (which are all put up or erected with screws); and the closet-pans, 10s., I humbly submit may not be deemed fixtures. Therefore I trust that my application will be reconsidered, and that I shall be conceded some consideration in the matter.

The Inspector of Police, Greymouth.

JOHN JEFFRIES, First-class Constable, No. 36.

Greymouth, 29th May, 1897.

The following copy of Commissioner's decision with regard to Constable Jeffries's application for a refund of expenses incurred in effecting alterations at Picton Station is forwarded for the constable's information, viz.: "As these things were obtained and put up without any authority, I cannot give any compensation."

Sergeant McArdle, Nelson.

JOHN PRATT, Inspector.

For Constable Jeffries, Takaka.—Please note and return.—H. MCARDLE, First-class Sergeant, No. 32.—Nelson, 1/6/97.

Received and noted.—JOHN JEFFRIES, First-class Constable, No. 36.—Takaka, 2/6/97.

19. You did not vote at the election?—No, I did not.

20. You have told us that not only has the Commissioner given you authority, but he approved of the work you were doing?—He said he was very pleased at the work I was doing, and said I

had effected improvements. He gave me no direct authority, orally or written ; but I think it is the duty of every constable to make improvements at his station.

21. But you were not allowed to remove these fixtures as any ordinary tenant would have been?—I was not.

22. Being a policeman under Colonel Hume's régime, you were not allowed the privileges of any ordinary tenant?—No.

23. You left Picton and went to Takaka?—I did.

24. What was the date when you went to Takaka?—My order of transfer was on the 8th February ; so far as my memory serves me, it was about the 22nd or 23rd when I got there.

25. I want to know what was the position of things as to the dwellinghouse at Takaka?—The place was in a very dilapidated condition, and, what was worse than all, the house was situated a mile and an eighth from the lock-up and the Courthouse, where my duties were. I was appointed Clerk of Court and bailiff there.

26. Therefore it was impossible to carry out the provisions of the Police Offences Act in regard to visiting prisoners?—I could not.

27. Did you bring this under the notice of the department?—I did.

28. What was their tenancy of this dwellinghouse : was it merely a weekly tenancy?—So far as I know, the department paid 9s. per week for it.

29. The department would have no difficulty in getting rid of the tenancy, and getting a decent house near to the lock-up and Courthouse?—I could not see where there was any difficulty in getting rid of it. Anyway, I could have got a very convenient place close to the lock-up.

30. You were at Takaka about twenty weeks?—Yes.

31. *The Chairman.*] You did not occupy the house?—No ; I boarded out at 16s. per week.

32. *Mr. McNab.*] And did you pay house-rent in Picton?—Yes.

33. Putting it in that way, you did lose £10 for the twenty weeks?—I lost the house-rent. Had it been a convenient station, and the house suitable to accommodate my family, I would have brought my family over.

34. From Takaka you were transferred to the Port at Nelson?—Yes.

35. At the Port you found what was alluded to yesterday ; you found the place infested with cockroaches?—It was in a much worse condition than the police-station at Takaka. As regards the rooms, they were smaller and less in number, and in a much more dilapidated condition, and infested with cockroaches.

36. You were in Nelson thirty-two weeks before you got into the police-station?—Yes.

37. You were thirty-two weeks without habitation to your name?—Yes.

38. And you reckoned that cost you 10s. per week?—Yes.

39. Now, the present Commissioner met you somewhat fairly?—Yes.

40. And allowed you £6 10s. on account of that £16?—Yes.

41. You reckon your total loss to be £66—namely, Picton improvements, £40 ; Takaka, £10, and Nelson, £16. But, as the present Commissioner has allowed you £6 10s. as from January last to the time of occupation, your total loss is £59 10s.?—Yes.

42. I believe you were never allowed anything by the previous Commissioner, notwithstanding?—No ; he treated me, according to my idea, very unfairly and very unjustly.

43. *Colonel Pitt.*] What are the quarters like now at Nelson?—Good ; they are satisfactory.

44. *Mr. McNab.*] You have some complaint about the system of promotions?—Yes ; I might state I am lodging this not so much as a complaint on my own interest as in the interest of others.

45. I think there were a number of promotions to the position of sergeants which took effect on the 1st January last, and you were senior to all of them?—Yes.

46. You have nothing on your defaulter's sheet?—Nothing that I know of ; I have never seen it, although I have applied for it.

47. In the ordinary course you were entitled to promotion before the persons named?—Yes ; not that I want it. I joined on the 1st April, 1866, and have always been a first-class constable. At the abolition of the provinces I was taken over as a first-class constable, and have remained at that grade ever since.

48. In addition to the system of promotion, you have also to complain that some constables receive more loaves and fishes in the way of emoluments than others?—Yes. It is not that I am complaining against those constables, they are mostly excellent men ; but I do complain of the practice of passing over senior men who are equally capable ; it savours of favouritism.

49. When you were in Picton did you have any trouble with a man named Seward at the George Hotel?—I had.

50. Were you successful in getting him committed for trial for arson, and getting him committed for trial for perjury?—Yes ; and previous to that I had to prosecute the man for breaches of the Licensing Act.

51. Did Seward make use of threats to you?—Yes ; he said he would get me out of Picton for what he called persecuting him.

52. When was this?—About February, 1896.

53. Did he go farther than that?—Yes ; he said he would get Mr. Mills on the job. This was before the election and about the time I was prosecuting him on the third charge for breaches of the Licensing Act, for which he was convicted and had his license cancelled.

54. Did he mention anybody else besides Mr. Mills?—No other name that I recollect.

55. Have you no recollection yourself as to any other threat being made, or any other name mentioned besides Mr. Mills's?—I cannot recollect. He said he had persons at work, and I would be shifted.

56. *The Chairman.*] Do you attribute your removal to him or to his influence?—I cannot say. I am not going to state that he did possess sufficient influence to get me transferred, but he certainly threatened me with it.