

1909.  
NEW ZEALAND.

# POLICE FORCE OF NEW ZEALAND

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

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

## CONTENTS

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

WELLINGTON.

BY AUTHORITY: JOHN MACKAY, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

1909.

## COMMISSION.

---

PLUNKET, GOVERNOR.

By his Deputy, JAMES PRENDERGAST.

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

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

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

HELYAR WEDDERBURN BISHOP,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Issued in Executive Council.

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

J. G. FINDLAY.

[Seal.]

---

## EXTENDING PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE POLICE COMMISSION SHALL REPORT.

PLUNKET, Governor.

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

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

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

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

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

Approved in Executive Council.

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

J. G. FINDLAY.

---

### FURTHER EXTENDING PERIOD WITHIN WHICH THE POLICE COMMISSION SHALL REPORT.

---

PLUNKET, Governor.

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

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

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

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

Approved in the Executive Council.

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

JOHN G. FINDLAY.

## REPORT.

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

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY.

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

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

have to report as follows :—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No. 2 is the following :—

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

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

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

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

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

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

"DEAR SIR,—

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Yours respectfully,

"LOUISA HALBROOK."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No. 3 case was the following:—

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Men entering the Force are dealt with as follows :—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### INVERCARGILL.

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

#### DUNEDIN.

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

#### CHRISTCHURCH.

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

#### GREYMOUTH.

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

#### WELLINGTON.

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

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

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

#### WANGANUI.

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

#### NAPIER.

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

#### AUCKLAND.

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

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

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

#### THAMES.

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

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

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

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

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

The Force is distributed in the districts as follows :—

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Thames, 8th September, 1909.

“To the Secretary, Police Commission, Wellington.

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

“J. M. KIELY, Inspector.”

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

“Auckland, 29th September, 1909.

“To the Secretary, Police Commission, Wellington.

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

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

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

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

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

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

“J. CULLEN, Inspector.”

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

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

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

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

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

EFFICIENCY AS SHOWN BY CRIME RETURNS.

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### GENERAL.

##### *Headquarters Staff.*

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

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

\* A recent appointment owing to increase of work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Sub-Inspectors.*

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

#### *Clerks.*

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

#### *Detectives.*

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

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

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

#### *Senior Constables.*

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

#### *Leave.*

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

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

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

#### *Physical Training.*

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

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

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

#### *Rifle Shooting.*

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

#### *Attending Court.*

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

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

#### *Sunday Leave.*

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

#### *Late Leave.*

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

#### *A Dunedin Complaint.*

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

#### *Appeal Board.*

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

#### *Detective Rank.*

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

*Superintendents.*

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

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

*Situations outside the Force.*

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

*General Complaints.*

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

*Educational.*

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

*Emoluments.*

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



*Work done for other Departments.*

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

*Finger-print Branch.*

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

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

*House Allowance.*

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

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

#### *Travelling-allowances.*

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

#### *Travelling.*

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

#### *Departmental Inquiries.*

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

#### *Rewards.*

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

#### *General Conduct.*

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

#### *Police and Ex-Prisoners.*

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

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

### Strength.

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

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

### District Constables.

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

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

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

*Native Constables.*

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

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

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

*Special Cases.*

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

*Dismissals and Resignations.*

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

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

*Dismissals.*

Period.	Number of Dismissals.	Reason for Dismissal.
1/7/07 to 30/6/08 ..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1</li> <li>3</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using obscene language.</li> <li>Being under the influence of liquor.</li> <li>Convicted of assault.</li> <li>Making a false statement in his application to join police.</li> </ul>
Total .. ..	6	
1/7/08 to 30/6/09 ..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1</li> <li>6</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Being under the influence of liquor, and making a false statement regarding a rug.</li> <li>Being under the influence of liquor.</li> <li>Being concerned in disorderly conduct on the public street, and failing to render assistance to a person who had been assaulted.</li> <li>Convicted of assault.</li> </ul>
Total .. ..	10	

*Compulsory Resignations.*

Period.	Number.	Reasons.
1/7/07 to 30/6/08 ..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marrying without permission.</li> <li>Borrowing money from an hotelkeeper.</li> <li>Seducing a girl and refusing to marry her.</li> </ul>
Total .. ..	3	
1/7/08 to 30/6/09 ..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2</li> <li>1</li> <li>1</li> <li>2</li> <li>1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Immorality.</li> <li>Failing to report theft of a purse and £1 12s. 6d., and failing to account to the owner for the money which he advised her he had recovered.</li> <li>Neglecting to assist his brother constables in a street disturbance.</li> <li>Receiving beer when on duty.</li> <li>Making a false statement regarding his marriage when applying for enrolment.</li> </ul>
Total .. ..	7	

*Voluntary Resignations.*

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

*Discharges.*

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

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

*The Wrack Case.*

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

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

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

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

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

"To Inspector of Police, Auckland.

"*Morrison v. Wrack.*

"*Mangan v. Wrack.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

“February 22, 1907.

“Memo. for the Inspector of Police, Auckland.

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

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

“JOS. A. TOLE,  
“Crown Solicitor.”

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

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

#### *Auckland Police Surgeon.*

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

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

### Rank and Service.

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

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

### Pay.

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

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

\* With allowance of 1s. per day.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Lamps.

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

### Batons and Handcuffs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The Commissioner of Police.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### CONCLUSION.

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

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

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

The full evidence taken before me is forwarded herewith.

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

H. W. BISHOP,  
Stipendiary Magistrate and Commissioner.

---

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

INVERCARGILL, WEDNESDAY, 7TH JULY, 1909.

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

*Present:* H. W. Bishop, Esq.

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

The Commission was read by the Secretary.

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

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

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

“Hon. the Minister of Justice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

“W. DINNIE,

“Commissioner of Police.”

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

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

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

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

“J. G. FINDLAY,

“Minister of Justice.”

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

INVERCARGILL, THURSDAY, 8TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.10 p.m.

## DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 12TH JULY, 1909.

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

## DUNEDIN, TUESDAY, 13TH JULY, 1909.

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

## DUNEDIN, WEDNESDAY, 14TH JULY, 1909.

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

## DUNEDIN, THURSDAY, 15TH JULY, 1909.

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

## DUNEDIN, FRIDAY, 16TH JULY, 1909.

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

## DUNEDIN, SATURDAY, 17TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Joseph Charles Willis, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 James Frederick Arnold, member of Parliament, was further examined.  
 Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.  
 Terence O'Brien, Inspector, Dunedin, was further examined.  
 The Commission adjourned at 12.15 p.m.

## DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 19TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Supreme Court Buildings at 10.30 a.m.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 John Fox, constable, stationed at Dunedin, was further examined.  
 Francis George Cumming, agent, Prison Aid Society, Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 William John Phair, Sub-Inspector, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Patrick Denis O'Connell, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Thomas O'Grady, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Edwin Murray, sergeant and District Clerk at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Michael McKeefry, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 William Eccles, sergeant, stationed at Dunedin, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m.

## OAMARU, WEDNESDAY, 21ST JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Magistrate's Court at 12 noon.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.  
 Thomas Griffiths, sergeant, stationed at Oamaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Robert James Gillies, Inspector in Charge of Canterbury and North Otago District, was sworn,  
 and gave evidence.  
 William Miller MacKenzie, carrier, Oamaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

## TIMARU, THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at the Magistrate's Court at 10 a.m.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Henry Teevan, medical practitioner, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Ellis Mills, wharf labourer, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 John Gillespie, constable, stationed at Temuka, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Henry Green, Sub-Inspector at Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 John Joseph Weathered, constable and Police Gaoler, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Patrick Bowman, sergeant, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Henry Green, Sub-Inspector, Timaru, was further examined.  
 In response to the request of Mr. W. Dinnie, who desired to visit Wellington to deal with urgent departmental business, the Commission was adjourned until Tuesday, 27th July, 1909, at Christchurch.  
 The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m.

## CHRISTCHURCH, TUESDAY, 27TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Provincial Council Chambers.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Mr. Dougall, solicitor, appeared for Mr. George Laurenson, M.P.  
 John Connell, constable, stationed at Invercargill, was further examined.  
 George Laurenson, member of Parliament for Lyttelton, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.  
 Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.  
 Charles Rutledge, ex-sergeant, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 William Henry Symes, Police Surgeon, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Ernest Alexander Regan, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Martin James Carney, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Justin Eric MacCarthy, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 The Commission adjourned at 4.10 p.m.



## CHRISTCHURCH, WEDNESDAY, 28TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Provincial Council Chambers.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Ernest Alexander Regan, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was further examined.  
 Edward McKay, sergeant, stationed at Rangiora, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 William James Whatman, constable, stationed at Little River, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 William Fouhy, sergeant, stationed at Ashburton, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 John Gillespie, constable, stationed at Temuka, was further examined.  
 Thomas Frederick Hammond, constable, stationed at Bingsland, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Patrick James Fitzgerald, constable, stationed at Lyttelton, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.  
 Michael Leahy, constable, stationed at Oxford, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

## CHRISTCHURCH, THURSDAY, 29TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Provincial Council Chambers.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Frederick Knight Hunt, solicitor, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Victor Grace Day, Stipendiary Magistrate, Timaru, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Michael Donnelly, barrister, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Charles Rutledge, ex-sergeant, was further examined.  
 Maurice Roche, ex-constable, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 James Johnston, station sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Alfred Edward Remer, sergeant, stationed at Sydenham, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.  
 David Jackson, constable, stationed at Addington, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Peter Maloney, constable, stationed at Akaroa, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Patrick Ryan, sergeant, stationed at Lyttelton, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Alfred Edward Remer, sergeant, was further examined.  
 Michael Donovan, sergeant, stationed at St. Albans, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Edward Punjab Bird, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 George Keep, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Richard Thomas Hodgson, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Thomas Frederick Hammond, constable, was further examined.  
 The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

## CHRISTCHURCH, FRIDAY, 30TH JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. in the Provincial Council Chambers.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 George Warren Russell, member of Parliament for Avon, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Charles Rutledge, ex-sergeant, was further examined.  
 James O'Connor, constable, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Clifford Simeon Thompson, representative of Turnbull and Jones (Limited), electrical engineers, Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 William Miller, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 John Burrows, sergeant, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Thomas Gibson, acting-detective, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Thomas Alfred Evenden, constable, stationed at Rangiora, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.  
 Frank Joseph Bishop, Chief Detective, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 James Johnston, station sergeant, was further examined.  
 Alfred Edward Remer, sergeant, was further examined.  
 Mr. O. T. Y. Alpers, solicitor, Christchurch, appeared for Constable T. F. Hammond, and made a statement.  
 Robert McClelland, sergeant and District Clerk, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Joseph Albert McGrath, Sub-Inspector, stationed at Christchurch, was sworn, and gave evidence.  
 Thomas Frederick Hammond, constable, was further examined.  
 Robert James Gillies, Inspector, was further examined.  
 The Commission adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

## CHRISTCHURCH, SATURDAY, 31ST JULY, 1909.

The Commission met at 10.30 a.m. at the Provincial Council Chambers.  
 Mr. W. Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was in attendance.  
 Robert James Gillies, Inspector, gave further evidence.  
 Frank Joseph Bishop, Chief Detective, gave further evidence.  
 Joseph Albert McGrath, Sub-Inspector, gave further evidence.  
 The Commission adjourned at 11.20 a.m.

## GREYMOUTH, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

## REEFTON, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

## WESTPORT, THURSDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

## NELSON, MONDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

## PICTON, TUESDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

## WANGANUI, FRIDAY, 13TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

## PALMERSTON NORTH, SATURDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m.

## NAPIER, TUESDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 1.25 p.m.

## AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 24TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.15 p.m.

## AUCKLAND, WEDNESDAY, 25TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

Patrick John Dunne, constable, was further examined.

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

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

Frederick Augustus Moore, sergeant, was further examined.

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

## AUCKLAND, THURSDAY, 26TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

## AUCKLAND, FRIDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

John Frederick Hammerly, mounted constable, was further examined.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 4.5 p.m.

## AUCKLAND, MONDAY, 30TH AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

Edwin Eales, sergeant, was further examined.

Patrick John Dunne, constable, was further examined.

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

The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

## AUCKLAND, TUESDAY, 31ST AUGUST, 1909.

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

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

Timothy Donovan, constable, was further examined.

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

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

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

---

AUCKLAND, WEDNESDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

---

AUCKLAND, THURSDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

---

ROTORUA, MONDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

---

THAMES, WEDNESDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

## WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 13TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michael Greene, constable, was further examined.

The Commission adjourned at 3.35 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, WEDNESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, THURSDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

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

William Mathieson, sergeant, was further examined.

Michael Murphy, sergeant, was further examined.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, FRIDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Commission adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, SATURDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1909.

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

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

Michael Greene, constable, was further examined.

John William Martin Dart, sergeant, was further examined.

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

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

William Mathieson, sergeant, was further examined.

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

The Commission adjourned at 1.5 p.m.

## WELLINGTON, MONDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 1909.

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

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

Walter Dinnie, Commissioner of Police, was further examined.

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

The Commission adjourned at 12.30 p.m.

## INDEX TO MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

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



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

ERRATA.

---

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

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

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

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

INVERCARGILL, WEDNESDAY, 7TH JULY, 1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

78. Nor in Dunedin?—No.

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

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

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

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

3. In regard to control?—No.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

35. There is not much crime here?—No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

55. Do you not think the clerks in the office should have some knowledge of police duties?—I cannot see of what advantage it is, unless there is a possibility of their leaving the office and going on the street.

56. Supposing, for instance, I left my office, is not the Sub-Inspector in a position to answer any questions in regard to pressing matters in a way in which no ordinary clerk could do?—He occupies a false position such as I do not think he should.

57. But should not any one in that position have some knowledge of police duties so as to be able to answer questions in my absence?—It would be decidedly an advantage.

58. Are you aware that throughout the Force the clerical staff are police officers?—Yes; but I do not think a Sub-Inspector should be placed in such a position as to enable him to dictate to one in a higher position in the service than himself.

59. I quite agree with you there, but I mean as regards police experience?—In Australia members of the Force hold clerical positions, and so they do in England.

60. *The Commissioner.*] But a man who had been some time in the office would acquire a knowledge of police duty?—My own opinion is that in the absence of the Commissioner there should be a senior Inspector to take his place.

61. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But in the Commissioner's office there should be a man with police knowledge to attend to matters in the Commissioner's absence?—Undoubtedly; I think a Chief Inspector should be put there as Acting-Commissioner.

62. Previous to my taking charge you remember the Accountant and the Chief Clerk were both experienced police officers?—Yes.

63. *The Commissioner.*] But they have ceased to hold police rank?—Yes, both are Civil servants.

64. Do you think that is more desirable?—Yes.

65. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You quite approve of the present system of promotion?—Yes; I do not see how it could be improved upon.

66. You believe in efficiency and not seniority, or the two combined?—Yes; seniority should take second place to efficiency in the service.

67. One man has been promoted over the heads of a number of others, has he not, because he has passed an examination as a solicitor?—If my opinion were asked, I should say without hesitation he was well worthy of promotion.

68. On what ground?—General capacity.

69. You refer to general qualifications, not as being affected by the passing of an examination?—It strengthened his claim.

70. How is he going to make a better sergeant because he is a solicitor—it only raises his standard of education?—That is so.

71. You have already said it is not necessary, in order to make a man an efficient sergeant, that he should have extra education?—No; but with the two qualifications combined, as in this instance, I think promotion was deserved. I know the class of man he is.

72. The mere fact of one man being promoted over two or three hundred means nothing, as the others may not be qualified for anything but to act as constables?—Yes. In your knowledge there are a great many men whom it would be farcical to appoint as sergeants.

73. *The Commissioner.*] I want this made clear: I understand from you that you do not think the pay and emoluments of the Force debar applicants?—What I think is this: it would be a great inducement to get a proper class of men if the pay were raised 6d. a day all round. At the same time, I do not think the pay is much of an obstacle at the present time.

74. But you think they are entitled to another 6d.?—Yes.

*The Commissioner:* I ask you formally to produce all records in the district office. [Records produced.]

THURSDAY, 8TH JULY, 1909.

JAMES REYNOLDS STUCK, Retired Farmer, examined on oath. (No. 4.)

*Witness:* My complaint is against Inspector Mitchell, for having used his position to interfere with the course of justice. The facts are as follows: A marriage was arranged between my daughter and Thomas Boyle. I consented to the marriage, but stipulated that my daughter should not be compelled to be married at the Roman Catholic Church, but that the marriage should take place at the Church of England. I arranged with Archdeacon Stocker to perform the ceremony on New Year's Day, having been authorised to make all the necessary arrangements in Boyle's absence. Three or four days before the date fixed, Boyle, who was a platelayer at Mossburn, came to Invercargill, and on Sunday interviewed my daughter in my absence, with the result that on my return my daughter said the marriage would not take place at the English but at the Catholic Church. This caused some unpleasantness, and my daughter promised she would not go to the Catholic Church. Next day she stopped with me, not leaving my sight all day, and, although there was a large gathering to see the marriage, it did not take place. At about 5.30 Boyle came to see my daughter, and, as the legal time had expired, I left them together. I met them again, and an arrangement was come to in regard to getting a new license, and Archdeacon Stocker agreed to marry them at a private house—her married sister's. My suspicions, however, became aroused, and on Wednesday morning at 6 o'clock I went to the Catholic Church, where I tried all the doors, and found them fastened. I remained there till about 6.45, when I heard the click of a door, and saw the front door open. I could see no one. About five minutes after Dean Burke, Father Delaney, and another man in civilian dress, whom I did not know, went into the church at the back door from the Dean's house. I entered at the front door, and looked all round the body of the church, and when I passed the vestry I heard some mumbling, as if some one was at prayers. I went out again, and heard the 7 o'clock train coming up. I stood on the steps of the church, and watched to see if my party were in it, but could see nothing of them. I heard the train stop at the Elles Road Station, and I went to where I could obtain a view of the platform, and saw two women and a man board the train. A few minutes after the train went on, Dean Burke, Father Delaney, and the other person came out of the church, and passed close by me without seeing me. It was 7.15 when I left the Catholic Church. I went to where my daughter was staying, but she had not been seen there since the previous evening, nor had she used the bed that night, and her sister pretended to know nothing about her. Next morning I asked John Newton, the guard of the 7 train, if he had taken on any passengers at the Elles Road Station, and he said, "Yes, two females and a man," and that he recognised one of them as one of my daughters, and that a platelayer who happened to be on board the train told him it was

Boyle. I got further evidence from Thomas Jones, guard of the 7 train at Kingston, who said he was on the platform when the Gore train arrived, and saw the Boyles alight and go to a hotel. I told the Registrar of Marriages here what had occurred, and he said he would not be able to get me a copy of the marriage-certificate for some time, as returns were only sent in every three months. On the Thursday morning I went to Dean Burke, and asked him to give me a copy of the register, or allow me to look at it, telling him the position, and asking if she was married. He put on a very serious face, and said, "I don't know anything about it, but I will make all inquiries, and let you know." I have never heard anything more from him. As soon as I thought it was time to be able to get the certificate I wrote to the Registrar, but I did not get it until May. After I got the certificate I went to Sergeant Black and laid a complaint. He took it down, and I signed it, and he took it to Inspector Mitchell, and I was told it would be attended to. About eight or nine days afterwards I was asked to see Detective McIlveney, who took down five type-written sheets of particulars from me.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you see the Inspector personally on the matter?—Not at that time. After about eight weeks I met the detective, and asked him if anything was being done. He said there were two or three he had not seen yet. I went away for about six weeks, and on my return I was told the detective was about to be removed. I went to see him just as he was leaving, and he told me he had turned over all the correspondence to Inspector Mitchell. I went to Mr. Mitchell's room, and he looked up the papers, and read me a statement from three persons—Thomas Boyle and the two witnesses of the marriage. I thought it was strange there was no other paper read to me. Knowing the detective as well as I do, I thought it was strange he had not interviewed any of my witnesses, so I asked the Inspector if there was no other evidence taken by the detective. I saw I had touched a tender spot. He said he had done all he intended to do, and he had no time for such—I believe his word was "rot." I said, "Well, if you have not time I will find some one who has." That was the last time I spoke to him. I wrote to the Minister, and some time after I received an acknowledgment, and later on I received a letter from Mr. Dinnie, with some excuse. I cannot find the letter, but it was as much as to say that there was nothing to be done. My opinion is that they are all tarred with the same brush.

2. What kind of brush?—Well, they were all Catholics. That is how the matter stands. When I saw there was a change of Ministry I thought I would write to the new Minister to see what I could get from him, but just then I saw there was to be a Commission, and I thought that would answer my purpose better.

3. Did you consider the advisability of prosecuting yourself?—No; I acted on the Registrar-General's advice.

4. Your daughter and Boyle were both of age, and had a right to get married where and how and when they liked?—Yes.

5. Your desire was simply to see that your daughter was properly married?—Yes; that was my desire.

6. In whose interest?—In the public interest. I was spoken to by one or two clergymen. It was the talk of the place, and they said if they had been concerned in it they would have been prosecuted.

7. You insinuate that because certain officers of the police are Roman Catholics the authorities were being protected?—Yes.

8. Why did you not lay an information yourself?—I did not know what expense I might be dragged into.

9. So you handed the matter over to the police, and said, "Here is a breach of the law; it is for you to look into it"?—Yes.

10. *Inspector Mitchell.*] Do you remember what month you first spoke to me about this matter?—Immediately I received the certificate in May, 1906.

11. Would you be surprised to hear it was not until November you came to the station and spoke to the police?—No, I would not, because I was away two or three times; but I know it was shortly after I received the certificate from the Registrar-General.

12. *The Commissioner.*] But it is a long time between May and November. Apparently you received the letter from the Registrar-General shortly after the 8th May?—I believe I did.

13. *Inspector Mitchell.*] If I tell you the correspondence shows it was on the 5th November you first came to the police-station would you contradict it?—No, because I was away twice, for weeks at a time.

14. Within two or three days of your first visit to the station you were invited by Detective McIlveney to give him a full statement?—Yes, I believe it was within a week.

15. When he took your statement did the detective strike you as being biassed in the matter, or as trying to cloak or conceal anything?—No; he was very enthusiastic, and took great interest in the matter, apparently.

16. Had you not reason to believe that following on your statement further inquiries were made from others?—I had no proof they were; I considered from the detective's demeanour that he would have taken evidence from my witnesses. Why did he not go to them as well as to the others?

17. You say he appeared very enthusiastic, so it is unlikely he would only partially do his work?—That is what I thought.

18. Do you remember your second visit to the station, when you and I talked the matter over? On that occasion I read three statements to you?—Yes, those of Boyle and the two witnesses.

19. Do you remember what I said after reading them?—I believe you said, "In the face of these statements, I could do nothing."

20. And that the parties present at the ceremony were those we must rely on to support the charge you proposed to lay against the dean?—Something to that effect; you were not very well pleased, I know.

21. Did I not also say we could not possibly hope for a conviction without evidence?—You might have said so; I would not say you did not.

22. Do you remember the reply you made?—I cannot call it to mind.

23. Did you say words to this effect: that that did not matter, that you were determined to show the dean up?—No.

24. You say so positively?—Yes.

25. Is it not a fact that that was your determination?—It was.

26. Whether evidence was forthcoming or not, to expose the dean?—Yes, because I considered I had been made a fool of. The first time I went to the office on the same day, before I had left the office an hour I saw you call at the dean's house. The next day it was reported all over the store belonging to one of the witnesses how the dean had told how he had put me off when I went to ask for the register.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Where did you get this information?—From people who were in the store.

28. *Inspector Mitchell.*] Would you accept my assurance if I tell the Court I never entered the presbytery in my life till within the last three months?—I followed you, and I believe you entered the gate or porch.

29. Did you see me do so?—Yes, and I walked on.

30. In regard to our conversation at the interview, you received my decision with rather a bad grace; you considered the decision I made known to you was a wrong one when I informed you that the evidence available would not warrant such a charge being preferred?—No; my only objection was that no other evidence was taken.

31. After telling you I could not take action in the matter upon the evidence available, and that I would not be a party to assisting you to show the dean up, did I not suggest if you were determined to take action that the Court was always open to you?—I do not remember anything of the kind.

32. Did I not say if you were determined to go on without evidence you could lay an information yourself as easily as I could?—I considered I had laid an information, and had done my part.

33. Did I not go so far as to explain where you should go?—No.

34. Did you call a third time at the station?—I paid a second visit to your office with a day between; I went back to ask if no other evidence had been taken.

35. Did I not then say to you, "I have done all I can possibly do; I can do nothing more in the matter, and if you are not satisfied go and consult a solicitor"?—No.

36. You say that positively?—Yes; you told me you had no time for such rot, or some such expression.

37. You are sure I did not suggest you should see a solicitor?—I am quite sure; I had already seen the late Mr. Macdonald.

38. Was it not after your third visit you saw Mr. Macdonald?—I do not know whether it was before or after; I believe it was after.

39. Was that not in consequence of my suggestion?—No; I went on my own account.

40. What advice did he give you?—That it would be a difficult matter; he did not give me any encouragement.

41. He advised you much on the same lines as I did?—You did not advise me at all.

42. Was it not advising you to tell you that the proceedings were unwarranted?—You did not tell me that.

43. Were you not disappointed because I would not accede to your request, and instruct an officer to lay an information?—I considered I had laid an information.

44. Then, receiving no encouragement from me or Mr. Macdonald, you communicated with the Minister?—Yes, in a long letter setting forth all the particulars.

45. Had you not reason to believe later on that the Minister, through the Commissioner, had full inquiries made?—I never had anything to show that anything was done.

46. Did you receive a reply from the Minister?—An acknowledgment of the receipt of my letter. The next communication was from Mr. Dinnie, the gist of which was that he did not see that there was anything to be done in the matter.

47. You accuse me of having interfered with the course of justice: how did I do so?—From the demeanour of Detective McIlveney I knew he had something in his mind he wished to say which he could not at the time; you were in your office with the door open, and he and I were in the passage outside; we had always been friends, and he made some remarks which showed me he had something he wished to say but could not.

48. What prevented him saying it?—I suppose he thought he might put his foot in it. I thought he had been ordered not to go further into the matter from what he said.

49. Do you suggest I prevented him from making certain inquiries?—I consider it was through you he did not proceed further in the matter.

50. That I prevented him making further inquiries?—You might have given him a hint

51. Do you suggest to the Court that I did that?—I believe it was through your influence he made no further inquiries.

52. What motive could I have in hindering inquiry?—Trying to shield Dean Burke.

53. What have I to do with him?—I do not know, but I believed you were trying to shield him.

54. *The Commissioner.*] What is in your mind?—I believe Inspector Mitchell is a Catholic.

*Inspector Mitchell:* Even supposing I am, under what obligation am I to the dean that I should shield him if he had criminally committed himself?—I have been amongst Catholics for fifty years, and I know the run of their strings.

55. *The Commissioner.*] Do you suggest that the Minister is a Catholic?—I consider he has not been there long enough to form an opinion.

56. You say they are all tarred with the same brush?—I believe they are.

57. Do you suggest the Commissioner of Police is a Catholic?—I do not know; he might be. There are as good Catholics as any other, but they will not swear one against the other on any account.

58. But you do not suggest that Catholics would deliberately perjure themselves?—If those three go into Court and swear this, I have done with it.

59. You allow your feelings over the matter to influence you to make statements you cannot substantiate?—I only give my private opinion.

60. You are impugning the honesty of the Catholic section of the community?—I know that: I am speaking my thoughts.

61. *Inspector Mitchell.*] Mrs. Hoffman, one of the witnesses, in her statement, says the marriage took place on Tuesday, the 2nd January, between 8 and 9 in the morning: why should she tell a lie on the subject?—There is the guard and my other witnesses. Newton took their tickets, and knew my daughter. I took a note in my pocket-book of what he told me.

62. In Boyle's statement, which I read to you, he says, "We were married at 8, or between 8 and 9, in the morning of the 2nd January." He was not in any danger or trying to avoid trouble: why should he tell a lie?—To shield the dean.

63. When reading Boyle's statement to you, do you remember me reading this: "On the day preceding my marriage he [that is, you] referred to me [Boyle] as a rotten crawler, and producing a bottle, said, "If it is holy-water he is looking for, I have got it here." The bottle contained tar, or some such substance, and he also informed me the contents of the bottle would destroy my clothing and my wife's. I fully believed he was carrying a revolver in his pocket, and intended to injure us"?—This is the first I ever heard of it. Detective McIlveney met me in the street one day, and said, "There is a report you are following them with a revolver." I said, "I have never had one in my hand for forty years."

64. You have told the Court that I read Boyle's statement to you?—You did not read that; you only read his statement that the marriage took place at a certain time.

65. Why should I fail to read an important part like that?—You did not read it.

66. Did I not afterwards explain that that would be the reason you did not see what you expected to when the ceremony took place—that they tried to avoid you lest you should do them harm?—We parted at half-past 6 on the Monday night on good terms.

67. Did I not explain that this would explain their going into the church by another entrance, for fear you should do them some harm?—No; I swear I never saw a person in the church but the dean, Father Delaney, and another man.

68. What motive could I have in failing to read such an important part of the statement?—I do not know. You only read from the three statements about the time of the marriage: the three statements appeared to be copies of one another.

69. You tell the Court positively I never explained to you why you may not have seen any one go in at the front door of the church?—No.

70. Is your memory good?—Pretty good.

71. If I swear I did tell you?—Most decidedly you would swear falsely.

72. What motive should I have?—That is your business.

73. Did you make use of such language to Boyle as "You are a rotten crawler," and, producing a bottle, say, "If it is holy-water you are looking for, I have got it here," and say that the contents of the bottle would destroy his and your daughter's clothes?—I did not.

74. Why should he say you did?—I will tell you how it might arise. After I took my daughter away from him on Monday, when she came to my terms, I took a little bottle of oil which had some kind of medicine in it, and threw it away, saying, "I would have spoiled his coat for him." I never spoke to Boyle on the matter. She might have told him this.

75. Your grievance against me is that you think I restricted the inquiry by the detective?—That was my opinion.

76. If I swear to the Court I gave no such instructions, and that there was no restriction in the inquiry, are you prepared to accept that assurance?—I do not think it would alter my opinion.

77. I ask you the question, if I on oath assure the Court that in no way, directly or indirectly, did I restrict the inquiry, are you prepared to accept my assurance to that effect?—I suppose I must accept it.

ALFRED JAMES MITCHELL further examined. (No. 5.)

*Witness:* In November, 1906, the complainant called at the police-station at Invercargill, to make a complaint. By my instructions Sergeant Black attended to Mr. Stuck at that visit, and furnished a report embodying the substance of the complaint. That report was minuted by myself to the detective stationed here at the time—McIlveney: "Please arrange to see Mr. Stuck in your office, and there obtain a full statement setting forth specifically his grievance. You may be able to ascertain from him where the contracting parties now are." No instructions of any kind were conveyed to McIlveney, either directly or indirectly, as to the scope of the inquiry he was to make. It was dealt with by me, as all other inquiries are—minuted to a subordinate for full inquiry. From the beginning I recognised that the main and most reliable evidence would be forthcoming from those present at the ceremony, and I was naturally anxious that statements from the contracting parties and from the witnesses to the marriage should be obtained, recognising that if that failed me outside evidence would be practically of little or no value. When Mr. Stuck called the second time at the station he came into my office, and I read over to him the whole—I regret to say it in conflict to Mr. Stuck—the whole of the statements made by Boyle and the two witnesses, and I explained to him that the latter portion of Boyle's statement would very

reasonably account for the parties to the marriage having entered the church by the back way rather than by the front way, solely for the purpose of avoiding him, seeing that he had threatened to do them harm. I also explained to Mr. Stuck at that interview that with such material as was then available it would be simply absurd for me to do as he desired—have a charge preferred, and a criminal charge at that—against the dean: that we could not reasonably hope for a conviction without evidence to sustain the charge. I now say that Mr. Stuck, in reply to that, said—I am not giving his exact words, but the gist of it—that it did not concern him so much as that he was determined to show the dean up. I then replied, “Very well; I am not going to be a party to assist you to show any person up,” and suggested to him that if he was so determined to have proceedings taken all he had to do was to lay an information with the Clerk of the Court—the channel equally open to him as to the police. Mr. Stuck left the office very much displeased with me because I would not promise him I would have proceedings taken. He was very angry with me, and I took every care to explain my inability to comply with his request. I took special pains to satisfy him that it was not a case of want of will, but that it would be absurd to do so in the absence of reasonable evidence. He called at the station a third time at the interval of a day or two in order to again ask me if I could reconsider the matter and take action against the dean. He was very determined and persistent that, whether evidence was forthcoming or not, proceedings must be taken against the dean. I said I had done all I could for him, and that I would not take any action, and if he was not satisfied with me why did he not go to a solicitor? In great anger he left the office, and I have reason to believe the next day or two saw the late Mr. Macdonald, explained the whole matter to him, told him what I said, and that Mr. Macdonald said, “Doubtless the Inspector has given you good advice; if evidence is not forthcoming, how can you hope to sustain the charge?” Later on I received a letter from the Commissioner, addressed to the Minister of Justice, signed by Mr. Stuck, setting forth fully his complaint, which was minuted to me for inquiry and report. The whole of the file in the office was attached to the correspondence, and returned to the Commissioner. I heard nothing more about it. Mr. Stuck has told the Court he received a reply. The train that left here at 10.10 in the morning connects with the train leaving Gore at 1.3 in the afternoon, and the mere fact of persons travelling by the train from Gore at 1.3 affords little or no evidence as to the train they left Invercargill by: it might have been either by the 7 or 10.10 train. I explained this to Mr. Stuck when he suggested I should see the guard in charge of the Gore-Lumsden train, and showed that it would be idle to get a statement from him. I say now, without the slightest fear of contradiction, I did everything I could to try and satisfy Mr. Stuck, but unless I was prepared to lay an information of a criminal nature against the dean I failed to do so.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Was any statement obtained from the dean?—Yes, I have a copy here. It is to the effect that the marriage took place about 8 o’clock.

2. And that was corroborated by the two witnesses and the contracting parties?—Yes. One point I omitted to mention. Mr. Stuck emphatically says he saw me enter the gate of the presbytery on some occasion while inquiries were in progress. I say on oath (though I do not accuse him of deliberately trying to mislead the Court) that until within the last three months I have never been in the presbytery in my life.

3. *Mr. Stuck.*] Why was not Mrs. Boyle examined? She will not deny it if brought before the Court?—The detective had full power to make inquiry. His instructions were to make a full inquiry, and when I received the statement of Mr. Boyle and the two witnesses I did not think it necessary to get hers as well.

*Witness:* I desire to supplement the evidence I gave yesterday. With regard to clerical staffs, I do not wish any inconsistency to appear in the evidence I gave. In regard to the Commissioner’s office, I am of opinion (it is not a matter of complaint, but I am making a suggestion) that the service would benefit as a whole if the staff in that office ceased to have police rank. I think whilst grades are to be admitted on the clerical staff necessarily the result is that these men must be competing with men outside engaged in general police duty. My opinion is that this competition is unfair to the men doing every-day uniform duty, and I would suggest that a clerical staff should be provided for by a grade of its own, separate and distinct from the other branches of the police. For instance, though I said I thought all district clerks should be sergeants, I explained my opinion by saying that if one district clerk is to have the rank of sergeant then all should, as the duties performed by each are on the same lines. But I would suggest in preference to that that they should be put outside the pale of the grades and ranks of the service, and so avoid being brought into competition with other members of the Force. A man who has been a number of years doing clerical duty only could not at a moment’s notice be sent into the street to compete with men engaged on police work all the time. With regard to Chief Detectives being eligible for promotion to higher grades, I gave the opinion yesterday that they should be, and I still think so; but I wish to qualify it to this extent: The duty performed by Chief Detectives is very different from that of the ordinary police, and they have a different experience as regards the supervision of men from uniform sergeants and station sergeants. Far more care, therefore, is necessary in the selection of a Chief Detective for the grade of Sub-Inspector than in the selection of a station sergeant for the same position.

4. *The Commissioner.*] The crux of the matter is as regards the question of discipline. A man who has been many years in the detective branch of the service must prove to be sufficiently a disciplinarian to qualify for the higher rank—effective discipline is absolutely necessary in the interests of the Force?—Yes, in dealing with his qualifications I include particularly the element of discipline; and I say the same in regard to the Commissioner’s office. It is subversive of discipline for a Sub-Inspector to occupy the position of the Commissioner during his absence.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How many of the present Inspectors have been district clerks at one time?—Three, so far as I know. Inspectors Ellison, Wilson, and myself.



6. Do you not think it is essential that an Inspector should have a knowledge of clerical work, and that he ought to go through a district office?—Undoubtedly; but that without practical knowledge would be useless to him.

7. Do you not find that men going through the clerical department have turned out better officers than those who have not passed through?—I know one Sub-Inspector who has, but he combines practical with theoretical knowledge.

8. Is not a certain amount of training in a district office, together with training outside in uniform, essential?—Yes; but I am not sure that it follows that the man with clerical knowledge is going to prove the best policeman.

9. *The Commissioner.*] How are you going to get the office training if you form your office staff under a different grade?—If the solution is not to be found in making members of the clerical staff entirely free and independent of the grades and ranks of the service, I would suggest that a distinct grade be formed which would avoid their coming into competition with the uniformed police.

10. Would you shut them out from the means of ordinary promotion?—If they choose to take that grade I would, but I would give increased remuneration to that service.

11. How are you going to get the training that you both agree to be essential to the best qualities of an Inspector?—In saying "essential" I did not desire to convey that it was indispensable, but that it would be useful for a man to have clerical knowledge. He may obtain that, however, without being a district clerk.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In what way?—The education he receives before joining the service should enable him to prepare a report.

13. *The Commissioner.*] Some Inspectors I have known would make mighty poor clerks?—Of course, there are many men with the clerical experience of a lifetime who cannot write a decent hand. A great deal of the necessary knowledge is to be obtained without passing through the grade of clerk in the office. This matter of clerks in the office and the position they often take up has been a sore point with me for a long time. The position is a false one, and before a former Commission my evidence was strongly directed to the matter of district clerks dominating over station sergeants.

14. I suppose some of them run the office?—They do.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What is your opinion as to the qualifications of the Sub-Inspector at Headquarters?—He is a most capable man, of whom I could not speak too highly.

16. *The Commissioner.*] I want you to make it quite clear if a distinction is to be drawn between these qualities as applying to the ordinary Sub-Inspector and as applying to the Chief Clerk of the Commissioner?—As to the Chief Clerk in the Commissioner's office, it would be a difficult matter to improve upon the man at present in the position; but I do believe it is unfair to the other Sub-Inspectors outside doing general police duty that they should have to compete with a Sub-Inspector from the office, who would claim an Inspectorship by seniority before those who have been engaged for a lifetime on general police work, all of which is taken for naught.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] They have special qualifications, otherwise they would not be able to take the position?—Yes, for performing their duty as clerks; but they have never been outside as Sub-Inspectors in charge of a district. Take Sub-Inspector Donovan, it would be very difficult to say another is better than he; I should be sorry to say Inspector Wilson is better.

18. Do you not think Donovan stands as good a chance of promotion as Wilson?—I cannot say whether he is junior to Wilson or not, from memory, but supposing he is, I say it is unfair that Wilson should be promoted to the grade of Inspector before him, seeing that he has done nothing but clerical work all the time he has been in the service, while O'Donnell has been doing general duty. Wilson can have no claim to enter into competition with other Sub-Inspectors, and it is a mistake for him to hold that rank.

19. As regards the qualification of the Chief Detective at Headquarters?—He is a man who was most thorough in his work here; it is impossible to speak too highly of the way he performed his duties here.

20. *The Commissioner.*] You speak generally as to his abilities whilst here?—Yes.

21. Who ever called his ability into question?—It has been questioned outside.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your opinion is that the office staff should be transferred to the Civil Service?—I think that would be a very good solution of the difficulty.

23. You would, then, have no objection to the clerk's minutes on papers?—It would overcome the difficulty in regard to a junior dictating to a superior officer. I wish to emphasize the point that the competition at present existing between members of the Force engaged wholly in clerical work with men out in uniform doing general police duty is wrong.

24. It exists in other Forces?—It may, but to argue that does not excuse the system.

25. Would you believe in a system by which men having experience in the office should go out on probation before getting higher positions?—I do not see why they should enter into competition with policemen doing outside duty holding the rank of sergeant: if he is so treated he would be taking some other man's place.

26. But I suggested he should go out as a constable till transferred to a higher rank. I urged that district clerks should be sergeants for the reason that three-fourths of them are sergeants at present, and if five out of seven hold that rank the others are entitled to it. It is really a means to the end of getting higher remuneration.

27. *The Commissioner.*] You gave the impression that you do not consider it necessary for the duties that a clerk should be a sergeant, but you think if some are sergeants then all should be; and your ground was that they should receive extra remuneration on account of the duties, and if the only way to do that was by his being raised to the rank of sergeant you say it should be done?—That is exactly what I wish to convey. If a man is qualified to hold the position



of district clerk, then if his brother holds the rank of sergeant he should also hold the rank, because it carries with it certain additional remuneration: it is for that reason only I think they should hold that rank.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Commissioner would not have the same control over a Civil Servant clerk as he would have over his own men?—That is another matter.

29. There is one question I wish to ask you: Do you know of any political interference so far as you are personally concerned?—I know of no instance where it has been resorted to.

JOHN CAMPBELL MACKENZIE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 6.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Gore. In 1876 I joined the Otago Provincial police. I was about three weeks in Dunedin, then at Palmerston for a month, then in charge of Waiholo for six months. From there I was transferred to West Taieri, where I remained for fourteen years and a half. From there I was transferred to Lumsden, where I remained seven years and a half. In January, 1898, I was promoted to the rank of sergeant, and transferred to Queenstown sub-district. In 1903 I was transferred to Gore, where I remained for sixteen months; from there I went to Auckland, where I remained four months; then to Gisborne for eighteen months; and in June, 1906, I was transferred back to Gore, where I remain.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What led up to all these transfers from all the different places?—Probably the interests of the service.

2. During your long service, have you formed any opinion as to the general organization, control, and enrolment of the Force? Is the control satisfactory from your standpoint?—I do not know that I have the same confidence in the Commissioner as I used to have in former Commissioners. I feel that the Commissioner does not back us up so well as we might expect. There is nobody to take our part against the public, and we are not allowed to do it ourselves.

3. In relation particularly to what?—To complaints by the public, and so on.

4. The Commissioner is more inclined to side with the public than with the Force?—I should say so.

5. Do you think this has an unsatisfactory effect upon the Force?—It gives us a feeling that we are not backed up as we ought to be.

6. Is your feeling shared with others within your knowledge?—I have not discussed the matter with any one.

7. Do you notice any deterioration in the class of men being enrolled in the Force of late years?—There probably is not the same class of men available that there used to be, and a much larger number of men are required.

8. Why are they not available?—Probably because the inducements are not sufficient in the way of pay and promotion. The pay is not now what it was thirty-three or thirty-four years ago, when I joined. It is nothing like it, and promotion is extremely slow. The probabilities are that from now for the next ten or twenty years promotions will be very few to the higher ranks.

9. Do you find fault with the manner in which promotion is carried on?—I do not care to go into that. I have not been sufficiently connected with the Department, having been principally in out-stations.

10. But you must have formed certain opinions in regard to men who have not received promotion, but who you thought were entitled to it?—I should consider that a matter of discipline. If an Inspector considers certain men entitled to promotion his opinion is better than mine, and he has a right to have things done the way he wants them.

11. The Inspector has very little to do beyond recommending?—That is a great point in the matter.

12. Do you know anything of any political or improper interference with matters affecting the Force?—No.

13. Have you used political influence yourself?—No, I have not used even police influence. I have taken everything as it came.

14. As regards the efficiency, sobriety, and morality of the Force to-day as compared with your long experience?—I do not know that there is any appreciable difference.

15. How many men have you at Gore?—Two.

16. Do you always get good men?—Yes.

17. You have no cause of complaint?—Not recently.

18. Since when?—Not in Southland of any consequence.

19. So far as your experience of the Force goes, are they apparently sober and moral?—Yes. They compare more than favourably with any other Department in the public service.

20. Have you any suggestion to make in regard to an improved method of promotion? There seems to be a scarcity of first-class men coming forward. How would you improve it?—I have not considered the matter.

21. Have you given any thought to the amount of educational qualification required for enrolment?—No; but I do not think the standard is too high.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you are not backed up as well as you think you ought to be: what was the cause of your transfer from Gisborne to Gore?—I have no official idea.

23. You had the papers on the matter: was it because of neglect of duty?—I do not think it was.

24. Did you apply for transfer?—No; but I had more work than I could do. I had three men's work to do.

25. Were you not transferred for neglect in the performance of your duty?—I was not aware of it.

26. Were you not behind in your clerical work?—I was, but I do not consider that neglect of duty, as I could not overtake it.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Did you ever complain that you had too much work?—I applied to the Commissioner for two men, and he promised me them some time after Parliament. There was and is a tremendous amount of work to be done, and I did more than a fair share of it.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were transferred for neglect of clerical work?—I do not think so.

29. *The Commissioner.*] You were transferred because you could not do the work?—Yes.

30. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Will you give me a case in which you were not backed up?—I was under the impression that a prosecution under the Licensing Act in Gisborne had a good deal to do with my transfer. There was a complaint made by Mr. Stock, a solicitor there, about some man who was arrested.

31. What was the result of the arrest?—The case against the man was dismissed.

32. Was there ground for the complaint?—I do not think so; the man is in gaol now, and has been several times since.

33. But the case you refer to was dismissed?—Yes.

34. What other case have you to complain about not being supported in?—There was another case of a woman named Mrs. Scott, who complained about being turned out of the police office.

35. What was the result of that complaint?—I was cautioned for ordering her out, and I do not consider I should have been.

36. Any other case elsewhere?—There was one case at Gore where a man named O'Neill complained of being summoned for supplying liquor to a young man. The summons was dismissed.

37. What support did you expect in that case?—I expected I was right.

38. But the Magistrate did not think so?—Convictions do not always follow.

39. Did not the Magistrate say there were no grounds for the summons?—I do not recollect what he said. He dismissed the case, after taking time to consider it.

40. Did he not say there was no justification for a summons being issued?—I think he did.

41. As regards promotions and the opportunity a man may have to receive instructions which help him to gain knowledge of police matters, do you know what instructions candidates can secure? Do you know that they have to attend a class at each centre for instruction?—I have heard so.

42. Were your transfers all at your own request?—None of them.

43. But they were in the interests of the service?—Presumably so.

44. Not for misconduct?—No, they were not. When I was transferred from Outram it was against the wishes of the Inspector.

PATRICK McGRATH, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 7.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at the Bluff. Before I came to New Zealand I was three years and a half in the Royal Irish Constabulary. I joined the New Zealand Force in 1874, but did not remain long, leaving the service to better myself, as I thought. After about two years I joined the Wellington Provincial Force as second-class constable. After serving there for three years and a half or so I had a case before Judge Prendergast, who congratulated the Inspector on the manner in which it was brought. I was promoted, and transferred to Patea. I remained there for thirteen months; then I was transferred to Auckland; thence to the Thames, where I remained for three years and a half; transferred to the North Shore, at Auckland, where I remained nine or ten months; transferred to Hamilton, where I remained for four years; and was then transferred to Sydenham. I was there when prohibition was carried, and Sydenham being reduced to a constable station, I was transferred to Dunedin; and when a station was opened at the Bluff seventeen years ago I was transferred there as sergeant in charge and Clerk of the Court. I have been there ever since.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You are satisfied with your position?—Very well. For years I have been very well treated. I had a grievance when I was at the North Shore, which it is too late to go into now, being reduced four or five steps, as I thought unfairly.

2. Have you anything to say about the organization, control, or enrolment of the Force?—There was one case that came under my notice. A relation of mine came from the Home-country to the Bluff, who thought he would like to join the police. He made application, and reference was made to me for his character. I supplied it, but it did not seem to give satisfaction, and inquiry was made as to where he came from, and they sent to Ireland to make full inquiries. I feel that proper inquiry was made. He is now in the Force.

3. That shows that care is taken?—Yes. I have seen it stated that men can join the Force easily. I do not think that is correct. I myself had to produce a certificate of character from my place in the Old Country; it is not easy to get a character.

4. Have you noticed anything in regard to the control of the Police Force?—It is better than formerly. I have served from one end of the country to the other, and there is a very great improvement. I know some men are grumbling about the rate of pay, and I think they have reason: the pay is too low, especially for a man with a wife and family.

5. That does not apply to men in charge of a station?—No, only to uniform men.

6. Another 6d. would make all the difference?—I am certain it would. The man with me is married, and has two children: he has to pay 10s. a week rent, while only allowed 1s. a day. The rate of wages at the Bluff is 10s. a day, and you could not get a man to do your garden for less. Some wharf labourers get 2s. an hour if they work at night, while a constable gets nothing extra.

7. A single man would be better off than a married man?—But the Department do not care about sending single men, as they have to stay at boardinghouses or hotels.

8. In regard to the discipline and efficiency of the Force?—It is head and ears over the discipline of the provincial days; there is a great improvement in the service.

9. The Force is more efficient to-day than during any part of your experience?—The only place where it was superior was Dunedin; I came over with Branigan.

10. In regard to character and sobriety?—The men are sober, and do their duty; they may grumble, but they do it all the same.

11. They are a credit to the Force?—So far as I can see.

12. Do you know of any cases where constables have used political or other influence?—I never knew of such a case. In my case it has been thought I was a favourite of Sir Joseph Ward. I was never under any obligation to him, nor would I ask it.

13. You have been seventeen years at the Bluff, and have not asked for anything?—So long as I am left alone I am quite satisfied. A man who cannot carry on under Inspector Mitchell is a dunderhead: he can hardly make a mistake.

14. Do you think promotion is unfairly dealt out?—I do not know of a case: some men have been on a station for a long time, but I understand they have refused promotion.

15. What should be the reasons governing promotion?—I should say intelligence and efficiency, taken together with seniority. Seniority alone would not do; you want common-sense and judgment in dealing with the public.

WALLACE ABERCROMBIE BROOKES, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 8.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Invercargill. I joined the police in 1889, and was sent to Clyde; from there I was transferred to Invercargill, and from there to the Bluff; from there to Ophir, and from Ophir to Ross; from Ross to Christchurch, on promotion; and from there to Invercargill.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Were you satisfied with your promotion, and the circumstances under which it took place?—Yes, I received it when I thought I was entitled to it.

2. In regard to the general organization of the Force and control or enrolment, have you anything to say?—No.

3. Do you know that at the present time there is a difficulty in getting the proper class of men?—I believe there has been some difficulty; there might have been a better class got.

4. To what do you attribute that?—I think the pay is the cause of it, for one thing.

5. Do you hear grumbling in regard to it?—I have heard dissatisfaction expressed with the rate of pay, more especially among the married men. When I was in Christchurch, as a sergeant, it cost me more to live than I earned, both rent and the cost of living. I paid 17s. 6d. rent, and was allowed 10s.; my pay was 10s. a day. I have eight of a family.

6. How does that compare with Invercargill?—I think it is somewhat cheaper here.

7. If it costs you more to live than you earn you will get into debt?—That is so. Constables with small families are in the same position. I have been told on many occasions by the men that it takes them all their time to live.

8. Do you attribute that to the increased cost of living?—Yes.

9. You think the knowledge of this has an effect on recruiting?—I could not say.

10. I suppose if men in the Force were asked for an opinion by men who thought of entering the Force they would say "Keep out of it"?—That is my opinion.

11. To what extent could the position be improved?—I believe it acts most harshly with married men joining the Force.

12. There are not many married men joining now?—Well, men get married shortly after joining, but there are married men who join, and that has been their experience. They have complained to me about it.

13. How is the average married man in any other walk of life better off?—I do not know.

14. Is there much difference between the amount the average constable or sergeant receives compared with the average civilian?—Others may live in different quarters; we are expected to live in a respectable locality, and we pay higher rent.

15. What do you mean by better quarters? There are plenty of respectable quarters with small rents?—I could not find them in Christchurch. I have free quarters here, but married men on this station have told me they spent all they earn on living.

16. How could this be improved?—I do not know, unless married men were to receive a larger house-allowance and a rise in pay.

17. Your position is worse because you have a large family?—Yes.

18. What would you do to improve the position?—It would be hard to do that.

19. Are the men you come in contact with fairly efficient?—Yes; I have no fault to find.

20. Do you often have to report men?—On one or two occasions since I came here I have had to report for trifling things.

21. How do you find your position supported?—My complaints always receive consideration.

22. The general conduct of the men?—It is good.

23. Both in regard to soberness and morality?—Yes, I dare say there are a few exceptions.

24. I want those exceptions?—There are no exceptions here.

25. I want you to give me the names of any for my private information, not to be used for publicity unless I am satisfied they are undesirable men. These men you have in your mind, how did they escape being dealt with?—They have been dealt with.

26. But they are still retained?—Apparently.

27. Would you consider them fit to be in the Force?—I would not trust them out of my sight.

28. That implies they are not fit to be constables?—Yes.
29. They are the class of men you would always have to keep under watch if on your beat?—There is one I could name we have to particularly watch.
30. Have you even known of any political or other interference?—Not to my personal knowledge.
31. Have you heard constables boast of exercising it?—Only hearsay. Some one might say, "Oh, he must have got that by so-and-so."
32. Have you ever heard a man say, when ordered to transfer, that he would get that altered?—No.
33. Did you see anything of the general conduct of the Force in barracks when in Christchurch?—No; I was not much in the barracks.
34. Have you any views on promotion?—No, I have been fairly dealt with.
35. What do you think should be the reasons governing selections for promotion?—Seniority and ability.
36. General all-round ability as policemen?—Yes.
37. Is the standard of education an important factor in a sergeant?—I think so; I do not think he could undertake his duties if he had not some education.
38. What extra clerical work has a sergeant to do as compared with a man in charge of a station?—He has a good deal of clerical work to do.
39. So has a constable in charge of a station?—He is on the same footing, but he might have more to do than a sergeant.
40. If a man has sufficient education to justify his selection for the charge of a station, and discharges those duties for many years, would he not be equally qualified to discharge the duties of a sergeant?—Yes.
41. The standard of education is not important beyond that?—Those are the men mostly chosen for sergeants.
42. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say there are men in Christchurch addicted to drink: how many?—I can mention one particularly.
43. Any in the Force at present?—I should not like to say anything about one man who had one lapse and is now sober.
44. *The Commissioner.*] How long has he been sober?—Since about Exhibition time.
45. I want from you the names of all the men in the Force whom you have seen under the influence of liquor during the time you were there?—I could name two.
46. Have they both been dealt with?—Yes; one for drunkenness, whom I took off the street myself on night duty, and the other for entering a hotel when on duty and having a drink.
47. What service had these men?—One a very short time, and the other, I think, about fifteen years.
48. A man to be properly qualified as a sergeant must have something above the ordinary education required for a constable?—There are some men on beat who are very well educated.
49. Any education you may have is of assistance to you as sergeant?—Yes, and to the Inspector.
50. Have you anything to say as regards promotion?—No.
51. You believe in efficiency as well as seniority?—Yes.

JAMES KERR SIMPSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 9.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Invercargill. I joined the police from the Permanent Artillery in 1895, and was sent to Greymouth, where I did duty as foot constable for two years; I was then mounted there for three years; and was then transferred as second man to Kaiapoi, and held that position as mounted constable for four years; I was then appointed in charge of Kaiapoi for four years; was then appointed sergeant, and transferred to Auckland; remained there for twelve months, and was then transferred to Invercargill, in 1909.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you formed any opinion as to the organization, control, and enrolment of the Force?—I have nothing to say in regard to that.

2. Are you aware whether there is a difficulty in properly recruiting the Force owing to lack of suitable men?—That has existed for a considerable time. I attribute it to the increased cost of living and the low rate of pay, together with the high standard of wages ruling for manual labour, which is 8s. or 9s. a day.

3. Wet and fine—seven days a week?—I will not say that.

4. You think the rate of pay too low: are you taking a special class of constable or the average constable, because as a rule they come in as single men?—It is too low to command a good sample of men; you can get any amount of men with the present rate of pay.

5. But it would not attract first-class men?—Not at present.

6. How ought it to be improved?—I think constables should start at least at 8s. a day after going through the school.

7. Would you improve the pay of all grades or only of constables?—6d. a day might be added to all.

8. What does it cost you, a single man, to live?—I live in barracks, and it costs me 15s. a week for board alone.

9. Would you say the Force is fairly efficient?—Yes.

10. What about their general conduct?—I should say it is good, with exceptions that have been before the public lately.

11. Have you come into personal contact with any exceptions?—In Auckland I noticed several little cases, but they were promptly dealt with by the Inspector. In some cases dismissal followed; they were breaches of regulations, and in some cases drunkenness.

12. How many were dismissed while you were there?—As far as I can recollect, there were three in the twelve months.

13. Are there any men, to your knowledge, at present in the Force who are addicted to drink?—I cannot say I know of any.

14. Were there any who were dealt with for drunkenness while you were in Auckland?—I do not think so.

15. In regard to morality?—The men I have come in contact with in Southland are all of good moral character.

16. What about Auckland?—There were some exceptions there amongst the recruits, but in all cases they were dealt with.

17. To what extent was this immorality?—I do not say I know of any immorality or grave breaches of propriety.

18. Do you know of any instance in which political or other influence has been used on behalf of constables or sergeants?—No, I never heard of any. I have heard it mentioned that So-and-so had a good "pull."

19. Was that understood to be political "pull"?—I understood it to mean that.

20. Do you think that exists?—Not to any extent; I cannot say of my own knowledge that I know of any case where there has been any.

21. Do you think it exists?—It is only human nature that if a man has friends at court he should try and make use of them.

22. Have you any views on promotion?—No, I have been fairly dealt with myself. An examination has been lately instituted, and the Commissioner stated that those who went up and were otherwise qualified would be considered for promotion. I passed the examination in general knowledge of police duties and in certain statutes.

23. And you received promotion soon afterwards?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What service had you when you were promoted?—Thirteen years and over.

25. It was not simply because you were examined that you were promoted?—No, I was otherwise qualified.

26. Do you find amongst probationers and young constables we have some trouble as regards drinking?—Yes.

27. Do you know any senior constables who are addicted to drink?—No.

28. Do you really believe influence obtains to any extent?—I have suspicions of it.

29. What makes you suspect it: what you hear?—Yes, from the man in the street.

30. Have you seen anything you could not account for in any other way than by political influence?—No, I know of nothing myself.

31. *The Commissioner.*] Can you name any one you have heard boast of it?—I have heard others speak of it, but not the ones concerned. There is one matter I might mention: when sergeants of police are travelling they have to travel steerage.

32. You think they should be allowed to go first-class?—I think so. All branches of the Railway service, for instance, are supplied with first-class passes.

33. Up to what grade do they travel steerage?—All constables, all sergeants, and all detectives except Chief Detectives—any one below the rank of Sub-Inspector.

34. Have you travelled steerage?—I paid the difference myself. Steerage accommodation is not fit for the Force, especially in the case of married men with families, particularly as regards the people you have to associate with.

35. Men like you prefer to pay the difference?—Yes.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I may say the regulations are being altered in this respect.

DUNEDIN, MONDAY, 12TH JULY, 1909.

JAMES FREDERICK ARNOLD, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 10.)

*Witness:* I should like to preface anything I have to say by reading a communication sent to me by the Minister of Justice on the 1st of this month. It is as follows: "Sir,—I have the honour to transmit, for your information, the accompanying copy of a Commission under the hand of His Excellency the Governor, appointing Mr. Bishop, S.M.,\* to inquire and report on certain allegations and statements respecting the administration, efficiency, and control of the Police Force. The Commission will open its sittings in Dunedin early next week, and I have no doubt that you will facilitate its proceedings in every way, and furnish it with the fullest information concerning the cases referred to by you in your recent speech in Parliament.—I have, &c., J. G. FINDLAY." I read that because the Minister refers to a speech I delivered in Parliament during the session just ended, also to show that it is partly at his wish that I am here to give evidence. I should like to say also that I am delighted that you, sir, have been appointed to conduct this mission, and I am pleased to be here this morning to help you in every way I possibly can, not only to-day, but during the whole of your mission. It has been suggested that, having taken an active part in this matter, and having been interested in police matters for years past, I should accompany the Commission through its travels; but after making full inquiry, I am satisfied the Commission can itself ascertain the full facts as to the position of affairs in the Police Department, and I am satisfied that neither I nor any other individual can get evidence before the Commission from members of the Force itself to prove the true position. I trust, however, the Commission will be able to ascertain those facts in other ways. There are various departments of the public service which it is necessary public men should interest themselves in, and it is necessary they should be ready to conserve and to protect the members of those branches of the service; and from my experience I have felt that if there be one branch that requires the sympathy and co-operation

of public men more than another it is the branch of the Justice Department which we speak of as "the police." That is clearly shown by the statement I have just made as to the difficulty of obtaining evidence. I may say that during last week, although I think every member of the community knows that any communication sent to me is absolutely confidential, yet I have received scores of letters either under *nom de plume* or without signature at all. The Police Department is a department which, if it is to be successful and do the work it should, must have the full confidence of the general public. While it is necessary that our Judges and our Magistrates should be men who have the sympathy, co-operation, respect, and confidence of the public, I think the ordinary member of the Police Force hardly comes second to the people holding the high positions I have just referred to; and after my travels through the Dominion during the last few months I have come to the conclusion that the Police Force of to-day has not the confidence of the general public, and that the confidence which the general public had in the Force is gradually being lost; and if that position is continued or becomes more acute the result will, I believe, be serious. It is not necessary for one to emphasize the fact that when we are in a strange city we look upon the ordinary policeman as our friend when we meet him in the street, and when we leave our home we leave feeling a certain amount of security, not only as regards our property but also as regards our wives, and daughters, and our families generally, because we realise there is a Force of straightforward, clean, honest men who are there prepared to sacrifice themselves for the protection of that which is ours. Immediately the confidence of the general public is lost the position becomes most lamentable. Now, if that be the case, there must be a reason for it, and I will go further presently, and strive to show that the Force itself is in a state of dissatisfaction—that there is an undercurrent of unrest amongst the members of the Force. I have already said it is difficult to get members of the Force to prove this, but I trust the Commission itself will find the proof. The public know it is a fact. Individual public men know it is a fact; and I myself, though I cannot call dozens of witnesses to prove it, on my oath, say it is so.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We shall see how many more say so.

*The Commissioner:* I would ask you not to interrupt, Mr. Dinnie.

*Witness:* If the Commissioner can prove that it is not so, I shall be delighted. I am not here this morning to act as prosecutor of the head of the Department, or of any other member of the Department; but what I do want to see is justice done to the members of the Department, and also to see the confidence of the general public, which I say is being lost, restored. That is all I ask. If I am quite wrong, if the public have confidence, and if the members of the Force are quite satisfied, then I myself shall be delighted. Certain things, however, have arisen, and I will say that in all probability in Dunedin we have as little discontent and as little public mistrust in the Force as there is to be found anywhere; but it is an open secret that things have happened and have appeared in the public Press that have caused this public unrest to some extent. For instance, the fact of certain constables rowing amongst themselves in the street of a city, and, as a result, making an assault upon certain private individuals, is public property. The fact that a constable goes out of the barracks at 9 o'clock at night, and at 10 o'clock at night is ordered home in a state of intoxication, is public property; and the public not only want to know why that is allowed, but they want to know where he got the drink between 9 and 10 o'clock at night; and I shall be glad if it can be proved that the constable was not in a state of intoxication when he left the barracks at 9 o'clock. If he was, then I want to know who is responsible. I need not enlarge upon those things, which have been made public, but they are quite sufficient to cause the unrest I have alluded to. Now, with regard to the Force itself, what do we require of members joining the Force? In the first place, a man must be physically fit; he must be a man with certain educational attainments; he should be a man of good moral character; he should be a man possessing something above the ordinary intellect; and he should in most cases be a man who is prepared to sacrifice himself at the call of duty. Now, if the Department can secure such men as that—and in all probability they can—when those men are in the Force they should receive the very best consideration and treatment it is possible to give any large body of men. Now, it has been suggested that, in consequence of laxity of inquiry in respect to candidates for the police, those individuals who have been alluded to, and others, have entered the Force—

*Mr. Dinnie:* Not suggested. It has been openly stated by yourself.

*The Commissioner:* I would ask you, Mr. Dinnie, to refrain from making answer to Mr. Arnold's statements while he is speaking. You know he is here at the express request of the Minister. Such interjections cannot have any possible effect upon the final decision I shall give upon the matter submitted to me. It is inconvenient, and it is disconcerting to interrupt a speaker when he is giving a connected narrative.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not quite see, with all due respect, the reason for this opening speech at all.

*The Commissioner:* That is for me. I do not recognise your status in connection with the Commission at all, unless it may be in respect of any charges made against you personally. I cannot allow you to make any reference to the manner in which I think proper to conduct this inquiry. It is for me, as Royal Commissioner, to say when any witness is travelling outside the order of reference.

*Witness:* Thank you, sir. It is of little consequence to me, because if the inquiries were made which should have been made, and still those people entered the Force, which certainly they did, I can only say there must be something very radically wrong somewhere. Now, I do not think it is a fair thing for any man to be asked to quote the names of individuals referred to, and I do not intend to do so. If a man is not in the Force to-day, there is no reason why I, in referring to something in connection with his character, should injure him; and if a man is in the Force to-day, such as men I shall presently refer to as having received promotion, it is not wise that I should publish the name of that man so that the general public will be in a position to say, "Ser-

geant So-and-so was promoted over so many other people," because it is not for me to say as to whether that man was qualified or not; and if he has got his promotion, well, I say, in the language of the boy in the street, "Good luck to him." I do not want to say a word against him. So if you will permit me I will simply allude to these seven cases as numbers 1 to 7, handing in to the Commission the names of the people I refer to.

*The Commissioner:* That is the course I adopted in Invercargill. Where any constable, or sergeant, or detective was referred to by a witness I have asked that the name should be handed in to the secretary, so that I may make further inquiry. It is possible that allegations may be made against some individual in the Force at the present time which ultimately will not be found to be supported by evidence, and it would be unfair to the individual that his name should go forth to the public in that connection.

*Witness:* These are the cases referred to in my speech in Parliament. I regret I have not a duplicate copy.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I should like to have a copy, so that I may clear the cases up.

*The Commissioner:* It is for the Commission to clear them up.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Am I to be allowed no time to look into them, in order to be in a position to reply to Mr. Arnold? It will not be fair to me. I may want to cross-examine upon them.

*The Commissioner:* I cannot allow you to refer to anything I may do as being unfair. If you will represent to me any matters you may wish considered I shall be glad to consider them. I am under no obligation to you at all as an individual. In connection with this Commission, all I am required to do is, where there may be specific allegation made against you or anybody else, to give you twenty-four hours' notice of the fact, so as to enable you to reply to that allegation. In connection with this, there is no allegation at the present time. If there is an allegation, when I find it to be based on sufficient material I shall at once afford you an opportunity of dealing with the matter.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Twenty-four hours' notice is scarcely sufficient.

*The Commissioner:* That is the time mentioned, but if in connection with any allegation you want a week, a week you can have.

*Witness:* Of course, I do not know Mr. Dinnie in these matters at all. It might be any Inspector in New Zealand who is affected by this reference, because Mr. Dinnie may have made the promotions on the recommendation of an Inspector in charge of a district. Perhaps before I quote these cases I had better say I did not understand that Mr. Dinnie was here to cross-examine witnesses, and if that is so, of course, it appears to me there should be counsel on the other side, and I might have reconsidered my position in coming here at the request of a certain number of people. If there is counsel on the one side only, I think it is hardly a fair position.

*The Commissioner:* This raises rather an important question. I may say the Department is on its trial. This is a Commission set up particularly to inquire into certain allegations made against the Police Force, and the Police Department must be held to be responsible for the present condition of things if they do exist. The Department being on its trial, it may be said that the Minister at its head is also on his trial politically; and it seems to me the permanent head of the Department must necessarily have some reflection cast upon him in connection with the administration, and it would be only justice to allow the permanent head of the Department, without introducing any personal feeling into the matter at all, an opportunity from time to time of clearing up any matter which may be brought before the Commission by the various witnesses.

*Witness:* It has been suggested, I repeat, that a number of people whose names I have supplied to you were received into the Police Force without due inquiry as to character, and as a result certain things have taken place which have caused unrest amongst the members of the Force itself, and which have caused certain members of the Force to feel they do not care how soon they get out of it, if they are going to be associated with such people, and which have made it more difficult for the Department to get recruits from the right class of men. No. 1 was a man who was concerned in the assault case of which I spoke as taking place in the streets of Wellington recently. No. 2 is a man who left England in company with his wife's sister, who came to New Zealand and joined the Police Force. How much inquiry there was remains to be proved. His deserted wife made inquiries, and it was discovered that he was here in the Police Force, living with his wife's sister, by whom he had two children. He was found at the Lower Hutt. No. 3 came from England, joined, and went to Auckland. He was transferred for fighting, and then he cleared out with a married woman. As a matter of fact, he had been boarding with a certain person, and, although the police may not have known for certain, other people did know that things were not as they should have been. No. 4 was a man who was working on the tramways. He was dismissed from the tramway service in one of our New Zealand cities for making immoral suggestions to lady passengers, and he joined the Police Force. No. 5 was in the Glasgow Police Force. He was dismissed from there for an assault on his sergeant. He came to New Zealand and joined here. What his papers showed I am not in a position to say, as, of course, I cannot get at the file. No. 6 is represented to me as being perhaps the most extreme case. He was an Australian, and I do not think it is necessary for me to say from what part he came. He was a notorious thief. His photo and his finger-prints were in the Police Department in New Zealand.

*Mr. Dinnie:* No.

*Witness:* Well, if they were not, so much the better. In any case, he came here, and he was what I have stated. That will not be denied. He joined the Police Force. Whether his finger-prints were in the office when he joined or not, they certainly were afterwards, and while he was still in the Force

*Mr. Dinnie:* His photograph only.

*Witness:* Well, his photo; and while certain people—and amongst them, I understand, Detective Cassells—were at the window looking at the photograph they recognised this person on

beat opposite the station. I mention Detective Cassells for this reason: that it has been largely suggested in Wellington that he has given me certain information, and, as he is not in New Zealand, he cannot protect himself if the matter is mentioned. Now, I am speaking on oath, and I can say that, so far as I am aware, I have never spoken to Detective Cassells nor he to me in my life. If I have seen him or spoken to him I am not aware of the fact, and I certainly can swear that I have never received one line from him by way of any communication. I want to make that clear. No. 7 is a man also from the "other side." He came over here and joined the Force, and whilst there was an assault being committed on members of the Force in Cuba Street, Wellington, he was amongst the crowd in plain clothes, urging on the civilian as against the police. There are the seven cases, and I say that if 50 per cent. of those cases are authentic, it is sufficient to cause the unrest which I say does exist amongst the members of the Force. In my speech in Parliament I also spoke of some of the scenes which took place in the Wellington barracks. I shall not, unless I receive other communications urging me to do so, accompany the Commission to Wellington, but will leave the Commission to find out whether those statements are correct or not—whether it be a fact that two sergeants had themselves to go into the barracks and make peace amongst the constables upon one evening within the last few months. I should like, also, the condition of the sanitary arrangements in connection with those barracks looked into. Then, here is the circular I have alluded to: "In future applications for situations outside the Police Department are not to be made without the sanction of the Commissioner first being obtained." That circular was issued on the 26th August, I think, of last year. Now, that is an extraordinary position. It does seem absurd to the ordinary individual, and I know it does seem ridiculous to many members of the Force, that they are not to be permitted to apply for positions outside the Force without first going to the Commissioner and getting permission from him. That circular alone has caused a great amount of feeling amongst members of the Force. There is a suggestion as to the reason, although I am not going to touch upon that at the present moment, and in any case I do not think it is correct. It is alluded to in my speech, and I hope the Commission will be able to clear it up. Then there is this other question which I alluded to in my speech, and which the Premier, I think unwisely, made apply to the Commissioner. I did not do so, and that must be recognised at once. It was the case of a constable who applied for thirty-six days' leave in order to go to Australia to get married. His application was refused, as he was only entitled to twenty-nine days' leave. It was then pointed out that under a circular which had been issued from the Commissioner's office special provision had been made for those desiring to visit Australia, and when that was pointed out the thirty-six days was granted, but seven days' pay was stopped. As to the question of whether a point should have been stretched, and whether the man should have been paid for those seven days when he was going to get married, perhaps the financial strain on the Department and on the Government would have been too great, and I would not like to suggest that such a thing should have been done; but I should be glad if the Commissioner would clear up this point, because members of the Force certainly do believe that another person was granted six months' leave of absence on full pay in order to go to Great Britain to get married. Now, Sir Joseph Ward said in the House that from information he had received only one month's pay had been given, and five months had been deducted. Well, I can assure the Commission that members of the Force are of the opinion that that six months' leave of absence was granted on full pay.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have the file here.

*Witness:* I shall be glad if the file proves otherwise; but I would emphasize this now, and would ask the Commissioner to clear it up, because it does affect him. The belief now is that that six months was granted on full pay, but that, in consequence of certain criticisms by a paper previous to my speech, and which I had not then seen, the authority had been altered from six months' full pay to one month's full pay, the leave of absence still being six months. Perhaps I might allude to one or two other cases. Here is one of the circulars which have been issued by the department. It is with regard to examinations, and was issued on the 27th October, 1908. It states that the next annual examination will be held at district headquarters in January, 1909, the subjects being the Lunatics, Coroners, Industrial, Criminal Code, and Police Offences Acts. Now, the Legislature had passed a new Coroners Act, which was a most important alteration of the law, and the circular went on to say that any amendment that had been made in the law that year need not be considered, as the questions would be based on the law as it stood in 1907. Well, to the man who is passing an examination, to be told that the examination is upon a law which does not exist—I do not know how it appeals to his mind or to the minds of some of those recruits, but I do know how it appeals to my mind as I read it in the *Police Gazette* and in the *Gazette* itself. The only explanation that can be given is that perhaps at that time, in January, the Act was not printed, but if that is the explanation it seems a peculiar one. It is true that solicitors and others, unfortunately, do not get their statutes until a later date, but we know that separate copies of those statutes can be obtained from the Printing Office if required. Here is one other case I should like to have cleared up, and then I will pass on. Here is a constable, whose name I will hand in to the Commission, who was stationed up north. He was charged with robbing a drunken man. The charge was made by another constable, and an inquiry was held. Whatever the Commissioner thought of it, the constable believed the case was proved right up to the hilt. The person who was supposed to have committed the robbery was promoted and transferred to a more important position down south. As, however, he preferred not to go south, he was sent further north. The person who made the charge was sent into the backblocks on the Main Trunk line, and when he protested against his treatment he was severely fined.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Have you the date of that?

*Witness:* No, but I am supplying the Commission with the names. Now I come to the question of promotions, and perhaps these promotions cause as much feeling as anything among



the members of the Force, and one of the regulations is considered to be very unfair. It was that clerks in the Police Department having ten years' service might be promoted to be sergeants on application. I do not say that what I am now going to outline is actually done, but if a constable has been nine years in the service, and the higher officials wish to get him promoted, they have only to take him off beat, place him in the office, and in twelve months he would get promotion. It is felt very strongly that the clerical staff should be placed upon a different footing from that of the men who are doing the active practical work of the Police Force, and that there should be no regulation by which a man who is doing clerical work and who has not had practical experience should be entitled to get promotion over the heads of those who are doing the harder and more practical work. If it is convenient, I intend to allude to these promotions under the letters of the alphabet, and will hand in to the Commission a full list of the names immediately. "A" was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st March, 1905. When in a certain district up north he was transferred on account of being mixed up in a drunken row in which a young man who was a draper lost his life. He was transferred to Auckland, and since then he has been promoted to the position of sergeant over 116 senior constables. "B" joined on the 1st July, 1899, and was promoted on the 1st October, 1906, over 273 men senior to him. "C" joined on the 1st April, 1903, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st April, 1909, when there was another man who had joined in 1902—twelve months previously—and who had been passed over, although he had done extraordinarily good work in the Force. I have some of his record here before me. "D" joined in 1897, and was promoted on the 1st April, 1906, over the heads of 182 seniors. "E" joined on the 19th September, 1898, and was promoted in 1908 over 221 who were senior to him. "F" joined on the 16th January, 1896, and was promoted on the 1st April this year over 140 senior to him. "G" joined on the 15th January, 1896, and was promoted on the 16th March, 1909, over 139 seniors. "H" joined on the 13th September, 1890, and was promoted on the 15th February this year over 100 seniors. "I" joined on the 14th November, 1895, and was promoted on the 15th February, 1909, over 136 seniors. "J" joined on the 10th October, 1891, and was promoted on the 1st July, 1908, over 108 seniors. "K" joined on the 18th April, 1896, and was promoted on the 10th June, 1908, over 154 seniors. "L" joined in December, 1898, and was promoted in 1907 over the heads of more than 200 seniors. We know there is an examination that constables recently have been asked to sit for so that they may prepare for promotion, and this is supposed to help them to promotion. As a matter of fact, however, numbers of the men—the great majority of them—never have passed this examination, and some who have passed it have not been promoted. I wish the Commission to understand the reason I have not mentioned these men's names—I do not say they are not qualified to fill the positions—I do not know; but I do say, and it is held by the members of the Force—I do say it seems to me absurd to say there is not one man out of 100 or 150 or out of 233 who is qualified. Surely there must be one out of that number, or else the Police Force of the Dominion is in a very bad state indeed. Sir Joseph Ward also referred to the fact that a certain man named Dart was promoted because he had passed a solicitor's examination. As a matter of fact, he was promoted over the heads of about 300 others, and his case was not quoted by me in Parliament, nor do I quote it this morning, because if there is a case—I do not say there is—that could justify the Department in making a man a sergeant simply because he had passed a solicitor's examination—I do not say this—it was the case of Dart. And as he is now doing the educational part of the instruction of the recruits in Wellington no doubt he is well qualified for the work he is doing. I only make this allusion because Sir Joseph Ward mentioned the name in the House.

*Mr. Dinnie:* You make no complaint about this case?

*Witness:* No.

*The Commissioner:* When you say you make no complaint do you mean that his having passed the examination was sufficient excuse for promoting him over 300 others?

*Witness:* I do not say so, but I say if there were a case that might be justifiable this would be the one. In conclusion, I have told the Commission what I consider the public mind to be in regard to the Force, and I have told you what I think the feeling is internally amongst members of the Force themselves; and I am sure the Commission and Mr. Dinnie, together with all, will be very glad to have this condition of affairs removed if it exists as I have said I believe it does. How is it to be done? In the first place, if you are to restore public confidence you must remove the old larrikin element from the Police Force, if it is there. The right class of men must be induced to join the Police Force, and if you are going to have the right class of men in the Force your conditions must be such as to attract men of that class. I need not point out to this Commission what a policeman is and what he has to be. He is always on duty seven days a week. It may be said he gets paid for it; so he does, but he does not get paid double for Sundays. If he is on night duty he has to be up in the morning, if he has a case to attend in the Court: he must be always ready to be called upon, day and night, in case of rows, fires, or anything of that kind; he has to handle dead bodies and lunatics, and—I was going to say filthy drunks, but this is so common as to be not worth mentioning; his work is not the most pleasant in the world. His pay is 7s. 6d. a day—that of an ordinary labourer; and yet he has to be a model man if he is to come up to the requirements of the Department. That is the remuneration he gets to commence with. If he is a married man, speaking of constables, he gets 1s. towards his house-rent. He has to live within a quarter of a mile of the depot, and every one knows the difference in rent if you have to live close to the congested population. He has twelve days' holiday on full pay every year; but a man in an ordinary commercial house would have ten days on full pay, and in addition all the holidays that are going. When a policeman is on leave, if he is travelling by train or steamer, and is called upon by a guard or other person to interfere with drunks, &c., he has to leave his wife and children, and is on duty, although supposed to be away on leave. If a man is married and has children—rightly so, we do not complain—if a transfer is necessary, he has to pack up

his goods or sell them, and away he goes, but unfortunately some of the members of his family who may be just commencing to do business have to be left behind, and that is a hardship. I spoke in the House with regard to the travelling-expenses of the Detective Force. Personally, I do not think it sufficient, and I am sure it is not a fair thing for a man away on duty to ask him to go down into the steerage—particularly in some of the smaller steamers—and rough it with the same class of criminals he is always doing duty among. My opinion is that if the Force is to be placed on a better footing these conditions will have to be improved, and there will have to be a rise in pay. The conditions will have to be made more attractive than they are at present. And, above all, the men will have to be made to feel, if they are to belong to a class which the Commissioner and all of us wish to see in the Force, that on entering the Force they are going amongst a community of men who are their equals intellectually and morally as well as physically. I have to thank you, sir, for listening to me so attentively. I have alluded to the fact that I am satisfied you will have great difficulty in getting the evidence I would like you to have. I am quite satisfied that any communication you may receive confidentially, without my stating where I got my information from, from time to time as you go on your tour, you will look into; and I am quite satisfied, whatever the Force or the public may think of the appointment of this Commission, that, as a result, good will be done, not only to the general public, but more particularly to the members of the Force.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you given any thought to the conditions of pay, &c., necessary to make the Force more attractive?—I have not, because I do not think I should suggest what increase there should be.

2. Do you think the Force is insufficiently paid?—I do.

3. The whole question comes under the head of recruiting, in connection with which the Commission is asked to make suggestions?—I think you will find in your travels that recruiting is not only falling off, but that the class of recruit is not as acceptable as those of a few years ago. I have reason to believe, and I know, that reports have been received by Inspectors that recruits who go on night duty are not men fitted for the position of constables—not in this town. I should be glad, the training depot being in Wellington, if the Commission, while sitting there, will ascertain how many of these recruits have been reported by the two sergeants in charge of the station as being fully qualified for appointment as constables. In regard to pay, I think the pay of a constable joining should be increased by at least 1s., and there should be a general rise.

4. Do you think the standard of education required is too high?—Yes, I do. I think the Fourth would be quite sufficient, providing you permit Sergeant Dart, who does this class of training at the depot, to state that he considers the educational qualification of a candidate is sufficient. There are men at the age of twenty-five or twenty-six who cannot readily get a Fifth Standard certificate, yet since they left school and have improved their education all round are well qualified for the position of constables.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] They do not have to produce a certificate if they pass an examination equal to the Fifth Standard?—I know, but they have to pass an examination either under a schoolmaster or one of the School Inspectors, and frequently the passing in this way is more difficult than the Sixth Standard examination in an ordinary school.

6. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to ask Mr. Dinnie any question, Mr. Arnold?—I do not intend to take up the position of prosecutor in any way. At first I did. I was communicated with by a large number of members of the Force, and thought of going through with the Commission, so that I might receive communications from them constantly, if necessary, and represent their case. However, I do not see that much is to be gained by that course.

7. The only thing to be gained would be that they would give you information which they would not give me personally?—Exactly, but perhaps if they knew that anything I receive from them I will forward to you—not the documents, but the information—that may be of some help. I do not intend asking Mr. Dinnie or any other person any questions at the present juncture, and the reason I took action in Parliament was that I felt the time had arrived for some action to be taken. It is very well for a person like myself to be told “You should communicate with the Minister,” but constables know if they communicate with the Minister that would be in itself an offence. If a man communicates with the Minister he may be marked. I do not say such things are done in New Zealand, but it might happen, and in any case the Minister gets a reply from the Department, and that is sent to the man, and the whole thing drops at that. I felt the time had arrived when something more should be done, and that was the reason I made the speech in Parliament, which I believe has been the cause of the appointment of the Commission. In future, if I find there is any necessity for me to follow the Commission up north, I shall be pleased to do so. In the meantime I am not prosecuting the Department, but I want to see it placed on a satisfactory footing in the eyes of the public, and for the sake of the men themselves.

8. Have you any clear opinion as to whether there is any political or other interference?—I have not. I do not think there has ever been political influence so far as this town is concerned, either in the appointment of constables or promotions. I do not know of any.

9. If a constituent comes to you and makes a complaint in regard to the conduct of any local officer, what would you do?—If a constituent who is not a constable came to me and complained of the action of any constable I would go to his superior officer.

10. Would you communicate direct with the Minister? My reason for asking this is that on going through the file the other day—which I intend to do in connection with every case that comes under my knowledge—I found that there are no less than three letters from a certain member of Parliament addressed to the Minister, forwarding complaints made to him by his constituents with regard to a certain constable. It seemed to me by going to the Minister direct a political aspect would be introduced, while it is open to the member to go to the immediate superior officer or to the Commissioner. In the latter case it becomes a departmental matter.—

*Mr. Dinnie.* I am not supposed to answer any member of Parliament. That answer must be sent to the Minister.

*Mr. Arnold:* That is quite correct, not only in connection with the Police Department, but all departments. If a complaint were made to me about a constable, in all probability—it would depend upon what the case was—I should come down and see the Inspector, but I would not write to him. If I had to put my name to paper I should go to the Minister. The same thing applies if I were to write to the General Manager of Railways, and in all probability I should receive a communication from the Minister telling me the communication should pass through him. That will explain why the file contains these letters from members of Parliament.

*The Commissioner:* Then, Mr. Dinnie, if you received a letter from Mr. Arnold forwarding complaints from certain of his constituents you would lay them before the Minister?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I would cause inquiry to be made, and give the result to the Minister. In cases of complaint by the public they should come to me, and I would see that it was properly investigated.

*The Commissioner:* I have repeatedly made complaint to an Inspector, and would not think of troubling you if satisfied of the way they were disposed of.

*Mr. Dinnie:* But I am anxious to know what is going on.

---

TUESDAY, 13TH JULY, 1909.

WILLIAM WALKER, ex Police Constable, examined on oath. (No. 11.)

*Witness:* I was at one time in the Police Force of New Zealand. I joined in February, 1878, in Dunedin. I joined as a constable and left as a constable. I was stationed in Maclaggan Street for three months, then in King Street for three months, at Port Chalmers six months, and was then in charge of Oamaru Gaol for two years; transferred to Ngapara in charge of that station, and remained there eighteen months; transferred back to Oamaru, not at my own request; transferred from there to North-east Valley, where I remained twelve years; transferred from there to Riverton, where I remained seven years; transferred to Invercargill, where I remained twelve or fifteen months, leaving the service on pension in 1903. I desire to make the following statement: In placing this statement before the Commission I am afraid it will not be of much weight, as anything that I can state is hearsay from the police all over the Dominion. My own injuries that I received I leave out: they are too old, and those that did me the injury could have no chance of reply. In regard to political and private interference, this is a sore grievance with all members of the police, and from what I have heard from members of the Force it is freely used, especially in Wellington and Auckland; but how to prove one case I know not. I know the men have got to think that if they have not got the political "pull" on the Commissioner they will not get on, but be passed over in promotion by those that have. The removal of that impression from the minds of the members, and thereby making the men contented and more careful of their employment, should be taken in hand at once. I take it that this is the object of this inquiry, and, as you have invited suggestions for the improvement of the Force, I, with some knowledge of this political or private "pull" and its pernicious influence, offer mine. I would suggest that at once the office of Police Commissioner be removed from under the control or influence of the Minister of Justice, or whatever Minister it is under, and be placed under the control of one strong man. I know of two men who would fill that office with satisfaction to the public, and in whom the police have every confidence, and this confidence is much required at the present time. The two men I refer to are Mr. J. W. Poynton, Wellington, and Inspector Mitchell, Invercargill. Failing these two get back the old Commissioner, Tunbridge. Give the Commissioner full control, and let him be responsible to Parliament only, not to the Government in office, no matter of what party. With either of these men in charge this political and private influence used by members of Parliament and others would be at an end. I want it to be clearly understood that I have not one word to say against the present Commissioner. I have heard his men speak of him as a kindly gentleman, but I am afraid their trust in him is gone. And why? His Minister has done it. By making this alteration, the New Zealand Police Force would be ruled the same way as the Royal Irish Constabulary; and I know I do not require to say anything to the Commissioner about that Force—the model for all Police Forces. As I said, this is all hearsay, but it has been gained in various conversations with members of the Police Force and others in various parts of the Dominion. I hope you may find it of use. In regard to the pay of the Force, I say with every confidence and a practical knowledge of what I say that the members of the Force are not sufficiently remunerated for their services—especially the married men—to enable them to live in any comfort, and put by something for old age. These men must give their whole time to their duties: they are practically employed the whole twenty-four hours, and eight of those at as fatiguing work as need be. I should like to point out that the cost of living has nearly doubled within the last fifteen years. The married constables are compelled to live near the central station, where the rents are always higher than in the suburbs, the excuse being that they can hear the fire-bell. I think the pay of married men should be raised at least 1s. per day at once. In regard to fire-alarms, I think that constables in their beds, and especially married constables, should not be compelled to attend fire-alarms unless in cases of serious fires, and should be allowed to live where they choose, and, if compelled to live near the central station, houses fit to live in should be erected for them. In regard to concessions, I think when a constable goes on leave he should be supplied with a free railway pass for himself and his wife if he has one. It was in years gone by, and for various reasons it should be renewed. Constables cannot make a tour of inspection and a holiday fit into one another. In regard to constables doing duty near their friends, I think

the practice of transferring constables to be near their relations should be stopped at once. How can a man do his duty amongst his friends? From my personal experience, I would suggest that departmental inquiries be done away with, and all inquiries be held by a Magistrate in open Court. The pernicious practice of obtaining written statements from suspected persons, which has lately crept into the Force, should be stopped: it is unfair, un-English, and does not give a suspect a fair chance of defending himself if he is brought to trial. A practice has crept into the Department of employing newly appointed constables to detect sly-grog sellers. This practice should be stopped, as it lowers the members of the Force in the eyes of the public, who are too ready to believe that a conviction is necessary to an appointment. I know this view of the matter is not correct, but still it exists. Men employed for such a purpose should not be admitted into the police. The act of one tells on all as well in the police as in other bodies of men. Great care should be taken in the selection of candidates for admission to the Force, and the whole of the responsibility should rest on the Commissioner, the selection to be made from country candidates; and more reliance should be placed on the certificate of the officer in charge of the sub-district where the candidate comes from than all others. I remember hearing of a candidate being sent by a Cabinet Minister to the Commissioner's office a few years ago for admission into the police. The Commissioner rejected the candidate, but a few days after he came back with an order from the Minister to the Commissioner to take him on at once, and he was taken on. I believe this was in Mr. Tunbridge's time. This one case alone bears out what I say—namely, take the control out of the Minister's hands and put it in the hands of a man whom the members of the Force will have confidence in. If something is not done, I know that some of the best men will leave very shortly. In regard to travelling-allowance, I think all expenses out of pocket should be allowed, and that the officer incurring the expense should be made to show the work he was performing, and that he was not out to make a cheque. I will give a case in point: A few years ago an Inspector used to come to my station monthly. He would arrive about 8 p.m., go to his hotel, remain all night, come to my office at 8.30, and leave at 9, just signing his name. At another station I was in charge of the Inspector would arrive in the evening, remain all night, go to one of the outlying stations from mine, visit another station next day, and come back to the town I was in, and, as a rule, took a whole week to do this, that could easily be done in two days. I have been on duty with Inspectors, and lived in the same hotel, and sat at the same table, and the Inspector got 12s. per day and I got 6s. I am of opinion that work done for other departments should be stopped or paid for, as it takes up a lot of time that should be otherwise employed.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are the opinions you express in regard to the present administration of the police, and the feeling of dissatisfaction amongst them, based on information you have received in Invercargill or Southland alone?—No; all over New Zealand. In the last six or seven years I have travelled half a dozen times to Wellington, three times to Christchurch, once to Auckland, and if there is a policeman about I always have a conversation with him.

2. And they speak their mind more freely to an ex-constable than to another?—Yes.

3. When were you last away?—Last year, at the time of the visit of the American fleet, I went to Auckland.

4. You think the feeling of dissatisfaction is deep seated?—It is.

5. When did you first notice it as a serious factor?—It has been going on all along; as long as I have been in the Force there has been political and private influence, but the consequent dissatisfaction is more serious now than formerly.

6. Do you trace it mainly to the existence of what is called "political pull"?—I do—political and private "pull." I never used it. I would not join the police under present circumstances.

7. Without political "pull" a man cannot get beyond the rank of constable?—No.

8. Do you think this "pull" is being exercised more in connection with the present Commissioner than previously?—I do not say so for a moment.

9. But you are prepared to get rid of the present Commissioner, while the previous one was in just the same position: why?—The previous Commissioner was a man of more firmness and backbone than the present. I never saw the present Commissioner till the other day at Invercargill, and I have never spoken to him, but from what I hear he is completely under the control of his Minister, and does whatever he dictates without question.

10. But you instanced a case in which Mr. Tunbridge, who you recommend should be brought back, took on a man because the Minister told him to?—But he refused in the first instance.

11. How do you know Mr. Dinnie would not do so?—I cannot tell. The man in question came from the West Coast, and was ineligible in every way.

12. I notice, in suggesting suitable men for the position of Commissioner, you limit your choice to Invercargill or Southland?—I am personally acquainted with them. I never exchanged ten sentences with Mr. Mitchell in my life, but I judge by what I see.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any case at all since I took charge of the Department in June, 1903, where political influence has taken effect?—No, I could not give an instance.

14. Do you know anybody else who can give an instance?—I do not.

15. But police constables have been talking a great deal to you: have they not told you?—They may have, and no doubt they have, but I cannot give any names: if I recollected them I would not give them to you.

16. *The Commissioner.*] What would happen if you did?—What happened to me when I went before a Royal Commission ten or twelve years ago. I have heard from time to time from policemen all over the colony that if they could get some person to go to Mr. Dinnie they would get what they wanted.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think there are a great number of constables who could get influence if they wished?—I am quite satisfied of it.

18. Yet you do not know one who has tried or succeeded?—No.
19. You have no evidence whatever to show that this influence has taken effect?—I know of no actual evidence.
20. Do you know what inquiries are made at present when candidates are selected?—No.
21. Do you know what the present travelling-allowance is?—No.
22. Do you know that members of the Force are allowed what expenses they incur?—I expect they are.
23. That is what you suggest?—Yes. What I wanted to show was that some Inspectors go on tours of inspection to make work for themselves; and where an Inspector or Sub-Inspector was allowed 12s. I was allowed 6s.
24. Have you any suggestion as to how political influence could be stopped?—I have made it as clear as I could: by taking your office—no matter who is in it—from under the control of the Minister.
25. But we have a Minister now who is not in the lower House?—But he is there for members to get at, and get what they want, and he controls you.
26. But members could go to the Commissioner of Police?—I expect they could.
27. I want some proof that influence has been exercised?—I have no proof, but such is the impression amongst the public and the police—that unless a man has friends in office he will not get on.
28. *The Commissioner.*] That is generally held throughout the Force?—Yes, and if you could get the men to come before you they would tell you so. I am afraid, however, you will not get them to do so.
29. Do you believe a man would be punished for giving evidence?—I do.
30. What would happen to a constable who came forward and gave evidence?—He would remain as he is all his life, and he would be shifted from here to the back-blocks.
31. Who would instigate that treatment?—It would be thought it would be as well to get rid of him. If I were a constable in uniform, and made the statement I have made, passing over Inspector O'Brien for an Inspector of inferior rank, it would be natural to think that Mr. O'Brien would shift me out of Dunedin, or pass me over for promotion. I think it would occur.
32. But he has no direct control over promotion?—But he would never recommend me. If a constable made himself obnoxious in any way to his superior officer he would pay the penalty.
33. According to your idea, it will be hopeless to try and get evidence from the constables?—Yes; you are hardly likely to get the information necessary to make a report which will be of any use.
34. What do you imagine to be the object of the Government in setting up this Commission?—Well, I do not know; probably to gloss over their own doings in some way.
35. This is a whitewashing Commission?—I am satisfied you will not use the brush, and so is every member of the Force.
36. Probably the fact that the Government did me the honour to appoint me Commissioner was due to the fact that the men are more likely to trust me than perhaps they would another?—Yes; I know they are thoroughly satisfied your report will be as much in their favour as you can gather from the evidence. But the difficulty will be to get men to come forward.

THOMAS RYAN SONNTAG, Nurseryman. (No. 12.)

This witness was sworn, and entered into a long rambling statement. As he refused to put his statement into concrete form, the Commissioner suggested he should put it in writing. This he refused to do, and the Commissioner ordered him to stand down.

FREDERICK MALLARD, ex-Inspector of Police, examined on oath. (No. 13.)

*Witness:* I am an ex-Inspector of Police, and also ex-Inspector of the provincial police. In 1872 I assisted the late Inspector Weldon to reorganize the Force. I come forward on this occasion to speak impersonally. I know none of the Force here with the exception of ex-Sergeant O'Neill. My sympathies are entirely with the Force. I know the difficulties a police officer has to contend with, from the highest to the lowest grade. I look upon the police as a social sewer—not using the word in an offensive sense—through which we have to carefully sift all kinds of complaints, and we should try to keep the sewer as clean as possible. I can only say to Mr. Dinnie, as I did to Mr. Tunbridge: it is our duty to help you as much as we can, consistently with discipline. I take a great interest in police matters in all branches, and I interest myself in criminology. I hold very strongly on the subject of the Westport murder case, and I believe in that case there has been a very palpable blunder. I hope the Commission will read all the departmental reports in connection with that case, from its inception to the finding of the jury. Who is responsible for the blunder it is impossible to say. I have read the evidence at the trial, and I am afraid there was no loyalty: there was evidently some cross-purpose in working up the case, and the only way to get at that is to read the departmental reports. Touching another phase of the organization of the Police Force, I am much surprised that the present Minister of Justice (who, by the way, should have a seat in the lower House; I have looked up all the papers I could, and never found a Minister of Justice anywhere else in an upper House)—I was surprised that the present Minister of Justice altered the decision of his predecessor in regard to the promotion of men from plain clothes to the uniform branch of the service. Mr. McGowan said that promotions were to be kept in the uniform branch, but when Dr. Findlay became Minister this was altered, and plain-clothes men were promoted to the rank of Inspector.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How about Inspector O'Brien? It was not Dr. Findlay who promoted him?—I am not referring to him; but I am proud to say Mr. O'Brien was one of our own men: his conduct was exemplary, and he has been a uniform man. So was Mr. McGrath. The rule was, however, departed from, and, I am sorry to say, for political reasons.

2. But this was not the first time a plain-clothes man was promoted to a higher office?—No; but what brings about disorganization is this: One Minister of Justice will lay down one rule—that promotions in future are to be made from the uniform branch; the next Minister comes and tears the whole thing up, and says, "Promote them from either branch." This saps discipline and the confidence of the men in their superiors. There should be no vacillating discipline. In my opinion, when a man once chooses the plain-clothes branch, it very clearly follows that he should always remain in plain clothes. He should simply aspire to the rank of Chief Detective. The uniform men, who have to do the disagreeable work, should look forward to promotion to Inspectorships. Another point: Too much has been made of these allegations of Mr. Arnold—far too much. I have known instances where men have got admission into the Force who have served sentences; I have one case in mind now—a trivial offence. He turned out a good policeman, and did good work, and we were sorry to part with him; but when we found out he had entered the Force after doing two or three months' "time," we had to ask him to resign. I can only say, if Mr. Arnold went round and did duty with these men, he would sympathize with them.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Everybody does. That does not point a moral. We know their responsibility, and the disagreeable duties they have to perform, and we want to secure that those doing them should be as efficient as possible?—The cases Mr. Arnold refers to have been investigated.

4. I do not care: I am going to investigate them?—But you see how it interferes with discipline.

5. We cannot question the right of Cabinet to set up a Commission. Certain statements have been made in regard to the administration of the Department. Cabinet has weighed those statements, and, in the exercise of their discretion, have decided there is sufficient warrant for the setting-up of a Commission to get at the root of the matter. There is no reflection on the Commissioner?—My references are quite impersonal, and I am here to help Mr. Dinnie; but it strikes at the root of the organization if there is any conflict between plain-clothes and uniform men. A great deal has been said about political "pull." Well, there are political "pulls" in all Police Forces, and every one knows the Home Secretary is king, and the Chief of Police has to do as he is told. I was retired owing to what you call political "pull," and junior officers to myself were kept on. Afterwards a Cabinet Minister told me it was absolutely impossible to avoid it owing to political "push." Mr. Dinnie cannot be free from it: he must do as he is told. I could give information in regard to the matter in private. But I say political "pull" has been here since I can remember to an outrageous extent, and you cannot stop it. The police have got votes, although we fought against it.

6. Would you disfranchise them now, as a matter of policy?—I would not like to answer that question till after the investigation. In regard to a man being taken on who has done some three or four months in gaol, I suppose he tried to do his best. There is on record in the annals of the Victorian department a case where a Stipendiary Magistrate got the appointment after doing three or four years.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any particular case in New Zealand where political "pull" has existed recently?—No; I have been in commercial life lately.

8. But having been an officer, you take an interest in the police, and have spoken, I suppose, to the men occasionally?—Oh, no, except to my friend Mr. O'Neill, and we never refer to police matters. I think the division of responsibility between the uniform branch and the plain-clothes branch is wrong. Mr. O'Brien, vigilant officer as he is, cannot be everywhere. There may be a murder at Clutha, and he goes down there. The Sub-Inspector takes his place, but he knows nothing about the criminal reports coming through the detective branch. I believe the Chief Detective should consider himself subordinate to the Sub-Inspector, and the latter should be held responsible. If he is not competent, then get some one who is. In regard to promotion, constables should qualify themselves for sergeants, and sergeants for Sub-Inspectors; after that promotion should go by seniority. You should never make an invidious distinction between officers. An officer is an officer, and when you make distinctions you break his heart.

9. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Do you think detectives have no heart to break?—But the moment a man joins the detective branch he should be instructed that right through he will be subordinate to a Sub-Inspector, which is not the case. I do not see that should break his heart at all.

10. You think he should remain for ever subordinate?—Certainly; the moment he enters the detective branch the Sub-Inspector should be his senior.

11. How many detectives have you known in your experience in this country, outside Dunedin?—I was never outside Otago.

12. Were you a member of the Victorian police?—Yes; I did night duty at Sandridge and Williamstown.

13. You came here with that experience and joined the Force in Otago, and were never out of Otago?—Yes.

14. And all your experience under officers extended only to Mr. Branigan and Mr. Weldon?—Yes.

15. Do you tell the Commission that detectives are unfitted for promotion to Inspectors?—No. What I say is, when a police constable elects to become a detective he should remain in that branch.

16. Why should I not be entitled to be promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector, notwithstanding my being in plain clothes, if I am eligible in other respects?—I am only giving my opinion.

17. Why do you say that when a man is a detective he should always remain so?—Because it is a separate and distinct branch.

18. Unfortunately nearly all the uniform men hold the same views as you, and I shall endeavour to show the Commission there is no ground for it. Did you join in New Zealand as a constable?—Yes.

19. In what rank did you leave Victoria?—Constable. I was there about seven years.

20. You became Sub-Inspector in time?—Yes; I was always treated as more than a constable.

21. In a very short time?—No; I think in 1871.

22. Your only qualifications were what you learned in Otago and in the water police as constable in Victoria?—Yes.

23. You consider with those qualifications you were rightly promoted as Sub-Inspector?—I must leave that to my superiors; I do not want to blow my own trumpet.

24. I rely principally on the evidence of people like yourself to prove our case to the Commission: I rely on the unconscious prejudice that a long experience in uniform such as you and others have had engenders to do more than I could by pleading our own cause?—Your cross-examination seems a personal one.

25. Do you recognise the Victorian Police Force as being up to date in your day and since?—I have not followed it.

26. You know they have a real up-to-date and live Force there?—They did not come very well out of the last Royal Commission.

27. Are you aware that out of ten superintendents in Victoria five have passed through the detective department?—Yes.

28. And that the present Chief Commissioner O'Callaghan never was a constable?—Yes.

29. Do you say, in the face of that experience, it is a wrong system?—What I say is this—there is no feeling in the matter: If the Minister of Justice vacillates in the way he has done, it is not good for discipline of the service.

30. Do you know the Police Force to-day has unbounded confidence in the present Minister of Justice?—I should say so; but you put the Minister over your chief. Mr. Dinnie is your head. The Minister is your political head, and he abrogates the law laid down by Mr. McGowan.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* The Commission will have the experience of Scotland Yard as well as that of Victoria, and there is not a detective in New Zealand to-day who has not had experience in uniform for years.

OWEN PATRICK BROSINAN, Porter, examined on oath. (No. 14.)

*Witness:* I come before this Commission to lay complaints against certain members of the Police Force. In taking this step I do not seek notoriety, nor do I wish to create the impression that I have personal spite or animosity against the police as a whole. As a matter of fact, I have received consideration at certain times from some of the officials. My grievance consists of the treatment accorded me by individual members. Before proceeding, I may say that I have a number of convictions recorded against me which almost make me eligible to be adjudged a habitual criminal, so that in the light of recent events I am almost compelled to adopt this course as a means of facilitating my future reformation, also to receive, if possible, immunity from future unjustifiable acts by the police. After completing a sentence of hard labour I was released on the 9th June last, experiencing the usual difficulty of persons such as I in obtaining employment. I at last succeeded, but took the precaution of acquainting my employer with my past, and started work on the 22nd of the same month. From what Detective Mitchell subsequently told me, a number of robberies were enacted in this city lately. The police were unable to locate the author of these crimes. Although they possessed not one iota of tangible evidence that I had been connected with these affairs, it was thought necessary I should undergo investigation at their hands. On the 2nd of the present month Detective Mitchell visited the house of my parents. My mother, not caring to have the detective standing outside, invited him into the house. He then stated that I was wanted in connection with robberies at Shearers' and Crown Hotels, and inquired of my whereabouts. My mother told him I was at work. He told her I was deceiving her, as he knew for a fact I was not at work, and that I would have to explain my movements to him. Without legal authority he proceeded to search and ransack my room. On leaving he bound my mother over to secrecy concerning his action, saying that if she divulged the fact of his visit, or communicated the fact to me, or visited any member of the family, he would be under the necessity of shadowing her for the rest of the day. Mitchell's next step was, in company with Thompson, to visit my employer with, I positively assert, the object of disclosing my past to him, and probably also having me ousted from work, in which, fortunately, he did not succeed. They would not be content with a private interview with me, but most unnecessarily visited me in the presence of others. He started to cross-question me, and I then got permission to leave my work, with the object of consulting Inspector O'Brien as to the legality of their action. Mitchell prevented me from doing this of my own free will, and took me into custody. On the way to the station I told him what I thought of his action, and said if he required any information respecting my movements I was quite willing to supply him with the same if he cared to see me apart from my work. Arriving at the police-station I was not allowed to see the Inspector, but was escorted to the detective office at once and searched, they reading my private letters. I was then asked to give an account of my movements on the previous Saturday, and also the day before—the 1st July. Happily I was able to account for every moment of time. Had I not been able to do so I should probably have been in the unenviable position of other persons who have found themselves unable to establish the fact of their whereabouts, and if an unscrupulous official has charge of a case he does not hesitate to adopt unprincipled methods in the sometimes falsely called interests of justice. Mitchell instructed Thompson to ring up the Crown Hotel, and send a person down



to identify me. On his arrival they adopted a course which I understand is quite illegal, for I sat in a chair with three officials present while this person scrutinised me without result. I interviewed Inspector O'Brien, and made a plain and straightforward statement of my complaint, after which he—I may have been unduly affected by my trouble—remarked that I appeared to be drunk, and he did not care to go into the matter. I can with all truthfulness affirm that I do not drink, and that I certainly had no drink that day. I told him that if I did not get a promise of redress, in order to prevent future unjust annoyance, I should interview some higher official than he. He then told me that if I put my complaint in writing he would inquire into the matter. As I did not think I would receive much consideration from that quarter, owing to the insults heaped on me, I have taken the occasion of appearing before the Commission fully convinced that these wrongs will be righted. Speaking as one who has had dealings with the police officials, if such an opinion as mine will be accepted, I desire to make the allegation that there are those in the Force who adopt unprincipled methods to secure convictions as a stepping-stone to promotion, and who, instead of being guardians of the public welfare, are not only a menace to society generally, but are manufacturers of crime. Were I not confident of my own ability of reforming myself I should do what many another has done in the same circumstances—lose heart, and sink into the old groove again. But I demand as a free citizen, as long as I am living an open and honest life by my own exertions, be the past what it may, I demand I should not be subjected to the hounding-down methods of despicable members of the service—those few who cast discredit and bring opprobrium on the honest members of the Force.

1. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Did you call at my office on a certain day?—Yes, at 3 in the afternoon.
2. Before that you had been in the detective office?—Yes.
3. You were greatly excited when you arrived at my office?—I may have appeared unduly affected.
4. As a matter of fact, you were greatly excited?—I dare say I was.
5. You told your story in a very excited manner?—Not necessarily in an excited manner; I told it plainly and straightforwardly. I was no more excited than I am now.
6. What was the suggestion made about your being intoxicated?—You said I appeared to be drunk.
7. What were the words I used?—That I appeared to be drunk, and you did not care to go into my story.
8. Were not these the words I used, "Broshnan, have you been drinking to-day?"—So far as I remember, you told me I appeared to be drunk.
9. Do you remember everything that passed on that occasion?—Yes, the facts of the case made such an indelible impression on me.
10. Did I not tell you to put your complaint in writing?—Yes.
11. Have you done so?—No; I did not consider I should receive proper consideration, as insults had been heaped upon me. I wrote to the *Dunedin Star*, and the sub-editor consulted with me, and told me he had communicated with Mr. O'Brien, and his advice was to give evidence before the Commission, so I did not consider it necessary to put my complaint in writing.
12. You decided to appear before the Commission, instead of placing it in my hands?—Yes. It has been promised me that my name shall not be divulged.
13. Why did you not give me a trial first, and if I failed you would then have your remedy before the Commission?—You told me I was drunk, and I might have been told I was doubly drunk the next time I came before you.
14. *The Commissioner.*] Are you in respectable employment now?—Yes, in a grain-store. I have been there since the 22nd of last month.
15. Has this prejudiced your position?—In a certain sense.
16. Will the fact of your coming before the Commission affect your position?—I should not think so. I understand my employer interviewed Mr. O'Brien in respect to the police action.
17. Were you actually arrested by Mr. Mitchell?—I was taken into custody.
18. But if a man is in custody he can only be released by a Court?—Well, I would not say I was arrested exactly, but I was taken in charge, and escorted by him.
19. Compulsorily? What did he say? Tell me exactly whether you were arrested or not?—I will tell you what took place. I was working, and Mitchell and Thomson came along and asked me about a bike I was riding. Mitchell told Thomson to go and look at the bike, and then said he wanted to ask me a few questions. Knowing police methods, I refused absolutely to satisfy him.
20. Had you any previous knowledge of them?—No; they had been in no way connected with my previous trouble. I knew Mitchell by sight. My employer was standing alongside, and my fellow-workmen were looking at me in wonder at these two detectives speaking to me. I went to my employer, and asked him to allow me to go and speak to Mr. O'Brien, as I wished to ask him whether this was legal. I got on my bike. Mitchell said, "Where are you going?" "To the Inspector," I said. "No, you are not," he said. A scuffle took place.
21. Did he lay hands on you?—Yes, and prevented me going of my free-will, and escorted me to the detective office.
22. In the presence of other persons?—Yes; four persons I could name.
23. Why did you not prosecute him yourself?—I am in no circumstances to prosecute.
24. He actually laid hands on you?—Yes.
25. Who were present?—Four persons.
26. I should consider it very improper if you were laid hands on by any officer without sufficient warrant, but you must be supported by evidence, and I shall want the names?—I will give you the names privately.



27. *Inspector O'Brien.*] You declined to answer any question when the detectives first visited you?—Yes.

28. Did you not tell them at once, "I shall not answer any questions; I shall go with you at once to the detective office"?—No, that is a lie.

29. Will you also say it is a lie if any one says you walked to the station of your own free-will, without being in any way pressed, pushed, forced, or anything else?—They compelled me to go; I wanted to ride on my bike, but they would not allow me.

30. What do you mean by "compelled"?—Compelled me to go in their company.

31. But what do you mean by the word "compelled"?—I knew it was inadvisable to resist two constables who say, "You can't go unless we go with you." That is where the compelling came in. They forced their presence on me, and compelled me to walk with them.

32. Did they put hands on you, and force you?—No; but in the first instance Mitchell prevented me from going on my bike.

33. What became of the bike?—I wheeled it to the police-station.

34. Would you be surprised to hear that some one else wheeled it, not you?—Yes; Thomson may have said to me, "I will hold your bike for a few minutes." He wheeled it while I smoked a cigarette, and then I wheeled it myself, as far as I remember.

35. Oh, you smoked a cigarette comfortably on the way?—That does not say I was not under compulsion.

36. But what did the compulsion consist of?—In my not being able to please myself about what I did; they persisted in coming with me to the station.

37. They did not invite you to go to some quiet place to converse with you?—So far as I recollect, they said, "You had better explain to us," and I went and got my employer's permission to go to the police-station. I thought the best thing would be to consult a lawyer, but I had not the means to do so.

38. Describe the compulsion?—It wants no describing: they would not leave my company.

39. How did they prevent you from going of your own free-will?—Mitchell assaulted me, and prevented me from going by laying hands on me, and, as I did not wish to make matters worse, I allowed them to compel men. It was a case of passive resistance.

40. To what extent did you carry it out?—When Mitchell laid hands on me I went under compulsion.

41. You say Mitchell laid hands on you?—I do.

42. Was it not on your bike he laid hands?—On me also; he pushed me against the wall, and laid hands on my bike also. I got on the bike, and he pulled me off.

WILLIAM HENRY HIGGINS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No 15.)

*Witness:* I am sergeant of police stationed at Lawrence. I entered the Force on the 8th October, 1878, and was made sergeant on the 1st August, 1898—after twenty years' service.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make any general statement with regard to the matters under inquiry?—No.

2. Have you any opinion with regard to the general organization of the Force at the present time as compared with any other period of your experience?—My opinion is that the Force is just as well organized now as it was formerly. In Mr. Weldon's time—thirty years ago—discipline was very strict, but I believe it is even stricter, if anything, now.

3. And is the control fairly effective?—I think so.

4. How many men have you in your district?—Three men, and they are all men of some years' service. I have been out of touch for over three years with the general body of men at head centres. I have been at Lawrence for three years on the 13th June last.

5. How do the men at the present time entering the Force compare with those who used to come in formerly?—A good many inquiries have gone through my hands with regard to applicants for the police, and I believe there is more searching inquiry made now than ever has been made previously. In fact, from the very time the applicant leaves school until he makes his application his history is looked into.

6. How do you account for unsuitable men getting in?—I have never heard of a case. I am only speaking from what correspondence has passed through my hands.

7. You are prepared to say that from your knowledge any inquiry has been searching and effective?—Yes.

8. What is the discipline as compared with past years?—Quite as strict and quite as good.

9. And the general efficiency is as good?—Yes.

10. Now, with regard to the sobriety of the men?—Well, I am out of touch with the great body of the men, but those under my charge are sober men. They are men of long service, and I have never known of anything against them in that way. I believe the general sobriety of the Police Force is better than you could get in most walks of life.

11. And as to the general morality of the Force, is that as good?—Yes, I think so.

12. Is there any way you could suggest in which the Force could be made more attractive, say, to recruits?—I think the pay should be a little more. I think 7s. 6d. a day—and it used to be only 7s.—is not enough for a man joining the service. He may be a married man with two or three children, and for the first twelve months after he joins he gets no house-rent. He has to live as close to the station as possible, and he is lucky if he gets a house at as low as 15d. or 18d. a day. Then he has to pay 5 per cent. or 6½ per cent. into the Provident Fund. He has to pay £2 for the making of his uniform, and all those things mount up. Then he is at the beck and call of the service. He is not like the ordinary labourer, who only works for eight hours a day.

A policeman is never free. I think he should be given 6d. a day more. These men have a certain position to keep up; they cannot live in any hovel, but must try and live in a respectable locality.

13. Do you think the pay at present is sufficient for the single men?—I do not.

14. The married men are surely the worst off?—Quite so. I have eleven of a family, and I am in a place where living is high, and there is no employment for my family. However, I have made no complaint, and I will get out of it in time, I suppose. Nine of my family are girls, three of whom are in work, but there are four for whom I cannot get work. I cannot send young girls to town away from home.

15. You have no particular complaint to make, I suppose?—No.

16. You have had no experience of political or other interference?—I have heard it spoken of as long as I can remember, but I do not think there is much in it. I have never asked for anything since I joined the service, and I was five years in the Armed Constabulary before I joined. I have never asked any one to advance my interests, and I have only made one application for a station in twenty-eight years, and I did not get that.

17. You have heard it mentioned as being used?—I have heard it spoken of among the men. It has been said that So-and-so has had political influence, but I do not know that there was any truth in it.

18. Have you ever seen cases of promotion which seem unaccountable except on that basis?—No. You might hear some man say So-and-so got a certain station through some influence being used, but it is only hearsay, and hardly worth repeating.

19. With regard to the methods of promotion, have you any opinion?—Of later years they have been promoting men who have not the same amount of service as was the case in Commissioner Tunbridge's time. Then we had to have about twenty years' service. It is not so now, and that is the only difference; but it never bothered me.

20. You were never asked to pass any examination?—No.

21. Do you think the men who are promoted at the present day are as efficient as the men used to be?—I suppose they would be, but I have seen very little of the men generally for over three years.

22. Should there be a limit of age in the promotion to a sergeant?—I dare say that would be a good thing.

23. What should you say should be the limit?—I should say forty-five years—that is, if it was for street duty. I have done a good deal of street duty in Dunedin, and it is hard work, especially on the feet. You require to be strong to go through it.

24. What standard of education should be required of a man to qualify him for promotion?—I could not say. The Fifth Standard is supposed to be the standard of entrance, but I consider that too high. I have seen some of the best policemen in Otago thirty years ago with very little education, but with a good deal of common-sense.

25. Have you any opinion in regard to promotion from the detective branch to the higher offices?—I think the detective has just as much right to get advanced as any other man. I have never known a detective who was not at some time a uniform man, and why should he be debarred from promotion; and if a man gets to the rank of Chief Detective, I do not see why he should not aspire to the rank of Sub-Inspector.

26. Do you know of any feeling in the Force contrary to that?—No.

27. You have been in the backblocks practically for some time?—Yes.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have nothing to complain about?—No.

29. You say the Force is as well organized as it was before?—Yes, to my way of thinking.

30. Equally strict as regards control?—Yes.

31. You say political influence is spoken of?—Yes, ever since I have been in the service.

32. It is not recent only?—No; when I was in the Armed Constabulary the same kind of thing used to be spoken of.

33. You have had several investigations to make as regards candidates for the Force: do you consider those investigations to have been strict?—Very strict. In fact, there was one case of a young man who backed out of it eventually, but his papers went backwards and forwards for some time, and it seemed to me the investigation was too strict for him. A man would have to have a real good character to get through.

34. When the reports were not satisfactory they were returned for further inquiry from you?—Yes.

35. Have you ever heard allegations made that in respect to single men there was no inquiry made into their character, and do you believe that?—No, I do not, because I know I have made inquiries myself.

36. As regards promotion to sergeant, you think the age-limit should be forty-five years. The age at the present time is fifty?—I should say forty-five for street duty.

37. Do you approve of the present system of promotion as regards placing the men promoted in a city?—Certainly.

38. And then, according to seniority, be placed in charge of a station?—Yes.

39. That system has not been in vogue very long?—No, I know it is only of recent years.

40. And it seems to give satisfaction?—Yes; I never heard any remarks passed about it.

41. As regards the detective branch being promoted to the uniform branch, suppose there is a Chief Detective senior to the uniform man, and better qualified in every way for promotion, should that senior detective remain as he is and the inferior man be promoted?—I should say he should not.

42. I suppose you do not know the system obtaining in other Police Forces?—No, all my experience is in Otago. I think those of the detective branch should be given the same chances as are given to those in the uniform branch.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 16.)

*Witness:* I am Inspector of Police in charge of the Dunedin district. I entered the Force in the month of October, 1874, as a constable. I was appointed sergeant in 1877, and in the month of March, 1881, I was appointed detective. I continued in that branch of the service, finishing up as Chief Detective in 1899. I then became Sub-Inspector, and at the end of 1900 I was appointed Inspector. I have been in charge of the Dunedin district about seven years and three months.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make any general statement before I ask a few questions?—I think I am only voicing the feelings of the Force throughout the Dominion when I say that each and every one of them has full confidence in the Minister of Justice who is now the head of the Department. I think, if matters are fairly and impartially presented to him, any cause for dissatisfaction that may now exist amongst the members of the service will soon disappear. I desire further to state that I have neither directly nor indirectly communicated with Mr. Arnold, Mr. Taylor, or any other member of Parliament respecting matters in connection with the Police Department recently mentioned in Parliament. I think that little explanation necessary, as some of the remarks I am about to make will be on the same lines as some of those referred to by Mr. Arnold. In the first place, I think it only fair to the present Commissioner of Police to tell him that there is a general impression amounting to a feeling of unrest prevailing amongst the members of the Force—I might say from the extreme north to the extreme south—that he has stationed in each centre some member of the service who is known as a useful man, that man's chief function being to convey to the Commissioner through some channel or another the names of members of the Force who speak in praise or in dispraise of him. I know nothing of such appointments myself. I do not say there is one word of truth in it, but I think it is only fair to the Commissioner that he should have an opportunity of denying it on oath.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have heard it, you say. You know nothing of it yourself?—No. If there should be anything in that opinion, all I can say is that I am afraid some of the constables stationed in my district have not been speaking very favourably of the Commissioner. For some reason or another, there is little or no promotion amongst the constables stationed in the district, nor has there been for some years. I have recommended constables whom I thought would be efficient, honourable men—men deserving of advancement in the service—and to my surprise those men have not been promoted. There may, of course, be very good reasons for that: it is for the Commission to say.

3. I shall get those names from you subsequently, of course?—Yes. I think also it is desirable, in the interests of the service, that the Commissioner should take more notice and give more effect to the recommendation of his District Inspectors. I have made other recommendations which, to my surprise, have not been acted upon. I contend that the Inspector in charge of a district has the best opportunities of knowing the requirements of that district. He is continually amongst the people; he is conversant with them, meets them both in town and country, and he knows their wants. He also knows the men who are stationed under him. He knows their capabilities; he knows the stations they are fit for and the stations they are not fit for. Those are advantages that the Commissioner does not possess. Therefore, if the opinion or recommendation of the Inspector is worth anything at all, when he makes a recommendation some weight should be given to it. I contend that transfers in the Inspector's own district should be absolutely made when the Inspector recommends them; and in the matter of recommending constables or appointing constables to no-license districts I think the Inspector in charge of the district should have his absolute choice. The Inspector knows what his men are capable of doing, knows what class of offence they are most likely to be keen in detecting, knows where they are likely to give satisfaction to the residents and where they are not. In the matter of recruiting constables, I think it would be far better if Inspectors in charge of districts were allowed to enrol a good man when they see the opportunity without asking that man to go to Wellington and present himself there for enrolment. In the days of the Provincial Councils each provincial district had a separate Force of its own, having either an Inspector or a Superintendent at the head of affairs in each of those districts. To my mind, in those days, when each Inspector or Superintendent, as the case may be, enrolled his own men, they had a better class of constables and sergeants than we have now. I have lived long enough in the service to realise that a clean-handed, pure-minded, and efficient Police Force is one of the most valuable institutions that any civilised country can possess; and if we are going to have such a Force in this Dominion I think it is highly necessary that we should offer more inducements to the better class of young men to join the service than we are doing at present. I consider the pay of the constable joining the service is at present too low. He should, I think, commence at no less than 8s. a day, and, instead of his increment of 6d. a day every four years, I think that increment should come about every three years. Again, in the matter of house-allowance, which now stands at 7s. a week, I consider that is far too little for a constable who has to perform duty in a city and reside there. I think his remuneration in the way of house-allowance should be at least 10s. 6d. a week, and that he should have added to the free list of uniform which he is now receiving one pair of boots per annum. At present no boots are supplied with the uniform. I think the sergeants stationed in cities should have equal advances in pay, and that their house-allowance should be increased to 14s. a week. I believe the time has arrived when the Chief Detective at each centre should attain the rank of Sub-Inspector. That would not, I think, entail any increase in pay, as in all probability the Chief Detective now receives as much as a Sub-Inspector, who may be appointed from the general Police Force; and I think the Chief Detective, when he attains to the rank of Sub-Inspector, should receive the same house-allowance as the Sub-Inspectors are receiving at present. Detectives serving under the Chief Detective should, I think, after a certain number of years, attain to the rank of sergeant-detective, and then junior detectives might be styled detectives only; the plain-clothes

constables to remain as they are at present, receiving, of course, the allowance they now receive for plain-clothes work. I think it would be a cruel thing to say that because a man elects to join the detective branch of the service anybody should say to him, "Now you may go on until you attain the rank of Chief Detective, but there you must stop." Well, to begin with, the detective is selected for his work simply because he shows more intelligence, more tact, and more ability than the ordinary constable. Then, why should he be debarred from attaining higher rank in the service—even that of Commissioner—provided he has the ability to fill the position? There is one other little matter I desire to refer to, and that is the number of defaulters from other districts who have been sent to this district during the last four or five years, which has occasioned me great surprise, so much so that I begin to look upon the Dunedin district as a common dumping-ground for defaulters. On the other hand, as is the case in all other districts, I have my defaulters here, but my defaulters in about nine cases out of ten are left with me. They are not palmed over on to the Inspectors of other districts. There may be a reason for that—I do not know. I have had a constable sent to me not long ago whose defaulters sheet gave me very great concern. It was anything but creditable to the man, and the question that arose in my mind was, Why was this man not discharged from the service in the district from whence he came? I scrutinised the sheet very carefully, and I asked myself three very serious questions: what the man could have been doing at a certain place at a certain hour of the night, or, rather, I should say morning. I do not know what the explanation was, but no doubt the matter must have been investigated. The explanation may have been a feasible one, leaving upon the mind of the investigating officer perhaps an innocent impression; but I have not had an opportunity of perusing the papers.

4. *The Commissioner.*] I am calling for the papers in that particular case?—Then, I think you will realise what I mean, sir. However, I shall not proceed further on that subject. As to the mode of recruiting constables at present, I must say I am not in agreement with it. I have had constables sent to me from the depot to this district whom I could not conscientiously recommend to a master chimney-sweep for appointment. When those men got into the service I can only think there was either bad judgment or neglect to scrutinise, to say the least of it. By that I do not mean to convey the impression that their general character had not been inquired into. Very probably it had; but the physique and the general intelligence to be found in those men was something very terrible indeed, for neither physique nor intelligence could be found there. There is one other little matter which has also given dissatisfaction in this district, and that is the apportioning of rewards for special services, such as convictions in the matter of sly-grog selling. I shall only quote one instance where a conviction for sly-grog selling took place in a no-license district. The person convicted was a notorious sly-grog seller, and he gave a great deal of trouble for, I think, over a year. In that district I had a very zealous constable stationed, who I know of my own knowledge had worked very hard indeed both day and night for months and months in order to bring this offender to justice. Finally he succeeded, and a heavy penalty—£50, I think, and costs—was imposed. In that case I recommended that the full reward—that is to say, £5—should be given to the constables responsible for this result. The full reward was not given. I recommended that four-fifths of the reward should go to the constable stationed at the place where the conviction took place, being the constable who had done the major portion of the work. The duties of the only other constable who was concerned in the matter extended to assisting in executing a search-warrant which took him from a quarter of an hour to twenty minutes. The reward was apportioned in this way: £2 10s. was given to the constable who did the major portion of the work and £1 10s. to the constable who did practically nothing at all. It is needless for me to say that the constable who did the work was somewhat disappointed. I wish also to recommend that, in the matter of departmental investigations, the Inspector holding the inquiry should have the power to swear his witnesses just as they are sworn in a Court of justice. Every Inspector of Police is a Justice of the Peace, and I see no reason why he should not be empowered to administer an oath at these inquiries. It would be a safeguard to the constable accused or the sergeant, as the case may be, and it would be a safeguard to the Department. As we know, there are some people very good-natured and very obliging, and if a constable should happen to get into a little trouble, and he should go to one of those people and say, "There is a little trouble in connection with which I may be fined or punished, but if you come along and tell the Inspector so-and-so I will get out of it. You need not fear any consequences. There is no oath to be taken. You have only to mention the matter to him; that is all." I think that should be discontinued as early as possible. Officials of the Railway Department who are not Justices of the Peace have the power at present to take evidence upon oath—that is, the evidence of any witness at an inquiry—and I think it is quite as desirable that the same practice should obtain in the Police Force.

5. Have you verified that statement with regard to the Railway Department?—I have, sir. I did not believe it until I actually saw the thing. I discussed the matter with a railway servant, and he convinced me of it. I do not know that there is anything else I desire to refer to specially.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have had occasion to have a little grievance?—I am not aware of that.

7. We had a previous Commission here?—That is so.

8. What was the result of that Commission as regards yourself—I am sorry to have to be placed in this position. What recommendation was made—

*The Commissioner:* That is on record. I have a copy of the report.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I simply want to show that the witness—

*The Commissioner:* If I remember rightly, that recommendation did not provide for Inspector O'Brien being here, so that evidently the recommendation was not carried out.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Well, I shall not proceed with that any further.

*Witness:* I will say this in answer to your question: that, whatever recommendation was made by the Commission at the time, it was, I think, brought about by the evidence you gave in Wellington at the last moment, before the curtain dropped on that inquiry.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you really think the Commission would not take into consideration the evidence they had obtained here?—I do not think there was anything in the evidence obtained here to justify the Commission making any recommendation which would be at all to my detriment.

10. Then, I am sorry for the Commissioners if they would not take into consideration the whole of the evidence obtained here, together with that which I gave them. The Commission would be a farce otherwise?—Then, I should be very sorry that any Commissioner of Police should think it proper to make a charge behind an Inspector's back which he dare not make to his face. You refrained from giving evidence in Dunedin while I was present—while I had an opportunity of asking questions and of calling evidence to disprove any allegation you might make. You went away to Wellington, when neither Sub-Inspector Green nor myself were present, and you made, according to the newspaper account, sweeping statements which we were never given an opportunity to contradict or disprove.

11. Did I arrange in any way how the evidence was to be taken?—I do not know what you arranged. I only know what you did.

12. Did I not give my evidence when I was asked to?—Probably you did. You say that notice should be taken of something that transpired in Dunedin in evidence. Why did you not, then, in Dunedin give your evidence, and give Sub-Inspector Green and myself an opportunity of saying something in reply?

13. I should have been pleased to do so, but I was not asked to do so. My evidence was kept to the last. I was bound to give my general evidence at Headquarters?—You were not bound. It was open to you at any moment to step into the witness-box in Dunedin and give what evidence you chose.

14. I do not know whether that can be called a fault of mine or of the Commissioners?—It was evidently the fault of yourself.

*Mr. Dinnie:* It was due to an arrangement by the Commission that my evidence should be taken at Headquarters.

*The Commissioner:* I was not sitting alone on that occasion. I have a perfect recollection of what took place, so far as Mr. O'Brien's position is concerned. That particular Commission had no idea of the lines on which the Commissioner would give his evidence. It was merely a matter of convenience that he should give his evidence in Wellington, to finally clear up the proceedings of the Commission. Very likely if we had been aware that in that evidence there would be statements reflecting upon any officer who had already given evidence we should have heard those statements in the districts in which the officers were stationed. I propose to adopt that practice throughout this Commission. The Commissioner of Police will be sworn once for the whole of the sittings of the Commission, and at each locality where any individual is affected he will be asked to give his evidence, so as to clear up the matter once and for all.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I think you will remember, sir, that it was in answer to a question from yourself that I said anything in respect to Inspector O'Brien at all.

*The Commissioner:* Naturally, I would want your opinion as Commissioner of Police as to the manner in which the Inspector had discharged his duties. I did not know what your answer was going to be. Possibly a mistake was made in not hearing your evidence in Dunedin, but I will see that the same difficulty does not arise again.

15. *Witness:* No; but I think I have your assurance now, sir, that you did not in any way prevent Mr. Dinnie from giving evidence in Dunedin.

*The Commissioner:* All he had to do was to come forward and give it. We expressed the opinion that it would be more convenient that he should close the Commission by giving his evidence in Wellington. Of course, we could not anticipate what the nature of his evidence would be.

*Witness:* Well, I feel quite satisfied there is no other Commissioner of Police in the British dominions who would have done what he did on that occasion.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] That is a matter of opinion?—Yes, and I put it forward boldly.

17. So that you have a little grievance?—No, I am not a man with a grievance at all.

18. *The Commissioner.*] At any rate, the grievance is not a matter which is likely to affect your evidence now?—I have no grievance, sir.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest I have placed a man in each of the centres as a sort of spy?—I did not suggest anything of the kind. I said it was a matter commonly talked about by men of all ranks from the north end of the Dominion to the south.

20. Will you give any instance of any one telling you so?—I will mention no names.

21. I mean, to the Commissioner?—I will say I have heard it from all ranks of the service.

22. I shall be very glad indeed if you will give the Commissioner the names of any persons who have given you this information. You say you have recommended a number for promotion, and that none of those recommended have been promoted. Are you sure of that?—I am sure of everything I say, Mr. Dinnie.

23. I think you have recommended very few for promotion. Who have you recommended during the last year?—I presume you have the papers there. I might say that, in consequence of these failures to promote, there has been a tendency for men in my district to apply for transfer to a neighbouring district.

24. *The Commissioner.*] On the supposition that they would not get advancement here?—I do not know. Probably they thought promotion would come about quicker in another district.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Here is your last list. Here is Constable McIntyre, who is acting Inspector of Weights and Measures. Is he fit to be promoted to the rank of sergeant?—I think so, otherwise I should not have recommended him.

26. Are you aware he has been to see me?—No.

27. Are you aware he says himself he is not fit to perform street duty?—I am not.

28. We will call him later on. Then, you recommended a man named West: what is his length of service?—I should say, considerably over twenty years.

29. What is his age?—I do not know exactly, but I know you have promoted men who are very much older than he is.

30. I have not promoted a man of over fifty years of age, and West is over fifty?—I do not know what his age is, but still I will assert that you have promoted a constable to the rank of sergeant who is older than West.

31. *The Commissioner.*] Will you give us his name?—Sergeant Donovan, at present stationed at St. Albans.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That requires explanation.

*Witness:* Does Mr. Dinnie say that Sergeant Donovan was not promoted in his time, sir?

*Mr. Dinnie:* No, I do not.

*The Commissioner:* How did he come to be promoted?

*Mr. Dinnie:* He was offered promotion before I came here, and he accepted it.

*Witness:* I thought the promotions were usually made by the head of the Department.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He was promoted by the Minister of Justice, but not on my recommendation. It was very much against Mr. Tunbridge's wishes.

*The Commissioner:* Did you protest against his appointment to St. Albans?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes, I explained the position, and stated I could not recommend him, as the papers will show.

32. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The next man you recommend is Matthews: do you know what has become of him?—Yes; he is now at the Chatham Islands. He is an excellent man undoubtedly, and deserving of promotion. I am aware he had only eleven years' service in 1907, but I have known constables of only ten years' service promoted.

33. District clerks, I suppose?—Yes; but why?

34. Because of their special qualifications. The next man you recommend is McKenzie, a man of similar service?—Yes, another man deserving of promotion, to my mind.

35. Your recommendations are not very strong. In the case of West you say he is a steady, reliable constable, has a very good general knowledge of police duties, writes a good report, and is not likely to place himself under obligation to any one. As regards Matthews, you say he is a steady intelligent constable, with a good knowledge of police duties, writes a good hand, and frames a most intelligent report; further, that he has passed the late police examination. As regards McKenzie, you say he is a good constable, has a fair knowledge of police duties, writes a fair hand, formulates a good report, is active and always ready when definite duty is to be faced?—Well, I think that is a good recommendation.

36. But you know there are recommendations from other districts?—No doubt.

37. You will recognise that men of more than eleven years' service are recommended by other Inspectors than yourself, and perhaps better men?—That may be so. In connection with a point you referred to a little ago, I shall name another constable who was promoted to the rank of sergeant some considerable time after he had attained the age of fifty years. That is Sergeant Morgan, of Canterbury.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have not the files here to show his age, but I do not think he is over fifty.

*The Commissioner:* I know he is a most excellent officer, and I think he is more than fifty years of age.

*Witness:* If I say he was over the age of fifty-five at the time of his appointment will the Commissioner of Police contradict me?

38. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be special cases where men are promoted, and I think it is only right. Your recommendations have been few?—You speak of 1907 only. There have been recommendations later than that.

39. How many did you recommend last year?—Three, I think.

40. One was West again, I suppose?—I believe so.

41. And the other two were Taylor and McKenzie?—Yes.

42. What service had they?—I do not know exactly.

43. What service had McKenzie?—Ten or eleven years.

44. What is the length of service for which men are promoted now, barring special cases, such as district clerks, for instance? Is not the least about fourteen years?—No, I think there are some promoted whose service does not amount to that.

45. And who have not special appointments?—I know nothing about special appointments.

46. Who was the last man promoted, do you remember?—Eccles.

47. He was a man who came to your own district?—He was not in my district when he received his promotion.

48. What was his service?—I do not know.

49. Now, fourteen years' service is the lowest I have recommended for promotion. With regard to these men of yours, West was over fifty years and the other two had only twelve years' service?—Yes, but the question arises, why is West, who you say is over fifty years, not promoted, in the face of the promotion of a man who was about sixty at the time of his promotion?

50. I do not know of any man of sixty, but if there is such a man I suppose it would be because that man had better qualifications than West, for instance?—I have had experience of both, and, if I am any judge of qualifications, the man who has not been promoted is by far the better qualified of the two. Both have been stationed under me, and I have had good opportunities of knowing them.

51. That apparently is not the opinion held by others?—Of course, opinions may differ, but I assert it boldly. I do not speak at random. I think before I speak.

52. You think transfers should be left to the Inspectors to deal with as regards their own districts?—Yes, I think the recommendations of the Inspector should be given effect to without fail.

52A. Do you not know that there are a great many transfers that must take place as the result of misconduct and other reasons, and that certain men are qualified for certain stations?—That is what I have been trying to impress upon the Commission. The Inspector has the best opportunity of knowing who are qualified for certain stations.

53. Suppose you wanted a man transferred from your district to another?—If I thought it was in the interests of the service that he should be transferred I should submit the matter to the Commissioner, giving my reasons, and let the Commissioner deal with it as he thought proper.

54. Suppose there was no vacancy in the other district for him?—Then let him wait.

55. Would you keep the man waiting about for a vacancy?—No, I think the Commissioner should wait until he can find a vacancy. The Inspector has control of his own district only. Outside that he has no control, and that is why I suggest those transfers should be left to the Commissioner. He knows where the vacancies are and the stations most suitable for the men. But I referred only to transfers from station to station in my own district.

56. You know there are not always vacancies available, and it is almost impossible to carry it out in that way?—It is quite easy, Mr. Dinnie, changing constables from one station to another.

57. You know we have frequent applications from men for transfers from one district to another, owing to ill health and all sorts of reasons, and owing to the difficulties we meet with in effecting transfers, do you not think it is best left to the head of the Department? We have also men to be transferred on account of bad conduct, and I am afraid if the matter were left to the Inspectors we should be in serious difficulties as regards transferring men from other districts when there was no vacancy for them?—Quite so, but I spoke only of transfers within the district itself.

58. I am afraid constables would not always accept transfers in that way?—If I had my way, constables would have to accept what was given to them. I was transferred to two or three different stations during the time I was constable, sergeant, and detective. I never objected to go to either of those stations; in fact, I dare not object. I think that system ought to obtain to-day.

59. Do you not think we should get better work out of a man if he is pleased to go to a station instead of his having to go against his will?—That may be, provided you have a station vacant, but I am speaking of where there is no station vacant, but where a transfer is desirable in the district. It may happen that a man was unsuitable for a certain station because his hands were tied and for other reasons; the Inspector, being in the best position to know those reasons, should have the power to change that man with some other man who would be more suitable for that particular station.

60. Is that not frequently done?—It is only done by sanction of the Commissioner. That sanction may be readily granted in some districts, but in other districts the recommendation is given a deaf ear to.

61. In what other districts would you suggest that applies?—The Dunedin district for one.

62. Any others?—I do not know of any others.

63. The question of transfers is a matter of opinion, and I shall not press it further?—With regard to junior constables who have been promoted to the rank of sergeant, I omitted to mention that a constable named Muggerridge, in Wellington, whose service had not extended much beyond ten years, if at all, was promoted to the rank of sergeant.

*The Commissioner:* I see he entered the service on the 1st July, 1899, and he was promoted on the 1st October, 1906.

64. *Mr. Dinnie.*] He holds, I think, a special position, does he not?—He holds a very nice snug position. He is departmental storekeeper.

65. Well, that is a responsible position. He has to deal with all the clothing, he has to collect money, and he is responsible for everything there, is he not?—I think we have other constables acting as Clerks of the Court in towns who also collect money, and who have responsibilities very much greater than those of the sergeant in charge of the stores in Wellington. That man has so many suits of clothes, so many pairs of boots, and so many blankets to take charge of, and he has a safe place to keep them in. If he does not properly account for those things he is easily detected, and where does the responsibility come in any more than that of the constable who is acting as Clerk of the Court in a country township, where he may have to receive as much as £200 a week, and account for it?

66. Do you know anything about this constable's qualifications as regards education and otherwise?—No; but whatever his qualifications are I consider he has no right to be promoted over other men who are equally as good, and whose service is, at any rate, five years longer.

67. You think, whatever his qualifications may be, it should not affect his promotion?—It should when the proper time comes. Not before.

68. You have spoken in disparaging terms of some of the men who have been sent here and placed under your charge?—I have stationed under me in this district some of the best constables that any Inspector could wish to have under him—men who would be a credit to any Police Force in the world. On the other hand, I have some who, to put it mildly, are not quite so good.

69. What does your annual report say about the conduct of those men for the last three years?—There is one annual report for each year.

70. What have you said in your reports for 1906, 1907, and 1908?—Fairly good.

71. You have said more than that. Here are your own words. I will take the report for the year 1906: "The conduct of the members of the Force has, with a few trifling exceptions, been exemplary, and considering that the majority of them are but young in the service, they have, on the whole, proved themselves fairly efficient"?—I did not say there were not exceptions, you see.



72. This is your report for 1907: "During the year the conduct of the members of the Force, with very few exceptions, has been exemplary, and very few punishments have been found necessary. They have performed their various duties in a manner conducive to the public welfare and to the credit of themselves." This is for the year 1908: "During the year the conduct of the members of the Force has, with very few exceptions, been most exemplary. Only in very few cases has it been necessary to inflict punishment. Their duties are multifarious, and, on the whole, they have been performed in a satisfactory manner." Those are very good reports really as to the conduct of the men?—I spoke of them as a body. You see, I refer to exceptions.

73. Have you made representations about this at any time?—Many a time verbally. There are many things one does not care to put in an annual report. There should be confidence between the Commissioner and the Inspector, and they should discuss between them many little things in connection with the Force which should not be placed upon paper.

74. Why should not this be placed upon paper? What is the annual report for?—I have given you there the general conduct of the men as a body, and, as you see, I say there are a few exceptions.

75. I believe in records putting everything in black and white, and then we should know what you are talking about. Now, as regards pay, the last rise in pay was 6d. a day all round, practically at the end of 1907?—Yes.

76. Do you know what recommendations as regards pay have been made by me recently?—I do not know what you have recommended.

77. Nor as regards lodging-allowance?—No.

78. With regard to Detective McGrath, was there anything wrong in promoting him to the rank of Sub-Inspector?—Certainly not. Knowing his capabilities, I consider him a very suitable man.

79. And you think promotion ought to be open to the detectives?—Yes, to the highest rank, even to that of Commissioner.

80. You also believe there should be the rank of sergeant amongst the detectives?—Yes.

81. As in other Police Forces?—Yes; that rank obtains, I think, in other Forces, including those of Australia, I believe.

82. Have you ever compared the pay and allowances of our own Force with those of other Forces?—Not for some considerable time.

83. You spoke of a constable who had a bad defaulter sheet: do you know the circumstances under which that man was appointed?—No.

84. Perhaps you know his service?—His service was very short indeed. I saw his defaulter sheet.

85. *The Commissioner.*] I have it, and I know it struck me at the time I saw it.

86. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You mentioned a sly-grog selling case, in which a reward of £2 10s. was given to one man out of a total reward of £4?—I did not find fault so much with the amount of the reward as with its apportionment. The man who did practically nothing was rewarded nearly as well as the man who did all the work.

87. There was 20s. difference. Without the file I cannot go into that?—Perhaps I might be allowed to mention another case of promotion of a constable who, I think, was over the age of fifty at the time. I do not for a moment infer that he should not be promoted. I simply raise the question of his age, to show that there is in reality no uniform age for promotion, although the circular says we are to recommend men between the ages of forty and fifty.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I think it says "men of over ten years' service who are under fifty years of age."

*The Commissioner:* We can get the circular afterwards.

*Witness:* With regard to a district clerk, I do not think he has any more claim for promotion after he has attained ten years' service than has any other man. I think he should wait his turn. When he becomes district clerk or clerk in an Inspector's office he is allowed 1s. a day extra, and he has a good many privileges that the ordinary constable has not. He has every night in bed, and his hours range from 9 o'clock in the morning till 5 in the evening. He gets off on Saturday afternoons and on Sundays, also on a good many public holidays. I will say this for my own district clerk, that between 8 and 9 every Saturday night he collects the mail from the Post-office, opens the letters, does any minuting he considers he is capable of doing, and places the correspondence on my desk. He is not, however, compelled by any instructions from me to do so. He is a most zealous and attentive man, and takes as much interest in the work as I do, and I take this opportunity of thanking him, and showing my appreciation of his services.

87A. Do you know that your opinion as to promotion of district clerks to the rank of sergeant is at variance with that of all the other Inspectors?—That may be so, but it does not alter my opinion. Of course, after a man has been fifteen to twenty-five years a district clerk he should be appointed a sergeant when the proper time comes, but not before. I say there should be no cast-iron rule laid down for the promotion of a man doing work in a district office after he has served ten years. It engenders a spirit of discontent amongst the men who are out in the street in all weathers, and who have to handle any drunken roughs who may be misbehaving themselves.

88. Do you not think a man requires to have special qualifications for duty as district clerk?—His education should be above the ordinary constable.

89. Is he not the right-hand man of the Inspector?—To a certain extent, and he gets his 1s. a day extra for that up to the time—say, fourteen or fifteen years—when he should in his proper turn be promoted to sergeant.

90. Do you know how clerks are treated in other Police Forces?—No.

91. This is the memo. as regards promotion: "Constables under fifty years of age with over ten years' service are fit for rank of sergeant": do you remember that circular?—Yes; and recommended constables over ten years' service, and they were not promoted.



92. But they had not fourteen years' service?—They were approaching it, and some had a great deal more. I will give you another instance. I remind the Commission of Constable Lees, at Roxburgh. His qualifications are very good. He is a very fit man to be promoted, but he has not been; he is about fifty-three or fifty-five, but he was much younger when I recommended him.

93. You recommended a man name Dale?—I did not strongly recommend him, and he was promoted. Regarding the standard of education, I should like to say that, in my opinion, the standard should be kept up to the Fifth. I think the man whose degree of education is less than that is very likely to shirk duty which entails the writing of a report. You very often find a constable would rather not see a thing that would entail the writing of a report if he can possibly get out of it. If we can get physique as well as a degree of education up to the Fifth Standard it would be well. But discretionary power might be given to the Commissioner, where a man's physique and other surroundings are good, to enrol him although he has not passed more than the Fourth Standard.

94. *The Commissioner.*] You are then liable to open the door to complaint by aggrieved people that they were not accepted under similar educational conditions?—I would simply give the Commissioner power to reduce the standard in certain cases.

95. Would it not be better to lower the general standard to the Fourth?—I would be very much against lowering the standard except in exceptional cases.

96. I am not in favour of lowering it, but if you cannot get sufficient candidates who can pass the higher standard you must necessarily reduce it?—I am told there are excellent men in the back-blocks who have only passed the Fourth Standard, but who would make very good men.

97. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You do not know the number of application forms we send out to men who apply for enrolment which are not returned?—That goes without saying.

98. Nor the number of men who apply to me at my office, and when they are told they have to pass the Fifth Standard nothing more is heard of them?—No.

99. Do you not think we are apt to lose a great many men of the farming class who might turn out the very best constables, but are not eligible owing to the Fifth Standard requirement?—I do not think there is much excuse for young men not being able to pass it.

100. *The Commissioner.*] But the fact remains that—I am not speaking by the book—the great majority of lads in the country leave school after passing the Fourth?—A great many do.

101. *Mr. Dinnie:* The Fifth Standard is only on its trial so far.

102. *Witness:* I am a great believer in farmers' sons as candidates for the Force.

---

WEDNESDAY, 14TH JULY, 1909.

JAMES NEIL, Botanical Chemist, examined on oath. (No. 17.)

*Witness:* I reside in George Street, Dunedin. I have a small grievance against the police. I do not think they are sufficiently zealous in trying to protect the liberties of public speaking. I have been at public meetings, from which I have been glad to escape with my life, where there were three or four thousand people, and seats and things were broken, and it was a wonder heads were not broken too, and there were only two policemen. After a time I succeeded in getting outside, and saw five constables and a sergeant, and I asked them if they were going to do anything to save people from getting killed. The sergeant asked what they could do, and I said, "You can go and let the people out, at any rate." They did go, and in a quarter of an hour the place was quite orderly. Some men fear neither God nor man except a policeman, and as soon as they see one they are cowards. I have known of a man paying £5 for the rent of a hall, and not being allowed to speak one word owing to roughs taking possession, and I noticed two policemen at the back of the hall enjoying the fun. My personal grievance is that policemen do not like open-air preaching.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What have policemen to do with that?—Well, a number of young men come along, and have not the sense to go away if they do not like to listen, but make mischief, and prevent people from speaking. I have been preaching at the Fountain for five or six years, and sometimes they come and throw water over me, and knock my hat over my eyes, and even push me down. I have complained to the police of it.

2. To whom?—Not any one in particular—the Force as a whole—and I have been told I ought to take a hall for preaching. I said, "The people I want to speak to will not go to a hall." The law allows liberty to speak in the open air. I have preached in Glasgow, Belfast, London, New York, and Melbourne, and have never been handled so roughly as in Dunedin. I thought there was a law preventing juveniles from smoking, but in my experience numbers of young senseless lads get behind me and smoke me off the place. I was told by the Inspector that there is only one man from the Octagon to the Monument, and he could not be everywhere. I said he did not want to be everywhere, but he could put in an appearance occasionally, and if there were any complaint he could attend to it. So long as open-air preaching is allowed by law policemen should try and stop senseless disturbance. I would suggest that one or two plain-clothes men should attend sometimes, and make an example of one or two of the disturbers. As a citizen, I consider I have a right to have my liberties protected so long as I say nothing blasphemous, galling, or personal.

3. Have you made any complaint to the authorities?—Yes.

4. To any responsible head?—I have complained to the Inspector. My complaint was that I was maltreated by these roughs.

5. What was his reply?—One time a mob followed me to the police-station, and one came behind me and pushed me down. I was told by the Inspector that all I could do was to summons him.

6. Do you suggest that the Inspector or person in charge of any district should send constables to protect the local preachers throughout New Zealand, because that is what it would amount to? In Christchurch it would take half the Police Force?—Those who go out in companies represented by organizations with drums to drown the trouble are all right, and are left alone, but when one like myself is not backed up by authority the trouble arises, especially when politics are mixed up with it. I find my platform now being taken by the socialists, and they get a good hearing, because if any boys make trouble they let them have it.

7. You suggest that a constable should be handy to take notice of all who interfere with you?—If they maltreat me.

8. If they do that it is the duty of the police to take action if they see it. You want the police specially told to watch?—Yes, I have offered to pay for a plain-clothes man to take names of one or two.

9. Did you see the Inspector or Sub-Inspector?—Both.

10. What was the reply given by each of them?—The Inspector said he would protect us as long as we did not interfere with the traffic.

11. When were you last interfered with?—About four months ago.

12. You have been preaching every Sunday?—Yes, weather permitting, every Sunday evening.

13. Your grievance, then, is not a very grave one?—No, but it is pretty hard to get one's hat knocked off. One reason I have not been interfered with lately is that the nights are too cold, and the boys do not come out.

14. Where do you get your audience from?—Men will stand for some hours listening to me, and some thank me very much for what I say.

15. Perhaps it will meet your views if I ask the Commissioner to instruct the Inspector to occasionally have a man round this place to see that if there is any physical interference proceedings are taken to protect you?—Just so; but I would like to ask whether freedom of speech is not to be protected.

16. In what way?—Roaring and shouting and throwing crackers amongst the crowd.

*The Commissioner:* The latter is an offence under the Crimes Act.

*Witness:* I thought I was justified in making these complaints.

*The Commissioner:* This will probably have the effect you desire.

WILLIAM RICHARD LUBY, Commission Agent, examined on oath. (No. 18.)

*Witness:* I am a commission agent.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What kind?—Connected with the bookmaking fraternity. I live in George Street, Dunedin. I have no grievance against the police in general, only against one constable in particular, who was recently stationed in Dunedin. His name is Malcolm. I wish to ask whether any evidence I give will receive the same consideration as that of any other person.

2. Why not?—Because I have been in trouble.

3. I am prepared to attach the same importance to the matter as if you came into Court with clean hands; but when it comes to a conflict of evidence I should have to regard the evidence as being on one hand that of persons without a record and on the other of a person who has deliberately placed himself in the position of having some question attached to it. You can rely on anything you lay before me receiving full consideration?—I should like to call a Magistrate.

4. He probably would decline to give evidence on a matter that has come before him judicially?—I wish to make a complaint against this constable for the despicable methods he used in endeavouring to obtain a conviction against me.

5. Has the charge he brought against you been judicially disposed of?—Yes, the conviction was quashed on appeal. The constable, in giving evidence, committed perjury.

6. If he did so, there is no limitation of the time in which you can charge him with it as a criminal offence. It is, in fact, your duty, in the interests of the community as well as your own, to do so?—Is it not the duty of the police authorities to charge him? The Judge commented on the fact of my witnesses being respectable.

7. If it were in the knowledge of the Inspector that there was *prima facie* evidence of a constable committing perjury it would be clearly his duty to institute proceedings? Is that a sufficient answer?—Yes, but proceedings were not taken.

8. The Inspector is not here to-day. I think this evidence should be given in his presence?—Yes. The reason I asked the question was because I know a case in which the police arrested for perjury a man against whom a charge of indecency was dismissed by the Magistrate. If the Commission is open for suggestion, I wish to say that about three years ago I was staying at a boardinghouse which was under suspicion as being a sly-grog shop. While I was there there was a constable named Ross who should be in gaol for his carryings-on in that house.

9. Did you make a complaint at the time?—No.

10. Where does your suggestion come in?—That a man who has to inform and secure a conviction before he is put in the Force should not be there. A man who would do that would do anything.

*The Commissioner:* You are within your rights in making the suggestion, and I will not say I disagree with you in regard to the employment of probationary constables as informers.

*Witness:* I come before you on behalf of the women who gave evidence. I was staying with a woman who was separated from her husband. I was arrested, and charged with being a rogue, and when I was arrested a constable went into the house and told her the house was under suspicion, and asked if she knew she had been harbouring one of the worst criminals in New Zealand

—a rogue, perjurer, and liar. When the evidence came out he denied saying it. Further, when the woman went to the Magistrate to apply for maintenance he said he did not think he would give it her. The police had been to him and told him her daughter had run away with me to Melbourne. I never did so. That is why I wanted the Magistrate examined.

11. Probably if you went to Mr. Widdowson he would tell you what you want to know. Have you been to him?—No. The Judge commented on the respectability of my witnesses. If the constable went to the Magistrate and told him that, he does not deserve to be in the Force.

12. Did it affect the Magistrate's judgment?—Well, he said he did not feel inclined to make an order for maintenance, as she had me in her house. I must live somewhere. If I go anywhere, they will say I live in a house frequented by thieves. It is ridiculous to charge a man with living in a house frequented by thieves if there are forty rooms in it.

13. But you have to consider your record. Knowing that you are at all times under suspicion, if I were you I would get a small cottage, and try and build up your reputation again. Your complaint is that this constable committed perjury?—Yes.

14. Then it is your duty to lay an information against him, and not come before this Commission, which has no jurisdiction in the matter?—But this man has been promoted to acting-detective in Auckland. If I had given the same evidence as he did I should have been arrested at once.

15. The Court has power to direct prosecution for perjury, and the Court, if it thinks there is material to justify it, never hesitates to do so. It would seem as if the Court did not think there was justification in this case. Why did you not prosecute?—Because I did not think I should get any satisfaction. I have seen a lot of prosecutions for perjury, and know what the result is. I must say every time I have been to Mr. O'Brien I have got redress. But I submit, if it can be shown that a constable has committed perjury, the fact of his being in the Force should not stop the Inspector from laying an information against him.

16. In my experience, Inspectors never direct a prosecution for perjury as the result of a judicial investigation: they always take it for granted that that duty lying on the Judge, he will do it; and if he does not, I doubt very much if an Inspector would, as a matter of expediency. I would not make a complaint against the Inspector on that account?—I am not making a complaint against him.

FREDERICK MATTHEWS, Ironmoulder, examined on oath. (No. 19.)

*Witness:* I live in Walker Street, Dunedin. A few months ago I put in an application for a license for a billiard-room, and I have a grievance against the police in that the Town Clerk told me the police had put in a report and the license was refused. There was nothing against my character, and I want to know why it was refused.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you apply to the Inspector for information?—Yes; he said, "The police report is in, and I can't help you."

2. Did you ask the Town Clerk to let you see the report?—Yes; he would not show it me. I want to know what the police have to say against me.

*The Commissioner:* The report can be produced, if you wish.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* This man applied for a license, and the police reported on his fitness generally to have a place resorted to by large numbers of very young men and boys. Reasons were given to the Council which they considered good and sufficient to refuse the license.

*The Commissioner:* Personal to him?

*Chief Detective Herbert:* In regard to his having the conduct of a room—general fitness.

*The Commissioner:* What was the principal objection?

*Chief Detective Herbert:* His association with bookmakers and that class. The files will show the reasons of the police.

MICHAEL MASON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 20.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at North Dunedin. I entered the Force in July, 1905. At a meeting of members of the Force held at the central police-station on Friday last to discuss matters in connection with the service that were causing dissatisfaction I was appointed one of three delegates—Constables Butler and Fox being the others—to bring these matters under the notice of the Commission. We consider the rate of pay is not sufficient, owing to the present cost of living, and we have reason to believe that other departments are better treated, such as the Railway Department, which contains men similar to ourselves, and the Prisons Department. We think married men's house-allowance is not sufficient, being only 7s. a week. We have got to live in the city, and it is necessary to live in a decent house. The majority of married men are paying from 11s. 6d. to 14s. a week for a four-roomed cottage. Now, in the Prisons Department—similar to our own—the men get more pay, and £30 house-allowance as against our £18 5s. We suggest that the pay be increased by 6d. a day and the house-allowance by 6d. a day. In regard to uniforms, we think we should get our uniforms free. We have to pay for the making of our uniforms, which averages about £2 5s. We get an allowance of material for making two pairs of pants and one tunic every eighteen months. The Prison Department, we have every reason to believe, provides two sets of uniform every twelve months free of cost, and, in addition, provides two pairs of boots a year free of cost. Boots are a big item to the police, and they get none allowed them. I suggest that uniforms should be granted free, and also a pair of boots or two a year. In regard to annual leave, we are granted twelve days a year. We think this is not sufficient, owing to the fact that the police never get public holidays, and have generally got to work every day in the year. In some cases we get Sunday off and in some cases we do not.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You get no interim holidays at all?—No; we have the option of taking our holidays every year or of taking them all together every three years—thirty-six days. In the Prisons Department I understand they get fifteen days a year, and, in addition, they get ten days public holidays and every other Sunday off and every other Saturday afternoon, making about eighty-odd days a year, as against our twelve. In some cases we get a Sunday off, which means one holiday a year. I work 365 days a year, except the annual holiday leave. We suggest that the annual leave for all classes of the police should be increased by two or three days, which would give great satisfaction.

2. Have you made any inquiries as to the treatment of the staff in mental hospitals?—No. In regard to passes on the railways, we do not think we are treated liberally enough.

*The Commissioner:* I understand the Minister for Railways has declined to grant any concessions, and it is a matter for his discretion. The only possible way by which passes could be obtained would be by the Police Department paying for them, which is a big order.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I applied specially for them, and the reply was that the Department could not see their way to grant them.

*Witness:* I should like to say this: Owing to the fact that we can seldom get our annual holidays during public holidays we are unable to take advantage of cheap fares, and passes would be a great consideration. Railway men get passes for themselves and families at any time of the year. Then, again, when we are on annual leave we are liable to be called on for duty at any time.

3. *The Commissioner.*] Your holidays are granted subject to the requirements of the Department?—Yes. The Inspector in charge of a district may find, although your holidays are granted by the Department, that it is inconvenient for you to have them at the time. I think we should be granted a free pass when on annual leave, or, indeed, at any time of the year when we might want to go for a day.

4. When away on duty you get a pass?—Yes. The next question is that of promotion. I have no grievance in this respect, but I wish to say, on behalf of the meeting, that one or two promotions that have been made of young men in the service have given great dissatisfaction among the junior members of the Force. I am prepared to give one or two instances, and there are others, I understand, who will have something to say about it. One case is that of a young man who was promoted to the district clerk's office. There are men, I have reason to believe, who had seen as much service, if they were not actually superior to him, who applied and were overlooked. Ability seems hardly considered. I am not saying anything against this man, and do not say he is not fitted for the position, but it seems strange that some of the men who applied have passed the police examination, whereas he has not; yet he has been promoted.

5. By promotion you mean he gets certain additional emoluments?—Yes, such as every Sunday and every Saturday afternoon off. His name is Lennon.

6. Has it caused general dissatisfaction throughout the Force?—Yes, among the junior members. Another case is that where a constable was taken off the street and given a position two months after he joined in the district clerk's office: his name is Chalmers.

7. Was he exceptionally well qualified?—He is a particular friend of mine, and I have an idea as to his ability: he is just an average man, and has not passed the police examination. I do not say he could not if he went in for it. Any number of men could if they went in for it, but they do not bother about it.

8. Is there anything underlying that?—I do not know that there is, but there are many who may be fairly educated and yet be unable to pass the examination, because there are a certain number of catchy questions in it. I will not say that many appointments are not made in the best interests of the Department, but I wish to bring under your notice the fact that promotions have been the means of causing dissatisfaction amongst the junior members of the Force.

9. You contend that men of longer service and of equal qualifications should have the preference?—Quite so; if a man is sensitive it only needs a case or two like this—(if the Department do not consider it promotion the men do)—if this sort of thing goes on the young men will get disheartened and will leave the service. I cannot give any cases where they have done so, but I am sure they will. If I saw one or two cases where a man with no more ability than myself was promoted to a rank I had applied for while I was overlooked it would cause me to leave the service, because I should consider I had no chance. I have no reason personally to complain at all. I applied for promotion eighteen months ago, and have no reason to believe I have been overlooked.

10. You applied for promotion as what?—As acting-detective. I have reason to believe I shall get it when my turn comes. Although I quote these cases it is not because I envied the men at all.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards present pay and allowances, you do not mention what are the men's prospects: how long are they in the service before being entitled to a station, provided their conduct and qualifications are satisfactory?—From what I understand, from four to six years.

12. And then their position is pretty good?—I understand so.

13. Free rent, a good house, and other emoluments outside their duties in many places?—I have that to learn yet.

14. You get an occasional Sunday off in addition to your twelve days?—I have never got one off for three years.

15. How many men are there with you?—Five and a sergeant.

16. If it is the practice, you should come in with the rest?—I believe there must be some reason why it is not granted; these men may never have applied for it; I never asked for it. If I applied, I have every reason to believe the Inspector would grant it.

17. Do you know the qualifications of Lennon?—Not personally.

18. Do you know the qualifications of the other man you refer to?—Yes; I went through the depot with him.

19. Is he a good writer?—I do not think so.
20. Do you know he was recommended by his Inspector for the position?—I do not mean to say he was not
21. Do you know he was selected from others because he was well qualified?—I fail to see it. Every man in the Force would respect this man—Chalmers—but he is no better as regards education than an ordinary man. There was one man at the time doing street duty who had four or five years' service, of very great ability, and I understood from himself he would have been very pleased to get the appointment.
22. Did he apply for it?—I cannot say.
23. Do you say men leave the service through dissatisfaction in this respect?—I say they are apt to do so.
24. You do not know of a case?—No.
25. You have no complaint yourself?—No.
26. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion in regard to the employment of probationers or young constables in connection with the detection of sly-grog selling?—I would not like to have anything to do with it as a probationer intending to remain in the service; but there are men who do not mind it. If I were a constable I would not mind it any more than any other duty.
27. You do not think it would be a sort of brand on you in the future?—No, it does a man no injury at all.
28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is not desirable work?—No.
29. Not desirable to employ private individuals on?—No.
30. It is desirable such men should not be known?—Yes.
31. If an old constable were employed there would be danger of his detection?—Yes.
32. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any objection on the part of the police to coming into the general Superannuation Fund?—No.
33. You cannot tell me why they as a body think it more desirable to have their own fund?—I think one of the reasons is because they feel their own fund is pretty safe financially. The young members of the Force would prefer to go into the general fund, but the old ones do not.
- Chief Detective Herbert:* The handing over of £31,000 is one strong objection, and also the extra charge on men who have been ten years contributing. I would go up myself 1 per cent.
34. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] It seems to me it would be very preferable to have one general fund. Did you hear Mr. O'Brien's evidence?—Yes.
35. Have you heard anything about what he called the "useful man"?—I can say nothing about it: it has never been discussed at all. If there is one, I do not know him. I have not been very long in the Force, and have not come in contact with many except young recruits.
36. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The subject was not discussed at your meeting?—No.
37. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think the standard of education requisite for enrolment is high or low?—I think it is rather high, although I am satisfied a man wants to be able to pass the Fifth to be able to do his duty in a proper manner, though there are men who have only passed the Fourth who would get on just as well.
38. Assuming there is a difficulty in obtaining the right stamp of man for recruits, would you urge as an attraction first to increase the pay, and secondly to lower the standard of education?—I think if the pay and concessions in the direction I have mentioned were increased suitable recruits would be forthcoming.
39. How do intending recruits know of these conditions?—Well, before I thought of joining the Force as a single man my first inquiries were as to the pay and general conditions, and when I heard of the pay I decided not to have anything to do with it. As a married man, the occupation I followed—shearing—in Australia and different countries was not altogether suitable. I was married when I entered the Force. As shearing led to my having to leave my wife when going shearing to Australia and elsewhere I decided to apply for enrolment, as there was a living in it. Men in the country who think of joining first inquire from men in the Force as to the conditions, and if these conditions were altered I think intending candidates would get to know of it.
40. Are you aware, apart from the facts you have mentioned, of any general feeling of dissatisfaction in the Force with the existing order of things?—That is the only dissatisfaction I know of.
41. Have you ever heard constables speaking of political influence being used on their behalf?—No; I have heard the matter discussed.
42. With what result?—They seem to think such things do go on.
43. Have you ever heard any one boasting about having such influence?—No; men who would use it would be likely to keep it to themselves.
44. Is there drinking amongst members of the Force?—Not to any extent; individual members might drink. I think the majority—the young constables especially—are very respectable men.
45. How old are you?—About thirty-one.

VYVYAN RICHARD TAYLOR, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 21.)

*Witness:* I am in charge of Palmerston. I entered the Force in November, 1897. I would ask that constables should be allowed first-class travelling-allowance for their wives and families. I believe the higher officers are allowed it. If a man is transferred, for instance, from here to Auckland the Department compels him to travel by steamer for the sake of economy. He has a wife and family dumped into the steerage, and given a couple of frowzy blankets. I consider the wives and families of all members of the Force are entitled to as much consideration as those of any officer, from the Commissioner downwards. I would ask also that circular 1408 be cancelled, applying to men applying for positions outside the Force having to apply to the Commis-

sioner first. It is a free country, and I consider any man has a right to apply for any situation he likes if he thinks he can better himself without first applying to the Commissioner of Police. The Commissioner is reported to have said a short time ago that the duties of the men in the office are of a highly important and confidential nature, and that they must not be overlooked when promotion comes round. It appears to me as if the ordinary constable has not very much of a show. The men in district clerks' offices have more show than ordinary constables, being always under the eye of their superior, and uniform men are at a disadvantage. In the case of a man being brought into a district office or the Head Office he sits there for ten years and is promoted as a sergeant. There is a case in the last *Gazette*. A man named Cummings, who had just been ten years in the Force, and had not done six months' street duty since he had been in the service. He was nearly two years junior to me; and there are many whose qualifications are perhaps better than either of us. This sort of thing gives dissatisfaction in the Force. If there is a position for them, let them have a position of their own: put them into the Civil Service, or let them handle the lamp and baton and go out in the streets as others do, and take their turn for promotion. Then, I would ask that no man in the Force should have to answer charges brought against him by anonymous correspondents.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is that the practice?—I believe so; I have never suffered from it yet, but I take time by the forelock.

2. If it happened to you, would you decline to answer such a charge?—I could not question the Commissioner's orders.

3. Do you know it is a fact?—Yes.

4. Have they complained to you?—No.

5. How do you know?—I know men who have had anonymous letters written about them, and have been transferred—in fact, the man whose place I have just taken.

6. You believe that was the cause of his being shifted?—I cannot say that it was so. If a letter were written about me it would be probably sent to me, and the Inspector would come and make inquiries as to its truth. I say if a man has not pluck enough to put his name to a letter it should be put in the waste-paper basket. Another matter I should like to mention is the large amount of work entailed on constables in charge of country stations, who are Registrars of Old-age Pensions, for which they get no remuneration whatever. If the work were given to an outsider it would have to be paid for, and therefore the constable should have some remuneration.

7. Are you one?—Yes.

8. How many do you put through?—About seventy or eighty.

9. And you have to make all the inquiries?—Yes.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The circular you referred to reads, "In future, applications for situations outside the Force are not to be made without the sanction of the Commissioner being first obtained": Do you know that order obtains in other Forces?—No.

11. Do you not think it is desirable that the Commissioner should know your intention in such a direction, because he might have your name on the list for transfer or promotion?—No, I do not think it is right he should know.

12. Would he promote you if he knew you were going?—

*The Commissioner:* That might be an inducement to the man to remain, and that might be the reason for the circular.

*Mr. Dinnie:* If I knew he were applying for a situation I might let him know his chances and so retain the services of a good man.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In no case has an application been declined that you know of?—No, but I object to it on principle.

14. You quoted a Press statement about some remark I made: Press reports are not always to be relied on?—I said you were reported to have made them.

15. *The Commissioner.*] Under what circumstances were the remarks made?—I do not know; it was in the public Press.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any case in which a clerk has been promoted to the rank of sergeant, and sent out in the street?—No.

17. Then, does making him a sergeant interfere in any way with the men on outside duty?—I understand the reason the sergeantship came in was that in old times when an Inspector was away the clerk in the office had to forward correspondence and instruct officers higher in rank than himself.

18. But does such promotion interfere with the men on street duty?—Yes, because there is one more place which the uniform man has no chance of getting. I would put the clerks into the Civil Service.

19. But it does not interfere with the outside men?—Yes, because it makes one vacancy less.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Not at all, for there is no vacancy for outside men at the time.

20. *The Commissioner.*] The question with you is whether the clerks should not do a certain amount of outside work?—I think he should. I believe it was the practice once.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to anonymous correspondence, do you not think it should be investigated?—I do not.

22. Do you know what the results of investigations have been?—I am only speaking of them as applied to men in the Force.

23. Do you not think it is my duty to investigate any correspondence I may receive from outside in respect to a constable?—No. I say the Inspector of the district will know if the man is what he should be, and if he does what he should do. There is no need for any one to write to the Inspector.

24. But supposing a man misconducts himself, and the Inspector does not know: he is not always with him; if he does so seriously, and an anonymous communication is received complaining of his conduct?—If he commits himself seriously all the world knows, and the Inspector first.

25. Supposing he commits a little indiscretion, do you not think the anonymous communication should be inquired into?—No.

*The Commissioner:* That is more an ethical question. I am not prepared to say I do not agree with the constable.

*Witness:* Any private employer would put such a communication in the waste-paper basket. I feel very strongly on this point.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You object to old-age pensions work being done unless the constable receives some remuneration for it?—Well, I cannot object. I am Clerk of the Court, and it is part of my duty.

27. You get £10 a year for being Clerk?—Yes, I am Clerk of the Court, Inspector of Factories, Inspector under the Food and Drugs Act, and Registrar of Old-age Pensions.

28. You receive other emoluments in addition to your pay—mileage, &c.?—That is infinitesimal. I should like to say it appears, and it is patent to every one, that for some time past, since the last Commission, Mr. O'Brien's district has been under a cloud—why we do not know—and promotions do not show out well in proportion to those in other districts.

29. *The Commissioner.*] Is this a matter of general remark amongst the police?—Amongst some of us.

30. It is felt?—Yes, and his recommendations are evidently not taken much notice of in the matter of promotion.

31. Have you ever heard about what he termed the "useful man"?—I cannot say I have.

32. But you know what he meant?—Quite well; and I believe he exists.

33. You have heard of it?—I cannot say I did until the subject was brought to my mind by what the Inspector said yesterday.

34. What accounts for your saying you believe he exists?—I fail to see why the district should be under a cloud for so long. There must be something radically wrong, or else the district is very inferior to other districts.

35. From what I can see it compares very favourably with any other district. You think a man is handicapped by being in this district?—Yes.

36. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What service have you had?—Fourteen years.

37. Do you know that the last constable promoted outside had fourteen years' service?—I cannot say.

38. And that no man has been promoted under that length of service outside?—Very likely. The recommendations of my Inspector have never been carried out.

39. Do you know how many men the Inspector has recommended in the last three years?—I am not in his confidence, and cannot say.

40. If I tell you that only one over fifty years of age, the rest being under fourteen years' service, has been recommended by him?—That may be.

41. Do you think that men with twelve years' service should be promoted when there are men with fourteen years equally qualified?—That rests with you.

42. *The Commissioner.*] Can you suggest any direction in which the Police Force could be made more attractive to recruits?—By better pay.

43. Is the standard of education required too high?—I do not think so.

44. How long is it since you have been out of touch with the main body of the police?—I have been in the country eight years; I do not know much about the central stations.

45. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have nothing to complain about in regard to your treatment?—No; but, speaking generally, there is a general feeling of dissatisfaction, especially in this district, and I think it is my duty to say so. It has been hinted that a man who comes here is a marked man, whose career is finished.

46. Who has said so?—I have heard it.

47. *The Commissioner.*] I have given the Minister's personal assurance to all the men that they need not be afraid of speaking out?—But the question is, can the Minister carry it out?

*The Commissioner:* I think you may disabuse your mind of that; all we want is the truth.

*Witness:* I forgot to say something in connection with railway travelling passes. When a constable is in charge of a country station, something may crop up which necessitates a detective being sent up to assist, and the constable and detective may require to travel somewhere together by train. When they get to the railway-station the detective gets into a first-class carriage, while the constable has to travel second class. The position, then, is somewhat humiliating to the constable, as superiority is not recognised in travelling. Then there was something mentioned in Invercargill in connection with sectarianism, when it was said we are all supposed to be tarred with one brush. Now, I happen to be a Protestant. I believe my Inspector is a Catholic, as are many of the other officers I have been under, and I should like to say for them that they have never allowed my religion to influence their treatment of me in any way whatever.

HUGH HENRY BUTLER, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 22.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin Central. I joined the Force in 1905. I am one of three delegates appointed to make certain suggestions in the interests of the Force. We consider the rate of pay is not sufficient for the work we are required to do. We start at 7s. 6d., and after four years we get a rise of 6d., and so on till we reach the maximum of 9s. 6d., which is reached after sixteen years' service—practically half our service. We consider that uniforms should be provided free of cost. We are allowed material for the making of a tunic every eighteen months, and for trousers every nine months. Gaol warders, on the other hand, get two pairs of trousers and one tunic a year, and two pairs of boots free of cost. The making-up of our uniforms costs us about £2 10s. In the matter of leave, we get twelve days' annual leave, while

gaol warders get fifteen days, in addition to ten days Government holidays. They also get every other Saturday afternoon and every other Sunday all day. Married men should, we think, get a higher house-allowance. At present they are allowed 1s. a day, or £18 5s. a year, while gaol warders get £30, and they can live where they like, whereas we have to live within a certain distance of the police-station. We are liable to be called on at any time. In regard to passes on the railway, we get annual leave, but we can let it run on for three years. We are not allowed to take our holidays when it suits ourselves, but must take them when it suits the Inspector or the Commissioner. When we are on leave we are always on duty, and have to deal with drunks on trains, and so on; and if we see a row in the street, we have to take our part. Constable Mason forgot to say that if we cannot get free passes we would be satisfied with some concession. Every other member of the community can take a holiday at Christmas time or Easter when there are concessions on the railways, but we are not allowed to do so. We would be satisfied to be conceded excursion rates if we cannot get free passes. I wish to allude to a grievance on behalf of married men. There is a rule that all married men must go to and from their homes in uniform instead of being allowed as they used to be to keep a plain coat at the station to go home in. Some live at a considerable distance from the station, and may want to carry parcels home, or do some shopping, and it does not look well for a constable to do his shopping in uniform. Previous to the last Commission men were allowed to wear plain clothes going home. The married men feel this very keenly, as they consider they are put down as being as bad as the men who caused the recent trouble, and cannot be trusted to go home in plain clothes. Then, there are concessions in this respect made to certain constables who are allowed to go home in plain clothes. Not only that, but sergeants are allowed to go home in plain clothes. The married men feel very keenly about this matter, as it is very unpleasant for a married man to have to be seen speaking to his wife in the street in uniform, causing every one to take notice of a woman speaking to a policeman.

1. *Station Sergeant King.*] Are you aware of any instructions having been issued to the constables you mention authorising them to go home in plain clothes?—No, but I understand the Inspector has given them permission to do so.

2. Are you aware that the duties of one of them are partly plain-clothes duty?—My duties are very much the same as his.

3. Are you aware that instructions have been received from the head of the Department to the effect that men making old-age pensions inquiries must do so in plain clothes?—Yes. I am Court Orderly, and very often have to interview girls in reference to maintenance cases. The Inspector gave me permission to keep a plain-clothes hat and coat at the station for such purposes, but would not allow me to come to the station in plain clothes.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force apart from what you mention?—There is a general feeling of dissatisfaction, but I am satisfied. The last promotions in the district office caused some dissatisfaction: Constable Lennon was junior to myself.

5. Is there any reason why the clerks in district offices should not get a show?—No; but every third or fourth constable is capable of going into the office to-morrow.

6. You think the clerks should be given a turn at uniform duty?—Yes.

7. You have a lot of clerical work to do?—Yes; I was recommended by the Inspector for the last position, but I was passed over.

8. Do you know anything about political influence?—No.

9. The men in Dunedin are fairly sober?—They are very steady.

10. And bring no discredit on the Force?—No.

WILLIAM THOMAS BANDY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 23.)

*Witness:* I am a constable at the Central Dunedin Station. I entered the Force on the 1st March, 1908.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You desire to make a statement?—Yes. It is to the effect that when a sergeant reports a constable for any breach of the regulations, the evidence of the sergeant is given greater weight than that of the constable when neither have witnesses to substantiate their evidence.

2. Are you speaking as a delegate for others, or do you simply volunteer this evidence yourself?—I am speaking for myself only.

3. Have you suffered under this yourself?—Yes, on one occasion I was reported for alleged kicking up a row in the police billiard-room in Auckland. Sergeant Simpson reported me, and I knew nothing about the disturbance, as I was not in the room at the time. I had to produce five or six witnesses in order to save myself, while the sergeant had nothing to do but write out his report.

4. Did the Inspector hold that it was proved?—He said he would dismiss the case this time, but that he did not give much weight to the evidence of my witnesses. The sergeant said he saw me in the billiard-room himself.

5. Who were your witnesses?—Police officers.

6. We will call for the papers, and see what were the facts?—There was also another case, where a constable was fined for a breach of the regulations which he had not committed at all. It was the case of Constable Power, who was reported by Sergeant Anson for being off his beat; it was when I was stationed at Auckland. He was not off his beat, as I was speaking to him at the time.

7. Did you give evidence?—No.

8. Why did he not call you?—I suppose he had not the heart, or something.



9. Surely no man need be afraid of facing a charge when he is not guilty?—Lots of them face it and say nothing. A man is frightened of getting sat on, or of being marked afterwards.

10. For denying a charge?—Yes.

11. That is rather a grave reflection, because it practically means that there is almost a desire on the part of the superior officers to see their men get into trouble. I should have thought the contrary would be the case. Where is this man now?—In Auckland. He was fined 5s., I think.

12. It seems strange that he did not call you as the only witness who could have cleared him?—He could not call me then because I was away at the time.

13. Have you a clean sheet?—No, I have not.

14. When were you last in trouble?—In November, I think.

15. For some breach of discipline?—Yes.

16. Had the constable you refer to a good sheet?—This case was the only mark he had against him then.

17. I will look into the matter in Auckland thoroughly?—So far as you know, what is the feeling generally as to the administration of the Force?—There is objection to the way in which promotion is carried out. I have heard it spoken of amongst the constables in the district generally. Otherwise I have no complaint to make. I have not been here very long.

18. Were you in the depot in Wellington?—Yes, I was there six weeks, I think, after I had accepted.

JOHN FOX, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 24.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at the central station, Dunedin. I joined on the 1st September, 1906. I was appointed with two others by a meeting of constables to lay the views of the meeting before you, sir. The meeting was attended by the constables of the central station, and also of the North and South Dunedin stations. First of all, every constable in Dunedin considers that the present rate of pay is too low, and that this fact is in itself sufficient to prevent desirable men from applying for positions in the Force. Considering the unpleasant work a constable has to perform, and the risks he is exposed to, and the fact that morally and physically he is supposed to be almost perfect, and that he must have a fair education, he feels he is labouring under an injustice in being compelled to work for four years for 7s. 6d. a day. The ordinary labourer gets 8s. a day for work done between 8 in the morning and 5 in the evening. If he is called upon to work beyond those hours he is generally paid at the rate of time and a half, which would usually bring his pay up to about 12s. a day; while a great deal of the work of a constable is done outside those regular working-hours. Then, I think the Police Department is the only Department in which men have to pay for the making of their uniforms. This is considered an injustice by the men generally. Apart from the uniforms, the gaol warders are supplied with two pair of boots each year, and we consider we are just as much entitled to boots as they are, as there is no class of men so hard on boots as the beat-duty constables. It is also considered that when a constable travels on a train, whether on leave or not, he should be supplied with a second-class pass, as constables are always on duty in accordance with section 112 of the Police Regulations. Even if a constable is going on his honeymoon from Dunedin to Auckland, and some man commits an offence on the train, the constable has to attend to it under pain of a severe penalty. He may have to break his journey to have the offender dealt with. There is another little matter which, though it was not brought up at the meeting, some of the constables have asked me to mention. It is that a warrant card should be supplied to each constable to show who the bearer is, just as is supplied to constables in other Forces. It would be useful to a man in plain clothes, for instance, as a means of identification. Then, Regulation 128 makes it compulsory for single men residing at a central station to be in bed and have their lights out at 11 p.m. Well, it sometimes happens that a man may go to the theatre, and, as a play is not generally over before 11, if he remains to see the finish of the play he is liable to be fined. This regulation is strictly enforced. It is true that we can get late leave by making application in writing, but often a man may go out at 5 or 6 in the evening, and circumstances may arise which may make him wish to stay out later than 10 or 11. We suggest that the time should be extended to midnight. Beat-duty constables have only seven nights off in the month. On those nights they knock off at 5 o'clock in the evening, and are off until 9 o'clock next morning. There are some nights on which they go off at 9 o'clock, but they have to start work at 5 the next morning, and any constable of ordinary common-sense will not go out after 9 o'clock when he has to get up next morning at half-past 4. The men also complain of the system under which a sergeant visits each sleeping-room at 11 p.m. when the men who have to get up at 4.30 in the morning are generally asleep, and flashes his bull's-eye on the sleepers. It is, of course, not the fault of the sergeant, who under the regulations has to satisfy himself as to the identity of the sleepers. It is suggested that arrangements might be made for keeping a book in the ward room in which every man could enter his name before retiring for the night. Then, the beat-duty constables consider the lamps they have to carry are altogether out of date, and that something in the nature of this electric lamp which I have here might be supplied, and which was lent me by the firm of Turnbull and Jones. Not only are the present lamps inconvenient to carry, but they are dirty, and the oil soaks through on to the clothes and hands. This electric light seems to be quite as good as the bull's-eye now supplied, and I am informed by the firm that if some hundreds were ordered they could be supplied for 9s. or 10s. each—possibly less. They reckon it would cost about 6d. a month to keep them supplied, and they can be supplied wherever an electric-light station is in existence.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We have tried them, but they have not been found satisfactory altogether. They deteriorate as regards the strength of the light.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Something of the sort may yet be evolved, of course. Have you tested them at all?—No. With regard to holidays, at present we are only allowed twelve days' leave annually, and generally we have to take those days when it suits the Department. At Christmas and Easter time the constables are most required in the towns, and often we cannot get away when we want. Taking this into consideration, and the fact that the gaol warders are allowed more holidays, we think we are reasonably entitled to five or six days extra. The gaol warders, I believe, are allowed fifteen days annually, as well as eight or ten public holidays. We get a Sunday off every five or six weeks, and we think, if a different arrangement were made, we might get a Sunday off more frequently—that is, if the district clerks took their turn at Sunday duty. They are paid more wages than the constables, and they work only seven hours a day. They are off every Saturday afternoon and Sunday, and their work is much easier than that of the constable. Constable Butler, who is Court orderly, and Constable Edwards, the police photographer, do not have regular beat duty, but still they take their turn on Sunday, and we do not see why the clerks should not do the same. That would give the constables extra Sundays off. Beat-duty constables have a good deal of overtime to do. They have their ordinary eight hours on the street, and if there is an arrest made, or anything arises during the night which requires reporting, though they are not off until 5 o'clock in the morning, they have to get up at 9.30 and be at the Court at 10, and probably be at the Court for an hour, and, of course, their sleep is broken. They have to be on duty, again at 9 o'clock at night all the same.

2. How do you propose to remedy that?—I can see it would be difficult to remedy.

3. Do you think that practice interferes with the discharge of his duties by the constable—that he may overlook things which he otherwise would not?—I am quite sure of it. He would prefer not to have his sleep broken. There is another grievance existing here. On the last day of each month there is pay and parade at 2.15 p.m., and there is drill from 3 to 4 o'clock, which has to be done in the constables' own time. They have to go on duty again from 5 to 9, and have to get up at 4.30 the following morning. The drill is ordinary squad drill, and most of the men think the drill unnecessary, as most of the movements that are necessary we repeat every time we go on duty. Then, the officers who are intrusted with this drill have been themselves drilled under the old system, and they get mixed up between that system and the new, and the result is confusion.

4. Who conducts the drill?—Sometimes the Sub-Inspector and sometimes the station sergeant. I do not want to cast any reflection upon those officers.

5. You think it would be better to have a special drill-instructor?—Yes, otherwise it is a waste of time. There is a certain constable here who has passed the age of promotion, and he and some others have asked me to suggest that the rank of senior constable should be again introduced. This would afford some recompense for long service.

6. Is it asked that there should be any increase in pay?—No, it is just a question of status.

7. Do you mean that every man over fifty years of age in the Force should rank as senior constable?—No, only those men whose conduct would entitle them to it.

8. In this case you are not speaking on behalf of the Force?—No, although I should not object to it myself. The matter has not been considered by the Force as a whole. Then, with regard to promotion, there is a feeling that the district clerks have brighter prospects than have the constables on the street; and, again, some of the constables consider they are looked down upon by these men when they are put into office.

9. They are comrades, are they not?—No, they seem to have been removed into a different sphere when they leave the ranks of the police. Personally, I have not experienced any different treatment from them, but the general impression is that they are considered above the men in the street. Many of the constables consider they are just as capable of carrying out the duties of clerks as are the men in the office.

10. Have you any ambition to be placed in the office?—I should like it, of course, but have never applied. There are constables senior to me who have applied, but there does not seem to be much chance to get in.

11. You seem to be well qualified. Your handwriting is good, and you are able to put your words together very well, and I wonder you have not applied?—I have never given the matter serious consideration. Perhaps it is want of ambition on my part.

12. Is it considered that there is any favouritism shown in the selection of men for district clerks?—I can give no personal grounds for thinking so, but it seems to me that generally there is favouritism shown. Concerning promotions generally, there is a very unpleasant feeling amongst the Force and some of the outside public that if a constable happens to be a member of a Masonic lodge or an Orange lodge his chances of promotion are brighter than they otherwise would be. I do not like to mention this, but, in accordance with the oath I have taken, I think I should. I do not know how this feeling originated. I think myself it may have originated in the columns of a newspaper widely circulating throughout the Dominion, and if the Commission will give an assurance publicly that there are no grounds for such a feeling it will ease the minds of a good many of the men in the Force. The newspaper I refer to is the *New Zealand Truth*.

13. In what particular direction is it considered this favouritism is shown?—In the appointment of men to what are known as soft jobs—office jobs, and so forth. I am not even prepared to say that there are any grounds for such an impression.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think 11 o'clock is quite late enough for the men to be in their quarters and have their lights out?—Generally I think it is; and personally I am in bed, as a rule, before that time.

15. Is it not necessary, do you think, that the men should be in by that hour—10.30—and have the lights out at 11, and that the officers should know they are there, if discipline is to be maintained?—Yes.

16. With regard to a constable wanting to go to the theatre, as you know, he can do so by applying for late leave; and I understand you have no special grievance in that connection?—No. I have explained the little difficulty from the men's point of view.

17. You suggest the men should enter their names in a book before retiring, in order to obviate the necessity of a sergeant coming round and flashing his bull's-eye on the men when they are asleep: do you think that would be a safe method of ascertaining whether the men are there?—It was only a suggestion. I do not know whether it could be carried out or not.

18. With regard to the district clerks, they, of course, wear plain clothes: perhaps that has something to do with the feeling of jealousy on the part of the uniform men?—I could not say. I have no feeling of jealousy towards them myself.

19. And the extra shilling a day to the clerks is practically plain-clothes allowance?—Yes; but I would point out that while our uniform costs only about £2 a year, the plain-clothes allowance to the clerks amounts to £18 5s. a year.

20. With regard to the constables having to appear at Court in the morning in the event of an arrest after they have been up all night, I suppose your suggestion is that they should sometimes be allowed off at night—say, the following night?—Yes; I would say that the officers here are very reasonable, and that sometimes a man is allowed off under such circumstances.

21. *The Commissioner.*] I suppose it is one of the drawbacks of the service. You cannot keep the business of the Court waiting until a man has finished his sleep?—Yes. I have no practical suggestion to make in regard to it.

22. With regard to Inspector O'Brien's evidence yesterday, do you know anything about what he called the "useful man"?—I had not heard of it before that. Since then some of the constables have expressed surprise that I had not heard of it. They evidently had done so.

23. Do you think the carrying-out of some of the suggestions made by you would tend to make the Force more attractive to recruits?—Yes; that was the object of my suggestions.

24. Have you heard the question of political influence discussed?—Yes, I know there is a feeling that political influence has a great deal to do with promotion, but I am not able to point to any instance myself. I have never heard any man say he had political influence. It is just an impression that exists; I cannot say why.

25. Are you satisfied with the local conditions—administration, and so on: are you fairly treated?—I am perfectly satisfied.

26. Are you married?—No.

27. Are you satisfied with your quarters at the barracks?—They are all right.

28. What kind of bed do you sleep in?—We have to supply our own beds now. We use some of the old bedsteads that are still there, and we supply the rest ourselves, including the spring mattress.

29. What does it cost you, on an average, for messing in the barracks?—About £2 12s. 6d. a month, or about 13s. a week.

30. Do you live well for that?—Oh, yes, fairly well.

GEORGE BENNET EDWARDS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 25.)

*Witness.* I am a constable stationed at the Central Dunedin station. I joined the Force on the 1st May, 1905. I am not here as a delegate, nor do I come with any grievance of my own. I am simply taking advantage of your invitation to come here and show that there is dissatisfaction in the Force in general. I do not think there is any use in my going over the questions which have been already threshed out. The dissatisfaction is most profound as regards promotion, and in the instances I am going to give I do not wish to mention names, but will hand you in the list. "A" joined on the 1st December, 1906, and was sent to Auckland a month or two later, and was appointed to the district office. When that man was in the depot in Wellington he was recognised by the men as the dunce of the batch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Educationally or intellectually?—Both. I have this from his depot mates. "B" joined on the same day. Commenced duty in Wellington, and was then transferred to Greymouth. I do not know what services he had at either place. He was then transferred to Dunedin, and on the 1st July, 1908, he was sent as mounted constable to an out station where there is only a sergeant and another constable. "C," who joined on the 1st September, 1907, after five or six months' service was transferred as second man to a country station. In the case of "D," who joined on the 18th June, 1907, at Auckland, he did not, I understand, go through the depot at all. I do not know when he was mounted, but he was nine months later to my knowledge. He was called upon to resign on the 28th February, 1909. The last two are constables, and this is connected with dissatisfaction in the Force generally, and has nothing to do with promotion. They came from another country, and when they had been a few weeks in New Zealand they were sworn in and transferred to some station. One joined on the 31st March, 1908, and left on the 30th November the same year; and the other left on the 22nd December the same year. It is a cause of dissatisfaction amongst the men, more especially the colonials, that ex-constables from oversea should come to New Zealand and get sworn in at a moment's notice, even when they have no credentials as to education and so on, while colonials who have had their applications in for two or three years fail to get taken on.

2. Can you give any instances?—In my own case, my application was in for only eight or nine months before I was appointed; but I consider myself fortunate. There are, however, three constables in my batch who had their applications in for something like two or three years; while another man who applied at the same time, and who had been only three months in New Zealand, was sworn in, and he is now second man at a country station. I would suggest that no man should

be eligible for admission to the Police Force until he had been twelve months in the Dominion. That would tend to remove some of the dissatisfaction. With regard to the district clerkships, I will only say that the position is looked upon as the plum of the service.

3. Are you married?—I am married now. I was single when I joined.

4. You get 7s. a week allowance for rent?—Yes. You cannot get a house within quarter of a mile of the station under 14s. or 16s.

5. Do you know anything as regards this dissatisfaction in the Force which has been spoken of by other witnesses?—There is discontent right through, practically.

6. What is it due to, in your opinion?—It is due to a feeling amongst the men that no one but favourites can get on.

7. Favourites of whom?—Of the officers and heads of departments.

8. The Dunedin Inspector's grievance is that his recommendations are not given effect to. Do you refer to Dunedin only?—No. I was in Christchurch during the whole of the Exhibition time, and came in contact with men from all parts of the Dominion, and from conversations I had with them I am in a position to say there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest. Another grievance is that defaulters coming from another part of the district are given the soft jobs. I refer more particularly to a certain man at a smaller station who was dismounted; he gets a share of the relieving and the soft jobs, and he is a defaulter.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have those defaulters been punished by being sent here—reduced in pay, or anything of that sort?—I know they have been fined. As to whether they are reduced in pay or not I cannot say.

10. Have any of them been appointed to special duties here?—I am not in a position to say that.

11. You know who has the placing of them?—One of them, I have no doubt, got his position through yourself. Whether he was recommended to you or not I cannot say.

12. With regard to ex-constables coming here from other parts, you know it is stated on the application form that the Commissioner has power to appoint any ex-constable provided his qualifications are satisfactory?—Yes, I am aware of that. I would mention one little instance to show that intending recruits appear to think they are better off in their present jobs. One young fellow who sent in an application made a few inquiries afterwards as to the duties and so on, and he came to the conclusion that he was better off at £1 5s. a week and found in his present job. He considered the wages were too low in the Police Force.

13. *The Commissioner.*] Why is mounted duty especially sought after?—The mounted man has greater liberty. He is not under the direct rule of any sergeant. He has practically every night in bed. The position is almost as much sought after as that of district clerk.

LUKE MULLANY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 26.)

*Witness:* I am sergeant of police, stationed at Port Chalmers. I entered the Force in June, 1885, and was promoted sergeant in December, 1904. I was just on three years at Port Chalmers.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any statement to make?—On the question of pay I should just like to say that if constables on joining were paid 8s. a day we should get a better class of men than we have been getting recently. I do not think the present educational test is too high or too severe. I think sergeants should start at not less than 10s. a day, and the increments should be as at present, or perhaps a little more, up to about 13s. a day. As regards the appointment of Chief Detectives to the rank of Sub-Inspectors, I have no objection to that, provided station sergeants are made eligible for the position of Chief Detective. If a sergeant wished to go into the detective branch I think he should be allowed to do so, and take his seniority in that branch.

2. Have you thoroughly considered the effect of that? A man before attaining the position of Chief Detective must have gone through a very long and trying experience. He would have to go through a certain routine?—The same thing would apply to Chief Detectives joining the uniform branch. He would have no more knowledge of the work of the uniform man than would a station sergeant have of the detective work.

3. But the detective would have worn the uniform before going into the detective branch, and would have gone through the ordinary routine?—Some of them would have had very little training there. I should not mind so much if a sergeant were allowed to go into the detective branch and carry his seniority with him, without disturbing the position of Chief Detective. A sergeant only receives 12s. a day, while a chief Detective receives 16s. 6d. a day. I think the length of time a sergeant is in the service should count—that is, from the time he entered the police itself. Some of the sergeants have brought their seniority from the Armed Constabulary, and I do not think that is right, as the work in the constabulary was of quite a different nature. With regard to travelling, I think sergeants or constables, when transferred, should be allowed first-class railway and steamer fares, as is the case in other branches of the service. I think, also, if members of the Force were given some little concession when travelling on leave it would be greatly appreciated by all ranks. With regard to the general physique of the men at present, I have been for a number of years at country stations, and when I returned to town I was greatly struck with the fact that the physique and general appearance of the men, as compared with those I had worked with twenty years ago, had greatly deteriorated.

4. To what do you attribute that?—A good deal to recruiting from the ranks of returned troopers from South Africa. Although I look upon some of those men as very good men, I think, upon the whole, recruiting from the returned troopers has been a failure, and I think it has been the means of introducing a good deal of what may be termed the larrikin element into the Force. As to influence, I cannot say that I know of any having been brought to bear so far as promotion

or anything else is concerned, but it is generally considered that when a man is passed over and then promoted years afterwards some political influence has been used. I do not know whether it is so or not.

5. When you speak of political influence, what do you imply by that?—That a man has friends in Parliament or elsewhere.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you aware that the uniform men have the same opportunities of getting into the detective branch as the detectives have of getting into the uniform branch?—I was not aware of that.

7. Do you know of any constables who have been appointed to the detective staff after very short service?—I understand they would have about four years' service.

8. They would then only be appointed acting detectives temporarily until they are tried?—I do not say anything against that.

9. Are you aware that very few returned troopers have been taken on since I came to New Zealand?—The time I refer to is nearly five years ago, and I know a number of them were taken on in Christchurch when I was there.

10. Do you think they have not been a success?—No, a dismal failure.

11. You say the physique of the men has deteriorated. You know they have to pass a medical examination, and must come up to certain measurements?—Yes; but still I do not think the physique is what it was.

12. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Have you only learnt to-day that if you had chosen to join the detective department, instead of remaining in the uniform branch, you would have had an opportunity of doing so?—Yes, as sergeant I mean.

13. Are you aware that Sergeant Siddells was transferred to the detective department?—Yes; but I am aware he is the only sergeant who has been so transferred.

14. Do you know whether any other sergeant has applied to join?—No.

15. You were in Dunedin for nearly four years on beat duty: did it ever occur to you then that you might have been a detective if you had wanted?—I was asked if I would take the position when I was in Dunedin.

16. Do you not think it would be fairer, if you wanted to be a detective, to get in at the bottom and gradually work up—say, in twenty-five years?—A man may alter his opinion a good many times in twenty-five years.

17. Would it be fair that a sergeant who had no previous detective experience should step in at once at another branch of the service with the same rank?—A man must have considerable experience before he is appointed a sergeant. He has had experience of the detection and prevention of crime and of all other classes of work connected with the service.

18. They have often to send for a detective, with all their long experience?—It is not on account of their inability to do the work in the district, or on account of the exceptional ability of the detective branch, that they send for a detective, but it is because the sergeant in such a district has other duties to perform, and they have to send for assistance. It is simply a question of time.

19. Is not one of the main objects in sending for a detective in order that the responsibility may be transferred?—No.

20. Do you say a Chief Detective is not properly trained or qualified for the position of Sub-Inspector?—No.

21. Do you think it would be unfair competition that he should come into the uniform branch as Sub-Inspector?—I think, if the position is going to be given to the Chief Detectives, the uniform branch of the service has little or nothing to look forward to.

22. Do you realise also that the detective or the Chief Detective has nothing to look forward to?—I have no objection to the Chief Detective being appointed to Sub-Inspector provided a sergeant is given an opportunity of getting into the detective branch.

23. Have you discussed this question with the other sergeants, or are you giving only your own opinion in this matter?—It is my own opinion only.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think there is any feeling of dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Force with regard to the present conditions?—I have not been very much in touch with the police generally, but I have no knowledge of any dissatisfaction if it does exist.

25. You have no grievance yourself?—None whatever.

---

THURSDAY, 15TH JULY, 1909.

JOHN DOWNEY, Miller, examined on oath. (No. 27.)

This witness detailed circumstances which some twenty years ago led to his being charged with abusing a policeman and being fined £2 by the Magistrate. He submitted that he had been wrongfully interfered with by the policeman, and asked the Commissioner to endeavour to get his money back for him.

The Commissioner told the witness that it was impossible for him to review the decision of a Magistrate.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, Inspector, further examined. (No. 28.)

*Mr. Dinnie:* I desire to submit the report of the Commission held in 1905, specially calling attention to that part dealing with the supervision of this district. I make no comments, but leave the Commission to judge whether Mr. O'Brien's opinion is right as regards my evidence, and the result thereof.

*The Commissioner:* The unfortunate part of it is that I have not got the evidence. I have never even seen it. The reporter got so far behind with his notes that neither Mr. Poynton nor myself ever saw the evidence, our report being made solely on the newspaper reports, which were fortunately exceedingly full.

1. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You made a slight mistake the other day, Mr. O'Brien, as regards the promotion of Constable Dale: I think you did recommend him?—Yes, I intended to correct that part of my evidence the first thing. I did not strongly recommend him was what I should have said, and I wish that alteration made. There are certain reasons given in the report why I did not. I regarded him as an efficient constable, and a man of some energy, but there were certain matters over which he had no control which were sufficient reason for my not recommending him. The constable I had in my mind whom I did not recommend but who was promoted was Burroughs, station sergeant at Waikouaiti.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Were you ever asked to report in regard to him?—Yes.

3. And he was promoted?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think in the last three years you have recommended six men for promotion?—The files will show I am pretty careful not to recommend a man I consider not deserving.

5. Were they West, MacIntyre, Matthews, Dale, McKenzie, and Taylor?—Yes.

6. West was about fifty years old?—Yes.

7. *The Commissioner.*] What is your general opinion as an old police officer of what should be the age-limit for promotion?—About fifty.

8. A man over that age should not be promoted, having regard to the duty in cities being heavy?—No.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The circular is not out of place in respect of age, requiring that men should not be over fifty?—That is reasonable. When I first recommended Dale I think he was under fifty.

10. Do you know that McIntyre refused to take up street duty, being unable owing to his health?—No; so far as I know he has never been offered promotion. He is employed in the Weights and Measures Office, Dunedin.

11. Why has Matthews not been promoted?—I do not know; I know he accepted an appointment in the Chathams some time ago, but he was recommended for promotion some time before he was asked to accept that appointment.

12. What was his service?—Thirteen or fourteen years.

13. Dale was promoted?—Yes.

14. McKenzie and Taylor have not yet completed thirteen years?—I cannot say without the list.

15. Out of six, one, who is fifty years old, has not been promoted in accordance with your recommendation?—Yes.

16. In regard to transfers, do you know I have a list containing thirty or forty names applying for transfer from one district to another? If you were to adopt your system of obtaining men from your own district, how would you deal with these applications?—I do not ask that that should be done; I suggested my changing men already stationed in my district—sending one man to another station, and sending the other man back to where the first came from.

17. Supposing a man applied, because of his own or his wife's health, to get another district or climate, what are you going to do?—That is a matter for your consideration.

18. Then, that is a reason for transfers being left in my hands?—I do not suggest that every transfer should be taken out of your hands at all. I suggest that in my own district I should have the power to change a man from one district to another. Then if you afterwards think he ought to be sent away to another district and another man sent here in his place, by all means do so.

19. That would leave transfers entirely in my hands?—To that extent.

20. You know a good deal about the system of investigation as to candidates for enrolment in the service?—Yes.

21. You know the form that is used: do you think the inquiries are carried out carefully?—Yes, so far as I know.

22. Could you suggest any better system of investigation?—Yes. Very often these inquiries are made by practically inexperienced constables in charge of country stations. In my opinion, no man under the rank of sergeant should be intrusted with such inquiries; if a station sergeant, or Sub-Inspector, or even the Inspector, can do it, so much the better.

23. *The Commissioner.*] But how about the local knowledge the man in charge of the station has—though I quite agree with you theoretically?—His local knowledge might assist very much, but the sergeant could interview the local constable amongst others.

24. He should be specially detailed to go to the locality and make inquiries?—Yes, to insure thorough investigation.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Constables in charge of stations have considerable experience before their appointment?—Some of them.

26. *The Commissioner.*] Is service altogether the point? I know some in charge of stations I should be sorry to take the opinion of?—They would have a service of six years.

27. I want the matter of clerks appointed to do work in a district office made quite clear. What is their mode of selection? There is a great deal of dissatisfaction apparently in the Force?—First of all, you must have a good penman; that is absolutely necessary—a man who writes an ordinary legible hand. Then I want to be satisfied in my own mind that he is thoroughly honest. Then I want to be satisfied he is discreet, and that he will not go blabbing the contents of the correspondence to every Dick, Tom, and Harry about the station or in the street. Hitherto I know the service has suffered very considerably on this account—loose-tongued constables in the district office.

28. In taking an untried man you are liable to get a blabber?—That is so; but I say an Inspector should not be compelled to take any constable into his office to assist the district clerk until he has known him for a period of at least two years.

29. Is the selection of the men absolutely in your discretion?—No.

30. You recommend?—I do not recommend. If a constable makes application for appointment in a district clerk's office, I submit the application to the Commissioner, with my own remarks.

31. Why wait for the men to apply?—I do not if I have the selection of the men myself; but as soon as a vacancy occurs in my office the Commissioner sends me a man from some other part of the Dominion. The last two vacancies in my office, the Commissioner sent me two men from other places—strangely enough, they were two brothers: the first was an absolute failure, the second one I have not had long enough to say anything about.

32. You advocate having the right of selection amongst your own men?—It seems to me in every district the Inspector, if he keeps his eyes about him, can find suitable men for his own office amongst his own staff.

33. There is no difficulty whatever in adequately filling the position?—Not the slightest.

34. You know that this state of things has led to a considerable amount of dissatisfaction?—I know it does, and also causes embarrassment to the service.

35. It could be virtually overcome by giving the Inspector a free hand?—Yes, and a man should be known to the Inspector for at least two years before being allowed to go into the district office.

36. Let me quite understand: say a vacancy occurs in your office, and you are aware it is about to occur before it actually occurs; if simultaneously with your knowledge of the vacancy being about to occur you forward a couple of names of men you strongly recommend for appointment, what is done with them, or do you do it?—No; in my own case the Commissioner has filled the vacancy as soon as it became vacant.

37. But have you ever forwarded the names of any of your men to fill such a vacancy?—I think I have.

38. Have they been appointed?—I have one man in my own office now whom I recommended myself, and am pleased to say he gives entire satisfaction.

39. *Mr. Dinnie.*] That is Chalmers, is it not?—Yes.

40. *The Commissioner.*] How many are there in the office?—Two besides the district clerk, a sergeant, whom I regard as being thoroughly efficient and reliable.

41. Is there any reason why the junior men should not be occasionally shifted?—I think it very necessary.

42. Is it work that the men cannot easily pick up?—A man with any ability at all could soon pick it up.

43. The men could be shifted back into uniform again, and give other men a chance?—That would be regarded as a grievance.

44. Is there not as much grievance the other way?—Possibly.

45. The only point that would influence my judgment against the view I am taking would be the efficiency of the staff: if it would render it less efficient that would be the strongest objection: do you think the shifting of the junior men would prejudice the work of the office? How long would it take a man to get into the running?—Any man of any capacity could get into it in a week or a fortnight.

46. Does a man who gets into the office stop an indefinite time?—I think the longer he stays the more efficient he becomes: he knows where to place his hand on files, and returns, and records.

47. But I am speaking of the clerks in the office—not the district clerk?—They might be occasionally shifted.

48. It is a very valuable training for the constables, is it not?—No doubt; but when once they get employment in the office, if you were to put them into uniform again and make them go on street duty, they would dislike it, and regard it as a grievance.

49. If you put them into the office, and told them they would simply take their turn, with a view of qualifying for other work, they should not have any grievance in the matter?—I may mention that when the last man was sent to fill a vacancy in my office I had recommended a few very good men indeed.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Senior or junior to him?—One had been appointed, I think, the same day; he was on the spot, and was a man I could be thoroughly satisfied about. But no option was left me, and I had to take the man who was probably a pet somewhere else.

51. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views with regard to the employment of young constables or probationers for inquiring into sly-grog selling, or that class of offence?—As we are situated at present, we have no option in the matter; as a rule, constables dislike it, and it is not in every case an agreeable duty.

52. Does it affect the subsequent efficiency of a constable?—I do not know that it does; the offence must be dealt with.

53. It is not desirable to employ local men: it is not desirable that a man should remain in the locality after doing this work—he becomes a marked man?—To a certain extent, he does; it depends upon how he comes out of it. I may say the man I recommended for a position in the district office was a man who had passed the police examination; the man who was sent to fill the position had not.

54. In regard to small breaches of discipline, what do you do when they are reported by the sergeant?—A great deal depends on the nature of the offence.

55. In regard to minor offences, say, on the part of a young constable?—It is sent to the constable for his explanation, if it is some trivial matter; if of a more serious nature, the con-



stable has to attend at my office to answer the charge. The charge is read to him, and he is asked whether he admits it or denies it; if he denies it, then the evidence of the officer reporting him is taken.

56. Who is present?—Usually the Sub-Inspector and whatever sergeant may report him.

57. It is a sort of formal court-martial from the initial stage?—Yes.

58. To a young constable this would be rather overpowering. Would it not be well, in the case of the more trivial breaches of discipline, for the Inspector to have the man quietly before him, and give him kindly warning and advice?—The course you suggest is often followed where the matter is trivial. I have adopted that course over and over again. I have told a man, "You have done such a thing in such a way; would it not have been better to do it this other way?" and have given him my reasons, and asked him to be more careful in future, and to consult the Sub-Inspector or sergeant in case of uncertainty.

59. What class of offence have you to report to the Commissioner?—Drunkenness whilst on duty must be reported to the Commissioner, with the evidence and the Inspector's recommendation. There may be a few other serious matters, such as serious assault or serious neglect of duty. Anything really serious is sent to the Commissioner, any such offence as is regarded as rendering a man liable to dismissal.

60. Any charge, after being disposed of by you, can be reviewed and reversed by the Commissioner?—Yes; very few of my cases have been reversed, although I have had a good many appeals. In the last twelve or eighteen months only one very small matter has been reversed; in that I only administered a caution to a man, and that was reversed.

61. The Commissioner decides on the material furnished by you?—Yes. There was another case where I inflicted a fine of 5s., and the Commissioner reversed it, and administered a caution instead.

62. Have you any views with regard to the length of time a man should be allowed to remain in charge of a country station?—No fixed time.

63. Does a man outlive his period of usefulness in some cases?—Some will and some will not.

64. That is the personal equation: how are you to differentiate?—The Inspector ought to know.

65. Does he always know?—He has the best opportunities of knowing.

66. There should be no limit?—I do not think so.

67. If you became aware of a man not being thoroughly efficient you would take steps to get him transferred?—Yes; some men you may leave ten or fifteen years in a station, and they may be still efficient, and their local knowledge makes them still more efficient. Others, again, it is necessary to shift within twelve months.

68. In regard to giving constables an occasional Sunday off, is there any method adopted by you in regard to this? Why should not the clerks in the district office be sent out to do their duty?—I do not see much reason against it. In my case, in order to give constables on beat duty a greater number of Sundays off, I made the constable who acts as Inspector of Weights and Measures come on duty on Sundays occasionally. That was overruled by the Commissioner, and now he does not take up Sunday duty.

69. Do the clerks in the district office do any Sunday duty?—No.

70. It would not hurt them?—I do not think so. They only work five days and a half a week, and get 1s. extra pay, and wear plain clothes.

71. One man has told the Commission he has not had a Sunday off for three years?—I am rather surprised to hear that, but Dunedin North is a small station where there are only a few men.

72. Does the Court orderly do any ordinary police duty?—He takes a beat on Sunday.

73. I do not see why the others should not?—I quite agree.

74. This matter could easily be dealt with by a circular from Headquarters?—Yes.

75. It would inflict no hardship?—No.

76. The clerk would still get his Saturday afternoon?—Yes; and every night in bed, which is a very great consideration.

77. In going over the police-station it struck me as a great defect that the Chief Detective has no separate quarters: have you made representations on the matter?—Yes, and an addition was put up, but when this addition, consisting of two small rooms, was finished the Chief Detective considered the rooms too small, and preferred to remain in his old office. They are really too small; but our room is, unfortunately, very limited. I consider it necessary that the Chief Detective should have a separate office.

78. Have you any views on the circular to which some objection has been taken, in regard to men applying for positions outside the Force only being able to do so after notifying the Commissioner?—It seems to me a man in the Force should always be at liberty to better himself if opportunity offers.

79. I gathered from some questions asked by the Commissioner when this point was raised that he might be considering the transfer or promotion of a man, and it was necessary for him to know whether he was an applicant for outside appointment before he took steps in either one direction or the other?—There is that to be considered.

80. Then, if a man had a reasonable prospect of promotion he could have the choice of either going or not?—Yes.

81. You do not attach much importance to this point?—No; if a man sees a way of bettering his position by being employed in another way, I do not see why he should be handicapped in the least.

82. A good deal has been said about the embargo placed on constables leaving the station in plain clothes: what is your opinion in regard to that?—It is only recently it has come into force in Dunedin.



*Mr. Dinnie:* It applies now all over New Zealand.

*Witness:* The rule was made at the time the trouble occurred here, and it transpired then that some constables, when coming from their residence to the police-station and also on returning to their residences, visited certain hotels. That, to say the least of it, is most unbecoming and most undesirable. Even when off duty a constable, while wearing uniform, should not be seen in the bar or tap-room of a publichouse, nor should he in any way associate with persons who are habitués of such places.

83. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] The constable whose name I now hand to you, who is now on pension, was under you for some time?—Yes.

84. You know his general character for sobriety for a considerable time before his retirement?—Yes.

85. Do you consider the pension fund should be—

The Commissioner said he could not allow that question to be gone into.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* I expect Mr. O'Brien to say he should have been dismissed from the Force for his offence.

86. *The Commissioner.*] You raise the question of administration generally?—Yes.

*The Commissioner:* I will not object to that.

*Witness:* The constable referred to was finally discharged from the service owing to intemperance.

*The Commissioner:* If he was discharged, I cannot inquire into the matter.

*Witness:* Speaking of this man, I may say during the time he was in Dunedin he was very intemperate in his habits. One day, to my great surprise, I got a telegram from the Commissioner saying he was to be put in charge of Green Island, which I regard as a very important station. I disobeyed the order for the time, and sent a telegram saying I considered he was absolutely unfit to have charge of that station. I was allowed to put another constable there.

87. *The Commissioner.*] Had the Commissioner, to your knowledge, such information as would enable him to form a judgment with regard to his qualifications?—He had been punished for intemperance and other matters before this. When a constable is punished his defaulter's sheet is sent to the Head Office, so the Commissioner should have had the reports in his office.

88. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards Constable Havelock, it appears from the defaulters' sheets that Mr. Ellison dealt with him entirely—I did not?—That appears so. The same remark would apply to that constable that would apply to Fretwell—that a copy of his defaulter's sheet must have been sent to the Commissioner, who ought to have known what the man's history was.

89. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Had you and I any conversation before this Commission sat regarding the nature of your evidence or of mine?—None whatever.

90. You have had considerable experience as a detective: what is your opinion in regard to the travelling-allowance of 8s. a day allowed to detectives?—It is insufficient. In my own case I have, when on detective duty, spent nearly double my allowance.

91. *The Commissioner.*] On board and lodging?—Yes; and endeavouring to get into company and obtain information I was seeking. I think the fixed scale should be raised.

92. What is the general tariff in Otago?—From 6s. to 10s. a day.

93. What would the extra allowance you suggest be required for?—Suppose one wants to interview a man in a country township; in all probability, the only place to obtain an interview would be at the local hotel. One might require to take a statement, and would ask the landlord for a private room, which one might occupy for an hour or so. I should consider a detective to be a very mean man indeed if he did not ask the man he interviewed to have a drink, and I think, by way of compensating the hotelkeeper for the accommodation, at the very least he would spend 1s. or 1s. 6d. I have done it times out of number, and probably I am not more liberal than other detectives. If a detective loses his own money in this sort of way it discourages him in doing his work properly.

94. But he could get a refund?—He would have to answer all sorts of questions.

*The Commissioner:* The 8s. is only to cover actual board and lodging; anything outside he can show a necessity for he would be entitled to have refunded.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is the system.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* I might point out that men who are practically recruits in the service—the finger-print expert, for instance—who have not the same standing in the Force, get 10s. a day.

*Mr. Dinnie:* The whole question of travelling-allowance is being considered now.

95. *The Commissioner.*] I understand you are certainly not against the promotion of detectives to the uniform branch?—That is so.

96. Did you find yourself handicapped in any way as Sub-Inspector by want of knowledge of the uniform branch?—I did not. I had had previous knowledge in uniform, having served both as constable and sergeant.

97. Is there any analogy between the promotion of Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector and the promotion from station sergeant to Chief Detective?—No, I do not think so.

98. The sergeants would not mind so much the promotion of Chief Detective to the rank of Sub-Inspector if a station sergeant could be made a Chief Detective?—That would be an utter impossibility.

PATRICK HERBERT, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 29.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin. I entered the service about this time of the year in 1881 as a constable. I was transferred to the Thames, where I remained as constable, watch-house keeper, and clerk to the sergeant-major in charge. While there I was appointed specially out of the whole district to perform special plain-clothes duty at the Bay of Islands in connection with the Sheehan murder case. I performed that duty successfully in that case, and was given credit

for it, and a year after (in 1885) I was appointed acting-detective in Auckland, remaining there till 1890. My experience of detective duty was such as would have made most men abandon it, because it was very discouraging. I was acting five years before I was appointed, and during most of the time was only getting 7s. a day. At the end of five years, after various recommendations from superior officers, including Thomson, Shearman, and Brougham, Major Gudgeon appointed me detective. When Colonel Hume became Commissioner I was transferred, at twenty-four hours' notice, to Wellington, where I remained five years; I was then transferred to Invercargill; thence to Auckland and the Thames; then to Christchurch; thence to Dunedin. About six years ago I came to Dunedin as Chief Detective from Christchurch, and have been here ever since. I have been a detective for twenty-five years, although in name for only nineteen or twenty. I consider I am as well qualified as any man to express an opinion on general police matters. I have had no communication with Mr. Arnold in any way prior to the sitting of the Commission here. I have since. In regard to the present Minister of Justice, every one in the Force, so far as I know, hails his arrival as Minister with great pleasure. In regard to the detective and uniform police, I think the Victorian system might very advantageously be adopted in New Zealand. Detectives should not be placed at the bottom of the seniority list, as it has a bad effect generally. We come at the bottom of the list, after the junior constable appointed yesterday. This is calculated in some measure to make the uniform men look on us as outsiders, though I do not attach much importance to this point personally. This could easily be improved by altering the title of detectives in the same way as in Victoria, making them detective constables, detective sergeants, and so on. They should take their exact position in the list—that is, if a detective, by reason of pay and rank, is on a level with a sergeant of equivalent rank, but joined the day before, he should be on the list above that sergeant. Then the question of seniority, which is such a burning question with the whole Force, would be in a great measure settled. A man should be promoted from detective constable to detective senior constable or detective sergeant, and so on. Then he takes his true senior position in the sergeants' list. There is no need at all why he should be called a detective.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How is the Chief Detective rated in Victoria?—There is no such rank. There is a Superintendent of Detectives in charge of the whole Force, who is the only commissioned officer in the detective branch.

2. Who has local control of the detectives?—The detective force outside Melbourne is small, the whole force being practically in Melbourne. Outside they are under the local Superintendent of Police.

3. That would not be workable in New Zealand?—No, I do not propose that. I have here the Victorian *Police Gazette* for this year, and I wish to allude to two things to establish my argument. One is in favour of the seniority list, as I have described it; the other is that in Victoria the success of the detective department in reaching higher ranks has been very marked indeed, and I offer this as a reason in support of what I state—that a detective, owing to his experience, can make himself efficient, and has opportunities of making himself a better uniform policeman than a sergeant has—he has more varied experience, and a greater amount of it. The present Chief Commissioner of Police never was a constable; he joined as a detective, and everybody who knows him is aware of his great ability. Five of the ten Superintendents of Police in Victoria rose to their positions, some from uniform, but all through the detective office; one Inspector got there through detective work and one Sub-Inspector. Then there are numerous instances in the New South Wales police known to myself where detectives are now holding higher rank. For instance, Detective Roche, who was here at the time of the Duke's visit, and who was equal in rank with me, is now Superintendent of Police. I say I have an equal claim with him, and I leave the Commission to draw its own conclusions from the present difference in our ranks. I will now refer to the conditions under which we were placed during the time the last Minister of Justice held that position. He refused to recognise the right of a detective to higher promotion in the Force unless he first reverted to a lower grade, and competed with sergeants, station sergeants, and uniform men generally. That would have meant that if I wanted to be a Sub-Inspector I must leave the work I have been doing half my life, take up other work in a lower rank, and probably also take my place behind the junior station sergeant, and come in when the four station sergeants have passed out of my way. I need not elaborate this question in view of your Worship's experience. The present Minister of Justice departed from this rule, and promoted Chief Detective McGrath to Sub-Inspector.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] On whose recommendation?—I do not know, but I know something of the difficulties he had to get his claim recognised while Mr. McGowan was in power, and if the recommendation was made before and not after Mr. McGowan retired I take it the responsibility for his not being appointed at that time does not rest with yourself. I desire to point out that while Mr. McGrath was fighting to establish his claim to a vacancy a junior man to him and myself was appointed Sub-Inspector over both our heads, and he is now senior to Mr. McGrath. I would point out that if Mr. McGrath was entitled to be appointed Sub-Inspector to the first vacancy when Dr. Findlay came into office he was entitled to be so when his immediate predecessor was in office, and he now suffers the injustice of being junior to a man who should be junior to him. I desire to say I have the greatest possible respect for the man to whom I refer, and therefore do not wish to make his name public. This grievance—though not liking the word "grievance," I should rather call it "indictment"—against the enemy, whoever he may be, is equally my grievance. Twenty-five years ago I was appointed acting-detective, and nineteen or twenty years ago I was appointed detective, while the Sub-Inspector to whom I refer was a constable for seven years before he was appointed Sub-Inspector. I am not one yet, and I am not aware that Mr. Dinnie has yet recommended me. I have an extract here from a newspaper, which may or may not be correct, of what Mr. Mitchell said in Invercargill in regard to the question of station sergeants and Chief

Detectives. If Mr. Mitchell was fair he would have said a good deal more. In the first place, I submit he is no authority on the question, in spite of his high rank and experience. "Far more care is necessary in the promotion of a detective to Sub-Inspector's rank than in the promotion of station sergeant to Sub-Inspector." He does not say what entitles him to give an opinion at all; the mere fact that he is an Inspector does not make him any better judge. I ask you to look upon Mr. Mitchell's opinion as that of an ordinary police constable who has had considerable experience as a constable but practically none as an Inspector. Invercargill is one of the smallest districts, with the fewest men, in the whole Dominion. Mr. Mitchell is a great friend of mine, and we have spent many pleasant evenings together. I submit that if it had not been for me and Mr. McGrath, and for the fact that the latter is known to have been a success in his position, Mr. Mitchell would have said a good deal more; but he could not offend his old friends, so he thought it would not make much difference to us but it would kill all the others. I submit if I aspire to a Sub-Inspectorship, or if Mr. Mitchell is entitled to aspire to be Commissioner of Police, which is commonly reported if a successor to Mr. Dinnie may be required, then my aspiration is very humble indeed, considering that he and I were constables together in Auckland. His service is not worth a rap more than mine. As to his ability, I say nothing at all.

5. *The Commissioner.*] I do not know that he aspires to the Commissionership?—It is common talk. I think I had it from Mr. Dinnie himself. Then he said, "The class of duties is so essentially different that great care must be taken in promoting a detective to higher rank." They are only as different as the uniform the men wear; they are all under discipline; they are all prosecuting the same thief, the same by-law breaker, the same guesser; the duties are all the same, except that a detective has not to walk up and down a beat with gloves and a uniform on, and that does not justify his remark at all. His remarks are in favour of station sergeants as against Chief Detectives, and a strong argument in favour of my representations on the matter is that he knows nothing whatever about the merits of station sergeants at any rate, because he has never had a station sergeant under him. He was stationed for a great number of years in a country town—Paeroa—where there was a lot of work to do of a certain kind, but no police work; he was vegetating in the country all the time I was carrying on police work. It is a wonder to me, with his little experience, he is as good a man as he is. Supposing I were made a Sub-Inspector to-morrow, and there was something for me to learn to do—which I do not admit there is—what can it be that I could not learn in five or ten minutes? A constable comes in from the country, and is put on the street as sergeant; in many cases he has never seen an electric tram, but he manages to get along and keep out of the way of the trams. Surely an ex-detective could be competent to keep out of the way of motor-cars and accidents and official blunders and other traps as well as other men. Mr. O'Brien can tell you that when a man is arrested in a town the matter is handed over to the detectives at once. They perhaps arrest the man, make all inquiries, and get together all the evidence, piece it together, make out the brief, and go into Court; and now, since the last Commission, it is prosecuted by the Chief Detective, brought to a successful issue, and handed over to the Crown Prosecutor. We do all this serious work, and I am not afraid to say, if we do not do it any better than the uniform branch, we do it as well.

6. Sub-Inspector McGrath does not do it any worse because he is a Sub-Inspector than he did when Chief Detective?—No. He tells me his greatest difficulty now is with the people who go round street-corners at other than a walking pace. Now, I want to show how easily a man in our position may fall into serious trouble when doing what he considers his conscientious duty in the interests of the public when there is no need to do it, and he is taking a risk in obtaining admission of crime from a man accused. I do not consider I have any grievance in regard to the case I shall mention, because I am proud of the business, except that I leave it to the Commissioner to judge whether the Commissioner was right in saying to me what he did. A man was arrested here on a charge of arson in 1904—a poor silly lad, in connection with whose arrest or conviction no credit could be hoped for. There was no evidence against him, only suspicion; but I saw from the circumstances that he was very dangerous, as there were five cases, and I took the risk of having him detained. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that there was no evidence, but I charged him with the crime, and during the night told the constable on duty that I would take all the responsibility if he could get an admission of his guilt. I went out of my way to do this in the public interest—I could get no credit for it from the public. The man was convicted, and sentenced to a long term, on my evidence. The Judge who tried the case told me I was quite wrong—that I had done something I had no right to do, or a Magistrate had no power to do—that it was very improper to get an admission in this way, and wound up by saying something to the effect that he had never censured a police officer for doing wrong in the belief that he was doing right. I believe the remark was equivalent to paying me all the compliment he could under the circumstances. In forwarding my report to the Commissioner I made out what I considered a splendid case in justification of my conduct, and I considered the Commissioner would have been quite entitled to go no further than the Judge in view of the peculiar circumstances. What he said, however, was, "The Chief Detective's conduct is most reprehensible, and quite unworthy of a man holding the position of Chief Detective." I could not sit down under that, so I wrote saying I had not made myself clear, and asked for the file to be returned. I complain that the file was never returned to me.

*The Commissioner:* The doctrine of the end justifying the means is a dangerous one.

*Witness:* Quite so, but there are exceptional cases. I should like to draw a comparison between the Commissioner's treatment of those concerned in bringing this case to a successful issue and of those concerned in the Papakaio case. If they were entitled to be complimented and spoken of in flattering terms, then I was overlooked. In the police cases here I had all the responsible work on my shoulders; I had scores and scores of exhibits to take charge of; statements to take from an endless number of people, and other matters to arrange. The Commissioner, on his

arrival, said the arrest of these men (who were subsequently convicted and served long sentences) was a blunder; that they should not have been arrested, and that his intention in the case was contrary to mine and that of the Inspector, who felt that our only safe course to follow was to have no secrecy at all in the matter. I think the Commissioner's intention was to minimise the whole thing as much as possible for the general credit. I do not think that would be in the direction of the general credit. The cases were put through, and at the conclusion I did not ask for any recognition or credit, but I was never concerned in any case in the whole of my experience where I thought I was entitled to more recognition for what I had done. I am justified in holding this view when I know that men have been advanced in increment in recognition of special services in connection with other serious offences. In connection with the Papakaio case a memo. from the Commissioner is attached to the file very flattering indeed to the two detectives concerned. I do not say it was not fully justified, but I do say I consider the Commissioner is making fish of one and flesh of another. I should like to say that when that case came before the grand jury I was in attendance in charge of the grand jury, and, although the Commissioner was not a witness in the lower Court, he had his name placed on the back of the indictment by the Crown Solicitor, and gave his evidence before the grand jury on oath. I was present in the room, it being customary here. His evidence was reviewing the whole case, and giving the substance of the evidence of the witnesses.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Do you allege improper conduct on the part of the Commissioner?—I should like your opinion as to whether it was proper or not.

8. If the Commissioner was not a witness in the lower Court, how did his name get on the indictment?—It was placed there by the Crown Solicitor.

9. With what object, do you imagine?—The object speaks for itself, seeing that he gave evidence on oath.

10. Not of facts within his own knowledge?—I take it so.

*The Commissioner:* The facts stated by you, Mr. Dinnie, on oath were only gathered from reports made to you?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I was there throughout the whole of the inquiries. I opened the case to the Grand Jury.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* If you had not been Commissioner of Police I would not have allowed it. I had never known a case of the kind before. During the case the necessity for making some inquiries here in regard to the purchase of a revolver arose. Inquiries were made exactly in the terms asked, but the Commissioner was not satisfied that the inquiries were properly made, because when more information was obtained discoveries were made which we had no possible chance of making, and he promised when the case was over—I think this was in writing—that he would deal with us for our neglect. He has not done so so far. Of course, in connection with a serious murder such as the Papakaio case it is important that the best man capable of dealing with such a case should be on the scene as early as possible. Now, in Dunedin we are very much nearer to Oamaru than is Christchurch; and, while I offer no opinion derogatory to the ability of the men who were employed on the Papakaio case, I would point out that I have had very much more experience than they have, that I was much nearer to the scene, and that a man holding the position of Chief Detective of the district, who must have had some creditable record during his service, had a right to be sent there, in the best interests of the public. I am not complaining at not having been sent there, but there is a point I propose to make out of it. There was no reason in the world why the benefit of our assistance should have been considered not worth having, and it is one of the things that go to show—amongst others, which have been mentioned in previous evidence—that the Dunedin members of the Force were not popular with the Commissioner, and did not possess his confidence. I do not see any grounds whatever for the Commissioner taking up such a position. I know I am making a bold statement when I say that I consider, under the circumstances, I should have naturally expected that I might have been called to the scene, notwithstanding that the offence was not committed within the Dunedin Police District. It was committed in the Canterbury Police District, and I do not say that Inspector Gillies had a right to apply for our assistance; but I say the Commissioner of Police, who is in charge of the whole Force, and who must be presumed to know his men, knew we were there handy, and knew that we were never called upon nor consulted. I venture to say he did not trust us in connection with that case, and, if that was the position the Commissioner took, then he had no grounds whatever for his assumptions. With regard to the transfers of the general police and detectives, the manner in which they are carried out strikes me as being as detrimental to the best interests of the Force and to many of the individuals themselves as anything could possibly be. I propose to give some instances of transfer for which I cannot possibly account in any way. Take the latest one. There was a transfer from Wellington to Dunedin of Detective Cameron, and of Detective Connolly to Wellington to replace him. Just prior to that transfer, Detective Hill, who had been here for a considerable time, was offered a transfer to Napier, and he took it, and I believe he is there still. His transfer considerably weakened us here, and we were not what I would call strong before that. He was replaced by Acting-Detective McLeod, who had never done detecting work before. Then along comes soon afterwards the transfer of these other two men. Now, Connolly was a particularly valuable man in Dunedin, by reason of his extensive local knowledge—a particularly valuable acquisition in the performance of a detective's duties; it often enables him to find out more in five minutes than another man might find out in a fortnight. This transfer was ordered by the Commissioner without any reason being given at all. I protested against it in a report I made to the Inspector in what now appears to me stronger terms than I thought when I wrote it. I considered that the removal of two useful men who knew the town well, and who were doing good work, and replacing them by two strange men, however good they might be—and they were not better than the men who went away, for I do not want to criticize them beyond that—consider-

ably weakened our strength, and, having that in my mind, I, on the 3rd April, 1906, wrote this report to the Inspector: "I have to report that Detective Connolly's transfer would considerably weaken our staff; *in fact, he cannot be spared from here.* Constable Hunt has only been ten months here, Constable McLeod nine months, and Constable Mitchell a few weeks. They all came here comparatively strange to the city and to detective work, and it must be clear that we are at a disadvantage as compared with the other centres by having to work with four men, two of whom are perfect strangers to the city, while the other two are still new to the work. Our strength in number is below that of all the other centres, and I submit that is a reason why it should not be below them in other respects also. When Detective Hill was transferred I thought then that these facts should be represented. They have double force now that we are to lose Connolly, and I submit it is imperative that some protest should be made against his removal. He does not wish the transfer, but is satisfied to go if ordered; but he is a more useful man here than he could possibly be in Wellington for a considerable time to come. Our staff here during my time here has been very successful in keeping down crime and in detecting it also, and a very considerable portion of the credit of this is due to Detective Connolly's knowledge of the city and of the people, and, of course, to his energy also.—P. HERBERT, Chief Detective." That report the Inspector submitted to the Commissioner, with the following remarks: "I very much regret that you have seen fit to transfer Detective Connolly from Dunedin, as he is, with one exception, the only detective with a good local knowledge. It is only a few weeks since Detective Hill, who also had a good local knowledge, was transferred from here, and an inexperienced stranger was sent to replace him. Now it is proposed to replace Detective Connolly with an officer who has had no local knowledge. Under such circumstances it is quite certain that serious crime will go undetected. I sincerely trust that you will see your way to reconsider this matter, and not fill the detective branch with officers who will be practically useless for at least a year.—T. O'BRIEN, Inspector, 3/4/06." The Commissioner wrote in reply, and I will ask you, sir, to say whether—although my report was strong—his remarks relating to myself were not unduly severe, and did not show, together with what I have already said, that the Commissioner, to use an every-day expression, had no time for me: "Inspector O'Brien.—The transfer ordered must be carried out, notwithstanding your Chief Detective's dictatorial report, a repetition of which will be dealt with as merited. To have the detective work efficiently carried out at Dunedin it is evident to me that the change ordered is very desirable. You have now only one acting-detective, with short experience—viz., McLeod, nine months. Detective Cameron has had six years' experience, and is a superior man to Connolly in every respect. Acting-Detective Hunt, although only ten months acting-detective, is a man of fifteen years' police experience, and previous plain-clothes knowledge in South Island; and Acting-Detective Mitchell has had about three years' detective experience. Criminals of any note do not confine their operations to one district, and are consequently known in more cities and towns than one. This change has been ordered for the benefit of the service, and has not been decided upon prematurely. If you show me the necessity for the detective branch in your district being strengthened I will be pleased to consider the matter. You will find Detective Cameron a most reliable and efficient officer, and that you will be a gainer and not a loser by the change. Please report if you require an augmentation to the detective branch, giving reasons.—W. DUNNIE, Commissioner." Then I was ordered to instruct Connolly to proceed to Wellington, and the transfer took place. I do not propose to waste your time, sir, by referring to the dictatorial report that would be "dealt with as merited," if repeated. If I am not a mere figurehead, I submit I was entitled to make that report, although the remarks were strong; but I cannot feel strong without writing strong, and this was no trivial matter. I have never been told the reason of this transfer at all. It certainly was not because of anything against Connolly; but it has occurred to me within the last few days that there may have been a reason which I had never allowed myself to entertain—something which some people think exists in the Force to a greater extent than it really does. But I really do not entertain that idea, and I do not know what the reason was. I know the work is more serious, and that there is more of it to do in Wellington than there is here, for the reason that it is a different community, and if, as the Commissioner says, Cameron was a better man than Connolly, Wellington was the place for him; and if Connolly was not so good as the other, then he would be of still less use in Wellington by reason of his want of local knowledge. Then, where were the grounds for the change, unless it was with the idea of keeping us in a state of continual turmoil, or something equivalent to that, with new men? But as you, sir, have the papers you will no doubt be able to find out what is in it. There is not a detective here to-day who was here when I came about six years ago, and for a good period of my time there was not a man, including myself, who had been here five years. That is a very great disadvantage in a city, because every Inspector with detective experience will tell you that local knowledge is a very valuable thing for a detective in many respects. During my time we have had thirteen detectives here altogether. Our strength now is six, and during that time seven men have gone or come. Some of them were here only a very short time. One man was here a good number of years, and he went away on account of health reasons. His shift was justifiable; but it strikes me, from my experience of transfers, that the cost to the country must be something enormous in the Police Department alone, and this coming and going must be calculated to impair the efficiency of the service. In Australia young men who have entered the service often end their service in the same country town and in the same house in which they started. The longer they are there the better. I have known old men there who practically do nothing but lend their experience, as it were, to their comrades. They are able to say what somebody was twenty-five years ago and all about him. Why should not men who come here as detectives be left here as long as possible? Of course, there may be health reasons or other reasons for shifting him; but as regards conduct, he is not likely to conduct himself any better by being shifted. That brings me to Detective Connell's case. He said

he was hounded here, and did not get fair treatment. He was transferred from Christchurch after having been punished. He reported himself here on the 10th February, 1909, and took up his duties shortly afterwards. Detective McLeod, who had been here for some years, and who knew the town well, was sent to Christchurch, where his local knowledge was simply wasted. I do not see why our staff should be broken up to make a vacancy for a defaulter, who was sent here for no reason that we can discover. Coming here did not improve him, because he was disrated after he arrived. Possibly the reasons of his transfer may have done more credit to the hearts than to the heads of the authorities responsible, and they preferred that their killing operations should be done here.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was he not transferred for misconduct?—But is misconduct a ground for transfer?

12. *The Commissioner.*] I can appreciate the point. It is that there is no reason why a defaulter should not be dealt with in the district in which he has misconducted himself?—Yes. Why should another district have to do the killing?

13. You are assuming that the man is hopeless?—This man while here was reduced, and shortly afterwards transferred to Invercargill. McLeod was transferred to take his place, and those three transfers must have cost something like £50. That is a question which must affect the taxpayers, including myself. If my contention is right, the money is practically wasted.

14. The question is whether the transfers are made with due regard to the efficiency of the Force?—I believe, if a table were made of the transfers that have taken place to and from this station during 1905, 1906, and 1907, not one in half a dozen would be found to be justified. And this tremendous expense is going on while a lot of fuss is being made of the difference as between 8s. and 10s. a day travelling-allowance. I would here mention that cadets in the Government service drawing £100 a year get 10s. a day travelling-allowance, and the Post and Telegraph boys get it. I leave it at that. As to Connell's case, I see he gave evidence to the effect that he is an injured man. Everything that I have to say about him is in the files. It is true there is nothing on the file to say that he was drunk, but one meets men whom you would not be justified in calling drunk, and yet would not be sober enough to perform police duty.

15. You seemed to arrive at that conclusion when he met with his accident?—Well, I know he would not have been where he said he was at that hour of the night if he were in his proper frame of mind. It is a place where a man would not dream of going in the middle of the night unless he had urgent duty to perform there, and he had not.

16. He does not look like a man who drinks, if appearances go for anything?—There are some men who get very red in the face when they drink; others get white; he is one of the white sort. I would refer you to the file in connection with his case. The papers refer to the impossibility of getting him to attend at the office during office-hours.

*The Commissioner.* Undoubtedly he was reduced; but with regard to this particular incident, he said when he met with his accident he lay for three hours unconscious on the ground, and the doctor said he did not think his injuries were consistent with—

*Mr. Dinnie.* He was reported as unfit for the position.

*The Commissioner.* There is ample evidence as to that.

*Witness.* Now I come to the question of Acting-Detective Lilley, a very intelligent, steady, sober, and successful young man of eight years and four months service. He has been two years and two months in Dunedin, and within the last three months he has had favourable marks placed on his merit sheet for duties performed. I propose to compare his case with that of Detective Quartermain, who has two years and one month less service than Lilley, and who is a detective in rank. Lilley is a constable in rank, "acting-detective" being merely an honorary title. Quartermain is what is known as a finger-print expert. Any experience he has had in detective work must have been obtained while he was a constable—I do not know how long—but he could not get any experience of detective work in his present position, working as a finger-print expert, unless he went out in his spare time with detectives learning detective work, if it can be learned by one man from another. Lilley, on the other hand, is a practical working acting-detective, and has been so for over two years, besides having six years' experience of police work—mounted, foot, and so on. Yet Quartermain is Lilley's senior, and will be so for all time unless, in the turn of the wheel, Lilley jumps over him, as has happened before to-day. Quartermain, I understand, gets 10s. a day as detective, 1s. 6d. a day for house-rent, and another 1s. or 1s. 6d. a day as expert; making a total of at least 12s. 6d. And he jumps straight into that after six years and two months as a constable. When I was nine years a constable, five of which I was acting-detective, I was only getting 7s. 6d. a day; and when I had been twenty years in the service, and was looked upon as an experienced detective, I was not receiving as much pay as Quartermain does now.

17. *The Commissioner.*] You were not a finger-print expert?—That is one of Commissioner Dinnie's hobbies.

*Mr. Dinnie.* An important one, too.

*Witness.* A very important one, but it would be more important if it were not boomed so much. The finger-print business is being practically killed with kindness. It is boomed so much in the newspapers and elsewhere that it is not to be wondered at if the criminal goes to work with his gloves on; then the finger-print experts may fish so far as discovery by that system is concerned. I admit the system is a very valuable adjunct, but I do not give it the prominent position that I believe is given to it by our Commissioner. When a criminal is arrested, I do not believe, simply because his finger-prints are identical with the impression kept in the office, that the finger-print experts should take all the credit for the discovery. Sometimes when we send a good finger-print to the office, it may be of only one finger perhaps, and, according to their system of indexing, they cannot find whose print that is, because, of course, the system is not

yet sufficiently perfect. When we send them a print, and they cannot find in the office whose it is, they ask us to send them the names of half a dozen criminals, any one of whom might have committed the offence. Well, we reply that at the time the offence was committed Smith, Brown, Jones, or Robinson were in Dunedin, and if the print happens to be of one of those men, all the credit goes to the finger-print department. I mention this to show that the system is boomed by the head of the department for all it is worth, while those who are not in favour are treated with more or less harshness, to put it mildly. While on that subject I might mention that we have in our office now about fifteen hundred photographs of criminals from New South Wales alone, and numbers are coming in annually, some of them of aboriginals, and our present indexing system is so out of date that it is utterly impossible, with all the aliases of the criminals, to turn up anything when it is wanted, and since the Commissioner visited Tasmania we have been flooded with photos from that country of boys who have been fined for leaving cabs unattended and things of that sort. In the finger-print department they have now a most up-to-date system of indexing, and I think we ought to have some such system in our office. It would appear that the success of the finger-print department is of far more importance to the Commissioner than the success of the detective department; at any rate, so far as Dunedin is concerned. I cannot speak as regards the other districts. Now, when Mr. Tumbridge was Commissioner no district clerk was appointed a sergeant unless he went out on the block, leaving a vacancy for somebody else.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But you do not know his views on that point?—I only know the effect of them. I do not offer any opinion upon it myself. I also want to point out that while the maximum pay of a Sub-Inspector is higher than that of a Chief Detective, the minimum pay of a Sub-Inspector is less than that of a Chief Detective.

19. *The Commissioner.*] Are not the Chief Detectives paid alike?—Yes; but only when they reach the maximum. We are all at the maximum now, I think, except Bishop. The point I want to make is this: that if the Department should at some time require my services as Sub-Inspector, and I had to start at the minimum pay of a Sub-Inspector, I should be getting what might be termed an Irishman's rise, and unless I reached the maximum before my retiring-age it would affect my retiring-allowance. When Sergeant Siddells came into the detective branch at the bottom of the list I understand he suffered no loss of pay, and he continued at that pay until his services entitled him to the next increment in the ordinary course; and what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. I may say the detectives in our department feel very sorely the position they are placed in with regard to this finger-print expert. If any one had told me before I started to speak on this Commission that I would have said all the things I have said I would have considered they were mad. I would have told them I would not dream of impeaching my superior officer in the way I have done, and I should never have done so had it not been for your Worship's statement at the opening of this Commission. In fact, I should have been an unwilling witness. I have abandoned most of the matters I felt most concerned about since Dr. Findlay took charge of the Department, and were I not sure that your remarks would carry full weight I would have hesitated to give the evidence I have given to-day, because at the last Commission I said things that were not popular relating to appointments from the lower ranks to the higher, and that evidence has helped to bring about the strained relations which I feel have existed between the Commissioner and myself since that time. Though your Worship may make all these promises with the greatest possible earnestness, and Dr. Findlay may support you in that, the next year or the year afterwards there may be no Dr. Findlay and there may be no Mr. Bishop—

*Mr. Dinnie:* And no Mr. Herbert.

*Witness:* Just so; and no Mr. Dinnie. We have to take such remarks at what we consider their true worth. But in this case your Worship's promise is something more than the ordinary departmental necessary introduction. I will finish with one more reference, and that is the question of the qualifications required by a man having control of a Police Force like that of New Zealand. I recognise I am presuming greatly when I propose to make any reference to that at all, but I am absolutely in your hands, sir, as to whether I have the right to make it. But it is not with the intention of reflecting upon any Commissioner past or present, or upon anybody who may be considered eligible for the position at present. I am sure, with all the boast you may hear from members of the Force as to their great experience, you will not find one who has served under as many Commissioners as I have; and I know, because it is a good billet, when once they get it they will hold on to it for a long time. Now, I presume to say that it does not matter a straw whether a Commissioner is a man with thirty or more years of the best experience a policeman can have, or whether he is a man who never was a policeman, but who by reason of his general life and occupation, say, as a solicitor, or somebody in some such calling, who is well in touch with the work, who has the brains and who knows how the thing should be run. Experience as a policeman would not have endowed him with something that we call a judicial mind, or with the power to influence men and to deal with them as only a man with a judicial mind can. If he is a policeman, and has that mind, so much the better; but if not, he is better than the experienced policeman who lacks the born qualities that go to make the judicial mind. I submit that the great thing in the management of a Police Force is to have a man at its head who has influence over the men; in the next place, who has self-respect; and in the next place, who is almost incapable of dealing unfairly with any man, however little he may deserve sympathy. I do not know whether your Worship will pull me up when I say this, but I know of no man in New Zealand who, in my experience, holds qualifications in that particular respect equal to your own.

20. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know what the emoluments of my office are, and what the emoluments of the Commissioner are? Do you think it would be promotion to appoint me Commissioner of Police?—I think the country will discover that it will be worth while to give no con-



sideration to the question of emolument. I think it would be a great saving of expense whatever they paid your Worship. I may not be entitled to say it.

*The Commissioner:* I think you had better not pursue that question further. Do you wish to ask any question of the witness, Mr. Dinnie?

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As you know, sir, I have not the official files of papers by me now, and I rely entirely on the files in answering almost all the points raised by Mr. Herbert; but I should like to ask him this question: In cases arising in your own district, is an officer from another district ever sent to investigate?—Yes.

22. Has it been the system here?—I do not think so, but it was a system introduced by you when you sent Chief Detective McIlveney here in the case of the theft of the North Dunedin ballot-papers. It was at Christmas time when Detective McIlveney came here and interviewed me, and we made inquiry together. I submit that that inquiry could have been as well made by Detective Ward and myself, who, notwithstanding years, am still fit for such an inquiry; and it was needless to send a detective, at some expense to the country, to do our work.

23. Did that inquiry entail his going into other districts?—I do not think so; but suppose it did, we could very well do one part of the inquiry here, and other detectives could do the other part elsewhere.

24. Do you know of any case of a detective coming from Christchurch to take a matter in your district?—Yes. I remember Detective Ward, at the time of the Papakaio case, coming to make inquiries here.

25. That is a case arising in another district. You said you thought you ought to have been employed to investigate the Papakaio murder case. Was that a case of emergency?—I think anything in connection with that case was a case of emergency, but I do not think it was any question of emergency that induced you to treat us in that matter as you did. I think, for some reason or another, you had no confidence in us. You were evidently not satisfied with some inquiries we had made about a revolver previously. You jumped to a wrong conclusion, which is a very dangerous thing to do. You jumped to the conclusion that because we did not find anything on that occasion, it had been slummed by us, and that we were not as capable of doing the work as the man you sent would be.

26. Did I not send down an officer who found what you failed to discover?—You are treading on dangerous ground, and you are showing that you did not rely on us as being capable. The inquiry was given to me by the most careful and trustworthy man you could find in the office in Wellington—Detective Hunt. He made inquiries, and answered exactly the question the Department wanted answered. They only gave us a limited amount of information. The telegram was something to this effect: "Accused is believed to have bought a gun or revolver in Dunedin from So-and-so." Detective Hunt went into every shop in Dunedin to see if he had done so, and then the Department discovered from somebody that a particular man in a particular shop had sold the accused a revolver ten years before, and this offended Mr. Dinnie. I leave it to you, sir, to say whether our failure to find something that happened ten years ago was any reflection on our capabilities.

27. You have not told me of any officer coming from Christchurch to investigate a matter arising in your district within my time?—I do not just now.

28. It is not a general system?—No; and that is why I feel aggrieved at your sending McIlveney here to investigate this other business.

29. Do you know that McIlveney is appointed to take up special matters connected with the various Departments, such as Post Office cases, Railway cases, and other special cases—really expert cases?—If you say so, I will take your word for it.

30. You do not know the system in England?—No.

31. *The Commissioner.*] Is the matter of Detective McIlveney's appointment a grievance with the other detectives generally?—Well, he describes himself as Chief Detective, Headquarters Branch, and we could have no grievance except that in the distant future he might be a stumbling-block to somebody else's advancement. If by reason of his title he should become to be regarded as my senior, I feel I should have some grounds for complaint; but I do not think that is the intention.

32. In carrying out what you have outlined as a scheme based very much on the Victorian system, how would you provide for local control of the detectives? You must have some head, it seems to me?—I would make no change in the present system, except as regards placing them on the seniority list, and giving them another name.

33. Detectives would be detective constables?—Yes. Then you have detective sergeants, who would be equivalent to full detectives.

34. What term would you have answering to Chief Detective?—I would have constables who were detective constables as "Constable Brown, mounted, St. Kilda," "Constable Jones, foot, Brighton," "Constable Smith, C.I.B., Russell Street." Then, I would have "Sergeant Smith, C.I.B., Russell Street," and so on. This is how they would be described. Then, of course, at any place where there is a Superintendent there would be a vacancy for an Inspector. But I do not propose anything of that sort at all, as I do not think it would be entertained, particularly at a time when money is an object. Another reason is that the head officer here is the Inspector, and I do not think the idea would be entertained of making the present Chief Detective an Inspector equal with the Inspector in charge. Therefore I would ask that the next highest rank should be Sub-Inspector with seniority, with the right to remain as he is or go into the other branch in his proper turn.

*Mr Dinnie:* I quite agree with Mr. Herbert's ideas as regards the detective branch.

*Witness:* I submit your Worship might reasonably see your way, when framing your report, to review the past promotions to the extent of placing men who without sufficient grounds have



been promoted over their seniors in their proper positions, and then when the promotion of those men who have been passed over, if they are deserving of it, is to be carried out, they should be promoted over the heads of those who never should have been passed over them.

35. *The Commissioner.*] Have you noticed any deterioration as regards the intelligence and physique of the men joining the Force recently?—There are some splendid men in the police here—as good as you would find anywhere in the world I should say, but there are others who appear to me not as good physically.

36. Are you of the same opinion as Inspector O'Brien as to the degree of intelligence and physique generally of the men who have joined recently?—I am not in the same position of offering an opinion as the Inspector, and I do not care to venture an opinion upon that. But on the question of education, I do not think it is so much a matter of what standard should be set as the degree of ordinary common-sense a man possesses. I believe there are men who can barely read or write who would make better constables than many well-educated men.

37. Surely you must have some standard of education by which to gauge a man's fitness for the Force, otherwise you cannot tell what degree of intelligence he possesses until he is in the Force?—I should say the Fifth Standard as a general principle, and the Fourth Standard if in other respects more than ordinary qualifications are present.

38. That would be opening the door to differential treatment?—In some of the other colonies they have what are called "probationary constables," who are taken on at 1s. a day lower pay than the permanent men, and I would have men on probation in the Force for twelve months if I had my way. If a probationer fails to be taken on permanently, it looks better than being dismissed after he is taken on.

ROBERT CRAWFORD, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 30.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Clyde. I shall have had twenty-seven years' service on 2nd December next. Was promoted to the rank of sergeant after twenty years' service.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any statement to make?—Only that I consider the pay of the men on starting in the Force should be 8s. a day, and that when sergeants are on duty they should be allowed first-class passes on the railway. If it could be done also, I think when sergeants and constables are on leave they should be given some little railway concession. The constables in my district are sober intelligent men. I have no complaint to make with regard to promotion.

ALBERT TIVY EMERSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 31.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant, stationed at South Dunedin. I entered the Force in 1892, and was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1906. I have been in Dunedin about three years. In Dunedin we have some really good intelligent men, but some who have come down here within the last three or four years have been practically useless. I do not consider they were the right class to make good constables. They did not take enough interest in their work, nor had they the education.

1. *The Commissioner.*] They would have passed the Fifth Standard, and that is pretty high, is it not?—I do not know whether they did or not, but I know some of them did not remain very long in the Force.

2. Would you suggest anything that would make the Force more attractive to young men?—I would increase the pay. Most of the men I come in contact with complain bitterly about the pay; they consider they could make much higher wages outside the police, and have a much better time. They would not then have to work on Sundays, and they would have no night duty to do. They could live where house-rent is cheaper, and they might be able to keep a garden and fowls or something of that sort. In town the least one can get a house for is 14s. a week, and we are only allowed 7s. for rent.

3. Are you aware of any general feeling of dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion?—I have heard it expressed as regards junior men being promoted before their seniors.

4. Did you satisfy yourself that those complaints were well founded?—I could tell whether they were junior or senior by their regimental numbers.

5. You think the senior men were equal as regards efficiency?—Yes.

6. How did it come about?—I was one of the juniors promoted over the heads of others, and I was simply told by my Inspector that I had been recommended for promotion. I did not make application.

7. Do you know of any political influence being used?—I have heard men talk about "wire-pulling" and using political influence, but I do not of my own knowledge know of any cases.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Were the junior men you speak of appointed to special posts, clerical or otherwise?—I suppose some of them would be clerks in the Inspector's office, but my case was not one of those.

9. There are men junior to you who have been promoted?—Oh, yes. What I mean is that some of the men senior to me complain at my having been promoted before them. They were promoted after me.

10. *Station Sergeant King.*] If you were offered the position of station sergeant, and had to remain as station sergeant, would you accept it?—I should prefer to remain in the country as a sergeant. Of course, if I was to have a chance of rising higher it would be different.

WILLIAM GILBERT, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 32.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at the Dunedin central station. I think in physique and intelligence the junior men in the Force to-day compare favourably with the older men.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is the standard kept up?—I think the standard is hardly kept.

2. Do you think there is any gradual deterioration in the quality of the men?—I think there is, perhaps.

3. To what do you attribute that?—I think there should be a little more pay. The Force is not attractive enough, and the men can get better wages outside the Force.

4. Do you think the standard of education is too high?—I would not say that. I think you would get plenty of good men if they were properly paid.

5. Do you know of any dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion and treatment generally?—There is dissatisfaction as to promotion.

6. One man in your district said he had not had a Sunday off in three years?—Very often you cannot spare a man. I have not had a Sunday off in ten years; I cannot get away.

FRIDAY, 16TH JULY, 1909.

ALFRED EDGAR SIDNEY WARD, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 33.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin at present. I joined the Force on the 28th September, 1898, and on the following day had to report myself to Sergeant Emerson at Wanganui. I remained in that district, working between Palmerston North and New Plymouth, until February, 1902, and on the 2nd of that month I was transferred to Christchurch. On the 1st June, 1905, I was appointed detective, and in February, 1907, was transferred to Dunedin.

1. *The Commissioner.*] For what period were you acting-detective?—I only worked for one year in uniform.

2. Were you promoted for any special reason, or simply in the ordinary course?—I was especially promoted for the part I took in the arrest of a man named White in Christchurch. In the year 1900 I was detailed for special work in connection with serious fires that had taken place at Marton. Detective Bishop and I were there for about two months, and were successful in bringing a man to justice who was responsible for fires. At the conclusion of that case at the Supreme Court the Chief Justice made some highly complimentary remarks concerning the part I personally took in the matter. A few weeks later Commissioner Tunbridge asked me if I would care to join the detective department. This is leading up to a point I intend to make. Of course, I felt complimented at being asked by a man like him to join a certain department. I accepted, and I had no more uniform duty practically after that. When I am asked to take up duties in a certain department I fail to see why that avenue leading to the higher offices of the service should be closed to me simply because I chose to enter that department. We were very much disturbed some time ago by an announcement that was made in the House by the late Minister of Justice, who laid it down in no uncertain terms that the avenues to the higher offices were permanently closed to the detective force. I am well aware that Dr. Findlay has since altered his predecessor's opinion, but my point is that the political world might be turned upside down to-morrow, and we might get another Mr. McGowan; and we want you, sir, if you are satisfied by the evidence, to submit to the Government a recommendation which will have permanent effect, and which we can refer to in the event of our getting another man in office holding Mr. McGowan's ideas. We consider, of course, that we ought to be able to reach the higher offices of the department. Another small matter I wish to mention is this: To men in the detective force travelling on public service by boat steerage fare only is allowed. Personally I have never travelled steerage since I joined the department. Last October I was sent to Auckland to give evidence in a case in the Magistrate's Court. The Department, under their regulations, provided me with a steerage ticket between Lyttelton and Wellington return and between New Plymouth and Onehunga, and I had to pay the difference out of my own pocket. We consider we should not be called upon to do this.

3. That is on account of the class of people you have to associate with?—Just so. Generally speaking, the regulations do not affect me as much as they do the uniform men, but I have been asked to briefly refer to them. The regulations we are working under now have been in force since Goodness knows when—since 1886, I think—and that is a good argument why they should, in my opinion, be cremated and a fresh lot drawn up. This is Regulation 112: "Members of the Force who are on leave will be subject to every order, rule, and regulation of the Force, and will be liable to be called on to act, and to the consequences of any breach of discipline or good order, as if they were on duty." Now, the men have only twelve days' leave in the year—I do not know why not fourteen—and they consider, rightly or wrongly, that the Department should pay their train fare when travelling on leave or supply them with a pass. Regulation 122 reads: "No man will leave his barracks without acquainting the sergeant or constable on duty where he is to be found, or go from his station any greater distance than a quarter of a mile without permission." At the present day surely a man can be trusted to go away further than a quarter of a mile. I understand the regulation was framed in case of a strike or a sudden riot, or something of that kind, so that the men could be readily called upon for duty. If that regulation were wiped out not more than one man in twenty would be out in the country for a bicycle ride or at the other end of the city. I agree that the Inspector should have power to bring into force a regulation of that sort in case of sudden emergency, giving him local power. This is Regulation 128: "The hours for meals will be fixed by the officer in charge of the district, and posted in the dining-room. At half past 10 p.m. such men as have not leave or are not on duty will go to bed; and all lights and fires, except such as are authorised to be kept up during the night, will be extinguished by 11 o'clock." That, I suppose, was framed so that men would be well rested and ready for duty next morning; but I think if a man wants to read at night he should be entitled to do so as long as he likes, and if he is not fit for duty next day it would be for his

officer to deal with him. Then, Regulation 190 says, "In case of persons of known respectability being arrested for some trifling offence, they need not be searched, but should be requested to produce such property as they may have on their persons, and should, when possible, be placed in a cell by themselves, and provided with clean bed-clothes." The latter part of that is all right, but the first part I consider is absurd, because no matter how respectable a person may be he may have matches or poison on him, and if anything happens to him the watch-house officer is responsible. But I believe that is altered now.

4. What takes the place of that now?—I think the authorities have issued a regulation that all persons are to be carefully searched.

5. A very strict special regulation?—Yes. Then Regulation 214 says, "On any alarm of fire the police—including those who are off duty—will turn out in uniform, and render every aid in their power which circumstances may demand." I am not in a position to say whether that is strictly adhered to.

6. It cannot apply in all places, because fire-bells are not rung in Christchurch or Wellington, at any rate?—Well, where it does obtain I would suggest that certain men only of those who are off duty should be instructed to turn out. As regards enrolment, I consider that no man should be enrolled unless he has resided at least a year in the Dominion, and I should say that, as far as possible, the Force should be recruited from the farming community.

7. You were not of the farming community?—No. I should make the standard of education the Fourth Standard, and I would further suggest that every man, after serving his month or two months in the depot, should be placed on probation for six months, and that no probationary constable should be stationed other than in one of the four large centres for that period. In my short experience I have not noticed any marked deterioration in the Force. I am speaking of my own personal observations, and after perusing the annual reports of the several Inspectors in charge of the different districts. I think, without exception, it will be found that the Inspectors in their general remarks concerning the behaviour of the members of the Force use in effect these words: "With few exceptions, the conduct of the members of the Force has been so-and-so." Now, with regard to those exceptions, I would suggest that the Inspector, when forwarding his report to the Commissioner, should mention the names of those he deems to be the exceptions, and that their conduct should be made the subject of special attention by their sergeant and the other officers. Then when the next annual report is forwarded, if those men are still found to be exceptions, I think the sooner they are turned out of the Force the better. In 1906 or 1907, when that unfortunate affair took place in Dunedin, people, of course, said the Force was deteriorating, and going to the dogs generally. Well, that was simply because a few unworthy members had brought discredit upon the whole service. That same remark applies, I think, at present in respect to certain members of the Force who have so far forgotten all sense of decency as to bring disgrace at least on the North Island section. There is just one more thing I would suggest to the officer in charge of the Department, and that is, when he decides to appoint to the detective branch a constable who has served for five or six years in one of the big towns, that man should be appointed to the town in which he has gained his experience. When I came here I held the rank of detective, but the men on whom I most relied for local information in connection with the cases I had to investigate were the men who had been doing beat duty. Local knowledge is an invaluable aid to a man in the performance of his duties.

8. Why were you transferred from Christchurch?—Well, I had a brother in Christchurch who was favourably recommended, I understand, for detective duty, and the Commissioner did not deem it advisable to keep two brothers in the same town. I do not take any exception to that at all.

9. Your brother is only a constable now?—Yes.

10. I know he is a very good man. Which do you consider was most in the interests of the service: to leave you in Christchurch or leave your brother?—I think the step the Commissioner took. I only want to add this: There is no doubt that the Commissioner is now on his trial, and it is only my duty to say that since I have been in the Department I have received from the Department everything I consider I deserved, and without asking for it.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you are aware the Police Regulations are being revised at the present time?—Yes; but I think they should be promptly revised and given to the men.

12. You understand that it takes a little time to go through them and revise them?—Yes. Perhaps I am wrongly informed, but it is believed by many of the men that the revision of the regulations was in hand two years ago.

*The Commissioner:* When was the last change of regulations?

*Mr. Dinnie:* With the exception of amendments, there has been no change for many years.

*The Commissioner:* Are those amendments made piecemeal?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

*The Commissioner:* How long has it been recognised that a revision of the regulations is necessary?

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It has been recognised for some little time. Amendments have been made during the whole of the time I have been here. I should like to ask the witness this question. (To witness): although there is a regulation in respect to men who are off duty, are they not, as a rule, permitted to go where they like?—I am prepared to say the regulation is more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

14. *The Commissioner.*] It merely gives the Inspector the power to enforce it when necessary?—Yes; but where the regulation exists it is clearly the duty of the Inspector to enforce it.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know there is now an instruction that all persons arrested are to be thoroughly searched, no matter who they are?—That is so.

16. I quite agree with you that men drawn from the farming community generally turn out the best constables, but I am afraid we should have a difficulty in getting all our men from the

farming class. Do you not think we should accept men from other sources as well?—I would not make a hard-and-fast rule, only I would give them preference. The young fellow from the country will not develop into a rogue as quickly as the young fellow from the town, and the sergeant finds him easier to train.

17. *The Commissioner.*] You have suggested that men should be placed on six months' probation. You know that a man can be dismissed at any time after he joins the Force?—Yes; but there are men who go out on beat day after day for years—respectable sober men, but who are practically useless. They take no interest in their work, they will not see anything that is going on, and all they want is to avoid trouble. Well, you have a job to shift that fellow.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you admit such men will be found in all Government departments?—Yes.

19. You think a probationary period would get over that difficulty?—I think the right class of sergeant would drop to a fellow in six months.

20. I know of some sergeants who would not?—That means you must be careful as to who you appoint sergeants.

21. The difficulty is to get the class of men you require. The majority of them consider themselves fit for promotion, do they not?—Yes, the great majority, I should say.

22. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Do you consider Constable Macholm a useful man?—Yes.

23. He had considerable local knowledge in Dunedin: transferring him to another city he knew nothing about would handicap him considerably, would it not, for at least twelve months?—Yes, and longer. I had him in mind when I said if a man is appointed to our staff from a big centre he should, as far as possible, be left in the centre where he was appointed.

24. Speaking of uniform men in barracks, as distinct from detectives, do you not think a constable who comes off duty at 9 p.m., and who has to go on duty at 5 in the morning, should be in bed not later than half-past 10 if he is to be fit for duty?—Yes; but I would not make it a hard-and-fast rule, because next day he would be off duty at 5 and not on again till 9 the next morning.

25. In the matter of reading, lights, &c., I agree with you that every man should read as much as possible, but should there not be some restriction as to the time lights in barracks should be extinguished?—Yes.

26. Do you think 11 is a reasonable hour?—I would not make it a hard-and-fast rule. Men in the big cities often come off duty at 5 and go about doing duty although off duty, and return to barracks about 10, and I think they should be able to read till 11 or 12, as they are not on duty till 9 in the morning. I think 12 would be a reasonable hour.

27. On whom do you think the cost of leaving the lights from 11 to 12 should fall?—On the Department.

28. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Do you think twelve days' leave in the year is enough?—No, I think there should be at least fifteen days.

29. And that should be allowed to accumulate for three years?—Yes.

30. Do you think there are men in the detective branch who are entitled to promotion before Detective Quartermain?—His appointment does not affect me personally, but the men in the Force generally think his appointment is a mistake. As a general principle, I think so; he has had no practical detective experience.

31. Do you think he is entitled to rank as a finger-print expert in view of the fact that he has practically learned all he knows in a few weeks or months? Do you think the term gives him an exaggerated idea of his own position, and makes the position of other detectives appear comparatively insignificant?—Personally, I do not say he is not entitled to be called "expert," but I do say, considering his service, he is not entitled to rank as detective.

32. If it is a fact that he could become expert in so short a time, and considering also that a finger-print expert is a valuable man to have in the service, could not other acting-detectives also be converted into experts in the interests of the service by being given the same opportunities?—That is the general feeling—that the whole thing is kept in Wellington, and others know nothing about it.

33. It is unfair to other detectives, as well as injurious to the service?—Yes.

34. Every acting-detective could then be a finger-print expert, and be on the spot as such wherever he may be stationed?—I do not know that I would personally care to put in the time necessary to become one.

35. You may not want it now, but I am speaking generally of acting-detectives: would it not be an encouraging thing for them to find themselves in the same position as regards pay as Quartermain?—Undoubtedly.

36. Seeing that he learnt his business from Mr. Dinnie, jun., would the office be under any disadvantage if he were removed, and others sent to learn the business?—No objection could be taken to that.

37. Do you remember the Commissioner, in connection with the Papakaio case, saying in a memo. that in future he would watch over your and Bishop's interests, or something to that effect?—I know he appreciated the work we did.—I cannot be sure about the memo.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* I am asking this question to ask the Commission to read the papers connected with that case and see all the things said by everybody about everybody, and compare it with the experience of others.

*Witness:* In regard to acting-detectives as compared with men attached to the district office doing clerical work, they contend rightly that they ought to have a greater allowance than the clerical staff. Constables in a district office get ordinary pay and 1s. a day, and so do acting-detectives. They consider their work is of a far more important nature, and their hours are three times as long, and therefore they should receive more pay. And they contend they should not have to wait so long before promotion.

38. *The Commissioner.*] What is the average time?—I do not know.

39. Was Quartermain appointed over your brother's head?—He and Quartermain joined the same month, and came out of the depot together.

40. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you aware that Quartermain served in the Prisons Department for some time?—Yes.

41. Do you not think that is of great advantage in the position he now holds?—No; if he were attached in a big centre the experience might have been valuable.

42. Would it not be of advantage in the identification of criminals?—If he had been attached to one of the district staffs.

43. He knows a great many prisoners?—Yes; if Smith has a lot of convictions against him, and you had a photograph of Jones, he could say it was not a photo of Smith, but he could more readily detect criminals by finger-prints than photos.

44. Do you know he has had many outside cases in his time?—I know he has arrested men that he knew. I do not want to say anything unkind about him.

45. What are his educational qualifications?—Above the average.

*The Commissioner.*: Is Mr. E. Dinnie's position recognised on the estimates as a separate and distinct office?

*Mr. Dinnie.*: Yes, as an expert.

THOMAS KING, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 34.)

*Witness.*: I am stationed in Dunedin. I joined the Force in 1878, having had previous police experience. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1898, and station sergeant in 1906. It was only after hearing your Worship's address to the men that I decided to give evidence, as you assured the men that no injustice would follow the giving of evidence. I have a complaint to lay before the Commission, labouring as I do under a sense of injustice. In October, 1905, I received a telegram from Inspector Gillies, offering me the position of station sergeant, with an increase of 1s. 6d. pay. I replied asking what the house-allowance was, and on receiving a reply I telegraphed back that I had no wish for the position, as I considered the remuneration insufficient—that I would only accept it if instructed to do so. In the following February I read of my appointment to the position in Christchurch in the newspapers. I returned to my station, and got a telegram with the appointment, with a memo. to the effect that the pay was 11s. 6d., rising to 13s. by an increase of 6d. every two years and a house-allowance of £40. I replied to the effect that I had been led to understand the pay was 13s. per day from the start, and the pay offered was a reduction of pay to me. I got no satisfaction, and I made representations that I was dissatisfied, and wished to remain where I was, and had no wish whatever to leave. I got a reply saying that the arrangements were made and could not be altered. I came to Dunedin, and was handed the charge of the office. I carried out the duties as best I could. Five or six weeks afterwards Mr. Dinnie came to Dunedin, and I interviewed him in the Inspector's office. I complained of being taken from a good station and put to a loss of 3s. 6d. a week in connection with house-rent. Mr. Dinnie said, "Well, you had better settle down to your work if you want to get on in the service; it is a stepping-stone to further promotion. I intend to make all Sub-Inspectors from the rank of station sergeant." I left him with the understanding that it was to be so.

*Mr. Dinnie.*: It may be so yet.

*Witness.*: Some eight months afterwards I discovered that the station sergeant in Wellington was getting £50 house-allowance and the one in Christchurch was getting £65. I wrote asking for an increased house-allowance, and after writing again got it raised by £5. I was satisfied in a way, but it seemed to me I should have been treated as others were. Soon after that I was leaving the station in the afternoon, and Mr. Dinnie, who was leaving at the same time, joined me, and we walked together. He spoke of house-rent, and asked if I was satisfied. I said I would like to be treated as others in the same position. He asked how I stood on the promotion list. He said, "You are about senior, are you not?" I replied I was second—that Phair was senior to me. He said, "You won't have to wait long now." That was the last conversation I had with him. That was about two years ago. About two months afterwards I saw in the newspapers the announcement of Station Sergeant Norwood's promotion to Sub-Inspector. When I was satisfied the report was correct I applied for a transfer to Christchurch, as he was third on the seniority list, and was four years my junior. The application was sent back for reasons for making it. I attached a report saying that Norwood was to be sent to Dunedin, where he would be in immediate charge of me, who had hitherto been his senior all through the service, and I thought it might save a position which might cause unpleasantness to us both, which I wished to avoid. I also mentioned that there were free quarters in Christchurch for the sergeant, who was my junior in rank, while I was paying 13s. 10d. for rent in excess of my allowance. The Commissioner replied, "I understand Sergeant Norwood has not performed police duty either under or with Station Sergeant King, and they are practically strangers. If any unpleasantness should result through the change I am satisfied it will not be Sergeant Norwood's fault. I regret I cannot alter my arrangements." This position put me for two years and a half under Norwood. I must say I have found him a gentleman, and am sorry he left; but if any unpleasantness had arisen between him and me—which I am glad to say was not the case—he would have been believed, and I would not. It was practically a threat hanging over my head all the time he was in charge. I have been thirty-one years in the service, and have no enemies in the Force. That remark of Mr. Dinnie's hurt me very much. At the end of 1906 I happened to be on leave and staying with a farmer in the neighbourhood of the Papakaio murder, and I called in and saw the sergeant and constable on the scene. I knew my position better than to interfere, but having only lately left the district, I called the sergeant on one side, and gave him the best advice I could,

and offered to assist him if he wanted me to. He evidently did not want my help, and I left him. A day or two afterwards Inspector Gillies, who had arrived on the scene, asked me if I could remain for two or three days, as I knew the district, and my local knowledge would be of assistance. I consented to do so if he would inform my Inspector, which he did. I stayed about three days, and gave all the assistance I could. In three or four days Mr. Dinnie arrived, and Inspector Gillies told me the Commissioner said I was to return to my station.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What are you deducing from this?—I was unfortunate enough to be in the district at the time. False reports were circulated about certain things found in the house. I was not accused directly of circulating them, but I was by implication in a communication from the Commissioner.

2. I cannot reconcile what you are saying now with the fact that the Commissioner made you, as you told me, a promise of promotion to Sub-Inspector, because that was long subsequent to the Oamaru business?—The Commissioner seemed friendly to me until this unfortunate occurrence. Soon afterwards the Commissioner came down to Dunedin, and the man was committed for trial. After his return from Dunedin the Commissioner wrote to the Inspector saying, "I have information that false reports are being circulated in Dunedin about so-and-so; Station Sergeant King, who was on the scene, perhaps may know their origin." It was not a direct accusation, but the inference was there, and no other conclusion could be drawn than that I was a party to the reports. I have always been jealous of my honour, and I felt the position keenly, and I confess I wrote very strongly in reply. I replied in effect that these reports had been circulated in Dunedin before my arrival from Oamaru, and I was not many minutes in the place before I was accosted by several persons in the city who knew I had been in Oamaru and asked whether these reports were correct. I contradicted them in every instance, and mentioned the names of two or three persons in repute in the place who could be interviewed and asked what I did say. I said, "I am not going to see these men; I will give you the opportunity of seeing them, and if I am guilty of what I am accused of, if you can find one single instance, I am prepared to forfeit my position in the service." I got no reply, and I do not know whether Mr. Dinnie made any inquiries or not, but the matter ended. Then, one of the detectives who was down here making inquiries stated in my presence and that of Mr. Black that there were men in the police-station trying to prejudice the evidence in the case. I took no notice, not thinking I was suspected of it till I heard the matter talked of further. Some time after, when the detective came down again, I said, "I did not take any notice of your remark the other day about men trying to prejudice the case." He said he never said men in the station, but had said people in Dunedin. I took him into Mr. Black's office, and the detective repeated his explanation, but Black said, "You can twist it as you like, but you accused men in the station of trying to prejudice the case." The matter then dropped. About seven months after the thing had occurred I was told by a man that Mr. Dinnie had said to him that I was very indiscreet in ridiculing the evidence in the way I had. Now, unless Mr. Dinnie is prejudiced by this, I cannot see why I have been overlooked in promotion. Mr. Dinnie, no doubt, will say the best men are promoted. I have nothing to say about the men; they are good men, but I was senior to them. I have been recommended by my Inspector. I have been under Mr. Gillies and Mr. Ellison, both of whom, with my own Inspector, will say I am quite competent for the position. Has Mr. Dinnie the same opportunity of knowing the qualifications of a man as the Inspector under whose immediate charge he has been? To show what Mr. Dinnie thought about me when I came here first, in conversation in the Inspector's office immediately after my arrival, I said, "I want my duties defined"—the station sergeant's duties are very peculiar; you do not know what they are. One of the duties he allotted to me was prosecutions in Court, which I did for eighteen months.

3. While the Sub-Inspector was here?—Yes; I felt for him, but those were my instructions. I have done that duty off and on since, and I think I have given satisfaction. During all the time I have been in the Force I hold an unblemished record, I think, equal to any other man's. It would be very interesting to me to know what Mr. Dinnie's reason was for overlooking me. I do not think there is any sergeant in the Force in charge of a country station such as I had who would accept the position of station sergeant if he had not the hope of getting higher in the service. Every sergeant will tell you it is most irritating and unpleasant work. If I had any special duties allotted to me I should know my position, but as it is I have not. If anything goes wrong, I am held responsible; if I carry out duties or give instructions, the Sub-Inspector may come along and cancel them.

4. What are your duties?—I do not know. I come on duty about a quarter to 9. Any complaints that come in from sergeants or any correspondence during the night comes to me. If there is anything urgent, I attend to it at once. I parade the men when they come in and when they go out. The sergeants and constables all put in their reports through me, and I have them dealt with as far as possible before returning them to the Inspector's office. I am held responsible for the cleanliness of the station and other things. If people come with complaints, I take their reports.

5. How did you get into the way of doing your duties if they were not defined?—It is an understanding between the Sub-Inspector and myself. I got on very well with Mr. Norwood; we talked matters over, and understood one another; if anything was in doubt, we consulted one another. But I cannot order men away to do certain things without asking permission. I reported the whole of my alleged injustice to the Minister of Justice, and it went to the Commissioner from the Minister. The Minister was down here, and I told the Inspector I would like to see him, and he introduced me to him, and he asked me what I wanted, and I told him I considered an injustice had been done me by being passed over for promotion. He told me to report the matter fully, and in my presence told the Inspector to forward the report direct to him. The report was forwarded by the Minister to the Commissioner, and this is the latter's minute: "In the interests of the Department, and with a view to the efficiency of the Force, I recom-

mended two officers for promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector whom I consider to be superior in qualifications and better fitted in every way to hold that important rank, and who are the class of officers suitable for further advancement should vacancies occur. Station Sergeant King no doubt carries out his duties appertaining to his position in a very satisfactory manner, but I agree with my predecessor, whose remarks in respect to Sergeant King are that he is a good sergeant, but scarcely up to officer standard. That cannot be said of the two men recently promoted. The sergeant's suggestion that I am influenced against him on account of what occurred in connection with the Papakaio murder case is totally unfounded, and I am surprised at his Inspector indorsing his suggestion in respect to rumours originating from the station sergeant himself. If Station Sergeant King is the best man on offer, considering service and qualifications combined, at the next vacancy I will recommend him." The Commissioner has said that he takes credit for recommending me for my present position. I was in Inspector Gillies's district at the time, and I understood it was Mr. Gillies who recommended me, although I did not ask him to. Asked to note the above memo., I could not help writing as follows: "I respectfully ask to be allowed to make a few remarks on the minute above quoted, with reference to my non-advancement in the service. The Commissioner states he recommended me for my present position, and also states that I am carrying out my duties in my present position in a satisfactory manner. May I ask what better proof is required as to my fitness for the position of Sub-Inspector, only one grade higher than my present position, than the Commissioner's assurance that I have been efficient as sergeant and also as station sergeant? I do not consider that Mr. Tunbridge's remark as quoted by the Commissioner is applicable in my case." I never heard anything more of the matter. I have been on one occasion for three months acting Sub-Inspector and station sergeant combined. I think my Inspector will say I gave satisfaction. Again for six weeks I was acting Sub-Inspector, and lately again for two weeks, and on other different occasions. I found I gave satisfaction to my Inspector, who, I think, ought to be the best judge. My career in the service has been a very honourable one, and I have always been very jealous of my position, and have always had the welfare of the Force at heart, and have probably got on better than some. I joined in Wellington, and I was there for a month. The day after I was sent out on duty I was appointed, out of some thirty or forty men, as night watch-house keeper, and was there for three months. Then they wanted a mounted man for Oamaru, and I was selected for that position. I was in Oamaru for three years, and was one year at Ngapara. Inspector Thomson, in Oamaru, said, "King, I don't like to lose you; I would rather you remained," and I did remain. I was there only six months when I was under orders for promotion to third-class sergeant in Dunedin. I was, however, left in Oamaru till sent to Tapanui, and when I had been there twelve months Inspector Weldon came to the station and said, "I want you in Dunedin as sergeant." I said, "I am doing very well here. I am about to get married, and don't want to leave." He advised me to leave, and, after consideration, I said I would go to Dunedin as he wished. Mr. Dinnie hinted I was not offered promotion, but I was on that occasion. I defy any one to say I ever asked for anything I have got in the service. I never put in an application for promotion or transfer except when transferred to Oamaru, and on that occasion my application and my appointment crossed in the post. In reference to general matters before the Commission: In the first place, I think constables are underpaid. I may say we have some very good men, but others could be improved upon with a little care and judgment. I cannot understand how some men get into the Force; they say they have passed the examination, but, if so, they must have forgotten all they learned since doing so. I think it is worth nothing. Some men who have not passed the Fourth Standard are told to go to a teacher and undergo examination, and it is sufficient if he gives a certificate that they are equal to the Fifth Standard. We all know the value of such a certificate. I know a schoolmaster who would swear I had passed the Civil Service Examination if I wanted him to. In regard to recommending candidates, it was suggested that a sergeant should make the inquiries. I quite agree with that. I was in country districts where candidates came to me and said they wanted to join. I had my doubts about their character, and told them how it could be done. They went through the form, and in one or two cases were refused, and I was accused of putting in a bad report, and stopping their chance of getting into the Force.

6. By whom?—By the candidates. I made enemies of them and of their friends. They had no direct proof, but had a suspicion that it was my report. In one case there was a man arrested for a criminal assault; it was not a very strong case, but I had my suspicion that the man was guilty. He was discharged. To my surprise, a short time after he was in the Police Force. I happened to ask a constable what sort of report he gave this man. "Well," he said, "I gave him a favourable one, because I thought he would make a good constable, but I stated the facts of the case in my report." The man got into trouble here, and was dismissed in Wellington. If a sergeant were asked to make the report, he would first go to a constable and get his history.

7. Do you say the constable reported the facts of the prosecution?—Yes. As to education, I do not think the standard is too high. I find a difficulty in this way: If a constable has not a certain amount of education he will shirk work that entails the making of a report. There is a school of instruction once a week. I give one here once a week, in the afternoon. It is supposed to be compulsory for the first twelve months after enrolment; but I find the men who know least are the men that first absent themselves, and after the twelve months do not attend. In regard to travelling-allowance, that is a matter I have suffered from myself. In important cases a detective and I have travelled together—the detective first-class and I second, although I was in charge. My expenses were quite equal to his, yet he was allowed 8s. and I only 6s. I do not want to bring the detectives' expenses down to ours, but I want to raise our allowance. I have reported the matter, but got no satisfaction. I was told if I had produced receipts for amounts I paid I would have got them allowed: but there are many cases, when in a hurry to catch trains, that you cannot get receipts. As regards the class of men getting into the service, we are getting some very



good men and some very indifferent ones. I could name a man here who is to such an extent below the standard in physique that I have seen women turn round and look at him, remarking, "What a little policeman." There are others here who should not be. I do not say it is the fault of the Department, but there is one case in which I think a man should have been rooted out before being allowed to remain so long in the Force.

8. For what?—For an occurrence he brought on himself through his own folly.

9. Was he dismissed?—He was allowed to resign, and he is living now in a very shady way. He was about twelve months in the Force.

10. After the knowledge arose?—No; he was suspended for a month. He was suffering from a loathsome disease, and the men in the station objected to his being there. He was off for a month, and was then taken back. In regard to promotion, that is another matter that is causing dissatisfaction. In the three last promotions in the *Gazette* the last man in the list is senior to the other two in the service. This man will now be junior to the others all through. If he was fit for promotion at the time he was promoted, he should have been fit two months previously. This causes a great deal of dissatisfaction. I think a man who is passed over should be passed over for all time, though I hope it will not happen in my case.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your expression of dissatisfaction in connection with promotion was submitted to both Ministers?—No, only to the present Minister.

12. He has not thought it necessary to make any change?—No.

*The Commissioner.* He mentioned the matter specially to me, and he may have avoided taking action as this was one of the matters to come before the Commission.

*Witness.* These promotions took place soon after Dr. Findlay became Minister, and he did not know the details. Our opinion is that he is a capable Minister, and that we will get justice from him.

13. *The Commissioner.*] He must be dependent on advice from the Department for some time?—Yes.

14. *Mr. Dinnie.* Do you know that Mrs. King wrote to Mr. Arnold?—Six weeks ago Mrs. King was away from home, and a letter came in reply to a letter from my wife. I am as innocent of the letter as you are, and I will take good care she does not write another. That was the first information I got of her writing to Mr. Arnold. I take this opportunity of saying, as Mr. Arnold is here, that I never spoke to him in my life, nor asked any person to write to him.

*Mr. Arnold.* I received a letter from Mrs. King, and forwarded it to the Minister.

*Witness.* Did she tell you I was aware of it?

*Mr. Arnold.* I understood from her that you were not aware of it.

*Mr. Dinnie.* This is the letter written to Mr. Arnold by Dr. Findlay: "I have the honour to acknowledge a letter addressed to you by Mrs. King, of Dunedin, dated 23rd February, complaining of the non-promotion of her husband, Station Sergeant King, and, in reply, to inform you that, in the interests of the Department, and with a view to the efficiency of the Police Force, it is found necessary to promote the best-qualified men to the higher ranks, and occasionally junior men have to be selected with this view. This is what occurred on the occasion complained of, and the station sergeant has been fully acquainted with the cause of his being passed over."

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards probationers and their examination by schoolmasters, do you know as soon as they are taken on probation they are examined?—I was not aware of it. I went by the schoolmaster's memo. attached to the application papers before they enter the depot at all.

16. You do not know that they are examined before being taken on, and before they leave the instruction class?—No.

17. If sergeants are to inquire into the character and ability of candidates, where are you going to get them from, knowing that applicants reside in all the remote parts of the country?—There is a sergeant in charge of any sub-district, I understand. I should not think it a great hardship; my district extended about fifty miles generally.

18. You think it is practicable?—Yes.

19. Do you know of any cases where you reported against a candidate and he was afterwards taken on?—No.

20. What was the charge against the candidate you referred to?—Indecent assault.

21. And its result?—It was dismissed.

*The Commissioner.* That does not say the man was innocent. I have dismissed scores of cases where I had a latent feeling the man was guilty. Where a man is charged openly with such a crime it should be a matter of extreme care before he is taken on.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards measurements, you say the man you refer to was under the standard height?—I think so.

23. Do you know the measurement round the chest?—No, but extremely small for the Force.

24. Even small men have intelligence sometimes?—Yes; he was intelligent.

25. Do you know the Minister has approved of the admission of at least one man under height?—A quarter of an inch or so perhaps.

TERENCE O'BRIEN, Inspector, further examined. (No. 35.)

1. *Station Sergeant King.*] Have I given satisfaction during the three years I have been station sergeant?—You have given every satisfaction.

2. Have you recommended me for promotion as Sub-Inspector?—I have.

3. You think I am quite competent to fill the position?—I do; otherwise I should not have made the recommendation.

4. I have been acting Sub-Inspector on different occasions?—Yes, when a change was taking place, or when the Sub-Inspector was away on leave or on the sick-list you have filled the position.

5. With satisfaction?—You have indeed.



6. After I came here, were you instructed that I was to conduct the Court prosecutions?—Yes.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Was there a Sub-Inspector here at the time?—Yes.

8. What did you assume to be the reason? Did the Sub-Inspector take exception to it?—Probably the reason was that the station sergeant could do the work as well, and it would leave the Sub-Inspector the opportunity of more outside supervision. The Sub-Inspector took no exception to it.

9. I am surprised to hear the duties of station sergeant have never been defined. Is that a fact?—In a way. When the rank of station sergeant was created the Commissioner himself promised to define the duties; for some reason he has not done so.

10. Is there any difficulty about it?—Not a bit. If I had my own way, I would have had them defined long ago.

11. The Inspectors, in conversation with the Commissioner, could settle it in five minutes?—Yes.

12. Their not being defined does not conduce to good discipline?—Well, they are defined in a way, but there is no guide laid down for the benefit of station sergeants.

13. Is it desirable there should be?—We have been expecting it from the Commissioner all the time.

14. In regard to this man who was living in barracks with venereal disease, did you make any recommendation?—I reported the matter to the Commissioner.

15. What was the nature of the recommendation?—I do not know that I made any special recommendation. The station sergeant reported that there was dissatisfaction amongst the men, and the papers were sent to the Commissioner.

16. But the man came back to the station?—Yes; but he is out of the service now.

17. How long was he here after he returned?—Not very long.

18. How did the month's absence come about?—He reported himself unfit for duty.

19. Was the Commissioner aware, to your knowledge, of the man's condition?—No; and I was not aware of it when he first went on sick leave.

20. But did he not require to give a medical certificate?—Yes; but I do not think it mentioned the disease.

21. Then, what is a medical certificate worth?—Very little.

22. Who gives the certificate?—The Police Surgeon.

23. You might never have been aware of the man's condition had it not been for the men?—That is so.

*Station Sergeant King:* He did not disclose his disease, but was sick for nine days; he came back on duty, and I discovered what was wrong. The men took exception to being with him. He tried to get into the Hospital, but they would not take him in, and he was treated as an out-patient for a month. The Commissioner knew what he was suffering from, as it was in the correspondence.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Would you think it desirable, in the interests of the service, that a man having suffered from this disease should be allowed to come back?—I think it very undesirable.

*Station Sergeant King:* The man, from the beginning, was a very undesirable class of man. There is a matter I should like to mention in connection with what Chief Detective Herbert said in reference to Mr. Mitchell's knowledge of the station sergeants. I think Mr. Mitchell's opinions should be respected.

*The Commissioner:* Mr. Herbert was quite right to draw my attention to what he considered a weak spot in Mr. Mitchell's evidence. His reference to Mr. Mitchell was in perfectly good taste.

*Mr. Dinnie:* As regards the man suffering in the manner indicated, in other Police Forces I have known men suspended times without number, and when they were well taken back again to the same position at the same place.

#### DIANA PINE, Married Woman, examined on oath. (No. 36.)

Mrs. Diana Pine appeared, and asked to be allowed to tender evidence in reference to alleged slanderous statements made by Detective Mitchell concerning herself.

The Commissioner said that was a matter for a separate action in the Courts of law, and he could not hear evidence in regard to it.

#### WILLIAM DARK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 37.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at South Dunedin. Was enrolled on the 1st January, 1906. I think, if there is one aim a man has in the Force, it is to get off the street duty, and it is considered promotion to get to a station in charge of one man. I do not know who is responsible for promotion, but I will quote a couple of instances where junior men have been placed over the heads of seniors. "A" joined the Force in November, 1905. In August, 1907, when he had seen one year and nine months' service, he was transferred to a station over the heads of at least four other constables in the locality—one of three and a half years' service, one of two and a half years' service, one of two years and two months' service, and one of two years and one month's service. I do not cast any reflection on the men promoted, but the senior men were men with clean sheets, intelligent, and fit for the position at the time. The man with three and a half years' service was thirteen months afterwards put in charge of another sub-station, showing that he was competent to hold the position. "B" was an application of my own. I got a communication saying that my service was not considered sufficient. I was satisfied with that; but the next applicant who was put into the position was a man with three months' less service than I had. As the Inspector has mentioned, it is common talk among the men that if you are in the Dunedin district you have very little chance of getting any benefits, and the sooner you get out of it the better are your chances of a country station. Then, I consider that any man who is sent to investigate sly-grog selling cases, whether successful or not, should be afterwards transferred to another district.

I know of a man who had been sent on this work, and who was not successful, and I know from personal experience that he has suffered in consequence. With regard to pay, I think constables should start at 8s. a day, and that the increment of 6d. a day should come every two or three years instead of every four years. The rent allowance at present I consider is not sufficient for the married men. In 1897 Sergeant Emerson was in a house at Invercargill the rent of which was 8s. 6d. a week. The same house is now let for 15s. a week, showing the increased cost of house-rent, although the same allowance is made now as was made then—7s. a week. With regard to Sunday leave, I have only received four Sundays off in the last three years, not including holidays.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you applied for it?—No; but, of course, I recognise it is hard in a suburb to get Sunday leave.

2. What proportion of Sundays do you think a man should have off in the year?—It depends on the number of men at the station. It would not, of course, be possible to give as much as one a month, but I think the men should get as much as can be reasonably allowed. To show that there must be some dissatisfaction in the Force, the strength of the Force when I joined in January, 1906, was about 657; on the 1st July this year it was 766, being an increase of 109 in three and a half years; 316 men joined during that time, showing that 207 men have left in three and a half years. That is to say, at the rate of fifty-nine men a year are leaving the Force for some cause or another. Those figures are as nearly as possible correct.

3. How many have left voluntarily?—I could not say. With regard to transfers, I believe that in the last eight or ten years there has been only one man transferred to a station of his own from Dunedin South, and some of the men there have had long service.

4. To what do you attribute that?—To a certain extent to the fact that the sergeant in charge did not recommend the men; but I think the recommendation should come from the Inspector, as he surely knows the qualifications of his men.

5. I understand your application was for promotion to the watch-house, and that the man appointed had less service than you?—No; the man I spoke of was not appointed to that vacancy, but to the next vacancy that occurred. Somebody got it when I applied.

CHARLES HENRY LENNON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 38.)

*Witness:* I am one of the clerks in the district office in Dunedin. I wish to cross-examine Inspector O'Brien on certain statements made by him regarding the district office and my appointment.

The Commissioner ruled that, as the Inspector's evidence had had no personal application to the witness, he could not allow him to cross-examine his superior officer.

JOHN MACINTYRE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 38.)

*Witness:* I am Acting-Inspector of Weights and Measures at Dunedin. I joined the Force on the 1st September, 1883.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You remember that on one occasion you saw me in Wellington, and the question of promotion was mentioned?—Yes.

2. Did you then say you were unable to perform street duty owing to your illness?—Yes.

3. *Inspector O'Brien.*] How long ago was that?—Last January.

4. Suppose the rank of sergeant had been offered you four or five years ago, would you then have accepted it?—I should not like to say I would have accepted it on the street, but I would have accepted it freely if allowed to remain where I was, or if I had charge of a country station. I was asked to go to two stations something like three years ago, but I declined to go to them on account of my health. I got hurt in the service a good many years ago.

5. Up to the time you interviewed the Commissioner in Wellington, had you ever been offered a position as sergeant in charge of a station?—Yes.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Because you could not take charge of a station on account of sickness, would it not be inferred from that that you could not do street duty?—Yes; I refused a station on that account. I am strong enough for the duties I am carrying out now.

JAMES FREDERICK ARNOLD, Member of Parliament, further examined. (No. 40.)

*Mr. Dinnie:* I desire to express my appreciation of Mr. Arnold's action in appearing before the Commission on this occasion. It shows, at least, that he now has a desire to ascertain what truth there is, if any, in the serious allegations he has made.

*Mr. Arnold:* What do you mean by "now has a desire"?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I will explain what I complain of. I say "now has a desire to ascertain if there is any truth or any foundation for the allegations he has made." It seems to me most extraordinary and surprising that those allegations should have been made by a member of Parliament, or by any other person, without some little inquiry as to whether there was any foundation for such statements. That Mr. Arnold knew where to obtain that information is obvious.

*The Commissioner:* You know Mr. Arnold has a perfect right, as a member of Parliament, to say what he likes on the floor of the House.

*Mr. Arnold:* And I shall take full advantage of it at all times.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Undoubtedly, I do not complain of that; but he knew my mouth was shut. It was practically a stab in the back, both as regards myself and the Department. He dared not make those statements in public outside, otherwise he might have been appearing before another Court.

*The Commissioner:* You must, of course, take the responsibility for what you say.

*Mr. Dinnie:* If I thought it was in the interests of the service I should be satisfied, but I am afraid there is some ulterior object in the matter.

*The Commissioner:* Do you think it is wise to raise a question of that kind, looking to the fact that the Minister of Justice, in the exercise of his discretion, and with the full approval and concurrence of the Government, has thought proper, as the result of statements made by Mr. Arnold and others, to set up a Royal Commission? Do you think it is wise to refer to the motives which actuated Mr. Arnold?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I applied for the Commission.

*Mr. Arnold:* When you knew it was coming in any event.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Then, sir, you prevent me from making reference at all—

*The Commissioner:* When you are on oath I shall give you the fullest opportunity of defending your position as Commissioner of Police, but you are certainly trenching on my good nature in making a set speech now, quite different from Mr. Arnold when he commenced to give his sworn evidence. When the time comes I shall give you a full opportunity of traversing the whole position.

*Mr. Arnold:* I presume the position is this: When I tendered evidence I introduced it with a few words, and I am here now to be cross-examined. When Mr. Dinnie is sworn to give his evidence, then will be the time for him to make the statements he is now making, and it will then be my privilege and my pleasure to cross-examine Mr. Dinnie.

*The Commissioner:* I understand it is at Mr. Dinnie's own request that he shall be sworn to give evidence with regard to specific matters relative to the Dunedin district.

*Mr. Dinnie:* At present you will understand, sir, that I only intend to answer definite charges. Hearsay evidence and general charges, as you are well aware, are difficult to answer, and hearsay evidence is not admitted in a Court of justice, but here there is a great deal of it.

*The Commissioner:* But we are not a Court of justice.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I will confine myself to the specific charges which Mr. Arnold has made.

1. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I suppose I am right in saying that you have no practical experience in respect to the control or supervision or system of maintaining discipline in the Police Force?—You are quite correct to that extent, but I do know how a body of men should be treated.

2. Do you know there exist rules and regulations framed for the maintenance of discipline and efficiency of the Force?—Yes.

3. Do you know that the Police Regulations relative to the divulging of departmental information are precisely similar to those which obtain in the other branches of the Civil Service?—I am fully aware of it.

4. Do you consider such regulations are essential for the maintenance of discipline in the interests of the Department and of justice?—I do not.

5. You will perhaps recollect the steps which were taken in respect to those men attached to the Post Office who divulged departmental information at Christchurch?—Yes.

6. I think they were dismissed?—I understand they were.

7. Do you suggest that the information you obtained and the circulars you quoted in connection with the Police service in the House reached you otherwise than directly or indirectly through members of the service?—Certainly I do, and I may say this—and this is part of the matter quoted by me: that during your predecessor's term of office sixty-five men were dismissed from the Force and nine resigned, making a total of seventy-four; during your own term of office 146 have been dismissed and twenty-two have resigned, making a total of 168: and surely you must be aware that those men who have either resigned or been dismissed are as familiar with the working of the Force as are those who are in the Force to-day. In addition to which, I have, of course, had full access to the *Police Gazette*.

*Mr. Dinnie:* There may have been reasons for those changes. If you had looked further back you might possibly have found a similar difference in the numbers who left the Force.

*The Commissioner:* I understand Mr. Arnold is only giving the probable source of his information.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the charges you made, you did not seek to verify your information very much, apparently?—Why do you say "apparently"?

9. I will show that later on?—Well, let me say this: Those who know me know that I am not a man who enters readily into emotional or hysterical public matters. I do not look to have the limelight cast upon me, and I took the greatest possible care in the matters I entered into; indeed, some of them were given to me upon oath; and when the Commissioner gives opposite evidence upon oath, then it will be for me to judge as to whose words I shall accept—my friend's or the Commissioner's.

10. You will have the files. Will you believe them?—I will see about that later on.

11. It is doubtful now—they might be "faked," might they not?—I am not sure whether the Commissioner wishes those words taken down. The suggestion is that such a thing is possible.

12. It is possible, yes?—Thank you.

13. You knew perfectly well you could get verification of your statements in a most simple manner—by applying to the Minister of Justice?—Yes, but the Commissioner surely knows what my object was. We had evidence this morning from a man who believed he was suffering under a grievous wrong—he was discontented, if you like—and a connection of his communicated with me. That communication was forwarded to the Minister. From the Minister it went to the head of the Department, was minuted, and returned to the Minister. A reply was sent to me, and there the thing is. Mr. Dinnie should know that that sort of thing has been going on for the last four or five years, and while it has been going on, the Force over which he has control has been going from bad to worse, and the discontent which I alluded to the other day, and which has since been proven to exist by his own chief officers, has become more intense; and the reason I

did not go to Mr. Dinnie or the Minister was that I felt the time had come when some extraordinary action must be taken, in the interests of the public and in the interests of the Force. I knew what was before me when I took that step, and, as a result, this Commission, although Mr. Dinnie may say he asked for it.

14. What step did you take?—I delivered a speech in the House, instead of going to you.

15. Do you not think the Minister of Justice would have looked into any matters in connection with the Police Force?—I do; and although I asked for the Commission—and I am now delighted that it has been appointed, although I at first thought it would be a whitewashing Commission—if the term is allowable—when I made that speech and asked for a Commission, I believed the Minister himself was strong enough to go fully into the departmental matters, and bring about a washing-up, which would have the same result as this Commission will have, and some of us know what that will be already.

16. You saved the Minister the trouble?—That is a matter for the Minister. He preferred this course.

17. Do you consider that definite statements of that sort, if there is no foundation for them, are conducive to the welfare of the Department?—Do you say there is no foundation for them?

18. I say there is no foundation for the definite statements?—Which do you speak of?

19. One statement you made was in respect to the Finger-print Expert getting six months' leave on full pay. Is that a definite statement?—The statement made in Parliament was that the Finger-print Expert, who happens to be your own son—since you have brought the matter forward—had received six months' leave of absence on full pay to go Home for the purpose of getting married; and, in spite of what the file may say, I shall ask you, when you are giving evidence, if you will say on oath that originally six months' leave of absence on full pay was not granted.

20. My dear sir, you will have the file, which will prove that without my swearing it. I have asked you whether, if those statements are false it is wise to make them?—It is never wise to make false statements. I am surprised at your asking a question like that.

21. Do you not consider that information of any description in connection with the Department should be referred to the head of the Department, who ought to know best whether it is true or not, or to the Minister?—In this case I did not think so.

22. In the case of hearsay evidence, or information of any one coming to pitch a tale, do you mean to say you should repeat that without knowing whether it is true or not?—Everything depends upon where the tale comes from, and upon whether one believes it is true or not. I have not yet heard evidence as to whether it is true or not.

23. There is a saying that "If you believe all you hear, you might as well eat all you see"?—That is very true so far as this inquiry is concerned, from the evidence I am told we will have in connection with this matter.

24. On the 25th April, 1906, did not you and Mr. Barclay write to the Minister of Justice this letter: "DEAR SIR,—In making some inquiries in reference to the police changes here"—Of course, I do not know what right you have to make inquiries—

*Mr. Arnold:* We have every right to make inquiries.

*Mr. Dinnie:* "—we have been struck with the case of Constable McIntyre"—

*Mr. Arnold:* Is this connected with the Finger-print Expert?

*Mr. Dinnie:* This is to show that you knew to whom to apply for information.

*Mr. Arnold:* I did so in the case of Mrs. King, and you know the result.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That Mr. King has not got his promotion yet.

*Mr. Arnold:* That the matter was forwarded to you, minuted by you, and there the matter ended.

*Mr. Dinnie:* No; it went before the Minister. However, that is coming. But to continue this letter of yours: "This constable has a very long record of service, and a very clean conduct sheet. We have observed that a number of new sergeants are being appointed, and some of them are comparatively young men, and some who are clerks in the police office, and who, we believe, are not called upon for street duty. We venture to represent to you that Constable McIntyre has considerable claims to be promoted to the rank of sergeant. Possibly the reason why he has not been promoted is that he occupies the position of Inspector of Weights and Measures, and the mere fact that he has been selected presumably on account of his suitability and capacity for the position ought not to bar him from rising in the Force, and from being promoted to a sergeant's rank. We would respectfully ask that you would be good enough to inquire whether Constable McIntyre is not a proper man to be raised at the present juncture to the rank of sergeant, and, in conclusion, we add that we are making this representation to you quite independently of Constable McIntyre himself, and because it strikes us that the matter may not have received so far your attention.—We are, &c., A. R. BARCLAY, J. F. ARNOLD." Then did you receive this reply from the Minister: "I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of 3rd ultimo, re Constable McIntyre, who is employed as Inspector of Weights and Measures at Dunedin, and, in reply, to inform you that apparently your inquiries in reference to police changes at Dunedin, especially as regards this constable, were incomplete, otherwise you would, I think, have arrived at a different conclusion, and refrained from suggesting that Constable McIntyre had been overlooked. Constable McIntyre joined the Force on the 1st September, 1883, was advanced to second-class constable, 27/7/85, and appointed to charge of Alexandra Station on 9/10/90. Being then a single man, he was transferred to Dunedin, a married man replacing him. In January, 1898, he was appointed to charge of Arrowtown, but at his own request, on account of his bad health, he was transferred to Dunedin, and given light duties as watch-house keeper, and subsequently appointed as Inspector of Weights and Measures, as he was unfit to perform ordinary street duty. He has recently been offered charge of a station, but declined, being medically unfit for such a position." Now, this proves the reason for his non-promotion.

*Mr. Arnold:* It also proves the statement that we did not consult Constable McIntyre nor he us.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I am not suggesting that, but it does not prove it, otherwise we should not have had the other information. To continue: "The duties he is now performing are light, simple, and, in fact, the only police work he is capable of performing, being medically unfit for promotion or to hold any other position in the Department, and it is simply to prevent his being invalidated from the service that this appointment was conferred on him. It will be observed, therefore, that this constable has received every consideration, and that he is totally unfit for the promotion suggested, the qualifications required being ability, energy, and general fitness to superintend and maintain discipline.—I have, &c., JAS. MCGOWAN, Minister of Justice." That proves, anyhow, that Constable McIntyre is not fit for street duty as sergeant.

*Mr. Arnold:* You are now talking about the Finger-print Expert.

*Mr. Dinnie:* No, that is coming.

*Mr. Arnold:* Because we have the appointment of that expert to consider sooner or later.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes, we have, and I think it will be to your detriment.

25. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You have had other communication with the Minister?—Yes, in all probability.

26. Coming to this Finger-print Expert business, perhaps you will believe this is the original application, owing to the stamp, date, and everything else?—I do not know that I even admit that, if, according to your statement, these things can be "faked."

*Mr. Dinnie:* Other people may believe it, if you do not. This is dated 2nd December, 1908: "Application of E. W. Dinnie, Finger-print Expert, for leave of absence to visit England.—I respectfully beg to apply for six months' leave of absence from the 12th February next to the 11th August, 1909, for the purpose of proceeding to England on private business. I have now completed five and a half years' service, during which time I have not had any leave of absence. It is my intention when in London to visit the Finger-print Department of the Metropolitan Police, new Scotland Yard, with a view of obtaining all information in respect to all recent improvements in the system of identifying criminals, and also to purchase some up-to-date paraphernalia required in the finger-print branch.—E. W. DINNIE, Finger-print Expert." That is addressed to the Commissioner of Police. My minute upon that is as follows: "The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—Recommended: one month with pay, remainder without pay. Arrangements can be made in respect to duties of applicant during his absence.—W. DINNIE, Commr., 2/12/08." This is marked "Approved" by Mr. McGowan on the same date, 2nd December, 1908. I should like you to look at this document to see if it is genuine.

*Mr. Arnold:* It is immaterial in any case to me.

*Mr. Dinnie:* And yet you go and make a statement in the House—knowing that it is immaterial—to my detriment and that of the Force—a deliberate falsehood. There is the proof of it.

*The Commissioner:* A deliberate falsehood implies that the speaker knew it was false when he made the statement.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He had made no inquiry to ascertain whether it was true or not.

*Mr. Arnold:* Do you say I told a falsehood?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I say it was an untrue statement.

*Mr. Arnold:* Do you read *Hansard*?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do.

*Mr. Arnold:* Have you a very bad memory?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have this memory: that when you were told it was not on full pay you suggested that the original statement had been altered.

*Mr. Arnold:* You have suggested the possibility of such a thing, and I am surprised at that coming from you as head of the Department. Do you say now that I stated as a fact that your son had received six months' leave of absence on full pay, and that I told a falsehood?

*Mr. Dinnie:* What you said was that my son had got six months' leave of absence on full pay.

*Mr. Arnold:* And will you say that you read the report in *Hansard* and in the papers, and that you have a memory of some kind?

*Mr. Dinnie:* My memory may not be so retentive as yours.

*The Commissioner:* What do you suggest, Mr. Arnold, was the statement you made in the House? Have you a copy of *Hansard*?

*Mr. Arnold:* I am quoting from page 228 of *Hansard*: "But, strange to say, within a very short time, another member of the Force requiring to go to Great Britain received six months' leave of absence on full pay." You say he did not?

27. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] I am submitting the files for the consideration of the Commission. Perhaps you will say that *Hansard* has made a mistake?—No, *Hansard* makes no mistakes.

28. When you were informed by the Prime Minister that he was not granted six months' on full pay, did you not then suggest that he had been granted six months' on full pay, and that it must have been altered since?—I still suggest it.

29. I am surprised?—Why?

30. Because there is the file. I should like you to look at the file and see what you think of it?—I am quite prepared to leave the matter in the hands of the Commission.

31. You are not satisfied yet that this is the original file?—I have told you already that I hope to ask you upon oath whether your son was not originally given six months' leave on full pay.

32. Will you be satisfied if I swear on my oath that these are the original papers?—I shall then have to decide whose word I shall accept on oath, yours or that of the people whom I will not at present name.

33. If I call the late Minister of Justice, Mr. McGowan, who granted the leave, will you accept his word?—If you bring him down where I am, and I am given an opportunity of cross-examining him, I will take his word on oath.

34. I do not know about his doing that, but Mr. McGowan has offered to come forward at any moment?—I think it will be necessary, because either Mr. McGowan or you will have to defend yourselves very seriously.

35. I want to say, as regards the Finger-print Expert, that all he has been granted on full pay is one month, and he is entitled under the regulations to thirty-six days?—I made no complaint at all with regard to the leave of your son at six months on full pay. What I did complain of was that he should receive that leave on full pay whilst a constable was refused some days over what he was entitled to. It was discriminating between your own friends and others in the Force.

36. Seeing that Constable Potter has been given all the leave he was entitled to on full pay, and that I have not recommended in the case of the Finger-print Expert the full leave he was entitled to, do you not think the complaint should be on the other side?—That means that you are discriminating against your own friends—a thing which neither the public nor the Force give you credit for.

37. Do you not think I had an object in that?—I presume you had an object.

38. Do you know what it was?—I do not.

39. Well, it was for such as yourself. It was a little bit of bait for such as yourself to bite at?—Oh, nonsense; you can talk like that to the boys in the Magistrate's Court.

40. But I knew what I was doing at the time, and I knew it would be made public?—Intelligent men will not accept things like that. In your own words, you laid a trap for public men to fall into. That is really what it means.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We laid a trap for men who are interfering with the Department.

*The Commissioner:* We had better pass from that and continue the cross-examination.

41. *Mr. Dinnie (to witness):* I presume you accept the statement I made that Potter applied for thirty-six days' leave and received twenty-nine, and that that was all he was entitled to; also, that that was in accordance with the regulations?—That is not denied.

42. Then we come to Constable Mills, whose case was referred to by you both in the House and in your evidence?—I said that he came out of the barracks at 9 p.m., that he was on street duty until 10 p.m. on Saturday, that a constable was not likely to be in a publichouse during the time he was out, and that at 10 p.m. he was ordered back in a state of intoxication. I said I should be very glad if you could assure the Commission that he was not the worse for liquor when he came out of the barracks at 9 p.m.

43. Of course, you know I will have to call the men who saw him at that time; I am not able to prove that myself?—You are responsible for what takes place in your own barracks, surely.

44. I do not shirk responsibility at all, but the suggestion is made that inquiry is not made into these men's characters before they join the service?—I said nothing in regard to that man.

*The Commissioner:* I think, as it will be necessary for Mr. Dinnie to produce documents in reference to the appointment of these men and other matters, it will be as well that he should be sworn now. He has suggested it himself.

*Mr. Dinnie (who was accordingly sworn):* I produce the original files in respect to the appointment of Constable Frederick Mills. He left school at the age of fifteen years, and was in the employ of a tailor in Tuam Street, Christchurch, from February, 1899, to February, 1908. The files show that inquiries were made as to his character, not only where he was working, but where he was lodging, and that there was nothing to prevent his being taken into the Force.

*Witness:* It is admitted that this man was in the Force, and that he was sent off at 10 p.m. Do you still say, as you are reported to have said in a newspaper in Wellington, that it is impossible to find out such information until these men have been in the service for a considerable time?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I said they had to be tried before you could tell what they were.

*Mr. Arnold:* Did you say this: "He could speak with certainty, from his own knowledge of the London police, that the newspapers did not take notice of such incidents there"?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is so.

*Mr. Arnold:* And do you suggest such things should be permitted in New Zealand—permitted to pass without the public Press taking any notice of them?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not see what that has to do with the matter at all. I do not suggest that men should be allowed to get drunk if we can prevent it. If after careful inquiry is made in respect to the men it is found their characters are highly satisfactory, they are appointed. It is impossible for me or anybody else to foresee what may happen afterwards.

*Mr. Arnold:* Does that not suggest that the inquiries in regard to a man's habits are not sufficient?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I suggest that that man may not have tasted drink until he came into the Force.

*The Commissioner:* If a man is sworn in on the 28th October, 1908, and two months later he is charged with misconduct, as another man was, it is impossible to conceive a man in his sober senses doing that sort of thing. And then in June, 1909, he is dismissed by you for drunkenness. Could that man have suddenly developed those bad qualities after he had joined?

*Mr. Arnold:* The point I want to make is that in a case like this the man's dismissal does not take place until public attention has been drawn to the position.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Then, there were the three men who were concerned in that brawl in Wellington. They have all been dismissed.

*The Commissioner:* I think, without going into details, you might just let me have the file of papers.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I should like to show to the public that proper inquiry was made in each case, and that these men had specially good characters before they were admitted.

*The Commissioner:* I cannot understand where the information came from.

*Mr. Dinnie:* It came from the people with whom they were employed.

*Mr. Arnold:* There was a sergeant here who says on oath that an educational certificate could be obtained with the greatest ease, and that he could get one man to certify that he had passed the Civil Service Examination. I do not believe he could get one from any schoolmaster in Otago.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We do not rely upon certificates of character. We say, let us know where you are employed?

*Mr. Arnold:* The trouble is that when people make statements they will not go back upon them.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Then, it does not matter whether you send a sergeant or a constable, if they will not go back on what they say.

*The Commissioner:* I quite recognise the difficulty; but I am not prepared to express an opinion as to whether we could not secure some better system of making inquiries.

*Mr. Dinnie:* This man Clay was a very good constable indeed before this particular occurrence.

*The Commissioner:* It seems extraordinary that a man can suddenly develop the worst characteristics.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He joined the service in 1907, and there is not a mark against him until this particular occurrence.

*The Commissioner:* How do you account for the sudden development of bad qualities?

*Mr. Dinnie:* There is only one way in which I can account for it—that he went out with two others, got into temptation, and started drinking.

*The Commissioner:* Do you mean to say that there is more temptation for them after they join the Police Force?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes; I have seen so much of it. I know they are induced to drink.

*Mr. Arnold:* Yes; the Force has my sympathy. One has to be very careful in the Force. Before you pass from Constable Clay, will you kindly tell me why, when the other two constables were dismissed, Constable Clay, who was equally guilty, was retained in the Force for some time, and what influence was brought to bear to secure his dismissal afterwards?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is not the case, I think you will find.

*The Commissioner:* The date of the dismissal of each man is given. Clay's dismissal was on the 2nd June, 1909, and the date of the others is the same.

*Mr. Arnold:* Were they all suspended?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Two of them were suspended, and the other was not.

*Mr. Arnold:* Why not?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Because the evidence against him was quite different. The evidence incriminating him did not transpire until it was given at the Court. Then we come to the case of Constable Halbrook: I understand your statement also applies to that case—that insufficient inquiry was made.

*Mr. Arnold:* It is contended that these men were practically taken on without inquiry. It is the only conclusion we can come to. I should like to know if it is admitted that a certain man left England with his wife's sister; that he came to New Zealand with her; that inquiries were made by his wife in New Zealand, and he was discovered living at the Hutt, in the Force, with his wife's sister, having had two children by her. Is that admitted?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Not exactly as you put it. It might be as well to go into the details of that case. It is a fact that he was living with his wife's sister, but he came to us from the Manawatu Railway Company, where he had been employed for some time. He was employed on the Government railways as a porter from 1904 to 1908, and all this time, it appears, he had been living with the same party, and had had two children by her.

*The Commissioner:* How did all this come out in the end?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Through his wife writing out inquiring about him; and I submit it was rather difficult for us to know whether it was his wife or not.

*The Commissioner:* Mr. Arnold only wants you to say whether you admit that this fact exists. It can be left to me to say whether there is excuse.

*Mr. Arnold:* My object is to prove that, in consequence of the admission of such men, the more respectable members of the Force feel discontented and dissatisfied, and that other good men will not join, and that is partly the reason for the inferior men you are getting.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Can you offer any suggestion as to how it could have been ascertained that he was so living?

*Mr. Arnold:* I think, in your predecessor's time, such a state of things would not have existed.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I may tell you that under the system of my predecessor the inquiry was not so complete as it is now. Five years back was considered sufficient to inquire. Five years back is considered in most Police Forces to be sufficient to inquire into the character of any applicant for enrolment.

*The Commissioner:* Does that apply in the Old Country?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

*Mr. Arnold:* Do you think it would be well to adopt that in New Zealand?

*Mr. Dinnie:* No; I think the stricter the inquiry the better. Then, there is the case of this man Ratt. The suggestion in respect to him is that when he left he ran away with another man's wife. I do not know what the Police Department has got to do with that.

*Mr. Arnold:* The suggestion is that this man came from England, and was stationed in the first place in Auckland; that he was transferred for fighting; and at that time the general public knew that the relationship between him and the married woman was not what it should be—although the Commissioner did not—and that afterwards he cleared out with this married woman.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I produce the papers giving certificates of this man's employment at Home, educational qualifications, and so on.

*The Commissioner:* How long was he in the Force before he ran away with this woman?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Perhaps twelve months.

*Mr. Arnold:* Living with her all the time?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That did not come under my notice. Eventually he resigned of his own accord. In regard to there having been insufficient inquiry into the case of Willets, his record is: Public Works Department, Otira Gorge, platelaying, 1897-99; Royal New Zealand Artillery, 1899-1907; joined tram service in Wellington, 1907; Humphrey Bros., as labourer, 1907-8; then joined the service.

*The Commissioner:* How was he disposed of?

*Mr. Arnold:* I understand he is still in the service.

[File handed in.]

*Mr. Dinnie:* In regard to Wallace, McBride, and O'Connor?

*Mr. Arnold:* Wallace was dismissed from the Glasgow police for assault on his sergeant: how is it that was not shown before he was accepted? Did the police know nothing about it?

*Mr. Dinnie:* No, not until writing to Scotland for information. He was taken on for a short time till a reply was received. As soon as the reply arrived he was dismissed. Not only that, but two other constables who had had service in the same Police Force, and who gave evidence that he was sober and honest, were also called upon to resign: the three had to resign.

*The Commissioner:* The whole trouble would have been avoided if inquiry had been made before he was taken on.

SATURDAY, 17TH JULY, 1909.

JOSEPH CHARLES WILLIS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 41.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin Central. I joined the Force in 1893. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1907, having previously passed the police examination. I had then had thirteen and a half years' service. I have been stationed at Dunedin as sergeant a little over two years. There is one matter I desire to bring under notice: the married men object to the very harassing restriction which compels them to go to and from their homes in uniform; they look upon it as degrading that they cannot be trusted to do so for fear of their doing something wrong. The order was the result, I understand, of the police scandal here some years ago.

1. *The Commissioner:* Do you know of no reason why it should be still enforced?—No. The men can very well be trusted to go to and from their homes without bringing discredit on the Force. If they are not fit to be trusted in this way they are not fit to be in the Force. Another thing the men complain of is that they do not get as much Sunday leave as they might. At present they get about every sixth Sunday, but if the district clerks were detailed for street duty on Sundays, to relieve the men who are out day and night all the year, they would be able to get off on Sunday more often. In regard to the clerical staff generally, personally I think I am voicing the feeling of the Force in saying they are pampered too much. The police are paid for working seven days a week, and these men only work five and a half days and only seven hours a day, while they are paid 1s. extra, and are allowed to wear plain clothes. And it opens a back door to promotion. They have Sunday and half Saturday off, and most of the public holidays, which comes to about eighty-five days a year—that is, they work three months a year less than the average constable. The clerical branch of the service is very much sought after. When a man has been in the Force a few days now he thinks he should be in the district office.

2. There are many men outside the office who are as well qualified to do the office work as those inside?—Yes.

3. It does not take any time to get acquainted with the duties?—I do not know where the extra qualification comes in. I know of plenty on the block who are qualified.

4. Do you think it would be desirable, in the interests of the men, that they should have a turn in the district office to qualify themselves for charge of a station?—It might tend to disorganize things if that were done. I do not come here with a grievance exactly, but in regard to promotion of these men, I do not know where their merit comes in. They occupy a snug position for ten years. At present the three district clerks doing duty in Auckland, Wellington, and Dunedin are just as capable as myself: I do not think they are any worse or better than I am, but they have become my seniors. The position is this: Supposing one of these men were to say, "I have had enough of the office; it does not agree with my health; I want to come out on the street," he would come out as my senior. If they had any particular merit, or had done anything meritorious, there would be no objection. Sergeant Dart has been promoted very early, but he is recognised as a very superior man. Another thing: I think it should be understood that a man has to put in a certain time on the street before being eligible for a staff appointment of any kind; it is not right that a man should join one day and in a few months find himself in a position in the district office, or watch-house keeper. In connection with the district clerks doing no Sunday duty, I would point out that the watch-house keeper and the constable who does plain-clothes inquiries in connection with old-age pensions both take their turn at Sunday duty, and there is no reason why the clerks should not do so. I would emphasize a point mentioned by Constable Fox—the fact that when a man enters the district office on the clerical staff he is no longer a comrade of the other policemen, but looks on himself as being a cut above them, and does not associate with them.



5. That follows as a fact?—In my experience. He is altogether a separate sort of person from a common policeman, and tells people he is secretary down at the station; he drops the title of constable, and calls himself "Mister." I think they should be taught that they are still constables, and be made to do that duty. Another thing: A constable or sergeant on night duty comes off at 5, and it is pretty well 6 before he gets to bed, and if he has a case he has to parade at the station and be at the Court at 10. This interferes with a man's health.

6. What do you suggest as a remedy for this?—It has been advocated that the Court should sit in the afternoon, but that, of course, is absurd. But the same might be done as in Australia, and the men might be allowed time off for it.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* That is a common thing in Victoria.

*Witness:* There is no reason why there should not be a scale fixed, and every time a man has to get up for some ordinary "drunk" he might be allowed an hour off. There are often cases which are not called on till late in the day, and the man loses the greater part of his day waiting in the Court, and then has to be on parade at 9. This is a hardship that in these days of eight hours should be made up for by time off.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Are not the officers considerate in the matter of giving time off?—A man never gets time off for this except in this way: If a man is kept at Court the whole day he might be let off an hour or two earlier in the morning, but, as a rule, he is not allowed anything for it. The same thing obtains with the man on the first relief—5 to 9. He has to go home and get breakfast, and be back to take the prisoners to Court at a quarter to 10. In regard to railway fares, it is generally considered that we should get some concession, as we cannot take our holidays at Christmas or Easter time, when the cheap fares are on, but always have to take them at times when normal fares are charged. Then, there is an anomaly in regard to the travelling-allowances of sergeants and detectives, the latter getting 8s. and the sergeant 6s. We maintain we are entitled to the same as the detective. Take the case of a station with a sergeant in charge and a detective attached: the man in charge gets 12s. a day as full pay and the detective 15s., and the man in charge has to travel second class while the other travels first. I think the pay of the Force should be raised; the present rate is not sufficient to attract a good class of men.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards going to and from the station in plain clothes: do you know that regulation is in consequence of the men going into the single men's quarters and hanging up their clothes there?—I have heard so.

9. The clerical staff, you say, is much sought after?—It is in Dunedin.

10. Do you know I have only seven or eight applications from the whole Force for those positions?—I am surprised to hear it. I know men, as soon as they join, aspire to the district office.

11. *The Commissioner.*] Is it generally known that men should apply before they obtain recognition?—I think so. I know there are four or five applications from Dunedin.

*Mr. Dinnie:* They would be quite recent.

*Inspector O'Brien:* Some are and some are not.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any case where a clerk has been sent out and promoted over the head of any uniform man?—No, but promoted and kept in the office.

13. But that has not interfered with the promotion as sergeant of any uniform man?—I know of no case in my own knowledge. As long as they remain in the office we do not object.

14. It does not interfere with outside promotions?—Hogan was entitled to it when he got it, but that is not the case all round.

15. Time is given off when a man is employed in the Court in the morning?—Very rarely, if a man is in Court all day.

16. In larger Forces the men can be relieved much more easily?—I presume so.

17. We have not sufficient staff to replace them?—I think it could be done.

18. *The Commissioner.*] How would you arrange it?—I have not thought it out, but a man would not be out more than three or four times a month, and I do not see why he should not get off for three or four hours at a time when the station sergeant could spare him.

19. Have you noticed anything in regard to the physique and intellectual ability of recent recruits?—We have had some very poor men during the two years I have been here—poor in every way.

20. Is there a difficulty in getting men of a better type?—It seems so. I am rather at a loss to understand it. I cannot suggest any reason for it. There is one matter I should like to mention: I consider it is a mistake to take men from another Police Force into our Force; they should be some time in the colony, so that some idea of their character may be gained.

21. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the Force as regards any burning questions?—I cannot say I do. From time to time there are little heartburnings.

22. Do you know anything of political influence?—I cannot point to anything of that nature that has come under my notice.

23. In regard to the sobriety of the men?—They are a very sober lot of men at present.

24. What is the maximum age at which a man should be promoted to the rank of sergeant to do street duty?—Not more than forty-five.

25. It is pretty trying work?—Yes; I was thirty-eight when I was promoted. If I had my time over again I would not leave a country station to come into town; I lose £50 a year by it.

26. Have you any views as regards the promotion from the plain-clothes branch to higher offices?—Well, it narrows the avenue of promotion to ourselves, but we cannot deny the justice of it. It is a pity a rank could not be created in their own branch. If a sergeant and a Chief Detective have equal ability, the sergeant does not get a "look in" with the detective. He is before the public every day; he prosecutes in Court; he comes into contact with the best people; he must acquire knowledge of the law, and a certain amount of polish. The sergeant may be as able, but he has no opportunity of showing what he can do. The station sergeant has no show

against the Chief Detective. He is connected with the administrative work in barracks; he may be as good as the Chief Detective, but he has no show.

27. It does not follow that every Chief Detective is fit for promotion to higher rank. You admit the justice of their promotion if the qualifications are suitable?—Yes.

28. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Have you ever known of an instance where a constable has applied for three or four hours' leave on the grounds that he had one or two days during the week to attend Court, necessitating early rising in the morning, and the application has been refused?—No.

29. Leave has been granted where the constable could be spared?—Yes.

30. As regards leaving the station and coming to it in uniform, do you not think the average constable is more likely to be circumspect in uniform than in mufti?—There is no question about that.

31. In order to carry out your views in this respect two things would be necessary—a dressing-room at the police-station with wardrobes?—It was never done before, when men came and left in plain clothes.

*Inspector O'Brien:* That was just the difficulty.

J. F. ARNOLD, Member of Parliament, further examined. (No. 42.)

*Mr. Dinnie:* As there may be some misconception as regards my meaning in respect to the statement made in the House by Mr. Arnold, I wish it to be understood that what I meant was that the statements made are not accurate, and that there is proof to the contrary. I wish it to be understood I am here simply to answer those definite charges, and that Mr. Arnold had other means of obtaining better verification of the statements than the one he adopted. That is as far as I go. I do not suggest that he made statements absolutely knowing they were not correct.

*Mr. Arnold:* I am pleased to accept the Commissioner's apology, but I think now he has mentioned it I might clear the matter up. What he did say—and the paper is correct, I think—was, "Do you consider statements of this description made in the House, if without foundation, are conducive to the welfare of the Department?" and I said, "Do you say there was no foundation for them?" You replied, "I do, as regards the definite statements"—that is, that there was no foundation for my definite statements. In his communication to the Minister, the Commissioner said that these charges were reckless. I presume the Commissioner will admit that the charges I made in regard to fighting in the streets of Wellington were definite. The one in regard to the man ordered off the street was definite; also in regard to the man who came to the colony with his wife's sister; and in regard to the person who went away with another man's wife; the one in regard to the constable who assaulted his sergeant in Glasgow; and also the notorious criminal who came from Australia, and whose photograph was in the possession of the Department. These were definite statements. Only two others have to be touched upon. The whole of these are proved up to the present. I would like Mr. Dinnie to say now whether he considers they were reckless.

*Mr. Dinnie:* What I do say is this: There are only two charges to answer, so far as I am concerned. The first is regarding the Finger-print Expert's leave of absence; the second, as regards no inquiry having been made concerning the men who got into trouble.

*The Commissioner:* Not sufficient inquiry. You would not say "no inquiry," Mr. Arnold?

*Mr. Arnold:* Certainly not.

*The Commissioner:* It is a question of the sufficiency of the inquiry. Mr. Dinnie referred to "deliberate falsehoods." Well, of course, we must assume a member of Parliament, speaking in the House with the sense of responsibility as speaking the voice of the people, would not tell what he knew to be deliberate falsehoods. The use of the word "deliberate" implies that the person knew it to be false when he said it. The paper this morning reports it, but does not draw attention to my statement in regard to it. I took exception to it at the time, and if it had not been brushed aside in the course of argument I should have spoken very strongly about it. There was perhaps a little heat on both sides.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I was quite calm.

*The Commissioner:* I know you were. However, I am glad to hear Mr. Dinnie's explanation of the matter—that he withdraws the suggestion that there was anything in the shape of deliberate falsehood. His complaint now is that inquiry was not made of a departmental officer, or through a Minister, of the various matters about which you made complaint in the House—that you should have gone to the Department and made inquiries. I am glad to have the reference to "deliberate falsehood" cleared up, because from a gentleman in Mr. Dinnie's position it looks bad, it reads bad, and sounds bad.

*Mr. Arnold:* I am delighted to hear Mr. Dinnie's explanation. If we are to confine ourselves to the two questions—what inquiries should have been made, and in regard to your son's leave of absence—I am quite willing. I presume you will admit the correctness of my other statements?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I shall be glad if you will read the papers, and see what inquiries were made.

*Mr. Arnold:* In regard to Willets, who I say was dismissed from the Wellington tramways, how was it the police could not discover that, if satisfactory inquiry was made as to the reason of his dismissal and the character of the man? He was not a man who had just come from Home.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I was not aware he was dismissed from the tramways.

*Mr. Arnold:* Is he in the service still?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I believe so.

*The Commissioner:* Have you submitted to me any evidence in regard to his being dismissed?

*Mr. Arnold:* Yes, in my evidence the other day.

*The Commissioner:* Have you submitted any corroborative evidence?

*Mr. Arnold:* No, but it can be obtained in Wellington. (To Mr. Dinnie): You admit that you had Macdermott's photo in the Wellington office?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I will read the particulars in regard to this case: "This man applied for appointment on the 19th March, 1908. At that time we were particularly short of candidates. Out of seventeen candidates called up on the 18th February, 1908, only seven accepted, and they were warned to report on the 9th March, 1908. On that date three of them did not turn up, so that there were only four to start the batch with. Seven more were then called up—9th March, 1908—which exhausted the list of available candidates. Out of the seven called we got six, which made the batch up to ten. On the 13th March, 1908, one of the ten resigned, which only left nine. It therefore became necessary to select a few candidates who had not been placed on the list, owing to the inquiry into their antecedents not having been completed, but who could be got at once, as the work of the batch was being delayed. Macdermott came with the best of recommendations, showing that he had been employed as wardman in the Gundagai Hospital from January, 1899, to March, 1900; as overseer for the Lunny Sisters, at Darlinghurst, from March, 1900, to February, 1905; as dredge-hand at Port Stephens from March, 1905, to December, 1906; and again by the Lunny Sisters from January to December, 1907. He had relatives at Petone, and Mr. Wilford, M.P., who personally recommended applicant, assured me that the family, whom he had known for twenty-five years, was a most respectable one. As it was necessary to make up the batch in the depot to at least a dozen, Macdermott and two others, who were in Wellington at the time, were medically examined, passed, and sent to the depot at once on probation, being told that inquiries would be made as to their antecedents, and, should they turn out unsatisfactory, they would be discharged. A letter was accordingly written to the New South Wales Police on the 3rd April, 1908, giving details of Macdermott's employment, and asking for a report as to his character. No reply having been received before the batch were sworn in, on the 14th May, 1908, he was appointed, still subject, of course, to the inquiries being satisfactory. Shortly after his being sworn in a testimonial in his favour was received by Mr. Wilford from Mr. John Thomson, M.P., Melbourne, and submitted. I may mention that while in the depot his finger-prints were taken, but no similar prints could be found in the finger-print bureau, owing to the fact that they had not been received from New South Wales. The following month his photo was accidentally noticed in a volume of New South Wales criminals; inquiries were made, and it was put beyond doubt that he had been convicted of forgery in Australia, and he was at once discharged. The result of inquiries in New South Wales did not come to hand until after his photo had been recognised here, and he had been dismissed."

*The Commissioner:* The reports from New South Wales verified that?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

*The Commissioner:* That is a letter addressed to you by your Sub-Inspector?

*Mr. Dinnie:* It is got out by myself. I asked him to prepare it, and I minuted it.

*The Commissioner:* This is actually an admission of the facts alleged by you, Mr. Arnold. The Commissioner takes up the attitude that under pressure, owing to a shortage of men, he did not complete inquiries before the man was appointed.

*Mr. Arnold:* This opens this difficulty in my mind: that in March, 1909, it was almost impossible to get suitable men to enter the Force, and yet during the last twelve months there have been no less than 387 candidates. Can the Commissioner explain this?

*Mr. Dinnie:* It is easily explained. The number rejected is much greater than of those accepted. Although we may send for the candidates, frequently they get employment whilst they are waiting, and we cannot get them.

*The Commissioner:* When do you commence inquiries?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Immediately the application is made.

*Mr. Arnold:* 387 men applied and 250 were rejected: only 137 were suitable?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes. That tends to verify what I say: that every inquiry is made.

*Mr. Arnold:* It also proves the class of men trying to get into the Force. Why can you not get suitable men? There are plenty in the Dominion.

*Mr. Dinnie:* My impression is that, although it was considered advisable a year or two ago to raise the standard of education with the view of getting better men, it has been found by experience we have barred a great many men who might have possibly proved to be better constables, but who have passed only the Fourth Standard.

*The Commissioner:* What would you suggest for consideration by me as to the means to be adopted to increase the area of choice?

*Mr. Arnold:* If the pay were made such as it should be—attractive for suitable men, and the conditions improved, and the larrikin element kept out of the police that has been introduced during the last three years—it would be possible to get plenty of suitable men in New Zealand; and there is not the slightest reason why the Department should not make the fullest inquiries to satisfy themselves in regard to every man in New Zealand. But the seven instances I gave are quite enough for me to quote in Parliament. When the Commissioner selects men the majority of whom are imported then proper inquiries cannot be made.

*The Commissioner:* Do you think the standard of education is too high?

*Mr. Arnold:* Yes; in my evidence I said I thought the Fourth Standard was quite sufficient, always providing the sergeant in the training school is permitted to say as to whether he considers a man's all round education is sufficient to enable him to do his ordinary work.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Do you suggest that more strict inquiries are made in any other Police Force than here?

*Mr. Arnold:* I am not aware.

*The Commissioner:* Is there a list of discharged prisoners in the office in Wellington?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* The man's name must be in the New South Wales *Police Gazette*.

*The Commissioner:* To whom do you delegate this work?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have one clerk in my own office and one in the finger-print department.

*The Commissioner:* If a man comes from New South Wales, it would be very simple to examine the New South Wales *Police Gazette*.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He would not know how far back to search. He did not carry out his duty as he should have done, and he has been dealt with for it. He is a very careful man as a rule.

*The Commissioner:* One mistake in a matter of that sort discredits a man.

*Mr. Arnold:* If it is admitted that this officer did not make careful inquiry, and has been reprimanded for it, that is another proof of the correctness of my statements.

*Mr. Dinnie:* As it happened, I was not in Wellington at the time. What do you suggest in regard to Hood?

*Mr. Arnold:* I say he was in the Police Force, that he should not have been; and that when an assault was committed on a constable on duty in Wellington, he was amongst the crowd urging the civilians on as against his own comrades.

*Mr. Dinnie:* The report does not prove that in any way.

*The Commissioner:* How was he dealt with?

*Mr. Dinnie:* This is my minute: "It seems evident he did not render the assistance he should have done, and is reported as useless as a constable. I call upon him to tender his resignation at once."

*Mr. Arnold:* One of two things seems certain. Either inquiry was not made or the inquiry made was useless.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I will not admit that.

*The Commissioner:* It is a question for me to decide whether inquiry was made or whether it was useless.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I want to show that in some cases, no matter what inquiry was made, this man would have been admitted into the Force. With regard to the promotion, as the files are at Headquarters, I think it would perhaps be better to leave it to the Commissioner to look into them there.

*Mr. Arnold:* I have given you the dates and the names, and I am quite satisfied.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I was pleased to observe in *Hansard* that Mr. Arnold said that from the standpoint of ability and character the Police Force of New Zealand to-day is equal to any Force in the Australasian Colonies.

*Mr. Arnold:* I said also that it was gradually degenerating, and that I wished to prevent that.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Well, I should like to draw attention to the figures in my annual report, as showing the percentage of arrests for all offences reported as compared with what they were before I came here. It will show Mr. Arnold, I think, the degree of efficiency of the Force at the present time. In 1901-2 it was 93·86; in 1902-3, 94·43; in 1903-4, 95·53; in 1905-6, 94·7; in 1906-7, 95·65; in 1907-8, 95·86; in 1908-9, 95·63. That, I think, shows the Force are doing their work.

*Mr. Arnold:* It shows that you have some capable officers, such as those who are now sitting around this chamber, and in all probability the great majority of arrests are made by those men.

*Mr. Dinnie:* It shows there are a good many of them, because the arrests are made all over the Dominion.

*Mr. Arnold:* I believe you have a splendid Force, if you treat it properly.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I think they have received better treatment than for many years past. Perhaps they are too well treated. That is what I am afraid of.

*Mr. Arnold:* Mr. Dinnie has practically admitted everything I require at present, at any rate. You admit the correctness of the circulars I quoted from?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes, I do.

*Mr. Arnold:* In my evidence, when I spoke of the dissatisfaction, and the undercurrent of unrest that exists, you said, "We will see how many others will say so." I suppose after the evidence you have heard this week you are fairly well satisfied there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I am far from satisfied.

*Mr. Arnold:* I may say that some of the evidence given in Dunedin has come as a surprise to me, though I knew where evidence was likely to come from that would prove all I wanted. I consider, even if Mr. Dinnie had not admitted all my charges, the evidence that has been given this week from the Force has proved my general statement on that head.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have not admitted all your charges.

*Mr. Arnold:* All with the exception of that relating to the Finger-print Expert.

*Mr. Dinnie:* But that is the most serious charge.

*Mr. Arnold:* I have proved all with the exception of that. Now, I have a communication which I am about to hand to the Commission, and I shall quote two or three lines of it, so that Mr. Dinnie may have an opportunity of denying it if he can. I am anxious to have all the evidence I possibly can, and I think every constable and every sergeant in New Zealand should have absolute confidence in the Minister of Justice and in the Commission, and should come forward boldly and give any evidence he has to give. The safety, of course, is in numbers, and the more that will speak boldly the safer the position is. This communication is bearing upon the evidence of another witness who stated it was believed that you had a spy in every centre who communicated with you as to what was transpiring. Now, the writer of this letter is a most reliable man, and he says, "As now conversation *re* Commission is very guarded, as it is commonly reported that Mr. Dinnie has placed a number of spies out to gather all information as to who is going to give evidence against him." Of course, it is hearsay as far as this man is concerned, but he knows what he is talking about. I would like you to give this a direct denial if you can, so that the constables and others in Wellington and elsewhere may have more confidence than they otherwise would have.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I can only say there is not an atom of foundation for such an allegation. It is one of the most outrageous allegations I have ever heard, and it can only have been made by some one with some object detrimental to myself.

*Mr. Arnold:* The writer believes this to be absolutely confidential. He did not know I was going to quote it.

*Mr. Dinnie:* If that person would kindly give you a little more information as to who are the parties I shall be pleased.

*The Commissioner:* It is only fair to give you an opportunity of giving this an emphatic denial upon oath, because the allegation is strongly made. You say it is absolutely incorrect?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Absolutely without the slightest foundation.

*Mr. Arnold:* So far as these men are concerned, they need not fear to come forward boldly and give evidence?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I certainly say that. I went so far as to send to Dunedin to encourage them to come forward.

*Mr. Arnold:* With regard to your son, he applied for leave of absence and the application was sent by you with a minute thereon to the Minister.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

*Mr. Arnold:* And you swear on your oath that that application and the minute was not for six months' leave of absence on full pay?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That application submitted is the genuine one, and there was no application submitted suggesting that he should have full pay for six months. I will prove that by Mr. Matthews, Mr. McGowan's secretary, and by Mr. McGowan himself.

*Mr. Arnold:* Do you know there is a newspaper published somewhere in New Zealand called *Truth*?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do, and I have prosecuted it on many occasions.

*Mr. Arnold:* I do not say they did not deserve it. Do you know that immediately that leave was granted, nearly all the Force in Wellington believed that your son had six months' leave of absence on full pay, and that *Truth* had a very cutting article upon it?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do know that.

*Mr. Arnold:* And you say that in consequence of that article the original application was not withdrawn, and another one made for six months' leave of absence with one month's pay only?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Most certainly not. When that appeared I went so far as to take advice as to whether I should take action against *Truth* or not, and you will see the papers in reference to that very thing. I have them still, and I have Mr. Myers's opinion on the matter. I spoke to my Minister about it, and, as he did not seem to encourage a prosecution, I let the matter drop.

*Mr. Arnold:* Do you think that was wise?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Well, considering the position I hold, perhaps it was.

*Mr. Arnold:* Were you aware that right through the Force in Wellington there was a feeling that you were doing this for your son while refusing another man an extra seven days' leave on full pay?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Certainly not. There are in Wellington one or two dissatisfied men, and my belief is that it was through those men that the suggestion was made to *Truth* to hurt me. It could not have been done by any one else. It was known at the station that it was not on full pay.

*Mr. Arnold:* I said in my evidence that I would be very pleased to discover that Mr. Dinnie could clear this matter up; but, as I said yesterday, it was of no consequence so far as my general charges were concerned. The whole of the Force in Wellington did and do believe that originally six months' leave was granted on full pay. I was not myself aware of that article in *Truth* when I spoke in the House.

*The Commissioner:* If Mr. Dinnie states on oath that this is the only and original application that was made in connection with that leave, we must accept that. Is this the only and original application, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is so. I hope Mr. Arnold will be gentleman enough to withdraw the assertion if he is satisfied.

*The Commissioner:* This, of course, bears the Minister's initials.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I think Mr. Arnold ought to withdraw his statement.

*Mr. Arnold:* I do not wish to prosecute the Commissioner, so far as favouritism in connection with his son—

*Mr. Dinnie:* I think you ought to withdraw the allegation. It is a serious matter to me

*Mr. Arnold:* What allegation?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That I did recommend him, and that he went on leave on full pay. It is only just to me that you should withdraw, seeing what you have seen and the evidence you have got.

*Mr. Arnold:* If this had taken place yesterday I might have done so, but I must say conscientiously that I am not too sure about those files.

*The Commissioner:* I have looked carefully through the files, and, from a very long experience in connection with such documents, I can say that if the allegations made in connection with the matter were true the Minister must have been a party to the withdrawal of the original application and the substitution of this. You will recognise the Minister's initials on this paper, Mr. Arnold.

*Mr. Arnold:* Well, that is the belief in the Force at the present moment, and I am pleased that Mr. Dinnie has made the matter clear for his own sake.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I should like to hear from you that you are satisfied, Mr. Arnold, because I can bring further proof if not.

*Mr. Arnold:* No, I am not satisfied.

*The Commissioner:* It remains now in my hands. Have you any further questions to ask, Mr. Dinnie, as this is the last opportunity you will have in Dunedin?

*Mr. Dinnie:* With regard to the promotion of Detective McGrath: I sent for the information about it, and it appears that I recommended him and others for promotion on the 8th October last year, that the application was submitted to Cabinet by Mr. McGowan, and that the delay that occurred was in Cabinet. He was not promoted until after the present Minister of Justice came into office.

W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 43.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] What are your views with regard to the question of promotion from the plain-clothes branch to the higher offices of the Force?—I agree with Mr. Herbert in that respect. I think if a man in the detective force is fully qualified for promotion, and is equal in seniority to the men in the uniform branch, he should have an equal claim to promotion.

2. What was it that disqualified Station Sergeant King as regards promotion? I wish to remind you that he has sworn that on one occasion you specifically told him in so many words that he would be promoted?—Well, I must deny that. I do not think there is a man in the service who can say I made a promise of that sort. I always tell them their application will be considered. I go no further than that, because I know the danger I am running.

3. Are these promotions always made by Cabinet?—No. The Minister in some cases sends the matter to Cabinet.

4. I want to know how far your powers go in regard to promotions?—I recommend in every case, and it is for the Minister to approve or otherwise.

5. Can you give me any instance in which promotion has been granted without your recommendation?—I do not remember a case.

6. Then, I take it that you have never been ignored as regards promotions?—Certainly not.

7. Coming back to Station Sergeant King, *prima facie*, on the evidence, he would appear to be entitled to promotion. Now, your minute on the papers indicates that he is not entitled to promotion. I am bound to ask you why?—There are sergeants who are fit for the position of sergeant and nothing more, just as there are constables who are only fit to be constables; and there are station sergeants who are not qualified for the higher ranks. When Sergeant King's case came up there were two other men who were specially qualified, and their Inspectors, who know them best, will say so, I think.

8. Who were they?—Norwood and Henry.

9. I want to know what particularly disqualified Sergeant King?—I did not think he was capable of holding the rank, and there were others ahead of him.

10. Suppose there was a vacancy now, would you still view it in the same light?—If I had a better man.

11. How are the promotions of sergeants made? Are they made by you?—I always submit promotions to the Minister for his approval.

12. What does the Minister know about it?—It is more a matter of form than anything else. I recommend them from a list of those whom the Inspectors recommend.

13. When a promotion is to be made, do you recommend them in a certain order of preference, or do you recommend a particular man? That is to say, if there is one vacancy you recommend one man, and if there are three vacancies you recommend three men?—Yes, from my list. The approval by the Minister is more a matter of form than anything else.

14. How do you promote the men from street duty to the charge of a station?—I do that without reference to the Minister. All the actual promotions go to the Minister for approval.

15. Has that always obtained in the office?—Yes, I think so.

*Inspector O'Brien:* I have no questions to ask Mr. Dinnie, in view of his silence. I had anticipated he would have had something to say by way of evidence-in-chief.

*The Commissioner:* No evidence will be given by Mr. Dinnie in Wellington, where I intend to wind up, in respect to any particular locality or the officers in that locality. His evidence will be of a general character.

*Inspector O'Brien:* I quite understand, and I appreciate it very much.

16. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] I understood Mr. Dinnie to say that there had been no case where a man who he had refused to promote had been promoted over his head?—I did not exactly say that.

17. Have there been no cases of promotion from constable to sergeant where you did not recommend them?—There was a case when I came here first of all, but that man was accepted as a sergeant before I came, and I had simply to put the file before the Minister.

18. You are referring to the case of a man now in Christchurch. I am thinking of a man named Burrows, who was stationed in this district, who was promoted in spite of the fact that he was not recommended by the Inspector. Was he recommended by the Inspector?—I could not say until I see the files. I may mention that my predecessor left a list for me, giving me his opinion of the men. It may have been that Mr. Tunbridges's opinion in respect to that man was different from that of Inspector O'Brien.

19. Would you be influenced by his opinion rather than Inspector O'Brien's?—To a great extent, because I found his opinions were very sound.

20. Do you say that Burrows was not promoted against a recommendation by you to the contrary?—I am certain he was not.

*The Commissioner:* I will call for the papers.

21. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] You remember the late Minister of Justice saying in the House that Chief Detectives would not be promoted to the higher ranks without first reverting to the lower grade in uniform and working their way up as a sergeant has to do?—I would not say it was exactly that.

22. Do you remember that the effect of what he said was that the Chief Detectives must first go out of their own rank into uniform to qualify for the position of Sub-Inspector?—It was something to that effect.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* The Commission will remember that the late Minister of Justice refused to permit men from the plain-clothes branch to go right on to the higher positions in the Force.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not think he entirely refused.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* I want to put the saddle on the right horse if I can. We believe the Commissioner himself was opposed to the promotion of McGrath to the rank of Sub-Inspector out of the detective branch, and that when Mr. McGowan made that statement in the House he did it with the concurrence and by arrangement with the Commissioner—that the Minister's views were the Commissioner's views.

*The Commissioner:* You are trenching upon ground that is dangerous. It would be better not to refer to or criticize in any way Ministerial acts.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I remember the effect of the Minister's statement in the House, but I am not sure whether Mr. Herbert has given the precise words.

23. *Chief Detective Herbert.*] Did you recommend Chief Detective McGrath for promotion to the position of Sub-Inspector prior to that?—I do not think I did.

24. Had you any intention prior to that of recommending any Chief Detective for the position of Sub-Inspector?—Oh, yes.

25. Had you recommended any?—No.

26. Were you, prior to that statement by Mr. McGowan in the House, favourable to promotion from Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector?—Certainly.

27. Was the Minister aware that that was your view?—I do not know that he had occasion to be aware of it, because I had not recommended it to him.

*The Commissioner:* You would not wish me to take evidence as to verbal conversations between the Commissioner and the Minister?

*Chief Detective Herbert:* No, sir. The only thing is that we thought the Minister would not have made that statement in the House without Mr. Dinnie being aware that he was going to make it.

*The Commissioner:* Now that you have Mr. Dinnie's absolute denial upon oath, I think you should be satisfied.

*Chief Detective Herbert:* I am, sir.

28. *Station Sergeant King.*] I should like to ask Mr. Dinnie a question. You have denied that you at one time told me that I should not have to wait long for promotion?—Yes.

29. Do you remember my interviewing you in the Inspector's office in Dunedin some months after I was appointed? Do you remember I then asked you what my duties would be as station sergeant? You said you could not very well define them then, but one of the duties you told the Inspector I was to do was to prosecute in police cases in Court?—Yes, I think that was so.

30. Did you use these words to me on that occasion: "You settle down to your work; it is a stepping-stone to promotion, and you are near the senior on the list"?—I do not think I used those words. I may have said it was a stepping-stone to promotion, but I could not swear as to whether those were the words or not.

31. What was your reason for passing over Phair and promoting Norwood, who was his junior?—Because of the qualifications of the junior man. Phair was not such a good man as Norwood, in my opinion.

32. Since I left the Court yesterday, I understand you have been showing a paper to some of my juniors in the service, and that on that paper were some hints or suggestions which Mr. Tunbridge had given you, and on that paper was my name?—I have no such paper. Let us hear more about it.

*The Commissioner:* Do you refer to the file of papers that came up in evidence?

33. *Station Sergeant King.*] It was stated in the paper that I was a good sergeant, but hardly up to the position of Sub-Inspector. Mr. Tunbridge has been away now for over five years. Do you not think my experience would be greater now than it was then?—Yes.

34. But still you think I am not fit for the higher rank?

*The Commissioner:* He did not say so. His statement was general—to the effect that some of the junior men were superior to the senior.

35. *Station Sergeant King.*] How much of my work comes under your notice?—Your reports and other matters. I knew of your connection with the Papakaio murder case, for instance.

*Station Sergeant King:* Unfortunately for me, I think.

*The Commissioner:* I must ask you to confine yourself to asking questions.

*Station Sergeant King:* I would like to ask Inspector O'Brien whether he can remember the conversation which passed between Mr. Dinnie and myself on the occasion I referred to just now.

*Inspector O'Brien:* I cannot repeat verbatim what passed between Mr. Dinnie and yourself on that occasion. I know you made some representations as to losses incurred by you in coming from Oamaru to Dunedin to take up the position of station sergeant. I clearly recollect that in reply to that the Commissioner told you to settle down to your work, and that he used some words from which it might clearly be inferred that future Sub-Inspectors were to be made from the office of station sergeants. The Commissioner made no discouraging remarks. It was rather the contrary. No actual promise was made, so far as I can recollect.

*The Commissioner:* Simply an encouragement to settle down and do his work, and his chances would be considered.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I admit that.

*Station Sergeant King:* I made a statement yesterday which, if I was correctly reported in the Press, did not convey the meaning I intended. I am reported to have said I had no doubt I could get a Civil Service certificate if I wished. Well, I did not want to cast any reflection upon the teaching profession. What I meant was that I thought candidates could get certificates a little too freely.



MONDAY, 19TH JULY, 1909.

JOHN FOX, Constable, further examined. (No. 44.)

*Witness:* I am here to represent the views of fifteen out of seventeen of the single constables living at the central station, Dunedin, in reference to the matter of late leave at night. This has not been originated by me, but I am here to support their views as far as I can. When I was giving evidence the other day I said that by applying for late leave in writing it was granted. I omitted to say that we were not allowed leave later than 1 a.m. Now, some constables, like other people, like to go to a dance or a social occasionally, and sometimes to a wedding, and they think it a hardship if on such occasions they must be in by 1 a.m. This is more especially the case perhaps when a man has to see a lady friend home afterwards and return some considerable distance to the station before 1 a.m. Very often the amusement is just as its height about the time one has to leave, and we see no reason why leave should not be granted until 2 or 3 a.m.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any occasions on which leave to a later hour has been refused?—Yes. For instance, on two occasions I myself applied for leave, once until after midnight and the other until 2 a.m. On the second occasion it was granted to 1 a.m. I wanted to attend a social. Of course, that may not have been considered leave for some special purpose, but I understand there is a rule that leave cannot be granted later than 1 a.m.

2. At what hour have you to be on duty the next morning?—At 9 a.m.; but we have only four hours' duty, and there is nothing to hinder us from going to bed for two or three hours in the afternoon. But I have not mentioned this so much because of myself, but it is considered a grievance by the men.

3. Do you want the Inspector to be given wider discretion in the matter, because you could scarcely have that sort of thing fixed by regulation. The only thing you could do is to give the widest possible discretion to the Inspector, and if, in his discretion, the Inspector refuses an application, who can gainsay him?—We think that under special circumstances a constable might be granted leave for an hour or two later than he is now. I would like to refer briefly to a portion of the evidence I gave before the Commission the other day. In answer to a question by yourself I stated that I knew of no instances where political or other influences had been used in connection with promotions, but that I knew of a certain feeling existing among the members of the Force to the effect that influences other than political were supposed to have been used. From what I have heard since, some of the men have misunderstood me, and they think I had an ulterior motive in giving such an answer. As a matter of fact, I answered what was the truth to the best of my knowledge, and I am still of the same opinion. I think your Worship did not understand from my remarks that I had any such motive.

4. I think you gave your evidence fairly and straightly, and with advantage to the view you were supposed to be placing before me?—There is a certain member of the Force superior to me in the service who has done me the honour to call me a scoundrel behind my back for making mention of this affair. I do not see the reason for it, because nothing was further from my mind than to offend any one personally. I merely made a general statement, and I say that the feeling I spoke of is not at all confined to the members of any particular religious denomination.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know of no case yourself in which such influence has obtained?—Not one.

6. Neither Masonic, religious, or anything else?—No, I have not heard of one. I simply say the impression exists.

7. You know when I address the constables, as a rule, I tell them not to seek influence in any way, and that it does not obtain?—Yes, I have heard you say so.

FRANCIES GEORGE CUMMING, Agent, Patients' and Prisoners' Aid Society, Dunedin, examined on oath. (No. 45.)

*Witness:* At the outset, I may say I am here with no grievance, and if I had anything to say with regard to the Police Force it would be complimentary rather than the other way. I have had a good deal of experience during the last twenty-five or twenty-six years in connection with police matters, not only in New Zealand, but in Australia and in other parts of the world, where I have come in contact with the Force. During the last few years my contact has been perhaps more close than previously, and I would like to say that to my personal knowledge the reason why some of the men required for the Force, such as farmers' sons, and so forth, are unwilling to apply is the smallness of the allowances made in the way of salary. We say that in the Police Force we want men of ability, both from the standpoint of education and physique and character. The men who possess these qualifications have no hesitation in stating that 7s. 6d. a day is too little, and I honestly believe that men of that description cannot be procured at so low a rate of pay. I think 7s. 6d. a day is not sufficient for a constable to live on, at all events in the centres of New Zealand. It is a lower wage than is paid to the ordinary working-man, and the work of a constable is certainly no less laborious than that of the man who works with a pick and shovel. A policeman has to take a good many risks, and altogether I think a constable should be paid not less than 8s. a day. I would further suggest that after two years' service there should be an increase in his pay. If what I suggest is done I am satisfied that a better class of men can be procured. Another grievance that the young married men in particular bring forward is that they are placed at a great disadvantage inasmuch as they only get 7s. 6d. a day and 1s. a day for house-allowance. It is not possible for any one to secure a home for himself and his wife and family at 7s. per week, and I do not see why a constable should be asked to provide the remainder of the rent for a house, which may cost him from 15s. to 17s. per week. It may cost a little less in Christchurch or Dunedin than in Wellington, and I think that fact should be taken into consideration when the allowance is made.



1. *The Commissioner.*] I do not say I disagree with you, but when you make a comparison between the pay of a constable and that of an ordinary working-man, you must take into consideration the fact that the working-man has to pay his own rent?—I admit that is so.

2. It seems to me that if you are going to argue for an increased remuneration, and at the same time for an increased house-allowance, then you are trenching on the impossible?—I merely wanted to point out the difference between the position of the married men and the single men. I have had no communication upon the matter with any constable, and my statement is made purely voluntarily. The next question I would mention is in reference to the leave of constables. At present they receive only twelve days in the year. I think any constable working for twelve months should be given at least from sixteen to twenty days' leave in the year. With regard to the standard of education, I think it would be a great mistake to bring it below the Fifth Standard. In this country most boys pass the Fifth Standard.

3. Are you sure of that?—There is, of course, a difference between the country and the town. I admit that a man who has passed, say, the Fourth Standard might make a splendid constable, and if he is sufficiently qualified in other respects I think he might be admitted, but I do not think the Fifth Standard is placing the education test too high.

4. Do you think the requirements of the Fifth Standard constitute a factor against the enrolment of good men?—I should say no.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you aware that we have to reject a very large number of applicants owing to the fact that they have not passed the Fifth Standard?—That is so.

6. And many of them men who might turn out excellent constables?—Yes; but, as I say, I would not block a man because he has only passed the Fourth Standard; but, taking the education test as a whole, the Fifth Standard is not too high for New Zealand, I think.

7. *The Commissioner.*] But if we have the test, surely we ought to adhere to it?—That is so.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know that married men who have been in the service for a short time have an advantage over the single men in that they are appointed to stations?—Yes, I admit that.

9. And that is a very good position?—Yes; I was speaking of the married men principally, in the centres.

10. You mean, for the first few years of their service?—Yes. I know, for instance, that a married man in Timaru or Oamaru has an advantage over a married man in Christchurch or Wellington or Dunedin as regards rent-allowance. I think the smallness of the allowance granted in the cities may have the effect of causing men to live in localities where they should not have to live.

WILLIAM JOHN PHAIR, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 46.)

*Witness:* I am now stationed in Dunedin. I was in Wellington from the time of my promotion up to the time of my coming to Dunedin.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why were you transferred?—I cannot say.

2. Was it at your own request?—No.

3. When did you join the Force?—On the 27th April, 1877. I entered the depot at Mount Cook, and was sworn in on the 18th May of the same year. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant on the 1st January, 1898, and was promoted to be station sergeant on the 1st March, 1906. I was promoted to Sub-Inspector on the 1st July, 1908.

4. Have you any general remarks you wish to make?—I may state I have no grievance either against the Commissioner or against any of the Inspectors. With regard to the ruling rate of pay in the Force, you will no doubt remember that some years ago the Police Force was recruited principally from the farmers' sons, or from those who were working upon the land. Owing, however, to the prosperity of the country during the past twelve or thirteen years that channel has been somewhat closed. The farmers have been receiving such good prices for their produce that they have been able to pay a good rate of wages, and they select the best men they can get to do their work. The Police Force only pay 7s. 6d. a day, which cannot induce good men to come forward. Consequently the Force has had to draw its recruits from other sources, and the men of late years have not been up to the physique that they formerly were. I feel satisfied, from my own knowledge of what takes place in Wellington in regard to the selection of men for the Force—and I was there three years and four months—that the Commissioner selects the best men he can possibly get. The inquiries in many instances have passed through my hands, and I am fully aware that the strictest inquiries have been made as to their character. In fact, I have often wondered why the inquiries were so strict, because even if a man had been only, say, two months in a place it was necessary that inquiries should be made as to how he conducted himself during that time. The inquiries in Wellington were, under my instructions, carried out by a sergeant and not by a constable. With regard to the rate of pay, I think if it was increased probably a better class of candidates would be obtainable—men with good physique, who could stand the strain and hardship of a policeman's life. The men working upon the farms have a certain amount of freedom, and they have a bed to sleep in every night; while the men in the Force have to be on duty day and night, and their life is a hard one. I think, therefore, they are entitled to a little more consideration. I also think their privileges might be increased; for instance, they might be allowed a little more leave. There is another matter in connection with the Department I should like to refer to, and that is the quantity of outside correspondence that comes into the hands of the police. I do not know that it can be called police work. For instance, the Education Department gives us a lot of work. We are a regular inquiry office for those who are in arrear for maintenance of children, &c.; they have to be sought for all over the colony; inquiries have to be made, money collected, and distress warrants and warrants of commitment served if necessary. All this entails a large amount of work on the police, and consequently many constables have to be taken off their ordinary duties. I think Departments such as the Education Department should have their own officers for this, and leave the police to do only what

is purely police work. Then there are many other things, such as inquiry after lost property (not stolen), and other matters which I think might reasonably not be placed on the shoulders of the police. Then in connection with railways and steamers—lost luggage, principally owing to the carelessness of the owners; they leave their luggage to any person, and expect the police to find it.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] After making inquiry themselves unsuccessfully?—Yes. These are matters that require attention. If these matters were taken off the police, and they only had police work to do, it would be very much better. Both the clerical staff and outside constables are called upon to do a large amount of work they should not have to do.

6. As regards inquiries made about applicants, you know they are much more stringent now than when I arrived?—That is so; the strictest and most careful inquiries are made.

7. Do you know of any case in which there has been an adverse report and the candidate has been appointed?—No.

8. You know that the files are frequently sent back for additional inquiry?—Yes.

9. This morning I gave you a number of files to examine: have not strict inquiries been made in these cases?—Yes, most careful.

10. Is there anything in these papers to show why the men should not be admitted into the Force?—Nothing; on the contrary, they had the best of characters.

11. Some of the men had been in Government service before?—Yes, and in other police services.

12. The suggestion was that sufficient inquiry was not made into these cases, or no inquiry?—The fullest inquiries were made.

13. Special attention has been given to the case of Willets, and it has been stated that he was discharged from the tramway service: will you look at this report from the sergeant on the matter from the head of the tramways? Does that say he was discharged?—No.

14. The report states that the sergeant interviewed Mr. Richardson, engineer in charge of the tramways, and states that the attached testimonial was signed by him, which speaks very highly of Willets. He also reports that he interviewed Mr. Humphreys, contractor, who states that the attached testimonial was given by him, speaking very highly of Willets. There is nothing to indicate the man was discharged. I suggest this is a full answer to the suggestion made. In the case of Macdermott, this letter shows—

*The Commissioner:* Why ask the Sub-Inspector these questions?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I want to prove here that the men's characters were highly respectable, and no Force would refuse them.

*The Commissioner:* You enrolled the man before you got a reply.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He was temporarily employed.

*The Commissioner:* But it does not do away with the fact that he was employed while he was a criminal, and you did not wait till you got a reply.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He was simply on probation till the reply came. The reply did not come when it ought to have come; that I could not prevent. I made the same statement as regards Wallace; the letter here shows that inquiries were being made, and as soon as the reply came the man was dismissed. These were the only cases where two men were taken on probation till the reply came.

15. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] As regards the employment of a special man with a view of obtaining information, have you heard anything of that sort?—Never.

16. Do you not think you would have heard if such a rumour had gone about?—I should think so.

17. Would you believe it if you did hear of it?—No.

18. Would you repeat it if you heard it?—No; it would not show good discipline.

19. What is your opinion now of the condition of the Force here?—From what I have seen, it is a very good Force; there are an intelligent lot of young men here.

20. You know from your experience that most respectable men join the Force, and sometimes a man here and there gets into trouble and gets dismissed?—There are black sheep in every flock.

21. Other Government Departments in New Zealand have the same thing from time to time, and the cases are quashed?—I think the Force compares very favourably with a good many of the Departments.

22. Or any other Police Force?—Yes.

23. Men are promptly dealt with when they do misbehave?—Such has been my experience; the late dismissals in Wellington seem to show that.

*The Commissioner:* They could not do otherwise, when men are convicted of crime.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Prior to that you know their characters were excellent? Did they perform their duties?—I regarded them as three of the steadiest men in the station—excellent men; but they got into trouble when off duty.

25. Through taking a little extra drink?—Yes; and probably if they had not been interfered with there would have been no trouble at all.

*The Commissioner:* Would taking a little extra drink induce a man to abominably assault a woman in the public street? What is the use of talking like that?

26. *Mr. Arnold.*] I understand you say that ample inquiries were made as to the characters of these eight men referred to before they were brought into the Force?—Yes.

27. You admit, with the Commissioner, the charges made against them were correct?—Yes; and the men were dismissed promptly.

28. Have you had any experience outside the Police Force in commercial or manufacturing affairs?—Not in this country; I have at Home.

29. Do you think it likely men such as they could have found employment in responsible positions in private firms?—I do.

30. If sufficient inquiry was made as to the character of these men, and they still got into the Force, what is the good of your inquiry?—I suppose all men are frail, and liable to make a mistake.

31. Do you consider the inquiry made in connection with the admission of candidates is sufficient?—Yes.

32. And yet in this case it proved to be absolutely useless?—Afterwards it did. But the inquiries were full and complete, and the men were shown to be of good character at the time of their admission.

*The Commissioner:* The Sub-Inspector's opinion will have no bearing upon my judgment. I have the papers, and rely on them. He tells me the closest possible inquiries were made, and these men were of excellent character when admitted to the Force.

*Mr. Dinnie:* So they were.

*The Commissioner:* Some of them were of bad character when admitted to the Force, and I still repeat my opinion that the Sub-Inspector's evidence on a matter of this sort, where men of bad character entered the Force, will have no bearing on my inquiry.

*Mr. Dinnie:* He speaks of some of the men.

*The Commissioner:* Please do not interrupt me, Mr. Dinnie. I am speaking of some of these men. I have to report to the Governor, and if my report is based on insufficient evidence I am responsible to the Governor.

33. *Mr. Arnold.]* Your opinion is that the character of members of the Force is excellent: does that apply to Dunedin?—I consider they are efficient men.

34. You were in charge of the station at Wellington as Sub-Inspector for, how long?—Twelve months; part of the time—two months—I was unwell.

35. Are the young men of the Force in Wellington equal to those in Dunedin?—I cannot say that, because the men here have had more experience. It is the practice in Wellington to send the older constables from the depot and to retain the men of very little experience. There is a greater proportion of raw constables in Wellington than in other head stations, and the older men are continually drafted away to fill vacancies, Wellington being consequently left with the younger men. It has been a wonder to me it has escaped so well, with the material it had.

36. Will you give your idea as to why there has not been better material to work with?—I have already expressed the opinion that owing to the prosperity of the country young men can get better wages outside the police.

37. Can you explain, then, why a very much larger number have left the Force during recent times, when there has not been the prosperity we have had recently, than during the time of prosperity?—A good many have left to settle on the land.

38. Do you know that a very large proportion of those who applied to enter the Force during the last twelve months have been rejected as unsuitable?—I can understand a good many being rejected, because a good many passed through my hands for measurement, and they were under standard.

39. Then, they were rejected because they were not physically fit?—I presume so.

40. The Commissioner says it was in consequence of the inquiries being unsatisfactory as to their character?—I am speaking of my observation.

41. As a matter of fact, is it not because the salary is insufficient, and the conditions of the Force not attractive, and because the larrikin element is such that many respectable fellows will not enter the Force?—I do not know about the larrikin element; I know the pay is not considered sufficient; I have heard it frequently discussed.

42. Do you think the general conditions of the Force are such as to attract men to enter?—I do not know as to the conditions; I consider, owing to the high wages ruling elsewhere, men are not so willing to join.

43. You do not know anything about the conditions, such as the treatment the men receive, outside of the regulations?—I am not aware of any bad treatment they receive. The Inspectors in the majority of the districts treat their men very well.

44. You are not acquainted with any complaints?—Not against the Inspectors.

45. But as to the general conditions of the Force?—No.

46. Is there any undercurrent of discontent amongst the members?—I am aware there are two or three in Wellington who are discontented.

47. Statements have been made with regard to the conduct of the men in the Wellington barracks: who is responsible for their management?—It depends upon who is on duty.

48. You were not responsible more than others?—I was in charge during the time I was there, in the absence of the Inspector.

49. Are you aware that considerable rowdiness and larrikinism goes on in barracks at night there?—I am not; I was not there at night; it may be so. I have not heard of it, except, I believe, when I was away on sick leave.

50. Would you not be likely to hear of it if it was the case?—I might or might not; if it came to the ears of the sergeant it would be reported to me.

51. If it is the case, and you are not aware of it, there may be considerable discontent in the Force without you being aware of it?—I do not think so.

52. You should know what is going on in barracks at night?—How could I be expected to know? I went home at 9 as a rule, and unless some one told me I should not be likely to know.

53. *The Commissioner.]* Is there always a sergeant on the premises?—The sergeant on night duty is in and out.

54. Who is really responsible?—The sergeant on night duty.

55. *Mr. Arnold.]* You do not know that the men who come in after night duty complain that it is impossible for them to get any rest in consequence of the behaviour in the barracks, which

is very bad indeed?—I have heard them complaining about men making a noise going up when they come off duty at 5 in the morning.

56. Have you ever heard of two sergeants having to go in and quell a disturbance?—I heard of it; I was sick at the time it happened.

57. Is there a library in the barracks?—A small one; it is not now used.

58. Do you know why?—No.

59. Who receives the subscriptions?—I cannot tell you.

60. Is there a billiard-table?—Yes; it is used.

61. Who keeps the bank?—I think, Sergeant Gavney.

62. Do constables play there during the luncheon-hour?—At any time during the day; not, as a rule, in uniform. I have seen them in uniform before going out on duty, not while on duty.

63. Did you ever play with them yourself?—I am not a billiard-player. I may have had one or two games.

64. Do you know any Sub-Inspector that does?—No.

65. Do you think it would be a right thing for a Sub-Inspector to play with them while in uniform?—I have never known such a thing to happen, but I do not see why a Sub-Inspector should be debarred from enjoying himself during lunch-hour.

66. Do you think it would tend to discipline?—I do not say that he did play with the men, or that any of them play with the men. I think, as a rule, the Sub-Inspectors keep themselves to themselves as much as possible. I know I have always endeavoured to do so.

67. Can you tell me who is recognised in Wellington as the Commissioner?—Mr. Dinnie, of course.

68. Is it not generally admitted that Sub-Inspector Wright, and not Mr. Dinnie, is the man who is ruling the Police Department?—I have never heard of it. Mr. Wright is the Chief Clerk, of course, and I have never heard of his being regarded as the Commissioner.

69. Is it not a fact that the members of the Force in Wellington consider that the failure during Mr. Dinnie's time, if that be proven, is in consequence of his permitting Sub-Inspector Wright to occupy a position which Mr. Tunbridge would never have permitted him to hold?—I have never heard such an expression from any member of the Force.

70. If a constable were about the barracks the worse for liquor before going out on duty, do you think such a thing would be reported?—I am satisfied it would be reported if it were known.

71. You remember that on a certain Saturday night a certain constable was sent home in a state of intoxication at 10 o'clock: would you be surprised to hear that that man was the worse for liquor when he went out at 9 o'clock?—I scarcely think he would be, because the relief is paraded every night either by the station sergeant or by myself at those times. But I was not on duty that night. I have never seen any drinking in the barracks in Wellington.

72. Would you be surprised to hear that this man going out at 9 o'clock at night is not the only occasion on which the same thing has happened?—I should be surprised. I spoke to the constable who was reported next morning about the matter, and he said that he had felt unwell—that his bowels were bad—and that he went into a hotel and had two nips of brandy; that he was quite sober at parade, but directly he went into the cold air it had a sudden effect upon him.

73. Was any departmental inquiry held?—Yes; Inspector Ellison held an inquiry.

74. Was evidence taken as to whether he was the worse for liquor when he went out?—I could not say.

75. Has the evidence given in Dunedin as to the discontent existing in the Force come as a surprise to you?—I have not heard the evidence except for a few minutes to-day.

76. Do you mean to say you have not read the evidence given by Inspector O'Brien and Chief Detective Herbert?—Yes, I have in the papers.

77. Did not their evidence as to discontent in Dunedin come as a surprise to you?—I have been only a short time in Dunedin, but it did surprise me, because, with the few exceptions I have referred to, in Wellington I have heard of no grumbling. Having been in close touch with the men in Wellington, if there was grumbling I think I should have heard of it.

78. You do not admit it to be correct?—I have no reason to consider it correct in any way.

79. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was Mr. Wright the Chief Clerk when I came here?—No, not for some time afterwards, I understand.

80. I suppose the suggestion is that he took over the office of Commissioner when I appointed him. Do you believe there is any truth in the statement, from what you have seen and from the manner in which I have dealt with the men?—No, you are looked upon as Commissioner, and no one else.

81. You know there are two or three of the men in Wellington who have been dissatisfied for years past, and who have fully expressed their dissatisfaction?—Yes.

82. You have seen what appeared in the newspaper called *Truth*, I suppose, in respect to the Police Force: did you draw the conclusion from that that some of the dissatisfied men had been communicating with the Press?—I do not wish to go so far as that. It has been hinted at, I know.

83. You look for a motive in these things?—Yes; but I do not say they did so.

84. *Inspector O'Brien.*] You do not profess to be conversant with all the little chat that goes on amongst the members of the Force in Wellington?—Not all of it—only what comes under my notice.

85. So that there might be some feeling that there might be such a person as "the useful man" in existence for all you know?—I had not heard it stated.

86. A good many other things have occurred in Wellington that you do not appear to have heard of, and this might be one of them?—All I know is that I have never heard of it. I cannot go beyond that.

87. Respecting the candidates who have been brought to Wellington for enrolment, say, from Southland, Otago, and Canterbury, who do they interview before being actually enrolled?—They generally go to the Commissioner's office in the first place, and get their papers.

88. And if the Commissioner is not there?—I suppose they get their papers from the Chief Clerk, Mr. Wright.

89. And then they are sent to the depot at Mount Cook?—Yes, after a few inquiries, measurements, and so forth.

90. You say many of the men are rejected as not being up to the standard as regards height, chest measurement, and so forth?—Yes.

91. That includes applicants from Southland, Otago, and Canterbury?—I could not say, but I should not think they would be called to Wellington unless they were fit medically and of proper height, and that the inquiries showed they were of good character.

92. Have you come into contact with those applicants very much before they are established at Mount Cook depot?—Not with those from other districts. The men from the Wellington District, as a rule, pass either through my hands or the station sergeant's for measurement, and very often for inquiries.

93. If they are not up to the standard, do you recommend that they be rejected?—No, I simply enter the measurements on the form. That is sent to the Commissioner, I understand; then returned to the Inspector, who deals with the matter afterwards.

94. Is it not a fact that many have been admitted into the depot who were not up to the standard as regards height and chest measurement?—I have not known of any.

95. With regard to those men who have been drafted from Wellington to Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin, are they not usually men who have been defaulters?—There are a few, of course; but it is generally the men of good character who are sent away. Inspector Ellison often prefers to deal with his own defaulters in his own district; he has said so himself.

96. Can you assign any reason for men from the depot—inexperienced—being allotted to Wellington more than any other district?—The requirements of Wellington are greater, and the vacancies are more numerous, I suppose, than in other centres.

97. What makes vacancies numerous?—Men leave or are drafted away elsewhere. There have been times when we have been working shorthanded in Wellington. I have known of our having only four men for relief duty when we required six or seven.

98. Why are they drafted from the Lambton Quay Station rather than from the depot?—I do not know why.

99. You have heard of a good many defaulters from the Lambton Quay Station lately?—Yes.

100. If they are not actually discharged from the service, what is done with them, as a rule?—A good many of them are kept there. Some of them are sent to other districts, if their length of service and conduct warrant it.

101. Are there many of the candidates who are not intelligent?—I have noticed a good few lately who are not very intelligent.

102. *The Commissioner.*] What do you gauge their intelligence by?—Principally by the reports they submit.

103. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Have you had men considerably under the standard height on duty in Wellington?—I am not aware of any.

104. *The Commissioner.*] As to those eight cases which the Commissioner has mentioned, how many have you first-hand knowledge of?—I do not know that I had first-hand knowledge of any. I was only speaking from what I had seen of the papers, and from some inquiries that were made in Wellington.

104A. Unless you have first-hand knowledge, I do not think an expression of opinion by you will be of much value as evidence, because I shall have the papers.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I suggest, sir, that he has the same opportunity as you yourself will have to express an opinion.

*The Commissioner:* Mine is the opinion of authority. That is the difference. I do not require the opinion of any witness as to what those papers convey.

105. *Mr. Dinnie* (to witness).] You know that Wellington supplies Napier, Wanganui, and the West Coast with men when vacancies occur, and that in consequence you have sometimes to send away men with some service?—Yes.

106. You know it is advisable to keep the young men at the station in order to teach them their duties?—No doubt it is advisable.

107. Under the system every probationer is posted in a city?—Yes.

107A. And he remains there for two or three years before he gets a transfer?—They generally remain twelve or eighteen months anyhow.

108. You know that defaulters are frequently transferred from one district to another—from Wellington to Christchurch, from Auckland to Wellington, and so on?—Yes.

109. And we get a good many in Wellington who were defaulters in other districts?—Yes.

110. *Inspector O'Brien.*] I should like you to ask the witness, sir, whether he has had any defaulters in Wellington from Dunedin during the time he was stationed there?—I do not remember any from Dunedin coming to Wellington.

111. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to the general policy of transferring defaulters from one district to another, that would depend upon the nature of the default, of course: you cannot lay down any hard-and-fast rule?—No.

*The Commissioner* (to Mr. Dinnie): Was the Sub-Inspector transferred from Wellington here on your recommendation, or in any other way?

*Mr. Dinnie:* On my recommendation.

*The Commissioner:* As a matter of discipline?

*Mr. Dinnie:* In the interests of the service.

*The Commissioner:* Is the Wellington District considered a more important one than this?

*Mr. Dinnie:* It is.

*The Commissioner:* Presumably you want a good man there?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

*The Commissioner:* You consider the Sub-Inspector you transferred from here answered those requirements?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do, certainly.

PATRICK DENNIS O'CONNOR, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 47.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin. I was enrolled in September, 1890, and was promoted sergeant in February, 1909. My experience of late years has been in small county districts.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinions in regard to the physique of the Force as compared with its condition when you first joined?—There are some very good men in the Force.

2. Does the physique of the Force, as a whole, compare favourably with its condition when you joined?—I think so; there might be a little falling-off.

3. Did you pass the examination before becoming a sergeant?—No.

4. How old were you when you were promoted?—About fifty.

*The Commissioner:* What do you take as evidence of age, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* We have a certificate of birth from applicants, but in many cases they could not be got, and we have had to rely on a sworn affidavit.

5. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] Was your promotion a surprise, or had you applied for it?—I applied about twelve months ago. I was strongly recommended by the Inspector.

6. Do you know of the existence of a sort of rule—*lex non scripta*—that no man over fifty shall be appointed sergeant?—I have heard a rumour of it. I was not surprised, because I was strongly recommended.

7. Have you felt physically fit for the work? Have you suffered at all?—Not the slightest.

8. You are still fit for a good many years?—I think so. Some men are old at forty-five, and some old men are young at sixty.

9. What is the general conduct of the younger members of the Force here?—Very good.

10. They compare favourably with any that have gone before?—Yes.

11. Have you ever heard any statements in regard to political or other influence being used on behalf of particular men?—I have heard such statements, but have never known it to my own knowledge.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard anything about a special man being placed by me at each district to obtain information?—Never.

13. Would you have heard if it had been seriously talked about?—Perhaps; I am not very long here.

14. *Inspector O'Brien.*] You were stationed in the country, not in Christchurch?—Yes.

15. There might be a great many things in Christchurch you never heard?—Yes.

16. The district in which you were promoted was Canterbury?—Yes.

THOMAS O'GRADY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 48.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin Central. I joined the Force in June, 1893, and was promoted to sergeant in December, 1907. I have been here ever since, having been transferred from Auckland. I consider the travelling-allowance to the police is not sufficient; it should be raised all round from 6s. to 8s. I consider that amount is necessary.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is the general charge in hotels in Otago?—Some run to 10s. a day.

2. Then, you are out of pocket?—Yes. Then, I think uniforms should be free: the making-up at present costs about £2 10s. Boots also should be allowed—two pairs a year. Then, in regard to transfers, we consider we should be allowed saloon passages by steamer. I found it necessary to pay the difference—I have a family of two. I consider an increase of pay should be given all round—say, 6d. This would induce a better class of men to come forward. Men get better wages outside; a working-man gets 8s. 6d. or 9s. Another matter is that constables should be allowed time off after having to attend Court. If a man locks up a prisoner between 5 and 9 in the morning, he has no time to get his breakfast before having to attend Court.

3. It affects the efficiency of the work?—Yes; many a man escapes being locked up because the constable would have to get up in the morning if he were arrested. Then, the order compelling men to go home in uniform is unsatisfactory, and I do not think it is fair. He may have shopping to do, and if he goes into shops in uniform people gape at him, and wonder what he is doing. The men might be trusted to go home in plain clothes. I consider the Sunday leave is not sufficient. I think the men should get two Sundays a month. To assist that, the clerks in the district office should be compelled to do Sunday duty. They get Sunday, half Saturday, and every holiday, and get 1s. extra pay, while the others work all the year round. Then, I think when the men are on leave they should get some railway concessions.

4. The difficulty is that the Railway Department will not have it, and it would become a charge on the police. How old were you when you became a sergeant?—Thirty-nine.

5. What is your opinion in regard to the maximum age at which a man should be promoted, having regard to the class of work he has to do?—He should not be much over forty or forty-five; it is very trying work, and a man over fifty does not last long at it.

6. If you were in charge of a station at that age you would rather remain there?—Yes.

7. What class of men are the young constables now?—The majority of them are very good.

8. The exceptions mean that you have to exercise greater supervision?—Yes.

9. That is what a sergeant is for?—Yes.
10. Is it only the result of youth and inexperience or intrinsic badness?—They do not seem to have the same qualifications in regard to intelligence. They are some of them very green, and may improve. The stamp of men is not up to the standard it used to be some years ago, with a few exceptions.
11. Their conduct is fairly good?—Yes.
12. Is the discipline pretty good in this district?—Very good.
13. Do you think promotion is fairly dealt out, or do you hear complaints?—Well, some have been put over me who were of less service, but I make no complaint.
14. You assume there is some adequate reason for their promotion?—Yes.
15. Do you hear anything about political influence or interference?—I have heard of it, but I do not know of any case.
16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to promotion to sergeant, you know that they are first of all placed in a city?—Yes.
17. How long were you in the city before being placed in charge of a station?—Three or four years.

EDWIN MURRAY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 49.)

*Witness:* I am stationed in Dunedin, as district clerk. I have been sergeant since 1907. I joined the Force in February, 1897, and have been district clerk since 1902. Previous to that I was assistant clerk since 1899 in Christchurch. I was district clerk five years before promotion.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was the reason for your promotion?—At the last Commission it was one of the recommendations that the district clerk in charge of an office should take the rank for special reasons, on condition that he was recommended by his Inspector.

2. How many clerks are there in your office?—Two.

3. Is there any reason why the clerks in your office should not go out on beat occasionally, to relieve men from duty?—The question never came up till this Commission. The work of the district office depends greatly on the arrival and despatch of mails. The first mail from the north is in the boxes about 5, and another comes in about 11. On Saturday when the second mail comes in I have to keep a clerk to attend to it. I do the first mail myself, which takes from one to three hours. Another clerk takes up the mail at 11, and passes it to the Inspector's office, the correspondence being dealt with by the Inspector on Saturday night or Sunday morning, and the record clerk has to dispose of that on Sunday morning. If the men had to do duty on Sunday the work of recording would devolve on myself.

4. Why not send them out alternately?—Well, there would not be so much inducement for a constable to work for the position.

5. But there are surely other attractions—the men get not more than six days' work, 1s. extra, and can wear plain clothes?—It is only of late years constables have been offering for this work. I think they should not be required to go on the street. The work they do is altogether different from street duty. They receive, after probation, 1s. a day, and are termed "assistant clerks."

6. They have no rank as such; they are constables. They regard themselves as clerks, and that is the trouble?—If they make a report, they have to sign as clerks.

7. Can you show me that it would be detrimental to the service that these clerks should be sent out on street duty occasionally?—I think they should not go out.

8. Would it be in any way detrimental to the service or to their usefulness as clerks?—It is different work; they would not take the same interest in their office-work.

9. You are cutting the men off from the Police Force, and taking up the ground that they should be assistant clerks, and nothing else?—Yes.

10. What proportion of the men remain in the position of assistant clerks till they work up to be district clerks, and what becomes of the rest?—I do not know. Men who are found unsuitable have to go back to street duty.

11. What does the average suitable assistant clerk work up to?—He has the rank of sergeant to look forward to, and that is the end of his promotion.

12. But there is nothing to prevent your asking for further promotion?—Yes, there is; it was understood that I was to be district clerk only.

*The Commissioner:* Is there anything to prevent him applying if he thinks proper, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Nothing at all. I rather encourage them to go out as sergeants, because they make good men. After years in the office they make better men; but they will not go out.

13. *The Commissioner* (to witness).] You have not a full appreciation of your position?—Yes; I have a full appreciation of the responsibility.

14. The fact remains, it is not quite right to say as a set off to other things that you have to remain a district clerk—that is, at your own option?—That was the understanding when I was promoted.

15. Do you think you are unfit to be a sergeant in uniform?—No.

16. If you wished to be a Sub-Inspector, and go out again into the uniform branch, you have a perfect right to do so?—I should then be entering into competition with the sergeants in the street. The reason of the appointment was the pay.

17. You would rather keep your clerks in your office?—Yes, because I think they would lose interest in their work.

18. Because they are called upon to do a little duty with other members of the Force?—Yes; in the same way as constables doing street duty could not come into the office.

19. How long would it take you to get a constable into shape, assuming he had suitable qualifications?—Eighteen months, or perhaps more.

20. How long do you think it takes me to get a cadet fresh from school into the work of my Court? I cannot understand that it would take eighteen months to get a constable into shape?—If you got a man with exceptional qualifications, it might take less; but it requires more than a Fifth Standard education to do the work in the police office. I passed the Sixth Standard, and went on to a high school, and I cannot say I know too much.

21. But you know enough?—I have had considerable experience.

22. Does not experience often go as far as education?—A man profits by experience.

23. What standard have your two men passed?—I do not know. The qualification is not always the result of education.

24. *Dr. Dinnie.*] You think the longer you have a man in the office the better he is able to perform his duty?—Yes.

25. *The Commissioner.*] And you would not keep them so long if they were sent into the street?—No.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Men would hesitate to apply for the clerical positions if they were sent out in the streets on Sunday?—Yes.

27. At present applications are few?—Yes; there are more in Dunedin than in Christchurch.

28. You do not suggest they should be sent out?—No.

29. Should you say from the work you see that your two clerks have passed more than the Fifth Standard?—I should say so. There are subjects on which they might not have.

30. As regards the "useful" man at each station, have you heard anything of that?—No; only since the Commission started.

31. You are in touch with the men a good deal?—I do not care to gossip in the station.

32. Would not the constables with you tell you?—I should think so.

33. *Inspector O'Brien.*] Your two assistants get Saturday afternoons off pretty regularly?—Yes, but they work in the evening.

MICHAEL MCKEEFRY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 50.)

*Witness:* I joined the Force, after service in the Armed Constabulary, in September, 1887. I was promoted, at the age of forty-eight, to the rank of sergeant in 1908.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Had you applied for promotion for some considerable time?—Yes. I applied in 1904, owing to a paragraph that appeared in the Commissioner's annual report stating that sergeants in the Force were getting old, and that discipline would be better if younger men were promoted, and that plenty of men were eligible of from thirteen to twenty years' service from forty-five to fifty years of age. I received a favourable reply, saying that my application would be considered, but others had a greater claim. I was satisfied till, in December, 1904, a man junior to myself was promoted, and I began to feel annoyed, and applied again. I got a memo. saying that the application would be considered when the next selections were being made. After eighteen months there were other men junior to myself promoted. I saw the Commissioner when he visited the station, and told him. He replied that I should have to pass an examination. Several of these men who were junior to me never passed an examination. I finally sat, and passed it.

2. You were never asked to pass before?—No.

3. Are you aware of any reason why these men were promoted over your head?—No; I do not think they had better claims. Some of them I had taught all they knew.

4. Do you know of any reason why you were not promoted?—No; there are twenty-six who are senior to me now who are junior in the service. In regard to general matters, there seems to be dissatisfaction in this station owing to married men having to go to and fro in uniform; this is not enforced on other stations, and I do not think it should be. They have to do business on their way to and fro, and being in uniform they are sometimes called on to perform police duty, and they have to explain why they are late. I think the men should have more time off on Sunday.

5. Could that be managed in any way?—Men doing light work about the station should be available, such as the clerks. Many a time their services could be used without any disadvantage to the office or the service. There was an instance not long ago where, a man being sent on escort duty to Seacliff, only two men were on the street, while one of the clerks was reading in the library and the other airing himself in the street. It would have been no hardship for them to go on the street at a time like that.

6. It would hurt their dignity?—That is the only thing.

7. Do you think there is much feeling of this sort between the clerks and the men?—I think so; they do not recognise the men as comrades. The men think there is very little show now that the clerks are getting promoted. The office is looked upon as the recruiting-ground for sergeants. As regards men joining the Force, I consider if the men who are not well known were put on probation for a certain time their ability could be known, and it would be of more advantage to the Force. I was placed on probation when I joined, and I was previously in the Armed Constabulary. I consider a watch-house keeper more entitled to extra pay than clerks. He is put in a position where his sheet may be more readily marked. He has to take charge from constables, and if a man is not properly searched, and if he has a match left on him and sets fire to his bedding, he is liable to be fined. A clerk is not subject to anything of this sort. There are plenty of men available for clerks; I have never known one to be put out for not being efficient yet. It has been said that no sergeants have been sent into the street from the office. That is not so in Hogan's case. He is a long way junior to me, but is senior sergeant.

8. How does the men's physique compare nowadays?—It is not so good as it was.

9. To what do you attribute that?—When I joined there were a good lot to select from, and the best were taken. The Armed Constabulary was a good recruiting-ground. Nowadays a man can get as good pay outside the Force, where he is not subject to the same restrictions.

10. This question was a burning one with you at one time?—Yes.



11. You think other men are in the same position?—Yes.
12. You felt you were badly treated?—I did. If I had got what others have I should be now on maximum pay.
13. Are you more efficient to-day than when you were passed over?—I cannot see it. There is a case of a man who is now a month senior to one with ten years more service.
14. What is the general conduct of the men here?—Good.
15. Have you any knowledge of political or other "pull"?—I have heard it spoken of.
16. Do you believe it exists?—I do.
17. Does that account for things you cannot otherwise account for?—It looks like it. I do not see how it can be put down to anything else. The way men are picked out in batches—how could they all qualify if there were not some curious business?
18. What kind of business?—Either themselves or their families "pulling the wires."
19. Does this create much discontent in the Force?—Men think if they cannot do this their prospects are very poor, and they have no chance of rising; it affects the efficiency of the service.
20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Speaking of "wire-pulling" can you tell me an instance?—That is a very hard question.
21. Do you know of one instance?—I could not tell you of one.
22. It is just hearsay?—Yes; I have heard of it ever since I joined. I remember Captain Coleman saying to me when in the A.C. Force, "Well, you have not got into the police yet? I see So-and-so has, but he has two members and you have only one."
23. How do you make out that the clerical department is a recruiting-ground for sergeants?—I said it was going to be.
24. How many cases do you know of a clerk being sent out into the street on promotion?—The case of Hogan, during the Exhibition time.
25. It is not the rule?—I cannot see what is to be done with them in a short time if they are not sent out; they will be all sergeants in the district office. A man who has been ten years in the office gets promoted whether he asks for it or not. You might get one or two to go out into the street, but others will not go out and qualify for higher position.
26. *The Commissioner.*] You have not been long away from Christchurch?—Sixteen months.
27. Is there any feeling of dissatisfaction there in regard to promotion?—Just the same as here, so far as I know.
28. In the detective branch as well?—Yes; I do not consider they are any better treated than others.
29. Has there been any injustice in Christchurch?—Acting-Detectives Gibson and Ward are still acting-detectives; they are as good as any in New Zealand.

WILLIAM ECCLES, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 51.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Dunedin. I was enrolled on the 15th June, 1886, and promoted to be sergeant on the 16th March, 1909. I was recommended by the Inspector of the Auckland District, where I was stationed, in charge of Devonport. As far as I am aware I was senior man amongst those recommended. I am the youngest sergeant on the street, being thirty-seven years of age.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Where were you doing duty as sergeant prior to that?—I came here straight after my promotion.
2. What sort of men are you coming in contact with at the Dunedin Station?—With a few exceptions, the men have been very good.
3. What are the few exceptions composed of?—As regards education, defaulters, and so forth.
4. What kind of breaches are most frequent?—Leaving their beat, and things of that sort.
5. Have you had occasion to report one?—None whatever here. With regard to the rate of pay, I also think it is too small. I should start constables at 8s. a day, and allow them 1s. 6d. a day for house-rent, so as to induce single constables to marry. I think the pay of sergeants should be increased to 11s. a day, with 2s. for house-rent. I also think we should have free uniform and one pair of boots a year. I notice that the 1898 Police Commission recommended two pairs of boots a year, and that recommendation was never carried out. As regards promotion, I think the detective branch of the service are quite as entitled to promotion as I am, and *vice versa*. If a sergeant of police shows exceptional ability in the detection of crime, and applies for a transfer, he should be entitled to a transfer to the detective branch, and rise to the higher ranks in the service. With regard to the district clerks and police storekeepers, I do not think they should be promoted to the rank of sergeant, as that causes a great deal of dissatisfaction. Mugeridge was promoted after six and a half years' service. I believe he is a real good man, though I do not know him personally. He may be entitled to the pay, but I contend he is not entitled to the rank. I think district clerks are quite entitled to the pay they receive, but they should not get the rank of sergeant until they qualify for it. A district clerk may afterwards go out in the street, and although he was junior man in the service he might be promoted station sergeant before his seniors. I would also advocate that constables, sergeants, and detectives travelling on transfer should receive a saloon passage in lieu of steerage as at present, and I think that constables applying for positions in the Force should have at least three years' street duty to start with. Then, I think if married constables are not to be intrusted to go home in plain clothes after finishing their duty they are not entitled to be in the service at all. In connection with all breaches of the regulations brought under the notice of the Inspector, I consider the evidence should be taken on oath. It would be fairer to the sergeant as well as to the men.

This concluded the Dunedin evidence.

OAMARU, WEDNESDAY, 21ST JULY, 1909.

WILLIAM DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 52.)

*The Commissioner:* The Hon. Mr. Jones, at whose invitation the Commission came to Oamaru, is unable to be present. I do not know if there is anything to bring before the Commission. The only matter I am concerned with is the question of whether the district shall continue to be part of the Canterbury Police District or be merged into Otago.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I know of no one coming forward to give evidence unless you wish to take the sergeant's statement as regards the change of district. The only factor in that is as regards correspondence; it is a loss of time to send to Dunedin and back to Oamaru. Another reason is the fact that there is a detective at Timaru, and it is very convenient to get him here at short notice; it would take longer to come from Dunedin, but these matters are trivial.

1. *The Commissioner* (to Mr. Dinnie).] What is your opinion, as Commissioner of Police?—I see no objection to the change; it would work better attached to Dunedin.

2. Geographically it should be part of Dunedin District?—It was originally, and it was only when Southland was worked from Dunedin that the alteration was made.

3. This district could be easily added to Mr. O'Brien's district without placing too much strain on him?—Yes. I think it could be very well worked from Dunedin.

4. *The Commissioner* (to Inspector Gillies).] Mr. Gillies, have you any remark to make on the matter?—I have no objection. The only point is in connection with the correspondence, which would have to go from Wellington to Dunedin and back to Oamaru.

5. But the train service is much better than it used to be, and it would cause little delay?—I have no feeling at all in the matter; I merely mentioned the fact.

6. What would it relieve you of?—Four stations—Hampden, Kurow, Ngapara, and Oamaru.

7. Then, if you and the Commissioner both agree it will be better for me to make a recommendation in my report that the change should be made without going further into the matter?—I may mention that the first express arrives from Christchurch at 12.40, whereas the first from Dunedin arrives at 11.30; consequently, in a matter of urgency the Inspector could be here earlier from Dunedin.

*The Commissioner:* The local feeling being in favour of the change, in a case of this sort, where there is no official objection, I do not see why the change should not be made.

THOMAS GRIFFITHS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 53.)

*Witness:* I joined the Force in March, 1876. I was promoted in February, 1900. I have served as sergeant nearly nine years, in Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Oamaru. I took charge here three years and three months ago. I have five constables and a gaoler on the station. It is a police gaol.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Does that require a gaoler?—There has always been one. I am pleased to say the gaol is not used very frequently.

2. Is the gaoler a police officer?—Yes; he is available for police duties; he is rated as a constable, but is paid by the Prisons Department direct. His name is George Macarthy; he joined the Force in 1899; he is very frequently called on to do police duty, and is always at my disposal. I have three out-stations—Ngapara, Kurow, and Hampden; there is a constable at each place.

3. Has the result of no-license in the district been that you get extra work?—It does not lessen the work, except from the point of view of there not being so many arrests, but otherwise the constables are fully employed.

4. In the detection of sly-grog selling?—It means a great deal of extra work.

5. Has crime diminished in the district?—Considerably.

6. During your experience, have you noticed, in any respect, the physique of the Force is not so good as it used to be? Is there any deterioration in the quality of the men?—No; they are not so large as they used to be—not so robust.

7. But they come up to the standard?—Yes; and their intelligence is very good.

8. Some sergeants I have examined imply that the intelligence of the average young constable is not equal to that of some years ago?—I cannot say that, but I think the constables of some years ago took a greater interest in their work.

9. To what do you attribute this lack of interest in their work?—It is not made attractive from the pay point of view; they think they are underpaid.

10. You have free quarters here?—Yes.

11. Have you anything to say about the sobriety of the men?—I have had men who were not giving satisfaction, but on being reported to the Inspector he had them removed.

12. Was that for being drunk?—In two instances it was.

13. What happened to them?—They were transferred and taken to Headquarters, so as to be under the immediate supervision of the sergeant there. The first one was owing to drink; the other was not giving satisfaction. I had my suspicions, although it was not directly reported, that he was tippling. The first man was reported for being under the influence of liquor. I reported him, and he was allowed to resign.

14. How long were you aware of the habits of these men before they were dealt with?—About three weeks; then I reported the matter immediately. An inquiry was held by the Inspector immediately here, and the result was as I have said.

15. Do you know of any political or other interference with any member of the Force?—I heard of a case where political influence was tried to be used, but it was not effective; it was only hearsay; the man himself did not tell me, but his friends did. This was about six months ago—not on this station, but not far from here.

16. In what direction was influence sought to be used?—The man had been transferred, and his friends used influence with members to have him retained, but unsuccessfully.

17. For what reason was he being transferred?—I think he had been giving dissatisfaction—not under me; I had nothing to do with him. I can give you his name.

18. Have you any views in regard to the method of promotion? Have you noticed anything that calls for remark?—I have not; I think promotion is given according to ability and fitness.

19. You mean the cases you know of appear to you to be proper?—Yes.

20. Under what circumstances were you promoted?—I gave a great deal of satisfaction in the suppression of sly-grog in Balclutha, and my Inspector recommended me for promotion.

21. Were you promoted over the heads of others?—There were seniors to me on that occasion—I should say, about two hundred.

22. You were promoted for special merit?—I should say that is what it was for.

23. Do you think this district could be as well worked from Dunedin as from Christchurch?—There is the matter of an hour and ten minutes in the arrival of the Inspector.

24. Not much difference, whichever way it goes?—No; I have no wish to part from Mr. Gillies.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The man you referred to was transferred notwithstanding the influence sought to be brought to bear?—Yes.

26. There is a feeling that sufficient inquiry is not made in respect to sly-grog selling here: I should like you to say whether special steps are taken?—When I have thought I was unable to cope with sly-grog selling I have reported the matter to Inspector Gillies, and on all occasions he has sent assistance.

27. Strange men have been brought into the district?—Yes; generally young constables.

28. Do they take up the work readily?—Yes.

29. There have been some here when you had no knowledge of it?—Yes; one was here for five weeks without my knowing anything about it.

30. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know anything of a constable having been found drunk in a sly-grog shop?—This is the first I ever heard of it.

31. The constable whose name you mentioned has since left the service?—I could not have said it was a sly-grog shop; he had some beer for his own use, and invited his friends to help him.

32. The general allegation is made that the management of the Force is unsatisfactory, and that no help appears to be given to suppress illegal drinking?—The outside public do not know what is done; if they did they would not talk.

33. Then the allegation goes on to say that a constable was found drunk in a sly-grog shop, and has been retained in the service?—It was not a sly-grog shop; it was a private house. The constable is still in the service in Christchurch. I would not say he was reported for being drunk, but he was under the influence.

34. There is not much difference. You will agree that a constable, once seen under the influence, is unfit to be one?—That was the ground I took.

35. The principal point is the selection of the men sent here to assist you?—The Inspector does that.

36. How long had these men been here?—One for six and the other nine months.

37. Were they specially selected?—I could not say.

38. In order to assist you and to resist the special temptations offered by sly-grog shops, they should be specially selected?—It would be well if they were—specially sober men.

39. What sort of men have you now?—Very good.

40. You have no complaints?—No.

41. Immediately you see grounds for complaint you get rid of a man?—Yes.

42. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I should like this matter cleared up. What was the man you refer to reported for?—Being under the influence of liquor when on duty. The report was submitted to the Inspector, an inquiry was held, and he was transferred.

43. Was the charge of drunkenness proved?—No, he produced a doctor's certificate to prove that he was sober.

44. The case was not proved at all?—No; but he was transferred.

45. But not for drunkenness?—Evidence was given against mine that he was sober.

46. *The Commissioner.*] Are you absolutely certain he was under the influence of liquor?—Yes, but the weight of evidence was against me.

47. Did the doctor say he examined him about the time?—Yes, immediately before I charged him. There was other evidence too, but the Commissioner thought proper to shift him.

48. His conduct had not been satisfactory?—That is so.

*Inspector Gillies:* Some fault seems to have been found with the administration of this district from Christchurch. I feel that very keenly.

*The Commissioner:* The person who supplied me with particulars is not here.

*Inspector Gillies:* I think, in justice to me, I should know who makes the complaint; it affects my administration.

*The Commissioner:* I have no objection to your knowing the contents of the telegram addressed to the Minister of Justice. It is as follows: "Management Oamaru police from Christchurch most unsatisfactory. No help suppress illegal drinking. Alleged policeman found drunk sly-grog shop Oamaru been retained service." Neither Mr. Dinnie nor I take it as a reflection on your administration; it is only unsatisfactory geographically. I think you are taking a wrong view of the matter.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I quite agree. There is no reflection on the Inspector.

*Inspector Gillies:* In that case I take your assurance that I am not affected.

*Witness:* I have been requested by the men to make certain representations. They would like to see the pay increased by at least 1s. a day, and also the house-allowance to married men. Owing to the dearth of houses they think it should be increased by at least 3s.; that is, to 10s. At present there are very few houses to be had in Oamaru. The average rent is about 12s. 6d. They would ask your Worship to recommend an increase to 10s.

*The Commissioner:* I shall probably make some recommendation; I cannot say it will be to 10s.

*Witness:* There is another matter: they desire to have uniforms supplied free. At present they have to pay the cost of making up, which is about £2 5s.; and they wish to be allowed a pair of boots a year. They say the Railway and Telegraph Departments get their uniforms free. I should like to state, in regard to the administration of this district from Christchurch, that the Inspector has been here twice within a little over three months.

*Mr. Dinnie:* As regards boots, the question of supplying them has been tried in different Forces, but the men prefer buying their own. Regulation boots are not a success.

49. *Inspector Gillies* (to witness).] How long have you been in charge?—Three years and three months. I came just before prohibition was carried.

50. Have I not from time to time charged you and your men to use special efforts to detect sly-grog selling in the Oamaru district?—You have.

51. Have I not sent men specially to you—men who were here for six or seven weeks—for no other purpose than the detection of sly-grog selling?—You have.

52. Has anything been left undone, so far as I as Inspector of the district was concerned, for that purpose?—Nothing that you or the police could do has been left undone to suppress sly-grog selling.

*Inspector Gillies:* I look upon that telegram which has been sent to you, sir, as a stab in the dark. You know my administration for many years past.

*The Commissioner:* I do not think it was intended as a stab in the dark, nor do I feel that the person who sent the telegram intended it as a personal reflection upon yourself in the slightest degree.

*Inspector Gillies:* Well, I feel sensitive on the matter.

*The Commissioner:* You are quite at liberty to see the telegram. Perhaps it would be as well that you should be sworn now and examined.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 54.)

*Witness:* I am Inspector of Police in charge of the Canterbury and North Otago District, and have been so for the last seven years and a half.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general evidence you wish to give?—I do not think I need refer to anything at present except the question of sly-grog selling. When prohibition was carried I took special steps to instruct the sergeant and the constables in the district how to detect sly-grog selling, and I have sent men from time to time, even unasked, to the district for that special purpose. On one occasion a special man was here for over six weeks without the knowledge of the sergeant or any of his men, and it was only when I sent the second man that I had to disclose the position to the sergeant. Everything that a police officer could do, to my mind, I have done. The police is not an advertising department, because we do not want the public to know what we are doing all the time. When a complaint is made I think it ought to go to the Inspector of the district instead of to the Minister, so that he may have an opportunity of replying; otherwise the Inspector is placed in a very false position.

2. So far as you are personally concerned, you say you have done all that you possibly could for the suppression of sly-grog selling in your district?—Yes.

3. What have you to say with regard to the administration of the local sergeant?—I am satisfied he has done his best, so far as his judgment goes; in fact, I think he has done all a sergeant could have done. From my observation, I should say sly-grog selling in this district was very limited, and I have no hesitation in saying that a certain section of the community advertise it a great deal more than is necessary.

4. Do you make a practice of sending men periodically to the district for the purpose of detecting this offence, or do you only send them when representations are made to you?—I send them when I believe, from my own observation, it is necessary.

5. Where do you get the men for that work?—Generally, from the depot in Wellington. I make arrangements with the Commissioner to have them sent. I do not think, as a rule, he would send men from Christchurch unless they were young men just appointed in Christchurch. We generally get young men, but the great point is to select the right man for the work.

6. Do you find there is any objection on the part of young constables to enter upon this class of work, or do they take it up willingly as a part of their police duties?—I should not send a man who had the slightest scruple, or who did not like the work. It would be utterly useless to do so. I know they have done their very best, because I have been in communication with them under an assumed name.

7. With regard to the men to serve under the sergeant in this district, do you select men as having special qualifications?—I generally recommend to the Commissioner the men whom I think would be most useful here, because I consider the work we have been speaking about is the principal work here.

8. There are two men whose names have been handed in: do you know anything of their records before they came here?—One of them had a clean default sheet. As to the other, I do not recollect. One of the men was reported for being under the influence of liquor on the morning of a fire. An investigation was held immediately, and the matter submitted for the Commis-

sioner's consideration. He ruled that the charge was not proven. I thought, however, even where there was a suspicion the man should be transferred, and he was transferred at once.

9. Generally speaking, you are exceedingly careful in the selection of the men for a district like this?—Yes. I prefer to have the men against whom there is any suspicion under proper supervision, and they are not sent to out-stations.

10. With regard to administration, do you know of any direction in which it could be improved? Do you think there are any weak spots?—Well, the matter is under our consideration at present.

11. At any rate, you can say that within a short time you hope to effect certain improvements?—Yes.

WILLIAM MILLER MCKENZIE, Carrier, examined on oath. (No. 55.)

The witness tendered evidence with regard to certain complaints which the Commissioner ruled were outside the scope of the inquiry.

This concluded the Oamaru evidence.

TIMARU, THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 1909.

HENRY TEEVAN, Medical Practitioner, examined on oath. (No. 56.)

*Witness:* I am a duly registered medical practitioner, but on account of ill health am not now practising. I wish to make a statement as to the treatment I have received at the hands of Sergeant Mullany, who at the time of which I am about to speak was Constable Mullany. This matter goes back five years ago, and arises out of a collision I had with a man while driving one very dark night about twelve miles from Temuka, where I lived. The name of the place is Peel Forest. I was driving, with my lights burning brightly, on the near side of the road, when suddenly, and without warning, I was rushed into by a cart in which there were two men. The hub of my wheel was struck, and the near light extinguished. I was almost thrown out, and my horse bolted. I felt that I was being rushed to sudden death. When I did manage to pull up, I found that the swingletree was smashed in half, one half retaining its hold on the trap and the other half being suspended to the trace, so that the sharp end was dangling against the horse's side. My rug and other things had been thrown out. I went back along the road to see if any damage had been done to the cart, and to see if I could render any medical aid, but could find neither cart nor driver. I had to get my horse and trap home as best I could. I found out afterwards from the coachbuilder that the axle of my trap was twisted. There is no doubt I had a very narrow escape of losing my life, and the chances were in favour of my lying out all night, dead or alive. On my reaching Geraldine I reported the matter to Constable Mullany, who, however, said it would be almost impossible to find out anything about it. The accident occurred on a Monday, and I went to the constable on the following Tuesday evening, and on the next day again I showed him my swingletree. Seeing that the constable was not going to do anything about it, I determined to find out myself who it was that had run into me, and I offered my own man 10s. if he would find out the owner of the cart for me. Very soon after gaining a certain amount of information by means of telephoning to one of the stores in the district—which cost me 1s. 6d.—and through the Post Office, I found out who the owner was, through the blacksmith's shop where this man's cart had also to undergo repairs. I immediately gave Constable Mullany the name of the man, and he promised on that day (Wednesday) to go and see about it that day. He said he would go to the hotel at which the man had been drinking before the accident and also to Peel Forest. The owner of the cart which ran into me is now dead, so that I do not wish to say anything more about a dead man. On the following Sunday I went to the constable to see what he had done in the matter. He told me I was a most unreasonable man to expect him to go out to the places he had promised to visit. I had a few more words with him, from which I knew that he was not going to inquire further. He did not even carry out his promise to come and see my gig, although I live only about three minutes' walk from the police station. He said it was not his business to do so. He said further, "You are not satisfied, I know. You have got your remedy." I knew what was behind that, of course. However, the day before the case *Police v. Bull* came before the Court, the constable told me that I should be wanted to give evidence. Now, at the time there was no law in force under which a man could be charged with driving without lights, and this man was consequently charged with negligent driving.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was the result?—The case was dismissed, and I was comforted by the Justice of the Peace telling me that if I took a civil action I might probably get damages. At the hearing of the case the constable said to the Justice of the Peace, "Do you not think I did my duty, sir?" And the answer was, "You have done your duty." I then communicated with the Police Commissioner on the 16th August.

[Correspondence between witness and the Police Commissioner read.]

*Mr. Dinnie:* All that correspondence will be found upon the file.

*The Commissioner:* Then I can call for the papers in connection with this case.

*Witness:* Although the constable claims that he did his duty, I want to say that if he had visited the hotel he promised to visit he would have found that the man who ran into me was so beastly drunk that he could scarcely get into his trap. About three months after this the man was promoted.

2. The crux of your complaint is in the fact that the local constable did not act promptly on your information in the matter of inquiry?—Yes, he made next to no inquiry.

3. What is your object in bringing this matter up now?—To show how the Police Force is run.
4. Have you any wider knowledge of the police in other cases?—I have always been on the best of terms with them.
5. How long have you been in practice in Geraldine?—Twelve years.
6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What time of night did the accident occur?—A quarter past 8. The night was inky dark.
7. What time was it when you informed the constable?—About 5 the following day. Having been thrown out of my work by the accident I was unusually busy next morning.
8. Would it not have been better in a matter of this sort to go to the constable in the morning?—There were people waiting for me who ought to have been seen over night.
9. The constable gave you notice to attend the Court?—Yes.
10. And the man was brought forward and summoned and prosecuted: what was the result?—The case was dismissed.
11. *The Commissioner.*] Did you give evidence?—Yes; and was told by two Magistrates that if I had brought a civil action I might get damages.
12. Who else gave evidence?—The sergeant and the man Bull.
13. And the Court considered the case not proven?—Yes.
14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Subsequent to that you allege the local member (Mr. Flatman) and I connived to get this man promoted?—Yes.
15. *The Commissioner.*] You allege that as a fact, in your opinion?—Yes. I said if it was not due to political influence it did the Commissioner no credit.
16. Did not Mr. Flatman deny this?—Yes.
17. Then, you think influence was used on that occasion?—Yes.

ELLIS MILLS, Wharf Labourer, examined on oath. (No. 57.)

*Witness:* I desire to make certain complaints. The first case is in connection with a stack of oats I had, which was destroyed by some boys who pulled the stack to pieces looking for rats. The oats were lying about for a fortnight or three weeks before I knew anything about it, and in the meantime heavy rain had destroyed them. I went to Sub-Inspector Green, and complained to him, and gave him two or three names of boys I knew, and said there were other boys I did not know. I believe it was Detective Connell who made inquiries into the matter, and seven boys were implicated. I wanted only to get some compensation for the destruction of the oats; I did not want to incriminate the boys. The police said they could do nothing except prosecute. I believe Detective Connell would have prosecuted the boys if Mr. Green had allowed him. I said he would have to prosecute them, because I wanted prosecution. In the meantime Mr. Green told me it was not a case for the police to take up, and he advised me to see a lawyer about it. I said it seemed peculiar that the police would take no action.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why?—On account of two certain boys.
2. What was the connection?—They were sons of the gentleman at the head of the Telegraph Office.
3. What had that to do with the Sub-Inspector? How did the inference arise in your mind?—By a word or two that dropped.
4. You infer that because they were sons of a certain person the police refused to prosecute?—Yes. Then there is another matter. I am a large exhibitor at the flower-shows, and every year have been a loser through my tomatoes being nearly all taken. Last year I had 40 lb. or 50 lb. of tomatoes at the show, and they were nearly all taken. I had two express loads of vegetables taken, with the exception of a cabbage or two and some turnips. I spoke to Sub-Inspector Green about it, and he said he would see the committee. I told him the name of one of the boys who had been taking the tomatoes, and I had two witnesses. I had kept two of my boys to look after the exhibits, and they found some boys taking the tomatoes.
5. Did you want the police to prosecute?—Yes, and they refused.
6. Did they give any reason?—No.
7. Then you complained to the Commissioner?—Yes, and you have the reply.
8. Yes. He says, "With reference to your letter of the 24th ultimo, relative to alleged theft of your flowers and stack destroyed, I have the honour to inform you that, as a result of inquiry, it appears to me that as regards the destruction of your stack the local police rightly refused to investigate the matter, as you expressed your intention to proceed civilly against the culprits, hence it was not a matter for police interference; and as regards your missing flowers, it seems evident that at least a number of your exhibits were left behind unclaimed after the show closed, and were no doubt distributed amongst children and others, as is usual on such occasions. The Sub-Inspector to whom you mentioned the matter appears to have informed you of this, and referred you to the show officials. Under the circumstances, I do not consider the police are to blame in the matter, and am satisfied that any genuine criminal matter complained of will receive prompt attention." Do you dispute the correctness of that?—I do.
9. You withdrew your statement that you did not wish to prosecute, and asked the police to do it?—Yes.
10. You withdrew your statement that you did not wish to proceed criminally, and asked the police to do so?—Yes.
11. Did you ever go to the show officials?—Yes; they said it would be the best thing for some one to take action.
12. It was open to you to prosecute yourself. If you are aggrieved at the inaction of the police you could emphasize it better by taking action yourself, which might result in a conviction: that did not enter your mind?—No; I asked Mr. Dinnie what was the best thing to do,

and look at the reply I got. Now, to show a comparison. A boy of mine, seven years old, was playing in the street, and broke a neighbour's window with a stone. They laid an information with the police, and a case was made of it. My wife offered to pay any damages, and the neighbour's wife consented to withdraw the case, but the constable said the charge could not be withdrawn, but must go through. Now, in this case I am a loser to the extent of £4 or £5 in connection with the stack, and about £4 in connection with the other matter.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the stack, you said at first you did not wish to prosecute criminally?—No, I wanted to get compensation.

14. That was your sole object?—Yes.

15. Failing to get compensation, did you not ask the police to prosecute criminally?—Yes.

16. Your whole object being compensation?—Yes.

17. Well, the police do not take action in such matters?—Well, it is a poor lookout if you cannot get compensation or a case looked into.

*The Commissioner:* One of the first principles in connection with the administration of justice and the police is that they must not assist in any matters from a criminal standpoint to extract civil compensation for injury.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards the second case, would you not have accepted compensation in that case?—No.

19. You had evidence against two boys of stealing: what evidence?—By my own two boys.

20. Nothing further?—No.

21. *Sub-Inspector Green.*] How long is it since the stone-throwing happened?—About eight years.

22. I had nothing to do with that?—I believe you were here.

23. When did the loss of the stack happen?—About three years ago.

24. In regard to the vegetables, what was seen taken?—Tomatoes. They were helping themselves freely.

25. Did you see it?—No, but my boys saw them taking them and planting them—4 lb. or 5 lb. perhaps.

26. When you spoke to me about it, did you not say your boys saw a boy take one tomato?—Yes, and more too.

27. Is that not what you told me?—I said "tomatoes."

28. And you said you did not want to bother about that?—No; I left you to do what you thought fit.

29. My recollection is that you said you did not want to bother about the tomatoes?—The tomatoes were the main trouble. My boy saw one boy with others, but he did not know the names of the others.

30. Do you know it is a practice with people to give their exhibits away after a show?—I have nothing to do with other people.

31. But at other shows have you not found it so?—It was not my practice. I have been a loser at other shows.

32. There was no one to look after your exhibits after the show closed?—They were in charge of the officials there, and they ought to have had somebody there.

33. There was, and, as is the usual practice, they were allowed to be taken away?—The committee never got my authority to allow it, because I spoke to them about it.

34. I advised you, did I not, to consult the committee?—I consulted the vice-president, and he told me the best thing I could do was to go to the police and lay a complaint.

HENRY GREEN, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 58.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your recollection of what passed between you and Mr. Mills?—From what I remember, Mr. Mills made a complaint about a small stack of his being damaged by boys who were hunting for rats in the stack, and, as far as I recollect, his own boys were among the culprits. The names of others were obtained and handed to Mr. Mills, but from what Mr. Mills then said, I understood he did not want the prosecution to be proceeded with. He, however, wanted damages out of the parents of the boys, and I advised him to take a civil action in the matter himself. I do not know that O'Connell had anything to do with it, and, if I remember aright, Constable Lewen was here then. With regard to the theft of vegetables, I remember Mr. Mills speaking to me some time after the flower-show, stating that he had lost a quantity of his exhibits after the show. He mentioned that a son of his had seen one boy take a tomato during the show, but that he did not want anything done with regard to that; but he said the exhibits stolen after the show meant a considerable loss to him. I made inquiries, and ascertained that Mr. Mills's exhibits, with others, had been distributed, or allowed to be taken away practically by any one. Some were given to the Old Men's Home and some to the Hospital. That is what I understand usually happens after a show. No one being there at the moment, the things were taken away by any one who was about the place. I thereupon advised Mr. Mills to see the committee about the matter, as I gathered he wanted compensation for the loss of his vegetables. Mr. Mills, I understand, did see the committee, and there was some talk about it, but no further action was taken, either by Mr. Mills or anybody else.

2. You did not consider there were any grounds for a police prosecution?—There was no hope of a conviction.

3. Did you explain this to Mr. Mills?—Yes.

4. How do you account for his attitude towards you to-day?—Well, he has had some little trouble with the police, and I suppose he has some motive for it.

5. *Mr. Mills.*] When I spoke to you about the tomato being taken, did I not give you the name of the boy?—You did.

6. Did not that put another complexion upon it? Was the reason why you did not prosecute because it was a certain boy?—No, you said you did not want the boy to be prosecuted.

7. I emphatically deny that?—Well, we differ about it.

*The Commissioner:* Are not all these exhibits at the close of the show held at the risk of the exhibitor? I think you are aware of that, are you not? So far as my experience goes, the only way in which an exhibitor can protect his exhibits is to take them away as soon as possible after the show is over. People, for some reason, do not appear to regard exhibits at a flower-show as ordinary property, and they help themselves freely.

*Mr. Mills:* How could I take away a couple of express-loads of stuff immediately after the show?

*The Commissioner:* It seems to me your only compensation is not to exhibit again. With regard to the stack of oats, did you instruct the detective not to prosecute?

*Mr. Mills:* No. The detective said he could not prosecute until he had seen Inspector Green about it. Then, when I saw Inspector Green, he said it would rest with the detective as to whether he prosecuted or not.

*The Commissioner:* If the detective had reported to the Sub-Inspector that, in his opinion, after making a few inquiries, there were *prima facie* grounds for a prosecution, the Sub-Inspector would not have dared to refrain from it.

*Mr. Mills:* Why did he not do it? I told them what the boys had done. Sub-Inspector Green says my boys were in it. I can prove they were not there, because they were at school.

*The Commissioner:* You will have to leave it at that. It will be for me to say where the blame lies, if there is any blame.

JOHN GILLESPIE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 59.)

*Witness:* I am a constable, stationed at Temuka. I wish to give evidence with regard to the present system of promotion.

*The Commissioner:* In the telegram you sent me you simply say, 'I desire to place on record the unfairness of the present system of promotion.' Then, to the Sub-Inspector, in your letter, you say, "I beg to report that when the Police Commission sits at Timaru I desire to place certain evidence before the same on matters in connection with the past and present administration of the Police Department. I intend referring to a matter concerning Constable Hammond, who was formerly stationed at Pleasant Point. I would therefore like him to be notified of the fact, so that he may be present if he so desires. I also desire the production of my defaulter's sheet, the entries on which will be referred to by me when before the Commission." If you had given those details to me as Commissioner I should have been able to take your evidence with regard to Constable Hammond to-day, as I should have been able to give the constable the necessary twenty-four hours' notice in writing. But you have written to Sub-Inspector Green, who has nothing to do with the Commission. Where is Constable Hammond now?

*Sub-Inspector Green:* He is in Christchurch.

*The Commissioner:* The evidence on this matter will have to be taken in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] When did you enter the Police Force?—On the 17th July, 1876.

2. Have you any statement to make apart from references to Constable Hammond?—In October, 1899, as you are aware, there was a Commission held to inquire into the administration of the Force, and, owing to the unsatisfactory state of the service, Commissioner Tunbridge was brought from Home to reorganize the Department. Under this reorganization the status of the whole Force was altered, and country constables were left in the lower branches of the service. There were twelve branches when Mr. Tunbridge came, and he reduced them to six. I was at the bottom, and I thought I had been long enough there, more especially as I had been passed over by the Commissioner. I applied to the Commissioner for promotion, as I thought it was my only chance of reaching a higher grade and retiring with a higher pension than I would if I remained a constable.

3. How old are you now?—I am fifty-eight years of age. I made my application in 1899. I will read it in full, because I would ask you to place the applications of those who were promoted over me alongside of mine, and see which were the most deserving. I have no complaint whatever to make with regard to those who were promoted before I made my application. I would refer you, sir, to the regulations with regard to promotions. This is the application I made:—

"Having served in the New Zealand Police Force (not A.C. Force) as a constable during the past twenty-three years, and having always during that time endeavoured to do my duty according to the oath of office I took when appointed, I have formed the opinion that I am now entitled to some advancement in the service. Since I received my appointment I have never, directly or indirectly, asked for advancement, favour, or reward from any person either in or out of the Police Force. I have at times had to claim what is every man's right—namely, justice—and I think that has misled the Commissioner in judging my character and capabilities when he was selecting men for promotion. In submitting this application I am placed at a disadvantage, owing to my present Inspector having little knowledge of my ability, energy, or general fitness for promotion, as I have only been twelve months under his supervision. Some of the Inspectors who knew me best are not now in the Police Force—two are dead, and others retired. The only two left whom I have served under are Inspector Pender and Pardy, and I am not aware that either of those two Inspectors ever had any cause to complain of me in any way whatsoever during the time I served under them. I think they will bear me out in saying that I was always equal to any duty I was ever asked to perform. To give the Commissioner a slight idea of some of the police duties I have performed over twenty years ago when I was in charge of Palmerston North Station, I attach a list of crimes and offences that passed through my hands at that station, and if Inspector Goodall (who was my Inspector then) was now in the service he would, I am certain, certify that I was then deserving of promotion. I attach two memos. that I received from him to show that it was not through outside influence that I obtained promotion from third- to first-class constable so long



ago as 1879. I also attach newspaper report of what was the direct cause of my promotion to first-class constable. Palmerston North district in those days contained a large population of half-civilised Natives, who, owing to land and other disputes, used to give the Government a deal of trouble, and I had many difficult and dangerous duties to perform amongst those Natives, but I managed the duties in such a way that when the Native trouble, and what is known as the late Mr. Ballance's 'one-policeman policy,' commenced that gentleman selected me as the most suitable police officer to be placed in charge at Parihaka to keep the peace there in those troublesome times. The *Evening Post* newspaper commented on the selection in words that gave a clear indication of what the late Mr. Ballance's opinion of me was. I attach the paragraph referred to. I did not go to Parihaka, because Inspector Parry, who was in command of the district, wanted a man that he knew personally, I being a stranger to him at the time. Nevertheless, he selected me to fill the post vacated at the White Cliffs by the transfer of Captain Messenger and his armed force. Seeing that I have been passed over and left to make this application, I respectfully ask the Commissioner to ascertain from some of the Stipendiary Magistrates of the colony whom I have served under as Clerk of the Court what their opinions are in regard to my ability and general fitness for promotion to sergeant. (I attach names and addresses of the gentlemen I refer to.) I also attach for perusal Audit Inspector's report for Court work done at Foxton, my last station. At the time I was placed in charge of Foxton district it was a hotbed of crime and disorder, but, owing to the manner I dealt with the criminals and evildoers that existed there, the district became one of the quietest in the colony. The late Inspector Thompson, who was in command, on more than one occasion complimented me on the way I dealt with the law-breakers. Temuka (my present station), now proclaimed a borough, is, I submit, of sufficient importance to warrant my Inspector recommending my application from a district point of view. I hope that it will be understood that the cause of this application is only my desire to be placed on a level with men who were not in the Police Force until many years after the date of my appointment. I attach for perusal some newspaper remarks *re* my conduct, which are a fair sample of hundreds of other remarks made in newspapers from time to time concerning my doings and treatment. The Commissioner will no doubt give this my first application for advancement his earnest consideration. — JOHN GILLESPIE.—The Commissioner of Police, Wellington."

"Palmerston North Station, from June, 1877, to April, 1884.—List of crimes and offences that passed through the hands of Constable Gillespie when in charge of Palmerston North Station, from June, 1877, to April, 1884: Abusive language, 16; Animals Protection Act, 2; attempting to shoot a woman, 1; assault (common), 8; attempt to have carnal knowledge of a girl under twelve, 1; application for prohibition order, 3; assaults on police, 2; aiding and abetting to commit felony, 2; Arms Act, 1; breach of peace, 34; being in public place with intent to commit a felony, 1; Beer Duty Act, 4; cattle-stealing, 1; cruelty to animals, 6; cutting and wounding, 1; drunk, 192; distillation (illicit stills), 9 (fines, £400); embezzlement, 1; forgery, 9; false pretences, 7; gaming and lotteries, 3; horse-stealing, 11; indecent assaults, 1; illegally on premises, 14; insulting language, 1; indecency, 4; lunacy, 18; larceny, 35; Licensing Act, 30 (fined £20); murder, 3; minor offences, 105; malicious injury to property, 17; obscene language, 30; obstructing Government survey, 1; obstructing police, 10; other arrests, 7; Public Works Act, 28; perjury, 4; resisting police, 6; receiving stolen goods, 5; stealing from the person, 5; suicide, attempt, 5; Stamp Act, 3; vagrancy, 30.—Acted as Bailiff of Magistrates' Court nearly all the time I was in Palmerston North; Pound-keeper and Ranger; officer of Customs; Inspector of Weights and Measures; Immigration Officer; and General Government Agent. Attended about fifty inquests. Dog-tax collector for the Borough of Palmerston North and County of Manawatu. And, with the exception of the Offences Arms Act (1), distillation, illicit (9), and murder (3), I had no assistance from any person. I had the sole management of all cases that arose in the district."

"16th March, 1900.—Report and application of Constable John Gillespie relative to his application for promotion.—On the 1st day of October last I submitted to the Commissioner, through you, an application for promotion. The Commissioner, on the 7th day of October, duly acknowledged receipt of the application, and intimated that it would receive full consideration when future promotions were made. I now note by the *Police Gazette*, 1900, pages 34 and 46, that Constable Thomas Griffiths, No. 433, Alexander Cruickshank, No. 281, and Samuel P. Norwood, No. 416, have been promoted to the rank and pay of sergeants since my application was submitted. As the recently promoted men are years junior to me in the service, and I am not aware that any of them have ever publicly or privately shown any exceptional merit or performed any specially valuable service to the colony to entitle them to promotion before me, I am at a loss to know why I have been rejected and these men elevated to the position I claimed to be justly entitled to according to my past publicly proved efficient police service and personal fitness for promotion. After noting the recent promotions, I can only infer that my application has been fully considered by the Commissioner and rejected. I therefore respectfully ask for a return of my application papers. — JOHN GILLESPIE, Constable 192.—Sergeant Fraser, in charge of Police, Timaru."

"Police, 00/480.—Police Department, 19/3/00.—Memoranda.—INSPECTOR ELLISON,—Constable Gillespie's application is a departmental document, and cannot therefore be returned. To be plain with the constable, I may say I do not consider he possesses the tact, &c., required to make a good superior officer, and until I have reason to alter my opinion of him I certainly shall not bring his name forward for promotion. His latest report only confirms me in the opinion I have formed of this constable. Let him be informed as above, and return to him the documents he submitted with his application.—J. B. TUNBRIDGE, Commissioner, 19/3/00."

"SERGEANT FRASER,—Please inform Constable Gillespie accordingly, and return him the documents.—T. O'BRIEN, Sub-Inspector, 21/3/00.—For Constable Gillespie: C. Fraser, Sergeant No. 29, 23/3/00."

“ Temuka, 26th March, 1900.—Report and explanation of Constable Gillespie relative to his application of the 16th instant, and the Commissioner’s remarks thereon: I desire to respectfully explain that when I submitted my report and application of the 16th instant for the return of my application for promotion papers I was careful to word the application in respectful language, and submitted it in accordance with Regulation No. 71. I regret to find that my action in asking for the return of the papers in question has caused the Commissioner to come to the conclusion that I am not possessed of sufficient tact to make a good superior officer of the New Zealand Police Force. I submitted my application for promotion under the belief that my character, conduct, and manner in which I had performed my duties as a first-class constable during the past twenty-one years would be inquired into by the Commissioner, and that he would have judged my fitness for promotion accordingly. It was my first application for reward for past services, and it will be my last. I am thankful to the Commissioner for plainly intimating that I will not receive promotion. My reason for asking for the return of the papers was only my desire to know the result of the Commissioner’s inquiry, and to know what chance I had of promotion, so that I might be in a position to consider whether or not it would be to my advantage to remain longer in the service. Surely after twenty-four years of honest service the Commissioner will not find fault with me in my desire to, if possible, better my position. Notwithstanding the severe censure of the Commissioner, I will, so long as I remain in the service, continue to honestly perform my duties as a constable, and will always endeavour to comply with the regulations, feeling satisfied that I have been the victim of misjudgment.—JOHN GILLESPIE, Const. 192.—Sergeant Fraser, Timaru.” That is my application.

4. You never renewed it?—No; why should I? I received a telegram two or three months afterwards from Commissioner Tunbridge asking me to meet him at the train, and I met him at Timaru. I am not going to repeat what he said, but he led me clearly to understand that it was not his fault.

5. Whose fault did he imply it was?—The Minister’s.

6. Who was the Minister at that time?—I cannot say from memory. He gave me clearly to understand the Ministers were to blame, and not he. I should like to point out that he said I was not possessed of sufficient tact. In reference to that, I should like to remark that prior to the last election a high official came to Timaru to make a selection of a man to represent the Department in the electoral line, and he selected me, and I was appointed Registrar of Electors and also Returning Officer. I opposed taking these appointments, but they were forced upon me, and I will read letters to show the manner in which I discharged the duties to the satisfaction of the public and all concerned. [Letters read.] After such recommendations, I think I must possess some tact.

7. You see, the person who said you possessed none has left the Dominion?—That is so, but the Government is still here. I ask you, in Wellington, to place Sub-Inspector Norwood’s application beside mine, and say whether I should not have received equal promotion. I am not finding fault with any one else’s promotion; they are excellent officers—perhaps better than I; I only say my application received no consideration whatever.

8. What time elapsed between your receipt of the minute from Mr. Tunbridge and his conversation with you at the railway-station?—About two months.

9. What is your object in bringing up these matters now? You have apparently accepted the position?—In justice to those who are not receiving promotion—to show that the present system is unworkable.

10. If you can show me a weak point in the administration of the present Commissioner there might be something in it?—I have served under six Commissioners, and I believe Mr. Dinnie is the best we ever had in the Dominion.

11. If he is working on a new principle, how is that affected by these matters of years ago?—It shows that men who are really deserving of promotion are not receiving it.

12. Then, Mr. Dinnie is still liable to criticism?—Well, he is responsible.

13. Can you give any concrete instance in which the present Commissioner has failed to recognise the claims of men for promotion?—No. The men are not selected according to ability.

14. Whose fault is that?—I blame the Government, and the system the Commissioner is working under.

15. What system?—No proper system at all.

16. Are not promotions always rather a question of individual merit, and is it not largely a matter of personal opinion as to whether a man merits promotion?—That is so. I have no fault to find with the men who were selected before myself. But if a man applies for promotion the Commissioner ought to give the application consideration when making an appointment.

17. Can you give me an instance in which he has not done so?—My own.

18. But that is ancient history—I am dealing with the administration of to-day?—The same system is in force to-day.

19. Can you give me an instance in which you think political influence has governed promotion?—No; but it is a well-known fact that political influence is used in all branches of the service. I would also refer you to my defaulter’s sheet, because it may be said that there was something against my character or reputation, and I can give an explanation to every one of those entries.

*The Commissioner:* I cannot go into the question of your defaulter’s list, because every one of those matters has been already dealt with judicially by the persons in authority.

*Witness:* I should like the defaulter sheet read, because I am writing a book on my experiences in the police service, and in that book I shall be able to explain all those things. [Defaulter’s sheet read.] As to the question of political interference, I should like to give one illustration of the manner in which men suffer through political interference, and how it is used in attempts to

deprive men of their stations. This particular complaint relates to myself, and it was sent by a member of the Legislative Council—the Hon. Mr. Jeremiah Twomey, a well-known New Zealand politician. I will read the whole of the official correspondence relating to the case:—

“Police—05/976.—New Zealand Police Department.—Received, 11/5/05.—From Hon. J. M. Twomey, Temuka, M.L.C.—Subject: Forwards complaint of Mr. M. N. Herapath against Constable Gillespie. Memorandum.—INSPECTOR GILLIES,—Please investigate and report.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, 11/5/05.

“SERGEANT WARRING,—For immediate attention.—R. J. GILLIES, Inspector, 13/5/05.

“CONSTABLE GILLESPIE,—Please report exactly what took place on the day in question. You will also call upon Constable Fraser for a report of the facts.—W. WARRING, Sergt., 15/5/05.

“CONSTABLE FRASER,—Please report, as requested.—JOHN GILLESPIE, Const. 192, 18/5/05.”

“‘Temuka Leader,’ ‘Geraldine Guardian.’ J. M. Twomey, Proprietor.—6th May, 1905.—The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—DEAR SIR,—As requested, I enclose to you the complaint of Mr. Herapath against Constable Gillespie, in Temuka. Mr. Herapath is a very wealthy English gentleman who, with his wife, has spent several fishing seasons in Temuka; both most courteous, urbane, and inoffensive people, and extremely well liked. Constable Gillespie must have known them, as they are known to almost everybody. I find on inquiry that on the morning in question Constable Gillespie, accompanied by his subordinate constable, made the annual inspection of the hotel between 10 and 11 o’clock. When they reached the Crown Hotel, where Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were staying, Mr. Phillips, the licensee, was at the bank. They were asked to delay the inspection until the landlord came back, but they refused to do so, and went through every room in the house, unaccompanied by any one. They entered the bedrooms and other rooms in the most unceremonious manner, and, amongst others, the private suite of rooms Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were occupying. I think that to inspect hotels at such an early hour is wrong, and that to enter rooms without knocking is outrageous. People here are highly indignant at the way Mr. and Mrs. Herapath have been treated. This is a sample of the manner in which Constable Gillespie does his duty. There is scarcely a man of standing in the town, and, indeed, in places beyond it, who has not asked me to try and get him shifted. I have always refused, telling them to make a report, although I am told that he has boasted that I have been trying to get him shifted for three or four years. You know, at any rate, that I never did anything of the kind. How I came to get Mr. Herapath’s letter is that I went in to the hotel immediately after the affair took place. Mr. Herapath asked me would I do anything in it. I told him if he put his complaint in writing I would forward on to you. I did not then know that he was leaving for Wellington that day; if I had, I would have recommended a personal interview with yourself. It is very easy to get other instances of his conduct just as bad as this, but it is no business of mine to report them.—Yours truly, J. M. TWOMEY.”

“52, The Terrace, Wellington, 5th April, 1905.—DEAR SIR,—I shall feel greatly indebted to you if you will kindly submit through the proper quarters a serious complaint that I wish to make against Inspector Gillespie, of Temuka. My complaint is as follows: On the morning of the 4th May, about 10.30, when my wife and I were in our private sitting-room (the door marked ‘Private’) in the Crown Hotel, Inspector Gillespie, accompanied by Constable Fraser, opened the door without knocking, giving no reasons for intrusion. My wife asked them if they were in search of any one, we naturally supposing they would not take such liberty without a search-warrant. Inspector Gillespie replied, ‘We are on the annual inspection of hotels,’ or words to that effect. He also asked if we had any complaints to make. I told him we found the hotel most comfortable and orderly. I must state that Mr. Phillips was out at the time they came, so I had to wait until his return to find out the meaning of their unwarrantable intrusion. I determined to speak to Inspector Gillespie myself, and waited till he and Constable Fraser returned up the street. I stopped Inspector Gillespie, and asked him if he would tell me on what authority he had intruded on us without asking our leave, or accompanied by the lessee, Mr. Phillips. With an insolent gesture, he walked away. I followed him, again asking him to give me reasons. He entered the Post-office letter-box room, where Constable Fraser was standing, and said, ‘Do you hear what this man says?’ I repeated my question, to which he answered, ‘Who are you?’ I told him I was a British subject, and as such had a perfect right to a reply to why he had intruded; and failing to get an answer, as he joined Constable Fraser and walked away, I told him that it was a most unwarrantable intrusion; and there are those who can vouch for what I have said. Now, sir, I consider that I am entitled to an apology from Inspector Gillespie. I do not know what the powers of the police in this country are, or if the Government will allow such treatment as I received to be passed over unnoticed, but I feel sure that if it were known the English travelling public would think twice before putting themselves in such a position. I think those with whom I have come in contact in Temuka will bear me out when I say I have not been wanting in courtesy, and I have certainly met with it always all over this colony until now. I shall be at the above address in Wellington for a fortnight should any official wish to see me. I have no intention of letting this matter drop; but I feel sure that you will see that this complaint of mine is quite just. I am much obliged to you for assistance in bringing this matter before the proper authorities.—Believe me, yours faithfully, MERVYN WILFRED HERAPATH.—The Hon. J. M. Twomey.”

“Police Station, Temuka, 19th May, 1905.—Report from John Fraser, Constable No. 807, relative to inspecting the Crown Hotel in company with Constable Gillespie, and the complaint of Mr. Herapath: I beg to report that about 11 a.m. on the 4th of the present month, in company with Constable Gillespie, we entered the Crown Hotel for the purpose of inspecting the premises, to report for the annual licensing meeting. The only person I saw when we entered was the barmaid. Constable Gillespie told her we were just going to have a look through the house for report

for the annual meeting. The porter came into the passage, and passed the remark, 'You had better wait till the boss comes in, or there will be trouble if you don't.' Constable Gillespie replied, 'There is no occasion for any trouble.' We then went upstairs, and had a look through some of the rooms, of which the doors were nearly all open. Constable Gillespie opened a sitting-room door. I was a few paces from him, standing on the landing at the head of the staircase. I heard him say, 'I beg your pardon, I thought there was no one in the room,' to some person inside. He had hold of the knob of the door, and when it was half opened I saw Mr. Herapath. Constable Gillespie told him that we were just having a look through the premises to report to the annual licensing meeting, and at the same time asked Mr. Herapath, who was exceedingly affable in his demeanour, if he was comfortable, or had he any complaints to make about the house; and Mr. Herapath replied that he was quite comfortable. Constable Gillespie said, 'I am very pleased to hear it,' and nothing further took place. We did not enter the room, nor did I see any other person there except Mr. Herapath himself. After inspecting the remainder of the premises we went up the street and inspected three other hotels. About 12 noon we returned to the Post-office. I went into where the private boxes are to see if there were any letters. Constable Gillespie entered and said, 'This man wants to know why we entered his room.' As I was closing the box Mr. Herapath said to me, 'How dare you enter my private room without a warrant?' He appeared to be very angry, so I did not give him any answer. Constable Gillespie walked out, and I followed him. We went across the street, in the direction of the Police-station. Mr. Herapath followed us across the street, and said, 'I will ask you one more question: will you acknowledge that you entered my private sitting-room without a warrant?' Neither Constable Gillespie nor myself made any answer, but walked towards the Police-station.—JOHN FRASER, Constable No. 807.—Constable Gillespie, in charge, Temuka."

"Police-station, Temuka, 19th May, 1905. — Report of Constable Gillespie relative to the attached complaint of the Hon. J. M. Twomey and Mr. M. N. Herapath, late of Temuka, but now of Wellington: I beg to report that on the 4th instant, at 11 a.m., Constable Fraser and myself (in uniform) entered the Crown Hotel at Temuka for the purpose of making an inspection of the premises in accordance with section 44 of 'The Licensing Act, 1881'; and section 180 of the same Act gave me, as the Inspector of Licensed Houses for the Geraldine Licensing District, power to enter the premises in question during business-hours and make such inspection. In section 4 of the Act of 1881 the premises to be inspected is clearly defined. On entering the hotel we saw no one about except the barmaid, who I informed that we had called to have a look over the house to make a report for annual licensing meeting. As we left the barmaid, a young man who is porter at the hotel saw us, and said, 'You had better wait until the boss comes in, or there will be trouble.' I said, 'There is no occasion for any trouble.' Then went upstairs, followed by Constable Fraser. Looked round the landing and bedrooms, the doors of same being open, and no person in the rooms. There are two public sitting-rooms opening on to the landing, with doors marked 'Private.' Both have been used as public sitting-rooms ever since I have been inspecting the house. The door of one of those rooms was open. We entered it, and looked around; then passed to the next room. The door was closed. I opened it, and saw a man and a woman there, and who I was afterwards informed were Mr. and Mrs. Herapath, who had been staying at the hotel for a day or two. When I saw the persons in the room I did not enter, but merely said, 'I beg your pardon, I thought there was no one in the room; we are just having a look through the premises to make report for annual licensing meeting.' I asked Mr. Herapath if he was comfortable, or had he any complaints to make about the house. He said, 'No; we are quite comfortable.' I said, 'I am pleased to hear you say so.' I did not enter the room; neither did Constable Fraser. I then closed the door, leaving both Mr. and Mrs. Herapath seemingly pleased and in good humour. We then looked over other parts of the house, but entered no private sitting-rooms or bedrooms used by the licensee, his servants, or his family. When I do inspect the whole of the premises I always give the licensee notice that I will do so at a time stated. On this occasion there was only an inspection of the public parts of the premises. After inspecting three other hotels we returned to the Post-office at 12 noon. Constable Fraser went in to the letter-box to get the letters, and just after he left me Mr. Herapath came from the Crown Hotel, which is just opposite the Post-office, and said to me, in an angry and most insolent manner, 'By what authority did you enter my private room without a search-warrant?' Mr. Phillips, the licensee of the hotel, was standing on the footpath in front of the hotel smiling and looking towards us. From Mr. Herapath's manner and the position of Mr. Phillips I formed the opinion that Mr. Phillips had influenced Mr. Herapath to accost me and endeavour to create some trouble for the purpose of doing what he has done — viz., to obtain matter for a report against me; and being of that opinion I merely said, 'Who are you?' I did not know Mr. Herapath by name, but had seen him about the district at times. He replied, 'A British subject.' He said nothing more, and I, being of the opinion as stated, walked away from him and went into the Post-office, where Constable Fraser was. Seeing Mr. Herapath following, I said to Constable Fraser in an undertone of voice, 'This man wants to know why we entered his room.' Mr. Herapath then addressed himself to Constable Fraser. I walked out on to the street; Constable Fraser shortly afterwards followed me, and so did Mr. Herapath, who again said, 'I will ask you one more question: will you acknowledge that you entered my private sitting-room without a search-warrant?' Neither Constable Fraser nor I answered him, but walked on towards the Police-station, and Mr. Herapath went over to Mr. Phillips. About 2 p.m. same day Mr. William Gregson Aspinall, who is a solicitor in practice at Temuka, informed me who Mr. Herapath was. The above is the true facts of all that took place on the occasion referred to, and, summed up, Mr. Herapath's complaint is simply that, while in the performance of my police duties, I opened the door of a public sitting-room in the Crown Hotel at Temuka at 11 o'clock in the day and looked in on him and his wife, who made no complaint at the time, but an hour afterwards, on being apparently influenced by Messrs. Phillips, Aspinall, and Hon. J. M. Twomey,

endeavoured to cause words, or some unpleasantness to take place, with the view of founding a charge of wrongdoing against me as a police constable, and which he has done to the Minister of Justice through the medium of the Hon. J. M. Twomey, who has seen fit to apparently arrange with Mr. Herapath to write the letter and transmit it from Wellington to him to enable him (Mr. Twomey) to submit the same to the Minister with his own comments thereon. Mr. Twomey says in his letter that he has made inquiry into the matter, and that we entered every room in the house, bedroom and others. That assertion is false, and his pointing out and submitting that my actions on the occasion mentioned is a sample of the manner in which I do my duty shows a very marked bias against me; and, further, in his letter he says, 'There is scarcely a man of standing in the town, and, indeed, in places beyond it, who has not asked him to try and get me shifted, and that he has always refused, telling them to make a report.' I respectfully submit that when a person who is a Justice of the Peace and a member of the Legislative Council of the colony deems it his duty to become the medium of transmitting a complaint to the Minister of Justice against a police constable, and in doing so pens a letter to the Minister condemning the constable and insinuating that all the respectable men of Temuka and places beyond it have endeavoured from time to time to influence him (Mr. Twomey) to get me shifted, some notice must be taken of the allegations made. No constable would be safe in doing his duty if such a person as Mr. Twomey is allowed to place on record such insinuations, and in not one single instance or manner does he seek to show or attempt to prove that I have at any time during my term of service at Temuka been guilty of any wrongdoing or neglected my duty in any manner or form; and Mr. Twomey further states in his letter that it is no business of his to report them. Then why has he deemed it his duty to assist Mr. Herapath? It certainly looks as if Mr. Twomey had asked Mr. Herapath to assist him in condemning me. I submit that, as Mr. Twomey has apparently no cause for any complaint himself against me, and as he is certainly unable to quote one single instance of wrongdoing or neglect of duty on my part, his insinuations and false assertions should not, and I feel sure will not, be accepted as proof that I have been guilty of any alleged wrongdoing, or even incivility, to any person whilst discharging my police or other duties here. On the 8th November, 1899, Mr. Twomey made a complaint of a similar nature as the attached against me with the view of getting me shifted from Temuka. On that occasion it was found that Mr. Twomey's complaint was in substance a falsity; and so it is on this occasion; and I feel sure that Mr. Twomey cannot name or produce a single respectable citizen of Temuka, or any person in the colony, who can prove (not insinuate) or even point to any neglect of duty or wrongdoing on my part as a police constable or private individual. I court the fullest inquiry into all my doings, either public or private, at Temuka or elsewhere; and it would be well for Mr. Twomey if he could court the same full inquiry into his character and reputation.—JOHN GILLESPIE, Const. 192.—Sergeant Warring, in charge of police, Timaru."

"New Zealand. Police—05/976.—Police-station, Timaru, 20th May, 1905.—Report of Sergeant Warring, No. 202, relative to attached complaint of Mr. Herapath: I respectfully report that, from inquiry made, I am inclined to think this complaint has been made by Mr. Herapath at the instigation of one or two others. Mr. Phillips at this time felt bitter towards Constable Gillespie for having only a week or so before summoned him for having served a Native youth, nineteen years of age, with liquor, he being then and there in a state of intoxication. I also find that Mr. Aspinall, solicitor, of Temuka, who is very friendly with Mr. Herapath, and also the Hon. Mr. Twomey, would like to see Constable Gillespie removed from Temuka, as the constable will not give him any information and bend to his wishes. The constable has no doubt crossed a few of the residents in that part over getting the pound removed off police grounds; but, apart from this, I am unable to find a single one who can point out anything he has done or left undone that would reflect on his conduct; and I am confident that were the Inspector to come to Temuka and hold a most searching inquiry nothing could come out against the constable but what would be to his credit. Constable Gillespie is of a very independent disposition, and very straight, so much so, in fact, that it doubtless at times causes him to be disliked by those who for motives of their own would like a more pliable man, but to my mind he is the right man in the right place. It appears the sitting-room Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were in, although marked 'Private,' was nevertheless a public room, and has always been counted as such by different licensees, and returned on the reports of licensed houses. The Hon. Mr. Twomey says 11 o'clock in the morning is too early an hour to inspect hotels; but I beg to differ from him. I think it is a reasonable hour, and that the rooms should be tidy by that time. It might have been better, seeing that Mr. Phillips was out, and that his wife was from home, if the constable had got one of the servants to accompany him upstairs and through the house. I always make it a point to do so myself, for many reasons; and I would certainly not enter any room if door closed without knocking, and Constable Gillespie tells me he would not have done so had he thought for one moment Mr. and Mrs. Herapath were there. The Hon. Mr. Twomey says the people about Temuka are highly indignant over the matter; if this is so, the people have a wonderful command over their feelings, for not a whisper of the thing can be got by me in or about the place.—WILLIAM WARRING, Sergeant No. 202."

"Submitted to the Commissioner.—I have never had a complaint against Constable Gillespie, and I have always found him to be a good officer with considerable ability, and it is hard to imagine that he would act as alleged.—R. J. GILLIES, Inspector, 23/5/05.

"The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—I consider Constable Gillespie one of the best constables in the service. His explanation in respect to the complaint requires little comment, beyond a remark that it would have been, under the circumstances, more discreet to have asked a servant to accompany him during his inspection. I am satisfied that otherwise nothing whatsoever can be brought forward but what is creditable to the constable, whose officers can testify thereto.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 27/5/05.

"I have carefully considered these reports, and I think Constable Gillespie acted most indiscreetly in his method of inspection, and he should be cautioned, and informed a like method should not again be adopted.—J. McG., 9/6/05.

"INSPECTOR GILLIES,—Please caution Constable Gillespie to be more discreet in his method of inspection in future, and to always invite the licensee or one of his servants to accompany him during inspection. (Not to be entered.)—W. DINNIE, Commr., 7/6/05."

"N.Z. Police Force, District Office, Christchurch, 10/6/05.—SERGEANT WARRING,—*Re* complaint against Constable Gillespie, who inspected the Crown Hotel, 'Temuka, offensively,' Police 05/976 attached. Please notify the constable of the remarks indorsed thereon by the Commissioner, dated 9/6/05.—JOHN DWYER, Sub-Inspector, for Inspector.—10/6/05. (366/05.)

"CONSTABLE GILLESPIE,—Please note.—W. WARRING, Sergeant No. 202, 12/6/05."

"Temuka, 7th July, 1905.—Report and explanation of Constable J. Gillespie relative to the attached correspondence: I note the remarks of the Minister for Justice indorsed on the correspondence, and respectfully submit to the severe censure contained therein. I also note the Commissioner's and my superior officers' remarks with much satisfaction; their approving remarks inspires me to still continue to discharge my police duties in an honest and faithful manner to the Department. I have been twenty-eight years an Inspector of Licensed Houses, and Mr. Twomey's complaint is the first occasion that any complaint has been made against me in connection with my duties therewith. I feel sure that that complaint would never have been made only I was directed by Inspector Gillies to prosecute Robert Vyse Phillips, the licensee of the Crown Hotel, for an alleged breach of the licensing law. I attach a newspaper report of the prosecution I refer to, and submit that it will be seen thereby that the police prosecution against the licensee of the hotel was the real cause of Mr. Twomey's complaint, and not my mode of hotel inspection. I would also like to place on record that Sergeant Warring is in error in believing and stating that I had crossed a few of the residents of Temuka by my action *re* the removal of the public pound from police reserve; that is not correct, for, as a matter of fact, the Chairman and all the members of the Temuka Road Board and myself are on most intimate and friendly terms. The same remarks apply to the Mayor and Councillors of the Borough of Temuka, and the citizens of Temuka are much pleased over the removal of the pound from the police reserve. It was a very great eyesore to the citizens, and was situated close to their domain gates. I can assure Sergeant Warring that I have the respect and confidence of all law-abiding and right-minded persons in the Temuka Police District. There are certainly a few rogues and evil-doers in Temuka who would like to see a more pliable constable here, but those persons are only a very few, and they are unworthy of notice except to know and pity them. I will certainly keep the remarks of the Minister for Justice in mind, and will in the future be extremely careful in my mode of hotel inspection.—CONSTABLE No. 192.—Sergeant Warring, in charge of Police, Timaru."

20. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish me to deduce from that? The matter has been dealt with by the Minister. Do you wish me to understand that the Minister has been influenced by Mr. Twomey?—I should call that political influence.

21. I see no evidence of it. The Minister, in the exercise of his discretion as political head of the Department, has dealt with the matter?—I think there should be some regulation under which a matter like that should be sent to the Stipendiary Magistrate for full inquiry.

22. There was some regulation to that effect, but I believe it is a dead-letter?—That is my reason for submitting these papers. I should like to say that during my period of service under the present officers I have no fault to find with them. I have always had justice and fairness from them.

23. Then, you have no fault to find?—No; but they are endeavouring to carry out a system that is unworkable.

24. How do you propose to improve it?—I would suggest that there should be an Appeal Board to deal with all complaints of a serious nature against constables.

25. It would affect the discipline of the Force. You have now the political head, the Commissioner, and the Inspectors, who ought to be capable of governing the Force. You consider you have suffered injustice, and you apply it to the general administration of the Force?—It is the fault of the system.

26. What is the good of my going into your complaint? The position is passed; you are past the age for promotion?—I am not looking for it, but it would show the injustice that has been done me.

27. But how is it going to be remedied?—The Government can remedy all injustice.

28. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were asked some years ago whether you would accept promotion to the rank of sergeant?—You asked me yourself, and I asked you not to make me a sergeant.

29. *The Commissioner.*] I do not quite understand what your grievance is. Mr. Dinnie was apparently prepared to make good what had not been done in the past?—I would not put my case again in the hands of the Department, because I thought any application would meet the same treatment as on the first occasion.

30. But if you had been made a sergeant, would it not have wiped off anything said about your unfitness in the past?—I do not think so.

31. I presume Mr. Dinnie was prepared to recommend you for promotion?—That may be said, but the Minister in power might not have done it.

JOHN JOSEPH WEATHERED, Constable and Police Gaoler, examined on oath. (No. 60.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Timaru, as gaoler. I have no prisoners at present. I do clerical work in the Police Department. I desire to read the following statement: "I beg to report for your information that I had no intention of making any suggestions or giving evidence before the

Commission until I read the report in the *Otago Daily Times* in which you express a desire 'that every man might regard himself as a sort of Sub-commissioner, and thus help you'; and it is in consequence of the foregoing that I make the following statement. To build up and maintain an efficient Police Force is, I believe, in some measure like the building of a permanent structure—to be a success you must commence at the foundation, with the best available material, and follow up that principle in all additions thereafter; and to obtain good material you must pay a fair and reasonable price. If good, bad, and indifferent material be mixed, defects will soon be obvious, with unsatisfactory results, and it is so with the New Zealand Police Force at the present time. The recruiting has been carried out from candidates whose qualifications are good, bad, and indifferent. Fortunately for the Government, a large number of candidates of good material have been enrolled at what I may describe as bargain prices—too low pay; while others are but poor value, and some dear at any price. It is an easy matter finding fault and pointing out defects, and, as you will have enough and to spare of this from others coming before you to give evidence, I shall, to some extent, refrain from so doing, and proceed to make some suggestions for the betterment of the Force as follows: Pay of constables to commence at 8s. per day, and advance to 10s. by increments of 6d. per day every four years. Pay of all other ranks to remain as at present. Candidates of a good class are attracted by the pay of constables; with reasonable pay at the commencement and the certainty of regular rises of pay for length of service and good conduct, and not influenced by the pay of Inspectors and detectives, who are nevertheless entitled to good pay. Constables of over twenty years' service, and not promoted to the rank of Sergeant, should be raised to a special rank—viz., that of senior constable, provided their conduct has been good and their duties satisfactorily discharged. The methods adopted, or, rather, the want of method, for promotion to the rank of sergeant has caused much dissatisfaction; and I cannot understand why, in the interests of fair play, a man is overlooked, year after year, while his juniors are promoted; and then he is promoted, and for the remainder of his service he suffers by these juniors in length of service taking a senior place for further promotion. If a constable has been overlooked for years (or for any period), and then promoted, it creates a suspicion in the minds of the whole Force that the Commissioner has been unduly influenced either at the time the constable has been overlooked or at the later period when he was promoted. I think the recommendations of Inspectors in charge of districts should have great influence with the Commissioner when electing constables for promotion; then he (the Commissioner) would have all the recommendations in front of him, and judge each man on his merits and length of service. I think eighteen years' service would be fair and just to all concerned if named as a minimum for constables eligible for promotion (not ten years, as at present), unless in cases of merit in the detection of offenders charged with serious crime, but not the merit of being a good storekeeper. The sharp line of demarcation of constables over fifty years of age being debarred from promotion is detrimental to the best interests of the Force, as there are many men at the age of fifty-five physically superior to others of forty-five years of age. I say this most disinterestedly, as I am not seeking promotion. I believe in the members of the uniform branch of the Force being granted a free supply of material for uniform, as at present, with the addition of a refund of the actual cost of making up on production of the necessary receipts for payment. I disagree entirely with the suggestion of free boots. The case of prison officers is different: they are on the spot where the boots are made by the prisoners, and have an advantage of being measured, whereas the police would likely be supplied with stock boots of a given size (according to order) from the Wellington store; and there are many members who have their boots made to measure and would not wear the ready-made-up boots even as a gift. In any case, I deem the request paltry, and do not give it my support. I suggest to pay the constables a reasonable salary, and let every man buy his own boots (although Gaoler here for over eighteen years, I have never applied for a free issue of boots). I consider there should be no difference in the amount of house-allowance allowed to constables and that given to sergeants and detectives. A constable has often a larger family than the sergeant or detective, and it is equally desirable and necessary that he should live in a respectable locality. The present scale of travelling-allowance is sufficiently liberal, except that which applies to men travelling by boat on transfer. I think saloon fare should be allowed by boat, as travelling by steerage is very uncomfortable, and I believe in most cases constables pay extra and travel saloon. The suggestion of a constable in Dunedin that constables or sergeants should travel first-class by train is so absurd that it requires little notice. I characterize the request as a piece of impudence, and I feel ashamed of it. I have no desire when travelling by train to enter a first-class carriage and obtrude my presence on a Judge of the Supreme Court, Stipendiary Magistrate, barristers, or others of high social standing, but feel it more in keeping with my walk in life to travel with those more on my social level. I have much admiration for Chief Detective Herbert in the matter of his ability as a detective officer; however, following the principle 'Honour to whom honour is due,' I am bound to disagree with his criticism of the finger-print branch. I hope I may be given credit, without any suspicion of egotism on my part, to speak with some authority on the excellent results of the finger-print system in New Zealand. I have been taking finger-prints of prisoners in Timaru Gaol since the system was inaugurated in New Zealand, and I can testify to numerous instances of old criminal offenders being quickly identified as soon as their finger-prints were forwarded to Wellington office, and this, in most cases, when the local detective—a very capable man—had no idea of the offenders' identity. Since the finger-print branch has been in charge of the present experts (Mr. Dinnie, jun., and Detective Quartermain) I notice a marked improvement in its results, and I have no hesitation in expressing my utmost confidence in the ability of these officers, and consider the finger-print branch a most valuable adjunct to the detective department, and well worth the money necessary for its maintenance. The publicity given to the success of finger-prints in various cases has done no harm, and the officers of this branch should not be held responsible for expert offenders having the intelligence to wear gloves; and even if this publicity had put some



on their guard, that same publicity had a deterrent effect on others. My correspondence with the officers of the finger-print branch has been strictly official, and I am not putting forth my opinions through friendship, but rather in the interests of fair play, with the view to assist the Commission arriving at a proper conclusion, since the subject has been thought worthy of criticism by Chief Detective Herbert, and apparently taken by the Commission as a matter for consideration. If the finger-print system had existed in New Zealand when Moses, ex-constable, was originally convicted of housebreaking, he could not have obtained admission to the New Zealand Police Force. Members of the Royal Irish Constabulary are granted thirty days' annual leave of absence by the County Inspector, and the District Inspector has authority to grant four days' quarterly leave, besides which station sergeants can grant a few hours at any time when it is believed to be required for legitimate purposes, such as attending entertainments, public or private. I think a request for fifteen days' annual leave, to be cumulative for three years, is not asking too much for the New Zealand Force; and in this matter the Minister of Railways might, with good cause, be asked to grant tickets to members of the Police Force travelling by train at half ordinary fare—viz., return tickets at single fares. It would be an easy matter for the Police Department to have printed certificates to be handed to the Railway Department when a police concession ticket is issued, and thus insure that such tickets are legitimately obtained for members of the Force on leave of absence only. The foregoing concession in railway fares is no more than that granted to the public at frequent intervals when, as a rule, the police cannot be spared from duty to any appreciable extent. My views are that the police, as servants of the State, who cannot obtain holidays at will, have a reasonable claim to the concession I name, but have no more right to a free pass on the railways on leave than has any member of the public. I do not agree with the suggestion of Inspector O'Brien that Inspectors should be empowered to enrol candidates locally for their respective districts; such action would be a retrograde step towards the days of provincialism. It is in the best interests of the Force and the public that a constable should perform his duties after appointment, for a time at least, in a district where he has no relatives or former companions of his civilian career. I consider the present standard of physique sufficient in measurement for candidates for the Force. If raised it would exclude many who would be excellent constables. The present education test is not too high. If sufficient pay is given, candidates with good education (or at least those who have passed the Fifth Standard) can readily be obtained. In the words of Commissioner Dinnie, 'Ignorance is an insuperable bar to promotion.' Ignorance should be a similar bar to appointment in the Force, and I feel confident that to a man in your position it will be obvious that it is greatly in the interests of justice that a constable should have a reasonable education; it may sometimes mean life or liberty to a prisoner how a statement of his is taken down by a member of the Force, even to the proper placing of a word in a sentence, or the leaving out of a word. In the interests of discipline, good moral conduct, and general welfare of members of the Force stationed in barracks, I think it highly desirable that reasonable restrictions should exist, and be carried into effect, in the matter of being indoors at a fixed time at night; and if any man wants to be out later he should give a reason; and I am sure the good sense of the station sergeant to see that no hardships were inflicted would be the result. I think the hours at present in force should not be extended except under special circumstances. To be physically fit for doing good work while on duty men should have (and in some cases be made to take) reasonable rest when off duty. In reference to Circular 17/06 (*vide Police Gazette* of 31st October, 1906), I made a report to Commissioner Dinnie expressing my pleasure at the rises of pay to the various ranks above that of constable, and regret that no consideration in the matter of rise of pay was given to constables, and asking his favourable consideration to my application that all constables having over twenty years' service might have a rise of pay. I respectfully ask that you call for that report of mine, which I presume is filed in the Commissioner's office (dated November, I think), and see for yourself the answer I received. Being mindful of 'the boy and the nuts,' I asked in that application and report only half of what I thought should be readily given even without application. In conclusion, I wish to state that I gave evidence before the Commission of inquiry in Mr. Tunbridge's time (*vide blue-book*, pages 520-23, and page 525). If you have time I shall be glad if you will read my evidence there, as I believe I was a marked man thereafter as a result of my truth and candour in evidence, much of which was not published. Nevertheless, I have the utmost confidence in the present Minister of Justice, and his desire to put the Force on a proper basis; further, that if any man can elucidate the cause of dissatisfaction, at present and in the past, existing in the Force, it will, with all earnestness, be done by you; and it is largely on this account that I take the trouble to place my views in writing before you. And, lastly, I am satisfied that the present Commissioner, Mr. Dinnie, has performed his duty to the best of his ability. What that ability is, or whether it is sufficient for the proper administration of his important office, I trust may be manifest at the close of the evidence given before you." I joined the Force in 1883, and after ten months was selected to take charge of a sub-district, and was there for six years and nine months, giving satisfaction except in one instance, when I was fined 10s. by Inspector Bullen. That is the only mark on my sheet. I went to Christchurch for nine months; was transferred to Timaru, where I have been Gaoler for 18½ years. I am 52½ years old. I was for seven and a half years in the Royal Irish Constabulary. During the time I have been here I have had 3,500 prisoners to lock up, and never had a return sent back for correction. There have been over 4,000 arrests, 500 of which were between 9 in the evening and 6 in the morning. I have had 2,246 prisoners received on remand for trial and under sentence; included in this number were 812 suffering from delirium tremens, forty-four male lunatics, and six females; and during all this time there was only one case of death, and he was in a state of collapse when brought in, and never left the cell.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you ever apply for promotion?—About five years ago. I recognised I was under a disadvantage in being unknown to the Commissioner, and also personally to Inspector Gillies, and thought it desirable to state a little of my history, and the fact that I had



never, except in the one instance, been reported for any offence. The indorsement of the constable in charge of the papers was, "Constable is sober, intelligent, and capable, and thoroughly understands his duties." Inspector Gillies said, "I have very little knowledge of the constable, owing to the short time I have been in the district, and his not being directly under my observation." This went to the Commissioner, and he indorsed it: "This application will receive due consideration." I was satisfied for the time being, but very soon afterwards I saw that a man who was a year and nine months my junior was going to be promoted before me—Constable Mullany—and I was right in my anticipations about him.

2. Why did you anticipate that?—An officer then in the Force told me that unless I had strong influence I would never be promoted. He is not alive now, or I would not say this for fear of injuring him

3. Have you had any instance yourself of that?—Not in connection with promotion, but I have had strong circumstantial evidence of undue interference to the detriment of one man and the advantage of another. Mullany never passed the examination, and he was made a sergeant. I passed the examination in 1890, and took ninth place, with 136 marks, out of thirty-four successful candidates, and no doubt a larger number did not pass. I am referring to the second examination, not the first, which I did not go in for, as I thought it would be no advantage. In the first examination Norwood passed, and took 117 marks in a paper simply in regard to Police Regulations; in the matter of law I took 78 per cent. Then Sergeant King in the same list took 111 marks. This shows that I was possessed of some relative intelligence. In applying for promotion I quoted this list, and expected I should be favourably considered by Mr. Dinnie. When I was overlooked I felt so disappointed that I made application to withdraw my application for promotion, as since that I would not have applied except under certain considerations. I interviewed Mr. Dinnie, and said if I were offered promotion as junior sergeant where there were two I did not want to go out into the street, but would take it in the position I hold. I want you to call for the file, and see why my name is on the black books.

*The Commissioner:* I will call for the file.

*Witness:* I cannot understand why Mullany, with no brilliant record, should have been promoted over my head. Then, in regard to Sergeant Mugeridge, it is not claimed that he did anything particular, and I want you to compare his record with mine, and see whether the position I am in is not equally responsible to that of Mugeridge, considering I have kept all these prisoners without putting the Government to expense in the matter of any escapes and the serious responsibility of being in charge of persons charged with murder and other serious offences. As to keeping books, I am prepared to undergo a competitive examination with any district clerk. In regard to influence, I know a case where there is strong circumstantial evidence of political influence being used. Four years ago a sergeant told me in confidence that Mr. Dinnie wrote a memo. to Inspector Gillies saying that if Constable Findlay wanted Palmerston he should apply for it in the proper channel. Findlay reported that he did not apply for Palmerston, but his wife was in such a state of health that she thought a change would do her good. It was a remarkable occurrence that shortly afterwards Constable Hillyard—a most intelligent man—was sent up in Findlay's place, and the latter—a most illiterate man—was sent to this important station. There must surely be something in the file to show under what circumstances this man went to Palmerston, and the intelligent man went to the other place, where his intelligence could be of no advantage in the service. I made application to Mr. Dinnie, and he replied, "This application will receive due consideration"; but this is the part I take exception to: "I wish it to be understood that I don't wish any old or broken-down men to remain in the service; I had rather they would retire." I think he was going out of his way in saying that.

*The Commissioner:* I will call for the papers, and look into them.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You applied to Mr. Tunbridge for promotion, did you not?—No.

5. He did not consider you eligible, or he would have given it you?—I did not expect it. I think he would have done a great injustice to other men in the Force if he had done so.

6. But if he considered you eligible for promotion, would he not have considered you the same as the others?—I was not entitled to it in his time.

7. Were any junior to you promoted in his time?—Yes, but very few.

8. Was there any question in regard to your promotion as to whether you would go on street duty?—It was an unconditional application I made.

9. Was there not some question of going on the street?—No.

10. About your fitness to go on the street?—No.

11. You have not had good health?—As good as many who have been promoted, although I do not put myself forward as a robust man.

12. You say greater notice should be taken of you by your superior officers?—I do.

13. How do you know notice is not taken?—When I made the application I said I was under the disadvantage of not being actually under my Inspector for some years, and I would be obliged if he thought me fit if he would recommend me, and he promised to do so.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Were you physically fit at this time?—I was, in my own opinion.

15. As regards influence, how many cases do you know of?—I have mentioned the only case.

16. You do not know from your own knowledge?—No, only circumstantial evidence.

PATRICK BOWMAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 61.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Timaru. Was enrolled on the 20th November, 1878, and was promoted to be sergeant in January, 1898. I was in charge as sergeant at Clyde for three years, and was then transferred to Lawrence.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Why were you transferred?—I applied for a transfer, as I wanted to get away further north, but was transferred to Lawrence. When I had been there for three years I again applied for a transfer, and was sent to Timaru.

2. Have you any general statement to make?—I have no grievance. With regard to political influence, I only want to say that it was not half as rampant before the year 1887, when the franchise was given to the police, as it is now.

3. Are you in a position to give any instances of political influence being brought to bear?—It is much talked of now, but there are no special cases that a man dare give.

4. Do you think men go to members of Parliament?—I think it is done indirectly. They get their wives or some one else to interview a member, and the member may go to the Minister. I am not in favour of the suggestion that the detectives should have the right of promotion to the uniform branch. There are five Chief Detectives in New Zealand at the present moment, and they have far more opportunities of going round and pulling the wires than have the uniform men, who have to stick to their regular round. The detective goes much more amongst the people, and has better chances of using influence. If the uniform man sees these men being put in front of him he has no hope of promotion, and he is likely to lose all ambition.

5. That is assuming political influence is used. But putting that to one side, would you say that a Chief Detective should not have the right to promotion if he is suitable in every respect?—I think he might be made a Detective Inspector, or something of that sort, but I do not think he ought to enter the uniform branch.

6. Do you think a Chief Detective is not qualified for the position of Sub-Inspector?—I think he should have to do some uniform work before he gets it. I notice that it has been said by one Inspector down south that the standard of education for entry into the Force is too high. I think it should be higher, and that the pay also should be higher. An ignorant policeman is not a safe man.

7. I admit an educated constable or an educated sergeant is all the better for his education, but assuming there is a falling-off in the numbers of men available for recruits, how are you going to remedy that?—I would make the pay higher.

8. Do you know what proportion of boys pass the Fifth Standard before they leave school?—I should think there was a very large proportion at the present day.

9. Have you noticed any difference in the physique of the men joining the Force in recent years?—As compared with the time I joined, they are not so tall or so well built, nor have they the appearance they used to have.

10. They have still to pass the physical test?—I do not think the test would stand in Mr. Weldon's time. I refer to the men we used to see a good many years ago in Dunedin.

11. To what do you attribute that falling-off?—I think it is because there are other avenues of employment now, and that better inducements are offered to the good men elsewhere.

12. Why should the weedy men go into the Force?—Perhaps because they cannot get anything else to do.

13. What have you to say as regards the general conduct and sobriety of the men?—In Timaru they are all steady, sober, and intelligent men, and they do their duty well.

14. Do you know of any discontent in the Force with regard to promotion?—There is none that I know of.

15. But you still hold to your opinion that there is political influence at work?—I think there is, owing to the police and their wives and relatives having votes.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Can you tell me one instance of political influence being used?—As I have said already, I cannot give an instance.

17. Can you tell me of any one who knows of such a case?—No.

18. Do you not think, if it were so rife, you would have heard of something definite?—No; people take care there will be nothing definite.

19. It seems to be the general belief that it is used, but we have tried all along to find a case in which it has been used, but we have been unable to do so?—Of course, if we have your word that it is not so, we accept it.

20. I am glad to hear that there is someone who will accept my word. You think the physique of the applicants is not so high as it was in years past?—Of course, we had a splendid class of men in Dunedin in the old days.

21. You have not much trouble here?—I think we have a superior class of men in Timaru.

22. If I tell you that a batch or two we had three or four months ago were all over 6 ft. high, and chest measurement accordingly?—I am pleased to hear it; but some of the towns do not show that class of men.

23. Have you heard anything about a "useful" man being stationed in each district by me to report everything that is going on?—No.

24. If this was the general belief from the extreme north to the extreme south you surely would have heard of it?—Very likely I would, but I do not think it is true.

25. Do you know anything about inquiry into the qualifications and character of candidates for enrolment?—I have had papers passing through my hands.

26. Is the inquiry strict?—Yes, very strict. If a man wanted to become a clergyman he could not have stricter inquiries made into his character.

27. Has it been more strict since I came here?—I think so.

HENRY GREEN, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 62.)

*Witness.* I am in charge of the South Canterbury sub-district. I joined the Force in 1874, and was promoted to sergeant, I think, in 1886. Have never been a station sergeant, as I was appointed before that rank had been inaugurated. Was appointed Sub-Inspector in September, 1901.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make touching matters for inquiry by this Commission?—My idea is that there should be some sort of Board or Council before which the men could ventilate their grievances.

2. Do you mean a Board of Appeal similar to that existing now in connection with the Railways and the Post and Telegraph Department, because, as you know, there is still the Ministerial veto?—There are many occasions when the men are not satisfied with the decision of the Commissioner or the Minister, and I think there should be a Board before which the men could have their grievances discussed apart from the Commissioner or the Minister.

3. You must give them a legal status, otherwise they would not have power to administer the oath?—I should not go so far as that.

4. How would you have the Board constituted, and who would you have as president?—I would let them elect their own president.

5. You would have no nominated representative upon it at all. Do you not think that the Government, who would have the greatest interest in the deliberations of the Board, should have some representative upon it?—My idea is that the grievances of the constables and others should go before the Board, and that the Board, after considering them, should pass them on through the Commissioner to the Minister, with their recommendations. The men feel now that in many cases their grievances do not reach the Minister.

6. It would be reviewing the action of the Commissioner?—Yes.

7. But if the Minister had the power of veto, what effect would that have?—I think it would do away with a principal cause of grievance the men have or consider they have.

8. The matter will be considered, but I must say at once I do not favour the constitution of a Board on which the Government is not represented. Have you anything to say as regards any other subject within the scope of the Commission?—I think, when a man is transferred from one station to another, the officer in charge of the district to which a man is sent should be given some information as to the man's character and disposition, as well as a copy of his defaulter's list. At present a man may be sent to me about whom I know absolutely nothing, and I cannot find out without asking the Inspector. On the question of promotion, I am of the same opinion as most of those who have given evidence already. Recently I have been passed over by a junior officer, and perhaps without due consideration.

9. Who is the officer?—Inspector Dwyer. I am the senior Sub-Inspector. I have had no reprimand nor anything recorded against me, nor any intimation that I was to be debarred from further promotion, but I have been passed over.

10. Would you contend that in all cases seniority should hold as regards promotions?—I think mine is the only instance in which it has not been recognised in the senior ranks of the service.

10A. Might there not have been special circumstances?—I am quite willing to concede special circumstances, but what they were I do not know. I was in Dunedin for three years, and, of course, there was some trouble there. There are now, I think, four men in Dunedin to do the duty I had to do there for three years.

11. It was lack of control over the uniform force that led to the trouble there?—That may be a matter of opinion. I think, sir, you reported that it was practically impossible to supervise the Force there. When I heard that promotion was about to take place I brought the matter under the notice of the Commissioner, and, as I found out afterwards, the Inspector strongly backed up my application. In the Commissioner's office it was simply noted "File." I think it should have gone to the Minister. I think it is dated 19th August of last year.

12. I will call for the file. What have you to say about the physique of the men at the present day?—I think some of them are scarcely up to the standard that should obtain, although I do not think there is any all round falling-off.

13. They have all to pass certain tests, have they not?—I think there must be some concessions somewhere. There is one man here who I think must be below the standard. I think he has been about twelve months in the Force. As regards promotions from the detective force to the uniform branch, my idea is that they should have an equal chance with the uniform men so long as the detectives promoted are not out of proportion to their numbers.

14. Do you know anything about political interference?—I think there is political influence to a certain extent, but I do not know how far it affects promotions and so on. Probably it gets credit for a great deal more than it deserves.

15. What have you to say as to the conduct of the men generally?—The men I have come in contact with of late years are fairly sober and steady.

16. How would you deal with cases of insobriety?—I think a second offence should entail dismissal, unless perhaps there is a very considerable lapse of time between the offences.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Would you not take into consideration a man's length of service? If, say, a man had served fifteen or twenty years at the time of his first offence, and he commits a second offence within a few months?—Yes, I should take his length of service into consideration.

18. Suppose the second offence was within a few weeks of the first?—I should be very doubtful as to what I should do. I would not make a hard-and-fast rule that if a man was drunk twice he should go.

19. And if he was drunk three times?—I should have no doubt about it.

20. As regards the defaulters' sheets of the men who are sent to your district, you can have them if you apply for them?—Yes. I think some information as to character and disposition of a man should be given to me when he comes, perhaps not his defaulter's sheet.

21. You have suggested that an Appeal Board should be constituted to consider any grievances the men may have?—Something of that kind.

22. Do you not think the Commissioner or some independent party should be on that Board?—I do not think so. The Board would be practically reviewing the Commissioner's decision; but any recommendation the Board made would go through your hands to the Minister.

23. You do not yourself know of any cases in which political influence has been used?—No, and I have never heard of any definite case, but I think it is recognised throughout the Department that there is such a thing in existence.

24. You know that the Minister has already addressed the men in Dunedin on the evils of political influence, and that he endeavoured to dissuade them from any attempts to use it?—I take it he did that because he thought it was necessary to do so.

25. No one disputes for a moment that men try to use it, but has it any effect upon promotions?—As I have said, it probably gets credit for a great deal more than it deserves.

26. How old are you?—I am just sixty.

27. What is your retiring-age?—The compulsory retiring-age is sixty-five.

28. What is your opinion with regard to age being a consideration in promotion?—I think it should be against promotion; but if there had been a hard-and-fast rule to that effect I should not have said a word about my case. The man promoted was only two or three years my junior, and I know of a man older than I am who was promoted recently.

29. What is the difference between your age and that of Inspector Black?—I could not say.

30. But Inspector Dwyer is a much younger man than yourself?—I think he is fifty-six or fifty-seven.

*Inspector Gillies:* He is fifty-two. According to the papers, he was born in 1857.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard anything about this “useful” man who is reported to be in every district from the north to the south?—I have never heard anything about it.

32. *Inspector Gillies.*] How long have you been in charge at Timaru?—Three and a half years.

33. During that time have you ever asked for any man’s defaulter-sheet from me?—No.

34. Have you any reason to believe that you would not get it if you asked?—No.

This concluded the Timaru evidence.

CHRISTCHURCH, TUESDAY, 27TH JULY, 1909.

*The Commissioner:* Mr. Laurenson, certain reference was made to you during the course of the evidence taken at Invercargill by a constable who was at one time a detective at Lyttelton, and I instructed the Secretary to give you notice of the main heads of the statement, so as to enable you, if you so desired, to meet the allegations made. The allegations come properly within the scope of the Commission, because I think they can fairly be held to be *à propos* to the paragraph of the order of reference in regard to political or other interference. Therefore, it is only having regard to your official position as a member of Parliament that you are imported into the matter, because if the statements made were correct it would certainly lead to the inference that political interference had been used. It is for you to deal with the matter as you think proper. The constable has been brought from Invercargill, and you can examine him.

*Mr. Laurenson:* I am much indebted to your Worship. Mr. Dougall has been instructed to appear for me.

JOHN CONNELL, Constable, further examined. (No. 63.)

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] I understand you made a statement that about two months before the election of 1905 Mr. Laurenson approached you with reference to pilfering that was going on at Lyttelton?—I would not be sure that it was two months, but it was some time before the election.

2. Do you remember when the complaints were made about you?—Yes.

3. Can you locate the time by those complaints?—It was a good while after the complaints.

4. Are you quite sure?—I am quite certain. I have not any doubt about it.

5. Yet it was before the general election of 1905?—I think it was some time before.

6. And after all the complaints?—Yes.

7. Will you repeat now what you allege Mr. Laurenson said in your office?—He came into my office, and was going to use the telephone, and he said to me, “Hullo! Connell, old man; how are you getting on?” I said, “All right.” He said, “How are you getting on with those rascals down the wharf?” I said, “You ought to know.” “Well,” he said, “I suppose you have heard about me seeing Mr. Dinnie; but bear in mind that when I saw Mr. Dinnie in reference to you I told him the character of the men on whose behalf I was complaining. I did not misrepresent you in any way to Mr. Dinnie.”

8. He said he had seen Mr. Dinnie, and spoken to him about you?—Yes.

9. Was it in the nature of a complaint that he spoke to Mr. Dinnie?—Yes; but he said that in making the complaint he represented the character of the men who were making it.

10. Was this prior to the written complaints?—The complaints were then all over.

11. Was this interview with Mr. Dinnie before the election of 1905?—A good while, I should say.

12. You are not mixing up your dates at all?—I do not think so; but the files will show. It was a good while after the complaints.

13. And before the election of 1905?—I think so.

14. When did you leave Lyttelton?—I think, in March, 1906.

15. The election was in the previous December?—I suppose so.

16. When you gave evidence before you used these words as having been said by Mr. Laurenson: “Before you got amongst them [the wharf labourers] they could furnish their houses and get boots and clothes from the ships, and a great many are leaving”: do you repeat that?—He said before I was appointed some could furnish their houses and get boots for their children—not clothes; and I said, “How do you come to make complaints about a man who has tried to do his duty?” That was when he said he did not misrepresent me to Mr. Dinnie.

17. I want you to be quite clear as to what you allege Mr. Laurenson did say?—He did not say “all the men.” The papers seem to make a great deal of what I did say. I lived eleven years amongst the wharf lumpers at Lyttelton, some six or seven hundred, and they are as decent men

as are to be found in the Dominion. I do not mean to say either Mr. Laurenson or I tried to make out that they were all pillagers. But he did say, "I dare say there are some bad rascals amongst them, and they no doubt furnish their houses and find boots for their children." He went on to say he thought it pitiable to see the number of them hanging round and drinking beer, and some of them only working two or three days a week.

*The Commissioner:* There can be no doubt about what the constable said, for when he made the reference to Mr. Laurenson I appreciated at once the seriousness of it and I pulled him up, and pointed out to him that he had better seriously consider the effect of what he was saying—that it was tantamount to accusing a member of Parliament of being privy to theft. My reason for referring to this, Mr. Dougall, is that you are asking him whether he is not departing from the words he used. I wish to emphasize the point that there is no doubt whatever as to what he said and intended to say, because I gave him an opportunity in the most explicit way of withdrawing from the position he was taking up; and where that is done I cannot entertain any evidence in regard to the difference between what he said then and what he is prepared to say now.

18. *Mr. Dougall.*] Am I right in gathering from what you say that Mr. Laurenson did not make such an emphatic statement as we were led to believe?—According to the papers, it read as if I said—

19. *The Commissioner.*] Never mind what appeared in the papers?—I am giving exactly what took place. I am trying to repeat the conversation.

20. *Mr. Dougall.*] Am I right in inferring that Mr. Laurenson did not make such an emphatic statement as you previously said in Invercargill?—I did say boots—not clothes; some of them.

21. You qualify it by saying "some of them"?—Yes.

22. And what about a great many of them leaving?—Some of them were leaving, and have left since.

23. Since when?—That particular time. This was a private conversation with Mr. Laurenson. I did not wish to attach great importance to it, because it was only in private conversation.

24. *The Commissioner.*] But you brought it in yourself; nobody knew anything about it except you; you voluntarily tendered the evidence?—It is true. After speaking to me he rang up Mr. Taylor's house. I do not think Mr. Taylor was in, and I heard him make arrangements as to meeting Mr. Taylor. I remarked then that I did not think Mr. Taylor would have done such an action as Mr. Laurenson did.

25. *Mr. Dougall.*] What did you mean by that?—I did not think he would go and complain, seeing Mr. Laurenson was so friendly, and wanted me to take an out-station rather than have to meet these fellows at 12 o'clock at night—that it would be much better at an out-station such as Little River; and he mentioned one man in particular—I do not know whether he said he got him transferred—who was better off then.

26. *The Commissioner.*] In what connection did he mention that?—He said, "Look at So-and-so that used to be here, and is now at an out-station."

27. *Mr. Dougall.*] Did you infer that Mr. Laurenson had him promoted or transferred?—That he had him promoted, because he referred to the person he married.

28. To get him out of the way?—Oh, no.

29. No inference of that sort?—Not at all.

30. What is the connection between this and your suggestion that Mr. Laurenson wanted you to stop investigating thefts, practically?—He said I would be much better out of it. But he had previously tried to get me out of it in another way—by other means.

31. How?—By going to the Minister and Mr. Dinnie.

32. How do you know?—From his letters, because I had to explain them.

33. Inquiries were held as the result of the letters?—Yes.

34. What was the result?—I came out of it all right.

35. You say these inquiries were all antecedent to these complaints you talk about?—Yes.

36. How long before you left Lyttelton were these inquiries held? These inquiries in connection with Campbell and Wood and Bowman—were they not two or three months before you left?—Bowman came to me on the Lyttelton platform, and told me I could go to—somewhere, and that he was going up to Laurenson to fix me up.

37. Was there any inquiry as the result?—There was.

38. You came out with flying colours?—I could not do otherwise; the thing was absurd.

39. As a matter of fact, you were promoted after you left Lyttelton?—Yes.

40. It was only after you had been in Christchurch some time that any question arose regarding your conduct?—I do not know.

41. You were disgraced again after you came to Christchurch?—No.

42. Where, then?—In Dunedin.

43. You were sent to Dunedin as what?—As detective.

44. There were complaints about you in Christchurch?—Very trifling ones.

45. Still, there were complaints?—You can always find complaints.

46. In Dunedin you were disgraced?—Yes, for meeting with an accident.

47. The suggestion was that the accident was the result of incapacity?—There was no proof.

48. But they disgraced you?—Without any inquiry whatever.

*The Commissioner:* It was not altogether on the ground of the accident; it was on account of general inefficiency as detective. The accident may have been the immediate cause that led up to the general question of fitness, but it was only an incident.

49. *Mr. Dougall.*] To come back to the conversation with Mr. Laurenson, you say Mr. Laurenson said a great many wharf labourers were leaving?—He said many, or some of them.

50. You are modifying every word of this original statement of yours?—I am trying to tell the truth as near as possible.

51. Let us get at exactly what Mr. Laurenson did say?—I have told you.

52. Tell us again?—He said, “How are you getting on with those rascals?”—I think that was the word—“down at the wharf”? or something to that effect. He said exactly what I stated.

53. *The Commissioner.*] Repeat his words?—He said, “Before you went amongst them they could furnish their houses and find their youngsters in boots, and I dare say there are not many of those now,” or something to that effect; I am not sure of the exact words.

54. *Mr. Dougall.*] You inferred from what he said that the men had left Lyttelton?—That some of them had.

55. And what inference did you draw? What was the object of Mr. Laurenson in saying that?—I do not know at all.

56. It was not with the idea of getting you to mitigate your investigations into these matters?—I do not suppose so. I could not say.

57. Did he come into your room and make that remark in a casual manner, without any reason?—He came in to use the telephone, but before doing so spoke to me.

58. In a purely casual sort of manner?—Yes.

59. If what you now say is correct, were you justified in making the statement you did in Invercargill?—What I said was true.

60. You know what was inferred?—I simply repeated the exact truth—I did not concoct anything.

61. You said you were a marked man as the result of Mr. Laurenson’s complaint?—If a man like Mr. Laurenson makes complaints about you it does not do you any good.

62. But that is not what you said. Did you or did you not say that as the result of Mr. Laurenson’s complaints you were a marked man?—I took it at that.

63. Subsequently to these complaints and to this conversation and subsequently to all your work in Lyttelton you were promoted in Christchurch?—Yes.

64. Did Mr. Laurenson have anything to do with your subsequent reduction?—I do not say that.

65. Was Mr. Laurenson the only one in Lyttelton who complained about you?—Yes; the only person of any note. He did not complain himself. We have always been on friendly terms. He forwarded complaints on behalf of others. But I did not think it just to me for him to go to Wellington with a complaint without first of all consulting the officer in charge of the district, and letting him inquire into it.

66. Did you repeat this conversation you had to any one, or talk about it to any one?—I do not know that I did. I do not think I ever spoke to any one about what Mr. Laurenson did. I have never given it publicity. I never told a member of Parliament about it. I never tried to do him any harm, although he tried to do me injury.

67. Did Mr. Laurenson complain at all about your prosecuting the wharf labourers?—What he said was, “I wish you would let me get you this out-station; you would be much better off; you would get more money, and these rascals would not be bothered with you.” He said, “There was never anybody here in this capacity before you, and I suppose that is the reason they do not like you.”

68. Had you been prosecuting any of these men about this time?—Not the ones he complained for.

69. I think there had not been a prosecution for two years prior to this?—I do not know.

70. I have a record here which shows that from 1900 to 1906 only four men who could possibly come within the definition of wharf-labourers were charged with petty theft, and during the two years preceding your conversation there was not a charge of theft against any one. How was it that Mr. Laurenson came to talk about this, seeing that there had been no charges for two years?—He said the reason was that the men did not like to be looked upon with suspicion when they were going home at night.

71. You said in your previous evidence something about a lot of lumpers passing through your hands: as a matter of fact, no lumpers had been through your hands?—Some of them.

72. Can you give me any instances during the two years before you left?—I have not a record.

73. You made some reference to an incident with an air-gun that was the ultimate cause of your being shifted: did you pay for the gun?—No.

74. Did you break it?—No, I did not.

75. Did your daughter go over to Mrs. Roderick’s house with a handful of money?—I could not say if she did.

76. Had Mr. Laurenson anything at all to do with the air-gun business?—No.

77. Have you ever at any time brought charges against any individual of a similar nature to this against Mr. Laurenson?—Not that I remember.

78. Did you make a charge against Father Salvatore before the Police Commission in 1897?—No; I was summoned in regard to a report I made about him.

79. You did not make a complaint similar to this in regard to interfering with your duty?—No; I had to make a report in connection with a disturbance at a hotel, and that came up before the Commission. That is what you are referring to.

80. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say Mr. Laurenson told you of a constable who was transferred from Lyttelton, and you inferred he had got him removed?—In this way: He said, “Look at So-and-so; is he not much better off than among these fellows at night?”

81. What did you infer?—He told me he got him away.

82. Will you give the constable’s name?—Hastie. He is not a constable now.

83. Do you suggest he was the means of that man’s promotion?—I do not.

84. But you inferred that he got him moved?—No. He said why did I not take an out-station? I said I could get a country station myself without his assistance.

85. Did you infer Mr. Laureson was the cause of this man's transfer?—He was leading me to believe he wanted me to let him get me removed.

86. Did you believe it?—I did not.

87. The reason of your removal from Lyttelton was the matter with the air-gun?—Yes.

88. Nothing else?—That was the last.

89. Nothing Mr. Laureson did?—I was continually having to explain in connection with letters he wrote to Wellington.

90. What was the cause of your being moved?—There was no cause, although I was moved.

91. Is not the cause on record in the file?—Yes; but I am sorry to say the record is not correct so far as I am concerned.

*Mr. Dinnie:* This is my minute: "I am not satisfied with acting-detective's action or reports in this matter. Unless he intended to prefer a charge against one of the boys he should not have taken possession of the gun at all, but seen that it was returned to its owner, and the boys and their parents should have been cautioned. The acting-detective also withheld the fact from me that he had, or his daughter had, paid for the damage done to the gun. He now denies knowledge of this, but fails to call his daughter to prove his statement. I cannot believe his daughter could pay for the gun without his knowledge and approval, and therefore strictly caution him for misleading me in this respect. As we have had so many complaints recently about this acting-detective I will arrange a change at Lyttelton."

*The Commissioner:* There you have it.

*Witness:* I want to say, in reference to this, that I had no idea that the gun was paid for.

92. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you in Christchurch after you got advancement?—Two or three years.

93. Your conduct was satisfactory?—Yes; I was advanced to the rank of detective.

94. What was the cause of your transfer from Christchurch?—I got reported over a trifling matter.

95. Was not this the cause: "The detective's excuse for failing to report himself is unsatisfactory. Detective Kennedy reported himself to the sergeant in charge. Why not Detective Connell, who seems to have wandered about and done nothing, and ignored the officer in charge? The making of a false entry in diary is proved by the detective's own statement that he left Christchurch about 10 a.m. for Lyttelton, whereas the entry in diary is 9 to 11 at office. That prompt attention was not given to the complaint of a burglary occurring at boardinghouse is obvious from the statements of the persons interviewed, and disobedience of orders in neglecting to attend the detective office at stated times is not satisfactorily explained by the detective. Altogether, the detective seems to have no energy for his work, and it is questionable if he should be retained in the detective branch. He is fined £1 on all charges, transferred to Dunedin, and a report is to be submitted in three months on his conduct and fitness for detective work"? That was why you were transferred to Dunedin?—Yes.

96. You had not been in Dunedin three months before you were in trouble again?—It was not my fault.

97. You were reported?—Yes.

98. For uselessness as a detective?—For being drunk, I believe.

99. That is not so: it was for being useless, and other complaints?—Very likely.

100. And reduced to constable?—Yes.

101. You have seen the files in respect to Mr. Laureson's complaints?—Yes.

102. The complaints which he received from private individuals were simply sent by him?—Yes, in a particular way.

103. I will read the letters: "28/9/05.—To the Minister of Justice.—I have received the following letter from Mr. D. Campbell, of Lyttelton, in which he complains very bitterly about the conduct of a police constable in searching his house. I met Mr. Commissioner Dinnie yesterday, and mentioned to him that I had received this letter, and would send it on for inquiry to be made. I now do so, and will be pleased if the matter is carefully inquired into.—G. LAURENSEN." The reply was: "I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of 28th instant *re* complaint of Mr. Duncan Campbell against the police for searching his house at Lyttelton, and, in reply, to inform you that the matter will be carefully investigated, and result communicated to you.—J. MCGOWAN." A further letter on the same subject is dated the 10th October: "With further reference to your letter of the 28th ultimo, *re* complaint of Mr. Duncan Campbell against police for searching his house at Lyttelton, and insulting his wife, I have the honour to inform you that, as a result of inquiry, it appears that a search-warrant was obtained on information given by a respectable inhabitant of Lyttelton concerning a larceny of clothing, and two constables executed the warrant. They both strenuously deny using any insulting language to Mrs. Campbell, who was apparently excited on the occasion. The circumstances of the case appear to have justified the action taken, and I do not therefore consider my interference is necessary.—J. MCGOWAN." The next is a letter from Mr. Laureson, dated 18th October: "When I was in Lyttelton on Monday last one or two of my constituents visited me to complain about the conduct of Constable Connell. One of these parties has since put his complaint in writing, and I now enclose it for your consideration. The others who complained were the Mr. Campbell whose complaint has already been put before you and Captain Clark, the Harbourmaster at Lyttelton. If half of what I hear about this constable is true, then there ought to be an immediate and exhaustive inquiry into his conduct." This was acknowledged the following day, to the effect that inquiry would be made, and on 25th October the Minister wrote as follows: "With further reference to your letter of 16th instant, enclosing a complaint against Acting-Detective Connell, of Lyttelton, I have the honour to inform you that, as a result of inquiry, it appears that about twelve months ago Mr. Wood, who is well known to local police, was observed moving about the railway yard at Lyttelton in a suspicious manner with a bundle under his arm, and, having been previously seen under suspicious circumstances at night,



Acting-Detective Connell asked him what he had in the parcel, when Mr. Wood at once opened it and produced some clothes which he said he got from a railway hand. The acting-detective was satisfied, and never laid hands on Mr. Wood, or searched him in any way, nor has he had occasion to speak to him or search him previously or since, so that his allegations as to being searched three times are apparently without foundation. The acting-detective further alleges he never searched the man Beaumont as alleged. As regards the Harbourmaster, I should be glad to have his complaint in writing, as it seems the acting-detective has never had occasion to interfere in any way with him, although about three months ago his son was arrested for drunkenness and using obscene language, hence probably his motive for complaint. Observing, therefore, that the two complaints received against this acting-detective are in the same handwriting, that the complainant and Beaumont referred to are associates, that Mr. Wood's complaint is in respect to a matter occurring twelve months ago, and that the allegations made are apparently groundless, the motive for such being obvious, I do not propose to take any further action in the matter." The next letter is dated the 30th November, from Mr. Laurensen to the Minister: "Enclosed I hand you another complaint against Constable Connell, who is stationed here. Without expressing any opinion as to these complaints, I certainly consider that the least which you can do is to order an inquiry into these charges (this is the fourth which I have brought before you within three months), so as to see what is in them." The reply to this, after inquiry, is as follows: "With reference to your letter of the 30th November last, *re* complaint of one Arthur Beaumont against Acting-Detective Connell, of Lyttelton, I have now the honour to inform you that, as a result of careful investigation made by the District Inspector, it is quite apparent that there is no foundation for the allegations made in Beaumont's letter. I cannot find any respectable persons who have the slightest cause for complaint against the acting-detective, and the investigation held clearly demonstrates that the suspicious actions of the complainants have been the cause of police interference, which was justified under the circumstances. Although this is, as you allege, the fourth complaint against the acting-detective, I regret I can only treat the four as one—viz., an attempt to remove an officer who has done good work at Lyttelton and vicinity in bringing offenders to justice." These are all the complaints made by Mr. Laurensen, and you have seen the whole of them?—Yes.

104. What harm do you suggest Mr. Laurensen has done you?—I asked him about Clark. I said, "What about this man Clark; I do not know about him?" He said, "As a matter of fact, Clark came to me and told me he had been insulted by you." I said, "That is not true"; neither it was. "Well," he said, "I do not know. I simply told what was told to me." I asked him what his object was.

105. Do you suggest that influence was brought to bear?—I suggest that Mr. Laurensen tried every way he could to get me out of Lyttelton.

106. Do you suggest anything fruther than the ordinary sending on of complaints in these letters?—I suggest this plainly: it does not matter who it is, if there are a number of complaints, no matter how good a man may be, if the head of the Department has a number of complaints, they go down as something against him.

107. Do you suggest the letters were written with a view of bringing influence against you?—With a view to getting me out of Lyttelton.

108. But private individuals complained to Mr. Laurensen?—Any one who heard a complaint, without knowing whether there were any grounds for it, should not go to you or the Minister, but to the officer in charge of the district—to Inspector Gillies, who is quite competent to investigate any charge against a constable.

109. Do you not think it is the duty of every one who receives a complaint against the police to submit it to the head of the Department?—Not at all. If the outside public knew that, they would be running to the head of the Department all the time.

110. You know they do write to me frequently?—I pity any one they write about.

111. Do you not know it is a common occurrence?—It may be so.

112. Why should you pity any one?—Well, I do.

113. In what way?—If the head of the Department is troubled with complaints, it matters not how good a man is, there must be something done to quieten those who are complaining.

114. Do you not think every matter is inquired into, and the result shown?—Is there nothing against me in what you have read to justify my reflection?

115. *The Commissioner.*] What can be fairer to you than the replies by the Minister? Mr. Dinnie wants you to admit that it is apparent from the papers that there is nothing in this correspondence between the Minister and Mr. Laurensen to justify an inference that there was any connection between the correspondence and your removal from Lyttelton?—But I wish to point out what is a justifiable conclusion, that I was removed for taking a gun from the boys in the street.

116. But that has nothing to do with the correspondence of Mr. Laurensen. Mr. Dinnie wants you to admit that?—I want to point out that the decision of the Commissioner is contrary—

*The Commissioner:* Never mind that; that has nothing to do with Mr. Laurensen; we are only dealing with your complaint about Mr. Laurensen.

117. *Mr. Dinnie:* These files show it was not owing to this that you were transferred?—Yes.

118. You admit Mr. Laurensen had nothing to do with the gun?—The decision says there were other complaints.

119. *The Commissioner.*] You cannot say the mere fact of Mr. Laurensen forwarding this correspondence to the Minister, which was dealt with to your entire satisfaction, has had any bearing whatever on your subsequent position in the Force?—I would like to know the motive.

120. Why were you promoted if the Laurensen correspondence had anything to do with your subsequent removal to Dunedin?—But all these things tell. It matters not how good a man has been, so long as complaints are made against him by a man like Mr. Laurensen it has a tendency to do him harm.



121. The question is this—it is a very broad question, and one on which you will find a majority of people will have a different opinion: what is the duty of a member of Parliament when he receives a complaint from a person in regard to the conduct of a member of the Police Force?—I should say, to acquaint the officer in charge of the district.

122. It seems to me that would raise more the presumption of political interference than by appealing to the political head of the Department; the officer in charge of the district is only the creature of the political head?—Mr. Laurenson never told me he had forwarded complaints behind my back.

But he simply forwarded complaints, and asked for inquiry. That was held, and the Minister told Mr. Laurenson in the plainest terms I ever read that there was no ground for the complaints, and he was not going to interfere. I do not follow you in the view you wish me to take of the correspondence. It may be a matter of opinion whether a member of Parliament has a right to forward a letter to a Minister. I should prefer a member to forward direct to the Minister than to go to the local head.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I should like to have your ruling in this regard—as to what a member should do in the event of complaint being made to him.

*The Commissioner:* Would it have any weight?

*Mr. Dinnie:* It might bear out my opinion.

*The Commissioner:* I understood you to say a member of Parliament is not supposed to communicate with any head of a Department.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I suggest, the Minister.

*The Commissioner:* That, I say, is the proper thing. If they go to the officer in charge, they practically go to the creature of the Minister—using the word “creature” in its technical sense. Instead of that they should go to the political head. That would be the best security a constable could have that he would not be dealt with in an improper way. If they went to the lower head, it would raise the presumption that he might be liable to do an act to please the member for the district.

*Mr. Gillies:* To make the position clear, I might mention that the detective was transferred from Lyttelton to Christchurch on the 5th March, 1906, and was promoted detective on the 1st June, 1907.

*The Commissioner:* He did not fall in your estimation at that time through the correspondence?

*Mr. Gillies:* If he had he would not have been promoted. Up to that time I was very well satisfied with him.

*The Commissioner:* Then he seemed to lose interest in his work?

*Mr. Gillies:* Yes.

123. *The Commissioner:* I have been through the file, and have read every letter and paper, and have formed a deliberate and judicial opinion in regard to the evidence on the file. It may be hard on you, but there it is?—In regard to Mr. Laurenson’s interference, it was impossible for me to do my work in Lyttelton.

124. And you were removed from Lyttelton and promoted. Therefore his action did not prejudice you. But you are now running away from the main issue—your very grave allegation against Mr. Laurenson made at Invercargill, when I gave you the opportunity of withdrawing what you said. I explained the inference I should draw—that Mr. Laurenson was apparently making himself privy to acts of dishonesty. I pointed out the gravity of this, having regard to the fact that Mr. Laurenson is a public man, and I suggested you should reconsider the effect of what you were saying. If I remember right, you said, “I stick to what I said”?—I should be sorry to allege that Mr. Laurenson was a party to any of these things.

125. I pointed out to you what was the logical and moral effect of what you were saying—there can be no mistake about that?—I simply repeated as well as I could remember what he said to me.

126. What you said was directly in the direction of showing that his sympathies were with law-breakers?—I do not say that. I did not mean to put it in that way.

127. I am glad to have that explained; but if you had given me that explanation at Invercargill I should have taken a different view of what was said. You have forced this position on me?—My object was to show that I do not think he had any right to interfere in the manner he did.

128. You consider Mr. Laurenson had no right to forward those letters to the Minister of Justice?—I do not. He knew the class of men they were—one especially. I was surprised at Mr. Laurenson taking up the attitude he did.

*The Commissioner:* There can be no mistake about the position. The witness made certain statements in evidence at Invercargill. I do not think he fully comprehended the effect of them, and so much did I think so that I pulled him up and explained to him the effect. I used very plain language. I try, and I think I do, convey exactly what is in my mind, and I conveyed to him the effect of what he said, and gave him the opportunity of withdrawing it. He did not do so, but stood by what he said. There was an undoubted inference against Mr. Laurenson, and I believe it went all through the Dominion. It is all very well for him to come to-day and say, “I did not mean that.” If so, why did he not tell me so at the time?

*Mr. Dougall:* He modifies his statements, and leaves us to the inference that it was owing to Mr. Laurenson’s action his reduction took place. There cannot be any doubt that the letters written by Mr. Laurenson were written in absolutely correct language, and that he acted in a manner one would expect a member to act. Mr. Connell sets up that the men were of bad character. Whether they were or not I am not prepared to say. Mr. Laurenson knows the men, and will probably say something about it. I should like to refer to another point in Connell’s evidence—

the time at which he says this took place. He was quite emphatic, and I gave him an opportunity of correcting himself. He says it took place prior to the election of 1905, and some time after the complaints were made and inquiries held. The first of these complaints was made in September, 1905, the last on the 30th November. The election took place on the 6th December, and the last complaint was not investigated—at least, the reply was not sent—till the 8th January following—a month after the election, less than two months prior to Connell's removal to Christchurch, which was consequent upon an entirely different matter, and one with which Mr. Laurenson had nothing to do. It is obvious that, as a matter of continuity, if nothing else, Connell is entirely astray regarding the time of this conversation. He says that Mr. Laurenson made certain remarks which Mr. Laurenson will deny he could ever have made—that such a thing never entered his head, nor would he be willing in any way to associate himself with matters such as Connell alleged. In Connell's evidence to-day the sting has been entirely taken out of the matter, because he says he did not intend to make any imputation, nor did he consider any such inference could have been drawn from anything he said.

*The Commissioner:* In regard to certain general statements made by the constable in his evidence in regard to the wharf-labourers or stevedores generally, I do not think he intended to say that they generally were a dishonest community. The way in which his statement has been used and advertised was liable to cast a stigma on the general body of wharf-labourers, but that was not the impression left on my mind, and I do not think it would be on most people's. He was dealing more with individual members amongst the labourers. Therefore there is no ground whatever for their saying their honesty as a body was impugned. I should say there is nothing in the evidence to warrant that view, and if anybody asked me to believe, on the evidence of a disgraced detective, that the wharf-labourers as a body were dishonest I should scout the idea. It would make no impression on my mind. It is one of those wild statements that are very difficult to answer. At the same time, the wharf-labourers would not like to guarantee that every member of their body was absolutely honest. No doubt pilfering does take place at Lyttelton. I do not suppose there is a port in the world where it does not, labourers being placed in the constant way of temptation. The wharf-labourers approached me with regard to clearing up this question of their honesty, which I do not think at all necessary, and should be sorry to make myself a party to any such presumption. I say this openly, because they are labouring under what they consider to be a grievance, and think they ought to come and declare their honesty. I refused their request because it is not necessary.

GEORGE LAURENSEN, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 64.)

*Witness:* I am a member of Parliament for Lyttelton, and I reside in Lyttelton.

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You have read a copy of the evidence given by Constable Connell in Invercargill?—Yes.

2. You have also heard what he has said here to-day?—Yes.

3. Did any conversation of the kind referred to by Connell ever take place between you?—Never.

4. Did you ever at any time suggest to Connell that he was too active in the performance of his duties?—Never once.

5. Did you ever offer to get him a better position if he would leave Lyttelton?—Never.

6. Those letters which you wrote to the Minister were written, I think, in consequence of complaints having been sent to you?—Yes.

7. And at one of your political meetings you were questioned on this point?—Yes.

8. And that is what caused you to write and to forward the written complaints?—May I explain? When I was verbally complained to about these matters, I refused to have anything to do with them until a written complaint was put before me. I said that if any of the men who considered they had a grievance under which they were suffering liked to give me a written statement of their grievance, I would forward it to the Minister of Justice. As the letters on the file will show, I was careful not to say a single thing against Constable Connell. I did not suggest for an instant that he should be reduced, shifted, or anything else. I simply asked that an inquiry or investigation should be made into the allegations made in those letters. I recognise the difficulties of a constable's duties, and, although complaints were made to me in writing, I was careful not to follow them up by asking that anything should be done to the injury of the constable. It is only right that I should say also that Constable Connell seems to be under the impression that I have used some influence outside those letters to his detriment. Commissioner Dinnie and Inspector Gillies are here, and, as both those officers were in charge of their respective departments when this took place, they are in a position to say whether I have in any way asked that any injury should be done to Constable Connell, or that he should be interfered with in any way at all. When I read the evidence he gave in Invercargill I was thunderstruck, because I had not thought for an instant that he had any grievance against me. As far as I knew, we were on friendly terms enough, and, in fact, I felt that if I could have done him a good turn in any way I would have done it. But when he stated in Invercargill that I had said Lyttelton was losing its population on account of his action, and that people were furnishing their houses and finding boots and shoes for their families, I wondered if the man was in his judgment.

9. You never at any time, either directly or indirectly, tried to get Connell moved from Lyttelton?—I never interfered further than to forward those written complaints, which were given to me by men whom I knew, and who came to see me about his conduct.

10. The election took place on the 5th December, 1905?—Yes.

11. And those complaints had come in just prior to the election?—Yes. Connell, in his evidence, stated that this would be about two months before the election of 1905 that this alleged conversation took place. Well, up to within five weeks of that election I was in Wellington, and

—I looked up *Hansard* last night to be sure about this—I took part in the last division of that session. Sometimes during the session I would come down to Lyttelton to attend a meeting of the Harbour Board, and on those occasions I generally arrived in the morning and returned to Wellington by the steamer in the evening of the same day, so that I was generally pretty busy during that day. I could therefore hardly have had such a conversation with him as he alleges two months before the election of 1905.

12. As regards the men who made the complaints, you say you knew them personally: Connell has stated they were men of bad character?—I do not think he is justified in saying that. One of the men, I understand, has had one or two convictions against him for drunkenness, but I know of nothing against either Beaumont or Campbell. The former has not been long in Lyttelton.

13. So far as your knowledge extends, they were men who were worthy of credence?—There was nothing wrong about the men so far as I know, with the exception I have mentioned.

14. Were any other complaints made to you about Connell which you did not forward on?—Yes; I remember that one man, who was a strong supporter of mine, wanted me to forward a complaint, and, in fact, he wanted me to interfere with Connell in connection with his duty, and I refused to have anything to do with it. The man I refer to is here to-day.

15. Who is he?—Thompson.

16. I suppose in your capacity as a member of Parliament you are besieged with all manner of complaints and requests?—Yes, I get a good few.

17. And, as a result, you get a considerable quantity of correspondence?—Yes; last year I forwarded over 3,000 letters, and I suppose my interviews average from eight to sixteen a day, and there are telegrams and various other matters besides.

18. And you absolutely deny that any such conversation as Connell alleges ever took place between you?—I am positive of that. As to his statements—of course, he has considerably modified them here—but the statements he attributed to me in Invercargill I could never have made unless I were mad.

18A. You have not since you have been a member of Parliament attempted to get Connell or any other constable moved?—I do not remember having ever interfered with a single constable in the Force. I recognise what the difficulties of their duties are. The chiefs of the Department are here to-day, and they can certify to what I say. Sergeant Rutledge, who has been in the district about sixteen years, can also certify as to whether I have ever used any influence in any cases of prosecution or otherwise.

*The Commissioner:* Do you wish to ask the witness any questions, Constable Connell?

19. *Constable Connell.*] I do not know that there is any use asking any questions, as he denies having had any conversation with me. I would just ask Mr. Laurenson whether he remembers on any occasion speaking to me in the Lyttelton office?—Yes, I have spoken to you often.

20. Do you remember on one occasion ringing up Mr. Taylor on the office telephone?—The telephone bureau at Lyttelton is always closed after 8 o'clock in the evening, and consequently the only way in which we could get connection with Christchurch was through the police office.

21. Do you remember speaking to me about a "rascal" called Wood? When I say "rascal" I am using your own expression?—I am positive I did not call Wood a rascal, nor do I remember ever speaking about Wood to you.

22. Do you remember remarking that Wood had a respectable family?—I do not. I know that Wood has a very respectable family, and, in fact, a rather distinguished family.

23. I said something to you about Wood writing letters, and you said, "Yes, I believe he did write. That rascal is always drunk." Do you remember saying that?—I do not.

24. Do you remember saying anything about Little River—what a nice station it was?—I do not. Do you expect me to remember a conversation of four years ago?

*Constable Connell:* That is all I have to ask.

WALTER DINNIE, Commissioner of Police, further examined. (No. 65.)

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You know Mr. Laurenson?—I do.

2. Have you, in your official capacity, ever known him to interfere in any way with any constable or any one in the Force?—No.

3. Have you ever known him attempt to use influence of any sort?—None whatever. He never has, so far as I am concerned.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Perhaps I should take this opportunity of asking you whether any other members of Parliament have done anything of this nature. What is the practice?—The practice is for members of Parliament to write to the Minister.

5. Do you think that is the proper course, rather than going to the local head?—Sometimes members have written to me, but I do not send the reply. The Minister sends the reply.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 66.)

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You are in charge of the Canterbury District?—Yes.

2. You know Mr. Laurenson?—I do, very well.

3. You have come into contact with him at different times?—Frequently.

4. Have you ever known him, either directly or indirectly, to attempt to influence you or any one in connection with the Force in any way?—Never.

5. How long have you known him?—For seven years and a half—since I have been in charge of this district.

6. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to Constable Connell, I notice on the papers you speak highly of him in connection with work he did at Lyttelton. How do you account for his deterioration?—I cannot account for it. He did exceedingly good work while he was at Lyttelton, and I

recommended him for acting detective's pay, and I got him his allowance afterwards. He was afterwards transferred to Christchurch. It was after he became a detective that he seemed to fall away in his work. Up to that time I had not the slightest ground for complaint against him; in fact, he was very energetic.

7. Did you acquiesce in the action of the Commissioner in moving him to Dunedin on account of the deterioration in his work?—Yes; he was not giving satisfaction to me, and I thought a change might be the means of giving him a fresh start. I considered the punishment he received to be most just.

8. He has had his opportunity again?—That is so.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think his falling-off may have been owing to family troubles?—That may have been so to a certain extent. I know his wife died, and I believe he has had some family troubles. That may have made him careless.

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, ex-Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 67.)

*Witness:* I was formerly a sergeant of police, stationed at Lyttelton, and I was there during the whole of the time Acting-Detective Connell was there.

1. *Mr. Dougall.*] You know Mr. Laurenson fairly intimately?—Yes; I have known him during the last sixteen years.

2. During your experience, had you any reason to think that he interfered with the work of the constables there?—No.

3. You never knew or heard of his attempting to get Connell moved?—Never.

4. Did Connell ever complain to you about Mr. Laurenson?—No, he did not.

*The Commissioner:* I have gone carefully through these papers, and I considered it only right that Mr. Laurenson should have the fullest possible opportunity, as a public man, of putting himself right in the eyes of the public, if he could do so, with regard to this particular matter; and it was on account of my realising the seriousness of the position that I instructed the Secretary to forward him immediately a copy of the evidence reflecting upon him. Of course, I am not going to express any opinion now, as my report goes to the Governor. Of course, it will have to be seriously considered at a later date what will be the effect upon the constable as to the evidence he has given. That is a matter I shall not refer to at all. However, we will pass over this incident for the present.

*Mr. Dougall:* I have other evidence which I am ready to call, but perhaps it would be only waste of time.

WILLIAM HENRY SYMES, Police Surgeon, examined on oath. (No. 68.)

*Witness:* I am a duly qualified registered medical practitioner, residing in Christchurch. I am Police Surgeon.

*The Commissioner:* I should like you to make your own statement.

*Witness:* I wish to bring before you a few matters bearing upon the health and upon the efficiency of the Force. As regards the present overcoats supplied to the men, they consist of a mackintosh, which is worn in the day time in wet weather, and a heavy overcoat, which is compulsorily worn every night all the year round. This overcoat weighs 8 lb., and with accoutrements 13 lb. If the refreshment-flask is added, that still further increases the weight; but that is not usually carried, on account of its cumbersomeness. When this overcoat is soaked with water it weighs about 19 lb., exclusive of accoutrements. The men would prefer some coat such as that used by the tramway conductors, which is lighter in weight and of a closer texture. I produce specimens of the two kinds of cloths-I have referred to. They would like to wear such an overcoat in cold weather, when standing for some considerable time at a street-corner in the day time, as standing without an overcoat in cold weather is very trying, and they cannot possibly use the present regulation overcoat, not only because it is too heavy, but also because it is practically soaked with oil which has leaked from the lamps which are used at night. The men would like to have a uniform pattern overcoat which they could use both day and night. If it were decided to adopt this newer pattern of overcoat, I would suggest that it could be rendered comparatively waterproof by being soaked in a solution of acetate of lead alum, which is very effective in preventing the penetration of rain. This solution has been used now for some considerable time, and has been found very satisfactory. It might have to be renewed, say, every couple of years, but the cost would be so trifling that it is hardly worth considering; and waterproofing of that kind could be done anywhere by anybody at any time. But supposing it were considered inadvisable to change the present pattern, the men would like to have permission to leave it off on warm nights in the summer time. At present it is compulsory to wear this heavy overcoat all the year round—summer and winter alike; and it is obvious, from its weight, it must be a considerable hindrance in the pursuit or the arrest of a man. If the new pattern I have recommended is adopted, the men would like it to be fitted with a movable collar, which could be worn at night. The regulation pattern has no collar, and the consequence is that the rain gets in at the neck and wets their underclothes. They would also like to see the present shako abolished, and the helmet substituted. They say the shako affords no protection against blows on the head or against falling *débris* in the case of fire or against rain and snow, whilst the helmet which is used in many other countries does afford such protection. The shako is also said to be uncomfortable, as all the weight comes on the forehead, whereas with the helmet the weight is equally distributed, and the weight is not greater than that of the shako, I understand. Then, with regard to the night-lamps: The colza-oil used in them becomes very hot, and, as the lamp is kept burning from 9 o'clock at night to 5 in the morning, the heat becomes oppressive. I have felt them myself after they have been burning quite a short time, and I could not bear my hand on them. Then, the smell of the oil is

offensive, and, as the lamp is worn in front, the fumes rising up into the men's faces tend to cause sickness and headache. I should recommend the substitution of electric lamps such as are used in Sydney. One advantage is that the light is completely extinguished when not in use, whereas in the case of the oil-lamp, when it gets old and knocked about, a glimmer of light may be seen in some cases. The electric light would be more powerful, quite light to carry, and they are not expensive. Then again, these oil-lamps all leak more or less, with the result that the men's overcoats are practically soaked with oil; and this is all the more apparent if a man has slipped down or has been knocked down. This naturally gives the overcoat a most discreditable appearance, and they are not fit to be seen. Then, with regard to supplying the men with refreshments at night, this matter has been under discussion by the Inspector and myself for some years past, and, though several plans have been suggested, the only one we have tried is a tin (a sample of which I will ask the Inspector to hand in) which will hold a little coffee or other suitable fluid which the spirit-lamp underneath will heat up in a very short time. The tin weighs about a couple of pounds when full. The men, however, seem to object to carrying it about with them at night for a number of hours. The tin holds about a pint of liquid. Only four of these tins have been used so far, owing to the objection the men have to carrying them. Now, to obviate the necessity for carrying these tins about all night, I would suggest the establishment of three pillar-boxes in this city—one at the clock-tower, which would serve beats 3, 4, 5, 9, and 10; one at the Bank of New Zealand corner, which would serve beats 1, 2, and 6; and one at Victoria Square, to serve beats 7 and 8. The remainder of the beats are close to the station, and would not require a box. The Postmaster informs me that the cost of these boxes would be about £1 10s. each, but if attached to a telegraph-post the cost would not exceed 15s. The only thing the Postmaster asks is that the boxes should be so painted as not to resemble the letter-boxes. Then, these pillar-boxes could be fitted up with the telephone, connected with the central station. Not only could these refreshment-tins be deposited in these boxes, but the men could leave their overcoats and other things there if necessary. Then, I should strongly recommend the establishment of a gymnasium at the station. The men at present are on their feet all day, but they do not get enough muscular exercise. Living in the open air as they do, they probably eat too much meat, and their mode of living probably accounts for a good deal of the sickness from which the men suffer. I believe if they had a gymnasium it would greatly contribute to the health of the men as well as to their recreation, and generally to the efficiency of the Force. The next matter is the library. The library has had no new books supplied to it for something like ten years. The Inspector has a scheme for establishing a library fund, and the men are quite willing to contribute, but they think such a fund should be subsidised to some extent by the Government. I would recommend, if a proper library is established, that books and periodicals should be sent to the country stations from the library from time to time, and when returned others should be sent in exchange. There is a splendid dormitory at the Police-station, but there is considerable complaint on the part of the men at being unable to sleep, on account of the noise of the traffic that goes on just below them, and they want a door or curtain to screen off the entrance, to minimise the noise and to shut off the draught which comes through that entrance. The only drawback to this fine dormitory is that the ceiling is rather low, and the draught from the windows is thrown down too directly on to the men's beds. This matter has been complained of to me a great many times, and if a door or curtain such as I suggest were put up it would greatly minimise the draught. Then, there is another subject I am anxious to bring before you, and it is one which I have already mentioned to Mr. Dinnie. It is that the men joining the Force should be put on twelve months' probation before being made permanent. Although the men have all been subjected to a very careful medical examination, we find that after three months' or six months' work they often show signs of certain defects which it was almost impossible to recognise at their examination. To mention an instance: One man came to me a few months ago suffering from very bad varicose veins, and that was within six months from the time he was originally examined elsewhere. Now, if that man had had two or three weeks' complete rest, perhaps lying on his back, before his examination for entry into the Force, those veins might entirely disappear.

1. Very improbable, surely?—I admit it is not probable, but the effect of rest upon varicose veins is most remarkable; and after such a rest the condition of the man applying might be such that the surgeon would not consider himself justified in refusing him. We have considerable difficulty in regard to the examination of these candidates, and in doubtful cases I sometimes take as long as an hour and a half to two hours over the examination. Of course, in a straightforward case it might not take me more than half an hour or twenty minutes. In cases where I have had to refuse a man I frequently receive inquiries as to why the man has been refused, and all kinds of pressure is sought to be brought to bear upon me with a view of getting me to pass him.

2. Pressure from whom?—From his friends and others.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Not from the Department?—No; the Department is only too anxious to get at the truth. Looking to the scarcity of men for enrolment in the Force, it is somewhat remarkable that the men should show so much disappointment at being refused.

4. *The Commissioner.*] Your report goes to the Department, I assume. How is it, then, that the friends know what you have reported?—The man asks me himself. I do not tell more than I can help, but I like to be as straightforward as I can with the men. I also get asked by his friends why I have refused him.

5. I do not see how any man can make a grievance against you for reporting adversely upon his physical condition. I do not think the friends should go to you?—Perhaps not, but I do have some considerable difficulty in the matter. Now, as I have said, I would recommend that the men should be put on twelve months' probation. The test of having to walk about in the streets from 9 o'clock to 5 every night for a fortnight is a very severe one, and walking about for eight hours

seems to try some men more than others. Some of the men will begin to show defects in a very short time, defects which it would have been almost impossible to discover at the time of examination. And even a three months' probation would bring out some of those defects; but I think twelve months would be best.

6. I am strongly in favour of a period of probation, and I intend to report in favour of it, but on other grounds than those you have mentioned. I, however, quite recognise the force of your argument?—Of course, there are other defects than varicose veins, and I may say that standing about is often a more severe test than walking.

7. What proportion of the men have varicose veins which have appeared subsequent to their being passed?—It is very difficult to say. The trouble is much more prevalent in the last ten or fifteen years of a man's service. Then, again, a man may have a certain constitutional weakness, such as a slight tubercular tendency, which, though it would not be sufficient to cause the surgeon to reject him, might make him more liable to catch cold. There are some constitutions that can stand exposure night after night in heavy rain in overcoats that are never properly dried, but others cannot, and they are very liable to get bad colds. Looking at the sick list, the first thing that strikes one is the number of cases put down as catarrh—a general term used for catching cold. There is another matter which I would bring forward merely by way of suggestion, and it is one which relates to pensions. In every body of men there is a certain number who, while they cannot be classed as drunkards, have what may be called "nipping habits," which, in my opinion, has a very serious effect upon their health. Now, the pension fund has to be used, of course, to the best advantage for the benefit of the Force as a whole, and it appears to me to be somewhat unfair that men who exercise self-control should have their pensions reduced proportionately by the fact that a certain class of men indulge in a habit which tends to the injury of their health.

8. Are you sure there is such a proportional diminution of the pensions, or would it not only go to the root of the stability of the fund itself? You see, the men are entitled to a certain pension by statute. I quite agree that a man who brings himself into a state of unfitness by his own misconduct should not be entitled to claim the privileges of the fund. I have known of a medical man certifying that a man was medically unfit when I have held a strong opinion personally that his unfitness was due to his own fault?—When reporting on claims for pensions there is no provision for dealing with that aspect. If a man has been convicted of drunkenness that might be another thing.

9. In any case, this does not come strictly within the scope of my inquiry?—Well, I will pass on to the next matter. In view of the decision come to at Home to give the London police a weekly day of rest, I think it would be reasonable to consider the question of giving a weekly or a fortnightly day of rest to our own Force, as I believe it would contribute to the health of the police. Now, I notice that at the present day there are fewer men coming forward for examination, and that there is distinctly less desire on the part of able-bodied men to join the Force. I think the pay on joining should be increased to 8s. a day. If that were done I feel sure there would be a greater inducement to men to join. A man can get 8s. a day in any other employment in town.

10. You recognise, of course, that he gets now 7s. 6d. a day every day of the week?—Yes; but he would much rather not work seven days in the week.

11. I only mention the point as it should be taken into consideration when making a comparison?—The question is whether for the seven days' work he should not get extra pay. With regard to that refreshment-tin of which I spoke, and a sample of which you now have before you, there is no objection to it, but we want a box in which to place it.

*The Commissioner:* Surely a constable can always find some corner in which to place it until he wants it.

*Inspector Gibbies:* There is only one man in the city who uses the tin, although every one can be supplied with one.

12. *The Commissioner.*] How do you account for that, Dr. Symes?—It is very awkward to carry about. I think, if a box such as I have suggested were provided it would be more convenient.

13. There would be no hardship in a constable taking it out with him and planting it in some doorway?—No, I suppose not. There is one other thing I would touch upon. In my opinion, political influence is the moral cancer of the Force.

14. Upon what do you base that opinion?—It is an extremely difficult matter to deal with, because members of Parliament are our masters, and it does not do to quarrel with them.

15. I am afraid I do not quite follow you. In what direction do you think political influence is used?—I think promotions should depend on merit rather than on seniority. If a man is not promoted on account of his seniority he at once applies to a member of Parliament.

16. Then what does the member do?—I suppose he sends it on to the Minister.

17. What then does the Minister do?—I would not like to say.

*The Commissioner:* I do not see how you can prevent a member communicating with the Minister; but I cannot conceive that a Minister, in his responsible position, would injure a member of the Force. We have heard a good deal about political influence; we have had no instances of its having been used with success.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We quite admit that members of the service do seek political influence, and I know that constables have been to members of Parliament.

*Witness:* I have been written to by members of Parliament occasionally about the examinations I make.

18. *The Commissioner.*] I do not think they have any right to approach you on that matter at all. With what object are the letters written?—I suppose they are written to show that especial interest is taken in the candidate.

19. Would they influence your judgment at all?—No; I have always endeavoured to do my duty, irrespective of anything of that sort.

20. Do you think this political interference affects the efficiency of the Force?—I believe it affects it very seriously.

21. How?—It is very dangerous to mention facts. I reported years ago to a certain Inspector certain men who were in the habit of drinking—I do not say they were drunkards; I think worse of a man who nips than of the occasional drunkard. That Inspector said to me, “I don’t think it is advisable to interfere with these men; they have more political influence than I have.” That was not the present Inspector. In my opinion, continual nipping has a more serious effect on health, and leads more to early invaliding, than occasional drunkenness. Another matter came under my own observation. A constable who had a record for drinking was sent home from the racecourse in a cab for being very drunk. He was in charge of a much smaller constable, whom he nearly killed, and who had to be rescued by the cabman. This constable was dismissed from the Force, and was reinstated by Mr. Seddon within twelve months.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When was that?—It was some years ago; before your time. I should like to say that, in giving the evidence I have, I have been actuated solely by a desire to promote the health and efficiency of the Force.

23. In regard to the gymnasium, do you know that very few men use it?—No.

24. Very few indeed?—But they might have an instructor, and be compelled to go through a course. One of the sergeants might take it in hand. If the men had systematic gymnastic exercise it would conduce greatly to their health.

25. *The Commissioner.*] They have plenty of opportunity in the towns?—But they do not take advantage of them.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest it as part of their discipline?—Certainly.

27. As regards the greatcoats, do you know we are introducing a new pattern?—No.

28. The old ones have been in force for many years, and have always given satisfaction?—Not to the police.

29. There have been no complaints?—They have complained to me.

30. As regards helmets instead of shakos, do you know it was put to the men as a whole while Mr. Tunbridge was here, and the great majority voted for the shako?—I heard something about it. The men here seem to be unanimously in favour of the helmet.

31. As regards draughts in the dormitory, did you not mention something about a door once before?—Yes; a door was placed to cut off the lobby.

32. It was attended to at once?—Yes.

33. Did you mention anything about the dormitory to the Inspector?—We talked over it many times, and I said what I thought was necessary. Mr. Gillies thought it would entail too much expense.

34. Are many men rejected on account of varicose veins?—Yes.

35. But you have not had many cases to re-examine after men have been in service for some time?—I cannot say I have.

36. That is a most exceptional thing?—Yes.

37. You have compared the police pay with that of the labourer: which is best off, the policeman with 7s. 6d. and a certain amount of clothing free and underclothing at wholesale price, or the labourer with 8s.?—Many of the men are carpenters, who would get more than 8s. And constables live harder, owing to night work, while the labourer only works eight hours.

38. But he loses time, and the policeman does not?—A policeman would rather lose time than stand for hours in the rain.

39. Do you know of any case of political influence within the last ten years?—I cannot recall dates exactly; the case I mentioned was, I should think, within the last six years or so.

40. Any other cases?—I do not keep a diary of these things.

41. But it is a serious thing to allege that influence obtains if you cannot mention one instance?—I can only say that is my conviction.

42. Is it hearsay?—No; it is based on experience.

43. Let us have your experience?—I cannot give facts, because I have no record.

44. You think a man who gets drunk occasionally is not so bad as a continual “nipper”?—It is not so bad for his health.

45. If he is a continual “nipper” it interferes more with his duties?—Yes, I think so.

46. Then, it is better for us to get rid of the continual “nipper” than the man who gets drunk occasionally?—Yes.

47. The men who gets drunk occasionally might reform, but not the continual “nipper”?—I have known a good many “nippers” reform; I have reformed a good many myself.

*Mr. Dinnie.* In regard to the electric lamp, I desire to say that we have tried them of various kinds, to see how long they would last, and have not got one so far that is satisfactory; they give a good light to start with, but they gradually grow weaker, and they have to be refilled very frequently. We are waiting for a suitable lamp before we make the change.

48. *The Commissioner.*] Have you noticed any deterioration in the physique of members of the Force during late years?—We have not the same selection of men.

49. Do you attribute that entirely to the pay?—Not at all; it has more to do with the general increase of wages in the country. Indirectly, of course, it has to do with the pay, which has not been increased as the wages of the working-classes.

50. Do you think the standard of education is rather high?—It appears to me it is higher than it used to be.

51. You say the physique in the Force has deteriorated because the area of selection is not so large?—Yes.

52. How do you find the morality at present?—I think it is very good; I have reason to believe it is.



53. Do the men consult you about their ailments?—Yes, largely.  
 54. They can go to an outside doctor?—Yes; any doctor they like.  
 55. There is no ground for assuming the morality at present is any worse than it was?—  
 I should say on very good grounds that there is less immorality in the Force now than formerly.  
 56. You are about the station a good deal?—Yes.  
 57. What is the general conduct of the men?—Very good.

ERNEST ALEXANDER REGAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 69.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1907. I appear, with two other delegates, to speak on behalf of the Christchurch police. The first matter is in regard to the pay. We agreed to ask that the pay should begin at 8s., with the present increments every three years instead of every four as at present; that is, in the constables' grade.

*Mr. Dinnie:* A recommendation has been made in respect to pay.

*Witness:* Our reason for this is, in the first place, that a man applying for enrolment has to be of exemplary character before he is taken on, whereas outside a position does not depend upon character.

1. *The Commissioner.*] That is rather a bold statement to make. You do not say a man in business would employ a man without inquiring into his character?—No; but his character is not inquired into to the same extent. A man's character has to be fairly perfect before he gets into the Force. Another reason is that constables many times have to do overtime—more than eight hours—attending Court especially. When on night duty, and they have a case to come before the Court, they get to bed at half-past 5, and have to come to the Court in the morning in their own time. They are not allowed time off for coming to Court, and it means working overtime. When taking prisoners to Lyttelton the men are allowed the travelling time.

2. If a case did not come on till midday, what is the position then?—I have in two cases experienced getting time off in such a case, but if a case is finished before midday we are allowed no time off. Another thing is that men who apply for enrolment have to undergo a medical test, which in many other positions they have not to do. Then, as regards the house-allowance to married men, it is at present 7s., and we ask for an increase of 6d. per day.

3. Have you worked out the average rents that men have to pay in Christchurch?—It comes to about 13s. 7d. I think that is a fair estimate for the last five or six years. Some of these places are outside the boundary. A policeman must reside in some area close to the police-station, and rent within the boundary is far dearer than that outside. Then, a working-man can occupy a small house in no matter what locality, whereas a policeman must be in a respectable locality. In regard to the question of annual leave, we ask for an increase of four days; at present it is twelve days. Men stationed at a distance from their homes—say, between Auckland and Dunedin—have to travel so far that twelve days leaves them very little time to see their people. Gaol warders are allowed eighteen days. Then, we ask for a free railway-pass during our holidays.

*The Commissioner:* The difficulty about that is that the Minister refuses it.

*Witness:* The ground we go on is that constables have to take their holidays at a different time from the general public holidays, and therefore cannot take advantage of the excursion fares. Then, constables are, as a rule, known to nearly every guard on the line, and perhaps when on their annual leave are called upon to do their duty if there is a row on the train.

4. *The Commissioner.*] If Court proceedings followed, and their leave were broken, would they get it again?—I could not say. Again, if an accident occurs on the train the constable would be compelled to take charge of a body, and would be put to inconvenience and loss of leave. We also ask for one day's rest in a fortnight. At present we are allowed Sunday leave one Sunday in four when convenient; but sometimes we might go six or eight weeks without a Sunday off. It depends on the number of men who are available. It could be worked by allowing one man off each night, with the exception of Saturday.

5. Is there any reason why the clerks in the district office should not take their turn of relieving?—They are a separate branch from ours; they are not in uniform.

6. You have not considered that matter?—No, I should not like to touch on that.

7. But you must show how time off can be given without impairing the efficiency of the Force?—The district clerks are a distinct branch.

8. But they are constables?—Yes; they get Sunday off always. They are looked upon as being of more ability than the men doing uniform duty—of more clerical ability.

9. But none the less they are constables?—We never broached that subject. Another matter is the coat for day duty, which would be more suitable than the mackintosh. The mackintosh is not a warm coat by any means, and you cannot wear it without the cape, and it looks absurd to wear a cape when the sun is shining.

10. What do you suggest in lieu of the mackintosh?—Something more after the style of coat the tramway men wear, only longer. At present we have to wear night-duty lamps, which leak and spill the oil over the coat, and it could not be used for day-wear. Another matter is in regard to the 11 o'clock regulation—having to be in barracks by 10.30, and all lights out at 11. We ask for this to be extended to 12 o'clock. We can at present, by applying, be out till 12; it is never refused; but we ask to be allowed to be out till 12 without applying. One may leave the station in the early part of the evening without intending to stay out, and one may meet with a friend who asks you to go to the theatre, and you might get back five or ten minutes late, and be reported by the sergeant. It is not that we want to stay out always after 11, but on many occasions one is kept after 11 through no fault, and the sergeant has to report you. If men do not, as a rule, come in in proper time they are not fit to be in the Force. We do not want the rule done away with, but only extended to 12.



11. Reserving the right to ask for a further extension if necessary?—Yes, in case of wishing to attend a dance. Then, in regard to uniform, we ask for a free uniform and a pair of boots a year. The average cost of making up a uniform is £2 5s. A pair of trousers is supposed to last us nine months, but if you ride a bike or get rough usage they will not last that time. We are allowed a tunic twelve months after we join, and then one every eighteen months. Then, in regard to the regulation that married men must go to and from the station in uniform, we ask that that shall be abolished. A married man may want to do shopping with his wife, and women do not like being seen walking with a policeman in uniform. I have known of an instance where a man, it being a wet day, took his wife home in a cab, and it caused a crowd to gather round to see if she was going to be locked up. Then, the men here ask for a gymnasium at the station.

12. The Commissioner says the one in Auckland is not much used?—That is so, but the men here take a great interest in that kind of thing, and go in for it on their own. Another matter is the night-duty lamp. At present it has to be worn alight from 12 o'clock on the inside beats, and on the outside beats alight all the time. The heat of the lamp weakens the back, and also the front when making use of it, and the fumes give you a headache.

13. What do you suggest as a remedy?—Electric flashes.

14. The objection to the electric lamp that has been produced is, I understand, the shortness of time the charge lasts?—The present lamps are considered to be very unhealthy and very dirty, as they all spill the oil; I have used a great number, and they are all alike in this respect. Another matter is that we are asking to be allowed to use our own discretion in regard to discarding the night-duty coat. At present we are compelled to wear them all night, as well as accoutrements, and in summer nights this becomes very hard. We are not allowed to discard them. If we took them off we could put them in some place where we could get them again. It is a big handicap to have to wear these heavy coats for eight hours. We also ask for a more suitable headgear than the shako. With the present one the rain comes down all over your face and the back of your neck. If it had a covering over it for a wet night it would be a great help.

15. Do you prefer the shako to the helmet?—I have had no experience with the helmet; I know the Victorian helmet, which is more suitable than the shako.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to the lamps, you mean they run over when held down?—Yes, or if you are walking very fast, or if they knock against you.

17. Do you know the reason why men are not allowed to go home out of uniform?—I believe, on account of the last Commission over the Dunedin scandal.

18. Was it not because they used to go into the single men's quarters?—I heard something of that.

19. It is desirable to keep the married men out of the single men's quarters?—Yes.

20. It would necessitate having a room for the married men's clothes?—There is one now.

21. For single men; but the married men should not mix with them?—At present there are pegs for each man, and each man could keep his own peg.

22. They have to go home in uniform here?—Yes.

23. There is a room in which they could keep their clothing?—Yes.

24. In regard to Sunday leave, do you say you have had only one day in eight months?—No; I said I had experience of only getting one Sunday in eight. The general rule is one Sunday in four.

25. Did you apply for more?—At one time. It is not that the superior officer would not grant it; but say you apply on the fifth Sunday; a senior man is granted in preference to you; then, you may be on night duty, and that carries you on two weeks more.

26. There is a possibility, then, of having eight weeks without a Sunday off?—Yes; but it is very rare. If you take the average, a man gets about one Sunday in five during the year.

27. The difficulty is that we have not many men?—That is the trouble.

28. Do you not think 11 o'clock is late enough to stay out?—As a rule; but many a time a man goes out not intending to stay out after 11, but comes in ten minutes or so after. If a man cannot be trusted to come home at 12 he should not be in the Force. Many a man applies for an extension to 12 as a safeguard.

29. It is always granted?—Yes; it has never been refused that I know of. But a man who can be trusted with police duty could be trusted to come in before 12; the remedy, if he does not keep proper hours, is to dismiss him.

30. Do you not think it necessary to call the roll at night?—Yes.

31. Do you think it should be done away with?—It would be better if we could report ourselves instead of being disturbed by the sergeant turning the lights on.

32. To whom?—To the sergeant or the watch-house keeper.

33. But we want a superior officer?—If a man's staying out comes under the notice of a superior officer there is another remedy.

34. *Inspector Gillies.*] Do you think a constable coming in at 12 would be fit for duty at 5 o'clock in the morning?—No, not if he made it a rule; but one night now and again would not injure him.

35. Do you know of any case on this station where a man has been punished for being out after 11?—No.

36. Why this complaint, then?—I am only representing the Force; it is not my own suggestion.

37. Do you think it is desirable, yourself, that men should be allowed out at 12 every night?—No.

38. Would you think it desirable for every man you know to be allowed out till 12 every night?—No.

39. Where do you wish to draw the line?—If constables were allowed leave till 12 any night, and a man stayed out generally till that time he should be reported.

40. *The Commissioner.*] But he would have the right to do so?—If men are fit to be constables they would look after themselves, and provide themselves with enough sleep.

41. *Inspector Gillies.*] Have you ever known of a constable being refused leave till 12?—There was some time ago, but I think you intimated that every man who applied for leave would not be refused so long as he gave suitable reason.

42. Have you ever known a constable refused leave till 3 or 4 if he explained what it was for?—No; we have no grievance at all against the present conditions of the station. The conduct of the men as a whole is very good, and they are treated very well.

43. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction existing among the men owing to the present conditions of the police?—No.

44. Have you heard of any rumour that I have a special man appointed at each district with a view of obtaining information?—The first I heard of it was from the evidence given in Dunedin.

45. But this is said to be rumoured from north to south?—I never heard it here.

MARTIN JAMES CARNEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 70.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled on the 25th October, 1906, and have been in Christchurch ever since. I am one of the delegates appointed by the members of the Christchurch Force to appear before the Commission. The first thing the men advocate is an increase of 6d. a day in their pay, and that there should be a rise of 6d. a day every three years instead of every four years, as at present. It is felt that if the men started at 8s. a day there would be greater inducement to a better class of men to enter the Force. The cost of living now is much higher than it has been for some time past, and we think the rise should be given every three years. If, as the Commissioner has said, a man is qualified for promotion at the end of twelve years we think he should be worthy of his full pay at the end of three years as he would then have a good grasp of his police duties. House-allowance to married men, we think, should be increased to 1s. 6d. a day. At present it is 1s. As a married man, I am paying 11s. a week for a house just over the South Belt, on the Sydenham side, and it is not much of a house at that. I only know of one married man who is paying less than what we are asking as rent-allowance, but I believe if he could afford it he would have a better house. The rent of houses in the centres, I think, is a good deal higher than it used to be. With regard to annual leave, we ask that we should be granted an extra four days, making sixteen days in the year; and we think we should be allowed one day off in each fortnight, and that we should get Sunday off without having to apply for it. Under the present system we have to make application before getting Sunday off. Even if it were only once in every three weeks, when there are sufficient men available, it would be a great advantage to get a Sunday off, and it should not be less than every four weeks. As to the extra holidays in the year, I would say that during the Government gazetted holidays some of the men have to work overtime, and they get nothing for it. And then again, we have to take our holidays at the slack time of the year, and not when most other people are taking their holiday. Considering the fact that the men have to work at night in all weathers, I think it is reasonable that they should get sixteen days' holiday in the year, so that they may go away and have a spell, more especially at a time when they may not feel very well. We also think, when a constable who has been on duty all night has to attend the Court next morning, he should be allowed time off. In some of the Australian States if a man who has been on night duty has to appear in Court the next morning against some drunk he has arrested he gets from one hour and a half to two hours off duty the next night. It is nearly 6 a.m. before a night-duty man gets to bed, and he has to appear in Court at 9.30, so that I think our request is reasonable. Then, we think we should be allowed free passes on the railway when on our annual leave, or some concession similar to that granted to the railway employees. We have to do duty connected with the Railway Department, and even when on leave we are liable to be called upon at any time for duty. I understand most of the employees of the other branches of the service get some concessions when travelling on leave. We also ask to be supplied with free uniform. The cost, on the average, is about £2 5s. And we think we should be supplied with one pair of boots a year. We are under the same Minister as the warders in the gaols, and they receive fifteen days' annual leave, and get every second Sunday off, as well as every second Saturday afternoon off. Every warder gets two uniforms and two pairs of boots a year. They also get £30 a year house-allowance as compared with our £18 5s. a year. As to their pay, I believe it runs a little higher than our own. Then, we ask that a coat suitable for cold weather should be supplied to the men, in place of the mackintosh supplied at present, and which does not keep the men warm. I am told also the mackintosh is injurious to health if one is perspiring at all. The present coats tend to hamper a constable when he is effecting an arrest, and we think it is not necessary to wear the cape on a fine day, more especially if it happened to be windy. A coat similar to those worn by the tramway men would be very acceptable. We suggest that an electric lamp be supplied in place of the present night-duty lamp. Not only is the present lamp injurious to health, on account of the fumes and heat on one's back, but no matter how careful one may be, the oil will leak out. Also, when a constable is arresting a violent prisoner, if he falls on his back the lamp may cause him an injury which might be the cause of his having to leave the service. We consider, also, that saloon passages ought to be allowed to men when on transfer. At present the constable has to go into the steerage with a class of men, probably, that a constable should not be with. And when we are escorting a prisoner, I think some arrangement ought to be made with the Union Steamship Company to allot us some suitable place for our prisoner. The stewards have usually been very good in doing what they can in the matter, but I think arrangements should be made by the Department for a steerage cabin for the prisoner. It is suggested that the helmet might be substituted for the present headgear of the Force. I have seen the helmet worn in Australia, and I think they afford more protection from

the sun and rain than the present shako. With regard to the regulation by which single men have to be in bed by 11 o'clock, I understand that if they wish to be out later they must apply for leave before 5 o'clock that evening. If, therefore, they go to the theatre or a dance, and want to take a girl home, or anything of that sort afterwards, they run the risk of being reported if they get in late, unless they have applied. The men also object to the sergeant coming into their cubicles at 11 o'clock with his lamp to see if they are in bed. They say it is of no use going to bed before 11 if the sergeant is allowed to come round and wake them up just when they are comfortably asleep. Then, the married men want to be allowed to go home in plain clothes, and this is a sore grievance with them. They are in uniform for twelve hours in the day. When they leave off duty it would be simply a matter of changing their coat and putting on a hat instead of the shako, and they could go and do any little business, or see anybody. Under the present system they have to go home to change their clothes if they want to do any private business, and they have to go home again to get into uniform. I would ask the Commission to give especial attention to this grievance. It is true some of the married men might not avail themselves of the right to wear plain clothes, but they think the right should be given in case they require it. With regard to the gymnasium, I heard the Commissioner say that it was never used in Auckland, but I think, as a constable has no opportunity of joining in any outdoor sport such as cricket or football, they should have a gymnasium where they can enjoy themselves, and keep themselves in form, and get physical exercise. That is all I have to bring before you, sir.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I understand the matters you have mentioned are not grievances, but merely some suggested alterations?—That is so. Up to this time we have not had an opportunity of bringing them forward as a body.

2. How often do you have an arrest during night duty which would cause your attendance in Court in the morning?—Sometimes it might be three or four in a week, and at other times we might not have more than one in a month.

3. It does not occur every day, or every second day or third day?—I should not like to express an opinion.

4. Do you think a constable would be likely to turn a blind eye to an offence if that occurred?—I do not know. But I would like to say for myself that on several occasions when I have had to appear in Court in the morning I have been granted time off.

5. You say you are paying 11s. a week for rent. Do you know that in a few years you would be entitled to a station?—I do not know about that. The position is that if a single man who is living at the barracks and who joined three months before me happens to get married he would be more entitled to a station than I am.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That may be; but I am just showing you that you have something to look forward to.

6. *Inspector Gillies.*] With regard to Sunday leave: provided there is the full complement of men at the station, have you ever known less than seven or eight men to be allowed off on Sunday?—I think that is so.

7. You know that we have been shorthanded occasionally?—Yes.

8. And, notwithstanding that, there have always been from seven to eight men off on Sundays?—I have never counted them up, but there have been a fair number.

9. If more men were allowed off, would the public be getting fair treatment?—I do not think the number doing duty should be lessened. We are not complaining of the administration here in any way, but we think that some arrangement might be made to give us more Sunday leave, so that we can have it regularly without application.

10. Would that not entail an increase in the number of men, unless the duty is to be neglected?—That is so.

JUSTIN ERIC MCCARTHY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 71.)

*Witness:* I am a constable, at present performing the duties of assistant district clerk in Christchurch. Was enrolled on the 1st November, 1906. I am delegated to represent the uniform branch of this city. I have no complaints to bring forward, but the question of pay seems to be the greatest item of trouble in the Force. They think constables should start at 8s. a day. The two former delegates considered that we should rise by increments of 6d. a day every three years. Well, I and others I have been speaking to think it should be 6d. every two years, so that the maximum salary would be attained at the expiration of eight years. At the present time a constable starting at 7s. 6d. a day takes sixteen years to reach the maximum of 9s. 6d. Now, a young apprentice in a trade can become a journeyman in five years, and can participate in a journeyman's wage of, say, 10s. 6d. a day, and we think it would be a fair thing to allow us to reach our maximum in eight years. With regard to house-allowance, I should say a married constable has to pay on an average 12s. 6d. a week. I know of one who pays 15s., and another 16s. A constable has to live in a good locality, and I think it should be ascertained where every constable is going to reside. A gaol warder receives £30 a year house-allowance, while the constable receives only £18 5s. Another reason why we think constables should receive more pay is that he is compelled to work on public holidays, and on such occasions as, say, the Christchurch Exhibition it is impossible for him to get away on account of the great rush of work. And as regards Sunday duty, men in other services, such as the Tramway service for instance, if they are called upon for Sunday duty, get paid double time or time and a half, while the policeman receives his 7s. 6d. a day the same as usual. We ask that we should get an extra four days' leave a year, making sixteen days in all. The warders in the gaols get eighteen days a year, and every second Sunday off, as well as every second Saturday afternoon, I believe. They also get all the gazetted public holidays. We also think we should get free uniform. The average cost of making up, which is about £2 5s., is a very big item to us. As against that, the men in the gaols receive two suits a year

free, I believe, and two pairs of boots. We ask that we should be supplied with one pair of boots a year; and a policeman must be very much harder on boots than the gaol warders. We also ask that we should be given one night off during our fortnight's night duty. In the winter time particularly night duty is very severe on the men, and a night off would be a great boon to them, and would allay any little discontent that there might be as regards night duty. As to Sunday leave, I would advocate that it should be given to the men in turn without their having to apply for it. I agree with the previous witness that the present mackintosh should be abolished, and, apart from the fact that it does not keep one warm, I will quote an instance as to how it hampers a constable in the performance of his duty. A constable in this town on one occasion when effecting an arrest was attacked, and in the struggle his cape was pulled over his head, and three of his ribs were broken. The present shako, while it has its advantages, certainly does enable the wet in rainy weather to run down the forehead and gain an entry at the neck. I have not had much experience of it myself, but I have seen the patent-leather helmet used in Victoria. It is waterproof, and appears to be satisfactory in the winter time, but I do not know how it would affect one in the summer. I agree that it would be desirable to substitute an electric lamp for the present oil-lamp that is in use. When the lamp is more than half-full—and it must be filled when you go on your beat—if you increase your pace, or happen to slip, the oil runs out through the little air-hole in the lamp, and gets on to your clothes, and when the dust gets on that you are in a pretty pickle. The night-duty coat would last very much longer, and its appearance be improved, if that lamp could be improved. With regard to the question of railway passes, I can assure the Commission that the withholding of these passes is a universal grievance with the men. After their twelve months' continuous work, when they have to go away on a holiday they should be given free passes, more especially as they are practically on duty all the time. To quote an instance: There is the case of a constable who was travelling, and had paid his own fare. Between Dunedin and Port Chalmers about two years ago a man jumped from the train between the carriages, and was cut to pieces, and the constable, having been appealed to by the guard, was in duty bound to go and give a hand. I think if a constable is liable to be called upon for duty at any moment like that, in the interests of the Railway Department, it is worth their while to give him some concession, however small. If there is a row in one of the second-class carriages and a constable happens to be there on a holiday, he is the victim. And when a constable is travelling on transfer by steamer, or is on escort duty, it is not altogether pleasant for him to have to mix up with some of the people who are in the steerage. When he is returning by boat it may happen that he has to occupy a bed alongside one of the men he has had in the lock-up. Then, there certainly seems to be a complaint on the part of the men owing to their having to be in bed by 11 o'clock at night. It is true that in Christchurch, if you apply for it, you can get late leave pretty well every night of the week, provided you state why you want it; but in Dunedin we could only get it twice a week. Referring to the gymnasium which has been advocated, we do not want the Government to go to a large expense in putting up an elaborate gymnasium. In my opinion, if we had a suitable room, provided with a wrestling-mat, it would go a long way towards giving the men exercise. With regard to Mr. Dinnie's remarks as to the Auckland gymnasium being very little used, I would suggest that might be due to climatic conditions in Auckland, as on account of the warmer climate the men would not be so inclined to go in for heavy exercise; but here the men seem to be very partial to it. Even on the asphalt down here you see the men tackling one another. Others have spoken on the subject of having to appear in Court occasionally after night duty, and it has been my personal experience to attend on three consecutive mornings after night duty, and it is not pleasant to have to break your sleep. With regard to other matters, I indorse what the previous delegates have placed before you. I may say personally, with regard to the coffee-can which has been handed to you, that in Dunedin these were dealt out, and I carried one for some four or five months, and there is no doubt, if one has an opportunity of taking them on to the beat, they are a great boon. The drawback is that the lamp underneath can be lighted only once, and that is when the tin is full. If you want to light it a second time—say, at about 3 o'clock in the morning, when the tin is about half full—the solder will melt, and it runs down. Apart from this, they are a great boon.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How is it that only one man uses it in Christchurch if it is such a boon?—Perhaps they have not been exhibited here as they have been in Dunedin. Of course, it is rather a big item to carry about when it is full.

2. Surely any constable can find some corner in which he can place it?—Well, when there are small boys about, and they see a policeman looking into a corner, they must go and see what he has been after.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service owing to the present control?—I cannot say that I do.

4. If such did exist you would be likely to know of it?—Yes.

5. Have you heard any rumour at any time during your service that I had a special man in each district with a view to getting information?—I have no knowledge of it.

6. Do you believe it to be the case?—I do not.

7. If you had heard it stated that such was the case would you have repeated it publicly?—No.

8. *The Commissioner.*] What is the average cost to each constable of messing?—The cost in Christchurch is considerably higher than in Dunedin. The average in Dunedin would be about £2 12s. 6d., and in Christchurch about £3; but in Christchurch we employ a waiter and in Dunedin they do not? In Dunedin, also, they go in for a Chinese cook, which makes a difference.

9. How long have you been in the district office?—Seven or eight months.

10. Did you seek it yourself?—I applied for it.

11. Do you prefer that to ordinary uniform work?—I do.

12. On what ground?—The conditions are more favourable.

13. But having regard to your future in the service?—Well, personally I am more favourably inclined to clerical work.

14. Might you not as well be out of the Force, then?—No; I have always worked hard in the Force, and take a great interest in it.

15. Do you know that the district office is a position much sought after?—Yes, I believe there was keen competition for it when I was appointed.

16. Is there any reason why the men in the district office should not do a little outside work occasionally?—Well, personally, I am not permanently a district clerk. If I were I should consider I had a grievance if I were put on the street.

17. Even if you were asked to do occasional Sunday duty?—Yes; because I look upon it to some extent as promotion when a constable is put into plain clothes in the office.

18. He gets 1s. a day extra, and has only five and a half days' work, and he has no night duty?—That is so.

19. Is that what you mean by promotion?—Yes; and, apart from that, a man requires to possess a little more than the ordinary ability to fill that position; and I think if I am considered fit for that work I should have preference as regards promotion; and personally I cannot see why I should be placed on a level with the uniform man, who is content to walk about the streets.

20. Perhaps he is not content. What do you look forward to in that position as regards rank?—I have not studied the question seriously from that point of view. I have not looked so far forward yet as ranking as a sergeant, but if I go on and rise to 9s. 6d. a day I am not getting a bad salary. When I get a permanent footing in the office I may look forward a little further perhaps.

21. Are you not all the time getting out of touch, to a certain extent, with the uniform branch of the service?—I do not think so. All the routine of the service is constantly before me, and I should say it rather fitted me for the higher branches.

22. Is there any difficulty about the work in the office—any more than an intelligent man can do with a certain amount of education?—I think there are a good many of the uniform men who could do the work if they set their minds to it and enlightened themselves a bit with regard to it.

23. Do you think it would be a good thing for constables to take their turn in the district office, so as to qualify themselves for stations, and so forth, or do you think it is better that a man once in the office should be always in the office?—Personally, I think it would be a difficult thing to try and train any large number of the men into the work of the office. I think a man would require to be in the office a couple of years in order to get a thorough grip of the work.

24. The system is not a difficult one at the present time?—No; but one requires a good deal of experience.

25. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have simply been in the office from time to time relieving while others have been away?—Yes.

26. You have drawn no extra pay?—No.

27. How long have you been working in the district office altogether?—This last time has run me into about three months.

28. Do you think in twelve months you would have thoroughly learned the duties of the district office?—No.

29. You know there are three departments: do you think it would take you twelve months to learn all the routine of the first department which you are in now?—It might take me that.

30. Would you then be efficient?—I dare say there might be some things I could be told then.

31. How long would it take you to become efficient in the next stage?—Well, the work there is so much above my present stage that I could not pretend to estimate it.

32. Could you get six men in this district on street duty who are capable of doing the work of assistant clerk in the office?—I could not name them.

33. You know very well that the work in that district office is enormous?—Yes, there is a lot of work to be done.

34. Could you get a better training for an advanced position than in that district office?—I do not think so.

WEDNESDAY, 28TH JULY, 1909.

EDWARD MCKAY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 72.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Rangiora. I was enrolled in 1877, and was promoted sergeant in 1894. Since then I have been stationed at different places. I have been at Rangiora for a year and a half, having been transferred there from Mount Cook, Wellington. From my experience, I consider the pay in the Force is not sufficient to enable one to keep up to the required standard, as we are supposed to go about in more decent style than the ordinary run of men, and to keep ourselves in such a way that the pay is not sufficient for. I have free quarters at Rangiora.

1. *The Commissioner.*] The position of sergeant in charge of a country district is better than that of one on the beat?—I would not say that, for the reason that, although the beat is pretty constant work, the man in charge of a country district has longer hours, and is more liable to be called up at all times of the night.

2. What was your experience of the difference between rent in the city when allowed ordinary house-allowance and your present position?—It varies in different towns, rent being very much higher in Wellington than the other four centres.

3. How much more did you pay in Wellington than your allowance?—I was allowed £1 for quarters; the house rented by the Department was £1 a week, and the rent of the house was £1 7s. 6d.

4. What is your opinion in regard to the general efficiency of the Force at present as compared with your previous experience?—We have not the same class of men coming into the Force.

5. Do you mean physically, morally, or intellectually?—I do not think we have the same stamp of men altogether.

6. Although they are up to the standard?—Yes; I would not say they were intellectually up to previous standards in point of general intelligence.

7. Have you noticed anything in regard to the conduct, sobriety, and morality of the men?—I have not noticed anything wrong.

8. Do you know of any general feeling of dissatisfaction on account of promotions?—I can only speak personally; I have felt it so; others have been promoted over me, and I have been placed under them to do duty, which I naturally felt to be hard.

9. What men have been promoted over you?—Inspector Mitchell is junior to me—he was promoted sergeant at the same time as I was; Sub-Inspector Dwyer is my junior—I was sergeant for some considerable time before him; Inspector O'Donovan is junior to me—I was sergeant before him; Sub-Inspector Norwood is my junior both as sergeant and in the service; Sub-Inspector McGrath is junior to me in the service; and Station Sergeant King is my junior both in rank and service. There are others who are junior to me in service but not in rank. I can only suppose they were overlooked when I got promotion.

10. You have a general feeling of injustice over your treatment?—Yes.

11. Do you know of any reason for your being passed over?—No.

12. Is there anything in your police history that would justify it?—I do not know of anything that would keep me back.

13. Had the Nelson affair anything to do with it?—Perhaps.

14. From your knowledge of the men promoted over you, having regard to their efficiency in the Force and the merits of the position, do you consider yourself as well qualified as they?—I do. I consider myself as capable as they are.

15. When did your feeling of injustice first begin to affect you?—When I found that Inspector Mitchell was promoted to Sub-Inspector and then to Inspector. I thought that was a high jump, considering I had no advancement.

16. Have you ever reported your dissatisfaction to the Department?—No.

17. Have you ever used political influence?—No.

18. Do you know of its use in any direction except by rumour?—No, not of my own personal knowledge.

19. Have you ever been offered promotion?—No.

20. When the rank of station sergeant was instituted, were you offered promotion?—No.

21. Was it ever suggested to you that you could have promotion if you applied?—No.

22. How old are you?—Fifty-three.

23. You were much younger when the case of Inspector Mitchell occurred?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Inspector Mitchell, Sub-Inspector Dwyer, and Inspector O'Donovan were promoted before I took charge?—Yes.

25. *The Commissioner.*] How about the other station sergeants besides King?—I do not mention them, because they have prior service to me, though I was promoted before them. I was their senior as sergeant, but not in the service.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you say promotion should go by seniority alone?—No.

27. Why were you transferred from Wellington?—I made a request to yourself, I believe, to get some quiet station, as I had been injured.

28. Did not your Inspector report on your conduct for some time past at Wellington?—The only intimation I had of that was when I was before you with the Inspector. As to his reports, I did not see any.

29. Were the files not referred to you?—Not so far as I recollect. There was no report against my conduct. What was the conduct?

30. Were you not transferred here because you had not performed your duty satisfactorily in Wellington?—Not that I know of. When I was in front of you Inspector Ellison said I did not keep the supervision over the district he thought I would.

31. He was not satisfied with your conduct?—I asked him the question whether the Mount Cook district was not in a better state than when I came, and he said Yes, it was. If that was so, there could have been no neglect on my part.

32. Did he not say that at first you did your duty well, but of late years you had not done it as satisfactorily as it had been done by another sergeant?—Yes; but I might mention when I went there they increased the area of the district from what it had been; so if I was remiss, why did they place extra duty on me in the district? I must have been competent, or they would not have extended my district.

33. Your feeling is simply a personal one?—Yes.

34. There is not a general feeling of dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Force?—I do not say there is. I do not undertake other people's complaints.

35. You are not aware of any?—Only from rumour.

36. *The Commissioner.*] You mean in regard to promotion?—Yes.

37. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You do not believe in promotion being entirely on a seniority basis?—Not altogether.

38. *The Commissioner.*] All other things being equal, seniority should be taken into consideration?—Yes.

39. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards candidates for the Force, you know the standard has been raised the last few years?—Yes.

40. Therefore the men would naturally be more intellectual than before?—Well, some are and some are not.

41. But all are qualified to pass the Fifth Standard?—Yes; I think those who were not were not taken on.

42. You know they pass an examination when they enter the depot and another before leaving it?—Yes.

43. And are two months in training?—Somewhere about that.

44. You had a free house in Wellington, rented by the Department?—The Department paid £1 and I paid 7s. 6d. in addition, prior to having purchased one myself.

45. It was because you wanted to live in a certain house that the arrangement was come to?—I bought a house, and went to live in it. I am receiving £1 7s. 6d. for it now, though I let the Department have it for £1.

46. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion in regard to a period of probation on which constables should be placed prior to being finally enrolled as members of the Force?—I think they should be placed on probation after coming out of the depot for six months. It would be to the advantage of the Force.

47. It would be more difficult to get rid of them after enrolment than during probation?—Yes.

48. You think insufficiency of pay is the principal matter in keeping men back from enrolling?—Yes; because a common labourer gets 8s., and works only eight hours. A policeman's time is never done. I have often worked fifteen to seventeen hours a day myself. That cannot be altered, because on country stations it is necessary it should be so. A man undertakes that when he goes there.

49. Is the position of station sergeant sought after by the outside sergeants?—I never sought after it; they think it is an advancement in pay. There is one thing I should like to mention. I have been transferred very often, and I think it is hard for a man with a grown-up family that they should only be allowed a second-class passage by steamer. Let him go steerage, but do not make him pay the difference between steerage and saloon for his family. No man should be asked to put his family into the steerage. I have had to pay very considerably over this. I think when a man is transferred his family should be allowed first-class fare. There is another matter which I consider an injustice. Detectives are allowed 8s. a day when they travel, while sergeants and constables only get 6s. There are places where the charge for board is more than 6s. Speaking personally, I have been refunded the amount of my actual expenses, but the thing is we are placed on a different basis from detectives, and perhaps a man with only nine years' service is getting 8s., while a man with twenty years' is only getting 6s.

50. Is there any reason why detectives should be allowed more? Are they put to extra expense?—I do not see it. I have travelled with them, and have had to make the same inquiries as they.

*Mr. Dinnie.*] How often have you been transferred within the last six years?—Only once.

WILLIAM JAMES WHATMAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 73.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Little River.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is the date of your enrolment?—That is what I came to speak about. I do not agree with the date of my enrolment. I wish to bring before the Commission the position of district constables. Some have joined as district constables, who have afterwards been admitted into the Force.

2. How long were you district constable before you were enrolled?—A year and nine months. I was enrolled in February, 1896. I was sworn in by Inspector Broham, and appointed district constable at Cheviot. My duties were the same as any constable with five or ten years' service in charge of a station.

3. You think, as a matter of common justice, your service as district constable should be allowed to count?—Yes. The work is more onerous and responsible than that of a constable who has just joined. The Department practically had a trial of one year and nine months before I was admitted permanently.

4. Was there no break between your service as district constable and your permanent appointment?—No; I came directly into the Force.

5. Have you ever applied to be enrolled as a regular constable?—The reason I applied was that the work was too severe for the money paid—£50 a year. There are forty men on the list who are above me, but who joined after me, and who have had less service counting my district service. During Mr. Tunbridge's time I made application, after joining the Force, for that time to be allowed. My application was declined, without any reason being given. I spoke to Mr. Dinnie, and from what he said I gather he thought I was entitled to some consideration. Since I have been in the Force I have received the utmost consideration from my superior officers, and I have no other complaint to make. There is a question I should like to bring up: whether some allowance should be made to constables in charge of country stations who provide their own horses. I provide my own horse and a bike. The Department treat my horse the same as the Government horses, and allow free fodder, shoeing, and cover.

6. Is that the regular rule?—Some time ago the Government found the horses. After that they introduced a better system, any man who wishes finding his own horse.

7. What advantage is that to him?—It is his own, and he can drive it and use it as he likes. I prefer this system, but it is a question whether some small allowance should not be made for deterioration and risk of accident in the Government service.

8. What is the value of your horse?—I have had two, one worth £40, and the one I have now about £20.
9. How long does a horse last?—I have had mine for about three years; it is not worth so much now.
10. Have you had much work of your own out of it?—Practically none.
11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you bailiff in the district?—Yes.
12. Do you not use your horse for that work?—Yes.
13. *The Commissioner.*] That makes a great difference?—But would I not use a Government horse for the same work?
14. *Mr. Dinnie.*] The Government would not find you in a horse, and give you 1s. a mile?—I believe that is the custom.
15. Do you know the system now is for the men to find their own horses, and to receive a certain amount per annum?—I did not know that. I know a circular was issued some years ago, but I never heard of it since.
16. Were you not permitted, when district constable, to carry on a business of your own?—Yes; but I was in charge of a large district, and it took the whole of my time.
17. That was the reason, perhaps, your time was not counted?—I do not know what the reason was; perhaps I did not make my application as clear as I might have done.
18. If your whole time had been devoted to police duties, and you had been paid a regular salary, would you not have been contributing more towards your pension?—The duties are more responsible than those of an ordinary constable in town.
19. But if this period were allowed to count for general service, it would mean you were not contributing according to the service you rendered to the general fund?—I would be quite prepared to do so.
20. But you did not contribute?—No.
21. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ever considered at all the question of promotion? Are you ambitious?—If I were offered promotion I should probably refuse it. I reckon I am better off as I am. I am married, with no children.
22. You prefer being in a satisfactory country station to promotion on street duty?—Yes.
23. Is that the opinion in the Force generally?—Judging from sergeants who have been promoted, they seem to be sorry they took promotion. I can understand men with large families whom they want to bring into town being anxious for promotion.
24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say some sergeants are sorry they have accepted promotion?—That is the opinion I have formed.
25. Do you know of any sergeant who has said so? You know they are only two or three years on the street before they get charge of a station as sergeant?—They do not seem particularly pleased with the change at first.
26. *The Commissioner.*] How old are you?—Forty-two.

WILLIAM FOUHY, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 74.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Ashburton. I was enrolled in 1882, being transferred from the Armed Constabulary. I was promoted sergeant in 1902.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views in regard to promotion?—I have nothing to say. I am quite satisfied, and have no sense of having suffered injustice.
2. Can you express any opinion as to the physique and general intelligence of the men now as compared with years ago?—They have gone back a good bit.
3. In what direction principally?—In physique, and also a bit in intelligence.
4. If they pass the test they are not up to the old standard?—No.
5. To what do you attribute this?—I think principally owing to the pay being too small to induce the best class of man.
6. The conditions of the Force are not attractive?—No.
7. That has caused a general deterioration?—Yes.
8. The remedy would be increase of pay?—Yes, the only one I know of; and a little more vigilance being exercised in selection.
9. But there are inducements in the police which there are not in other walks of life?—The cost of living is a great deal, and the pay is not in proportion.
10. A single man gets free quarters?—Yes; but a man's prospects are a good deal limited, and he is tied down.
11. You think the pay is the main trouble?—Yes; if the pay were better, you would get better men to select from.
12. Do young men ever ask you any questions in regard to admission to the Force?—Very seldom. I have spoken myself to some, and they do not seem very keen, for some reason. I know a case in which a man who has passed all the requirements was called on to report himself, but he did not go; he had engaged in other business.
13. What is the general conduct of the Force now as compared with years gone by?—I do not think they have gone back at all, but they have not the same energy as policemen used to have. The general conduct is fairly good.
14. Is the discipline as good as it used to be?—Fully.
15. The Force is well governed and controlled?—As well as ever it was, if not a little better.
16. Do you know of any political influence?—It is supposed to exist. It is not easy to put one's finger on a thing of that sort. One assumes a good deal that does not come out. A man may suspect another man of having got influence.
17. In what way would the influence be used?—Through members of Parliament, reaching Ministers personally; that is only surmise, of course.



18. You know of no instance?—I have suspected a few.
19. In cases of men being advanced over the heads of others?—Yes.
20. There being nothing in the particular merits of the case which would afford another explanation?—Yes.
21. Seniority cannot always count?—No.
22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have no cause for complaint?—No.
23. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction existing in the Force owing to the present control?—No.
24. It is principally in regard to the pay?—Yes; that is the root of all the dissatisfaction.
25. Do you know there have been certain changes and improvements in the Force during my time?—Yes.
26. As regards candidates for enrolment, can you say anything as regards inquiries now as compared with those made previously?—They are much more strict now. If you slip anything at all, the correspondence is sent back to you, and you have to find out about almost every day of a man's history.
27. You have had a good number through your hands?—Yes.
28. You think the inquiries are sufficient?—I do not see how they could be increased or improved; every hour of a man's life is inquired into, and often after a man is accepted a second inquiry is made.
29. You know a system of classes has been adopted in the cities enabling men to get a good knowledge of their duties?—I believe so.
30. You know a system of drill has been adopted?—Yes.
31. And a finger-print system organized?—Yes.
32. You think with an increase of pay a better selection of men could be made?—There would be a greater number to select from.
33. In regard to promotions, do you agree with me that seniority cannot always count by itself—you must study efficiency?—Yes.
34. Have you heard anything about my having a special man in each district as a sort of scout?—Never, till this Commission started.
35. Do you believe it?—Not in Canterbury, at any rate.
36. The discipline now is equally strict with that in days gone by?—Yes.
37. *The Commissioner.*] Are you in favour of a period of probation before final enrolment?—Yes; six months; till they get some idea of what a man is. I think twelve months would be too long.

JOHN GILLESPIE, Constable, further examined. (No. 75.)

*The Commissioner:* In regard to the case of Constable Hammond, it seems to me the whole of the evidence in this case is contained in the papers. I have read the Commissioner's memorandum. I do not want to express any opinion on the matter. If I differ from you it is a mere difference of opinion in regard to the way in which the matter was treated, but there is nothing to be gained by threshing it out now. I asked Constable Gillespie why he brought the matter up, and he said because he considered there has been a miscarriage of justice—that instead of the matter being dealt with departmentally Constable Hammond should have been prosecuted for perjury.

*Mr. Dinnie:* You saw the circular I issued immediately afterwards?

*The Commissioner:* Yes; you said in future cases of the same sort would result in prosecution.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes, I have reason to believe it has been done elsewhere.

*The Commissioner:* The only question is whether that was the wisest and best way to deal with the matter, seeing that there was *prima facie* evidence of a technical offence, and whether it would not have been well to let the law deal with it. But I do not see why Constable Gillespie should be the mover in a matter of this sort.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I did not see the probability of a conviction.

*The Commissioner:* But that is not a question for the Commissioner of Police. If every case were waived on that hypothesis, it would be usurping the functions of the jury.

*Constable Gillespie:* Do you think my action was wrong?

*The Commissioner:* I am not expressing any opinions about it. But I do not see now what benefit will result to the service, or any individual, by going into the matter beyond what is contained in the papers. I will read the Commissioner's minute. I am bound to give publicity to the matter, because you gave it publicity in the south. The Commissioner says:—

“Police Department, Wellington, 18th July, 1907.—The Hon. the Minister of Justice.—I have to submit, for your information and consideration, the following facts in respect to the action of Constable Hammond in making a false affidavit in respect to the service of a civil summons. It appears that on the 1st instant Mr. Michael Scannell, of Coal Creek, Temuka, complained by letter to the Clerk of the Court, Temuka, that a charge of 10s. for the service of a summons on him had been made, whereas the summons had not been served personally on him, but given to his daughter at Pleasant Point. As a result, he was interviewed, and stated that on the 18th June his daughter Margaret handed him a summons at Coal Creek, which she said had been given her at Pleasant Point by Constable Hammond to hand to him. Margaret Scannell, the daughter, says, on the 18th June Constable Hammond accosted her at Pleasant Point Railway-station when she was returning from school at Timaru, and handed her a letter for her father; that she took it home, and gave it to him. She also remembers seeing the constable a week previously at her home at Coal Creek, when he asked her if her father was at home, and she told him he was not; but the constable did not say what he wanted. Constable T. F. Hammond, stationed

at Pleasant Point, says that on the 12th ultimo he went to Coal Creek to serve two summonses: one he served personally, and as regards the other, which was for service on Mr. Scannell, he ascertained from Margaret Scannell that her father was away from home, and he, in consequence, could not serve it, but returned it for enlargement. That he subsequently saw Mr. Scannell at Pleasant Point, and told him he had been to his residence with a civil summons, but finding he was absent, had returned the summons for enlargement. That on the 18th ultimo he saw Mr. Scannell's daughter at Pleasant Point Railway-station, and gave her the summons—enlarged—in an envelope to hand to her father, which she promised to do, and that he saw her subsequently, when she told him she had given it to her father; that he made the annexed affidavit of service on 20th ultimo (in which he swore the summons was served personally on defendant), believing that as defendant knew the summons had been issued and was returned for enlargement, that his daughter said she had delivered it to him, the service was tantamount to personal service, and the 10s. charged as mileage was incurred through his visit to defendant's house on 12th ultimo. Now, I cannot believe that any constable is ignorant enough to consider that such service as described herein is personal service; the wording of the affidavit is so explicit (*vide* following copy): 'I, T. F. HAMMOND, constable, of Pleasant Point, do hereby swear that I served the within named Michael Scannell with a summons, a true copy of which is within written marked A, together with a copy of the statement of claim hereunto annexed marked B *by delivering the same to him personally, at Pleasant Point, on Tuesday, 18th day of June, 1907.*—T. F. HAMMOND, Signature of deponent.—Sworn at Pleasant Point, this 20th day of June, 1907, before me—JOHN CRAWFORD, J.P.' Printed on the margin of affidavit are the following directions: 'If summons served *otherwise than personally state precise mode of service.*' The action of the constable is serious and inexcusable, and must be dealt with in a severe manner. I do not think that a prosecution for perjury would result in a conviction under the circumstances, as I cannot conclude it was wilful and corrupt perjury. We have a precedent in which a constable was prosecuted, but the result was that the bill was ignored by the grand jury, the constable dismissed from the service, and subsequently granted compassionate allowance by the Government. The complainant desires that no notice be taken of his complaint, and the mileage charge of 10s. made was justifiable, as the constable had been to Coal Creek to serve the summons. Under all the circumstances, and subject to approval, I will fine the constable £1, and remove him from charge of a station.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner of Police.—Appd.—M.J., 19/7/07.

"Inspector Gillies.—This constable has been treated somewhat leniently, considering the seriousness of his offence. I fear this is not the only instance in which similar action is resorted to by constables, although not brought to light as in this instance. I intend issuing a circular on the subject. Please have Constable Hammond transferred to Timaru, and replaced by Constable Collins (911) if you consider him suitable for the post.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 20/7/07.

"Sub-Inspector Green.—For Constable Hammond to see and note.—R. E. GILLIES, Inspector, 22/7/07.

"Inspector Gillies.—Note and return.—W. GREEN, Sub-Inspector, 25/7/07.

"Respectfully noted.—T. F. HAMMOND, Constable No. 702, 24/9/07."

*The Commissioner:* The Commissioner evidently appreciated the seriousness of the offence, and the only point on which we could join issue is as to whether his action was right and proper.

*Constable Gillespie:* The facts as stated are not altogether correct: Scannell informed me repeatedly that Hammond had not been seen about his place at any time.

*Mr. Dinnie:* The girl was there alone.

*Constable Gillespie:* But her father says that was not so.

*The Commissioner:* That is beside the question. I cannot conceive that a constable who appreciated the fact that he had committed a serious crime would persist in claiming an amount for mileage to which he was not entitled.

*Constable Gillespie:* I should like to state that since the affair happened the constable has cast a reflection on me as being the cause of his removal. I may say I have no hostile feeling towards him. I never had an unpleasant word with him or a grievance against him. But, seeing so much had been said about the matter in the district, I thought it my duty to place the documents before you for investigation.

*The Commissioner:* It seems clear to me, in your capacity as Clerk of the Court, this summons coming under your notice as not being properly served, you would have been lacking in the proper exercise of your duty if you had not drawn attention to the fact. So far as you are concerned, you were perfectly within your rights, and were doing your duty properly in drawing attention to it. But that has nothing to do with the ultimate issue of the inquiry to-day. There is ample *prima facie* evidence of the committal of an offence, and the only point at issue is whether the constable was dealt with in the proper way. He was dealt with in a certain way, and punished. There is nothing on his defaulter's sheet except that. This having been dealt with, and the Commissioner having recommended a course of action which was approved by the Minister, it only remains for me to say whether I should consider that was the most judicial treatment. You do not want the man prosecuted now?

*Constable Gillespie:* I should be sorry to see it.

*The Commissioner:* I never remember any case in which I could say a constable has deliberately made a false affidavit, but I have seen affidavits made by constables which I knew were not legally and perfectly correct. I am not prepared to labour the matter any further. The mere fact of the publicity is a certain amount of punishment to the constable, apart from the way he was dealt with. There is a matter in regard to the evidence given by you in Timaru. Mr. Twomey has taken exception to that evidence. He was only brought into it by the correspondence.

*Constable Gillespie:* I explained that to Mr. Twomey.

*The Commissioner:* What, then, is his grievance?

*Constable Gillespie:* He is always looking for a grievance.

*The Commissioner:* He writes: "Excuse me for saying that where the names of private citizens are dragged into the inquiry you are holding at the present time by malicious policemen, I think such private citizens should be invited to attend. In some cases you would not allow the inquiry to proceed without the persons affected being present, yet you allowed Constable Gillespie, of Temuka, to state that Messrs. Phillips, Aspinall, and Twomey conspired to induce Mr. Herapath to report him (Gillespie). This is an atrocious falsehood." I want to emphasize the fact that I am under no obligation in the order of reference to give notice to private individuals—I am only under an obligation to give notice to members of the Force where they are affected. I have given notice in one instance to a private individual, but I specified my reason—because he was a member of Parliament, and therefore to a certain extent a public man. The Commission is quite clear on the point. I presume the instance Mr. Twomey refers to is my refusal to go into the case of Hammond till he had notice. I wish to emphasize the difference between private individuals and members of the Force. "Mr. Aspinall and myself are ready to swear that we never spoke to each other on the Herapath incident until we saw the report of Constable Gillespie's evidence in the paper. We have now no remedy except to follow you to Christchurch, at our expense, and tender evidence. Will you kindly cause a copy of Mr. Herapath's complaint and also a copy of my own letter to the Minister to be supplied to me? I think that under the circumstances I am entitled to this courtesy at your hands. I never used any political influence to remove Constable Gillespie, and, though his conduct towards myself has been atrocious, not a single line has appeared in the local papers of which I am proprietor and editor to the detriment of Constable Gillespie. The fact is that Constable Gillespie's malicious temperament sometimes clouds his reasoning faculties; that is as mild and charitable as I could put it. By forwarding me copies of the letters I refer to you will oblige." I want to make it clear that I am not going to allow this Commission to deteriorate into a medium for the ventilation of private grievances between private citizens and the police. If I do that, I shall never get through the work which has been intrusted to my care; and if it had not been for that correspondence which you read, and which you said you had the right to read, so far as I can see Mr. Twomey would never have been brought into it.

*Constable Gillespie:* That is so. I may state that prior to my going to Timaru I went and saw Mr. Twomey, and told him I was going to read his letter, and I asked him to be present when I read it. He asked me not to do so, but I said it was connected with one point I had to make, and that I was going to read the letter. I told him I had nothing to say against him, but that he had better be present when I brought the matter up.

1. *The Commissioner:* You actually gave him notice that you were going to bring this matter before the Commission in Timaru?—Yes; I gave him notice two or three times. He has written scores of letters to the Government, condemning me in the most severe terms, and every one of them is a falsity.

2. So far as I know, I never saw Mr. Twomey in my life, but I certainly do object to have blame cast upon me for something for which I am not responsible. It came up on the question of political interference, and although Mr. Twomey approached the Minister there was nothing done to you?—I was cautioned.

3. The only peculiar circumstance about it is that the Minister dealt with the matter instead of the Commissioner, and you would infer that it was through Mr. Twomey interfering?—Yes.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not quite follow your remark, sir, on the point that the Minister dealt with it.

*The Commissioner:* You will remember that the Minister put a special minute on the papers, to the effect that he was not satisfied with Constable Gillespie's conduct in respect to that incident.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is from what I told him.

*The Commissioner:* Had you formed a different impression about it?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not think so.

*The Commissioner:* Unfortunately, the minute has not yet been copied into the evidence, but I can clear the matter up when I get the file.

*Witness:* I remember the minute perfectly well. It said that I might have acted more discreetly, and that I should have knocked at the door before entering the room. My only fault was in accidentally opening the door without knocking.

4. You evidently considered the gravamen of the matter was contained in the Minister's minute, because you say in your memo. in reply that you note the remarks of the Minister of Justice, and that you respectfully submit to the severe censure. So that it was the Minister's action and not the Commissioner's?—Yes; in fact, I looked upon it that Commissioner Dinnie had tried to shield me.

5. What are your general relations with Mr. Twomey?—During the past four years we have been on the best of terms. But when I first went to Temuka there was an opposition paper started in the township, and he wanted me not only to prosecute that man but to persecute him, and get him out of the district, and because I would not do that he began to make complaints. Of course, he could do nothing, because I have been there eleven years, and I do not think there is a man in the district who can say a word against me. Mr. Twomey has made plenty of insinuations, but he could never prove anything, whereas if I turned round I could prove a great deal as regards his reputation and character.

6. You were not concerned with his character or reputation so long as he did not commit an offence?—That is so, and therefore I did not trouble him.

7. He is a Justice of the Peace?—Yes; but owing to his drunken habits he has not sat upon the bench for several years—in fact, he is a disgrace to the list of Justices.

THOMAS FREDERICK HAMMOND, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 76.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Bingsland. I had fourteen years' service on 12th March, 1908. I was at one time in charge of Pleasant Point. I understand that when a constable has any complaint to make against another notice should be given to the man against whom the complaint is to be made. I believe some evidence has been taken from Constable Gillespie against me.

*The Commissioner:* No. When there is any evidence submitted which is likely to cast a reflection personally upon any one it is my duty to refrain from proceeding with the inquiry until twenty-four hours' notice has been given to the person interested, and on that ground I refused to go into the matter at Timaru.

*Witness:* But the thing might not have come before the Commission at all if Constable Gillespie had not taken advantage of the opportunity to make public a matter which had been dealt with over two years ago by the Department, and for which I was punished. When Constable Gillespie brought the matter up I had not the faintest idea what the complaint was, and, as a matter of fact, I have only seen the papers this morning. Now that it has been made public, I am known to the public as a man who has made a false affidavit. It places me in the position of having to speak now, and, seeing that the thing has gone so far, I would ask that the Commission rehear this matter.

*The Commissioner:* This is a question which, so far as the Commission is concerned, relates only to the general discipline and control of the Force, and it is not a question as between you and Constable Gillespie. The question for me is whether the action of your superior officers was in the best interests of the service or not. I will allow you to make any statement you wish on oath, but it cannot alter my view of the facts so far as the evidence on the papers is concerned.

*Witness:* I would like to ask Constable Gillespie a question or two. (To Constable Gillespie): Seeing that it is now over two years since this matter was first brought under the notice of the Stipendiary Magistrate, and it was dealt with by the Department; and looking to my explanation when called upon to give one; and to Sub-Inspector Green's minute on the papers, in which he says he does not consider there was any malicious intent on my part, and that I had always performed my duties in a fairly satisfactory manner; also the Commissioner's minute to the Minister, in which he says that he does not think that an action would result in a conviction for perjury under the circumstances, and that he himself did not believe there was any intention of wilful and corrupt perjury, I ask you, what is your reason for bringing this matter up again, and taking advantage of this Commission of making the matter public?

*Constable Gillespie:* So that the Commission can inquire into it, and see whether it has been dealt with rightly by the Department or not. I have no grievance against you whatever.

*Witness:* You, as a fellow-constable, notwithstanding the ruling of the Department on the matter, are of opinion that I should have been prosecuted?

*Constable Gillespie:* I have no opinion at all on the matter.

*Witness:* If you have no opinion, why did you bring the matter up again?

*Constable Gillespie:* If you want my opinion, I think you should have stood your trial for perjury.

*Witness:* I am sorry you were disappointed. I should like this matter reviewed by the Commission. I felt at the time that I had been pretty severely dealt with, and, seeing that prior to this I had had thirteen years' service and a clean sheet with a "note in favour" attached, and considering all the circumstances surrounding this false affidavit, I would ask the Commission to review the matter.

1. *The Commissioner.*] But you admit the affidavit was false, and what is the good of going into the matter again?—I do not consider I received any consideration for the circumstances surrounding that false affidavit or my previous record. When I made the affidavit I made it conscientiously, and thought no more about it, and, in fact, when Sub-Inspector Green saw me about it I was surprised, and for the moment could not imagine what he was referring to.

2. What do you call personal service?—I know exactly the point. When I delivered the paper to the daughter, a girl of sixteen years, I looked upon it at the time as personal service, and no harm could have been done to any one by what I did.

3. But you claimed mileage?—Yes, because I had done the journey, and I therefore thought I was entitled to it.

4. The only grievance you can suffer now is that the matter has been given publicity to after this lapse of time. Is that not a personal matter as between you and Constable Gillespie?—Yes; it is hard on me that publicity should have been given to it. I could express my opinion of the action of Constable Gillespie in strong terms, but I will not do so.

PATRICK JAMES FITZGERALD, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 77.)

*Witness:* I am a constable, stationed at Lyttelton. Was enrolled on 9th December, 1893.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make a statement?—Yes, sir. I was present yesterday when the delegates from the Christchurch Force were giving evidence, and I agree with everything they said, and I only want to make a few remarks on one or two points they did not touch upon. First, with regard to the circular issued by the Commissioner that the married men should go to and from their homes in uniform, the intention was, I believe, to keep the married men from the single men's quarters. Well, the necessity for that does not exist in Christchurch at all, as there is a special room set apart, with proper pegs for the men to hang their uniforms upon, and they are not obliged to go near the single men's quarters at all. Then, with regard to work in the district office, the Inspector yesterday asked Constable McCarthy what some of us considered a very unfair question. He asked if there were six men in the district who were fit to take a

second clerk's place in the district office. Well, apart from anything else, we feel that the constable who is a comparative stranger in this district was not in a position to answer that question, as he could not possibly know what the men's qualifications were; and we also feel that the suggestion conveyed to the Commission was that the men are unequal to the task.

2. You mean to say that there are other men who consider themselves as fully qualified as the men who are there to act as second clerks?—Yes. Every man who has had any length of service knows that the work of Constable McCarthy as acting third clerk in the office amounts to nothing more nor less than copying manuscript reports into a book. With regard to the second clerk, it is different; but there are several constables in this district who, with a few months' experience, would be equally as capable of doing the work as the men who are there.

3. That is, below the chief clerk?—Yes. There are men who have served not only in this district, but in other districts, who can get officers to vouch for their ability. There have been various causes for dissatisfaction in this district, especially of late years. I have served under three Commissioners, and I have served under nearly all the Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, and non-commissioned officers at present in the Force. I think the only exceptions are Sub-Inspector Norwood and Inspector O'Brien, of Dunedin. I joined the Force here in 1893, under Inspector Broham; was transferred to Wellington, and then to Blenheim; back to Wellington, and on to Auckland, and then again down here. When I joined the Force the members of the Force had no vote at the parliamentary elections, and I say without hesitation that since we have been granted the franchise our interests as a body of men have suffered. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that political influence is being used largely. And if it stopped at political influence it would not be quite so bad, but there are other influences which are quite as pernicious. My statements now may appear to be exaggerated somewhat, but whatever I say I shall try to support with evidence of witnesses and by correspondence which can be produced. Now, I do not want to make any attack upon Masonry, as I know hundreds of Masons who are upright and honourable men, but every honest Mason will admit that there are a number of men who are hanging on the outskirts of Masonry, and who are exploiting it all they can. It may be said that I am prejudiced in this connection, and perhaps to some extent I am, but I do not want to say anything that I cannot prove. I would first refer to the late promotions, and the manner in which they have been made. I have a list of promotions made from August, 1906, to the 1st July, 1909. The first was Sergeant Edwin Eales, No. 649. He was promoted on the 17th August, 1906. I have known that man since he has been in the Force, and I knew him in the Artillery before that. I served with him in Wellington, and I have kept in touch with him ever since. Now, the last promotion outside those of district clerks is that of Richard Hodgson, No. 621, who was promoted on the 1st July, 1909. Constable Hodgson, in service, is senior to Constable Eales, who is promoted three years in front of him. Knowing both men personally, I say that Hodgson is Eales's superior mentally, physically, and in every way; and I know of nothing that Eales has done which would entitle him to promotion before Hodgson. The same kind of thing applies right down through this list, which I have drawn out roughly from the *Gazette*. Hodgson is senior to J. C. Griffiths by some considerable time, and also to C. Kelly; also to O'Grady, and to Green, and to Harvey by a number of years. He is senior to Ferguson by some considerable time; senior to Rowell by some years; as well as to Miller by a number of years. He is also senior to Eccles and McCrorie. The position now is that Eales, who is Hodgson's junior, has three years' seniority to him as sergeant. I do not know whether Hodgson is dissatisfied or not; but I say, if anything is required to show that there are some influences at work in regard to these promotions, this list will go to prove it. If you go right through the *Police Gazette*, the same thing applies, but not to such an extent as recently. And when the men compare the records of these men who are promoted, these are the things that prick. Another thing that has caused dissatisfaction is the examination system introduced by the present Commissioner. Since this system has been introduced there have been a number of men promoted, and the idea was, I believe, that the men before being promoted must have passed this special examination. I think, out of the twenty-eight promotions, six or eight only have passed the examination. By some of the men this examination is regarded as having been specially instituted to block certain men from promotion. I am speaking for others besides myself. Personally, I am looked upon as a man who is a dangerous man, or a marked man as it were, in this district. But I will refer to my own treatment later on. Another thing which has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction is the circular which appeared in the *Police Gazette* of 1908, page 374, which says, "In future applications for situations outside the Police Department should not be made without the sanction of the Commissioner being obtained." There have been several comments made at the time as to the reason of that circular, and I do not pretend to know the reason, but it has been suggested that it was issued to prevent any constable from coming into competition with the son of the Commissioner for a position outside the Police Force—the position which that officer fills now. I would now refer to treatment meted out to two men under exactly similar circumstances. A complaint was made—I do not know the nature of it—about two constables who were stationed at Lyttelton. One of those constables was transferred to Christchurch, while the other was allowed to remain in Lyttelton. The man who was transferred to Christchurch has since been transferred to Wanganui, while the other is still in Lyttelton. The constable who was transferred is not a Mason, while the other is, and capital is made out of the suggestion that one man gets better treatment than the other on account of some political or Masonic influence. With regard to my own position, when I was stationed at St. Andrew's I applied for promotion, and the Commissioner minuted my application to the effect that "This constable's application cannot be entertained, as he has not passed the annual examination." Now, my only reason for applying for promotion was that the country station I had was a bad one. The house I rented was owned by a Mrs.

Weathered, whose husband is the police gaoler at Timaru, and she occupies the position of female searcher. I applied to the Department to have the house repaired, but Mrs. Weathered resented the idea, saying it was good enough for better people than I to live in. I was sent to St. Andrew's in March, 1906, when the weather was fine, but in the winter it was another matter. The rain was coming in through the door, and the paper was hanging from the walls from the wind coming in, and the passage, front room, and bedroom were saturated with water whenever a shower of rain came. Well, I stood that during the first winter, but in the second winter I represented the position to the Department, but they said they understood the house was in good enough repair to last for a number of years. When I understood they would not move in the matter I offered to get the Department another house at a lower rental, and to remove the only property belonging to them—namely, the lock-up—at my own expense. As they would not agree to that, I notified them as early as February, 1907, that if I did not get accommodation for myself, my wife, and family before the winter came on I should have to send my wife and family away. As a matter of fact, I did send them away to Wellington, and I had myself to live in the lock-up of that station; and the residents of the district, as soon as they found out that my wife and family had cleared away, went into Timaru and saw Sub-Inspector Green, and threatened, I understand from one of the men who interviewed the Sub-Inspector, to write to the paper with regard to the treatment I had received. The man who said this is a reliable man and a Church of England clergyman. The others who waited upon Sub-Inspector Green were the Rev. Mr. Brady, of St. Andrew's; the Rev. Mr. Tattle; Mr. George Lyall, a farmer down there; Mr. Beasley, and Mr. Stowell. They are all men who are prepared to come forward and testify as to my treatment, and the correspondence you can see for yourself. With regard to the whole thing, I consider I have been unjustly dealt with from the time that matter started right to the finish. Then, the house that I and my wife and family had been living in at St. Andrew's was burnt to the ground, and everything I had was burnt with it. An inquest was held, and I was called to give evidence. I was then living in Wellington on sick leave. Even in the matter of the inquest, it seems to me that that inquest was not really into the fire, or as to whether there was a fire at all, but from the police point of view it was to see whether I was drunk or had been drinking during the time I was stationed at St. Andrew's. That seemed to be the only thing that Sub-Inspector Green troubled about. In connection with that, I feel that I was badly treated. In the first place, the man who made the inquiries into it I consider should not have been sent to make such inquiries. The Department, knowing what they did about him, must have seen it was unfair to send him, and, as a matter of fact, that it was an insult to me that he should be allowed to inquire into anything in connection with the matter.

4. Who was that man?—Detective Kennedy, of Christchurch. With regard to my application for promotion, and the Commissioner's minute thereon, I referred the Commissioner to a number of officers—some of the most prominent men in the Force, and recognised as the most able members of the Force—as to my suitability for promotion. This is a copy of my application: "Police Station, St. Andrew's, 18/7/07.—Report of Constable P. J. Fitzgerald, relative to my application for promotion.—I beg to report that I applied for promotion some time ago. In support of that application I referred the Commissioners to several Inspectors and sergeants as to my suitability or otherwise for promotion. The Commissioner said in his minute on the correspondence that he could not entertain my application unless I passed the examination introduced by himself. I would like to be respectfully allowed to point out to the Commissioner that I never had an opportunity to qualify for this examination, as I did not have the necessary statutes of New Zealand to refer to. This station has never been supplied with the statutes of New Zealand. I applied for a set in February last; they are not to hand yet. I called at the district office, Christchurch, in May last. The District Clerk informed me that he requisitioned for the statutes applied for by me in the usual way, and he could not understand why they had not been forwarded. Since I applied for promotion I notice by the *Gazette* that James Coghlan Griffiths—a man some six months junior to me—has been promoted. I know him well, but I never knew he possessed any special abilities; nor did I ever hear he had done anything that would specially mark him out for promotion. I have never used political influence, as I did not think it was very effective, but I am told now that a man must have political influence, and what is still better religious influence, and use both if he wants promotion. I do not like to commit a deliberate breach of the regulations, to which the Commissioner has so often referred to, but if any more junior men are promoted I will be compelled to either tender my resignation or else do as I know others have done. I respectfully ask that this correspondence be forwarded to the Commissioner.—P. J. FITZGERALD, Constable No. 661.—The Sub-Inspector of Police, Timaru." That is what I wrote in July, 1907, to the Commissioner, and that is my opinion still with regard to influence. When I first came to Canterbury I was transferred to Sheffield or Annat, in this district. On my arrival in Christchurch I had my wife and five young children with me. I left them at a boardinghouse near the railway-station, and went to the district office. I am a poor sailor, and am usually seasick, and when I went to the district office I was not feeling too well. I saw Sergeant McClelland, a man I have known for a number of years. I reported my arrival to him, and he asked me to go in and report myself to the Inspector. I told the sergeant that I would sooner not go in, as I was not feeling too good. I said I thought it was quite enough to report myself to him, and I would go on by the first train to Annat. However, he advised me to go in. Now, I knew Annat was a mounted station, but I did not know there was a troop horse attached to it, but, as was mentioned by Constable Whatman, I gathered that where the horse was owned by the constable the Department simply gave food for the horse and a paddock, and paid for the shoeing. Every constable who has had any experience of that system believes in it, because he can use his own horse for either riding or driving, whereas a troop horse, according to the regulation must not be put in harness. When I went to see the Inspector in his office I mentioned that I had just heard there

was a troop horse on the station. I think the first question the Inspector put to me was, "Are you in good health?" I said, "Usually"; and he replied that I did not look very well. He then asked me if I was a mounted man, and I said I had not been officially mounted, but that I had a knowledge of horses. I said I had been relieving at out-stations, where I had had to do a certain amount of horse work. He then asked me how long I had been in the Force, and I said I had had about ten years' service. He said, "Well, you ought to know what to do." I then went from the office, and I did not know what occurred from the time I left until nine or ten days afterwards. I then had notice through Sergeant Fouhy that I was transferred from Annat to St. Andrew's. I had no knowledge of what it was for, but I have been told since that Inspector Gillies represented to the Commissioner that he did not think I could do mounted work. I was transferred to St. Andrew's, and I never made any protest against it. There is the correspondence on the subject, but I have never seen it. I consider it was unfair that, before the Inspector could have had any knowledge of me as a constable, I should be treated in that way. So that almost from the time I came into the district I must have been prejudiced in the eyes of the Inspector. I am sorry to have to say it, but it does seem to me to be the case. I would not refer to the treatment of other men transferred under similar circumstances for the purpose of comparison. Constable John Harvey, who was in charge of Cheviot, was transferred to Christchurch station. I do not know what was the cause of the transfer, but I saw from the public Press that during the time he was in charge of that station a man hanged himself in the cells. Now, Constable Harvey did not come into the Christchurch station as what one might call a defaulter usually comes in. He came straight to the watch-house, as it were to some sort of a position made for him. The conditions of my transfer were very different. I consider my transfer to St. Andrew's was unjust. This is a copy of the Commissioner's instruction in reference to my transfer:—

"Police Office, Timaru.—Constable Fitzgerald, St. Andrew's.—The following is a copy of the Commissioner's decision respecting you being absent without leave from your station and your application for promotion: 'Inspector Gillies,—This constable's reports are the most impertinent and disrespectful I have yet had to deal with, and cannot be overlooked if discipline in the service is to be maintained. The constable has ignored Police Regulations altogether, and, besides leaving his district without authority, has reported disrespectfully of his superior officers, for which offence he is liable to be dismissed. He will be no loss to the Department should he carry out his threat and resign. On account of his lengthened service (thirteen and a half years), I will not dismiss him on this occasion, but will not hesitate in doing so in the event of a recurrence of such conduct. It is evident he requires strict supervision, and for this reason he is fined £1, and transferred to Christchurch.—W. DINNIE, Commissioner, 22/7/07.' Please note this and return it, or, as informed before, the file is in my office for your perusal, and you can visit Timaru and see it.—H. GREEN, Sub-Inspector, 28/7/07." On the face of that, I did not know really what I had been fined £1 for, unless for the fact that I ought to be under strict supervision. I do not come here to say that I am better than any one else, but I say there are men who have received preferment whose defaulter-sheets are worse than mine. Anything that appears on my sheet previous to my arrival in Canterbury is quite correct, and I should like my defaulter's sheet produced; but since my arrival in this district I have never had anything in the shape of fair play or justice, and what appears on my sheet since then is neither fair nor reasonable, and I will give my reasons. I mentioned Harvey, who is a good constable, and who was made watch-house keeper. Before he left for Cheviot he was sent out in charge of relieving squads, where he was in charge of men senior to himself. It may be said that he had a clean defaulter's sheet, but Harvey must be regarded as a singularly lucky man. From the time he started he seemed to get into a good groove, and was recognised as a good man; but I do think it a rank injustice for senior constables to be put in the street under Harvey. Then, I would mention the case of Wade, who was stationed at Waimate, and who is now, I think, at Eltham. During Commissioner Tunbridge's time that man made application to get married to a certain woman. The Commissioner refused the application, but after Commissioner Tunbridge left Wade got married to this woman, and he is still in the Force. Since then Constable Leckie applied to get married to a certain woman, and his application was refused, and the constable was dismissed from the Force. Well, I would like you to call Constable Maloney, who was at Waimate at the time, also Sergeant Ferguson, now in Auckland, who was senior constable in charge at Waimate. They can tell you that this Constable Wade and his wife used to attack everybody. They wrote letters to the Inspector in Christchurch both openly and anonymously. The Inspector will be in a position to produce the correspondence if he likes. This man wrote to the Inspector in this strain: He said that a hotelkeeper doing business at Glenavy went up to Constable Findlay and said, "I am going to apply for a conditional license for the sports and races at Morven. Understand that I will not apply for this license unless you promise me to keep sober." Around the district Wade and his wife have accused Mrs. Findlay, the wife of the constable, of being no better than she ought to be, and with carrying on with the Station-master in the absence of Findlay. Mrs. Findlay is a most respectable woman. This man Wade is at the present time in the Force. I do not know that he ever said anything about me, but the first man who went there was Constable Christie, and he has left the Force; and about the next man, Constable Barrett, he wrote to the effect that Barrett was not fit for service medically, and that his hearing was bad. In fact, he attacked everybody he could attack. That man is not in charge of an important station. He was sent from Waimate to Taihape, and from there to Eltham. During the time he was at Taihape something occurred which I do not wish to refer to. That is the kind of thing more than anything else that makes the Police Force think they are not fairly treated. In dealing with the matter of promotion, I omitted to say, in regard to officers in charge of districts recommending constables for promotion, there are various reasons why certain constables are recommended. The practice is when a constable is promoted to transfer him to some other district. It has been openly said that an Inspector when he wants to get rid of a man will



recommend him for promotion simply to get him out of his district, if he does not want to do him an injury; and it is said that if the Inspector had to put up with him as sergeant in his district he would never recommend him. In regard to the influence that is supposed to exist, and which the majority of men know very well does exist, there are various reasons for saying it exists. There retired from the Force last week Constable Flewellyn, who had been for twenty-eight years in and around Christchurch, as capable a police officer as ever I knew anywhere in Canterbury. He retired as a constable; a more honourable man I never met anywhere in any walk of life, and it is a well-known fact that the reason he never got promotion was that he never used anything in the shape of influence, considering it to be beneath him to do it. It is a general impression that a man must have some influence. If he is promoted out of his turn, they want to know the source of the influence that got him his promotion; that is the first question asked. It is not a nice thing for a man to say, and any constable who says it is naturally marked down, notwithstanding the guarantee from the Minister. I will give my reasons for saying that some strong influence has been at work. I think it was in 1903 that a station sergeant who is not at present in the Force was charged in the Magistrate's Court here with being the putative father of an illegitimate child. During the hearing of the case some of the circumstances caused the presiding Magistrate to make some strong comments on the case.

5. *The Commissioner.*] You mean Detective Maddern?—Yes.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That was before my time.

*Witness:* I am not referring to it as occurring in your time. I was stationed in Auckland at the time, but was down here on a holiday, and on my journey back to Auckland I got into the train at Palmerston North with two members of Parliament and a member of the Legislative Council. One of the members whom I knew very well was a solicitor practising in Auckland, and he told me that he was one of a deputation who had come away from interviewing the late Commissioner and the then Minister of Justice with the understanding that nothing could be done but Maddern must go. He was with seven other members of Parliament, and this was the answer they got. That is all I am going to say as illustrating influence. If there is one thing more than another the men in this district have reason to complain about it is the confidential report that exists here. I have been on several other stations, and have not known it to exist anywhere else. For instance, any constable stationed in this district might for all purposes of promotion or preferment be damned eternally to the Inspector without knowing anything about it. I cannot say there have been any confidential reports about myself—I do not know; but this I do know: In regard to a station sergeant here a short time ago, now transferred, something appeared in the paper about his former career as a constable. He suspected a constable stationed at Christchurch of giving information to the paper. He went round to make inquiries into the matter, and submitted a report to the Inspector in Christchurch, saying that the constable was seen in a hotel talking to the reporter of the local paper in which the matter appeared, and the licensee was prepared to say he heard the constable talking about matters he knew should not be mentioned outside the police office. There are two men I could name who saw that. I did not see it myself. They saw it passing between the station sergeant and the Inspector.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What was the result?—I know nothing about the result; but I do know that that constable had been reported time and again. Not only was he prosecuted, but persecuted, by that particular sergeant, and it was a subject of comment among all the men on this station that he did not get fair play. The constable's name was Brown and the sergeant's name was Barrett. As far as I am concerned, I have nothing to complain about any of the sergeants except Sergeant Brooks up to the beginning of the present year. Everybody must admit the supervision in Christchurch is as strict as anywhere, but I realised that there was special attention to be paid to me. A direct order came from the Commissioner, and I knew that, and I anticipated I would require to be extremely careful. After being transferred from St. Albans I resumed duty in the beginning of September, 1907, and up to January, 1909, nothing was said and no reports went in against me. It is said among the men in Christchurch that any man who does twelve months' duty without having to go to the Inspector's office is doing really well. Prior to being transferred there were various reports about me. Some of them contained suggestions that I was drinking, and had been drinking hard. At no period of my life have I been charged with drunkenness. There is no man either in or out of the Force who can say he has seen me drunk, or anything approaching it. I do not claim to be a temperance man, and until the beginning of the present year I have always had a drink when I felt inclined; since then I have not had a drink of anything alcoholic, and it is a most peculiar thing that since then I have been reported five or six times for trivial things. I have no reason to object to being reported for anything any more than any one else, but I have been reported for things which have been glossed over or carefully winked at in the case of other men. And I have not only been reported, but the manner in which the reports were made show a certain amount of venom and a personal element of spite, the sergeant who made the report not simply reporting it as a matter of neglect of duty. I have been treated pretty well, and have no reason to complain of my treatment by the commissioned officers or the Inspector. As a constable I have very little to do with the Inspector under ordinary circumstances. The men say that when they are reported, and have to go before the Inspector, they get anything but a fair hearing—that the Inspector would believe one sergeant in preference to all the constables. In my own case a sergeant reported something, and I had another sergeant to substantiate what I had to say and a constable, and Inspector Gillies, on the correspondence connected with the report, minuted, "Notwithstanding the reports of Sergeant So-and-so and Constable So-and-so, I still have my own opinion on the matter." That could be taken anyhow. I complain about the general treatment I have received since I came to the district. At present I am better situated than ever before in my police career, but the general treatment I have received since I have been in this district up to my going to Lyttelton has not been anything like fair or just or reasonable. During the time



the correspondence was going on in connection with my application in certain correspondence that passed between the Department and myself, I stated what I thought to be honestly true in every instance. The Commissioner placed a minute on that that I deliberately insulted my superiors. At the beginning of the present year something transpired in connection with which I was reported. A key was found in a door, and I got reported for neglect of duty. In answer to that report I made what would be called an explanation to my superior officer, Mr. Gillies. I was on night duty, on what is known as No. 1 beat. I went on at 9, being relieved at 5 in the morning. The constable who came on duty to relieve me found a key in a door. I was asked for an explanation, and I reported, and mentioned that the beat was too large for any one man to pay proper attention to. Several other constables were prepared to say the same. I was reprimanded, I think, but I made a report as to what I thought ought to be the beat. As laid down now, the beat is not fair to the men placed on it, and it is not fair to the public to have only the amount of protection one man could afford in the very centre of Christchurch. After I reported, all the sergeants did so, including the station sergeant. Some reported very fairly, others made some comments that were not called for, and among them was one who had only just come here, and who hardly knew the beat properly. In connection with my transfer from St. Andrew's to Christchurch and prior to that transfer, I might say that that station was opened by Constable Dillon, and he had the same trouble as I had there. As a matter of fact, his trouble was worse than mine, because he narrowly escaped going to gaol. Mr. Weathered had three houses and 50 acres of land, and during Dillon's time some people named Burns lived in the house next door to the station. Weathered got the house insured on the representation that Constable Dillon would burn it down, and got the insurance increased from £50 to £250. In March, 1907, the house was burned down. I furnished a report to the Sub-Inspector, but did not complete it, because I could not know the actual value Mrs. Weathered had placed on the property, nor the amount of insurance, and she was residing at Timaru. I sent the report to Sub-Inspector Green, and before I saw the amount of the insurance I mentioned it was a suspicious case, and wanted a detective to investigate the matter. But when I saw the amount of the insurance, and the way people talked about the matter—saying that when it was burned down ten or twelve years ago it was insured for £130, and this time for £250—I did not like the look of it, and inquiries were made into it. Not only that, but I went into Timaru and saw the representative of the Royal Insurance, with whom it was insured, and told them what people had been saying. I asked him what the house I was living in was insured at, and he told me £275, and the wash-house for £25. I said that was too much insurance, and the best thing he could do was to reduce the amount as soon as he could. It was suggested at the time the inquiry was made into the house I was living in, which was burned down, that it was burned down not wilfully, but while I was under the influence of liquor, and not capable of knowing what I was doing. That came out at the inquest. That was the whole of what Sub-Inspector Green wanted to find out of all the witnesses—whether they knew I was drinking, or saw me drinking. During the time this correspondence was going on the owner of the property made various allegations about me. One was that I had stolen some iron connected with the old house. This report went to the Inspector, and came back to me. I asked the Department, when Mrs. Weathered made these charges against me, to get her to lay an information against me in the usual way. I got no reply. Afterwards I made an application for permission to consult a solicitor, because Mrs. Weathered was going round slandering me, and I wanted to stop her. The Commissioner wanted me to make a specific charge. I could not do so at that time, because I wanted to consult a solicitor first as to what he would advise me to do. I was advised to let the matter drop by some person who knew better than I did. About that time, also, I arrested a deserter from His Majesty's service. There was a reward of £3 from the Imperial Government and £5 from the Colonial Government. I arrested the man on information supplied by Constable Collins, of Timaru. The matter was notified in the *Police Gazette*. The naval authorities refused to take him on board ship. I applied for the reward, and so did Constable Collins, and we never got it. They say there was no reward, because the naval authorities did not take him on board. We were both out of pocket over this man's arrest. Another thing: I think I have been unfairly treated by the Commissioner himself. After I left St. Albans I was in the Timaru Hospital for three weeks, and I attribute my sickness to the house and accommodation I had, and three of my children were sick with colds and pneumonia, and one nearly died. After I came out of the Hospital I got a certificate from Dr. Gabites recommending I be granted three months' sick leave. I stayed in Timaru for a day or two, and returned to Christchurch to be examined by the Police Surgeon. He will tell you I was suffering from a very bad cough, and was run down, and had bronchitis very severely. After I was examined by him I got fourteen days' sick leave, and I was proceeding to Wellington, and was instructed at the end of that time I could go to the Wellington Police Surgeon and get it extended. When I was all right, and going to resume duty in Christchurch, I went to the Commissioner and produced certificates from Dr. Burbank and Dr. Henry in Wellington, and told the Commissioner it would be dangerous for me to shift for five or six months from that time. He told me to go to Christchurch and resume duty there, and he would probably give me the first chance of a transfer to Wellington. On the strength of that my wife started housekeeping in Wellington, and I went on doing duty in Christchurch. I had applied for transfer, and fully expected the first vacancy in Wellington. Instead of that, another man was transferred to Wellington, and he made use of his transfer by leaving the police and going into another department. As soon as I saw that I withdrew my application at once. I got disgusted. As soon as I got a few pounds together I brought my wife and children down from Wellington, and started housekeeping here. I got no consideration from the Commissioner for having to do this. I had had to pay their fare from St. Andrew's to Wellington, which the Department would have had to pay. I got no consideration for that. I do not want to say that I am better than any other man, but I can get the evidence of officers and non-commissioned officers under whom I have served who will

say that I know my duty, and have always done it. In Christchurch for six months a junior constable was what is known as making inquiries at the police-station; he had had three years' experience, and I had had sixteen years' service before he joined the Force. I was considered capable of conducting anything in the shape of inquiries by some of the ablest officers in the Force. The present Minister of Justice came to Christchurch, and we were paraded, and he said amongst other things that seniority must always take precedence, everything else being equal. Duties change fortnightly on all big stations. I waited till the next change of duty, and I sent in the following report: "I respectfully bring facts in connection with the above matter under the Inspector's notice, as I do not think he has noticed it, otherwise he would not allow it to exist. First, Constable Scott has been on inquiries since or during the greater portion of the time Sub-Inspector Dwyer has been relieving at Napier. I see by the duty list for the ensuing two weeks that he is again down for inquiries. I wish it to be clearly understood that I do not wish in any way to interfere with Constable Scott, nor do I mean to detract him or any one else in any way, but I think I can say without egotism that I am as capable of performing those duties as he is, and considering the fact that he is years junior to me, and the clearly expressed promise of the Minister for Justice *re* the claims of seniority, I am in justice to myself compelled, although reluctantly, to bring this matter under the notice of the Inspector." This went to Acting Station Sergeant Bird, who said, "Forwarded to the station sergeant. Constable Scott has been put on inquiries again this fortnight with your full knowledge; he has performed the duties satisfactorily during the time he has been on inquiries." The station sergeant, Johnston, says in his minute, "All things being equal seniority should prevail. I consider Constable Scott the best man for position outside the watch-house keeper, therefore accept the responsibility for him doing the inquiry." The Inspector said, "The constable who is most suitable for inquiry duty is the one to be appointed; at all events, we will soon have the usual strength of sergeants, then you will have a sergeant for inquiry work." Now, Sergeant Johnston says the best man was on these duties. Before this constable ever joined the Force I could refer you to some of the best officers at present in the Force to say I was quite capable of performing inquiries years before he ever joined. In the course of my duty the other day this was sent to the sergeant of police at Lyttelton in connection with an inquiry I made. It is the first complimentary thing that has been said about our duties in connection with this work for years: "The Sergeant of Police, Lyttelton.—*Re* Ruka Weteriki: Will you kindly thank Constable Fitzgerald for his comprehensive report of the 17th instant with respect to the above-named Native? I feel quite satisfied now to recommend the Public Trustee to pay Mr. Tikao 10s. per week for his maintenance, and to make a payment of £5 for clothing for the old man.—Yours faithfully, M. C. BARNETT, District Manager." This was a surprise to me—that anything in the way of praise should come my way at all. I have been stationed in Auckland, in Wellington twice, in Christchurch twice, at Mount Cook, and three months in Lyttelton, and will refer you to any of the officers as to whether I know my duties, or ever shirked them, or whether they can say anything against me. Now, Sergeant Johnston takes on himself to say a junior constable of three years' service is more capable of performing these duties than I with sixteen years. It is not fair to say that. In regard to promotions, I do not attribute the whole of the promotions to the Commissioner; he is not responsible for all of them. I say the Inspectors in charge of districts in certain cases are as much responsible, and probably more, for influence in connection with promotions and recommendations.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Could you suggest any better system as regards promotions than the present?

*The Commissioner:* The witness attacks the way in which some Inspectors make recommendations, and leads me to infer you are in many instances at the mercy of the Inspectors.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Can you suggest some better system, so that the Inspectors would not be in a position to mislead me?—I do not think it is a fair question to ask me. I am not in a position to make any suggestion.

9. Do you know that you were recommended for promotion, and appear in my list?—I should be very much surprised to know that I was.

*The Commissioner:* By whom was he recommended?

*Mr. Dinnie:* From Auckland first, I believe.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your application for promotion is dated May, 1907. You say I declined to entertain it unless you passed the educational test?—The memo. that was on the application when returned to me was, "This constable's application cannot be entertained until he passes the annual examination."

11. Is not this the memo.: "Will expect this constable to pass the examination, as Constable Williams did before he was promoted"?—There was no mention of Williams, or anybody else.

12. Did you note the papers as having seen them?—Yes.

13. Is not this the minute?—To the best of my knowledge, neither Constable Williams nor any one else was mentioned.

14. Is not this your signature?—Yes.

15. Then you are wrong in saying Constable Williams's name was not mentioned?—I said I did not notice it was mentioned; but I say there are several men who have been promoted who have never passed the examination, and were not asked to pass it.

16. At this time you appear to have been next on the list for promotion, and the one senior to you had just been promoted?—There was one junior to me who had just been promoted.

17. Is not this what you say: "I notice by a report in the daily papers that the last constable promoted to sergeant is a constable one senior to me"?—Probably, and I mentioned a man much junior to me, which was what drew my attention to it first.

18. Was it not very soon after that you were reported for insubordination and other matters?—At that time I made the application I saw this thing coming, and wanted to get out of where I was. Had I been on a suitable station I should not have made application for promotion.

19. You saw it coming?—I did, and my predecessor had seen it before. It was not only me that was affected.

20. You saw you were likely to get into trouble, and you thought the best way out of it was to apply for promotion?—In order to get out of a place where I saw my officers were taking sides against me.

21. Do you not think you were not promoted owing to a report against you and the way I dealt with you?—Probably. But I am satisfied I never received justice in any matter connected with this file.

22. We may all be mistaken about you?—I will refer the file to his Worship.

*The Commissioner:* I shall call for the file.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You had some trouble with Mrs. Weathered in connection with the house in which you resided? It was burnt down under peculiar circumstances after your having trouble with her about certain alterations?—The alterations were taking place at the time it was burned down; they were partly completed; two rooms were papered and lined, and there was only one room and the landing to be done. The house was getting into a splendid state of repair, owing to the interference of some one who compelled the Department to act.

24. It was strange it should be burned down at such a time?—That struck me very forcibly—to my loss.

25. As regards the other men promoted who were junior to you, have you more knowledge of their qualifications than their superior officers?—I have done duty with several, and know their qualifications.

26. In your opinion, they are not such good men as you?—In my opinion, they are no better.

27. Probably that is not the opinion of their superior officers?—I can refer you to some of the best officers and non-commissioned officers in the Dominion whether I am as capable as any of those men.

28. What do you allege about Wade being transferred?—I said because he had a certain amount of political influence he could do what other men dare not do.

29. Where did the influence come in on that occasion?—He got married to a woman the Department objected to when Mr. Tunbridge was in charge, and immediately after Mr. Tunbridge left he married the woman, and is still in the Force. He must have some influence.

30. You have no proof?—No.

31. Can you tell us some other case?—I mentioned the case of the two men reported from Lyttelton.

32. What influence was brought to bear there?—I do not suggest any, but one was transferred for the same complaint that the other was left alone for; the one man was a Mason and the other was not.

33. Imagination again?—The facts are there.

34. There may have been a reason for his transfer?—I do not know of any reason, but you might have had one.

35. Will that man come forward and tell us to whom he applied for influence?—Very likely he will.

36. Will you give us the names of any of those who you say reported confidentially to the Inspector on different matters concerning constables?—I was given an instance of a confidential report that went in about Constable Brown.

37. Is it in existence at the present time?—It was.

38. How do you know?—Because it was seen by two constables, and they informed him of the fact.

39. Then, it could not have been very confidential?—He did not know anything about it at the time.

40. What was the date of that report? We might be able to trace it?—It was some time ago. The sergeant went and reported in connection with Constable Brown that there was very little doubt that he was responsible for a certain report in a newspaper.

41. You have not seen that report itself. It is merely hearsay?—No; I am giving you as nearly as possible what are the facts.

42. But you have not actually seen it yourself?—No.

43. You go so far as to say that Inspectors recommend men for promotion in order to get rid of them?—I am not the first who has said it.

44. Do you believe it?—I would not say I do believe it, but it has been said, and it did not originate with me.

45. You have not a very good opinion of your Inspectors, evidently. Knowing that you were on the list for promotion at the time you applied for it, and that it was simply owing to your getting into trouble that you were not promoted, are you not satisfied?—I am very much surprised to hear that I was recommended for promotion.

46. As you appear to be so disbelieving, I had better let you see your name on the list?—That is not my name. That is my brother's.

47. I am sorry. I made a mistake. I fully thought it was the witness, because the two brothers are from the same district. Then, you were not recommended for promotion. Why were you not recommended for promotion in Auckland?—I was not entitled to it when I left Auckland in 1902 or 1903.

48. What service had you when you left Auckland?—Nine or ten years.

49. And what is your service up to now?—It will be sixteen years in December next.

50. Then you must have had thirteen years' service when you left Auckland?—I went to Wellington after that.

51. You were not recommended from Wellington either. Did you make any application?—No; I was at the Mount Cook Station, and I had nothing to do with any of the Inspectors while I was there.

52. Do the Inspectors ever make recommendations without application?—They may, but they did not seem to think it worth while to recommend me.

53. *Inspector Gillies.*] What service had you when you came to Christchurch?—I had something over twelve years' service between Wellington and Auckland.

54. And you have served under Inspectors Cullen and Ellison?—Yes.

55. Were you ever in charge of a station before you came here?—Yes; I was in charge of a suburban station—Surrey Hills—temporarily.

56. For how long?—I could not tell you from memory.

57. Is it usual for a good active man to be kept on the beat for twelve years without getting charge of a station?—There have been instances, but it is not usual, I should think.

58. Would such a man not be placed in charge of a station in five years, as a general rule?—I could not say whether he would or not.

59. You were twelve years without having charge of a station?—I was for twelve or eighteen months in charge of a station.

60. Why were you transferred to beat duty in Wellington?—I was on beat duty in Auckland when I was transferred to Wellington.

61. What was the reason for your being transferred from charge of a station to beat duty in Auckland?—The reason was that I was reported for leaving my district without permission. That is on my defaulter's sheet.

62. That was under Inspector Cullen. You were not then under me?—No.

63. Why were you transferred from beat duty in Auckland to beat duty in Wellington?—I applied for that transfer, and I had a good deal of difficulty in obtaining it.

64. Why did you apply?—On account of my wife's ill health.

65. Have you any complaint with regard to your treatment by Inspector Cullen?—I think it was pretty fair.

66. Was it good treatment to put you on street duty?—It was probably my own fault.

67. Under what circumstances were you transferred from Wellington to my district?—I was simply transferred to Annat.

68. You have related a conversation which took place between us when you called at my office on your arrival in Christchurch. That was four years ago. You must have a good memory to be able to say clearly everything that occurred?—I have a pretty good memory.

68A. I will test your memory. Did I ask you if ever you had been mounted?—You did.

69. Did I ask you if you had ever ridden a horse?—No; you asked me if I had ever been mounted, and I said I had never been officially mounted.

70. You say you have a good memory. Did I not ask you if you had ever ridden a horse?—I do not think so, but I remember telling you I had experience of horses, and that I had no doubt I could do whatever was to be done there.

71. Did you not say that you had not been in the habit of riding horses, and had not been used to them?—No, I am perfectly certain about that.

72. Did I not say to you that under the circumstances I would try and bring a mounted man from St. Andrew's, and put you at St. Andrew's?—I distinctly say No.

73. Were you asked to unpack until we saw whether you could be sent to St. Andrew's or not?—I had no intimation of any change until after I had my furniture unpacked and I had settled down at Annat. I then got a telegram from Sergeant Fouhey to proceed to St. Andrew's. I was nine or ten days at Annat.

74. Is not St. Andrew's a better station than Annat or Sheffield?—It is not half the station Sheffield is. There is probably more work at Sheffield, but it has not anything like the advantages or the perquisites.

75. How was your health at the time you came to see me?—It was fairly good.

76. Did you ever complain to me about going to St. Andrew's instead of Sheffield?—Unfortunately, I did not.

77. Have I not from time to time inspected at your station at St. Andrew's, and have you ever mentioned to me that you were not pleased with your station?—I think you came twice. I did not mention it to you.

78. Did you not tell me you were glad to be there because your brother was near at hand to help you in any matters, as he was then stationed at Timaru?—I never said any such thing. I never mentioned him at all.

79. With regard to a certain report which Mr. Dinnie questioned you about, you said that Williams's name had never been mentioned in it, and you insisted that you had not seen the minute on the file until you were shown your signature. Then you could not help admitting that you had seen it. Do you remember that?—Yes.

80. Is your memory just as good on that point as it is on what took place between us when you first arrived in Christchurch?—My memory is generally better than most people's.

81. Will you give me any particulars as to unfair treatment you have received since you arrived in this district?—I did not mention you in connection with it at all.

82. But the inference was that I treated you unfairly?—I did not consider putting a junior constable on to make inquiries about my case was very fair treatment, and I thought I was being treated unfairly by being shifted from Sheffield to St. Andrew's. Also, from the time I started to make complaints about the house being out of repair, I said then, and I say now, that it appeared to me that both you and Sub-Inspector Green took sides with Mrs. Weathered.

83. How long had that house been built when you went into it?—It was practically a new house, but as to its condition I do not want to say any more about it myself. I would refer you to Mr. Bradey, who is a practical farmer, living at St. Andrew's, and he can tell you more about the way that house was built than I can.

84. How long were you with me in Christchurch after your return from St. Andrew's?—From the beginning of September, 1907, to 7th March this year.

85. Can you give me any instance of unfair treatment during that time?—I have already said in my evidence that I had nothing to say as regards the treatment meted out to me by you, as a constable does not come personally into contact with the Inspector.

86. Do you know of any constable who has come before me without a sergeant?—No; because according to the regulations he cannot do so.

87. Are you satisfied that I carry out the regulations pretty closely?—I have never said anything to the contrary.

88. Did I ever ask you personally, or through anybody else, some two or three months after you were back from Lyttelton, whether you would like to go to Wellington?—No; I was waiting anxiously to go to Wellington, where my wife and family were, but when a single man was transferred to Wellington I saw I had no chance of anything.

89. Coming to your complaint about a junior man being placed in charge of a relief in the street, would I have the appointment of that man, or would I leave it to my Sub-Inspector?—You would leave it to the Sub-Inspector.

90. You know, I suppose, that I offered you Lyttelton as soon as there was a vacancy, and that you got that station, which is equally as good as any other station. You know, also, that I recommended you for bailiff work when there were three or four applications for it at the same time?—I know there were junior men down there who applied for the bailiff work, and if you had given it to one of them I would not have taken the transfer to Lyttelton.

91. But you did get both the station and the bailiff work?—Yes.

92. Are you not comfortable and fairly well off there?—I am better off than I have been for a long time.

93. You say that some sergeant made a confidential report to me about a constable at the station, but that you had not seen it yourself. You said, however, that there were two men who had seen it. I would like to know who those two men are?—I would rather not give their names.

94. Have you heard since you have been stationed here that I have been in the habit of receiving confidential reports from any member of the Force?—It is pretty common rumour here that you habitually receive reports from the sergeants that the men are not aware of. As to whether it is correct or not I cannot say, but I have heard it time and again.

95. *The Commissioner.*] Is this your defaulter's sheet?—Yes.

*The Commissioner:* What is the object of attaching this foolscap sheet with memoranda concerning the men upon it?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Only cases in which the men have been fined are entered upon the defaulter's sheet. Those on the other sheet may be reprimands or cautions, and they do not operate against the constable.

*The Commissioner:* Then, what is the object of attaching it?

*Mr. Dinnie:* It is only done in this district. I suppose it is done as a means of easy reference. I have given no instructions with regard to it.

*Witness:* The Inspector asked me if I had any complaint to make about his treatment of me. Well, prior to being transferred to Lyttelton I made application for a station which was about to be opened up at Islington. The man who was appointed to that station is junior to me by a good deal, and just before being appointed he had been convicted of a breach of the regulations.

96. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was any reason given to you for your not being sent to Islington?—No, it was simply noted for future reference.

97. Does not your defaulter's sheet show that you have been six times dealt with for misconduct?—I admit everything in that defaulter's sheet except that with regard to my transfer from St. Andrew's to Christchurch. That, I maintain, is wrong and unjust. There have been men promoted whose defaulter's sheets have been worse than mine.

MICHAEL LEAHY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 78.)

*Witness:* I am a constable, stationed at Oxford. Was enrolled in June, 1879, and have been in charge of the station fourteen years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you wish to make any statement?—I only wish to know why I was not promoted.

2. How old are you?—Fifty-three.

3. Have you ever applied for promotion?—No.

4. Have there been many instances of men being promoted over your head?—You can see from the numbers of the sergeants promoted. My number is 310.

5. Do you know of any reason why you have been passed over?—No.

6. You have a clean defaulter's sheet?—Yes.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If you had been promoted in accordance with your service and in accordance with the dates at which others were promoted, you would have been promoted many years ago?—Yes, I would.

8. How many years' service have you?—Thirty years.

*The Commissioner:* I understand he has been recommended repeatedly by his Inspector.

*Mr. Dinnie:* And I think he was recommended to my predecessor, but he did not appear to have formed a very good opinion of him.

*Witness:* In order that I might have a better chance of being considered I passed the first police examination that was held, and there is the record of it in the *Police Gazette*.

*The Commissioner:* I do not profess to understand it. I would ask the Inspector when he recommended this man for promotion.

*Inspector Gillies:* I have recommended him before he was fifty years of age, but since that time I have been debarred from recommending him.

*Witness:* I am quite satisfied that Inspector Gillies has been very fair to me; but there was an inducement held out to us to stand for the examination, and I passed that examination twenty years ago, but I have never got anything since. I could refer you, sir, to Inspectors under whom I have served and other officers as to my service and work.

*The Commissioner:* I do not want any one to speak on your behalf. I have the fact that your Inspector recommended you. Have you anything against this man, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* No.

*The Commissioner:* Can you offer any suggestion as to why he has been passed over without going into detail?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Not at present. I can only say that my predecessor said he was an average constable, fit for a quiet station only.

*Witness:* But I have held the position of Clerk of the Court and bailiff.

*The Commissioner:* Were you governed entirely by the memoranda left by your predecessor, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Not entirely. I have seen a good deal of his reports, and so on, and I judged by them to a certain extent.

*The Commissioner:* He is a good penman, and a man of intelligence?

*Mr. Dinnie:* He has got into years.

*The Commissioner:* He has not always been old.

*Witness:* I am as strong and able to-day as any man in the Force.

*The Commissioner:* If it were possible, with due regard to the efficiency of the Force, would you be prepared to recommend his promotion—that is, if an injustice has been done to him?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Well, one has to look at the other side. If an exception is made in this case, it might lead to all sorts of trouble. And I am not admitting that an injustice has been done.

*Witness:* Looking to the fact that I have passed the necessary examination, and that my conduct and work has been favourably reported upon, and that I have been recommended by the Inspector, I hope, sir, that you can see the justice of my claim.

*The Commissioner:* I think you have made out a very strong case indeed for special consideration, but, as you see, the Commissioner cannot say anything without the necessary material in front of him, and in any case, I am not the Minister; I can only make recommendations. I have, however, had the opportunity of seeing a good deal of your work, and I quite recognise that you have a strong exceptional claim for consideration, and I hope I do not see many cases such as yours. Have you anything further you wish to add?

*Witness:* No, sir.

---

THURSDAY, 29TH JULY, 1909.

FREDERICK KNIGHT HUNT, Solicitor, examined on oath. (No. 79.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] How long have you known me?—About six years, at Akaroa.
2. You have had a great deal of Court work to do with me: how did I do my work?—I think you did it very well indeed; nearly all the Court work there has been with you.
3. You were thoroughly satisfied?—Yes; I think you were very careful and painstaking, and conducted your cases very well.
4. In regard to correspondence or anything, did I give any trouble?—Not in the least; you were most obliging, and did your work very well.
5. *The Commissioner.*] As having had considerable experience, what is your opinion of this constable?—He is above the average; he is very painstaking and conscientious. Frequently, since I opened an office at Akaroa, Constable Jackson has asked me to solve legal conundrums, showing that he evidently took a great deal of interest in his work.

VICTOR GRACE DAY, Stipendiary Magistrate, examined on oath. (No. 80.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I was under you as Clerk of the Court for some time: how did I do my work?—You were under me in that capacity for three years. You did your work very well, both as constable and Clerk of the Court. You had a considerable amount of old-age pension work, in connection with which you exhibited great tact.
2. There were never any complaints against me?—Never.
3. How did I conduct cases in Court?—Above the average of the ordinary constable. I had no fault to find.
4. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion of the constable generally—purely in regard to a question of promotion? Do you think he would make an efficient sergeant?—I should think so, and he would be above the average of sergeants. I have had means while talking to residents of Akaroa of ascertaining their opinion of him as a constable, and from their sentiments as expressed to me I gathered that he was very zealous in the discharge of his duties, and did good work in Akaroa. There was a certain amount of tendency to drinking amongst the younger members of the community, and from statements made to me by prominent residents, Constable Jackson has very materially assisted in checking that tendency.

5. I should like to ask you a question or two on general matters. In regard to the employment of the police generally in connection with sly-grog selling, you have had a long experience at Ashburton—a no-license district: will you give any general views you may hold in regard to this, having regard to the efficiency of the Force?—Sly-grog selling is one of the most difficult things to detect, any person engaged in the traffic being always on his guard against surprise, and it is only natural under those circumstances that means have to be used to detect the selling of grog which would not readily be used in other matters.

6. It may possibly come before me in the course of the Commission at different parts of the Dominion, and to my mind it is more a question of ethics than anything else—the employment of the police to detect offences. You know the opinions held by some persons—I do not say I hold them myself, but they are pretty prominently before the public on occasion: have you any views on the matter?—I take it it is part of the duty of the police to detect the offence, and to use all means that may be necessary to detect and check it.

7. I am alluding more to the enticing of the offence for the purpose of detecting it?—I do not see that there is any enticing in it. If a constable has a suspicion that a certain person is a sly-grog seller he simply goes and proposes to buy some; unless he uses any inducement more than the mere asking for it, I do not think anything can be said against it.

8. You do not see any impropriety in it, but consider it simply a sort of necessary adjunct to police duty?—Provided that the constable does nothing to induce the person to sell the drink.

9. In regard to the conduct of cases, especially licensing cases, in Court?—In my opinion, the constable or sergeant who possibly receives a reward when a conviction is obtained should not be allowed to conduct the case in Court. It is highly improper that any person who is directly interested in the result of a criminal, or quasi-criminal, case should conduct the prosecution. It has been held for a long time that all such prosecutions should be conducted by the Crown Solicitor, and before any prosecution is entered upon the facts should be laid before the Crown Solicitor for his opinion. If this were done fewer cases would be brought and fewer dismissed. It would be in the interests of justice. If a conviction follows, the Crown gets the fine, and the question of the small amount of fees to the Crown Solicitor is inconsiderable. That is my opinion, as the result of experience.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Would you have Crown Solicitors employed in all licensing cases?—I do not say in technical cases, like failure to send a notice to the Clerk of the Court; but in any charge of selling I consider the Crown Solicitor should be employed.

11. That would include sly-grog selling, and any case against a publican?—Yes, I think so. I believe it is a rule that in all these licensing cases where a conviction is obtained a certain amount of reward is divided among the constables.

12. That is only in sly-grog cases?—In all cases of that kind there is a possibility of the constable or sergeant straining a case in the hope of getting the reward.

13. At the same time, you think it desirable to give rewards?—I said nothing of that.

14. Do you think it advisable?—I am hardly qualified to give an opinion.

15. But in all cases against a publican you think we ought to have the assistance of the Crown Solicitor?—I think it would be in the interests of justice to do so, because, as a rule, they are technical cases.

16. We have authority to employ the Crown Solicitor in these cases?—Only in the centres—very rarely in the country districts.

17. Do you know what the present system of detection of sly-grog selling is?—All I know is what comes before me in Court.

18. You get more sly-grog selling cases than any other Magistrate?—I think I do. From what I see, no other method could be used than the one you adopt. Formerly, I believe, men were employed who were not even probationary constables, and that led to abuse I believe. It was discontinued, and probationary constables employed. They are only carrying out their duty in detecting these cases.

19. It is better they should be employed than private individuals?—Most decidedly.

20. As regards promotion, do you not think the superior officer is best qualified to know when a constable should be promoted?—Yes.

21. Is he not in a position to know the man's qualifications better even than you?—Not altogether. You have the case of Constable Leahy living a long distance away, and not always under the sergeant's or the Inspector's eye, and he is overlooked.

22. But a constable has many other duties than those that come before you?—Yes.

23. *The Commissioner.*] Your point is that the Inspector gets little more opportunity of judging than you?—Yes, except by correspondence.

24. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But he is in the position to recommend?—Nobody else can do so.

25. *Inspector Gullies.*] Ashburton is the principal part of your district where sly-grog selling is carried on?—Yes.

26. From your knowledge of the work done there, has it been done successfully and well?—Rumour has it that plenty of sly grog can still be obtained, but the difficulty is to obtain evidence. As far as it can be done, it has been done well.

27. You are satisfied, as far as the police are concerned in Ashburton, they have used every effort to detect it?—Yes.

28. You have had numerous cases before you?—Yes.

29. You have no fault to find with the way the cases have been got up?—No; but I say it is not desirable that where any reward is attached the case should be in the hands of the man who is to receive the reward.

30. My reason for asking this question is in justice to the sergeant in charge of the district, who is one of the best men in the service?—He is a splendid officer, and one of the few men suitable to be in the district.

MICHAEL DONNELLY, Barrister and Solicitor, examined on oath. (No. 81.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] You have known me for a number of years?—Eighteen years.
2. And have had a great deal to do with me in Court matters?—Yes.
3. Have you found me a good man?—I think you have been always very straightforward, energetic, and zealous—far above the majority of ordinary policemen. I met you first about eighteen years ago, in connection with an assault and robbery case, and we had a very hard conflict then. I have seen you in Akaroa and Christchurch since in Court and out of Court, and you have done as much as any constable to maintain the best traditions of the Police Force in New Zealand.

*The Commissioner:* You cannot have higher praise than that, and Mr. Donnelly is competent to judge.

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, ex-Sergeant, further examined. (No. 82.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I was a constable under you at Akaroa?—Yes, for three or four years.
2. How did I do my duty while you were there?—Remarkably well. I had no fault to find. I had every confidence in you.
3. Was there ever any delay or anything incorrect in regard to correspondence, or anything of that sort?—None at all; everything was in good form and correct.
4. I had a number of licensing and other cases which I conducted myself?—Yes.
5. *The Commissioner.*] What about Constable Jackson's suitability for promotion?—I consider him quite competent.
6. You have had a long experience as sergeant, and are competent to judge?—I have been a sergeant about thirty-three years.
7. You think he would have justified his promotion?—Most undoubtedly; he is a man in whom every confidence is to be placed.

MAURICE ROCHE, ex-Constable, examined on oath. (No. 83.)

*Witness:* I have had twenty-five years' experience as a constable in New Zealand, and was about seven years in New Orleans and two years in the London Metropolitan. I retired on superannuation.

1. *Constable Jackson.*] You have done duty with me, and have known me for a number of years?—Yes, I have been associated with you in important cases.
2. What is your opinion of me as a constable?—You are just the very man I would want.
3. I did my work well?—Yes; when you were associated with me you did everything that was necessary.
4. You coached me for examination: had you any fault to find?—You could answer orally any question I could see in any of the Acts mentioned in the examination. I told you if it were a literary examination it might not be so good. You cannot get an Oxford graduate for 7s. a day, although I see they have got a solicitor for that.

JAMES JOHNSTON, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 84.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] You have known me for a number of years?—Yes.
2. We have done duty together: what is your opinion of me as a constable?—You are as loyal and energetic a constable as I know. You did your work remarkably well.
3. You have trusted me with inquiries about hotels and with information?—I would trust you with any ordinary inquiry; I would prefer you to any man I know.
4. The information you gave me did not leak out?—Not that I know of.
5. You think I am a good constable?—I do not know of any better.
6. *The Commissioner.*] Having regard to the men you see promoted, do you think this constable would be a suitable man for promotion?—I do not know whether it is right for a subordinate member of the Force to answer that question. My superiors are here; it would be better to ask them.
7. I ask you, and insist on an answer. If you answer that you consider him qualified, it is no possible reflection on your superior, because it is a matter of individual judgment. If Constable Jackson had been chosen for promotion, would he have been suitable?—Undoubtedly, in every way.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 85.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I was under you for about eighteen months: how did I do my work?—You were very steady and energetic, and thoroughly efficient, and absolutely trustworthy. I am satisfied if you were transferred from Akaroa to-morrow I should have great difficulty in finding a man to get through your work.
2. There is a large amount of work on that station?—There is really two men's work, and the work has been most efficiently performed.
3. *The Commissioner.*] If it had fallen to the constable's lot to be promoted, do you consider he was worthy of promotion?—Most certainly.
4. There would be nothing in the shape of disqualification?—Nothing whatever.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 86.)

1. *Constable Jackson.*] I have been under you for five years: have you any fault to find with me?—Not the slightest.
2. I have done my work well?—Thoroughly well.
3. Akaroa is a station where you always like to have reliable men?—Yes.



4. Have you ever recommended me for promotion?—I have.
5. I had several sly-grog selling cases and other work under you in the North Island?—Yes; I never had a more energetic constable, or one who has given me greater satisfaction in the position.
6. *The Commissioner.*] When did you first recommend him?—I think last year; but he applied before that, and I put practically the same remarks on his sheet as when recommending him.
7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What were the remarks?—I cannot say from memory.
8. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know why he was not promoted?—No.
9. You are as much concerned as the Commissioner in getting the very best quality of men in the service—it would be of assistance to the Commissioner?—When I recommend a man I consider I have done my duty.
10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You did not place him on your list previously, I suppose, because you thought you had better men?—Quite so. I am called on every year to submit names of those who I think are qualified for promotion under the age of fifty years. When making the selection I take into consideration seniority if they are qualified, not unless. I simply recommend the man I think would be most successful as a sergeant. When recommending a man I give my opinion shortly. Jackson's recommendation was this: "An energetic, active, steady man, well conducted, and I think will make a fairly good sergeant in a city."
11. *The Commissioner.*] For purposes of comparison, did you recommend the man whose name I pass to you?—I never put him on my list. He applied later, and I gave my opinion of him then. I never put him in my return.
12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Is this what you said of that man: "This is a careful, steady, well conducted constable, who has done his work satisfactorily, and I should think would make an average sergeant if not too old for promotion"?—When he made his application some time after, I had submitted my sergeants for promotion.
13. *The Commissioner.*] If you had your choice of the two men, which would you prefer?—I would prefer Jackson. There is no comparison at all. I wish to make it clear that I never put the other man on my list.
14. You have no doubt as to the qualifications of Jackson?—Not the slightest.

DAVID JACKSON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 87.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Addington. I joined the service in 1892. I was stationed in various parts of Auckland. I took charge of Mahanga in 1899. After a time was transferred to Mangaweka, where, besides being constable, I was Clerk of the Court. The plaints ran about 160 a year. From there I was transferred to Akaroa, where I was also Clerk of the Court, Deputy Registrar of Old-age Pensions, Inspector of Weights and Measures, and Inspector of Factories. I have another constable under me. The pensions were about forty-seven. I did all my own Court work, prosecuting in all cases, including indictable offences and licensing cases, and I have had no trouble with any case. During the time I was in the North Island I prosecuted all my own cases, and I have gone to other stations to prosecute. I was also concerned in two sly-grog raids there, and closed up a wholesale license at Taihape. I gave evidence at various times against wholesale licenses being granted in the North Island. I applied for promotion some time ago. I was told I had not passed the police examination. I went in for the examination, and got 59 marks out of 60. A large number of juniors have been promoted over me, and it is only right, if one man has to undergo the examination, another should. No distinction should be made. I hand in a list of twenty-five men promoted over me, and also the total number of constables promoted since the issue of the circular relative to the police examination. Six have passed the examination and nineteen have not.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What reason has been given you for being passed over?—Nothing, except not having passed the examination. I am forty-nine in September. I have always been in charge of out-stations till coming to Addington. I have a large amount of work there.
2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know now your name was not placed in the recommendation list till 1908?—No.
3. So you may be the next promoted?—That is so. The men each side of me have been promoted.
4. The regulation does not say you must pass the examination; it simply says that will be a consideration?—That is so.
5. *The Commissioner.*] How long is it since you thought you were entitled to promotion?—About two years ago I began to think it over seriously.
6. When did you put in your application first?—About two years ago, through the present Inspector, and he recommended it. In regard to the statement that Masonic influence has to do with promotions, I think it only fair to say I am as old a Mason as there is in the room, and my position here shows that that has nothing to do with promotion.
7. It shows you have not used it?—No.
8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been in stations north and south: have you ever heard anything about my placing a special man in each district to give me information?—You hear remarks, but they are like any other rumours.
9. Do you know if there is any general dissatisfaction in the service?—I think the most dissatisfaction is that some men are being promoted without passing the examination, while others have to go in for it. There is dissatisfaction there, I must say.
10. *Inspector Gillies.*] You are in touch with the men pretty well in the city and suburbs and in the country: have you ever heard from any man that I was in the habit of calling for confidential reports from sergeants about men in the district?—Never. I had occasion to make a report on a constable, and it was returned in full. There was nothing confidential about it. I never heard of it till yesterday.

11. *The Commissioner.*] Have you had inquiries to make in regard to applications for enrolment?—Yes.

12. Have you had any experience of the manner in which inquiries are made by constables?—I think constables have not been careful enough. A man came to me and wanted me to recommend him for the Force, and I said I would recommend him for Lyttelton Gaol if he did not take care.

13. Have you ever had to deal with an inquiry in a case recommended by a constable?—Yes.

14. What would you suggest in the way of making inquiries as full and careful as possible? Every constable has not the same sense of responsibility?—They should be made only by qualified men, and before the man goes to the depot there should be inquiries where the man lives. A man may be a decent man, and yet not fit for the Police Force. If inquiries are given to every constable, the chance is one may have a friend he wants to get in, or something like that.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have to place a good deal of reliance on constables in connection with other important business, have you not?—Yes, but important matters are generally handed over to responsible men.

16. Have not constables in charge of stations a responsible position?—Yes; but in many cases inquiries are made by constables who are not in charge of a station.

17. In how many cases that you know of have inquiries not been satisfactory?—I know of one—the one to which I referred.

18. What was done in that matter?—The man could not get in.

19. Was not something done to the constable who made the report?—He was dealt with.

PETER MALONEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 88.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Akaroa. I was enrolled in 1904. In November, 1905, I was sent out after two escaped prisoners, and did some rough work in company with Roche, and we arrested them at Amberley. Neither of us was recognised in the matter, while two detectives in Wellington got £5 for arresting an escaped prisoner. If it is fair for one man to get a reward it is fair for another. About March, 1908, I applied for a mounted position, and was recommended by Sub-Inspector and Inspector Gillies. A junior man by twelve months was given the position in preference. Since then several junior men to me have got similar appointments.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know the rewards have nothing to do with the police—that it is the Prisons Department that has to do with them?—I do not know.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I believe a recommendation was made to the Prisons Department in the matter.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Have you had any conversation with Constable Fitzgerald in regard to Constable Wade?—Not that I remember.

3. You know Wade?—Yes.

4. Do you know anything about letters that it was said he used to write to people?—There were some such remarks in the district—that he used to write anonymous letters, but I cannot say personally.

5. Letters to whom?—Different people. I never saw any of them.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What were the letters supposed to be about?—Different things. If he took a dislike to a constable, he had the name of writing an anonymous letter to his officers.

*The Commissioner:* I should not care to go into that in the absence of the constable; it is a very serious statement to make.

7. *Inspector Gillies.*] Who were they supposed to be written to?—I suppose, the Inspector and Sub-Inspector. It is only hearsay.

*Inspector Gillies:* I never received any such letters, so far as I am concerned.

PATRICK RYAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 89.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Riccarton. I was enrolled in 1877, and was promoted in 1904. In regard to the pay, I think it is due to that that not more desirable candidates come forward; the service is not attractive enough.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You think an improvement in pay would improve that?—Yes.

2. How does the Force to-day compare with that of years ago?—I think the conduct of the men would compare very favourably with any time. The physique of the men is not so good. The discipline is very good.

3. Do you know anything of political influence?—No; I have heard it talked of, but I have never seen any instance of it.

4. In regard to promotion?—There is a good deal of talk about junior men getting promoted out of their turn; there is no more fertile source of discontent.

5. If there are grounds for discontent it would tend to disturb the Force?—Yes.

6. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction on that score?—I have heard a good deal of talk about it. When a constable well down in the ranks is promoted it causes a good deal of discussion.

7. In regard to the admission of candidates for enrolment, do you make inquiries yourself occasionally?—I do not know that I have made any personal inquiries; I have had some through my hands that I have passed on to constables in the sub-district.

8. Would you prefer the sergeant to make the inquiries?—There is no doubt some constables are as reliable and efficient as sergeants.

9. But there must be some you would not trust with inquiries?—Yes.

10. And you would prefer it to be done by a sergeant?—They might be more responsible.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Speaking of promotion out of turn, do you not think junior constables should be promoted if they are better qualified?—Yes; but there are instances where a sergeant has been promoted and placed in the office. Those are the ones there is the most talk about.

12. It is those special cases to which you refer?—Partly; but there are others as well.

13. You believe qualification should be considered, and not seniority alone?—Yes. There is one thing hard to understand: a man is passed over and a junior is promoted over his head, and then the man is promoted; he was as good when first passed over as afterwards.

14. But supposing he would never go further than sergeant, and the other man was better qualified to go a step higher, which of the two would you promote?—I know junior men who have been promoted, and had they not been promoted the Force would have suffered, because they are a credit to the Force.

15. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have served under me for a number of years?—Yes.

16. Have you ever had instructions from me, either by word or writing, asking you to furnish a confidential report about any man under you?—I have not.

17. Have you ever heard that such a thing was done until yesterday?—I do not think so. I would not believe it if I did.

18. You know me pretty well?—Yes, I have had a long experience of you.

19. As regards my dealing with the men, has anything ever been concealed from the men by me?—Not to my knowledge. If a report is made against a man, your custom is to send it to him for explanation.

20. And if that is not satisfactory I hold an inquiry?—Yes.

21. During the inquiry, has the constable the right of cross-examination?—Yes, to the fullest extent.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever heard that I had a special man appointed in different districts to get information?—Not until this Commission sat.

23. Do you believe it?—I have no reason to do so. There was a matter mentioned yesterday by Constable Fitzgerald about a man shifted from Lyttelton. He could not have known the circumstances of the case. It did not make any difference whether the man was a Mason or not. Another matter I wish to refer to is the difference between the travelling-expenses of a sergeant and a detective. I have charge of Lyttelton, where there are five men and a detective. If it so happened that the detective and I had to travel to the country on duty he would go first class and I would have to go second, and if we had to get lunch he would be allowed 2s. and I 1s. 6d. I do not say the detective gets too much, but there should be no difference.

*Mr. Dinnie:* The question is now under consideration, and an alteration will be made.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 90.)

*Witness:* I am in charge of Sydenham sub-district. I joined the service in 1881, having served a few months in the Armed Constabulary. I was mounted constable in Wellington for about three years, and was at my own request transferred to Ashburton as mounted constable, where I remained two years. Transferred to Timaru as mounted constable; there I married, and was transferred to Pembroke, a lucrative station on the Otago goldfields, where I remained a little over eight years; and, at my own request, transferred to Clutha, where I was for six years; then promoted sergeant, and appointed to Christchurch. I remained there two years, and then was given charge of the Reefton sub-district. I remained there twelve months, and, at my own request, was transferred to Sydenham. The only suggestion I want to bring forward is that it would be a great improvement, and tend to truthfulness, if departmental investigations were taken on oath. I speak very feelingly on the matter.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you anything to say about the pay, having regard to the efficiency of the Force?—I think the pay is a bar to better men getting into the Force, in this way: Taking into consideration that the police are paid for seven days a week, wet or dry, it is fully equal to that of an artisan; but there is the fact of the discipline, and having to work on Sunday and holidays.

2. Some inducement is wanted to bring a better class of men to join. Do you think the standard of education is high?—I would not lower it. Education has never helped me, but I would not lower the standard. I have known men almost illiterate, who, by studying to improve themselves, have been able to write a good report. I have known men with good education to be valueless as constables.

3. What is your opinion in regard to the physique of the men? Are they as good as they were?—I think they have deteriorated considerably in that regard, and not only in physique, but in ability; they are less intellectual than they were.

4. Is there any laxity of conduct?—They have not that sense of duty they had in years gone by.

5. Are you aware of any political interference or influence being used?—I am not in a position to prove it; I have heard of it.

6. Do you think it exists?—I do.

7. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force at present as regards promotion?—There is dissatisfaction, particularly with reference to promotions of juniors over the heads of seniors, and a month or two afterwards the senior man being promoted and having the mortification of finding himself junior for the future to the man who is really his junior. In illustration, I instance the cases of Sub-Inspectors Wright and Norwood and of Sergeant Griffiths—all juniors in the service. Sergeant Fouhy, my junior, was promoted before me, and so were two other men. These three are now senior to me, and if I was fit for promotion in July I was equally fit in June, when they were promoted. One of these may be an Inspector while I am still sergeant.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You are referring to some years ago?—Before your time.

9. *The Commissioner.*] Has the same thing occurred lately?—I have noticed junior men promoted.

10. And the same remarks which apply in your case would apply in theirs?—Yes. The general opinion is—though there may be nothing in it—that when a senior man is passed over and later on promoted that he has pulled the wires, and brought influence to bear to get his rights.

11. In regard to the selection of men for enrolment, do you make inquiries from time to time?—Yes; I always make the inquiries in my own district. I agree that sergeants should make all the inquiries. Cases have come under my notice where constables have put in favourable reports which have come through my hands, and I have put an end to the application. Of course, this entails a good deal of expense, and a good deal of extra work on the sergeant.

12. Have you come into contact with any cases where the inquiries have not been sufficient from your knowledge of the men after enrolment?—I cannot say I have. Greater care is taken now in making inquiries. Most exhaustive inquiries are made; but it would be an improvement if the inquiries went further back than when a man leaves school. I think his upbringing should be gone into, and his environment, and his parentage.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You would not condemn a man because his parents had been bad characters?—No; but it would be better not to have him in the Police Force.

14. Even if he has been of the best character from childhood?—Yes. I consider if a man's father is a convicted thief, and his mother of immoral character, he should not be admitted into the Force.

15. You say you are satisfied that influence obtains: how are you satisfied?—Well, I am satisfied it does.

16. What is your reason?—Because men have been promoted over the heads of their seniors.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Men of equal merit?—Yes.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] In regard to the morality of the men, are they more immoral than they used to be?—I can point out a man who was in the Force in Christchurch who had to go on the sick list suffering from gonorrhœa.

19. I dare say you could have done that years ago?—I know of other men being dismissed for immoral acts.

20. I am talking about those in the Force at present?—I cannot point to any case.

21. Have you heard of my having a special man in each city?—Such a statement is absurd, and would not be believed by anybody.

22. *The Commissioner.*] What would you understand such a statement to mean?—That the Commissioner had some constable or other individual specially to let him know what is going on—a sort of spy.

23. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have been under me for some years in the city and Sydenham, and in charge of sub-districts?—About six years.

24. During that time, have I ever asked you for a confidential report on any man serving under me?—No. I read the statement in the paper; it is absolutely false.

25. You have been acting station sergeant on many occasions, and have been present at many inquiries I have held: when a constable is reported on, does he not get the sergeant's report for examination, and if that is not satisfactory I hold an inquiry?—Yes.

26. Has the constable the right of cross-examination in every instance to the fullest extent?—To a far greater extent than any other Inspector would allow. I have never been at an investigation where a man has a greater show than under you; he can cross-examine a witness time after time, and you will always adjourn in order to give him further opportunity.

27. Have I ever denied a constable the right of cross-examination or an adjournment?—No.

28. Have you ever heard that I have been in the habit of getting confidential reports from sergeants about the men in their district?—It is absolutely false.

29. *The Commissioner.*] What are your views with regard to the disqualification of constables for immorality—say, for instance, a man was found to be suffering from gonorrhœa?—I should call upon him to resign.

30. He would not be fit to remain in the service?—No, for it would stand to reason he must have had connection with a prostitute, and that sort of thing has to be kept in check. In my opinion, in every case of immorality—whether a case of disease or being a putative father—the man should sever his connection with the Force.

31. In regard to drunkenness, for how many offences should a man be discharged?—I should say the first time he is drunk when off duty he should be punished, and the second time called upon to resign. If drunk once while on duty he should be called upon to resign; that is, if in uniform and doing duty.

32. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are there not good officers in the Force now who, when young, have been convicted for drunkenness?—I think I know one or two who have turned out good men, but I do not think you will have a clean Police Force unless you have only men who are moral and sober.

33. I quite agree with you, but there may be men who have only once given way. Do you know the system in other countries?—No.

34. Do you know that in the case of venereal disease they are suspended and reinstated?—I do not know. I have only given you my own opinion.

35. *Inspector Gillies.*] Do you know of any cases of immorality in the Force in Christchurch during the last six years?—No. The one I have referred to is the only case that came under my notice. My remarks did not apply to Christchurch. They were general.

36. *The Commissioner.*] I have on my notes reference to a case in which the men complained that one of their comrades was suffering from venereal disease. What would you do in such a case?—I would recommend the man's dismissal.

MICHAEL DONOVAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 91.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at St. Albans. Was enrolled on the 28th February, 1876, and promoted to be sergeant on the 1st January, 1904. I consider the condition of the Force is better now than ever before in my experience of the past thirty-three years. When I was on the West Coast I was ordered to a place called Okarito, one of the roughest stations in New Zealand, and when I raised an objection to going it was pointed out that, as I was a first-class constable, I would have to go, but they added that after I came from that station my promotion was assured, and it would not be many years before I was relieved. Well, they kept me there for fifteen years. It was about the roughest time any man could have in the Force. In my quarterly trips to Jackson's Bay, 125 miles from my station, I had ferry rivers to cross, and others to ford as best I could. My principal duties were Clerk of the Warden's Court. I was recommended by the Warden and by the late Hon. Mr. Larnach, who came there in his capacity as Minister of Mines, for promotion to the rank of sergeant, owing to the dangerous journey I had to travel. But the answer was that my time would come. I was then transferred to Ahaura, in the Grey Valley, in 1896, and there served as Clerk of the Court. During this time I was sent temporarily to Reefton, and while there the people, recognising the injustice done to me, petitioned the Government to have me promoted. The petition was a most representative one, including the clergy of all denominations except one. I also made application through Inspector Macdonnell, reminding him of the promise made to me. And, lastly, I made application through Inspector Wilson, now of Wanganui, who recommended that I should be put in charge of a station of the strength of two to three men, stating at the same time that I did not look more than forty years of age, which was the limit for promotion at that time. Commissioner Tunbridge then asked if I would accept the rank of sergeant, and do duty in one of the principal cities, to which I answered Yes. Commissioner Tunbridge minuted the papers to the effect that he left my promotion to the favourable consideration of his successor, and on the 1st January, 1904, I was promoted and transferred to Dunedin. In 1905 a scandal arose in Dunedin, and Commissioner Dinnie came down and asked for statements from the men, and I was the only member of the Force who made a statement in the presence of the Commissioner and Inspector. Some time after that I was transferred to Christchurch, which I did not like, as it deprived me of the opportunity of cross-examining the Inspector and Sub-Inspector. Even at this stage I would ask the Commission to peruse the evidence I gave prior to the Commission which was afterwards held. I have served under many Commissioners, and I think there has been more fair play under the present Commissioner than under any other in my experience. I agree with what has been said with regard to free uniform and rise in house-allowance to married men. I do not believe in the night-duty men taking out coffeetins with them, as they would only be a laughing-stock amongst the young men, and offer an opportunity for burglary.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What was your age when promoted?—Over fifty, but I am fit to do duty yet.

*The Commissioner:* Was this constable promoted in your time, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes, there was a memorandum left by Mr. Tunbridge, as the witness has said. He was asked if he would accept a position in a city, and he said he would, and, as he had been offered the position by my predecessor, that promise was carried out by me.

*Witness:* As my age has been mentioned by Inspector O'Brien more than once, I should like to say that when I came up here to Christchurch it was at the extra busy time of the Exhibition, and although my work was particularly heavy, I can claim that I carried it out faithfully and well. I have no grievance whatever. The only time I was disappointed since the present Commissioner has been in office was when I was transferred to Christchurch, and that was because I felt that people would think I had been transferred in connection with the trouble in Dunedin.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was it not owing to your application that you were transferred—on account of the ill health of your wife?—No, she was anxious to go to the West Coast, but I was not.

3. But it was owing to your application that you were transferred from Dunedin?—You know best. I had made an application.

4. You think the service now is more efficient than ever it was?—The best in my experience; and discipline is well maintained.

5. You have heard of the statement which originated in Dunedin that I have a special man in each district to gather information for me?—It has not been said here. I have never heard of it. Do not believe it is true. Would not repeat it if I had heard it.

6. *Inspector Gillies.*] You heard the evidence given by Constable Fitzgerald yesterday, to the effect that the sergeants were in the habit of giving me confidential reports. Is that true so far as you are concerned?—No.

7. Whenever you had a man up before me, had not that man the right to cross-examine in every case the sergeant or any witness?—Yes; in fact, you were more lenient with the man than with the sergeant.

8. *The Commissioner.*] If you knew of a man being at the station suffering from a venereal complaint, what would you do with him?—I do not think he should be dismissed. He might be shifted to some more suitable place.

9. It would have been evident that he had been associating with prostitutes, and I wanted to find out what was your view as to the effect upon the Force?—Well, the man might have fallen in a weak moment, and might never offend again. He might afterwards turn out a first-rate man.

EDWARD BIRD, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 92.)

*Witness:* I am stationed in Christchurch. Was enrolled on the 21st October, 1881, and promoted to be sergeant on the 1st October, 1904. I have no general statement to make.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you think of the physique of the men of the present day as compared with what it was when you joined?—I think the men are somewhat below the size they used to be.

2. They have to pass a certain standard?—Well, they look smaller, although they may come up to the required standard.

3. To what do you attribute that?—I suppose the men are not so easily obtained now, perhaps because the Force is not attractive enough. In other lines of business the rates of wages have increased more than they have in our Department, and until quite lately better employment could be got outside. The discipline of the present day I think compares favourably with the past. I think the pay should be increased.

4. What do you think of the present system of inquiry so far as the recruits are concerned?—I think the inquiry is efficient, and I consider it is necessary that the sergeants should make the inquiries.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you heard of any general dissatisfaction existing in the service under the present control?—No.

6. Have you heard the suggestion that has been made that I have a man in each district acting as a spy?—Never, until I saw it in the paper. If I had heard it I would not have believed it.

*Witness* (to Inspector Gillies): I have been under you in the Christchurch district ever since you have been in charge—seven years and a half. During that time have done a good deal of station sergeant's work. When Sub-Inspector Dwyer was away I acted as station sergeant for twelve months. During that time you have never asked me for a confidential report upon any man in the city or anywhere else, to my recollection. When a constable is reported to me he is very often called upon for an explanation first, and if that explanation is not satisfactory, he is taken to your office, and an inquiry is held. Then the constable or the person charged has full opportunity of cross-examining all the witnesses that are called against him; in fact, he often gets greater latitude than the sergeant. I heard what Constable Fitzgerald said yesterday about sergeants supplying confidential reports, but I do not believe such a thing exists.

GEORGE KEEP, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 93.)

*Witness:* I am stationed in Christchurch. Entered the Force on the 10th October, 1891, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st July, 1908.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How does the physique of the men of the present day compare with your experience of the past?—They do not appear to be of the same stamp as they were a few years ago.

2. To what do you attribute that?—It is hard to say. The Force might not be attractive enough, on account of the pay; and many of the men consider the standard of education is a little too high. I would make it the Fourth instead of the Fifth Standard. I think that would bring forward more men, even without an increase in pay.

3. Have you heard of any dissatisfaction as regards promotion?—You hear complaints from pretty well every one who has been passed over. I have myself been passed over by nineteen. I do not know why. I think I was as well qualified as I am now.

4. What, principally, do you object to in the matter?—There are some men in the Commissioner's office who have only ten years' service, and I do not see why a man who has served sixteen years and odd should be passed over by them.

5. You do not think there were any circumstances to justify it?—They may have been especially good scholars, but I do not think that should give a man the privilege of earlier promotion than his seniors. Sergeant Mugeridge, who is my junior in the service, is now my senior as a sergeant.

6. Do you know of any special qualifications which would entitle him to promotion before you?—No.

7. Do you think that was a cause of dissatisfaction?—I do. Then, take the case of Sergeant Hodgson: his number is 621, and the man before him was 719. I do not think the man promoted before him was any better qualified for sergeant than he was.

8. Those are the kind of things you have got to accept, but cannot account for?—Yes. The men lately have been complaining about a junior being placed in charge of the watch-house while the permanent man was away for a while. The man who was put in had only seven weeks' service, and there were men with four or five years' service available. They should have the same system as in Auckland.

9. It is a responsible position for the time being?—Yes. The men have complained to me, and I believe they have reported it.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be a reason why you were not promoted in your turn?—There may be, but I do not know of it. My defaulter's sheet is as good as the others.

11. Who recommended you for promotion?—Inspector Cullen told me he recommended me for promotion two years before.

12. You have been up North. Have you ever heard it said that I had a special man as a spy in each district?—I had never heard a word about it.

13. And yet it is said to be rumoured from the north to the south. Is there any general dissatisfaction under the present control?—The only thing I know of is in regard to the watch-house keeper.

14. You say a young man of seven weeks' service was placed there: when did that occur?—Last Saturday night, and he has been in for three nights.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not know about it. I presume it is a temporary arrangement.

*The Commissioner:* It is an unsatisfactory one, at any rate.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you consider the efficiency of the Force is as good as it was years ago?—As regards efficiency, it is all right, but the physique is not quite so good.

16. Is that within the last year or two?—Within perhaps the last five years.

17. How is discipline maintained now?—Both here and in the North it is well maintained.

18. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have served as sergeant under me for some time. During that time have I ever asked you for a confidential report concerning any man under you, either by word of mouth or correspondence?—No; nor have I ever heard of such a thing being done.

19. You say that a young man was put in as watch-house keeper last Saturday night while another man was away: do you know what his qualifications are?—He might be a good scholar, but I do not think he would know enough about police duty for that position.

20. I do not know the circumstances, but there was a change of watch-house keepers on Friday night last, was there not?—Yes.

21. The Sub-Inspector will be able to speak as to that. I will make a note of it, and hand in the papers to the Commission. So far as you have seen, have I dealt fairly with the men since you have been sergeant here?—Yes.

RICHARD THOMAS HODGSON, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 94.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Christchurch. Was enrolled in March, 1892, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 1st of the present month. I am just recently from Wellington.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make before I put any questions to you?—No.

2. It has been represented to me that you have some knowledge of recruits, and so on, in Wellington, or have you any opinions concerning those recruits?—I have not been at the same station with them, but there are various opinions about them. I was in charge at Manners Street.

3. What do you know about them?—I was never with the recruits at Mount Cook, but it seems to me that they have deteriorated.

4. You have evidently been talking to somebody about them, otherwise this communication would not have come to me?—I have had a good deal of talk, and I think they have deteriorated a good deal lately.

5. Morally or physically?—Both.

6. Can you suggest any reason why that is so?—No, I cannot; but I think the discipline in the depot could be improved. The instructor is a married man, and not resident at the Mount Cook depot; he resides at home. They are not really in charge of anybody. The beat-duty sergeants have to look after their sections, and the sergeant at Mount Cook is also a married man, and living away from the station, and the recruits, in my opinion, can do what they like at night. I think if there had been strict military discipline a number of the men who have been dismissed of late would never have joined the Force. They would have been hounded out of the depot without joining. I have myself seen a good deal of hoodlumism. There was one man who has been dispensed with lately who I think should never have been allowed to join the Force, and I have heard a good deal about the others.

7. The wonder to you is that he was enrolled?—I think, if there was strict discipline, and a man were put in charge of the recruits at the training depot, sufficient would be seen of them to prevent some of them from being enrolled at all. I am not blaming anybody, but I think there should be some one in charge to see in what state these recruits come in at night, and so on. The sectional sergeant visits the men at 11 o'clock at night, but the sectional sergeants are away on other duty before that.

8. How long were you in Wellington?—Fifteen months. I came from Auckland.

9. What do you say as regards the discipline and general efficiency in Auckland?—I think it was good.

10. Was there any dissatisfaction there in your time?—I dare say there was a good deal.

11. What was it based on?—I dare say promotions had something to do with it—juniors overstepping seniors. I have heard other people complain.

12. Were you dissatisfied yourself?—Yes; I was passed over myself.

13. Do you know the reason? Were you less fit in those days?—I do not think so. Twenty-five or twenty-six were passed over me. I did not know the reason.

14. Was there any dissatisfaction as regards the promotion of the men doing special work in the office in Wellington?—I do not think any one junior to me was promoted over me in Wellington.

15. Where were you when Sergeant Mugeridge was promoted?—I was in Auckland.

16. Were there any reasons apart from his connection with the office which would have justified his promotion?—I have heard a good deal of dissatisfaction about his promotion in the office.

17. Do you know anything about the duties he was performing?—No; but I have heard other men say that his duties were looking after the police stores.

18. Not strictly police duties?—Except as being attached to the Police Commissioner.

19. Were you dissatisfied yourself in connection with that appointment?—I cannot say I was dissatisfied.

20. But he is still senior to you as a police sergeant?—Undoubtedly. There is one thing I want to say about the uniform. We are allowed now a pair of trousers every nine months and a jumper every eighteen months. I think two pairs of trousers should be issued with the jumper, then the colour would probably wear the same. As it is now I am wearing a black pair of trousers and a blue jumper, and it makes the uniform look odd. Then, there is another thing. The single men are provided with barracks, light, and fuel, and I think the married men are justly entitled to the same treatment.

21. What house-allowance do you get?—10s. 6d. a week. I am paying 13s. as rent. The house has not all the conveniences I have been used to, but I have to take it.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You make some serious allegations about the recruits, although you have not seen them. Do you mean to say that Sergeant Dart's supervision is not strict?—I do not blame Sergeant Dart; I blame the system. He is a married man, not resident at the station.

23. What was your duty if you found these men misconducting themselves?—I was not at the station, and did not see this thing. I said I was at Manners Street.

24. This is only what you have heard?—Yes, I have said so all along. I was not at the training depot when these fellows were going there.

25. Do you know that the barracks are practically new?—Yes.

26. Do you know there is a police-station close to the barracks, and that there is a sergeant there?—I believe so.

27. Do you know that the men are under Sergeant Dart the whole day, and that at night there is a sergeant at the station next to them supervising them?—That is so. My remarks referred to Mount Cook.

28. Well, a sergeant is in charge of the station there?—No; the sergeant resides half a mile away.

29. *The Commissioner.*] How many men were there?—I could not say.

30. You think the men would get on the "loose" when the sergeant's back was turned?—I do not know anything personally. I only speak from what I have heard.

31. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know whether you were recommended for promotion whilst in Auckland?—I could not say.

32. Was there not some trouble?—Yes, there was some little trouble.

33. That was perhaps the occasion for your transfer?—I applied for it.

34. You know the cause of it?—The Inspector recommended it, and I applied for it as well.

35. Have you heard any suggestion that I had a man specially appointed in each district as a spy?—I never heard of it until I saw it in the paper the other day.

36. Do you believe there is any truth in it?—I do not think so.

37. As regards the discipline of the Force, is it not as good now as it has been for years past?—I think the general discipline is as good now; but it is the class of recruits that are now coming into the Force that are bringing such disgrace upon the service.

38. What is the reason for it? Is it pay?—I certainly think pay would be one of the causes.

39. Are not the investigations made in respect to candidates carried out more strictly than in previous years?—Yes, I think so; but there are a good many men coming into the service that we cannot make much inquiry about. They come from other countries, and you have to go on what they carry with them.

40. You know we write to the other countries and get them certified to?—Yes, I suppose so.

---

FRIDAY, 30TH JULY, 1909.

GEORGE WARREN RUSSELL, Member of Parliament, examined on oath. (No. 95.)

*Witness:* I am a member of Parliament, representing Avon, and I have been for several years Chairman of the Board of Governors of Canterbury College. I wish to say at the outset that, speaking for myself, as a man who has been identified with public affairs for a great many years, I have never under any circumstances endeavoured to influence either the Minister or the administrative head of the Department with regard to any person who has misconducted himself as a police officer. My object in coming before the Commission, however, is to give vent to the opinions I hold, and which I can support with facts, regarding the educational status of the Police Force, and what can be done to improve it. The educational standard which is set up as the minimum is the Fifth Standard, although applicants for admission to the Force are preferred who have passed the Sixth. As I presume the age of men who join the service will probably be somewhere between twenty-two and thirty years, it will be found that these men will have passed the educational examination on which they produce their standard certificates quite a number of years before they apply for admission to the police; and we all know there are very few men who carry for any number of years the education they have possessed for a specific examination. My opinion is, seeing the majority of the police are drawn from what may be called the agricultural-labourer classes, if these men, when applying, were set to pass the Fifth Standard of the public schools, a very small minority would be able to do so. Consequently it must follow that the standard of education of the members of the Force must be below what should be expected of men who have to undertake the responsible duties that are frequently cast on the police. My opinion is that the Police Force does not present sufficient attractions as an occupation to draw men of a higher class of education. There are in the Force altogether about eight hundred constables, and only nine Inspectorships and six Sub-Inspectorships, and somewhere about ninety sergeants; the result being that out of eight hundred men the chance of promotion, carrying with it higher pay, is so small as not to make the occupation of the police one that is likely to attract men having a higher standard of education than the class from which they have been hitherto drawn. I have been connected with education in every one of its aspects in New Zealand for a number of years, and I have come to the conclusion that if the general standard of the Police Force is to be raised there will have to be provided some means by which there will be more chance of



promotion and increment in salary than the Police Force itself is able to offer. My opinion, therefore, is that in order to encourage the entrance into the Force of the better and more highly educated class of men who probably would be available if the conditions were more favourable, an arrangement should be made by the Government under which the Police Force might be regarded as a recruiting-ground for other branches of the public service. For example, if the Factory Inspectors, of whom there are a considerable number, were drawn from the Police Force, and if the Landing and Tide Waiters employed in connection with the Customs Department at all the ports of the Dominion were drawn from the police, it would open up other avenues to which the police would be the leading door; and men would understand that when they join the police they were not going to have a twenty-five-to-one chance of finishing up as policemen, but that there would be other avenues open to which they would be able to pass from the police. If this method were established, an arrangement might also be made by which the municipalities would draw their inspectors also from the same body. But it should be an integral part of the proposal that those men drawn from the Police Force for other occupations, either in the Civil Service or municipalities, should still continue to be members of the Force, and be liable to be called on in the event of any panic or inter-State trouble, or anything of that kind, for actual service within the Force. They would, in fact, constitute a kind of reserve, which could be drawn upon if the occasion arose. I am quite aware the objection might be raised to this proposal that probably a lot of the best men would be drawn from the Force. But the answer to that would be that under the proposal I venture to lay before you there would always be a fresh group of men coming on the whole time, and the whole standard raised, so that ten or twenty or fifty might be drawn from the police and there would still be another body equally capable of taking their places. I think, also, one most important operation in connection with the rank and *personnel* of the service would be the encouragement of the men, after they join the service, in connection with raising the standard of education for themselves. I do not know whether there are school-classes in connection with the different barracks in the cities or not; I am not aware how far they go; but I do think that if in connection with such classes certificates of knowledge of law, which would represent actual fitness for the higher class of police work, were established there would be encouragement to the men, and you would soon mark the men who by diligence and aptitude in their studies stamped themselves as persons specially qualified for promotion. If this plan were adopted the old idea of a man who had been twenty years in the service being necessarily the best for promotion would speedily disappear. Men of a higher standard of education and better training would so completely mark their position in the service that it would be almost impossible for men who were comparatively unfit for higher positions to be put there simply on a question of seniority. I am getting on in years, and I do not wish to depreciate the value of age, but at any time as between the comparatively young man who is trained up to date and the elderly man who has had merely experience I should be disposed to say the educated and trained mind is the one best to be relied upon under ordinary circumstances. Then the university colleges might well be asked to take a part in connection with raising the standard. Speaking as Chairman of the Canterbury College, we have an extremely valuable law department in connection with it, and in Wellington the Victoria College specialises in connection with law. My opinion is that there should be prepared, if it has not been done already, by some thoroughly competent barrister, a small and simple compendium of law relating to criminal work. This should contain a clear synopsis of the law of evidence, and a clear definition of the different crimes and offences, and such full explanation as may be deemed desirable in order that the average man of intelligence may be able to pass an examination in these things. In my younger days, when living in smaller places than Christchurch, I have seen absolutely ludicrous instances of policemen endeavouring to conduct cases in the Courts before Justices of the Peace—I may say I have been one for thirty years—and being turned absolutely inside out by the smart type of lawyer who considered he had on the bench Justices who did not know when he was wrong and when he was taking advantage of them. The policeman, not being acquainted with the law, was scored off every time by the lawyer; and in many cases I believe mistakes are made in the administration of the law in this way. If the university colleges were to arrange that their law lecturers should have a course of lectures specially adapted for the police, taking in all the matters that come in the ordinary course of police work, you would find that not only would the average policeman be glad to attend them, but that even Inspectors and other officers would be quite willing to go and learn the principles, and the application of the principles, of the laws in which they take so important a part. Speaking for my own college, I can say that our Board would be prepared immediately to endeavour to set up such a course as I have suggested on conditions that would entail very small cost indeed. We have already established a course of engineering for the purpose of instructing the engineering Volunteer corps in the City of Christchurch, and the Board is desirous of in every way using its endowments and the position it occupies for the benefit of the country as a whole. I can conceive nothing better than this if the suggestion I make were carried out. Another thing is this: as settlement goes on in the back-blocks any one must see the enormous advantage it would be to the distant country settler if he had located in his midst a police officer who had some general training in the law. I need not amplify this point, but, from a thorough knowledge of the back-blocks, I am able to speak with confidence in saying that if the police were acquainted with some general principles of law their services would be largely availed of. Then, if you had these trained men in connection with the Force, they would be the men naturally to receive promotion in the way of filling country stations where the men have to act as Clerks of Court and in other capacities where some legal training would be of great advantage. There is one matter I should like to refer to before closing my evidence, and that is this: I think the detective branch of the service should be so arranged as to attract to itself men who intend specially to follow that branch of police work. At present the ordinary practice, I understand, is that from the ranks of the main body of the police

a man who shows himself industrious and reliable is selected first of all as a plain-clothes officer, and is subsequently promoted to the rank of detective. No doubt in many cases this acts correctly, but I have myself stumbled across detectives in this country—I will not say in Christchurch—that were too slow to catch worms. They absolutely had no training in regard to the general development of the intellect, and where it came to refinement of crime they were absolutely paralysed, and could do nothing but sit on the back-door step and see if the criminal came out of the window. My idea is this: To have a first-class detective service you must catch your detective from the jump; start him on that line; and there should be men specially trained who would instruct the younger men on the lines of the profession. I would not suggest that they should be put through a course of Sherlock Holmes, although perhaps they might get some tips from the author of those celebrated books. If the plan I suggest were given effect to the detective force might study under a university teacher works on criminology and scientific works on such matters, and even if it did not bear very directly on the lines of crime there would be the stimulus of the intellect and the training given by these men being specially prepared for this branch of police work. We should then catch the man adapted for detective work, and let him make a study of it under proper scientific conditions. I do not think I have anything more to say except that if the proposal I have made should be considered favourably by the Department, I am prepared to bring immediately before the Board of Governors proposals necessary to give effect to what I have suggested as possible.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You suggest this course should be followed by practical experience, with the ultimate issue of a diploma?—Yes.

2. The men would then carry a sort of hall-mark?—They would have a diploma that they possess qualifications for this branch after going through a certain course. Another thing is this: The men I suggest would naturally confine their studies in the first place to their own particular branch of the law. Now, in order to qualify, supposing a police officer wishes to become a lawyer, he has to undertake so much study of general law which will have no direct bearing on his duties that it is almost impossible for any man to pass a legal examination. But if they were studying only criminal law and evidence probably a number of them would make the attempt.

3. The essential thing would be the preparation of certain suitable text-books, because the present ones are quite valueless for the average man?—That is so.

*The Commissioner:* I am very much obliged to you for your valuable and interesting remarks; they open up a new line altogether.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you know we have in the probation classes a sergeant who has passed as a solicitor?—I was not aware of it; the fact does him great credit.

5. He instructs the whole of the candidates both in legal matters and police duty before they are appointed. We also have classes in each city for similar purposes?—I was not aware of it. I would not mind putting one of our people on to examine for you.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We would be very pleased to have him. It may come to that. We have an annual examination in police and legal matters.

*The Commissioner:* Mr. Russell wants to make it a part of the educational system of the Dominion.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think that practical knowledge of police duty is the best education they can have?—No, I do not. A man may go and make a blunder; he gets practical knowledge, and finds he has made a mistake, and will not do it again; but he has made a mistake, whereas if he had been trained beforehand he would have been able to avoid doing so.

7. It is not always the best-educated man who makes the best constable?—I am prepared to admit that may be the case.

8. A man must have some natural acumen to make a good detective?—Yes; my suggestion is to find the man with the acumen at the start.

9. You know men are selected and tried before they are appointed to see what they are made of: is not that a good system?—I think under your present system you have got the best plan you could have.

10. You wish to go beyond it?—Yes; I want to offer inducements, which appears to me the most practical aspect of the matter. The more inducements you can offer the better men will come into the Force—putting the educational standard on one side altogether.

*Mr. Dinnie:* It is rather a gigantic scheme.

*The Commissioner:* There is nothing unfeasible in it; it only wants working out.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What about those who cannot pass the examination physically?—I do not suggest that any physical test should be set aside for one moment. I want, instead of drawing the police from one class, to offer inducements so that men coming to me and asking for my influence to enable them to get into other departments of the Civil Service will say, "I would like to join the police."

CHARLES RUTLEDGE, ex-Sergeant, further examined. (No. 96.)

*Witness:* The only grievance I have is that a few months before I left the Force I got a doctor's certificate for three months' sick leave; it was returned to me with a memo. from the Commissioner that the three months' sick leave would count as my three months' leave of absence to which I was entitled after leaving the Force. I have never heard of such a thing before, and I thought it very unfair.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did the doctor recommend three months' sick leave?—Yes, for change of air. I was pretty well done up at the time.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I forget the exact details of this case, but the sergeant was treated very fairly indeed. You got leave, did you not?—I got sick leave on the doctor's certificate, and you granted

me three months' leave on full pay, arranging that it should be with the three months' sick leave. After a lot of correspondence, which I was really too ill to attend to, you extended the leave one month, so I had four months. There are now two months owing to me. Both you and the Inspector said there was nothing against my character.

*The Commissioner:* I will go into the papers.

JAMES O'CONNOR, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 97.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Christchurch. I was enrolled in 1907, and have been in Christchurch ever since. I should like to bring under notice a little incident that occurred yesterday of a report in connection with a junior constable being given watch-house duty while senior men were available. He had only six weeks' service, and I, with a number of other senior men, felt the position very much, and it caused a lot of dissatisfaction and discontent. I consider I was quite justified in putting on paper what I did. Yesterday I got the report back, after it had been criticized by the Sub-Inspector, and a note from the Inspector, severely cautioning me and reprimanding me for what I had done. There was a minute from the station sergeant, "Constable O'Connor.—For your information. Please note." I took the correspondence away, and read it, and having other matters to attend to, put it in my pocket. Shortly after the inquiry finished yesterday I met Sergeant Keep, and he said, "I brought this matter up at the Commission today." "Oh," I said, "did you? See what they have done to me," drawing the report out of my pocket and showing it to him. Sergeant Keep was returning it when the Accountant came out of the office and wanted to know if I had noted the report. I said I had not and did not intend to. Sergeant Johnston, who was standing by, said, "Sergeant Keep, give up that report"; and, turning to me, said, "You have no right to let other people see the report." The Accountant turned to Sergeant Johnston, and said, "Sergeant, you had no right at all to allow this correspondence out of your office." I have reason to believe that since the matter was mentioned at the Commission yesterday something has gone astray with the reprimand, on account of Sergeant Keep bringing the evidence out at the inquiry. I wish the correspondence to be produced.

*The Commissioner:* Where are the papers?

*Inspector Gillies:* In my office. After what you said, I went into the matter, and will place the facts before you. I may say it appears a young man was placed for three nights in the watch-house by Sub-Inspector McGrath. He has seven weeks' service in New Zealand. He is very well educated, and had twelve months' service as mounted constable at the Cape. During the absence of the proper watch-house keeper, who was dispensed with, and pending another one being appointed, it appears the Sub-Inspector put this young man in the office. I will show you the whole of the correspondence.

*The Commissioner:* Would you approve of it under ordinary circumstances?

*Inspector Gillies:* I do certainly, and I think when you see the report you will agree that there was palpable impertinence on the part of both constables in their reports. There was a proper way of laying the matter before the Sub-Inspector, and he would deal with it. I dealt with it as a very impertinent action on their part, and I think you will probably agree with the action of the Sub-Inspector and myself.

*The Commissioner:* I cannot express any opinion at present.

*Inspector Gillies:* But it shows the insubordinate action of the constable; and then their coming forward here without notifying me about it.

*The Commissioner:* Of course, inquiries of this sort must necessarily disturb the discipline of the Force for the time being. I can only trust to the good sense of the members generally not to abuse in any way the opportunities they have. This matter was brought up by Sergeant Keep yesterday in such a way as to make it *prima facie* the object of inquiry, and men labouring under a sense of injury may not act with the same discretion as they would in calmer moments. The constable has a perfect right to come here and bring the matter up. I will go into the matter.

*Witness:* I would like to know, since this severe caution and reprimand was sent out, why it was withdrawn.

*Inspector Gillies:* I withdrew it till I knew the facts. I drew up a memorandum, unsigned, as to what I was going to do with the constable, and in my absence from the office the clerk took it off my table, and wrote it out, and apparently sent it out, appending my signature. After hearing what I did yesterday I sent for it, and brought it, with the idea of going further into the matter. I had not approved it.

CLIFFORD SIMEON THOMPSON, Manager for Turnbull and Jones, examined on oath. (No. 98.)

This witness produced a sample of an electric-flash lamp, the cost of which was 11s., the cost of refills, taken in quantity, being 2s. 3d. It would burn four hours continuously, and supply 960 flashes of a quarter minute duration.

*Mr. Dinnie* said he had experimented with a similar lamp, and found the flashes to get weaker the longer the lamp was in use.

WILLIAM MILLER, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 99.)

*Witness:* I joined the Force in 1895, and was promoted sergeant this year. Since then I have been in Christchurch. I joined in Napier, was transferred to the Thames; was promoted first class, and transferred to Devonport, where I had three men under me during the Auckland Exhibition of 1898-99; then I was promoted to a country station where there was a district constable. I reported unfavourably on him, and his services were dispensed with. I recommended another young man, who was appointed at £30, and since then, owing, I claim, to my training, his salary was raised to £100.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How do you find the physique of the Force to-day as compared with formerly?—It is not so good.

2. To what do you attribute this?—The pay is not sufficient to encourage qualified youths from the rural districts to join the Force. This is within my knowledge.

3. In the district you used to be in, would men discuss it with you?—Yes; when Mr. Dinnie sent out a circular to the effect that constables should talk the matter over with men they thought fit to join I spoke to different farmers' sons who were all fit for the position, and when they heard the wages they pooh-poohed the idea, saying they could get £3 or £3 10s. in the bush, or as much as £5 digging gum. As to Sergeant Remer's statement as regards selection of recruits from parents who are absolutely good, and so forth, I do not see how it would be workable in New Zealand, because at present, through the natives of rural districts in New Zealand not joining, the majority joining lately have been Australians and arrivals from the Old Country, and you could not find out their parentage.

4. What I understood him to say was that sons of known ill-behaved parents should not be taken on. Is there any reason you know of why New-Zealanders cannot be induced to join?—None except that the rate of pay should be raised. There is another little thing: Since the uniform branch and the detective branch have been brought into competition as regards promotion, I think the position of station sergeant should be put on a more equal footing with that of Chief Detective in standing in the Force, and in pay. If a Sub-Inspectorship becomes vacant, I think the Chief Detective is the more likely to get it. The Chief Detective receives 16s. a day, and the sergeant only 13s.

5. As far as promotion is concerned, it does not appear to me to be a factor at all. Sub-Inspector Hendry was a station sergeant, and so was Sub-Inspector Phair and Sub-Inspector Norwood. I think you are taking a wrong view of it: the matter of pay has nothing to do with it. If a station sergeant happens to be fit and competent, probably he would be given promotion over the head of a Chief Detective who is not so competent. Have you any views in regard to promotion? You have been fairly dealt with?—Yes.

6. Have you heard any talk amongst the sergeants or others about juniors being appointed over the heads of their seniors?—I have heard talk about it.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know something about the inquiries now made in respect of candidates for enrolment in the service: are they more strict than they have been?—They certainly are much more strict in every way.

8. You have had inquiries to make yourself?—I think I did in Devonport.

9. Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction owing to the present control of the service?—No.

10. What do you think of the discipline as compared with some years ago?—It compares favourably.

11. Have there not been some reforms since I have had charge, such as revision of the *Police Gazette*, system of classes, compulsory attendance, system of drill, and the finger-print system?—Yes.

12. Do you think all this is for the benefit of the service?—Undoubtedly.

13. In dealing with defaulters for drunkenness, do you not think it is a very important matter, and one in which the greatest care should be exercised?—Yes.

14. There are many occasions on which a man may be reported for drunkenness. A man may be under the influence of liquor on one occasion, but if retained in the service he may get to the top of the tree by good conduct?—Yes.

15. *The Commissioner.*] You would draw a distinction between being drunk on duty and drunk when off duty?—Yes.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards influence, do the Force generally believe that influence obtains?—I have heard them talking about it.

17. Have you known any case in which it has been used?—No; you hear the men talking about it, but they will not give you anything to go on. It is a hard question to answer. I never applied for promotion.

18. You have not been much in the centres?—No.

19. You have no fault to find with the system of selection for promotion?—No; I have nothing to complain of myself.

20. Have you ever heard of the suggestion made in Dunedin, that I have a man stationed in each district as a spy?—Not until I saw it in the newspaper.

21. You would have heard of it had it been rumoured from north to south?—I think so.

JOHN BURROWS, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 100.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Christchurch. I was enrolled in 1885, and promoted in 1906, at Waikouaiti. I have been here ever since.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion in regard to the efficiency of the Force?—It is just as efficient as it was years ago.

2. In regard to the physique of the men?—I do not think it is quite as good as it was. We have a good many fine young fellows, but a few are not up to the standard.

3. The conduct generally?—I think it is as good as it was years ago.

4. Is there any dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion, &c.?—You hear that sort of thing.

5. Is it affecting the efficiency of the Force?—I do not think so.

6. To what do you attribute the falling-off in men coming forward for enrolment?—I can hardly explain it. When I joined twenty-five years ago I did probationary duty at 5s. a day, and

I think the conditions of the Force to-day are more in advance of what they were then. I might further say up to 1898 there was a stagnation of promotion in the Force for thirteen or fourteen years, there being practically none.

7. What do you deduce from that?—The Superannuation Fund was organized, and the older men went out; before that they stayed in till they died.

8. But that does not account for the fact that it is not so easy to get good men now as it used to be?—Probably it is the pay. I cannot form any opinion.

9. It must be traceable to some cause?—Speaking to young fellows about the town, they seem to think they can do better outside. I think it is the discipline; they do not like to knuckle down to discipline. There is no question the discipline of to-day is better than it was years ago.

10. You consider, generally, the Force has improved?—I do.

11. If there is a lack of attraction it is due to the conditions?—Yes.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know in all large bodies of men there is always a certain amount of dissatisfaction?—That is so; there is nothing more in this Force than any other.

13. Have you heard anything about this "special man"?—Not till I read about it.

14. Do you believe it?—No.

15. *Inspector Gillies.*] How long have you been in Christchurch?—Over three years.

16. During that time have ever I called on you for a confidential report about the men serving under you?—Never.

17. What do you think about the discipline in Christchurch?—I think it is well maintained.

THOMAS GIBSON, Acting-Detective, examined on oath. (No. 101.)

*Witness:* I have been acting-detective since 1906. I was enrolled in the Force in 1902. I wish to put on record that a junior man was promoted to the rank of detective before me, and will now be senior to me for all time. I allude to Detective Quartermain.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is there any special cause why he was given promotion?—None whatever, except being in the Commissioner's office.

2. It has been a subject of comment among plain-clothes men?—Yes.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Are you capable of filling Quartermain's place?—If I got the chance. I never had the opportunity.

4. You have not had the experience?—No.

5. The mere fact of his being promoted does not affect your advancement?—I should like to know that.

6. He has not filled an outside place?—He is placed on the seniority list as detective.

7. He will not retard your advancement?—In years to come he may.

8. At present he does not?—But I am looking forward.

9. If kept at Headquarters always he will not interfere with you?—What assurance have I that he will be?

10. *The Commissioner.*] You are anticipating he may be sent out?—Certainly.

THOMAS ALFRED EVENDEN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 102.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1893. I had two years in Wellington, five years at Port Chalmers, and nine years at Rangiora, where I am now stationed. I have never been offered a station, and I want to know why I have been passed over.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your defaulter sheet like?—There is a fine of 2s. 6d. and one of 5s.

2. That was when you were a young constable?—Yes. Twenty-one men have been appointed over my head.

3. Have you ever applied for a station?—No. I consider the Rangiora Station far superior to the ordinary one-man station. I have been in charge there for thirteen days at a time, and repeatedly for from five to ten days during the time the sergeant has been away, and I have also relieved nearly all the stations in the sub-district. On the North Canterbury stations now all the constables in the sub-districts are junior to me. The man in charge at Kaiapoi was not in the Force when I went to Rangiora. Three men have been sent to Cheviot, two to Kaikoura, one to Culverden, and one to Amberley—all junior to me. In regard to travelling in boats on transfer, I think better accommodation ought to be provided. One time I came from Wellington I had to travel in the steerage with Chinamen. I think the house-allowance ought to be increased. The house I live in is not much of a house, and you cannot get one under 15s. I am living in free quarters, such as they are. The rate of pay for constables of sixteen years' service is too low; it should be at least 10s. An ordinary ganger on the railway gets 10s. for eight hours' work, whereas a constable has to be called on at all hours of the night. I work an average of ten hours a day.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There may be some reason why you were not appointed to a station?—Not that I know of. I never asked for any favour.

5. Are you fitted for Clerk of Court?—I could take it on right enough, but I do not want it.

6. *Inspector Gillies.*] Do you know why you have not been appointed?—I do not. I was recommended for a suburban station.

*The Commissioner:* On the face of it, it would appear peculiar that he has not been advanced.

*Inspector Gillies:* He was put on my list for a suburban station, but nothing further.

*The Commissioner:* What is the average service a man puts in before he gets charge of a station?

*Inspector Gillies:* Five or six years.

*The Commissioner:* He has sixteen years. Do you know the reason he was not appointed?

*Inspector Gillies:* He never asked for it. The only reason I know is I do not think he is fit for anything more than a suburban station. He has the same privileges where he is.

*The Commissioner:* What do you call suburban stations?

*Inspector Gillies:* Islington, Belfast, New Brighton, and Sumner.

*The Commissioner:* Do you wait for a man to apply for a station before you recommend him?

*Inspector Gillies:* Certainly not. My recommendation is before the Commissioner that he is fit for a suburban station.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not want to bring out specially what I know against this constable, but there is something. I shall make inquiries very soon, and it may be he will have to be transferred very soon.

*Witness:* I know of no reason whatever why I have not been appointed. I was five years under Sergeant Johnston at Rangiora, and I have known Constable Roche for seven years.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Why have you not applied for a station?—Because my family are living in Rangiora, where they have improved in health. My children are now grown up, and I was not particular whether I was moved or not.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You told me that when I saw you once?—Yes.

9. *The Commissioner.*] I presume, from the fact of your coming before me, you suffer under a sense of injustice?—Not particularly; but as other men are making complaints, I thought I might as well make mine.

10. You come because you feel that you are suffering under injustice, and complain that after sixteen years' service you never had the offer of a station. There is either a reason or no reason for this. If there is no reason, you appear to have been exceptionally treated; if there is a reason, you should say so?—There is no reason I know of.

11. What has your conduct been?—Good, so far as I know.

12. There have been no complaints about you?—Not as far as I know. I notice some constables are making complaints about influence and Masonry, and so on. I have been a Mason for years, and I never used any influence.

13. *Inspector Gillies.*] You are in just the same position at Rangiora as if you were in charge of a suburban station? You have the same privileges, but are more a free agent?—Yes; but when the sergeant is away most of the work falls on my hands, and there is more work at Rangiora than an ordinary out-station.

14. You do not want a station?—Not particularly.

FRANK JOSEPH BISHOP, Chief Detective, examined on oath. (No. 103.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1892, and was appointed to the plain-clothes branch three months afterwards, not at my own request. I have been doing plain-clothes duty ever since. I was sent to Palmerston North as acting-detective, and from there to Wanganui. I have no complaint whatever. I have received my just dues.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views in regard to the promotion of men in the plain-clothes branch to higher office?—I cannot understand why there should be such an objection to it. When a detective's turn comes for promotion, I can see no reason why his claim should not be considered. In the first place, the Inspector picks out the best man available to go into the detective office; he must be intelligent and persevering, and if he proves a success as acting-detective he is promoted when his turn comes. So you fill up the office with the most intelligent men in the service; and why, because he is placed in the detective office, he should be considered done with so far as promotion is concerned is a thing I cannot understand at all.

2. The objection in the minds of some is that the plain-clothes men will be out of touch with uniform work, and there may be laxity of discipline?—So far as I know, the Chief Detectives in the colony are all disciplined men, who have gone through severe tests of discipline which the younger constables now joining have no idea of. They go through practically no discipline compared with those I am referring to. I was a member of the Permanent Artillery for two or three years, and I can tell you the discipline there was—well, once you learn you do not forget it.

3. You are aware that for some time no promotions were made of detectives till the promotion of Chief Detective McGrath?—That is so.

4. You agree the very best man must be taken?—Yes.

5. It does not follow that because a man is Chief Detective he is the best?—No; but I say when his turn comes he should be considered with others. I think the Chief Detective's position should be made equal to that of Sub-Inspector. The ranks should be on all-fours; they have to deal with all the serious crimes.

6. What would you call the Chief Detective?—Sub-Inspector of Detectives.

7. Is there any other matter you wish to mention?—I consider 8s. a day as travelling-allowance for detectives is not enough.

8. What about the 6s. a day for the constable?—I do not object to his getting an increase; but I want to point out that when a detective is away on service conducting investigations into serious crime, the first thing he has to do is to get lodgings, and that costs him 6s. a day at the very least; then he has to spend a certain amount of money in making inquiries, and, from my experience, I should say he is usually 1s. to 2s. a day out of pocket.

9. Does he not get a refund of any reasonable expenditure of that sort?—Yes, if he brings it under the notice of the Department, but he cannot remember every shilling here and there. In Melbourne they have a system of unauthorised expenditure, and they get their receipts as they pay any one for information, or for anything that is done for them. If that were in vogue here, I think it would be a good thing; but if 10s. a day were allowed when travelling it would about meet the case. When I was travelling in the Taranaki and Wanganui district I was always out of pocket to some extent.

10. Has the promotion of Detective Quartermain caused any dissatisfaction among the plain-clothes branch?—Gibson and Ward thought they should have been promoted before him, as they were his seniors.

11. They are exceptionally good men?—Yes; I have no doubt about that.

12. *Mr. Dinnie:* So is Quartermain?—I do not know anything about him, as he was in a different branch altogether. In reference to travelling-allowance, in every other branch of the Government service, from the cadet upwards, they get 10s. a day, and they are not called upon to spend money as the detective is. The detective must spend money if he wants to be a success.

13. *The Commissioner.*] It seems to me that that should not be spent under the guise of travelling-allowance, as it might open the door to a great deal of abuse throughout the service. I should infinitely prefer a special fund?—Well, the detective would prefer that too; but 10s. a day would about clear it.

14. There has been so much dissatisfaction about travelling-allowances throughout New Zealand that I do not think they are likely to be raised again?—The detective must be a good man. When he has an investigation to make he very often gets very little sleep at night. He has to find all his own clothes, which cost him about £20 a year for wear-and-tear and one thing and another. As the constable has his uniform he has to spend very little upon plain clothes.

15. In your official relations, do you deal direct with the Inspector or through the Sub-Inspector?—Direct with the Inspector.

16. Do you know anything about the finger-print business?—Yes, I understand it fairly.

17. Do you think it would be any advantage to take a promising man occasionally from a district and give him instruction in the finger-print branch?—Not as the office is situated—in Wellington. It is a splendid branch of the service. When a shop is broken into, for instance, we take the finger-prints, and send them on to Wellington, where they are immediately enlarged, and very promptly we get word down to say who the offender is. With regard to steamer-fares, from the Chief Detective downwards we have all to travel steerage, and, as many of the detectives and sergeants have large families, they cannot afford the extra fare charged for saloon passages. It often happens that telegraph boys and railway porters are travelling by the same steamer in the saloon, their fares being paid by the Government, while the members of the Force have to travel steerage. I think we should receive saloon fares. Then, the allowance of 2s. a week is not sufficient as a bicycle allowance to enable us to keep our own bicycles in repair. We have worked it out, and we think 3s. a week would about meet the case. That would come to about £8 a year. The allowance is made in this district only.

18. What about the prime cost of the bicycle?—From £20 to £22, as we have to get as good a machine as we can. You can get them from £5 upwards, but I would not ride some of those. Since I have used a bicycle it has cost me £46, and my second bicycle is pretty well done now. But we do not complain about that. It is the cost of the upkeep that we think we should have a larger allowance to meet. I need not point out to you, sir, I think, how greatly the use of the bicycle adds to the efficiency of the detective branch. I only wish to add that the detectives here have all been satisfied since Mr. Dinnie has been in charge, and they have no complaint to make. They consider the Force has never been in a better position. As regards the office here, the pay, and everything else, there is no complaint to make.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards travelling-allowance, would a regulation of this description satisfy you: "Officers, Chief Detectives, and detectives will travel first-class by boat or rail; non-commissioned officers will travel saloon by boat and second class by rail. Constables will travel steerage by boat and second class by rail"?—I think that would be reasonable.

20. You were appointed to plain clothes after about three months' service: did that give great dissatisfaction to the members of the Force?—Well, in those days you could not get men to take the position, and when any man showed himself worthy of it Mr. Pender at once jumped at him, and tried to get him into the office.

21. *The Commissioner.*] Why was the duty not so sought after in those days? Had the pay anything to do with it?—I only received 7s. a day as acting-detective for five years.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to the finger-print department, do you not think it would be a dangerous thing if we allowed the finger-prints to be taken and classified in the different districts—I mean, as regards tendency to mistakes?—I would not interfere with the present system. It is quite satisfactory.

23. You know that at Headquarters we have a complete system of registration of offences and criminals, and an easy reference to the photographs?—Yes, it is a pleasure to see the system in vogue there.

24. Do you know anything about the inquiries that are made into the antecedents of candidates for enrolment in the Force?—Yes; I think the present system is very efficient, and it is more strict now than it has ever been.

25. Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction in the service?—So far as Christchurch is concerned, every one appears to be satisfied. One hears of political influence here and influence there, but I have heard that kind of thing ever since I have been in the Force. I know when my time came for promotion to Chief Detective I was told I would be passed over for a certain man, but I said I thought I would receive justice from the Commissioner when my turn came. And as it turned out, the rumour was without foundation.

26. Since I took charge do you think there have been improvements in the *Police Gazette*, and as regards the introduction of the education classes and the finger-print system?—I do, certainly.

27. Do you know of any case where political influence has been effective?—No.

28. You know nothing of this spy I am said to have in each district?—The first I heard of it was through Mr. O'Brien's evidence in Dunedin, as published in the papers. It astonished me, because I had never heard of such a thing.

29. If you had heard it, would you have repeated it in Court?—No; nor would I have believed it.



JAMES JOHNSTON, Station Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 104.)

*Witness:* I am station sergeant, at Christchurch. I joined the Force on the 27th October, 1876, and was appointed sergeant on the 1st August, 1898. Was promoted to be station sergeant on the 1st May, 1907. Since then I have been in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You did not do town duty from the time you were appointed sergeant until you were made station sergeant?—No.

2. Since then there has been a rule that sergeants promoted should go into the cities. You admit, I suppose, it is a good rule?—Yes; but in that year there were a large number promoted to be sergeants, and there were more than the cities required, and I believe a few of those, apart from myself, got stations without going to a city. I agree it is good for the Force that they should go into a city.

3. How does the physique of the Force now compare with what it was a few years ago?—As I have been out of the city for some time I am not in a position to say, but I do not think it is anything like it was when I joined.

4. To what do you attribute that?—I could not say, but I know that fine young eligible farmers' sons would not think of joining the police. From what I have heard, they do not like the discipline.

5. Of course, we must have discipline. As a set-off against that, do you think there is anything that would make the Force more attractive?—I think if you made the pay sufficiently high you would have the men tumbling over one another to join, more especially if the men were allowed half their time off duty.

6. I want you to view the position from a practical standpoint?—Well, I do not think the pay is high enough, because men have said to me that they can do better outside, and have more Sundays off. In speaking about pay, I would like to say that I do not think the station sergeant receives sufficient pay in proportion for the duties he has to perform. He starts with 12s. 6d., and rises in two years to 13s. 6d.

7. And as to house-allowance?—I could not tell you anything about that.

*Mr. Dinnie:* It depends.

8. *The Commissioner.*] What is your position?—I have a house rent-free and 13s. 6d. a day as pay. Were it not for the hope of reward in the shape of a pension I would not keep the position as against that of sergeant. Looking to the work and the responsibilities of station sergeant, I do not think he is paid sufficiently in comparison with sergeants, although I do not like to make comparisons with others. I think Station Sergeant King told you it was the most irritating position in the service. The maximum pay for sergeants is 12s.

9. How does the pay compare with that of detectives and Chief Detectives?—A Chief Detective gets 16s. 6d. and a detective 15s.

10. What would you consider a fair amount as a maximum for a station sergeant?—If I had another shilling a day I should be perfectly satisfied.

11. Do you consider the discipline is well maintained?—Yes, it is good, but not so severe as when I joined the service.

12. Are you aware of any general dissatisfaction existing in the Force?—The only thing I hear criticized is the method of appointing sergeants from constables.

13. You mean placing men over the heads of seniors, and afterwards promoting the seniors?—Yes.

14. Do you consider that is a real grievance?—It seems to be from the way it is talked about.

15. Knowing the men, and going through the list, would you be unable to account for some of the promotions?—The men cannot account for it.

16. Have you any personal grievance?—I have been treated exceptionally well since I have been in the service, although there have been junior men who have been placed over me. But Mr. Dinnie has nothing to do with that. It has been in existence ever since I have been in the Force.

17. But there are certain instances that you, as a reasonable man, cannot account for in your mind?—That is exactly the position.

18. Do you see any reason why a Chief Detective, if as competent or more competent than the next station sergeant, should not receive promotion to the rank of Sub-Inspector?—This is the attitude I take up: Suppose, for example, that Chief Detective Bishop and I are equally qualified for the position, and although I may be the senior man he may be the smarter; if he is appointed Sub-Inspector and I am subsequently appointed Sub-Inspector I am then made junior to him, when I consider I should be the senior. I do not object at all, however, to the promotion of detectives to the plain-clothes branch if they have the qualifications and the ability. But I would point out that a detective, as a rule, would not have the knowledge of the police routine that the uniform man would have.

19. You know that for a long time no such appointments were made?—Inspector O'Brien is the one man who has been appointed from the detective branch, and I think, if a man has the ability, there is no reason why he should not be promoted in that way.

20. You know the then Minister stated that before a man in the detective branch could be promoted he would have to go into the uniform branch and work his way up?—Yes.

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is the system adopted in the Metropolitan Police in London.

*The Commissioner:* I understand you do not agree with that system?

*Mr. Dinnie:* At one time it was an open question with me.

*Witness:* But the other side of the question has not been touched. I do not see why, if a sergeant is considered capable, he should not be promoted to the detective branch. There might be some men of exceptional ability in the service who might like to join the detective branch.



21. *The Commissioner.*] Do you really think it would tend to the efficiency of the detective branch that a sergeant should suddenly be transferred to that branch?—I have no feeling in the matter. I merely throw it out as a suggestion.

22. With regard to alleged political influence, can you put your finger on any case in which it has proved effective?—No, I cannot. I noticed that an ex-constable named Walker gave evidence in Dunedin to the effect that no man could get above the rank of constable without some influence. I can only say that since I have been in the service I have never asked for nor sought promotion, and I should certainly be amazed if any one has written to the Commissioner or any one else to recommend me.

23. I strongly recommended you myself for the rank of sergeant years ago. I spoke to Commissioner Tunbridge of your case?—I never spoke to you about it, sir.

24. You did not know until I told you?—I think, with all respect, that Inspector Broham strongly recommended me.

25. I spoke to Inspector Broham about you at the time; but that is not the kind of influence that is objectionable: I refer to influence of a kind that is against the interests of the service. Do you know of any case where such influence has been used with effect?—No, I do not; and it should not be tolerated. I have heard, of course, that such influence is used, but I do not know of any case.

26. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards promotion, you said there was a certain amount of dissatisfaction in the Force, and you said that there were some constables who were fitted for promotion who had been overlooked: would you leave them in the position of constable to the end under such circumstances?—Certainly not, but the men should not have been overlooked in the first place.

27. Suppose some constable had been overlooked before my time, and was still qualified for promotion, would it be fair that he should still be overlooked by me?—No, I suppose not.

28. *The Commissioner.*] At what age would you cease to promote men to the rank of sergeant?—I think after a man gets to fifty years of age it would be a hardship to him to have to go and do the block. If a man is worth anything at all, and shows adaptability, he will be made a sergeant well before that age.

29. You are aware there are a great number of men who would be fit for sergeants but not for any higher rank?—Yes.

30. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You will recognise that there are men who are not particularly active as sergeants, and having an active sergeant or two amongst them will make a difference to their general efficiency?—Yes, influence of that sort is a very good thing.

31. Are the inquiries made into the antecedents of candidates for enrolment not more strict now that they have been for years past?—I do not see how you could have any more strict inquiry than at the present time. I know that sometimes certificates have not been accepted until I have gone and verified the signatures, although I knew those signatures to be genuine, and that takes up a good deal of a sergeant's time.

32. You know that in the House it was alleged that no inquiry was made in some cases?—That must have been said without any knowledge of what goes on, if my experience goes for anything.

33. With the exception of the promotion question, do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the Force?—No.

34. Is the discipline well maintained?—Yes; but I do not think it is as rigid as when I joined the service. At that time a man could not go out of the station without leave.

35. As regards the rule that the men must be in at 11 o'clock at night, do you not think that hour is quite late enough?—I think so.

36. It was mentioned in the House that the men even had to be in at 11 o'clock at night: does that not show ignorance of what discipline means?—Yes, because a man can get special leave when he wants it.

37. Do you think the system of education classes is a good one?—Yes.

38. And there has been a revision of the *Police Gazette*?—Yes, there have been improvements all round. The only thing that could be improved is the pay.

39. I suppose you have not heard of this spy I am supposed to have at all the stations?—We have heard a lot of wild rumours, but I did not hear that until I saw it in the papers recently.

40. Did you believe it?—No. If he is about here he is lying very low.

41. *Inspector Gillies.*] You have served under me altogether about seven years and a half: have you ever known me to communicate with you or with any other sergeant confidentially about any of the men serving under you?—No. No report is made reflecting upon any man without that man subsequently sees it.

42. When a constable is reported, is the system in Christchurch not this: that the report—unless it is for something very serious—is sent back to the constable for explanation? Then, if the explanation is not satisfactory, the constable comes before me, and the evidence is taken, and the constable charged has the fullest opportunity of cross-examining each witness that comes forward?—Yes, that is so.

43. Amongst other things, Constable Fitzgerald stated, in effect, that the men had no fair play at such an inquiry?—That is contrary to fact.

44. You have been at most of the inquiries held in my office during the past two years and a half?—Yes, a good many of them.

45. What do you think of the proceedings before me?—I think you are very forbearing, and give the men every opportunity of placing their side of the case before you, and of calling or cross-examining any witnesses they please.

46. As to these alleged confidential reports, had you ever heard such a thing talked about until it was mentioned in evidence here?—Never.

47. *The Commissioner.*] With regard to the case of Constable Leahy, of Oxford, do you know of anything that would have disqualified him from holding the rank of sergeant?—No.

48. He has been about thirty years in the service, and has a clean defaulter's sheet?—As for the defaulter's sheet business, there are some of the best men in the service who have not clean defaulters' sheets.

49. Is it not unusual for a man of long service, with an absolutely clean sheet, to remain a constable?—I think not.

50. Has Constable Leahy, in your opinion, the attributes which would go to make a successful sergeant?—Yes, I feel sure he has. To show that he has some backbone, he is the only man who when he was in charge of men in Christchurch here got a man fined £1.

51. But he is past the age for promotion?—It has often been a wonder to me why Leahy has not been promoted. He was under me for several years when I was in charge at North Canterbury; and whenever I went to Oxford he was always in uniform, and clean and tidy, and the station books were exemplary. The stable was always whitewashed, and, in fact, everything was as it should be. I have often wondered why he was never promoted.

52. As a matter of discipline, have you any opinion as to what action should be taken where a constable was drunk or under the influence of liquor when on duty?—I do not think there is any excuse for a man under those circumstances.

53. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Of course, you know that young men joining the Force are subject to greater temptation as regards drinking than they would be in their private capacity?—Yes, much more, because people will ask you to have a drink if you are a policeman.

54. And there is more likelihood of their getting into trouble?—Well, if a man is not strong enough to resist there should be trouble.

55. Is it not mostly the young constables who fall into this trouble?—Yes; when they are not hardened to people who want them to drink.

56. Do you not often find that the men with the most marks on their defaulters' sheet are the men who do the most work?—Very often.

57. It is not always the man with the clean sheet who is the most suitable for promotion?—No, because very often a man in trying to do his duty gets into trouble. I have been the victim of it myself.

58. The slow constable has often the cleanest sheet?—Yes. With regard to promotions, I want to say there seems to be an impression that it is necessary to make application before a man can get promotion.

59. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not know recommendations are made every year?—I do not know what the system is.

*The Commissioner:* I notice the question has been frequently asked of a witness, "Did you apply?" I strongly object to it myself.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I keep a list of applications, as well as a list of recommendations.

ALFRED EDWARD REMER, Sergeant, further examined. (No. 105.)

*Witness:* I have been informed that in giving evidence yesterday as to the moral conduct of two constables I said the occurrence did not take place within the Christchurch District. If I did say so, that is an error. What I intended to say was within the City of Christchurch. Since then I have remembered another instance of gross immorality that took place in Christchurch.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Is that in respect to a case where the man was dismissed?—Yes. I was asked if I knew any specific cases. I want to further explain that when I used the word "immorality" I did so in the broadest sense of the term. I did not mean dismissed for having actually had illicit intercourse; but if illicit intercourse has not been proved, it had been proved that the intention was to have it. If, on the other hand, an indecent act had not been proved, it was actually proved that the intention was to commit it. In my examination I said the service had deteriorated morally, physically, and intellectually. *Mr. Dinnie* asked me, in cross-examination, to give specific instances, and there they are.

2. *The Commissioner.*] All these men have been dealt with?—I believe they were promptly dismissed. At present I do not know of any immoral men in Christchurch.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As soon as it was found out these men were acting immorally they were immediately dealt with?—Yes.

THOMAS FREDERICK HAMMOND, Constable, further examined. (No. 106.)

The witness appeared and, through his solicitor, *Mr. O. T. Y. Alpers*, explained in detail the circumstances in connection with the service of the summons which formed the subject of part of Constable Gillespie's evidence, and produced evidence to show the esteem in which he was held after the occurrence by responsible police officers and by prominent residents in the Temuka district; and that after the occurrence on the occasion of his transfer from that district he was presented with a testimonial, and his wife with a purse of sovereigns, the testimonial being signed by three hundred persons, including five Justices of the Peace, the clergy of various denominations, and all persons of responsible position, fifty of whom were personally known to *Mr. Alpers*.

*The Commissioner* said he had specifically discouraged the bringing-up of this matter, but it having been brought up he was bound to inquire into it. He now said that he did not intend to allow the matter to be referred to again, and he did not intend to mention it in his report, nor would he allow it to be used to the constable's prejudice.

*Mr. Alpers* said the constable had ample reason to be satisfied.

ROBERT McCLELLAND, District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 107.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1879. A month after I was transferred to Christchurch; and thence to Lyttelton; thence after three years back to Christchurch. In 1887 was appointed assistant in the district office, and in 1899 was appointed district clerk, and in 1901 was appointed sergeant. I have been here ever since. I have two clerks in the office. A third man is very seldom required.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you generally get suitable men sent you?—Yes, I am very fortunate; the two I have now are excellent men, of very good education. There is a great quantity of work, and it requires experienced men to deal with it. The man of experience has the advantage over the man without.

2. An inferior man with large experience is worth more than a better man without?—Yes.

3. How long does it take a man, on the average, to become a fairly good assistant to you?—He should pick up his work in a few months if he takes an interest in the work, and intends to remain in the office; but a man with twelve months' experience is of some value, because all the work of the stations in the district comes through the district office, and has to be supervised by the Inspector and his staff, and the Inspector necessarily expects me to take a share, and I expect my assistants to take a share.

4. Something has been said in other places about making use of the assistant clerks for relieving work on Sundays, &c.: have you any views on that?—I should be very sorry to see the clerks deprived of their Sundays off.

5. One case was before me where a man said he had not had a Sunday off for three years?—I can scarcely credit that. Some do not care for leave. I have never asked for my annual leave. I do not think I have had three months in twenty years. The reason I have never asked for leave is because we get our Sundays off, and the assistants do not ask for leave on that account.

6. Would it affect the efficiency of the staff to occasionally utilise their time in the direction I have indicated?—I think it would.

7. You would not be in favour of it?—I certainly would not. We have never closed our office on Saturday for the last ten years; if we did, we should have to come back and work on Sunday.

8. It has been represented to me that the clerks work, on an average, five days and a half a week?—Here it is not so.

9. Then, if they had to be on beat on Sunday, there would not be sufficient recreation for them?—No. I think they are fairly entitled to their Sundays off; it is a little encouragement for them to remain in the office.

10. You are able adequately to cope with the work you have to do?—Yes; if we wanted assistance we would get it.

11. Do the men take kindly to the work?—They would work twelve hours a day if they were asked.

12. Do you consider the position attractive to suitable young constables?—All that is attractive is that they have no night duty, and their hours are regular. It is a kind of work some are adapted to; others would not care about it.

13. When a man gets into the office he does not care about leaving it?—We encourage them to remain, and make everything as pleasant as possible for them to induce them to remain. In regard to pay, I think, to get the right class of men into the Force, it would have to be raised, because an ordinary tradesman earns from 7s. 6d. to 10s. a day, and a constable has to serve four years before he gets a rise, which is too long. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction about promotion. It seems everybody wants promotion, and we cannot all be Sub-Inspectors. For my own part, I do not grudge any man whatever promotion he may get. I have never seen a man promoted yet who was not well able to fill the position.

14. The question is whether there are other men equally good who have a better claim?—It is impossible for the Commissioner to satisfy everybody in making appointments. It would be impossible to stop grumbling.

15. Does the dissatisfaction exist to such an extent as to impair the efficiency of the Force?—I can safely say it has not done so in the Christchurch District. In my opinion, the standard of efficiency in the Christchurch District is higher than eight or ten years ago.

16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know the clerks are liable to be called on for documents at any moment?—Yes.

17. If they were out on street duty there would be a difficulty in getting them?—They would not be there to be called on.

18. Do you think many would apply for the position if they were to be called on for uniform duty?—I do not think they would.

19. You want special men as assistant clerks?—Some men are better adapted for the work than others; I have had men who were glad to go out again, and whom I was glad to get rid of.

20. You do not want your work sent back for correction?—No.

21. Are the inquiries into candidates for enrolment more strict than in years gone by?—Very much more strict.

22. You have no fault to find with that?—No.

23. If anything comes in wrong it is sent back to you?—Yes.

24. In regard to discipline as compared with former years?—On the whole, it is very good. Some of the younger men do not take kindly to it at first.

25. *The Commissioner.*] Would you be in favour of a period of probation before a man is finally enrolled?—Yes—say, for six months.

26. Do you think, owing to the strict discipline, some men leave?—I do not know of any instance where a man has actually left on that account. In former times men have left, as they used to say, in disgust.

27. Do you think the discipline maintained now is any reason why men do not join the service?—I really do not know why they do not join. I think it is on account of the pay not being sufficient.

28. Have you heard of a "special" man being employed in each district to get information?—No; the first I saw of it was in the Dunedin papers.

29. You have no reason to believe it?—None whatever.

30. *Inspector Gillies.*] Have you known instances where the clerks have to come and work on Sunday?—Yes, and after hours as well.

31. Are you ever able to leave your office till after 5, except on Saturday?—No.

32. And one of the clerks and sometimes two remain on Saturday also?—Yes.

33. And even after that they have sometimes to come back with a mail between 7 and 8?—Yes, frequently.

34. Have you known instances where I have had one of the clerks up till 9 and 10 to work?—Yes; we do not think anything of that.

35. Do your clerks have a spare moment from the time they come in the morning, one at 8 and one at half past, to the time they leave at a quarter past 5?—No; they have to work very hard indeed.

36. And the whole of the work is very exacting?—It is all important work. A young man without police experience would be no good whatever; he requires to have police experience, because the work from the out-stations has to be supervised.

JOSEPH ALBERT McGRATH, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 108.)

*Witness:* I am stationed in Christchurch. I joined the Force in 1878. I left it in May, 1882, and rejoined in December, 1882. My former service was allowed. I was appointed detective in 1885, Chief Detective in 1899, and was promoted Sub-Inspector in 1909.

1. *The Commissioner.*] In regard to promotions from the plain-clothes branch to commission rank, have you any views? Do you know of any reason why any difference should be made?—I think the best man should be appointed, I do not care in which branch of the service he is found, selecting, of course, from the higher ranks. I think it would be grossly unjust to debar a man from the higher ranks because he has chosen to take up detective work. I regard the detective branch as the right arm of the service.

2. What is your opinion on the apparent unwillingness of the Department to promote detectives before your promotion took place?—The detectives were very much dissatisfied, and I venture to think it would be the means of keeping good men from joining the detective branch. Personally, I have no complaint to make. I was not at all sweet on taking the appointment, and I think Mr. Dinnie will admit I took some time to consider the matter.

3. Have you any views in regard to dealing with the detectives under a different heading from the police? Taking the Victorian Force as a basis: we have the various grades of the Force, and then at the end of the list the Chief Detectives and detectives, making it appear that you have to look in a different part of the roll for their seniority?—I think that is a mistake. I would not advocate the Victorian system in its entirety; I think it would work very well in a city with a population as great as that of the Dominion, but I do not think it is practicable in New Zealand.

4. Would you have grades of detectives? I want a suggestion in regard to the inclusion of detectives in their proper seniority on the roll as it stands?—I think it would be a very good system.

5. How would you place them?—You would have to make some alteration. I believe it would be well to have the rank of constable detective, detective sergeant, and instead of Chief Detective I would have a Chief Detective at each centre ranked as Sub-Inspector, and let him take his proper place as such, and when a vacancy occurred he would be as well entitled to it as the Sub-Inspector in the uniform branch. I would have in each centre two Sub-Inspectors, one in charge of the detective branch and the other of the uniform branch.

6. Would that lead to dual control or friction?—None whatever; one could be responsible for the detective branch, the other for the uniform branch. I do not see why that should not work very well.

7. How does the pay of Chief Detective compare with that of Sub-Inspector?—The maximum pay of a Chief Detective is about £40 more than the minimum of a Sub-Inspector. The result in my case, with house-allowance, meant a loss to me of about £20 a year. I suggest that should not be; and that when a man is appointed to a higher rank he should not draw less salary than his subordinate.

8. Do you find it any detriment to your work as Sub-Inspector that you have been out of touch with the uniform branch?—I think it has been of great assistance; I gained knowledge that is invaluable in my present position. I have had previous experience in the uniform branch myself.

9. You come from Wellington: how did you find the discipline there as compared with here?—I have not had the same opportunity of judging in Wellington, but I have no fault to find with the discipline here. I think it is very good. I do not at all agree with what has been said about the young men who are joining now. I think they are a fine lot of young fellows, and very promising constables. Both physically and morally I see nothing to take exception to. You must have seen that yourself on parade, sir.

10. I did not understand that there was any direct detrimental remark made about the men joining at the present time, but in comparing them with the men of the past there was a somewhat

sharp contrast drawn?—Well, some of us who are old in the service are inclined to think there were giants existing in the early days. I dissent from that view entirely. I think, with a very few exceptions, they are a fine lot of well-conducted young men in the service to-day.

11. You know there has been a great deal said about political influence?—Yes; I have heard that for years.

12. Do you think it has been such as to in any way affect the efficiency of the Force?—I should be very sorry to think that any member of Parliament would interfere in such a way as to prejudicially affect the discipline of the service. For myself, I have never received any advancement in the service for which I was not strongly recommended by my superior officer, and the only influence I ever brought to bear on him was hard work and strict attention to duty.

13. As regards promotion, has there been any dissatisfaction of such a nature as to affect the Force generally?—There has been a good deal of grumbling about juniors being placed over seniors, and then the seniors being afterwards promoted and losing their seniority; in fact, that has occurred to myself, and, of course, I naturally felt sore, but I might have been quite wrong. Of course, there may be a good deal in the point advanced by Mr. Dinnie this morning, that in promoting junior men he may be promoting the best men, and then going back to the man who was passed over as being the next best.

14. Does that dissatisfaction exist to a considerable extent?—I think I may say it does, but I have always heard the same complaint. It has always existed.

15. You have heard the opinions expressed with regard to the promotion of Detective Quartermain: did that create any dissatisfaction amongst the detectives and plain-clothes men?—I have heard it did; but I had left the branch at that time, and I know nothing of it personally. It has been said this morning by some one that only one sergeant had joined the detective branch—namely, Sergeant Siddels. I have been acquainted with six—namely, Neil, Walker, Eccles, Hughes, Geerin, and Siddels.

16. Why was Siddels particularly mentioned?—Probably because he is the only one in the service at the present time.

17. It has been claimed that if detectives can be promoted to the uniform branch the men in the uniform branch should have the same right of promotion to the detective branch?—That seems to me quite absurd. A man requires special qualifications and training for detective work.

18. What have you to say about the general conduct of the men?—I should say it is very good.

19. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There is no rule to prevent uniform men from getting into the detective branch any more than there is no rule to prevent detectives from getting into the uniform branch. The same opportunity is given to each?—Yes.

20. *Chief Detective Bishop.*] From your experience as Chief Detective, and the experience you have had now as Sub-Inspector, do you find any trouble about coping with the uniform branch?—No. I think a man who is capable of successfully carrying out the duties of Chief Detective is quite fit to carry out the duties of Sub-Inspector.

21. *Station Sergeant Johnston.*] You heard what I said with regard to the pay and the duties of station sergeants: do you agree with that?—I do. I know what the station sergeant has to do, and I know he has very hard and wearing work, and long hours. I think he should get at least 1s. a day more.

THOMAS FREDERICK HAMMOND, Constable, further examined. (No. 109.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Bingsland. I wish to make a statement on general matters. As regards uniform, I would suggest that the uniform supplied to members of the Force be made free of cost. I do not see why an exception should be made in the Police Department when the other departments of the service have their uniforms free. It has been mentioned that the helmet would be more suitable for wearing than the shako, and I would suggest that before the Commission recommended anything on that point a vote of the men should be taken.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that a vote of the men was taken, and that a huge majority voted in favour of the shako?—I did not hear that. As to the proposed concession on the railways, I would point out that the railways is a public place within the meaning of the Act, and that when a constable goes into a train his mere presence there brings about a better state of affairs than would otherwise exist, and, apart from that, a constable is liable to be called upon at any moment, whether on leave or otherwise, and there have been cases where he has been of great service to the guard in relieving him of awkward work. I could mention many instances which have occurred when a constable travelling has been called upon for duty. Considering, therefore, the relations existing between the Railway and the Police Departments, I think it is only reasonable that some concession should be offered to constables when travelling on leave. I think the present system of enrolment of candidates is a very good system. I have on several occasions had inquiries to make in this respect, and there is only one thing I would suggest, and that is, that any candidate for the Force should first submit himself personally to the Inspector of the District, because, although he might be passed by the surgeon as medically fit, the Inspector would even be in a better position, through looking him up and down, to say whether he would be a suitable man or not for the Force. Then, provided, of course, that he could pass the necessary examinations, let him be enrolled. Then I think that the inquiries that are made into a man's previous character, and so on, should be put into the hands of a man, whether constable or sergeant, who is picked out by the Inspector as being specially fitted for the work.

2. *The Commissioner.*] Do you mean a man specially appointed for that purpose?—Yes; I mean an officer for each district and sub-district.

3. That is tantamount to saying that the average man in charge of a district is not dependable?—I do not think in all cases he is.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 110.)

*Witness:* I am Inspector of Police, in charge of the Christchurch District. I joined the Royal Irish Constabulary on the 6th June, 1870, and resigned from that Force in August, 1874. I joined the New Zealand Armed Constabulary on the 14th January, 1875, and was transferred to the Auckland Police in April of the same year. I was afterwards stationed in various parts of the colony. I was promoted to be sergeant in 1883, I think, and from sergeant I was promoted direct to Inspector, there being no Sub-Inspectors in those days. I came into office as Inspector as from the 1st January, 1899. The present is the authorised strength of the Christchurch District: One Inspector, two Sub-Inspectors, one station sergeant, thirteen sergeants, 113 constables, seven detectives, and three acting-detectives; the total strength being 140. There are forty-seven stations, including Hampden on the south and Kaikoura on the north. To show the efficiency of the Christchurch Force to a certain extent, I would quote some figures. I took charge of Christchurch in 1902. For the year 1903 the percentage of detected crimes of the offences reported was 96; in 1904 it was 95; in 1905 it was 95 and a fraction; in 1906 it was 93; in 1907 it was 95 and a fraction; in 1908 it was 95. I might go further and say that the small percentage of undetected crime was due mostly to the property not being identifiable, or something of that sort. As regards the men who have been appointed to the service for some considerable time past, I do not agree with some of those who have given evidence. I admit that the physique of the majority of the men is not as good as it was in the early days, but I consider that at present we have a very fine lot of young men in Christchurch, and a large number of them will make splendid officers. So far as the morality of the Department is concerned, I think it has never been higher than it is at the present time in this district. I cannot, of course, speak for other districts. It is quite true that we are not getting the same number of applicants for the Force as we did formerly, and I certainly attribute that to the pay to a great extent. The ordinary labourer can make his 8s. a day, and I consider that the responsibility of a constable, and the work he has to perform, should place him on a higher footing than a labouring man as regards pay. The constables, although they are supplied with uniforms, have to pay for the making-up, and the average cost is £2 5s. I understand that the gaol warders get their uniforms free, and other perquisites. That also applies to the Postal and Railway Departments. I certainly think that sergeants, when travelling, should have a larger allowance. At present they get the same as the constables. There is a distinction made between sergeants and detectives; I do not say that the detectives have enough now, but I think the sergeants should be on the same footing with the detectives when travelling as regards allowance, and also as regards having a first-class fare. I agree that men joining the Force should be placed on at least six months' probation before being finally appointed constables. That has been my opinion for years. I think it would give an opportunity of testing both the character, the habits, and fitness generally of a man during that time, and before he was finally appointed.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Of course, we have heard a lot about political influence: can you say that anything of the kind exists?—So far as I am concerned, I never used any influence in my life. Whatever I have got has been through my superior officers; but, rightly or wrongly, there is a strong feeling amongst the men that political influence is used, and men who do not make any effort to use it feel aggrieved because they think they ought to get what is due to them without political influence. They are under the impression that others who are not deserving sometimes get before them through political influence. I cannot give any proof of that; I am only giving you the feeling that exists, and it is a feeling that must affect discipline. There is a regulation against seeking political influence, and I think if it were enforced it would go a long way towards putting a stop to it.

2. But if members of Parliament will try and influence the powers that be, is it not very difficult to put a stop to it?—Yes. Then the regulation should be wiped off the regulation book, to my mind. While the regulation is there it should be enforced.

3. We know that members of the Force do seek influence, but as to whether it is effective or not is another matter?—I think there are only two members of the service who can say as to that—the Minister of Justice and the Commissioner.

4. What is the object of attaching the sheet of foolscap to the defaulter's list?—Early in 1906 there was a conference held in Wellington of the four city Inspectors and the Commissioner, and it was then agreed, with the approval of the Commissioner, that nothing was to appear on the defaulter's sheet except in the case of fines. Reprimands and cautions would not appear. That has been strictly adhered to ever since. There are instances where men have been reprimanded or cautioned several times, and, as the file sometimes is very large, I have adopted this plan of putting the reprimand or caution on a separate sheet, so as to save my clerks half an hour's work looking up the papers when a man comes before me. It is only for my own information. When the constable is transferred from this district that sheet is detached and put in the fire. If I find a constable comes up four or five times for a reprimand I might possibly take that into consideration and say it is time he was fined.

5. In the other districts I have visited the defaulters' sheets came before me without this sheet of foolscap attached. You did not think it advisable to detach this sheet when handing in these defaulters' sheets to the Commission?—No, I did not feel that I was at liberty to detach anything when the papers were called for by the Commission.

6. I understand you do not deal with cases of drunkenness?—No; I have no power to do so. They are dealt with by the Commissioner.

7. I think you have already said you are in favour of sending on a man's defaulter's sheet when the man is transferred to another district?—I think it should be sent to a commissioned officer, as in the case of Sub-Inspector Green, for instance, who raised the question.

8. In the case of district clerks in the office, how are they placed there?—They have all been sent to me except, I think, two. When I have wanted a man in the office, and I considered there was a qualified man available, I have recommended him, as in the case of Sergeant Hogan, who was then a constable. He remained in the office until he was promoted to be sergeant. I also took on a man named McGlone when we were short of clerks, but, unfortunately, he was not a success.
9. The appointments are made by the Commissioner on your recommendation?—Yes, unless I have no one I think I can recommend; then I apply for a man.
10. If there were a promising young man in your district, and there was no vacancy in your office, would you recommend him in that capacity generally?—Yes; in fact, we are asked to do so on our returns.
11. How do you recommend constables for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—Each year I forward a list of men under fifty years of age in my district suitable for promotion.
12. To what extent have your recommendations been carried out?—They have been fairly carried out in my district, with the exception of two or three. Of course, some may be recommended who have not come to their time yet.
13. And some past their time?—There was only one, I think. You had the case before you yesterday.
14. Take a case such as that of Constable Leahy: would you consider it consistent with your duty, or the relations existing between yourself and the Commissioner, if you thought the man over fifty had been overlooked, to draw the Commissioner's notice to it?—Well, we are under military rules, and, of course, I was brought up in a very strict school, and I never like to approach my superior officer in that way.
15. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction on the score of promotion?—I have heard it talked of from time to time, but I am not able to say whether it is well founded or not.
16. But you occasionally see instances where perhaps a little explanation may be needed?—That is so. There may, of course, be a reasonable explanation.
17. Have you recommended all the men who have been promoted in your district?—There was one, I think, I did not put on my annual list, but my remarks were favourable to him. All the others were on my list.
18. And in the course of time they gradually come to their turn?—Yes, with the exception of one, or perhaps two.
19. Are many of your decisions overruled on appeal?—I think there have been two or three.
20. Is there generally a rehearing?—The Commissioner asks for an explanation, or some further report from the constable concerned as a rule, and on his report he has certainly overruled me in two or three cases.
21. Are you particularly exhaustive in your inquiries?—Yes; but, of course, it is a matter of opinion.
22. Do you see the supplementary report of the constable before it goes in?—Yes.
23. Do you offer any supplementary remarks upon it?—It depends on the circumstances. In some cases I think I have done so.
24. If there is a supplementary report asked for, the inference would be that your first inquiry was not sufficient?—It would be so.
25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards inquiry into character of candidates prior to joining, do you think it is more strict now than it has been in years past?—A great deal more.
26. If full inquiry is not made, the files are returned to you?—Yes, although I have been very careful over the files; I have had them sent down to me until the thing is complete.
27. As regards alleged dissatisfaction in the service, what do you say?—I have not seen any so far as this district is concerned. Dissatisfaction as regards promotions, of course, has existed ever since I have been in the Department.
28. And in all large branches of any service that sort of thing must exist?—Well, particularly in our own Department. One hears the same thing outside with regard to other Departments.
29. What do you say as regards the condition of the Force generally?—I consider I have a very efficient Force in my district, and the percentage of detected crimes will show that clearly, and I consider I have a large number of promising young men.
30. And discipline is well maintained?—I consider it is very good here.
31. Since I have had charge of the Department there have been several improvements introduced, have there not—such as the system of education classes and the revision of the *Police Gazette*?—As regards the education classes, I think I was the first Inspector to introduce that prior to the last Commission. It is compulsory now.
32. We have now the finger-print branch?—I have no hesitation in saying that is a most important branch. I admit I had very little faith in it until I thoroughly understood it, but I can now see the great value of it.
33. As regards the promotion of constables to the rank of sergeant?—I consider my own selections have been good.
34. What do you think of mine?—Those I have seen, I have no fault to find with.
35. Do you consider that the return of detected crimes in proportion to reported offences throughout the Dominion shows to a great extent the efficiency of the Force?—Yes.
36. Since my time here seven men in your district have been convicted once for being under the influence of drink?—That is so.
37. Altogether eleven men since 1883?—Yes..
38. Have there been any men dealt with for that since this Commission has been set up?—There has been a case, but it has not been finally dealt with. There is an appeal to the Minister. I could not therefore put it on my return.

*The Commissioner:* Does the Minister review your decision with the papers before him in the same way as you review the Inspector's, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes.

39. As regards Sergeant Donovan, he was transferred on application to Dunedin, and Ramsay was transferred to Dunedin in his place?—I understand that is so.

40. During the time Ramsay was here, had you any fault to find with him?—None whatever. He was only here two or three months.

41. Is this the circular that is issued with regard to police instruction classes (Circular No. 14, of 1906)?—Yes, that is so.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I will hand it in to the Commission.

42. You think it would be well to put men on six months' probation before being permanently appointed. You know that according to the terms of their appointment there is no reason why they should not be dismissed after they have been appointed, if they are found to be unsuitable or are defaulters?—Well, you must have a very clear case before you can deal with a man after he has been appointed. That is my experience. In the case of a probationer, you would not have to give the same reason for dispensing with him. In my opinion, it would be much easier to get rid of a probationer than a full-fledged constable, even if there is a contract in their appointment.

43. Do you think it is wise that the men should be allowed out after 11 o'clock at night without leave?—I say that a man who is out after 11 at night is not fit for his work at 5 o'clock in the morning; but I have never refused a man leave if I considered it was a genuine case. It depends a good deal on your men.

44. I suppose you have never heard of this "special" man of mine in each district?—Never, until I read it in the newspaper reports from Dunedin.

---

SATURDAY, 31ST JULY, 1909.

ROBERT JAMES GILLIES, Inspector, further examined. (No. 111.)

1. *Dr. Symes:* Is it not the case that a certain number of men are placed on the sick list on account of catarrh and pleurisy, and complaints of that nature?—I suppose so; I always get your certificate.

2. Do not 10 per cent. of the constables appear more repeatedly on the list than the other 90 per cent.?—I cannot say. I leave that matter entirely in your hands.

3. Seeing that if six months' probation were adopted it might not include the winter weather, would not twelve months be better?—Yes, but that would mean rather a large order, and the result might be that, seeing they might be dispensed with at the end of the twelve months, we might not get any applicants at all. No reasonable man could object to six months.

4. Is there not a small proportion of men—say, 10 per cent.—who are not fit for night exposure although they are perfectly sound healthy men?—I think those men should be rejected.

*Dr. Symes:* It is impossible at the preliminary medical examination to eliminate these men.

*The Commissioner:* I am inclined to agree with the Inspector—that a twelve months' period of probation, with the possibility of final refusal, would certainly detract from the attractions of the Force.

*Witness:* I might say that when we find a man with a weak constitution, or with a susceptibility to catching cold, we cannot discharge him on that account.

*The Commissioner:* Are there any indications of that in your preliminary examination, or is there no doubt in your mind as to his fitness?

*Dr. Symes:* The man may be perfectly sound and healthy, and yet, from heredity causes, be very susceptible to catching cold.

5. There is another matter: would not time be saved if the Inspector could grant a man a few days' sick leave to enable him to go home without the necessity of applying to Wellington?—It would not save much time; but such an application has never been refused to my knowledge. If a man sent an application to me for sick leave on your recommendation, I should grant it till approved by the Commissioner, and in an urgent case I should wire to the Commissioner and take the responsibility on myself of granting him leave to go home till I got a reply. I am sure it would never be refused.

6. *Mr. Dinnie:* In regard to probation, do you not think that even six months is a pretty long time?—I think six months is a reasonable time, and I do not think it would prevent the proper kind of men from coming forward. If there were anything wrong about them they might be afraid of it being discovered during the six months.

7. But would it not have this tendency: that a man might be cautious about joining if he knew that he might not be appointed after the six months?—I do not think that would affect the good men, as they would have nothing to fear. It would only affect the doubtful men.

8. What do you consider the main reasons which prevent applicants from coming forward for enrolment?—I certainly think that the rate of pay is one—the principal one—and the discipline is another. The younger men do not like the discipline.

9. *The Commissioner:* But they do not know much about it till they join?—It is talked about; and I believe a third reason is that the Police Force of the Dominion is held up from time to time unfavourably. That would deter some from joining.



10. Such exposure as the present, you mean?—I do not wish to speak of the Commission at all, but I think your Worship will agree with me that the Commission affects the discipline of the Force considerably, and that it is some years before it gets back to its proper place. I go further, now that the subject has been raised: the self-respecting men of the service feel keenly how they are being held up to the public. If there are a few in the service who deserve punishment—and I say there are—these men should be dealt with, but the self-respecting men who are the bone and sinew of the Department should not be held up before the public in the way that is done from time to time. I have spent my whole life in the service—thirty-nine years—which I joined as a boy, and I have taken the greatest possible interest in it. I have always liked the work, and I have never been tired of it no matter how long my day was, so much was I interested in the work. But I feel so keenly the way we are held up to the public—undeservedly I consider—that I should be glad to-morrow if I had reached the age for retirement, though I have always loved the service.

11. How are you going to stop it? The trouble is that the few cases are distorted in the public mind as being typical of the whole?—That is exactly where we are suffering.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I think you will agree with me that the whole cause for this Commission arises entirely from a few malcontents in the service, and a few who have left?—There is not the slightest doubt about that in my mind, and I could name a good many if I wished.

13. There has been some misunderstanding in respect to promotion. Supposing we have a man fourteen years in the service specially qualified for promotion, and another man with forty-five or fifty years' service who would make an ordinary sergeant, which would go up first?—The man with fourteen years' service I should consider, in the interests both of the service and the public.

14. On the other hand, supposing the senior man was equally qualified with the junior, which of the two would be promoted?—I should promote the senior; but I say if you want a good service you want to pick out the best men, whether they be senior or junior.

15. That is an explanation of what is going on?—Yes.

16. And this may not be understood by the men, and may be the reason for the dissatisfaction?—That may be so.

17. A great deal was said by Inspector O'Brien in regard to Sergeant Burrows—that he did not recommend him: is he carrying out his duties in a satisfactory manner?—I have no fault to find with his work. He is giving me every satisfaction.

18. Do you think he was qualified for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—I certainly do; he has done nothing to make me think otherwise.

19. Inspector O'Brien complains of receiving defaulters in his district?—We all receive defaulters from other parts.

20. You have had some from Dunedin?—Yes; I have had them from every district. We all get them, and we all send them away sometimes. I do not think it always desirable that when a man is punished he should remain where he is, and I therefore have him transferred.

21. *The Commissioner.*] You have not got a very bad lot, at any rate?—No.

22. *Mr. Dinnie.*] For five or six years you have reported favourably as regards the conduct of your men?—I could not do otherwise.

23. Have you anything to say about your clerical staff doing street duty?—I say at once that I think it would disorganize the office if they were sent out on street duty on Sundays.

24. *The Commissioner.*] The evidence that has been given here puts quite a different light on this question?—I have no hesitation in saying that the clerks under me are the hardest-worked men in the Department, and the least they can have is their Sunday off, and they do not always have that.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever heard of such a suggestion as that they should go out on street duty?—I cannot understand such a suggestion being made by any one who knows what the office work is, and I have never heard of it being done in any other Police Force.

26. *Chief Detective Bishop.*] Are you satisfied with your present Sub-Inspector?—Thoroughly. I would not ask for a more competent man. The point has been raised about men being promoted from the detective rank: I say without hesitation, from experience, that a Chief Detective, if he has the same qualifications as a station sergeant for advancement, is entitled to it in the same way; and I say further, that the four Chief Detectives in the Dominion should have the same rank as Sub-Inspectors.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Would not that mean recasting the grades, although I do not know that there would be any particular difficulty?—I have no wish to change the present title of Chief Detective, but he should hold the same rank and get the same pay as a Sub-Inspector. He is intrusted with the most delicate portion of the duties in the way of inquiry and getting up the most important cases. I do not consider station sergeants are sufficiently paid for the work they have to do.

28. Have the duties of station sergeant been defined?—It is a very open question. They have charge of the station and all the duties connected therewith, and I leave that pretty well to the Sub-Inspector, because one cannot define everything a station sergeant has to do. I think it therefore wise to leave it to the Sub-Inspector.

29. I think, speaking from memory, a complaint was made by one of the station sergeants that his duties had never been defined?—We have never had any trouble at this station. The station sergeants and Sub-Inspectors have all worked well together. They have been able to arrange matters so as to have a Sunday off in turn, and so on; and I have thought it better to leave such arrangements entirely to themselves. If there had been any friction, of course, I would have stepped in, but I am glad to say none has existed under me.

FRANK JOSEPH BISHOP, Chief Detective, further examined. (No. 111A.)

*Mr. Dinnie:* I would like to ask Chief Detective Bishop if he remembers the Papakaio murder case?

*Chief Detective Bishop:* I do.

*Mr. Dinnie:* You will have noticed that Chief Detective Herbert, in Dunedin, commented strongly on the fact that he was not allowed to conduct the inquiries in that case: do you think he had any grounds for complaint?

*Chief Detective Bishop:* None whatever.

*Mr. Dinnie:* What is the system that has always been adopted in the investigation of such cases?

*Chief Detective Bishop:* The cases are always investigated by the officers in whose district the offence is reported to have been committed. No officer from another district attends to them at all.

*Mr. Dinnie:* You know that certain investigations were made in Dunedin by the local police, and that we afterwards sent an officer from this district who obtained information which they failed to obtain there. I suppose that is the reason for Detective Herbert's complaint?

*Chief Detective Bishop:* Evidently so.

JOSEPH ALBERT McGRATH, Sub-Inspector, further examined. (No. 112.)

1. *Chief Detective Bishop.*] Will you state your opinion with regard to travelling-allowance made to detectives?—I have always found 8s. a day quite insufficient when travelling on duty. I think a detective should be allowed at least 10s. a day. In the case of a sergeant it is different, as he, as a rule, has no inquiries to make, while a detective has frequently to go to a hotel and use a room for a whole evening, taking statements, and so on, and the hotelkeeper would look upon him as a rather "dry-hash" sort of fellow if he did not spend a few shillings.

2. *The Commissioner.*] We have it in evidence that there are occasions when a sergeant has to travel around with a detective making inquiries, when they both stay in the same house and spend the same money?—Such cases may occasionally occur, but while the sergeant might have to go once in twelve months the detective has to go frequently, and if his allowance is too small he will lose a considerable amount of money when travelling.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have had considerable experience myself, and I know I have been a good deal out of pocket owing to incidental expenses. There is no comparison between the expenses of a sergeant and a detective. Detectives are always making inquiries.

*Inspector Gillies:* A little matter came before the Commission yesterday with reference to appointing a certain man to the watch-house. It has been made public, and I think the papers are before you, sir. I wish now to say that I adhere to that memorandum which you have seen signed by me, but had I known the whole of the facts I should have punished more severely the constables concerned. But as it stands I leave it at that.

*Sub-Inspector McGrath:* I selected the man I considered the most competent for the duty. It was merely a temporary arrangement for three or four nights only.

*The Commissioner:* I think it is to be regretted that a question of that sort has assumed any importance at all.

This concluded the Christchurch evidence.

GREYMOUTH, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

MALACHY O'GRADY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 114.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1902. I appear as delegate for the police in this district. The men are of opinion that the pay is insufficient, and consider it should commence when joining at 8s., with increments of 1s. every four years, until eight years' service enables them to reach 10s. It should then remain till promotion to a higher rank.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You mean to the charge of a station?—No.

2. There are other emoluments attached to a station which the ordinary constable does not receive?—Yes, house-allowance. We consider we should get free uniforms. At present the cost of making up averages £2 10s. We should also be allowed at least two pairs of boots a year. We consider that constables on leave should get free passes on the railway, because they are never really free from duty, and on occasion arising are always called upon to act. I have several times been so called upon when on holiday leave. Another thing is that we cannot get our holidays when it suits us, but when it suits the Department, and we never get them while cheap fares are on. Then, the men here have a grievance in regard to Sundays off. For the last twelve months the men have only got four Sundays off, and we think a constable should get at least one Sunday a month off. We are short-handed on this station, and that could only be done by increasing the strength of the Force.

3. Is this generally regarded as a hardship by the men?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You suggest a rise in pay till a constable gets 10s., in the course of eight years; by that time he would most likely be in a free house if he behaved himself?—Yes.

5. Do you know the time it takes a man to get charge of a station, if he behaves himself, and is fitted for it?—Between five and six years.

6. Then, if, in addition, he got 10s. a day he would be pretty well paid?—I do not think it would be very high pay. The ordinary labouring man on the Coast can get from 11s. to 14s. a day.

7. *The Commissioner.*] Do you mean casual labour?—Yes; the average pay of the men in the State Coal-mine was 14s. 10d. for the year.

8. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What is the rent of a suitable five-roomed house here?—From 14s. to 18s.

9. Then, if you add 14s. to the 10s. a day, would not that be more than the labouring man gets? In regard to Sunday leave, I suppose you get a day off when you apply occasionally?—Not always; when we can be spared we do.

10. *The Commissioner.*] What is the average cost of living to a single man here?—I have paid for my board since I have been here from 16s. to 17s. 6d. a week, in a boardinghouse. I live in barracks. Living is very dear on the Coast. You pay 1s. here to get your hair cut.

DAVID JAMES WHITE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 115.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1899, and served ten years. I am now in the State collieries. As regards applications for enrolment, I think New-Zealanders should be given the preference. Good men from the country can be obtained.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Under present conditions?—Yes; and all applicants should have resided at least twelve months in the colony. More physical drill should be encouraged in the training depot, such as club-swinging, dumb-bells, and single-stick. I do not agree with probationers being employed to detect sly-grog selling; experienced constables should be told off for that duty.

2. They would have to be brought from other parts?—Yes; and any expenses they incur should be refunded to them. White gloves should be abolished, and also collars. The tunic should be made similar to those worn by the Permanent Militia, as a man wants his freedom. Constables should be supplied with one pair of boots a year, and should be allowed 9s. for the making up of trousers and £1 10s. for the tunic. They should be supplied with trousers every nine months, and tunic every twelve months. Better lamps should be provided, as at present they are clumsy, and the oil escapes, and destroys the uniform. The hours for night duty in cities should be from 10 p.m. till 6 a.m. A duty roster should be drawn up, so that a man could take his turn on every beat; and a man should not be on the same beat always, or twice in succession. Every man should have a turn at making inquiries, and so forth, in the centres. It would be a good idea once a year to have practice shooting with revolvers; few of the men have ever fired out of their revolvers, or know how to shoot at all. The statutes should be kept in the watch-house, so as to be at the disposal of the constables. The last place I was at they were kept in the sergeant's room. Country sub-stations likely to become vacant should appear in the *Gazette*, so as to give every man an opportunity to apply. On all stations there should be rubber gloves for use when handling dead bodies, to guard against blood-poisoning. I think the men in the Force should have the opportunity of balloting for the Police Surgeons in the centres; they are not satisfied with all those in the centres.

3. You would give the constables practically the right to appoint the surgeons?—Yes. In country stations, where there is no medical man, constables should be allowed £5 a year in case of sickness; anything more they can pay for themselves. Constables in charge of country stations should be supplied with kerosene; at present they have to find their own kerosene for the office or police cells. Constables should have some experience in relieving duty before being appointed to country stations. On country stations constables should be allowed to collect the dog-tax, and be allowed 1s. a head, as they used to be, and as they do now with regard to the agricultural statistics. Constables on transfer should be allowed for damage to their furniture. When on holiday leave they should be allowed a free pass on the railways, or at least privilege tickets at quarter-fare for their wives and families. And their wives and children under fourteen years should travel saloon when on transfer; the steerage is not fit for women, especially if delicate. No man should remain on a station longer than ten years, as he is liable to become too intimate, and to shirk duty. Watch-house keepers should be appointed from old servants who are unfit for street duty. Where a policeman is likely to give way to drink he should be removed to a prohibition district. Bicycle-allowance should be increased from 2s. 6d. to 3s. a week. All policemen before being appointed to office-work should do two years' street duty. Apart from that, preference should be given to old servants who are too old for street duty. The pay is insufficient; it should commence at 8s., and increase by 6d. every two years up to six years. House-allowance is too small at present. Inspectors and Chief Detectives should receive 15s., sergeants 12s., and constables and detectives 10s. Men should be allowed to keep poultry on country stations.

4. Is that prohibited by regulation?—Yes; there was a circular to that effect.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] There is a reason for that, is there not—because it was found that the horse-feed was used?—Yes; but a certain amount of horse-feed could be supplied, and let that do for a month.

6. They can get permission when they apply occasionally?—I do not know of any case.

7. As regards to training depots, do you know what is done there now?—No; I went through some years ago.

8. As regards the employment of experienced constables in cases of sly-grog selling, do you not think they would be known?—Bring them from other places.

9. Do you know that has been tried, and failed?—I could not say.

10. Do you not think it requires a strange person?—I think detectives could do the work in some places where they are not known.

11. As regards every man being employed on inquiry shift: perhaps some are not capable of carrying out that duty?—In Port Chalmers every man got a turn.

12. But do you not think the best men ought to be employed for that duty?—I understand a man must be a good man before he is admitted into the Force.

13. But are there not good and inefficient men?—Yes.

14. And should not the best man be selected?—Any man with common sense could have undertaken the inquiries I went through.

15. You must admit the best man ought to be selected for making important inquiries?—Yes, I suppose so, but they keep them to one man in the centres.

16. If one man makes the inquiries do you not think he gets accustomed to the system?—Yes; but others do not get a show to get any experience.

17. You think vacant stations should be gazetted: do you not know there would often not be time for that?—Surely there would be time when men are going out on pension.

18. What difference does it make? You know the Inspector recommends men for stations: it does not require any application?—I know when a station is known to be likely to become vacant, men apply for it.

19. You say men should be removed every ten years: do you know that very few remain ten years?—I know one who has been at a station thirty years.

20. But the majority are moved?—I believe so.

21. You suggest a man who has been dealt with for being under the influence of drink should be sent to a prohibition district: do you think he would be any good there?

*The Commissioner:* That scarcely needs answering; it is the very worst place you could send him.

*Witness:* I think dummy inquests should be held at the depot. I had a case in Otago Central where the Coroner had never held one before, and I had no experience, and had simply to go by the book.

22. *The Commissioner.*] Are you aware if there is any general dissatisfaction in the Force over any of the matters you have touched on? How long is it since you were in a centre of population?—Six years since I left Wellington. Things went on very smoothly there, and, so far as I know, it is so still.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If it is said that dissatisfaction has been existing in Wellington for years past, it is not true?—There have been a few dissatisfied men there.

24. When you were there, six years ago?—Yes.

25. In all large bodies of men there are always a few dissatisfied?—Yes, in every department.

26. Men get dismissed for misconduct, and have for years past?—Yes.

ALFRED HASTINGS JONES, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 116.)

*Witness:* I was enrolled in 1897. In regard to the pay, since I have been in the service it has taken me all my time to pay my way with the pay I have received. I have had to deny myself things a constable should be entitled to have. At present I receive 8s. 6d., but I think, considering the cost of living on the Coast, I should have at least 10s.; I think I am worth it. In the district I am in—Stafford—I could not get any young men to join the Force because all the workingmen are making 10s., and therefore would not think of joining at the present rate of pay. If the pay began with 8s., and gradually rose by 6d. every two or three years, it would be an inducement to better men to join than do at present. I think, considering the nature of the duty, and that a constable has to be exemplary in his conduct, and withstand exceptional temptations in the way of drink and being dishonest, the pay should be higher. I also think that when constables are being transferred from one station to another, they, with their wives and families, should be allowed saloon passages by steamer. I am quite satisfied with second-class accommodation on the railway, but I think it is somewhat degrading to a constable to have to travel with the class of passengers that are often found in the steerage of our coastal boats. In many cases constables pay the extra fare charged for saloon out of their own pockets, and a constable is always put to a certain amount of loss when on transfer, more especially as he has to dispose of some of the things he cannot take with him for a good deal less than their value, and buy new things at his new station. Then, I think the plain-clothes members of the Force should remain in their own branch. Then men who have borne the heat and burden of the day in uniform, in my opinion, should be entitled to the higher ranks of the service, provided they have the necessary ability. The detective and the uniform branches should be kept quite distinct from start to finish. As regards recruits, I consider the young men from the country turn out the best constables, as a rule, as many of the young fellows brought up in the town acquire habits which are not conducive to discipline. If the pay was raised it would, I feel sure, induce a better class of men to join. I think all promotions to the rank of sergeant should be made on the recommendation of the Inspector, who has a better knowledge of the merits and qualifications of the men in his district than any one else can possibly have. If a man did not turn out a good sergeant it would certainly recoil on the officer who recommended him for promotion. And I do not think those men who have passed the police examination should take preference of men who are known to have practical experience.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are not promotions now carried out on the recommendation of the Inspector?—I think the police examination has a good deal to do with it. I am not speaking as a disappointed man, as I have not asked for promotion; nor do I think I would take it in preference to a country station.

2. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you do not know that the Inspectors every year are asked to recommend a certain number of constables for promotion to the rank of sergeant?—I understood that was so, but I have heard of men applying for promotion, and of their being told to pass the examination.

3. May that not have been because they had not been recommended?—I do not know.
4. You have been only twelve years in the service, and would not therefore be entitled to promotion yet?—There have been several junior to me promoted.
5. That would be for special positions. I mean for street duty?—I could not say. I do not know where the men go when they are promoted.
6. *The Commissioner.*] Just name some of those who have been promoted over you?—There is a man named Dart, and there is another man whose name is in the *Gazette*.
7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Those are for special positions. For street duty a constable must have seen at least fourteen years' service before being promoted. You are getting 8s. 6d. a day yourself and a free house, are you not?—Yes.
8. A free house makes a difference to you?—Yes, but only 5s. a week in my district.
9. *The Commissioner.*] Are you Clerk of the Court?—Yes; I get £15 a year as Clerk of the Warden's Court, and £15 as Clerk of the Magistrate's Court, but I have a lot of work to do for that.
10. From the fact that you have time to discharge those duties, I assume your duties as a constable would not be heavy?—I am out every night until after 11 o'clock.
11. You say it is the young constables that are most tempted to drink?—Yes; drink is held out to them as a bribe. The young constables give the most trouble. I do not think, myself, that a man should be taken into the service until he is twenty-five years of age.
12. That would affect the pension?—Yes, probably it would.
13. You think detectives should not compete with the uniform men as regards promotion. Suppose there is a station sergeant and a Chief Detective both fitted for the position of Sub-Inspector, but the Chief Detective is in every way the superior man as regards qualifications?—If he is superior, by all means give him the position; but at the same time, I think it should be a recognised thing that no plain-clothes man should compete with us for promotion. Each man, having selected the branch he is going into, should remain there.
14. Do you think the educational standard is too high as regards candidates?—No, I think an educated policeman is better than an ignorant one.
15. Do you know if there is any general dissatisfaction in the service owing to the present control?—No; but there is one thing I would indorse, and that is, that the police should be allowed a free pass on the railways when on leave.
16. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that I have applied to the Railway Department for that concession, and have explained the reasons for so applying, and that the Railway Department did not see their way to grant the concession?—I did not know that. The principal complaint, so far as I have heard, amongst the members of the Force is with regard to the pay.

JAMES ARTHUR CRUICKSHANK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 117.)

*Witness:* I am in charge of the station at Ross. I joined the Force on the 21st June, 1898. Was stationed at Dunedin for two years, and at the Bluff for seven years. For the past two years I have been at Ross. I think the pay of men joining the Force should be raised to 8s. a day, and that it should be raised to at least 10s. a day in the ten years. The cost of living has gone up by at least 30 per cent. in the last six or seven years. I feel sure a better class of men would be induced to join the service if the pay was raised. Suitable men have spoken to me on the question of joining the Force, but when I have mentioned the pay to them they would not look at it. They said they could do much better outside. I also think constables should be allowed 10s. a week in town, instead of 7s., as house-allowance. A constable is compelled by orders to live in close touch with the station, and rents in central localities like that are high. The rent of a four or five roomed house in Invercargill or Dunedin would be 12s. or 13s. a week. Then, I think assistant clerks in the district offices should do some relief work on Sundays or in the watch-house occasionally. I understand they are better paid than the ordinary constables, and they have every Sunday off, and have no night duty practically. I agree that a constable on transfer should be allowed saloon passages by boat for himself, his wife, and family; and, further, I think when travelling with his wife and family a constable should be allowed to travel in plain clothes. There is a regulation now that he must travel in uniform, and he has practically to treat his wife as a prisoner. I think more efficiency would be maintained in the Force if some of the older members were punished for glaring breaches of the regulations, instead of being allowed to go scot-free.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you refer to cases that are reported to the Inspector?—I am not blaming the Inspector. I blame the Department as a whole.
2. Do you know of any instances in which breaches of the regulations have been overlooked after having been reported to the Inspector?—I know of the case of one constable who was mixed up in horse-racing at one of the stations, and that is, I understand, a breach of the regulations.
3. Was the Inspector aware of it?—Yes. The facts came out in the course of a Supreme Court case, and the constable was transferred to a better or quite as good a station.
4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was that down South?—Yes.
5. *The Commissioner.*] Will you write down the name of the constable?—Yes. [Name written down, and handed in.]
6. Do you know of any other cases?—No; I simply refer to this particular one. I also notice that men are chosen for plain-clothes work after very little service. I fail to see why an Inspector should choose a man after a few months' service on the street for the position when he has done nothing to merit it, and there are older and more experienced men applying for the position.
7. What about the man's merits?—Well, he had done nothing at all.
8. He would have been recommended by the Inspector, surely?—That may be.

9. Then, you are setting your own judgment against that of the Inspector, practically. Somebody must be responsible for the selection of these men?—I think the Inspector, if he is worthy of his position, ought to see that the men are qualified before going into plain-clothes duty. There is one more matter I would mention. I feel satisfied that in some districts constables are in the habit of writing to the Inspectors privately about other constables, and those letters never come to light.

10. What ground have you for making that assertion?—One constable made that statement at the last Dunedin Commission, and it was admitted, and there is a feeling amongst the members now that that sort of thing is being done.

11. What was done?—So far as I know, nothing.

12. What resulted from the letter?—No action was taken.

*The Commissioner:* An isolated case might occur, but it would not be fair because of that to assume it was a system. This question arose in Christchurch the other day—that the Inspector was in the habit of receiving confidential reports from his sergeants. Now, every sergeant upon oath stated that he had never furnished such a confidential report concerning the men under him, and that he had never been asked to do so; and the Inspector also stated he had never received such a confidential report.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you in a city before you were in charge of a station?—Two years.

14. Had you a free house?—Yes; that saved me 10s. a week.

15. You did very well then?—You had to do three years' service before you got 1s. a day at that time.

16. You referred to older members of the Force committing breaches of regulations, and not being punished, and referred to a case in the south: do you know the man was not punished?—He was transferred.

17. Was not a fine inflicted?—I cannot say for a certainty, but it was not heard of by the members of the Force.

18. He was dealt with: where is he now?—I cannot say, but I know he was transferred from a good station to another good station.

19. The emoluments are not so good at Geraldine?—No; but it is a very important station.

20. What was proved against him as regards horse-racing?—I cannot give the details, but I know there was a case in the Supreme Court.

21. Do you know the Inspectors recommend every year those men they think fit for plain-clothes duty?—I cannot say.

22. It is on their recommendation the men are appointed?—I understand so.

23. Are they not in the best position to recommend the right man?—This is the way I look at it: If a man has four or five years and a good record, is he not better than a young man who has only been a few months on the street?

24. As regards letters being sent to Inspectors, you can only mention one case?—I merely mention this: that I hope the matter will be severely dealt with if it is allowed to go on. I only know of one instance. I am satisfied in my own mind it is going on, and there is more than I in the service who thinks so. I should like to make it clear that I referred to the Southland district only. In any dealings I have had with the Inspectors under whom I have served I have found them very good.

25. Do you include Southland?—Well, leave Southland out of it.

THOMAS BARRETT, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 118.)

*Witness:* I am in charge of the Hokitika sub-district. I entered the Force in 1890, and was promoted in 1896. I know of no general dissatisfaction in the service. I know the conditions obtaining in the Force at present are better than formerly. Of course, the men entering now may not be in a position to appreciate that fact. There is a certain amount of discontent and grumbling, but to what it is due it is difficult to say. So far as political influence is concerned, I cannot state a case, because it never affected me. I have only heard it spoken of. I think quite a number of us do not give those in authority credit for understanding the exigencies of the service. A good deal of consideration is shown to the men—far more than formerly—in the way of leave and time off. The physique of the Force has fallen away a little. It is difficult to say to what it is attributable. I would urge an extra 1s. a day; that might have something to do with counteracting it. From my experience as a beat sergeant, and from close association with recruits, I think there is a strong desire on the part of 90 per cent. to get into the plain-clothes branch. Beat duty is heavy and monotonous, and some find it physically hard.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you find the average constable entering the Force good intellectually?—Yes, better to-day than formerly, and the moral standard and sobriety of the Force is good; it is quite a rare thing to see a man under the influence of drink.

2. What was your experience in Christchurch in regard to sobriety?—Very good; I know of old hands there who were fond of drink, but the sobriety in Christchurch is very good, and with two exceptions it will hold its own with any district in the Dominion.

3. Have those men to be carefully supervised?—I believe so, and have been reported: they have improved—taken a pull on themselves.

4. But those sort of men have to constantly be under watch?—Yes; men like that make a bad impression on the others.

5. Would you retain men like that in the Force?—I would give them an opportunity.

6. They have large consideration shown them?—Yes; they have perhaps got more opportunities than they should have.

7. You say it is really the pay that would form the attraction to the Force?—Yes; Is. a day rise would attract a better class of men.

8. Have you anything to say about promotion?—No; I have no fault to find with the system. There is some comment on the clerical division being promoted, but I do not think it affects us very much. I think the idea is that when a man goes as a clerk he should remain one for all time.

9. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you do not know of any general dissatisfaction in the service owing to the present control?—No.

10. Do you know whether there is any reason for the public being uneasy as regards the Police Department?—No. I am afraid there is too much talk and breaking of confidence: the private work of the service is divulged.

11. Do you think it is owing to a few dissatisfied men, who have divulged matters connected with the Force?—I do; and I think too many get to the ears of politicians. That is a sign of the times, and the labour leagues.

12. And owing to letters appearing in the Press occasionally?—Yes.

13. You mentioned two men who are addicted to drink in Christchurch: do you know how often they have been reported for being under the influence of drink?—Once during my period there of two years—each of them once.

14. Would you dismiss a man for being reported once?—No; I think they should be entitled to one chance.

15. You know that young men in the service have been dealt with for being under the influence, and who have subsequently turned out well?—Yes, first-class men. The temptations are many, and it would be hard to dismiss a man for the first instance. It is a case of degree; if it occurred when a man is on duty in uniform it is more serious. I have never seen a case so bad as that.

16. Do you consider the Force is as efficient as it has been for some years?—Yes.

17. Are the men strictly dealt with for misconduct?—Yes; but they get a fair show, and opportunity for a fair trial.

18. Are they treated as well as they used to be?—Yes, and far better; the old hands can appreciate that better than the new ones.

19. While you were at Christchurch did you ever hear of this "special" man Mr. O'Brien mentioned?—I never heard the faintest suspicion of the existence of such a person. I believe it is purely imagination.

20. You have heard no rumour to that effect?—Never.

21. Would you have been likely to hear it?—Yes.

EUGENE EGAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 119.)

*Witness:* I entered the Force in 1879, and was promoted in 1902. I have been stationed in Greymouth for four years and a half.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How does the efficiency of the Force to-day compare with formerly?—In my experience it is as good, and the quality of the men is fairly up to average. In regard to transfers, I think tenders should not be called for packing and removing men's luggage, as it gets badly knocked about; other departments get it done by the Express Company, who are responsible for breakages.

2. When on transfer, do you pay the expenses or the Department?—The Department; but I had a lot of luggage destroyed. In regard to the pay of the Force, I think it should be increased, in order to keep up with the times in all grades, especially the lower grades.

PATRICK BLACK, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 120.)

*Witness:* I am in charge of the Grey district. There are twenty stations in my district, thirty-one constables, five sergeants, and one detective. The sergeants are at Hokitika, Reefton, Westport, and two at Greymouth, one being district clerk. There are two men in the district office. I entered the Force in 1878, in Wellington; was transferred to Dunedin, where I did duty for seven years and a half, and, after doing duty as acting-sergeant for a year, was promoted and transferred to Wellington, where I remained for seven years; was transferred to Dargaville for two years; transferred to Auckland for two years; from there to Gisborne for three years; transferred to Napier, and promoted Sub-Inspector; transferred to Christchurch for two years; to Auckland for three years and a half; from there to Dunedin for thirteen months; promoted Inspector, and sent here, two years ago.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinions in regard to the promotion of the plain-clothes branch?—My opinion is that every man should have the opportunity of rising as high as possible, according to his qualifications.

2. Making merit the essential test?—It should take preference over seniority, which, however, should count if the qualifications are equal. Seniority should not be the sole cause of promotion.

3. Is there much difficulty here in giving men Sunday off?—In a small place like this, with the present number of men, it is impossible to give them the Sunday as suggested; it could not be done. The men get all the Sunday leave I can possibly give them.

4. It could only be dealt with by increasing the Force?—Yes; we are not always full-handed, owing to different reasons.

5. Are you sufficiently policed here?—I have suggested that two more stations should be opened—one at Cobden and another at Blackwater. At the latter place there are about three hundred miners, where a goldfield has been opened. The constable at Ahaura visits there, but cannot remain there.

6. That would not help in regard to the Sundays off?—No.



7. That could only be done by increasing the number of men in Greymouth?—At present we have the full number we are supposed to have, but, owing to sickness and leave, &c., we are always one man short.

8. Is it desirable to give men a Sunday off?—I think they should get as much Sunday leave as they can be given.

9. One Sunday a month is not very much?—It is not too much. I think they should have at least that. I think it is a little overdrawing the matter to say they only get one Sunday in three months here. I think the Sunday leave would average about one in every six Sundays.

10. Would you advocate having power to take evidence on oath at your inquiries into breaches of discipline, &c.?—I think it would be better to do so, as a good many men might be tempted to make a false statement if not sworn.

11. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Not that I am aware of.

*Mr. Dinnie:* At one time all the Inspectors were appointed Justices of the Peace, but the practice has not been continued. All those in the large centres, however, are Justices of the Peace, and one or two of the others, I think.

*The Commissioner:* Do you think they should all be Justices of the Peace?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Yes, I think so.

12. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinion as to the period a man should have to serve before being enrolled in the Force?—I think those in charge at the depot should be able to come to a definite conclusion at the end of six months.

13. We have it in evidence that the best class of men are not coming forward for enrolment in the Force at the present day: to what is that due, in your opinion?—I think insufficiency of pay is one reason, but I think another reason is that a good many men object to being policemen at all, and wearing the uniform, because it is not looked upon as a very honourable calling.

14. Why?—I could not say; but I believe there has been that feeling ever since I have been in the Force. There are not many fathers who would encourage their sons to join the Police Force. If you take any man in the Force earning, say, £200 a year, his social status is not equal to that of a man earning the same salary in any other service, Government or otherwise.

15. Which of a policeman's duties do you think operate principally to create that impression?—Well, their duties are regarded as something that gives offence to a certain extent.

16. The Attorney-General the other day, in a public address, referred to the police as being the right hand of the law?—I consider the Police Department is one of the most important departments under the Government, but, as I have said, there is a lack of social status, and, as every one knows, the Police Force has always been the butt of a good deal of ridicule.

*The Commissioner:* But that would only apply to a very irresponsible portion of the community.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I am able to bear out what the Inspector has said. I know I did not let my parents know that I intended to join the Force, because I knew they would have objected.

*Witness:* I do not mean to say that the better class of the community look down on the police, but, at the same time, they do not want to have anything to do with the police unless they require the services of a policeman. Every policeman knows that.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any views on the subject of promotion?—I think promotion should be open to every one qualified for it, from the highest to the lowest, either in uniform or plain clothes. As to pay, my opinion is that a constable when he joins should be paid at the rate of 8s. a day, and should go on to 10s. It would take that to place him on a level with the ordinary labouring man, and any man who is fit to be a policeman should be as well paid as the man working on the wharf or in private employ, and a policeman's duties are far more responsible than those of the man in private employ; besides which a policeman is expected to live in a respectable locality, and to dress decently. With regard to the length of time a constable should remain at any one station, I have already expressed the opinion at the last Commission that every man in the service under the Commissioner should be transferred every five years. I am of that opinion still—that there should be a hard-and-fast rule to that effect. If the Department want to kill political influence, such a rule would go a long way in the direction of killing it. A man living for a long period at any one station is bound to make many friends, and a policeman, being human, does not care to do anything that is likely to injure one of his own friends. And as to cost of transfers, it is not necessary that a man should be transferred from Auckland to the Bluff. The same effect would be brought about by a transfer to a much nearer station.

18. Is it an advantage to have a district clerk a sergeant?—Yes. As a rule he is a superior man to the ordinary beat-duty constable.

19. Have you more than one clerk here?—No; one clerk does the whole of the work.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to your suggestion that men should be transferred every fifth year, do you not think it would be rather a hardship on a constable having a large family if you move him away from a place where he is finding employment for his family?—I am looking at it from the point of view of the service. I think it would be beneficial to the service. Even at present there are some men who are transferred as often as every five years, but there are others who are left ten or more years.

21. You know men are transferred when it is found necessary to transfer them?—Yes; I dare say that is correct.

22. You know that it takes some considerable time for a constable to know all the people in a district?—Yes, it takes time; but a constable in charge of a station ought to pretty well know the run of the district in twelve months, and my experience is that when a man is transferred to a new district he is more energetic than he has been in the district where he has been located for five or six years. He has no friends there, and there is nothing to prevent him from doing his duty thoroughly.



23. You have been all over New Zealand: have you heard anything of this "special" man Inspector O'Brien has mentioned as having been placed in each district by me?—I never heard a whisper of it until I saw it in the report of the proceedings down south; and I was three months in Dunedin before I came here.

24. You do not believe it?—I do not.

25. If you had believed it, would you have repeated it in public?—I do not think I would.

26. Is there any general dissatisfaction in the service as regards the present control?—Not that I am aware of.

27. You know that in any Force there are a certain number of men who are dissatisfied?—Yes; I have found that wherever I have been.

28. Do you not think those are the men who cause all the trouble?—Yes, I think there are agitators who cause a good deal of it.

29. As regards influence, political or otherwise, you do not know of any case where influence has obtained?—I am satisfied, from what I have heard, that there is such a thing as political influence in the Police Force, ever since it has been a Force, more or less.

30. You know constables do run to influential people?—Yes; but I cannot put my finger upon any particular case. Speaking for myself, I have never, directly or indirectly, applied for anything except a transfer.

31. As regards men who have been dealt with for being under the influence of liquor, you know there are men who have been fined, and who are in the service now, and doing well?—Yes; I know of some men who have been under the influence more than once, and have turned out to be among the best men in the service. I may say that, as a rule, it is not the duffers who get the worse for liquor. The men who indulge a little occasionally are, as a rule, smarter men than those who never touch liquor. I know there are some men, also, who have a good many marks on their defaulter's sheet, and they are to-day occupying high positions in the service. In my opinion, if a man makes the mistake of taking too much liquor, or commits some other offence that is not altogether intentional, he should be given an opportunity of recovering his position; but if after having had his opportunity he still persists in doing those things, he should be dispensed with.

32. If we were to dismiss all the men who have been under the influence of liquor we would have a difficulty in obtaining candidates to fill their places?—Well, I have known some of the best men in the service who have had a little too much liquor more than once. It is the man who is constantly nipping who should not be in the Force at all.

33. As regards the alleged unrest in the public mind in respect to the Police Department, is that not caused by a few malcontents circulating rumours, writing to the Press, and perhaps by the Commissions continually arising?—I think a great deal of whatever discontent there is at present has been given rise to by a few malcontents in Wellington and Dunedin. I have no doubt at all that the members of Parliament who have made statements in reference to the Police Force received their information from members of the Force who have had access to some of the records.

34. One member went so far as to say he received that information from a man who had been dismissed from the service?—That might be so.

THOMAS OLIVER, Sergeant and District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 121.)

*Witness:* I am district clerk in the office at Greymouth, and have been in that position since April, 1900. I did not apply for the position, but was sent here. I was in Wellington in charge of a station for a time, and Inspector Pender sent for me, and asked if I would come here. I was promoted to be sergeant in 1906. I was employed as second clerk in Wellington before I came here.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have a good knowledge of your duties?—I had six years' street and wharf experience in Wellington.

2. You do the whole of the work of the office in this district yourself?—Yes.

3. Can you do it with ease?—I have quite sufficient to keep me going.

4. When you acted as second clerk in Wellington, had you an assistant under you?—No; I was the only assistant clerk there at the time, but that is a good while ago now, and I believe the staff has been increased.

5. How long would it take a fairly educated constable to become pretty proficient in the work of the office?—Anybody could do the work of assistant clerk in Wellington; but before he would be of much use he would require from six to twelve months' experience.

6. Have you any general opinion to offer with regard to the administration of the Force generally?—I do not think so.

7. You are satisfied with your position?—Yes, I have no complaints to make.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 122.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Greymouth, where I have been for six years. I entered the Force in 1879 as constable, and eighteen months later was transferred to the detective branch. In 1884 I was promoted detective, and served in Wellington under Inspectors James, Shearman, Thomson, and Pender. I was promoted Chief Detective in 1899, and transferred to Dunedin in place of Chief Detective O'Brien, promoted. My family not being strong, I applied for transfer to a northern town. Commissioner Tunbridge said I could exchange with another Chief Detective if I could arrange with any of the others to do so. In lieu of that he offered me Timaru, but I pointed out that, having been Chief Detective for twelve years, I would be looked upon as being disgraced if I took Timaru. He said I could still retain the rank. I refused to go to Timaru. When leaving the service Mr. Tunbridge wired offering me Greymouth, with the same seniority as when I joined as Chief Detective. I accepted that, and have been here ever since. Shortly after my arrival here I discovered that Chief Detectives were made a separate class, and got 1s. a

day rise in salary. I reported on the matter to the present Commissioner, pointing out that I was entitled to it, and received a courteous answer saying he regretted he could not grant it. Since then the Chief Detectives have got another 1s., and they get 2s. a day more than I do. Two of the present Chief Detectives have only half my service, and served under me. I have thirty years' service. I am not finding fault with those men getting promotion, but I think I should have got promotion at the same time. I am only allowed 10s. 6d. for house-rent, and the Chief Detectives are allowed 14s. I refer to any Inspector I have served under as to my ability or work, and the records will show that I have done more work as detective than any detective in the service at the present time. I may say that since I came to Greymouth I am drawing 6d. a day more than when I was Chief Detective, but there has been a general rise all round. I pay £1 a week rent.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know Chief Detectives are promoted now by merit, and not seniority?—Yes.

2. When you were made Chief Detective you were promoted by seniority simply?—By seniority and merit as well.

3. You did not assume that you were to be transferred here as Chief Detective?—I did not, but had I known my transfer here would be a bar to further promotion I should not have come here.

4. It is not said to have been a bar—not that alone?—It has been in this way: that six other men have been promoted over my head with better pay. Mr. McGrath served under me; I do not say he is not entitled to all the promotion he has got.

*The Commissioner:* Were there departmental reasons, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* Oh, yes, undoubtedly.

*Witness:* As regards my conduct, I have a clean record. If there has been any report against my character it has never been brought under my notice.

*Mr. Dinnie:* There is not a word against your character.

*Witness:* Or my ability.

*The Commissioner:* That must be a matter of departmental judgment.

*Witness:* In regard to the work I have done, I can refer to the officers I have served under as to whether I gave satisfaction.

5. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think you ought to be appointed Chief Detective, and sent to a centre?—It is a matter of indifference to me where I am placed. I would be quite willing to go back to a centre.

6. Do you want to know why you were not offered the opportunity?—Yes, certainly.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Not only do I not consider him qualified, but my predecessor held the same opinion.

*Witness:* Well, he did not say so. My record speaks for itself. I think I have not been justly dealt with.

REEFTON, WEDNESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1909.

JAMES BLACK, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 123.)

*Witness:* I am sergeant of police, stationed at Reefton. I was enrolled in 1890, and promoted to be sergeant in 1906. I have been in Reefton since 1st March last. Previously I was in Invercargill for about two years and seven months, doing street duty. I have no complaints to make.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you noticed any falling-off in the physique or mental capacity of the men in recent years?—I cannot say I have. I have read all the evidence that has been given before the Commission down south.

2. Do men ever speak to you about joining the police?—Well, I have heard men say that they would not take on the job at the present pay the constables are getting.

3. You think the young men are not coming forward as they used to?—I do not think they are. A man can get work at 10s. a day elsewhere.

4. You get free quarters?—Yes. There is one thing I cannot understand, and that is why a detective gets 15s. a day as pay, while a sergeant who is responsible for the district, and who has his nose kept to the grindstone, receives only 12s. a day. I have given the maximum amounts, and that does not include Chief Detectives. I think 7s. 6d. a day is too low a rate for a constable to start at at the present time.

5. Have you good men in your district?—Yes; I have not the slightest trouble with them.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have been in Auckland, Invercargill, Marton, and here: do you know of any general dissatisfaction amongst the men in respect of the control of the Force?—I have never heard of any.

7. You know, of course, that men are dismissed from year to year for misconduct, and so on?—Yes; one was dismissed at my instigation in Invercargill.

8. Have you heard anything of the rumour that Inspector O'Brien mentioned as to my having a "special" man at each station?—I never heard of such a thing before I read his evidence. I only laughed at it when I read it. I have heard of a good deal, but I never heard of that.

9. You have not noticed any falling-off in the physique of the men?—I have been reading up the evidence about the physique of the men, but I consider you do not merely want size in the Force. If you get a man with a little tact and brains, he is probably worth three men of 6 ft. 6 in. or 6 ft. 4 in. I could name some of the best men in the service, so far as police work goes, who are only 5 ft. 7 in.

THOMAS KEENAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 124.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Westport. I was enrolled in Auckland on the 11th February, 1897. I have been at Westport for nearly two years. I have been a strong healthy man all my life, and the only time I had medical attendance up to the time of the occurrence which I am bringing before the Commission was when I had a touch of rheumatics in Christchurch.

1. *The Commissioner.*] I understand you had to deal with Conolly, who is now undergoing sentence for manslaughter?—Yes.

2. How long were you in charge of him?—On the 31st May, 1907, two men named Halinan and Andersen were committed for trial for the wilful murder of John Burke, of Westport. Conolly was the principal witness in the case. He was bound over to appear at the Supreme Court against Andersen. During the time the proceedings in the lower Court were going on he was under the supervision of Sergeant Cullen in the sergeant's own house. In consequence of some remarks made by Mr. Rawson, S.M., in committing the two men for trial, Conolly was turned out of Sergeant Cullen's house. Inspector Black said that Conolly would have to be looked after, and, although I objected, I was ordered to look after him in a room in the police-station, and beds were put in the room for Conolly and myself. As I knew the Inspector very well, I did not make much demur. I had instructions to walk out with Conolly for two hours every afternoon and forenoon, but those instructions were not given in writing. I carried out the instructions to the best of my ability. The witness was very troublesome all the time, and was a source of great annoyance to me. So bad was he that one morning I struck him and knocked him down. He endeavoured to strike me with a shovel, and a constable came to my assistance. Well, I took him to Nelson, and he gave evidence there at the trial. After that trial I arrested him on a charge of perjury on a private information, and took him back to Westport. While at Nelson Dr. Simpson, jun., pointed out to me that my hair was coming out, and that I had alopecia areata. As I knew that Dr. Conlon had been successful in treating complaints of that nature I consulted him, and after a course of treatment at his hands I was ultimately cured.

3. Are you absolutely cured now?—With the exception of two or three spots. When I was at my worst there were bald patches all over my head.

4. What did this treatment cost you?—I should think, roughly speaking, about £20.

5. I understand that what you ask is that the Department should take into consideration the actual loss incurred by you in connection with the treatment for the trouble which you consider is traceable directly to the execution of the particular duty of which you have spoken?—Yes.

6. Do you say your illness was caused by anxiety when looking after this man Conolly?—Yes, I consider that has been the cause of it. I knew the man had been brought up at a reformatory, and that he was a convicted thief, also that he was a dangerous man.

7. You are not a very young constable. I presume you have had considerable experience?—Yes; but the night the murder was committed, this man had a knife on him, and I had my strong suspicions that he had used it. I thought twenty-four hours in each day was too long for me to be with him.

8. Why did you not speak to your Inspector about it?—I was told by the Inspector to look after the man, and to produce him at the trial, and I did not think the results would be so serious to me as they have been.

9. Did you feel that you were losing in health all the time?—I felt a giddiness in the head.

10. Did you sleep at night?—I had some sleep, but I kept the gas burning all night. I was afraid he might use a knife on me.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you so engaged?—Five weeks.

12. You say you were afraid he might use a knife. Was there a knife in the room?—I had two sometimes in my pocket, but I used to take them out and put them under my pillow at night.

13. How long after this was it that your hair began to come out?—It began during that time.

14. How often have you been on the sick list before?—Sixteen days in twelve years.

15. You never suffered in this way before?—Never.

16. *Inspector Black.*] I suppose you will admit it was necessary that the witness Conolly should be carefully guarded?—Yes.

17. You were the only single constable at the station?—Yes.

18. While you were looking after Conolly, had you any other duty to perform?—No, that was all I had to do.

19. Did you think it was a very hard job for a man like you?—He was not a pleasant companion. I would much rather have been doing street duty.

20. You say that on one occasion you knocked Conolly down. Why did you not report that, so that I might have known of it?—Well, I did not report it. I do not know why. He said he would report me himself. I was sitting by the fire at the time with my boots off, and he made some remarks about the smell of my socks, and I just gave him a knock on the side of the head. I did him no harm. But he had worried the life out of me before that.

21. Did you ever, during the five weeks you had charge of Conolly, complain of having too much to do, or of being worried?—I told the sergeant, and the sergeant said if he did not conduct himself better he would have him taken to Ross or Hokitika. He made himself as great a nuisance to me as he could. He would scratch on the walls, and he would burn every police document he could get his hand on.

WILLIAM ALOYSIUS CONLON, Medical Practitioner, examined on oath. (No. 125.)

*Witness:* I am a duly qualified registered medical practitioner, practising in Reefton.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Did you know Keenan before he consulted you for this trouble?—Yes, I knew him, but I had never seen him as a patient.

2. When did he first consult you?—In October, 1908.

3. What did you find?—He was suffering from a disease of the scalp called alopecia areata. As you will have noticed, Keenan is a man of extremely nervous temperament, and at that time he was suffering more markedly than he is at present from nervous disorder.

4. Is this scalp trouble traceable to nervous causes?—Yes, it is purely of nervous origin. Of course, there are numbers of neurotic people who do not get this trouble, but people who go through what seems to them cruel or hard experiences sometimes do. His condition now is far better than it was. He is quite fit for duty now. I came to-night at Keenan's request to say, apart from other treatment, I ordered him plenty of nourishing diet, which must have cost him something.

5. Has he paid you your fees?—Yes.

6. *Constable Keenan.*] You have heard about this man Conolly. Do you think it would be good for me to have to sleep in the same room with him for nineteen nights?—I think it would be better to sleep in a separate apartment, if that were allowed by the Police Regulations. Of course, it would be horrible to sleep with a man you knew to be a criminal, and to have him with you at all times.

WESTPORT, THURSDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1909.

LEONARD JOHN COCKERY, ex-Constable, examined on oath. (No. 126.)

*Witness:* I am licensee of the Royal Hotel, Westport. I was at one time in the Force. I joined in 1898, and resigned in 1907. I desire to make a few remarks in regard to a thing I consider causes dissatisfaction in the Police Force. A man on retiring under ten years' service is at present not entitled to a refund of any contribution from the Provident Fund. I was paying into the fund for some time. If a man is dismissed he gets a refund of his contributions, and if he resigns he gets none. If I had made a blackguard of myself in any way and had been dismissed I should have had a refund, but on resigning with a good character I got no refund, because I had not been ten years in the Force. It has been asked why men do not apply for enrolment in the Force. I think the reason is this: a man must be intelligent, and be fit to pass a Fifth Standard examination, and you offer him 7s. 6d. a day, deducting 6d. for the Provident Fund; while a man with physical energy can earn on the wharf from 11s. to 14s. a day, and he has not to live in a respectable part of the city, nor wear a good suit of clothes. I think the house-allowance for a constable should be the same as that of a sergeant; I fail to see why there should be any difference. Then, constables' travelling-allowance is not sufficient. A constable has to travel with his Inspector sometimes, as I have done, and to put up at the same hotel, and while the Inspector draws 12s. 6d. the constable only gets 6s. travelling-allowance, which is not fair, especially on the West Coast. A night-duty coat should be served to every man in New Zealand, and specially on country stations, where on many a night the constable is called out on duty where he never would be on other stations. When on leave the men should be supplied with a free railway-pass, as is done on other public bodies. I should like to say, in reference to letters that have appeared in the Press in connection with the Conolly case, that the constables on the West Coast are as good a body of men as in any part of the Dominion. In regard to myself, I have the biggest reward ever given to a constable in the Dominion. I left the Force because Mr. Dinnie did not treat me as he should have done. Mr. Tunbridge, when leaving the colony, told me if I would open the Blackball Station he would leave me there two years, and told me he would leave a letter for his successor. When I interviewed Mr. Dinnie in Wellington I applied for Marton, as I wished to leave the West Coast, for the sake of my wife's and children's health. He told me it was filled. I said I heard Seddonville was vacant, and he said, "You can go to Seddonville, or stay where you are."

1. *The Commissioner.*] You asked for Seddonville?—Yes, in the presence of Mr. Wright. Mr. Dinnie did not fill Marton for a month after I asked for it. There is no getting away from the fact that I had the biggest reward ever given to a constable—6d. a day, twelve months' seniority, and being asked to open a station.

2. You declined to accept Seddonville?—I did not. The conditions of life at Blackball when I went there were such that the pay was inadequate. I have been there for a week, and never had a letter or a paper, through floods in the river. I was promised a shift after two years, which was never granted.

3. How long after did you leave the Force?—I took Seddonville, and sixteen months later resigned.

4. What was the primary cause of your resigning?—I recognised I had not been fairly treated.

5. Up to that time did you intend to remain?—I did.

6. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You seem to have a grievance against me for not letting you have Marton?—Yes; you told me an absolute untruth—that you had filled Marton, and a month later it was filled.

7. How do you know arrangements had not been made when you applied?—I know it from some of your own officers.

8. The papers will show?—Oh, no; it was altogether wrong; I had it from your head officers. It was not filled; I know it from a letter from Constable Black, whom you appointed three weeks after I spoke to you.

9. Where was Black transferred from?—I could not tell you.

10. A transfer from here to Marton would be very expensive, would it not?—Nonsense; no such thing.

11. You say Mr. Tunbridge left a letter about you: will you believe me when I say he never left a letter about any one in the service?—I would not believe it. I never knew him to break his word.

12. Would you believe me if I state it on oath?—Yes, I would take your oath.

13. Well, I say now that I did not receive any letter from him?—My merit sheet shows what my record has been. There is another thing. Every man on resigning from the Force has an absolute right to ask for a copy of his merit sheet to be attached to his discharge. This is refused under the present system.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ever applied for yours?—It is no use applying.

*Mr. Dinnie:* We have never been asked for such records: they are kept for the information of the head of the Department.

*Witness:* They are testimonials of character, and I want to know whether there is any departmental reason why a man should not get it.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I do not think so; it is not the practice; I do not know any substantial reason for refusing it.

15. *The Commissioner.*] Can you give me any reason why it should be refused? You have assumed that it would be?—I know others have asked, and have been refused.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Well, you apply to me, and see if it will be refused. As regards the Provident Fund, that matter is under consideration at the present time, and I believe an alteration will be made next session; and the regulations in regard to travelling-allowance will be altered.

JAMES STEVENSON REID, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 127.)

*Witness:* I am stationed at Seddonville. I entered the Force in 1900, and was given charge of a station two years ago. I appear as delegate on behalf of the police in this district. The constables consider the pay is inadequate; they think they should receive 8s. on joining, with increments of 6d. every two years up to 10s. House-allowance is inadequate for constables, who should be on the same footing as sergeants. I have paid as high as £1 1s. in Wellington. Uniform should be issued free, with an extra pair of trousers every twelve months. The average cost of making up at present is from £2 5s. to £2 10s. Two pairs of boots should be provided annually. Rain-proof coats should be provided once a year; at present they are issued every two years. The men on country stations should get night-duty coats. A greatcoat should be provided every three years. The 6s. travelling-allowance is inadequate, and free passes on the train should be provided for men on leave, as men on leave are liable to be called on for duty. The men think, after serving two years on the Coast, they should be transferred to a more favourable climate; the cost of living being also higher here than any other part of the Dominion. We consider a Board of Appeal should be established to deal with grievances, or that appeal should be granted from the decision of the Commissioner to a Stipendiary Magistrate. We think that rewards are not fairly distributed.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Can you give an instance?—Yes; in regard to a sly-grog case at the Thames, myself and Constable Butler were told off to make a raid, which was successful, and the man was fined £50. We were travelling four or five days in the bush getting the liquor out. Butler and I got £2 each, while the sergeant who gave us the information got £4 or £5.

2. The man who did next to nothing got double?—Yes. In regard to promotions, the men here consider they have not given satisfaction, in many instances men having been promoted over the heads of their seniors, though both had the same ability. The men also consider that the men in the Commissioner's office should rank as Civil servants, and not as members of the Force.

3. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Why do you come to that conclusion?—There seems to be so much dissatisfaction about their being promoted over the heads of the others; they seem to get their opportunity before the man on the street.

4. *The Commissioner.*] You think they have the ear of the authorities?—Yes.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know the men are selected from the whole Force because of their qualifications?—Yes. I refer to the case of Muggeridge, who joined in 1906, and was promoted in 1909 to sergeant.

6. You admit that the clerks in the office are specially selected?—Yes.

7. Are you of opinion that men ought to be advanced by merit?—They should be promoted in their turn.

8. Do you think a man should be promoted by merit or seniority?—Both. We think men are getting promoted at present who should not. I think only about three men have been promoted who have passed the examination.

9. The circular does not say they must pass the examination?—No; it is not compulsory.

10. It is simply with a view of getting the men to study the law pertaining to their duties?—Yes; but those who pass ought to be given consideration.

11. So they are?—I do not see it lately.

12. Do you not think men ought to be promoted according to merit?—Yes, and seniority.

13. Do you know the qualifications of the last junior man promoted?—I do not see why Cummings should have the right to promotion.

14. But referring to ordinary promotions to street duty, leaving out special cases?—I consider the men on street duty have every right to be promoted before the men in the office, as they have greater experience and a better knowledge of street duty.

15. Did you not say the complaint is that junior men are promoted over their seniors as regards street duty?—No; I am alluding to the whole lot.

16. You think the men in the office are promoted before their time?—They should not be.

17. You do not know anything about the qualifications of those who have been promoted?—No; but I have never seen their names as having passed the examination.

18. Do you know the best men are selected for the office?—Probably.
19. Should not their special qualifications entitle them to promotion before others?—Not if they have not passed the examination.
20. But they are capable of passing any time?—Then, they ought to be made to pass it.
21. In regard to the sly-grog case in which you say you did not get a sufficient reward, how many persons were prosecuted?—Two.
22. Do you know that £5 is the highest amount of reward that can be made in each case?—I consider it should be equally divided.
23. You admit the sergeant got the information?—I think so.
24. It appears to me that the amount was equally divided. The sergeant got £5 and you got £2 10s. each?—I am not sure.
25. You think night-duty coats should be given to those at out-stations: have they ever been applied for?—I could not say. Personally I have not applied.
26. Do you not think the proper thing would have been to make application to your superior officers?—Probably it might.
27. Do you not think, if any of the men are aggrieved as regards promotions or anything else, their proper course would be to make representations to me?—I do not think the men should meet together for the purpose of making representations.
28. Could you not do it yourself?—We should be pulled up for breach of discipline. Personally, I have no grievance. I have always been treated very fairly.
29. You know that the regulations do not require that the men must keep their grievances to themselves?—Yes, the regulations tell them what to do.

SAMUEL JOSEPH DEW, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 128.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Westport. I joined the Force in June, 1883, and was promoted to be sergeant in February, 1903. I have under me three constables in town for street duty and one gaoler; and there are five constables in outside parts of the sub-district. When there are no prisoners in the gaol the gaoler does reserve duty in the watch-house.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are his duties light?—Yes.
2. Have you anything to say as regards the physique and intellectual capacity of the men in your sub-district?—In that respect the men here are equal, I think, to any in the Dominion. I have no complaint to make with regard to that.
3. You know that there is a difficulty now in getting suitable recruits for the service?—Yes, and I think the reason for it is that as regards pay a man can do better in private life. That applies more especially on the West Coast. If the pay were increased it would, I think, tend to induce a better class of men to come forward.
4. Have you any views with regard to promotion?—I am under the impression that there is a certain amount of political influence, and I think there has been a certain amount of undue favouritism in regard to certain promotions to the rank of sergeant. I have known of junior men being promoted over the heads of their seniors.
5. Have you known the men?—I have known some men who have had fifty or sixty passed over them. I have not been able to account for those promotions.
6. With regard to admission of men to the Force, are you in favour of a period of probation before a man is finally enrolled?—Yes. I think before a man is passed on to the street duty he should go under a strict course of discipline of, say, six months.
7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think that if candidates knew they had to undergo a six-months probation and training they would be so anxious to join the Force?—Well, I have been in the Imperial service, where the men have to undergo from twelve to eighteen months' strict military training, and they get plenty of recruits there.
8. But you do not compare the Police Department with the military?—No; but I do not think men, as a rule, would hesitate to join the police if they knew they had to undergo proper training.
9. *The Commissioner.*] You think the advantages of probation would more than counter-balance the drawbacks?—Yes, I think so.
10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] With regard to promotions, suppose you had in the service a man of about forty-five years of age, of fifteen or twenty years' service, and who was fit to be an ordinary sergeant, and suppose you had another man of, say, fourteen years' service who was more efficient and capable, which would you promote?—I should go over the list carefully, and see if there was any man among the senior men who was capable of filling the position, and, if not, I should promote the junior man. I should be careful that no capable man was passed over, as has been done in some instances.
11. Do you believe in the present system, under which the Inspectors send in a list of names of men recommended for promotion each year?—I think in some instances that might be objectionable, because Inspectors are bound to have favourites. I think the Inspectors should make recommendations, but I should not rely entirely on their recommendations.
12. But they are in a better position to know the qualifications of the men than I am?—I think it would be more satisfactory to the Force if there was a Board set up to make the promotions.
13. What knowledge would a Board have of the men?—They would have in front of them a list of the men, and the remarks of the Inspector, and they could find out the qualifications of the men.
14. They would not have practical knowledge of the men?—They would have the knowledge of the Inspector.
15. Then, you come back to the Inspector again?—Well, there is a feeling on the part of some of the men that favouritism is shown.

16. *The Commissioner.*] Then, I understand it is not the system you are attacking, because you have not given us a sufficient reason for altering the system. Have you been passed over?—No.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction existing beyond that?—I have heard it stated over and over again that before a man can get along he must have some political "pull."

18. The Commission has been trying to find a case where such influence has been successfully brought to bear?—I do not think, by the time the Commission finishes up in Auckland, they will have been able to find a single case, and I do not suppose the men who have been pushed along could tell the Commission how they got there.

19. The files will show pretty well how the men came to be promoted?—Well, I know of one instance in which it would take a lot to satisfy me there has not been some influence used. I refer to the appointment of Sergeant Dart as instructor at the training depot.

20. Do you know his qualifications?—In my opinion, if he was the only man in the Force capable of filling the position there was not a sergeant in the Force who was fit to carry the stripes of a sergeant.

21. What I said was that he was the most fitted to fill the position. Do you not think he was specially qualified, seeing that he had passed the solicitor's examination?—I do not see why a constable requires such a tremendous knowledge of the law for police duty. I consider that any member of the Force carrying the stripes of a sergeant is fit to teach recruits their duties.

22. I think his Inspector recommended him strongly for the position. Do you know his qualifications?—Yes, I was in Auckland at the time. I look upon the position as a sort of training-ground for a Sub-Inspectorship, as the last Sub-Inspector appointed was taken from that office.

23. Do you not think Sub-Inspector Gordon was qualified for promotion to that position?—Yes; I think he was thoroughly entitled to the position, but I am speaking of the principle. I should like to mention one other point. I think that a man having once entered the detective branch should stick to that branch, and should never go back again to the uniform branch. I have no objection to a detective getting promotion, even to the rank of Inspector, in his own branch; but if they are to compete with the men in the uniform branch, I am satisfied there is not much chance of getting past them for the position of Sub-Inspector. What chance has a station sergeant against a Chief Detective in a big centre for the position of Sub-Inspector?

*The Commissioner.* I should say he has a very good chance. I do not know of any Chief Detective who would be likely to get the position now.

*Witness.* Well, I do not know of any station sergeant in New Zealand who would be likely to get ahead of him.

*The Commissioner.* I do. That is where you and I differ. A good many of the best sergeants have admitted that, other things being equal, a Chief Detective is as much entitled to promotion as a sergeant.

*Witness.* I admit that; but I say, let him have promotion in his own branch.

NELSON, MONDAY, 9TH AUGUST, 1909.

JAMES CAMERON, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 129.)

*Witness.* I am stationed at Richmond, where I am in charge of the station. I was enrolled in the Force in 1888, being transferred from the Permanent Militia. I have been twelve years in charge of a station. I consider that after passing out of the training depot constables should receive not less than 8s., increasing by 6d. every three years till a maximum of 11s. is reached, at the end of eighteen years. A good many good men are leaving the Force now through the smallness of the pay, whereas if there was something to look forward to they would devote their whole time to it, instead of looking out for something else. Seven shillings is not enough for house-allowance. For eight years I paid rent before house-allowance was granted, and I found it very hard to make both ends meet. I think 10s. house-allowance would not be too much to allow, especially in the big towns. I think the Department should pay for the making-up of uniforms, and provide two pairs of boots a year; and the issue of uniforms should be on a more liberal scale, especially during the first year of service, so that a recruit should always have a good suit for day duty and an ordinary one for night. Saloon passages should be provided for the wives and families of constables on transfer. I have had to pay the difference out of my own pocket. Annual leave should be increased from twelve days to sixteen, and be allowed to accumulate for three years. Free railway-passes should be given to constables on leave. I think the Department pays too much attention to anonymous and other letters.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is the procedure in regard to them?—The letter is sent to the sergeant, who calls upon you for an explanation. This causes unnecessary annoyance.

2. You think no notice should be taken of them?—No. A letter has been sent to the Minister of Justice about me—signed by the writer—and the worst he could say about me was that I acted as instructor to a brass band, and also took part in operas. I have been put to considerable worry over it.

3. You would advocate that such a letter should be put in the waste-paper basket?—Not a letter with a name to it, as this one had; but a person can presume on acquaintance with a Minister or member of Parliament to annoy a public officer.

4. How are you going to stop that?—The proper course would be to write to the officer immediately superior who knows the local circumstances.

5. What would be the difference between writing to him and to the head of the Department?—If it was a frivolous complaint such as this, the sergeant would know how to deal with it.

6. Do you not think it is better for you to know about it?—Yes, I court full inquiry. But there is annoyance caused. Constables have certain duties to perform, and any communications from Headquarters have to be completely answered, and it takes time—more time than the matter deserves. In regard to promotion, I have served twenty-one years in the Force, and have a clean defaulter's sheet, and have also a fair record of merit. I have also passed the annual examination—in 1907. Three constables who passed at the same time are junior to me, and have been promoted to the rank of sergeant. Their names are Willis, Kelly, and Hardy.

7. Have you ever had an offer of promotion?—No.

8. Do you know whether you have been recommended by your Inspector?—I could not say. I made an application last year, and was informed that I was too old. I am fifty-seven years of age. I am physically fit for town duty. I have not tried it for a long time, but I would stand the test with any town sergeant.

9. You would not dispute the fact that age must be considered?—Certainly not, but I am not too old. The Commissioner told the men on parade that those who had passed the examination, and who were not promoted to the rank of sergeant, would be appointed to stations where they would be Clerks of Court and of Licensing Committees, &c. That was in 1907. I have been waiting till now, and I see others who have not passed the examination, and are much junior to me, being appointed to these positions. I cannot understand why I am overlooked. Some of those who have been appointed sergeants are nearly as old as I am. One constable appointed sergeant this year joined the service the same day as I did. There has been a lot of talk about political, sectarian, and Masonic influence, but I have not seen any during the last ten years. I know of it personally previous to that. I am a Mason—as high, if not higher, than any other man in the service—and I never saw or heard of Masonic influence being used. It has never been applied in my case. Regarding the discipline and efficiency of the Force, so far as I can see, the men joining now are as good as those of fifteen or twenty years ago.

10. Do you mean physically or intellectually?—Physically; and they are educationally superior. And morally they are equal. In my opinion, the reason there is such an outcry about the police is that the discipline is more exacting now than it was fifteen or twenty years ago, and the offences we commit now are taken more notice of than in those days. Ever since Mr. Tunbridge was appointed the conditions in the service have been very much improved. In regard to the clerical and uniform branches, it seems to give dissatisfaction that the men in the clerical staff should be promoted after ten years' service, whereas the men doing the practical work are not promoted for twenty years. A man brought up in the office, while being useful in that department, would be lost in doing the work in which we gain experience on the streets. Although I am in charge of a very quiet station at present, it is not my fault I am there, and I am quite prepared to do more active work if given me. I can refer to Magistrates, solicitors, and others to testify to my ability and experience as a constable. I had a brilliant record at Blenheim. I was formerly at Seddonville, which district is now manned by three constables.

11. When did you first apply for promotion?—Last year. I did not apply before passing the examination. This is my application: "I respectfully beg to apply for promotion to the rank of sergeant, and in support of my application respectfully beg to state that I have served nearly twenty years as a constable (the last ten years in charge of stations), during which time my conduct and ability has never been questioned. I have also nine years' service in the Armed Constabulary and Permanent Militia without a blemish, and I was also successful in passing the police examination held in January, 1907. I therefore respectfully submit this my application to Inspector Ellison, trusting that he will be pleased to recommend and forward it for the favourable consideration and approval of the Commissioner." Inspector Ellison minuted: "Constable Cameron has been in an out-station all the time I have known him. He is a quiet decent man, and has given satisfaction in the discharge of his duty. There is not much active police duty to do at the station where he is." Mr. Dinnie replied: "I have no doubt Constable Cameron carries out his duties in a very satisfactory manner as a constable, but in the interests of the Department I must have younger men to place over the constables in the city districts." I took it I was too old for promotion.

12. If it is a fact that recruits are not coming forward as satisfactorily as one might wish, to what would you attribute that?—To the small pay.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You were over fifty when I first took charge of the Department?—Yes.

14. And you were not recommended for promotion prior to that?—No, I never applied.

15. You know a return is called for every year, and the Inspector recommends those he thinks fit for promotion?—I believe so.

16. *The Commissioner.*] You recognise it is not necessary to apply in order to get promotion?—Yes.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think that anonymous letters should be put in the fire?—Yes.

18. Do you know that in some instances it is very important to inquire into them?—It may have been in some instances. In my instance it was a falsehood.

19. But in your instance it was signed?—The one I am referring to was an anonymous one; it was inquired into by the sergeant, and there was not an atom of truth in it.

20. Do you know the result of inquiry into anonymous communications has been very often to show that constables have not been performing their duties satisfactorily?—Perhaps so, but I am speaking from my own personal standpoint.

21. Have you ever applied for transfer?—No.

22. Are the clerical staff not selected from the uniform branch?—Yes.

23. And they have had some experience in it prior to their appointment to the clerical staff?—Yes; but they lose the benefit of it after going into the office.



24. Do you not think their clerical duties assist to fit them for promotion?—The two together.  
 25. Do you know what would be the cost of the increased pay and house-allowance, free clothing, &c.?—No; but it would make a more efficient Force.  
 26. You know of no influence obtaining?—No; I do not believe it does obtain.

JOHN WYBRANT ELLISON, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 130.)

1. *The Commissioner.*] How long was the witness under your jurisdiction?—Three or four years, since the district was transferred to my charge; he was previously under me in Westland for twelve months.

2. Have you ever recommended him for promotion?—No. I was called on during the last six years for a return of all men under fifty, and having over ten years' service, whom I could recommend. Cameron did not come under that category while under me.

3. If he had been recommended it would be by previous Inspectors?—Yes. The matter of the anonymous letter was not while he was under me.

JOHN TIMOTHY FOLEY, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 131.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Collingwood. Have been there eleven years and one month. Was enrolled in December, 1892. Previous to taking charge of the Collingwood Station I was for a couple of years at the Manners Street Station, Wellington.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general statement to make?—There has been a good deal of dissatisfaction in regard to promotions since the 1st April, 1906. There has been quite a number of men promoted to the rank of sergeant over their seniors.

2. How old are you?—Forty-five years. I do not know that I have caused the Department an hour's anxiety as to my duties since I joined the service. I have a clean defaulter's sheet.

3. Have you ever applied for promotion?—Yes; I applied in August, 1907. This is my application, dated from Collingwood, the 15th August, 1907: "I beg respectfully to apply for promotion to the rank of sergeant, which, I presume, would mean my transfer from this to some other district. I have now over 14½ years' service, having joined on the 28th December, 1892, and several junior men to me in the service, some of whom I have served with in Wellington, have since been promoted either to the rank of sergeant or detective. Besides being in charge of this large but sparsely populated district since the 1st July, 1898, I have for the first two years after my arrival here performed the duties of Clerk and Bailiff of the Magistrate's and Warden's Courts; Collingwood, Receiver of Gold Revenue, and Mining Registrar for Collingwood and Takaka Mining Districts; also Inspector of Factories and Awards for this district, which appointment I still hold. The other appointments I gave up in 1900, there being at that time a large increase of mining work on account of the dredging boom. For all the extra work and responsibility attached to these offices I have received the very moderate sum of £10 per annum, although permanent clerks who have since done the office-work have received good salaries. Still, my services were always available there when required, and I have always assisted successive clerks to the office in becoming acquainted with their duties, especially the work relating to mining, which takes a long time to learn. As I have five children, the eldest being twelve years and the youngest two years, I am particularly anxious to get stationed once more in some one of the larger centres of population—Wellington preferred—so that I might have an opportunity of sending them to my choice school.—JOHN FOLEY, Const. No. 640." That was addressed to Sergeant Dougan, Nelson. The minutes thereon are as follows: "Forwarded to the Inspector.—J. DOUGAN, Sergt., 16/8/07." "Submitted to the Commissioner.—Please see my report of June 16th on qualifications of constables for promotion. Constable Foley has always been steady and well conducted since I have known him, and anxious to do his work well. He has been a long time away from the active bustle of city duty. He would no doubt make a careful man as sergeant if he had some renewed practice in city duty. Probably a term in a busy suburban station would be an advantage if such an opportunity arose.—J. W. ELLISON, Inspector, 19/8/07." "Inspector Ellison.—Noted for consideration, with others, as vacancies occur.—W. DINNIE, Commr., 20/8/07." It was then sent for Sergeant Dougan and myself to note.

4. That recommendation of the Inspector's is only a qualified one, I notice. It is tantamount to saying that a man, after being at a country station, is unfit for promotion, though, of course, it would not apply in the case of many other men promoted. Since then you have received no offer of promotion?—No. I know it is a difficult matter for the Commissioner to satisfy everybody; but I consider the clerical staff should be kept distinct from the Police Force, and they should be paid as clerks, and not as policemen. With regard to pay, although I now receive 9s. 6d. a day, I submit it does not come up to the average pay of the ordinary working-man, in Collingwood, for instance. I consider constables should receive 8s. a day on joining, and that the pay should rise by regular increments to 11s. I do not think the Department will get a good staff of men otherwise.

5. You have perquisites in addition to your pay?—Yes; but it is very hard earned in an up-country station like Collingwood.

6. If you were offered promotion to-morrow, would you take it?—Yes; but I should like to have the question considered as to what my position would be in relation to those who may have been promoted over me contrary to regulations.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What regulations do you refer to?—Nos. 60 and 61, I think, relate to promotions.

8. *The Commissioner.*] If you will read the regulation you will see that seniority, although it is taken into consideration, is not the only ground of promotion?—That is so.

9. There is no getting away from the fact that if you were promoted to-morrow you would rank junior to those who had been previously promoted. Would you take promotion now if offered?—Yes, sir. I only want to say that I should like to compete by examination or otherwise with those who have been promoted over me.

10. That would mean upsetting the whole roll. If you should reach the rank of sergeant, there is nothing to prevent you or anybody else from promotion to the higher ranks according to merit.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Why have you not gone in for the examination before?—Other men who were promoted did not go in for it, and I did not think it was any use.

12. *The Commissioner.*] I suppose you know nothing as regards political influence?—I can say that in the past I have used it.

13. Successfully?—It was in regard to a matter long gone by. You will probably see it in my history if you look it up.

14. Do you know of anything in recent years?—No; but I should use it if I thought I could get any benefit by it in competing with others, because it is almost a moral certainty that it is used.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] But you do not think it is any good?—I do not think it has been any good to me.

JOHN DOUGAN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 132.)

*Witness.* I am sergeant, in charge of the Nelson sub-district, and have been here for seven years. Was enrolled on the 4th January, 1879, and was promoted to be sergeant on the 7th October, 1898.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you want to make any general statement before I put some questions to you?—I think, speaking broadly, the people, through the Government, are at fault to a great extent, and there are many things that require adjusting. The people want for the Force men mentally, physically, and morally almost without blemish, and they want them at a shoddy price. The pay of a constable is not sufficient to encourage the better class of men to come forward. I consider no constable for active street duty should be under the age of twenty-six years, and I think he should be able to pass the Sixth Standard. No appointment should be made until the Department is satisfied as to the high moral character of the candidate. This is of the utmost importance, owing to the great temptations to which young constables are exposed, and having regard to the protection of the public, more especially of women and young girls; and I consider the pay of the constable should be equivalent with the importance of the duty he has to perform. I think promotion should be placed on a proper system, so that every constable would feel assured that if his conduct and long service merits advancement, he will not be passed over by others less deserving. I think the office of constable should be rendered so important and of such value to the State that every member of the Force would be looked up to by the public, and appealed to with confidence in any emergency. It is time, I think, that the people awoke to the fact that the policeman of to-day is not the old watchman of years gone by. As to the training of the men, although I do not altogether approve of religious instruction, I think the candidates for the Force should be thoroughly grounded in a strict code of moral rules which they would not be likely to forget. Early training of that description will stand by a man when all else fails, and I know from experience the temptations a young constable is subject to. If a constable has no such training he is more likely to be a menace to the community than a protection and a care. I should like the people to feel when they lie down at night, "It is all right; Constable Brown is on the beat"; and I hope to see that yet before I die. Personally, I have no grievance of any kind. I have had rows, but they have been fought out fairly and squarely, and are done with. Speaking of promotion, there is one thing some of the men feel they have a grievance about, and that is the promotion of Sub-Inspector Dwyer over Sub-Inspector Green to the position of Inspector.

2. Do you know the two men?—Yes; I know them both personally.

3. Have you compared the qualifications of the two men?—I leave that to the Commissioner.

4. I happen to know the two men very well indeed, and if you cannot get a better case than that, I should doubt the soundness of the men's contentions as to promotion?—The Commissioner may have had real good grounds for the promotion, and I have no doubt he had.

5. The grounds would be the respective merits of the two men?—Yes, I suppose so.

6. If the Commissioner has never done any worse than that in connection with promotions, he has done very well?—I am glad to hear it, sir; and I leave it at that.

7. You have advocated that promotions should be carried out on a system: is it not impossible to have any fixed system?—It is impossible, but there are other things in the regulations which are impossible.

8. Theoretically no one can be in a better position than the Commissioner of Police to know the proper men to be promoted, and necessarily the personal question must enter into the promotions?—Then, it behoves the Government to get the best brains the country can produce for the office of Commissioner of Police. I think, in making promotions from constable to sergeant, for instance, the character of the men should be fully probed into, and the record of his service should be looked into, to see whether he has been reported for anything. The main thing is to ascertain whether a man is truthful or not. If a constable is not truthful he is not fit for promotion.

9. You know there are men in the higher ranks of the Force whose defaulters' sheets they certainly would not like to have published?—I am well aware of it.

10. Probably many of them have outgrown their faults, but the contention is that those men have justified their selection, although they have had records in certain directions. If you find a man has been living down something to his discredit it says something for him?—It shows that reformation must have taken place.

11. I know one or two instances in which a man has justified his promotion, although probably I would not have recommended him?—Just so. But you must depend on the superior officers to pick out whom they consider the best men. The sergeant is the backbone of the service, and I consider a sergeant in a city does not want to be more than from thirty to fifty years old.

12. That is a very wide margin. You were advocating just now men only being admitted to the Force at twenty-six?—Yes; if a man does his duty in a city it is a short-lived one. Very few people have the remotest idea of the duty of a constable and a sergeant who takes charge of twelve or fourteen young men, and has to record two or three visits every night. I have gone home so tired that I could not sit down. The duty is most laborious, and you want active young men, who are not afraid of work.

13. What is the maximum age you would appoint a man sergeant?—Not over fifty.

14. It is a good thing to have all your sergeants in a city for a time?—Yes; I do not think a man in charge of a station is fit for promotion till he gets a brushing up in a city again. A man goes half asleep in a country place. Personally speaking, I have very good men in my district. In reference to travelling-expenses, I cannot travel on 6s. a day. I think, also, sergeants and detectives should get saloon passages on steamers. It belittles an officer in charge of a district to travel steerage. I could not do it, for the sake of the Force. I do not mean, of course, when travelling with a prisoner, but when on transfer.

15. You pay the difference yourself?—Yes. In regard to the detectives, I consider they should be promoted within their own branch. I would suggest Detective Inspectors, and so on.

16. What would their duty be?—To inspect the detective force throughout the Dominion.

17. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you think the detective force is strong enough at present for the appointment of an Inspector?—I could not say.

18. Do you know anything about inquiries made in respect of candidates coming forward for enrolment?—I know whenever they come to me the inquiries are carefully made.

19. Are the inquiries more careful than heretofore?—No.

20. *The Commissioner.*] Do you do it yourself?—As a rule.

21. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that prior to my coming here inquiries only went five years back?—No.

22. *The Commissioner.*] Are you ever asked by young men in your district in regard to entrance into the Force?—No; with the exception of one young man.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that young men joining the service are subjected to more temptation than if appointed to any other Government or private employment?—There are none who undergo such crucial test as young constables.

24. It is the young men you mostly have trouble with?—Yes; as a rule they come into the Force without a real grasp of the responsibilities.

25. You do not anticipate getting an immaculate Police Force?—I do not anticipate anything.

26. In regard to the system of promotion, it resolves itself into the fact of promoting men by seniority and merit combined?—All things being equal, seniority should get one point at least, but I believe in men competing for a position, and I do not believe any Inspector or Sub-Inspector should be put into the position without qualifying for it.

27. Is not an Inspector in the best position to know the qualifications of his men?—He ought to be, but in many cases he does not.

28. Is a sergeant in a better position to know?—There is no man in a better position, being in touch with the men.

29. The Inspector sometimes consults his sergeant?—Very often.

30. Then, if so, the Inspector is the man to make the recommendation?—Yes; he ought to be in the best position to do so.

31. It has been stated in Dunedin that I have a "special" man attached to each district to get information for me: have you heard anything about that?—I have through the newspaper. I do not believe it.

32. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know anything about the exercise of political influence in connection with the Force?—I never knew of it. I would consider a man who listens to the constable worse than the constable himself. I have heard men grumbling who ought to be very pleased that they are in the Force at all.

33. Have you any opinion on the question of helmets and shakos?—The white helmet may be the most suitable in the north, but the shako is most suitable in the south.

34. What men have you in your district?—Seven in the city. The district is fairly large: I do not go round it at stated times, only when I am required; it is left to myself to go when necessary. Lately the Inspector has been making periodical visits, so that it is unnecessary for me to go.

35. Would you be in favour of a period of probation before enrolment in the Force?—Yes; I would make it twelve months.

36. Do you not think you could find out all about a man in six months?—Perhaps, but a man wants a good purging to go into the Force.

37. An opinion has been expressed that no man should be admitted till he has been in the Dominion for a time?—That is altogether nonsense. I would rely on a man from the rural districts in England before any colonial.

38. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you not think the standard of education is rather high? Do you not think if it was the Fourth we should get many respectable men from the farming class?—Yes; they are the best class, as a rule. My opinion is that, taking the Force as a whole, they will compare favourably with any other seven or eight hundred men in New Zealand.

PICTON, TUESDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1909.

GEORGE ALBERT WILLIAMS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 133.)

*Witness:* I am a constable of police, in charge of the Seddon Station. I entered the Force in 1889. Have been in charge of stations about eleven years.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general statement to make?—Prior to joining the police I had about eight years' service in the Armed Constabulary. Before 1887 those men who came from the Armed Constabulary to the Police Force had their service in the Armed Constabulary counted for superannuation. I joined the police, as I have said, in 1889, and am not therefore entitled to have my back service counted. I come before the Commission now to know if there is any possibility of my getting my back service taken into consideration, as it would be an advantage to me when I retire. I understand there are others in the Force who are in the same position as I in this respect.

2. The whole matter is under consideration. It will have to be dealt with by statute, as you know. I understand from the Commissioner of Police that arrangements are being made to ascertain the views of the Force generally as to superannuation matters with a view to, if possible, providing for such anomalies as you have referred to. I may say this does not come strictly within the scope of the Commission, but it is open, of course, for me to make a recommendation to the Minister. Is there any other matter you wish to mention?—I think, looking to the present cost of living, there might be a rise in pay throughout the Force. I am now receiving 9s. 6d. a day, but out of that I have to contribute 9d. a day, which is a big item. I and other constables in the district think concessions should be given to us when travelling on leave by railway. Other Civil servants seem to have railway concessions when on leave.

3. What other Civil servants? I only know of the Railway people?—Yes, the Railway servants. A policeman is always a policeman, and when travelling on a holiday he is supposed to attend to any duty that may present itself, just as if he were on regular duty.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You receive 9s. 6d. a day. What about house-rent?—I am paying no house-rent.

5. That means something to you, does it not?—I suppose it does.

6. Do you hold any appointments?—I am Inspector of Factories, but I get nothing for that except bare expenses; and there is a lot of work in that.

WILLIAM THOMAS MASON, Sergeant-major, examined on oath. (No. 134.)

*Witness:* I am the only sergeant-major now left in the Force. I joined the Force on the 28th October, 1868. I was transferred to the Armed Constabulary, where I have been sergeant for years. I became sergeant-major of police on the 15th December, 1884.

1. *The Commissioner.*] When will your retirement take place?—In about ten months.

2. You retire on superannuation according to your status?—Yes.

3. How many constables have you in your sub-district?—Eight. There are four in Blenheim, and the rest are in charge of stations. Two of them are in Picton, one acting as gaoler as well.

4. Are the men up to the standard you used to see in the Force?—There has been no falling-off so far as I can see. The men here are a fine clever lot. Both as regards physique and intelligence, they are all that could be desired.

5. What is your rate of pay?—12s. 6d. a day.

6. Have you any general remarks to make?—I indorse the evidence of the last witness—that the pay of a constable should be up to the standard of the ordinary labourer. The investigations and inquiries that are made before a candidate is enrolled into the Force are such as very few services in the world require. He has to pass the Fifth Standard of education, and he must be of fine physique. I think a constable on joining the Force should be paid 8s. a day. Apart from the question of pay, I think the position of the men in the Force is very good. I have nothing to grumble at at all, and I do not think they should.

7. With regard to the gaoler here, is he exempt from police duty when he has prisoners to look after?—Yes. There is rarely a week when he has not a prisoner. He has only prisoners who are in for a period not exceeding thirty days.

8. What do they do in the gaol?—They potter about the gaol premises. It is more to save the expense of sending them to Wellington.

9. You are satisfied with your position?—Yes. Speaking candidly, I rather deprecate constables coming before the Commission to ventilate their grievances. It seems to be subversive of discipline. If they have any grievances, they ought to go through the proper channel.

10. Any inquiries that are made are with a view to seeing if there are any weak spots in the system of promotion, and so on. The Commission is not to inquire into individual grievances. Have you any other suggestions to make?—I should be very glad to see the Police Force armed and trained in the use of the rifle. It would tend to discipline, and would form the basis of an armed and disciplined force in case of emergency.

*The Commissioner:* That seems a very good suggestion.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I have made a recommendation to the Minister in regard to that.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know of any general dissatisfaction owing to the present control?—None at all. I have read the absurd statements made about dissatisfaction, but I think the men are fairly treated.

12. As well as ever they have been?—Unquestionably. I have seen no undue favouritism. Of course, in every Force in the world there is a certain amount of influence used; but the promotions here are very fair and equitable.

13. Is the discipline and the efficiency of the Force equal to what it was in the past?—Yes; in fact, the discipline is rather more strict.

14. You have heard it stated in Dunedin that I had a "special" officer stationed in each district to furnish me with information?—Yes; and I thought it an absurdity.

15. You did not believe it?—No, I did not.

16. Do you think the standard of education is too high for recruits at the present time?—I am afraid it is, and for this reason: that the time may come when something may break out in New Zealand, such as a goldfield, or wages may become easily earned, and you will not be able to get men of the same standard then.

17. You think that, if we instituted the Fourth Standard, we should be able to draw more young men from the farming class?—Yes, and they make the best constables you can have. I just want to add that I agree with Constable Williams that some concessions might be made to members of the Force travelling by railway when on leave. A constable is always on duty, and he cannot overlook anything that comes under his notice, whether he has paid his own train fare or not.

18. Have you made any of the inquiries with respect to the antecedents of candidates for employment in the service?—Yes.

19. Do you think they are more strictly carried out than heretofore?—Yes; in fact, I think they are too strict. The other day a young man applied, and handed in unimpeachable testimonials with his application. Yet the matter was referred back for investigation into what the applicant had been doing during fourteen days that had not been mentioned in his testimonials. As he had been shearing during that time, a constable had to go away a considerable distance to make that inquiry.

20. You thought you were put to too much trouble?—No; but I thought such an investigation was unnecessary, in view of the references he had already shown.

21. Has that man been admitted yet?—No; it was only quite recently that these inquiries were made.

---

WANGANUI, FRIDAY, 13TH AUGUST, 1909.

THOMAS BOURKE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 135.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Wanganui. I entered the Force in November, 1877, and was promoted sergeant on the 1st January, 1898. I have been three years and seven months in Wanganui, and prior to that in various places. I have no grievances at all, as all the Commissioners and Inspectors I have served under have treated me as well as I could have expected. But there is dissatisfaction about the promotions; junior and inferior men are promoted when senior and better men are passed over. I refer to the promotions from constables to sergeants.

*The Commissioner:* Write down the names of a few of the men you have in view, so that I can ascertain whether their cases are properly the subject of dissatisfaction. [Witness handed in a list of the names of men he considered should have been promoted.]

1. *The Commissioner.*] How old were you when you were promoted a sergeant?—Forty years.

2. Have you any opinion to offer with regard to the maximum age at which men should be promoted to sergeant from the ranks?—Generally, not after fifty. That is, to put him in a town.

3. You would agree that a man who has been many years in charge of a country station, on promotion, should be placed in a centre?—Not necessarily.

4. How would you distinguish?—Taking a man who has been passed over unjustly, and is thoroughly capable and intelligent, there is no reason why he should not fill the position I hold here without any probation at all in the cities.

5. Taking a concrete instance, do you know Constable Leahy, of Canterbury?—I have known him close on thirty years. He is fit to fill any position in the Force, if he had the opportunity.

6. He has been recommended for promotion on various occasions, but he is now fifty-three years of age, and, taking your idea of the maximum, he would be too old for promotion: what would you do in that case?—I would promote him to any district that is vacant. There is a man in that list who is quite as intelligent as Leahy, and is above the average policeman for intelligence. The non-promotion of men like that is a distinct loss to the Department, and to the men themselves, as they have to retire on very small pensions.

7. You know there are many excellent men in the Force who will not accept promotion: how would you deal with those cases?—I do not see why they should be allowed to refuse. If a man's promotion means furthering the efficiency of the Force his wishes should not be considered.

8. You know, as a fact, that they do refuse?—I do, and they should not be allowed to refuse. They are allowed to refuse promotion.

9. Since when?—Since Mr. Dinnie's time. I do not know of any cases before the present Commissioner's time where the men were asked if they would accept promotion, or would like to be transferred from one place to another.

10. You think that if a man is ordered to go he should go?—Yes; there should be no nonsense about it. I never had the chance but once to say whether I would go or not. When I was ordered to Wanganui I did get an option, but that was the only time.

11. With regard to men entering the Force, are you in favour of a period of probation before they are finally enrolled?—I think the period of probation should be from six to twelve months, and then if a man does not come up to the mark he should not be finally enrolled. At present we get men in the service who are totally unfit for policemen, and they should never have been enrolled.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Perhaps you will mention the names of those men?—[Witness wrote down the names and handed the paper in.] One man was stationed here for a time, and he should never have been allowed in the police at all. He was a “waster.”

13. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any opinion with regard to the standard of education which a recruit should satisfy?—I would keep it as high as possible.

14. Do you think the present standard, which is equivalent to the Fifth, is too high?—I do not think so; but there are some men who would make very good policemen who could not pass any standard.

15. What about those likely men who do not remain at school beyond the Fourth Standard?—If they are wanted they should be taken in. I know we can get good men who could not pass that standard, and they would make better policemen than a great many of those who do pass it.

16. What is the rule here in regard to allowing men time off when they have been on night duty, and have to appear at Court next day?—There is no rule at all.

17. Is no consideration shown in those cases?—No. The men never ask for it, and do not regard it as a hardship being called on to appear at Court next day.

18. Do the men get Sundays off occasionally?—Yes; every man gets his Sunday off in turn. It is a very good station for that, as when fully manned the men get off on one Sunday in three weeks.

19. Assuming there is a falling-off in the number of suitable candidates for enrolment, what do you attribute it to?—I think it is the pay.

20. You think that 7s. 6d. a day is too low?—Yes; I think that is the main reason.

21. Have you any views with respect to the somewhat burning question of promotion to the higher ranks of the plain-clothes' men?—No; but if you get a good man, and he shows intelligence, he should be promoted.

22. Have you from time to time made inquiries in this district respecting the antecedents of men asking for enrolment?—Yes, frequently. When it is possible to make them myself I do so.

23. When they are made by some one else, who makes them?—If the man is out in the country I hand the application to the mounted constable to see the man's employer.

24. Do you not think it most desirable that these inquiries should be made by a sergeant rather than by a constable?—I think it would be better, but in the country districts like Waitotara and Patea the constable of the district makes the inquiry.

25. Assuming the Department made it a rule that all these inquiries should be conducted by sergeants, you would be in a practical difficulty in this district in carrying that rule out?—There would be difficulty.

26. Therefore the present system is the best?—The constables in charge of country stations are, as a rule, as reliable as the sergeants, and they feel the responsibility of keeping a bad man in the service. But I do not see how closer inquiry could be made than is made under the present system.

27. Would you be in favour of establishing a special grade for detectives?—No; I think that would be to the detriment of the service. I do not think we could have a better system than we have. It brings the detectives into closer contact with the constables, and if they had a roll of their own separate from the general police, it would cause a good deal of bickering.

28. Do you become aware in any way of the previous conduct of men who have been transferred to this district? Do you hear the reasons of their transfer?—We sometimes hear the reasons.

29. Are they officially communicated to you?—No. I dare say the Inspector gets the man's defaulter's sheet.

30. Where the Inspector thinks proper to do so he informs you of the antecedents of the men?—Yes, that is done.

31. A great many men are transferred as a sort of punishment?—I think the mode of transferring by way of punishment is totally wrong.

32. Why?—The man commits an offence—some breach of the regulations—and he is transferred to a better station probably, while a good man is inadvertently punished by being sent to take his place. I have suffered myself several times in that way.

33. How would you deal with such a defaulter?—If he becomes incorrigible, turn him out.

34. But there are certain offences you would not dismiss him for?—If a constable commits a degrading offence he should be put out. If it is a breach of the regulations, punish him severely, and leave him where he is, or send him into some big town where he can be kept under surveillance.

35. How would you treat drunkenness?—Sometimes constables get drunk, but when inquired into the offence is found not to be very serious.

36. What would you do with such a man?—Send him into a big town.

37. But if it has occurred in the big town?—I would leave him there, and punish him, and if it occurred again I would put him out.

38. You would distinguish between offences committed when in uniform and when off duty?—Certainly.

39. Is there any grievance on the part of constables about uniforms?—In the case of the uniform I am wearing, the material costs about £1 5s. or £1 6s., and it costs me £2 13s. to make up. There is not so much concession in regard to the uniform as the public think when they say the police get free uniforms.

40. A good deal has been said about changing the present headgear from shakos to helmets: have you any opinion about that matter?—We have got so used to shakos that I do not think it would make any difference. I would like to see a better-wearing shako, as after rain the present one gets soft, and is knocked out of shape. The material is poor, and the shape is no protection to a man in very wet weather.

41. Hitherto I think you have been required to travel steerage?—Yes; men on transfer pay the difference for their families.

42. Have you any views respecting the length of time constables should be allowed to remain in charge of a station?—It entirely depends on the men. Some men could not stay in a place three years, when others could go on in the same place twenty years without impairing efficiency. I do not know of any reason why men should be shifted about.

43. Do you think a man loses in efficiency if he has been a very long time in one place?—I do not think there should be any rule. Some men would become inefficient in a very short time, and others would not deteriorate at all. It might not be to the interests of the service to keep a man too long in one place.

44. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards moving constables from one place to another, do you not think it takes a man two or three years to know his district thoroughly?—Yes.

45. And if that man is a good man, you believe there is no necessity to transfer him, unless he misconducts himself?—I do not think it necessary to transfer a man from a station if he is a good man, and does not give way to the public. But some men the public get hold of in a very short time.

46. It depends entirely on the man?—Yes.

47. *The Commissioner.*] Sometimes nothing is known against a man until anonymous letters have been received. The practice of writing such letters is taken very grave exception to by certain officers of the Department: have you considered that matter?—Sometimes such letters might prove very dangerous, and sometimes they are very useful.

48. Of course, those letters might come about a man who has not been twelve months in one station?—Yes, and in many cases I know there has been no ground for them at all.

49. But still you believe they should be inquired into?—There should be some inquiry into them.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Have you ever made any representation in respect to your shako to the Inspector?—No.

51. Do you know of any complaints having been received in respect to the shakos?—I do not think any have been received. I mean that they are very little protection from the rain; they should be made of better material than at present.

52. Would you prefer the helmet to the shako?—I do not think so.

53. You know it has been put to the vote of the men, and a large majority wanted the shako?—That is so.

54. When men are punished for misconduct when in charge of a station, do you not know that they are frequently sent to the cities and replaced by other men?—I do not know that. I have often seen them shifted about to a better station.

55. It depends on the offence?—Yes.

56. Men having to attend Court in the morning do get time off, do they not?—In the towns we used to give them time off, but here they have not asked for it. If they did ask for it, and I saw sufficient reason, I would probably see the Inspector, and they would get it.

57. They get Sunday occasionally?—They are very well treated here about Sunday leave.

58. Are not the inquiries about candidates much more strict than they used to be?—Yes.

59. Do you not think it would be very difficult to arrange for sergeants only to make those inquiries?—It would be difficult, and I do not think it could be done as efficiently, as the men in the country stations know the people.

60. And we could not very well spare the sergeants?—Quite so.

61. As regards defaulters' sheets, you know that those sheets are always sent to the Inspector in charge of a district when a man is punished by being transferred, and it is for the Inspector to acquaint his sergeant if he thinks it necessary?—I know of that having been done.

62. As regards education, do you not think there are a good many of the farming class we might get as candidates if we reduced the standard from the Fifth to the Fourth?—You probably would, and you would probably find them to be the best men.

63. *The Commissioner.*] Do you think the question of the reduction of the standard of education might be left to the judgment of the Commissioner of Police for the time being?—I think a lot depends on the Commissioner and the man who has charge of the depot. I believe they send men out of the depot who should never have been sent out. It should be first ascertained whether they are likely to turn out good men or not. One man whose name I have given could not go through the first stage, and it should be patent to the Commissioner that the man would never make a constable.

64. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say there are men go out?—That is one.

65. You spoke as though there were a great number of them?—That is one.

66. That is the only one?—What I wish to convey is this: that if the officer in charge of the depot were careful, and the Commissioner listened to his representations, these unintelligent men who will never make policemen would never go out at all, and we would have less inefficient men.

67. You are talking now of what you do not know. Do you know what is being done?—I know that a man came out who should not have come out.

68. Did you represent the matter to the Inspector?—No.

69. Why not?—He had been through several hands before I had him.

70. Is it not your duty to report to the Inspector the conduct of the men, and their qualifications, if you think they are not fitted for the service?—I have never reported, and I do not think any sergeant has ever done it, without being called on by his Inspector.

71. You must admit that it is your duty to call the attention of the Inspector to a man of that description, who is not performing his duties?—I have had several talks with the Inspector about him.



72. Regarding promotions, I see that in this list you handed in the majority are clerks—eight of them are clerks?—I really could not say, not having taken notice of what they were.

73. Do you know anything about the qualifications of these men?—No; I know some of them to be really good men.

74. There is Till, for instance?—He is as good a man as any we have had in the service.

75. O'Brien: he is not in the service now?—No.

76. Do you know he was offered promotion by my predecessor?—I could not say, but if he was he should have taken it.

77. It might not have been in my time?—I am only saying that the system is totally wrong.

78. Do you know that others have not been recommended for promotion?—I could not say, but I say there are men in the Police Force who should have been promoted, and the Force would get better service from them than it is getting now.

79. Perhaps the Inspectors are of a different opinion?—That is so.

80. Do you not think the Inspectors are the better men to recommend?—The system is wrong, and influence is brought to bear by some men to get promotion. Some of the men I have mentioned, if they had used influence, would have been promoted; but because they did not do that they were not promoted; and they were wronged.

81. Speaking about influence, do you know of a single case where influence has obtained?—If I say I know of a case, will the name have to be mentioned, because the men we know have used political influence are our friends, and they will resent the names being mentioned. They told us about it and what progress was being made.

82. *The Commissioner.*] You are asked to give the names of any persons you allege have used political influence, but I will not use those names in that connection. I will send for all papers in connection with their careers, and satisfy myself as to whether any act done in their behalf was the direct result of political influence. Do you know of such a case?—I know of a constable who was passed over. He is now as good a sergeant as any in the service, but I doubt if he would have been a sergeant to-day if he had not used political influence. But he felt himself degraded by being passed over, and he used political influence. He told me what progress was being made. Whether it is entered in the records or not I do not know. That is the greatest friend I have in the Force.

83. You say he is an excellent man now?—And always was. There is no reason why he should not have been promoted before me. I know for a positive fact he had to pull very hard, and to use members of Parliament to be made a sergeant. I was told week by week the progress that was being made.

84. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Was he promoted during my time?—Yes.

85. Can you suggest a system of making promotions? The same system obtains now as obtained for many years past?—As it is at present, political influence is necessary, and will be necessary. It has been used all the time I have been in the Force, and I believe it will be used after I have gone out of it. We want some Board that men who have been passed over can appeal to—some power beyond the Inspectors and above the Commissioner. An Inspector might be biassed against me—and it is the fact that we often get unconsciously biassed against each other—and he might not recommend me. And the Commissioner might have some feeling against me; and there should be some Board outside the police that we could appeal to—the Stipendiary Magistrate, a man appointed by the Government, and another by the police. Take the case of Leahy and other men: if there had been a Board of that kind Leahy would be a sergeant.

86. *The Commissioner.*] Have you always held that opinion with regard to a Board of Appeal, or only recently?—In discussing the matter lately with the Inspector I have come to the conclusion that political influence will be necessary until we have some higher power to go to.

87. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that they have the right to appeal to the Minister at present?—We have that right, but they are frightened to appeal to him.

88. Why?—It is very seldom done, and in going to the Minister the constable has got very little show against the Inspector and Commissioner.

89. Then, you believe in the present system obtaining, but with an Appeal Board so that any man, whatever his grievance, could appeal to that Board?—Yes. I think if I had a good claim to promotion I should be able to apply to an independent Board.

90. You believe in seniority and ability being considered together?—Certainly.

91. Not seniority by itself?—No.

92. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service beyond the question of promotions?—There is a certain amount of dissatisfaction about the clerks.

93. But general dissatisfaction as to control?—I do not.

94. Have you heard anything about a "special" man they mentioned in Dunedin?—No; never in my life.

95. Do you believe in the story?—I do not.

JAMES BREE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 136.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Aramoho, and am in charge of that station. I was enrolled on the 17th February, 1880, and have been in charge of a station about eleven years. I appear as a delegate on behalf of the local constables. We submit that in order to secure the services of better men the pay should be increased to 8s. a day at least on joining, while the maximum should be 10s., the increases being 6d. a day every three years. Free uniforms and boots should be supplied, and a house-allowance to the married men of from 7s. to 10s. 6d. per week. You can get a four-roomed house and scullery here for about 12s. 6d. a week.

*Sergeant Bourke:* I do not think there are any of the men getting a house here under 14s. a week.



*Witness:* I would say, 14s. a week. The annual leave should be increased from twelve to twenty-one days a year. The police are on duty every day in the week, including Sundays, and are liable to be called out at any hour of the night. The Royal Irish Constabulary get thirty days every year, and the hours are six a day.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Since when?—That is in existence now. In my opinion a man when on leave should get a free railway pass. There is also another matter, with reference to escorting prisoners on remand. We will say, for instance, that the *Police Gazette* arrives here containing a notice that a man is “wanted” in Auckland on warrant, and that man is arrested, and a policeman is told off to escort him to Auckland: the policeman goes in uniform, and persons seeing the two on their journey know that the man is under arrest. If the accused is found to be innocent, and if, when looking for work later on, he meets some of the people who saw him in charge of a constable in uniform, it may militate against the chance of the man getting work. I therefore submit that a prisoner on remand should be escorted by constables in private clothes. It is also submitted that a constable on night duty who has to attend the Court in the morning should get some consideration in the way of time off. That is really all I have to represent.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are there any matters personal to yourself?—No; in fact, I would not have been here at all if the men had not elected me to come here and speak on their behalf. But I submit that I should have been considered some time ago in the way of promotion. Of course, it was for the Commissioner to consider my qualifications.

2. Do you know whether you have been recommended for promotion?—Yes.

3. By whom?—Inspector Kiely.

4. Did you apply?—Yes; and the answer to my application was that my application would be considered in the usual course, amongst others.

5. And it is still being considered?—Yes.

6. How old are you?—Fifty-one.

7. Would you accept promotion if it was offered to you?—Yes; but I would prefer being sent to a country station rather than being sent to do street duty.

8. You know that has been the rule all round?—Yes.

9. What is your objection to going into a centre?—My objection in the first place is that I would have to do night duty, and when you begin to get on in years you do not feel as fit as you were perhaps ten years previously.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you recognise that there is some difficulty—I mean, as regards promotion being given to every one?—Yes, very great difficulty. We cannot all be sergeants, Sub-Inspectors, and Inspectors.

11. Do you not think twenty-one days' leave is rather too much to ask for?—No; I think twenty-one days is little enough.

*The Commissioner:* None of the delegates have asked for anything like that number of days' leave.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Do you know that the duties of the Irish Constabulary are quite different from your duties here?—Yes.

13. Their duties are much more arduous than yours here?—Yes, they are in some cases.

#### JAMES RIORDAN, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 137.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Wanganui, and am in charge of the Wanganui East Station. I joined the Force on the 12th January, 1891, and have been in charge of this station four or five months. Previous to that I was at Taradale, Hawke's Bay.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you wish to bring before me?—I have two suggestions to make which I think would be beneficial to the Force. And I have one request to make. The request I have to make is that the allowances for expenses of married men be increased when on relieving duty. At present the amount we are entitled to when on relieving duty is 3s. per day after the expiration of six days. I think that should be increased to 6s. per day. In support of that I would like to mention that the cadets—who are, of course, all single—in the Railway Department, when on relieving duty, travel first class free by railway, and I am given to understand that they are allowed up to 10s. a day expenses. I suggest, also, that Stipendiary Magistrates should give their opinions as to the qualifications of members of the Force seeking promotion. If the member of the Force is not known to the Magistrate, he could be examined by him. I suggest, also, that a Police Appeal Board be set up, the Board to be constituted of three members—one, a Stipendiary Magistrate appointed by the Government; a constable to be appointed by the constables; the third member to be appointed by the non-commissioned officers and the officers.

2. For the whole Dominion?—Yes. If that were done it would have a tendency, in my opinion, to stop political influence, which I think exists, though I cannot particularise any case. It would also have a tendency to stop the “useful handy man,” who is said to be in existence. It would result in giving the senior qualified man his turn of promotion, and would thereby cause unity and content in the Force.

3. That unity and content you speak of, is that lacking at the present time; or, in other words, do you think there is any dissatisfaction?—Yes, in regard to the senior men who have been passed over; but not so far as I am particularly concerned; I have not asked for it, and do not want it.

4. Then, you do not agree with Sergeant Bourke, who said that when it was thought proper to promote a man he should not have the option of refusing? Would you compel a man to accept?—No. I would not compel anybody. If a man proves himself to be a qualified man, and being a senior man obtains promotion, I should say he should have the option of refusing or taking it.

5. Then, you do not agree with Sergeant Bourke, who considers that no man should have the option?—I think a man should get the option, because in many instances men with large families may be better off in charge of a station than in a large centre.

6. Then, there is the set-off against that of the efficiency of the Force?—That is so.

7. *Mr. Dinnie.*] A man promoted against his will may not perform his duties so well?—I think that is so.

8. About this “handy man,” what have you heard about him?—As far as you are concerned, sir, I have never heard anything other than what I have seen in the papers during the sittings of the Commission.

9. You know nothing yourself?—Not as far as you are concerned.

10. We have been trying to find this man?—He has been very prevalent in Hawke’s Bay; he was very much encouraged there, but not in this district.

11. Is that ancient history?—No.

12. How far back are you going?—Prior to the retirement of Sub-Inspector McDonnell.

JAMES FITZPATRICK, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 138.)

*Witness:* I am a constable, in charge of Marton. I was enrolled on the 16th February, 1899.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What do you want to bring before me?—I have a few suggestions to bring before the Commission. In my opinion, the rate of pay of constables at the present time is insufficient. It should commence at 8s. a day, with a rise of 6d. per day every three years until ten years service. At the present time the rate is 7s. 6d. per day for four years; and out of that 7s. 6d. 4½d. per day is deducted for the Police Provident Fund, leaving constables 7s. 1½d. per day to live upon.

2. But men are generally in charge of stations after a short time: what is the average time a constable serves before he gets charge of a station?—I have no idea.

3. I mean the average time of a qualified man?—I was stationed at Wanganui for six years before being put in charge of a station.

4. Under your scheme you would be getting 9s. to-day?—Yes.

5. Instead of that, what are you getting?—8s. 6d. a day.

6. Of course, there is no comparison between the men in charge of stations and other constables?—That is so.

7. Is there anything else you wish to say?—As regards promotion, under the present system there will always be dissatisfaction. I think there should be a conference of Inspectors when men are to be promoted, and the abilities of the men should be discussed, and they should be promoted accordingly. The men would then know they would have the benefit at such a conference of the presence of their respective Inspectors. Therefore a case such as that of Constable Leahy, which has been mentioned—and many others—would not occur.

8. You know that at the present time the Inspectors do recommend men?—Yes.

9. The Commissioner of Police has before him the detailed recommendations of every Inspector, and ought to act according to his judgment upon those recommendations. What do you claim for the conference?—In my opinion, the talk of the Inspectors round a table would be more in the interests of the Force than all the writing that could be put on paper.

10. You would rather have such a conference than an independent Board?—Yes.

11. What is your next point?—I think that no constable over forty-five years of age should be promoted to the rank of sergeant to do street duty in the cities. After that age he would not possess the necessary activity and energy for the position. A sergeant has a lot to do with the breaking or making of a constable, especially of the young men under his charge. If you have an inactive, easy-going sergeant you will have easy-going constables.

12. In other words, the sergeant is the backbone of the Force?—Exactly. As regards the promotion of district clerks, that is unsatisfactory at the present time. A man who has been a district clerk is promoted, whilst a man who has done actual service in ordinary police duties is passed over. I have been recommended for promotion by my Inspector, and I have also received a letter of recommendation (addressed to the Commissioner) from Mr. Stanford, ex-Stipendiary Magistrate of Wanganui. Sergeant Cummings—I am speaking on the principle and not personally—who is five months my junior, has been promoted after ten years’ service, and now becomes my senior. He has been most of his time, I understand, in the district office, and has not done actual police duties. There is not sufficient encouragement held out to the men who are responsible for maintaining law and order. Sergeant Mugeridge—I am still speaking on the principle and not of the man—who has done little or no police duty, has been promoted after seven years’ service. I say that the qualifications for promotion should be—first, ability; and I should say that the abilities of a senior man should be carefully weighed before he is passed over, but if the abilities of a junior man are greater he should receive promotion.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Supposing you had a man with twenty years’ service and a man with fourteen years’ service, and the latter was the best qualified man, would you promote him?—He should certainly be given promotion; but if the two had equal qualifications, promotion should certainly be given to the senior man.

14. Do you know what is being done at the present time?—No.

15. Well, that is the system that is being adopted. As regards that recommendation from the Magistrate, did you ask him for it?—Yes.

16. Is not that using influence?—No, not political influence.

*Mr. Dinnie:* I am not suggesting that you are not a fully qualified constable in every way—and I may say your name is on the list for promotion—but I am suggesting whether it is a proper thing to ask for such a testimonial.

*The Commissioner:* This is a letter addressed to me personally as Royal Commissioner, and I presume that Mr. Stanford is physically unable to attend the Commission. I will read the letter. [Letter read.] It does not come under the category referred to by Mr. Dinnie. This is a letter addressed to me personally, and it is entirely in my discretion whether I accept it or not.

17. *Mr. Dinnie* to witness.] Do you not think your Inspector is in a position to make a recommendation?—Yes, but the Magistrate is able to form an opinion too.

*Mr. Dinnie*: I was totally unaware that the Magistrate recommended this man's transfer at all, and it was not owing to his recommendation that the change was made. I specially selected this man myself to go to his present station because I knew he was a good man.

*The Commissioner*: I have no means of testing the accuracy of these statements now.

JAMES SIDDELLS, Detective, examined on oath. (No. 139.)

*Witness*: I am a detective, stationed at Wanganui. I have been a detective for four years and six months, having been appointed a detective on the 1st January, 1905. I was enrolled in October, 1877, and was a sergeant for seven years.

1. *The Commissioner*.] Did you elect to go into the detective branch?—Yes, it was at my own request.

2. Was there any particular reason for it?—I saw that you invited members of the Force to give evidence. I have given the whole question of the Police Force much thought, and have had considerable experience in the Force. I have no grievance. I have prepared a statement suggesting what I consider to be remedies, and the suggestions may assist the Commission in coming to a decision or judgment on certain points. There may be some views expressed or suggestions made that the Commissioner and Inspectors may not agree with; but I submit them for what they are worth, and in the utmost good faith.

3. The question is whether they commend themselves to me, not whether they commend themselves to anybody else?—Yes. This is the statement I have prepared: My name is James Siddells, and at present I hold the rank of detective at Wanganui. I joined the Armed Constabulary on the 9th October, 1877, and served in that Force for two years and three months, when I was transferred to the police branch, and sent to the Napier District, where I was in charge of various stations for eighteen years. I was then promoted to the rank of sergeant, and placed in charge of the Dannevirke sub-district, remaining there two years. I was then sent to take charge of the Gisborne sub-district. I remained at Gisborne for five years, when, at my own request, I was transferred to the detective branch, and sent to Wanganui, and have been here four years and seven months. Throughout my career in the Police Force I have never been fined or admonished. I am perfectly satisfied with the treatment I have received from the various officers and Commissioners that I have served under. I have every confidence that had I remained in the uniform branch I should at the present time be occupying a higher grade in the Force, but I fully recognise that this is my own fault, as I took a downward step at my own request. With regard to the Force as a body, I know that considerable dissatisfaction exists (in many cases probably uncalled for). My experience leads me to believe that many men have only imaginary grievances. Among a body of men this will always exist. There is no question but that a great many of the Force feel that promotions are not made fairly; and, in my opinion, there are undoubted cases where men have good reason for complaint—notably, where they have been passed over and subsequently promoted. I can quote many instances where this has taken place to the detriment of apparently good men. When a man is passed over and is subsequently promoted he loses his seniority, and this probably prevents him from attaining to the higher offices of the Force. Unquestionably, merit should count first; but it is questionable whether that can be shown in all cases of promotion in the uniform branch of the service. At any rate, I am satisfied that many members of the Force do not consider that it can. This probably is not the Commissioner's fault. In my opinion, there would be a better Force in every way if the Commissioner was solely responsible for the working of it, and we all, as members of it, knew and felt that such was the case. In my opinion, the Commissioner should be supreme, except that there should be a Board of Appeal to which any member could go if he considered that he was being unjustly treated. Good men would have nothing to fear, and members would not go to appeal on frivolous grounds. I am of opinion that the Force is considerably handicapped on account of there being no means of getting rid of the useless men. I have never known of a man being removed from the Force on the ground of him being useless for the work. It appears to be a recognised rule that once a man is enrolled in the Force he is there for all time, no matter whether he is capable or not. A man may be a respectable and good living man yet utterly unfit for police work. I think it would be an improvement if a man was placed on probation for six months or twelve months; by that time the Inspectors would be in a position to judge whether the man had sufficient intelligence and ability to make a good policeman. Every man in the service should be made to feel that his position in same was dependent on his carrying out his work in a proper and efficient manner. There is no question but that the Force is composed mostly of highly efficient men. The trouble is that there are some who cannot do the necessary work, and others that will not. The consequence is that those who can and will have to carry the burden of those who cannot and will not. If there was a clearance of the drones, the others would be keener and better men. It is questionable whether the increment rise is not a mistake on account of it doing away with the ambition to get on. Personally, I am of opinion that stations should be graded according to the amount of police work to be done and the importance of the district, on the same principle as the post-offices and railway-stations. If this practice prevailed, men would be paid in proportion to the work and responsibility they had. At present it frequently happens that a senior man is stationed at a small unimportant station, where a great many perquisites are to be made; and a junior is at a very busy station, where his time is fully occupied in doing hard police duty, and nothing to be made but bare pay. Another cause of dissatisfaction to the man that does not and will not pull the ropes is the way transfers are carried out. I think that when the Commissioner orders a transfer it should always be carried out. He knows his men, and makes transfers for the good of the Force and the com-

munity. Therefore, why should a man who has a number of friends be able to remain at a station when the Commissioner knows that he should go? There seems to be a widespread impression that political influence is of great value in the Force; but I cannot say anything on this point. I never used it myself, and I think I can safely say that there are many others higher up in the service who got there without any political assistance. I am satisfied that the Force would benefit greatly if it could be endued with the idea that political influence was of no value. For years past—in fact, as long as I have been in the service—the Department has been issuing circulars stating that members of the Force attempting to use political influence would be severely dealt with. The Police Commission of 1898 found that political influence was used, and it is very questionable whether it is not as rife now as ever. If it is not, it is hard to understand how some of the promotions in the Force have been made. Another factor that bears on the promotion and non-promotion of men is the personal bias of the Commissioner and Inspectors. This is only human, and often unconscious, but it not unfrequently does a good man a great injustice. In my opinion, to guard against this, an Appeal Board should be established—one for the North Island and one for the South Island—consisting of a Stipendiary Magistrate, some person representing the Department, and another the non-commissioned officers and constables. Considerable dissatisfaction exists over the amount paid to police for travelling-allowance. I am of opinion that the police are being unfairly treated when compared with other departments. In the police, a constable and sergeant is paid 6s., a detective is paid 8s. The sergeant asks why should the detective get more than a sergeant, as their expenses are the same. I myself cannot see why there should be any difference. An official in the Post Office receives 10s., and a warder in the gaol 12s. 6d. All have to lodge at the same hotels, and police frequently are out of pocket in travelling. I am of opinion that no man should be allowed to apply for promotion or other advantage. If the Force was run on the lines that every man got his just dues, there would be no need for such a practice, which often means that a good and efficient officer is left behind. The Commissioner and Inspectors know, or should know, the men who are entitled to and suitable for promotion, and they should act in the best interests of the Force and public. If there was an Appeal Board, I submit that men would be promoted in order of seniority, coupled with ability, without any need of applying for same. In my opinion, the greatest cause of complaint amongst most members of the Force is the exceptional treatment meted out to the clerical staff. It appears to be a rule that a constable employed as a district clerk is promoted to the rank of sergeant after ten years' service. Many of them, no doubt, are very capable men, but there are a number of very capable men doing duty with considerably more than ten years' service. If a man chooses to leave the office after being promoted to the rank of sergeant, it gives him a great "pull" over men who have been doing police duty for years. The clerks have no hardships to contend with, their responsibility is not excessive, and I venture to say that their pay is as good as that of other clerks in similar positions without them being raised over the heads of men more entitled to promotion. During the sitting of the Commission a good deal has been said about raising the standard of the Force, and an increase of pay. The question is, will an increase of pay tempt a better class of men to join? I am of opinion that under existing circumstances it will not. At present our recruits are principally drawn from the labouring classes. It is impossible for a person to become attached to the Police Force until he attains the age of twenty-one years, consequently there is a period between the time that a lad leaves school and is old enough to join the Force that he must start out at something. The consequence is that, as a rule, the brainy intelligent youth makes his mark and settles at some calling before he is old enough to join the Police Force. I think that if there was a system of cadetship preparatory to joining the Force some of the brightest youths would take on the work. There are plenty of ways in which cadets could be employed in the Force—for instance, some could be employed in the offices doing work that is now done by men who are in receipt of good pay. Others could, I think, with advantage be attached to the detective branch, in which I am sure they could do valuable work, and in time become experts. If at the end of their cadetship any were found unsuitable for police work, they could be drafted into other branches of the Government service. Their training in the Police Force would be an education that would, I think, stand them in good service in after-life. Such a system would be a saving to the Government, and would, I think, assist to elevate the Force, and cause a better class to come forward. In nearly all walks of life persons start young, and why not in the Police Force? Strength is all very well, and it is necessary that a Police Force should have plenty of it; but strength without brains and intelligence is a danger that requires to be guarded against. The present system of enrolment could continue as heretofore.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you took a downward step when you joined the detective department?—Yes.

5. Is it a downward step?—I think so.

6. Why did you apply for it?—It suited me at that time. There was not much prospect of promotion. I think you came to Gisborne, and kindly advised me to stop in the uniform branch. But you said that there was very little chance of promotion, and I replied that I would get more pay and less worry in the detective service than as sergeant in charge of a sub-district. I consider that the sergeants in charge of sub-districts are the most important men in the Force, and are not sufficiently paid.

7. Then it was not a retrograde step?—I went over at the same pay. I am getting more pay now than I would have got as a sergeant.

8. Then, it was not a downward step?—Not in pay.

9. As regards the Appeal Board, how do you suggest it should be constituted?—A Stipendiary Magistrate, one to represent the non-commissioned officers and men, and the other to be appointed by the Government.

10. How would they ascertain the qualifications of the men?—By evidence.

11. What evidence?—The evidence of the men. Constable Leahy's case has been mentioned. A man junior to him might apply for his case to be heard—exactly the same as in the Railway Department. He would enter an appeal to the Board. The Board would sit, and the constable would be entitled to call evidence—the evidence of the Inspectors who had had to do with him in the past. And the evidence of the Stipendiary Magistrate and solicitors could be taken to show whether the man was a qualified, intelligent, brainy man. And if the Appeal Board decided that this man was entitled to promotion he would be passed up. One result would be that the Commissioner and Inspectors would be very careful not to allow personal bias to come in.

12. Do you think they do at the present time?—Yes, but it may be quite unconscious.

13. Can you mention any particular case?—No; I would not like to mention any particular case. In every walk of life there is apt to be unconscious bias.

14. Do you suggest that I am unjust?—No, not in any shape or form. I would be very sorry to say that you were in any way biassed, but promotions have been made that the Force cannot account for. We cannot understand how some men are promoted and others are left out.

15. There are a number of men who are fitted to be sergeants and nothing more?—Yes.

16. Those younger men who are fitted to go higher than sergeants, should not they get the first chance of promotion?—I would not like to go so far as that.

17. I mean, men with a fair length of service?—Of course.

18. *The Commissioner.*] Take that list: are any of the men in that list?—No; the two men I have in view at present are Sub-Inspector Norwood and Sub-Inspector Hendrey. Right through-out the Force they are recognised as most capable men, and nobody objects to their promotion.

19. I suppose you will admit that Sergeant Dart is a specially qualified man?—Qualified as a solicitor. I do not know him.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I was in favour of an Appeal Board at one time, but whatever is done I am afraid there will be some dissatisfaction, even with an Appeal Board?—I am quite aware that there must be some dissatisfaction in all branches of the Government service. There is one matter that I omitted to mention—the great injustice to the police in connection with their pension fund.

*The Commissioner:* That is outside this inquiry. The matter is now under consideration, and probably something will be done.

WALTER HENRY HADDRELL, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 140.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at New Plymouth, and am in charge of that station. I was promoted to the rank of sergeant in October, 1898. I was enrolled in 1872.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any remarks of a general nature to make before I ask you any questions?—No.

2. Are you aware of any dissatisfaction in the Force based upon anything you have heard?—Only what has generally appeared in the papers—that a certain amount of political influence is the thing to put you along in the service.

3. Do you know if that exists?—No, I have no means of knowing.

4. Do you believe it exists?—I have no reason to believe or disbelieve it. I have never used it.

5. Have you anything to say with regard to promotion?—There appears to be a certain amount of dissatisfaction. You see certain junior men promoted, and a senior man is sometimes promoted later on. I consider that I was just as efficient ten or fifteen years before I was promoted as when I was promoted. I could not see why I was not promoted before.

6. Would you have promotion granted on application?—No; I think a man should never ask for these sort of things. I certainly did apply for promotion at one time, when I saw a man who was neither use nor ornament made a sergeant above me, but he did not reign very long.

7. You think that every man should be judged and treated on his merits—having regard to seniority, of course?—Yes. If a man is not under the eye of the officers he is apt to be overlooked. If I had to start over again, I would try to remain at Headquarters. If I had remained at Headquarters I feel certain that by this time I would have had rank.

8. With regard to the quality of the men coming under your notice—the recruits—do you think they are up to the old standard?—There are some very good men coming along, and, of course, you have some men who are not so good. They require training. It depends very often on the sergeant under whom they act when they first go on the beat. I remember one constable being taken off the street, and being sent to the Hospital in charge of a man who had murdered his children and cut his throat. That constable was the very last man who should have been sent. He did not know the difference between writing a report in the first or the third person. I would never have sent him. But he turned out a very good man. The sergeant who sent him did not know what he was doing.

9. It is practically admitted that the men coming forward for enrolment are not so numerous as might have been expected: what is that due to?—I should say, the flourishing condition of the country up to this year, and the opportunities for young men in other walks of life.

10. Do you think the pay is too low to attract men?—Yes, I think it is.

11. And probably that is the principal reason?—Yes; the pay is not likely to attract the most suitable men.

12. Do you think the standard of education is too high?—No; I would make it the Sixth Standard. Writing seems to be a lost art with men. We have to deal with many men who cannot sit down and write a report right off. Their report has to be written out first, and copied afterwards.

13. You do not see any falling-off in intelligence?—No.

14. You really think, after consideration, that the pay is the real factor?—I think better pay would attract a better class of men. An ordinary labourer, who requires neither intelligence

nor skill, gets 8s. a day—not constant work, nor is he paid for Sunday—but he has no responsibility nor risk. A constable accepts all sorts of responsibility, legal and physical, and for that he does not think he is well paid. I knew a very decent young fellow—a man whom I thought would have been very suitable: he gave it a trial, and left.

15. What was wrong?—He did not get out of the depot. It might have been his own fault. Of course, the discipline has a lot to do with it. A lot of young men do not care about discipline. It is perhaps rather more than they anticipated when they joined.

16. I should like to have your opinion as to whether a man should have the right to accept or decline promotion, having regard to the efficiency of the Force?—If a man is promoted, and does not accept it, he should be allowed not to take it, but he should stand at the bottom of the list.

17. Say there is an excellent man—a man who is a credit to the Force—who is in charge of a station, and it is thought proper to promote him, would you give him the option of accepting or declining?—It would be the exception to the rule for a man to refuse promotion. The rule is that they all think they ought to be promoted to be sergeants.

18. You have heard of cases where men have refused promotion?—Yes. With respect to Constable Leahy, I could never understand why he was passed over. Perhaps it is because he is rather far away. It may have been a case of “out of sight out of mind.”

19. You got promotion in due course?—I do not know whether it was in due course. Leahy is a much younger man in the service than I am.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When do you think Leahy ought to have been promoted?—I do not know, but he has been passed over.

21. He has been passed over for a great many years?—Yes.

22. Do you think he should have been promoted before I took charge?—Yes.

23. Do you know of any man who has been asked to take promotion, and who has not accepted it?—I have heard of the case of a man at Woodville—a most excellent man; but whether it is true or not I cannot say.

24. Do you think that there are any specially qualified men who have refused?—I have no opportunity of knowing.

25. Is it likely they would refuse?—No; it would not be the rule. I have always put it down to the fact that Leahy has practically refused.

26. *The Commissioner.*] He stated on oath that he never refused. What do you think the maximum age at which a man should be promoted to sergeant?—I have never thought of it. It depends practically on the man. Some men are years younger than others at the same age.

27. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know they have to take street duty for a few years when they are promoted?—Yes, that is the rule.

28. You want an active man to do that?—Yes, a fairly active man.

29. Under what age do you suggest?—I think, when a man gets over fifty he is not so active as he was.

30. You spoke of influence: do you know of any case where influence has obtained?—No.

31. As regards promotion, you know the present system has been carried on for years back?—I have often wondered whether there was a system in years back. There was no system before Mr. Tunbridge came here.

32. There has always been a certain amount of dissatisfaction about promotion?—I have no doubt about that.

33. And always will be?—I suppose so.

34. Do you know of any general dissatisfaction in the service?—No. When Mr. Tunbridge was here there was a good deal of dissatisfaction through lack of promotions, the Police Force having been swamped with sergeants from the Armed Constabulary. Mr. Tunbridge promoted a body of men on the 1st January, 1898, on the Inspectors' recommendations. He said, I am told, that all the other promotions he would make would be on his own responsibility, and I was the second one he promoted. I do not believe I have ever been recommended by any Inspector.

35. Your promotion took place from October, 1898?—Yes.

36. Is the efficiency of the Police Force as good as it has been in the past?—I should say so, most decidedly.

37. And the discipline?—It is not so severe now, or so harassing, as it was when I joined.

38. Since Mr. Tunbridge came out, has the discipline been maintained?—I should say, most decidedly. Of course, you will always have good and bad in a large body of men, but you cannot weed them out until you have given them a trial.

39. You know about the inquiries made into candidates' applications?—Since Mr. Tunbridge took over the service the inquiries have been far more searching than they were before.

40. But within the last few years, are they not more searching?—I do not know that they are more searching now than in Mr. Tunbridge's time.

41. He used to inquire only five years back?—I did not know that.

42. Now the inquiry is from the time they leave school?—Yes; but it is difficult to inquire about their career after leaving school if they come from the Old Country.

43. We can write and ascertain?—Of course, you can do that.

FRANCIS CULLEN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 141.)

*Witness:* I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Stratford, and am in charge of that sub-district. I was appointed sergeant on the 20th October, 1900, having been enrolled on the 3rd August, 1877. I was at Westport, but was transferred at my own request, on account of health. I can retire in less than two years. I have no remarks to make concerning myself.

1. *The Commissioner.*] What is your opinion about the Force at present?—It is much the same as it was; I see no difference.

2. Is there any dissatisfaction with regard to promotions?—I have been in small stations lately, and could not say. I have only two men under me.

3. Assuming there is a difficulty now in getting recruits of the proper class, what do you attribute it to?—I think it is the most difficult thing the Commissioner has to do—to select these recruits. I think the pay generally is too low. A young man from Westport who joined the police stayed in the Force only a week, and when I asked him why he left, he said he was not going to accept starvation wages.

4. Did he not know the wages before he went?—I told him, but he thought he could live very well on them. He went back to his former billet.

5. Then, beyond the pay, you cannot show any reason?—I think the system of recruiting could be improved. When a recruit joins the Royal Irish Constabulary he has to go to the District Inspector, who examines him himself. If he passes the education test he sends him on to the County Inspector, who again examines him. If he passes the test there, and the doctor and everything else, he is sent on to the training staff depot. There he is again examined, both physically and intellectually. He is then put through six months' training, and the list of subjects includes all the duties a constable has to perform. Then if he is not up to the mark he is discharged. If he passes all requirements he is sent to a county, and the County Inspector disposes of him wherever he wants him.

6. There is not much difference between that system and the one here?—I think, if the Inspector saw the recruit himself, and examined him, it would be better. In the Irish Force, in dealing with promotions, the Inspector puts down the names of the men he deems suitable for promotion, and on a certain date he calls them all in and examines them. The list is then sent on to the County Inspector, who again examines the men for sergeant, acting-sergeant, or head constable. If they pass they are placed on his list, and are then promoted according as they are placed on that list.

7. At present here the system is for the Inspector to recommend certain constables for promotion. There is not much difference?—They are examined in one case, and not in the other.

8. But the Inspector is always examining them if he does his duty?—But in the case I refer to the men are called in and examined in his office. I heard a constable's name mentioned here—Constable Leahy. I served with him for years in Christchurch, and found him an excellent man. With regard to his age, he is just the age I was when I was promoted. I was fifty-three when I was promoted. Mr. Dinnie examined my books on the West Coast last March twelve months, and he remarked to Inspector Black that there was less undetected crime there than at any other station; so that it shows that the age did not interfere with the work being properly done.

9. You think there should be no limitation of age?—I could not advocate it myself. One man might be game up to seventy and another man go under at fifty.

10. How old would you put a man on the streets in charge of men?—That would depend on the man himself.

11. Then, you would want a physical examination as well as one respecting ability?—I did not feel any difficulty in doing the work in Wellington, although I was that age.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How long were you on street duty?—About two years five months.

13. Then you got charge of a station?—Yes.

14. It was during Mr. Tunbridge's time?—Yes.

15. I suppose you know there has been dissatisfaction for many years with regard to promotions?—Yes, since I joined.

16. You know the difficulty of giving satisfaction in that respect?—I know I was offered promotion by Mr. Tunbridge before I took it, but I refused, because financially I would have lost.

17. *The Commissioner.*] Why did you take it afterwards?—I had to take it. I was told I was going to be transferred to another district.

18. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Your reference to the Royal Irish Constabulary is to a good many years ago?—Yes; I dare say there have been changes since.

19. You know the system of inspection here in regard to recruits?—Not quite.

20. You do not know that the men are inspected before they are taken on at the probation class?—They are inspected by a doctor.

21. Besides that, they are inspected by an Inspector, and by myself when I am there?—I did not know that.

22. And they are put through an examination as soon as they go into the depot?—I did not know that.

23. And they have to pass an examination when they leave the depot?—I did not know.

24. *The Commissioner.*] Do you suggest the promotion of the district clerks?—I think it is a very good thing to make the district clerks sergeants, because they are in a very responsible position, if they have had the service.

25. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think they are entitled to promotion after ten years' service as a district clerk?—Yes; I have known them in the Royal Irish Constabulary to get promotion in three years.

STEPHEN TILL, Sergeant and District Clerk, examined on oath. (No. 142.)

*Witness:* I am a district clerk at Wanganui, and a sergeant of police. I was enrolled in September, 1898, and promoted to sergeant in September, 1908, after eight years' service as district clerk. I served as assistant clerk in Christchurch for about eighteen months before being made district clerk.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You think a man can qualify as a district clerk without that service?—Some men can.

2. Something has been said about utilising the services of the assistant clerks for relief duty on Sundays: what do you think of that proposal?—I know the clerks themselves would not like it.



3. Would it affect their efficiency as clerks?—It could not do that, but it might make them dissatisfied with their appointments, and lead them to choose some other walk in life.

4. How many men have you?—One. He is a constable with between five and six years' service. He has been in the office between two and three years. The hours are from 9 to 5, closing on Saturday at 1. His position compares favourably with that of a constable.

5. Do you think it would affect the efficiency of the district clerks if they were required to take street duty on Sundays?—They would become dissatisfied after being clerks, and might refuse to go into a station, preferring to go back on the streets, and then to get a country station.

6. Would they not be much better off in charge of a country station?—Very often they are, but some men prefer clerical work.

7. You think in that way, by causing dissatisfaction, it would impair their efficiency?—Yes.

8. Do those men look forward to becoming district clerks?—Yes, certainly; as a rule, a man enters the office with that in view.

9. How long does it take a man, putting aside your own experience, to become efficient as district clerk, after entering as an assistant clerk?—Two or three years before he could get a thorough grasp of the work.

10. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know a number of the assistant clerks have gone out and taken charge of a station?—I know of one lately.

*The Commissioner.* At their own request?

*Mr. Dinnie.* Yes; I would not send them out without.

11. *Mr. Dinnie.*] As regards doing street duty, are you not liable to be called to the office at any time?—Yes; I have often been back in the evenings.

12. And you want your assistant clerk to come back occasionally?—Certainly.

13. So that if he were out on duty you could not get him?—No.

14. Not only that, you would not have the same number of applications for the office-work if they had to take outside duty?—No; that is where the objection would be.

15. You know we have only a few applications at the present time?—I have seen it in the papers, but I would not know of it.

16. And there are not very many men who would be competent to discharge the duties of assistant clerk?—There are a great number who would not be able to do it.

17. We have to select him?—Yes. If a vacancy occurs in a district office, and a clerk is wanted, the selection should be made from the whole Force. I do not think all the suitable men are considered when such appointments are made. Very often the Inspector has a very suitable man for office-work, and if he wants a clerk he recommends this particular man, and he is appointed. I do not impute favouritism, but such appointments should be spread over the Force as a whole.

18. *The Commissioner.*] Your point is that there may be half a dozen men in the Force in other districts who are senior to him and quite as capable?—Yes.

19. The complaint is made by some that men are not appointed locally, but from outside, and you are voicing the other side of the question?—I do not know it is the case now, but at one time it was.

20. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It is not the case now. You know I send for returns asking the Inspector to recommend a certain number of men, that is for the purpose of making a selection?—Yes.

21. *The Commissioner.*] What rent do you pay?—I have a house of my own.

EDWARD WILSON, Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 143.)

*Witness.* I am an Inspector of Police, in charge of the Wanganui District, which comprises thirty-nine stations. Three of these stations—Ongaruhe, Taumarunui, and Raurimu—are managed from the Auckland end by Inspector Cullen, although they are in my district. I have a Sub-Inspector at Palmerston North. There are eight sergeants, sixty-three constables, one district constable, and three detectives, the latter being stationed at New Plymouth, Wanganui, and Palmerston North. I was enrolled in 1871, and commenced my thirty-ninth year of service on Sunday last. I was appointed sergeant on the 16th December, 1884, being promoted from district clerk. I was a district clerk about four years before being promoted. I was transferred to Christchurch to take the district clerkship there, but Captain Lanauze had more friends than I had, and he was retained while I was sent out on the streets.

1. *The Commissioner.*] After you were actually transferred there for the purpose of taking the district clerkship?—Yes.

2. Your friends were very useful there?—They were. I was made a Sub-Inspector in 1899, and promoted to my present rank in 1902.

3. Have you any general statement you wish to make?—I am not aware of any general discontent in the Force, and I have no cause for complaint. I have not heard of the "handy man" till the Commission sat. With regard to candidates for admission to the Force, the inquiry which has been made of late years has been very careful and minute. I do not think the sergeants are promoted early enough. I think, if the Commissioner and Inspectors cannot recognise a man's ability in ten years, they will never recognise it.

4. At what age would you promote them?—I would bring it down as low as ten years' service.

5. What would you make the maximum age?—Fifty, excepting in some special cases where men have been overlooked.

6. Then, you would still promote them?—Yes, the men who were overlooked.

7. What would you do?—If it is recognised by the Commission that these men have been overlooked, I would give them country stations. I would not put them on the street. A man who is promoted to go on the street as a sergeant should undergo a strict medical examination to see



whether he is fit for street duty, because I know of men who have been promoted and have taken up street duty, and they have not been long in that position before they have gone in the legs, and so on.

8. Would you be in favour of making a man do street duty after he is first appointed a sergeant?—Undoubtedly.

9. Except in those cases which have been overlooked?—Yes.

10. Of course, those men would lose their seniority?—Yes; but you could not help it. I think the sergeants should get more pay. There is not so much complaint on the part of single men, but for married men it is certainly a very difficult position. You cannot get good reliable married men with only 7s. a week house-rent. It is not sufficient inducement. When I was on the West Coast—I lived there about two years ago—I used to get men down there at 7s. a day. And as soon as they landed on the wharf they found that the lumpers on the wharf were drawing from 10s. to 15s. a day. The lowest-paid man in the mines was earning 9s. 6d. a day—a man who did not require any character, and who simply had to shove a truck along. And men wheeling out sawdust from the saws were getting 10s. a day. The men in the Force were naturally dissatisfied with their position. It is the same here. You want men in the Force who are mentally and physically good. I am satisfied that the inducements offered are not sufficient to attract suitable men. And this is more felt in the case of married men. A single man can put on his hat and go anywhere he likes, but a married man cannot; and, as a rule, the married men are more steady, and look after their billets better. I heard it said that some officers objected to recruits from the depot. I do not object to them; in fact, I like to get recruits and break them in here. I do not get men straight from the depot. They have passed through somebody else's hands. I understand that it is the system to draft the recruits out to the four chief centres under sectional sergeants. I am not satisfied with the present increment system for constables. I consider that it destroys individual energy, and a desire to perfect a man in a knowledge of his duties. With very few exceptions, a man has to wait four years to get a rise. If a constable were told that he could get from class to class by passing an examination, and on getting a favourable report from the sergeants and Inspectors, and, say, one year off each period, it would stimulate these men to perfect themselves in their duties, and would be a benefit to the Force. They would lean more on their sergeants and Inspectors; they would look to them more; and there would be a better feeling between them. I think the district offices should be used more than they are as a learning ground for prospective sergeants—that a man should go through a couple of years in the office. And with regard to the higher positions of Sub-Inspector and Inspector, I think the men appointed should have at least two years' service in the district office.

11. I was inclined to raise that point myself, but it was objected that it would upset the organization of the office, the constant changes that would result?—I was going to say that I consider that each district clerk should be a sergeant. I think the position warrants it. And a man coming in should learn his business under him. I understand that there are four clerks in Auckland; three or four in Dunedin, and Wellington, and Christchurch. I have only got one district clerk and one assistant.

12. Do I understand you to say that upon a man's appointment as sergeant you would bring him into the district office?—No; I would let him do street duty first, and if we found he was likely to go on.

13. Are there any sergeants who would be of no earthly use in the district office?—Yes; but if we found a man a good efficient sergeant, and we said, "This man in a few years will probably be appointed a Sub-Inspector," in that case I think he should go into the district office for a time. I make these suggestions for what I consider the benefit of the service. It is a fact that the larger number of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors are men who have been through the district offices. I may say that I find that there are very few men who are really suitable for clerks.

14. Are you in the habit of recommending men?—Yes. I have only a limited number, but I have recommended a man or two since I have been here. I do not think the discipline is quite so good as it was years ago.

15. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What do you mean by years ago?—Perhaps ten or fifteen years ago. I will bring it back to the close of the South African war. I think our colonial troops were found wanting in discipline. I think that the altered conditions, and the position of the ordinary labourer nowadays, has affected the position of the men in the Force to a considerable extent. The conditions of colonial life are not conducive to the implicit obedience to orders that there used to be. The regulations under which I joined the Force provided that when a man entered the Force, if he was careful and industrious, and looked after his business, all the upper positions in the Force were open to him. I think the detectives should stand on just the same ground as the other members of the Force. If a man is the best man, no matter whether he is a sergeant or a detective, if the opportunity comes, he should get promotion. There is a general impression that there is a good deal of political influence. I have not had brought under my notice many cases; but there is no doubt that it exists. In March last year I got a telegram from the Commissioner directing the transfer of a detective from Palmerston North to Wellington, and another was to be transferred from Wellington. The Palmerston North papers published a statement that the member for the district had sent a protest against the change, and here is a telegram that was published in the *Wanganui Chronicle* on the 24th March: "Palmerston North, March 23.—Telegrams were sent to the Government to-day by the member for the district and the President of the Chamber of Commerce protesting against the removal of Detective Quirke to Wellington. A petition is also being circulated by the member for the district." That transfer did not eventuate.

16. *The Commissioner.*] It was actually ordered, and then cancelled?—It was held over. The transfer never came off, and three or four months have elapsed since then. I do not think, when men are promoted to the position of sergeant, they should be allowed to refuse. The Government

pay the men, and have a perfect right to select the men for any position they like, and the men should accept it.

17. And no consideration of family or convenience or anything else should intervene?—I do not think so.

18. And the same with regard to transfers?—I think the men should not be allowed to remain too long at any station.

19. That where a man has been transferred he should not be offered the position: he should be ordered?—It seems to me that within the last few years a system has arisen of saying, "There is a station vacant, will So-and-so accept it?" I think if there is a vacancy, say, at Marton, a man should be sent there; he should not be asked if he will accept it.

20. You do not think it is conducive to discipline?—I think it destroys discipline. I also think a constable should serve a period of at least six months' probation.

21. You were going to say something about a man not being allowed to remain too long at one station?—I do not think a man should be allowed to remain too long at a station. I think it would be better if the men were removed occasionally. There are some men who can stop a long while; but if a man goes to a station, and brings up his family at that station, his children going to school with his neighbours' children, it is natural that there should be a tendency to relax on his part. With regard to the escort business, I think it would be a very good thing if the Government were to build a railway carriage for this Island and another for the South Island—running from Auckland to Wellington, and from Christchurch to Invercargill, once or twice a week, and thus do away with a lot of this escorting of prisoners. This would get over some of the difficulties that have arisen. I think the present leave granted is fair. The men get twelve days every year, and they can allow it to accumulate up to thirty-six days. They ought to get one Sunday a month off, and the duty should be arranged accordingly. I try and arrange it so in my district. I think the leave should be on a sliding scale. I think a man with under ten years' service should get twelve days, and a man of over ten years' service and under twenty should get so many more. I think the older the man and the longer he has been in the service the bigger leave he should get. I believe that that system exists in the Post Office Department, and I think it is a fair one.

22. What is the maximum leave you would give?—Twenty-one days. I have got no data for what I am going to say, but it always seems to me that the Commissioner has never had a proper free hand in the management of affairs. I think the Commissioner should have an absolutely free hand, and be responsible only to Parliament for the management of the Department.

23. That is to say, he would go over the political head of the Department?—I think that is so in other places, and I think it is a right thing.

24. You would be rather in favour of that than an Appeal Board?—I am not too keen on an Appeal Board. I have been thinking about it, but I cannot say that I am in favour of it.

25. You would make the Commissioner answerable to nobody except to Parliament?—That is so.

26. Rather a big order that?—Well, I think it is done in other places.

27. You would have to have an exceptionally good man as Commissioner: he would have to have an exceptionally stiff back sometimes. You are assuming that there is undue influence brought to bear on him?—There might be. I am inclined to think that every Commissioner is interfered with. I do not say that Mr. Dinnie is in particular.

28. We are only dealing with the system?—Yes; and that is my opinion. With regard to Constable Leahy, I may say that in 1888 he was then doing sectional sergeant's duty, in charge of the reliefs going out. I was away from Christchurch for a couple of years. He used to do sectional sergeant's work, and was watch-house keeper, and his work in both positions was satisfactory. I never could understand why he was not promoted. In my opinion, he was fit to fill almost any position in the service. I mentioned his case to Mr. Tunbridge on two occasions, and told him what a good capable man he was.

29. You think he is capable of filling any position?—I have not seen him for twelve years. I think, if he had had the opportunity, he was capable of filling any position in the service.

30. How would you deal with him?—I should promote him, and give him a country station, and I think it would be most satisfactory.

31. He would still lose his seniority?—Yes; but it would be righting a wrong.

32. His would be an exceptional case?—Yes: it is an exceptional case now.

33. Is there an exceptional case in your district?—I think Constable Bree should be promoted.

34. Have you recommended him?—He was recommended by Inspector Kiely on a couple of occasions. I came up in May, and in the same month I was asked to recommend men for different promotions, and I wrote across the face of these reports that I was not long enough in the district to make any recommendation. The next time there was an opportunity—twelve months after that—I found that Constable Bree had turned the age of fifty, and he was not recommended by me.

35. Otherwise you would have recommended him?—Yes. I think, if I remember right, the return says, "ten years' service, and not over fifty."

36. Would you consider that in his case age should operate as a bar?—I do not think so. He is a man in good physical condition, I think. But I should have a strict medical examination in such cases to see whether a man is fit to do street duty. I have seen dozens of young vigorous men who could not stand it.

37. In these exceptional cases where a man has arrived at over fifty years of age, and who has been passed over, you would not apply the medical examination?—No, not in those cases. You are simply righting a wrong.

38. You get the defaulters' lists of men when they are sent to your district?—Yes; but the regulations say that unless a man is fined 5s. for an offence he is not put on the sheet: but he can do many things, perhaps trifling in themselves, but in the aggregate they might be very serious

to the Department. I think that if any charge is brought against a man, all the papers should be attached to the file, and the file should follow him wherever he goes.

39. But you would not put them on his defaulter's list?—No.

40. But what difference would it make?—It is the rule. I should then know why he was sent to my district. I sometimes get men sent here, and I know absolutely nothing about them; there is nothing on their sheets.

41. But would a man be sent to you as a matter of punishment in respect to a matter not on his defaulter's sheet?—Yes, I think so; and I would know nothing about it. That is my impression.

42. I have gone through your defaulters' lists. I am not going to mention names; but here is a very bad one [indicating same on the list]: what is that man's efficiency?—During the last two years he has been doing his work fairly well.

43. He has lived down what is bad against him?—Yes, as far as I am concerned.

44. The passing-over of his offences has been justified?—Yes, I think so.

45. With regard to drinking, where a man has been found to be giving way to drink, either in connection with the discharge of his duty or otherwise, how would you treat those cases?—In a small country district like this, where a man has been convicted of drinking, I think he should be dealt with here; and then he should be sent, with the whole of his papers, to one of the four centres, where he would be under the immediate attention of a sectional sergeant. In a number of cases it is the surroundings that make men drink; it is the companions a man has got in with; and if he is sent to another place it gives him an opportunity to pull himself together.

46. Assuming it occurred in a centre, how would you deal with it?—If it occurred a second time it would be the last. In the first case I would still keep him there, and fine him. If the Inspector found that the man had got in with a number of companions, and that was the cause of the offence, I would recommend a transfer, but I would allow the papers to go with him.

47. I understand that you would not recommend a transfer as a punishment?—Not as a general rule. There are seldom two cases "on all-fours." I think each case demands a particular method of dealing with it.

48. And it would greatly depend on the report to the Commissioner?—Yes, I think so.

49. Do you think that in all inquiries before the Inspector the evidence should be taken on oath—of course, it would require a statutory provision?—I think it would be better.

50. Would it not place you in a better position?—Yes, I think it would.

51. You know very well that it is human nature that a man will state sometimes what he knows to be untrue in an open inquiry when he would not do so on oath?—I think it would be better to take the evidence on oath.

52. Are you a Justice of the Peace?—Yes, but I do not exercise power in that way.

53. What do you think with regard to the standard of education and admission to the Force?—That is a very big question. I think if the standard were lowered to the Fourth Standard it would do no harm.

54. Do you think it would enlarge the area of choice?—I think it would. And I think that when these men go before an Inspector he should examine them orally, and ascertain their degree of intelligence. My experience is that it is not always the best-educated man who makes the best policeman, but the self-made man with a moderate education is generally the best man in the long run.

55. Do you recommend any men from your district for assistant clerkships in the district offices?—I prefer always to recommend a man in my own district for any position in it if I have a suitable man, because I know what I am doing. I would not recommend him unless I was satisfied. A man from another district is an unknown quantity to me.

56. Something has been said about the assistant clerks in district offices doing occasional relief duty: would that affect their efficiency?—I do not think so. I think it is a fair thing to allow them to take turn and turn with the men. They are constables, and ought to stand on the same level with the others. They could be utilised on Sundays.

57. Is there any genuine hardship in connection with their Court duty where men are on night work?—In some places, yes. In Christchurch I have gone to Court at 10 o'clock after having been on night duty, and had to be at Court again at 4 o'clock in the afternoon; but in places like this we get that over very quickly. The men here get well treated in respect to Sunday leave—I think, every third Sunday off.

58. Do you see any special difficulty in making a special grade for detectives?—I do not think there should be a special grade. I do not think the Chief Detective should rank any higher than a station sergeant, but he should have the opportunity of going to Sub-Inspector and Inspector if he is a suitable man.

59. It has been contended that they should rank as Sub-Inspectors?—I do not agree with it.

60. What is the position of the Chief Detective at present? He is not answerable to the Sub-Inspector?—Yes, he is, if the Inspector is away.

61. You think he should be a police officer pure and simple, under the control of the commissioned officers?—Yes.

62. Have you had anything to do with the station sergeants?—Not here; there were none when I was a Sub-Inspector.

63. The point has been raised as to whether the Sub-Inspectors should not have duplicate copies supplied to them of the defaulters' lists of the men placed under their charge: what is your opinion of that suggestion?—If the Sub-Inspector applied for them I would certainly supply them.

64. If it is the correct thing to do, should it not be done as a matter of every-day work?—Yes. As he gets the men he should get the sheets too, and know all about them.

65. Just look at this list [list handed to witness]. Have you heard anything about that man [name pointed out]?—I have heard that that was not his right name.

66. Was it the subject of remark?—I think it was known to a few. That man was at Utiku when I came here.

67. But you do not know anything about the facts?—No.

68. It would not affect his efficiency as an officer?—I do not think so; but still, if it were the fact, he should never have occupied the position.

69. You would take it that immediately a matter of that kind became known it should be threshed out, and if true the man dealt with?—A man who gets anything under false pretences should be dealt with.

70. You say this has been known apparently?—When I say I did know, I meant I heard a remark or two. That is all.

71. I do not know that I feel disposed to go very much beyond that at present, but would the knowledge of that fact—rightly or wrongly—have any effect upon the *morale* of the Force?—No doubt, if there were any truth in the statement, it would affect the *morale* of the Force.

72. If a man does not go under his proper name there is generally a reason for it?—Yes; he relieved me in Auckland in, I think, 1900.

73. Is there anything you wish to add?—Sergeant Bourke mentioned a man this morning as inefficient. I think I reported on that man to say that he would never make a constable.

74. If your opinion were correct, and if Sergeant Bourke were correct, there was no warrant for his remaining in the Force?—He is one of those incompetents, and will always be so.

75. You recommend a list periodically for promotion?—Yes.

76. Do you find your recommendations carried out?—I do; almost every one I have recommended has been promoted. I will not recommend a man unless I am perfectly satisfied he will do me credit.

77. Is there anything else you wish to mention?—You were asking about political influence and unrest in the Force.

78. I am directed to inquire whether any political or other improper interference exists in connection with the Force, and if so, whether such interference has any influence on the administration?—That is what I want to get at. It is with regard to the complaints and unrest in the Force. Well, complaints, in my opinion, go from private individuals to members of Parliament, and to ventilate them without inquiry stimulates the belief that political influence is valuable and necessary. And the fact of these complaints being listened to by members of Parliament, and being ventilated in Parliament without due inquiry being first made, has, in my opinion, a most pernicious effect.

79. Well, I take it that this Commission is the result of such complaints?—It is. I consider that if the men knew that they had only their officers to look to, and possibly even a Board to go to beyond their officers, instead of going to members and getting their complaints ventilated in Parliament, it would be a great deal better for the Force.

80. But I doubt very much whether the complaints as a rule come from members of the Force I think they come from men out of the Force?—A great number do.

81. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You think it would be desirable that before the statements were made on the floor of the House they were first inquired into?—That is what I mean.

82. Your recommendations have been pretty well carried out?—Yes.

83. You think that detectives should be under the Sub-Inspector as well as under the Inspector?—I think so.

84. And the Chief Detective also?—I consider he should be under the Sub-Inspector.

85. Do you know the system in other Forces?—I do not know the other systems. My experience is confined to the New Zealand Force.

86. As regards the clerks, do you know that in some districts the clerks have to go back at nights to do extra work?—I do. In Auckland we used to be back there every night and on Sundays. It is so here. The work must be done.

87. Do you not think that if they were sent out on ordinary duty on Sunday it would interfere with their work?—There is no occasion to send them out. You could put them into the watch-house to relieve the keeper. Then, again, some men have to be kept in reserve, and they could do that. It would mean a considerable expense, because a lot of these men do not have any uniforms, and if you are going to send them out on the streets they would have to be supplied with uniforms.

88. I suppose you are aware that a great many men are refused admission to the Force because they cannot pass the Fifth Standard?—I did not know that.

89. When a man is found under the influence of drink in charge of a station, is he ever left at that station?—It depends entirely on the man's history.

90. Do you know of any case where a man has been left at a station when found under the influence of drink?—No, I cannot call it to mind.

91. You know that returned troopers were taken on in preference to other men for a time, and they did not turn out a success?—Yes; they did not understand discipline.

92. And a good many have been dismissed since?—Yes.

93. You suggest that men should be promoted when they have about ten years' service?—Yes.

94. Do you know that I promote men at thirteen years?—I believe you have done so. One witness said this morning that the Force at one time was filled with sergeants from the Armed Constabulary Force. That was incorrect. It was men from the Provincial Government service who were promoted when the General Government took over the functions of the Provincial Governments. In Canterbury nearly every second man was a sergeant-in-charge, and that is what we had to fight against for several years.

95. You think it is advisable to send recruits to cities to learn their duties first instead of to out-stations?—At a station like Wanganui or Invercargill, they would learn just as well as in the big centres.

96. But are they not under better supervision in the cities than in the out-districts?—I prefer to get a man straight from the depot, as I then have a chance of making something of him.

97. Would they not be under more strict supervision in the cities than they would be outside?—I do not think they would. Under Constable Gillespie a recruit will very soon learn his business, and he would make him a more efficient policeman.

98. Are not there fewer cases in the country as compared with the city?—They have all-round work here.

99. You want the young men to break in yourself?—Yes, I do.

100. As regards the clerical work, you would suggest that it would be a good idea to put the assistants in the office for about five years, and then send them out for practical experience before promoting them?—Yes; but it is generally the opposite way round. Men are generally from two to four years in the service before they are put into the office.

101. Supposing they remained in the office another five years, would that do them any harm?—I do not think it would.

102. And then send them out?—Yes.

103. Once a man is promoted to district clerk he should go out within three years?—If he elects to remain a sergeant all his time he should stay in the office, but if he does not so elect he should go out.

104. But the clerical work is of great assistance?—The greatest possible assistance. I owe my present position to my clerical training. The knowledge and education I acquired in the district office has been invaluable.

105. As regards Constable Leahy, he is said to be a pretty good man?—Yes; he used to practically run that station in Christchurch. He should have been promoted about 1890.

106. Then there are a few more than myself responsible for his non-promotion?—Undoubtedly.

107. The same applies to Constable Bree?—I do not know much about it, but from what I do know I reckon he is a very good man.

108. What is his age now?—Fifty-one.

109. Then, he should have been promoted a long time ago?—Oh, yes.

110. Do you know Constable Jackson?—Yes.

111. Do you think he is specially qualified for promotion?—I do not.

112. In what respect has he failed?—As a constable I do not think he was a particularly brilliant man. He was in this district, and he did not get on very well here.

113. In what respect did he fail?—I think he lacks education, and he is small in physique. I must confess I like to see good big men as sergeants.

114. Do you know Fitzgerald at all? Is he fitted for promotion?—I would not trust him. I know him well, and I would not recommend him.

HORTON CHARLES DAVID WADE, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 144.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Eltham, and am in charge of the district. I was enrolled in July, 1899, and appointed to the charge of a station about two years and a half ago. I wish to make a statement with reference to Fitzgerald's remarks about my getting promotion. I applied to Commissioner Tunbridge for promotion, and it was granted. I also wish to refer to his and Moloney's statements that I had written anonymous letters. I absolutely deny having written any such letters, and no Inspector, sergeant, or any one else can produce any letter of that kind written by me, or sent to them by me.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you ever quarrelled with those men?—I have had no quarrel with Fitzgerald or Moloney.

2. What do you attribute their attack to?—I have no idea. With regard to my promotion, I applied for promotion in order to get married, and it was granted by Commissioner Tunbridge.

[Certain evidence given by witness Fitzgerald at Christchurch was read over to Constable Wade by the Commissioner. The constable denied the truth of the allegations, and stated that Constable Fitzgerald had done him a great injustice in stating the things mentioned.]

3. Then you are here to give an absolute denial on oath to the statements made?—Yes.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] It has been suggested that you were favoured in respect to getting a station: is that so?—I had six and a half years' service before I was appointed to a station, and I think during all the time I have been under an Inspector or a sergeant I have been an efficient constable.

5. What would be the motive in these men making these statements about you?—As far as Moloney is concerned, he came to Waimate with about twenty months' service, and perhaps because he did not participate in the "mileage" when he was there that was divided between the two senior constables—about £25 or £27—he made these charges against me. But that was afterwards arranged, and it was divided amongst the three of us who were there.

6. What about Fitzgerald?—I cannot account for Fitzgerald's action in any way, unless he was spoken to by ex-Constable Christie in any way.

7. Ex-Constable Christie had to leave the service because of drinking habits?—Yes.

8. You said that it was six years and a half before you got a station?—Yes.

9. Where were you stationed first?—Taihape.

10. Why did you have to leave Taihape?—Because they made it a sub-district, and put a sergeant there.

11. It was suggested that you were put to another and better station than Taihape?—It was made a sergeant's station, and I am now at Eltham.

12. And, as far as you know, giving satisfaction?—Yes. I have no political influence. I got the position through my work and attention to my duties.

13. You used no political influence, or any other influence?—I have never used influence of any kind whatever.

14. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any other remarks?—I should like to see the Land Regulations amended to permit a constable to take up land in view of his retirement from the service, and to have the residence clause dispensed with until such time as he actually retired. At present a man has to reside on his section within four years of taking it up, but constables cannot afford to leave before their time is up.

15. Is there any special reason why constables should be specially provided for? The system of superannuation presumes that a man will not be left unprovided for?—Some men would rather do without their superannuation than fail to qualify for taking up land.

*Mr. Dinnie:* Perhaps Inspector Wilson will certify whether this constable has done his duty satisfactorily?

*Inspector Wilson:* This constable was first at Taihape. It was a very difficult place, with plenty of work, and his conduct there was very satisfactory. His work at Eltham has also been very satisfactory.

*Mr. Dinnie:* You have no cause to believe the statements which have been read?

*Inspector Wilson:* I do not think so. I have had no anonymous letters of any sort. I have had plenty, but none I can attribute to him.

PALMERSTON NORTH, SATURDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1909.

MARTIN DUDLEY STAGPOOLE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 145.)

*Witness:* My name is Martin Dudley Stagpoole. I am a sergeant of police, stationed at Palmerston North. I was enrolled in the Force in February, 1872, and was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 1887. I have been in charge of stations ever since. I have been in three of the large centres, but not in Dunedin. I have been a couple of years in Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have had pretty considerable experience?—I should say, a good deal.

2. Have you any general remarks to make with regard to the efficiency or otherwise of the Force?—I have not much to say. I think the whole of the ground of police complaint is want of sufficient pay. The pay seems insufficient to attract the right class of men. We want to get the right class of men; that is the main thing, I consider.

3. When you refer to pay, you mean in comparison with the pay that obtains in the ordinary walks of life?—Yes; a labouring man in the street gets more pay. The members of the Police Force are expected to be physically, mentally, and morally good. A bricklayer, or bricklayers' labourer who carries bricks, gets 10s. and 12s. a day, and he can wear poor clothes, and need not have much more brains than a monkey. Yet he gets more privileges than the ordinary policeman. The travelling-allowance is not sufficient, and you cannot pay your way on it unless you go to a very cheap place. A constable should not be forced to associate with the lowest class. His position should be such as to enable him to associate with a better class of people.

4. What do you think would be sufficient?—I think, 2s. a meal and bed, or 8s. a day should be allowed when travelling on duty.

5. The detectives get 8s. a day?—They have different work to do. I have done a lot of investigation in my time; and detectives have a little more work to do than ordinary men. No man wants to make anything out of the travelling-allowance, but he does not want to lose money by it.

6. But at the present time I understand that a man can recover his actual expenses?—Not so. In our case here we cannot do it.

*The Commissioner:* Is that so, as I have stated, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* That is so, in every case.

*Witness:* It is not so in Palmerston North.

7. *The Commissioner.*] If you sent in a claim for actual expenses they would be refunded?—It has been in my case. I send a constable on escort duty—say, to Wellington. He arrives there with the prisoner, and delivers him up at the gaol at 8 o'clock, and gets back to town at 9 o'clock, and then he has to hunt round the town for a cheap place to board; and he is only allowed 1s. 6d. for meals and 1s. 6d. for a bed.

8. Have you ever sent in a claim for expenses on behalf of a constable that has been refused payment?—Yes, for Constable Barry, and another one lately; those claims were refused.

9. Is there anything else of a general nature you would like to say?—I think the recruiting could be improved on. A great many men are taken into the depot on their papers, and the Commissioner rarely sees them. We have got some splendid men from the depot. I think that every recruit, before he is sent into the depot, should be seen as to his physique and appearance.

10. He has to pass a standard in physique?—That is so, but a man can pass a standard without being an ornament to the Force. I think that if such a precaution were taken—that the Commissioner or the Inspector in charge of the district where the recruiting is carried on saw the man, he might be able to say, from the man's appearance and his knowledge of the man generally,

whether he would make a smart man, and a man who with a little training would be a credit to the Force. I also say that it is an impossibility for any instructor, no matter how good he may be, to turn out good, nice clean men in two months at the depot. The men should be in the depot at least six months—not less. While they are in the depot the men should get a couple of hours a day military physical drill, and then in six months they would be turned out smart, active, fine-looking young men. I think they should also be taught by a professor wrestling holds and grips, so that they may know how to handle a prisoner with care and safety both to themselves and the man they are handling. I also think they should be taught boxing. That can all be done in six months.

11. You think they are insufficiently trained?—Yes, I do.

12. You think they come out half-trained?—Yes, because they have not time in two months to grasp all they are taught. They try to get men from the country, and it is impossible that they can be turned out properly in two months from the depot. There is one other matter I would like to bring forward, and that is with regard to constables travelling by steamers. On this point I can speak from my own experience. You and your family are only allowed steerage passages. I have never gone steerage, because I have always paid the difference out of my own pocket, and have travelled saloon. I think it would be a disgrace for me to allow my wife and children to go steerage, and have to associate with the people there—more particularly in coastal travelling. I think it is degrading for the wife and children of a constable to travel steerage, or that he should have to pay the money out of his own pocket.

13. Do you know anything about political or other interference, and, if so, whether it affects the efficiency of the Force?—Personally, I have not.

14. Have you heard of it?—I have heard talk about it, but I cannot say it exists. I think it is impossible for any one to say so definitely.

15. Have you any views on promotion?—I think the promotion is not satisfactory. I do not know why it is.

16. What feature of it do you particularly find fault with?—Junior men have been promoted over senior men in all branches; but I am speaking for myself particularly. I have been passed over. I have been twenty-two and a half years a sergeant, and as you are aware I have held some very responsible positions. As far as I am aware I have done my work creditably. I have had no complaints in regard to it, and yet I have seen very junior men passed over me.

17. You admit that seniority must not always govern promotion—that exceptional qualities should be taken into account?—Yes, unless a man is far above the ordinary standard.

18. You know of no reason why there should be some of these cases?—No; I feel naturally sore about it.

19. As to the general promotion from constable to sergeant?—I know several good men—senior men—who have been passed over. I think that, if otherwise capable, and all things being equal, and that they are men with a good record, promotion should go by seniority.

20. Do you think that creates any dissatisfaction in the Force?—Yes.

21. And therefore affects its efficiency?—I cannot say that it affects its efficiency.

22. A discontented man will not do his duty so well as he otherwise would?—He may do his duty.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You say you know of two cases in which travelling-expenses of constables have not been allowed: were the circumstances explained?—Yes.

24. How long ago was that?—Within the last couple of months.

25. Do you know anything of the system that obtains in the probation class?—I have not been there, but I have heard from constables who have come from there.

26. Do you know anything of the condition of the men when they go into the depot, as regards their education or knowledge of police duty?—They know nothing at all.

27. Do you know what they are like when they come out?—My experience in that respect has not been satisfactory.

28. How is that?—Because when they come to me straight they try to teach me my duties.

29. It is apparent that you do not know much about it?—I know what they are when they come to me.

30. Do you know that they have to pass an examination in police duties and in the law appertaining thereto?—If they do, it is a very poor one.

31. Do you know the officer who trains them?—Sergeant Dart

32. Do you know anything about his qualifications?—I understand that he has passed as a solicitor.

33. You say they come out of the depot worse than when they go in?—Yes.

34. You are the first who has said it?—There are others who will say so.

35. Who have you got direct from the depot?—O'Connor is one.

36. Was he a married one?—Yes.

37. Had he any previous service?—Only in Dunedin.

38. Any others?—I think a man came from the depot the other day. He had previous experience at Home. He is a very good man. Another constable had not been long out of the depot when he came to me.

39. Had he not been twelve months in a city?—That does not say much for the depot if he had been twelve months in the city after coming out of the depot.

40. About your own promotion: you ought to have been promoted a long time ago, should you not?—Yes, by my service.

41. By your abilities and qualifications?—I have had a good deal of experience.

42. Were you ever recommended for promotion?—I cannot say. I would never know.

43. You have applied on many occasions?—I have.

44. You were promoted to sergeant through some special action of yours in saving life?—Yes.
45. Do you think your educational qualifications are sufficient to have justified promotion?—Yes.
46. How is it that you were not promoted long ago—before I came here?—I cannot say; promotion was very slow at one time. I am not talking of Mr. Dinnie's time.
47. But there were a great many promotions when my predecessor came here. My predecessor did not seem to think you were suited for promotion?—That appears so; otherwise I suppose I would have got it.
48. You say that some good men were passed over—I suppose they were like yourself?—No doubt the superior officer thought fit to pass them over.
49. Do you think the system of recommendations is a good one—the Inspector to recommend?—I do not know much about it.
50. Do you not think the Inspector is the proper man to recommend promotion?—He should do so, but very often he does not.
51. Do you think the Inspectors do not do their duty in that respect?—Human nature is a very hard thing to alter. Men have their likes and dislikes in every class of life.
52. Still, we must have some system of recommendation?—Yes.
53. The Commissioner must be guided to a very great extent by his Inspectors?—A good deal, but he should have every man's papers in front of him.
54. What papers do you mean?—The papers which show a man's ability, age, and length of service, and if he has been frequently in trouble.
55. That is his defaulter's sheet?—Yes.
56. Beyond that, what papers are there showing his qualifications?—You have the papers.
57. Do you know of any other system except the Inspector recommending?—By a man's seniority. If a man is capable he should be promoted before a junior man.
58. There is an examination held occasionally, is there not?—Yes.
59. Have you ever passed that examination?—There have been no opportunities in my time.
60. There are examinations now?—I do not know of any sergeant who has gone up for examination.
61. Do you think you could pass that examination?—Beyond doubt.
62. I am afraid I am not of the same opinion as you, sergeant. As regards efficiency, what do you say about it now as compared with the past?—I do not think there is much difference.
63. And as to the discipline maintained?—I can see no difference. The men are just as good now. Perhaps they may not be physically as good as in years gone by. We used to get a better and bigger class of men. I think we should get a better class of men physically.
64. You think the pay is insufficient?—If there was better pay, better men would offer themselves for the police.
65. You suggest that the men should be six months at the depot?—Yes.
66. Do you not think there would be a difficulty in keeping our strength up?—In the last part of the time they could be doing duty.
67. Do you know that at the present time we have a difficulty in keeping the strength up?—That is the reason; you cannot get the men.
68. It is not the class we are talking about—it is the number?—Why should there be a difficulty in getting more men—they can be replaced by new men.

CHARLES BOWDEN, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 146.)

*Witness:* My name is Charles Bowden. I am a sergeant of police, in charge of the Feilding sub-district. I was promoted to sergeant in September, 1901. I was enrolled in 1877. Since I have been promoted to sergeant I have been stationed at Invercargill for five years, and the rest of the time at Feilding.

1. *The Commissioner.*] You have only been in charge since you have been at Feilding?—I was performing all the duties of sergeant previously.
2. Have you any general remarks to make with reference to the Force?—I can only say that I regret exceedingly, after my years of service, that there should be any necessity for a commission of this kind, and that there should be such dissatisfaction throughout the service.
3. What does this dissatisfaction arise from?—I should say, from want of loyalty on the part of some men to the Commissioner and the Inspectors.
4. Explain yourself?—If the newspaper reports are true of what was said before the Commission at Dunedin, I say it is a regrettable thing.
5. I do not want your opinion on that. You say there is dissatisfaction: what does it arise from?—The rate of pay, particularly promotions, and as to travelling-expenses.
6. As to the promotions, who do you think is responsible?—The Inspectors, I think.
7. You think the Inspectors are responsible for the inequalities in the promotions?—I do.
8. And through them, you say the Commissioner suffers?—I do.
9. Of course, you recognise that the recommendations to the Commissioner would probably come from the Inspectors?—Yes. If Mr. Tunbridge and another officer has been here I would have held a different rank to-day. I was promised by both of them.
10. You are dissatisfied?—I have no grievance, and I would not have come here to-day if I had not been called.
11. I mean in regard to whether you consider you have been unfairly treated in regard to promotion?—I only objected once, when Sub-Inspector Black was promoted.
12. What is the remedy, in your opinion, of this dissatisfaction, as you allege?—I think a great deal of dissatisfaction arises from the appointment of these district clerks.



13. Their appointment as sergeants?—Yes; and not only that, but with regard to district clerks generally, and as to their manner—there are exceptions—to men who are senior to them. Too much is left to them.

14. Do you mean that they have the ear of the Inspectors, or what?—I believe that in some cases the tail wags the dog.

15. Would you have no district clerk a sergeant?—No. I should do away with all these “recording angels.” They should be in Wellington, and there should be a superintendent to supervise the various districts.

16. You would have no Inspectors at all in charge of a district?—Not in country places. I would have them in Wellington.

17. What would the Inspectors do in Wellington?—They could assist the Chief Inspector there. A proper supervision could be made of the men coming out of the depot to insure that they were likely men for the service.

18. How could they possibly obtain the same knowledge in Wellington that they would gain by coming in contact with the men in the country districts?—I respectfully submit that they would know more, because it would be their business to know. One Inspector in Wellington would supervise these things.

19. Have you given any thought to the matter? I do not follow you with regard to controlling everything in Wellington?—I mean each of the four centres—Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

20. You would do away with the Inspector in charge of this district?—Yes, I would have him in Wellington. Regarding travelling-expenses, I think there should be one scale. A man should get his actual travelling-expenses.

21. Do you think a daily rate leads to abuse?—I would not say that; but there is a great deal of quibbling regarding the payment of these expenses.

22. How many men have you in your district?—Five.

23. Is there any dissatisfaction amongst them?—No, we are all comfortable in our district.

24. All good men?—Yes.

25. And the district is efficiently worked?—Yes; I think our Inspector will admit that.

26. Do you know of any dissatisfaction with regard to promotions in this district?—I do not know of any promotions since I have been here.

27. There was one sergeant's promotion?—Yes.

28. Is he a capable man?—I do not know whether he is a capable policeman or not. I have been referring to the system of appointing district clerks. I am not referring to the district clerk here.

29. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You have no grievance with regard to the control of the present service?—None whatever, except in regard to our pay. There is a great deal of trouble and talk about promotions. We cannot all be promoted, whether we have the qualifications or not; the service is too small; but I say that a man in charge of a station should go up. Then, there is no equality of pay between detectives and sergeants. A man is appointed a detective, and in a certain number of years he gets 14s. a day, but a sergeant is kept down to 12s.

30. There must be some system of pay?—Yes, but I think the system stops rather suddenly at the sergeants.

31. *Inspector Wilson.*] Is not your position as good as that of a detective at 14s. a day?—I do not know. I think we ought to get more pay.

HENRY BEATTIE, Sergeant, examined on oath. (No. 147.)

*Witness:* My name is Henry Beattie. I am a sergeant, stationed at Taihape, and have been there about eighteen months. I was promoted in 1906, and was enrolled in the Force in 1889. I came from Mount Cook, Wellington, to Taihape.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Have you any general remarks to make with regard to the Force?—Yes; the rate of pay for constables is too small. I think a constable joining the Force should receive the pay of an ordinary navvy—8s. a day at the least. My idea would be to introduce the old system of first, second, and third class constables. I think it would be a good thing, and would be an inducement to men to join the Force, and would be an incentive to them afterward. Say, two men join the Force at the same rate of pay, and one is superior to the other: the superior man has all the work to do; the inferior man plods along, and at the end of four years he gets the same rate of pay as the other. I think the superior man should receive extra recognition. I think in five years he should be promoted to the rank of second-class constable, and receive 9s. a day; and if after ten years he is deserving I think he should receive the rank of first-class constable, and should get 10s. a day. That system was formerly in existence, and was an incentive to the men to work. I was four years in the service when I was made a second-class constable, and I felt quite pleased to feel that the authorities recognised my services; and it put additional spirit into me to do my duty. In my opinion, the married constables are not getting sufficient house-allowance. One of my constables stationed at Taihape is paying 17s. 6d. a week house-rent, and he only gets 7s. a week house-allowance. He is a splendid man, and is only watching his chance to better his position outside.

2. Is that case exceptional?—No; living and house-rent is very dear there.

3. What does it cost to live?—It costs me nearly £10 a month to keep us going in groceries, &c. I have a big family. As I have said, living is very dear.

4. Have you quarters found for you?—Yes.

5. Is there any other point?—I am quite satisfied from my experience in the Force that as long as detectives are taken out of the uniform branch dissatisfaction will exist. I do not care

who is in charge of the Force there will always be trouble. I have heard it said that they take the intelligent men out of the uniform branch. I say we want our intelligent men in the uniform branch. I think the branches should be distinct.

6. You suggest creating a special district branch for the detectives?—Yes.

7. As to the clerks, you must make them clerks pure and simple—Civil servants—or you must take them from the Force?—I would have the clerks educated to their work. The system of promoting sergeants to be clerks I have nothing to complain about. There have been no junior men promoted to me. I have received my proper turn in promotion. I have heard a great deal of talk about this: that the men are very dissatisfied with the promotion of sergeants, particularly the district clerks and clerks in the offices generally. I think they would be better taken from civilians and be broken into their work there. With regard to travelling, I take no exception to travelling second class on the Main Trunk line or any other railway-line, but I did take exception to taking my wife and six daughters stearage in a steamer. I have only had one experience of that—going to the West Coast and back. It was certainly not a place for my family.

8. I think that is going to be remedied?—I think the leave is rather short. I think the allowance for meals when away on duty should be 2s. instead of 1s. 6d.

9. The Commissioner has stated that the Department would have allowed you that 2s. if you had applied for it. With regard to district constables, they have generally to deal with Natives, and Natives will not take notice of a man unless he has some uniform?—I think something should be done in regard to that

10. What pay do they get?

*Mr. Dinnie:* From £40 up to £100. It depends on their work.

*The Commissioner:* Do they get any other privilege or concession?

*Mr. Dinnie:* No, they have their own business that they can carry on.

*Inspector Wilson:* The man just referred to gets £50 a year, and a very good house to live in.

*Witness:* I think they should have the distinction of having a uniform. At Raetihi we have had frosts at Christmas, and I think both the constables should be allowed a big coat. It is extremely cold there.

11. *The Commissioner.*] Does the dissatisfaction you refer to with regard to promotion arise mainly from the promotion of district clerks? You said it causes a lot of talk?—I have heard a lot of talk about it. The Department may know more about the senior men who are promoted.

12. Do you know anything about political or other interference?—I cannot say anything about political influence.

13. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I suppose you know that there always has been dissatisfaction in the Force as regards promotion?—Yes, as long as I can remember.

14. You know the difficulty there is in giving satisfaction in regard to promotion?—Yes, it is very hard to give satisfaction.

15. Can you suggest any better system than the present one—the Inspectors recommending annually the men whom they think are fitted for promotion?—I can see no other way than the present system.

16. With regard to district constables, do you know that some of them object very strongly?—I have never heard of it.

17. As regards districts clerks, do you not think, seeing the responsible positions they hold, that it entitles them to the rank of sergeant?—I think they are entitled to a higher rate of pay, but I do not think it is quite the thing to make them sergeants.

18. Do you not think the clerical training is an advantage?—They cannot have too much of it.

19. Keeping to promotions, do you not think a clerical training is of great advantage to them afterwards if they are promoted?—Yes.

20. Is there any general dissatisfaction in the service except in regard to promotions?—It is chiefly about promotions and detectives.

21. *The Commissioner.*] We had a witness yesterday who said he took a step down when he gave up the position of sergeant and took up that of detective?—Yes; he said he considered it a step down.

22. You seem to think it is promotion to be a detective: it is not sought after to any extent, is it?—There are a lot of men after it. They like to get into that branch.

23. *Mr. Dinnie.*] I get very few applications?—I would take them all, and let the Chief Detective break them in himself.

24. Do you not think it would be better for a man to have some training in the uniform branch first before being selected for the detective branch, and that we should know something of his qualifications for that position?—I think he could receive his training and be broken in the same as a constable is.

25. Supposing he began as a probationer, what should be done then?—I would pick out well-educated smart young men.

26. Of course, you know it is not the best educated man who makes the best detective?—I have not had much experience with detectives. I cannot say much about them. I notice that the Chief Detectives down South are applying for the rank of Sub-Inspector.

27. What is your opinion about detectives having the same promotion as the uniform branch?—I think they should be kept to their own branch.

28. *The Commissioner.*] You would not promote detectives at all. How do you think the Chief Detectives should rank?—They know the position when they join the detective branch. They get better pay.

29. Do you think the only way to get over that would be to create a separate branch?—Yes.

FREDERICK WOODS, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 148.)

*Witness:* My name is Frederick Woods. I am a police constable, in charge of Foxton. I have been there two years and a half. I was enrolled in the Force as a district constable in 1898, and was appointed to the Permanent Force in 1899. Foxton was my first station. I did not get married till two and a half years ago, and then I got the station. I am a delegate from the constables of the Palmerston North sub-district. The first thing I wish to bring before your notice is the question of pay. I would like to suggest that we should receive 1s. more a day than we are receiving at present.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Entering at 8s. 6d., instead of 7s. 6d.?—Yes; with increments practically the same as now—1s. every four years, until the maximum of 10s. 6d. is reached. Before I joined the Force I was getting 10s. a day. When I joined the probation class in Wellington I was getting 6s. a day, and was then turned out to do street duty at 7s. a day. I consider the pay too little altogether.

2. Why did you give up 10s. a day?—Because I had an inclination to join the Force.

3. You wanted to make it your profession?—Yes. I consider the pay too small, in view of the cost of living at the present time. The second subject is that of allowances when on special relieving or temporary duty. I would suggest that constables receive at the rate of 8s. per day for the first seven days, and after that 6s. a day. In 1879 the pay was 6s. a day, and before 1899 it was reduced to 3s. a day after seven days. Speaking on this subject, I have a constable under me at Foxton. He was ordered to do special duty at Wanganui during last winter. There had been a lot of fires there. He could not get board at a private boardinghouse, and he had to stay at a hotel. The cost of board at the hotel was £1 10s. a week. I did not think he was fairly treated in the matter of allowance. An application for better treatment was made, but was refused. I suggested to him that he should apply to have the voucher brought under the notice of the Commissioner, but he said he did not want to fall out with the Inspector.

4. It never reached the Commissioner?—That is so.

5. What reason did the Inspector give for refusing the application?—He pointed to a circular which he said governed such special cases.

6. You regarded the case as exceptional?—Yes; I think that 6s. a day is right enough, but when it is brought down to 3s. a day, you cannot get board at 3s. a day. The next subject is house-allowance. I would like to see it increased to 10s. 6d. a week—an increase of 6d. a day on what we are getting now.

7. To be on the same footing as a sergeant?—Yes. It is impossible to rent houses in country places under from 12s. to 17s. a week, and an allowance of 7s. a week is too little altogether. The constable I have at Foxton is paying 12s. a week, and that is recognised to be a cheap rent. The next point is regarding clothing. We would like to be supplied with free uniform, and also with a pair of boots per annum. We have to pay £2 5s. for the making-up of the cloth. Yet the Department say we get free uniform, whereas we have to pay double the value of the stuff for the making-up.

8. Do you know what is done in other branches of the public service—say, mental hospitals, gaols, &c.?—Yes; in gaols the warders get free uniform and two pairs of boots per annum. I think the annual leave should be increased from twelve to eighteen days, and that constables should be given a second-class free railway pass. As to district clerks, I would like to see them do Sunday duty with the constables.

9. You mean the clerks in the district office—the assistant clerks?—Yes, the assistant clerks. I think they should do Sunday duty, so as to relieve some of the constables on the beats; and they should also take their turn in doing uniform duty on holidays. I would like to keep the detective branch separate from the uniform branch. Then, as to applications for outside positions—Circular No. 1408—we ask to have that cancelled. As to constables travelling with their families while on transfer, we would like to see them given saloon passages by steamer. That is all we have to bring before you. I would like to mention, in support of what Sergeant Beattie has said in regard to district constables, that I was a district constable for over twelve months, and I found it very difficult to keep order without a uniform at small meetings. I was at Ohaeawai, Bay of Islands, and applied to the Inspector for a uniform, and Inspector Cullen said he could not grant the request, but he had a kind of uniform sent up which did for the purpose; it helped me very much in keeping order at small meetings.

10. The Commissioner of Police states that many district constables do not like to wear uniform?—I do not hold with that. I think district constables do like to have to wear uniform. They think it an honour to wear uniform. I did.

11. What salary did you get?—I started at £20, and went up to £50. I was on a farm at the same time, and was liable for duty when called upon.

12. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You know that some district constables do wear uniform?—Yes.

13. All those who wish to do so can wear it?—Yes. I left the constable who relieved me my uniform.

14. You know the regulations regarding travelling-allowance?—Yes.

15. Do you know Regulation 239, which says, "Other members of the Force shall receive their actual expenses"?—I saw that, sir. That governs the case I pointed out. I recommended the constable's application.

16. I do not know anything about that: it never came to me. How long is it since you left the depot?—Over ten years.

17. Can you tell me anything about the system there?—Sub-Inspector O'Donovan was our teacher there.

18. Do you agree with the representations of Sergeant Stagpoole—that a man comes out worse than he goes in?—I did not learn very much there, but have learnt more since I went out on the streets.

19. But you had the technical knowledge there?—I learnt a little about the law.

20. You learnt a bit of drill?—Yes.

21. And about the Police Regulations?—Yes, and one or two of the Acts.

22. Were classes in vogue there then at the various stations?—Not in my time.

23. Still, all that was of service to you afterwards?—Yes, it was a foundation.

24. That is what is required?—Yes.

25. As regards the certificate about seeking other employment, is it not desirable that the Commissioner should know a man was applying for another situation, because he might have that man in his eye for promotion, or wish to transfer him?—If a man applied for an outside position, and the Commissioner knew he was after it, he might very likely give him a bump downwards instead of upwards.

26. But do you not think he would encourage him to remain if he were a good man?—Naturally you would think so.

27. *The Commissioner.*] Is there anything you wish to add?—With regard to district clerks being promoted to sergeants, I hold at Foxton six other appointments besides that of police constable, and I have the same responsibility as the Clerk of the Court. Men who joined the service at the same time as I did have been promoted to sergeants. I do not say I have a grievance, but, as I have a lot of the responsibilities of district clerks, and they have none of the responsibilities of my position, I think I should be considered for promotion before them.

28. *Sub-Inspector O'Donovan.*] You said you were taught one or two things in the depot?—Yes, and several Acts.

29. How long were you there?—Two months.

30. Who was the instructor?—You were.

31. What course were you taken over?—Through the drill.

32. Were you taught drill before going in there?—Only in the Volunteers.

33. Who drilled you?—The sergeant-major.

34. What else did you learn there?—The different Acts, evidence; and we were taken down to the Court, and listened to the cases, and after we went back to the depot the proceedings we had listened to were explained to us by our instructor.

35. Were you instructed in general knowledge?—Yes, it was imparted, but the time was too short.

36. You were taken over a complete course of the regulations?—Yes.

37. In general knowledge, the Fourth Standard was the test at that time, was it not?—Yes.

38. Were you taken over that?—Yes.

39. Did you learn arithmetic?—No.

40. Spelling or dictation?—Yes; but the time was so short, and the course so great that you did not know where you started or finished. We just read enough for a foundation.

41. Come, now: had you any idea before you went there, excepting a vague one, of general police matters?—Yes.

42. Did you have any idea of police work or discipline?—I did not know what an information was.

43. Did you know your ordinary work?—Yes.

44. You also had to pass the course of the St. John's ambulance?—Yes.

45. Would you rather have had that course or not?—I would sooner not have had it. We had too much to learn and remember. I think the time should be extended to three months.

46. You were suffering a bit from mental indigestion?—Yes.

47. Supposing you had remained in another month?—We would have had a better grounding.

48. So that the course of instruction was pretty wide, and covered a lot of ground?—Yes, but we could not retain it.

49. You were not allowed to be idle?—No.

ROBERT EDWARDS, Architect and Justice of the Peace, examined on oath. (No. 149.)

*Witness:* From my observation of the Police Force for many years I consider that every possible encouragement within reason should be given them. The position of the service should be improved so that men would be attracted to it, and would afterwards strive to rise therein. The police, from the lowest grade upwards, have a great responsibility on their shoulders, but their wages are too low. Policemen should start at 1s. a day at the least above the present rate of pay. The house-allowance is too low. As a Justice of the Peace, I consider that the police have a much greater responsibility than the general public imagine, but you cannot get good men unless you pay them well.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] How do you think the police carry out their work as a body?—Very well indeed.

2. Do you think a rise in pay and house-allowance would secure more applicants, and that there would be a better field to select from?—I do. The pay is probably not so low as to keep many good men out, but if it were raised I think a great many better men would apply.

3. Of course, you know that the annual crime returns indicate pretty well the efficiency of the Force—the number of arrests and the action taken by the police?—That is so; but, still, there may be dissatisfaction all the same. Men always live in hope, and look forward to rising in the service, and they will remain in the service very largely for that reason.

4. I suppose you know that in all large bodies there is always a certain amount of dissatisfaction in connection with promotions?—No doubt.

5. It cannot be prevented?—No. I do not wish to pose as an authority on these matters, but merely remark that the Police Force ought to be made as attractive as possible, in the interests of good government.

WILLIAM HENRY McLEOD, Mounted Constable, examined on oath. (No. 150.)

*Witness:* I am a mounted constable, doing duty in Palmerston North, having been enrolled on the 1st February, 1904. I wish to refer to the question of house-allowance to men living out of the station, and who have to keep their mothers. I am a single man, but I am keeping my mother. I also wish to speak for Constable Bevan, who is in the same position. I have been five years and a half in the service, and I cannot keep two homes. I received permission to stay out of barracks, but I am in the same position as a married man, and have the same claims.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Is your mother entirely dependent on you?—Yes.

2. Have you made any representations about the matter?—I have applied, but was informed that it could not be granted, because the regulations only referred to married men.

3. You think an exception ought to be made?—Yes, in cases where the Department is satisfied that a man is doing his duty by his relatives.

4. You would not go beyond the mother?—Well, his father too.

5. What about an invalid sister? Would you draw the line?—I would draw the line at the mothers.

*The Commissioner:* Has this matter come under your notice, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I believe it has, but it has not been the custom. I would consider it favourably, but it depends entirely on the circumstances. I would treat each case of its merits.

ALEXANDER RUSSELL, Constable, examined on oath. (No. 151.)

*Witness:* I am a police constable, stationed at Palmerston North, and I joined the Force in 1897. I have never been in charge of a district. I think we should get a substantial rise in pay—1s. a day rise at least—as the cost of living has very much increased the last few years. It has gone up by from 30 to 40 per cent., while our pay has remained at a standstill. Compared with other branches of the public service, the police are the worst paid of any. With regard to the question of the promotion of the district clerks, if any alteration is made in that respect they should revert to street duty after they have been promoted. I think the detective branch should be kept entirely separate from the preventive branch. The fact of Chief Detectives being promoted tends to cause dissatisfaction amongst the rank and file.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Do you know of any dissatisfaction over that matter?—I have heard complaints from time to time about detectives being promoted to Sub-Inspectorships. I am in favour of the examination system in the Police Force, and promotion accordingly. I think that men on taking charge of a station should even be required to pass an examination, and sergeants and Sub-Inspectors, before being promoted, should be examined all round, to ascertain if they are qualified for promotion. The leave should be increased. Twelve days is not enough. It should be increased to eighteen days a year, or allowed to accumulate for two years. The house-allowance should be raised considerably.

2. Are you a married man?—No, single.

3. What does it cost you to live?—About £2 10s. a month.

4. Then, you do not know much about the question of house-allowance if you are not married?—No, I do not.

ALEXANDER CROZIER, Police Pensioner, examined on oath. (No. 152.)

*Witness:* I am a police pensioner, and left the Force on the 10th December last, after serving from 3rd May, 1870. I had about thirty-seven and a half years' service. I left because my time was up. I wish to enter a complaint against the manner in which the lodging-allowance was administered in my case. I was stationed at Ohingaiti for two years while the great viaduct was being built, and on that station being closed I was transferred to Palmerston North to do mounted duty. I left my family at Marton, as two of my boys were in good situations, and came here, where I occupied a small room in the back of the police-station. At that time there was nobody excepting Constable Woods on the station. He was the only single man there, and I had to answer the door at all hours of the night. I was paid lodging-allowance for one month, and then it was stopped, for what reason I have never heard. I was advised by the sergeant to make an application about the matter, but I considered it was not my business to remind my superior officers of their duty. This was the position until I was appointed gaoler, in August, 1905.

1. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When were you granted lodging-allowance first?—In December, 1902.

2. And appointed gaoler when?—5th August, 1905. Ex-Detective Benjamin, who was transferred from here to New Plymouth, was situated similarly to myself. He did not shift his family, but occupied a room there, and drew lodging-allowance all the time he was there. Detective Henderson for a long while drew lodging-allowance in Auckland, while his wife lived in Dunedin, keeping a boardinghouse. Sergeant Mulville was in a similar position, and drew his allowance. Constable McCormack was transferred from the South Island, and occupied apartments in the Wellington Police-station, and drew lodging-allowance. Constable Hogg, in the Inspector's office, Auckland, came to the colony as a widower with two children, and he lived on a station and drew lodging-allowance. The reason given by Inspector Kiely for not paying lodging-allowance (according to the Commissioner) to me was that I had accommodation at the police-station. If that was his interpretation of Circular 28/99, why was I paid one month's allowance, and never asked to refund it? And, further, why was I not informed that it was to be disallowed in future? If there were any reason for not paying me lodging-allowance before I was appointed police gaoler

there was certainly no reason after, as it was my duty to sleep on the premises. The gaoler who succeeded me at Palmerston North was paid lodging-allowance from the day he relieved me by the Police Department, and house-rent by the Prisons Department. On the 2nd February, 1909, I asked Inspector Wilson by letter why I was not paid lodging-allowance for the three months previous to my discharge from the Force, and he referred me to the Commissioner. One Inspector—Mr. Kiely—paid me the allowance for one month, and then stopped it without the knowledge of the Commissioner, or telling me that it was stopped, while the other officer—Inspector Wilson—referred me to the Commissioner. This indicates a lack of discipline.

3. *The Commissioner.*] What about your letter applying for the correspondence?—I made application for a copy of the correspondence, and why I was not paid lodging-allowance for the three months' leave of absence on being discharged from the Force. Neither Inspector Wilson nor the Commissioner answered that question, but the latter paid me the three months.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] You referred to this letter of yours to the Minister that never reached me?—That is a procedure I have never seen before. There is nothing on the letter to show that it ever reached the Minister. I had to send it through the police.

*The Commissioner:* I will call for the file, and see the correspondence.

5. *Mr. Dinnie.*] When you found your allowance stopped in a month's time, were you not anxious to know the reason why?—I felt very much annoyed; but I allowed the Department plenty of time to find out their mistake, and at the very time I was being treated in this way other men connected with the Force were being paid the lodging-allowance.

6. Then, you made no application for it at all?—No.

7. Yet you must have thought there was some reason for paying you a month and then stopping?—It was for the same reason that I was not paid for the last three months I was in the service—it was wilful neglect.

8. Then, you had a complaint and kept it two years?—I had a complaint, but I objected to the Department not knowing their duties.

9. What does clause 74 of the regulations say?—I think it is that if you have a grievance you can write to the Department.

10. Why did you not comply with that?—I did not comply because it was a matter of going to the back door.

11. You would not comply with that regulation because you knew that there was a reason for that money not being paid?—I know there was a reason, but I left it to the Inspector to find out his mistake.

12. Were you not told the reason at the time it was stopped?—I never was told the reason.

13. Did the Inspector not tell you himself personally?—He never did.

14. Then, he is not speaking the truth if he says so?—Who?

15. Inspector Kiely?—He never indicated the matter to me, either by writing or any other way. Mr. Dinnie and the Inspector visited the station here. That was the first time he knew anything about me, and when they were leaving Mr. Dinnie asked me if I had anything to say. I said "No, excepting with regard to my lodging-allowance," and the Inspector got a chance of speaking, but he did not open his mouth. Mr. Dinnie asked me why I was transferred from Ohingaiti, and I told him because the station was closed. He said he would have to look out for another station for me. I spoke to him about the lodging-allowance, and he said that he did not see his way clear to establish a precedent by paying men lodging-allowance when occupying police quarters, as "quarters" in the regulations meant quarters for married men, and there was no need at that station for married men. Mr. Dinnie said he would see into it, and that was the last I heard of the matter.

ALBERT GRAHAM, Farmer, examined on oath. (No. 153.)

*Witness:* I am a farmer, residing at Apiti, and I applied for admission to the Police Force. I want to know from the Commissioner whether any false reports regarding my character have been sent down to Wellington. I applied over twelve months ago. I filled in the police form on the 19th February, 1908. About a fortnight or three weeks afterwards I got a note stating that the Commissioner, upon inquiry, could not entertain my application. Not being satisfied, I went to Wellington, and produced all the references I had, but the Commissioner never looked at them. I do not know why I was refused admission. I have here references from people who have known me fifteen or sixteen years.

*The Commissioner:* What is the position in this case, Mr. Dinnie?

*Mr. Dinnie:* This was an applicant for employment in the service. Inquiry was made. Of course, we do not look at references, but simply want to know where the applicants have been since being at school. The result of the inquiry was not satisfactory, and the witness was refused admission.

*Witness:* Has any complaint been made regarding my character?

*Mr. Dinnie:* I cannot tell you anything about complaints. Reports are sent in, and on those reports we judge whether you are fit for the service or not. I cannot give any information about those reports; it would not be right to do so.

*The Commissioner:* The reports are obtained in the district in the fullest possible manner, and I am not going to allow this Commission to be used as a means by which any one can traverse the decision of the Police Commissioner with regard to the admission of men to the Force. If any man has been improperly admitted I should certainly consider that question, but I am not going to reconsider his decision in the matter of refusing a man admission. Do you still want admission?—Yes.

*The Commissioner:* If you are not considered a fit and proper person, I think it is unwise for you to question the decision. I will call for the papers, go carefully into them, and notify you further on the matter.

JOHN O'DONOVAN, Sub-Inspector, examined on oath. (No. 154.)

*Witness:* My name is John O'Donovan. I am Sub-Inspector, in charge of the sub-district of Palmerston North, acting under the Inspector at Wanganui. I was appointed a constable in April, 1879; promoted to sergeant, January, 1898; and promoted Sub-Inspector, July, 1902. I was in charge of the training depot, Wellington, for some time—from the time it was established until I was promoted Sub-Inspector.

1. *The Commissioner.*] Are there any remarks of a general nature which you wish to make?—With regard to constables, and the improvement of the material of the Force, a great deal depends upon the class of men available to be recruited from.

2. We are faced with the fact now that they are not coming forward?—I should say that the low rate of pay is detrimental from that point of view.

3. You think that the pay should be raised?—I think that a man who joins the Police Force should receive a rate of pay that would put him in a respectable position as regards maintenance, and as regards his status in society. His salary should be such as to put him in a respectable position, and a little above the position of an ordinary labourer. I think constables should begin with 9s. a day—that is, three guineas a week. I base that upon this: that in the City of Wellington, for instance, there are about four hundred men in the tramway service who are receiving from £3 to £3 10s. a week. I consider that the pay of a constable should be equal to that, in order to keep a good class of men in the Force. In my opinion, if that were done a good class of men would come forward. With regard to their qualifications, I need not touch upon physique; that is too obvious. Then, as to their education, and the method of selection, the Commissioner undoubtedly is very much handicapped in this way: he hardly ever sees a man, so far as I am aware, until the man gets into the training depot. (To Commissioner Dinnie): Am I correct?

*Mr. Dinnie:* No. I see the men before they go into the depot. They apply to me for forms, as a rule.

*Witness:* I think there should be a personal interview. I understand that the method pursued in Melbourne is this: The Commissioner advertises that on a certain day applications will be received for the Police Force, and all who present themselves are examined on that day by a competent officer in the presence of the Commissioner; and if more than the required number of men are picked out, the final selection is made from them. I think that such a system as that would be better than the system adopted here. I only mention that as a mere suggestion that something of that sort might be done to help the Commissioner to select a better class of men; and he could go through the educational qualifications of the men, and have their characters inquired into. All that sort of thing could be done in a more complete and thorough manner. The Commissioner would see the men, and could ascertain what class of society they came from. There are numbers of men who are living in certain walks of life in which they contract habits which will never be eradicated—habits which are detrimental to their moral character and to the efficiency of the Police Force. They are not necessarily men of bad character, but they contract certain habits. I think that care should be taken in that respect. With regard to education, there is a great deal of divergence of opinion with regard to the standard. When I was in the training depot the standard was the Fourth. I said nothing about it. It was fixed according to "The Civil Service Act, 1886." I consider that that standard is quite high enough if the men really attain a fair degree of efficiency in that standard, and if they have not forgotten what they learned at school. What I would do in that respect is this: Simply ask the men to sit down and write certain things from dictation, and write out a report of what they had done or saw on their way to the depot. That would, I think, enable the Commissioner to form a better opinion of the men straight off, and what they could do in the way of a report, and without any further educational test, provided they had passed the Fourth Standard. The Commissioner could test them by a very simple examination on the spot. So that the education question is very simple, if it is dealt with in a proper way. With regard to the promotion of constables to the rank of sergeant, every witness that I have heard of is agreed that that has been a long-standing grievance. I myself was nineteen years in the rank of constable. Some of the men complained of my promotion, but they made no complaint when they were promoted over others. We are all alike in that respect. I think the Commissioner is entitled to receive not only the aid of one Inspector, but of four Inspectors. I think that men with a certain fixed length of service should be eligible for promotion. Let the Commissioner and his Board of three or four Inspectors go through the list of those who are qualified by seniority, and agree amongst themselves upon the men who are to be promoted to the rank of sergeant when the time comes to promote them. The conditions and state of affairs vary at different periods. I think the Dominion is getting to that stage when a step forward should be made in the matter of arranging for promotions; and I throw out the suggestion that the Commissioner should be assisted by four of the chief Inspectors, who probably would have knowledge of each individual who asked for promotion. The Inspectors would get their knowledge from the way they are moved about. With regard to the method of selection, I think this would be a good way: that out of the district offices five, six, or eight reports furnished by the candidates for promotion should be submitted to the Board, and let the officers form their own opinions as to the capacity of each of the candidates. I think the position of station sergeant is more or less of an anomaly and a stumbling-block. I think it would be better if that rank were abolished altogether. In saying this, I am speaking from my own experience. It would be sufficient, in my opinion, if a sergeant were simply placed in charge of the station. The principal part of a station sergeant's duty is simply to supervise the work of the watch-house keeper and to attend to callers who require special attention at the watch-house. The station sergeant has practically no responsibility whatever with regard to the street duty. So that there is no necessity whatever for the rank.

4. I suppose you know that the duties have never been defined?—Yes; that is so. I know from my experience in Wellington that the station sergeant's duties are limited in the way I have indicated. His duties do not necessitate any superior rank whatever to the sergeant doing duty on the street. The Sub-Inspector really supervises the work at the station.

5. The creation of the rank in the first instance was with the view of relieving the Sub-Inspector from a great deal of detail work?—It would do equally well if a competent sergeant were there.

6. What difference does it make?—It creates difficulties, and in my opinion the rank is not necessary. And if a man is once made a station sergeant and is not found suitable, what are you going to do with him?

7. What do you do with a Sub-Inspector when you find him not altogether suited? Does not the same thing apply?—Yes. I simply mention it as my opinion that there is no necessity for the rank.

8. You think they are a sort of fifth wheel?—Yes, and rather a stumbling-block to the efficient discharge of the duties within the station. If the station sergeant is not suitable he can be sent to another station, or be given street duty, as the case may be. He does not really exercise any direct control over the sergeants, nor does he really supervise the street duties. I think that any man who is promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector should submit to an educational examination—an examination which will show whether he is qualified or not. Any man who is not qualified by passing the necessary educational test or examination should not be promoted to the office.

9. You mean an ordinary educational test?—They should submit themselves to some examination like the Dublin police, who have to undergo a very stiff examination for the rank of Sub-Inspector.

10. Do you not think a man might pass an examination with sufficient ease? But there is also the personal equation. I do not say that an educational test is not a valuable adjunct, but I say it is not everything?—I admit it is not everything.

11. It is admitted in all walks of life that an examination test is not a true test?—I quite admit that.

12. How do you propose to get over that?—The trouble arises principally from men who really are not qualified, but who have seniority alone. I think that when once a man comes to the position of Sub-Inspector there should be some test—he should be subjected to some examination, either by the University or by a special Board set up for the purpose. If that is not done, there are sure to be constant complaints.

13. What would be the maximum age at which you would promote a constable to be a sergeant?—I certainly should not go beyond, say, forty-two years.

14. Do you consider it a good thing for the efficiency of the Force that the moment after a man is promoted he should be sent to one of the centres?—Not from country stations.

15. We want to put the Force on a thoroughly efficient footing. With that in view, would you suggest that no man should be promoted after he was forty-two years of age?—That is the limit if they are to be sent to city duty. If these men could be provided for in country stations, it is not too old.

16. But you would have endless trouble and difficulty if some men were left in charge of country districts and some men were sent to the towns?—Practically the man's age might determine it then.

17. Would not you determine it, then, by having one rule, and one rule only—that no man over a certain age should be promoted?—I would fix it absolutely at forty-five. But with regard to duty in the cities, I consider that young men should be promoted to the rank of sergeant who would be available for the more active life required in the city. And if the system of promoting district clerks after ten years' service is followed, I should certainly say they quite fill that gap I am speaking of—that younger men should be promoted to serve on the streets for a number of years, until they are forty-two or forty-five years of age, and then be sent out into country stations. I think that would be a better system—to have the younger sergeants in the city, where greater activity and alertness is required, and where there is a greater draw upon their vitality than in country stations.

18. You know that at the present time the system is to promote district clerks to be sergeants?—Yes; that is causing a lot of discontent.

19. You think it causes discontent?—It seems so from the evidence I have seen in the papers.

20. Immediately you promoted a district clerk by service qualification to be a sergeant you would send him out into the street?—Not immediately. That would be a matter for arrangement within a period of one or two years.

21. Why do you promote them at all?—I do not know why they are promoted, except that they are a better class of men.

21A. You would have a clerical staff?—Yes; and they would be selected for the work, and be subject to a test. In that way, you would select the very best men throughout the colony. With regard to the duration of training, and training in general, that point was touched upon by Sergeant Stagpoole. I think that a period of training is necessary.

22. For what period do you think men should be in the depot?—For three months at least. At the end of two months they are beginning to grasp what they have been taught.

23. You are breaking in the raw material in the first two months, and they are finished off in the third month?—Yes. When men leave the depot a great deal depends on whose hands they get into.

24. You would place a man on probation?—Yes; and if he did not give satisfaction in the first twelve months from the time he joined the depot, he should not be retained. The course



of instruction in the depot is very comprehensive and very practical. With regard to detectives, I think their position should be defined somehow or other, if they are not kept in a separate class.

25. Do you see any sound objection to the creation of a separate class, making what is known as the plain-clothes constable a constable detective, and your present detective to what answers to a detective sergeant, and so on?—Yes; because at the present time there is no co-ordination between the detectives and the ordinary Police Force.

26. What would you make the Chief Detective—a detective inspector?—Certainly not; he must be subject to the Sub-Inspector. It would undoubtedly lead to trouble if he were given exactly the same rank as the Sub-Inspector, who is to control him in the absence of the Inspector. I do not see any necessity for giving him the rank.

27. But in the absence of the Inspector, you become Acting-Inspector, and he, as Chief Detective or Sub-Inspector, would simply be in charge of the plain-clothes branch, whereas you would become head of the station?—At the present time, with the rank of Chief Detective, the Sub-Inspector has quite enough to do to avoid conflict with him. The Sub-Inspector simply takes control in the absence of the Inspector, but he is still only Sub-Inspector.

28. He is only Sub-Inspector in rank, but he is holding delegated powers from the Inspector; he is *de facto* the Inspector?—I quite agree with that; but the Chief Detective might not be so ready to recognise that as you are.

29. That is a matter of discipline, of course?—Yes.

30. Recent appointments have been from Chief Detective to Sub-Inspector?—Yes; but he ceases at once to be Chief Detective, and goes over to the uniform branch.

31. The last appointments seem to have given general satisfaction?—I quite agree. Sub-Inspector McGrath is an able officer.

32. You would still allow the Chief Detective the same opportunity as a man in the uniform branch of getting further promotion?—Certainly; but going into the detective branch is a shorter cut to promotion. I do not object to the promotion of Chief Detectives. When the Chief Detective has qualified by service for rank, I say that rank ought to be co-ordinated with some other rank in the Police Force, and when he is eligible for the position of Sub-Inspector he should get that rank by examination. Speaking generally as to promotion, men complain of being passed over. Undoubtedly a good man here and there will be passed over by the system I have referred to, but they will be in a minority to what they are now. I have not had time to go into details; the details must be worked out in the Commissioner's office. I only throw out the suggestions.

33. Is there anything else you wish to say?—I am not aware of anything else. I have mentioned about the position of clerks in the district office, and also the junior clerks—that the best way to select them would be by examination and competition.

34. But Mr. Dinnie informs me that in the whole of New Zealand there are only eight applications at the present time for the position of assistant clerk in the district office, so that it cannot be a position sought after to any great extent; and if there was to be a competitive examination that would further reduce the number?—But if it is a short cut to promotion.

35. If it is a short cut to promotion, why are there not more applicants?—I do not know. I only mention it in connection with some complaint about a man not being fit, or something of that sort, and a man who was not wanted by one Inspector being sent away to another. I consider, if a man is appointed under a proper system, he is entitled to be put under any Inspector. I wish again to say, with regard to the pay of constables, that I think the pay ought to commence at 9s. a day, and in five, six, or ten years they should receive 10s. a day, with 1s. a day house-allowance.

36. Do you see any objection to empowering Inspectors to take evidence on oath in inquiries with regard to complaints against constables?—I think it would be a good thing.

37. I understand that Sub-Inspectors in charge of sub-districts do not get the men's defaulters' lists?—No, sir.

38. Do you think it would be an advantage to have that knowledge of the men?—I ought to have some information as to the men coming to my station.

39. I have not heard any reason why it should not be?—I may say I have not asked for it.

40. *Mr. Dinnie.*] Defaulters' lists are sent to the Inspector for his perusal, to do what he thinks proper with them; he may send them to you if he thinks proper?—Yes.

41. When you are in charge in the absence of the Inspector, are you not the Inspector *pro tem*?—I quite agree that I am,

42. You are not the Sub-Inspector?—I do not agree that I am the Inspector; I am exercising his power.

43. You do not expect that we can promote you for the time being?—I am simply exercising whatever routine powers or discharging the routine duties that fall to me. The orders are that important matters are to remain over till the return of the Inspector—that is, important matters that do not require to be dealt with at once.

44. The Chief Detectives are under you during that time?—Yes.

45. And you ought to act as if you were the Inspector?—Yes, I ought to do; but I find a greater line of resistance.

46. *The Commissioner.*] I know, if I were Sub-Inspector, the position I would take up?—A man can take up a very peculiar attitude without leaving himself open to anything very definite.

47. *Mr. Dinnie.*] If you are acting as Inspector, you ought to act up to the position of Inspector?—Yes.

48. It depends entirely upon yourself, does it not?—A great deal depends upon myself. It is not the view that the Sub-Inspector takes, but it is the view the other man takes when the Inspector is away.

49. *The Commissioner.*] I should want to know the reason why, and that very quickly too, if my position were questioned?—There is apt to be conflict.

50. *Mr. Dinnie.*] What do you say about the discipline and efficiency of the Force now as compared with former years?—It is very like the weather. It is very hard to compare the weather at any particular time with what it was ten years ago. I should say that, generally speaking, there is a tendency on the part of the men—I do not say it is actual—but there is a tendency to relax in discipline—for the men to disregard the necessity for discipline slightly more than there was years ago.

51. How long back are you speaking of?—Ten or twelve years ago. I may say that one of the reasons that might account for that is that formerly there were numbers of men in the Police Force who had served in the Armed Constabulary—who had been subject to years of discipline, and who had acquired habits of discipline. At the present time one of the weaknesses of our Force is that a man is only a short time in the depot, and has not acquired the habit of or seen the necessity for strict discipline. He is sent out amongst other men who are in the same state as himself, or probably more so.

52. It depends greatly on the Sub-Inspector and Inspector as to discipline?—Yes; and a great deal depends upon the non-commissioned officers into whose hands the constables get.

53. Yes; it depends greatly upon yourself and the officers as to the discipline that is maintained?—That is quite true.

54. It is for them to maintain discipline in the district?—It rests principally on the sergeants.

55. You suggest that the Commissioner should examine the men. Do you know that the men are all paraded by the Inspector and by myself before they are put on the probation class, and when they are taken into the probation class they undergo an examination?—Yes.

56. And that examination is submitted to me at once?—I did not know that.

57. The result of the examination is submitted to me with the report from the sergeant in charge of the men, and on that it is decided whether the men shall be retained in the depot or not?—I was not aware of it.

58. You said that in Victoria the Commissioner advertises that the men are to appear on a certain day, and he then selects the men: how can he select the men without knowing something of their previous history?—I said that a larger number of men than were actually required were picked out in the first instance, and the selection is made from these men.

59. Supposing their characters are bad, what is the use of picking out the men in that way?—The whole thing is gone into then.

60. Do you not think the whole thing should be gone into beforehand?—The system gives the Commissioner an opportunity of at once selecting the men who *prima facie* are suitable for police constables.

61. You know that we inquire into the history of the applicants?—I do not find fault with the system, but I throw this out as a suggestion which would enable the Commissioner to have a more complete control.

62. If the men were advertised for, as in Melbourne, and a certain number were picked out, perhaps they might all have to be discharged again because nothing was known of their previous character or history?—That is the time the inquiry should commence.

63. You would retain those men until the inquiry was made?—Certainly not.

64. What would you do?—Let them go back to their occupation. Let them present themselves on a certain day, on the understanding that if they are picked they will be required to attend the depot for training.

65. Do you not think they would lose their situations, coming from a distance?—Not necessarily.

66. I do not see the advantage of it. As regards promotions, you suggest another system. You say there are a number of men who are passed over now who should be promoted?—I say there are a number of men who are complaining that they are passed over. I was in that position myself. I was nineteen years with the rank of constable, and a number of men were promoted over me. As I have said, the men who complained that I was promoted over their heads did not complain when they were promoted over the heads of others.

67. You are not suggesting that men are passed over now who ought to be promoted—simply that they are complaining?—Yes, that is so.

68. Do you not think there will always be that, even with a Board?—I suggested that there should be a Board to assist you, and take away the responsibility in this respect to some extent.

69. What would that Board know of the men in the short time they had the men before them?—You have Inspectors in the different centres who have been in the different districts.

70. These are the men who would recommend?—Yes; each one of the Inspectors would know men who were eligible for promotion, and they would probably know from actual experience the qualifications of all the candidates.

71. As regards the clerical staff, I suppose you admit that the clerks are specially qualified?—I admit that they are, and they ought to be. There is exceedingly great difficulty in getting clerks.

72. And being better qualified, they are entitled to promotion early?—They are certainly entitled to promotion early.

73. The position of district clerk is an important one, is it not?—Yes.

74. Their work is often of a confidential nature?—Yes.

75. It is the case, is it not, that men are removed from that position because they are not confidential and are not qualified?—They must possess the qualifications that the Inspector and the position require.