

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.