

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Applications withdrawn	41	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