

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