

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.