

—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.