

for it, and a year after (in 1885) I was appointed acting-detective in Auckland, remaining there till 1890. My experience of detective duty was such as would have made most men abandon it, because it was very discouraging. I was acting five years before I was appointed, and during most of the time was only getting 7s. a day. At the end of five years, after various recommendations from superior officers, including Thomson, Shearman, and Brougham, Major Gudgeon appointed me detective. When Colonel Hume became Commissioner I was transferred, at twenty-four hours' notice, to Wellington, where I remained five years; I was then transferred to Invercargill; thence to Auckland and the Thames; then to Christchurch; thence to Dunedin. About six years ago I came to Dunedin as Chief Detective from Christchurch, and have been here ever since. I have been a detective for twenty-five years, although in name for only nineteen or twenty. I consider I am as well qualified as any man to express an opinion on general police matters. I have had no communication with Mr. Arnold in any way prior to the sitting of the Commission here. I have since. In regard to the present Minister of Justice, every one in the Force, so far as I know, hails his arrival as Minister with great pleasure. In regard to the detective and uniform police, I think the Victorian system might very advantageously be adopted in New Zealand. Detectives should not be placed at the bottom of the seniority list, as it has a bad effect generally. We come at the bottom of the list, after the junior constable appointed yesterday. This is calculated in some measure to make the uniform men look on us as outsiders, though I do not attach much importance to this point personally. This could easily be improved by altering the title of detectives in the same way as in Victoria, making them detective constables, detective sergeants, and so on. They should take their exact position in the list—that is, if a detective, by reason of pay and rank, is on a level with a sergeant of equivalent rank, but joined the day before, he should be on the list above that sergeant. Then the question of seniority, which is such a burning question with the whole Force, would be in a great measure settled. A man should be promoted from detective constable to detective senior constable or detective sergeant, and so on. Then he takes his true senior position in the sergeants' list. There is no need at all why he should be called a detective.

1. *The Commissioner.*] How is the Chief Detective rated in Victoria?—There is no such rank. There is a Superintendent of Detectives in charge of the whole Force, who is the only commissioned officer in the detective branch.

2. Who has local control of the detectives?—The detective force outside Melbourne is small, the whole force being practically in Melbourne. Outside they are under the local Superintendent of Police.

3. That would not be workable in New Zealand?—No, I do not propose that. I have here the Victorian *Police Gazette* for this year, and I wish to allude to two things to establish my argument. One is in favour of the seniority list, as I have described it; the other is that in Victoria the success of the detective department in reaching higher ranks has been very marked indeed, and I offer this as a reason in support of what I state—that a detective, owing to his experience, can make himself efficient, and has opportunities of making himself a better uniform policeman than a sergeant has—he has more varied experience, and a greater amount of it. The present Chief Commissioner of Police never was a constable; he joined as a detective, and everybody who knows him is aware of his great ability. Five of the ten Superintendents of Police in Victoria rose to their positions, some from uniform, but all through the detective office; one Inspector got there through detective work and one Sub-Inspector. Then there are numerous instances in the New South Wales police known to myself where detectives are now holding higher rank. For instance, Detective Roche, who was here at the time of the Duke's visit, and who was equal in rank with me, is now Superintendent of Police. I say I have an equal claim with him, and I leave the Commission to draw its own conclusions from the present difference in our ranks. I will now refer to the conditions under which we were placed during the time the last Minister of Justice held that position. He refused to recognise the right of a detective to higher promotion in the Force unless he first reverted to a lower grade, and competed with sergeants, station sergeants, and uniform men generally. That would have meant that if I wanted to be a Sub-Inspector I must leave the work I have been doing half my life, take up other work in a lower rank, and probably also take my place behind the junior station sergeant, and come in when the four station sergeants have passed out of my way. I need not elaborate this question in view of your Worship's experience. The present Minister of Justice departed from this rule, and promoted Chief Detective McGrath to Sub-Inspector.

4. *Mr. Dinnie.*] On whose recommendation?—I do not know, but I know something of the difficulties he had to get his claim recognised while Mr. McGowan was in power, and if the recommendation was made before and not after Mr. McGowan retired I take it the responsibility for his not being appointed at that time does not rest with yourself. I desire to point out that while Mr. McGrath was fighting to establish his claim to a vacancy a junior man to him and myself was appointed Sub-Inspector over both our heads, and he is now senior to Mr. McGrath. I would point out that if Mr. McGrath was entitled to be appointed Sub-Inspector to the first vacancy when Dr. Findlay came into office he was entitled to be so when his immediate predecessor was in office, and he now suffers the injustice of being junior to a man who should be junior to him. I desire to say I have the greatest possible respect for the man to whom I refer, and therefore do not wish to make his name public. This grievance—though not liking the word "grievance," I should rather call it "indictment"—against the enemy, whoever he may be, is equally my grievance. Twenty-five years ago I was appointed acting-detective, and nineteen or twenty years ago I was appointed detective, while the Sub-Inspector to whom I refer was a constable for seven years before he was appointed Sub-Inspector. I am not one yet, and I am not aware that Mr. Dinnie has yet recommended me. I have an extract here from a newspaper, which may or may not be correct, of what Mr. Mitchell said in Invercargill in regard to the question of station sergeants and Chief