

541. *Mr. Taylor.*] As a matter of fact there are policemen in each district adjoining Oamaru, Hampden, and those adjacent districts?—Yes, and then there is a big country round there. We have two very busy seasons every year. One is harvesting and the other is shearing.

542. If any one were to say of the police at Oamaru that their principal occupation was in getting out of each other's way, you would think it was saying what was not true?—I should.

543. Do you know the constable at Hampden—Constable Joyce?—Yes.

544. Has he been there many years?—He has been there since the end of 1880.

545. Has he ever been recommended for removal?—I could not answer that. I think it is very difficult to find a station for him, because he has got seven children, and our houses will not run seven children as a rule.

546. On that particular point—constables with large families—can Colonel Hume tell us the circumstances connected with the removal of Constable Darby from Carterton to do street duty in Wellington—a man with a large family, I think ten children? First, what was he? first-, second-, or third-class constable?—First-class constable; he is sergeant now.

547. Who recommended his transfer?—On the 27th January, 1896, I recommended Constable Darby's transfer from Carterton to Wellington, and the reasons I gave were that he had been at Carterton since 1883; and he is now a widower and it is not desirable that he should continue in charge of a station. As I have explained, in the case of a single man or a widower it is not desirable that he should have charge of a station where he has to deal with women.

548. Is that a general rule?—Yes; always so.

549. He had been Clerk of the Court at Carterton?—Yes.

550. He would lose very considerably by the transfer?—Yes; another man down South suffered in exactly the same way.

551. This man had ten children?—I think so.

552. It was necessary he should be in charge of a station. It is only men who are in charge of stations who are Clerks of Court?—Yes.

553. Did he not get a very respectable woman as housekeeper immediately after his wife's death?—I do not know.

554. One of the reasons for his transfer was that his wife having died there was no female searcher at the station?—Quite so. He would have to take charge of females, and that was not desirable.

555. Can you tell us whether Mr. Hogg, the member for Masterton, did not interfere actively in getting this man transferred? Did he not bring the matter under your notice that the man's wife having died it was desirable that he should be transferred?—Oh, no; they have to report the fact.

556. Did he not see you about it, then?—I do not think so.

557. Now, with regard to Constable John Ryan; he was Clerk of the Court at Raglan?—He was, but not now.

558. You said yesterday that you could remember he was charged with, I think, some error in his forage account, but you could not remember his being charged with blackmailing in connection with judgment debtors?—I may say there was an inquiry held by the Inspector there.

559. *The Chairman.*] Will you tell us where he is now?—He is at Taupo, in charge there, and Clerk of the Court there.

560. What is his rank?—He is a first-class constable.

561. *Mr. Taylor.*] What was he at the time he left Raglan?—Second-class. The following is the report of the Inspector:—

Police Office, Auckland, 29th October, 1894.

Memo. No. 516A.—The Commissioner of Police, Wellington.

I FORWARD herewith statements of witnesses made before me at Raglan on the 24th and 25th instant respecting charges preferred against Constable John Ryan, No. 348. First: The first charge made was that he had on 2nd March last attempted to deduct 10s. from a sum of £4 1s. payable to a Maori out of Court trust funds; that the Maori appealed to Mr. Langley, a storekeeper of Kawhia, who caused Constable Ryan to pay the full amount. During the inquiry a number of other charges were preferred against the constable. Second: That he asked for and received by way of commission, on the 24th June, 1893, the sum of 8s. from Mr. James Rendell, storekeeper at Raglan, out of a sum of £7 8s. payable to him out of Court. Third: That he in December last assaulted a man named William Badley who was tipsy at the Royal Hotel at Raglan. Fourth: That he informed a man named Peter Middlemiss that his tender for fencing Courthouse reserve for a sum of £7 was accepted, and after the posts had been ordered he gave the work to Mr. A. Langley, of Raglan, the price being £6 15s. Fifth: That he has on three occasions had the shoes removed on his own horse at the same time that the shoes on the troop horse were removed, and has charged the removes as new shoes to the department. Sixth: That when arresting a man named Patrick Nolan, on the 25th October, 1893, for being drunk and disorderly he knocked him down. Seventh: That he retained 8s. 9d., with costs of Court 5s., out of an account of £6 8s. 9d. adjudged by the Court to be due James Rendell. Eighth: That he received 5s. for an information laid by James Rendell, which sum he retained for his own use. Ninth: That he used the horse-cover purchased for troop-horse on his own horse.

I submit that the first and second charges have been proved. That the third charge has not been proved. It appears he heard a noise in the Royal Hotel about 9 o'clock at night, in December last. On going in to see the cause a man named William Badley, who was tipsy, trod on his toes. Constable Ryan pushed him off and he fell. That the fourth charge has not been proved: indeed, I may say it has been disproved. The fifth charge has been proved. He admits that on three occasions when the troop-horse required his shoes removed he was not fit for work; he got the shoes removed, and at the same time got the shoes removed on his own horse at a cost of 3s. 6d. each, and charged each time for a set of new shoes to the Police Department. The troop-horse being old and not fit to do much work, he has more frequently used his own horse on police duty. From February, 1893, up to date—twenty-one months—accounts for fourteen sets of new shoes have been paid. No account for removes has been received by me. The sixth charge has not been proved. The seventh charge has been disproved. The record-books produced show that he received only £6 from a Native named Mete Karaka, and that amount was paid to Mr. Rendell. The eighth charge has been disproved. The information laid by Mr. Rendell's son was produced with stamps for 5s. affixed to it. The information had been withdrawn. This information has passed audit. The ninth charge has not been proved. I have seen a cover for his own horse much like the one for the troop-horse, and both covers have been used at the same time on both horses. He admits he has received no permission to keep a private horse.

I attach hereto a copy of my entry of inspection. Some delay has occurred from the time the first complaint