

and towards the public generally?—No; I supposed that the Inspector based his report to the Licensing Committee entirely on this case of dismissal, and I do not believe because a man makes one slip and pays the penalty that he is to be deprived of his livelihood for the rest of his life.

779. So far as you can see, is the file in the Lawliss case complete?—I will have to compare the file and the papers laid on the table of the House to see.

780. Do the papers laid on the table of the House include the telegrams you have now read?—Yes; both telegrams.

781. Throughout the whole matter do you know if the Minister acted without any personal feeling at all in the matter, and entirely on your recommendation?—Yes; entirely on my recommendation.

782. I would like to refer to the case of Constable Bennett. Is there anything on these papers to show, or do you know of anything to prove that the Minister knew anything whatever about the case, or that it was ever brought under his notice at all?—No.

783. You dealt with it entirely as Commissioner of Police, acting on the recommendation of the Inspector of the district?—Yes. Probably we shall examine Inspector McGovern at some period of this inquiry, and he may be able to give some further grounds in regard to this recommendation.

784. There is one more point arising in connection with this case, and that is the absence of any record of this affiliation case on the constable's defaulter's sheet. Now, the fact that there is no such record was not through any Ministerial interference?—No.

784A. The Minister is not responsible for that?—No.

785. It is merely a question as to whether such a charge should go on the defaulter's sheet or not; and in your opinion you thought it should not go on the sheet?—In every service I have been connected with it has always been a debatable point whether civil convictions should be recorded in defaulters' sheets. In this instance of Bennett, the offence was not entered by the Inspector of the district in the return, already alluded to this morning, sent in to my office, and consequently it was not entered in the defaulter's sheet. As I stated the other day, I am of opinion that civil convictions should be entered; but that is only my opinion.

786. *The Chairman.*] Was it by your instructions it was not entered in the monthly return?—No; it was not omitted from the Inspector's return by my instructions.

787. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] In the case of McGill's long leave: were you in that case guided entirely by the medical certificates and the Inspector's report?—Yes, entirely.

788. And the Minister was also?—Yes.

789. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do you know if that is the constable referred to in the House by Mr. Taylor as having been incapacitated from duty through debauchery?—I have no doubt that was the man referred to by Mr. Taylor.

790. Now, in regard to Constable Cox, about whom you were questioned by Mr. Taylor, has Constable Cox done good work since he has been in the Force?—Very good, since he has been a plain-clothes constable.

791. Was one of his cases that of the Browns, convicted for abortion?—Yes; Brown got eighteen years, and his wife about two years.

792. He was connected with the case of attempted murder at Balclutha?—Yes; and he arrested the man here in Wellington.

793. Was he also engaged in the case of illegal trading at the Central Hotel, Christchurch, where the licensee was heavily fined?—Yes. I should like to explain that case. It was rather a special case. I ascertained that there was a good deal of illicit selling going on at this Central Hotel. I spoke to Inspector Broham, and he said, from the situation of that hotel, and the scouts the proprietor had out, it was impossible to catch him, as all the local constables were known to the men. I sent down two men from Wellington, and Cox was one of them, and told them not to interview Inspector Broham or any of the police, or report themselves in any way until such time as they had got sufficient evidence to lay information. They carried out their duties with great sagacity, which resulted in obtaining, I think, two convictions, and the man was heavily fined, and gave up the hotel. I mention this case specially, because Inspector Broham felt hurt at two constables being sent to his district without his being consulted or informed.

794. Why did you do it?—I thought they might be seen about the police-station, and that the licensee would get wind of their being in Christchurch.

795. You did not doubt the loyalty of the local police at all?—No; not at all. I was afraid the men would be seen and become known if they went near the station.

796. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Cox has been engaged in many other cases?—Yes; one was a notorious pickpocket, whom he got arrested and convicted.

797. And has he shown zeal and intelligence in carrying out his duties?—Yes; and I look upon him as a coming detective.

798. And as regards Nixon, has he also displayed very considerable intelligence and so on in carrying out his duties?—Yes; I have no fault whatever to find with Nixon. I think he also will make a detective in time.

799. Therefore, whatever reasons there were for bringing these men into the Force, they have shown they are very good police-officers?—Yes; and I should also like to add that I brought no pressure to bear upon Inspector Pender to employ them as plain-clothes constables. They were his own selection.

800. You were asked about ex-Sergeant Duffin: Was this officer upwards of thirty years in the Force before he was dismissed?—Yes.

801. And until the reports of drinking that led to his dismissal, had he a perfectly clean sheet?—Perfectly clean.

802. I should like to ask Colonel Hume about transfers: You said in your examination in chief that you thought every officer should be transferred at least once in five years?—That is so.