

had a conversation with the Defence Minister about removing detectives, and I said I thought both Chief Detectives O'Connor, in Christchurch, and Henderson, in Dunedin, had been too long in each place; and the Minister said, when making any moves of detectives fix these two up. I think I put a recommendation before him to remove three detectives, and, so far as my memory serves me, he said, "Halloo! you have not got Chief Detectives O'Connor and Henderson here. Why have you not included them?" I said, "I was afraid of bringing a hornet's nest about my ears." He said, "Oh, that is it. I will soon see about that," and he then asked me if I considered the transfers necessary, and I said "Yes; certainly." He then entered the two men in the list of removals in his own handwriting, and said, "Now carry that out." They were carried out.

54. What telegrams passed about these transfers?—There are two on the file in reference to the transfer of Henderson, as follows: "Hon. R. J. Seddon, Premier, Nelson.—Hope Hume will make other arrangements not necessitate removal of Detective Henderson. Not fair to his part take him away, and cruel injustice to man himself by compelling great sacrifice on his and family's part. It means the almost giving away his little freehold home, and actual loss. Surely entitled some consideration.—LARNACH, Dunedin." This was answered as follows: "Hon. W. J. M. Larnach, M.H.R., Dunedin.—I think you will admit that periodical removals tend to promote efficiency in the Force, and it would be manifestly unjust to other members of the Force to move them two or three times whilst other members of the Force, by bringing influence to bear, should remain for years in the one place. Henderson has no reason whatever to complain; and the removals were well considered before being determined upon. To me it is at any time pleasing to meet your wishes, but there are good grounds why the transfers ordered should be adhered to, and though sorry this particular officer's private affairs should be prejudiced, the efficiency of the Force is paramount to all else.—R. J. SEDDON." The next telegram reads: "Hon. R. J. Seddon, Picton.—Re Henderson. Cannot find fault with your reasons. Have nothing further to say.—LARNACH, Dunedin." The next telegram is dated the 2nd February, 1895, as follows: "Hon. R. J. Seddon, Premier, Nelson.—Some friends have requested me to ask you reconsider transfer Detective Henderson. He is not one of my people, but I know him as an obliging and capable officer. His remaining here would give pleasure to many of your friends.—P. LYNCH, Dunedin." The answer was sent on the same day, as follows: "The Rev. Father Lynch, Dunedin.—Henderson is a valuable and efficient officer, but the exigencies of the service demand his going to Christchurch. He has not had a removal for years, and has no good grounds for complaint. To rescind decision would be subversive of discipline and injurious to the Force. The other first-class detectives have been removed several times, whilst Henderson allowed to remain in Dunedin.—R. J. SEDDON."

55. Do telegrams addressed direct to the Defence Minister come to your department, or are they retained by him?—They are all here.

56. I should like to ask Colonel Hume whether Inspector Broham has not reported to him that Detective Henderson is of drunken habits?—Yes, he has.

57. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Has not Detective Henderson since that date been dismissed from the Force?—Yes.

58. *The Chairman.*] Was he dismissed on account of his drunken habits?—No.

59. *Colonel Pitt.*] Has he also been reinstated in the Force?—He has been reappointed. That is to say, when that report was written he was chief detective. He was afterwards brought back as second-class detective.

60. *The Chairman.*] Have you yourself made an inquiry in respect to that report of Inspector Broham's, to satisfy you as to its justification or otherwise?—No; I only received it just a day or two before I handed it over to Mr. Tunbridge.

61. You have never investigated it yourself?—No. I could never get anybody to say they had seen Henderson drunk. That was my trouble.

62. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] I will ask Colonel Hume to read my memorandum to the Minister, by which Detective Henderson was readmitted to the Force?—It is as follows:—

Memorandum for the Hon. the Minister of Justice. Police Department, 9th February, 1898.
WITH respect to the case of ex-Chief Detective Henderson, Mr. Beetham, S.M., practically acquits Henderson of all charges except that of failing to report to his Inspector the disturbance between Mohr and his wife at the hotel, in the course of which he was assaulted with a hairbrush by Mohr's two daughters. For this offence simply I think dismissal from the Police Force too great a punishment, and if all other charges are to be eliminated, then reduction from the rank of chief detective to that of second-class detective, and transfer to some other district, would, I think, meet the case. I wish it to be understood that in making above suggestion I am acting entirely on the report of the Stipendiary Magistrate who held the inquiry, without in any way saying whether or not I agree with that learned gentleman's findings.
J. B. TUNBRIDGE, Commissioner.

That recommendation was carried out, and he was transferred to Wellington.

63. *Mr. Poynton.*] Of, course, Mr. Taylor's charge is that by outside interference the Force has been demoralised. Has there been outside influence in this matter, or were you induced as Commissioner to keep this man on, or overlook his conduct?—There was nothing for which to get rid of him.

64. But was there any outside influence?—No.

65. *Mr. Taylor.*] During the seventeen years he was at Dunedin was it never proposed to remove him?—I never saw it on the papers.

66. You never proposed to transfer him before he was finally transferred?—I spoke to the Minister a short time before his removal—about a month or so.

THURSDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1898.

ARTHUR HUME: Examination on oath continued.

67. *Mr. Taylor.*] Have you the papers for Constable William McGill, who is acting as district clerk at New Plymouth?—Yes. I have the defaulter's sheet. He entered the service on the 31st May, 1882, with eighteen months' previous service in the A.C. Force.