

with this was heard in the local Court, but the Magistrate was not satisfied, and dismissed the case. As the result of the whole matter, Inspector Ellison recommended the removal of this man to another district, as the public were not satisfied with the constable's conduct. He was then transferred.

Later on he was, with extraordinary lack of judgment, sent by the present Commissioner in charge of a station in the very district where he had been previously known as a bookmaker, and where he was brought in constant contact with the very people to whom he had defaulted years before. In October, 1907, the Commissioner makes reference to this in the following terms, by way of excuse: "It is unfortunate he was put in charge of this station, or any station in that vicinity, where his previous history was well known. I was quite ignorant of this when I approved of the Inspector's recommendation to put him in charge there." How the Commissioner was ignorant I cannot understand, for the whole history of the man's antecedents was set out in the file, and the district and places that he had favoured with his attention were particularly described and are on complete record.

In August and September, 1907, further charges were made against this man, who was described as the "police spieler" in the correspondence regarding them. The charges were various, from theft downwards. Inquiry was made into these charges by an Inspector, and a report made. A charge also of undue familiarity, by a married woman, was inquired into at the same time; but this, as is so frequently the case, resolved itself into one word against the other. The Commissioner, in dealing with the charges, expressed himself, *inter alia*, as follows: "Constable A's previous history (which is certainly not of the character which would now be accepted by the Department) is well known in that district, and he is not respected as a police constable ought to be. He is strictly cautioned." This was in October, 1907.

A serious charge of robbing a prisoner had been previously preferred against this same Constable A by Constable B. The inquiries into this, with other allegations, occupied some considerable time, and on the 19th October, 1907, the Commissioner wrote as follows, *inter alia*: "I must say, however, that in this charge the weight of evidence is against Constable A, and it is questionable in my mind whether or not he can be relied on and should be trusted with the charge of a station, as we cannot overlook his history previous to joining the service and since. It is apparent that his transfer must now be effected, especially in view of the public feeling against him in the district, and also the friction existing between him and Constable B and Constable C. Subject to approval, therefore, I will arrange for his transfer to a more suitable station where his previous history is unknown to the public."

A more extraordinary position for a Commissioner of Police to take up in respect to a constable whom he practically admits is utterly discredited, and whose honesty he himself seriously impugns, I cannot well imagine. And he calmly proposes to pass him on to a section of the public "*where his previous history is unknown.*"

But we have not done with him yet. He receives thirty-six days' leave so that he may visit Auckland and Rotorua. Orders are then issued for him to transfer to a station in the South, and Constable B is ordered to go to an inferior station in the North Island on the Main Trunk Railway. Constable A then wires that he is sorry that he cannot accept the proposed transfer, on the ground of his wife's and his own health. He is then told that he may go to a district in the North, but will not be in charge. He goes there for the time being, but evidently has no intention of remaining, for on the 28th January, 1908, he applied for three months' leave of absence *without pay* from the 1st May to the 31st July, and stated that he intended to resign from the New Zealand Police Force as from the latter date. He gave as his reason for this application that, as he would then complete ten years' service, he would be entitled to a refund of three-fourths of his contributions to the Police Provident Fund. The Commissioner minuted this, "I cannot approve of this application.—W. DINNIE, Com'r. 4/2/08." On the 5th April, 1908, Constable A renews his application,