

On the other hand, he had represented to Henne, for whom he had undertaken to purchase a part of the property—viz., the license and billiard-table—and who had authorised him to give £160 for such part, that Miss Conway would not sell same for less than £170. Sergeant Hannan subsequently told Henne that Miss Conway had sold the property to him, Sergeant Hannan, and he agreed to sell the license and billiard-table to Henne for £160, who agreed to buy same at that price after he knew that Hannan had bought for himself. Upon Hannan's representation that he could not get more for her, Miss Conway agreed to sell, and did sell, the whole property to him for £135, so that he got the whole property (including land and buildings, estimated for stamp duty by his solicitor at £45) for £135, and sold the license and billiard-table only to Henne for £160. In short, we find that he deceived both Henne and Miss Conway, each of whom Hannan led to believe he was acting in their interest, and that he acted fraudulently towards both of them.

*Complaint* of Third-class Sergeant John Dwyer, No. 268, as to his non-promotion in turn.

*Finding.*—Sergeant Dwyer, in our opinion, is an excellent officer, a fact which the present Commissioner of Police has recognised by removing him from Clyde to Christchurch. We think that the non-promotion in turn of Sergeant Dwyer arose through a misunderstanding by the late Commissioner of Police (Colonel Hume) in thinking that Sergeant Dwyer was unwilling to be moved from his position as police-gaoler at Oamaru. If Sergeant Dwyer's position in the seniority list can be now rectified without injustice to others we are of opinion that it should be done. We are of opinion that in all cases of sergeants or constables acting as police-gaolers their seniority of service should not be interfered with by reason of their so acting.

*Complaint* of Constable H. Mulholland, No. 135, that he has been most unfairly treated in regard to promotion, and that his juniors in the service have been promoted to the rank of sergeant.

*Finding.*—Having heard Constable Mulholland's evidence at great length, we do not consider he has any ground of complaint owing to non-promotion to the rank of sergeant. Constable Mulholland's case is an illustration of the necessity for periodical removals of constables, so that the better as well as the more undesirable and disadvantageous stations should be occupied by different constables in turn. While Constable Mulholland was at what may be called a "good" station, with considerable extra emoluments, he made no complaint of non-promotion. We have no recommendation to make in this case.

*Complaint* of Mr. A. C. Henderson, of Invercargill, solicitor, that he had suffered pecuniary loss and much annoyance through the Police Force at Invercargill preventing prisoners employing him. Also suggesting that members of the Force be not allowed to remain too long in one place.

*Finding.*—There has been evidently some feeling between the complainant, Mr. Henderson, and Sergeant Macdonell, but we cannot say that it is proved that members of the Police Force at Invercargill prevent prisoners or others employing Mr. Henderson professionally. We think the police should be instructed to send for any solicitor a prisoner may desire to see, or, if he does not know the names of the local solicitors, the names of those in the habit of practising in the local Police Court, of whom a list should be kept at the station, should be supplied to him. We think this would prevent such complaints as Mr. Henderson's being made in the future. The matter of periodical removal of members of the Force is dealt with in our general report.

During the investigation of the above complaint, evidence was given as to what were considered questionable methods used by Sergeant Macdonell in obtaining evidence in criminal cases, by leading persons to believe that certain other persons had made statements to him which had not been made, whereby such first-mentioned persons were deceived into making certain admissions. Whilst recognising the difficulties the police often have in procuring the necessary evidence to obtain conviction against guilty persons, we desire to record our opinions that a resort to falsehood by the police in order to procure evidence to obtain a conviction is highly reprehensible.

*Complaint* by First-class Constable John Jeffries, No. 36, who complains as follows: (1.) That many juniors to myself in the service have been promoted to higher class and pay, while others have been appointed to stations where the emoluments are considerable in