

connection with work outside what is generally deemed to be police employment. (2.) That during the time Colonel Hume was Commissioner I was transferred four times, being a removal about every year and eight months on the average, which I think unreasonable; besides, it has been ruinous financially and otherwise to myself and family. I am utterly unconscious of having done wrong in any way to deserve it, hence am anxious to know why I have been selected for so much punishment. (3.) That, having been informed by Colonel Hume I was transferred from Picton because I interfered in the last election, and, having denied the accusation, asked him to grant me an inquiry into it, and he peremptorily declined to do so, thus affording me no opportunity whatever of defending myself, which I consider a drastic and most un-English-like proceeding, and contrary to all sense of fair-play. (4.) That when transferred from Picton Station, Colonel Hume would not allow me any compensation for improvements I had made to it, and which I was almost bound to effect or carry out in order to make the premises inhabitable and somewhat comfortable, neither would he permit me to remove them after giving up possession of the building, but retained them, either in the interest or on behalf of the Government, or for the benefit of the constable who succeeded me there, which I consider not only denotes ill-feeling and prejudice against me, but was a drastic proceeding, whereby I have been made a monetary sufferer, amounting to several pounds. The improvements in question consisted of the erection or fitting-up of venetian window-blinds, clothes-bars and hooks, hat-racks, shelving, lamp-stands, &c., wash-house, wood- and coal-house, and other outdoor improvements, all of which were necessary and cost money.

*Finding.*—A great deal of evidence was taken in reference to this complaint, both at Nelson and Blenheim, and we have come to the following conclusion on the matter: (1.) As to non-promotion complained of by Constable Jeffries, we have no recommendation to make. His and similar complaints upon this head are dealt with in our general report. (2.) As to the second complaint we have no recommendation to make. (3.) The main point sought to be established by Constable Jeffries in reference to his conduct during the preparation of the electoral roll for the House of Representatives, prior to the last general election, was that he, Constable Jeffries, had not improperly omitted from the Wairau electoral roll the names of a number of persons living at Admiralty Bay and other places to the westward of Pelorus Sound, who were entitled to have their names placed upon that roll. The evidence entirely satisfied us that Constable Jeffries carried out the instructions he received from his superiors fully and in a perfectly impartial manner. We are also satisfied that a telegram which was sent to him by Sergeant Möller, at the instance of Mr. Mills, M.H.R., altering his (Constable Jeffries') first instructions was not received by him at all. (4.) We are of opinion that Constable Jeffries should have been allowed to remove from the police quarters occupied by him at Picton the following things: Venetian window-blinds, clothes-bars and hooks, hat-racks, shelving, and lamp-stand; and that, as he was not allowed to remove them, he should be paid a reasonable value for the same.

*Complaint* of Third-class Constable John Cullinane, complaining of evidence given by Charles Slight before the Commissioners concerning the complainant, and alleging a promise by the Minister in charge of the Police Department that complainant should be restored to his former position as first-class constable upon refunding the compensation which he had received on being allowed to retire from the Force through illness.

*Finding.*—We find that Constable Cullinane retired from the service as a first-class constable owing to illness, and that the Minister in charge of the Department agreed that he should be allowed to rejoin as a constable upon refunding the compensation which was paid to him on retirement. This he did not refund, claiming that he was promised by the Minister that he should be reinstated as a first-class constable. This promise is not proved to our satisfaction. We consider that when Constable Cullinane leaves the service again he should not receive any further compensation or retiring-allowance. If the police pension scheme is instituted he would be entitled to receive his pension in the usual way, his service to count from the date of his rejoining the Force.

*Complaint* of Constable Edward Brophy, who complains that he was put to extra expense in being sent on relief duty to Seddonville and detained there on that duty for nearly six months, whereas he had been led to believe he would be kept there for only a few weeks.

*Finding.*—We consider that, under the circumstances, Constable Brophy should be compensated to a reasonable extent for the extra expense so incurred by him.