

1906.

VICTORIA.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE VICTORIAN POLICE FORCE.

REPORT

ON

I.—THE EFFICIENCY OF THE POLICE FORCE IN CONNEXION
WITH THE REPRESSION OF CRIME;

II.—THE PRESENT CONDITION, ORGANIZATION, AND ADMIN-
ISTRATION OF THE SAID FORCE;

WITH

APPENDIX AND MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

PRESENTED TO BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY'S COMMAND.

By Authority:

J. KEMP, ACTING GOVERNMENT PRINTER, MELBOURNE.

APPROXIMATE COST OF PAPER.

										£	s.	d.
Preparation—Not given.	-	-	-	572	0	0
Printing (1,500 copies)	-	-	-			

Edward, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

To our trusty and well-beloved JAMES CAMERON, Esquire, M.L.A.; ALFRED ARTHUR BILLSON, Esquire, M.L.A.; JOHN WILLIAM BILLSON, Esquire, M.L.A.; JOHN JOSEPH CARLISLE, Esquire, M.L.A.; JAMES FRANCIS DUFFUS, Esquire, M.L.A.; HUGH MCKENZIE, Esquire, M.L.A.; and DAVID SMITH, Esquire, M.L.A.

GREETING—

Whereas we have deemed it expedient, for divers good causes and considerations, that a Royal Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into, and report as to—1. The efficiency of the Police Force in connexion with the repression of crime; 2. The present condition, organization, and administration of the said Force: Now know ye that we, reposing great trust and confidence in your zeal, discretion and integrity, have authorized and appointed you, the said JAMES CAMERON, ALFRED ARTHUR BILLSON, JOHN WILLIAM BILLSON, JOHN JOSEPH CARLISLE, JAMES FRANCIS DUFFUS, HUGH MCKENZIE, and DAVID SMITH to be our Commissioners for the purposes aforesaid: And for the better effecting of the purposes of this our Commission we do by these presents give and grant unto you or any three or more of you, in case you shall think fit so to do, full power and authority to call before you such persons as you shall judge likely to afford you any information on the subject of this our Commission: And we do by these presents will and ordain that this our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you our said Commissioners, or any three or more of you, may from time to time proceed in the execution thereof, and of every matter and thing therein contained, although your proceedings be not continued from, time to time, by adjournment: And our further will and pleasure is that you do, with as little delay as possible, report to us under your hands and seals your opinion upon the matters herein submitted for your consideration: And we appoint you, the said JAMES CAMERON, to be the CHAIRMAN of this Commission, with authority to give a second or casting vote at any meeting at which the votes (including that of the CHAIRMAN) on any question pertaining thereto shall be equal: And for your assistance in the execution of this our Commission we have made choice of our trusty and well-beloved DAVID BARRY, Esquire, to be SECRETARY to this our Commission and to attend you, whose services and assistance we require you to use from time to time as occasion may require.

In testimony whereof we have caused these our Letters to be made Patent, and the seal of our said State to be hereunto affixed.

Witness our trusty and well-beloved the Honorable Sir REGINALD ARTHUR JAMES TALBOT, Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Governor of the State of Victoria and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia, &c., &c., at Melbourne, this Fifteenth day of August, One thousand nine hundred and five, and in the fifth year of our reign.

L.S.

R. TALBOT.

By His Excellency's Command,

SAMUEL GILLOTT.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. Creation of Commission	v
2. Scope of Inquiry	vi
3. Procedure	vi
4. Present Condition of Police Force	vi
5. Strength of Force	vii
6. Appointments to Force	viii
7. Probationary Period	viii
8. Promotions—How made	viii
9. " Examinations for	ix
10. Beat System	x
11. Eight Hours System	xi
12. Plain Clothes Police	xi
13. Grade of First-class Constable	xi
14. Pointsmen	xi
15. Purchase of Horses	xi
16. Uniform, &c.	xi
17. Police Regulations	xii
18. Travelling Allowances	xii
19. Allowances in addition to Pay	xii
20. Rewards	xii
21. Pensions	xii
22. Retirement Age	xiii
23. Crime and Criminals	xiii
24. Undetected Crime	xiv
25. C. I. Branch	xiv
26. Gambling Clubs	xv
27. Lotteries and Gaming	xv
28. Collingwood "Tote"	xv
29. Control of Police Force	xv
30. Chief Commissioner	xvi
31. Police Interest in Licensed Premises	xvi
32. Charges by Mr. Gaunson	xvi
33. " Wilkins	xvii
34. " Roberts	xvii
35. " Mackinnon	xvii
36. " McHugh	xviii
37. " Fryer	xix
38. " McGinley	xix
39. " Crowe	xix
40. Charge against Detective Whitney	xx
41. " " McManamny	xx
42. Constable Geelan	xx
43. Detective Carter	xx
44. Departmental Correspondence	xx
45. Complaint against Police	xxi
46. Sectarianism	xxi
47. Barracks, &c.	xxi
48. Government-owned Buildings	xxi
49. Premature Closing of Evidence	xxi
50. Conclusion	xxiii
Appendix	xxiv

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE VICTORIAN POLICE FORCE,

REPORT.

*To His Excellency the Honorable SIR REGINALD ARTHUR JAMES TALBOT,
Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath,
Governor of the State of Victoria and its Dependencies, in the Com-
monwealth of Australia, &c., &c., &c.*

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

We, the Members of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report concerning matters affecting the Victorian Police Force, have the honour to present to Your Excellency our Report on—

- I. The efficiency of the Police Force in connexion with the Repression of Crime.
- II. The present Condition, Organization, and Administration of the said Force.

CREATION OF THE COMMISSION.

Before dealing with the various matters submitted for our consideration, we purpose referring, in as brief a manner as possible, to the causes which led to the appointment of this Commission.

In the closing hours of the Parliamentary Session of 1903, during the discussion which arose after the House had resolved itself into a Committee of Supply and when the police vote was being considered, the honorable member for Collingwood, Mr. Edgar Wilkins, made very serious charges of corruption against a member of the Police Force, who, he alleged, in connexion with what is known as the Musgrove case, had participated in a sum of money which he divided with a member of the New South Wales Police Force. Mr. Wilkins referred also to the Rocke, Tomsitt case. He stated that he was not, however, prepared to give to the House the name of his informant.

He alleged that a sum of £300 was paid in the Musgrove case "in order to square the case and keep it from the Law Courts," and urged the Government to institute an inquiry. On being asked to give the name of his informant, he said he would only do so to a properly-constituted tribunal, and pressed for the appointment of a Royal Commission, to whom he was prepared not only to give the name of his informant, who was a responsible officer of the Government, but also the name of the accused person.

An ex-constable of police, Cornelius Crowe, had also made charges against the police which were embodied in pamphlets, widely distributed, wherein he brought under notice several matters relating to alleged miscarriages of justice owing to corruption in the Force.

The representative of the public officers, Mr. David Gaunson, in his speech on the Address-in-Reply (*Hansard*, pp. 275 *et seq.*), in July of last year, criticised the present Chief Commissioner, and drew attention to articles appearing in a metropolitan newspaper on the amount of undetected crime and the alleged disorganization of the Force, stating that a detective named Fryer had accused another of receiving £50 for "condoning a forgery" in the Moss case, and that Fryer would only disclose the name of the accused before a Royal Commission, where he would be protected. Mr. Gaunson cited other instances referring to the Detective Branch as "rottenness, corruption, and dead men's bones," and he asserted that, if a Royal Commission were appointed, and witnesses duly protected by the Government, there would be evidence to make "each hair of your head stand on end."

The matter having been fully considered, and in order to allay the unrest which had been occasioned, and to permit of the allegations being publicly investigated, a Royal Commission was issued on the 15th day of August, 1905.

SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY.

It will be seen from the terms of the Commission quoted above that, though the inquiry was limited to the *present* condition, organization, and administration of the Force, and its efficiency in the repression of crime, still the investigation under these heads embraced a very extended area.

PROCEDURE.

The first public sitting of the Commission was held on the 20th September, 1905; Mr. C. L. Andrews, counsel appointed by the Government, instructed by Mr. A. C. Fairhall, of the Crown Law Department, conducted the examinations.

In pursuance of the powers delegated to the Commission 56 public sittings were held, and the evidence taken of 134 witnesses, embracing representatives of the various grades of the Service, including the Ex-Chief Commissioner, Mr. H. M. Chomley, the present Chief Commissioner, Mr. Thos. O'Callaghan, and a number of officers, sub-officers, and constables, together with a number of civilians whose names had been referred to in the course of the evidence, and others who, in the judgment of the Commission, were possessed of information material to the inquiry.

Owing to the difficult and complex nature of the inquiry, and in order that every facility should be afforded for the production of evidence and examination of witnesses, and lest the purpose for which the Commission was appointed should be frustrated, the greatest possible latitude was extended to witnesses and counsel appearing for them. Your Commissioners deemed it their duty to permit the fullest and most exhaustive inquiry into the grave allegations levelled against certain members of the Force, and the oral evidence thereby adduced, which is printed and available, was more than ordinarily extensive. The exhibits, consisting for the most part of departmental files and documents, also assumed very large dimensions.

PRESENT CONDITION OF THE POLICE FORCE.

We premise the criticisms or recommendations hereafter made by observing that, in our opinion, based on the evidence given at this inquiry which continued for many months, the Police Force as a whole consists of a reputable body of men, to whom the public may look with respect and confidence. Grave imputations of corruption and compounding of felonies were made which, after an exhaustive inquiry, we find were not proven.

Other matters affecting the discipline of the Service, and the efficiency of the Police Force in the repression of crime, are dealt with under their several headings.

In our opinion, large bodies of men who have to act in concert must always be regarded as semi-military or *quasi* military bodies, where the strictest discipline must be observed. Any deviation therefrom must be fraught with serious menace, not only to the well-being of the Service itself, but to that confidence which the public should entertain towards those who are employed to protect and serve them. It is, then, the more to be regretted that an instance of lack of discipline, not only amongst members of the rank and file, but extending to certain officers, was shown to have occurred.

It was given in evidence that in April, 1905, in consequence of reports furnished by the officer in charge of No. 1 Division of the Melbourne District, an order was issued by authority of the Chief Commissioner retaining a number of constables in barracks as a reserve in case of emergency. We do not discuss the wisdom or otherwise of such an order which was cancelled a few weeks after issue ; but we are concerned with the evidence of a breach of discipline, in that a number of constables, ignoring departmental regulations and flouting their superior officers, including the Chief Commissioner, deputationized the Minister, accompanied by their parliamentary representative, for the purpose of having the order annulled. We do not deny the right of appeal to the Ministerial head, which we consider should be a privilege jealously conserved, but the appeal should be made through the proper official channel.

Much of the time of this Commission was taken up by members of the Force coming forward with grievances which they imagined were serious enough for a Royal Commission to deal with. We found it impossible to check them, inasmuch as briefs of the evidence were not supplied in all cases. The gravity of the demeanour of witnesses, and the earnest manner in which they brought forward charges and complaints of the most trumpery character, do not reflect to advantage on the judgment displayed. Petty matters were magnified into grave irregularities, and times out of number we stopped the witnesses, and asked if their further testimony was likely to be helpful to the Commission in determining the matters we were appointed to inquire into, and we were solemnly assured that they were just entering on the serious aspect of their case.

We were thus placed in the invidious position of either allowing the witnesses to proceed or peremptorily stopping them, and so laying ourselves open to a charge of suppressing evidence vital to our inquiry.

It must be remembered that we were dealing not with recruits in the Police Service, but with experienced men and officers whose training should have taught them the value of the testimony they had come to give.

In our opinion no more serious charge could be levelled against them than their inability to determine the value of evidence, and this failure on their part must reflect itself in their every-day work, and accounts in a measure for the criticisms of the public and of magistrates to whom they present cases.

STRENGTH OF FORCE.

The Police Force of Victoria consists of a Chief Commissioner, an Inspecting Superintendent, 10 Superintendents, 7 Inspectors, 17 Sub-Inspectors, 252 Sub-Officers, and 1,225 men.

With regard to the suggested increase in numbers of the Police Force, we are of opinion, from the evidence taken, that the present numerical strength is not sufficient to efficiently police this State, on account of the multifarious duties imposed upon them apart from police duties ; and we recommend an increase of 50 constables to the Force.

After reviewing the whole of the evidence given in regard to the various duties allotted to the police, such as attendance at football matches, race meetings, shows, &c., we are of opinion that reasonable care should be exercised to see that the police are engaged on strictly police duties at these places of public resort, and not on duties which should be performed by civilians specially employed.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE POLICE FORCE.

The method of making new appointments to the Police Force during Mr. Chomley's term of office was by a Board, consisting of the Chief Commissioner, the Inspector-General of Penal Establishments, and a Military Officer, which Board advertised and selected the men from a number who attended the depôt.

The Chief Commissioner has power under the *Police Regulation Act* 1890 to make appointments ; but both Mr. Chomley and Mr. O'Callaghan were of opinion that the Board strengthened their hands, and was of great assistance to them.

The practice shown to prevail is as follows :—If 60 men are required, 600 or 700 apply, so that the selection is made from a large number. After their selection by the Board, which submits them to certain elementary educational tests, they are medically examined, and the names of those who pass are placed on the list to be called for duty as required.

With the exception of a change in the *personnel* of the Board, Mr. O'Callaghan pursues a course similar to that adopted by Mr. Chomley : the present Board consisting of the Chief Commissioner and two senior police officers.

The educational tests have been shown to be most elementary, and are not such as to insure that candidates who seek employment in the Police Force possess the average education of a boy in the 3rd class at a State School.

In view of the fact that a system of free and compulsory education has been in force in this State for many years, and, having regard to the growing importance of the duties allotted to the police, we are of opinion that the educational tests of candidates for admission to the Force should be raised to the standard of the 4th class required by the Education Act.

The age of entrance for foot and mounted police should remain as at present, viz. :—between twenty and thirty years, and the minimum height for candidates should be fixed at 5 feet 9 inches.

PROBATIONARY PERIOD.

The present system, which has recently been improved, was previously very imperfect in regard to training of recruits, constables being sent out with very little knowledge of their duties. Further, young constables were placed in charge of important traffic points, though their knowledge of the city working was of the crudest character.

It is very desirable that during this period new entrants to the Police Force should undergo systematic drill, and receive instruction in regard to their various duties before being placed in responsible positions either on beats or elsewhere. First aid to the injured and the art of wrestling should form part of their training, and they should undergo a musketry course and be able to swim and to row.

PROMOTIONS : HOW MADE.

According to the evidence elicited, promotions are made on the basis of seniority combined with merit. Other things being equal, the promotion falls to the senior man. Below the rank of officer, men who have qualified by examination are promoted by the Chief Commissioner on the recommendation of their officers, and the officers in their turn are promoted by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Chief Commissioner.

Seniority is the first consideration, and, if any recommending officer passes over a senior man, he is asked for an explanation. It was found also that there is a tendency for officers to recommend their clerks, who are under their immediate supervision, to the disadvantage of other men who only occasionally come under notice.

Mr. Chomley was of opinion that there had been too much importance attached to seniority, and merit was not sufficiently recognised ; and he stated that the stupid man who had nothing against him had an equal opportunity of promotion with the smart and active man who might be his junior. He further made the remarkable admission that under the present system there was no incentive to a man to be active and energetic. The man who does not possess these qualities receives promotion by reason of his seniority simply because he has nothing against him.

EXAMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION.

The system of examinations for promotion in the Service was instituted by Mr. Chomley in consequence of a recommendation made by a prior Police Commission which sat some twenty years ago. There were provided an examination for the rank of sergeant and one for the rank of officer.

We have had many opportunities of judging the effect of such examinations in regulating the promotion of men and officers, and we regret to say that the desired result, viz., increased efficiency, has not been achieved.

It is very evident to the most casual observer that, for the purpose of passing a "book" examination, close application, and a system of "cram" whereby the memory only is tested, will attain this end.

The system has had a fair trial for over twenty years, with the result that many zealous and painstaking men have been debarred a well-merited promotion owing to the exigencies of the Service requiring their constant activity during long hours of duty leaving no time available for the pernicious "cram."

The evil effect of such a system is not always apparent, inasmuch as some of the most efficient men in the Police Force have passed the examinations, but a study of these men will at once demonstrate that they were always efficient, and the examination system has not made them more so.

The following extract from the Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Melbourne has an important bearing on the question of written examinations:—"It is difficult to make the examination a satisfactory test of a general knowledge. It is generally a test of a sort of ability which may not have any relationship to the business of life afterwards, and may represent a great deal of wasted effort . . . if there were more practical and oral examinations the 'cramming' system would be eliminated to a very great extent."

That the present examination system for promotion has failed in securing the best available men for the higher positions in the Police Force was only too evident. There can be no severer criticism of this system than the fact that this Commission received its most valuable evidence regarding the various phases of police duties from the representatives of the constables, senior constables, and sergeants, who showed their complete acquaintance, not only with matters affecting the discipline of the Force, but with the law and its various ramifications, together with its ineffectiveness to repress certain classes of crime.

Evidence was given before the Commission that in the opinion of certain witnesses there should be examinations for promotion for *each grade* above that of constable. The uselessness and absurdity of such a compulsory system was at once apparent to us, inasmuch as the imbibition of book lore would form a fundamental part, to the neglect of the practical side, of police duty.

Effective preservers of law and order can only be trained in the school of every day practice.

Mr. O'Callaghan, the present Chief Commissioner, admitted in his evidence that there were many good men who could not pass the present examinations—"fine, energetic fellows." At the same time some officers who had passed the examination had been found to be incapable as prosecutors, and complaints had been made to him by magistrates of the way in which cases were presented.

We were not impressed with the evidence given by some of the officers who appeared before us, and we are forced to the conclusion that a better type of man would result if a system of making promotions not cast iron in its working were devolved.

We, therefore, recommend the abolition of the present system of examinations for promotion, and in lieu thereof we recommend the appointment of a special Board to deal with promotions by whom merit shall be taken to be the first consideration, seniority being taken into account only when there are two or more persons who in the judgment of the Board possess equal merit.

The Board should consist of the Chief Commissioner, an Inspector from the Education Department, and a Police Magistrate, and this Board should be composed of men of sufficient judgment to be able to say whether a proposed promotion was justified or not. Under no circumstances should candidates pass on a written examination alone, the Board being empowered to pass on an oral examination men who have failed in the written, when the circumstances are such as to justify such action.

BEAT SYSTEM.

The beat system was first introduced here 50 years ago on the importation of London police, and has obtained ever since.

The evidence on this point tends to confirm the opinion of experienced men that it is the only safe method whereby thorough effectiveness can be secured, although the working of the beat has been criticised in an able manner by many witnesses.

The practice hitherto obtaining of placing young and inexperienced constables in charge of important beats is one to be condemned, and they should only be placed there after having undergone a training with experienced men. Another trenchant criticism was launched at the appointment of inexperienced senior constables to supervise this duty. It was shown that almost invariably these supervisors were men promoted from the country to the rank of senior constables in the city and placed in charge of men doing beat duty. Incompetence in the discharge of the onerous duties allotted to them was only too evident. In some instances they knew very little about the city, deriving their knowledge from the constables whom they were supposed to supervise.

A witness directed attention to the transfer from the country of men who had been punished and placed at Russell-street for the purpose of being under closer supervision, where they were actually rewarded by receiving the allowance to constables doing city duty. The evil effects of such transfers are apparent when it is considered that the constable punished, say, for drunkenness, is brought to Russell-street and put on important beat duty. Another practice which should have been discountenanced was that reputable and zealous constables were removed from Russell-street to make way for the "drunks" or the "incapables," to the monetary loss of the efficient man, and consequent gain to the disrated.

Such a travesty as rewarding men in the city who cannot be trusted to do duty elsewhere would not be permitted in any system where business capacity and intelligence are exercised.

The want of judgment displayed in the appointment of these beat supervisors was further manifested when it was shown that some of them only remained in the city a short time, when they were placed in charge of country stations, and a new lot of inexperienced men appointed.

To render this system the more ineffective officers of little city beat experience frequently controlled the inexperienced constables and senior constables, and these officers had in many cases been promoted from the Criminal Investigation Branch, and had not done ordinary police duty for many years.

Such a system of beat working could not be effective, and we conclude that those responsible for such a condition of affairs were strangely unobservant and lacking in capacity to manage an important department of Police work.

This inefficiency, we may state, has obtained for many years, both under the *régime* of the present and the past Chief Commissioner.

In consequence of the revelations made before the Commission, and the exposure of the defective methods of working, a number of junior constables have now been transferred from doing beat duty in the city to less important stations.

The beat system should be so arranged that only experienced constables, senior constables, and officers should be placed on the section, and the method of working should be constantly changed. Particularly regarding night duty, no hard-and-fast rule of commencing at the same point each night should be permitted. Changes should be made constantly, and constables after being paraded at Head-Quarters should proceed singly to the starting point allotted by the officer, and not in groups as now.

Further, men in plain clothes should work the beat irregularly and contrariwise to the uniform men, and none but experienced senior constables should be appointed to supervise them.

The officers also should be the most experienced available, for thus only can be accomplished the end in view, viz., the proper protection of the lives and property committed to their care.

We were unable to make a very essential comparison between the systems in vogue in Victoria and those of the neighbouring States, including the cost, owing, as shown elsewhere, to the action of the Cabinet in stopping supplies. It must be recognised therefore that our inquiry in this respect lacked completeness.

Regarding the working of the Force in large inland cities, such as Bendigo and Ballarat, we were prevented from taking evidence for the same reason.

EIGHT HOURS SYSTEM.

We deemed it extremely desirable that the question of eight hours' continuous duty should be considered, and comparisons between it and our present system made. In Adelaide, we understand, such a system is worked; but we were precluded from taking any evidence there.

Owing, thus, to the incompleteness of the evidence on this head, we do not feel justified in making any recommendation.

PLAIN CLOTHES POLICE.

There are nineteen plain clothes police in the Melbourne District, all of whom do serviceable work, and there is a consensus of opinion that the number should be increased, which view we indorse. We have already recommended that on the beats constables in plain clothes should work conversely with the uniform men as on occasion is done now, and this system should be largely availed of, especially during the night.

GRADE OF FIRST CLASS CONSTABLE.

The creation of a new grade of first class constable was considered by us after hearing a great deal of evidence proffered by those desirous of such a change, but we are convinced that such a grade is unnecessary as it would be an addition to the cost, and would not insure greater efficiency in the Police Force. Our recommendations in regard to promotions, if carried out, will obviate the necessity of such a reward to long-service men, who may have done good work, and who in our opinion should be substantially promoted when they have duly merited it.

POINTSMEN.

To the public generally the position of pointsman, whose duty it is to regulate traffic at street junctions, is highly important, since so much depends on the intelligence, steadiness, and discretion of the constable.

He should be instructed that his duty is to assist, not harass, the public, and to act with tact and consideration.

A knowledge of horses is essential, and no recruit should be placed even temporarily in charge of a point.

It has been shown that prosecutions in most cases can be avoided by zeal and attention on the part of the constable.

PURCHASE OF HORSES.

During Mr. Chomley's term of office, horses were bought by Inspector Beckwith, but the present annual vote is so reduced that the retention of a special officer to purchase horses would be an extravagance, and Mr. O'Callaghan himself does the purchasing. His time is so occupied that he can only visit the country for this purpose at intervals, and his choice must necessarily be limited.

A better system would be to permit mounted constables, who should be good judges of suitable mounts for the police, to choose likely horses, and take them on trial. Should they prove suitable, the Chief Commissioner, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of the district, could then finally select.

UNIFORM, ETC.

The present helmet worn by the police is unsatisfactory for many reasons, and a lighter one, such as is worn by pointsmen in the city, should be substituted.

Armlets are unsuitable attachments to the police uniform, as they afford an effective hold to the disadvantage of an arresting constable, and therefore should be abolished.

We recommend the introduction of khakee uniform for summer wear for the whole Force where practicable.

POLICE REGULATIONS.

The Police Regulations issued for the conduct and guidance of members of the Force were approved in 1877—nearly 30 years ago, and many of them are obsolete. Numerous alterations and additions to the regulations were made from time to time, and Orders in Council promulgating the same were published in the *Gazette*. This has been found to be an ineffective means of securing the acquaintance of constables with the Regulations under which they work, and the present Chief Commissioner, Mr. O'Callaghan, has, after much labour and thought, produced a new work entitled the "Police Code." We submitted a copy of it to several competent police authorities, and the evidence given shows that this new code is on the whole an excellent work and fills a long felt want, and, subject to the revision hereinafter suggested, we recommend its adoption for the Police Force of Victoria.

Before receiving the consent of the Governor in Council for its issue, the code should be revised by the Hons. the Chief Secretary and Attorney-General.

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

The regulations now in force as to the travelling allowances to be granted to members of the detective and ordinary branches, have the effect of causing much dissatisfaction. The allowances are so unfairly apportioned as to give rise to discontent amongst members of the Police Force whose duties require them to be absent from their station or district. The allowances to the detectives in particular are inadequate, and should be reviewed. No sum less than 10s. per day should be paid to detectives absent on duty, and no man should be allowed to be out of pocket when away on police duty.

We recommend the entire revision of these regulations, which work so inequitably and unfairly.

ALLOWANCES IN ADDITION TO PAY.

The system of allowances, in addition to salary, made to members of the Force, and to officers in particular, is objectionable and should be abolished forthwith.

Police officers and men should be paid such a sum as the nature and value of their services warrant, and that sum should be fixed, and should be quite irrespective of place or position. We recommend a revision of the whole system in order that it may be clearly shown as salary in one sum how much a constable, sub-officer, or officer receives for his services to the State.

REWARDS.

The system of rewards now obtaining is one to be entirely deprecated. The pay of the police, and especially of detectives, should be such as to warrant them exerting their best energies, and no rewards should be sanctioned, as their continuance only leads to a possible slackening of enthusiasm in a case where no reward is expected. The consequence is that those able to pay rewards for services are probably well served, while those who are unable to pay are liable to be neglected.

We, therefore, recommend the abolition of any system of rewards to officers or men of the general police or detective branch.

PENSIONS.

On the question of pensions which, so far as new appointees are concerned, were abolished by Act No. 1798, we took a good deal of evidence. We recognise that the police have to perform difficult and dangerous duties, which at times may prejudicially affect their health. In such cases we recommend the Government to vote such a sum by way of compensation as may be fixed by a Board acting in conjunction with the Medical Board.

In the event of the death of a member of the Force as a result of injuries received in the execution of his duty, the Government should make suitable provision for those dependent upon him, the Government effecting their own insurances in this regard.

RETIREMENT AGE.

The whole trend of the evidence is in favour of all members of the Force retiring at 60. With this we concur, and recommend that by Legislative enactment the age of retirement be 60, with provision in the case of the Chief Commissioner, for the Governor in Council, if he thinks fit, to extend the age of retirement to 65 years and no longer.

CRIME AND CRIMINALS.

Experienced witnesses are agreed that the law in relation to crime and its prevention is ineffective. There is practically no control of any criminal once he leaves Pentridge. He cannot be questioned as to how he is getting his living, whether by honest or dishonest means, and the detectives either lose trace of him altogether or may have good grounds for suspecting that he has no lawful means of support, but the vagrancy law in its present condition is not an effective weapon in dealing with him.

It is a lamentable fact disclosed in evidence that crime is rampant in our midst, and that the city of Melbourne contains a large number of notorious criminals, who haunt the busiest thoroughfares. The number of receivers of stolen property is considerable, and thus the facilities for the disposal of stolen goods are such as to render almost impossible any trace of them being found. As an instance, during last year a sensational robbery of £1,000 worth of diamonds occurred at a private dwelling in Toorak, and the stolen property has not been discovered. Numerous other instances are reported in the *Police Gazette* from time to time, but no clue is ever obtained. By means of the melting pot the dishonest manufacturer effectually disposes of the proceeds of the robbery. These receivers of stolen property are known to the detectives, who experience great difficulty in obtaining their conviction, the law being such that their best endeavours are often frustrated, unless the thief is followed into one of these places, and the receiver actually detected receiving stolen property.

Under certain Acts of Parliament, as, for instance, the *Marine Stores and Old Metals Act* 1890, purchasers of certain articles are bound to keep the goods in the same form as they receive them for a fixed period; and this, though the marine dealer cannot melt down his goods in the easy manner in which jewellery may be disposed of.

Greater facilities should be afforded the detectives to enter and search suspected places, for if there were no receivers the sphere of crime would be considerably diminished.

The advent in our midst of the garrotter is a new danger, which was effectually suppressed in London by the application of the cat-o'-nine-tails. Bomb-throwing is also a danger, as witness the attack on the home of Detective-Sergeant O'Donnell.

So long as our vagrancy laws are ineffectual, the lives and properties of residents of the city and suburbs will be continually menaced by the ruffians who are roaming at large.

In England a very wise provision is made by Act of Parliament whereby the habitual offender is sentenced to report himself to the police for a certain period. If he does not do so he has committed an offence under the Act. The police are thus enabled to judge if the ex-convict is making any attempt at reform or if he is frequenting his old haunts of crime.

The opportunities afforded the uniform police of obtaining a knowledge of criminals are insufficient, and we recommend that photos and criminal records of all discharged prisoners be distributed amongst the suburban and large country stations, and that every constable should be compelled to make himself familiar with them.

The work of producing such photographs and records could be effected in Pentridge at very little cost. At the present time suburban constables and others on beat duty in the city may pass by notorious criminals and be unaware of their character. Lives and properties in the city and suburbs cannot be efficiently protected without this essential knowledge, and no time should be lost in giving effect to our recommendation, so that every constable may recognise the criminal lurking about for the purpose of "spotting" or committing felonies.

And we further recommend—

- That all persons who buy gold in any condition, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, should be licensed, saving persons who are *bond fide* purchasers of manufactured goods from a jeweller in the ordinary course of business.
- That detectives, by a written authority of an Officer of Police, should be empowered to enter and search suspected places.
- That purchasers of manufactured gold should be compelled to keep the articles in the condition they receive them, and dispose of them only through a Government depôt to be established, and that a register be kept by the purchasers of all articles purchased.
- That habitual offenders, under any sentence imposing imprisonment, be ordered to report themselves to the police for a certain period after leaving gaol under a penalty for non-compliance.
- That no person should be permitted to melt any manufactured or old gold, but—
- That there be established a Central Depôt under Government supervision, to which all manufactured gold should be sent, and a fair market value given therefor.

UNDETECTED CRIME.

Statistics referring to the above have been proved in evidence to be most unreliable. The method of collecting such statistics has been faulty and untrustworthy. For instance, 40 crimes may be committed by one man. On apprehension the Crown decides to proceed against him on three, four, or six of the charges only. He is convicted and sentenced, and no further charges are brought against him. The statistics under the present system show the 30 odd crimes not prosecuted as “undetected crimes,” which is fallacious and misleading. Further, many persons report matters as offences which on investigation turn out to be unfounded, and these are classed as undetected crimes. Some method should be adopted whereby closer approximations to the actual number undetected could be obtained. We think this can be done by the Chief Commissioner’s office, in conjunction with the C. I. Branch, and reliable statistics issued for the information of the public.

Making all due allowance for the above, it is unquestionable that the proportion of crimes actually undetected is abnormal, and is due to many causes, some of which we discuss under the heading of “Crime and Criminals.”

C. I. BRANCH.

The detective force was originally a separate branch, but on the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1883 it was merged in the general police. To this branch is assigned the duty of investigating and dealing with serious crime committed in the State.

In 1885 the staff of detectives consisted of one inspector, one sub-inspector, eleven first class sergeants, eight second class sergeants, and ten constables—total 31. At present the staff is made up of one superintendent, one first class sergeant, two second class sergeants, two senior constables, and 30 constables—total, 36.

The present staff is under-officered, and the Superintendent cannot always be in attendance at the office, his duties frequently requiring his presence in the country. On such occasions the detective office is practically unofficered, except that the Inspecting Superintendent of general police, in addition to his other duties, takes charge of this branch. Such a system cannot work for increased efficiency, and there should be an officer subordinate to the Superintendent whose duty would be to assist him, and in his absence to assume control.

We recommend that the staff be strengthened by the appointment of an inspector, to be promoted from the detectives, and that the further promotion of such officer be confined to the C. I. Branch.

The method of appointment to the C. I. Branch came under review, and we are of opinion that the best available men either inside or outside the Service should be chosen for such positions. The minimum height for recruits of 5 ft. 9 in., recommended in another portion of this Report, should not apply to appointments to the detective branch.

With regard to the separation of the detective branch from the general police, no sufficient reasons having been adduced for such separation, we recommend the continuance of the present system.

In our investigations of matters affecting the C. I. Branch we took evidence as to certain charges against its members. Constable Geelan informed the Commission that a man named Duke had told him that detectives had been squared to permit Duke and others to play unlawful games on the race-course. This serious allegation was duly inquired into, but Duke swore he referred to the "sixties," and altogether his evidence proved to be worthless.

As to other charges against specific members of this Branch, our findings are recorded in another portion of this Report.

Though the evidence on this head, taken before this Commission, clearly shows that the Detective Office is not the "corruption and dead men's bones" alleged by Mr. Gaunson when asking for a Royal Commission, the facts that differences between detectives prevented their converse, that a detective who issued valueless cheques received no reprimand, that charges of sectarianism were made that led to a special board of inquiry, are evidence that the administration lacked firmness in maintaining that discipline which is essential to the highest efficiency.

We are of opinion that, under an administration marked by zeal, strictness, and intelligence, the present members of the C. I. Branch would prove themselves a capable body of men.

GAMBLING CLUBS.

The evidence is clear as to the existence of clubs in this city where gambling is carried on, and under the present law it is extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for the police to suppress it; we, therefore, recommend that amendments of the law be made to strengthen the hands of the police.

LOTTERIES AND GAMING.

We received a considerable amount of valuable evidence from the officer immediately responsible for the enforcement of the law relating to these subjects, who also submitted a written statement of the present legal position regarding the matter, embodying suggested amendments of the existing law. This statement forms an Appendix to our Report.

We do not presume to give a judgment on matters of a legal nature such as these, but we are convinced that the evidence given affords strong *prima facie* grounds for recommending, as we do, that the whole of the matter contained in the Appendix should without delay be considered by some competent legal authority, and such action taken as may be necessary.

COLLINGWOOD "TOTE."

That the Collingwood totalizator, known as "Wren's Tote," still exists, is clear from the evidence of Sergeant O'Donnell, Rev. S. P. Carey, and others.

We are concerned only with the fact that gambling is being carried on there, and the police are powerless to suppress it. Our inquiry was limited to determining the reasons for such failure, which we determined to be the inefficacy of existing legislation.

As the law stands at present there is evidently no chance of the police suppressing the tote, and unless such a measure as the Hon. I. A. Isaacs, M.P., introduced into the Legislative Assembly some years ago be enacted, the efforts of the police will continue to be fruitless, and we recommend that the Government should take immediate action to amend the law.

CONTROL OF POLICE FORCE.

The question of control of the Police Force by a Chief Commissioner or a Board consisting of three persons was dealt with in evidence before us.

The advocates of a Board failed to adduce any adequate reason for a change from the present system, and we recommend that the control of the Police Service be as now, in the hands of a Chief Commissioner subject to the Minister.

CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.

The present Chief Commissioner of Police, Mr. Thomas O'Callaghan, has passed through almost all the grades of the Police Service, and was appointed to his present office on the retirement of Mr. Chomley.

Mr. O'Callaghan was the second witness who gave general evidence before this Commission, and we were impressed with his intimate knowledge of every phase of the Police Service.

That Mr. O'Callaghan's administration has many blemishes cannot be gainsaid, and we have previously referred to his failure to appreciate the weaknesses and absurdities of the working of the beat system, which were pointed out to him by his officers and sub-officers.

It was urged also that his personal manner towards his subordinates was of the most unsympathetic character, and his brusqueness was the cause of severe comment.

While granting this, it is undoubted that no charge of corruption was sustained against him, though we certainly think that he should not have remained a trustee of licensed premises, when he must have known that his acting as such trustee would be prejudicial to the impartial administration of the licensing laws.

It was evident that a considerable amount of the unrest in police circles was due to the fact that Mr. O'Callaghan did not leave the Service when he attained the age of 60 years. The evidence of men and officers made it clear that, though they had taken great pains to secure his appointment as Chief Commissioner, feelings of resentment against him were developed because he did not retire at 60, as was expected, which led to incidents of the gravest character, affecting discipline and provoking an antagonistic spirit which has proved disadvantageous to the Force.

POLICE INTEREST IN LICENSED PREMISES.

Section 44 of the *Police Regulation Act 1890* absolutely prohibits any member of the Force from being directly or indirectly interested in a house for the sale of wine, beer, or spirituous liquors.

It was admitted by Mr. O'Callaghan, the present Chief Commissioner, that he was the trustee of the licensed premises known as the Barkly Hotel, Carlton, but he denied having received any pecuniary benefit therefrom.

There was evidence that the cheques received as rent from the hotel were taken by Mrs. O'Callaghan to her father, Mr. McDonald, the owner of the premises, and he in exchange gave her cash for the amount of each cheque. Mr. McDonald stated that he had voluntarily entered into the arrangement to give to Mrs. O'Callaghan the rents received from the hotel.

Whether Mr. O'Callaghan can be said to be directly or indirectly interested in a hotel, in which his wife is interested and in regard to which he acts as trustee, is a matter that we recommend for the consideration of the Crown Law authorities.

Whatever be the legal definition of "directly or indirectly interested," we are strongly of opinion that it is improper that the Chief Commissioner, or any member of the Force, should act as trustee where licensed premises are concerned, and Mr. O'Callaghan should be called upon to resign his trusteeship forthwith, and we recommend that legislation be introduced prohibiting any member of the Force from acting as a trustee in any such case.

CHARGES BY MR. GAUNSON, M.L.A.

Mr. Gaunson, in the Assembly, made very serious charges against members of of the Police Force which were duly inquired into.

A report of a newspaper interview with Mr. Brabazon, manager of the New Zealand Insurance Company, was read in the House by Mr. Gaunson as to rewards having been improperly received by detectives who recovered stolen goods which had been insured by this company, but it was shown in evidence that the amounts paid to detectives did not exceed £50 in five years, and the receipts for same always came through the office of the C. I. Branch in accordance with the Regulations.

Mr. Brabazon, who was called as a witness, stated that the police did not ask him for any money. When the goods were recovered he called at the detective office and said he was prepared to pay, but he had not paid for some time as no goods

were recovered. This witness admitted in examination that his statement reported in the press was incorrect as to many of the parts, and that he had written to the newspaper that certain portions of it were quite wrong. The most serious allegation contained in his reported interview was to the effect that if the detectives found out that the goods stolen were insured they proceeded to make terms, but Brabazon, on being questioned as to this, replied, "No, I do not think that."

He gave a very unsatisfactory explanation as to the reason he permitted statements reflecting on the police purporting to be made by him to the press to go unchallenged. These statements were quoted in the House, yet Brabazon was not prepared to support them on oath before the Commission.

At an early stage of our proceedings an officer of the Crown Law Department, who had been intrusted with the duty of preparing the evidence, interviewed Mr. Gaunson with a view of collecting any available evidence he possessed, but Mr. Gaunson confessed he knew nothing of his own knowledge, with the exception of the Scott case, which had been dealt with, and referred the inquirer to Inspector Mackinnon, who, he stated, had the whole matter at his fingers' ends. Mr. Mackinnon's failure to prove the charges alleged by him is referred to in another portion of our Report.

At a later stage John B. Cullen, a clerk in the employ of Messrs. Gaunson and Lonie, was summoned to appear before the Commission to give evidence. This witness absolutely declined to be sworn or give evidence, and endeavoured to treat the Commission with contempt, and Mr. Gaunson, who was in Court, ordered his clerk to leave the witnesses' chair.

We caused a prosecution to be initiated against Cullen for his refusal, and he appeared before Mr. Dwyer, P.M., and was fined £15. Mr. Gaunson appeared for him and fought the case.

It will thus be seen that instead of assisting the Commission Mr. Gaunson adopted a hostile attitude, which was not calculated to further the purposes of the inquiry.

Had he possessed any evidence which would help the inquiry it was his duty to place it at our disposal. On the other hand, if the information which caused him to make allegations of corruption against members of the Police Force was based on hearsay, and on inquiry it was found to be unreliable, it was due to the accused that Mr. Gaunson should have availed himself of the opportunity when in the witnesses' chair to remove the stigma which he had cast on their honour and integrity.

CHARGES BY MR. EDGAR WILKINS, M.L.A.

The Commission invited Mr. Wilkins to give evidence relevant to his statements made in Parliament on the 22nd December, 1903, to which we have referred at an early stage of this Report. He stated he knew nothing of his own knowledge as to their truth or otherwise. He explained that the information on which he acted was given to him by Inspector Charles Mackinnon, an officer of police, who called upon Mr. Wilkins, and had several subsequent interviews with him. He also produced to the Commission many letters written by this officer in reference to matters he desired a Royal Commission to inquire into. Mr. Wilkins stated that he felt very sore indeed when Inspector Mackinnon, who had given lengthy evidence on general matters, was silent as to the information supplied to him. Continuing, he said—"It is bad enough to have men outside the Force who are bringing charges, but it is infinitely worse to have men inside the Force who, when statements are made and an opportunity arises, are not prepared to substantiate those statements."

CHARGES BY MR. ROBERTS, EX-M.L.A.

The serious charges alleged by Mr. Roberts, ex-M.L.A., against members of the Police Force were proved in evidence to be wholly unfounded.

CHARGES BY INSPECTOR CHARLES MACKINNON.

Mr. Mackinnon stated that he had given certain information to Mr. Wilkins, M.L.A., and that he was acting for himself and others, amongst whom were Inspectors Beck, Graves, and Milne. He also stated that he was asked to communicate to Mr. Wilkins this information embracing charges, not specially against Sergeant McManamny, but admitted that the Musgrove case and the

Rocke, Tompsitt case referred to McManamny. On being asked by Mr. Andrews, counsel assisting the Commission (Q. 10219), "Did you make them" (referring to the two cases just quoted) "on your own behalf or for the Sixty Retirement Committee?" he replied—"I could not say. It was not on my own behalf." Graves, Milne, and Beck denied on oath that Mackinnon acted for them *in re* allegations against McManamny, but it is very strange that Messrs. Milne and Beck swore that Detective Christie had made statements to them reflecting on McManamny, which statements reached Mackinnon, who embodied them in his letters to Mr. Wilkins.

As to the Musgrove case, Inspector Christie denied on oath having said that Mr. Musgrove made any statement such as was alleged he made, and Mr. Musgrove denied that he had ever told Christie that he had paid any money to McManamny, and stated as a fact that he had not paid any. Granting that there was some misapprehension as to what Christie told the officers referred to, Inspector Mackinnon, an experienced police officer, should have taken due precaution regarding his facts before approaching a member of the Assembly to induce him to make charges.

Throughout Mr. Mackinnon's evidence it was apparent that he had induced Mr. Wilkins, from his place in the Assembly, to make grave charges of corruption in the Police Force, and when asked by this Commission to furnish proofs he could only say that he knew nothing of his own knowledge, and admitted his evidence was hearsay.

It is apparent that Inspector Mackinnon's antipathy to Sergeant McManamny obscured his judgment and led him to make accusations of the gravest character on statements unverified by him, and that he was one of a number who sought to cast serious reflections on the character and integrity of certain members of the Force, including the Chief Commissioner.

This officer did not confine himself to allegations against the police, but Ministers of the Crown and others were included in the charges which were shown to be unfounded. We are therefore of opinion that his conduct is such as to merit the severest condemnation.

CHARGES BY EX-INSPECTOR McHUGH.

Ex-Inspector McHugh complained of interference during his term of office as Licensing Inspector, and the evidence is clear that certain interference on the part of his superior officers and the Chief Commissioner did take place; but the question arises, did such interference not occur in the ordinary course of duty and discipline, or was it due to other causes, such as pressure, being brought to bear to stop prosecutions?

The Chief Commissioner and the Inspecting Superintendent, it was urged, are the superior officers of the Licensing Inspector, whom they control to an extent, and with regard to whose work they have certain responsibilities. They caused the papers in a number of cases to be submitted for their consideration and judgment, but contended that whatever power they exercised was lawful.

In our opinion the Licensing Act makes the Inspector wholly responsible for the prosecutions he initiates, and he should not be subject to veto either by the Inspecting Superintendent or Chief Commissioner. We therefore recommend that in future no interference with the Inspector in the execution of his duties be permitted, and any attempt at such interference on the part of officers or the Chief Commissioner be brought under the notice of the Minister.

Mr. McHugh also complained that he had a number of licensing prosecutions on hand when he sent in his resignation from the Force, and that though he wished to remain in the Service long enough to complete them, he was "jerked" out hurriedly in order that these proceedings should not eventuate, with the result that the cases could not be carried on by his successor, Inspector Oliver, who would have had to commence *de novo*.

We inquired into these allegations, and on inspection of the files it was found that Mr. McHugh had himself withdrawn some of the cases in writing, and that Mr. Oliver had appended the following minute:—" . . . with the exception of one they are weak cases, and I do not think it would be wise to run the risk of a dismissal in any of them which . . . would probably carry costs."

We desire to draw particular attention to two of these cases—the Cathedral Hotel and the Park View Hotel. An extraordinary procedure was adopted in these cases. The papers anent thereto were asked for by Inspecting Superintendent

Hamilton, who forwarded them to the Chief Commissioner with a recommendation that the cases be proceeded with, and Mr. O'Callaghan minuted them "I concur." No action, however, was taken, and they were pigeon-holed in the Chief Commissioner's office, and remained there until this Commission asked for them, the explanation for such inaction being that as Mr. McHugh had left the Service they could not be proceeded with.

The explanation given by the Chief Commissioner, Inspecting Superintendent Hamilton, and the Chief Clerk is highly unsatisfactory, and also fully bears out the contention of leading officers in the Service that the Licensing Inspector should not be under the control of the Chief Commissioner or the Superintendent, but should be solely responsible to the Minister.

It was shown that when Mr. McHugh's resignation came before the Superannuation Board it was at once accepted. It is clear that, when asked by the Inspecting Superintendent if he would permit of his case being considered by the Superannuation Board on the day after his papers were sent in—as the Board, it was stated, would probably not meet again for a month—he consented, and left on the next day. He was aware that his leaving would stop all prosecutions initiated by him, and he was thus a party to it, when he withdrew the cases in writing.

We are of opinion, however, that the services of Mr. McHugh should have been retained until the prosecutions pending had been dealt with.

Mr. McHugh also directed attention to a case which was subsequently proved in evidence, that Constable Brady, a clerk in the Superintendent's office at Bendigo, had made use of information he received in his confidential capacity as clerk in the Superintendent's office, and purchased a building at Fosterville in his wife's name for £150 and let it to the Police Department for £36 per annum.

We cannot too severely animadvert on the conduct of this constable, who used his position for the purpose of gain to the disadvantage of the Department, whose interests it was his bounden duty to conserve.

CHARGES BY DETECTIVE ROBERT FRYER.

The evidence shows that the statements of Detective Robert Fryer, who had made serious charges against a member of the Force, are unreliable. It has also been shown that he had been in the habit of passing valueless cheques, and we recommend that his conduct be brought under the notice of the Hon. the Chief Secretary.

CHARGES BY CONSTABLE MCGINLEY.

In the course of his evidence Constable McGinley alleged that Mr. O'Callaghan, the Chief Commissioner of Police, was interested in a wine and spirit licence contrary to the *Police Regulation Act 1890*.

It was clearly proved that he acted as trustee for his sister, and was not directly interested, but our remarks and recommendations *re* police acting as trustees where licensed premises are concerned apply also to this case.

CHARGES BY CORNELIUS CROWE.

This witness, who is an ex-constable of police, has been very active during the last few years in making serious charges against members of the Police Force in numerous pamphlets which he circulated.

Ex-constable Crowe applied for permission to present evidence before us touching the conviction and imprisonment of two men named Henry Hutchens and Timothy Noonan, who were convicted of robbery in company, and sentenced to four years' imprisonment on the 16th of April, 1883, at the Central Criminal Court, Melbourne.

The evidence which Mr. Crowe was prepared to adduce was contained in a pamphlet laid before us, but, from a perusal of this document and of the extensive departmental papers relating to the case, there appeared to be very little additional information to what the file already contained.

It is clear that this was not a case of alleged wrong or injustice which had in vain called for investigation, as no less than four law officers of the Crown, namely, the Hon. R. S. Anderson, the Hon. A. Deakin, the Hon. G. B. Kerferd, and the Hon. I. A. Isaacs, had successively caused exhaustive inquiries to be made into the case, and all had concurred in recommending that the sentence of the Court should not be interfered with. The papers on the matter had also been laid on the Library table at Parliament House.

On consideration of the above facts, we were of opinion that the case was not one that should employ our attention, and particularly having regard to the terms of our Commission, and the fact that the matters in question arose in 1883 (twenty-three years ago), we unanimously resolved that it was one which did not fall within the scope of our Commission.

We afforded Mr. Crowe the fullest opportunity to prove on oath any or all of the charges levelled by him concerning the Police Force, and, after fully investigating them, we are unanimously of opinion that there is no foundation whatever for the serious charges alleged by him against members of the Police, with the exception of his repetition of those against certain ex-members of the Force, which charges were duly inquired into, and punishment awarded years ago.

We are further of opinion that he is a person utterly unworthy of credence. His personal history in the Police Force of Victoria, to which he gained admission by suppressing the important fact that he had been dismissed the service in New Zealand, is detailed in evidence, and shows clearly the character of the man.

CHARGE AGAINST DETECTIVE WHITNEY.

An allegation by Mrs. Louisa Hogan that she had been induced to pay a sum of £27 or £28 to Detective Whitney on the restoration of a large sum of money stolen from her was the subject of an exhaustive investigation by this Commission. In this case there was a great conflict of evidence, and we find that the charge was not proven.

CHARGES AGAINST DETECTIVE McMANAMNY.

The serious charges alleged against Detective-Sergeant McManamny were clearly shown in evidence to be untrue.

CASE OF CONSTABLE GEELAN.

This constable, who does point duty in the city, had been called upon by his superior officers to explain why he had not obtained cases. Geelan replied that there was no occasion to have cases owing to his method of working the point.

We inquired into this, and are of opinion that Constable Geelan is entitled to a great deal of credit for the painstaking manner in which he regulates traffic, and that the action of his superior officers in insisting on "cases" is one that should be condemned, and any such interference calls for attention.

The Hon. the Chief Secretary, in a memo. dated the 21st June, 1905, in dealing with the matter has acted commendably, and we indorse his judgment.

The aim of every constable should be to direct and assist the public, and not to be continually looking for petty breaches of by-laws, &c.; and Geelan is to be commended for the zeal he has shown in preventing the public from unwittingly committing offences.

Nothing could be productive of such harm to the Police Force generally than the system which has grown up of officers demanding cases from constables. It should be the duty of every constable to exercise tact and judgment in dealing with traffic.

DETECTIVE J. C. CARTER.

We are of opinion that this member of the detective police was unfairly treated in not being allowed the highest rate of expenses, namely, 5s. 6d. per day, granted to active and intelligent detectives.

There was no valid reason adduced why he was deprived of this advantage, and the evidence shows that he was an efficient officer; but the increased allowance was in the discretion of the Superintendent.

DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE.

It was shown in evidence that marginal notes in pencil were frequently made in correspondence submitted by the Chief Commissioner's office to the Hon. the Chief Secretary, and that certain passages of reports were marked in blue or red pencil to draw attention to a particular paragraph or line.

We are of opinion that such a practice is entirely unfair and reprehensible and should be discontinued, inasmuch as the person most concerned has not the opportunity of perusing the additions to his correspondence, nor does any one in particular take the responsibility of the pencil notes, but undoubtedly they are calculated to prejudice the fair consideration of the matter to be dealt with.

Another matter that calls for attention is the lengthy and recriminatory tone of ordinary correspondence on matters which have been the subject of report. Files were produced in regard to the most trivial matters, and much waste of time must have taken place in writing memoranda couched in language not calculated to insure the respect of subordinates, and certainly not tending to an amiable feeling in the Force.

It is also evident that officers in devoting a considerable portion of their time to writing such memoranda, neglected their police duties, and this should have been discountenanced and stopped by the Chief Commissioner, whom, from a perusal of the correspondence, we found to have been the arch offender in this regard.

COMPLAINT AGAINST POLICE.

A complaint was made and much evidence taken regarding the alleged ill-treatment by constables of a person found lying injured on the road and taken in a cab to the hospital. We find that the complaint was not sustained.

SECTARIANISM.

Throughout the inquiry we tested the question as to whether sectarian differences impaired the efficiency of the Force. Each witness examined on the subject denied this, and Mr. O'Callaghan, the Chief Commissioner, said he strove to discourage any exhibition of sectarianism, and, personally, he had not found it prominent. The Inspecting Superintendent, Mr. Mahony, Inspector Mackinnon, and others, agreed that there was no ill-feeling arising from sectarianism in the Force.

No evidence was given to support the allegation that sectarian influence was active in the Force.

BARRACKS, DEPÔT, ETC.

We had purposed visiting the Barracks, Depôt, &c., to inspect the accommodation provided for constables, but owing to the premature closing of the evidence were unable to do so. No recommendation in these matters can thus be made.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED BUILDINGS.

The system of renting buildings used as police stations is one that obtains generally in Victoria, the annual cost totalling £6,132.

In settled districts the stations should be owned by the Government. The only buildings rented should be those which are temporarily occupied as police stations.

PREMATURE CLOSING OF EVIDENCE.

The evidence was prematurely closed owing to the action of the Cabinet, and in a letter addressed to the Hon. the Premier we have dealt somewhat fully with this matter, and now print the correspondence which took place. We desire, however, to place on record the fact that not only were we debarred from calling witnesses who in our opinion could give valuable evidence affecting certain phases of our inquiry, but briefs had been received by Counsel for the Commission and witnesses duly advised that they would be heard.

We may quote as instances Superintendent Milne, of Hamilton, Detective-Sergeant Wilson, of Bendigo, Constable Priestly, of Marong, Senior Constable Breen, of Ballarat, and others whose evidence if given on oath would, in our opinion, have materially assisted the inquiry.

The cause for their non-appearance before the Commission is thus explained :—

No. 576.

Premier's Office, Melbourne,
8th February, 1906.

SIR,

I have the honour to inform you that the application of the Police Commission for further funds was before the Cabinet on Monday last, when it was decided not only that the request should not be granted, but that the Commission should at once close its inquiry.

I have therefore to request that you will, without delay, be good enough to take the necessary steps for bringing the work of the Commission to a conclusion.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

TH. BENT,

Premier.

James Cameron, Esq., M.L.A.,
Chairman of the Police Inquiry Commission.

State Parliament House, Melbourne,
8th February, 1906.

The Hon. the Premier,
&c., &c., &c.

SIR,

With reference to your communication of the 8th inst., I am desired by the Commission to state, in reply thereto, that the Commission's work is at such an important stage that we are unable to close until certain essential evidence is taken in Melbourne, which it is estimated will occupy two days further.

The amount of £350 asked for as a further advance is required for the purpose of paying outstanding accounts, amounting to about £100, Mr. Boe's salary, and other expenses.

It is proposed to visit certain country centres to take necessary evidence, which it is not expedient to take in Melbourne.

It is also proposed to visit Sydney for the purpose of making a comparison between the systems in vogue in Sydney and here, and to visit Adelaide for the purpose of inquiring into the eight hours system as worked in the Police Force there, and comparing the working of the beat and other police systems.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES CAMERON,

Chairman.

No. 625.

Premier's Office, Melbourne,
10th February, 1906.

SIR,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, and to inform you, in reply, that the Government does not approve of the Commission visiting country centres to take evidence, or of its visiting Sydney or Adelaide for the purposes mentioned in your letter. I have therefore to request that the proposed visits may be abandoned.

I understand that the taking of evidence in Melbourne is now closed.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

TH. BENT,

Premier.

The Chairman, Police Inquiry Commission, Melbourne.

Royal Commission on the Victorian Police Force.

Supreme Court Library, Melbourne,
13th February, 1906.

The Honorable the Premier, &c., &c., &c.

SIR,

In deference to the wishes of the Cabinet, as expressed in your letters of the 8th and 10th inst., the Commission have determined not to take any further evidence, and on the material collected to proceed to the consideration of a Report.

The members of the Commission, however, are unanimously of opinion that the Hon. the Premier, in forwarding such letters, has overlooked the terms of the Commission under which they were appointed, which are as follow :—

To inquire into and report concerning—

1. The efficiency of the Police Force in connexion with the repression of crime.
2. The present condition, organization, and administration of the said Force.

It will be seen that the terms of the Commission do not limit the investigations to the Metropolitan district, which comprises less than half the Force, nor do they confine the inquiry to specific charges of corruption against certain members thereof.

It will be recognised that the evidence taken to date supplies matter for criticism which may be destructive in its character, but the Commission, in order to make recommendations for the future guidance and better working of the Force as a whole, deemed it desirable to compare the systems in vogue in Sydney and Adelaide, which have already been prominently referred to in evidence.

As regards taking evidence in the country, so many applications were received from various centres, submitting highly important evidence affecting the country districts and the Police Force generally, that it was deemed advisable, in the interests of economy, and to save time, to visit Ballarat and Bendigo rather than bring witnesses at considerable expense to Melbourne.

It is to be regretted that in the reports of the interview with the Premier which appeared in the press, it was implied that the Commission was anxious to travel about the country and the adjoining States. As a matter of fact, they were anxious to avoid doing so, but felt compelled to, in order to complete their inquiry.

At the recent interview the Premier stated that he was guided solely by the press reports of the proceedings. These are necessarily limited by considerations of space, and narrate interesting but unconnected incidents rather than present a digest of the evidence given. The most valuable evidence from a public stand-point is often the least attractive from a journalistic point of view, and the most important matters, which should form the basis of the Commission's recommendations, will only be disclosed by a perusal of the detailed minutes of evidence.

For instance, Superintendent Commons, the third man in the Force, gave most valuable evidence, especially as regards the unfairness of the present system of promotion, and made suggestions for improvement. This occupied a full day, and yet in one of the metropolitan papers the next morning, this evidence was dismissed in ten lines.

The members of the Commission desire to draw attention to the precedent that is set by the attitude taken up by the Cabinet. It is laid down by the highest authorities that within the limits of their prescribed functions, Royal Commissions have the absolute power of regulating the proceedings of their own tribunal. It will be a dangerous position if any Government, for certain occult reasons, is to have the right to say "You must close down. No more evidence shall be taken," and practically enforce it by refusing to pay the necessary expenses.

Under all these circumstances they most emphatically enter their protest against the attitude adopted in your letters of 8th and 10th insts. as being both a reflection on those who, as members of the Legislature, are selected to undertake an unpleasant and difficult task without any remuneration whatever, and also as tending to establish a precedent which would be most dangerous to the welfare of the community.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) JAMES CAMERON,
Chairman.

CONCLUSION.

Your Commissioners desire to place on record their high appreciation of the indefatigable energy displayed by Mr. Barry as Secretary of this Commission.

His tact and zeal in collecting evidence covering the whole scope of the inquiry, the industry displayed in the work entailed by the perusal of piles of departmental documents, and in placing before us their salient features are deserving of the highest commendation.

All of which we have the honour to submit for your Excellency's consideration.

Witness our hands and seals this 26th day of July, 1906.

JAMES CAMERON, Chairman (L.S.)

ALFRED A. BILLSON (L.S.)

J. W. BILLSON (L.S.)

JOHN J. CARLISLE (L.S.)

J. F. DUFFUS (L.S.)

H. MCKENZIE (L.S.)

D. SMITH (L.S.)

DAVID BARRY, Secretary.

APPENDIX.

LOTTERIES AND GAMING.—AMENDMENTS REQUIRED.

Section 37 Police Offences Act 1890.

Should be amended in order to reach Chinese lotteries in a more effective way than at present. Chinese lotteries can never be suppressed till the sale or disposal of the ticket alone (stripped of all technicalities) is made the offence. It should not be necessary to obtain from the Chinaman an assurance, undertaking, promise, or agreement to pay any fixed sum of money as a prize for striking correctly any given number of marks. The law should be so framed or amended that the case of *Ah Sue v. Call* (see *Victorian Law Reports*, page 178), would be rendered nugatory.

Chinamen are so well advised that they will not answer any questions, and the consequence is that, although they may sell millions of lottery tickets, the lotteries cannot be stamped out. A few only are, or can be, caught at long intervals; and when they are caught, and the cases are prepared with great care by the Crown Law Department, and conducted by counsel, and convictions are obtained in the police courts, the convictions (owing to the technical state of the law) are frequently upset by the higher courts.

The Chinese have a rich gambling society (variously said to be from £3,000 to £8,000 strong) behind them, in order to fight the authorities and pay fines and legal expenses.

It would also be very useful if these lottery shops could be declared to be common gaming houses, and common nuisances contrary to the provisions of Part IV. of the *Police Offences Act 1890*. If such were done, the frequenters or persons found therein could be arrested and convicted for being found in a common gaming house without lawful excuse. Part IV., section 58, wants amending so as to provide for a minimum penalty for persons found in such places, and the form of the special warrant also requires altering to follow the words of the Act.

A section is also required to deal with agents here who communicate with Tasmania or any other place, and obtain tickets or chances in sweeps or lotteries or schemes for Victorian investors.

A section is also required to deal with newspaper publishers or proprietors who insert advertisements for such people as Tattersall, and to deal as well with people who exhibit such notices in their windows or on their premises, as "We communicate with Tattersall by every steamer," &c.

A section is also required, such as section 2 or section 7 of the *Street Betting Suppression Act 1890*, providing for a minimum fine and a minimum of imprisonment as well, and increasing the punishment for a first, second, or third offence.

In Part IV. of the Police Offences Act 1890.

Before or after section 48, a section should be inserted declaring the game known as "Two-up," or any similar game, to be unlawful games within the meaning of the Act. (See the case of *Sin Ching v. Duncan*, *Argus* report, 7th July, 1869.) It was in consequence of that case that the Legislature of that time introduced section 48. In fan-tan cases a bank is kept, but till it was declared to be an unlawful game the law was of no effect. In two-up no bank is kept, and the game is not unlawful. Two-up schools are, therefore, very difficult to reach under statute law, and even if we had evidence that a hazard school existed it is doubtful if the statute law as it now exists could be applied to a hazard school. The game has not been declared unlawful, and as it was necessary in 1869 to declare fan-tan unlawful, hazard, or similar games should be declared unlawful. It would remove some of the obstacles at any rate under which gamblers shelter themselves.

In Section 49.

After the words "No house, office, room, or other place," and before the words "shall be opened," insert the word "whatsoever," as has been done in the West Australian Criminal Code, and amend this section so that the cases *O'Donnell v. Gardner* (vol. 23, A.L.T. 196; 8 *Argus* L.R. 81) and *Rex v. Deaville, Deaville and Simpson* (1 K.B., 1903, p. 468), may be got over (see also *O'Donnell v. Hitchen*, *Argus Law Reports*, vol. 8, page 42, and vol. 23, A.L.T. 166). In these cases the offenders got off because they did not have something equivalent to a proprietary use or dominion or control over the places where they were betting. If it be proved that a man made fifty bets in a shop belonging to, say, a grocer or a barber, during an afternoon while the owner was away, and did not know what was going on there in his absence, the man who made the bets cannot be prosecuted to a conviction, because it cannot be proved that he had a permissive right to use the place. Such technicalities frequently save the betting offenders from conviction.

In Section 52.

It should be amended by a minimum fine and a minimum of imprisonment being fixed. Some magistrates fine offenders ridiculously small fines, and where a minimum fine is fixed the minimum of imprisonment is not stated. There exist cases where magistrates have fined offenders £20 or twelve hours.

In Sections 55 and 56.

The penalty should be much heavier, not less than £100 or six months, and it should be possible to convict the publisher or proprietor of a newspaper for the publication alone of the advertisement, which every reasonable person in the community knows very well is the advertisement of a betting man who is advertising for clients to bet with. As the law is now interpreted it is almost an impossibility to reach the newspaper owners or publishers who insert bookmakers' advertisements, because two things have to be proved at one and the same time. It is first necessary to prove that illegal betting is done by the bookmaker at the place named in his advertisement before the newspaper people can be got at. Where a bookmaker advertises as follows:—"Sol Brown, Melbourne, is prepared to lay S.P. all events—address, Sol Brown, Melbourne," it would not be possible to sustain a prosecution, because he could not use Melbourne for betting purposes, and no charge could be laid.

People who don't understand the technicalities of the law cannot understand how it is that the newspapers are not prosecuted for inserting such advertisements, but the impossibilities of the position are the sole reasons.

In Section 57.

The form of the special warrant (see the second schedule to the Act) should be altered to correspond with the words of the Act (1) by giving authority to seize all tables, &c.; and (2) by giving authority to arrest "all persons found therein," as contemplated by the section.

Instead of giving the authority contemplated by the Act, it gives an authority (1) "to search for all instruments of unlawful gaming," but it does not say one word about seizing them; and (2) it empowers a constable to arrest "(persons there haunting, resorting, and playing," for whose punishment or arrest the Act does not provide, while it does provide for the arrest and punishment of "persons found therein," but the warrant mentions not a word.

On this subject, see *Stutfield on Betting, &c.*, third edition, at page 197, where the following footnote appears:—"A question was raised in *Turpin v. Jenks* as to what was to be done with the persons found therein." The answer seems to be that "the power is given to enable the officers to ascertain by inquiry how far these persons were responsible for the gaming. See per Field, J., in *Anderson v. Hume*, 46 J.P. 825; besides the statute 17 and 18 Vict. C. 38 compels three persons to give their addresses. It would seem, therefore, that, having given their addresses, they should be released until the police are in a position to make a definite charge against them."

That is the law in England, and such is the law here, too, as matters now are, but alter the warrant to follow the words of the Act, and the warrant at once becomes a very useful adjunct to suppress gaming houses with.

Tote sheets, double books, betting books, cards, and all and every document or book used by book-makers for the purpose of carrying on the business of betting in any house, office, room, or place should be made and declared to be instruments of gaming by Act of Parliament.

In Section 58.

Make the same amendment as in section 51, where that section is amended by section 7 of the *Street Betting Suppression Act 1896*, and amend the latter part of the same section (58), so that there shall be a minimum penalty of, say, £5, and a minimum of imprisonment of, say, one month, in default payment of the fine for those found in such places.

In Section 64.

The provisions of this section should be altered so as not to apply to two-up, and, after the game has been declared to be unlawful, it should not be necessary to prove that a bank is kept there. For the purpose of a prosecution against a two-up school, this section, even after the game is declared unlawful, contains a stumbling block. After the words "unlawful game" it says "and that a bank is kept there." The two are therefore linked together "unlawful game" and "bank."

No bank is kept in two-up, and the chances of the game are alike favorable to all the players. There is no banker in the game. The game is not managed by any one in particular. All take a hand in it. Coins used in playing the game should be made instruments of gaming. They are so under section 47, but not under 60 or any other section.

In Section 70.

The section should be completed by providing the penalty and alternative for delaying, preventing, or obstructing a constable from so entering.

A section should be added exempting the police or their agents enforcing or attempting to enforce the laws relating to the suppression of lotteries and betting from all actions or prosecutions for anything done in the execution of their duties in or relating to their endeavours to suppress betting, gaming, or lotteries, or in securing evidence to enforce the laws in that respect.

A section is also required to make a wife liable for betting so that she cannot, as Mrs. Ellen Dawe did at Richmond on 19th August, 1905, plead coercion. A number of unscrupulous betting men are using their wives to carry on their nefarious business in a similar way.

In the Street Betting Suppression Act 1896, No. 1436.

The provisions of section 89 of the *Police Offences Act 1890*, No. 1126, should be applied, because when a street betting man is fined, the fine at present can only be recovered by distress, and once he leaves the Court in very few cases is he ever seen again. The Act as it stands at present is a farce.

The provisions of section 100 of the *Police Offences Act 1890*, No. 1126, should be made to apply to this Act too, because the ratepayers should not pay one penny for the prosecution of such wrong-doers.

There should also be a minimum of imprisonment of, say, one month for each offence to prevent magistrates making a farce of the Act by fining offenders £20, or twelve hours, as at present is done.

The provisions of Part IV. of the *Police Offences Act* and this Act should be exempted from the operation of section 191 of the *Justices Act 1890*.

The Licensing Act.

No publican should be permitted to placard, post up, exhibit, or permit to be exhibited in or about his licensed premises anything relating to betting.

Regarding Wren's Collingwood "Tote."

The Bill introduced in the Legislative Council in 1898 by Sir Henry Cuthbert, and of which Mr. Isaacs had charge in the Legislative Assembly, or some other measure more drastic, must be made law to rid society of this place. (See *Victorian Parliamentary Debates*, session 1898, pages 2737, 3941, and 3955.) Mr. Isaacs' speech described the whole circumstances of the case, and the difficulties to be got over.

Regarding the Mining Exchange at Bendigo.

A section should be introduced to apply the betting prevention laws to this and similar cases, and to get over the decision in the case *Sheahan v. Jackman*, see 19 A.L.T. 184, 4 A.L.R. 47, of 1898, where the decision was that "a passage through a house along which the public pass from one public street to another, by the permission of the owner, and which is not always open, is not a thoroughfare or a street within the meaning of section 2 or 5 of the *Street Betting Suppression Act 1896*."

Regarding the Owners of Property or Buildings.

At present it is almost an impossibility to prove that the owner of the property where people carry on betting shops and betting clubs, totes, &c., knowingly and wilfully permits his property including licensed premises to be so used for such an illegal purpose. If the owners could be reached with greater facility, and severe penalties imposed for letting their property to betting people or gambling people, it would greatly help to diminish shop betting, &c. The Act should provide for the service of a notice, in writing, signed by an officer of police, being sufficient evidence that the landlord, agent, &c., knew that the place was so used. The notice should warn the landlord, &c., on whom it should be served, that if, after a certain number of days, betting or gambling, &c., was not discontinued in the particular place referred to, proceedings would be taken against the person on whom it was served (landlord, agent, executor, &c.) for knowingly and wilfully permitting the place to be so used.

The police should also be freed from actions in this regard. At present they are not.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON POLICE FORCE.

INDEX TO WITNESSES EXAMINED.

I.—IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER.

Name.	Description.	Page.
A.		
Alcock, H. R. ...	Mounted Drill Inspector ...	204
B.		
Bannon, Michael J. ...	Detective ...	383
Batchelor, Richd. J. ...	Constable ...	406, 416
Beck, Wm. J. ...	Inspector of Police ...	366, 390
Beckett, Jas. T. ...	Age Reporter ...	308
Bedell, Jno. ...	Chief Clerk, Police Department ...	593
Bell, Clement ...	Constable ...	203
Boardman, Patrick ...	Bookmaker ...	336
Borritt, Jno. E. ...	Auctioneer ...	647
Powman, Jno. ...	Constable ...	386, 414
Brabazon, H. E. ...	Manager Accident Branch N.Z. Ins. Co. ...	459
Brady, Thos. ...	Senior Constable ...	239
Brown, Joseph ...	Ex-Superintendent of Police ...	383
Burke, Thos. M. ...	Manager Civil Service Stores ...	262
Butler, Geo. H. ...	Dis. Supt. Metr. Fire Brig. Board ...	162
Byrne, Patrick ...	Sergeant in charge of Russell-street ...	130, 649
C.		
Calwell A. A. ...	Watchhouse-keeper, Bourke-street W. ...	447
Carey, Rev. S. P. ...	Baptist Minister ...	268
Carter, J. C. ...	Detective ...	432, 479
Cawsey, Henry ...	Inspector in charge of No. 1 Division ...	102, 115, 227
Campbell, W. H. J. ...	Auctioneer ...	652
Chomley, H. M. ...	Ex-Chief Commissioner of Police ...	1
Christie, Jno. M. ...	Detective Inspector ...	319, 373, 377, 411
Clark, E. R. ...	Confectioner ...	127
Colenso, William ...	Grain Expert ...	586
Commons, Phil. ...	Superintendent of Police ...	512, 515, 521
Considine, J. R. ...	Member of C. I. Branch ...	651
Costello, Jno. ...	Collector ...	337
Costello, Wm. Jno. ...	Sergeant of Police ...	624, 632
Crawford, F. W. ...	Constable ...	140
Crooks, Wm. Jno. ...	Senior Constable ...	243, 253, 281
Crouch, Rich. A. ...	Solicitor ...	384
Crowe, Cornelius ...	Proprietor of a Night Patrol ...	316, 320, 328, 338
Cullen, Jno. B. ...	Law Clerk ...	334, 356, 578
Culleton, Margaret ...	Licensee Warrnambool Hotel ...	644
Curran, A. J. ...	Constable ...	440, 469
D.		
Don, James J. ...	Constable ...	140, 643
Davies, Thos Hy. ...	Clerk of Works ...	415
Davis, Fred. Hy. ...	Constable ...	466
Davis, Wm. ...	Fruit Salesman ...	595
Dixon, Jos. Wm. ...	Barrister and Solicitor ...	414
Donegan, Jno. ...	Jeweller ...	335
Donnelly, Jno. ...	Manager Auburn Carriage Works ...	579
Duke, Ch. J. ...	Ship Providore ...	298
Dungey, A. E. ...	Sub-Inspector Police ...	343, 356, 367, 538
Dwyer, Jas. ...	Ex-Senior Constable ...	403
Dwyer, P. J. ...	Police Magistrate ...	497
E.		
Ellory, Ernest	574
F.		
Fiske, A. J. ...	Liverystable-keeper ...	142, 153
Fleming, J. W. ...	Bootmaker ...	295
Fletcher, Chas. W. ...	Secretary ...	419
Fryer, Robert ...	Detective ...	368, 391, 396, 580, 582, 621, 645
Fripp, Samuel ...	Manager of Rocke, Tompsitt, and Co. ...	304, 308, 388
G.		
Galvin, M. A. ...	Constable ...	207, 213, 241
Gaunson, David ...	Barrister and Solicitor ...	556, 655
Geelan, Hy. ...	Constable ...	264, 282
Gillard, Hy. J. ...	Boilermaker ...	270
Gillard, Walter W. ...	Printer ...	272
Gleeson, Lawrence ...	Inspector of Police ...	145, 154, 164, 538
Graves, E. C. ...	Inspector of Police ...	291, 365, 401, 428, 435, 551, 560, 582, 589, 597, 607, 621
Guinness, E. J. D. ...	Crown Solicitor ...	412
H.		
Hamilton, Richard ...	Ex-Inspecting Superintendent of Police ...	229
Hamilton, Wm. ...	Secretary St. John Ambulance Association ...	143, 151
Hemmy, Frank ...	Accountant, Police Department ...	82
Hibberd, Reubin ...	Sergeant of Police ...	423, 425
Hogan, Jno. ...	Retired civil servant ...	333, 349
Hogan (Mrs.), Louisa	333, 347, 378, 386

INDEX TO WITNESSES EXAMINED—continued.

Name.	Description.	Page.
I.		
Irwin, Jas. ...	Ex-Sergeant of Police ...	634
L.		
Lawson, Geo. E. ...	Secretary Drivers and Cab-owners' Society ...	454
M.		
Macdonald, Angus ...	Accountant and Auditor ...	101
Mackinnon, Chas. ...	Inspector of Police ...	169, 183, 196, 350, 355, 364, 420, 435, 656
Maffezzoni, Bert ...	Plain-clothes Constable ...	417
Mahony, Michael ...	Inspecting Superintendent of Police ...	77, 83, 87
Mercovich, Francis Joseph ...	Constable ...	587
Milne, Jno. ...	Superintendent of Police ...	369
Monahan, Th. Edwin ...	Herald reporter ...	235
Morris, F. B. ...	Gunsmith ...	579
Moss, H. L. ...	Financier ...	414
Murphy, G. E. Read ...	Police Magistrate ...	310
Musgrove, Geo. ...	Theatrical entrepreneur ...	307, 370, 377
Mc.		
McDonald, Edward ...	Retired Civil Servant ...	568
McFarlane, Jas. R. ...	Constable ...	144
McGinley, James ...	Constable ...	258, 263, 276
McGrath, D. E. ...	Constable ...	646
McGrath, P. W. ...	Secretary United Carters and Drivers' Union ...	458
McHugh, Robert ...	Ex-Inspector of Police ...	205, 208, 216, 226, 228, 234, 235, 242
McManamny, Patrick ...	Detective Sergeant ...	580
N.		
Nance, Alf. J. ...	Sauitary Engineer ...	653
Nelly, Jno. F. ...	Medical Practitioner ...	418
Nicholls, Jno. ...	Herbalist and Money Lender ...	595
Nolan, M. R. ...	Sergeant of Police ...	630
O.		
O'Callaghan, Thos. ...	Chief Commissioner of Police ...	14, 31, 48, 63, 225, 266, 302, 570, 616
O'Donnell, David Geo. ...	Detective-Sergeant ...	298, 308, 331, 409, 480, 485, 638
O'Heare, Michael ...	Ex-Sergeant of Police ...	333
Oliver, Geo. ...	Superintendent of Police ...	403, 407
Osgood, H. A. ...	Contractor ...	137, 163
P.		
Paine, F. C. ...	Employé Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board ...	163
Panton, Jos. A. ...	Police Magistrate ...	496
Parkin, Wm. G. ...	Senior Constable ...	247
Peake, H. ...	Printer ...	588
Phillips, P. D. ...	Manager Federal Tinsmiths' Company ...	341
Phillips, David ...	Solicitor ...	414
Porter, David ...	Constable ...	320, 578, 587
Plowman, William ...	Manager Fiske Bros. ...	153
R.		
Raby, J. C. ...	Hon. Sec. Public Morals League ...	268, 272
Reynolds, Wm. ...	Clerk ...	326
Robertson, Jos. ...	Constable ...	637, 644
Roberts, Geo. E. ...	Ex-M. L. A. ...	513, 573, 578
Robertson, McPherson ...	Confectioner ...	419
Robertson, Howard ...	Confectioner ...	430
Rogers, Jos. ...	Constable ...	151
Rogerson, Wm. ...	Sergeant of Police ...	273
Rosa, S. A. ...	Journalist ...	400
Russell, P. J. ...	Solicitor ...	355
S.		
Sadleir, Jno. ...	Ex-Superintendent of Police ...	333
Sainsbury, Alfred G. ...	Superintendent in charge of Criminal Investigation Branch ...	498, 502
Sexton, Michael F. ...	Detective ...	382, 423
Sharp, Robt. ...	Ex-Superintendent of Police ...	253, 299, 411, 470
Smart, Ed. A. ...	Solicitor ...	416
Stapleton, James ...	Senior Constable ...	632
Strickland, A. E. ...	Constable ...	641
Smith, Moss	615
T.		
Tapper, R. Thos. ...	Constable ...	138
Tevlin, Michael ...	Sergeant of Police ...	101
Toolin, C. D. ...	Ex-Managing Clerk ...	596
Toole, Henry ...	Constable ...	645
Trainor, Jno. ...	Journalist ...	330
Tratford, Alfred ...	Constable ...	463, 635, 647, 648, 659
Tucker, A. E. ...	Plain-clothes Constable ...	450
Tucker, James ...	Constable ...	517
W.		
Watson, Rev. E. L. ...	Baptist Minister ...	269
Whiting, Arthur T. ...	Mercantile Broker ...	296, 301, 387
Whitney, Alf. E. ...	Inspector of Police ...	378
Wilkins, Edgar ...	Member of Legislative Assembly ...	345, 440

II.—IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER.

Date.	Name.	Page.	Date.	Name.	Page.
1905.			1905.		
Sept. 20	H. M. Chomley ...	1	Nov. 23	C. Crowe ...	328
21	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	14	24	Jno. Trainor ...	330
22	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	31	24	D. G. O'Donnell ...	331
27	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	48	24	M. O'Heare ...	333
28	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	63	24	Jno. Sadleir ...	333
29	M. Mahony ...	77	24	Jno. B. Cullen ...	334
29	F. Hemmy ...	82	24	Jno. Hogan ...	335
29	M. Mahony ...	83	24	Jno. Donegan ...	335
Oct. 4	M. Mahony ...	87	24	P. Boardman ...	336
4	M. Tevlin ...	101	24	Jno. Costello ...	337
5	Angus Macdonald ...	101	24	C. Crowe ...	338
5	Hy. Cawsey ...	102	28	Louisa Hogan ...	338
6	Hy. Cawsey ...	115	28	P. D. Phillips ...	341
10	E. R. Clark ...	127	28	A. E. Dungey ...	343
10	P. Byrne ...	130	29	E. Wilkins ...	345
11	H. A. Osgood ...	137	29	Louisa Hogan ...	347
11	R. T. Tapper ...	138	29	J. Hogan ...	349
11	F. W. Crawford ...	140	29	Chas. Mackinnon ...	350
11	J. J. Don ...	140	30	P. J. Russell ...	355
11	A. J. Fiske ...	142	30	Chas. Mackinnon ...	355
11	Wm. Hamilton ...	143	30	J. B. Cullen ...	356
11	J. R. McFarlane ...	144	30	A. E. Dungey ...	356
11	L. Gleeson ...	145	Dec. 5	Chas. Mackinnon ...	364
12	J. Rogers ...	151	5	E. C. Graves ...	365
12	Wm. Hamilton ...	151	5	Wm. Jno. Beck ...	366
12	A. Fiske ...	153	5	A. E. Dungey ...	367
12	W. Plowman ...	153	5	R. Fryer ...	368
12	L. Gleeson ...	154	6	Jno. Milne ...	369
17	G. H. Butler ...	162	6	Geo. Musgrove ...	370
17	F. C. Paine ...	163	6	J. M. Christie ...	373
17	H. Osgood ...	163	6	Geo. Musgrove ...	377
17	L. Gleeson ...	164	6	J. M. Christie ...	377
18	Chas. Mackinnon ...	169	7	Louisa Hogan ...	378
19	Chas. Mackinnon ...	183	7	A. E. Whitney ...	378
24	Chas. Mackinnon ...	196	7	M. F. Sexton ...	382
25	Clement Bell ...	203	7	M. J. Bannon ...	383
25	H. R. Alcock ...	204	7	J. Brown ...	383
25	Robt. McHugh ...	205	7	R. A. Crouch ...	384
25	M. A. Galvin ...	207	7	Louisa Hogan ...	386
25	Robt. McHugh ...	208	7	Jas. Bowman ...	386
26	M. A. Galvin ...	213	7	A. T. Whiting ...	387
26	Robt. McHugh ...	216	12	A. T. Whiting ...	387
26	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	225	12	Sam. Fripp ...	388
31	Robt. McHugh ...	226	12	W. J. Beck ...	390
31	Hy. Cawsey ...	227	12	R. Fryer ...	391
31	Robt. McHugh ...	228	12	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	392
31	Rich. Hamilton ...	229	14	R. Fryer ...	396
Nov. 1	Robt. McHugh ...	234	14	Sam. Rosa ...	400
1	Th. E. Monahan ...	235	14	E. C. Graves ...	401
1	Robt. McHugh ...	235	14	Geo. Oliver ...	403
1	Jas. Brady ...	239	14	James Dwyer ...	403
1	M. A. Galvin ...	241	14	R. J. Batchelor ...	406
2	Robt. McHugh ...	242	14	Geo. Oliver ...	407
2	Wm. Jno. Crooks ...	243	14	D. Geo. O'Donnell ...	409
2	W. G. Parkin ...	247	14	R. Sharp ...	411
2	Wm. Jno. Crooks ...	253	14	Jas. M. Christie ...	411
2	R. Sharp ...	253	15	E. J. D. Guinness ...	412
8	James McGinley ...	258	15	P. D. Phillips ...	414
8	Thos. M. Burke ...	262	15	H. L. Moss ...	414
8	James McGinley ...	263	15	J. W. Dixon ...	414
8	Hy. Geelan ...	264	15	Jno. Bowman ...	414
9	Thos. O'Callaghan ...	266	15	T. H. Davies ...	415
9	Rev. S. P. Carey ...	268	15	E. A. Smart ...	416
9	J. C. Raby ...	268	15	R. J. Batchelor ...	416
9	Rev. E. L. Watson ...	269	15	Bert. Maffezzoni ...	417
9	H. J. Gillard ...	270	15	J. F. Nelly ...	418
9	J. C. Raby ...	272	15	McPh. Robertson ...	419
9	Walter Gillard ...	272	15	Chas. W. Fletcher ...	419
9	Wm. Rogerson ...	273	19	Chas. Mackinnon ...	420
14	James McGinley ...	276	19	R. Hibberd ...	423
15	Wm. J. Crooks ...	281	19	M. F. Sexton ...	423
15	Hy. Geelan ...	282	19	R. Hibberd ...	425
16	E. C. Graves ...	291	20	E. C. Graves ...	428
16	Jno. W. Fleming ...	295	20	Howard Robertson ...	430
16	A. T. Whiting ...	296	20	J. C. Carter ...	432
16	D. G. O'Donnell ...	298	20	E. C. Graves ...	435
16	Chas. J. Duke ...	298	20	Chas. Mackinnon ...	435
16	R. Sharp ...	299	20	E. Wilkins ...	440
21	A. T. Whiting ...	301	1906.		
21	Sam. Fripp ...	304	Jan. 17	A. J. Curran ...	440
21	Geo. Musgrove ...	307	17	A. A. Calwell ...	447
21	J. T. Beckett ...	308	17	A. E. Tucker ...	450
21	D. G. O'Donnell ...	308	18	G. E. Lawson ...	454
22	Sam. Fripp ...	308	18	P. W. McGrath ...	458
22	G. F. R. Murphy ...	310	18	H. E. Brabazon ...	459
22	C. Crowe ...	316	18	A. Tratford ...	463
23	J. M. Christie ...	319	18	F. H. Davis ...	466
23	D. M. Porter ...	320	18	A. J. Curran ...	469
23	C. Crowe ...	320	19	R. Sharp ...	470
23	W. Reynolds ...	326			

II.—IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER—*continued.*

Date.	Name.	Page.	Date.	Name.	Page.
1906.			1906.		
Jan. 19	J. C. Carter	479	Feb. 2	J. Bedell	593
19	D. G. O'Donnell	480	2	W. Davis	595
23	D. G. O'Donnell	485	2	Jno. Nicholls	595
23	J. A. Panton	496	2	C. D. Toolin	596
23	P. J. Dwyer	497	2	E. C. Graves	597
23	A. G. Sainsbury	498	6	E. C. Graves	607
24	A. G. Sainsbury	502	6	Moss Smith	615
24	Phil. Commons	512	6	Thos. O'Callaghan	616
24	Geo. E. Roberts	513	6	Robt. Fryer	621
24	Phil. Commons	515	7	E. C. Graves	621
24	Jas. Tucker	517	7	W. J. Costello	624
25	Phil. Commons	521	7	M. R. Nolan	630
26	A. E. Dungey	538	7	W. J. Costello	632
30	E. C. Graves	551	7	Jas. Stapleton	632
30	D. Gaunson	556	7	Jas. Irwin	634
30	E. C. Graves	560	7	A. Tratford	635
31	E. McDonald	568	8	Jos. Robartson	637
31	Thos. O'Callaghan	570	8	D. G. O'Donnell	638
31	Geo. Roberts	573	8	A. E. Strickland	641
31	E. Ellory	574	8	J. J. Don	643
31	Geo. Roberts	578	8	Jos. Robartson	644
Feb. 1	J. B. Cullen	578	9	Marg. Culleton	644
1	D. Porter	578	9	R. Fryer	645
1	F. B. Morris	579	9	H. Toole	645
1	Jno. Donnelly	579	9	D. E. McGrath	646
1	R. Fryer	580	9	A. Tratford	647
1	P. McManamny	580	9	J. R. Borritt	647
1	R. Fryer	582	9	A. Tratford	648
1	E. C. Graves	582	9	P. Byrne	649
1	W. Colenso	586	9	J. R. Considine	651
1	D. Porter	587	9	W. H. J. Campbell	652
1	F. J. Mercovich	587	9	A. J. Nance	653
1	L. Gleeson	588	9	D. Gaunson	655
1	H. Peake	588	9	Chas. Mackinnon	656
2	E. C. Graves	589	9	A. Tratford	659