great complaint in the New Zealand Force is the lack of promotion, which this rule 5 would help to obviate. There are about thirty-one men in the Force now over fifty-five. Add to these the number that may be assumed as entitled to superannuation during the first ten years of the fund, say 103, and there are thus 134 vacancies in that time irrespective of casualties.

No. 2.

The Hon. Mr. CADMAN to Mr. W. HUTCHISON, M.H.R.

SIR,— Wellington, 6th June, 1892.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 7th ultimo, inclosing a copy of the basis of a proposed Police Superannuation Fund, and inviting me to make suggestions and amendments thereon, and in reply have to thank you for your courtesy in forwarding your proposals, which I regret you did not do prior to submitting them to the members of the Force in Canterbury and Otago. In the present financial state of the colony I am of opinion that it will be quite useless to ask Parliament to vote a sum of £20,000 for this purpose, seeing that the £6,000 yearly voted for long-service pay is still to be continued, and will exist for many years to come. It is stated in a note on the Table 2 that the members of the Force reckon with confidence on being reasonably entitled to expect from the Government at least the sum of £20,000 as above, seeing that under the present system the Government pay the amount of one year's salary to every member on retiring, &c.; but this is not the rule unless the retiring member has completed twelve years' service. I cannot learn from the proposals submitted from what fund it is proposed to pay the compensation now granted to men of the Force when retiring between this and the 1st April, 1898, which will amount to probably some £1,600 a year. If the Government have to continue to pay this compensation for five years more it will probably amount to at least £8,000, in addition to the £20,000 and the £6,000 long-service pay. The members of the Force drawing long-service pay, which, I am informed, was granted in lieu of pensions, are, under the proposed scheme, put on exactly the same footing as regards contributions as those who do not and will never draw long-service pay. This seems to me somewhat unfair. With regard to the grant of £20,000, guided by the experience of the last five years as to the amount paid as compensation, it may be approximately stated that it would take many years under the present system to absorb £20,000, which, under these proposals, would have to be dispensed in one grant. As regards the proposed Board, if it became the law to submit any and every grievance concerning the internal working of the Force to a Board composed of men of no police *status* (outsiders, as they would be regarded) is it not reasonable to suppose that the position of the officers and non-commissioned officers would be assailed, and the discipine of the Force generally become endangered. Another point brought forward which I am unable to grasp is, that as the £70,000 represents money paid annually in salaries, it would always have to be provided. How, then, could the grant of £20,000, which is an additional charge upon the department quite independent of the amount paid in salaries, be the means of saving £50,000? I notice that no provision is made for an annuity to a member of the Force, after paying for many years to the fund, who is then promoted to the position of an officer. In conclusion, I may state that the Government will, this session, submit, under the Civil Service Bill, proposals which will meet all that is required, and place the Police on a better footing than in the scheme submitted by you, and without extra cost.

I have, &c.,

Wm. Hutchison, Esq., M.H.R., Wellington. A. J. CADMAN, for Defence Minister.

No. 3.

Mr. W. HUTCHISON, M.H.R., to the Hon. Mr. SEDDOON.

SIR,— Wellington, 25th June, 1892.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 6th instant, commenting upon certain proposals for the basis of a Police Superannuation Fund, which I submitted to you for consideration. I presume, however, from the gist of your remarks, that you have not had time to make yourself acquainted with the details of the scheme, and therefore content yourself with raising generally a number of objections which, on more mature deliberation, I venture to think you will come to see are either irrelevant or of little consequence. The scheme does not profess to be either perfect or complete, and suggestion and amendment are solicited, but wholesale condemnation can serve no good purpose. As the matter is one of much interest to a deserving class of State officials, I can hardly accept your careless dismissal of it without an endeavour to remove certain misapprehensions under which you seem to labour, although I confess that my task in attempting to do so is rather an uphill one, seeing your reply has very much the appearance of being founded upon a foregone conclusion. I shall take your objections *seriatim* in so far as they can be disentangled one from another.

1. You regret that I should not have submitted these proposals to you before consulting the members of the Force. Why? These men are chiefly concerned in them, and to devise a scheme which meets their approval, as this one does, is half-way towards its success. Yet, to avoid the slightest infringement of Police rule, you may remember that I asked and obtained your consent to meet with the men before I did so. It is curious you should now express regret at a course sanctioned by yourself.

2. You are of opinion it will be quite useless in the present financial state of the colony to ask Parliament for a sum of £20,000 to wipe off a gradually-accruing sum of £70,000 payable to the Force in the form of retiring allowance. You know the present financial state of the colony better than I do, but, seeing the surplus for the past year is publicly represented to be an amount ranging