

pretty severe. Is that the usual thing, and is this man often late? Please look into it." I did so, and found he had never been late before, and I therefore remitted the 2s. 6d., and ordered that he should be admonished, and wrote a memorandum to the Inspector to that effect, a copy of which is in the letter-book. Then, as regards the system of recruits from the Permanent Force, I was under the impression, until I read my evidence over, that I gave the Commissioners as one of my reasons that the Commander of the Forces was protesting against his gunners being taken just after they had become efficient, which was clearly pointed out by the Minister in the House in reply to Mr. Taylor. Then, as regards a man named Russell, who was dismissed, and afterwards taken into the Force again: As I had not the necessary papers before me, I think I omitted to inform the Commissioners that he joined the Force on the 12th June, 1879, and was promoted to second-class constable on the 1st July, 1893, and that during the whole of that service he had never had an entry in his defaulter's sheet. The offence for which he was dismissed was the first one ever brought against him. He had done good service in the Force, and had a wife and eight children. I should like to add that after so long police service he was unfitted for any other employment, and with his large family was virtually starving. That is all I have to say.

715. *Colonel Pitt.*] He was reinstated and appointed a third-class constable?—Yes.

*Mr. Tunbridge:* I should like, first of all, to put in a return called for by Mr. Taylor, asking the number of men outside the Permanent Artillery who were appointed during the period from the 17th October, 1889, to the 24th January, 1891. The return shows that during that period there were nine candidates enrolled into the Police Force outside the Artillery. The appointment of these men were authorised by various Ministers—not all by Captain Russell; and the return shows three were appointed by Captain Russell, one by the Hon. F. Whitaker, one by the Hon. Sir H. A. Atkinson; and in the case of one it says, "Instructions given," but it is not stated by whom; and three were appointed direct by Major Gudgeon. There is nothing on the papers to show that there was any Ministerial authority for their appointment.

716. I wish now, Colonel Hume, to refer to the case of the late Sergeant-major Moore?—Yes.

717. You stated that the late sergeant-major was reinstated in the Force on parliamentary recommendation?—Yes.

718. That recommendation was not by any means a party recommendation, but Parliament generally?—The Petitions Committee.

719. Not representing any shade of political opinion?—No.

720. And no Minister, so far as you are aware, took the slightest personal interest in the reinstatement, but acted simply on the recommendation of the Petitions Committee?—Yes, so far as I know.

721. And you have already said he was only readmitted on the promise to refund the amount that had been paid him on his retirement: that was a condition of his reinstatement?—On that clear condition.

722. Now, at the death of the late sergeant-major, had he not received that compensation, his widow and children would have been entitled to compensation or compassionate allowance?—Well, not virtually entitled, but it is always given.

723. You have never known it refused?—No.

724. In fact, it is given as generally to the widows and orphans as is the compensation given to a constable when retiring on other grounds?—Yes.

725. This compassionate allowance to the widow and family is based on practically the same calculations as is the compensation given to men on retirement: a year's pay is usually given?—Sometimes more, though never less than a year's pay. Generally it is eighteen months' or two years' pay.

726. Therefore had the late sergeant-major not received the amount he did at the time he was retired from the service in 1891 the widow and children would have been entitled to a sum almost equal to that amount?—I cannot say entitled.

727. They might reasonably be expected to have received that?—Yes.

728. Well now, you know, as a matter of fact, that the widow did not receive the allowance she otherwise would have received?—She did not.

729. As a matter of fact she received at the time nothing more than the actual expenses she might have had in the way of expenses allowed her for transfer from Gisborne to Westport, had she gone to Westport when her husband went?—Yes.

730. The amount she received at the time was the amount which she would have been entitled to as travelling-expenses consequent on the transfer of her late husband from Gisborne to Westport?—Yes. She had a sick son at Gisborne, and could not leave when her husband was transferred, and we gave her her expenses afterwards, as though she had then travelled to Westport. The travelling-allowance was £50, and she wanted the doctor's expenses for attendance to her husband, but she did not get them.

731. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand that, at the death of officers and men, practically their widows are given eighteen months' or two years' salary?—Yes.

732. That means natural death under any circumstances?—Yes, so long as the officer is in the service. In regard to transfers, circumstances may arise, owing to domestic reasons, that prevent a woman leaving at the same time as her husband is transferred. In those cases we always pay her expenses afterwards, as she was clearly entitled to them.

733. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Now, this compassionate allowance was withheld from the widow entirely, in consequence of her late husband having previously received compensation?—Yes.

734. Then, it really resolves itself into this: That the colony has not been a loser of this £700 odd, but merely that the sergeant-major had the use of the amount some years before he was entitled to it?—That is the exact state of the case. The money must have been paid at some time or another.