

735. In regard to the question of the two men, Cullinane and Hattie: these two men were taken back into the Force on the promise to refund the compensation they had already received?—Yes.

736. Well, now, the Minister who decided these men were to be readmitted to the Force had these papers before him, in which they promised to refund the compensation?—Yes.

737. Had you anything to lead you to suppose that the Minister did not expect that they would not make that refund?—No.

738. The Minister reappointed them on the understanding that they would refund that amount, so far as you know?—Yes.

739. They have never refunded?—No.

740. Because they have never been asked?—Quite so.

741. You never received any directions from the Minister not to demand a refund?—No. I presume I must take the responsibility of not demanding a refund, but I am under the impression that such cases are provided for in "The Civil Service Act, 1866"; and though the Police are not Civil servants, and therefore do not legally come within the four corners of that Act, I consider it is a distinction without a difference; and I have never known, so far as my recollection serves me, of anybody having had to refund their compensation under those circumstances. If any blame attaches I willingly take the responsibility, as I do not think it fair to ask a man in the position of a constable, or on the pay of a constable, to make any refund.

742. *Colonel Pitt.*] You mean anybody in the Civil Service?—Yes, under similar circumstances.

743. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] These men on their final retirement from the service will not be granted a second compensation?—Certainly not; and that was an additional reason for my not demanding a refund.

744. Now, will their widows, should they die in the service, receive any compassionate allowance?—No.

745. There will be no second payment made to these men?—No.

746. So that the colony is not and will not in future be a loser by the compensation these men have received?—That is so.

747. I should like to ask you a question about the artillerymen coming into the Force: You stated in your cross-examination that the names of the men were selected for transfer to the police. Was that made by the Minister?—Yes. I used to put a list before him, and say these are the artillerymen anxious to come into the police.

748. You did not always make recommendations in writing, did you?—No.

749. You made many verbal recommendations?—Yes, very many, and some of them confidential ones.

750. Were not always the question of education, character, and physique taken into consideration in making these selections for transfer?—Certainly; and whether married or single, and religion.

751. Do you know of your own knowledge, or is there anything to show that these men were ever transferred to the police on political or Ministerial grounds, and not upon the general ground of fitness?—I know they were not. They were transferred on the general ground of fitness.

752. Do you remember any case or cases where the fittest were rejected?—No.

753. Now, as to the scheme submitted for superannuation for the police: I think, *Colonel Hume*, the principal idea of finding funds for carrying out that scheme was that the long-service pay, and so on, should be put into a general fund for superannuation?—Yes; that was the first scheme. It was to take away the men's good-conduct pay and the year's compensation, and they were to get a lump sum of £400, or a little over £1 per week when they were sixty-five years of age. That was the original scheme.

754. It simply meant this: that the men who were receiving long-service pay were to lose that long-service pay, and those not receiving long-service pay would lose nothing?—That is so.

754A. And it was principally on the ground that it did not act equally all round that it fell through?—I believe so.

755. Those who were receiving long-service pay preferred to hold on to the bird in the hand?—That is right.

756. In reference to the case of an assault alleged against *Inspector Emerson*: Now, in this case the complainant was advised to lay an information against *Inspector Emerson* before the Magistrate?—Yes; and he said he would do so.

757. Has the department considered that, in a case where there is a conflict of evidence, it was much better that the evidence should be taken on oath before a Magistrate and dealt with judicially?—Yes; and besides it is in accordance with the regulations.

758. You still maintain that the decision in that case was the correct one to give?—The department took the perfectly right course.

759. In reference to the case of *Lawliss*, whose papers are here now if you would like to look at them: This man *Lawliss*, before he applied for the license to be transferred to him, did he ask you if the fact of his dismissal from the Police Force would act as a bar?—Yes; I should like to read what I wrote to him. He first wrote to me from *Dannevirke* on the 12th February, 1895, as follows:—

SIR,—

With reference to my dismissal from the Police Force on the 30th January last, I would beg to state that I tendered my resignation on the 23rd January, while I was suspended, but no notice appears to have been taken of it. With regard to my pleading guilty to the charge for which I was dismissed, I was advised by *Inspector Emerson*, who even wrote me a copy of my plea of guilty, telling at the time that I would be more leniently dealt with by the Commissioner of Police, and also save the Department the expense of inquiry. I was therefore misled by my *Inspector*, and wrote an admission which appears to have deprived me of the right of resigning, or one penny