

22. There is really no date on it?—It is dated 1892, and the 19th October is filled in in pencil in the handwriting of, I think, Mr. Field. Mr. Levi was solicitor for Mrs. O'Leary. He was advising her.

23. Has Mrs. O'Leary in that deed actually parted with her interest in that property?—Certainly.

24. When did she part with it?—When she signed the document.

25. What date?—1892.

26. Is it legal to fill in the date with pencil?—Certainly. A document without any date at all is perfectly valid. The date can be otherwise proved. It was not completed because the title was vested in a man named Egan, who was a trustee, but it has since been cleared up. Egan is an uncle of the Dealys.

JOHN JACKSON JOHNSTON was examined on oath.

27. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the Police Force?—Yes.

28. What rank?—Second-class constable.

29. Where?—Stationed in Wellington.

30. We shall be glad to hear anything you desire to say?—I desire, on behalf of a number of constables in the Wellington Police District, to lay before you what has been for several years past a grievance with the men, and that is, the discontinuance of the long-service pay. Now, you are aware that in 1887 the long-service pay was stopped, and since then there has been nothing but dissatisfaction amongst the men who have joined, and especially amongst those men who have been transferred from the Permanent Artillery. These men now find that constables in the Force who were fortunate enough to be transferred previous to the year I have mentioned are in receipt of 1s. per day extra, long-service pay.

31. All who were transferred prior to that date get 1s. long-service pay?—Yes.

32. And none after?—No. That is the date when the discontent commenced in the Force.

33. Do you mean discontent on the part of those who were in the Force prior to the 10th February, 1887, the date of the circular, or since?—Those in the Force since; and they are the large majority of the men. They have no hope of ever getting on an equal footing with the others, and consequently they are dissatisfied. They have nothing to look forward to, and no encouragement for good conduct, because there is no reward held out for them. This long-service pay was granted purely for long service and good conduct. There has never been much promotion in the Force at the best of times. The men have nothing to gain by expecting anything in that line. It is out of the question. To convince you of the unfairness of the system as it now stands it will be necessary for me to adduce a particular case as an instance—to put my own, as briefly as possible.

34. When did you join?—I joined the Armed Constabulary in 1886.

35. When did you join the Police Force?—In 1889. I served seven months in the Armed Constabulary, and I was transferred to the Auckland forts as third-class gunner, and remained in the Force for over two years. I was transferred in 1889 to the Police Force under Major Gudgeon. I have been doing police duty since. Of course, if I have been unfortunate to lose my long-service pay I have always been extremely lucky in having good officers to serve under, and that has gone a long way.

36. Where has your service in the Police Force been?—In this district. Here is my discharge, and you will see I only got credit for seven days in the Armed Constabulary. At that time they were building fortifications, and they no doubt found my services as a navvy more valuable than as a gunner, and I lost a shilling a day through that for seven months.

37. Why did you lose 1s. per day?—Well, the Permanent Artillery got 6s. per day and the Armed Constabulary got 5s. per day.

38. You joined the Armed Constabulary, and then joined the Permanent Artillery?—Yes, after serving there over seven months.

39. What were you doing?—Building fortifications.

40. Had you any reason at all to expect, when you joined the Police Force in 1889, that you were going to receive an allowance which had been abolished in 1887?—That sort of thing has occurred in the Force before. They reduced the pay 10 per cent. one time, and then made it up again afterwards.

41. Is your object in saying what you have said a desire to express a grievance, in not having received long-service pay, or to show to us the advantage and importance of re-establishing the long-service pay?—It is to have the long-service pay established if possible, because the men will not be satisfied without it. They will be far more satisfied with the long-service pay than with any pension scheme. We do not want to have anything to do with what we have lost by it, but to see the thing established. Mr. William Hutchison was in Wellington some years ago and explained a pension scheme to us; and every man on the station opposed that, because the long-service pay was abolished and we would not be on the same footing as the other men. We were discontented with that.

42. You disagreed with Mr. Hutchison's scheme?—Yes, every man on the station.

43. Do you think that the men would be more satisfied with more pay per day than with a pension scheme?—Yes, the men would be inclined to work out a pension scheme of their own if they got decent pay. Of course, I have completed now twelve years in the New Zealand Forces—namely, nine years in the Police Force and three years in the Permanent Force—twelve years, with good conduct, and it is not worth a penny-piece to me.

44. And you think a system of increased pay at stated periods, say, every five years or so, would be acceptable and satisfactory?—Undoubtedly so. There has been nothing but dissatisfaction ever since that pay was stopped.