

10. I presume we must wait with a measure of patience for your promised scheme of superannuation. Past experience does not lead to high hopes concerning it. A scheme that may suit the Civil Service cannot with any fairness be proposed to the Police, whose pay falls so far short of the other.

The Hon. R. J. Seddon, Minister of Defence.

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM HUTCHISON.

No. 4.

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

SIR,—

21st July, 1892.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo *re* proposed Police Superannuation Scheme, and to inform you in reply that my reason for expressing regret that you should not have submitted these proposals to me before consulting the members of the Force was because you gave me no opportunity of knowing that you based the whole scheme on a grant from the Government of so large a sum as £20,000. It is quite true that you asked and obtained my consent to meet the men before you did so; but you never for a moment gave me to understand that your scheme entirely depended upon a grant from the Government of a large sum of money, which, in my opinion, renders the proposal impossible. You also state that the scheme you have submitted meets with the approval of the Force; but I am informed that they are by no means unanimous in their approval, many contending that, owing to their already paying high premiums on their life insurances, they cannot afford to have any more deductions made from their pay. My reason for stating that the long-service pay was granted in view of pension I gathered from a document laid upon the table of the House in 1890—viz., the annual report of the then Commissioner of Police, dated Wellington, 5th April, 1890, and as the Hon. Mr. Bryce, the Minister who sanctioned the long-service pay, was then a sitting member, and never questioned the accuracy of that report, I naturally concluded it was correct. Considering the financial state of the colony, I cannot conscientiously recommend the House to grant so large a sum as £20,000 for the proposed scheme, and as the Government are submitting to the House a scheme of superannuation for the Civil Service, in which the Police may participate, I feel it would be superfluous to further discuss this matter at present.

I have, &c.,

William Hutchison, Esq., M.H.R.

R. J. SEDDON.

No. 5.

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

SIR,—

Police Department, Commissioner's Office, Wellington, 16th August, 1892.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant *re* Police Superannuation, and to inform you in reply I am of opinion that it is advisable the matter should stand in abeyance until after the discussion on the Civil Service Bill, now before the House of Representatives, has taken place.

I have, &c.,

William Hutchison, Esq., M.H.R., Wellington.

R. J. SEDDON.

No. 6.

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

SIR,—

Wellington, 13th August, 1892.

Notwithstanding the somewhat peremptory intimation of your desire to close discussion on the subject of Police Superannuation, an intimation which, I confess, has kept me from day to day from sooner acknowledging receipt of your letter of 21st July last, I have come to think that I ought not to abandon the matter without at least one other appeal to you for some measure of consideration for a body of men who are precluded by their position from speaking for themselves. In no other of the Australasian Colonies are the Police left without permanent provision on retirement from active service, and it is hardly creditable to New Zealand that it should be the exception. The members of the Force waited patiently for the scheme of superannuation in which you say they might participate, but now that it is before them they find it utterly inapplicable to their case. You say to a constable of forty years of age, "You pay £7 10s. annually, and when you retire at sixty, having paid £150, you will get a pension of £16 14s. 6d." You say to another of forty-five years of age, "You pay £7 10s., and when you retire at sixty, having paid £112, you will get a pension of £9 16s. 6d." *Ex duo disce omnes*. You do not expect men to accept terms of this kind. It can now serve no good purpose to regret that you gave me permission to meet the men of the Force, neither is your statement that the scheme depends entirely upon a grant of £20,000 from the Government at all a fair or correct mode of putting the case. Excuse me if I say that you are arguing in a circle. You do not deny that the State will have to pay £70,000 in retiring allowance to men now in the Force. In the face of this fact, a proposal by the Police to accept of £20,000 at once, and entirely forego the balance of £50,000, can hardly be spoken of as if it were a compassionate or even munificent grant. In my letter of 28th June I demonstrated to you that the long-service pay had no connection with a pension. Yet you cling to a contrary notion, and furnish the following extraordinary reason for doing so: "I gathered it from a document laid upon the table of the House in 1890, viz., the annual report of the then Commissioner of Police. . . . and