you saw yesterday. I found very often I was not sure whether a man was fit to be mounted or not, if it happened to be a mounted constable's station that was vacant. Further, I did not know whether a man was fit to be Clerk of the Court or not, whether Stipendiary Magistrate's or Warden's, and so I got that return; and with those returns before me I was in a position that I could tell pretty well how a man would do on a station without referring to the Inspector at all, and in many cases I did not refer to the Inspector, asking him whether he thought the transfer was a desirable one or not. I think it was stated yesterday, when I transferred a man who was Clerk of the Court, for which he received £10, I invariably transferred him to a station where he would also be Clerk of the Court. I do not think there was any exception to that at all, so that the man would lose nothing by it. I did not, however, go further than Clerk of the Court. For instance, there were men who were agents for the Public Trustee. Well, I could not consider that. It would be an endless thing if I went in for consideration of everything. Another man, for instance, is Post-

master at a place, for which he gets as much as £15 a year.

84. Well, in transferring constables who were Clerks of Court you put them in posts where they would act in the same capacity?—Yes, but I did not go beyond Clerks of the Court; and also when I knew that a man had a grown-up family or just growing up I endeavoured to get a suburban station for him where there would be a chance of his children getting some employment. I do not know that there is anything else about transfers. There was something said yesterday about men paying for their uniforms. That is a matter I never considered one way or the other. I never had any complaint about the men having to pay for them, and I never considered it one way or the

85. Do you know whether that was taken into account in fixing the rate of pay?—I could not at all. While on the subject of pay, I may mention that when I submitted my scheme that say at all. they should be paid by increments -- by length of service-I was careful in framing the scheme that no man should lose anything—that is, that no man should be reduced by its coming into effect; and in order to do that I had to start at a lower scale than they were getting: that is to say, that a third-class constable at this time was getting £127 10s. a year to start with, and in order to carry out my scheme he was reduced to £120 a year, £7 10s. being taken off for the first year.

86. You had to suggest a reduction of pay to the new men?—Yes, I was obliged to do that, because I had to work up to such a high scale to prevent anybody being reduced. The scheme was submitted to the Premier who was then Defence Minister. I think about January or Eabruary of

submitted to the Premier, who was then Defence Minister, I think about January or February of the particular year, and he gave me to understand that he approved of it and would submit it to

87. What year was that?—I think it was 1895—1894 or 1895. When the 1st of April of that year came round I put the men joining after that date on the £120, because the scheme was to start from the 1st of April. The Premier was extremely angry with me, and said I should not have reduced the pay without his sanction. I explained to him it was a misunderstanding—that I thought the scheme was to be adopted, and that I knew if it was not adopted the men could get the balance afterwards; whereas if they had been paid the higher scale they could not have been made to refund. He told me to let the matter remain as it was, and the men have received the £120 ever since.

88. That has been going on ever since?—Been going on ever since.
89. And has the other part of the proposal been adopted?—No; the scheme has never been adopted.

90. The progressive rise has never been adopted?—No.

91. So that they have got the reduced pay without the progressive rise?—Yes; the scheme was never adopted. I may say that I consulted several of the officers and men, and they all seemed to approve of the payment by long service. They did not know the exact scale, but they knew they would be paid by annual increments, or whatever it was, and they knew—or they would know from my proposal—that if they came into the service, and behaved themselves for, say, ten years, they would know what pay they would be getting at the end of that period.

92. Your scheme was to give a rise every two years?—I will not say it was every two years, but it was something of that sort. I think it was something like two years right through, but it

was taken by service instead of classes. I may say it is the same system that was in force in the

Royal Irish Constabulary and in the London police.

93. Can you state the changes that have been made in the rate of pay during, say, the last ten years?—There has been no change during the last ten years. I think I can speak pretty well since 1880, and I do not think there has been any change in the rate of pay since that time.

94. I would like to know the class of men from whom the police are recruited—the social

class, as compared with the wage-earning community—who do they rank with?—They are farmers'

sons as a rule.

95. Then you do not place them in the same category as skilled mechanics?—We very seldom get skilled mechanics.

96. You put them as a sort of superior labourer?—Yes.

97. Do they come from the labouring class, or the skilled mechanic class?—They are farmers' sons as a rule.

98. Who have no trade or occupation of their own?—Quite so.

99. Colonel Pitt.] Do you mean agricultural settlers?—Yes; principally agricultural men men who have worked on farms, ploughmen, and so on. Of course, when I said there was no material change of pay I told you this morning the long-service pay was done away with.

100. Mr. Poynton.] And the goldfields allowance?—And the goldfields allowance. The long-

service pay was done away with in February, 1886.

101. The Chairman. You say the Force is primarily composed of men who have worked on farms—agricultural labourers, farmers' sons, and others, who have not been trained to any particular pursuit?—Yes.