

56. *Colonel Pitt.*] Do I understand you to say that they were taken exclusively from the Permanent Artillery up to 1897?—I am not quite sure about that. No, I think not.

57. *The Chairman.*] Were not all vacancies filled from the Permanent Artillery?—Yes, I think so.

58. You are not aware of any exception to that rule?—I could not answer that with any degree of certainty. I cannot recollect.

59. Will you kindly tell us anything you may have to say about the working of the Force up to that period—up to the change in 1897. How did these men recruited from the Permanent Artillery do their work as constables?—Well, Sir—

*Colonel Hume.* May I be allowed to say that Mr. Pender has omitted to state what happened in 1886 when the Police Force Act was passed.

60. *The Chairman.*] What happened when that change took place?—I do not think there was any change really in the working generally of the Force by the passing of the Act of 1886. I was in charge in Canterbury, and I do not think there was any change.

61. You do not know of any change taking place?—Not in the general working of the Force. I do not recollect any. I think we went on just the same. There was some reduction. I forget whether it was at that time or previously.

62. It was under that statute the present regulations were made?—Yes.

63. Had you any regulations prior to that?—Yes. We had provincial regulations. Then when the Armed Constabulary came in there were regulations.

64. Did the regulations under this Act bring about any change that you are aware of?—They did differ in some respects, but really I cannot recollect them. I think they pretty well followed the Victorian regulations.

65. *Colonel Pitt.*] These present regulations?—In many things I know the regulations were similar. In New South Wales they were somewhat the same.

66. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the organization of the Force under this statute of 1886: how did it work with you? You were in full charge, were you?—Yes. I do not think the Artillery were up to the previous standard. The transferring of men from the Artillery did not work well, I think.

67. *Mr. Poynton.*] They were not up to the standard of previous recruits?—No.

68. *The Chairman.*] You consider recruiting from the Permanent Artillery not satisfactory?—That is my opinion.

69. *Mr. Poynton.*] You think they require some other training in addition to the artillery training?—I think it is essential that they should be trained other than in mere drill.

70. *The Chairman.*] After they are recruited from the Artillery are they put through any training as constables? Is there any depot training?—There is no depot training. The Inspectors and sergeants do all they can to instruct them. I myself, a couple of times a month—certainly once every month—instruct them.

71. Had they any regular system of training?—Of course, I cannot speak with regard to other districts, only my own. When a new man arrived, whether he came from the Permanent Artillery or otherwise, I always placed him with an old hand for a fortnight or so.

72. He picked up what he could, but there was no regular training?—No regular training.

73. Did men so treated make what you consider good and efficient constables?—Not as a rule. Some of them turned out very well, and made good men.

74. But that was the exception?—They were allowed liberties while in the Artillery that told very much against them after they came into the police. It did not suit police work at all.

75. What liberties?—Well, they were allowed to frequent publichouses and to go to any place they wished. The discipline in the Artillery was altogether different from that in the police, and the life too. As a rule, the discipline of soldiers is not suitable for the police, but of course there were many exceptions. Many of them made capital constables.

76. *Mr. Poynton.*] You do not attribute that to their training as artillery-men?—No.

77. *The Chairman.*] I wish to let you understand the sort of information we want from you: will you kindly, without asking any other questions just now, make any statement or offer any information you have as to the general working of the Force and its efficiency whilst under your control at Christchurch. We will come to Wellington afterwards. Or, say, since 1886?—The Force during the whole time I was there was thoroughly efficient, making allowances for men now and again who got into trouble.

78. Do you know anything of the mode of selection from the Permanent Artillery?—No, Sir.

79. Those selected for removal into the Police Force?—No, I do not.

80. You have really nothing to tell us with regard to the condition of the Force whilst in Christchurch beyond that you consider it was in a thoroughly efficient condition?—It was in a good condition.

81. Up to the time of your removal?—Yes.

82. Now we will come to Wellington. You came to Wellington in what year?—1892.

83. And what can you tell us of the condition of the Force when you came here?—The Force was a good Police Force.

84. It was in good order when you came here?—Yes; it was in good order.

85. Did you consider it efficient?—Yes, I did.

86. You considered it good and efficient when you came here?—Yes.

87. Is there anything at all in connection with the working of the Force which you would like to bring under our notice?—I think married men labour under a great disadvantage compared with the single men.

88. What is their disadvantage?—The single men have free quarters and a mess at the station, and they are provided with free fuel and light.