

manifestation, other than voting themselves at elections." So that clearly shows they had the right to vote at that time, and that is how they got it—by repealing the Act of 1867. Then, a member of the Commission asked me how it was this Armed Constabulary pay counted for the long-service medal, and I was under the impression it was by a circular; but you will find that it is provided for under Regulation 65: "Long-service medals are awarded to members of the Force of not less than fourteen years' continuous service in the Police or late Armed Constabulary Force, provided that for the last three years they have not been entered in the defaulters' book"; and I will now put in the circular doing away with the long-service pay. [Exhibit 17.] This, of course, will affect another answer I gave you. I was asked, "Then, more than half of the Force came in knowing they had the franchise?" and I said "Yes." But of course there will be a great deal more than that, since the Act was passed in 1886. I suppose I may correct my evidence in these particulars.

MONDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1893.

PETER PENDER examined on oath.

1. *Mr. Taylor.*] You said it was the exception for men enrolled from the Permanent Artillery to make good police-officers?—That is my experience.
2. When they are once enrolled in the Force do they usually remain there—I mean those men who are such indifferent policemen. I suppose it is very difficult to get rid of them?—If they misconduct themselves, of course they have to go.
3. The men to whom you referred, Inspector Pender, I suppose, with a few exceptions, are still in the Force somewhere?—I really cannot say. I could not point out any particular man. I am speaking generally in regard to the artillerymen. As a rule they do not make as good police-officers, in my opinion, as outsiders.
4. Well, now, take the case of a man named Gantley, do you remember him?—Yes.
5. Was he taken from the Permanent Artillery?—Well, I could not tell you exactly. He was here in the Force when I came from Christchurch. I think he did come from the Permanent Artillery.
6. Do you remember the exact circumstances connected with his removal from Wellington?—Yes, pretty well; I think I recollect.
7. What are they?—Well, he was employed as a plain-clothes constable, and he was not giving satisfaction.
8. What was the particular offence that was charged against him that was the immediate cause of his removal?—None that I recollect.
9. None within your recollection?—No particular charge.
10. You do not remember whether he was charged with exhibiting indecent pictures in a public-house in Wellington?—He was not.
11. No particular charge of that kind made against him?—Colonel Hume wrote a confidential memorandum to me, or spoke to me. I think he spoke to me. I had inquiries made by Detective Campbell, and I think it was found to be altogether a groundless report—no foundation whatever for it—and no charge was made against the man.
12. Are there no records of the incident?—That would be the only record—the confidential memorandum from the Commissioner to me—that is, if Colonel Hume wrote a confidential memorandum to me.
13. Have you got it?—No; I would send it back. I am not sure, although he did speak to me as well.
14. Was it immediately after that matter was dealt with that he was removed?—I think he was moved about the time.
15. Was he not moved within twenty-four hours of the matter being investigated?—Oh, no. That had nothing whatever to do with his removal.
16. Well, now, do you know what Colonel Hume said about the man—that he was dissatisfied with the way the man was doing his duty—was that the reason for removing him?—Yes; I think I was dissatisfied as well.
17. What was he guilty of—what were his faults?—You may be dissatisfied with a man, but still you are not able to bring a charge against him. A man doing plain-clothes duty may be lazy, or he may be inefficient—not working as you would like. We at the time considered that Gantley was not doing his work as he should have done it—doing his work properly, making himself efficient; and I am not sure whether I spoke to Colonel Hume about it—very likely I did—and he ordered his removal; but the report about the pictures had nothing to do with his removal, as far as I know.
18. There was no charge made against him to the effect that he was exhibiting these pictures?—We found there were no grounds for the charge; and there was no charge made. I mean there were no grounds for the report.
19. Would not Detective Campbell report?—He may have done so; but he would see me personally, probably.
20. Not make a written report?—Well, if I saw him he would not.
21. Do you take verbal reports on a matter of that kind?—Frequently, in a thing of that sort. I heard about it, and asked him to make inquiries and see if there was anything in it.
22. You receive a constable's complaint, and instruct a detective to make inquiry, and you take a verbal report?—Well, not as a rule. I sometimes do.
23. It is the exception to do so?—Well, I do not know that it is the exception. I often do it. If I hear anything in the town, for instance, I have inquiry made, and hear the report about it. I tell Detective Campbell to make inquiries and see if there is anything in it. If there was anything in it he would report, and then we would deal with it.