

434. Do you remember the special circumstances connected with his resignation—immediately preceding it?—I think, so far as my memory serves me, he was drunk on the racecourse.

435. Did you see him drunk on the racecourse?—I certainly did not see him.

436. Would you read the report in connection with the case?—This is from Sergeant McDonald, who, I think, was in charge next to Inspector Pender at Christchurch: "Police Station, Christchurch, 5th November, 1890.—I beg to report that at 4.20 p.m. on this date Constable Cullen informed me that he had been sent from the racecourse in charge of the constable named marginally (Patrick McGill, first-class constable No. 22) by Sergeant Briggs, who was in charge on the course. I saw the constable, who was under the influence of drink, and unfit for duty. I informed the constable that he was to consider himself suspended, and remain at the station until further orders. Later on I told the constable he could go to his station, and that he was to report himself at this office at 9 a.m., 6th November, 1890.—ALEX. McDONALD, Sergeant-major." This is minuted, "The Sergeant-major.—Please instruct Constable McGill to give any explanation he wishes. The Commissioner will investigate the case at 9 o'clock a.m. to-morrow, when the constable and witnesses must be present here.—P. PENDER, Inspector, 6/11/90." The next paper reads: "Police Station, Christchurch, 5th November, 1890.—*Re* Constable McGill.—I beg to report that on this date, about 3 p.m., I saw the constable above-named under the influence of drink while doing duty at the Riccarton races. He was attending to the outside totalisator on the course, but owing to him being in such a state I deemed it advisable to send him home to Christchurch in charge of Constable Cullen. When I spoke to Constable McGill about the matter, he said that he was suffering from a severe headache, and had only taken a little liquor to relieve his pain. See Police Regulations, section 62.—JOHN BRIGGS, Sergeant, 175." The next reads: "Police Station, Christchurch, 7th November, 1890.—I beg to report that in accordance with the Inspector's instructions last night I sent a mounted constable with an order to Constable McGill to either deny or admit the offence with which he is charged. The constable (Allman) returned after 11 p.m., and informed me that he went to Phillipstown station, and was informed by Mrs. McGill that the constable was not at home. The constable has not as yet complied with the order (8.40 a.m.).—ALEX. McDONALD, Sergeant-Major." Then my minute follows: "Inspector Pender.—As Constable McGill has failed to appear at your office at 9 this morning, and as he was absent from his station last evening when under suspension, he has only aggravated the first offence, which is of itself the most serious; but as he has very long service I will not dismiss him, but his services are dispensed with from date of suspension.—A. HUME, 7th November, 1890." On the same paper there is the second minute as follows: "The constable appeared a few minutes later, and cross-examined the sergeant-major and Sergeant Briggs, but did not shake their evidence.—A. HUME, 7/11/90."

437. *The Chairman.*] Is that man in the service now?—Yes.

438. *Mr. Taylor.*] You dispensed with his services, but you did not dismiss him: you allowed him to resign?—Yes. That appears clearly to indicate that at that time I had power to dismiss. That was the 7th November, 1890.

439. Was that under Captain Russell's administration?—Yes. Captain Russell was in office until the 24th January, 1891. The next paper on the file is a telegram dated the 13th November, 1890, as follows: "Colonel Hume, Wellington.—Regret Constable McGill been discharged through breach of regulations. Have known him several years. Always thought most efficient officer. Pleased if could reinstate.—S. MANNING, Mayor of Christchurch." To which I replied on the 14th November, as follows: "His Worship the Mayor, Christchurch.—Am sorry to say that Constable McGill's offence is so serious that the punishment, which is in accordance with clause 62 of the regulations, cannot be altered. As the offence was so public, his reinstatement would be disastrous to the discipline of the Force.—A. HUME."

440. Do you remember, Colonel Hume, whether you had any conversation with Captain Russell about this case, or whether he was approached in the matter?—I do not think I had.

441. Were there any other requests for his reinstatement?—There is a petition here, dated "Christchurch, 17th November, 1890.—To the Hon. the Minister of Defence, Wellington.—The undersigned ratepayers and householders of the police district lately under the supervision of Constable P. McGill beg respectfully to draw your attention to the following facts: Constable McGill has been a member of the New Zealand Police Force for more than twenty-four years. For the past twelve years he has been in charge of the Phillipstown district. During the whole of the above time (twelve years) Constable McGill has by his courteous manner and polite but strict attention to his duties earned the respect of all who came into contact with him. We have lately been pained and surprised to hear that Constable McGill has misbehaved himself in such a manner as to deservedly earn the displeasure of the Commissioner of Police, who has dismissed the constable from the Force. We acknowledge that breaches of duty on the part of constables require prompt punishment, but taking into consideration the constable's long service (over twenty-four years), we think we are justified in asking you to be kind enough to review his long career in the service and his previous good conduct, and to reconsider the case, if not with a view of re-admission into the Force, at any rate to consider whether a long-service bonus may not be granted to him." The first signature is J. Ollivier, formerly Resident Magistrate for the district, and there follow eighty-four other signatures.

442. What was the result of that?—There is a letter dated the 5th December, 1890, as follows: "*Re* petition dated Christchurch, 17th November, 1890, to the Hon. the Minister of Defence. The same has been submitted to the Hon. the Defence Minister, who has directed me to inform you that Police Regulation No. 62 states that drunkenness on duty will invariably be punished by dismissal or enforced resignation, and in Constable McGill's case it was a bad case of drunkenness on account of its being in a public place—namely, the racecourse—and in the sight of a large concourse of people. The constable was in consequence of his long service allowed to resign instead of being dismissed, but the Hon. the Defence Minister is unable to grant him compensation, and