

451. I think it is a fair question. Is it not likely to cause well-grounded dissatisfaction, and lead to disorganization?—No, not under the circumstances in which the report was made.

452. I want to ask whether that telegram ordering his reappointment was sent directly under the instructions of the Defence Minister, Mr. Seddon?—Yes. When the report from Inspector Pender came in I wrote as follows: "The Hon. the Defence Minister.—Mr. Broham informed me verbally that McGill was a very good constable when he served under him on the West Coast some years ago; and Inspector Pender now gives him a very high character, and recommends his case for favourable consideration. Taking into consideration that he has now been over six months out of the service—a heavy punishment in itself—and he has been a first-class constable for thirteen years and in the Force some twenty years, with a good character, I recommend he be taken back into the Force from the 5th proximo, and that he be placed at the bottom of the list of first-class constables.—A. HUME. 22/5/91." This is minuted, "Approved.—R. J. SEDDON. 23/5/91."

453. Do you know if Constable McGill was formerly stationed on the West Coast in the Township of Kumara?—Somewhere on the West Coast, but I do not know where.

454. About 1893 or 1894 Constable McGill had a very lengthy sickness, I think?—I will have to get the papers.

455. What was the longest sick-leave which Constable McGill obtained?—Two separate leaves of one month each, in 1895.

456. Did he apply for the second month?—Yes.

457. I think the records are wrong. I think it will be found that McGill had several months' consecutive sick-leave on full pay, and the last month of his leave, I am informed, was telegraphed to him without his making any application?—I will produce the papers referring to it.

458. Where is Constable McGill now?—In Addington.

459. He has been reinstated in his old rank, alongside of his colleagues from whom he was dismissed?—Yes.

460. Do you know what occupation he followed whilst out of the Force?—I have not the slightest idea.

461. You do not know that he was landlord of the Garrick Hotel while he was out of the Force?—I do not know.

462. Was Constable McGill allowed to retain his long-service pay of 1s. a day after he was reinstated?—Yes.

463. Now, take the case of Sergeant Frederick Percy Carlyon: do you remember him being charged with being drunk, using obscene language, and being guilty of an assault in a hotel during prohibited hours, I think at Dargaville?—I remember he was reduced for an irregularity, but what it was I cannot say without seeing the papers. I remember him being accused of being drunk and with using obscene language, and committing an assault, but the latter was not during prohibited hours.

464. Was he punished by being reduced from the rank of sergeant to third-class constable?—Yes.

465. That was in 1893?—Yes.

466. He has been promoted since?—Yes, to the rank of first-class constable.

467. And put in charge of the Featherston Police-station?—Yes; but he was in charge of a station before that.

468. Is he Inspector of licensed houses now at Featherston?—Yes.

469. Will you tell the Commission what were the special circumstances connected with this man's promotion to rank of first-class constable. You do not remember who interfered on his behalf specially?—No, not without the papers.

470. Have you the papers now in connection with the retirement of Constable Hattie on compensation?—Yes. The first paper reads: "Police-station, New Plymouth, 7th January.—Application of Third-class Constable No. 260, Alexander Hattie, for his discharge from the New Zealand Police Force on compensation, owing to ill-health: I respectfully beg to request that the officer in charge of the district will recommend and forward for the approval of the Commissioner this the constable's application for discharge on compensation. For some time past I have been in a delicate state of health, owing to illness contracted while on duty; and I am now informed that if I continue the duty of a constable, when I am necessarily subject to exposure, that I shall be liable to be seized with illness which might terminate fatally. In support of my application, I would beg to state that I have served for a period of thirteen years and a half in the New Zealand Constabulary Force. Medical certificate attached.—ALEXANDER HATTIE, Third-class Constable No. 260." This is forwarded to the Commissioner of Police, Wellington, by the Inspector, with the following report: "I have the honour to inform you that the constable named in the margin (Alexander Hattie, Third-class Constable No. 260), stationed in New Plymouth, has been in delicate health for a long time past, and from the 16th of last month has been unfit for duty, and, so far as I can learn, there is little prospect of his being able to resume duty for a long time, if ever. Under these circumstances, I would recommend his discharge from the Force on the usual compensation. He is a respectable, intelligent man, and during the time he has been in this district, apart from his ill-health, he has performed his duties in a very satisfactory manner—so much so that I am very sorry having to recommend his discharge. I enclose a medical certificate from Dr. Leatham, who is his medical attendant.—I have, &c., W. S. PARDY, Inspector." This certificate reads: "I certify that I have professionally attended Constable Alexander Hattie, of New Plymouth; that he has recently had a severe illness, contracted from exposure whilst on duty; that he is now in a debilitated condition, and is, in my opinion, an unfit subject for the work of a policeman, such occupation being injurious to his constitution, and likely to be attended by serious results if he continues to be exposed to the effects of climatic influences as he has been of late. I have advised him to resign his post on account of the injurious effect the work has had on his health, and also in anticipation