

of evils to come should he continue in the same line of occupation.—H. B. LEATHAM, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.—New Plymouth, 6th January, 1890.” Then follows: “Inspector Pardy, New Plymouth.—You may discharge Hattie. Voucher for compensation (£138 12s. 8d.) passed on this date.—W. E. GUDGEON, 17th August, 1890.” It appears this man had been in the Force before, and had resigned, and Major Gudgeon submitted this to Captain Russell, who wrote, “Compensation must be reckoned on his last term of service only. As he resigned in 1877, he forfeited all claims by so doing.—W.R.R.—15/1/90.”

470A. When was he reinstated?—He writes on the 27th February, 1891, as follows:—

SIR,—
Chelmsford House, Thorndon Quay, Wellington, 27th February, 1891.
I beg respectfully to apply for reinstatement as a constable in the Police Force. Reference to my papers will disclose that I was discharged at Taranaki on compensation as medically unfit. Having fully recovered my health (please see attached certificate from Hon. Dr. Grace), I now feel thoroughly capable of performing my duties satisfactorily; and if, therefore, you will be good enough to consent to my request, I should feel deeply grateful, and should at once refund the compensation I received on leaving.
The Hon. the Defence Minister, Wellington.
I have, &c.,
ALEXANDER HATTIE.

To this I replied on the 3rd March, 1891, as follows:—

SIR,—
Police Office, Wellington, 3rd March, 1891.
I am directed by the Hon. the Minister of Defence, in reply to your application of the 27th ultimo for reinstatement in the Force, to forward for your information copy of an application from you for retirement on compensation on account of ill-health, dated “7th January, 1890,” together with a copy of a medical certificate which accompanied that application; and to add that the Minister is not satisfied that your health is sufficiently restored to admit of your being taken back into the Force.
Mr. A. Hattie, Chelmsford House, Thorndon Quay, Wellington.
I have, &c.,
A. HUME, Commissioner.

471. *Colonel Pitt.*] Who was the Minister?—Mr. Seddon.

472. *The Chairman.*] When did Mr. Seddon take over office?—On the 24th January, 1891, as Defence Minister; and Mr. Thompson on the 22nd June, 1896, on which date the police were transferred from Defence to Justice.

473. *Mr. Taylor.*] What happened after you had sent that letter?—The next thing is a memorandum of the 1st August, 1891, to Inspector Thomson: “Ex-constable Hattie has been directed to report himself at your office on Monday morning next, the 3rd instant, for duty. Please swear him in accordingly.—A. HUME, Commissioner.”

474. Will you say what passed in the way of correspondence, or interviews, between the letter in which you stated the Minister was not satisfied that Hattie was fit for reinstatement and the sending of that memorandum?—There is nothing to show.

475. You do not know who appealed on behalf of Hattie?—I would not know.

476. Is there a memorandum from Mr. Seddon bearing on the subject?—Yes.

477. What does it say?—“Please give me your views on this matter. The applicant seems a very decent fellow, and is well recommended.—R.J.S., 15/4/91.”

478. What was your reply to that?—“Mr. Seddon.—I do not think this man should be again taken on in the police. He resigned in 1877, and was medically unfit in January, 1890. Major Gudgeon says of him, ‘I have known Hattie for twelve years, and he has always been a weak-chested man.’ He is better now, no doubt, because he has had a rest from police duty; but I do not think he is fit for police work.—A. HUME, 16/4/91.” Mr. Seddon minuted this: “Matter to stand over.”

479. *Colonel Pitt.*] Did he refund his compensation?—I do not think so. I do not think there is any case of a man having refunded his compensation.

480. *The Chairman.*] In reply to the memorandum from the Minister you reported against his being taken on?—Yes. I thought he was too weak-chested.

481. You would scarcely remember, I suppose, if there was any further correspondence between the sending of that note and the date of his appointment?—There is certainly no correspondence, or it would be here on the file.

482. *Mr. Taylor.*] Do you remember any constable within the last few years—say, two years and a half—objecting to go to a station to which he was ordered, protesting on the grounds that he had reported the sergeant in charge of that station for drunkenness, and that it would be impossible for him to get on with him?—I think there was such a case.

483. Do you remember if the man was forced to go?—Probably. I should think so.

484. You do not think that would affect the discipline of the Force?—Oh, no. I would look upon that as an idle excuse.

485. You do not think it would be likely to interfere with the discipline of the man, the fact that he had to work under a sergeant whom he has had occasion to report for drunkenness?—No.

486. Nor that a superior officer is not likely to take any notice of a constable having reported him for drunkenness?—No.

487. What is the custom, so far as sergeants are concerned: are they supposed to be in charge of stations where there are no other constables?—Yes; and I have pointed out the farce of it. There is a man—Sergeant Hannan—in charge of himself, at Stafford.

488. He was transferred to some North Island station in 1892, and was away for about four months?—I believe so.

489. Do you remember anything special about his being returned? Was his return ordered by the Minister?—Undoubtedly.

490. Who was Defence Minister then?—Mr. Seddon.

491. Is Constable Donovan, who took his place, still living?—Yes.

492. Was he a first-, second-, or third-class constable?—He was third-class then; he is second-class now.

493. I would like to ask whether the police-officer named Donovan, who relieved Sergeant Hannan for four months at Stafford, was not, immediately after the return of Sergeant Hannan, promoted to the rank of sergeant?—I will have to look up the papers.