

591. Now, with reference to Constable Carlyon. Yesterday you could remember he was charged with being drunk, using obscene language and being guilty of disorderly conduct in a hotel, but you did not think it was during prohibited hours. He was reduced to third-class constable?—Yes.

592. And he has since been promoted to first-class?—Yes, on the 1st June, 1896.

593. *The Chairman.*] Have you any record to show how or why or under what circumstances?—I see a recommendation on these papers from Mr. Lawry.

594. *Mr. Taylor.*] Mr. Frank Lawry, M.H.R. for Parnell?—Yes.

595. What is the date of the recommendation?—3rd February, 1894.

596. *Colonel Pitt.*] What was he recommended for?—The following letter was written by Mr. Seddon: "Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 4th December last, *re* consideration of the case of Constable Carlyon, I have the honour to inform you that I have given instructions for this constable to be promoted to the second class, and to be posted to Ponsonby Station, which is now vacant.—I have, &c., R. J. SEDDON. F. Lawry, Esq., M.H.R., Auckland." On the 8th June, 1896, I wrote to the Minister: "You will see the offences for which this man was reduced from second-class constable to third-class constable were about as bad as they could be. You will see also, by letter from Defence Minister to Mr. Lawry, M.H.R., of the 3rd February, 1894, that this man was at that time promoted from third- to second-class constable, and, as he has given entire satisfaction ever since he left Dargaville, and does not now drink, I have much pleasure in recommending he be now promoted to first-class constable. He has had charge of Ponsonby Station (8th February, 1894), and has carried out his duties to the satisfaction of his superiors.—A. HUME." Then: "Approved —T. THOMPSON."

597. *Mr. Taylor.*] Was he the subject of any special conversation between yourself and Mr. Thompson prior to your making the recommendation?—I do not remember. I should not have written this probably if there had been, because I have written it out fully here.

598. Have you the papers now about Constable McGill's sick-leave?—Yes.

599. I would like to know what is the longest period of continuous sick-leave that he has had?—The first paper, dated the 9th February, 1895, is the report of Constable Stanton, as follows: "I have to report, in accordance with Police Regulation No. 39, that First-class Constable Patrick McGill, stationed at Addington, has been sick more than four times during twelve months, as follows: 1894—July 23rd to 31st, nine days, influenza; October 25th to 30th, six days, influenza; December 14th to 25th, twelve days, influenza. 1895—January 24th to 27th, four days, influenza; February 8th (still on sick list), influenza." Then comes the minute: "Forwarded to the Commissioner. Constable McGill is now stationed at Addington.—T. BROHAM, Inspector." Then my minute: "Please report when this constable resumes duty." Then: "McGill has just obtained a month's leave of absence on account of sickness." On the 9th February, 1895, application of Constable McGill for three months' sick-leave of absence on account of sickness on full pay: "I beg most respectfully to apply for three months' sick-leave of absence on full pay, as I have been for some time suffering from a severe attack of influenza, which can be seen by the attached doctor's certificate. In support of this application I would respectfully state that for over twenty-eight years' service I never had a day's sickness up to within the last six months. I trust that my officer, knowing the circumstances of my case, will be good enough to recommend this application for the favourable consideration of the Commissioner." Accompanying this: "9th February, 1895. —I hereby certify I have for a considerable time been attending Constable McGill, who has been suffering from the after effects of influenza. His constitution has been so severely tried that I have strongly recommended him to obtain, if possible, complete rest and thorough change for a period of three months, in order to restore him to his usual state of health.—A. C. DE RENZIE, M.R.C.S., England, 58, Oxford Terrace, Christchurch." The reply to that is a telegram dated 18th February, 1895: "First-class Constable McGill is granted a month's leave of absence on full pay. If not in a position to resume duty at the expiration of that time he must apply for an extension of leave, which will be duly considered.—A. HUME." Then, on the 11th March, 1895: "I hereby certify that Constable McGill is still suffering from severe mental depression following influenza. I am of opinion he will require another month or two of complete rest and change before he will be in a fit state to return to duty.—A. C. DE RENZIE, M.R.C.S., England." On the 11th March he applied for two months' sick-leave of absence on full pay, on which was minuted: "Forwarded to the Commissioner and recommended. Constable McGill has suffered very much from influenza. He has lost three and a half stone in weight, and is physically and mentally very much shattered. With rest and change of air he will soon be well again.—T. BROHAM, Inspector." The answer to that was on the 23rd March: "McGill is granted an extension of one month's leave, at the expiration of which you will be good enough to forward a report on his state of health.—A. HUME." Then, at the expiration of one month, 24th April, 1895, Inspector Broham reported that McGill was still far from well; that the "influenza had left him thin and worn and exhausted of all energy. Another month's leave recommended.—T. BROHAM, Inspector." Then the further minute: "Recommended that this man be granted another month's leave, which will make three months in all.—A. HUME." That was approved.

600. *Mr. Taylor.*] Did he return to duty at the end of that time?—The next certificate is dated the 27th June: "I hereby certify that Constable McGill is still under medical treatment suffering from severe nervous prostration after influenza, and is not, in my opinion, at present fit for duty.—ARTHUR C. DE RENZIE, M.R.C.S." Then, on the 2nd July, I wrote to the Minister: "This constable has now been nearly six months off duty from sickness within the last twelve months, and, as he is not now fit to resume duty, I recommend he be retired on medical grounds, receiving the usual compensation." I presume the Minister was away somewhere. Anyway the case was not dealt with, and I have added to this: "As this man resumed duty on the 11th instant, these papers can be filed." This is where the delay came in, apparently, for there appears this memorandum: "When a