

but they have not found their way to me. The Inspector, as soon as he got them, should have turned the corners down, put minutes on them, and then handed them to me; but, instead of that, they are sent to a junior, and I shall have to take my orders from him. There are no memoranda at all by Inspector Atchison. You will see that matters are not going as they should. I am degraded for no purpose whatever. I was put on the duty of serving summonses, when these matters were lying by.

1096. *Hon. Mr. Gisborne.*] Has this occurred since you gave evidence?—No; previously to that: since I returned to duty.

1097. Would it be since this Committee was appointed?—Yes.

1098. What is the cause of this assumed degradation, then?—It was because I was supposed to have supplied Mr. Barton with information. When I came down to the office, on the 19th of this month, I reported myself as returned to duty. Before I went away I was in the habit of going to Inspector Atchison's office of a morning for instructions. I went in the first morning, and was told by the clerk that he had nothing in the office, and that I was to go to Sergeant Smith for instructions. I thought it was strange that I should be sent to a junior; but next morning I again went to the Inspector's office, and again the clerk said there were no instructions, and referred me to Sergeant Smith. Since then every morning I have made it my business to ask at the Inspector's office for instructions, but have always been referred to Smith.

1099. Has the Inspector told you to go to Smith?—No; I generally see the clerk, and that is the same.

1100. Has the Inspector given you no reason for doing this?—No.

1101. Did you, as a matter of fact, give any information to Mr. Barton?—No; I have before sworn I neither gave Mr. Barton information, nor have I given it to any one who would be likely to give it to him.

WEDNESDAY, 2ND OCTOBER, 1878.

WILLIAM HENRI PASCOE, being duly sworn, was examined.

William Henri Pascoe.

1102. *The Chairman.*] You are a brewer carrying on business in Wellington?—Yes, in company with a partner, as Pascoe and Co. 2nd Oct., 1878.

1103. The Committee understand you have some complaint to make against the police with regard to licensing publichouses?—I have, inasmuch as I have large interests involved, and I have been a considerable loser by the conduct of the police.

1104. Will you state any circumstances or cases on which you base your complaint?—I will take the case of the Albion Hotel.

1105. *Hon. Mr. Fox.*] Does that belong to you?—Yes; we purchased that property for £1,550, and succeeded in getting a tenant named George Budge. We received from him £600 in cash out of £1,550, and the rest of the purchase-money was taken in bills. This occurred about three years ago, in April. He made application for the usual temporary transfer, and it was refused. Inspector Atchison was at this time in Wanganui; but I believe telegrams passed between him and the officer in charge at Wellington with reference to the matter. However, the transfer was granted to William Donald, and at the annual meeting Budge made application for a license in his own name. It was strenuously opposed by the police, on the ground that he was not a fit and proper person to keep an hotel. Inspector Atchison told the Bench that Budge had a wife in England; that he had also married a young girl in the colony, and was living with her, and treating her very badly, although he had a large family by her.

1106. The objection was that he was a bigamist?—Yes.

1107. *The Chairman.*] Was that really the case?—I believe it was, but he was not maltreating the woman that I know of. The license was therefore refused, and the house thrown upon my hands. I had to refund Budge this £600, and had to lose the rent in the meantime—that was £60, ten weeks at £6 a week. We lost the beer account, about £140, and wines and spirits in the store to the value of about £250, besides paying a spirits' account to Mr. Krull; and, more than that, we had to pay Budge £40 for his loss of time. That closed our connection with Budge. We then got another tenant, Mr. Charles Martin, who made application for a license; and it was granted.

1108. No objection was raised against Martin?—No. Some months after that Budge made up his mind to go into the hotel business again. He said he was going to Blenheim, and, as it happened, we travelled to Blenheim in the same steamer. I asked him how he was going to get a license after what had occurred. He replied he had seen Inspector Atchison, and there would be no objection. He said, "I have squared the whole matter." He went to Blenheim, got his license, and has remained in possession of a license ever since.

1109. Did he say how he had "squared" the matter?

1109A. *Hon. Mr. Fox.*] What did "squaring" mean?—I supposed he had talked Atchison over.

1110. Does not the word "squared" imply something more than mere talking over. Does it not imply that there was some "solid" argument used?—I think so.

1111. *The Chairman.*] He is still living with this woman?—Yes.

1112. And that was the objection raised against his getting a license here?—Yes.

1113. Had Atchison anything to do with the licenses at Blenheim?—No; but he must have abstained from using his influence in the matter, because, in the case of one Edwards, who was refused a license here, he followed him to Wanganui, and prevented his getting a license there.

1114. But Wanganui is in the Wellington police district?—Yes.

1115. *Mr. Barton.*] Will you tell the Committee about the Army and Navy case?—That hotel was situate on Lambton Quay, and for about thirty-seven years had been licensed. About three years ago Mr. Bailey, the occupier, made application for a renewal of his license, and it was refused, because of the dilapidated condition in which the house was.

1116. Was it in a dilapidated condition?—Not in comparison with others to which licenses were, at the same meeting, granted. Just previous to the Bench refusing the application in respect to this