William Henri Pascoe. 2nd Oct., 1878. house, they had renewed the license of a house about a hundred yards distant therefrom, called the European Hotel. That house was kept by a man named Hausmann, an habitual drunkard. It had been erected for about as long as the Army and Navy, and was in a similarly dilapidated condition. Bailey, I may say, was a steady man.

1117. Was the license for the European Hotel recommended by the police?—A mild objection was made that the House required rebuilding; but the license was granted, and an opportunity given the proprietor to rebuild before the next annual license day, the licensing being meanwhile continued. When an objection was made to the Army and Navy Hotel on the same ground, I stepped into the box and asked the Bench to give me the same latitude that had been granted in the case of the European The Bench, however, said they had given their decision, and they would not alter it. license was refused.

1118. Did the police object to your getting an extension of the license?—They said the house was

not fit to have a license.

1119. Did they object to your getting twelve months in which to rebuild?—I asked that term from the Bench, and I think one of the gentlemen spoke to Atchison and then to Monaghan. Monaghan said the house was rotten: that it was full of bugs, and that it was not fit to live in, and not fit to be licensed.

1120. Mr. Tole.] The objection was only to the house, not to the character of the applicant?

1121. Mr. Barton. The ground-lease of this place was yours, and that of the other place was

Staples's ?—Yes.

1122. Mr. Swanson.] I understand there was a good man in your house, and he was refused the license; there was a bad man in the other house, and it was granted; and both houses were equally bad in respect of buildings?—Yes.

1123. The Chairman.] The police did not object to this other man that he was a drunkard?—No.

1124. Was he notoriously a drunkard?—Yes, notoriously. However, the license was granted; and he kept the old house going on till within two or three months of the next annual licensing day. I omitted to say that, when we made application, we presented a petition from seventeen lodgers in favour of the license being continued.

1125. Mr. Swanson. Do you think, if the police had stated what was the character of this man Hausmann, the license would have been refused?—Yes, I think so. He had been a great drunkard for

four or five years

1126. Hon. Mr. Fox.] Had he ever been in custody?—I do not know; but I know the police had frequently been called in by his wife. I frequently heard rumours of disturbances in the house.

1127. What has become of the Army and Navy Hotel?—It was rebuilt by us at a cost of £2,800.

I lost £280 by the license having been refused.

1128. Who is the present licensee?—Mr. Robertson.
1129. Was any objection taken to it by the police after the hotel was rebuilt?—No.

1130. Has the same thing been done in the case of this other hotel? -Yes; but they were allowed

a license while they were rebuilding; we were not.

1131. Mr. Barton.] Were there any other cases at that meeting in which Staples's houses, in a similar condition, were granted licenses?—There was the Te Aro Hotel. That house was in a much more dilapidated condition than the Army and Navy. That property belonged to a Mrs. Kennedy. Inspector Atchison, I think, was a trustee in the estate: at any rate, he always took a great interest in the old woman and the family; and I believe there was partiality shown on that account.

1132. Who was the brewer interested in the house?—Staples. The trustees were allowed to re-

build, and since then a large and commodious place has been built.

1133. Do you recollect the case of the Royal Tiger Hotel?—Yes; that house had been licensed for many years, and three years ago last licensing day Mr. Fenton was the licensee. It was what was called a "free house:" that is, Mr. Fenton bought beer from whom he pleased, and he had beer from all three brewers. Just before licensing day Fenton, whose lease had only two and a half years to run, made an effort to buy the property. He entered into negotiations for it, and Staples, having heard of this, went in and bought the property over Fenton's head. Fenton became annoyed at this, and refused to have any more beer from Staples. When Fenton applied for a renewal of the license there was an objection raised by the police that he was not a fit person to keep an hotel, because he encouraged drunken people about the place; and also that the place required rebuilding. Staples was in the Court at the time, and he produced a plan of a new building, which satisfied the Bench, and the license was granted conditionally that, before next licensing day, the house was erected in accordance with that plan. Of course Fenton could not afford to rebuild when he had only two and a half years

to run, and he had to make terms with Staples.

1134. Was the place rebuilt?—No. About three years have since elapsed, nothing has been done to the place, and it is still liceused. There has been no objection to the house by the police since then.

Fenton went out five or six weeks after this occurred.

1135. Was Fenton unfit to keep a house?—No; it was one of the best conducted houses in the

1136. Did he encourage drunkenness?—No; if he was not a fit person to keep that hotel why has he since been granted a license for the New Zealander Hotel without any objection. He held that license for two years, and then sold out to Frank Mountain.

1137. Mr. Swanson.] Then you mean to say that since Staples got this house, the Royal Tiger, it is all right, and the place does very well?—Yes.

1138. The Chairman.] Is it now a bound house?—Yes.
1139. Mr. Barton.] Since that time, have they dealt with you from that house?—No.

1140. Now, about the White Swan Hotel and the City Hotel, will you tell the Committee what you know about them?—The White Swan Hotel does belong to Staples, and the City is in the interest of another brewery firm, Mace and Arkell. Mr. Murphy held a license for many years of the White