

*Sergeant Fraser.*

1710. They were reports?—Yes.

8th Oct., 1878.

1711. What had been done about them?—A good many had been inquired into, and I think Farrell was acquainted with the contents of most of them at the time.

1712. They had not been minuted?—No; but they had been entered in what I described when I was before the Committee previously as an occurrence book.

1713. Is it not customary to give these reports over to a detective officer?—Yes it is.

1714. How is it that these were not given to him?—I think they were given to him.

1715. *Mr. Barton.*] Then he was the proper person to have charge of the papers?—He generally takes extracts from the papers. I have the charge of them, and he takes extracts for his own use. For instance, if there is a warrant issued, and a description of the man wanted given, he takes an extract of the description.

*Mr. Fitzherbert.*

Mr. H. S. FITZHERBERT appeared and made a statement with reference to a portion of evidence previously given by him.

8th Oct., 1878.

I said in my evidence that Staples said it would be all right, alluding to a transfer of the license of the Victoria Hotel to Thornborough. I may have been mistaken as to who said it. It might have been Staples, Macfarlane, or McIntyre. They were all three engaged in this matter.

*Mrs. Howe.*

WEDNESDAY, 9TH OCTOBER, 1878.

9th Oct., 1878.

Mrs. HOWE, being duly sworn, was examined.

1716. *The Chairman.*] We understand, Mrs. Howe, that you have had some reason to complain of the police's mode of conducting their duty with regard to publichouses, and we want to know whether you have anything to say in the matter. You keep a licensed house?—My son keeps an hotel.

1717. Where at?—At Foxton.

1718. Do you complain, or have you had reason to complain, of the conduct of the police with regard to your house?—Yes, we have had great reason to complain; but do not want to say anything now. My husband said the other day to me that, as things were now quiet, and he is civil to us, we ought not to interfere.

1719. Who is "he"?—Constable Purcell. My husband said he did not now want to make himself obnoxious to the constable, which he would be sure to do if we gave evidence. He has been very unfair with us, stating things in Court which had nothing to do with the case, in order to get our license refused. We were respectable people, and he should not have said the things against us that he did. We lost over £1,500 in connection with the matter. It was arranged that one of my sons should take the house, and when the license was applied for, and Purcell was asked if he knew anything of the applicants, he said, first of all, that he had been in the Government service for ten years, and was too delicate to have a place of that kind. When he found that it was not that son, he then said the applicant was too young. The Magistrate, however, refused to entertain further objections; but the application was postponed for three or four months. It cost us, in all, about £1,500, and eventually the license was granted. I might say a good deal as to our treatment, but it is not worth while.

1720. What does he complain of?—Oh, it is supposed he has an interest in the other house, and, knowing we would keep the house respectable, he endeavours to annoy us.

1721. Has he an interest in the other house?—I do not know, but it is said so. He is a man worth some money—some thousands of pounds, I should say.

1722. How has he made his money?—By buying and selling cattle and horses. I believe he has a butcher's shop there. I know he supplies meat, and the ground on which the shop stands belongs to him. He is too big to be up there, and ought to have been removed years ago, but has been allowed to remain owing to favouritism.

1723. How long has he been there?—Ten years.

1724. Had he any money when he went there?—I do not think he was worth a pound, but he was not long there before he had a farm. He seems to rule the whole place. I should say more, but I am afraid that he would be doing more harm to us. He could easily do us harm if we were to speak against him.

1725. In what way?—In saying that the house is not properly conducted. Mr. Wakeford could give better evidence than I can.

1726. Is yours the new house or the old house?—It is the old house, but it has been greatly improved. We bought it as a matter of speculation, and put a son in it; and the opposition arises from jealousy. I told Inspector Atchison about the opposition we had encountered, and he said he could not understand it, but would see about it when he went up. There was no opposition after the three or four months, and we got the license. Then my son had to go to Wanganui to pay the license fee, because they would not take it at Foxton, and that cost a lot of money.

1727. Why did they refuse to take the money?—I suppose they wanted to give us as much trouble as possible. There was no one there to receive it, they said. The Foxton folk want sifting out. They seem to rule the Government just as they like up there.

1728. Whom do you mean?—The big people, such as the Justices of the Peace.

1729. You have nothing else to say about the police?—No. It was quite time Purcell was removed. Mr. Wakeford could give better information than I could. He was in Court, and said he never heard of a more disgraceful thing. So did Dr. Buller. Of course it does not do for us to say anything.

1730. In what way are you afraid of Purcell?—We could do a good deal more business in the house, but we must be very careful.

1731. You mean he keeps the house strict?—Yes.

1732. But he is not so strict with other houses?—No; the other house has been left open till 11 o'clock, although it should not be kept open after 10 o'clock; and Purcell has been told about it, yet has taken no action.