

Mr. HENRY CARTER, being duly sworn, was examined.

*Mr. H. Carter.*

9th Oct., 1878.

1733. *The Chairman.*] You are interested in a publichouse at Karori?—Yes; the Karori Hotel.

1734. You have a brother named Thomas Carter?—No; Thomas Carter is no relative of mine whatever.

1735. He had something to do with the house?—Yes, he was a tenant.

1736. Will you state under what circumstances he got out of the house?—The house was sub-leased by Mrs. Hindge to Mace and Arkell, brewers, and by them sub-leased to Hatch, and by him to Carter, who became the tenant of Mace and Arkell. He failed to pay his rent, and to carry out the conditions of his lease with Mace and Arkell, and they took certain steps in connection with that. Mace and Arkell themselves failed to pay Mrs. Hindge her rent, and the bailiffs were put in on her account. It is a complicated business. However, the result was that Carter was ejected by an action at law in the Supreme Court.

1737. By whom?—By Mace and Arkell. Mrs. Hindge then took possession, having purchased Mace and Arkell's interest.

1738. Did she get a license?—Yes.

1739. Was she objected to?—Yes, in the first instance, by the Inspector of Police.

1740. Why?—He alleged that when the license had been formerly held by the Hindge's the house was improperly conducted, although no objection was ever previously made by the police. Not the slightest question had been raised while they were the licensees.

1741. Was the license granted afterwards?—Yes; it was sold by the Sheriff, purchased by Mrs. Hindge, and she got the license transferred.

1742. Is she the licensee now?—Yes.

1743. What have you to do with the license?—Nothing at all.

1744. What had you to do with it?—Nothing at all. I am a mere outsider.

1745. It was alleged you had some interest in the matter?—Perhaps I have.

1746. What is your interest?—I do not think it is a fair question to ask me.

1747. Have you taken any steps in the matter?—None at all. I have no reason to complain of the police.

1748. Did you consider there was any ground of complaint against Mrs. Hindge?—From what I know of her, there was no ground of complaint.

1749. Then why was complaint made?—It was supposed the thing was in the hands of Mace and Arkell. There was an action pending between her and Mace and Arkell, and it was supposed that Mace and Arkell were using their influence to prevent her obtaining a license.

1750. But what had Mace and Arkell to do with the police and their objections?—That I could not say; but Mace said he had the Inspector on his side, and so long as he had it was quite impossible for Mrs. Hindge to get a license.

1751. Mace said that?—Yes.

1752. To whom?—To me, in the presence of Mrs. Hindge.

1753. That was before the license was granted?—Yes.

1754. When the license was granted had Mace anything to do with the house?—No; Mrs. Hindge had bought his interest.

1755. *Mr. Swanson.*] So long as Mace had anything to do with the house she could not get a license?—No.

1756. Until he was "squared," she could not get a license?—No; of course it must be said at the same time that this action was pending.

Mr. WILLIAM JACQUEBAY, being duly sworn, was examined.

*Mr. Jacquabay.*

9th Oct., 1878.

1757. *The Chairman.*] You are warder in the gaol here?—Yes.

1758. Do you remember anything of a prisoner who was brought into the gaol with evidences of maltreatment on him?—I remember something of the kind from the circumstance that Mr. Barton came up to the gaol and made some inquiries on the subject.

1759. Who was the man?—John Vitey.

1760. Did you take charge of him when he was brought to the gaol?—I have no doubt I did. I may say I take in four-fifths of the prisoners who are brought there.

1761. Do you remember anything of the condition in which the man was.—Yes; I know he was black and blue from head to foot in a manner of speaking, and his face was greatly knocked about: in fact, he could not go out to work, and we really thought the man would die. His chest was very bad, and he was for a long time spitting blood. He was put under medical treatment.

1762. Did Dr. Johnston attend him?—Yes, here (produced) is the prescription book.

1763. You say he received this treatment in consequence of the injuries he had sustained?—Yes.

1764. Had he any ribs broken?—That I could not positively assert.

1765. Did he state how he came by these injuries?—He complained that he had received them from the police.

1766. Did you hear anything from any one else on the matter?—No.

1767. Was any complaint or report made by the Gaoler on the subject?—That I do not know.

1768. Was the Gaoler's attention drawn to the state of the prisoner?—It was.

1769. Was any report made to the Inspector of Police?—None that I know of.

1770. Was no notice taken of the matter?—None that I know of.

1771. *Hon. Mr. Gisborne.*] What was the man brought into the gaol for?—Obscene language, seven days; assault on the police, one month. Sentences to be cumulative.

1772. He had been in Court in the state in which you describe, then?—Yes.

1773. Was he taken directly from the Court to the gaol?—Yes.

1774. Did the wounds seem as if they were very recent?—Yes; he was, as I said, spitting blood for days and days.