

*Mr. Jaqueray.*

9th Oct., 1878.

1775. Do you know if any representation was made on the subject either to the police or to the Government?—I do not know; but this I know: that, since Mr. Barton came to make inquiries about two men, this man and another named Edward Hughes, I have received orders, when a prisoner volunteers any statement as to his treatment by the police, to take a note of his statement in a book, so that if any inquiry is made we shall have some record to go upon.

1776. What was the date on which he was brought into the gaol?—24th April, 1876.

1777. *Major Atkinson.*] Was he a Wellington man?—He was cook and steward on board one of the vessels. In the previous January he had been in on a charge of drunkenness and assaulting the police. He was then sentenced to fourteen days.

1778. *The Chairman.*] Have you noticed on other occasions recent injuries on prisoners?—There was a case lately. I submit this paper to you. It is a copy of the report I made to the Gaoler. That is since the new regulation came into force. That man was submitted to medical treatment, and could not go out of the gaol for a day or two, he was so bad. I do not know if any further action has been taken.

1779. Was there any other case?—There was a case of a man named William Henderson. He got two months and four months, cumulative sentences. His wrists were very bad, owing to the police having handcuffed him, he said. He is now in gaol.

*Mr. G. Roxburgh.*

9th Oct., 1878.

Mr. GEORGE ROXBURGH, being duly sworn, was examined.

1780. *The Chairman.*] Do you remember, when you were connected with Messrs. Joseph Nathan and Co., having any negotiation with Swain about a publichouse?—No; I had negotiations with Mr. Duff.

1781. Did he negotiate with Swain?—Yes; Swain is a tenant of Duff.

1782. Do you know anything of any discussion having taken place with regard to a license?—Not the slightest.

1783. Did you have any conversation with Swain about the matter?—No; I never knew Swain in the matter. I did not even know he was to have the house till he was in possession of the house. All our transactions were with Duff.

1784. Swain did not speak to you in the matter?—No.

1785. Did he never say anything to you to this effect, or, rather, did you say to him in respect to getting a license: "Shall we give the police £10 or £5"?—Certainly not. The transaction was this: Duff purchased the interest of Tolly and Lewer in the hotel (the Union Hotel), and I understood he was going into the house, and I did not know till Swain was in the house that he had anything to do with the matter.

1786. Did Swain make any payment to the firm of Nathan and Co. on account of that arrangement?—No.

1787. Did he owe the firm anything?—I do not think he did.

1788. Did Swain at any time have any transaction with Nathan's firm with regard to a public-house?—I do not think he did, except in the way of purchasing spirits or wines. Had we known Swain was going into the hotel we should have asked a higher price.

1789. Well I will tell you what was alleged. It was alleged by Swain that, when this transaction was going on, he saw Mr. Joseph Nathan: Nathan said, "What shall I give the police, £10 or £5," and Swain replied that he thought £5 would be enough. We asked if anything was paid, and he said he did not know. We asked Mr. Nathan about the matter, and he said he was not in the colony at the time?—That is correct.

1790. And that it must have been Mr. Roxburgh?—There was not the slightest word ever passed between us in relation to such a thing.

1791. Was any money paid to the police?—Not that I know of.

1792. *Major Atkinson.*] In the transfer of licenses of publichouses with which your firm has been connected has anything ever been paid to the police?—Most decidedly not.

1793. Neither directly nor indirectly?—No. I used to make it an invariable practice to ask Inspector Atchison if he knew anything against the character of the tenants in our houses, and if we found they bore a bad character we got rid of them, in order to prevent any trouble on licensing days.

1794. Did you ever know an instance in which Inspector Atchison changed his opinion in regard to licenses? I remember one instance. I recollect there was a man named Bould, who was keeping the Clarendon Hotel, and I spoke to Atchison about him. Atchison said he had not a good character, and while we were speaking one of the police came down the street. Atchison said, "Wait a minute; I will call this man, and you will see how he will confirm what I say." He called the man, and asked him what sort of a character Bould bore. The constable said the house had been badly conducted, but he had given Bould a good frightening, and since then he had conducted it much better. That is the only case I remember. I may say we had no transaction with Bould buying into the house. I have had a great deal to do with the publichouses in Wellington in that way, and I never found there was any difficulty when the tenant was a good man.

1795. *Mr. Tole*] Have you ever intimated to Atchison the name of any applicant whom he promised to support in his application?—The only person I can remember was Joseph Harding, who took the Post Office Hotel. He is dead now. When Harding bought the Post Office Hotel I asked Atchison his opinion of him, and he told me what he thought, and I reported that to Mr. Levin or Mr. Walter Johnston, I am not sure which, because they were interested in the lease of the place. That is the only case that I can call to recollection.

1796. *Major Atkinson.*] Do you know of any case in which presents, either in kind or money, have been made to the police?—I do not,