

Mr. Barton.
11th Oct., 1878.

although Edwards had entirely disproved the charge. On one occasion when his license was objected to I produced in Court a memorial, signed by nearly all the respectable people in Kaiwarra, testifying to the good conduct of the house. That memorial I now lay before the Committee that they may have an opportunity of looking at it. It includes the name of one of Mr. Forster Goring's sons, and those of other respectable persons. This will show that the house was reputed to be a well-conducted house; yet I know of my own knowledge that that man Edwards was worried out of that house by the police falsely stating that it was little better than a brothel.

1867. Do you attribute any wrong motive to the police?—I believe the objection to the house was that it was Pascoe and Co's house. My firm were solicitors for Pascoe, and we found that nearly every house in which Pascoe had an interest was constantly objected to by the police.

1868. Every house that dealt with them?—Every house that was a bound house to them.

1869. Were Pascoe's houses, as a rule, good houses?—I am not able to say, but I can testify to this house of Edwards's that it was clean, well-conducted, and orderly. After he left that house he went to Wanganui, and I believe he is now in Australia, so that I am unable to call him.

TUESDAY, 15TH OCTOBER, 1878.

Mrs. HOWE, being duly sworn, stated—

Mrs. Howe.
15th Oct., 1878.

I wish to correct my evidence given on a former day. I did not wish the Committee to understand that we lost £1,500 in consequence of Purcell. We had lost £1,500 in farming before we applied for a license for the hotel, and when we applied Purcell made allusion to our misfortune, saying we had been summoned, as a reason why we should not get a license. I also wish to say I meant Purcell was worth a thousand pounds or so, not worth thousands.

Detective Farrell.
15th Oct., 1878.

Detective FARRELL, being duly sworn, was re-examined.

1870. *The Chairman.*] We wish to question you about evidence given here during the last day or two. Have you ever received payments or rewards directly, I mean not through the Inspector?—I have, on one occasion.

1871. What was that?—After I had done making inquiries into Pestrige's case I made a full report to the Inspector. I gave it to him in the Empire Hotel, and gave a copy to Mr. Wallace. Mr. Wallace gave me a letter. I opened it, and found it contained a cheque for £10 for myself in consequence of the trouble I had taken, and to defray the expenses I had incurred. I told Mr. Wallace that it only cost me £1 altogether; that I was not allowed to take these moneys; and that, if he wished to give money, he must send it to the Inspector. He would not send it to the Inspector, and I kept the cheque.

1871. Why did you not mention that to the Committee when you were giving evidence on the subject of payment?—You did not ask me about it.

1872. There is another bit of evidence. The Inspector states that he had to reprimand you for taking £1 from a prostitute; for finding a dog?—He never reprimanded me in his life. I did take £1 from a prostitute; but the reward was advertised in the *Evening Post* for the recovery of the dog: I recovered it, took the reward, and told the Inspector about it.

1873. You got the reward?—Yes; it was an advertised reward. The Inspector spoke to me afterwards about the matter. There was a summons case about the dog afterwards, and she told the Inspector about my recovering the dog. He asked me about it, and I said, "Yes, I did get the dog, and took the pound." He merely said it would be better not to take money in such cases, because if it got into the newspapers it would look bad.

1874. Did you think you were justified in taking that reward, according to the Police Regulations?—Yes; I can point to the last *Police Gazette*, to show that rewards have been paid to policemen.

1875. But is not the consent of a superior officer required?—It would be, if the regulations were carried out, but the regulations are not carried out.

1876. Did Inspector Atchison know of that at the time, and not reprimand you?—He never reprimanded me.

1877. *Major Atkinson.*] Did he know of it at the time you took the money?—Immediately afterwards.

1878. And what did he say?—Well, at that time certain parties were writing squibs about me. Perrier, of the *Times*, was the chief one, and Inspector Atchison said, "If these fellows get hold of that, they will make it warm for you." I said I had no bad motive when I took the money. He did not reprimand me. To prove that he did not, it would be easy to refer to the monthly report, which I am sure contains any complaint against me.

1879. *Mr. Bunny.*] How long is this ago?—Very nearly twelve months.

TUESDAY, 17TH OCTOBER, 1878.

Mr. EDWARD JOHN BARNARD, being duly sworn, was examined.

Mr. E. J. Barnard.
17th Oct., 1878.

1880. *The Chairman.*] You are a clerk in the employ of the firm of Johnston and Co.?—Yes.

1881. The Committee are informed that you have some evidence to give as to what has taken place in relation to licenses?—At Foxton?

1882. Yes?—Yes.

1883. Would you state what you know about the matter?—I applied for a license for a hotel at Foxton, but the people there were afraid to speak their minds, because they were frightened of the policeman stationed there.