

656. What was Atcheson ultimately dismissed for?—Something about a woman.
657. Do you know if he has been in the employ of the Rabbit Department since dismissal for that offence?—No I do not. I tried to find out, but I could not trace him at all.
658. What rule is followed in the Defence Department in the preparation of returns ordered by Parliament: For instance, supposing a return is ordered of all correspondence bearing on a certain question, does the Minister indicate exactly what portions of that correspondence shall be supplied?—No.
659. Is it all supplied?—No, we do not supply all. Instructions as to what is to be supplied is laid down in the Civil Service instructions. We lay all except Ministerial minutes and confidential documents.
660. You remember the correspondence with Inspector Emerson over the subject of granting a license to a man named Lawliss?—Yes.
661. A return of the correspondence in that matter was ordered, was it not?—Yes.
662. Was it all supplied?—All supplied, so far as I know.
663. Every letter?—Every letter.
664. Do you remember two letters, read by Mr. George Hutchison during last session of Parliament, which he alleges were omitted from that return?—No; but I can later on, if it is in *Hansard*.
665. You remember writing one letter, suggesting that the police should withdraw their opposition to the granting of a publican's license to this man?—Yes.
666. Who authorised you to write it?—I said I was directed by the Defence Minister.
667. Who was Defence Minister then?—Mr. Seddon.
668. You did not interfere with the police in regard to the issue of a license to this man of your own motion—it was distinctly under instructions?—Yes. I think the correspondence says so too.
669. When a serious charge is made against a police-officer, what method of inquiry is adopted? For instance, supposing a detective were to charge another detective with receiving blackmail from the bookmakers of Wellington, who would inquire into the charge?—The Inspector would, in Wellington.
670. Do you remember a case in which Detective Campbell charged Detective Kirby with receiving blackmail from certain gaming-shops in Wellington?—No.
671. Was that before your time, perhaps?—I do not happen to remember it, but it will be filed. Any way it may never have got to the Commissioner's office at all. The Inspector may have inquired into it, and found nothing in it.
672. Take another case: there were charges made by James Taylor, J.P., of Woodville, against Inspector Emerson, that he had been assaulted by Emerson on the Woodville Racecourse. How was that charge investigated?—The Inspector denied it; and it was decided that Taylor had his remedy in the Police Court—that Taylor could lay charges if he liked.
673. Have you had a charge of gambling made against Emerson at Napier?—I do not think so.
674. You do not remember that?—No.
675. Do you remember charges being made against Kirby by Hermann?—Yes: that also has been before a Court of law, you know.
676. On an important charge being made against a police-officer, would the inquiry into the charge be confined to getting a report from the officer?—Oh, but Hermann's case is a different thing altogether. I was rather awkwardly situated. I had it on my own hook for a long time, because I could not very well give it to a detective to go and find out about another detective. It was hung up for a long time. That was an exceptional case. You see you could not very well, where one detective was concerned, tell another detective to go and look after it.
677. You said, Colonel Hume, yesterday that it was impossible to enforce the provisions of the Licensing Act so far as Sunday trading and other matters are concerned?—Yes.
678. In your report for 1894, paragraph 9, you say: "The efforts of the police to suppress Sunday trading, liquor-selling after hours, and sly-grog selling, have been extremely successful during the past year"?—That is right, as compared with the year before.
679. You proceed: "And many convictions have been obtained, notwithstanding the defects and complications in the liquor laws, and considerable credit is due to all ranks of the Force for their exertions in this direction." Can you reconcile these two statements?—I do not see that there is anything contrary the one to the other. I say that, with the law as it stands, there was very considerable improvement during that year. You know yourself they are improving year by year, but still we have got some difficulty.
680. Do you not think the success of 1894 could be made a bigger success in 1898 if the Force were to exert themselves?—So it is. I say it has improved every year.
681. It is not impossible to enforce the licensing laws?—Oh, yes it is.
682. It does not depend on the exertions of the men really?—No; all the exertions in the world cannot stop Sunday trading as the law is now.
683. Have you ever had any conversation with the Minister of Defence as to the policy that was to be pursued in regard to enforcement of the licensing laws?—What do you mean, Mr. Taylor?
684. I mean, has not the Minister said publicly, and said to yourself as well, that he did not wish for a strict enforcement of the licensing law?—No, he never said anything of the kind to me.
685. He said so publicly?—He may have done, but he never said so to me.
686. *Colonel Pitt.*] What Minister is that?—No Minister has ever said to me, "I do not wish you to carry out the liquor-law or modify it in any way." On the other hand, several of them told me if I did not carry it out considerable changes would be made. I am very positive on that point.