

48. *The Chairman.*] How many people had entered the house prior to this?—I could calculate it, but I could not tell you now.

49. *Colonel Pitt.*] But you say there must have been people in?—Yes.

50. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Do you know the name of the constable or his number?—No.

51. Do you know the constable by sight?—No.

52. He was not accompanied by a sergeant?—No.

53. You have your notes: cannot you give us the date?—I cannot give the exact date. It is some Sunday in March.

54. Did you see a sergeant and constable visit this house at all during that day?—No.

55. If they had you would have seen them?—Yes.

56. And that applies to all three hotels?—Of course, at one hotel we could not see all the doors.

57. You are quite sure neither of these three hotels were visited by a sergeant and constable on that particular Sunday?—Yes. I think the date was the 4th March, but I am not sure it was.

58. *Mr. Taylor.*] If Mr. Denton says it was the 4th March you will accept his statement as being correct?—Yes.

59. *Mr. Tunbridge.*] Is this the only list that was kept?—Of that date, yes.

60. Then you gave your notes next week to Mr. Denton?—Yes.

61. You say between 12 and 1.30 you saw 116 people go in?—About that number.

62. Does this hotel provide dinners in the evening and breakfast in the morning?—I am not sure.

63. You do not know it does not?—I do not know it does not.

64. It would not surprise you if you were told it did?—No.

65. Is it not a fact that any one can get a feed at any time during the day if they go in?—I am not aware of it.

66. You say you kept a note on your list of the number of persons who entered carrying portmanteaux?—We made a note on that list, but they were not calculated in the 404.

67. Do you know anything about the lodging accommodation at this particular hotel?—No.

68. You do not know whether there are twenty or thirty lodgers at one time in the house, do you?—No.

69. You kept from your numbers those you saw entering with portmanteaux, but you had no means of identifying all those people in the event of their coming out and re-entering?—No; in some instances we might note where they went in the second time, and some a third time.

70. But you counted each one of those as a separate person: if one person entered three times you would count that as three persons entering?—Yes.

71. What I mean is this: If a person went in with a portmanteau you assumed he was going there to lodge, and that person may have come out half a dozen times and re-entered, and you would have counted him each time as a distinct person?—Yes.

72. You had no means of knowing whether these persons were asked if they were *bonâ fide* travellers?—No.

73. You are not able to say they were not asked?—No.

74. Or if they were lodgers?—No.

75. For all you know every one of these four hundred may have represented himself as a *bonâ fide* traveller, or that he was known to be a lodger, for all you know?—Yes.

76. *Colonel Hume.*] Will you swear there was any violation of the law in one single instance?—No.

JOSEPH BEAGLEHOLE, examined on oath.

77. *The Chairman.*] What are you, and where do you live?—Carpenter, residing in Hopper Street, Wellington.

78. *Mr. Taylor.*] Were you associated with Mr. Nicol in 1894 in collecting information as to the number of visitors to certain hotels on a Sunday in Wellington?—Yes.

79. What hotels can you see from the point where you were fixed that day?—Rylands's Hotel, Post Office Hotel, and the Pier Hotel.

80. Did you assist in making the notes as to the number of visitors?—Yes.

81. You are satisfied the list made out was pretty accurate?—Yes.

82. Were you there about twelve hours?—We started about 7.30, and we finished about 7.30 in the evening.

83. And you remember the number of visitors to the Post Office Hotel?—Well, I have got here over four hundred.

84. Did you purposely omit taking a note on that list of any one you thought was a *bonâ fide* traveller so far as your judgment allowed you?—Yes.

85. You could not tell, of course?—No.

86. If you saw people with portmanteaux you omitted them?—Yes.

87. So far as you could judge, the numbers given represented the general run of visitors?—Yes.

88. You distinctly understood you were not collecting information that was going to be used for prosecutions?—Yes.

89. It was in connection with the controversy as to whether Sunday trading was rife?—Yes.

90. And do you think those figures would bear on the question?—Yes.

91. Have you made any systematic observations since 1894?—No.

92. Did you see any police-officers go there on that Sunday—into the Post Office Hotel?—In the afternoon; about 2.30, I think it was.

93. Have you got it on your notes?—No, I have not got it here. All the same, I saw a police-man go in there about 2.30.

94. *The Chairman.*] Are any of those notes in your writing?—No.