

door of No. — room. What could it be all about? Probably a burglar run to earth. But rather queer that he should find his way into the luxurious little dove-cot of the lovely barmaid! Another vigorous attack on the door, threats of police and forcible entry, some hysterical sobbing from within, and then the door was unlocked and—horror of horrors—what a sight. Out marched the tall lithe figure of one of the best known men in town. What a spectacle as he slouched along the passage very airily clad indeed, with head not exactly as high nor as well thrown back as usual, and the spruce bastardised military air entirely missing. Here he was, a married man, father of a family, a prominent Government official, the very man of all others whose duty it should be not only to shun ruffianism and outrage itself but to hunt it down in others;—here he was, trapped under circumstances that should send him to the hulks. In a few minutes he appeared again as a fashionable lady-killer, and was incontinently taken by the neck and thrown down the broad stairs and out into the street, amid a lively chorus of anathemas from the assembled household. It is very questionable indeed whether the proprietor of the establishment in question should not as a matter of duty take measures for exposing this dissolute ruffian, and hunt him out of a position that he has publicly disgraced, and not for the first time either. As for the fair but frail Hebe, her services were quickly dispensed with; but such is the unhealthy state of the moral atmosphere in certain quarters, that the incident, disgraceful and filthy as it is, is not likely to do her very much harm in her profession.

Then, I got an anonymous letter; I do not generally act on them, but I forwarded this letter to Inspector Hickson. It is as follows:—

SIR,—

Dunedin, 12th May, 1891.

It is said that the fact has been reported to you of Police Detective Henderson having recently been caught at night in the ——— Hotel here by Mr. ——— in bed with his servant-girl, and that several cases of robbery were committed in the city about the same time. This is disgraceful; particularly so, Henderson being a married man. The facts are well known, and the people are disgusted.

Colonel Hume, Wellington.

Then the Inspector traced this article as referring to Chief Detective Henderson, and wrote to the latter as follows: “Having heard that the paragraph marked in attached copy of the *Tuapeka Times* of the 9th instant refers to you, I have to request you to report on it.—J. HICKSON, Inspector. 20/5/91.” Detective Henderson replied as follows:—

Detective Office, Dunedin, 30th May, 1891.

I BEG to report that with reference to attached memo., and paragraph in the *Tuapeka Times* of the 9th instant, which ostensibly refer to me, while I was making inquiries on the night of the 25th ultimo, about a watch alleged to have been stolen from a man named ——— (since recovered) while sleeping on a sofa in the bar-room at ——— Hotel in ——— Street. A good deal seems to have been made out of the subsequent proceedings, which are easily explained as follows: At a quarter past 11 o'clock on the night referred to, Mr. ——— reported to me that ——— had his watch stolen. The barmaid had just left the bar, and had gone upstairs to her room. As she was the person from whom I hoped to get the best information on the subject, I immediately went up to see her. On reaching the landing at the top of the stairs I saw the barmaid standing in her room, the door being open. I spoke to her, and hearing footsteps coming up the stairs she asked me to come in and close the door. I was not two minutes in the room when a knock came to the door. On opening it I saw Mrs. ——— on the landing. She appeared to be annoyed at finding me in the room, and reproached the girl with allowing herself to be in such a compromising position, when the girl indignantly denied that she had been guilty of any impropriety, and said if she was suspected she would leave the house. At this moment Mr. ——— came up from the bar, and made no comments whatever. It is well known that it is not at all an uncommon occurrence for a detective while making inquiries to be admitted into a lady's room, even her bedroom; and any person with a malicious turn of mind might have made as much capital out of my presence in the bedroom of Miss ——— of the Young Women's Christian Association, on the 16th instant, when making a similar inquiry about a stolen watch.

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

The next thing I can read to you is the report from Inspector Hickson, as follows:—

Police Department, Inspector's Office, Dunedin, 21st May, 1891.

Re slanderous report published in the *Tuapeka Times* of the 9th May, 1891, re alleged misconduct of a “Government official.”

Having heard that Chief Detective Henderson was found in the bedroom of the barmaid at ——— Hotel on the night of the 25th ultimo, I called him into my office and told him of the rumour, when he gave what I considered a satisfactory explanation. But having heard that the story in an exaggerated form had got publicity in the *Tuapeka Times*, I sent for a copy of that paper, and on receipt of it, although no name is mentioned in the article, I called on the detective for a written explanation with a view of forwarding it to you. I now forward it. It agrees exactly with his verbal explanation to me. Mr. ——— of ——— Hotel, not the ——— Hotel, has informed me that a little after 11 o'clock on the night of Saturday, the 25th ultimo, he reported to Chief Detective Henderson that a man had his watch stolen from him that evening while he lay asleep on a couch in the hotel. Soon afterwards he (Mr. ———) at about 11.30 p.m., heard Mrs. ——— and the barmaid having high words, when the barmaid used impertinent language to Mrs. ——— for daring to accuse her of any impropriety. Mrs. ——— states that one of the servants, who had been in the hotel only a few days, came to her about 11.30 on the night mentioned above, and said that a man had gone to the barmaid's room. She at once went to the girl's bedroom, and, on knocking at the door, it was opened immediately by the barmaid and Detective Henderson walked out. Mrs. ——— states that she was taken by surprise, and without waiting for an explanation, she upbraided the young woman, who resented what she considered was an insult to her, and indignantly denied that she had been guilty of any impropriety in admitting the detective to her room, and she became impertinent to Mrs. ——— for daring to imply that she had been guilty of any misconduct. For the impertinence to Mrs. ——— she was discharged next day. Mrs. ——— has further stated that some of the servants were listening, and she felt that if she made no remark then on what she thought was imprudent conduct on the part of the barmaid, they (the servants) might consider that she looked too lightly on the affair. Mrs. ——— also states that she had not at this time heard of the loss of the watch, and therefore did not know that Henderson desired to see the barmaid about it, and she felt so annoyed at the time she would listen to no explanation. Mr. and Mrs. ——— say that the barmaid was dressed as fully as when she left the bar about half an hour previously when she opened the door of her room, and that Detective Henderson was dressed in his usual every-day dress. Mr. and Mrs. ——— say that the young woman had been in their service about twelve months, that they entertained a very high opinion of her, and considered her above suspicion, and but for her impertinence to Mrs. ——— she would not have been discharged. Mr. ——— states that he has given the young woman a certificate of good character. He thinks it must be the servants' gossip that has given rise to the exaggerated and slanderous statement, and that he has thought it beneath notice to contradict it in the press. The man who reported that his watch had been stolen found on going home that he had left it at his home. He was sober when he reported the matter; but having had a doze on a couch, and on awaking missing his watch, he thought it had been stolen from him.

J. HICKSON, Inspector.

I then referred the matter to the Defence Minister, as follows: “The matter is, of course, a very serious one, and must either be overlooked or taken very serious notice of; but, as the detective bears a very high character, and nothing of the kind has ever been previously brought against him, I think he should have the benefit of the doubt, and no further action be taken.”

53. Under what circumstances was he transferred from Dunedin to Christchurch, and what date?—The approval is dated the 29th January, 1895. I may state that, previous to that date, I