

1851. He was arrested?—Yes; I met Farrell on the beach, and he said, "I am going to arrest Heggarty;" or else he had Heggarty and said, "See; I have Heggarty:" I am not sure which—it is a long time ago. Sergeant Smith.
—
11th Oct., 1878.

1852. Had Farrell any idea of Heggarty until he was pointed out to him by me?—I am quite certain if Farrell had known Heggarty he would have pointed him out to me on the wharf before you came down. The same man as you pointed out had been sitting on some timber on the wharf between his son and son-in-law, and we were all the time looking for Heggarty.

1853. Do you recollect drawing my attention to a lot of summonses from the Supreme Court waiting to be served, and do you recollect what I said to Farrell about them?—I drew your attention to them, and you said, "Get Farrell to serve them." I saw Farrell, and told him you wanted him. When he went up you asked him to serve the summonses, and he did so.

1854. Did he make any complaint that it was not his duty, or anything of that sort?—No.

1855. Farrell, in his evidence, says Carroll was fined for talking to him, is that true?—It is not true; he was brought up and fined for disobedience to orders.

1856. Was Farrell's name ever mentioned?—No.

1857. Have you had any conversation with Farrell about this inquiry?—He addressed me one day as I was walking past him. I may say I have avoided him since I have heard what he has been saying. He said, "You have taken a wrong idea about this matter. I don't want to harm you." I replied, "If you had the same principles as I have you would scorn to do what you are doing. You are doing all you can to get the Inspector into trouble, and you are getting me into trouble also." He said, "I don't wish to harm you." I said, "I don't wish to speak to you." There is one matter I wish to bring before the Committee. Mr. Owen, the proprietor of the Melbourne Hotel, came to me yesterday evening and told me he had been before the Committee to give evidence, and that he told the Committee he had been to me to get me to look over some misconduct of the house, and that I had consented. I convinced him that, as he had given his evidence to the Committee, he was wrong. It was the Sunday before the occasion on which the house was reported for being disorderly that this took place. It had nothing to do with the case at the Court. Mr. Owen is willing to come up here and explain that, if the Committee wishes.

Mr. M. MONAGHAN, being duly sworn, was re-examined.

Mr. Monaghan.

1858. *The Chairman.*] Detective Farrell says you were in the habit of having men up to your room to drink of a Sunday evening when you were in the police?—I was not in the habit of doing it, but a few of my personal friends, respectable citizens of Wellington, have been up there on several occasions; and I consider I had a perfect right to invite them there: just as much right as other persons have to invite friends to their private houses. They were all respectable men—men with whom it was creditable for me to associate. It occurred several times, but I think I had a right to have them there, and I think it was impertinence on Farrell's part to make such a remark. 11th Oct., 1878.

1859. *Inspector Atchison.*] Do you know the Pier Hotel, and the persons who are described as the "Pier-Hotel gang"—or "mob," I think they are called. How did that phrase originate?—It originated out of the spite of a Councillor in town, a person named Fisher.

1860. It is said that Byrne and others used to go there to drink and gamble?—I know Byrne does not play cards.

1861. Or Sergeant Donnoelly?—He was in the habit of going there to stay, because there was no accommodation for country police at the station.

1862. Does he drink?—Very little.

1863. What liquor does he generally drink?—Claret, and very little of that. He is a very temperate man.

1864. Have you ever seen gambling at the hotel?—I have seen cards played, but no gambling.

1865. What sort of an hotel is it?—It is used as a sort of private club, and certain rooms are kept apart. No one at all rowdy would be allowed to go into the room frequented by the persons whose names have been mentioned by Farrell. I never went there before 10 o'clock, and then, when all duty was done, I considered I had a right to an hour or two.

Mr. G. E. BARTON, M.H.R., being duly sworn, was re-examined.

Mr. Barton.

1866. *The Chairman.*] Perhaps you had better state what evidence you wish to give, Mr. Barton. —Yes; I will just mention to the Committee the circumstances attending what I consider to be the persecution by the police of Mr. Edwards, late of the Waterloo Hotel, Kaiwarra, a client of the firm of Barton and Fitzherbert. Charges of one kind and another were frequently made against him by the police. Almost every licensing day his house was objected to. It was said that the house was badly conducted, and that he himself was a person of bad character. It was stated by the police that it was a house to which persons were allowed to take bad women. I will say this: I and my son frequently of an evening, when we were too late for any train, used to walk out to and in from Petoni, where I live, and it was very usual for us to call in at Edwards's Hotel to rest and get refreshment on our road, and I can say that the house was always perfectly clean and well conducted. I and my son have been either in there or passing by at almost all hours of the night, up to the time of closing, and I always noticed that the house was quiet and orderly, the table covered with periodicals and papers, and quiet, respectable-looking working-men frequenting the house, and things generally were well conducted. A case was brought against Edwards by a farmer, who charged him with having stolen a large sum of money from his (the farmer's) wife. A mass of evidence was gone into, and the result was that it was shown that Edwards had behaved well instead of ill, and that the charge had been trumped up against him. The Magistrate dismissed the case, it being clear that Edwards was free from blame—that, so far from cheating her, he had done his best to preserve her money for her while she was in his house, and that the woman had gone to other places and there lost her money. That was clearly proved; yet, when Edwards was seeking a renewal of his license, objection was made by the police on the ground that he had robbed this woman. This was alleged, 11th Oct., 1878.