

*Mr. G. E. Barton.* 1921A. *The Chairman.*] Well, we had Coleman himself here five minutes ago, and he stated distinctly he had no further evidence to give, and denied he had ever told any one so?—I have not seen Coleman myself, but I understood from my son that he had seen him.

*Mr. T. C. Coleman.*  
17th Oct., 1878.

THOMAS CHARLES COLEMAN, recalled, being duly sworn, was examined.

1922. *The Chairman.*] Since you gave evidence here before, has anything particular occurred?—Sergeant Price came up to me one day and spoke in a very unbecoming manner.

1923. In what way: will you explain?—The day after I gave evidence here I was going down the wharf to a steamer with a parcel. I saw Sergeant Smith and Sergeant Price on the wharf, and when they saw me Price came to me and said he heard I had been up here before the Committee. I said I had. He said, in a very insulting manner, "What did you say?"

1924. What did you answer?—I did not like to answer, because I was frightened.

1925. Why were you afraid?—Because, if I had answered him as I should have done, probably he would have locked me up. I would not trust him.

1926. *Mr. Toke.*] Did you say nothing to him?—No; he walked away.

1927. Have you any other evidence to give?—No; I have no further evidence to give besides that.

1928. We understood you wished to add to your previous evidence?—No.

1929. Have you not told Mr. Barton you wished to give further evidence?—No.

1930. Or any one else?—No.

1931. You have nothing further to say?—No.

*Inspector Atchison.*  
17th Oct., 1878.

Inspector ARCHISON, being duly sworn, was re-examined.

1932. *Hon. Mr. Fox.*] Do you remember Wakeford keeping a publichouse at Foxton?—Yes.

1933. His license was cancelled?—Yes.

1934. On a police prosecution?—Yes; at least, I am not certain. I think it was his own statements that condemned him.

1935. At any rate, the police moved in the matter?—Yes.

1936. He afterwards applied, more than once—two, or three, or four times—for a renewal of the license?—I think he did.

1937. It was refused persistently by the Licensing Bench, and he never got it?—I do not think he did.

1938. That man came down afterwards, and applied for a license for one of the largest hotels in this city, the New Zealander, and got it?—He did not get it with my sanction. I was away at the time, and Sergeant Smith, who was in charge, did not know of the man's previous character; neither was the license got in his name.

1939. But it was transferred to him afterwards was it not?—Afterwards.

1940. There was no objection ever made to him?—Yes; I was vexed, and expressed my opinion to Mr. Quick, his solicitor; but, as the thing was done, I did not care about making a fuss.

1941. Did you express your opinion to the Licensing Bench?—No; I was not in town.

1942. But on transfer day?—No.

1943. To whom does that house belong?—To Andrew Young, I think.

1944. What brewer has got it?—I do not know whether it is Mace and Arkell or McCarthy, to whom they have sold out. I am not certain.

1945. Is it a "tied" house to a particular brewer?—I am not certain of that.

1946. Is it Pascoe's house?—I am not certain.

1947. There is another case to which I wish to refer. There was a constable sent up to Marton a little over a year ago, named Warren?—Yes.

1948. That man proved very active in prosecuting offenders against the liquor laws?—Yes.

1949. Both against publicans and other offenders?—Yes.

1950. About five months ago you came up there?—Yes.

1951. And intimated to him that he was about to be removed?—That was on account of evidence given by him at Wanganui. He was the principal witness in a case of indecent assault, and was asked what sort of a character a certain woman bore, and he made the remark she bore "an excellent character." I asked Warren how it was that he said the woman bore an excellent character, when he must have known that she was a very bad character. He admitted that he did know it. I therefore concluded that the man was not fit to have charge of a station by himself, for no dependence could be placed upon him.

1952. That was the reason you removed him?—Yes.

1953. Not because publicans complained that they thought he was too hard upon them?—No; because I thought, if he could give a woman a good character in Court when he knew she was a bad character, he was not to be depended upon.

1954. Did you consult the Magistrate's Bench up there?—No; Mr. Ward wrote to me, and, as I came down, I saw him and explained the reason why I had removed the man.

1955. I have nothing more to ask you, if that is the ground on which you removed the man?—Yes; that is the ground. I did not know anything of the woman's character myself; but, after Warren had given his evidence, Sergeant Donnoelly said, "Did you hear the character Warren gave that woman?" I said, "Yes." He said, "What do you think of that?" I said, "Why, has she not an excellent character?" He replied, "No, she is a very bad character." I then asked Warren how it was that he had given her a good character, and he did not give a satisfactory answer.

1956. Will you swear you did not find fault with Warren for having been too busy in prosecuting publicans?—I will.

1957. Nor with regard to a riot on New Year's night?—No.

1958. You did not tell him he had been too busy?—I did not.

1959. If he was to swear that you did he would be swearing what was untrue?—Yes; I think