

892. But how? It is three months after the occurrence?—I know; but they managed to fix up the time. My way would be, I would see the constable and the sergeant separately without any warning, and ask them to report without any communication between them. Then if they agreed the thing had been fair and honest I would be inclined to believe them. If they did not, what about it then?

893. Then, you would do this: A man is accused of an offence?—Yes; a constable.

894. You have the evidence of the man against him in support of that offence, a direct charge?—I had the uncorroborated evidence at the time.

895. Then, you would go to that accused man and say to him with a view of getting evidence—of manufacturing evidence from that man's own mouth?—I do not think that is a fair way of putting it.

896. Something to convict himself?—I mean that he is a police constable or sergeant, and he is accountable for all his actions, and his action on any occasion is liable to be called in question. If it is right he has nothing to fear, if it is wrong it may be the worse for him. We have a right to call upon him at any time to explain his conduct. It has always been done during my thirty-five years' experience—that is, calling on a man for an explanation as to what he was doing. I do not see anything at all unfair in it.

897. Is not the men's duty recorded in the diary for the day?—It is supposed to be.

898. Was it not? Do you not know perfectly well the diary is posted daily, and the duty the man is supposed to be doing is posted in that diary?—But I know also that the diary is not also always correct, and I know it was not so at Nelson, and I told you so.

*Commissioner Tunbridge*: I must contradict that. I know nothing of that.

*Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones*: Was that in writing or was it verbally?

899. *Mr. Hardy*.] Is it customary for such a serious thing as that to be sent from one officer to another verbally? Is it not the custom to make serious charges like this about the keeping of the diary in writing?—It may be by writing or verbally.

900. It is customary for one police officer to communicate with another on derelictions of duty without putting it into black and white?—Yes, sometimes.

901. Is that according to Police Regulations, Mr. Tunbridge?

*Commissioner Tunbridge*: Well, of course there are circumstances when perhaps it would not be convenient to go and commit everything to writing. If a charge is to be brought against any member of a Force, it should be immediately put into writing. There may be circumstances in which an officer has mentioned something to another officer that might not be considered of sufficient importance at the time to put into writing. I think probably he (the witness) is a little confused as to the particulars.

902. *The Chairman*.] I suppose a police-station is never left without somebody in charge?—Not a police-station like Nelson. There is always some one on the premises, although the man might be in bed.

903. Any one on duty there would have to keep the diary. He would have to report from hour to hour, I suppose?—The sergeant in charge has to keep a diary in which the duties of every man under him are entered.

904. Is it not the duty of any man who might be there to report himself from hour to hour?—There is no one in charge of the police-station in Nelson at night. There are men sleeping on the premises. The constable on the beat visits it about every hour, and he marks up the book at the time he visits—the visiting-book. The diary shows the record of the duties performed by each man attached to the particular station during the particular twenty-four hours. It shows the hours a man goes on duty and the hours he comes off.

905. *Commissioner Tunbridge*.] Mr. Macdonell, do you suggest that there is an inaccurate entry made in the daily diary in this particular instance, the 18th November?—No.

906. Now, with regard to the girl —, on page 13. There is the question of a telegram. I am reading from Chief Detective McGrath's report, and this is Mrs. Watson's statement. He says, "I beg to report that I have seen Mrs. Watson, who states that — came to her place as housemaid about June, 1901, from the —, where she has been employed for three or four weeks. She told Mrs. Watson that she was *enceinte*, and asked her if she knew any person who would adopt her child from its birth. Shortly afterwards Mrs. Watson says she arranged with a Mrs. —, wife of a farmer at —, to adopt the baby. Miss — was about a month at Mrs. Watson's when she complained of being ill one evening, and early the following morning Mrs. Watson was called to her room, and, finding her in labour, sent for Dr. Henry, who came at once, and a few minutes after his arrival the young woman gave birth to a stillborn child. Mrs. Watson shortly afterwards, at Miss —'s request, sent a telegram to Mrs. Hall to the effect that — was over her trouble." Well, now, Mrs. Watson, I suppose, is a reliable woman, as far as you know?—I do not know. I am not sure whether I know that woman or not. There was a Mrs. Watson here that I knew many years ago from the South. I do not know whether this is the woman or not.

907. You were stationed here in Wellington, were you not?—Yes.

908. For how long? You were stationed in Wellington for some time?—Yes; about nine months.

909. Mrs. Watson kept the Oriental Hotel at that time?—Yes.

910. Surely as Sub-Inspector of Police you would get to know something about the people who kept the hotels here?—I never saw the woman, and I do not know whether she is the woman I knew a good many years ago.

911. While you were here in Wellington you never heard anything to the detriment of Mrs. Watson, the licensee of the Oriental Hotel?—I would not say that. I think I heard something or other, but I cannot say exactly what it was.