

912. You are prepared to say that Mrs. Watson's version of the telegram that was sent is a correct one?—I cannot deny it. I cannot say it is not correct.

913. In reading the telegram that is put in here, do you still suggest that it bears the interpretation that has been put on it—viz., that the girl had had abortion procured on her?—That report does not say so. But I would like to see the telegram.

914. You will admit, will you not, that Mrs. Watson, who actually sent the telegram, is about as good an authority of what it contained as we are likely to get?—I do not know that.

915. Well, now, take the whole of Mrs. Watson's statement together. Do you consider the action of this girl was consistent with having abortion procured on her?—I do not see anything to the contrary.

916. Not that she had arranged with the woman to take the child: is that consistent with abortion?—If that is true she started very early to do that. The girl was supposed to be five months gone. She must have started very early. I never knew of a single woman making arrangements so early.

917. Would you disbelieve Mrs. Watson?—I might doubt it, because people do not care to have it known they are mixed up in these things even if they are. They do not like their house to get the name of that sort of thing going on.

918. Would you expect a woman who came over from Nelson expressly to have abortion procured on her to go first to the Trocadero and take a situation, and, secondly, to go from the Trocadero to the Oriental Hotel and there tell the licensee her condition? Do you consider that consistent with a woman likely to get abortion procured on her?—It all depends on how far her condition had gone. If she was only gone five months I would expect her to go to service.

919. *The Chairman*: Was the evidence of Dr. Henry taken?

920. *Commissioner Tunbridge*: Yes. Dr. Henry states: "That at the request of Mrs. Watson he called at the Oriental Hotel at 6.30 a.m. on the 12th August, 1901, and saw ———, who had a miscarriage shortly after his arrival. The doctor cannot remember the probable stage of gestation, but he saw nothing to indicate that the abortion had been wilfully caused." That is Dr. Henry's statement. Now, Constable Kemp is to be called as a witness, I understand; and, that being so, I will ask the witness one or two questions about him. You know that Constable Kemp was associated in a manner with the alleged charges of assault of Cox and others?—Yes.

921. Oh, Bannehr was present?—Yes.

922. Was Allen present?—I think so—at least one of these.

923. Page 19, Allen and Reed's assault?—I think there were three alleged assaults on the one night when the two constables were together.

924. Allen's on page 19, Reed's on the same page, and Walker, the fellow that was arrested, you know—he was concerned in this case—the complaints contained in this file?—Yes.

925. You know also, of course, that he was charged and found guilty of certain misconduct at the Exchange Hotel?—Yes.

926. Did you look upon that charge as a serious one against police discipline?—Yes, I did.

927. Well now, Mr. Macdonell, you are acquainted with the charges I formulated against these members of the Nelson Police Force?—Yes.

928. There were fifteen in all, were there not?—I believe so.

929. There were six against Sergeant Mackay?—Yes.

930. Three each against Durbridge and Burrell?—Yes, I think so.

931. Two against Constable Kemp?—Yes.

932. And one against Constable McGrath?—Yes.

933. That makes fifteen altogether?—Yes.

934. Now, do you consider that those fifteen charges embraced all the offences against the Police Regulations contained in your report? Do you consider they did?—Do you mean the whole of them?

935. Do you consider that those fifteen charges represented the breaches of Police Regulations disclosed in the report as distinct from the reports of assaults?—At present I think so. To be sure I would have to go over them carefully; that is my opinion without going carefully into it.

936. You have never felt that there were any breaches of Police Regulations in reports that you have sent to me that I did not inquire into the charges?—That is my opinion.

937. Now, out of the fifteen charges how many do you know that I found proved? Did I not find twelve proved?—Probably; I did not count them.

938. Charge 1, against Mackay. Bird's charge, that was dismissed?—Yes.

939. Do you think it was rightly dismissed?—I think so on the evidence.

940. Charge 2, cautioned. Charge 3, reprimanded and cautioned. Charge 4, that is not reporting Durbridge whom he was alleged to have seen sleeping in the house. Charge 5, cautioned. Charge 6, the dog charge, a trivial matter, no punishment; although it was proved I did not award any punishment. Burrell and Durbridge: Charge No. 1 (Constable Burrell) and charge No. 3 (Constable Durbridge), improperly taking into the single men's mess-room at the Nelson Police-station, in company with Constable Durbridge, two females named ——— and ———, about midnight on the 18th July last. Finding: The constables are each reprimanded, and cautioned to be more careful in future. Charge 2 (Constable Burrell), improperly leaving his beat without just cause, and going to the Nelson Police-station about 2.30 a.m., 14th instant: Severely reprimanded and cautioned on this charge. Charge 3 (Constable Burrell), improperly leaving his beat without just cause, and going to the Nelson Police-station at 12.30 a.m., 15th instant, and remaining there until 1.20 a.m. Finding: Fined 2s. 6d. and cautioned. Charge against Constable McGrath, reprimanded and cautioned. Then, Constable Durbridge, charged in connection with the Bush Tavern, reprimanded