

Mrs. Thomason and her sister really saw William Bayly on the train, why did they not mention it to his parents? No, Mrs. Thomason left Papamoa a week or two later without saying a word to any one of the alleged train incident, but from Wanganui, four months later, commenced to write letters to Mrs. Bayly in which she stated she had seen Mrs. Bayly's son on the train. Although Mrs. Thomason had no further information to impart to Mrs. Bayly, she insisted on the latter journeying to Wanganui to discuss the matter with her. Finding Mrs. Bayly reluctant to take the journey Mrs. Thomason took the remarkable step of threatening Mrs. Bayly with exposure in a well-known newspaper if she did not come to Wanganui. Mrs. Bayly, through her solicitors, informed the police, to whom the correspondence was handed over. By arrangement she then went to Wanganui, where, according to Mrs. Bayly, Mrs. Thomason asked from Mrs. Bayly a large sum of money. Although Mrs. Thomason denies to the police making any demand for money, it is significant that she names exactly the same sum of money mentioned by Mrs. Bayly (£10,000) as being discussed between them.

It is quite clear that at this interview the payment of money was discussed between the women.

It is further significant that in a statement made to the police immediately after her interview with Mrs. Bayly Mrs. Thomason admits that before leaving her home to interview Mrs. Bayly she suspected a trap would be laid for her, and that from the commencement of her interview in Mrs. Bayly's bedroom she feared some one was listening in the adjoining room. Of what value would the testimony of such a witness be, and how far would it be safe to put the life or freedom of any one in jeopardy on her word?

When originally interviewed by the police at the time of Elsie Walker's disappearance Mrs. Langdon made no reference to the train incident. When again interviewed last June after Mrs. Thomason's visit to Wanganui and before the latter had time to communicate with her (which she did by telegram the following day) Mrs. Langdon specifically and definitely denied having seen William Bayly on the train, or that her sister, Mrs. Thomason, had seen him, or had at any time said she had seen him on the train. A week later Mrs. Langdon reversed her previous statement. What reliance can now be placed on her statements?

Another sister, Mrs. Richardson, says that, although she has discussed the Elsie Walker case a number of times with both Mrs. Thomason and Mrs. Langdon, neither has at any time told her William Bayly was on the train.

Assuming it were true that Mrs. Thomason and Mrs. Langdon saw William Bayly on the train on the 1st October, 1928, such testimony would not help the Coroner to decide the cause of death. At most it would tend to show that William Bayly had given untruthful evidence at the inquest when he swore that he was in Auckland on the 1st October, 1928, but such is not a matter for investigation by a Coroner.

The extracts from the statements quoted show that in cross-examination the testimony of the persons referred to would be so discredited that no Court would be justified in placing any reliance on it.

Finally, the police have investigated more alleged evidence than has ever been published in the newspapers. They have visited and examined numbers of witnesses whose statements I have waded through, and I say absolutely that there has not been the slightest justification shown for reopening the inquest, nor has any evidence been discovered which will throw any light on the cause of death of Elsie Walker.

Believing this, and having had many opportunities of analysing and dissecting evidence, I refuse absolutely to assist in what must only be a farce, and cannot help in the slightest degree to elucidate the cause of her death.

Wellington, N.Z., 7th November, 1929.

THOMAS M. WILFORD.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (450 copies), £3 10s.

---

By Authority: W. A. G. SKINNER, Government Printer, Wellington.—1929.

Price 3d.]