

THE NOTORIOUS DR RUSSELL  
OF TRISTRAM HOUSE:

an American Creole abortionist in  
Christchurch, New Zealand, 1880-1915

Geoffrey W. Rice

Emeritus Professor of History

University of Canterbury

HAWTHORNE PRESS

With the

COTTER MEDICAL HISTORY TRUST

Published by HAWTHORNE PRESS  
73 Halton Street  
Christchurch 8052  
NEW ZEALAND  
with the  
COTTER MEDICAL HISTORY TRUST

First published 2020

Copyright © Geoffrey W. Rice

The moral rights of the author have been asserted.

This book is copyright. Except for the purpose of fair review, no part may be stored or transmitted in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

ISBN 978-0-473-55046-2



From the *Cyclopedia of New Zealand*, Volume 3 (1903), p.250.





Medical students of 1876 at Syracuse University, including centre front Sarah Loguen, the first African American woman to graduate in medicine from Syracuse. Russell is probably the male figure second from right.

[Wiki Commons](#)



## CONTENTS

Introduction	9
Acknowledgements	11
CHAPTER ONE: Censured for Alleged Extortion, 1880-87	13
CHAPTER TWO: Convicted and Imprisoned, 1887-92	19
CHAPTER THREE: A British Citizen at Tristram House, 1892-98	29
CHAPTER FOUR: In Search of Respectability, 1898-1910	39
CHAPTER FIVE: Fading Health and Reputation, 1910-15	55
CONCLUSION	63
ENDNOTES	67



## INTRODUCTION

The career of Dr Charles James Russell in Christchurch between 1880 and his death in 1915 throws light on several themes in New Zealand medical history. He was an outsider in a New Zealand medical profession that was struggling to assert its status and respectability in an age of quacks and faith healers. Though he claimed to have an MD degree from Syracuse in New York State, he could not produce the document and had to swear an affidavit before a JP. American medical degrees were held in low esteem by graduates of the British medical schools of London, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dublin, but Russell also had dental and midwifery qualifications from Glasgow University. Though admitted to the Canterbury Medical Society, he was soon censured by its committee for threatening legal action to recover a debt. This episode revealed that he was already involved with the shady side of Christchurch society, and lived close to its notorious red-light district north of Cathedral Square.

In 1887 he was convicted on two charges of procuring abortion and served five years in jail in Wellington. On his release in 1892 he was ostracised by the other Christchurch doctors but he continued to practise in Christchurch as an unregistered doctor, and attempted to demonstrate that he was a reformed character by joining a number of sports clubs and school committees. He gave public lectures on health subjects and was an enthusiastic supporter of the first Burgesses' Association in Christchurch. In 1895 he became a naturalised British citizen. However, in 1898 he was again charged with procuring an abortion, and though he was acquitted when the prosecution's chief witness changed her testimony, many people believed that he was guilty as charged.

In the early twentieth century he strove to demonstrate his respectability as an active citizen involved in several spheres, including swimming clubs, brass bands and the Royal Humane Society. In 1910 he was elected to the Canterbury Education Board where he campaigned for improved hygiene and seating in schools, becoming something of a crusading hero to some parents. But in 1912 he was again arrested on a charge of procuring an abortion, and faced a jury trial in the Supreme Court. The police, however,

failed to prove their case and he was acquitted. Christchurch's two main daily newspapers failed to print obituaries when he died in 1915, but the *Star* paid tribute to his community work and public service, with no mention of his prison term.

Russell's dark skin colour marked him as a man of mixed-race parentage. The *Police Gazette* described him as 'an American Creole', which at that time usually meant someone born in America of mixed African and European ancestry. His medical registration described him as a West Indian of mixed blood. That made him an exotic figure in the predominantly British, white, conservative, Anglican Christchurch of the 1880s and 1890s. There may have been an element of racism in his ostracism by the other doctors, as well as resentment that he undercut their fees. There are a few hints that he had great charm, and was popular with female patients. He had a fine singing voice, and played the guitar at fund-raising concerts.

It seems likely that he was a discreet and successful abortionist, making quite a lot of money. His fee for a termination in 1887 was 10 guineas, which converts to over \$2,000 in present day values. Women would have trusted him as a medical man, and would have preferred his expensive services over those of back-street abortionists. Indeed, in his defence he could claim that he was providing an essential service for women at a time when most men scorned the use of contraceptives.

Russell appears to have been the first medical man successfully prosecuted for 'the illegal operation' in New Zealand. The police constable and detectives involved in his 1887 prosecution were rewarded for bringing him to justice. His was only the second successful prosecution and prison sentence for this crime in the decade after 1877. Reviewing the other 18 abortion charges brought between 1887 and 1900, ten were acquitted for lack of evidence, but those convicted were given heavier sentences than Russell: seven, ten and even 18 years hard labour (unless the latter is a misprint). Abortion cases were notoriously difficult to prosecute successfully, even when there was a death involved.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the second in a series of small biographies of Christchurch medical men in the late nineteenth century produced as part of a proposed biographical dictionary. It is largely based on newspaper evidence gathered from the *Papers Past* website of the National Library of New Zealand, to whom thanks are due for compiling and maintaining this treasure-trove of information about early New Zealand. Other sources have also been consulted, such as the *New Zealand Police Gazette* (also available from *Papers Past*) and the minutes of the Canterbury Medical Society, 1881-91, now held by the Cotter Medical History Museum.

The story of Dr Russell is also one of the chapters missing from my book *Christchurch Crimes and Scandals, 1876-99* (Canterbury University Press, 2013). As that text grew ever larger, dealing with such scandals as the Severed Hand case, the Leonard Harper bankruptcy, and the Temple of Truth founded by the American fraudster-evangelist Arthur Bently Worthington, I decided to reserve the medical scandals for a separate book. The stories of Dr Powell, Dr Russell, Dr Nedwill, Dr Turnbull and Dr Hacon have already grown beyond the size of a book chapter, and deserve separate small biographies.

Thanks are due to Dr Claire Le Couteur for reading an earlier version of the text, and to Paddy Cotter and the Cotter Medical History Trust for assistance with publication.



## CHAPTER ONE

### CENSURED FOR ALLEGED EXTORTION, 1880-85

The first mention of Dr Charles James Russell (1830-1915) in a New Zealand newspaper occurs on 8 July 1880 in the *Globe*, the evening edition of the Christchurch *Press*. An advertisement by the 'Dauntless' Lodge No. 7 of the Independent Order of Good Templars announced a public temperance meeting for the next evening, to be addressed by C. J. Russell Esq., MD, 'late from England'.<sup>1</sup> His name does not appear in any shipping lists that year. (The ship's doctor of the *Westland*, which brought 305 government immigrants to Lyttelton in February 1880, was a Dr W. Russell.<sup>2</sup>)

Russell presented his qualifications to the Christchurch Registrar on 17 August 1880. He was a Licentiate of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow University in both dentistry and midwifery, 1869. He claimed to have an MD degree from Syracuse University, New York State, 1876, but said he had lost the diploma. He had to swear an affidavit to this effect before a JP before he could be added to the New Zealand Medical Register.<sup>3</sup> In the Register of Medical Practitioners for 1885 his qualifications are listed as LFPS Glasgow 1869, LMFPS Glasgow 1869, and MD Syracuse, New York, USA, 1876.<sup>4</sup> But nothing else is known of his years in the UK.

Some insight into Russell's beliefs can be gleaned from the unusually full report of a lecture on 'The Importance and Advantages of Friendly Societies' which he gave in the Oddfellows' Hall in Lichfield Street on 4 October 1880. The meeting was chaired by the politician and magistrate, Christopher Bowen, a pillar of respectable Christchurch society. Russell said that the Benefit or Friendly societies were destined to occupy a most important place in the history of New Zealand as they promoted self-reliance and a spirit of independence among the people. He looked forward to the day when the State made an alliance with the Benefit societies, of which everyone in the country would be a member: 'Some might say that these views were wild and Utopian, but so were the views of those who were in favour of the State emancipating the slaves in America a few years ago'. Russell went on to argue that the Friendly societies cultivated happy homes and deterred the poor from crime. He believed that a healthy body was the

best prevention of disease, and these societies encouraged habits of hygiene and thrift. He also thought the Benefit societies improved the moral tone of their members by encouraging regular church attendance. He thought that more attention should be paid to the intellectual development of members, by the provision of reading rooms and establishment of debating clubs. The societies were also a friend to the widows and the orphans. Finally he hoped the societies would tend 'in God's own time to sweep away crime and its attendant miseries from the earth'.<sup>5</sup>

A month later Russell seconded a motion at a meeting of the Young Men's Christian Association.<sup>6</sup> In December 1880 he gave a speech at a temperance meeting held in the Academy of Music, on the same platform as the Hon James Monro and the Reverend Dr Roseby. The Dean of Christchurch presided over the meeting, which ended with songs and duets.<sup>7</sup>

Sometime before the end of 1880 Russell was elected secretary of the newly-formed Church of England Temperance Society, and in May 1881 he was proposed for membership of the newly-established Canterbury Medical Society.<sup>8</sup> He clearly had a busy year with the Church of England Temperance Society, ordering a supply of publications from England and helping to set up ten parochial branches after a circular letter from the Bishop had alerted the parishes. But he did not offer himself for re-election at the first annual meeting in September 1881.<sup>9</sup>

Thus far Russell had done what any new doctor did, moving in respectable circles and giving talks to make himself known to the public. But in January 1882 he was censured by the Canterbury Medical Society for conduct unbecoming a medical man.

One of his patients who lived close to him in Oxford Terrace was a Mrs Chambers. Her real name was Martha Jane Blyth and she appears to have been a high-class prostitute, with many admirers visiting her at Roseville Cottage beside the Avon River. One of her visitors was a rising young lawyer, Thomas Stringer, who was later to become a KC. At the end of 1880 Mrs Chambers showed Stringer a letter she had received from Dr Russell, demanding payment of an account for £23: 'I must be paid or the matter must go into court for collection'. Stringer took this letter to the Medical Society's committee, along with his reply to Russell on behalf of Mrs Chambers. As a lawyer he regarded Russell's letter as an attempt at extortion, a criminal offence, by demanding payment on threat of exposure

in the public courts. He could hand it to the police and cause Russell much trouble, which would not reflect well on the medical profession in Christchurch. The Medical Society summoned Russell to a special meeting on 26 January 1882 to explain himself, with Stringer present.

Russell admitted that he had written the letter but insisted it had been intended as a private letter: 'Not for the purpose of extortion but to secure a quiet settlement of an honest debt'. Russell continued: 'Being a poor man and having a family depending on me I am not able to throw away my earnings'. He remarked that Mrs Chambers seemed to have many admirers, and it would not be asking much of them to pay off the debt. He admitted that he knew 'some of the gentlemen who frequent her house'.

Stringer's story was that in March 1881 he had visited the house of Mrs Chambers with two friends, and while they were there she had been taken ill. They sent for Russell, as he was her doctor, and after giving her some medicine he left, mentioning his fee as he left. Stringer said to send it to him. A few days later he received Russell's account and sent him a cheque on 18 March. However, he then learned that the young man who had walked to the gate with Russell had already given the doctor a pound as his fee.

Russell then gave a lengthy explanation, and said that the details of Mrs Chambers' illness were 'revolting' and it was with a view to suppressing these details that he had written the letter to secure a quiet settlement.

Dr Patrick moved 'That this meeting considers that Dr Russell acted indiscreetly in endeavouring to obtain payment of his claim against a profligate woman by threatening to expose her male associates'. Stringer objected to the word 'expose' as this conveyed a threat and was meant to apply to himself and his friends. The motion was duly amended and was carried unanimously.<sup>10</sup>

Russell was present at the next monthly meeting of the Medical Society on 23 March 1882 but never attended another meeting. No resignation was received, but after a while without paying his subscription he would have been written off. This was a serious setback for a new doctor trying to gain acceptance from his medical peers. More damaging, however, was the revelation that one of his patients was a notorious 'profligate woman' and that he knew some of the men who frequented her house.

Stringer seems to have chosen his friends and his recreational activities more carefully after this. He rose to become a leading lawyer in Christchurch, and had a distinguished career as a Crown Prosecutor and judge, retiring in 1927 as Mr Justice Stringer. He was knighted in 1928 as Sir Walter Stringer.<sup>11</sup>

Russell had a wife and daughter to consider, and seems to have kept out of trouble for the next few years. The only other mention of him in the newspapers before 1885 is a letter he wrote to the Board of Health in December 1882 about the reporting of infectious diseases.<sup>12</sup>

His pursuit of payment for professional services continued, however, and led to a court case in 1885 at which it was revealed that he was also a successful surgeon. He was claiming £57 19s 6d from Albert Watenburg for medical services to his wife. She had suffered from dropsy for some five years, and at first Russell told her that he could do more than offer palliative medicine for her condition. She really needed to go to hospital for surgery. The couple were market gardeners who lived five miles out of town at Rhodes Swamp (now Marshlands), so the claim included travel time. Mrs Watenburg said that she had already sought assistance at both Wellington and Christchurch hospitals without relief.

Russell attended her until the end of December 1883, with Dr McBean Stewart assisting him in ‘tapping’ her, or drawing off the excess fluid. Stewart offered to get her into the hospital, but she refused. Finally she agreed to have an ovariectomy. Russell had rented a room near his house, and hired a nurse to care for Mrs Watenburg in her convalescence. Russell said he had suggested that the Watenburgs could pay him a pound a week.

The ovariectomy was performed successfully on 24 January 1884 with assistance from Dr Stewart. Drs Prins, Bakewell and Thomas observed the operation. Russell removed a large tumour which with its contents weighed 105 lb, according to the *Press*. [This has to be a misprint, as that would be 47 kg. The weight is more likely to have been 105 ounces, or 2.9 kg]. He continued to attend Mrs Watenburg until May. He said he had never been paid, except for a few pounds and a load of carrots. Albert Watenburg offered to pay Russell £25, but he declined, claiming more than double that amount was owing.

The Watemburgs claimed that Russell had said he would perform the operation for free, as it was an interesting case. He denied this, and said that without the operation she would in time have died. He had suggested that Mr Watenburg appeal to the public, and Russell had inserted a notice saying that he had performed the operation and the Watemburgs were deserving of assistance. But only a few pounds had been received, which Watenburg passed on to Russell.

Albert Watenburg told the court that Russell had dissuaded his wife from having her operation in the hospital, 'saying that the doctors there were always quarrelling'. He insisted that Russell had offered to perform the operation for free, and did not mind if he was never paid.

Mrs Wright, the nurse who had attended Mrs Watenburg for nine weeks, said that she heard Russell say that he was going to offer his services for free, as they were poor people. She also heard Mrs Watenburg say that they should try to pay him £25. Russell objected to this testimony, saying that he regarded Mrs Wright as a hostile witness.

A neighbour, Mrs Jessie Henshaw, heard Russell say that Mrs Watenburg should have to have her operation in town, 'away from the damp and the noise of the children'. Another neighbour, Mrs Suhumfsky, testified that she had heard Russell say that he would perform the operation for free.

After hearing all the evidence, Magistrate Beetham said it was clear that Russell had offered his services for free, and gave judgement to the defendant, with costs.<sup>13</sup>

The only other mention of Russell during 1885 is the bare report that he was appointed Tent Surgeon for the Pride of Christchurch Lodge of the Independent Order of Rechabites, another temperance lodge. This was a common way for doctors to augment their income, attending lodge members and claiming a standard fee from the lodge.<sup>14</sup>



## CHAPTER TWO

### CONVICTED AND IMPRISONED, 1887-92

Russell was arrested on 11 January 1887 and charged with procuring an abortion on Mrs Mary Bower. While on remand in Addington prison, a further charge of procuring an abortion on a servant girl named Kate Fisher was added. Russell and Mrs Bower were further charged with procuring the miscarriage of one Annie Connelly. Mrs Bower's sister Isabella Wilson was also charged as an accomplice in the felony.

The arrest of a well-known medical man caused a great sensation in Christchurch and large crowds attended both the Magistrate's Court proceedings in January 1887 and the subsequent Supreme Court trial in April. Both of the city's leading dailies, the *Press* and *Lyttelton Times*, reported the court proceedings in great detail, with shorthand reporters producing almost identical verbatim testimony from the witnesses. After some initial delay while the police found additional witnesses (one had fled to Wellington), the prosecution cases were eased by full confessions from both Mary Bower and Kate Fisher. The following narrative is based largely on their accounts, and the testimony of the police detectives, Maurice O'Connor and Robert Neill.<sup>15</sup>

On Monday 10 January 1887 Constable Samuel Flewellyn from the St Albans station went to Mrs Bower's house with Inspector Peter Pender and Detective O'Connor to arrest her on a charge of procuring an abortion. The police had received an anonymous letter, which was later found among Russell's papers:

Notice. A woman, by name Bower, of St Albans, who is known to be pregnant, will doubtless visit a certain M.D. (as she has done before). The case is *known* and *watched* and the case will be in the hands of certain *parties* for examination and Court if it is meddled with. A warning from "One in blue."

At first Mrs Bower protested that she knew nothing about any abortion, but the police had been informed that she had written to Dr Russell seeking

an abortion and that he had replied to her. The police had a warrant to search the premises, which they proceeded to do, both upstairs and downstairs. Mrs Bowerne finally admitted she had had a reply from Russell, declining to perform the operation:

I did receive a letter from Dr Russell, but it is burnt. When I found I was this way I wrote to him, as I heard that he used to do things of this kind for women, and he wrote back to me on a part of my own letter, saying that he wouldn't do it.

Mrs Bowerne was taken to the central police station and placed in a cell for the night, but soon after midnight she said she wanted to make a statement, and tell the whole truth. Inspector Pender cautioned her and then took down what she said. Afterwards she signed each sheet of paper:

My name is Mary Bowerne, I am wife of Joseph Bowerne. I live at St Albans. About twelve months ago I met a gentleman one night, and I got into trouble with him . . . I told him about my condition. He asked me to go Home with him [i.e. England]. I said I would not go on account of my children. He asked me if there was anything could be done. I told him I had heard of Dr Russell and that the man who told me of Dr Russell told me the doctor's charge was £10 10s. The gentleman soon after went to England. After I found the gentleman who was the father of my child had gone Home, I went to see Dr Russell. I saw him at his own house. A young woman named Wylie was with me. She remained in a room and I saw Dr Russell alone. I told him I was separated from my husband, and that I thought I was pregnant. He said the only thing he could do was to put me under an operation. He asked me if I had the money. I said I had, and I said how much. He said he could not do it under ten guineas. I gave him the money then. I asked him if he thought he could bring on the miscarriage by giving me medicine. He said he could not give me medicine, but what he would do would not injure me so much. This was at night. I then came away with Miss Wylie.

About a week after this he called at my house in Salisbury Street, and asked me to have it done at his house. I went the same afternoon to Dr Russell's house. Miss Wylie accompanied me. I there went under the operation. He used an instrument. I then went home. About a week afterwards he performed another operation on me at his own

house. I think he used an instrument. I went away again and he told me the child might come in a week. About a fortnight after this the child came. I sent for Dr Russell the same night. When he came the child was born. He took it from the chamber, and I think he took it away with him, but I did not see him take it out. He called next day and every day for about a week. After I got better he told me if I were to tell that he would get ten years. He asked me if anyone knew about it. I said "No."

When I found I was again in the family way, five months ago, I wrote to him and asked if he could do the same for me again. My sister took the letter, but she did not know its contents until she came back, when I told her. My sister brought the letter back from Dr Russell, who wrote on it to the effect that he had a letter from the Police station saying that I had a child taken away from me, that I was in the family way again, and that he could do nothing for me. The same night I went to see him. I asked him to show me the letter he received from the police. He said it was not at hand, and he advised me to leave Christchurch. I then told him that if there was a divorce case, I thought he would get into trouble for what he had done. He said he could not help it; he could do nothing for me. I then went home.

That is all I have to say except about the letter I wrote to Christie. I blamed him, as I had told him of my going to Dr Russell, and I thought he had written to Dr Russell about it. I then wrote the letter to him and accused him of writing to Russell. Christie told me he had not done so. I make this statement of my own free will and voluntarily, after being cautioned.

Armed with this confession, Inspector Pender had issued an arrest warrant for Russell.

Detectives O'Connor and Neill went to Russell's house on 11 January and he met them at the door. O'Connor said, 'I have come to arrest you on a charge of procuring abortion in a woman named Mrs Bovern residing at St Albans.' Russell seemed 'very much affected' and said he wanted to go upstairs. He called his sister [in fact, sister-in-law] and they all went upstairs. O'Connor continued:

He said to his sister, "I have got into trouble." She said, "What did you do?" He said, "They say I did something wrong to a woman, but I did nothing but my duty to her." He then looked at me and said, "I don't know what to say to you. Is Mrs Bown arrested?" I said, "Yes." He said, "What did she say?" I said, "She has told all about it." He asked me again what she had said. I said, "She made a long statement, more than I can remember, but she said that you took the child away from her." He then said, "She came here two or three months ago, and wanted me to perform an operation on her. I refused to do so. I told her that I had had an anonymous letter, telling me that she was pregnant, and that if I interfered with her again it would be made a police case of. She had been with me on a previous occasion, and I did it for her then. I thought it was a case of simple necessity. I don't know whether I am right or wrong in doing it, but I have often done so in cases where women are likely to have a troublesome time."

Russell had asked if he might write some letters to fellow doctors, to arrange care for his patients, and the police waited nearly an hour while he did this. When O'Connor finally said it was time to be going, Russell put on his boots and coat, and said he wanted to speak to his sister:

He went to the end of the passage, and was speaking to his sister. I was three or four yards from him, and standing in the passage. I heard his sister scream, and say, "Oh! You must not do that!" I looked over and saw that the doctor had a bottle to his mouth . . . I rushed over and took it from him. Some of the liquid from the bottle was streaming down his beard and chin. I called Detective Neill, who was in the next room, and said, "Now you must come away at once." He [Russell] caught hold of the jamb of the door and said, "No, you are too late now; I've done it. I want to die in my own house." He repeated that several times - that he was dead; that he was dying; that he wanted to die in his own house. We got him along the passage as far as the top of the stairs. He then got hold of the jamb of an office door. We tried to pull him away from there, but couldn't, so we pulled him into the office where he fell on his face. We then got the handcuffs on him. [At the Supreme Court trial the detectives admitted having to manhandle him, as Russell was 'a big powerful man.'] We carried him downstairs and out into the street. He was kicking violently the whole time. When we got him into the hall, we sent for a cab. We

were taking him along [Oxford] Terrace when the cab met us. We put him into the cab at Manchester Street. We drove him from there to the Police Station, and right to the Hospital, where he was attended to by Dr Westenra and was sick. He said there several times that he wished he could die, and that it was better for him to die than disgrace a hundred families.

[If this last remark referred to the number of abortions he had performed in Christchurch, Russell must have been a wealthy man: 1,000 guineas converts to over \$200,000 in today's money.]

At the hospital the detectives searched Russell's pockets and found a letter he had written for his sister-in-law:

I am betrayed for doing the best I could for two families. Telegraph to Louie not to come. Pay all debts: there is quite enough, and a little for Louie and Eva. Kiss them for me. I cannot stand this and must die; God have mercy on my soul. Good-bye. C. J. Russell M.D.

Louie and Eva were presumably Russell's wife and daughter. Later in court it was mentioned that they were at that time living in England.

Further details of what happened at the hospital were revealed by Dr Fitzgerald Westenra. Russell said he had taken poison, strychnine followed by aconite. Westenra gave him an injection of apomorphia as an emetic, and Russell immediately vomited up the contents of his stomach. These were later analysed by Alexander Bickerton, Professor of Chemistry at Canterbury University College. He confirmed that it contained aconite, and speculated that the aconite may have neutralised the strychnine, especially as Russell had consumed a large breakfast. Though weak and shaken, Russell was well enough to appear in court the following day.

The police evidence continued with the papers found during the search of Russell's office. A scrap book was produced with an entry for 'Bowern, J., Mrs, Salisbury Street, £10 10s,' on 30 December 1885. The doctor's day book also had an entry for Mrs Bowen, Salisbury Street, on the same date, and 'cash £10 10s.'

Various witnesses recalled their conversations with Mrs Bowern about her condition and her visits to Russell. Elizabeth North, who lived near Mrs

Bowern in Springfield Road, St Albans, had seen the letter sent to Russell, and his reply written on the same page:

She told me that she had been in trouble before. I should have said – that she had undergone an operation before, and that she was going to Dr Russell to ask him to do it again. She said she had one child taken from her before. When I told my husband he forbade me to go there again.

Mrs North was questioned closely about what had happened to the aborted infants, and she recalled that something was said about the child, ‘or whatever it was that was taken from her’, having been burned.

The four magistrates then committed both Russell and Mrs Bowern for trial in the Supreme Court.

Inspector Pender then proceeded with the second charge against Russell, concerning the servant Kate Fisher. Unlike Mrs North, who had been a reluctant witness, Kate Fisher was a very willing and voluble witness:

I have known Dr Russell for 18 months. I went to him the night after the father of my child had been to him. I went to get him to tell me of a place where I could stay during my confinement. He sent me to Mrs Richard. There were some girls there . . . I remained until I was confined, a week before Christmas, 1885. I left there two months after being confined. Baby was twelve months old last Christmas.

Soon after I left I saw Dr Russell again, not very often. I saw him professionally. Afterwards he had a connection with me. It was in his own house. We were intimate until this last illness of mine; this last four months. He was intimate with me while I was at Mrs Richard’s, and before the first child was born. The intimacy commenced again after the child was born. The result was I got into trouble again. I was pregnant by Dr Russell.

After some time Dr Russell said he would use an instrument to me. [sic] Baby was about six months old. I had gone only two months and a half when Dr Russell used an instrument to me. I went over to him, and he said if anything was wrong with me, he would use an instrument and it would come away. I can’t remember when he said this. He spoke only once.

He did operate on me. I was at Mrs Richard's. I was servant there at this time. Mrs Richard knew nothing about it until after it had happened. I did not tell her till afterwards. I told her that Dr Russell had operated on me . . . [Mrs Richard said Kate could no longer live at her house, and asked Russell to find her somewhere else to live.] I went to Mrs Maclean's, in Madras Street. I stayed there a fortnight. Dr Russell saw me twice there . . . The result of the operation was that it came away from me – the child. I don't know what became of the child. There was no one present. I was quite alone in my bedroom when it came away. Dr Russell did not come till the evening.

An instrument was used. It was like a long glass tubing. It was used only once. The child came a week afterwards. The instrument remained in me a minute or two. Dr Russell said he did not want me to have a child belonging to him. During the time I was at Mrs Richard's Dr Russell paid my expenses, £12. I don't remember his giving me any money . . . I don't know what became of the child . . . After leaving Mrs Maclean's I went to Mrs Phillips'. Four or five girls were staying at Mrs Richard's whilst I was there . . . Dr Russell attended them all. They did not stay more than a fortnight generally.

Mary Maclean and Rachel Gregory confirmed the circumstances under which Kate Fisher had moved from Mrs Richard's house. Both were sure that she had been 'in the family way' and had had a miscarriage. They confirmed that Dr Russell had attended on the nights 'when she was very bad.' Mrs Gregory said that Mrs Richard only took patients for Dr Russell, and none from other doctors. She was told that they were regular confinements of married women, and had not heard of any other miscarriages, besides that of Kate Fisher.

Walter Stringer was the lawyer appearing for Mrs Richard, who had been charged as an accomplice in Russell's illegal operation. Mrs Richard had vigorously protested her innocence 'before God.' Stringer contended that there was 'not a scintilla of evidence against his client.' He accused the police of having 'gone to the gutters' to gather evidence. The senior Magistrate remarked that it was the Inspector's duty to get evidence, no matter where he found it. But he finally agreed with Stringer, and the charge against Mrs Richard was dismissed.

Detective O'Connor told the court that when he charged Russell with procuring the abortion of Kate Fisher the doctor had merely said 'Yes.' That concluded the case for the prosecution, and the accused were duly cautioned. Thomas Joynt was the lawyer appearing for Russell, and said he reserved his defence for the Supreme Court.

At the Supreme Court in April 1887 Mary Bownern promptly pleaded 'Guilty' to her indictment, and Mr Justice Johnston deferred passing sentence, as she was needed as a witness in the case against Russell. Joynt had argued that she might be induced to give evidence unfairly against Russell in order to obtain a mitigation of her punishment. Russell pleaded 'Not Guilty.' The judge ordered the court cleared of all women and boys.

Mrs Bownern repeated all the evidence she had given in the lower court, 'and was somewhat hysterical at times during the examination.' The prosecution called only Isabella Wilson (Mrs Bownern's sister), Elizabeth North and Dr Westenra. Under cross-examination by Thomas Joynt, Dr Westenra admitted that the instrument produced could be used in legitimate surgery in cases of tumours, which might sometimes produce the symptoms described by Mrs Bownern. But apart from this single intervention, Joynt called no further evidence.

The prosecution, led by a future Judge, J. C. Martin, declined to sum up for the jury as he felt the evidence was overwhelming. Joynt addressed the jury, and the Judge summed up (neither reported by the newspapers) and the jury retired.

After an absence of only 53 minutes the jury returned with a verdict of 'Guilty.'

On the following morning, everyone was back in court for the sentencing. Joynt announced that Russell had withdrawn his former plea and now pleaded 'Guilty' to the charge concerning Annie Connelly. After hearing further witnesses, the Judge noted that there was hardly enough evidence to convict Isabella Wilson as an accomplice. The jury retired, and after only 20 minutes returned with a 'Guilty' verdict for Mrs Bownern and a 'Not Guilty' for Isabella Wilson. Miss Wilson was then discharged.

Before sentencing, Russell was asked if he anything to say. He maintained that he had always acted for the good of the patient, and that where a woman had difficulty with her confinements it was better to terminate early rather than leave her to 'go to death's door'. Russell pleaded for mercy, on account of his wife and child:

On the first day of this year he had a comfortable home, and now he had nothing. He had injured his spine and was unable to do work. He had lost his diplomas and everything. His wife and daughter had no one to look to. Already he had suffered 96 days of excruciating agony. He was 56 years of age and trusted that His Honor [sic] would be as merciful to him as possible.

Mr Justice Johnston said he could not accept Russell's statement as any sort of exoneration. He had no doubt, from Russell's remark about the number of families concerned, that he had practised this offence 'very frequently' and had thus held out to young people 'the strongest temptation to immorality.' Parliament had branded this offence as a most infamous one. The prisoner had been wrong in saying that he was liable for only ten years, as the punishment for this offence was penal servitude for life. Such offences were a standing menace to the morality of society, and must be put down with a high hand. Russell had systematically extorted large gains from the women who employed him. A warning had to be given to other members of his profession who might be tempted to offer such unlawful services.

Russell was sentenced to seven years' penal servitude, concurrent on the two indictments. Mary Bower was sentenced to twelve months' with hard labour.

Not surprisingly, there was no editorial comment from either of the main Christchurch newspapers. Neither editor would have wanted to draw any further attention to such a sordid and sensational case. Not only had Russell been revealed as an abortionist on a large scale, making considerable sums of money illegally, but his sexual relationship with Kate Fisher would have been deeply shocking to his medical colleagues, whose code of honour was very strict against any such liaisons with patients.

However, Russell still had some supporters in Christchurch. A meeting was held in the Foresters' Hall on Oxford Terrace on 25 April 1887 attended by about 100 people, including a number of women. There was some delay at the outset, as those who had called the meeting were either not present or were not inclined to conduct it. Finally, Mr Stephen Lawrence of Sydenham was nominated and elected to chair the meeting. A 'free discussion' then took place, in which most speakers expressed the view that Russell's sentence had been 'excessive in the extreme'. The suggestion was made that a petition be circulated for signatures and sent to the government to ask for a reduction of his sentence, but nothing was decided, and the audience dispersed 'before the proposal could be properly formulated.'<sup>16</sup>

It is a pity that this meeting was not reported in more detail, as it would be interesting to know why those present thought Russell's sentence had been 'excessive.' There may have been others in the city who thought that he had been let off lightly, and should have been given the maximum sentence of life imprisonment.

Victorian society maintained high moral principles in public, reinforced by the churches, yet there was much hypocrisy in the private lives of politicians and aristocrats, as we now know from published diaries and letters of the time. Polite society preferred to turn a blind eye to social problems such as poverty, prostitution and child labour, yet they existed and indeed flourished in big cities like London. Britain's overseas colonies could not claim any moral superiority to the homeland metropolis, not even such an outwardly pious and conventional city as Christchurch, New Zealand. Police records show that prostitutes were numerous and active in Christchurch from the 1860s, and unwanted pregnancies were an occupational hazard for the oldest profession. There were undoubtedly a few midwives who performed abortions, and the odd chemist who might supply ergot to induce contractions, but it was extremely rare for a medical man to risk his reputation and liberty with an illegal operation that was so much disapproved of by society in general.

## CHAPTER THREE

### A BRITISH CITIZEN AT 'TRISTRAM HOUSE'

Russell was discharged from prison early in July 1892, having served only five years of his seven year sentence.<sup>17</sup> He had apparently been an exemplary prisoner, and had his sentence reduced for good behaviour. However, he had been struck off the Medical Register, and as a convicted felon his diplomas from Glasgow and Syracuse would have been cancelled.

He returned to Christchurch, and presumably stayed with friends until he found a property of his own. In September he advertised a series of public lectures, a common enough way for an educated man to raise cash. The first was entitled, ironically enough, 'Our Children and Health.'<sup>18</sup> The second, delivered in the Foresters' Hall in Richmond in October, was entitled 'Matrimony', and attracted a large audience.<sup>19</sup> Some may simply have been curious to see such a notorious disgraced medical man.

In December 1892 he wrote a letter to the *Lyttelton Times* calling for stricter controls over the use of tobacco by youths. This letter rehearsed the history of tobacco from its discovery by Columbus in 1492. At first the Papacy and many European rulers prohibited the use of tobacco by Christians, but its popularity swept the law-makers aside, and it was now ubiquitous, despite warnings of its dangers from 'profound thinkers and students of physical economy' over the centuries. Russell promised another letter to explain why attempts at the suppression of tobacco had failed, but no such letter appeared.<sup>20</sup>

Russell had presumably managed to conserve most of his capital while he was in prison, possibly with the help of his agent, the Jewish moneylender Hyman Marks.<sup>21</sup> [Marks was a native of Warsaw in Poland, who left £5,000 in his will when he died in 1895 for a new wing to be added to Christchurch Hospital.] Wherever he got the money, Russell was able to buy the leasehold on a large house in central Christchurch at the start of 1893.

In February 1893 Russell announced that his new address would be 'Tristram House', at 204 Manchester Street, opposite St Luke's Church. He

described himself as an Accoucheur and Sociological Consulter [sic], adding the note that 'Domestic Ethics and Economics, in relation to Practical Sociology, made the subject of careful study.'<sup>22</sup> Tristram House was one of many such large two-storey boarding houses in the blocks bounded by Manchester, Durham, Kilmore and Salisbury streets, which then comprised Christchurch's red-light district. As an accoucheur, he would have attended women during their pregnancies and delivery, providing rooms where they could recover after giving birth. Given his past record, it is reasonable to suspect that he also provided a discreet abortion service for women who did not want to give birth. Christchurch was in the midst of the Long Depression in the early 1890s, and an extra mouth to feed was probably the last thing some families wanted if they were already living on the breadline. Desperate women would have preferred the services of a qualified medical man, even if a disgraced one, rather than a back-street abortionist with a crochet hook. Though ten guineas was a large sum for a working man to find, there were plenty of loan-sharks willing to advance such a sum to a desperate couple at exorbitant interest rates.

In May 1893 Russell again announced a series of evening lectures, this time at the Oddfellows' Hall in Lichfield Street, the city's largest venue in the 1890s. They were to start at 8 pm on Sundays, so that they would not conflict with any religious services. The first lecture was on the subject of 'Health and Food', seemingly innocuous enough, but there was an added attraction in the form of 'beautiful photographs of the human body and its organs, by limelight, under the management of Thomas Crook.' Russell added, 'Many of the illustrations will be taken from my experience in general practice as a Doctor of Medicine and Surgeon . . .' There was no entry fee, but 'a free will offering' would be gratefully accepted.<sup>23</sup>

Does this suggest that Russell had been taking photographs of his patients, even during operations, with or without their consent? Medical photography had been pioneered in Christchurch as early as 1868, by Dr Turnbull, so it was not unknown, but it was only with the advent of electricity that sufficient light could be directed on an operation to enable successful photography.<sup>24</sup> Photographs of the female body would be sure to attract a large attendance.

There were no further lectures after this first one, suggesting that the police had intervened with a warning about the display of indecent images, or

perhaps the Christchurch doctors had lodged a protest about this blatant breach of medical ethics. There is no mention of Russell's lecture in the minutes of the Canterbury Medical Society.

But he was clearly not short of money. In February 1894 the *Lyttelton Times* reported that Steel Brothers in Lincoln Road, Addington, had just completed a new doctor's gig 'to the order of Mr C. J. Russell, MD.' This was a unique design, with a new arrangement of springs connecting to the shafts. The hood was 'of an entirely new pattern' and the body had 'a graceful sweep towards the back.' The ribs of the hood were connected by spiral springs to a lever which enabled the driver to lower or raise the hood without leaving his seat. The upholstery was of 'best quality black leather' and the body was painted steel grey with maroon lines. The reporter concluded: 'the vehicle has a very smart appearance.'<sup>25</sup>

A new gig was a very deliberate sign of success and affluence in the depths of the Long Depression. Some of the other doctors may have been envious, especially as Russell was now a notorious person of dubious reputation. They would have resented the fact that he drove around town in a smart new gig, wearing a black silk top hat like any respectable doctor.

They would have seethed at the thought that Russell proceeded to behave like any other respectable citizen, writing to the city council with a scheme to extend the city boundaries and amalgamate the suburban boroughs into a larger city, which would then be able to afford expensive public works 'to conduce to the health, solidity, convenience and beauty of the city and suburbs, and provide means for the employment of labour.'<sup>26</sup> Russell was not the only one promoting amalgamation [which finally occurred in 1903], but the city council took his letter seriously enough to ask him to submit his detailed plans. Unfortunately, no trace of them has been found in the city council archives.

Russell's plans apparently included a high pressure water supply, another idea current in the 1890s, for he wrote to the *Times* in November 1894 after the disastrous Fletcher Humphreys' fire to say that if his proposal had been in operation the fire could have been easily contained. Canterbury's winds made fire an ever-present hazard in a city that still contained many wooden buildings. Russell thought it 'unpardonable' that the city had no effective water supply for fire-fighting, especially 'knowing what we know of the frolicking nature of the elements in this part of the world.' Many readers

would have agreed with this sentiment and even smiled at the good-humoured letter that spoke for so many of them.

Russell aroused controversy yet again in 1895 when it was announced that he had been granted letters of naturalisation under the Aliens Act of 1880, making him a British citizen.<sup>27</sup> This announcement created outrage in some quarters, and surprise that a convicted felon of American birth could acquire British citizenship so easily. One of the Wellington newspapers, the *New Zealand Times*, published a letter in his defence, pointing out that his application had been accompanied by a testimonial to his good character [!] and reminding readers that he had served out his sentence: 'A man who has served his sentence has expiated his offence' and could not forever be deprived of his civil rights. The Colonial Secretary had been bound by the law to issue his naturalisation papers: denial would have been a gross injustice.<sup>28</sup> The *Evening Post* had noted that the Governor also had discretionary power to grant British citizenship, 'if he thinks fit'.<sup>29</sup>

Nothing was reported about Russell during 1896, but he continued his campaign to regain respectability with a long and passionate letter to the *Lyttelton Times* in March 1897 headlined 'Destitute Children.' He began by referring to the duties of the medical man in treating illness and saving lives. This should extend to seeking the causes of illness. For example it seemed pointless to continue treating people for certain illnesses when their fever-ridden district could be improved by sanitary reforms. His main concern was with neglectful parents and the suffering they imposed on their offspring: 'How many poor helpless children are thrown on benevolent institutions and public charities, through the depraved selfishness of their inhuman parents, who possess no moral sense of their obligation to their children or their duty to society?' Such parents could be likened to cuckoos, who left it to others to feed their chicks. Parental neglect produced 'shoal after shoal of these poor uncared-fors.' It was imperative for society to improve the home life of married people, as 'the home is the mother of the nation.'

Readers who knew about Russell's past could be forgiven for regarding this sort of plea as the height of hypocrisy, coming from a man who had deliberately destroyed unborn infants. They may not have been impressed by his impassioned conclusion: 'For all there is hope, and if kindness,

firmness and judicious benevolence are wisely tried, happy results, no doubt, would follow.' He urged his readers: 'Look to the parents and guardians! Look to the laws! Look to the schools! Look to the present institutions we have! Look to our own personal duty! Look to a Higher Power!' <sup>30</sup>

This sounded more like an aspiring politician or preacher than a disgraced medical man. His reference to the laws seemed especially rich coming from a convicted felon. One anonymous correspondent to the *Times* commented that Russell's letter seemed to suggest that matrimony should be confined to those of sound mind who were free from disease. The writer's main complaint was that medical men charged too much and were reluctant to attend the poor who could not pay: 'At Home, medical men set apart a day of the week to give free medical advice.' <sup>31</sup>

Russell now became involved with the Sydenham Gospel Temperance Mission<sup>32</sup> and supported the 'rescue work' of the Salvation Army among young unmarried mothers. After the opening of their new maternity home in Cashel Street, Russell gave a lecture that evening about 'the selfishness of the human heart' at a public meeting in the Salvation Army barracks in Victoria Square.<sup>33</sup> Russell was also one of many who gave money for the purchase of Victoria Park on Cashmere Hill, one of the city's markers for Queen Victoria's diamond jubilee in 1897. He gave one guinea.<sup>34</sup>

During the winter of 1897 Russell gave a series of evening lectures on health topics, starting with one on 'Health, Hygiene, Food and Physiology' in the Oddfellows' Hall in Lichfield Street. This was to be followed by one on 'Adolescence, or, from Manhood to Marriage.' <sup>35</sup> Other titles included 'Woman: her Place and Power in the light of Physiology', 'Digestion', and 'Food and its Adulteration.' <sup>36</sup>

Most of our information about Russell comes from the *Lyttelton Times*, as the *Press* rarely mentioned his name. The only exceptions were a few of the public notices about his lectures, and a list from the 1897 Rose Show of the Christchurch Horticultural Society in December, where Russell was named as the donor of two prizes for a group of potted plants.<sup>37</sup> However, his life was once again turned upside down early in 1898.

A *Press* headline for 19 February 1898 declared 'A Sensational Case: An Ex-Doctor Arrested.'<sup>38</sup> Detective Benjamin and Sergeant McLeod had arrested Russell on the Manchester Street bridge on a charge of having procured a miscarriage by use of an instrument on a certain woman on 5 February. The *Press* described his house as 'a rather picturesque residence, specially fitted up after his own design, at the corner of Manchester and Kilmore streets.' Russell was taken to the central police station in Hereford Street, where he was searched before being taken before a 28-year old dressmaker, Kate Louisa Scott, who identified him as the medical man who had performed an operation on her. He was then placed in a cell and bail was refused.

Kate Scott died on 26 February. If the inquest found that her death had been as a result of the abortion, Russell would have faced a charge of murder. The inquest was held on 28 February before the Coroner, Richmond Beetham SM. Edward Scott, carpenter, said he had noticed his daughter was ill on 9 February and called in Dr Hacon, who wanted to remove her to the hospital, but the patient refused. Dr Hacon then called in Dr C. Morton Anderson and Dr H. C. De Renzi. They diagnosed acute peritonitis and general septicaemia.

Her condition did not improve, and on 18 February she made a statement to Magistrate H. W. Bishop to the effect that she had gone to see Dr Russell on 4 February, with the 10 guineas provided by her boyfriend. She had never before been to Russell, but knew of him as 'a dark man [who] lived in Manchester Street, over the bridge.' Russell performed an operation on her on 5 February, and a few days later she was 'taken ill and had a miscarriage.' Her mother knew nothing about all this. On the following Sunday she became very ill and feared she might die.

The post mortem examination of Kate Scott was performed by Dr Symes, with five other doctors observing. Her body was 'exceedingly emaciated' and he found an abscess in her pelvis near the right fallopian tube. There were signs that she had suffered a recent miscarriage, and some indications of meningitis. Dr Symes and the other doctors present agreed that she had died from septic peritonitis.

The Coroner reminded the jury that if they believed the woman's statement they could conclude that Russell had procured a miscarriage, which had produced peritonitis, and this had produced death. On the other hand Dr Symes had found evidence of other conditions that may have contributed

to her death. After a short retirement the jury returned the verdict that 'Death resulted from septic peritonitis.'

Russell was off the hook for a murder charge, or so it seemed. But he still faced trial for conducting an abortion, and he must have expected a conviction, for on 5 March the *Lyttelton Times* announced a sale of 'High Class Furniture and Effects' from 'One of the Most Perfectly-appointed Houses in Christchurch.' The list of items to be sold on 7 March is quite exhaustive, and gives an insight into Russell's lifestyle.

The drawing room had a nearly-new velvet pile carpet, and might as well have been called the music room, for it contained a full-compass cottage piano in walnut by Milner & Thompson, a 16-stop walnut American pedal organ by Cornish, a guitar by Keith & Prowse, piano stool, organ stool, a couch and five easy chairs upholstered in velvet and brocade. Besides two tables the room had 18 oil paintings and engravings, 13 velvet bracketed mirrors, 'a beautiful collection of vases and ornaments', and a quantity of music, including nine bound volumes.

The dining room had an extension dining table, a bordered Wilton pile carpet, dining chairs, 12 framed paintings, an ormolu clock, book shelves, a couch covered in red plush, dinner and tea services and an assortment of silver and crystal.

The waiting room also had a plush-covered couch, various chairs and mats, engravings and Venetian blinds. The consulting room had a pedestal washstand with drawers, a pedestal writing table with drawers, a writing slope, a high-backed chair covered in Utrecht plush, an easy chair and the usual array of fender and irons, gas stove and paper basket. The walls were adorned with yet more mirrors and engravings, a carriage clock and a bookcase containing 50 volumes of books medical and historical.

The five bedrooms all had brass-mounted iron bedsteads, with washstands and rimu toilet tables, easy chairs, Kidderminster carpets, wardrobes, Venetian blinds, mirrors, gaslights and globes, together with the usual mattresses and bedding. The bathroom had linoleum on the floor and a large bracket mirror. The store-room had 14 covered store cans. The lower hall contained a hat stand, hall table, a gong, engravings, vases, flower stands and a Wertheim sewing machine. In addition to the kitchen and

scullery and all the usual kitchen utensils, the list concluded with a 'complete set of surgical instruments.'

Outside in the stables were the famous Scott Brothers hooded gig and a grey Arab Roadster by Gordon, with sets of harnesses, saddles and bridles, saddle cloths and brushes. The fowlhouse contained 18 Brahma fowls, the doghouse contained one dog named 'Vic', and the garden tools included a nearly new garden roller, lawn mower, wheelbarrow, Indiarubber hose and reel, flower pots and a 'very choice' assortment of pot plants.

Russell had also put up for auction the leasehold on the property, which included the house, stable and coach-house, and a conservatory. He certainly lived in some style, though some readers may have thought the quantity of mirrors and plush couches more appropriate for a bordello.

The inquest verdict appears to have given Russell some hope, however, for the advertised sale never took place. Instead he appeared in the Magistrate's Court on 8 March to face the charge of performing an illegal operation on Kate Scott. Walter Stringer was the Crown Prosecutor, and Thomas Joynt again appeared for Russell. Stringer had to admit at the outset that the girl had been an accomplice, as she had gone to see Russell with the money for an abortion.<sup>39</sup>

Dr De Renzi then repeated the evidence he had given at the inquest, and added that he was not present when she made her statement to Magistrate Bishop. He thought she was quite rational then, but was only semi-conscious in the last few days before she died. Joynt questioned De Renzi closely about the probable date of the onset of septicaemia, and what he observed of the post mortem. Magistrate Bishop then told the court about the deposition he had taken from Kate Scott, and that he had had Russell brought to her bedroom to be identified by her. After reading the deposition back to her, Russell had said, 'Will you ask her whether she saw the instrument?' She had already stated that she did not see it. The girl was perfectly rational throughout this interview, and Russell had been cautioned about the gravity of the charges he might be facing as a result.

Dr Symes then repeated his evidence from the post mortem examination, and was closely questioned by Joynt as to the timing of the onset of symptoms of septicaemia, and whether the adhesions observed between the brain and skull would affect the patient's intelligence. Dr Symes

thought it would take two to three weeks for the septicaemia to develop far enough to cause adhesions. Dr P. C. Fenwick was also questioned about the post mortem, and he said quite firmly that from what he saw of the brain the deceased was capable of making a rational statement on 18 February.

When the prosecution closed its case Joynt said he did not wish to say anything more at that stage as it was up to the Magistrate to decide whether or not to send the case for trial in the Supreme Court. But he pointed out that it was the invariable practice of judges to warn juries not to convict on the unsupported testimony of an accomplice. He thought the Crown case a weak one, and asked for bail. This was granted in £500 for the accused and four sureties of £125 each.

This first charge did not proceed to the Supreme Court: Joynt had put his finger on the key weakness of the Crown case. Russell put a notice in the *Press* on 12 March 1898 that he had resumed his medical practice at Tristram House, 204 Manchester Street, near St Luke's Church.<sup>40</sup>

Russell now faced a second charge of performing an illegal operation on 6 December 1897 on a different woman. He appeared before the Magistrate's Court on 22 March to face this second charge. However, the prosecution's star witness, the woman in question, repeatedly stated in the course of a long examination that Russell had never made use of any instrument, nor had he done anything wrong to her whatever. Walter Stringer was as surprised and frustrated by this testimony as the police, who had persuaded the woman to testify. Stringer said she had made and signed a very different statement, under which the police had been quite justified in taking proceedings against Russell, but he could not proceed in the face of her denial. The case collapsed and Russell was discharged.<sup>41</sup>

Russell had been extraordinarily lucky to escape both these charges, but the second case demonstrates the difficulty police faced in bringing charges against abortionists when the woman concerned was not willing to testify against the practitioner. They usually faced a wall of silence from the families and friends concerned.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### IN SEARCH OF RESPECTABILITY

Russell appears to have decided to cash in on his renewed notoriety. He announced another series of health lectures for the winter of 1898, some to be illustrated by limelight pictures. The first was on 'The Skin: its Functions and Diseases'<sup>42</sup> followed by others on the Blood, the Heart and Lungs, and Digestion. The last was reserved for males over 12: 'The Boy, the Brother, the Man, the Husband, the Father.'<sup>43</sup> Such a title, with such a restriction, was sure to guarantee a large audience.

Russell kept out of the public eye during 1899, apart from offering a special prize for tomatoes at the Canterbury Horticultural Society's Show in March.<sup>44</sup> Our only clue that he was practising as a doctor, albeit unregistered, as well as an abortionist, comes from November 1899. He had been treating a domestic servant, one Kate Johnson, for bronchitis, and had prescribed accordingly, but on his second visit found that her pulse was reduced, so he ordered her to be taken to the hospital. There Dr Fox found her bronchial tubes healthy, but she complained of headaches, and unexpectedly died. A post mortem found inflammation of the membranes inside her skull. The inquest recorded a verdict of death from natural causes. Dr Fox remarked that he agreed with Russell's treatment of the girl's bronchitis.<sup>45</sup>

The outbreak of the second Boer War in South Africa in 1899 saw a wave of patriotic fervour sweep New Zealand, and Christchurch was no exception. A contingent of Canterbury 'Rough Riders' cavalry, mostly recruited from the Yeomanry Cavalry of the Canterbury Volunteers, was trained at the Addington Racecourse. The public responded generously to appeals for 'comforts' for these troopers, and the name of Dr C. J. Russell appears in a long list of donors of gifts of books, etc. in February 1900.<sup>46</sup> He also donated 5 guineas to the Canterbury Agricultural and pastoral Association in June for prizes to be applied at their discretion.<sup>47</sup>

In February 1901 Russell reported four cases of scarlatina to the St Albans Borough Council's local board of health. They all came from the same

family, and Russell stated that he thought the house concerned in Edgeware Road was 'unfit for human habitation.' At the same meeting Dr F. G. M. Brittin reported a case of typhoid from a house in Weston Road, Papanui.<sup>48</sup> From an episode such as this Russell could claim to be a public-spirited general practitioner like all the other doctors, with a concern for public health.

His public-spiritedness also extended to local government reform. At a meeting of the City and Suburban Burgesses' Association in April 1901 he read out parts of the plan he had sent to the Christchurch City Council six years earlier, and observed that several of his ideas were now being carried out. But the main idea, which he then moved, was 'That Greater Christchurch is a necessity that should be favourably considered as soon as possible.'<sup>49</sup> Here Russell was riding a rising wave of public sentiment for amalgamation of the city with its adjacent boroughs. Back in the 1880s the then Medical Officer of Health, Dr Courtney Nedwill, had often criticised the fact that the health district boundaries did not coincide with those of the growing suburban boroughs, which made it impossible to collect reliable health statistics. The appearance of occasional typhoid cases, such as that reported by Dr Brittin, showed that health inspections were not being carried out as often as they should. Russell returned to this theme in December 1901 at a thinly-attended meeting of the Burgesses' Association, at which he again urged the formation of 'Greater Christchurch.'<sup>50</sup>

It is frustrating for the historian that we know so little about Russell's family life. Mention was made at the time of his 1887 trial that his wife and daughter were living in England. In May 1901, however, they appear to have returned to New Zealand on the RMS *Gothic*, which arrived in Wellington.<sup>51</sup> Perhaps he had reassured them that he had mended his ways and was no longer at risk of prosecution.

Early in 1902 Russell was involved in a fatal accident on Papanui Road. He was a passenger in a motor car being driven by one Henry James Shaw when a trap with a man and two women came towards them very fast. The trap turned suddenly into Webb Street to avoid the car, but one wheel rode up over the kerb, and the trap overturned. The driver of the trap was injured, and Russell called for an ambulance at once. [This would have been the St John Ambulance Association's horse-drawn ambulance waggon, stationed at Rink Stables in Victoria Square.] At the hospital the man Shaw was

attended by Dr Nedwill, but he was only partly conscious and was coughing blood. He died that night, and a post mortem found that he had broken ribs and head injuries. The inquest jury gave a verdict of accidental death, with no blame attachable to anyone.<sup>52</sup>

In March 1902 Russell sent a donation to the Colonial Fund in recognition of New Zealand's support for the Empire in the South African War, and asked the *Times* to print his accompanying letter. As a 'man of colour' himself, Russell noted that the British constitution made no distinction by race or skin colour. This meant that Britain could call on any and every subject to defend the Empire. He suggested that in South Africa, if the Imperial Government had called on 50,000 natives at the outset, the war would have been over in six months, saving thousands of lives and millions of pounds. Russell thought that New Zealand was taking the right course, to protect the lands of the Maori and to include them in every branch of learning and education, so that in future they would become 'not only suitable citizens of a progressive colony, but men able to bear arms and uphold and defend the honour and integrity of the Empire.'<sup>53</sup>

Russell made no mention of the New Zealand government's confiscation of Maori land, or the massive transfer of land ownership from Maori to Pakeha, which had left many Maori communities impoverished. In fact, as the First World War was to reveal, some Maori resisted conscription as they could see no reason to lay down their lives for a remote and rapacious imperial government. This letter also suggests that Russell had experienced racial discrimination and wished that he would be accepted as a British citizen without regard for his colour. However, respectable people in Christchurch would snub him not only for his colour but because of his notoriety as a convicted abortionist.

Russell now jumped onto another bandwagon in Edwardian Christchurch. This was the proposal for a ship canal from the Estuary to the city centre, to relieve congestion on the railway to the port of Lyttelton. The Drainage Board had dug a storm-water channel alongside the lower part of Linwood Avenue, which resembled a Dutch canal, and some people had the idea that this could be extended with a system of locks to enable ships to bring their cargo into the central city. Russell was clearly a vocal supporter of this scheme, for he was invited to chair a public meeting in July 1902 that was reported as 'The Canal Conference.'<sup>54</sup> He was not the only one: a number

of prominent citizens liked the idea, including the MP and future mayor Dr Henry Thacker. But nothing came of it. The Estuary was too shallow and the city's topography far too flat.

When the Canterbury volume of the *Cyclopedia of New Zealand* was published by Horace Weeks Ltd in 1903, the other Christchurch medical men would have been incensed to see not only that Russell had been included in the medical section, but that his photograph appeared, as bold as brass, looking handsome and confident.<sup>55</sup> No other doctor had his photograph in this massive trade directory and biographical dictionary, as that would seem like advertising. (The dentists had no such qualms, especially those with American qualifications.) Russell was still excluded from the New Zealand Medical Register.

Russell would have been gratified to see the amalgamation of Christchurch with the neighbouring boroughs of Sydenham, Linwood and St Albans in April 1903 to form Greater Christchurch, with a combined population of 57,000. He now gave his energy to the Burgesses' Association, which was campaigning for a loan to convert the tramway system to electricity.<sup>56</sup> He was duly elected president of the Burgesses' Association early in 1904, and at a meeting in July he presented a pamphlet outlining its aims and achievements, some of which he had promoted in previous years. He had campaigned for a District Health Officer, and the inspection of dairies. He now promoted infant health, and the regulation and inspection of private hospitals and nursing homes.<sup>57</sup> While these were all worthy causes, Russell's past history made his promotion of infant health somewhat hypocritical.

Another cause he took up was that of cremation. In June 1905 he issued a notice asking anyone interested in forming a Cremation Society in Christchurch to contact him at his home.<sup>58</sup> In the following month he gave another public lecture, this time on 'Marriage: is it a failure?' With one penny admission he is unlikely to have made a lot of money from this, though his wife might have been interested to hear his views on the topic.<sup>59</sup> An advertisement in October 1905 for a production of *The Gondoliers* reveals that Russell was now the secretary of the Christchurch Amateur Operatic Society.<sup>60</sup> In November 1905 Russell moved a vote of thanks to C. M. Gray after his election speech as candidate for Independent Labour in Christchurch North.<sup>61</sup> Gray was also elected Mayor of Christchurch.

At the start of 1906 Russell announced his interest in the issue of seating in schools. He advocated one seat per child, at the proper height and with a proper back to support the spine. Most New Zealand primary schools at this time had shared benches without backs. Russell noted that separate seats would prevent the migration of vermin from one child to another: head lice were a constant problem in this period. He contrasted the New Zealand situation with that in the US, where schools were much more like English public schools with separate desks and chairs for each pupil.<sup>62</sup>

During 1906 Russell was reminded rather forcibly that he remained *persona non grata* to the medical profession in Christchurch. As Mayor Gray explained at a meeting of the city council, he had been asked to chair a meeting of citizens to discuss the Shops and Offices Act of 1904, in particular the ventilation of workrooms, lavatories and seating accommodation for female workers, among other matters. He had accepted the invitation, and copies of the motions were received. On 27 April he had received a letter from one of the organisers, Miss Ettie Rout, to say that she had heard that Russell intended to address the meeting and ask why the Burgesses' Association had not been invited. She went on: 'This will be absolutely fatal to the meeting, for all the medical men who are to speak refuse point-blank to appear on the same platform as Dr Russell, or even to attend the meeting if he is allowed to speak.' The meeting had been advertised as a public meeting, and anyone could attend. But she asked the Mayor to ensure that the chairman confined the speeches to those who had been invited to speak, and not to allow Dr Russell or any other member of the audience to speak from the floor, otherwise they would not get through the arranged programme. She invited Gray to send a copy of her letter to Russell to ensure that he knew the rules.

Russell's reaction was to assert his right to attend and to speak at a meeting of citizens called to discuss important public matters. Miss Rout responded to Gray by warning him that if Russell was allowed to speak 'every medical man in the room will simply walk straight out of the meeting, and you may rest assured that they will be followed by a large section of the audience. The medical men simply will not be associated, either publicly or privately, with Dr Russell. No-one has denied Dr Russell's right to be present at the meeting, but his being permitted to speak means that the meeting will break up in disorder.' Miss Rout hoped that a strong chairman would

prevent 'this disaster' and enable the meeting to pass off in an amicable and business-like manner.<sup>63</sup>

The Mayor could not guarantee that he would prevent Russell from speaking, so the organisers asked the well-known prohibitionist and former Member of Parliament T. E. 'Tommy' Taylor to chair the meeting instead. Russell now wrote to Taylor and accused the medical men of attempting to suppress free speech and fair criticism, a constitutional right of every man. He described their reaction as 'monstrous', and declared that he had no desire to meet any class of men who would deny somebody the right of free speech.

In view of all these difficulties the meeting was postponed, and the medical men decided to hold a private meeting later on, to consider the reports already in hand. Russell was undoubtedly still a notorious and controversial figure in Christchurch, but he had his supporters, as several letters to the newspapers demonstrate.

W. J. Alpin wrote on 5 May calling for a petition to reinstate Russell as a qualified and legal medical practitioner. Another writer, 'Jure Humano', was sorry to see Miss Rout, a lady with 'phenomenal intellectual gifts and generosity', take up the cudgels on behalf of the medical profession, as it was already 'the most powerful and privileged of trade unions.'<sup>64</sup> The Burgesses' Association also supported its former president and most colourful member, passing a vote of thanks to Russell for his 'consistent liberality and public spirit.' They trusted that the government would soon reinstate him and allow the public 'the benefit of his professional experience.'<sup>65</sup>

Russell's next bid to win public approval was linked to the Waltham swimming pool, a community project that was struggling to find funds to complete the project. In May 1906 it was announced that he would give a lecture in aid of the fund 'in the BATH'. His topic would be 'Adolescence, or Health, and How to Secure it.' Another attraction was the lighting: 'Through the kindness of the Gas Company the Bath will be brilliantly illuminated.'<sup>66</sup> Unfortunately bad weather prevented the speech in the bath, and the gas illumination: the lecture was given in the school hall instead.<sup>67</sup>

Possibly thanks to his previous advocacy of single seating for school pupils, Russell was nominated for election to the Canterbury Education Board in 1906, and came within five votes of winning a seat.<sup>68</sup> His public lectures now reflected the range of his interests. In July 1906 he lectured on 'Consumption' in the Theatre Royal, at a meeting chaired by the Mayor, C. M. Gray. The collection money was devoted to Nurse Maude's Consumption Camp.<sup>69</sup> In August he addressed the St Albans Burgesses' Association on 'Individual Responsibility in Relation to Healthy Municipal Progress.'<sup>70</sup> In September he gave a lecture in the Alexandra Hall on 'City Development and Municipal Management.'<sup>71</sup> Unfortunately for the historian, none of these was reported in detail in the newspapers.

Russell appears to have suffered a serious illness at the start of 1907 and feared that his life might be nearing its end. When he recovered, he sent a long and remarkable letter of thanks to the *Lyttelton Times*, which is so revealing of the man that it is worth quoting in full:

#### GRATITUDE

To all whom it may please to concern, more especially that section of the community throughout New Zealand who have so liberally honoured me with their patronage, is the following expression of heartfelt gratitude and thanks extended. Not being able to reach the persons intended by circular must be my apology for this form of communication.

It is now twenty-seven years since my home was first made in Christchurch. Since that date a large section of the generous, liberty-loving community has never failed to honour me with its command, and most kindly introduced or recommended me to others.

This kind and sympathetic manifestation of pure humanitarianism has enabled me to provide a home for my family, take a humble part in the maintenance of a number of these institutions (the outcome of man's inhumanity to man and our perverted ideas of social

evolution) so imperatively necessary in the present unsatisfactory condition of society.

This faithful consideration on the part of my patients and many friends has also enabled me to take a position (as a rate and tax payer) in the municipal and political business of the city and colony, and in which every member of the colony should be interested.

For the reasons above stated, and the fact that my future life hangs by a tender cord, made more uncertain by the heavy weight of years behind, it is my heartfelt desire to express my burning sense of gratitude and to thank:

(1) My patients for their very kind and generous consideration for so many years.

(2) Those persons who have been friendly towards me, and those who have proved their friendship by their numerous acts of kindness.

(3) To those ladies and gentlemen who have had the courage of their opinions, and have not been afraid to express them in the public Press, on the platform, by signing petitions, offering their services and assistance, and by other means, done all in their power to secure for me those advantages, the birthright of the poorest and most humble of every community.

(4) To those Societies and Associations who have honoured me with positions of office, and distinction, and by so doing have done much to assist me and stimulate me to do all in my power for the benefit of the public whom it is my delight to serve.

(5) My thanks are due to the Press for the liberal way it has honoured me, and the kind manner in which my speeches, letters, remarks and suggestions have been treated. No doubt, when my days are numbered, the Press will have the last word; whatever that word may be will not trouble my remains; but it would trouble my last moments, and my death (to my mind, at least) would not be that of a Christian did the curtain fall before the perfecting of this act of heartfelt gratitude on this the 77<sup>th</sup> anniversary of my advent

into this life; a life that has been devoted (with all its mistakes) to the improvement of the condition of my fellow creatures, and yet:

Not understood. How many hearts are aching  
For lack of sympathy! Ah! Day by day  
How many cheerless hearts are breaking!  
How many noble spirits pass away. Not understood.  
Oh, God! That men would see a little clearer,  
Or judge less harshly where they cannot see;  
Oh, God! That men would draw a little nearer  
To one another – they'd be nearer Thee  
And be Understood.

CHARLES JAMES RUSSELL M.D. Tristram House, 204, Manchester Street, Christchurch, 25<sup>th</sup> February 1907.<sup>72</sup>

Russell's quotation from the Irish goldfields poet Thomas Bracken (1843-1898), part of which appears on Bracken's gravestone in Dunedin, would have appealed to many newspaper readers. It is one of New Zealand's most famous poems, and spoke for a generation of settlers whose hopes and dreams had failed to see fulfilment. Apart from the rather flowery style, Russell's letter clearly implies that he hoped to die a Christian. How he reconciled this with his activities as an abortionist must remain one of the secrets he took with him to his fiery end.

Early in 1907 he donated a pile of magazines and periodicals to the Tramway staff reading room, and in his accompanying letter to the Tramway Board urged that body to improve conditions for its employees. In particular he suggested the board attend to the men's health by warning them against excessive alcohol and tobacco consumption.<sup>73</sup>

April 1907 was a busy month for Russell. In the first week he assisted a Mrs Williamson to judge the baby show at the Lancaster Park Sports organised by Corrigan's Military Band.<sup>74</sup> Once again, the irony of this public posturing would not have been lost on those who knew about his past.

In the second week of April he was involved in another road accident. He was a passenger in a four-wheel cab (known as a 'Growler') returning from the International Exhibition in Hagley Park when the driver tried to beat a tram at the Kilmore Street corner. The cab clipped the end of the tram and was overturned, the horses dragging it a further 30 feet (10m). Russell was sharing the cab with the Reverend H. E. Taylor and his wife, and a Miss Wells. Russell was the only one injured, with a dislocated finger and a knock on the head, yet he gave assistance to the ladies, who were badly shaken.<sup>75</sup>

A few days later Russell inserted a notice of thanks in the *Press*, expressing his gratitude to those who assisted at his late accident, and all those who had sent messages of sympathy to Tristram House for himself and his guest 'in their moments of imminent danger.'<sup>76</sup>

At the end of that month Russell attended his first meeting of the Court of Directors of the Royal Humane Society, which had its New Zealand headquarters in Christchurch. The other directors were Colonel Slater from the Volunteers, the Reverend W. S. Bean, Superintendent E. Smith and J. A. Frostick. Russell had at last found a seat among respectable members of the Christchurch elite. They considered a long list of names associated with rescues, mostly from drowning, for recognition with the society's medals.<sup>77</sup>

Russell's advocacy of better conditions for Tramway employees extended to providing their annual dinner at the Federal Hotel in June 1907. The other speakers were C. M. Gray, H. G. Ell and the Reverend Guy. Russell said that some might say his hosting of this dinner was self-advertisement, but it had no mercenary element at all and was in keeping with a system he had practised in England over forty years before. 'In the Old Country' he had started a similar annual gathering of like-minded employees to meet, face to face, with their families, to 'bring Capital and Labour a little closer.' His original group was still meeting, though its members were now over sixty years of age.<sup>78</sup>

A week later Russell was on the platform at a meeting to discuss the poll for a high-pressure water supply for central Christchurch.<sup>79</sup> In July he was one of a large committee led by John Barr, the chairman of the Tramway Board, in support of the New Zealand Workers' Political Association.<sup>80</sup> He gave more health lectures during August 1907, and one of them, at the Salvation Army hall in Victoria Square, was to be 'preceded by special vocal and musical items, as sung by the Doctor fifty years ago.'<sup>81</sup>

Russell was now a vice-president of the East Christchurch Cricket Club, and chaired its annual meeting in September 1907.<sup>82</sup> Later that month he donated £26 to the YMCA building fund, one of the larger donations from individual citizens. Several companies donated £50 apiece.<sup>83</sup> As president of the City and Suburban Burgesses' Association Russell was appointed a delegate to the meeting called by the Women's Institute in February 1908 to discuss proposals for better supervision and treatment of destitute children placed in the control of the state.<sup>84</sup>

Russell's advocacy of single desks in primary schools was not endorsed by the meeting of householders of the East Christchurch School District in April 1908, but he was elected to the school committee, as a householder in the district. John Jamieson was re-elected chairman for the sixth year in a row. Also on the committee was Dr Inglis, who does not appear to have objected to sitting on the same committee with a notorious abortionist.<sup>85</sup> This was the start of a period in which Russell became a vocal advocate of educational reform. He had already spoken about the need for single desks in schools at a meeting of householders proposing a new school in Phillipstown.<sup>86</sup>

In addition to the East Christchurch Cricket Club, Russell now became patron of the Waltham Amateur Swimming Club and president of the Elite Brass Band.<sup>87</sup> He also presided at a meeting of the Canterbury United Horticultural Society in June 1908.<sup>88</sup>

The Ship Canal idea was still alive in Christchurch, and Russell was elected to a committee alongside the new mayor, Charles Allison, 'Tommy' Taylor the prohibitionist, and John Jamieson, chairman of the East Christchurch School, in September 1908.<sup>89</sup> This committee organised a mass meeting at which Russell spoke as president of the Burgesses' Association, and later moved that copies of the resolutions be sent to the Lyttelton Harbour Board.<sup>90</sup>

Russell's commitment to the temperance movement remained firm, and he appeared at a Children's Demonstration in November 1908, afterwards speaking at His Majesty's Theatre for the Salvation Army's No-Licence Campaign. Among other things he noted that the British public wasted £166 million pounds annually on alcoholic drink.<sup>91</sup> Also in November he was elected patron of the newly-formed Waltham Ladies' Swimming Club, which enrolled 40 members.<sup>92</sup> At the end of the year he spoke at a meeting of the School Committees' Association, and moved that a vote of thanks be sent to the Government and Minister of Education for their recent 'progressive' steps in primary education.<sup>93</sup>

Early in 1909 Russell was again reported at a council meeting of the Royal Humane Society, and at a meeting of ratepayers' associations. In March he spoke at a meeting of the Society for the Protection of Women and Children, reminding those present that men were not always the only ones to blame for domestic strife: there were 'delinquent wives as well as delinquent husbands', and also runaway mothers. But on the whole he commended the society's work.<sup>94</sup>

One of the great public issues of 1909 was the promise by Prime Minister Sir Joseph Ward that New Zealand would pay for a Dreadnought battleship for the Royal Navy. This extravagant gesture outraged many on the left of New Zealand politics, who believed the money would have been better spent resolving urgent social issues. A large crowd gathered in the King Edward Barracks in Christchurch in April 1909 to protest against this gift, but the meeting collapsed in disorder while Russell was giving his speech when a young man pulled down a flag from one side of the platform. He said later that he wanted to lead a procession, but many people saw his action as disrespect for the flag. The crowd was noisy and rowdy, and T. E. Taylor as chairman failed to control the meeting, finally walking off the stage before the Anglican and Catholic bishops could give their speeches.<sup>95</sup>

Russell was busy throughout 1909, speaking at sports clubs, the Burgesses' Association, protesting at the A & P Association against the docking of horses' tails, and giving yet another series of health lectures. But the item which probably caught the public's attention most was his request to the city council in June that his body be cremated in the city's rubbish destructor. He advocated cremation as 'the most reasonable, speedy, sound and satisfactory method for the disposing of the dead and for resolving

decayed matter into its original elements.’ He had provided in his will for the payment of all costs involved, and asked the council to arrange all details for the disposal of his body in the Destructor in Armagh Street. One councillor pointed out that there was a crematorium in Wellington, at the Karori Cemetery, but another councillor moved that Russell’s letter be referred to the Reserves Committee with power to act. Cr Horsley asked, ‘Does that mean we have the power to cremate the doctor?’ and Cr Horsley said, ‘Oh, yes.’ T. E. Taylor seconded the resolution and it was carried.<sup>96</sup>

Among his health lectures during 1909 Russell repeated a previous one entitled ‘Woman: her Place and Power’ and the *Times* gave a full summary. Russell had hired the hall at his own expense, and the collection was dedicated to the Society for the Protection of Women and Children. His talk began by suggesting that if national greatness were to be maintained, women needed greater equality with men so that her talents and abilities were fully realised. A woman’s anatomy showed that she was designed for ‘special functions of a highly sensitive and important nature’, namely reproduction of the race. Russell added that ‘Her physiological conditions also made her the most unique and wonderful creature in the world. Still, woman was a riddle unsolved, and even Moses, with all his wisdom, could not grasp the whole question of woman’s rights.’ Thanks to the march of civilisation, woman was more nearly man’s equal than she had ever been, but her position was not yet what it should be. She lacked the mental and bodily fitness to make her a full wife, mother and citizen. The forces working against women were all identified as stemming from the selfishness of men, especially their love of drink and gambling. As women became more enlightened, Russell argued, they needed to assert themselves and claim their right to a more simple, healthy and happy home life.<sup>97</sup>

Russell was capable of making more practical suggestions than these airy platitudes. Invited to speak at a meeting in support of a new borough at Papanui, he stressed the need for better drainage and water supply in the district, as the present water quality was ‘far from good.’ He also repeated points from a previous lecture about the need for improved house construction, with fireplaces in each bedroom and proper ventilation.<sup>98</sup> At a meeting of the Royal Humane Society he drew attention to the state of disrepair of the New Brighton Pier. On a recent walk he had noticed gaps in the wire netting large enough for a small child to slip through to the

water below. He also noticed the absence of ropes and lifebuoys, and was told that these had been stolen by larrikins.<sup>99</sup>

Despite all of these public-spirited activities, Russell was still viewed with deep disapproval by a large section of Christchurch's inhabitants. This came to the boil in April 1910 at the annual meeting of the East Christchurch School Committee. When Russell was nominated, the chairman T. W. Rowe MA said he could not receive it. Russell protested that he was eligible as a householder of the district, and was supported by several others present. Rowe said that if he was aggrieved he could appeal to the Education Board, but Russell's nominator, one Mr Badger, moved that the meeting should be adjourned in protest at the chairman's decision. A householder who seconded this motion referred to the 'contemptible action' of those who continued to oppose and stigmatise Russell for his past actions. When the motion was put, there were 'great shouts', both for and against. The chairman declared that the noes had it and the meeting should proceed. He warned that even if it were adjourned, his ruling would be the same at another meeting. The election proceeded without Russell.<sup>100</sup>

This episode prompted a letter in Russell's defence from 'Householder' to the *Lyttelton Times*: 'It seems to me that to hound a man down for a mere accident of his career is the very essence of shabby meanness.' The writer pointed out that Russell had been on the East Christchurch School's committee for the past two years and nobody had questioned his eligibility. Why had the chairman not previously expressed his 'virtuous indignation'?

Dr Russell has been one of the most generous and hardworking educational enthusiasts in the matter of school administration that the city has ever seen. He has put his hand in his pocket both privately and openly time after time when the happiness and welfare of the children have been concerned . . . In other departments of our civic life he has kept a stiff upper lip; and, under circumstances that would have crushed many a weaker man, has held his way with dignity and unflinching nerve . . . His record during his term of office has been irreproachable, and he has done more for the children of the East Christchurch School in two years than any other committeeman has done in the same period.

The writer pointed out that Russell had done much to promote the school Fair and to make it a success, but wondered if his call for a special finance

committee to supervise the sources of school supplies was his undoing. Though there was little likelihood of the chairman changing his ruling, Russell could 'rest assured that he had a strong and grateful following among householders whose children attend the school.'<sup>101</sup>

In fact it was Rowe who failed to be re-elected as chairman of the East Christchurch School committee, and the new chairman, W. Aiken, agreed with at least one of Russell's educational reforms, moving that the Education Board should be asked to place single desks in the new classroom to be added to the Phillipstown School.<sup>102</sup> Also in June the School Committees Association thanked Russell for providing a room for their meetings at no charge.<sup>103</sup> This room was in the Manchester Chambers, another building on Manchester Street leased by Russell.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### FADING HEALTH AND REPUTATION, 1910-15

Russell's health lectures in 1910 included a new one, 'Health and Primary Schools'. An added attraction was the promise of 'moving pictures' on a range of interesting topics. Russell described himself as 'late member of the East Christchurch School Committee and a candidate for a seat on the Board of Education for North Canterbury.'<sup>104</sup> In this lecture he reiterated his usual arguments for single seating, and added criticism that many schools in the district lacked proper sanitary conveniences for the pupils. He was also well ahead of his time in recommending that teachers should be trained to take charge of children with differing abilities and 'receptive faculties.'<sup>105</sup> The collection from this combined lecture and moving picture evening were given by Russell to the Mayor's Coal and Blanket Fund.

Russell was duly elected to the North Canterbury Education Board in August 1910, and appointed a member of its Building committee.<sup>106</sup> True to his promise, at its September meeting he moved that 'the subject of sanitary arrangements at Board schools be considered by the Building committee.' He also spoke at length about the need for a female inspector of schools, as so many of the teachers were women. Apparently he read long extracts from his public lecture on the evolution of women, and tried the patience of some members, who asked what this had to do with the motion. However, the chairman allowed him to finish, and his motion was carried.<sup>107</sup>

New Zealand gained Dominion status within the British Empire in 1910, and Russell spoke as a member of the Education Board at a ceremony to mark this event at the Normal School near Cranmer Square in September. It was a hot day, and the children had to stand for nearly an hour listening to other speeches, so Russell cut his short, and spoke briefly about the need for individual effort, self-control and self-sacrifice in all subjects of the Empire.<sup>108</sup> At a meeting of the Education Board in October to consider opposition from Woolston School to the proposal to make Phillipstown a main school, Russell said he thought smaller schools were better for both teachers and children.<sup>109</sup> Acting as a Board member, Russell opened a

miniature rifle range at Waltham School that same month, firing the first shot.<sup>110</sup>

In November 1910 Russell was one of two spokesmen chosen by householders of the Manchester Bridge and Kilmore Street area to present a petition from 41 residents to the city council, protesting at the dust nuisance. Though these streets carried large volumes of traffic, the council rarely watered them. They felt neglected in the matter of dust control. Their petition was referred to the Works committee, with the comment that the watering carts were already being used to their utmost capacity.<sup>111</sup>

Russell was now president of the Linwood Brass Band, and presented medals at gathering of members in mid-November.<sup>112</sup> In December he was present at a meeting of the Court of Directors of the Royal Humane Society, where he moved that all claims for bravery awards had to come to the Christchurch headquarters.<sup>113</sup> At the end of the month, besides attending a meeting of the Education Board, he was present at the prize-giving ceremony of the Addington School.<sup>114</sup>

A new interest in 1911 was the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. He joined in a discussion about the problem of stray dogs at a meeting in February, where he also suggested a new circular to advertise the society's activities, with photographs of neglected and ill-treated animals. This motion was carried unanimously, but his suggestion of a membership badge, to give members 'some degree of authority' when intervening in cases of cruelty, was voted down.<sup>115</sup>

Russell had a good year in 1911. He was now lecturing in favour of the Bible in Schools movement<sup>116</sup> and campaigned for more school swimming baths in order to teach children how to swim, so that there would be fewer deaths from drowning.<sup>117</sup> He was now a vice-president of the South Island Bands Association, and donated a prize for the Band of Hope contests.<sup>118</sup> At a large public meeting to decide on a Coronation Memorial at the start of the reign of George V, he supported the proposal for a consumptives' hospital, but objected to the inclusion of the word 'incurable' in its title, as he knew of some cases that had recovered. He was supported in this by the MP Dr Henry Thacker, but the original name was retained when the proposal was approved by 36 votes to 6.<sup>119</sup>

He was active in the amalgamation of the various Burgesses' associations to form a new Citizens' Association, and endorsed their support for Mayor Taylor's proposal to borrow £100,000 for street improvements, especially tar-sealing. Russell said he used the roads a great deal and it was obvious that there was room for improvement, especially as the advent of the motor car heralded a great change in the character of city traffic. He thought the Mayor's proposal was something that ought to have been done years ago. But conservatives on the city council were determined to oppose a plan coming from a radical and popular mayor such as 'Tommy' Taylor.<sup>120</sup>

In fact Taylor was already very ill, and died from a perforated gastric ulcer on 27 July. His funeral was one of the largest ever seen in Christchurch, with an estimated 50,000 people lining the route to Sydenham Cemetery. Russell paid tribute to him at the next meeting of the Education Board, describing Taylor as a man of 'high character and devotion to duty.'<sup>121</sup>

By contrast, 1912 was a dreadful year for Russell. It started badly in January with an inquest on the death of Mrs Christine Caroline Elstob after a miscarriage. Russell was named as the medical man she had attended the day before her death. Her usual doctor was Dr Frederick Borrie, who had been treating her for heart trouble for the previous 18 months. Joseph Henry Elstob, husband of the deceased, told the court that they had been married for 12 years and had four children [he later said five]. On 4 December last his wife had said that she was determined not to have another child, and he had objected to this, suggesting that she see Dr Borrie. She mentioned Dr Russell, and admitted having seen him the day before. He had given her some medicine to cause a miscarriage and had charged her three guineas. However, the medicine had no effect.

Mr Elstob went away on 22 January to work on Banks Peninsula harvesting Cocksfoot seed. Mrs Elstob immediately went back to see Dr Russell. On the day before her death she did a lot of laundry and finished mangling at 9.30 pm. About midnight she complained to their lodger Harry Bates, a furniture salesman, that she was in great pain. He gave her a drink of water. She called out again at 3 am, and she sent him to fetch Dr Borrie, who gave her a sedative. She told him that she had suffered a miscarriage. Dr Borrie returned at 8.30 am and saw symptoms of heart failure. She was still conscious, but died at 10.15 am.

The post mortem examination found that she had died from heart failure, but there was also clear evidence of a criminal abortion. Magistrate H. W. Bishop returned an open verdict that she died of septicaemia caused by an illegal operation.<sup>122</sup>

Russell carried on with his usual activities, attending meetings of the Education Board, school committees, householders' meetings and even giving gramophone recitals for the St Paul's Church Band of Hope.<sup>123</sup> But in September he was arrested and charged with using an instrument unlawfully to procure a miscarriage. The woman concerned was Margery Hilda Murray, aged 18. The police asked for the court to be cleared and an order prohibiting publication of the evidence. Russell had nothing to say, apart from pleading 'Not Guilty.' The Magistrate sent the case for trial in the Supreme Court and set bail at £400 with a surety of £400. Russell pointed out that 'last time' it was only £200, but the Magistrate ignored this comment and repeated that it would be £400 this time.<sup>124</sup>

Russell's case came before Mr Justice Denniston in the Christchurch Supreme Court in February 1913. Walter Stringer KC was the Crown Prosecutor. He said the facts were short and simple. The girl Margery Hilda Murray would give evidence that she had been intimate with one Stanley Robinson in Timaru and Dunedin and became pregnant. At his request she came to Christchurch to see Dr Russell, who performed an operation on her. Robinson had paid Russell 10 guineas. The girl went to see her parents in Invercargill, but the expected miscarriage did not occur, so she returned to Christchurch and again saw Russell. She took another young woman with her, but as this girl was technically an accomplice the Crown would not rely on her evidence. The corroboration came from Robinson's brother Harry, who would testify that he had accompanied Stanley to Russell's house and heard the conversation between them 'as to the girl being in trouble.' Russell had said words to the effect that he would operate on her for £10. Stanley Robinson had since left the country and could not be found.<sup>125</sup>

Margery Hilda Murray testified that Russell had taken an instrument from a cupboard and with it operated on her. A child had later been delivered prematurely. When arrested, Russell had said, 'Well, well, so is the way of the world.' Harry Robinson testified that Russell had told them he did not

use instruments, but could cure the physical irregularity that had caused her to suspect pregnancy.

Russell's lawyer, S. G. Raymond, reminded the jury that the intention of procuring an abortion had to be established, and also the use of an instrument, and for this the jury had only the girl's evidence, which could not be relied upon as she was an accomplice to the felony. He maintained that the facts all bore 'a perfectly innocent interpretation.' The detectives had searched Russell's home, but found only the ordinary instruments used by all doctors. If he had intended an illegal operation, knowing the risk of complications, he would have kept her nearby under his observation, but he had said she was free to travel to see her parents in Invercargill.

Mr Justice Denniston reminded the jury that if they had any reasonable doubt they could not convict. The prosecution had to establish the full criminality of the accused. The jury retired, and after only half an hour returned a verdict of 'Not Guilty.' Russell was discharged.

Having once again escaped conviction, Russell resumed his usual round of meetings, but perhaps significantly never again gave a public lecture. He was one of the officials at the Woolston Swimming Club's contests in March<sup>126</sup> and spoke in support of Henry Holland's re-election as Mayor in April.<sup>127</sup> In July he seconded a motion at the Education Board to congratulate C. A. C. Hardy on his elevation to the Legislative Council.<sup>128</sup> Also in July he was part of an amusing exchange in the Magistrate's Court, when an elderly man came up on a charge of drunkenness. Russell rose from the obscurity of the public benches to say that the man, aged 82, was one of his patients who had just had all of his teeth extracted, and had had a glass of spirits to dull the pain. The Magistrate asked, 'Was he drunk?' Russell replied, 'Well, he may have been intoxicated according to the first rules of intoxication.' The Magistrate asked, 'What rules?' Russell replied that a man may get drunk from just one drink. Magistrate Bishop rather tersely disagreed, and said that a man is drunk when he visibly shows the effects of liquor, and since Russell did not see the accused at the time he could not speak on that point. The old chap pleaded guilty, and Bishop convicted and discharged him as a first offender.<sup>129</sup>

Russell's last contribution at the Education Board in August 1913 was to urge the Board to object to the proposed Architects' Bill as the Board already had its own architect and it would add greatly to costs if the board also had to pay fees to the Architects' Institute.<sup>130</sup>

Russell was now an elderly man himself, aged 80, and in declining health. He was mentioned in the newspapers only a few times during 1914. In February at the Christchurch Musical Society he said that only performing members should be able to vote at the annual meeting.<sup>131</sup> At a meeting to discuss the site for a proposed new town hall Russell favoured the site occupied by the Limes private hospital on Cambridge Terrace, overlooking Victoria Square.<sup>132</sup> His last meeting with the Royal Humane Society was in July 1914, and in August he spoke at a tree-planting ceremony in Beckenham Park.<sup>133</sup>

Charles James Russell died at his home, Tristram House, on the morning of 15 April 1915. He was in his 85<sup>th</sup> year. An obituary in the *Star* said that he had caught a chill about six weeks previously and had been confined to bed ever since. He had rallied sufficiently the night before to discuss with a caller the proposed Education Act, which he feared would not benefit the children. The obituary gave his qualifications, as registered, and noted that in addition to his large general practice he had taken a great interest in education, and had been closely identified with the work of the School Committees Association and the Education Board:

There were few branches of public life in which he did not interest himself. He was a prominent worker in the Liberal [political] cause, he took a lively interest in municipal affairs, principally in connection with the Burgesses' Association, he was a patron of horticulture, he was closely associated with the Poultry Club, and was a frequent exhibitor at shows, he was a patron of swimming clubs, and he was a strong supporter of the Canterbury Band of Hope Union, going so far as to provide a free hall for the children in the Manchester Chambers which he owned.<sup>134</sup>

The obituary noted that these were only a few of the semi-public matters with which Russell was connected. It noted his health lectures, and said

that his benefactions were many, including poorer patients, so that 'their recovery might not be retarded with worry.'

Russell's wife and daughter were said to be living in England. He had asked the city council to cremate his body in the Destructor, but the council had declined this request and his remains were sent to the Karori Cemetery's crematorium in Wellington.

There was no obituary in the *Press* and only a brief notice in the *Lyttelton Times*, even though the latter had long been a Liberal paper. However, quite a few other tributes appeared in the following weeks. The Canterbury Band of Hope Union noted his 'valuable service' and his work among young people 'in the cause of total abstinence.'<sup>135</sup> At a meeting of the St Albans School committee E. H. Andrews said that Russell had been 'a man of more than average ability' and had shown enthusiasm in promoting educational interests. Mrs Stewart endorsed this tribute, and regretted that the newspapers had taken so little notice of a man who had for many years rendered valuable service to local institutions.<sup>136</sup> The United Burgesses' Association passed a vote of sympathy for Russell's family, describing him as 'a consistent worker in the cause of municipal politics.' The North Canterbury School Committees Association likewise passed a vote of condolence, and stated that Russell 'had taken a keen interest in educational matters.'<sup>137</sup> The Hope of Christchurch Lodge of the Good Templars prescribed three months of mourning for Russell by its members.<sup>138</sup> At the Education Board the chairman mentioned Russell's death and remarked that 'Members did not always agree with Dr Russell, but he set an example to all by his unvarying kindness and courtesy.'<sup>139</sup>

The absence of a probate record suggests that Russell died without leaving a will. His furniture and chattels were finally sold in June 1915, after an application by one L. W. Balkind to take possession of them in settlement of a debt.<sup>140</sup> There was so much furniture filling their rooms that the auctioneers apologised to its customers for the absence of the usual auctions in the days preceding the sale.<sup>141</sup> As well as the famous Scott Brothers carriage, Russell's stable had also contained 'a motor brougham'.<sup>142</sup> The owner of Tristram House advertised apartments to let in November 1915, so his house had reverted to its previous use as a boarding house.<sup>143</sup>



## CONCLUSION

What are we to make of the notorious Dr Russell, at this distance in time, in 2020? New Zealand society has changed enormously after two world wars and various economic recessions and financial crises, yet the country's core values have remained largely in accord with the Christian-based beliefs of the early British settlers. Church attendance has shrunk dramatically from the levels of a century ago and New Zealand is now a largely secular society. Homosexual law reform has enabled formerly persecuted minorities to emerge from the closet, and Gay parades are now an accepted part of New Zealand life, as are same-sex marriages. The Catholic Church still forbids contraception as well as abortion, along with the more conservative Protestant and Evangelical churches.

But the law on these matters has changed. Abortion law reform has established the principle that it is a woman's right to choose whether to carry an unwanted pregnancy to term. Termination is now easily available, with medical advice and hospital care.

That was not the case in Russell's day. Not only did the churches condemn abortion, but the law made it a felony punishable by life imprisonment. Yet women constantly faced the risk of an unwanted pregnancy, as men in those days considered sex to be part of their conjugal rights, and rarely practised contraception. Unmarried women faced the additional social stigma of having a baby out of wedlock. The major churches had their own arrangements for unmarried mothers, and the babies were nearly always put out for adoption.

Russell once said that he did not know if what he did was right or wrong, but he knew he was providing an essential service for desperate women. They in turn probably viewed his services as being much safer, coming from a trained medical man rather than some amateur back-street abortionist. Russell knew that what he did was illegal, and once said he expected to get ten years in prison if he was convicted. Yet he still did it, even after serving five years in the Wellington Gaol.

Why did he persist? He once denied any mercenary motive, yet it has to be admitted that it was a highly lucrative practice, as well as a risky one. He was clearly well-known in Christchurch as an abortionist, and may have

had a reputation as a safe practitioner, which must have been enormously annoying for the authorities who had the duty to suppress and punish such activities. He relied on the code of silence among the women, which made it extremely difficult for the police to bring successful prosecutions.

In the rest of his life he demonstrated an interest in public health, education and children's welfare. He was also clearly a generous man, and eager to help others. He was an enthusiastic supporter of good causes, and never lacked courage in promoting his ideas against disbelievers. His abortion practice needs to be seen in the context of a life of community service and active participation in civic life.

We must also remember that as a 'man of colour' he constantly had to contend with the deep-seated yet also well-concealed racism inherent in late Victorian British society. Jews suffered the same sort of discrimination from those influenced by the historical undercurrent of anti-Semitism in European culture fostered by the Catholic Church. As far as we know there were very few Black Americans in late nineteenth century Christchurch. Even Maori were almost invisible in the Garden City until after the Second World War. There were a few Chinese market gardeners or shopkeepers, and some individuals from the Indian subcontinent – Sir John Cracroft Wilson had brought Indian servants with him to staff his Cashmere estate – but the city as a whole was overwhelmingly white and British.

Russell must have felt from the outset that he was an outsider, never likely to be fully accepted by his medical colleagues, let alone the social elite of the city. When made aware of the demand for terminations, he may have thought, why not? Worth the risk, and well worth the money. He seems to have done very well from his medical practice, both the legitimate and illegal sides of it, and to have been a popular GP. When his eligibility for a school committee was questioned, his supporters were vocal at the meeting and willing to write letters to the papers in his support.

While most of his medical brethren refused to be seen with him there were a few who sat on committees with him, as did pillars of respectable society. He was clearly popular with the temperance movement, where his commitment appears to have been genuine, and with sports clubs and brass bands, whose members were mostly working class. Many such people probably felt able to forgive him his past crimes in the light of his evident

generosity and humanity. None of us is perfect, and most of us are bundles of unresolved contradictions at the best of times, so who are we to judge?

There will be some readers of Russell's tale who condemn him as a baby-murderer and killer of the women who died after one of his procedures. Fundamentalist Christians cannot see abortion as anything other than murder. There are powerful movements, especially in the USA, that would like to see the repeal of the current liberal abortion laws, and they are entitled to their opinions, based on their interpretation of the Bible. But not everyone today takes that dogmatic and judgemental approach. In our more secular age, now accustomed to abortion law reform and same-sex marriages, there are likely to be more readers who sympathise with Russell, as a man ahead of his time, and with the women he tried to help.



## ENDNOTES

---

- <sup>1</sup> *Globe*, 8 July 1880, p.2.
- <sup>2</sup> *Ashburton Herald*, 13 March 1880, p.2.
- <sup>3</sup> Rex Wright-St Clair, *Historia Nunc Vivat: Medical Practitioners in New Zealand, 1840 to 1930* (2003), p.332. Russell had in fact graduated from Syracuse as No.324 on the Alumni List: see *Alumni Record and General Catalogue of Syracuse University, 1872-99* (Syracuse NY, 1899), p. 304. Last known address: 'London, England.'
- <sup>4</sup> *NZ Gazette*, 23 January 1885, p.143.
- <sup>5</sup> *Lyttelton Times* (hereafter *LT*), 5 October 1880, p.4.
- <sup>6</sup> *Star*, 6 November 1880, p.3.
- <sup>7</sup> *Star*, 21 December 1880, p.2.
- <sup>8</sup> Cotter Medical History Museum, Christchurch: Minutes of the Canterbury Medical Society, 19 May 1881.
- <sup>9</sup> *Star*, 16 September 1881, p.4.
- <sup>10</sup> Cotter Medical History Museum, Christchurch: Minutes of the Canterbury Medical Society, 26 January 1882.
- <sup>11</sup> Robin Cooke QC, *Portrait of a Profession: the Centennial Book of the New Zealand Law Society* (Wellington, Reed, 1969), p. 271.
- <sup>12</sup> *Press*, 16 December 1882, p.2.
- <sup>13</sup> *Press*, 18 March 1885, p.3.
- <sup>14</sup> *LT*, 14 July 1885, p.5.
- <sup>15</sup> *Press*, 13 & 14 January 1887, both p.3; *LT*, 15 January 1887, p.5, 17 January 1887, p.4, 26 January 1887, p.4 Supplement, 14 & 15 April 1887, both p.3.
- <sup>16</sup> *Press*, 26 April 1887, p.2.
- <sup>17</sup> *NZ Police Gazette*, 1892.
- <sup>18</sup> *Press*, 14 September 1892, p.4.
- <sup>19</sup> *LT*, 11 October 1892, p.4.
- <sup>20</sup> *LT*, 3 December 1892, p.6.
- <sup>21</sup> *LT*, 25 January 1887, p.1.
- <sup>22</sup> *LT*, 8 February 1893, p.1.
- <sup>23</sup> *Press*, 20 May 1893, p.9.
- <sup>24</sup> *LT*, 3 November 1868, p.3.
- <sup>25</sup> *LT*, 14 February 1894, p.4.
- <sup>26</sup> *LT*, 4 September 1894, p.3.
- <sup>27</sup> *Press*, 12 January 1895, p.6.
- <sup>28</sup> *NZ Times*, 1 April 1895, p.2.
- <sup>29</sup> *LT*, 4 April 1895, p.6.
- <sup>30</sup> *LT*, 19 March 1897, p.3.
- <sup>31</sup> *LT*, 23 March 1897, p.6.
- <sup>32</sup> *LT*, 31 March 1897, p.6.
- <sup>33</sup> *LT*, 4 June 1897, p.3.
- <sup>34</sup> *LT*, 25 June 1897, p.5.
- <sup>35</sup> *LT*, 14 July 1897, p.5.
- <sup>36</sup> *LT*, 19 July, 30 August, 20 October 1897, all p.5.
- <sup>37</sup> *Press*, 4 December 1897, p.1.
- <sup>38</sup> *Press*, 19 February 1898, p.9.
- <sup>39</sup> *Press*, 9 March 1898, p.3.
- <sup>40</sup> *Press*, 12 March 1898, p.1.

- 
- <sup>41</sup> *Press*, 23 March 1898, p.6.  
<sup>42</sup> *LT*, 23 July 1898, p.12.  
<sup>43</sup> *Press*, 5 September 1898, p.1.  
<sup>44</sup> *Press*, 4 March 1899, p.9.  
<sup>45</sup> *Press*, 17 November 1899, p.5.  
<sup>46</sup> *Press*, 17 February 1900, p.8.  
<sup>47</sup> *LT*, 14 June 1900, p.3.  
<sup>48</sup> *LT*, 5 February 1901, p.4.  
<sup>49</sup> *Press*, 20 April 1901, p.8.  
<sup>50</sup> *LT*, 21 December 1901, p.3.  
<sup>51</sup> *LT*, 18 May 1901, p.7.  
<sup>52</sup> *LT*, 24 January 1902, p.6.  
<sup>53</sup> *LT*, 9 April 1902, p.3.  
<sup>54</sup> *Press*, 23 July 1902, p.10.  
<sup>55</sup> *Cyclopedia of New Zealand*, volume 3, Canterbury Provincial District (Christchurch, Weeks, 1903), p. 250.  
<sup>56</sup> *LT*, 25 February 1903, p.4.  
<sup>57</sup> *LT*, 2 July 1904, p.4.  
<sup>58</sup> *Press*, 21 June 1905, p.10.  
<sup>59</sup> *LT*, 29 July 1905, p.1.  
<sup>60</sup> *LT*, 30 October 1905, p.1.  
<sup>61</sup> *Press*, 3 November 1905, p.6.  
<sup>62</sup> *LT*, 25 January 1906, p.6.  
<sup>63</sup> *LT*, 1 May 1906, p.6.  
<sup>64</sup> *LT*, 5 May 1906, p.8.  
<sup>65</sup> *LT*, 15 May 1906, p.6.  
<sup>66</sup> *LT*, 5 May 1906, p.3.  
<sup>67</sup> *Press*, 17 May 1906, p.1.  
<sup>68</sup> *LT*, 8 August 1906, p.7.  
<sup>69</sup> *Press*, 28 July 1906, p.10.  
<sup>70</sup> *LT*, 31 August 1906, p.1.  
<sup>71</sup> *LT*, 10 September 1906, p.7.  
<sup>72</sup> *LT*, 25 February 1907, p.9.  
<sup>73</sup> *LT*, 26 February 1907, p.8.  
<sup>74</sup> *LT*, 8 April 1907, p.6.  
<sup>75</sup> *LT*, 13 April 1907, p.11.  
<sup>76</sup> *Press*, 15 April 1907, p.11.  
<sup>77</sup> *LT*, 27 April 1907, p.10.  
<sup>78</sup> *LT*, 17 June 1907, p.7.  
<sup>79</sup> *LT*, 26 June 1907, p.7.  
<sup>80</sup> *Press*, 9 July 1907, p.2.  
<sup>81</sup> *LT*, 21 August 1907, p.1.  
<sup>82</sup> *LT*, 17 September 1907, p.9.  
<sup>83</sup> *LT*, 21 September 1907, p.9.  
<sup>84</sup> *LT*, 15 February 1908, p.8.  
<sup>85</sup> *Press*, 28 April 1908, p.8.  
<sup>86</sup> *LT*, 4 April 1908, p.7.  
<sup>87</sup> *LT*, 4 May 1908, p.6; 12 October 1908, p.10.  
<sup>88</sup> *LT*, 27 June 1908, p.8.  
<sup>89</sup> *Press*, 19 September 1908, p.10.

- 
- <sup>90</sup> *Press*, 1 October 1908, p.7.  
<sup>91</sup> *LT*, 16 November 1908, p.12.  
<sup>92</sup> *LT*, 25 November 1908, p.7.  
<sup>93</sup> *LT*, 15 December 1908, p.8.  
<sup>94</sup> *LT*, 30 March 1909, p.6.  
<sup>95</sup> *LT*, 16 April 1909, p.8.  
<sup>96</sup> *Press*, 29 June 1909, p.9.  
<sup>97</sup> *LT*, 20 September 1909, p.5.  
<sup>98</sup> *LT*, 29 October 1909, p.2.  
<sup>99</sup> *Press*, 27 November 1909, p.9.  
<sup>100</sup> *Press*, 26 April 1910, p.8.  
<sup>101</sup> *LT*, 29 April 1910, p.8.  
<sup>102</sup> *LT*, 13 June 1910, p.8.  
<sup>103</sup> *Star*, 24 June 1910, p.1.  
<sup>104</sup> *LT*, 15 July 1910, p.11.  
<sup>105</sup> *LT*, 18 July 1910, p.3.  
<sup>106</sup> *Star*, 11 August 1910, p.3.  
<sup>107</sup> *Press*, 22 September 1910, p.4.  
<sup>108</sup> *LT*, 27 September 1910, p.7.  
<sup>109</sup> *LT*, 14 October 1910, p.4.  
<sup>110</sup> *LT*, 21 October 1910, p.6.  
<sup>111</sup> *Star*, 15 November 1910, p.1.  
<sup>112</sup> *LT*, 18 November 1910, p.6.  
<sup>113</sup> *Press*, 20 December 1910, p.8.  
<sup>114</sup> *LT*, 22 December 1910, p.8.  
<sup>115</sup> *LT*, 8 February 1911, p.11.  
<sup>116</sup> *Star*, 17 May 1911, p.3.  
<sup>117</sup> *Star*, 13 October 1911, p.4., and 1 November 1911, p.2.  
<sup>118</sup> *Star*, 8 September 1911, p.1.  
<sup>119</sup> *LT*, 14 June 1911, p.10.  
<sup>120</sup> *LT*, 28 June 1911, p.10.  
<sup>121</sup> *Star*, 9 August 1911, p.3.  
<sup>122</sup> *Star*, 31 January 1912, p.3; *Press*, 1 February 1912, p.2.  
<sup>123</sup> *LT*, 9 August 1912, p.1.  
<sup>124</sup> *Star*, 5 September 1912, p.3; *Press*, 17 September 1912, p.5.  
<sup>125</sup> *LT*, 12 February 1913, p.7.  
<sup>126</sup> *Star*, 3 March 1913, p.3.  
<sup>127</sup> *Star*, 24 April 1913, p.4.  
<sup>128</sup> *LT*, 3 July 1913, p.4.  
<sup>129</sup> *Star*, 12 July 1913, p.8.  
<sup>130</sup> *Star*, 7 August 1913, p.2.  
<sup>131</sup> *Star*, 13 February 1913, p.8.  
<sup>132</sup> *LT*, 19 February 1914, p.8.  
<sup>133</sup> *Press*, 11 July 1914, p.15; *Star*, 17 August 1914, p.3.  
<sup>134</sup> *Star*, 15 April 1915, p.6.  
<sup>135</sup> *LT*, 20 April 1915, p.3.  
<sup>136</sup> *Press*, 22 April 1915, p.6.  
<sup>137</sup> *LT*, 29 April 1915, pp. 3 & 6.  
<sup>138</sup> *LT*, 6 May 1915, p.8.  
<sup>139</sup> *LT*, 6 May 1915, p.3.

---

<sup>140</sup> *LT*, 1 May 1915, p.3.

<sup>141</sup> *LT*, 25 May 1915, p.12.

<sup>142</sup> *LT*, 4 June 1915, p.12.

<sup>143</sup> *Star*, 20 November 1915, p.13.