

be taken *cum grano salis*, for this reason—that, in the first place, what I was firing at was against a bank, and therefore there was very considerable resistance. A human being running away probably would not be anything like the same resistance. Then, also, I must state that the sheep's skin—I do not mean to say the outside skin, but the inner flesh, after being exposed to the air, is, of course, considerably harder or less penetrable than a human being's skin.

12. Have you anything further to add?—No.

13. You have seen the pieces of paper which the doctor says came from the wound in Hawkings?—Yes, Sir. [Pieces of paper produced.]

13a. Supposing the paper to have been lodged by a gun-shot in such a wound, would you not in an ordinary case expect that paper to come out without being at least singed?—No, I cannot altogether say that, because in some of our experiments it was singed, and in others it was blackened, and in others it was comparatively clean.

14. Supposing the texture of the clothing that was found in the wound was reduced to pulp, would you expect the paper to come out whole?—No.

15. Why do you say that?—I do not know why I say it. I am talking about what I really know nothing of; a human being alive is so different to an animal that is dead.

16. *The Chairman.*] I do not see how you could experiment on a live man?—No; but I do not want to say anything unless I am positively certain. I should say it would be more a medical question.

17. *Mr. Jellicoe.*] You in no way communicated to me either the nature or the result of your experiments?—Certainly not. I do not think we have spoken from that day to this about the experiment.

18. *The Chairman.*] Do I understand that in your experiments you extracted certain paper from the body of the sheep?—Yes.

19. Was the paper you extracted larger or smaller than the exhibits produced—the box of exhibits produced by Dr. Cahill?—About the same size.

[*Mr. Cooper*, Registrar of the Supreme Court, produced the pieces of coat that came from the wound.]

20. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen a horse-pistol with more than one barrel?—Yes, I have seen horse-pistols with two barrels; about No. 10 bore, I think.

21. *Mr. Gully.*] The shorter the barrel, the more the shot scatters?—Yes.

22. And therefore you said that a shot if fired at a distance would penetrate a body so close as the body of deceased?—Yes.

23. Is not that rather against the theory of a short-barrel weapon, which would necessarily scatter the shot?—No, I do not think that.

24. In other words, in order to cut a hole of the same circumference, would you not succeed better with a short-barrel weapon than you would with a long-barrel weapon?—Yes; I should say you would.

25. Then why should the closeness of the shot in this case lead you to distinctly assume that a short-barrel weapon was used; would not the result lead you to an opposite conclusion?—The best way I can describe it is this: in the No. 14 bore, in the powder, when in the breach, there are smaller interstices, and also it does not ignite so quickly as in the larger bore. Then, when it goes down the barrel, and when it escapes from the barrel, the flame is more confined and goes straight out. There is more flame, because it has less space to extend itself in the barrel. If we could only see the muzzle at the second when the charge leaves it, I believe you would see a big flame rush out of the small bore. In the large bore the powder expands itself more in the barrel, and there is not the same amount of flame when the projectile or shot leaves it.

26. You say the flame would project a greater distance from such a gun than from a horse-pistol?—Yes; that is why I say that you could get that result without burning the coat. You would have to go very close with that gun to make that small hole, and you must burn the cloth doing it. That is our experience.

27. You assume that a horse-pistol, if fired at a certain distance, would not singe the cloth?—Well, I should say, as far as I remember, talking it over with Captain Coleman at the time—he knows well the use of horse-pistols—we came to the conclusion that the distance would be about 3 yards, or 9ft.

28. Do you mean that if the distance were less than that the cloth would necessarily be singed with a horse-pistol?—Oh! I do not know that it would; but I am sure that it would with a gun of that calibre.

29. You are sure it would at no less distance than about 3 yards?—Yes.

30. Taking that as your theory, supposing that gun was fired 9ft. away from the body of a man who was running, and supposing the gun was loaded with greased shot, are you able to say, from your experiments, with any sort of certainty, that the clothing would have been singed?—No, I am not certainly able to say with any sort of certainty, because, as I explained to the Committee before, I think it would be totally different firing at a man running away.

31. And, so far as your evidence goes, it is quite possible that such a wound would have been caused 10ft. away by the firing of such a weapon as that?—I certainly could not say it would not.

32. It is well understood that the grease in the shot does make it carry with more effect?—No doubt it does; there is no doubt about that.

33. Would the closeness of the charge not also depend upon the way in which the charge was wadded—the quantity of wadding used?—In this case, as far as I know, there was no wadding whatever.

34. I am justified in using general terms when I speak of wadding—I am referring to the paper?—Yes, I should say it would depend on that too.

35. Apparently from your experience—it is your usual experience—that a charge of wadding in