

*The Chairman*: I spoke to Mr. Smith on the subject, and he had just seen Mr. Haselden, and he promised to make another search and see if Mr. Richardson's paper could be found.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: I should like to ask Mr. Richardson a question, in case they should not be forthcoming. Did you attach to the report you made any drawing of the knife?

*Mr. Richardson*: I am not positive, but I think I did. I know that I made a drawing of the knife, and took considerable care over it, and arrived at what I gauged to be the exact shape of the blade. I think the diagram was on the paper. There is one point I should not have mentioned but for the circumstance of some of the papers being missing. When Captain Russell went to the Federation Conference in Sydney he made inquiries of the Government there if they would lend us a first-class detective to take up this case. The head of the department said it was no use thinking of the matter until they knew something of the case. Some papers, including my memorandum I think, were sent to the detective department in Sydney, and after considering the papers the chief detective then came to the conclusion that the scent was too cold. The case had been left too long, and no good results could come of his coming over here. Thus I know that some papers were sent over to allow the detective department to form some idea of the case. No doubt Captain Russell could give some information.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: Did you form any idea as to the calling in business or life of the person who inflicted the wounds?

*Mr. Richardson*: That was the most curious thing of all. The man who used the knife must have had a practical knowledge of anatomy; because, although there were so many blows struck, they were not struck in the ordinary way. They were all directed towards the most vital parts.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: You think it was some person engaged in the slaughtering business?

*Mr. Richardson*: Yes, sometime in his life.

*Mr. Gully*: How many stab wounds were there?

*Mr. Richardson*: I do not know—something over twenty; but they were confined to three or four localities only. I think the stabs were given by someone in great excitement, but yet whose instincts caused him to go from one fatal spot to another. The pithing at the back of the neck was a proof of the knowledge of the murderer.

*Mr. Gully*: It would look as if it was a waste of skill, because there were about a dozen stabs, each of which were fatal.

*Mr. Richardson*: Some struck the arm and did not enter the body at all.

*Mr. Gully*: Do you think it probable that a man in a frenzy, as he probably was, could pick out correctly the fatal spots in each blow?

*Mr. Richardson*: I think it quite in keeping, Sir, for a man whose habits and training had taught him to do this instinctively.

*Mr. Gully*: You take it for granted that the assassin meant what he was doing?

*Mr. Richardson*: I think it is a strong point. No one unaccustomed to seeing animals killed would ever think of using a knife to penetrate the vertebra. There were no stabs in the back; they were all about the back of the neck, the side of the neck, and under the armpits. The broad surface of the body was untouched—the broad back and broad chest.

*Mr. Gully*: Such theories as these are rather unsafe, are they not?

*Mr. Richardson*: When we meet with extraordinary circumstances we have to consider how they happened, and the position of the wounds was extraordinary.

*Mr. Gully*: You consider it a safe theory to assume that the murderer was a butcher, by the position of the wounds on the body?

*Mr. Richardson*: I called attention to the fact, and told you the theory I formed.

*Mr. Earnshaw*: Not necessarily a butcher?

*Mr. Richardson*: No.

*Mr. Gully*: I understand you were able to draw a diagram of the knife from an examination of the wounds?—No; I never saw the body. From the clothes and from the doctor's evidence as to the length and breadth of the wounds.

*Mr. Kelly*: Then it is not founded on any observation, but Dr. Cahill's evidence?—Yes.

*Mr. Gully*: Was it founded merely upon the evidence of the width and the depth of the wound, and the observation of the cloth?—Yes; the cloth, of course, being the most important evidence in this respect, as it does not give and take to the same extent as the flesh.

*Mr. Gully*: How can a cut in the cloth show anything more than the width of the blade?

*Mr. Richardson*: But pardon me, some of the cuts were not half an inch wide.

*Mr. Gully*: At some given distance to which the knife penetrated—not from any spot from the hilt?—Where the blade could only have penetrated an inch or half an inch from the point.

*Mr. Gully*: It is a very unsatisfactory test, is it not?—I am speaking entirely from memory. I know that there was some very clear evidence given by Dr. Cahill.

*Mr. Kelly*: Do you still adhere to your former statement that the hole in the coat could have been caused by a charge of shot?—I have no doubt on the matter. Dr. Cahill, in his medical matters, I should bow to. When the coat came under the late Sir Harry Atkinson's notice, I said to him, "Look here, Atkinson, this is what they say is a bullet wound." He had seen bullet wounds caused in action many times, and he agreed with me that it was ridiculous to suppose that it was caused by a bullet.

*Mr. Gully*: The doctor asserts that a bullet wrapped up in paper would cause it?—He is equally wrong.

[Mr. Jellicoe read the reports of Mr. Tasker of the 12th June and of the 18th June, Mr. Tasker being present.]

JOHN TASKER, being sworn, deposed.

The report that has been read was written for the Crown Solicitor. It is in my handwriting. There is a clerical error in it—May 23rd, 1888, should be May 23rd, 1889. I had not finished the