You can search for more articles at http://leedsmercury.mirfield-2ndlook.info

THE MIRFIELD MURDERS.

COMMITTAL OF MC CABE AND REID.

Court-house, Dewsbury, Saturday, June 5.

This morning, at ten o'clock, the Magistrates assembled to continue the hearing of the evidence collected by the constabulary affecting the prisoners Mc Cabe and Patrick Reid, charged with being concerned in the murders of James Wraith, Mary Wraith, and Caroline Ellis.

The prisoners were brought over from Wakefield by Mr. Shepherd, the Governor of the House of Correction. Their appearance was very similar to what it was this day week. They wore the same dress, and their bearing in the dock was cool and collected, evincing a becoming interest in the proceedings. This was observable more in Mc Cabe than in Reid; indeed, as the evidence proceeded, it was manifest that he felt more concern than he cared to have noticed.

There were present on the bench Joshua Ingham, Esq., chairman; John Beswicke Greenwood, Esq., W. W. Wickham, Esq., John Hague Esq., and E. B. Wheatley, Esq.

The report that the constables had became possessed of information that would bring the crime closely home to at least one of the prisoners, caused considerable interest, and the Court-house was crowded by an anxious auditory.

It was rumoured that the possession of the instrument which was found in the well in Wraith's yard—the soldering iron, on which it will be remembered Mr. West found chemical proof of the presence of animal matter, *fibrin*, that portion of muscle or flesh, and of blood, which, after coagulation, resists solution in water; it was rumoured that the possession of this instrument, which has evidently been used in the perpetration of the murders, could be traced to the prisoner, Patrick Reid, only on the day before the murders were committed. As might be expected, the report that such an important link in the chain of evidence would be supplied, caused great excitement, and the development of the evidence on this point was watched with great attention. During the week there have been rumours of other arrests, but which are utterly unfounded. They received some degree of colour from the fact that constables Howarth and Green were seen in a hackney coach together with a "Navvy lookin' Irishman," driving from Huddersfield to Mirfield on Sunday last but the man was not in custody. It was believed that he could furnish information seriously implicating Mc Cabe in a murder committed in Ireland twelve or thirteen years ago, but we understand that the attempt has fallen to the ground.

At the examination this day, Mr. WATTS, solicitor, of Dewsbury, appeared for the prisoner Mc Cabe; and Mr. HALSALL, solicitor, of Middleton, near Manchester, for the prisoner Reid. Mr. WATTS had an interview with his client yesterday, at Wakefield House of Correction.

When the Magistrates had taken their places, the following evidence was adduced:—

Thomas Kilty.—I live at Dawgreen, and am a hawker in the spelching line. I know "this gentleman Reid," and have travelled with him many days. I live within twenty or thirty yards of the prisoner's residence. Have not seen the gentleman since this little occurrence, when he came into my house. Cannot say what day this was, as I am no scholar but I have a wife, who, when you have done with me, can tell you all about it. Had a little conversation with him.—Reid saying, "My father has sent me for the row," meaning an instrument like this—holding up the soldering iron found in the well) An iron like this was laid in the corner of our house, and Reid took it up and went away with it. Have had the soldering iron Reid took away with him several times, and the last time it remained with me 6 or 7 days. I had to use one in my trade. The iron I had belonged to Patrick Reid the elder: know the soldering iron I had. The one now produced is the one I had and the one Patrick Reid had away with him. I know it because of a particular mark on one side of it, (pointing to one or the corner portion); it cannot be used on that side, but on this side, in which there is a hole, it can be used.

Mr. Green, superintendent of constabulary, explained to the Bench, in answer to questions put, that the witness had minutely described the instrument before it had been exhibited to him. He had described its general appearance, and pointed out the particular marks upon it.

Witness continued—It is the iron. I can say no more. On the Monday after the day of the murder I sent for the iron to Reid's, but did not get it.

Catherine Kilty wife of the last witness, being a Roman Catholic, was required to bless herself before she took the oath A Testament, with a cross upon it, not being in court, some delay was occasioned by a messenger being dispatched to fetch one: when sworn, she deposed—I live at Dawgreen, within a short distance of the prisoner, Patrick Reid: I saw Reid the last time before now, the day after the murder was done, and I saw him the night before it was done when he came to our house for the iron. When he came, he said, "have you the iron." I said "Yes, it's there in the corner" I said "are you preparing for the row?" He said "No, my father wants it for something" He then took it away with him. I have seen the iron often at my husband's house. Having so seen it, I shall be able to tell it again.—(Looking at the soldering iron found in the well)—This is the one; it is the same; I have often had it in my hand. It is the same Patrick Reid had away from our house the day before the murder was committed. I have been at Patrick Reid's two or three days after the murder at Mirfield, to borrow the soldering iron; saw Pat. Reid, the elder, the prisoner's mother, his brother, and his wife. Did not get the iron on that occasion.

(The "row" this witness alluded to, when she asked the younger Reid "if he was preparing" for it, was an anticipated fight between the English and Irish residents at Dawgreen.)

By Mr. HALSALL.—First told of this about a week after, when I heard that the soldering iron had been found in the well. I told it to the wife of John Hirst. The moment I heard of the soldering iron being found, I told what I knew of it. Was not here last Saturday. Saw the soldering iron one day this week, and at once identified it as being the same. I have volunteered to give evidence on the present occasion. Nobody ever asked me to give evidence. Have not seen my husband this week. Have not seen the prisoner since the day of the murder. Cannot swear hard against Patrick Reid for fear he should escape. Cannot swear hard against him; for though I have lived in Dawgreen some four or five months, I know nothing bad of him, and can swear to nothing but that he took that iron out of our house. The man I set down head by my husband; we are married. We were married at Penistone church, and have lived together ever since. Have never lived in Wakefield, or my husband either, since I knew him. This is the first time I ever took an oath in my life.

Richard Green, superintendent of constabulary at Dewsbury, produced the soldering iron which he had received on the 20th May, from John Leadbeatter and John Howarth, constables. It has since been in the possession of Mr. Wm. West, of Leeds. Gave it to Mr. West the same day, the 20th. Got it back from him about a week ago. This is the same instrument. I showed this soldering iron to Thomas Kilty yesterday morning; but before I did so he gave me a very minute description of it. That description was a correct one.

Thomas Kilty, recalled: being a Roman Catholic, he was again sworn in the manner considered binding by those of his church, and his former deposition was read over to him. His examination was continued—Am able to identify the soldering iron because of marks and holes in it. One side of it cannot be used till it be subdued by a file. I have made complaints of this before to one Frank Brannan, to whom I have shown the holes; and he will be able to speak to it: he lives next door to the Reid's. I gave a description of this iron before I saw it. It is no use talking—the fact is, that if this was among *ten thousand* I could pick it out. I never saw one like it. I know it by the handle also, which is *burnt*.

By Mr. HALSALL: This is the only soldering iron I ever borrowed from Patrick Reid's father: will undertake to swear there is not another soldering iron altogether like this in Dewsbury. Tinmen use these sort of irons; they cannot do their work without them. Never saw one like this before. Tinkers use such as these, but this is ill-used and bad treated. I never saw one of the exact shape of this. I volunteered to give evidence, for my wife having heard something respecting this matter, I spoke to John Hirst, my landlord, and to him I gave a full description of the soldering iron. Have been in Wakefield House of Correction fourteen days for desertion. Have told my wife that I have been in Wakefield. Will not say from what regiment I deserted. Took an oath when I was attested. Never said that I would swear my best against this man, and am very sorry to have to do it now. Never said to any one that I cared nothing about an oath, for I had taken one and broken it. Have not received any money for coming forward; have not had any promise made to me and never expected anything.

Joel Sheard.—Am 14 years old. Live at "the City" in Mirfield with my father. Remember the day of the murders at Mirfield. Knows Patrick Reid; saw him on the day of the murder at our house between eleven and twelve o'clock. He had then a grey coat on, and a cap like a striped shirt, only the stripes were bigger. I spoke to him and said "Your cap is nearly like mine, Patrick." He said "yes lad." Our house is about six or 500 yards from Mr. Wraith's. The cap now shown me is like the one Patrick had on: and this other one is mine. Did not observe any holes in Reid's cap.

Richard Green recalled. I produce a man's cap which I received on Tuesday last from Joseph Cowgill. I gave the cap on Tuesday evening to Mr. West: received it back from Mr. West on Wednesday morning. This is the same cap: it has been in my possession ever since.

Henry Clark: Live at Mirfield: am servant to Mr. Ingham (the Magistrate), and live at the new Porter's Lodge. Remember the day of the murder: saw Patrick Reid on that day: know him now and have done so for some time: it would be a quarter minutes past two in the afternoon: I know the time, because I heard my own clock strike about five minutes before I went in to dinner. I was at dinner when Reid came: I noticed that that he had on a green coat and a black hat. The lodge where I live is about half a mile from Wraith's house: a person could walk the distance easily in ten minutes.

Jonathan Ashton gave evidence as to the finding of the soldering iron and the key of the kitchen door in the well, similar to what he gave at the adjourned coroner's inquest. Both were found at the bottom when the water was pumped out.

Joseph Cowgill, constable: Live at Dewsbury know the prisoner Reid. Saw him on the day of the murder, about three o'clock in the afternoon. When I was coming from the Crow nest towards Dewsbury, I met the prisoner coming out of the yard where his father lives. He was *going* up the Lawgreen towards the Crow-nest. He had on then a dark-green cord, fustian trousers, and a light-coloured waistcoat; will not swear as to whether he had on a hat or not. To the best of my belief he had—but am not sure. On Tuesday morning last, I found the cap now produced at the house of the prisoner's father. By instructions of Mr. Green I went with John Martin to search the house, and I saw Martin take the cap up from off a box which stood on a chest in the house. He gave it to me, and the same morning I gave it to Mr. Green.

By Mr. HALSALL.—Have known Reid some time. Noticed his dress only in a common way. Had no reason to suspect him of the murder, when I first saw him. He had on the same dress when we apprehended him. Know the time I saw Reid on that day, from the circumstance of having to be at the Crow Nest at three o'clock, for that was the time the people were to see to drive the Irish from Dawgreen. The place where I saw Reid would be about three miles from the house of the Wraith's.

William Sheard, of Robert Town, gave similar evidence to what he did at the adjourned inquest, with the addition of these particulars:—Saw Mc Cabe in custody at the Shoulder of Mutton Inn. When I was about leaving for home, Mc Cabe rapped at the window-frame, and called, "Bill, come here." I went in to see what he wanted, and he desired me to sell the pints and gauge to the mistress (Chadwick) and I answered that I would not have anything to do with it. He then repeated three times—striking his hands on the table at the time—"I see where I have missed it—I see where I have missed it—I see where I have missed it." I asked him where he had missed it? He said, "If I had given an alarm, the man would have been taken: now the man's gone, and I'm here." This conversation, and these exclamations, Liversedge, the constable, heard as well as me.

Examined by Mr. WATTS.—Went direct home to Flint's, after I had seen the Wraiths lying dead, and there saw first Mary Schofield. She began first to talk about the murder. She told me that Mc Cabe was upstairs, and then told me that Mc Cabe had said he had been at the house. Then when he (Mc Cabe) came down stairs, I asked him about it, and he told me the story I have related. It was not till after I had said, "I do not like to go to inform Mr. Ingham," that Mc Cabe said, "Dont go, Bill." He also said that, as he was going to the Shoulder of Mutton Inn, he could declare it himself. Half-an-hour was a reasonable time for Mc Cabe to get to Robert Town, to the place where Leadbeatter met him. When Mc Cabe said, "I see where I've missed it," Leadbeatter, the constable, heard it; at least I believe so. I did not hear Mc Cabe ask Leadbeatter to take him down to Mr. Ingham there and then. Nor did I hear him express, whilst there present, a desire to go to the magistrates. I left Mc Cabe at the Shoulder of Mutton, with Leadbeatter.

The Magistrates here retired, but before they had left the bench,

Mr. WATTS, addressing Mr. Greenwood, asked if the case was concluded, for he had a few questions to put to Mr. Green, which he should like to put before it was closed.

Mr. GREENWOOD could not say whether it was closed or not. Mr. Ingham had desired them to go out for a few minutes to consult together, but as what points he did not know. The fact was that about the getting up of the case he knew nothing. He had not seen Mr. Green except in court nor had he seen any one else. He was there to form his judgment by the evidence as it was given in the court, and there he endeavoured to get at the truth.

On the return of the Magistrates, Mr. Watts desired to put a question or two to Mr. Green on the evidence he gave last week.

Mr. INGHAM: No, not now Mr Green will have to be called again, and then you can examine him.

Mr. WATTS: It will do then.

Mr. INGHAM, addressing the prisoners, then said—"Patrick Reid and Michael Mc Cabe, you are remanded until this day fortnight; but I may as well intimate to you that you may consider yourselves committed to take your trials on this charge. The remand is only to give time for the connecting links of the evidence to be supplied. It is well to inform you of this, that you may be prepared to act accordingly."

The prisoners were then removed in custody; Mc Cabe seemingly not much disconcerted, Reid much more so. Indeed, it was evident that the testimony adduced to-day had produced a deep impression.

An attempt was made by the Irish, on Daw Green, after the close of the inquiry, to get Thomas Kilty away, which they would have accomplished but for the vigilance of Mr. Green. They had given the man liquor, which had produced intoxication, and what their ulterior object might have been it is impossible to say; both himself and his wife are now under the protection of the police.

THIRD ADJOURNED INQUEST.

Verdict of WILFUL MURDER AGAINST BOTH M'CABE & REID.

MIRFIELD, *June* 10, 1847.

This day the coroner and the jury engaged in the inquiry into the cause of the death of James Wraith, Ann Wraith, and Caroline Ellis, met, pursuant to adjournment, in the Methodist school-room, to further prosecute their investigation. The time named was eleven o'clock, but the coroner and several gentlemen deemed it necessary to go over the foot-paths leading to and from the house where the murders were committed, that they might better understand the evidence of those witnesses who depose to the passing of the prisoners along them. Some little time was thus occupied; and it was near twelve o'clock ere the proceedings in the jury-room commenced.

The prisoners were not present. On both the last occasions they have been absent. Indeed Patrick Reid has never been seen by the coroner and the jury at all. He has been apprehended and kept in custody, while evidence affecting his life and placing him in extreme jeopardy has been adduced against him in his absence. So also with McCabe, after the first sitting of the inquest Now this is not right—*it is not fair*—it is not English. These men, and every one so situated ought to have had the opportunity of hearing every word uttered against them, that they might have cross-examined the witnesses, or caused such questions to be put as would have brought out the whole truth, if any fact on was being withheld; or explained away any seemingly telling point against them; and they ought to have had this opportunity, that what might have been thus elicited, could have got put down in the depositions. Parties may say that they can do all this on *their trial*: but how important for the prisoners that these things should appear in their favour at first.

The depositions go into the hands of the Judge of the Assize before he opens the commission. On them he grounds his address to the Grand Jury. It is well known that what the Judge may then say has an important influence on the minds of the public at large who hear him, as well as the particular parties to whom he addresses himself: and his generalisations of the nature of the evidence affecting those charged which are *indicated* more or *less*, cannot but have their effect on the petit jury class. Is it not evident that the character of the evidence, as presented to the mind of the Judge, might be easily answered by half a dozen answers to questions put by the accused? And is it not evident also that if this be the case, the remarks he might make would have a wholly different bearing? The English principle of criminal justice is, that every man is presumed to be innocent until he is *proved* to be guilty; and another principle is, that *no man shall be tried in his absence*. Now, all preliminary inquiries are a portion of his trial. They all go more or less to make up the mind of the class from whom those who are to decide on his guilt or innocence are to be selected. Be as impartial as one can, the mind cannot be divested of what has been seen and heard before the jury-box is entered; and is it of no importance that what tells in favour of the accused should be considered along with what tells against him? Are we to seek up evidence only to convict, and to take measures to shut out what may establish innocence?

We all know that parties swearing hard, or stretching facts to make them fit a case, will do so glibly and unconscienceless enough behind the back of the party they are seeking to implicate; but it is a far different thing telling their story *for the first time*, with the eye of that party directed on them How many a stout but black heart has quailed under the glance of innocence? How often has a single question or a single observation put to flight a whole series of well-concocted and damaging plausibilities? And should not parties, whose lives are at stake, have the opportunity to see and hear and remark on their accusers and their testimony? Is the coroner's inquisition in England to become a secret inquisition, as far as those accused are concerned? Against this monstrous injustice we protest. Against these partial and one-sided judicial proceedings we raise the voice of alarm. They are un-English—they are unfair—they are a total abrogation of the first principle of our criminal jurisprudence. We enter our protest here, because this is the first attempt in the provinces, that we know of, to bring the ancient and valuable institution of the coroner and his inquest into disrepute. We know not whether it has in this case been done designedly or not, but whether so or no, the effect is the same. Let but the same practice be pursued but a few times, of parties preventing those accused of murder from being present, when evidence calculated to make their lives a forfeit is being taken, and *the just feeling of the country* will rise against the manifest injustice.

This point of our subject cannot well be closed without a statement as to how the difficulty has arisen in this case. It is the duty of a constable when he learns that a death has taken place from other than well known ordinary and natural causes, to apprise the Coroner, who thereupon issues his warrant for the summoning of a jury to inquire into the cause of death. It is also the duty of a constable to apprehend, take charge of, and retain in custody, until the result of the coroner's inquisition is known, any one who has been the moving cause of death; particularly any one whom he may have reasonable ground to suspect of having feloniously caused such death, whether by manslaughter or murder. It is also his *duty to* present such party to the coroner and his jury, with such evidence as he may have collected or known of, for his own justification in making such arrest, and keeping in *duresse*. All this was done in this Mirfield case, up to the end of the first day of the inquest: the coroner had been apprised, the warrant had been issued, a person had been apprehended, the jury had been assembled; and evidence affecting that prisoner's life had been taken in his presence, he putting questions, and remarking on the facts deposed to. The "case" being incomplete, an adjournment of the inquiry was made, and the constable took charge of his prisoner, to produce him at the next inquiry. The day following another prisoner was apprehended and in the regular course of things he too would have been produced. But before this next inquiry of the coroner, another party steps in and interferes. The Magistrates of the district institute *another* inquiry—This inquiry is in the main but a repetition of the former one, for the same witnesses are examined with very little addition. But for the purpose of having this magisterial inquiry the prisoners must be before them. But being once before the Magistrates they were out of the charge of the constable. The Magistrates had taken possession of them—to commit or to liberate, as the evidence warranted. This being so, the constable could not produce his prisoners before the Coroner, as they were his no longer, and he had no control over them. They had passed into other hands, who knew *nothing* of the Coroner or his doings; and thus the injustice to the prisoners arose.

Now, the question arises was it *prudent* for the Magistrates thus to interfere? Could not the Coroner and his jury inquire into the "cause of death," and collect the evidence affecting those accused of having caused those deaths? Were they insufficient for this purpose? Were it not the constables who had the getting up of the "case," to present to both tribunals? Could they not have presented the whole of that "case" to one court as well as to both or part of it to one and parts of it to another? Nay, does not the question arise, was it *necessary* for the Magistrates to interfere? Did not their doing so entail injustice on the accused, besides that particular one which has called forth these remarks? Was it fair in them to distract their minds with *two* inquiries into the same facts? Why should they be called upon to watch similar proceedings twice over, and twice answer the same charge—or rather answer to two parties? Besides, see the oppression to poor men on the score of cost, if they wish to have on each occasion the benefit of legal assistance? Is this no consideration? May not justice be rendered so expensive as to make it amount to denial?

It there had been reasons to believe that the Coroner was acting *partially*,—that he was excluding testimony either for or against, there might have been reason for some other authority to interfere, though even then, common fairness to all parties would have shown the propriety of waiting until the coroner's proceedings had been closed, ere their partiality had been pronounced on. How much more necessary was it to wait then for the conclusion of the inquest in this case, where no such imputation could be raised?

It is to be hoped that we shall never again witness such unseemly exhibitions as we have already seen on this question of jurisdiction: either those of two sets of authorities contending for the body and control of a person charged with murder, or those of initiatory proceedings for trial, behind the back of the accused. Let each distinct authority respect each other's authority, or they will soon lose the respect of those who, while they respect, will render cheerful obedience. Assure as one authority interferes and comes in collision with another, so assuredly will the interferers suffer in the estimation of all just men.

With these remarks on this most extraordinary portion of this most extraordinary case, we proceed to give the evidence laid before the jury this day in the absence of the accused.

Richard Green, of the Dewsbury constabulary, deposed: on Friday morning last, I saw Thomas Kilty for the first time. I asked him if he knew anything about "a soldering iron?" He said "he had been in the habit of borrowing a soldering iron from Reid's." It belonged to the elder Reid, the prisoner's father. He described the iron he so borrowed. I had not then shown him the one I had in my possession from the time I had received it from Leadbeatter except the time that Mr. West had it for the purpose of chemical examination, and excepting the time it has been in the possession of John Howarth, my fellow-constable. Kilty described it as having a long round wooden handle, which had at the end a wooden rim, to protect the hand from the iron: that the wooden rim was much burnt: that one side of the copper on the end used was rough or scabbed, through burning. He had often thought of taking a file to subdue it, as he had difficulty in using it: the other side, near to the point, as if a pellet had been in it: I had never observed those marks before, but went to see if it was so, along with *John Howarth*, who was present when this description was given. On examination, I found the marks Kilty had described. We then showed the iron to Kilty, and, he observed, that he was very sorry to see it again, as it was the one he had had from Reid's. Mr. Green produced the *soldering iron*; the knife that lay on the table in *Mr.* Wraith's room, bearing marks of blood; and the poker which had been used in the murders.!

John Howarth constable of Mirfield, re-called: was present when he heard the conversation now deposed to with Kilty. Have heard Mr. Green's evidence, and depose that it is correct: have never shown the soldering iron while it was in my possession to Kilty, before the time Mr. Green mentions: he (Kilty) did not see it till after he had described it.

Thomas Kilty, being a Roman Catholic, was sworn in the formula of that Church—*Live at* Dawgreen; deal in spectacles. Live within twenty yards of the prisoner Reid's father. Patrick Reid lives with his father. Have been in the habit of borrowing a soldering iron from the Reids ever since I went to Dawgreen, which is about four months. My wife has generally fetched the iron from Reid's, and the Reids generally fetched it home again. The last time I had it was for some six or seven days previous to Patrick Reid fetching it away, which was the day before the murders. He came about mid-day for it on the 19th of May, which was the day before Dewsbury fair. When he came he said, "His father wanted the iron." My wife said, "It is there in the corner, go and take it." It was in a corner of my room. He took it up, and took it away with him. I saw him handle it. He said nothing more, but went away. (Looking at the soldering iron found in the well.) I know this iron, and wish I never did. I can swear positively. Know it by the wooden handle, and by the wooden rim a portion of which is burnt, and another portion broken off. It would be possible to find another soldering iron with a handle like this, but this portion (pointing to it) is broken off. On the copper end of the iron, near the point, there is a hole as if a pebble, or a grain of shot had been in and fallen out. The opposite side is rough, and cannot be used. I have often thought of filing it, so as to make it usable. When I had this iron in use, the copper portion was straighter than it now is. This portion is bent on one side, as if with blows. This is the first soldering iron I ever used, and I have used it many times, and almost constantly during the last four months I have lived at Dawgreen. I can swear positively to this iron, from the marks I have described, and from its general appearance. I have filed the side where the hole is. I did so about six days before Patrick Reid fetched it away. It was a fine file I used. Had I possessed a rough file, I should have subdued the rough side. The reason why I filed the side I did, was that the hole was in the way of use, and I filed it to make it less. I used it afterwards about once. (The point of the copper on the side where the hole is was examined by the Jury with a magnifying glass, and it was said that marks of a file could be seen.)

By the JURY.—Have known Patrick Reid for some time, and we have hawked together. We went together the last time, "the day after he committed the murder." (The Coroner here corrected him, saying it was not yet proved he had committed the murder.) The witness said "well," then, we'll suppose so. We had no conversation about the murder. It was mentioned by a gentleman, but we had no further talk about it. Reid said nothing to me about it. It was spoken of but not continuously, was only with him about half an hour in the forepart of the day, but saw him again in the evening, when I met him with a great load, and he asked me to carry a portion of it. I was not able, and told him. We have always been the best of friends. (On being shown some cracks in the handle,) I never saw these before, or that mark or cut now shown. (The cut was a mark made by the constable to identify the iron with, and it was explained that the cracks seemed recent, and might have occurred through being some many days in the well.)

Catherine Kilty, wife of last witness. Live near to Patrick Reid's father. Have been in the habit of often borrowing a soldering iron from Reid's. I went to Reid's house for it and got it sometimes from one and sometimes from another. But cannot say from whom particularly. It was kept in the corner by the side of the fire. The last time I borrowed it was some six or seven days before the murder. Cannot recollect who gave it me then but it was in the corner. I remember that Patrick Reid fetched this iron away about mid-day on the day before the murders. He said "Have you got the soldering iron?" and I said "What do you want with it?" He said "My father wants it." My husband said "it wants filing: it won't take a drop, and some day I shall do it when I have time." He took it away with him. Patrick never fetched it before. Of this I am sure. We had it in the beginning of winter for six weeks, and I used it as a poker. I am sure this is the same pointing to the instrument before the jury. I know it by the handle by its being burnt, and by the copper—there is a hole in it. I know the iron well, and can swear to it. After Patrick Reid had taken it away on the 19th May, I went to his father's house in about four days, to borrow it again. Did not get it. Met his wife at the door, and asked if she could lend me the soldering iron, and she said "Oh! no we cannot find it." I said as I saw they were in trouble, "never mind, we'll do without it." I have been in the house since and observed that the soldering iron was not in the corner where it used to be. A few days after this, "his wife came to me at the yard end," and though I said nothing to her she said "it the old man has broken the soldering iron up, and sold it for old metal." I told my husband of this, and he said "Oh, never care about it—they are above doing a neighbour a good turn." I first told of this iron to Mrs. John Hirst, our landlady, when she told me that an iron had been found in a draw well at Mirfield.

By the JURY—Patrick Reid was not in the constant habit of being from home hawking. I have known him to be at home for days together.

This witness, during her examination, intimated that Reid's family had attempted to tamper with or threaten her, but as the prisoner Reid was not present when the remarks were made, it could not be set down in evidence against him. There was, however, so much said, that it was plain the woman felt fears as respected her safety.

The CORONER then asked Mr. Howarth, the constable, if he had any other evidence and the answer was "I have not."

The CORONER then said,—Gentlemen of the Jury—As was anticipated at the last adjournment of this inquest, it was stated that very important evidence would be brought forward, and I think that now the case stands in that position that it will be necessary for you to consider the evidence and return a verdict accordingly. You are sworn to inquire into the cause of the deaths of three persons—Caroline Ellis, James Wraith, and Ann Wraith. Your first inquiry will be the cause of death of those parties; and if you are satisfied that death has been occasioned by violence, then it will be for you to inquire by what person or persons that violence has been committed. Now, as to the first point of consideration, the cause of death, there can be no doubt From the evidence of the medical gentlemen called before you and the facts stated by them, there can be no question that the three persons into whose deaths you are met to inquire have been *wilfully murdered* by some person or persons Then will arise the momentous inquiry—by whom have these murders been committed? Two persons are in custody, as you are aware, Michael Mc Cabe and Patrick Reid. It will be for you to consider all the circumstances that have been given in evidence before you, and if you be satisfied that they are of such a nature as to criminate those parties, and to project a together such a case as will justify you in sending it before another tribunal it will then be your duty to return a verdict of wilful murder against one or both of the parties in custody. If, on the other hand, you think the evidence not sufficient against them, or either of them, it will be your duty to return an open verdict of wilful murder against some person or persons unknown. I will now proceed to go through the evidence, and in doing so I shall make to you such comments upon it as appear to me to be necessary: but although I make these comments, you will bear in mind that it is for you to judge of the evidence, and you are in fact the judges of the effect which it may produce upon your minds. It appears to me to be very important, in the first instance, that you should direct your attention to the time about which the murder appears to have been committed. By the evidence of Ann Lockwood, who formerly lived as servant at Mr. Wraith's for a considerable time it would be seen that the time when the attack was made would be about one o'clock, a little after, because she has told you that the old people usually dined about a quarter or half-past twelve o'clock, and that the dinner was finished in the room, and that it then came out into the kitchen about a quarter to one o'clock; and she also told you that after the dinner was finished Mrs. Wraith was in the habit of feeding some cats, and in doing so she placed the plate on which the food was put under the chair. Now, when the bodies were found, you will recollect the plate was put under the chair and therefore that shows the dinner had been finished by the old gentleman and his wife, and that the cats had been fed, so that that would take them up to about a quarter to one o'clock. The next point I think for your consideration is to observe the locality and position of the house, and then to inquire who are the parties seen near the building, and under what circumstances they were seen there. The house of the late Mr. Wraith, as you, gentlemen, well know from former connection with the place, stands by itself. It can be approached from three points, one point being a short way leading down to the house from the high road, the other two points being the termini of the footpath which passes by the back road of the house. At each of the entrances there is a house. At one entrance is the house in which a person of the name of Lockwood, whose daughter has been examined, and near the other end where the footpath comes into Water royd lane, there are three or four houses which come out near the end of the footpath at the other approach is the house of Mr. M'Kinnill. It appears that the prisoners, or one of them, called at each of these three approaches and it seems to me a matter for your consideration whether they called at these houses for the ostensible purpose for which they went there to sell the wares which they were hawking, or for the purpose of ascertaining that the inmates were engaged at dinner. It is also proved to you that the dinner hour in Mirfield was half-past twelve, so that therefore from half-past twelve to a quarter or half-past one most of the population would be in doors at dinner. I will now proceed to the other point I mentioned—who were the parties seen near the premises at the time the murder was committed. Now, Mary Ann Lockwood lives with her parents in a house I have told you, near one entrance of the footpath leading to Mr. Wraith's house on the high road. She proves that Patrick Reid was there at half-past twelve, and turned into the footpath separated from her father's house by a hedge leading to Mr. Wraith's house, and went down it. And he was also met and likewise spoken to about a field's length from the house by Marmaduke Shipley, who was leaving his work, and who confirms the time, because he says he left his work at half-past twelve, and it took him about five minutes to walk home and when he got home he looked at the clock: it then wanted twenty-five minutes to one. Therefore, you have Patrick Reid at half-past twelve or thereabouts within a field's length of Mr. Wraith's house in the footpath leading to it. In about twenty minutes after Reid had called at Lockwood's, his daughter tells you McCabe called, and he also went down the footpath leading to the house of Mr. Wraith and in the direction in which Reid had before gone. You will, perhaps, observe that both the prisoners stated they called at Mr. Wraith's, and according to their statements their calls must have been made after the murder was committed. That is rather an important fact, because Reid said he knocked at the door and no one answered. He walked forward and went on; and then he states that it was the last house at which he called before he went home. McCabe said he also called at the house, that he knocked at the door thrice or four times, and gave other particulars which he heard and saw. Therefore it would appear from their own statements that they both called after the murders were committed. Certainly, in regard to Reid, if he called in the ordinary routine as he passed the house after he had spoken to Shipley, the murder would not have been committed then, because he would be passing the house about half-past twelve; and from the circumstances which I have mentioned with regard to the finding of the plates under the chair and other appearances, it is quite clear the parties had finished their dinner, and this would not have been the case if he called as he went past the house at about half-past twelve. Then again he says it was the last house he called at before he went home. If he called there as he went past, and in the ordinary way, it would not be the last house, because he was afterwards seen at Mrs. Webster's. Reid, then, was first seen going towards Mr. Wraith's house from Lockwood's; he was next seen at the house (or the other end of the footpath where it enters Waterroyd-lane) that is occupied by Frank Webster. Reid appears to have passed along the back of these houses, and then to have proceeded to the front in a direction to Mr. Wraith's house; and according to the evidence of Morton he must have returned to Mr. Wraith's house, because Mrs. Webster tells you that the time he called at her house, was between half-past twelve and one, but she does not fix the time very accurately; it was somewhere about one; and according to the evidence of Morton he was seen standing at the lane end of Mr. Wraith's house, about one o'clock. But he called at Webster's between twelve and half past, and it would thus appear as if he had passed the house once; because he must have passed it in coming from Lockwood's to Webster's, so as to have been seen in the position near it in which he is spoken to as standing at one o'clock by Morton. Then Mc Cabe after entering the footpath was next seen about one o'clock by Morton walking up the third approach in a direction from M'Kinnill's: so that it would appear he had gone to Wraith's house after he had been at M'Kinnill's. It will be a point for your consideration whether the statement he made that he had gone to M'Kinnill's after the murder was correct, and whether or not he did not go there before the murder and at the time he was seen by Morton, whether he was not returning from Mr. M'Kinnill's, having then passed the house and reached the point named by Morton, going in a direction towards Wraith's house. You have, then, the important facts of Reid standing near the House, and McCabe coming towards it in sight of and within a few yards of each other And you also recollect that one had been in advance of the other within twenty minutes, and both were seen near together about one o'clock, when the deed was committed. About one o'clock the deceased were found as described by the surgeons with the wounds upon them, and it must have taken some time to have inflicted those wounds. The curtains are pinned, the shutters closed, the pockets of the old man rifled, the cupboard opened; and the razor placed across the breast of the deceased, which must also have been the work of some time. It is also important that you should notice the instruments used. Two instruments, both adapted for striking, have been used; the one was the kitchen poker found in the parlour, evidently used in the murder, having marks of blood upon it, and being bent. Since, a soldering iron, equally adapted to striking these blows, has been found in a well adjoining the premises. It certainly is not likely that one man would change the weapons, and is a very strong indication that two hands have been engaged in these murders. You have also two cutting instruments a razor found on the breast of the old man, and a knife similar to those on the dinner table. Again, on each of the coats of the persons charged, blood has been found; not a very great quantity certainly, but such as appeared in the language of Mr. West, the chemical witness, to have been spirtled or splashed upon the clothes very recently. It would be a matter of surprise how parties committing this murder could have done so without being deluged with blood; but you have this accounted for by the evidence of the surgeon, Mr. Bradbury, that as in this instance where parties were first knocked down by severe blows on the head and rendered insensible, the throats being cut from left to right, a person might have stood on the right hand of the bodies in such a state as easily to reach over and cut the throats without having much blood upon his apparel. Reid, by his own statement, was at the house. He says he called there and knocked at the door, but *got no answer, and walked on*. He was also seen there by Morton. He had been discharged from ever coming to the house at a time when he had some words with Caroline Ellis, about a tea caddy, and it would also appear that he had used threats towards a female, pointing in the direction of the house, and saying he would be revenged at one time or other. In addition to these facts you have the very important evidence of Kilty and his wife, as to the fact of Reid's fetching the soldering iron from their house on the day before the murder, and their being unable to borrow it again. With respect to Mc Cabe, you have his own statements, at the time he was apprehended; which are certainly very extraordinary, and it will be for you to consider whether or not they are credible If you are satisfied that his statement is a false one, then he must have had a motive in making it. He states that he knocked three times at the door, and there was a lapse of time between each knocking. He adds that he listened, and heard the trampling of feet on the chamber floor; he knocked again, and heard some one coming down stairs; and then he knocked, after a time, a third time, when a man came to the door and unlocked and opened it. He asked if the man wanted anything, and he replied, "No;" and that he held the door in his hand for three minutes, and that he saw some blood, and heard terrible groaning. It is for you to consider whether this is a probable story, or even possible. Is it likely, you will have to consider, that a man who, according to the prisoner's statement, had either then committed or was in the act of committing three murders, should remain in the house, and afterwards open the door, whilst a party was knocking outside, and a lapse of time occurred between each knocking? That, then, the man should come down stairs into the kitchen, open the door, show himself to a stranger outside, and also let the stranger see the blood on the floor, and also have the opportunity of hearing the dreadful groaning which McCabe speaks of? Is it probable or possible that a man engaged in the commission of such a terrible crime, should expose himself to the observations of a stranger, or whether he would or not, as he could easily have done, have made his escape at the front door, without being observed or running the risk of detection, by allowing a man the full opportunity of identifying him? Then McCabe says he felt alarm; and that he looked back two or three times; and you will observe now, what was his conduct after. He says he was frightened; what would have been the natural conduct of a man who was frightened and who had seen what he says he saw, blood on the floor and heard groaning, and had knocked three times without getting any answer? Why, he would have given an immediate alarm to the first house he came to. But, instead of that, he passes M'Kinnill's house, and does not say a word about it until he is told of it by Flint, and then he repeats the story he afterwards told the constable. What, again, are the reasons for not making known what he saw? He says, he thought they were killing fowls for the feast; but is it at all likely that he should have thought that, when he saw such a quantity of blood on the floor and heard such terrible groaning? Again, he says he thought the mistress was poorly, and the groans came from her; and further he says, he thought the master and mistress were quarrelling, and he would not tell lest he should lose their custom. You will therefore consider whether his conduct after he left the house, and the reasons he has given, are such as can be correct; and if you should be of opinion that his statement is false you will determine what, in your opinion, could be his object in making such a statement. He had now gone through all the facts and made such comments on them as seemed to him fitting. The depositions were there, and the jury could, if they pleased, look at them; and if any point needed further elucidation, he should be happy to aid them To recapitulate in brief, they had the two prisoners near the house at or about the time of the murders; they had the implements used, four in number; two for striking with—two for cutting—the soldering iron deeply affecting Reid. They would, therefore, now take the whole case into their consideration: first, as to how it affected each prisoner separately; and then, how it affected them conjointly; and if the circumstances were such as to convince the jury that these two parties, or either of them, should be sent before another tribunal, it would be their duty to send them there by returning a verdict of wilful murder against one or both, as the case might be; but if they were not so convinced, their course would be to return an open verdict of wilful murder against some person or persons unknown. He now left the case in their hands. He must, however, tell them that it would be necessary for twelve out of their number, fifteen, to agree on the verdict returned.

At five minutes to two the coroner had concluded, and the school-room was cleared, that the jury might consider of their verdict. While the public were retiring, one of the jury wished the coroner to ask Mr. Bradbury, the surgeon, if he thought that the servant, Caroline Ellis, who it will be remembered lay immediately behind the kitchen door, could groan after the blows she had received on the head, smashing in the skull, and scattering the brains. Mr. Bradbury's answer was, "she could not."

On the public being again admitted, and the Coroner having taken his seat, asked, "Gentlemen of the jury, are you agreed on your verdict?"

The FOREMAN—"We are, sir."

The CORONER—"How do you say, through your foreman, that James Wraith came by his death?"

The FOREMAN—"We return a verdict of WILFUL MURDER AGAINST PATRICK REID and MIC