

## John Alexander Dickman.

Further examined by Mr. TINDAL ATKINSON, K.C., v said that on the evening of 18th March, which was the ing of the day of the murder, he gave an account at the station of the appearance of the man he subsequently a that station, and that he then described his overcoat as a fawn overcoat. The impression the witness got in his through the doorway almost led him to make up his mind the man was not the man he had seen in the train, but the man at the police station seemed from a back view so more massive. Spink and the witness had both discussed at tea, and came to that conclusion.

(The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE—Although we have our own o as to what took place at the police station, we must say the question of identification by Hall is not so important would have been had the case for the defence been that man was not in the train at all.)

Mr. MITCHELL-INNES, K.C.—I do not propose to deal the irregularity; but at the same time, although Hall c that the view through the partially opened door assisted in his identification, he did not see a man wearing a overcoat, and was able to recognise the colour of his hair.

I now propose to put in evidence a statement made by Nisbet in response to a request by the Home Secretary information as to whether she had known Dickman by for a number of years.

(The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE—We have frequently decline listen to statements of the kind you now suggest. No c the Home Secretary receives all manner of communica from interested friends or from the prisoner himself. mere fact of their being addressed to the Home Secretary cannot make them evidence.)

Mr. TINDAL ATKINSON, K.C.—I may say that Mrs. Nisbet in Court.

The statement was then allowed to be read on the dis understanding that it should not be regarded as a precedent.

Mr. MITCHELL-INNES, K.C.—The statement is this—"I the widow of J. I. Nisbet, to whom I was married a eighteen years ago. I first knew the prisoner Dickman after I was married, and then only by sight. I was r introduced to him, and never spoke to him. On 18th March when speaking to my husband at Heaton station, the view profile I got of my husband's companion did not enable to identify him as any one I knew. On giving evidence the Police Court I never saw the prisoner until I had fini my evidence, when I caught sight of him in the dock. He in the same position, and I had the same view of his pr as I had in the train, and I then recognised him as being same man. I then fainted, and was carried out of Court.