



asked him was to clear up some point in this particular statement, and no bearing on the other statements, previous statements.

HIS LORDSHIP: Q. That that statement had left in the air, so to speak? A. Yes, your lordship.

MR. LICKERS: Q. When you asked this question, "Did you hit Isaac Hill with anything other than with the gun?" what were you trying to come back, in connection with the shovel and the axe? A. I can't say as I was, no. He had said that he had hit him with the shotgun, and I asked him if he had hit him with anything else other than the shotgun.

Q. You say you were not looking to a cross-examination at that time? A. No, I was not.

Q. Then why would you ask the very next question after that: "To your knowledge did anyone else hit Isaac Hill at or near the time that you hit him in the head with the shot gun?"

A. I may have had in mind at that time that as a result of the information which he had given me in this statement, suggesting that he had been accompanied by another person, that this other person may have hit Isaac Hill. Did you question him about that,

Q. In other words, then, you were still seeking information in connection with this whole thing?

HIS LORDSHIP: Q. I suppose you could not have failed to notice that there were at least two new elements introduced into the statement by the accused on this occasion? A. Yes, I did, your lordship.

Q. One new element being the presence of Joe