

truthfulness of this charge will be regarded as depending largely upon the proof adduced for the establishment of the two preceding charges. It is but human to conceal guilt. If, therefore, the Superintendent was guilty of the misdemeanors referred to in the two preceding charges, he would naturally conceal the evidence of his guilt, if possible, by placing out of sight the envelopes disfigured by his changes. It has been shown, I think, most conclusively, that he is guilty of the irregularities spoken of, so that the natural inference is that he did conceal the envelopes spoken of. In addition to this logical deduction from the premises--which I trust are regarded as true--you have also my own testimony to the fact specified in charge No. 3.

Charge No. 4 accuses the Superintendent of procuring in some way duplicates of secreted envelopes, and handing them over for the original. For the proof of this I claim to have presented before you three original envelopes, once torn in pieces, but now, with the pieces arranged and pasted upon paper, in the position which they held in the envelope when whole. Corresponding with these, bearing the same station mark and number, and showing either the same figures or an attempt to alter to the same, are other envelopes which I have designated as duplicates of those torn ones. That they are indeed duplicates is apparent from the figuring of the Superintendent upon them, which a comparison of the two is sufficient to show is without doubt his work. In the second place, the station mark and number is the same in each of the three cases. With respect to the station mark, which is placed on the envelopes by the Deputy Examiner in every case, as he alone is supposed to be cognizant of what that mark is, a comparison of it as found on the torn and duplicate envelopes with others of the same station will show whether or not both seem to be done by the same hand. For myself I can only say that I saw what was to me very plain evidence of the Superintendent's own hand. In the case of No. 24, Station G, it will be seen that the ending of the g is not such as to make it a very clever imitation of that of the Deputy Examiner, and I doubt not that a similar comparison of Nos. 25 and 98, Station W, will indicate some similar indications of imitation.

That the Superintendent should seek to procure duplicates of these envelopes, when he was called upon for them, in order to further concealment of his guilt, is simply just as natural as for him to conceal them in the first instance. Both were necessary that his guilt in altering the figures of the Examiners might not appear, which in other cases has been sufficiently proved. No. 98, Station W, is the best proof of charges Nos. 1 and 2, but there is no doubt whatever that it had been wanting had it been in the parcel with the others of that station reported upon. That envelope I retained in my own possession, fearing that all evidence of guilt would be removed by duplication of envelopes, as in the case of the three before alluded to, or otherwise that they would be destroyed altogether. But that No. 98 was only one of