

CAMBRIDGE INDEPENDENT PRESS,  
Huntingdon, Wisbech, Ely, Bedford, Peterborough, & Lynn Gazette,  
CIRCULATES IN THE UNIVERSITY, THE METROPOLIS, THE COUNTIES OF CAMBRIDGE  
(AND ISLE OF ELY), HUNTINGDON, BEDFORD, NORTHAMPTON, LINCOLN, NORFOLK,  
SUFFOLK, ESSEX AND HERTFORD.

NO. 2,984—VOL. LXVIII. —PRICE TWOPENCE. ... SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1873.

{PAGE 5 OF 8}

THE ADJOURNED INQUEST ON JESSIE CHAUNTLER.

---

[The following appeared last week in our town edition only.]

The adjourned inquest on on {sic} the body of Jessie Chauntler was held last night at the Granby Bridge-street. Under the warrant of the Coroner, the body of the unfortunate deceased was interred on Sunday last at the Cemetery, in the presence of a large concourse of spectators, by the Rev. A. Ward, vicar of St. Clement's. The public excitement in reference to the case has been greatly intensified by the publication of a sheet professing to give a full report of the proceedings at the former inquiry, but we have no hesitation in stigmatising it as a most unfair report. Last week the Coroner read one of the letters left behind by the deceased, which mentioned the name of one gentleman, but as the other letters found on her mentioned the names of others, which letters were not read, we thought it only an act of common fairness to suppress the one letter until the whole were placed before the public.

The inquiry took place in a room which, though large, was utterly inadequate to accommodate the jury and those professionally concerned, with the large body of chiefly respectable inhabitants of the town who endeavoured to gain admittance, and we cannot understand why the inquiry was not adjourned to the Guildhall. As it was, several of the jury and the professional gentlemen had to stand throughout the entire proceedings, and the atmosphere of the room for nearly three hours bore a strong resemblance to that of the Black Hole of Calcutta. Why this should be the case, with such ample accommodation as the Guildhall affords, within such easy distance, it is impossible to conceive. A large body of the Borough Police Force were present, but were unable to prevent the room being densely crowded, or to ensure the proceedings being carried out with that regard for decency and order which we are accustomed to see in courts of justice in this country. A very large amount of feeling was imported into the proceedings, and, as will be seen below, the Coroner had frequently to threaten to have his court cleared of the interrupters — a threat which by-the-bye he was utterly powerless to carry into effect.

The following is a list of the jury, who answered their names: — Messrs. T. Nichols (foreman), H. Spinks, W. Francis, D. Hobbs, G. Legge, J. Lawrence, E. G. Ransom, W. Potts, G. Collin, R. Clayton, J. Carelass and W. Bullen.

The CORONER asked for whom the professional gentlemen appeared.

Mr. JARROLD stated that he appeared on behalf of Mr. Dawson, of Shelford, whose name had been mentioned at the previous inquiry.

Mr. HORACE BROWNE said he appeared on behalf of certain persons whose names were supposed to be mentioned in the letters found on the deceased.

Mr. J. W. COOPER (instructed by Mr. E. Wayman, said he appeared, on the previous occasion, on behalf of Mr. R. Miller.

Mr. COCKERELL said he was prepared to appear on behalf of the Crown, but, as he found all the parties were represented, he did not think it necessary to so. However, he saw there several reporters —

Mr. COOPER objected to Mr. Cockerell making any observations, but was greeted with a

storm of interruptions which led the Coroner to threaten to have the room cleared.

Mr. COCKERELL went to condemn in very strong terms what he called the “scandalous, disgraceful manner” in which the former inquiry was reported in the newspapers, and he asked the Coroner, if the same thing were going to be done this week, to clear the room of the reporters.

The CORONER said that the reports in the newspapers were fair reports as far as they went. He read a certain letter at the inquiry, and he thought the reporters exercised a wise discretion in withholding that letter until the person mentioned should have opportunity of being present.

After this little episode the Coroner proceeded to take the following evidence: —

Mrs. Selina Jackson was sworn, but before she was examined the Coroner, on the application of Mr. Adcock, read the evidence given by this witness at the former enquiry. Mr. Adcock also asked that the original letter left by deceased should be read, as what was published in a report aa {sic} the letter, he was instructed, was not correctly reported.

The CORONER intimated his willingness to read it at the proper time.

Mrs. Jackson then said to the Coroner: Deceased used to generally go into the shop at eight o'clock in the morning. At least, she used to be down at eight o'clock, and then had breakfast, and afterwards went into the shop at about half-past eight. She would have no opportunity of going out till after the shop was closed unless she asked. That was at half-past eight or nine o'clock. She usually went out of evening and got in at ten o'clock. She kept her time pretty regularly. I never remember her being out later than quarter-past ten except one night, that I mentioned on the last occasion. On Sundays she would generally be at home till dinner time. Occasionally she would to church in the morning. Of an afternoon she generally went to King's College Chapel, and of an evening attended church. She attended some place of worship regularly, generally St. Mary's—our parish church. She was in on Sundays at a quarter to ten or ten o'clock. I don't remember her being out later than that. The longest time she was away from ours would be from half- past two till five, and from half-past six till she came in. She always dined at home on Sundays. I considered her pretty regular in her habits.

The CORONER now produced half-sheet of notepaper with pencil writing on both sides.

Witness: I recognise this paper as that which found in her box. It is in her handwriting. It was not folded then.

The CORONER then read it, the following being a copy *verbatim et literatim*:

“Please send all my things and money home to my beloved friends; how I do love them all, and ask Mr. Miller to pay for my funeral; he can afford it”

On the opposite side was the following: —

“if he had helped out of the trouble he gave me, he would not have had my life to answer for. I hope some one will pray for me.”

Witness (by Mr. JARROLD): I did not search the box of deceased, but was present and saw the things taken out. That was the only paper that was found. There was no paper that had the name of Dawson upon it. There was no money in the box, but a little was due to her. She was not at all expensive in her dress. She did not dress more than her salary would afford. Her clothes were not so good as they were when she first came to ours.

By Mr. COOPER: She was having £14 a year. She had not that salary all the time that she was at ours. She had been having £14 a year, I think, two months. After she gave notice to leave we raised her salary. It was done at or about the same time, but not in consequence of her having given notice. She never complained to me of her salary being insufficient, or her want of money. She had been in our service some time, and we thought it best to raise it. We should have done that to any young person. We raised it voluntarily. She did not request it.

By the Foreman of the Jury: I never had any knowledge of any instance of improper conduct on her part, but quite the contrary.

By Mr. ADCOCK: I never saw anything improper in her conduct, or we should not have continued her in our service. The assertion made that she was immoral is untrue, as far as I know. Mr. ADCOCK said the statement made by Mr. Cooper on the last occasion in reference to this was quite unwarrantable.

Mr. COOPER was sorry that Mr. Adcock had imported these matters; he should have to ask some further questions of witness now.

Witness (by Mr. COOPER): Her mother searched her box. I was present. I saw some medicine bottles found.

By Mr. Hobbs: And a prescription.

Mr. Hobbs: Have we it here?

The father of deceased produced it, and it was handed to the Jury.

James Starling deposed: I live in {31} Bridge street, and am a turner. I found the body of the deceased in the Cam last Friday morning, about half-past nine o'clock, about twenty yards from the Great Bridge. It was below the Bridge, on the Cambridge side of the river. It was floating about four yards from the Quay. I tried to get it with my "long arm," as it is called. It is a pole having a hook on the end, with which I hang up my hams. I could not reach her with it. I called Mr. Ransom and two young men to take hold of my hand, but then I could not reach her. I let it float to opposite my shop, which is thirty or forty yards lower down, and where there are steps, but I could not reach it then. I was then obliged to let it float to Mr. Rutt's boat-yard. I hurried round, and put off a boat, and got the body out there with assistance. I caught it with a hook on the sleeve of her jacket. Her body was fully dressed. There was what is called bonnet hanging by the strings at the back of her head. I helped to take the body to where it was found, and helped to undress it.

James Wm. Roberts, of 3, Petty Cury, deposed: I am a hairdresser, and manage the hair-dressing business for Mr. Jackson. I had been there about twelve days before the deceased left. I had not known her before. I used to see her four or five times a day. I did not notice that she was in low spirits till the night she went away. I usually took my meals with her. She was tolerably lively at meal times, until the last night I saw her which was on Friday, the 6th December. That night she had had her supper, and I was rather late in my room. About a quarter or twenty minutes past nine, as near as could be, I saw her. I was just getting ready to go; and she, when she got to the top of the stairs, level to my room, stopped, and seemed to stare at me. She never did that before. I was in my room. All of a sudden she turned round and went up to her room. I thought by her appearance she was out of breath, through running upstairs fast. She said nothing. She stood some seconds—nearly a minute—and then she went up to her own room. I did not see her again that evening. She seemed rather strange. That was all I saw. She never did like that before. She seemed to glare at me and looked wild. I had not seen her since tea time that evening. The night before she played at cards with me and Mr. Jackson, and appeared very jolly then. I did not think there was anything amiss, nor did what I saw strike me, till the Sunday that her mother came down. I have never seen her in any sorrow. I have not had much opportunity of judging, as we were in separate places of business.

By the Jury: I did not see her come down again; I was in my room.

By the CORONER: She was not dressed for going out when I saw her.

By Mr. ADCOCK: I went with Mrs. Chauntler to Mr. Miller's.

The CORONER suggested that the line of examination upon which Mr. Adcock was about to enter should postponed for the present.

Mr. ADCOCK assented, but presumed that he should have an opportunity of putting the questions hereafter (hear, hear). He should like to be informed upon one point. According to his instructions the Coroner had requested Mr. Miller's attendance. He should like to know whether it was his intention to appear.

Mr. COOPER: He does intend to appear (applause).

The CORONER said that on the former occasion he had summoned Mr. Miller because he was not aware whether the cause of death could be ascertained without his presence. He had found that his presence was not necessary to that issue, and therefore he had not summoned him on that occasion. He had, however, only thought it right to give him an opportunity of attending to offer any explanation that he might think fit; and therefore had addressed to him a note to that effect (oh, oh and "Money!"). It was only fair to Mr. Miller to say that he did not absent himself on the last occasion, as he had been out of Cambridge some days.

Mr. ADCOCK said he understood from a report which had appeared that Mr. Cooper had stated at the former inquiry that Mr. Miller did not know anything about it (applause).

Mr. COOPER said that what he said was that Mr. Miller could not have known anything about the inquest, as he had been away from Cambridge more than a week. The body had not been found till half-past nine that morning, and it was utterly impossible to have communicated with him (a voice: Oh, and Telegraph). In compliance with the request of the Coroner he had come down from London to attend the inquest.

Mr. ADCOCK wanted to know which Mr. Miller Mr. Cooper referred to. There were so many Mr. Millers.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Richard Miller.

Witness: My room was on the first floor, and hers on the second floor.

By Mr. ADCOCK: I have never seen anything improper or immoral in her conduct. She appeared to a respectable lady-like person—very so (hear, hear).

The CORONER said that before the enquiry proceeded any further he should have to ask the jury about one matter. He had not seen the report, but he understood that a statement appeared in the report to something that Dr. Ransom was alleged to have said, to the effect that she had been previously pregnant.

Dr. Ransom, who was present, emphatically denied this statement, and was confirmed by several of the jury.

Mr. ADCOCK, with considerable warmth, alleged that Mr. Cooper at the previous inquiry, had made charges against the deceased. He was there to clear her.

The CORONER suggested that the inquiry had better be conducted without the exhibition of much feeling.

Mr. ADCOCK excused himself on the ground that the deceased had a father and mother and sisters, and it was only right that this attempt to falsely stigmatise her with immorality should be exposed. He was there to stick to the young person, and it was only right that her character should be cleared.

Dr. Ransom repeated that never mentioned anything about previous pregnancy.

Mr. Hobbs asked the doctor whether it would have been an easy matter to have proved that.

Dr. Ransom said it could have been proved, but there were no signs of it. There was evidence of pregnancy, but it was incipient.

Supposing her to have been in the water a month, which it appeared she had, pregnancy would have dated some month or six weeks previous to her death.

By Mr. JARROLD: That would be some time after June.

Dr. Ransom gave some additional technical evidence in confirmation of his theory that the deceased was pregnant, and added that he made a careful examination, being assisted therein by Dr. Carver, and he was perfectly certain that there was nothing like disease about her. There was nothing whatever in the prescription which had been handed in to indicate that it was for disease. It was simply to allay irritation of the system.

Mr. ADCOCK said that the prescription was one of Dr. Bloomfield's, a London physician, who he was prepared to prove was her father's own medical man (applause).

The CORONER said that was all the evidence that proposed to call. If Mr. Miller wished to make a statement now was the time that he could do it.

Mr. WAYMAN was about leaving the room to fetch his client, when

Mr. COCKERELL protested that Mr. Wayman had no right to hold a consultation with Mr. Miller.

Mr. WAYMAN at once resumed his seat, and disclaimed any wish or intention to hold any communication with Mr. Miller, and the constable was despatched to request his attendance.

Mr. COOPER said that as Mr. Miller was coming voluntarily to make statement, he hoped there would no unseemly behaviour, but that he would be treated fairly. He had no doubt that Mr. Miller suffered severely under the imputations that had been cast upon him (oh, oh). He asked them to remember that this was a Court of Justice (A Voice: Let him come).

Mr. ADCOCK also appealed to the crowd to give him a fair hearing.

The CORONER intimated his wish that there would be no disturbance, otherwise he should send for the police and clear the room.

Mr. COOPER supposed from what had fallen from the coroner that he did not order the attendance of Mr. Miller.

The CORONER assented.

Mr. COOPER: He comes voluntarily.

The CORONER: Certainly. I have sufficient evidence put before the jury from which to find a verdict (shame). As an imputation has arisen on the character of Mr. Miller, I shall allow him to attend if he likes and make a statement. [Renewed interruption, one person who had been conspicuous throughout the whole of the inquiry by his loud exclamations and expressions of his indignation, being again particularly noticeable.]

The CORONER inquired who he was, and on being informed that it was Mr. Bovis, told that gentleman that unless desisted he would be expelled from the room.

After a short delay Mr. Richard Miller entered the room, his appearance being greeted with hisses and groans.

The CORONER: I must have the court cleared if this noise continues.

Mr. Richard Miller was then sworn, and gave his evidence as follows: — At the request of the Coroner I attend here this evening. He wrote me a letter that I was at liberty to attend. I attend here voluntarily to give any explanation with regard to a certain letter. I can give no explanation of it. With regard to a person named Miller, referred to in the letter, I can give no explanation as to connect me with it (loud cries of oh, oh). I knew the deceased. I have never in the whole course of my life had any connection with deceased which would justify her in alluding to me as she has alluded to some one. I believe not; on the contrary. Plainly speaking I have never had any criminal connection with the deceased (loud cries of oh, oh).

By Mr. ADCOCK: I can give you no dates as to when I first knew her. It was some time in the summer. I can't tell you when. I have seen her ten or a dozen times perhaps (sensation). The last time I saw her I should think was a month or six weeks before she disappeared. It was on the Parade, I believe, at night, from nine to a quarter-past.

The CORONER wanted to know to what the question of Mr. Adcock tended.

Mr. ADCOCK said it tended to prove to the jury the cause of this unfortunate occurrence. The jury had a right to know what had taken place between the witness and the deceased.

Mr. Miller: I am quite ready to answer any question Mr. Adcock likes to put to me.

The CORONER said the evidence must have some object in showing the cause of death.

Mr. ADCOCK: And the state of her mind.

The CORONER did not think that evidence material; but as Mr. Miller expressed his willingness to answer these questions, he would not further interpose.



Examination of witness by Mr. ADCOCK continued: I believe it was some time during the summer that I first knew her, and from that time until a month or six weeks before she disappeared I saw her ten or twelve times. It was always from nine to ten o'clock at night, always at the same time and place. It was by written appointment (sensation)—by her written appointment (renewed sensation). I kept it, but I did not on all occasions. I believe the first time, I made the appointment (sensation). I remember Mrs. Chauntler, mother of the deceased, calling on me on the Hills-road shortly after her disappearance. I did not at first deny any knowledge of her daughter. She said she was Mrs. Chauntler. I did not know her name. I only knew the deceased by her name Jessie. Directly she said she was the mother of the young lady who had been at Mr. Jackson's, I admitted knowing her. It was not after being pressed and being shown the note which has been read that I admitted knowing her. I told her at once all the particulars I knew as near I could. I believe I was equally as unreserved to her as I was to her husband when he saw me. I saw the father of the deceased when he called a few days after. I did not tell her father I had never been with her (sensation). To Mr. ADCOCK: When you say "been with her," what do you mean? That is a trap. I told him I had walked with her and had given her money (sensation). I did not say I had given her it from benevolence, but to enable her to pay her debts or something of that sort, and that is the truth. I believe the word "benevolence" was not used. I talked with him, but it is not a question of what I said but what I did (laughter).

Mr. ADCOCK: It is a question of what you said, because by your words will be judged your actions.

Witness: I never made use of the word benevolence. She told me she had been to a doctor.

Mr. ADCOCK: Did you say anything to her about going a doctor?

Witness: We had conversed about it.

Mr. ADCOCK repeated his question.

Witness: I don't recollect. I knew she had been to a doctor, and we had conversed about it; she had been for some disease. It was some time during the latter part of the summer. I know who the doctor is—Mr. Russell Hall (laughter). He is not my medical man. I never employ him, nor have I ever sent any one to him, I have been to him since she has been away. I had never been to Mr. Russell Hall before she went away. When Mr. Chauntler called on me, I told him his daughter had written to me. I think he asked me if I had any of her letters by me. I think I told him that the last letter I had from her came when I was away from home, and when I opened it and saw the word money" in it, I dropped it into the fire (great sensation). It was not probably so much because of the word "money" being in it, as because it was several days past the date. If letters lie at my place of business several days when I am away, I don't read them (oh, oh).

Mr. ADCOCK: Did you not say to Mr. Chauntler, "It's a pity that paper has been made public, or we might have arranged it between us."

Witness: Decidedly not. It is a pity the paper was made public (sensation). Mr. Chauntler's own remark was, "It's a pity that paper was made public."

Mr. ADCOCK: Did you not ask him several times what you could do for him?

Witness: I told him I would assist him in any way I could to find his daughter.

Mr. ADCOCK: At that time you knew the contents of the piece of paper which had been found?

Witness: Yes.

Mr. ADCOCK: You did not mean you would assist him in a pecuniary way?

Witness: I meant to assist him in finding his daughter in any way?

Mr. ADCOCK: What way

A Voice: going to London (laughter).

Mr. ADCOCK: Did you go to London?

Witness: I went to London some little time after.

The CORONER said he should like to see the direct object of the examination.

Mr. ADCOCK said that the Jury might feel disposed to make some observations upon it. He thought it was due to the friends of the deceased that these enquiries should be made. If the Coroner thought proper to stop him, well and good.

The CORONER did not like to that, because of the position of the friends of the deceased. At the same time there must be some limit to them.

Mr. ADCOCK said that if his learned friend (Mr. Cooper) had not thrown the imputations which he had upon the character of the deceased, he should not have ventured to have asked half the questions which he had felt it is {sic} duty to do. Those observations were painful to the friends of the deceased, and it was only right that they should be exposed, and it should be shown that what had been stated was absolutely untrue.

Mr. COOPER said Mr. Adcock entirely misapprehended what he had stated on the previous occasion. An imputation was cast on Mr. Miller, and he stated—and the Coroner reprimanded him for so doing and almost threatened to turn him out—that that inquiry was into the cause of death of the deceased and was not a court to inquire into morality. There were other letters found on the deceased in which other persons' names were mentioned. These letters were not read, and he did not wish that they should be in the absence of the persons mentioned, and therefore he objected to the letter found in the box of the deceased being read.

Mr. Bovis: You're a bad son of a good father (laughter).

Witness (by Mr. ADCOCK): I went to London I believe on the Monday that deceased was found on the Friday. I believe I had not been to London since the reports of the discovery of the paper till then. I believe I had not.

By Mr. Hobbs. I frequently go to London.

By Mr. ADCOCK: Mr. Wayman instructed Mr. Cooper to appear and watch the case in my behalf because my name was said to be in the letter and Mr. and Mrs. Chauntler had called on me. I very much doubt that the reference in it was intended to apply to me (oh, oh). I can't believe it does, not having had any connection with her. I referred Mr. Chauntler afterwards to Mr. Wayman.

By Mr. COOPER: After the deceased disappeared I never offered Mr. Chauntler money to hush up the matter. It never occurred to me to do so. I gave him all the information I could unreservedly. I first of all declined, but Mr. Chauntler said there would be no law, and then I went into the case.

By the CORONER: I can't attach any meaning to the words in the letter "the trouble he gave me". I never had connexion with her, that I have sworn. I told her father and mother so.

By Mr. Hobbs: I knew she had been to doctor and I know what for. She had gone there for gonorrhea. She told me so. She began the conversation first. She did not tell me direct. I swear most positively she told that. She sometimes appeared depressed. She used to say that she had no company, and her complaint was that she was paid so miserably at Mr. Jackson's that she could not get on, and, therefore, she asked me for money (You brute, and shame, shame).

One of the Jury appealed to the Coroner to suppress these expressions, and the Coroner again threatened to have the disturbers removed.

The Witness (by the Foreman): I distinctly swear I never had criminal connexion with her, although I have been with her and given her money. We used to walk generally round the backs of the colleges.

By Mr. Hobbs: She never seemed in trouble. She used to be sometimes rather depressed, because she could not pay her way. She did not tell where she owed money. I never went down Tennis-court-road with her. I don't recollect going on Tennis-court-road with her.

The witness then left the court amidst hisses and groans.

Mr. ADCOCK said that Mr. Jackson was there prepared to say that she had no debts, and to give the lie to Mr. Miller's assertion.

Mr. Jackson said he believed she owed nothing when she left. There might shilling or so, but not more.

Mr. ADCOCK thought there was witness named Butcher who could give important evidence. Mr. Miller had said he had only walked with her ten or a dozen times. He (Mr. Adcock) believed that that could multiplied by ten, and as he was instructed, witnesses could called to prove that.

Mr. Jackson: Plenty of people are ready come forward who have seen Mr. Miller with her many times.

Mr. Potts (juryman) believed that a witness who was present had seen Mr. Miller with her when she was crying.

Mr. ADCOCK said that was the witness he referred to, and asked that he might called.

The CORONER saw no necessity for calling him.

Mr. ADCOCK said if the Coroner would not call the witness, he should ask the jury to call him.

The CORONER said he was the judge in that court, and he intended to be master.

Mr. ADCOCK appealed to the jury to call William Butcher.

The CORONER said that he had requested the attendance of William Butcher, knowing what evidence he could give. He (Butcher) knew of one particular occasion on which Mr. Miller had been in her company. If Mr. Miller had denied any interviews with her, he should have thought it very important to have taken his evidence. He had not denied it, but had confessed to having walked with her ten or twelve times. The gentlemen of the jury were not so foolish as not to know what that meant.

Mr. ADCOCK reminded the Coroner that she was crying when this witness saw her.

Mr. Hobbs said Mr. Miller had not sworn that he had not seen her crying.

Mr. COOPER reminded the Court that he had said he had seen her depressed.

The Foreman said the jury were quite of opinion that the witness Butcher should called, but they would leave it to the Coroner's judgment.

The CORONER repeated that he really thought it was not necessary, but as the jury wished it, he would call him.

Mr. COOPER remarked that Mr. Miller ought to have been asked to the particular occasion that he understood Butcher was give evidence upon.

Mr. Butcher, deposed: I live at 6, Coronation-street, and am a tailor. I knew the deceased by sight. I spoke to her once. I had seen her at the door of Mr. Jackson's shop, and in the shop several times. Early last October, whether the 8th or 9th, I won't be sure to the day, I was going home. I was going to make a coat for Mr. Hobbs, the chemist. I was going by Tennis-court-road. I was going from Mr. Benton's, and was going homeward. Before I got to the back of the Hospital I saw two people—a man and a woman. I saw the man pulling the woman about on the path. When I got nearly up to them the man left the woman and passed me, coming towards the town. I recognised the man. It was Mr. Miller. I do not know his Christian name. He lives in the Market-place, and is a liquor merchant. I went up to the girl and she was weeping very much. I asked her if she was hurt. I heard her crying before I got up to her. She was crying aloud. I asked her if she was hurt. She made me no answer. The girl was the one who lived at Mr. Jackson's—I mean the deceased. I asked her the second time whether the man had hurt her, and she made me no answer then, but was weeping all the time. I saw something was wrong, and I followed the man. He went down Fitzwilliam-street, and I crossed the road and watched him about half-way down the street, and then ran round by Downing-street, because I had a mind to be positive who it was. Mr. Miller was tipsy. I got under the Pembroke lamp, opposite to the new chapel that is now being built. The first who passed me were two young



collegians. I then saw Mr. Miller pass me. It was in Trumpington-street. I then lost sight of him.

By the Foreman: She did not answer me at all. The nine o'clock bell was going; it commenced just I entered Tennis Court-road.

By Mr. ADCOCK: This was on the 8th or 9th of October. Mr. Benton can prove the time. That was the only time I saw them together.

By the Foreman: I know Mr. Miller was tipsy, because he could not walk straight.

By Mr. ADCOCK: He was pulling her about, same might get hold of any other girl (laughter).

The CORONER said it was now his duty say a few words to the jury with reference to this painful inquiry. They must bear in mind that the point of the whole inquiry was to determine the circumstances under which this unfortunate girl came to her death. Imputations having been thrown upon the character of a certain person, he had thought it fair and right to allow him to give explanations. It was not the direct duty of the jury to express any opinion upon character, but he did not say that they were not entitled to do if they thought fit. Their duty, as he had said, was to determine the circumstances of her death. Of the fact that the girl was drowned they could have no doubt. At the former inquiry it was said that he ought not to have produced that letter, as it was not evidence, but the fact was that it was most important evidence, as but for that there would no means of showing that the girl had not fallen into the river or been thrown in. That letter was the only evidence that she had committed suicide, coupled with the fact that she had been found in the river. They would have to consider as to her state of mind at the time that she committed suicide. That was peculiarly a question for the Jury. There was no doubt the law said that if a person killed himself in order for it not to be a *felo de se*, he must be in that state of mind that he did not know what he was doing. They must judge for themselves upon that question. In this case they would not find very much evidence, but the act itself was evidence, for it was difficult to see an exact motive for this act (A Voice: No). Certainly there was no immediate danger of discovery. They must assume that she had done something wrong, but there was no fear of immediate discovery; but an act of this kind must have been prompted by some very strong feeling. The only direct evidence was that of Miss Rushby, an acquaintance, to whom she said she was very much inclined to make a hole in the water, and that of the servant girl. However, the state of her mind was peculiarly a question for the jury, who knew the circumstances as well as he did, and he must leave it to them to find their verdict. He had certain letters, found on the deceased, but had not thought it necessary to go into them. He would not say that in any one of them there was evidence of criminality on the part of the girl, but there were certainly amongst them letters from young men asking for appointments, but whether they were kept or not there was no evidence to prove. He considered it was his duty to read a statement which he had received from the father of the deceased, which offered a very probable explanation of the fact of her having these letters, and he thought it was only just to the character of the girl that it should be read. He then read the following: —

“Having read a report of the first day’s proceedings at the inquest, you are stated to have observed that the letters, &c., found on the deceased showed that she was intimate with several persons. I have not seen the letters, and cannot, therefore, speak positively about them. But when she was in London, in September last, her mother noticed there were several notes in deceased’s purse on her opening it, and questioned deceased about them, when the latter and {sic} said, ‘Oh, they are notes which young fellows from the University are in the habit of coming into the shop and pestering me with. I put them into my pocket and take no notice of them. They will sometimes call next day quite angry at my not having met them,’ when she would laugh at them and say she never meant any such thing as meeting them; so that you see a wrong construction may be put on the fact of the letters referred to being found in her possession.”

He had thought it fair and proper to put before them that statement, but they were not required to go into that. He would leave them to consider their verdict. It was hardly his office, nor did he

often take upon himself to express an opinion upon the immorality or otherwise of persons, but this was so strong a case that all must feel that a most tremendous crime had been committed through somebody (hear, hear), and whoever was the person who was responsible for it would probably find it a sting to his conscience up to the day of his death. Nothing more appalling could have been penned than the words of the letter written immediately before committing this deed. It was very difficult to understand how such words could have been written, under such circumstances, containing any intentional falsehood. He concluded by expressing a hope that this terrible circumstance would be a warning to young men and to all in their future lives. He then dismissed them to consider their verdict.

After an absence of an hour and a quarter the Jury entered the room, and the Foreman read the following verdict: "We find that the deceased destroyed herself by drowning whilst in an unsound state of mind, and eleven of the Jury desire to strongly censure the conduct of her seducer, which they believe was the cause of her melancholy end, the other Juryman thinks that the name of Mr. Miller ought to be added as that of the seducer."

This verdict was greeted with tremendous cheers, repeated again and again, and followed by three cheers for Mr. Collin, the Juryman man in question

{page 8 of 8}

Cambridge: Printed and published by DANIEL DING, Printer (for the Proprietors), at the Offices of the "CAMBRIDGE INDEPENDENT PRESS", Printing House Yard, Market Hill, in the parish of St. Mary the Great, in the Borough of Cambridge, the said DANIEL DING residing at 15, Ely Place, Parker Street, in the Parish of St. Andrew the Great, in the said Borough, Saturday, January 18, 1873.