

[Care must be taken in folding not to crease the Photographs]

Name BLUNDERFIELD, George Farrow No. \_\_\_\_\_

(in full with aliases)

Date when Portrait was taken \_\_\_\_\_ Photo Register No. 10564

No. of previous Portrait \_\_\_\_\_ Gaol No. 8812 - 10564

Native place Plympton, S. Australia Reference to Criminal Register Vol. C. Fol. 57

Year of Birth 1872

Finger Print Classification { 15 R ( 0 )  
10 U ( 0 )

Arrived in { Ship \_\_\_\_\_  
State of W.A. { Year \_\_\_\_\_

Trade or Calling Engineer

Religion \_\_\_\_\_

Education, degree of \_\_\_\_\_

Height 5 feet 7 1/2 inches

Weight in lbs. { on Committal 146 lbs.  
on Discharge \_\_\_\_\_

Build Medium

Colour of Hair Light brown

Colour of Eyes Grey

Eyebrows \_\_\_\_\_

Beard \_\_\_\_\_

Moustache \_\_\_\_\_

Forehead \_\_\_\_\_

Nose \_\_\_\_\_

Mouth \_\_\_\_\_

Chin \_\_\_\_\_

Face \_\_\_\_\_

Complexion Fair



Particular Marks, Peculiarities and Remarks.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

THIS MARGIN NOT TO BE WRITTEN ON.

CONVICTIONS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Where and When.	Offence.	Sentence.	No. of Crime Offence Report.
① <u>Kalgoorlie</u> <u>30/10/99</u>	<u>Unlawful possession (Bicycle)</u>	<u>Fined £5 or 3 months H.L.</u>	
② <u>Supreme Court Perth</u> <u>6/3/1900</u>	<u>Carnally knowing a Girl</u>	<u>12 years P.S.</u>	<u>To T.L.</u>
③ <u>do</u> <u>7/12/1909</u>	<u>Attempting to Kill</u>	<u>9 years H.L.</u>	<u>Transferred 8812 to 10564.</u>
④ <u>NOTE:- Escaped from Rottnest Island on 5/4/1914.</u>			

Date discharged from Goal \_\_\_\_\_

### THE BLUNDERFIELD CASE

#### PRISONER CONVICTED.

#### SENTENCED TO 'TWELVE YEARS' PENAL SERVITUDE.

In the Criminal Court yesterday, before Mr. Justice Stone, the trial of George R. Blunderfield, for having, on January 20, at Kalgoorlie, committed a serious crime on a child of the age of six years, was concluded. Mr. Wood having completed his address to the jury, His Honour summed up.

His Honour said that the offence with which the prisoner was charged, was created by a statute. Formerly, although offenders could be prosecuted, it was always difficult to secure a conviction, owing to the inability of the child to understand the nature of an oath, and, consequently, to give evidence. If the child was of such tender years that the judge was of opinion that she could not understand the nature of an oath, her evidence could not be received. The jury could well imagine that in these circumstances many men got off punishment for this very serious offence. They much too frequently heard of offences of this character being committed against children of very tender years. The Legislature, therefore, very properly came to the assistance of the public, and enacted that, notwithstanding that the child might not be of such tender years as to be unable to understand the nature of an oath, still the evidence could be received, but only upon the condition that it was corroborated by some material evidence in support of her statement, implicating the accused. The jury in the present case would, therefore, have to bear in mind this provision of the Legislature, because, without the evidence of the child, who had been assaulted, they would be unable to convict the accused. In this case, they could have no doubt that the child had been most brutally outraged by someone, and the very serious question they had to determine was

In this case, they could have no doubt that the child had been most brutally outraged by someone, and the very serious question they had to determine was who that someone was. At first the Crown appeared to rely that the offence was committed about the time that a piercing scream was heard in the direction of Mrs. Palmers' house; but the jury would have very little doubt on their minds—particularly on the evidence of the child—that the occurrence did not take place at that time. His Honour then reviewed the evidence exhaustively, the summing up being, on the whole, strongly against the prisoner. In concluding, his Honour said that he had endeavoured to draw a line between the two sides—the Crown and the prisoner—and point out where the evidence seemed to point to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner. He had only to repeat what he had said at the commencement, that, in considering the evidence of the child, they must bear in mind that they must not convict on her evidence alone. If they had any doubt in their minds, they must give the prisoner the benefit of it.

After half an hour's retirement, the jury returned and asked his Honour whether the evidence of the witness William Warren, who was called for the defence, had been given in the lower court, or whether it was only a statement made before a solicitor.

His Honour said that the witness had made a statement to the solicitor on the Tuesday after the occurrence. There was no evidence that he made it before a magistrate. He was not examined, in fact, before a magistrate.

His Honour said that the witness had made a statement to the solicitor on the Tuesday after the occurrence. There was no evidence that he made it before a magistrate. He was not examined, in fact, before a magistrate.

After ten minutes' further retirement, the jury brought in a verdict of guilty. Asked whether he had anything to say why sentence should not be passed upon him, prisoner replied, "I have nothing to say whatever, only that I am innocent."

His Honour, addressing the prisoner, said: "The jury have found you guilty of a very atrocious offence. It is fortunate for society that the law has been altered, and that that little child was able to give her evidence to-day, because but for that alteration in the law you would have escaped. I hope you feel your position. You are a young man, but there is not the slightest chance for you, in committing such a dastardly offence upon that innocent child, whose innocence you have destroyed. The sentence of the Court is that you be kept in penal servitude for twelve years."

The prisoner was not affected in the slightest degree by the verdict of the jury, or the sentence imposed, and he left the dock with an almost jaunty step. His sister, however, fainted when the conviction was announced, and had to be assisted from the Court.

## CRIME AT HOPETOUN.

### THE POST OFFICE ENTERED.

### POSTMASTER FIRED AT IN BED.

### HIS WIFE STRUCK WITH AN IRON BAR.

#### AN ARREST EFFECTED.

Albany, October 28.

Intelligence of a desperate deed, involving an attempt at double murder, was received from Hopetoun this morning. The scene of the outrage was the post office, and the postmaster (Mr. C. J. Efford) and his wife were the victims of violence from which they were fortunate in escaping with their lives. Both naturally suffered greatly as the result of their experience, and the reports with which they have since supplied the police are necessarily vague.

From the information available it seems that Mr. and Mrs. Efford, who were sleeping in a room behind the front office, were disturbed in their slumbers at an early hour this morning. It was still dark when they awoke, and Mr. Efford had scarcely moved when a revolver was fired close to his head. The bullet grazed his cheek, and was subsequently found to have penetrated the pillow on which he had been lying. Mrs. Efford, on hearing the shots, sat up in bed. She immediately received a violent blow on the forehead from some blunt instrument, which laid open the flesh. Fortunately she retained her senses, and springing out of bed made for the window. She had time to throw open the sash, but her assailant seized her and literally tore her night apparel from her back. Still she persisted in crying for help. Unable to silence her the desperado, evidently panic-stricken, decamped, and disappeared as mysteriously as he had entered the house.

The police camp is situated on the block at the rear of the post office, and Constable McGillvray soon arrived on the scene. Both Mr. and Mrs. Efford were then in a state of collapse, and unable to give a coherent account of what had occurred. Even later on the details that they were able to supply were of the most meagre description. A search of the premises led to the discovery of a number of detonators, but otherwise nothing was found to give a clue to the identity of the desperate intruder.

The police camp is situated on the block at the rear of the post office, and Constable McGillvray soon arrived on the scene. Both Mr. and Mrs. Efford were then in a state of collapse, and unable to give a coherent account of what had occurred. Even later on the details that they were able to supply were of the most meagre description. A search of the premises led to the discovery of a number of detonators, but otherwise nothing was found to give a clue to the identity of the desperate intruder.

The post office at Hopetoun faces east on Veal-street. It is a wood and iron building, standing on a block of land bounded on the north side by another street and on the south by a vacant allotment. Across the right-of-way at the back is the police camp. The premises comprise five rooms. The compartment running right across the front is in use as an office. The door is placed near the northern wall, and a counter divides the room, the safe being strapped to the floor under the counter. Behind the counter a door leads into the sitting-room, and another door on the north side of the latter leads to the bedroom where the outrage was committed. The window opened by Mrs. Efford faces the north. From the sitting-room a second door leads to the kitchen, and from this again a second bedroom, in which Mr. and Mrs. Efford's three children sleep, is approached. Mr. Efford is 45 years of age, and has been stationed at Hopetoun for two or three years.

It can only be surmised that robbery was the object of the visitor, and he probably entered the bedroom with the intention of securing the keys of the safe. At all events, no effort apparently was made to open the safe. There is no bank at Hopetoun, and it is understood that all the cash from the post office is forwarded to Perth in bags as opportunity offers. With two steamers running from Albany remittances can be made frequently, so that the accumulation of cash is never heavy, although on pay-day there might be £200 on the premises.

George Blunderfield, alias George Farrow, a wharf labourer, was arrested this evening on suspicion of having broken into and entered the post office, and with having shot at Mr. Efford and assaulted Mrs. Efford.

## THE HOPETOUN CRIME.

### ATTACK ON THE POSTMASTER.

#### CONFESSION BY THE ACCUSED.

##### NINE YEARS' IMPRISONMENT.

The trial of George Farrow Blunderfield, a middle-aged man, arising out of an outrage at the Hopetoun Post Office in October last, was brought to a somewhat abrupt termination in the Criminal Court yesterday. The case was heard before Mr. Justice Rooth and a jury, Blunderfield being charged with having, at Hopetoun on October 28, unlawfully attempted to kill the postmaster (Charles John Eford), and, further, with having unlawfully wounded Eford with intent to do him grievous bodily harm. The case was opened on Wednesday, and evidence for the Crown was proceeded with up to midday yesterday. Upon the resumption of the case in the afternoon, however, Mr. C. R. Penny, who appeared for Blunderfield, had the plea of not guilty altered to one establishing the man as the perpetrator of the crime. Mr. Penny said the only plea which he had to put forward in behalf of Blunderfield was one of insanity, but he understood from a medical examination that the prisoner was deemed to be in possession of all his faculties. Blunderfield said he was agreeable to the course which his counsel had undertaken, and his Honour inflicted a sentence of nine years' imprisonment with hard labour.

The Crown Solicitor (Mr. A. E. Barker) appeared for the Crown.

Charles John Eford deposed that he was postmaster at Hopetoun. On October 27 he went to bed between 9.15 and 9.30 p.m. Later, there was a knock at the door. His wife went to the door, and she subsequently told him something. There was £108 4s. 7d. in the post office at the time. It was in a safe. The key of the safe was in one of the pockets of his wearing apparel. Witness and his wife retired to bed, but at about 1 o'clock witness rose from his bed and at the same time opened the window of the bedroom. Later he was awakened. It was about 3.30 a.m. then. He turned towards his left side and a revolver was immediately fired. He caught a glimpse of a figure of a man, and was stunned by the explosion, but was able to hear his wife calling out. There was not any light in the room. The figure appeared to be in a crouching position. The man in the room appeared to have staring eyes.

He turned towards his left side and a revolver was immediately fired. He caught a glimpse of a figure of a man, and was stunned by the explosion, but was able to hear his wife calling out. There was not any light in the room. The figure appeared to be in a crouching position. The man in the room appeared to have staring eyes. Witness had known the accused before this, but he could not recognise the figure of the man in the room owing to the pooriness of the light there. His wife called out, "Wake up; what is it?" He then heard a crushing blow, and his wife screamed. He next saw his wife jump through the window. She was immediately followed by a brown figure. Witness ran to the chest of drawers for his revolver, which, however, was useless, as it had not been in use for some time. He then proceeded to the police station, and saw Constable McGillivray, and the two of them returned to the office. The baby was still in the bed. The back door was wide open. Witness carried the baby to the residence of Mr. Lowe, to whose house his wife and other children had proceeded. Accused had been employed for a little time, on the telegraph lines. The breaking of an insulator would not interfere with the circuit; accused knew that. One of the insulators had been broken. Accused had never borne witness or his family any grudge so far as he knew.

By Mr. Penny: He could not say definitely whether the man in the room was kneeling at his (witness's) bed, but their two heads were on a level. Witness had known accused for a couple of years. Accused had often played with the children, and seemed always to be a very steady and good-tempered man. Accused's camp was situated about 20 chains away from witness's house. Witness did not see who delivered the blow on the night in question.

An infant son of the last witness next entered the witness-box. He gave his name as Samuel Eford, and his age as six years. He said he remembered the night when he got out of the window with his mother. He heard a "bang," but was first of all awakened by the back door making a noise. He saw a man going towards the diningroom. It was the accused. Later he heard his mother scream, and saw her jump out of the window. He also got out of the window with his young sister. The man was inside the room, with his knee on the window. On the same night he told the police constable of the occurrence. Witness, with his sister and mother, ran over to Lowe's house.

window with his young sister. The man was inside the room, with his knee on the window. On the same night he told the police constable of the occurrence. Witness, with his sister and mother, ran over to Lowe's house.

By Mr. Penny: Witness and his sister often had games with the accused.

By Mr. Barker: He saw the man twice—once when he was carrying a light and again when he was looking out of the window. He recognised him on each occasion.

Ivy Eford, eight years of age, was next called. She said she remembered the night when her mother and father were hurt. The moon was shining. She heard the back door open and someone creeping into the diningroom, and then into her mother's room. Next she heard a "bang" and her mother screaming. Later, she saw her mother on the ground outside the house and Mr. Farrow at the window. Accused had always been known by that name. She knew it was Mr. Farrow, not because her brother had told her, but because she saw him. She did not see him get out of the window.

Constable Angus McGillivray was also called. He said the police camp at Hopetoun was at the back of the local post-office. On the early morning of October 28 he was awakened by Mr. Eford. Witness immediately rose from his bed and went to the post-office. There was blood on Mr. Eford's face when he reached the police station, and also black marks about the ear. Outside the post-office door was a hessian bag. Two bedrooms appeared to have been occupied. There was a hole through a pillow on one of the beds. There was also some black marks and spots of blood. There was also a mark on the mattress and on the wall at the head of the bed. There was a rag and some iron (produced) on the bed. The iron was partly covered by the rag. Under the bed was a bullet (produced). In the bag were some detonators—four packages in all—and a bottle containing kerosene. Witness also found a revolver outside the window. It was a six-chambered revolver. There was a strong smell of powder at the time. Mr. Eford gave a description of the man, who, it was stated, had been in the room. The boy, Samuel Eford, was the first one to divulge to witness the man's name and other particulars. Witness sent for a black-

1908, and were then working on the telegraph lines. Witness had seen accused in possession of a revolver.

By Mr. Penny: Witness had seen accused constantly. Accused always appeared to be a happy man, although in the bush he was sullen at times and kept more to himself than when in the town.

Mr. Barker: It is not unusual for a man in the bush to become quieter?—No.

Frederick Arthur Abbott, telegraph linesman, with Hopetoun as his headquarters, said the broken insulator to which reference had been made during the case could not have been broken through the throwing of stones at it. There was the risk of a fault occurring through the bending of the wire. Witness could see that the line had been tampered with, and informed the police. The piece of iron (produced) could have produced the damage to the insulator and wire. The rag around the iron would protect a person from electric shock.

George French, bootmaker, of Hopetoun, said he had known accused for about two years. He heard a shot and a scream in the vicinity of the post office in October. On the same morning witness went to accused's camp and spoke to him about the disturbance. He asked him whether he had heard about the tragedy, and he replied, "Poor Efford." He did not say whether or not he had heard of the occurrence. Accused had told witness that he had a revolver. Accused had the clothes over his head when witness awakened him.

By Mr. Penny: Witness told accused to get up as a boat was in. Witness had never noticed anything peculiar about accused. On the same morning—October 22—accused said he was going to the post office to get some letters.

David Paterson, fisherman, of Hopetoun, said he had known accused by the name of Farrow. Witness heard of the occurrence at the post office, and spoke to accused about it, as the latter was on the way to the boat. Accused appeared to be surprised, and made no mention of the fact that someone else had already spoken to him about the matter. Accused had previously informed witness that he had a revolver.

On the resumption of the case in the afternoon, Mr. Penny said that, after anxious consultation with the prisoner's sis-

him about the matter. Accused had previously informed witness that he had a revolver.

On the resumption of the case in the afternoon, Mr. Penny said that, after anxious consultation with the prisoner's sister, who had done everything possible to assist the prisoner, he had been instructed to ask that the plea should be altered, and that Blunderfield should be allowed to plead guilty. His (Mr. Penny's) efforts and the efforts of the man's sister, to obtain any evidence to combat the evidence of Dr. Montgomery, Inspector-General of the Insane in Western Australia, had been unsuccessful. Dr. Montgomery declared that the man was of sound mind, and there was the evidence also of Blunderfield's mate, who said he had worked with him for some time and had not noticed any change in his demeanour. The case was a most peculiar one, for Blunderfield appeared to have turned on people with whom he had been most friendly, but that, of course, was no defence. Therefore, the only just and honest course for him (Mr. Penny) to pursue was not to delay the Judge or the jury by raising the only plea possible, namely, that of insanity, when Dr. Montgomery was of opinion that the man was possessed of all his faculties.

His Honour (to the prisoner): You have heard what your counsel has said. He has stated that he does not see how it is possible to defend your case, and from what I have heard of it, there does not appear to be any defence except that of insanity. The medical expert in the case (Dr. Montgomery) says that you are perfectly sane. It is a question for you to say whether or not the plea should be altered. It is in your power to make an application to that effect.

Prisoner said he was agreeable to the course taken by Mr. Penny.

His Honour: I presume you understand the seriousness of the offence. You wish to make an application in the terms I have mentioned, do you?

Prisoner: Yes, your Honour.

The jury then formally returned a verdict of guilty.

His Honour: Is anything known about this man?

Mr. Barker: Yes, he has been tried for attempted murder, but was acquitted on that occasion. He has also been sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment for rape, and came out of gaol about two or three years ago.

His Honour: I see he was tried in this Court, and was liberated after serving seven years' imprisonment. Will he be able to earn any remission on the three years' imprisonment which he will now have to serve in connection with that sentence?

The gaol warden: Yes, 48 days a year, if of good conduct.

The gaol warden: Yes, 48 days a year, if of good conduct.

His Honour: I understand the attempted murder case took place on the goldfields, and that just after he was found guilty of the other crime for which he was sent to prison.

Mr. Barker: Yes, it was in the following year.

Mr. Penny then spoke at some length in behalf of the prisoner, many of whose actions, he said, it was difficult to understand. In the case of attempted murder, the other man was a mate, and in this case, the prisoner had been on friendly terms with the Efford family.

His Honour: But he seems to have gone to work in a very systematic manner. He armed himself with detonators, a revolver, kerosene, and other articles.

Mr. Penny said Mr. Barker had made out a case which he was unable to answer, but nevertheless there were peculiarities about the man. Everybody who knew the man appeared to speak well of him.

His Honour: If he is sane, the best place for him is prison, because he is a dangerous man.

In sentencing Blunderfield, his Honour said the prisoner had pleaded guilty to one of the most serious crimes known to the law, and it seemed to him, after hearing the case hearing counsel for both sides, that had the case gone on, the jury must have come to the conclusion which had now been arrived at, viz., that he attempted to kill Mr. Efford. It was clear, his Honour thought, that when the crime was committed it was for the purpose of robbery. Prisoner had made his way into Mr. Efford's bedroom, armed with a revolver, and no doubt he had it in his mind to commit murder that night, if necessary. His Honour could not overlook such a crime. Blunderfield was a dangerous man. He now had to do portion of his previous sentence, and he would take that into consideration, but he thought he ought to have inflicted upon him an indeterminate sentence. This, however, his Honour was sorry to say they had not got in this State. The sentence would be one of nine year's imprisonment with hard labour.

Prisoner: Thank you, your Honour.

Escape from Rottneest.—Yesterday morning the superintendent of the Fremantle Gaol received a report from Rottneest stating that a white prisoner named Blunderfield, who acted as cook for the blacks who are imprisoned on the island was missing. The superintendent visited the island yesterday, and a thorough search, which revealed few traces, was made. The man's clothes were found on the beach, and tracks were clearly seen leading into the water. Just as the Zephyr was ready to leave for the mainland on Sunday afternoon a fire broke out, and all the officials were called out to extinguish it, and it is thought that this occurrence and the tracks were merely blinds to assist the man to make good his escape. Blunderfield, who has previously served a sentence on the island, was familiar with the routine of the place, and it is thought that he has made his way, assisted by confederates, to the mainland.

# THE TRAWOOL MURDER.

## OLDRING SENTENCED TO DEATH.

### LONG CAREER OF CRIME.

Melbourne, Feb. 22.

After a trial lasting over five days, Arthur Geoffrey Oldring, whose true name is George Farrow Bluzartfield, was to-day in the Criminal Court, before the Chief Justice, convicted of the murder of Margaret Taylor and her daughter, Rose Taylor, at Trawool, and sentenced to death.

The Chief Justice, in passing sentence, said the accused had been guilty of murders the atrocity of which had seldom been exceeded. For some reason, which had not been disclosed, he had lured a woman, of whom he had been a lover and who had shown considerable affection for him, to a lonely place under pretence of a picnic and there he had slain her. Then finding himself so placed, he had slain the unhappy little girl who had done him no harm and had given him no cause to harm her.

In the course of the trial the murderer admitted that he was a fugitive from justice in Western Australia, and the records of that State show that he had twice been convicted of very serious offences. He is a native of Plympton, South Australia, and he went to Western Australia in 1890. On October 30, 1899, he was convicted at Kalgoorlie on a charge of having been in unlawful possession of a bicycle and was fined £5, with the alternative of three months' imprisonment. Three months later at Perth on March 6, 1900, he received a sentence of 12 years' imprisonment for a criminal assault on a little girl. He was released on probation after serving about six years of this sentence and was again convicted at Perth on December 7, 1909, on a charge of having attempted to kill Charles J. Eford, postmaster at Hopetoun. A charge of having wounded Mrs. Eford with intent to murder was not proceeded with. In this case evidence was given that the man, who was known to Mrs. Eford, broke into the post office on the early morning of October 28, 1909, and shot at Mr. Eford in bed, wounding him, and that when Mrs. Eford screamed she was struck on the head with a blunt instrument. He was confined at Rottnest prison, where he caused a fire in the prison on April 5, 1914, and made his escape in the commotion that arose. He afterwards, apparently, succeeded in getting away to the Eastern States. He enlisted when in South Australia.