

account, and he explained that he had a lawsuit which would cost him from £10 to £12. Chemis replied that was nothing. Chemis said that he had a lawsuit, and if he lost his case it would cost £50 or £60; he said it was the case of Hawkings's, and, if he lost the case, God knows that it would ruin him. *John Tucker's evidence*: Then Tucker is called. He is a labourer at Newtown with Mr. Harlen, a milkman. He was in Harlen's employ last Christmas. He says he saw Chemis there on the Sunday before Christmas. Chemis said he had leased some land of Hawkings, 40 or 50 acres; that he wanted to chuck it up; that it did not pay; that Hawkings did not want him, unless he chucked up the house and land he was living on, to make a slaughterhouse. He said, "The son of a bitch wanted to do him the same as he had done one or two more." Witness asked Chemis if he thought Hawkings would get away with him, and Chemis replied, "If he get the better of me, I will fix the bugger so that he will get away with no other." Now, all that is going back to a period nine months before the murder, and that is all there is as to evidence of motive. *Emma Harlen's evidence*: This witness is called to corroborate Tucker as to Chemis being at her residence on Christmas Day. *William Wilson's evidence*: This witness is a shorthand-writer on the *Evening Press*. The day after the murder he goes to Kaiwara on the business of the paper. He picked up several pieces of paper on Hawkings's ground. This evidence also points to the fact that quantities of paper were lying about. He hands some pieces (described) to Detective Campbell and to Norman. *Stephen Green's evidence*: This witness also speaks to finding pieces of paper which he picked up, and which he handed over to Detective Benjamin. He identifies these papers by date 17th November. *Peter Joseph's evidence*: This witness speaks to a man going across the hill who had a gun and no dog. That was on the 31st of May, and very near 5 o'clock. But he says the prisoner Chemis was not that man.

*Mr. Moore*: Would that be in the direction of Chemis's house?

*Mr. Jellicoe*: No; his evidence suggests rather that it refers to another man that he saw going from the direction of Hawkings's. It was a matter, no doubt, which the police might have inquired into; but apparently no inquiry was made. *Cecilia Phillips' evidence*: This witness was barmaid at the Kaiwara Junction Hotel. She knows O'Dowd, but she observed nothing extraordinary in his manner on the 31st May. *William Skey's evidence*: This is the Government Analyst, who examined the stiletto and sheath-knife brought to him for blood, but found none. His evidence must be qualified by what Dr. Cahill says. *Henry Bradford's evidence*: This witness is Government Armourer, to whom detective brought a double-barrel muzzle-loading gun. He says he hardly thinks the left-hand barrel had been fired off on the 31st May. He put the barrels on the fire, and one of the nipples was exposed to the same heat as the breeches. *Thomas James Tolly's evidence*: This witness is a gunsmith, in the employ of Mr. Denton. He is in conflict with the Government Armourer, and rather suggests that the Government Armourer spoiled any evidence that might have existed of any value by putting this nipple in the fire. He goes on to describe the shot. *Lawrence Carroll's evidence*:—

*Mr. Allen*: What was the date of the murder?

*Mr. Jellicoe*: The 31st May.

*Mr. Allen*: You said July just now.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: That was the date of the trial.

*Mr. Allen*: You said it was nine months before that Tucker saw Chemis in the Adelaide Road.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: That was an error. Lawrence Carroll is the constable who examined the body of Hawkings and took it to the morgue. He found a pocket-handkerchief, a memorandum-book, but no pocket-book on the body. The cheque-book was contained in the pocket-book. Mrs. Hawkings speaks of having put the money into her husband's pocket-book, and giving him the pocket-book. Now, whoever committed this murder must have purloined the pocket-book. The possession of that pocket-book would have been the strongest evidence against a person charged with this murder. This constable was first on the spot. The next morning he examined the ground with another constable. They saw Bowles standing some distance above pool of blood. After examining the place they went up to Hawkings's house, and afterwards returned to the place where the pool of blood was. They found a stone 18 yards further down than the pool and 8 yards off the road, on the left side going up. Carroll produces the parcel No. 1, containing the handkerchief. Constable Healy found two smaller stones stained.

*The Chairman*: What was the distance—45 or 50 yards?

*Mr. Jellicoe*: That was, I think, the distance between the stones they found from the pool of blood. Carroll says that he picked up some of the paper, and some was picked up by others and handed to him. It is said by the prosecution that the pieces found in the wound are connected with three pieces found on the spot, and that the pieces found on the spot are connected with the larger piece found in the house; and, if the pieces found on the spot connect with the piece found in the house, that is direct evidence against Chemis.

*Mr. Houston*: The case practically rests on the paper.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: The piece coloured red. [Exhibit referred to.] Carroll says he arrived in town at twenty past 9 at night, and the paper was picked up about 8 o'clock the next morning. He put the pieces in his pocket, and locked them up in his house in May Street. You will now see what took place. There was a delay and a change of the papers when shifted about from one hand to another. The constable says they were never out of his charge until the 5th of June, when he took them to Inspector Thomson, who did not touch them, but told him to take them to Mr. Skey. He did so, and on the 6th he received back what he supposed to be the same paper. But he may have made a mistake as to the pocket he placed these pieces of paper in at the time he first received them, and may have made a mistake when he produced them to Inspector Thomson, or handed them to Mr. Skey or Mr. Tasker. He says, very properly of course, that he believes he got back the same paper from Mr. Skey and Mr. Tasker.

*The Chairman*: What is this question: "I did not unfold the pieces of paper. I could not identify them"?