ay they could find no powder-flask in my place; it was right along with the shot, and with one hand they could have taken up either. There were three or four quail in a tin," &c. (see report).
. . . "I never use paper at all in my gun. I hope your Honour will see to-morrow." I call attention to this because the Chief Justice seemed to think that the man had stated a pack of falsehoods. Nobody suggests that there was any conspiracy on the part of the police, nor is it necessary to say more than that they were mistaken. I pledge myself to establish the truth of every statement Chemis made. I first propose to explain the correspondence and all that took place on the matter coming into my hands. I undertake to prove the documents which I produce at this moment. I had an opportunity of seeing Chemis on the 16th July, the day following the conviction. In the presence of Warder Millington I took down what he said, and read it over to Millington, and handed it over to Mr. Fergus within an hour after it was taken down.

The Committee: Does he speak good English?

Mr. Jellicoe: Fairly well; the meaning of what he says can be clearly understood. referred to read. I have taken this down in the man's own words, so you will appreciate the extent of his English. At the request of O'Dowd I had sent my clerk up to see if he wanted me. The original was handed by me to Mr. Fergus. It was read over to Chemis to test its accuracy.

The Committee: Was Mr. Fergus Minister then?

Mr. Jellicoe: Yes. I will read a letter which Chemis produced: "I have just heard that some evil-disposed person states that I am too ill to conduct your case," &c. [See letter, p. 49, H.-33, The Chairman: What date is that?

Mr. Jellicoe: The 2nd July.

The Chairman: I do not think the correspondence makes any difference in this case.

Mr. Jellicoe: I agree, and shall not trouble you to read the correspondence you find attached to the printed papers. I wish to point out to the Committee that, before I had an opportunity of seeing Chemis privately, he had stated that he wished to make a statement, and he was invited by the Government to do so. He was told that he could make a statement, and it would be duly considered. The statement was made on the 22nd July, 1889. He had no communication with his wife or any person as to what we were doing outside, and we had no knowledge of the statement which had been made and sent privately by him to the Governor.

The Chairman: On what date did you take action on his behalf? Mr. Jellicoe: On the 16th July; the first letter is dated the 16th.

Mr. Allen: Do I understand that you had no knowledge of the communication made by Chemis?

Mr. Jellicoe: Not until long after.

Mr. Allen: He did not mention it at the interview with you?

Mr. Jellicoe: Possibly at the private interview he said he had sent a statement. I have no

Mr. Allen: He made a statement to you on the 16th July. That was some time before the

Mr. Jellicoe: The statement he made to me on the 16th was made in the presence of Warder Millington. I did not see him again except on the occasion when a shorthand note was taken of the interview. There was an interview with him on the 20th. The whole of that interview is reported—every word of it. The Government sent a shorthand-writer, and he took down everything that occurred. Nothing transpired as to any intention on the part of Chemis to send a statement to the Governor. He was afterwards told that any statement he made would be considered, and he sat down and wrote it out. The statement was communicated to me by the Executive after it was printed and placed on the table of the House. I knew nothing whatever about it before. On the 20th, as will be seen by reference to page 57, H.-33, 1889, I was in conflict with the Minister of Justice as to my claim to interview the prisoner privately, and on the very day that I was endeavouring to obtain a private interview the statement was made to the Governor, and that without any intervention on my part. [Statement read.] The reference to the words "good or bad" applies to an action which had been tried before the Chief Justice, or Mr. Justice Richmond, between Chemis and Hawkings. The Judge had reserved his decision, and that is what he refers to when he says the question between him and the dead man is in the hands of the Judge, and his death does me neither good or bad. He could not possibly tell how the judgment would go. I have read the evidence of the threat made use of by Chemis a considerable time before the murder was committed, having reference in some way or other to the lawsuit. I will now read the evidence from page 41. There were several affidavits submitted to the Governor prior to the prosecution of Benjamin for perjury taking place. All these witnesses were cross-examined by Mr. Bell, who conducted the defence of Benjamin. Holmes's affidavit certainly shows that, if it be true that four or five months before the murder there had been any ill-will on Chemis's part towards Hawkings, on the Saturday night before the murder it had ceased to exist; and had Holmes been allowed to give evidence he would have destroyed the so-called evidence of ill-will or threats. Ellen Collins, Minnie Flaws, and Sarah Eagles were summoned to give evidence in connection with the milk-bills sent out by Chemis, the suggestion being that if it could be shown that Chemis had been in the habit of sending out the milk-bills on the 1st of the month and had not done so on this occasion it would be some evidence for the prosecution, and they were not called for the reasons stated in their affidavit. "Shoot him down like a dog." That is the kind of language Hawkings was proved to have used towards Mrs. Bowles, his mother-in-law, in referring to her son.

The Chairman: Was she called?

Mr. Jellicoe: She was not. Mr. Bunny did not call any witnesses for the defence. Her evidence shows that ill-feeling existed between Bowles and the deceased. There is something omitted in the publication of this affidavit.

The Chairman: It does not seem to be of any importance.