

*Mr. Jellicoe* : It was thought perhaps that some part of the evidence ought not to be published. I should like the Chairman to obtain the original affidavit. This witness's evidence refers to the clothing Chemis was wearing when he was examined by the doctor.

*The Chairman* : This was on the evening when the murder was committed.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Yes. If the statement with regard to the position in which a man would stand when killing a sheep is correct, you would not expect to find blood on the right leg of the trousers Bowles was wearing.

*The Chairman* : What has become of Bowles since?

*Mr. Jellicoe* : I have got some evidence which I propose to give to the Committee.

*Mr. Moore* : Is there any evidence that a sheep had been killed that morning?

*Mr. Jellicoe* : No; no search was made. I applied to Sir Harry Atkinson to have an investigation made by an independent and reliable detective from the Australian Colonies, and unknown to the police of Wellington. Sir Harry Atkinson thought it a feasible proposal, and I believe he did communicate with Australia, but nothing came of it. I could not go myself to make a search, as, without authority of law, the Hawkings family would have been entitled to eject me.

*Mr. Gully* : No evidence as to that could have been produced at the trial of Chemis.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : No; but there is this to be said about it: Supposing Hawkings's premises had been searched, they might have either found or negatived the existence of traces of a sheep having been killed.

*Mr. Kelly* : Did not the police search Bowles?

*Mr. Jellicoe* : No; not at any time. They thought in Chemis they had the right man. Their theory was that he was the murderer, and they contented themselves by setting to work to prove him guilty.

*Mr. Gully* : I do not think there was a suggestion made by anybody that there was even a suspicion against Bowles.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Yes, there was at the trial, so well as Mr. Bunny could make it. But, unfortunately, he was not in a position to deal properly with the case, owing to the condition he was in. The next witness corroborates the evidence of Nicholl, and you have the fact that Bowles was not afterwards seen wearing the same trousers, although he had been seen by Nicholl frequently afterwards.

*The Chairman* : When was the wad-cutter produced?

*Mr. Jellicoe* : It came from Mr. Bunny's office. You will find it in the evidence. It was lying in the drawer when the detectives found the stiletto. Then we have the affidavit of Robert Dybell, whom Chemis asked to purchase a wad-cutter, and on the 13th April bought one, No. 13, at Denton's, for which Chemis paid him. Chemis afterwards told him his gun killed better with wads. On the 29th May Chemis told Dybell that he had killed two quail at his back door. This was just two days before the murder. On the morning of Thursday, the day before the murder, Chemis again shot two quail from the back of his house. This shows that Chemis discharged his gun for a proper purpose on the day before the murder. Then, Mrs. Mary Anne Holmes saw him both on the Friday and on the Saturday. On the Saturday he was wearing the same clothes as he had worn the night previously. John Daly corroborated Dybell as to the purchase of the wad-cutter. Lambert, the fish-curer, speaks of meeting Chemis on the Friday (31st May), the day of the murder; he describes his dress, and Chemis went to work as usual after their conversation. This and Mrs. Holmes's evidence shows that the clothes worn by Chemis the day of the murder and on the day after were the same. Supposing there was any evidence to show that Chemis had stabbed Hawkings, would not this Committee expect that on the following morning there would have been some stains of blood on his clothing? Here he was going about as usual, wearing the working clothes he had worn the day before. Now, as to the wad-cutter, this box of wads were actually in the possession of the counsel who defended Chemis on his trial, and the fact that it was not produced can only be accounted for by the state of health in which Mr. Bunny then was. Now, directly I was retained, I went out to prisoner's house and brought away the drawer from which the stiletto was taken, and I think it was very unfortunate that the police themselves did not bring it away. The explanation obviously is that they really thought at that time that Hawkings had been stabbed, and they did not trouble themselves about bringing away anything except the stiletto.

*Mr. Lake* : There are two No. 13 wad-cutters there?

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Yes; that is explained further on by Mr. Denton's man. [Affidavit by Edwin George Jellicoe of Wellington, solicitor, read]. I wish to point out that the examination by me of Chemis's child took place on the 21st July. She mentions the circumstance of her father cutting up mangolds. The prisoner's statement addressed to the Governor is dated the 22nd July. Oddly enough he also refers to this cutting of mangolds in his statement. There could be no possible collusion, as, prior to the 22nd July, I had not interviewed Chemis privately. I refrained from asking the child to sign an affidavit, considering her age and the circumstances. Then we have the affidavit of Greaves, which shows that this drawer was the proper place for keeping the powder-flask long before the murder was committed. He also says he was at Chemis's house on the Sunday after the murder, and they were preparing quail for dinner. John Dowd states that Chemis never carried a sheath-knife. It had been suggested that if the murder had not been committed with the stiletto it must have been done with a sheath-knife. Then there is the affidavit of H. C. Blandford, who, on the 31st May, the night of the murder, was taking the last bend in the road to Ngauranga about 9 o'clock in the evening. He heard a rustling in the scrub; he stopped and listened; the night was calm. He heard of the murder of Hawkings next day. A few days after he followed up a certain track in the scrub and found a pair of boots, and what appeared to him to be a pair of false whiskers. He took the things to Detective Benjamin, but he could not find him. The Committee would observe that after the police had left the *locus in quo* with the body, and after the doctor had gone away, there is no account of Bowles's whereabouts until he turns up at 11 o'clock at Norman's, where he stays in the whare until 6 o'clock in the morning. No inquiry has ever been