

6. What was the amount of bail you first insisted upon—was it not £500?—I do not know. I have no recollection whatever.

7. Did not I remonstrate with you that you had no power to require bail at all—that you were bound to accept the recognisances that were tendered, and did not you refuse my request and consult Mr. Bell?—I cannot say.

8. Did not I tell you that unless you accepted the recognisances that I should apply for a mandamus compelling you to?—Next day.

9. In the morning?—You possibly may have. I have no distinct recollection.

10. Did not I say that if you refused her recognisances I should have to apply to the Supreme Court compelling you to do so?—I think you said so.

11. And then you consented to take the recognisances without bail?—I think that is so. Mr. Bell and I went into the Act together.

12. Why did you find it necessary to consult the counsel for the defence with reference to the recognisances?—Mr. Bell objected to Mrs. Chemis's personal recognisances being accepted as sufficient.

13. What do you consider substantial bail?—I do not think there is any particular amount. I said I should require bail, and you said, "It is not necessary." I looked up the Act, and found by reference that it was not in my discretion. It was for the Supreme Court to say whether bail should be given or not.

14. *Mr. Moore.*] Do you think that your refusing influenced the subsequent proceedings of the trial?—No.

15. *Mr. Allen.*] Not in the prosecution of the perjury case?—No.

16. *Mr. Moore.*] How long before the Chemis case came on were you appointed to act as Resident Magistrate?—A few days.

The Hon. G. F. RICHARDSON, sworn and examined.

17. *Mr. Jellicoe.*] Were you a member of the Executive in 1889 which considered the Chemis case?—Yes.

[*Mr. Jellicoe* read the evidence given by the Hon. G. F. Richardson in the Magistrate's Court.]

18. I believe, from the evidence I have just read, you examined carefully the clothes of the deceased, produced by the police, in the evidence at the trial?—Yes; I examined the clothes carefully and the exhibits.

19. You were one of the Ministers who advised His Excellency to commute the sentence?—I do not think that is a proper question. I am only going to tell the Committee the result as far as I am concerned myself. I may also say that I put my conclusions down on paper, in a long memorandum, written by myself, at the time. I believe the Committee would be permitted to see that memorandum. They would see everything set out there. The memorandum was written so that any future Government dealing with the case might have my views on the matter, when we had everything before us at the time.

20. Have you any objections to that memorandum being produced?—No; it was a document prepared entirely by myself.

21. *The Chairman.*—Would you tell the Committee what you know of the case?—The first point that struck me on examining the exhibits was the fact that no bullet had been fired as alleged by the Crown. That the hole in the right-hand side of the coat, which was caused by some firearm discharged in a downward direction, was too large to be caused by a bullet, but had been made by a charge of shot fired at close quarters. Anybody acquainted with the effect of the discharge of firearms would not for a moment doubt that. The hole in the coat was, I should say, an inch and a half in diameter; whereas a bullet makes a hole smaller than its own diameter. On a broken portion of the knife, which was driven by this discharge out of the waistcoat pocket and found on the ground, there was, I thought, a distinct indentation of a pellet of shot on a portion of the brass lining of the knife. The next point was the wound at the back, and the extraordinary nature of that discharge. There was a large orifice through the clothes worn by the deceased. The charge had only penetrated to the shoulder-blade. From any ordinary gun discharged at short range the pattern would have been closer and the penetration much greater than in this instance. Around this orifice were scattered shot-holes for a considerable radius. The peculiarity of this result to my mind demonstrated that it could not have been caused by any gun; the discharge must have been from some very short-barrelled weapon of large calibre, something like an old ship's pistol loaded with shot fired at close quarters. The weapon used must have been something in the nature of a pistol or double-barrelled gun which had been cut down. There was another point with regard to the first discharge which demonstrates that the weapon could not have been a gun; the line of the first discharge was as nearly as possible in a downward direction, at an angle of forty-five degrees. It is impossible that a long weapon held to the shoulder could have been discharged at such an angle, except the person firing the weapon was suspended in the air, or standing on some raised structure, otherwise he could not be in a position to use the gun in such a direction. I believe, from the character of the discharge and the direction, that it was a short weapon held in the hand, and which might be turned to any angle, and may have been knocked downward when the murderer was in the act of firing.

22. *The Committee.*] Would the man be standing?—When he received the first discharge he must have been standing upright.

23. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the shot that was fired through the vest-pocket might not have been fired from the hill, and the murderer been below him when he fired the last shot into Hawkins's back?—No. Had the first discharge been fired from a gun held by someone on the side hill it could not have struck the murdered man higher than the knee; the second discharge may have taken place when Hawkins was below the murderer, and possibly in the act of falling.