I.—1B.

to raise any question between Mr. Jellicoe and myself. What I wanted to show was this: that this matter of Holmes's evidence and of the milkman's evidence has been raised over and over again before proper tribunals and refuted. That was all I wanted to show, and I wanted to have an opportunity of producing before this Committee the evidence to prove that not only had they been refuted, but withdrawn. I thought of doing that only as disproving the allegations so far as they might affect the mind of this Committee.

The Chairman: Of course, I feel it somewhat difficult to draw the line and lay down a basis to work out; but I want this to be borne in mind by all: That the Committee wish to confine themselves, as near as possible, to the evidence in the case of the convict Chemis, whether in his favour

Mr. Bell: I think I have been misunderstood. I should not have tendered evidence here merely to defend my own character. I tendered the evidence because, if I had been guilty of the misconduct alleged, then Chemis would have had an unfair trial. I should have been ashamed of myself had I raised any personal issue; but I felt that it was relevant to prove to this Committee that these allegations are, as I have called them already, simply lies.

(Mr. Bell then left the room).

Lieutenant-Colonel ARTHUR HUME sworn and examined.

1. The Chairman. You are Commissioner of Police?—Yes. I have held the office of Commissioner since 1st July, 1890. I was not holding that office when this trial took place. I was Inspector of Prisons. I may state, with reference to the position I held in this business, that I was Inspector of Prisons at the time this thing happened. After the trial was all over, I was sent for one night by the late Sir Harry Atkinson, at about 10 o'clock, when the House was sitting, to go to the House.

2. Mr. J. Kelly.] At what time?—Sometime during the session.
3. The Chairman.] Would it be near the time when you took these affidavits?—Yes; it was the day before—24th July, 1889. Sir Harry Atkinson told me that there was certain information he wanted me to try and obtain for him. I explained to him that it would put me in a very awkward position, as, of course, I had nothing to do with the police. However, he gave me the instruction, or he told me that my duty was to do as Ministers told me. He said there was a man he wanted me to find that night. I took a cab and went out to Ngahauranga, and found the man

that night.
4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man?—It was Blandford—the man up on the hill, who was at the Ngahauranga

4. Who was that man is the man up on the hill was the Fort Battery. I got the information, and brought it back to Sir Harry Atkinson. When I got back, between twelve and one o'clock, the House was still sitting. I may also state that at this time nothing whatever had passed between Mr. Jellicoe and myself with regard to this business. That is merely to show the Committee how I came on the scene. I was perfectly independent of

the police or Mr. Jellicoe.

5. I believe you made certain experiments for Ministers?—Yes.
6. Will you kindly explain the nature of those experiments, and the result?—I shall try to. The Chairman: Before you commence, I may say that the Committee would like to follow it up with any questions that may arise out of your statement.

Witness: The evidence referred to was taken long before this. Mr Jellicoe: I beg your pardon.

Witness: You took the evidence of men named Pickering, Hogg, and Sedgwick, and also Dybell, the blacksmith.

The Chairman: Perhaps it would be better to explain it in your own way.

Witness: As far as my memory serves me, I think it was from what Blandford told me-the man I saw that night; I think it was from what he told me, I went gathering information from

7. The Chairman.] Did you make any inquiry as to the man who had been seen on the hill that night?—No, Sir, I do not think I did. As far as I remember, I could not get any trace of him. I was terribly handicapped at first. I had no detective; I was simply acting on my own hook.

8. Mr. Jellicoe.] That is not Pickering's statement; he says otherwise?—Yes, quite so.

9. The Chairman.] But Pickering refers to some days previous, and not to the night before?— It refers to the Queen's Birthday, or some public holiday.

10. Mr. Jellicoe: You did not get any trace of the person said to have been quarrelling with Hawkings?—No; everything I got is down in this statement.

The Chairman: Then we will pass on from that.

11. Mr. Jellicoe: Will you kindly tell the Committee the nature of the experiments you made for the Executive, and the result?—Well, I took the gun, and I used three drachms of powder and an ounce and a quarter of shot. That is the usual charge for sporting guns; and I fired at part of a sheep, dressed up in clothes of similar texture to those worn by Hawkings, and the conclusion arrived at, both by myself and Captain Coleman, who assisted me, was that the murder could not have been committed with that gun. It must have been done with some weapon of a very much larger calibre, or of a very much larger bore. We found that, in order to drive the paper into the wound, as was driven in the murdered man's case, if you put the muzzle of that gun close enough to drive in the paper, you must burn the coat—you must be close enough to burn the coat. Again, if you go a little further back, you do not drive the paper into the wound, and you make a very much larger hole in the coat by the scattering of the shot. The conclusion Captain Coleman and myself came to, after our various experiments, was that the shot must have been fired from the weapon known as a horse-pistol; but I must, of course, tell the Committee that these experiments must