

*Mr. Bell:* My object is to show you that you have not got the whole evidence in order to arrive at a solution of this question about the powder-flasks. It is necessary to go into the case that would have been presented by the police when the perjury prosecution was concluded. Mr. Jellicoe has got evidence already called, but he has not got one single word of the explanation or suggestion by which the police could have met the charge for the prosecution. I have marked these facts for the information of the Committee that there were two constables, as well as Inspector Thomson and the detectives, who probably saw the drawer, and will probably be able to give you information upon the subject.

*The Chairman:* Was not Carroll examined again when the case of perjury was heard?

*Mr. Jellicoe:* No; no evidence for the defence was taken.

*Mr. Bell:* You will see on the bottom of page 24 (H.—33) that Carroll made a search of prisoner's house on the 5th of June, and took the paper from prisoner's trousers. He made a search. That would lead you to suppose that Carroll knew something of the contents of the drawer, and also Healey. I have not seen Carroll or Healey on this point at any time. *With regard to the "bullet;"* I have read what Mr. Richardson says. I am not an expert. I saw the waistcoat-pocket and the hole. The jury saw it and the Judge saw it, and we all assumed that it was a bullet-hole. Although not an expert, but having seen it myself, nothing will induce me to believe that this hole was made by a discharge from a shot-gun. The pocket would have been riddled with shot. I would like to see a shot-gun fired at a waistcoat at close quarters and not burn it, and make such a hole as this was. I do not know whether the coat is in the same condition now; but I have read Mr. Richardson's evidence, and on page 26 he speaks of a hole an inch and a half in diameter. All that I can say is that, as far as my recollection carries me, it was not an inch and a half in diameter at the trial. It astonishes me to hear that it was so. I have not seen the coat since the day I saw it at the trial, and I do not suppose that I saw it then more than once. But, of course, I saw it before the trial, and examined it carefully, and if the hole was then an inch and a half in diameter my memory must mislead me badly. Mr. Richardson's recollections differ entirely from mine.

*The Chairman:* Some of the papers have been mislaid. Colonel Hume told me that they would make another inquiry, and try to find them. A memorandum was attached by Mr. Richardson giving a very full and explicit statement to the papers laid before the Cabinet, and I am told that this memorandum has been taken off the paper, and cannot be found.

*Mr. Bell:* My memory is fairly clear as to what I saw, and, though I did not make a memorandum at the time, we all treated this as a bullet-hole without a possibility of a doubt.

*The Chairman:* I do not think, Mr. Bell, that the police are emphatic about it being a bullet-hole.

*Mr. Bell:* It is quite new to me then if that is so. With regard to the shot in the paper, Mr. Richardson says you cannot fire paper into a body with shot. My answer is that the shot was found in the body mixed with the paper. Dr. Cahill took it out, and it is no use theorising against that fact. If I doubted that the doctor's evidence was fact I would call him and see if I could shake him on the subject. It was proved to be a fact, and nobody ever doubted it. However, it was not essential to the case, for if the paper found on the ground fitted into the paper found in prisoner's house, it did not matter whether the paper was taken out of the body or not. Mr. Richardson's evidence is all theory, which the Committee are as well able to judge of as myself. About the experiments made with the knife I can offer no opinion. I should like to say that I have never yet seen the knife that was found in the gully. [The knife was here produced.]

*The Chairman:* That knife was put in evidence when we were looking at the paper collar. The collar seemed to be the only part of the clothing that was intact. The Committee tried the knife to see whether it would fit a cut which was in the collar.

*Mr. Jellicoe:* Was any stress put upon the cut in the collar?

*Mr. Bell:* No, I think not. It strikes me as being a new point in the evidence. Two cuts in the coat were before the jury. They carefully examined all the cuts. The stiletto was mere makeweight to the paper evidence. Referring to Mr. Richardson's evidence on page 26: Mr. Richardson is wrong there. There is not, I think, the slightest distinction in the edges of the paper. The only distinction in the characters of the papers is that one is blackened and the other is not. On page 31 of printed evidence Mr. Kelly asks, "Could the doctor have taken such a large piece out whole?" Well, no doubt there is evidence that the doctor was careless, and one part of the paper was wrapping and the other part extracted. Unless Dr. Cahill is perjuring himself, one part of the paper was mixed up with the shot extracted from the mass. Therefore both parts may have been used. But it is only necessary that one piece of the paper was extracted from the wound. In Chemis's statement, when called upon to say why sentence should not be passed upon him, he did not deny that paper was taken from his house. Now, with regard to further evidence that was obtained—I refer to the evidence of the shot-pouch and sheath-knife. That is, the Committee are aware, the discovery by Low. But the Committee has not been informed by Mr. Jellicoe that they were produced by him as counsel for Mr. and Mrs. Chemis in the most dramatic way. They were presented as genuine articles—as the murderer's weapons. Mr. Jellicoe was asked to produce them, and he pushed them up under Norman's face for the purpose of confronting him with them. Afterwards Mr. Jellicoe put them in a bag and declared that no Magistrate should have them. I only refer to this for the purpose of stating what is absolutely fact, that these were used by Chemis's counsel as genuine articles which had been overlooked in the search.

*The Chairman:* This was on the perjury case.

*Mr. Bell:* Yes. When I began to prove that the shot-pouch was Chemis's there was a change of front, and Mr. Jellicoe went on to state that they were a "plant." Mr. Hawkins, who took a very great interest in the case, was in Mr. Jellicoe's confidence. He was a solicitor in Wellington at that time, and owned the *Evening Press*. He used to come to me and say that they were going to smash us, and so forth. I did not seek his confidence. This can be borne out by Mr. Skerrett. When it was said to be a "plant," Mr. Jellicoe called some witnesses to show that they had