

of the barrels. One barrel having been wiped with a finger, it presented one appearance at the muzzle, and that which had not been wiped had another appearance. The suggestion may be right or wrong; I want it to be before the Committee. Now, with regard to the paper: it was suggested by Mr. Jellicoe that Carroll, having the papers in his hand during the inquest, may have got them mixed in some way or other. I want to remind the Committee of this: that the pieces of paper found on the ground, and directly connecting with the larger piece, were not all found by Carroll. One such piece was found by Inspector Thomson, another by Campbell, and at different times. The three sets of pieces were handed in separate parcels to Mr. Tasker. There is no possibility of any wrong act on the part of Carroll in connection with the paper. You asked me, Sir, whether inquiries had been made by the police about the men who were seen on the hills. I said, "Yes." But it did not, of course, apply to the men who were mentioned in the affidavits produced after the trial by Mr. Jellicoe. At that time the investigation was out of the hands of the police, and put into the hands of the Inspector of Prisons. I should not have had anything to do with anything after the trial. The man whom I referred to was the man whom Joseph saw.

*Mr. Jellicoe:* Was there not some question of false whiskers?

*Mr. Bell:* Yes. They were not false whiskers, however; it was a strip of hide with cow's hair on it. A witness took it to the police-station, and was told to leave it there. It would never have occurred to any one that it was false hair save to some imaginative advocate. I do not know that any inquiries were made as to the ownership of this cow's hide. There were endless "mare's-nests" which were being constantly communicated to the police and to myself, all of which we investigated; but some only merely nominally so. Some were sensible; but those who had theories only were listened to, and their theories considered.

*The Chairman:* I think we might confine ourselves to the points of the evidence. Will you deal first with the evidence taken in the first trial? Is there anything we have to deal with now from that last evidence?

*Mr. Bell:* I am referring both to the notes of the original evidence, and to the evidence taken before this Committee. Where I see that the information is contrary to fact, or where I see a suggestion made that can be answered, I propose to offer an explanation. With regard to the evidence of Charles Bowles and (in connection with the same point) that of Norman, on page 21, and on pages 24 and 25 of the printed papers: I have a very distinct recollection of Charles Bowles. I do not know whether the suggestion is that he is the murderer or not, but the Committee have only to call Charles Bowles and examine him, and that will settle the matter. I am convinced of it. I saw Charles Bowles between the time of the murder and the trial, and took his evidence. I had an opportunity, therefore, of judging him in addition to what I saw of the manner in which he gave his evidence. I suggest that you call Charles Bowles, and I believe that will settle that question if the Committee form their judgment from what they see of him. Charles Bowles is a man known to two gentlemen in this town who could also be called. One is Mr. Skerrett, and the other is my learned friend Mr. Thompson. Both of them happen to be friends of the Hawkings, and both of them were acquainted with Bowles. They have some knowledge of his character and habits, and, what is more important, they are able to speak most positively of the domestic relations of the Hawkings family. You will find that there is not the shadow of a suspicion.

*The Chairman:* We are trying to arrive at whether this man Chemis is guilty or innocent, no matter who else may be guilty.

*Mr. Bell:* I am not asking you to say who is guilty, but you have permitted Mr. Jellicoe to make the suggestion against Charles Bowles.

*The Chairman:* I do not take it, from the evidence, that Mr. Jellicoe meant to suggest it was Mr. Bowles.

*Mr. Allen:* Yes. That is what the evidence shows.

*Mr. Bell:* There is no doubt that Mr. Jellicoe said that he made no insinuation, but he immediately followed it up with an insinuation. The supposition was that Bowles was running away from the scene of the murder, and was prevented from escaping by meeting McCallum. When the counsel for the prisoner makes a suggestion against Bowles, it is only fair for me to say what I have said, and also to inform you of the gentlemen in this town who could be called if desired to give information.

*The Chairman:* I attach no importance whatever to what Mr. Jellicoe may have said about persons outside of our investigation. That is what I mean. We are asked to decide whether this man committed this murder or not, apart from any one else.

*Mr. Bell:* I think there is some mistake about my meaning. So far as the statement was made in reference to Bowles—as, for instance, Mr. Jellicoe's individual opinion. I look upon it as simply his own judgment. If Bowles's evidence is believed, then, no one in Hawkings's house had anything to do with the murder. Therefore it is important for you, as I would suggest, to know what kind of man this is. I have only suggested that you should call him, and judge for yourselves. But, if Bowles is to be believed, and Mrs. Hawkings is to be believed, they were waiting for this man to come home, and Bowles went out to look for him, and found him on the road. With regard to Norman, I see that Mr. Jellicoe has stated (on the top of page 25), "If you had seen his (Norman's) face when I saw him, you would think that he knew more than he told." I suggest to the Committee, send for Norman, and judge for yourselves. Mr. Jellicoe says that the stammering is put on; the Committee would be able to judge of that. I saw Norman before he gave the evidence, and I heard him give his evidence; and I also saw Norman when the shot-pouch and knife were dramatically thrust before his face by Mr. Jellicoe in the Police Court. I also saw Norman, as I have said, to take his evidence, and I also examined him. It is certainly to be allowed that he is deficient in intelligence, but the stuttering is obviously genuine. I say it is obviously genuine because there could be no reason for him to stutter when with me. He is a mere boy, or was when I saw him. I have never been able to understand what it is that is