

suggestion that the Crown challenged a number of jurors, I have no recollection on this point, but I would only be performing my duty in challenging any one whom I thought incapable. There was at least one Catholic on the jury who was not challenged.

*The Chairman* : Do you remember if any of the pieces of paper were marked by the police to show where they were found.

*Mr. Bell* : No; the coverings were marked, but the papers were not marked. It would have been impossible to mark the piece of paper found by Dr. Cahill. It would not have been impossible to mark those pieces which the police produced. On the top of page 21 it is suggested that my cross-examination of Chemis was a severe cross-examination. I certainly think that that is not justified. My cross-examination was directed to see whether he would contradict certain facts which I thought could be established, and also to ascertain how far his statements coincided with those of his wife. Mr. Jellicoe says that he (Mr. Jellicoe) behaved fairly through the case, and that he called the wife first; but if proper care was taken to get up the case, I would not expect two stories to differ from each other in any material fact.

*The Chairman* : I understand that Mr. Jellicoe had called Mrs. Chemis first because prisoner was then in gaol and could know nothing about what her evidence might be.

*Mr. Bell* : If the evidence was briefed, and if the solicitor was allowed free access to the prisoner there is nothing to be concluded from the coincidence of the two stories. That is all I wish to say on the evidence. I have this morning been shown the evidence of Colonel Hume. I notice in Mr. Jellicoe's statement a suggestion that the police admitted in the Magistrate's Court what they denied in the Supreme Court. That is in connection with the dynamite-caps and fuse. Mr. Jellicoe is wrong. These were sworn to in both the Police Court and the Supreme Court. The Judge has a note about the dynamite-caps. Percussion-caps were spoken of and also dynamite-caps. The police in both Courts spoke of dynamite-caps. I do not remember about the percussion-caps. You will find that the evidence given by the police in the Police Court was the same as that given by them in the Supreme Court. The dynamite-caps were different from the percussion-caps.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : I believe, Mr. Bell, you were not present at the first sitting before the Coroner?—Yes, I was.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : The first sitting? When Dr. Cahill gave his evidence?—No, I was not.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Mr. Thomson conducted the case for the police; then there was an adjournment for a week?—Yes.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : The evidence shows that all the exhibits were produced. When were you first communicated with by the police? You appear to have been first instructed on the 8th of June, but you had received and perused the papers and evidence already given?—Yes, that is so.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : On the 4th of June, Mr. Bell, it was decided, as I understand from Inspector Thomson's statement of the 5th before the Justices, to arrest Chemis?—That may be; I do not know.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Were you consulted on the 4th of June with regard to the arrest of Chemis?—I was consulted by the police on the subject of the murder before I received any instructions to attend the inquest.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : The arrest was made on the 5th, and accused was before the Justices on the 5th. Inspector Thomson then said that the police were justified in making the arrest on the strength of the suspicion that was attached to accused. In evidence in the Supreme Court he said the arrest was made on your advice.

*Mr. Bell* : I cannot say that I was consulted on the evening of the 4th by Inspector Thomson.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Inspector Thomson produced to you a statement of the evidence?—Yes, I should think so, certainly.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Do you know where that statement is?—I will try and find it. I think it is probable that it was returned. It would be there as a police proof of evidence in the Magistrate's Court.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Were not the exhibits produced to you that evening?—No, not at all.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : At that time the paper had not been extracted from the mass taken from the wound?—No, so I read from the evidence.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Will you tell the Committee what circumstances you considered that evening justified the arrest if the paper had not been extracted from the mass?—There was this fact, that Chemis had threatened Hawkings. That of course came from Mrs. Hawkings. Then there was the stiletto, the circumstances of the altercation between them, and there was the probability, in my opinion, that the act was committed by a foreigner. But with much less than that I should have arrested Chemis, because it is necessary in such cases to risk some injustice in order to get the immediate evidence. I think Chemis should have been arrested long before.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Did you know that the police had not brought away the revolver at this time?—I cannot say.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : You are certain you were not consulted earlier than Tuesday night?—I was not consulted, but I was informed by Sergeant Morice. The Crown Prosecutor has no right to interfere with the police.

*The Chairman* : I do not think that matters much to the Committee whether he was consulted earlier or not.

*Mr. Bell* : You will allow me to say that the Crown Prosecutor has no initiation of proceedings in these matters. He has no right to speak until the police put matters in his hands.

*The Chairman* : The police bungling the investigation in the earlier stage would not affect the position.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : No; I was only inquiring as to the facts which it was said justified the arrest. (To Mr. Bell) : You attended the inquest on the 10th of June?—Yes.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : At that time had you received any report from Mr. Tasker?—No, I am nearly