sure I had not, for this reason: my first communication with Mr. Bunny on the subject was at the inquest, and it must have been after that, because immediately after I received the report from Mr. Tasker I communicated with Mr. Bunny. I am pretty sure that my first communication with Mr. Bunny was at the inquest.

Mr. Jellicoe: The inquest was closed on the 10th of June, and Chemis was committed for trial on the Coroner's warrant. Up to that time you had not received any report from Mr. Tasker

relative to the papers?—No; there was an open verdict.

Mr. Jellicoe: But Chemis was in custody on a charge of murder?—Yes.
Mr. Jellicoe: On the 12th of June there was an interview between yourself, the police, and

Mr. Tasker?—Yes.

Mr. Jellicoe: Then it was between the date of the Coroner's inquest and the hearing of the case in the Resident Magistrate's Court that you had an interview with the police and Mr. Tasker?

Mr. Jellicoe: Where?—In the Survey Office.
Mr. Jellicoe: Had you received any report from Mr. Tasker before you went to interview him? —I had at some time to give him directions to stop the gumming of the papers. That was the first occasion on which I saw him. I think it must have been on the 12th, though I am not quite positive that I did not see him before. Mr. Thompson and I had the interview with him. I think that it was in consequence of being told that the pieces fitted that I went to see Mr. Tasker.

Mr. Jellicoe: Was it not on your suggestion that the pieces were fitted together. Did you offer Tasker any suggestions on the subject?—No, I think not.

Mr. Jellicoe: Are you responsible for the piecing the paper?—No; I was not responsible for even the instructions that the paper should be compared. That was the object of their being given to Mr. Tasker. After I was informed that they fitted I gave instructions that they should be sewn and not gummed.

Mr. Jellicoe: Did you suggest anything about it?—No. Mr. Tasker had received the paper on the 4th. I suppose he was instructed on the 5th. I suppose, if I was consulted on the 4th, I may have suggested it. I think it is very likely, Sir. The arrangement was made on the suggestion

of the police and not on mine.

Mr. Jellicoe: When did you first get Mr. Tasker's report?—I got no report from Mr. Tasker. Inspector Thomson informed me that the paper did piece—that the paper found on the ground did piece with the paper found in the house. Then I went up to see Mr. Tasker. I took a note myself of Mr. Tasker's evidence in the Magistrate's Court. He says, on page 6 of the printed evidence, "At the time 'J.' was handed to me I had no communication with the Crown Solicitor." A number of pieces had been gummed when I saw him. "J." was received on the 6th. I should say that the 12th was the first day that I knew that the paper pieced. I never had any communication with Mr. Tasker until I went to his room to direct him what to do.

Mr. Jellicoe: Are you sure you knew that the paper pieced when you were before the Justices on the 14th June? On the 17th June you were, according to your diary-entry, "a long time engaged examining the papers in Mr. Tasker's possession." Was that the first time? Had you any knowledge of the evidence Tasker could give?—Was that the day before the inquiry in the Magistrate's

Court began?

Mr. Jellicoe: No; it was after the remand.
Mr. Bell: In my address in opening the case in the Resident Magistrate's Court I referred to

the piecing of the papers.

whether it was the 12th or the 17th; it was one or the other. It was before I opened my case in the Magistrate's Court. It must have been on the 12th or after it.

The Chairman: I do not see what we can gain by these questions.

Mr. Jellicoe: Only this: It is a circumstance that the police did not then justify the arrest on

The Chairman: The whole thing has been done, and the man sentenced.

Mr. Jellicoe: I will be as brief as I possibly can. Mr. Bell has come here to give his interpretation of the evidence, and to put before the Committee his view of the case.

Mr. Bell: No; that is not correct. I do not appear here as an advocate in the case, Sir.

The Chairman: I understand that Mr. Gully would lay before the Committee, on behalf of the Crown, those points of the evidence that require to be clearly laid before them later on.

Mr. Jellicoe (to Mr. Bell): You examined Benjamin?—I think not. I am, however, responsible

for everything done. I find Í did examine Benjamin.

Mr. Jellicoe: You examined from the depositions taken from the Magistrate's Court?—Generally I should, and I suppose I did in this case.

Mr. Jellicoe: Did you notice that in the Magistrate's Court he said, "I did see some fuses and caps there. I did not know what the caps were, and he" (meaning Chemis) "told us?"—Yes; those are the dynamite-caps.

Mr. Jellicoe: He does not say so, but I know they were; I heard the evidence given in the Magistrate's Court. I say, having been present in the Supreme Court, that it was stated that the things that prisoner said were dynamite-caps were the things mentioned in Benjamin's evidence.

Mr. Jellicoe: Take Campbell's evidence before the Justices: he said that he saw dynamite-caps and "other appliances." Did you make any inquiry as to what was meant by "other appliances?" Did you ask him what these "appliances" were?—I did not, because I should not be allowed to ask such a question

Mr. Allen: Campbell, talking about Benjamin, said, "He said he had some dynamite-caps

there; we found no powder-flask or gun there."

The Chairman: The difference is this, that in the evidence before the Supreme Court he is 6—I. 1B.