

the police were guilty of anything it was of a mistake which would not involve them in a charge of a criminal nature, and I put the case no higher. I make no charge against the police of any nature whatever.

*Mr. Allen*: What is the object of this inquiry if Mr. Jellicoe abandons that statement?

*Mr. Bell*: I speak only as one who had charge of the defence of these policemen on the perjury charges; but I say that if I now had these men's interests in my hands I should not advise, except with the protection of counsel, to come here to defend their reputation, and submit themselves to the cross-examination of Mr. Jellicoe.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: I do not wish to cross-examine them, if that will satisfy you. I am even content to be absent from the room while they give their evidence, if you so desire.

*Mr. Bell*: I say there is this further that, though Mr. Jellicoe withdraws the imputations, if the police have a case such as I have suggested that they ought to be permitted to come with evidence, notwithstanding that Mr. Jellicoe abandons it. These men have already run enormous risk when they were charged with perjury. When Mr. Skerrett and I undertook their defence, I did not do so as paid by the Crown. We did it as solicitors for the police. They incurred heavy liabilities, which the Crown paid. They are asked to incur heavy liabilities again on the chance that the Government will pay them. Then I submit that it falls on the department to undertake the representation.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: I would like the Committee to consider the position from this point of view: A charge of perjury was made against the police; that charge was dismissed without any defence being entered upon. Is the Committee to be asked now to retry the perjury charge, and to allow the police to enter upon a defence which they did not venture to offer before the Magistrates? Are we on this inquiry to drift into a trial of the police—a trial which we say ought, if at all, to have taken place before a jury? I would like to remind the Committee that the police have already had the expense of their defence borne by the country. The Chemis's have been, and are, without means, and we are fighting this case without the slightest pecuniary assistance, and I cannot refrain from saying that it does look as if those who are conducting the case for Mrs. Chemis were going to be forced to abandon the field. This inquiry is a great loss to me, and if we are to really try the charges of perjury it would, of course, be necessary to meet them, and in that case I should probably hesitate to continue a gratuitous retainer, involving perhaps another month's work.

*Mr. E. M. Smith*: You suggested to the Committee to call this man Charles Bowles. Are you aware that he has left the colony?

*Mr. Bell*: No; he has not left the colony.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: George Bowles is evidently the person referred to by the honourable member.

*Mr. E. M. Smith*: Immediately after that you suggest the calling of two men to prove that there was no family disagreement. Are you aware that there was a family disagreement among these people about property?

*Mr. Bell*: I know what you refer to. It is some evidence about Hawkings saying he would shoot Bowles like a dog. But I repeat that there was no family difference.

*Mr. Jellicoe*: If Mr. Bell calls the two lawyers, Thompson and Skerrett, to prove that the Hawkings's were a happy family, I shall ask leave to call witnesses to prove quite the opposite.

*The Chairman*: I do not think we need go into that.

*Colonel Hume*: The men having been tried in Court and acquitted on these charges, are regarded as satisfactory by the department and the Minister. Of course if any one sends a petition to Parliament, and makes a statement in it, and the Committee asks me whether such and such things happened, I will send for the constables implicated. I am not aware that the police have seen this petition that is before the Committee. I have only seen it by accident. The case having been tested in the lower Court, I consider it is unnecessary for the police to take any further action in the matter.

WEDNESDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 1892.

Dr. CAHILL sworn and examined.

I made the examination of Hawkings's body at the Morgue on the day following the murder. I found a gun-shot wound extending from the upper angle of the shoulder-blade to the root of the neck, immediately above the shoulder-joint. I dissected out this wound, and removed from it a mass of paper, shot, shreds of clothing, skin, flesh, and blood. I had nothing with me at the time—no wrapper of any kind—so I went to the bag which I had brought with me, and took from it a piece of a newspaper which I had put there before leaving home that morning (1st June), having wrapped a piece of tow or wool in it. I put this mass in a piece of paper, torn from what I had in my bag, and took it home. Some days afterwards, when I came to dissect the mass, I found that the blood had soaked through part of the paper wrapper—the bottom or part on which it was standing. In taking off this paper from the mass, a little portion of the wrapper adhered to the mass, and I believe that piece of it remained behind, and was subsequently sent to Mr. Tasker. The newspaper which I had put in my bag that morning (1st June), I took from my dining-room, and it was most probably the issue of the previous evening (31st May). Newspapers are not left lying about in my house, they are removed by my servants, so it is not probable that the paper I took with me to the Morgue was one of an old date. I did my best to remove the adhering part of the wrapper from the mass, but it is possible that a small portion remained behind, and was handed to Mr. Tasker, with a much larger quantity of paper teased out of the centre of the mass which I removed from the wound. The adhering portion could only have been a very small piece, about the size of a shilling or half-a-crown, that could thus have got mixed up with the paper and shot which I gave to Mr. Tasker. I believe there was a question as to whether cloth or paper could be shot into wounds. It is a question of fact. It has happened on dozens of occasions before. I may also tell the Committee that when the late Government were a bit doubtful on this point they got