Í.—1в. 48

wrapped in ?--No, it is impossible. The great body of the paper was in the centre of the mass I had wrapped up. There could have only been a small piece adhering superficially.

Mr. Lake: It is suggested that Carroll, I think it was, was standing, with the pieces of paper he had picked up, in the Morgue, and that the paper had in some way or other got mixed up with the mass?—It is utterly absurd to make such a suggestion.

Mr. Lake: Can you say why it is that the police in their evidence say clearly that you gave them no intimation of a shot-wound. It was about two o'clock on Saturday when you gave them

notice of it?—I could not give them notice of the shot-wound until I found it.

Mr. Lake: We have it in evidence that the police did not get the information, because you thought the wound was a stab-wound?—That must be a mistake; I never thought anything of the kind. It is not possible to mistake a gunshot-wound for one made by stabbing with a sharp instrument.

Mr. Lake: At what time did you make the examination?—I saw the body on Friday night, and commenced my examination on the following morning at 10 o'clock. You must remember that the man was lying on his back, and I dissected all the wounds on the front of the body first. This shot-wound was one of the last wounds dissected, and it was late in the evening by that time.

Mr. Lake: Would not such a large hole in the coat have been seen at once. Did it not convey to you an idea? - One must not jump at conclusions; a rent in a garment is no evidence that it was

made by a gunshot.

Mr. Lake: Have you ever seen a horse killed with a charge of shot?—I cannot recollect.

Mr. Lake: I want to know if you have ever seen a case where a hole similar to that made in this case was made by a bullet?—No.

Mr. Lake: Have you ever seen a case?—I have seen a man shot.

Mr. Lake: At close distance?—I do not know what distance, I have never seen a small hole e by shot. The size of the hole depends upon the distance at which the shot is fired.

Mr. Lake: Did you notice whether there was any mark of burning on the coat? This is

unfortunately torn to pieces now by the moths?—I did notice. There was no mark.

Mr. Lake: In order to drive the wad, which in this case was paper, into the wound, you would have to be so close as to cause the burning of the coat?—I think you must come within 4ft. to cause the burning absolutely, but at a greater distance you would send the wadding into the

Mr. Lake: Have you any reason to believe that shot would scatter at such a short distance as 6ft.?—Yes, Sir. I have never seen it fired and make such a small round hole as that in the front of

Mr. Allen: As a matter of fact the paper got into the wound, and was found there?—Yes.

Mr. Bell: I might make a statement about what Dr. Cahill said about an unreported passage in reference to the knife. I think it is quite possible that in my note of the evidence, I might have the statement as I took it down; and it might be satisfactory to the Committee for me to get it. No doubt Mr. Maurice Richmond has also a note of it, and I suggest that if we have them we put them before you.

The Chairman: I do not think there is any necessity to get what you allude to.

Mr. Jellicoe: If Mr. Bell would look up his notes, and if he finds he has not the one in question,

he need not take any further notice; and if he has the note he can tell us.

Mr. Bell: Very well. I have received a letter from the Justice Department, which leaves to my discretion the putting in of the police reports. I do not know that under ordinary circumstances I should produce police reports, but in this case I think I ought to lay them before you. I find that there is no police report of Norman's evidence, nor have I anything except the deposition. I do not know what became of it. It is possible that I called him after the interview I had had with him briefed. I find a note somewhere among my papers, "Call Norman," so that I had not got his evidence before.

Mr. Jellicoe: The statement given to Benjamin was lost.

Mr. Bell: I have not got it. I find the report of the inquiry which was made with regard to the man whom Joseph said he saw on the hill. I think that should be before the Committee.

The Chairman: There is evidence that two men were seen with guns two days before, and

another man also with a gun.

Mr. Bell: That came out when the affidavits of Mr. Jellicoe were put into the hands of Colonel Hume and the warders. Inquiries were made into the statements made by persons at the Supreme Court trial. I find there is an official report of these inquiries, and that is why I produce it. I will put the reports before the Committee just as they are. They clear up one point concerning which you asked me a question. It appears that on the morning of the 1st of June Carroll and Healey left town at daylight, and proceeded to the scene of the murder, and went to Mrs. Hawkings's house. Carroll returned to town, having to give evidence in the Police Court. He returned to town before the detective party left for Kaiwarra. The point cleared up is this: It was suggested by Mr. Jellicoe that it was after Bowles and Norman had been interviewed by the detectives on the top of the hill, when Benjamin was sent back for the warrant to search Chemis's house. It appears that such is not the case. Benjamin was sent back by Inspector Thomson when he reached Kaiwarra as a result of the statement made by Carroll which Mrs. Hawkings had made to him, and possibly as the result of inquiries made at Kaiwarra. The reports show that Benjamin was sent back when Kaiwarra was reached. Benjamin was left to wait at the Morgue. When the constable came out of the Morgue, and said, "It is a knife-wound," Benjamin then left, and met Inspector Thomson at Kaiwarra, and it was then that he was sent back for the search-warrant. Mr. Jellicoe asked me for Mr. Tasker's report. There are two reports, I find, from Mr. Tasker. The first one is dated 12th of June, and the second report 18th of June. Then I might explain that the pencil-marks on the police reports show that I