

in it of this size?—There were pieces of all sizes. I could not now say whether it was this or the other.

248. *Mr. Lake.*] The only papers you attempted to examine were those which came from the gorse-bushes?—Yes.

249. *Mr. Moore.*] So far as you were concerned, when you marked them would you note who you got them from, if you had to hand them to experts?—I was not sure they would be required again. I locked them up. No one had access to them until I handed them over to the experts.

250. *Mr. Allen.*] You will swear that the newspaper was in the handkerchief?—Undoubtedly; it was all handed to Tasker.

251. I want to know whether you are sure there was the newspaper in the handkerchief?—Oh, yes; when I came to the printed matter I put the pieces aside, but the documents found I saw there was no necessity for keeping. It was then I put the pieces of printed papers in the envelope.

252. *Mr. Jellicoe.*] Would the witness say whether there was a piece as large as this (No. 6) in the handkerchief?—I cannot say, except that what I took never went out of my possession.

253. *Mr. Allen.*] How was the envelope marked?—"Taken from the bedroom" was on one. "Taken from Chemis's coat-pocket" was on the other.

254. *The Chairman.*] That was done after you returned to the station?—Yes, some time the same evening, in my office. I did not know they would be required again; I did not think it likely they would be.

255. You did not think there was need of any special care?—I did not know. I had in my mind's-eye another case that occurred at Bendigo. The guilt was brought home to the accused in that case by a piece of paper.

256. *Mr. Lake.*] What was done with that large piece (No. 6)—was that marked and handed to Tasker?—That was at the left-hand side. Benjamin handed it to me, with other pieces, in the handkerchief.

257. Would you conclude that if he took it from the envelope and marked it that it undoubtedly came out of the handkerchief?—The envelopes had got worn. I put them into new envelopes; they were in small envelopes. I put them in fresh envelopes, and put the same superscriptions on them.

258. *Mr. Earnshaw.*] With regard to the pocket-book, did it not appear singular to you, looking back and seeing that no search had been made of Hawkings's house, nor of those persons found near the body, that no such search had been made?—It is a most unusual course to search the wife of the murdered man. If the wife had afterwards been found to have any connection with circumstances in which the murder originated, that might be done; but in these circumstances it would have been very unusual.

259. But there was not only the wife of the murdered man, there were other persons living at the house. Did it not suggest itself to you that it would have been wise to have searched them?—There was no suspicion attached to Bowles or the others at the time, nor since.

260. *Mr. Kelly.*] Do you state that it is a most unusual thing to search a murdered man's house?—Under those circumstances. We had no suspicion of any one in the house.

261. No suspicion until certain circumstances were suggested to you?—Had there been anything definite to lead us to suspect any one in the house of the murdered man we would have searched it; but, in the absence of any suspicion, it would be an unusual course to take.

262. If a suggestion had not been thrown out as to the guilt of a particular person, is it probable it would have struck you so as to suggest itself that you would have considered it a part of your duty to have searched the house?—Possibly, under such circumstances, in a case like the present; but there was no reason for suspecting any one in their house; and unless there was something to attract suspicion to the murdered man's house, it would certainly have been a most unusual thing to do.

263. Would you have considered it your duty to have searched the house supposing nothing had ever been said about Chemis?—If there was anything to lead us to suspect any inmate of the house; but as the murder did not take place in the house, but in the road, altogether off the premises, there was nothing to induce us to search the house.

264. Suppose Mrs. Hawkings had never suggested any one as being the guilty party?—I believe that it was in consequence of what she said that our suspicions were first attracted to Chemis, but at this lapse of time I am not quite certain.

265. Did you think that you were quite right in never searching the murdered man's house to see whether you could find there any evidence of the crime?—With the knowledge I have now, and had then, there would be nothing to justify us in making a search of the murdered man's house.

266. But you did not search it?—It is a most unusual course to take to search the house of a murdered man in such circumstances. This man was murdered on the road; unless some circumstance pointed to some person in the house as being in some way connected with the murder, it would be an unusual course to take.

267. *Mr. Earnshaw.*] The first evidence you had was that of a person in his house?—His wife.

268. Would not that be a reason why, on the face of it, those persons who are first concerned should be the first persons required to give some account of the matter?—There was nothing which had transpired at that time, or since, that would lead us to suspect his wife.

269. *Mr. Kelly.*] But you took down what Bowles said?—No, I did not.

270. There was a certain piece of money in his pocket?—That I would not say.

271. It never seemed to strike the police that he could have had anything to do with it?—We were not guided by anything he said, or what was his relation to the murdered man. I think that the suspicion that Chemis committed the murder came from Hawkings's widow.

272. *Mr. Earnshaw.*] No persons would be so much interested in that pocket-book as the