

the articles Low had found. By that cross-examination Mr. Bell for the first time suggested that the articles could be proved to be Chemis's, and he mentioned certain names. I immediately sent a cab for each person Mr. Bell had named, and I placed each in the witness-box without a moment's delay. [Evidence read of Greaves, Hodge, and Round.] Hodge said, further on, that he had seen Chemis with a gun, but never with a knife. The suggestion of the police was that a knife which had been used in the Kaiwarra tanyard had been found in Chemis's house. The Committee will see from the evidence that that was a distinct statement. The questions put by Mr. Bell were: "You at work at the tanyard: did you not see one of the knives that had been used at the tanyard at Chemis's house?"—Answer, "No." "Have you not had the knife found by Low described to you?"—Answer, "No." "As a tanyard knife?"—Answer, "No." Then, being re-examined, he said, "I heard a rumour that a knife and shot-pouch had been found near the scene of the murder." He said he had heard Hodge's and also Gibson's name connected with it. Now, the Committee will see that I then put into the witness-box the very persons whom Mr. Bell said could establish his allegation that the articles were in Chemis's possession a short time before the murder. I did not wait for the Magistrate to call on the police for their defence. I accepted Mr. Bell's challenge that I should put them in the witness-box as witnesses, and I did so quite irrespective of the effect of their evidence. Gibson described the shot-pouch he borrowed from Hodges by a picture stamped on the side of it. [Gibson's evidence read.] His description of the shot-pouch does not answer the description of the shot-pouch found by Low.

*The Chairman:* To what are you leading up to now, by reference to this shot-pouch? I thought you were going more into the question of the knife.

*Mr. Jellicoe:* Mr. Bell relied on both, and suggested that if you were satisfied the shot-pouch was at Chemis's, as alleged, then you would have no difficulty in concluding that the knife found came from his possession also. Moreover he said, "The knife is perfectly well known to every one in Kaiwarra." The Committee are aware that I have been prepared throughout this inquiry to meet that allegation. If my friend had chosen, in the interest of the Crown, to call any of these witnesses which he said were able to prove that this shot-pouch or knife ever was in Chemis's possession he could have done so. Why have they not called all Kaiwarra? If they possessed any evidence I say it was incumbent on the Crown to call it.

*The Chairman:* You are still referring to the shot-pouch found by Low?

*Mr. Jellicoe:* Yes. Round could not say whether the shot-pouch he was speaking of had a picture on it or not; and then Mrs. Chemis is recalled (page 103), and she said she never saw any other shot-flask in her husband's possession except the one which the police took away. Then, being cross-examined by Mr. Bell as to the knife, she answers that she never saw a sheath-knife, or a sheath for a knife. She says, "The knife I produced"—the kitchen knife—"I gave to Mr. Jellicoe. I used it several times." Mr. Bell cross-examined in reference to even that knife. He asks her, "How many times did you use it? Where, and when, did your husband buy it?" She answers, "Some years ago. She could not say how many years. He cut pigs with it. He bought it in town." You can form an idea of the nature of the questions from the answers she gave, and the manner in which they were pressed. "There was no other house-knife like that. She had never seen a knife sharpened at both sides in the house at any time."

*The Chairman:* Is the knife she refers to one of the exhibits?

*Mr. Allen:* It was a kitchen-knife. That seems to me to be perfectly immaterial.

*Mr. Jellicoe:* No doubt. I grant it is immaterial; but when, on behalf of Benjamin, such questions were very much pressed, whether material or not, the Committee can see the length the police and their advocate were prepared to go to, and the weakness and shallowness of their case.

*The Chairman:* I think you should deal with the more material evidence—

*Mr. Jellicoe:* Mr. Bell then says that after this evidence was given by Hodges, Gibson, and Round, there was a change of front on my part; that I communicated with him; and with an air of mystery he said, "I will not say what that communication was, because to do so would amount to a breach of confidence." Gentlemen, you will remember that I offered to waive any objection to the disclosure of my communication provided Mr. Bell permitted me to explain the communication which he made to me. Your Chairman interposed, but you will please bear in mind that at the time Mr. Bell is speaking of the libel action, *Bell v. Jellicoe*, was pending. You have only to consider the course of the evidence offered on the 28th of August to see if there is the slightest ground for the innuendo made by Mr. Bell. Why, directly the imputations connected with the shot-pouch and knife were made they were refuted. After the witness Round was examined, on the same day, and without a break (page 103), he was immediately followed in the witness-box by Low and by Warder Coyle, the person who had searched the spot where the articles were found, on behalf of the Crown, a few days previously, and also by Mr. Glascodine, who gives the result of Tolley's examination of the contents of the shot-pouch. Also by Mr. Skey (page 105); and I venture to think the Committee will find that I was uncommonly expeditious and diligent in getting all these witnesses to the Court and examined immediately after the allegation was made by Mr. Bell. The Committee will of course not infer anything against my client on this part of the case unless there is some evidence to support it. I now come to the consideration of the analysis of evidence submitted to the Committee by Mr. Bell.

*The Chairman:* What page?

*Mr. Jellicoe:* Page 81. But I should first draw your attention to page 80. At the top of the page Mr. Bell says, "I shall now briefly review the other evidence"—that is, the evidence "other" than the evidence of the paper, against the prisoner. First he says, "There is the place where the murder was committed;" and he goes on to make the following points: (1) a place very likely to have been chosen by the prisoner, (2) well known to the prisoner, (3) and easily accessible to the prisoner. Now, honourable members have had an opportunity of viewing the scene of the murder, and will be able to form an opinion—(1) whether it is a place likely to have been chosen by Chemis for this crime, if he were the murderer, (2) whether it was a place easily accessible to Chemis