will suggest that after the 2nd of June any person manufactured wads to fit Chemis's gun. The Premier: "I compared the wads with the gun. They fitted very well. I compared the wads with the bandbox, and I formed the opinion that it was clear they had been cut from the bandbox." You have again John Dowd and another witness, who swear that after the wad-cutter was purchased they frequently took wads from the drawer, and on their returning from their shooting expedition returned the unused wads to the same place. The Chief Justice says, in his summing up, "What inference will you draw from the fact that there was no powder in the house?"

The Chairman: Are you bringing this in now so that it may be a convenience to the Committee to have before them all the evidence given upon these matters? You might tell the Committee whether you have any further evidence to bring before it on any certain point.

Mr. Jellicoe: This is the last opportunity I shall have before this Committee of dealing with the points said to have been made against me by the Crown. Mr. Gully relies on Mr. Bell's analysis. I ask your indulgence while I dispute the accuracy of that analysis.

The Chairman: It is but fair and right that you should go through that evidence if you wish: what I had in my mind was, whether you could shorten the details, or whether you wanted further evidence on a certain point.

Mr. Jellicoe: I am putting before the Committee the points made by Mr. Bell, and am endeavouring to show that they are wholly unsupported. Now, if Chemis had a powder-flask and the other "appliances," what became of them on the 1st June?

Mr. Allen: Is it suggested by him that there was not a powder-flask?

Mr. Jellicoe: The jury were asked to draw a contrary inference. If Chemis had them, then where were they when the police searched the house? Even if Chemis was guilty, nothing could be gained by concealing them and leaving the stiletto in the drawer and the gun on the premises. We say that these articles were one and all in that drawer, and we have already considered what I submit was the reason they were not noticed. No one outside a lunatic asylum would say that Chemis, if guilty, would hide all the evidence tending to establish his innocence, and leave for the police every article likely to tell against him. Then, if you find, as I think you must, that Chemis possessed these articles, and that he had wads, where was the necessity for the use of paper for gun-wadding? The paper would only be used by a person who had no wads in his possession, or had none ready for use. Dr. Cahill, in his evidence before the Committee, speaking as to the piece of paper of the 31st May found in the mass removed from the wound, or adhering to it, says the piece must have got detached from the wrapping, but he is unable to give any particulars as to the date of the newspaper which constituted the wrapper. The prosecution were, of course, in a dilemma when Tasker produced from the papers sent to him by Cahill a piece of the *Evening Post* of the 31st of May, and also a piece of the 23rd of May; and it obviously became necessary to consider whether or not the possessor of the balance of the paper of the 31st May might not be considered the murderer. If the murderer used part of the *Evening Post* of the 31st May, then Chemis is innocent, because his copy of the *Evening Post* of the 31st May was found whole. What reason has the witness, Cahill, given you for suggesting that the piece of paper teased from the mass of the 23rd was not part of his wrapping, and did not get there accidentally. Not the slightest. He says, "I did not know the date of the paper I had in my bag at all." He examined the mass before extracting the paper, and again before sending it to Tasker. If he had noticed a piece of paper adhering, he says in effect, he would not have sent it to Tasker. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if he teased the paper of the 23rd, as well as that of the 31st, from the wound, that there is equal reason for saying the piece of paper of the 23rd was part of the wrapping or the contents of the doctor's bag, as for suggesting that the piece of the 31st May found its way there by accident? The evidence he has given on this point prevents any Court or jury placing any value on his evidence of the paper.

Mr. Moore: In what page does he say that if he had noticed the piece of the 31st he would not have sent it to Tasker?

Mr. Jellicoe: It is an inference to be drawn from the answer he made to a question which I put. I asked him, "Did you notice any newspaper adhering to the mass you took from the wound? Did you notice a piece of the 31st May?"—Answer: "No. I sent all the paper to Mr. Tasker."

Mr. Moore: You stated to Cahill that had he seen this piece of paper of the 31st he would not have sent it.

Mr. Jellicoe: That is, I think, the only inference you can draw from the question and answer I have read.

Mr. Allen: Certainly not.

Mr. Jellicoe: I asked, "At the time you sent in the piece adhering to the mass that was in the wound, why did you not call attention to it?" and he answers, "That came out afterwards." That is to say, it was afterwards discovered that a piece of the 31st May was with the paper he had sent.

Mr. Allen: Do you say that Dr. Cahill said that?

Mr. Jellicoe: He said, "I sent all the papers that I teased from the mass to Mr. Tasker." He is then asked, "Did you notice the piece of paper of the 31st May?" He answers, "No." He is next asked, "If you had thought you had sent the piece of paper of the 31st May, why did you not call attention to the fact when you sent it?" He answers, "I did my best, but this came out afterwards, that among the mass was the piece of paper of the 31st May." Then he says, "I did not notice it." The only inference you can draw from the whole of his statement is that if he had noticed it was a piece of wrapping he would not have sent it. After Tasker examined the paper, and the piece of the 31st May is found, Dr. Cahill is asked to explain, and the only explanation he gives is that the piece in question must be a piece of the wrapping, and must have adhered to the mass. He has no reason for saying that the piece of paper of the 31st became attached to the