

found was "a strip of hide with cow's hair on it. It would never have occurred to any one that it was false hair save some imaginative advocate. I do not know that any inquiries were made as to the ownership of this cow's hide."

*The Chairman* : Is not that something that was said to him during the course of the trial?

*Mr. Jellicoe* : In his evidence on the trial of the libel action he swore, "I think that something was said to me by Inspector Thomson during the course of the trial, but I did not give any credence to the statement, regarding it in the light of a mare's nest."

*The Chairman* : These are mere details the Committee cannot waste time over.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : With regard to Norman, Mr. Bell characterised my examination of that witness as "dramatic," and he went on to say that "I imitated the man's stuttering to show that he was shamming." I reply to these allegations in the language used by Mr. Bell before this Committee on the 6th of September by saying they are simply lies. I have practised my profession in this city for eight years, and in England for another six years, and I venture to say that my reputation and standing are at least equal to those of Mr. Bell; and had I been guilty of such conduct as Mr. Bell attributes to me I would be ashamed of myself.

*The Chairman* : I do not think we ought to go into such matters here.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : He was allowed to make such a statement.

*The Chairman* : If you will remember, I checked him at the time.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : Commenting on the fact that I called Mrs. Chemis in the perjury prosecution first, and before her husband was brought down from gaol, Mr. Bell says, "If the evidence was briefed, and if the solicitor was allowed free access to the prisoner, there is nothing to be concluded from the coincidence of the two stories." The Committee are aware—(1) That I was not allowed free access to the prisoner; (2) that I had only one interview, and all that took place then has been laid before the Committee.

*The Chairman* : I feel certain from the opinions expressed by the Committee that all these little details are outside of the matters referred to our consideration. That I must say on behalf of the Committee.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : I suggest that they ought not to be outside the consideration of the Committee. Thirdly, Mrs. Chemis's evidence in chief was little more than what was contained in the affidavit she made before the death-sentence was commuted. At page 84 of the perjury depositions you will find Mr. Bell's cross-examination, commenced early in the morning of the 21st August, was continued all that afternoon and (pages 86 and 87) the greater part of the following day, 22nd August. Now, Mr. Bell cannot suggest that his cross-examination was briefed; and if the Committee will compare the cross-examination by Mr. Bell of Chemis, at pages 93 to 97, with the thousand-and-one minute details which were the subject of Mr. Bell's cross-examination of Mrs. Chemis, I venture to say that considerable weight ought to attach to the consideration of the two stories.

*The Chairman* : I do not wish you to infer that the Committee is not prepared to consider all matters of importance, but it seems to me that we are going over ground again which we have already examined.

*Mr. Jellicoe* : With reference to the statement that Benjamin, Thomson, and Campbell knew all about the pocket-book before interviewing Mrs. Hawkings on the 1st June, I point out that Mrs. Hawkings gave evidence upon the perjury prosecution, and then said she did not tell Carroll or Healy about the pocket-book. She did not know it was lost on the morning of the 1st. She told Thomson about it after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. She was at the Morgue on the Saturday morning. She went to the Morgue with Bowles to see the body of her husband. She says that no one knew that her husband had a pocket-book. I come now to Dr. Cahill's evidence before this Committee. In answer to the Chairman, he said, "As a matter of fact, Sir, I was of opinion that the stiletto had not been used in the committing of the murder. It is possible it might have been used, but my opinion was that it had not." I asked, "Did you give that opinion in your evidence at the trial?" Answer: "Yes. But it is not reported in the Judge's notes." I venture to submit that his evidence is entirely untrustworthy. First, if such an opinion was expressed at the trial it was certainly the most important feature in the whole of the doctor's evidence; and yet so careful a Judge as the Chief Justice does not notice it, but on the contrary repeats the doctor's evidence (page 8, section 42, of Judge's notes). Looking at the stiletto, the doctor said, "I believe the incised wounds and the fracture of the jaw could be made by this instrument."

*Mr. Allen* : "Could be made," not "was made."

*Mr. Jellicoe* : No doubt was suggested then. He had formed, as he tells us now, an opinion at the time that the stiletto had not been used. What follows at the close of the case, and after Cahill has given his evidence? Mr. Bell sums up on this point—as favourable to the accused? Certainly not, but in these terms: "It is only a limited number of people who have such a weapon, and when you find that the wounds have been made with such an instrument you reduce the class from which you have to find the murderer." And the Chief Justice refers to the finding of the stiletto [extract read]: "His Honor referred to the finding of the stiletto which the doctor said had fitted in size and length with the wounds." On the doctor's evidence alone I claim a favourable report on this petition. It is manifest that Dr. Cahill did not give the evidence on the trial he has given here. He did not tell the jury that, in his opinion, the stiletto had not been used. If he had done so then Mr. Bell's statement and the Judge's charge would have been unwarranted. He now substantially admits that the stiletto does not and did not correspond with the cut in the coat or the collar, and yet he was aware of all these circumstances when he gave his evidence at the trial and suppressed it. Now let us look at the other side of the picture. At page 25 of the printed documents (H.-33) you have evidence as to Chemis's character from Mr. W. A. Fitzherbert and Mr. Fred. R. Burgin. Here is a man who, as far as the evidence discloses, had a comfortable and a happy home—a man who had been married for nine years, who had a brave and devoted wife and five little children surrounding him; a man whose habit is to spend his evenings at home.