

632. Did you get that authority in this case?—I do not recollect the precise authority I got; but the authority, whatever it might be, would be conveyed in certain papers that would be attached and ascertained by reference to the number 33, which papers belong to the Postmaster-General's Department. I got authority of some kind, but of the precise nature of it I am not certain. It was on the certificate of transfer. The number of the paper would be sufficient to find it: that number would be 33 of the year 1889.

633. Is this the name in which the account stood in Blenheim?—It is.

634. So that it was not a joint account?—It was "Ida Prince; Alexander Livingston, trustee."

635. Where you have such an account as this, who must draw out the money?—On the signature of both parties.

636. Would it not allow the money to be drawn on the sole signature of the trustee?—I am not prepared to say whether it would or would not: there are certain regulations. It is customary to get the signatures of both parties.

637. How is it that Prince's signature is not to the deposit?—Not being necessary to deposit money.

638. Only to the drawing out?—It is usual to have both: I am not sure whether it is strictly necessary.

639. There is an account of Alexander Livingston, trustee: is Livingston's signature necessary?—It is.

640. Would it be necessary to any transfer?—Yes; it would be if he were alive.

641. If not alive?—Proof of death would be required, and the account could be operated upon by one person.

642. By whom?—The survivor.

643. By the depositor?—Mr. Livingston would be trustee.

*The Chairman*: I understood Mr. Salmon to say that Prince would be entitled to operate on the account upon proof of death. In such case the authority of the Head Office is always asked before the other offices will allow any withdrawal.

644. *Dr. Fitchett*.] Why is the consent of the Head Office necessary?—I cannot say why.

645. Could that account have been transferred to Wellington without authority from your Head Office on Miss Prince's warrant?—Mr. Livingston being dead it would first require the authority of the Head Office.

646. And you got it?—I believe so.

647. Do you know that they sent it?—I do not without looking at the papers.

648. Is it strictly regular—assuming the account to be transferred to Wellington in the names of Alexander Livingston and Miss Ida Prince—to transfer it to Mary Jane Rose?—It has not been so transferred. Perhaps, if the Committee would allow me, I might state to counsel what has been done. The account was transferred from Blenheim, judging by the papers, in joint names; that account, as soon as it was opened in Wellington—it was opened in Wellington on the 8th January or the next day—became absolutely closed in order that a new one might be opened by Ida Mary Prince for £509 13s. 11d., and that the other account from Blenheim is entirely done away with. There is no transfer of the account; she appears to have opened another or fresh account; but the one from Blenheim had become closed absolutely. She opens this other account for a similar sum in the joint names of Mary Jane Rose and Ida Mary Prince. This is a new account altogether; it is no transfer.

649. Is it regular, where an account exists in the name of a trust, to allow the *cestui que* trust to draw on the trust and put the money in her pocket?—I presume it is, if the necessary authority was obtained, the trustee being dead.

650. Would you do it in Blenheim?—If I had the necessary authority.

651. Then, it requires an authority?—It is quoted here.

652. But it is not regular without a special authority?—No.

653. It would not be regular without special authority to allow Miss Ida Prince to draw from the account of A. Livingston, the trustee?—I should suggest that the question should be asked of some higher authority than myself in such matters.

*The Chairman*: You are only asked to speak as far as you know.

654. *Dr. Fitchett*.] Was any money found and given to Miss Combs—sovereigns?—I do not know. If I am called upon to reply to this, I might say I would not have any hesitation in replying, but it would open up a very long matter altogether.

655. *Mr. Joyce*.] If Mrs. Rose had been in Blenheim before you sent the letter away, you would have given her the package?—I would.

656. You opened it, or did you find it open?—I found it open. I should have enclosed it in a letter, addressing it to Miss Ida Prince, and giving it to Mrs. Rose.

657. Would you have read the correspondence to her before closing the letter?—No. Of course, my own letter, in that case, would not have been written, or, if written, would have been destroyed.

WILLIAM RUSSELL MORRIS examined.

658. *Mr. Gully*.] What are you?—Clerk in the General Post Office.

659. In what branch?—Circulation Branch.

660. Do you know the petitioner, Miss I. Prince?—I have seen her.

661. Do you recollect when you saw her?—Yes; it was either the 1st or 2nd January of the current year.

662. Where did you see her?—At the post-office.

663. Was she alone?—No; she was accompanied by Mrs. Rose.

664. Will you explain what occurred?—Mrs. Rose and Miss Prince called in connection with an account opened by Alexander Livingston as trustee for Miss Prince. They wished to know the