

70. If the flap had been in, would any part of that ink bar have shown?—A certain portion on the outside, but none on the inside—the flap.

71. In your opinion, judging from that, are you able to say in what condition the envelope was received in the post-office?—I should judge it was received with the flap turned out.

72. Take the next on the list—the letter addressed to R. H. Fisher?—That is a similar case.

73. A similar case of stamping with the flap out?—Exactly.

74. Then the letter addressed to J. H. Hannan—anything to say about that?—A similar case, only much more pronounced. It will be seen that if the flap had been turned in the mark would have shown on the back of the envelope and very little on the flap.

*Mr. Ostler:* Mr. Hannan said the flap was out when he got it.

*Witness:* Mr. H. Symons: that is a similar case.

75. *Mr. Gray.*] Mr. Symons, I think, is the gentleman whose envelope Mr. Elliott said he dealt with himself—careful to see it was properly filled, &c. You heard his evidence?—Yes.

76. Any more of this batch?—No more.

77. That shows that four out of these nine, in your opinion, were posted with the flaps out?—That is my opinion.

78. It has been alleged that a number of envelopes were received by persons to whom they were addressed bearing pieces of stamp paper on the backs: one or two examples have been put in—you have two there, I think, one addressed to the Rev. Knowles Kempton and one to the Rev. Reuben Bailey: you observe that each of those has a piece of gummed stamp paper on the back. Is there anything there to suggest to you whether that paper was put there before or after posting?—

*Mr. Ostler:* Do you suggest that we put that on?

*Witness:* I cannot answer that question definitely, but I think I can say that before these letters I have in my hand went through the stamping-machine the gummed paper was on

79. *Mr. Gray.*] Why do you say so?—The impression of the back-pressure roller is showing, indicating that when the letters went through the stamping-machine the gummed paper was there, because the impression appears on the gummed paper. If the gummed paper had been put on after the envelopes went through the machine the impressions would have shown underneath the paper.

80. That applies to both?—That is so.

81. The stamping is one of the first processes after the letters are received in the post-office?—The facing-up is done first; then they are put through the stamping-machine.

82. Are you satisfied in your own mind in respect of those two that when they reached the stamping-machine they had the gummed paper on?—Quite.

83. Is there any trace, in your opinion, of those letters having been opened where the flaps have been gummed down?—I do not think they have.

84. What do you infer from those circumstances?—I infer that these pieces of stamp paper were on the envelopes when they were posted, one of the reasons being that there would hardly have been sufficient time between the letters being received in the post-office and passed through the stamping-machine. That operation is done, as a rule, very quickly.

85. Do you see any reason why those letters—apparently closed letters—bearing 1½d. stamps, should be opened in the post-office between the time of the chauffeur bringing them in and the stampers getting to work on them?—No reason whatever.

86. Is that kind of gummed paper familiar to you?—Very.

87. What is it?—Stamp edging—that is to say, the portion of sheets of stamps on which the stamps are not printed.

88. And I suppose that persons posting a large number of letters would provide themselves with large sheets of stamps?—That would be the custom, I should say.

89. And those generally bear the gummed edging?—Yes.

90. Are the perforations showing?—Yes, on each one.

91. Is it reasonable to suggest that the persons engaged in the process of closing these letters would put on pieces of this perforated gummed paper for the purpose of securing these flaps down?—

*Mr. Ostler:* That is not a fair question.

*His Worship:* Does he say that they did?

*Mr. Gray:* Of course he cannot say.

*Mr. Ostler:* It is a question of comment.

*His Worship:* Leave it to the evidence.

92. *Mr. Gray.*] There is another envelope: does that show the difference between an envelope stamped with the flap in and these with the flap out? Is there not a back mark on it?—The flap in that case, I should say, has been turned in.

93. Is not that an impression carried by the back roller?—That is so—showing when the flap is turned in. The others, when the flap is turned in, would not show.

94. You have a complaint, I think from Mr. Gailey, of non-delivery of his letter?—“Mr. Gailey,” the name is.

95. I produced this in the course of the cross-examination of one of their witnesses. Did you receive a complaint from a Mr. Gailey of the non-delivery of a letter?—Yes; Mr. Gailey, Mount Albert Road, Mount Albert; date of inquiry, 11th July. He complained that a letter addressed to H. Sydney, box 912, at the Auckland Chief Post, unregistered, posted by himself, and stamped, and containing a card, was not delivered to the addressee. Inquiries were made, and the following reply was sent to Mr. Gailey: “It has been ascertained that your communication to Mr. Sydney was duly received. The addressee states that the white card which was enclosed in