

ventory of them, but not an inventory of all the clothes, because we knew there were so many boxes of clothing.

2468. There are about a couple of pages of furniture—gipsy-tables, and so forth?—Yes, there were some articles of furniture.

2469. You received a communication from the son?—Yes.

2470. Requesting you not to dispose of the effects of his mother pending word from him. That appears to have come in the shape of a cable on the 28th January, 1889, but the sale had taken place some fortnight before?—Of course we sold the general effects as soon as we could get rid of them.

2471. This is the cablegram from Queensland: "28th January, 1889. Public Trustee, Wellington, New Zealand.—*Re* my mother, deceased: Do not dispose personal property. Communicating.—ARTHUR DALLON." You had disposed prior to the receipt of that cable of the personal effects, but had reserved the jewellery?—Yes.

2472. Then you advise him to that effect. You say here: "Mr. A. E. Dallon, Police Court, Gatton, Queensland.—16th February, 1889.—Marie Dallon, deceased: Replying to yours of the 28th ultimo, I have to inform you that all the furniture and effects of this deceased were sold prior to the receipt of your telegram, with the exception of her jewellery, which has been reserved pending advice as to the disposal from the next-of-kin. The furniture and effects netted £53 7s. 10d., and, as far as I know, is the only asset. The claims received to date against the estate, including burial expenses, amount to £39 16s. 2d., and possibly some more may be preferred. I enclose a circular which shows the proofs of kinship required before the residue can be paid to the next-of-kin.—R. C. HAMERTON." Then he writes you on the 9th March, stating his desire to have the jewellery forwarded to him. Why was that not done?—We did forward him what he was entitled to receive.

2473. What do you mean by "what he was entitled to receive"?—We had his watch, and a few little things. There is the receipt for them all.

2474. Personal effects of his own?—Yes. I think there were some few trifles added of no pecuniary value.

2475. Why was the balance not sent to him?—He has never proved that he is next-of-kin. He is supposed to be illegitimate.

2476. How do you know?—From information we had.

2477. There is nothing to show that on the papers?—There is a note on the general report that he was supposed to be illegitimate.

2478. I understood the papers in the estate showed the whole story in the office?—We have pretty good reason for saying the boy is illegitimate. At any rate, he has never proved his kinship.

2479. There are letters here, Mr. De Castro, which appear to have been found in the possession of the deceased, addressed to his mother from Sydney, "My dear mother," and signed "Your affectionate son, Arthur." Was not that proof enough that he was next-of-kin? Certainly not. She may have been his mother: who was his father? He has not rendered any proof of being next-of-kin.

2480. Is it necessary that every person should render a proof of their legitimacy to this office?—It is necessary he should prove he is entitled to receive the goods.

2481. Is it necessary in this office that every person shall furnish proof of their legitimacy before being placed in possession of the personal estate of their father or mother?—I think under the Act we can pay the proceeds of an intestate estate of the mother to her illegitimate issue.

2482. I am asking you a question: Is it absolutely necessary, in accordance with the practice of this office, that every person shall, if their mother is deceased, and who is the only son or daughter of the person so deceased, furnish proofs of legitimacy before the department pays?—Yes.

2483. Will you give us an instance, or two or three instances, in which that principle has been acted upon in other cases?—In all cases.

2484. Will you give us the names?—There are so many estates, I cannot call to mind particular estates at this moment.

2485. Will you be good enough to tell us upon what evidence you decline to admit the right of Arthur Dallon to receive his mother's effects?—Because he has not proved his right to receive them. There is no proof he is the son of Mrs. Dallon. There is no proof such as a solicitor would accept.

2486. Here is a letter addressed by him to his mother and found in her box?—But that is not sufficient proof of kinship.

2487. Is not that *prima facie* evidence of the sonship, or of the relationship?—It is not sufficient for us, at any rate. There might be another son; there might be daughters; there might be half-a-dozen children, and they are all entitled to equal shares.

2488. Have you made inquiry to find any other relations?—No. It is not our business to make inquiry to find relatives; it is their business to find us out.

2489. The principle of this office is not to bother yourselves to find relatives, but relatives must find the office?—We do take trouble. We were advised in the first place that it was not the duty of the office to search for relatives.

2490. The principle is, that it is not the business of this office to search for them?—No.

2491. The result of that is that estates accumulate that might be distributed if it was your business to search?—We do not know where to search.

2492. Your reference here was that the jewellery was to remain: "Jewellery must not be sold at present; it must remain," according to your letter to him. What took place then?—His portion of the jewellery, the things he was entitled to, his own property—I think there were two or three little things of no pecuniary value, but of value to him—were sent to him at the same time, but the