

I have, therefore, again to request the Commissioners of Stamps at their very earliest convenience to inform me of their decision on the various points urged by me in my letter of the 31st August. The Commissioners are fully advised of my intentions. I consider my request so reasonable in itself, and one with which the Commissioners can at once comply, that I cannot well understand why there should be a single day's delay.

C. T. Batkin, Esq., Secretary for Stamps, Wellington.

I have, &c.,  
WM. SWANSON.

### No. 9.

Mr. BATKIN to the DEPUTY COMMISSIONER of STAMPS, Auckland.

(No. 367.)

Office of the Commissioner of Stamps, Wellington,  
2nd October, 1871.

SIR,—

I have the honor, by direction of the Commissioner of Stamp Duties, to call your attention to my letter No. 324, of the 1st ultimo, to which your letter No. 39, of the 8th, purports to reply, and to repeat my request that you will explain why it was that the repeated applications alleged to have been made at your office relative to the document, "Cary to Swanson," were not transmitted to this office, so that the ownership of that document then lying in this office might have been traced.

I have, &c.,

The Deputy Commissioner of Stamp Duties, Auckland.

C. T. BATKIN,  
Secretary for Stamps.

### No. 10.

The DEPUTY COMMISSIONER of STAMPS, Auckland, to the Hon. the COMMISSIONER of STAMPS, Wellington.

(No. 58.)

SIR,—

Stamp Office, Auckland, 14th October, 1871.

Referring to your letter No. 367, of the 2nd instant, in which you repeat your request to be furnished with an explanation why Mr. Swanson's repeated applications for the agreement, "Cary with Swanson," were not transmitted to Wellington,—

In reply, I beg to inform you that I was not in charge of this office when any of the applications were made. I must reiterate my former statement that there was no office record of the document having been in the office prior to your letter before referred to (No. 473, of the 29th November, 1870), which accompanied the document itself.

I have again consulted with Mr. King on the subject, and he informs me that he searched for a record (on Mr. Swanson's application), but, being unable to find one, concluded that the agreement had not passed through the office.

It may be idle to suggest what may have been the case, but both Mr. King and Mr. Mulholland are under the impression that Mr. Crawford, in person, handed the document into the Stamp Office at Wellington during a visit there. Whether this was the case or not could, I presume, be ascertained by referring to the abstract which accompanied the document. Whatever the result may be, I am perfectly powerless to give any further information.

I have, &c.,

The Hon. the Commissioner of Stamp Duties,  
Wellington.

F. NELSON GEORGE,  
Deputy Commissioner.

### No. 11.

Mr. BATKIN to Mr. SWANSON.

(No. 418.)

Office of the Commissioner of Stamps, Wellington,  
3rd November, 1871.

SIR,—

With reference to your application of the 24th August, relative to an instrument presented by you at the Stamp Office, Auckland, in October, 1869, to be stamped, which instrument was not returned to you till November, 1870, I have the honor, by direction of the Commissioner of Stamp Duties, to inform you of the result of the inquiries which have been made in respect to this matter. It appears that the document in question, with the customary requisition attached, was forwarded from Auckland to this office, and was received here on the 1st September, 1869. The Commissioners have been unable to ascertain with any certainty by what means it came to this office; but it is stated by Mr. A. H. King, the officer who at the time of presentation of the instrument was stamp clerk at Auckland, that he is under the impression that it was brought down to Wellington by the late Deputy Commissioner of Stamps, Mr. Crawford, on the occasion of his visit to this place. This statement is supported by the present stamp clerk, Mr. Mulholland, who at the time referred to held the appointment of junior clerk in the Auckland office, and the impression appears to be confirmed by the fact that no record can be found of the letter which would, in ordinary cases, have accompanied the reception of such a document into this office.

The irregular manner in which the document came into this office appears indeed to have been the initial cause of the delay which subsequently took place, inasmuch as the document, after being stamped, was deposited in the office safe with the ordinary stamped documents presented "over the counter," to remain till called for. Here it remained for twelve months, and though, as stated by you,