If you were to say that you saw a document with the No. 8937 on it, with a date-stamp with a large black crown comprised in the date-stamp with a date 14/6/98, I should say you were mistaken.

If you were to say that you saw a document here with one half-crown brown stamp on it with the date 9/6/98 and another stamp apart from that stamp with no date-stamp whatever on it—a two-shilling stamp something the same colour as the half-crown stamp—I should say you were mistaken, because there is no two-shilling fine stamp. A fine stamp covers any value. You could not have seen such a thing on a document No. 8937.

If the date-stamp showed clearly on the stamp there was no necessity to send you upstairs to ascertain the date duty was paid. You would have to go upstairs to ascertain the amount of fine I never cancel stamps. I never wrote my signature across a ten-shilling stamp or just underneath. I may have done so when I was a clerk, but not since I was Deputy Registrar. I have been in this Deeds Office since 1883, I think.

L. H. Holloway.

Taken at Auckland, this 20th day of December, 1907,
before me,—
Herbert W. Brabant,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

In the course of Mr. Holloway's examination Mr. Greenhead says,—

I wish to state that I stand by the statement I made to Detective McIlveney with reference to the deed Exhibit A, and I further say that there has since the 7th July, 1905, and the present time another complete set of documents—that is, a deed in duplicate—been through the Deeds Office under the number 8937. The deed 8937 was deposited first between then and November—No. 8937. I do not say that document Exhibit A was removed and another similar document substituted. I say the document marked by Mr. Holloway was removed, and another substituted for it. It was removed from the office when I came to see it. I do not know where it was removed to. I called and saw Mr. Holloway at the end of August or beginning of September, 1905. I made a note in the book produced at the time as follows: "No. of stamp and date: 2004, 14/6/98. On deposit in office on 6/11/06. [Large crown, 14/6/98, ten-shilling stamp (punctured), date 9/7/05 in blue, rubber stamp.] Wrote Sir Joseph Ward *re* removal of deed 9/11/05 "R.H.B." on ten-shilling stamp 7/7/1905, 1st June, 1907, seen with Mr. Massey and J.H.G. on 28th May, 1907." Mr. Massey was here present with me on the occasion.

On seeing the search-book produced by Mr. Holloway Mr. Greenhead says,—

"I was in the Deeds Office two or three times, and I declare the leaves have gone from that book. I am making a mistake: it was on the 6th November, 1906, not the 6th Novemebr, 1905. Yes, I am quite right. I stick to the statement that the leaves have gone from that book for the 6th November, 1905—that a leaf is gone."

After the 1st August, 1905, I wrote to the Registrar of Deeds, calling his attention to deed No. 8937, asking his special attention to that document. I did not get a reply, and wrote a second time. I marked the envelope outside, "Strictly private."

I produce a letter I received from Mr. Holloway, dated the 29th August, 1905.

I am prepared to prove the document was removed from the Deeds Office.

The entry of deposit on Exhibit A has been put on since I saw it last. This is the first occasion I have seen the deed with Mr. Holloway's signature on it. There was no name on it at all when I saw it in the Deeds Office. I say another similar one with the No. 8937 has been through the Deeds Office. At least two others have 8937 on them. There was a blue rubber date-stamp on one.

I produce a letter from the Secretary of Stamps *re* blue stamps (Exhibit B).

I suggest that as soon as the detective had gone the document I saw was put back in its place.

Charles Henry Greenhead.

Taken at Auckland, this 20th day of December, 1907,
before me,—
Herbert W. Brabant,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

William Greer Fletcher saith,—

I am Stamp Clerk at Stamp Office at Auckland. I have been in the Auckland office over fifteen years, and I was so on the 14th June, 1898. I have seen the document produced (Exhibit A) before. That document, No. 8937 (Exhibit A), was presented for stamping on the 14th June, 1898, by E. Mahony, who is a solicitor. I could not say whether personally or by his clerk. There were two documents put in together. That produced (Exhibit D), duplicate copy of deed on Mr. Mahony's file, is the other document. That document bears my initials. The duty was collected on the two documents, and amounted to 5s.—namely, 2s. 6d. on each, and a fine or penalty of 25 per cent. upon the duty. The total amount paid by Mr. Mahony for duty and fine was 6s. 4d. Both documents were subsequently lifted from Stamp Office by Charles W. Harvey, a clerk in Mr. Mahony's employ. I have omitted to mention that the Stamp Office number, 2004, was put on each document. That is the number of the requisition for stamping. We get authority periodically from the Commissioner to destroy certain books and documents after they have been audited. The requisition No. 2004 has been destroyed. Requisition E, under "The Stamp Act, 1882," being an application for stamping an instrument after execution, was put in in duplicate. One copy we keep and the other goes to the Auditor-General.

I have no doubt that the documents produced are the documents which were stamped under that requisition.