

It is certainly not possible that a document stamped on the 6th June, 1898, could be stamped with a half-crown blue stamp. As far as I am aware, there has never been a blue half-crown New Zealand stamp. Certainly not within the last twenty-five years. Further than this, a document would not be deemed to be stamped if only an uncanceled stamp was placed upon it. Supposing it did not have a date-stamp on, it might have had the Commissioner's seal on.

To Mr. Greenhead: If the deed had been brought in on the 16th May, 1898, there would have been no fine payable. If the date 28th February, 1898, had been the date of the deed instead of the 16th May the fine payable would have been £5. The date being 11th April, it reduced the fine. I can account for the marks visible under the stamp. The practice in the office is to mark all deeds with a blue pencil as a guide to the office when stamping. The mark on deed 8937 is "2/6 f.p."—that means 2s. 6d. duty and a fine-paid stamp. I am quite sure the documents were stamped in 1898, and at the same time. The mark on the front of the "F" on the bottom of the date-stamp is a mark made by a bit of lead on the die. That peculiarity is on the die at the present moment. Regarding the blue stamp referred to by Mr. Greenhead, I believe there was a brown half-crown stamp with blue lettering; but it could not possibly be called a blue half-crown stamp.

The pressure is not always the same, or evenly applied when putting the date-stamp on.

WM. G. FLETCHER.

Taken at Auckland, this 20th day of December, 1907,
before me,—

HERBERT W. BRABANT,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

Statements made by Mr. Greenhead during the examination of Mr. Fletcher:—

I say neither of these are the documents produced before the Supreme Court, notwithstanding the indorsement of the Registrar. The one produced in the Supreme Court had two blue half-crown stamps not exactly the same shape. One of the stamps was dated the 6th June, 1898, and the other stamp had no date—was not cancelled in any way. I suggested it had never been near the Deeds Office. I suggest the blue stamps were taken off an old document for the time being for the purpose of deceiving His Honour Judge Edwards.

C. H. GREENHEAD.

Taken at Auckland, this 20th day of December, 1907,
before me,—

HERBERT W. BRABANT,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

WILLIAM GREER FLETCHER continued,—

I produce form Requisition E referred to in my previous statement, and samples of impressions of date-stamp taken in the presence of Mr. Brabant and Mr. Greenhead to-day.

The receipt-book for documents shows 6s. 4d. paid on the stamping of the documents.

An application is made on requisition E for stamping. Provided the duty assessed agrees with down on form E the document is then stamped and issued, a receipt being taken therefor in the receipt-book produced. The requisition is entered through the cash-book to account for the cash received, and entered through the stock-books to account for the stamps issued. Our accounts are made up weekly, the Controller and Auditor-General being supplied with a verified copy of the cash-book, and supported with the requisitions for the period dealt with. The item 6s. 4d. could be traced by the Auditor-General through the copies of account I have sent him in 1898.

WM. G. FLETCHER.

Taken at Auckland, this 20th day of December, 1907,
before me,—

HERBERT W. BRABANT,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

2 p.m.

Mr. GREENHEAD says,—

With regard to agreements on Mr. Mahony's file, I say that the one dated the 11th April, 1898, with the Registrar's initials, 5/6/05, is the one that was before His Honour Judge Edwards. It is signed "Charles Henry Greenhead," initialled "C.H.G." on the stamp. I now notice other initials that were not there then. I am referring to the one marked "Exhibit H, 5/6/05," and "Exhibit B, 12/12/04." I say it was *not* before the Judge at previous trial on the 12th December, 1904. I do not for a moment say the Registrar has put his initials there when it was not produced before the Judge. The agreement originally dated the 10th April, 1898, and altered to the 11th I am sure was not produced at the trial on the 5th June, 1905, and seen together with the other by His Honour. There was only one agreement shown to me on that occasion. A corresponding deed of lease of even date with the first-named agreement, and without any alterations in date, was produced and the signatures compared by His Honour. Neither of the deeds of lease now produced, dated the 16th May originally, which date has been tampered with subsequent to signing, and of which I knew nothing, and had April 11th added over the top—neither of these were compared with the two agreements dated originally the 10th and 11th April, 1898. I have never seen any deed or agreement with any alterations in the date until August, 1905, after the trial, and after I had written to His Honour. I then saw it in the Deeds Office under 8937. As soon as I discovered this I at once went to Mr. Wynyard and told him the deed in dispute, and which he paid Mr. Mahony a guinea to deposit, had not been deposited, and I strongly insisted to Mr. Wynyard it must be done, as it bore the Registrar's initials as being put in evidence. The one in the Deeds Office, No. 8937, has not got the initials. I then also wrote to Mr. Griffiths,