

APPENDIX No. 9.

Produced at Meeting 8th October, 1875.

(Memorandum received from Mr. Murdoch, Inspector, Bank of New Zealand.)

In New South Wales there are no paymasters, the Government adopting the same plan as in New Zealand; but with this important difference, that one-eighth per cent. exchange is allowed on all payments out of Sydney, which for 1874 amounted to £1,586 1s. 6d.

APPENDIX No. 10.

Produced at Meeting 13th October, 1875.

Bank of Australasia, Inspector's Office, Wellington,
12th October, 1875.

SIR,—

Having returned from Christchurch, I am prepared to attend the Committee again at any time most convenient to them during the present month, after to-morrow.

W. A. Thomas, Esq.,
Clerk to the Committee on Public Accounts.

I have, &c.,
E. W. MORRAH,
Inspector.

APPENDIX No. 11.

Produced at Meeting, 14th October, 1875.

The National Bank of New Zealand, Limited, Wellington,
13th October, 1875.

SIR,—

I have just received a summons to attend the Committee to-morrow morning. If it is intended then to proceed with my examination, I beg to point out to you that I am without a copy of the Act of Indemnity, which I should like to submit to my counsel before giving further evidence.

The Chairman, Committee on Public Accounts.

I have, &c.,
J. BRIDGES.

APPENDIX No. 12.

Produced at Meeting, 18th October, 1875.

(Memorandum, with reference to Mr. Batkin's statement contained in the Minutes of Evidence, 4th October, handed to the Committee by Mr. Bridges.)

PARAGRAPH 1 states agreement with Bank of New Zealand respecting London Account to be "on the understanding that the same terms were allowed for these balances as were granted by other banks." This understanding has not been carried out, and it now appears that the paper submitted to Parliament as embodying the agreement is merely a memorandum by Mr. Batkin.

Mr. Batkin would evidently wish it to be inferred that the Bank of New Zealand, not only at Wellington, but at all its branches, keeps separate accounts in its books for all the various public accounts to which he refers; but I understand such is not the case, that being done at the Treasury, and not at the Bank.

Mr. Batkin evidently feels called upon, not to devise means for facilitating the business of the country, but raises every possible objection, either reasonable or otherwise, to any change in the present system.

It is observed that the Bank charges 1s. per cent. for remittances by telegram within the colony. This is not according to agreement, and is a charge not made to private parties having accounts at various places.

Mr. Batkin's figures with regard to the difference between selling bills in London and causing funds to be transmitted to the colony are erroneous. The following is a more accurate mode of stating the case:—

Cost of transmitting money from London: Payment in London of £98 10s. 5d. will purchase a bill on New Zealand at sixty days' sight for £100; add interest for four months, £1; actual cost, £99 10s. 5d. To negotiate bills in the colony on London: Bills to produce £100 must be drawn for £100 2s. 6d.; less interest on funds in England, four months, £1; actual cost, £99 2s. 6d. In favour of process by bill, 7s. 11d.

But it must be borne in mind that these calculations are based on the assumption that the postal term between London and New Zealand is sixty days, whereas it is a fortnight less; and it must also be considered that Mr. Batkin has chosen to calculate at the rate of interest in London 3 per cent., whereas at the present moment it is only $1\frac{3}{4}$, and when he wrote it was either $2\frac{1}{4}$ or $2\frac{3}{4}$. These circumstances would reduce the advantage of the present system by at least 5s. per cent. It may be pointed out also that Mr. Batkin seems to ignore the use of the telegraph for such purposes, which would make a considerable difference. Mr. Batkin's reference to Mr. Morrah's evidence regarding the sum of £340,000 apparently unaccounted for in the Financial Statement is misleading, and seemingly intentionally so. The inference Mr. Morrah drew was that the £340,000 had gone to the Bank of New Zealand in payment of previous advances, and that is not denied. On the contrary, it may be reasonably concluded that such repayment formed a part of the "expenditure" to which Mr. Batkin refers, but of the particulars of which he is careful to avoid giving any information.