

favour, or affection, stays the hand of justice and shields a criminal may, for a like motive, cause an innocent person to be wantonly harassed.

I would suggest to you, Sir, with great deference the propriety of causing the police to report to you as to the alleged forgery, and why they have taken no steps to punish the forger or the utterer; and I ask you to be good enough to let me have a copy of their reply as soon as possible, for delay makes detection the more difficult.

The Hon. the Minister for Justice.

I have, &c.,

W. H. TUCKER.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I find that the police in March last reported the forgery and the name of the suspected person, but the report was suppressed, and does not appear in the *Police Gazette* in due course, as it ought.

No. 2.

Mr. HURREY to the Hon. the MINISTER of JUSTICE.

SIR,—

Gisborne, 20th December, 1880.

I have the honor to inform you that the police of this district are not allowed to exercise the functions appertaining to their office—viz., that of detecting crime and prosecuting criminals. I have been informed by the police here that in one case, although they believed both committal and conviction would ensue if they were allowed to prosecute, still they could not do so—in fact that their hands were tied. Still we have a case of “justice” shielding a criminal emanating from the act of a Mr. Shearman, who, some ten months ago, instructed or caused instructions to be given to the police that in the case of E. ff. Ward, jun. solicitor, they were not to prosecute him for uttering a certain deed to which the late Dr. Nesbitt's signature as Trust Commissioner had been forged. A charge of forgery was preferred against E. ff. Ward, but was dismissed: however, the evidence and circumstances surrounding the case were such that both the public and police were certain that a forgery had been committed by some one, and also that E. ff. Ward had uttered the deed by placing or causing the deed to be placed on the register.

I would therefore respectfully request that you would cause the police to be allowed to fulfil the duties for which they are paid, and also to furnish you with a full report of E. ff. Ward's case; and might I respectfully, and with great deference, suggest to you the advisability of your becoming acquainted with the reasons that caused Mr. Shearman or others to instruct the police not to prosecute in the case of E. ff. Ward, jun., solicitor, for uttering a deed to which the late Dr. Nesbitt's signature as Trust Commissioner had been forged.

I have, &c.,

The Hon. the Minister of Justice.

JOHN R. HURREY.

No. 3.

Mr. TUCKER to the Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER.

SIR,—

Gisborne, 23rd December, 1880.

I am requested by certain Natives—viz., Tamati Tiwha Tiwha, Hone Meihana, Hone Niwa, Rota Waipara, and others who are interested—to report to you that several years ago they signed a deed to G. E. Read. That when brought before the Trust Commissioner, the late Dr. Nesbitt, for his certificate, circumstances were disclosed which prevented his granting his certificate. That some eleven months after Mr. Read's death his properties were sold. That notice was publicly given at the sale in January, 1879, of the non-certification of the deed in question, and objection was made on that score to the sale of the Matawhero B property. That E. ff. Ward, jun., was solicitor to the estate of G. E. Read, and was present at the sale. That he did not contradict the assertion that Dr. Nesbitt had refused to certify the deed. That the property in consequence of the flaws in the title did not reach the limit, and was withdrawn. That subsequently it was bought by the said E. ff. Ward, who within one week of the sale had an interview with me about the deed, and requested me to obtain a certificate for it. That I declined to do so, or even to have anything to do with it. That about November, 1879, E. ff. Ward commenced a partition suit in the Supreme Court; but, apparently unwilling to go to trial, made many unsuccessful attempts at obtaining a submission by the Native grantees to arbitration. That, on the service of the writ for partition on the grantees, it was perceived that the very deed which remained uncertified at the time of Dr. Nesbitt's death in August, 1877, was now bearing his certificate, and was placed on the register by E. ff. Ward in February, 1879, shortly after he bought the property. That the said E. ff. Ward was informed against by one of the grantees for the forgery and subsequent uttering. That, on the hearing of the information, it was sworn by Mr. Greenwood, the late Dr. Nesbitt's clerk, that the signature was not his; and Mr. Woon, Court interpreter, Mr. F. G. Skipworth, formerly clerk to Dr. Nesbitt, and other gentlemen well acquainted with the late Dr. Nesbitt's signature, and of known standing and truthfulness, gave similar evidence. That the Magistrate, although he considered the charge of forgery not proven and dismissed it, yet required the counsel for the defence to be responsible for the production of the deed (about which there had been much shuffling by the defendant) to the police when required, showing that he thought the police should take steps to detect the criminal. That the sergeant of police here did report the crime some time in March last to Napier and Wellington, but such report was by some one in Wellington suppressed from the *Police Gazette*. That the said E. ff. Ward wrote a letter to the Resident Magistrate here deprecating any further steps being taken by the police. That the father of the said E. ff. Ward wrote a letter marked “Private and confidential” to Mr. Shearman, then, unfortunately, Commissioner of Police, who it is said gave instructions that the police should take no further steps towards the detection and punishment of this crime; and the police have since been perfectly passive, no doubt to the great satisfaction of the criminal, and now decline, although they admit knowledge of the crime and strong