

Mr. Justice Edwards, in his letter to Mr. Greenhead, said that, while he had no doubt at all as to the genuineness of the documents to which Mr. Greenhead referred, he was satisfied that he conscientiously believed that they were forgeries. Since then his charges have grown, until they have reached the magnitude shown in the letter to the Commissioner of Police.

I tried several times to reason with Mr. Greenhead, and to show him where he was wrong; but he either cannot or will not be convinced. It seems at least possible that, by allowing his mind to habitually dwell on his misfortunes and supposed grievances, he may have developed the morbid condition known as monomania, and may really believe what he states. I cannot pass an opinion on this question. I only suggest it as a possible explanation of his strange actions.

Just as I am closing this report I have been informed by the Registrar of Deeds here that he will not allow the deed of lease—Exhibit A—to be sent to Wellington with the other exhibits. His memorandum is attached. It is an important piece of evidence in the inquiry, but you will doubtless direct that it be sent up if it is required.

I return herewith the three files of papers (Police 07/179, Justice 1907/689, Stamps 1907/392) which were transmitted to me with your letter of the 9th December, 1907 (No. 2529).

I have, &c.,

HERBERT W. BRABANT,

Stipendiary Magistrate.

The Hon. the Minister of Justice, Wellington.

In the matter of an inquiry ordered by the Hon. the Minister of Justice, to be held by H. W. Brabant, Esq., Stipendiary Magistrate, into certain allegations made by Mr. Charles Henry Greenhead.

(Inquiry opened at Auckland on the 18th December, 1907.)

STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES.

Inquiry ordered by the Minister of Justice is opened at the Magistrate's Court at Auckland on Wednesday, the 18th day of December, 1907, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

Mr. Charles Henry Greenhead appears personally. He will make a statement himself, and call certain witnesses—viz., Mr. William Nicholls, of Mauku, farmer; Mrs. Hill, widow of late Walter James Hill; and the manager of the A.M.P. Society, from Wellington; Chief Detective McIlveney, whom Mr. Greenhead believes to be now in Wellington.

The Hon. Mr. McGowan's letter dated the 9th December, 1907, addressed to Mr. Brabant, was read to Mr. Greenhead.

Mr. Greenhead says he proposes to call evidence to show that certain documents are forgeries. The first document is a deed of lease dated the 11th April, 1898, and signed by Walter James Hill, Charles Henry Greenhead; and William Nicholls, attesting witness. Mr. Greenhead suggests that the whole three signatures are forgeries.

"I do not say who forged them, but I consider Mr. Mahony is responsible. He uttered them, and must know they were forgeries.

"The second document is one purporting to be an agreement between Walter James Hill and myself, dated the 11th April, 1898, and signed by Mr. Hill and myself. I am fully convinced that Mr. Nicholls also signed that one. The initials and date on the stamp I declared to be forged. I now assert that the two signatures of Mr. Hill and myself are both forgeries. I do not know who they were forged by. I paid Mr. Mahony a guinea to deposit that deed in the Deeds Office here, and instead of doing that he deposited an original deed of an entirely different date.

"I am quite clear that I have grounds for connecting Mr. Mahony with these alleged forged documents.

"The two forged documents are in the possession of Mr. Mahony still. I want Mr. Mahony to come here and produce the documents."

(Produced from Deeds Office: Lease of Allotment No. 42, W. J. Hill to C. H. Greenhead; lease of Allotment 42, Parish of Waiuku East, Registered No. 8937). (Exhibit A.)

Mr. Greenhead says,—

I accept that as a genuine document.

I produce a statement (Exhibit B) that I wrote for Sir Joseph Ward in 1906, at his suggestion. That statement contains the *full facts* that I am relying on. I produce a letter from Sir Joseph Ward (Exhibit C).

I wish now to state something that has taken place since I wrote the statement marked "B." With regard to the deed No. 8937 (A): The first deed deposited had a half-crown stamp and another stamp, not together, and it had a date-stamp of 9/6/98, a ten-shilling stamp with a signature across it or just underneath. On the 6th November, 1906, I went into the Deeds Office and found that deed had been removed.

The deed marked "A," obtained from Deeds Office, is not the one that I allege the forgery of.

I say the deed of lease (marked "D") now produced by Mr. Mahony is not the one I allege to be forged. The deed of lease dated the 11th April, 1898, which is on Mr. Mahony's file and which has on it the indorsement of "R.G.T., Registrar," dated "12/12/04" and "5/6/05" is not the one I allege to be forged. I accept that document as an original document, and I do not charge that it is forged. I believe my signature there is a genuine signature. I say that after seeing the initials "R.G.T." on the back. I have no reason to doubt the genuineness of the indorsements. I stated in the Supreme Court that a certain deed of lease was forged. I did not say to His Honour that the signatures to the deed of lease were forged.