

be two charges of perjury against Wrack, one for cases before Mr. Brabant and the other before Mr. Kettle. There may be a difficulty in former case of getting a witness to prove he administered oath to Wrack.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 7/2/07."

On the 21st February, 1907, a full brief of the evidence, as instructed, was submitted by the Chief Detective, and on the same day the file was sent to the Crown Solicitor with the following minute:—"MR. TOLE,—“Do you consider a prosecution should be instituted against Wrack for perjury? Please advise early.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 21/2/07."

On the next day the file was returned by the Crown Solicitor with the following memorandum:—

"February 22, 1907.

"Memo. for the Inspector of Police, Auckland.

"Re *C. S. Wrack and Alleged Perjury*.

"I have perused and considered the evidence contained in the attached file, and am of the opinion that on the first and second assignments there is a good case for a prosecution, and action should be taken accordingly. With regard to the third assignment, as it appears doubtful whether Sutherland can now be found and called as a witness, I think that this charge might be dropped. I return your file 917/07.

"JOS. A. TOLE,
"Crown Solicitor."

This was minuted as follows: "THE COMMISSIONER,—Please authorise the Crown Solicitor to conduct prosecution of Wrack.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 22/2/07." The following minutes then appear on the documents: "INSPECTOR CULLEN,—Approved. Please report result.—W. DINNIE, Com. 25/2/07." "MR. TOLE,—Please prepare necessary documents and conduct prosecution.—J. CULLEN, Insp'r. 28/2/07."

As already stated, an information was laid and warrant issued on the 2nd March, 1909, but from that time to the present nothing has been seen of Wrack. It has been broadly stated that for certain reasons this man Wrack was allowed to get away, and that the police connived at his disappearance by unduly delaying the proceedings. Apart from the fact that the whole proceedings seem to have been very leisurely, and that Wrack was not kept under strict police surveillance, having regard to the serious nature of the charges against him, and the strong *prima facie* evidence of the truth of them, I am not prepared to say that there is anything to support the allegations made against the police. Had Mr. Kettle expressly directed a prosecution for perjury, instead of requesting the police to make further inquiries and take such proceedings (if any) as might be considered warranted, the position would, of course, be wholly different. It would seem, too, that there was ample grounds for such direction. As it was, the police, without such full and complete knowledge of all the circumstances as was possessed by Mr. Kettle, thought it incumbent on them to make long and, as I think, unnecessary further inquiries, and at the end to submit the whole matter, still more unnecessarily, for the opinion of the Crown Solicitor. There is evidence on the papers to show that Wrack, hearing of the projected prosecution, thought it wise to disappear; and this he has done most effectually.

Auckland Police Surgeon.

A great deal was said in Auckland about the relations existing between the Inspector and the members of the Force generally and Dr. Sharman, the Police Surgeon. There can be no doubt at all that those relations are exceedingly strained, and do not tend to operate in the best interests of all parties. As things are now, the great majority of the men refuse to have the services of the Police Surgeon. The trouble has been in existence for a long time, and the