

service, and with exemplary records of merit, is no better off than the indifferent man, who may be no better than a "waster." I can see no objection to certified copies of the record of merit being attached to all certificates where a man is discharged with a good character.

*The Wrack Case.*

A case was brought under my notice in Auckland which I think I ought to refer to at some length with a view to remove certain misapprehensions which have arisen with regard to the true facts. The circumstances, as placed before me by Mr. James Regan, the proprietor of *Saturday Night*, and the statement made by Mr. Kettle, S.M., would seem to raise a presumption that there had been a gross neglect of duty, and perhaps something worse, on the part of the police. I have closely examined all available papers in connection with the case, and the following is the true position.

A man named Charles Stevenson Wrack, a warder at the Mount Eden Gaol, was on the 4th February, 1907, adjudged by Mr. Kettle, S.M., to be the putative father of the illegitimate child of a young woman whose acquaintance Wrack had made while she was serving a sentence in gaol, and he was ordered to pay 7s. 6d. per week towards the maintenance of the child, with other charges and costs. The hearing was a lengthy one, occupying some six days, and during the proceedings the defendant gave evidence on his own behalf, and this evidence was clearly entirely disbelieved by the Magistrate, who also had reason to believe that evidence given by the same defendant in another affiliation case, heard by another Magistrate in 1898, had been false, Wrack being questioned by Mr. Kettle as to the truth of certain statements made by him in that case.

The burden of the complaint made against the police in this connection is that at the close of the affiliation proceedings against Wrack, Mr. Kettle, S.M., directed, on the 4th February, 1907, that he should be prosecuted for perjury, and that the information charging him with this offence was not laid until the 2nd March, 1907, and a warrant to apprehend issued, when it was found that Wrack had probably left New Zealand, and could not be arrested. As a matter of fact, he has not up to the present time been apprehended, although inquiries have been made as to his whereabouts in Victoria, in New South Wales, and in those parts of New Zealand where it was thought likely that he might be found.

Mr. Kettle himself, and others interested in the case, seem to be under the impression that he had directed a prosecution for perjury against Wrack at the close of the affiliation proceedings. This is clearly not so, as conclusively shown by a reference to the official file. On the 5th February, 1907, Mr. Kettle addressed the following memorandum to the Inspector of Police at Auckland:—

"The Magistrate's Office, Auckland, 5th February, 1907.

"To Inspector of Police, Auckland.

"*Morrison v. Wrack.*

"*Mangan v. Wrack.*

"I desire to draw your attention to the admission, on oath, made by Mr. Wrack, defendant in this case, in Court yesterday, to the effect that in a case against him (*Morrison v. Wrack*, in 1898, and heard before Mr. Brabant, S.M.) he swore falsely. I enclose copy of Mr. Brabant's notes of evidence given by Mr. Wrack; and this morning's *Herald's* report of Mr. Wrack's admission is substantially accurate. I also desire to draw your attention to the evidence given by Mr. Wrack in the case *Mangan v. Wrack*, and my decision delivered yesterday, in order that you may, after full inquiry, take such proceedings (if any) as in your opinion are warranted by the circumstances.

"CHAS. C. KETTLE, S.M."

This was minuted by the Inspector as follows: "CHIEF DETECTIVE MAR-SACK,—Get full newspaper reports of proceedings of case, and paste them on paper. Then brief evidence in alleged perjury cases and submit. There may