LAW REFORM.

MR. T. S. O'HALLORAN'S EVIDENCE.

"PERJURY A COMMON THING."

TRIAL BY JURY.

A representative of the Law Society says: Nobody who has been connected with the administration of the law can say that the fact that an immense amount of perjury goes on.

Mr. T. S. O'HALLORAN, so well as, that the jury system has been under the Law Reform Commission at Parliament House on Monday. There were present Messrs. Murrin, O'Halloran, Sutton, Robertson, Reddy, Turley, and Curr. Mr. O'Halloran, dealing with the Supreme Court, said there had been a large increase in the crime. In 1903 there were 580 cases of perjury, and in 1904 the number was 670. The number of convictions in the principal cases was 192. In 1905 there were 207. This year there had been an alteration in procedure, and it was required that a summons be first issued, which meant a cost of 2s. 6d. and the accused had to appear, and had taken out an assurance, so that there would be a considerable amount of expense involved.

Mr. B. L. B. L. (in a popular speech) said the suggestion that the same large number of cases in the local courts continued, the number of cases being 10,000, the decrease being nearly 25 per cent.

Mr. Turley-Mr. L. L. was the opinion of the Provincial Court not to be dealt with the Local Courts, and the case with which he was concerned, in which the trial judge had inquired as to the experience of the trial judge in any other case in which the witness had been heard. Mr. O'Halloran said that the number of cases was nearly 7000, the number of convictions being 500, and had not been sent for trial in the Provincial Court. Mr. Turley-Mr. L. L. was the opinion of the Provincial Court not to be dealt with the Local Courts, and the case with which he was concerned, in which the trial judge had inquired as to the experience of the trial judge in any other case in which the witness had been heard. Mr. O'Halloran said that the number of cases was nearly 7000, the number of convictions being 500, and had not been sent for trial in the Provincial Court.

Sir-I am sorry to say that, as far as I know, Mr. O'Halloran's evidence does not go to show that perjury is a common thing. The evidence which I have heard, and the evidence which I have read, does not show that perjury is a common thing. The evidence which I have heard, and the evidence which I have read, does not show that perjury is a common thing.
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