

5. What was his reply?—One time a mob followed me to the police-station, and one came behind me and pushed me down. I was told by the Inspector that all I could do was to summons him.

6. Do you suggest that the Inspector or person in charge of any district should send constables to protect the local preachers throughout New Zealand, because that is what it would amount to? In Christchurch it would take half the Police Force?—Those who go out in companies represented by organizations with drums to drown the trouble are all right, and are left alone, but when one like myself is not backed up by authority the trouble arises, especially when politics are mixed up with it. I find my platform now being taken by the socialists, and they get a good hearing, because if any boys make trouble they let them have it.

7. You suggest that a constable should be handy to take notice of all who interfere with you?—If they maltreat me.

8. If they do that it is the duty of the police to take action if they see it. You want the police specially told to watch?—Yes, I have offered to pay for a plain-clothes man to take names of one or two.

9. Did you see the Inspector or Sub-Inspector?—Both.

10. What was the reply given by each of them?—The Inspector said he would protect us as long as we did not interfere with the traffic.

11. When were you last interfered with?—About four months ago.

12. You have been preaching every Sunday?—Yes, weather permitting, every Sunday evening.

13. Your grievance, then, is not a very grave one?—No, but it is pretty hard to get one's hat knocked off. One reason I have not been interfered with lately is that the nights are too cold, and the boys do not come out.

14. Where do you get your audience from?—Men will stand for some hours listening to me, and some thank me very much for what I say.

15. Perhaps it will meet your views if I ask the Commissioner to instruct the Inspector to occasionally have a man round this place to see that if there is any physical interference proceedings are taken to protect you?—Just so; but I would like to ask whether freedom of speech is not to be protected.

16. In what way?—Roaring and shouting and throwing crackers amongst the crowd.

*The Commissioner:* The latter is an offence under the Crimes Act.

*Witness:* I thought I was justified in making these complaints.

*The Commissioner:* This will probably have the effect you desire.

WILLIAM RICHARD LUBY, Commission Agent, examined on oath. (No. 18.)

*Witness:* I am a commission agent.

1. *The Commissioner:* What kind?—Connected with the bookmaking fraternity. I live in George Street, Dunedin. I have no grievance against the police in general, only against one constable in particular, who was recently stationed in Dunedin. His name is Malcolm. I wish to ask whether any evidence I give will receive the same consideration as that of any other person.

2. Why not?—Because I have been in trouble.

3. I am prepared to attach the same importance to the matter as if you came into Court with clean hands; but when it comes to a conflict of evidence I should have to regard the evidence as being on one hand that of persons without a record and on the other of a person who has deliberately placed himself in the position of having some question attached to it. You can rely on anything you lay before me receiving full consideration?—I should like to call a Magistrate.

4. He probably would decline to give evidence on a matter that has come before him judicially?—I wish to make a complaint against this constable for the despicable methods he used in endeavouring to obtain a conviction against me.

5. Has the charge he brought against you been judicially disposed of?—Yes, the conviction was quashed on appeal. The constable, in giving evidence, committed perjury.

6. If he did so, there is no limitation of the time in which you can charge him with it as a criminal offence. It is, in fact, your duty, in the interests of the community as well as your own, to do so?—Is it not the duty of the police authorities to charge him? The Judge commented on the fact of my witnesses being respectable.

7. If it were in the knowledge of the Inspector that there was *prima facie* evidence of a constable committing perjury it would be clearly his duty to institute proceedings? Is that a sufficient answer?—Yes, but proceedings were not taken.

8. The Inspector is not here to-day. I think this evidence should be given in his presence?—Yes. The reason I asked the question was because I know a case in which the police arrested for perjury a man against whom a charge of indecency was dismissed by the Magistrate. If the Commission is open for suggestion, I wish to say that about three years ago I was staying at a boardinghouse which was under suspicion as being a sly-grog shop. While I was there there was a constable named Ross who should be in gaol for his carryings-on in that house.

9. Did you make a complaint at the time?—No.

10. Where does your suggestion come in?—That a man who has to inform and secure a conviction before he is put in the Force should not be there. A man who would do that would do anything.

*The Commissioner:* You are within your rights in making the suggestion, and I will not say I disagree with you in regard to the employment of probationary constables as informers.

*Witness:* I come before you on behalf of the women who gave evidence. I was staying with a woman who was separated from her husband. I was arrested, and charged with being a rogue, and when I was arrested a constable went into the house and told her the house was under suspicion, and asked if she knew she had been harbouring one of the worst criminals in New Zealand