

Superintendent
Shearman.

27th Sept., 1878.

upon you, or that I wrote that letter before or after I wrote to Inspector Atchison. I never expected the matter to turn up again, and one cannot recollect all the transactions that go through the office.

752. I will give you dates, and, if you look at the dates of the various communications, you will be able to tell without any trouble. I find the letter of the Mayor to the Minister of Justice was dated 3rd April. That letter seems to have been followed by a minute dated 4th April, requesting you to make inquiry "as to the grounds Mr. Barton had for making charges against the police." The letter, which was forwarded to me stating inquiries had been made, was dated 13th April; between the 4th and the 13th, therefore, the matter was being inquired into. I want to know this: When Colonel Reader told you, you had better not communicate with me in the first instance, as he says, but to communicate with Inspector Atchison to make inquiries, was it after you had failed in getting any information from the police that you wrote the letter contained in the letter-book, dated the 9th April, which was cancelled and not sent?—The dates will tell. The whole thing is entered up regularly in the occurrence-book, and I could not tax my memory. You will see it in that book.

753. Well, from these minutes it would appear distinctly enough that your letter, intended to be sent to me (the cancelled one I am speaking of, dated the 9th April), was after these various minutes in which Mr. Atchison showed he had failed to get any information whatever on the subject?—Yes.

754. When you submitted two letters to Colonel Reader—namely, the one that was afterwards sent to me with the paragraph excised, and the one you proposed sending to me—did Colonel Reader give any special instructions, or was there any particular conversation between you?—No; I think not. I think all his written instructions appear in the record-book.

755. Colonel Reader has sworn, there was nothing to prevent you communicating with me; that if you had done so there would have been no disobedience of orders?—It might not have been.

756. You appear not to have been ordered to send that letter?—I cannot say that I was ordered not to send it, but I sent it to Colonel Reader, and it was retained by the department.

757. It was the Ministers who adopted the letter, and sent it on, minus the last paragraph?—It was not sent from my office.

758. Did you consider yourself at liberty to communicate with me after that occurrence?—No, I did not.

799. Did you consider that after that you had any right to communicate with me, directly or indirectly, without orders?—I did not.

760. *Mr. Swanson.*] There was something came up here yesterday, which I should like you to give us some information about. You are chief of the police; are you not?—I am in charge of the police in the North Island.

761. Detectives are under you, are they not?—Not specially under me. They are under the officers in charge of the several districts, and the officers in charge of the several districts are under me.

762. Well, you know something about their business, their duties, and have the control of them to a certain extent?—Yes.

763. Would you consider it your duty to have them as efficient as possible?—That is my wish.

764. Do you consider a man should have high qualifications to be a detective?—It would require very high qualifications to make a good one. He would require to be very intelligent and a well-educated man, trustworthy in every particular, and possessing superior knowledge to the ordinary class of men. Otherwise, he would be useless as a detective.

765. It would be desirable for him to move about in various phases of life, and to have an acquaintance with persons of various classes of the community, and still to keep himself as quiet as possible. In fact, a detective officer should not be known to the public except as little as possible?—That is so.

766. Do you consider, then, it would promote the efficiency of a detective to put him on duties that would make his identity known to every man in the town?—No; it would not conduce to the efficiency of the service, I consider.

767. If a man were put on duty, which would make him known to every man in the town, would it not ruin his efficiency in that particular town in which he was at work?—Yes; it would. I consider, as I said before, that a detective should go about unknown as far as possible.

768. I suppose it would be all the better, if it were possible, to make him move about invisibly?—It would be all the better.

769. Now, I want to put this matter before you, which came up before us yesterday: that a detective officer, who has been a long time in the service, has all sorts of duties put upon him—amongst others, the work of serving out some sixty summonses to jurors and other persons, so that every person in the town almost would know, who he was and what he was, and what his business was. Do you consider that, by such a course of administration, the efficiency of the detective service would be promoted?—No; I do not.

770. Do you not think it is calculated to make a man useless in the detective service in the town where he is doing that sort of thing?—Certainly.

771. You think it is wrong to do that, then?—It would be improper to employ a detective in such duties.

772. If that conduct was brought to your notice, what would you do?—I would have inquiries made, and would report the result to the Commissioner.

773. *Hon. Mr. Gisborne.*] Are not detectives examined in Police Courts and Supreme Courts?—They are.

774. Does that not make them known?—I admit that the system is not as it should be.

775. In England are they not examined as detectives in Courts?—They are, but there are other persons employed by them to get information, who do not appear in the Courts.

776. Employing a detective as a policeman in serving summonses is not in any wise declaring that he is a detective. The person on whom he served a summons would consider him an ordinary policeman?—I do not know about that.

777. *The Chairman.*] He is not in uniform, is he?—No.