

**F I R S T R E P O R T**

FROM THE

**S E L E C T C O M M I T T E E**

ON

**P O L I C E ;**

WITH THE

**MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.**

---

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,  
10 June 1853.*

---

*Martis, 26<sup>o</sup> die Aprilis, 1853.*

*Ordered, THAT* a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Expediency of adopting a more Uniform System of Police in England and Wales, and Scotland.

---

*Jovis, 5<sup>o</sup> die Maii, 1853.*

Committee nominated of,—

Mr. Rice.	Mr. Rich.
Mr. Sotheron.	Mr. Moody.
The Lord Advocate.	Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Walpole.	Mr. Brand.
Mr. Fitzroy.	Mr. Charles Howard.
Mr. Burroughes.	Sir James Anderson.
Lord Lovaine.	Mr. Philipps.
Sir John Trollope.	

*Ordered, THAT* the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

*Ordered, THAT* Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

---

*Jovis, 9<sup>o</sup> die Junii, 1853.*

*Ordered, THAT* the Committee have power to report the Minutes of Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

---

REPORT . . . . .	p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE . . . . .	p. 1

---

---

## FIRST REPORT.

---

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to consider the Expediency of adopting a more Uniform System of Police in England and Wales, and Scotland, and who were empowered to Report the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them from time to time:—

HAVE considered the matters to them referred, and have agreed to report the Minutes of Evidence taken before them to The House.

10 *June* 1853.



---

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

---

*Jovis, 26<sup>o</sup> die Maii, 1853.*

### MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Rice.	Mr. Sotheron.
Mr. Walpole.	Mr. Fitzroy.
Mr. Burroughes.	Sir John Trollope.
Mr. Mackie.	Sir James Anderson.
Mr. Rich.	Mr. Phillips.

EDWARD ROYDS RICE, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Captain *William Charles Harris*, called in; and Examined.

1. *Chairman.*] YOU command the constabulary in Hampshire?—I do.
2. For how many years have you done so?—For 10 years.
3. Was not Hampshire the first county which adopted the police?—No; three counties adopted the police previous to Hampshire, but only by a month or so.
4. In how many other counties has the police been adopted?—In 22 counties in England and Wales.
5. Have you seen the Parliamentary Return which has been made every year of the counties which have adopted the police?—I have.
6. Is that return correct?—I do not consider it so.
7. Can you furnish a corrected return?—Yes; I have a return of the counties in which the Act has been adopted; it has been adopted for the whole of 22 counties in England and Wales, in parts of seven others; but in 22 counties the old parochial system still continues.
8. Does that return differ materially from the Parliamentary Return?—I am not prepared to say.
9. Perhaps you will put that return in?—I can vouch for the correctness of this return.

Captain  
*W. C. Harris.*

26 May 1853.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Return:*]

RETURN of the several Counties that have adopted the Provisions of the Constabulary Act

For the whole County:

Bedford.	Salop.
Cambridge.	Southampton.
Durham.	Stafford.
Essex.	Suffolk.
Gloster.	Surrey.
Hertford.	Wilts.
Lancaster.	Worcester.
Leicester.	Cardigan.
Norfolk.	Carmarthen.
Northampton.	Denbigh.
Nottingham.	Montgomery.

In Parts only:

Cumberland.	Warwick.
Dorset.	Westmoreland.
Rutland.	York.
Sussex.	

0.71.

A

The

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

The following Counties continue the system of Parochial Constables :

Berks.	Northumberland.
Bucks.	Oxford.
Chester.	Somerset.
Cornwall.	Anglesey.
Derby.	Brecon.
Devon.	Carnarvon.
Hereford.	Glamorgan.
Huntingdon.	Merioneth.
Kent.	Radnor.
Lincoln.	Flint.
Monmouth.	Pembroke.

10. Can you generally say that the adoption of the police under the Act has proved efficacious in Hampshire?—In my opinion it has; serious offences are rare, and in most cases followed by detection; petty depredations are prevented, vagrancy checked, and beerhouses controlled.

11. Can you refer to any documents to prove that crime has decreased in Hampshire since the police force has been established?—Yes, by reference to the criminal returns of the force under my command (1851), it will be seen that since the year 1847, the year in which a register of offences was first commenced in Hampshire, the offences against property, as likewise the value of property lost, and the crime undetected, have all gradually decreased.

12. Perhaps you can state to the Committee generally the purport of those returns?—These returns I commenced keeping in 1847; in that year the number of felonies committed in our county were 709; the total amount of property lost was 1,338 *l.* 13 *s.* 4 *d.*; the number of prisoners committed for trial was 334; the number of offences undetected was 388; and the per-centage of undetected crime on the number of offences committed was 54. I will now take the last year, 1851. In that year the number of felonies committed was 609; the total amount of property lost was 476 *l.* 15 *s.* 1  $\frac{1}{2}$  *d.*; the number of persons committed for trial was 316; the number of offences undetected was 281; the per-centage of undetected crime on the number of offences committed was 46.

13. Can you give the Committee a statement of the condition of the county before the establishment of the police force?—No, I cannot.

14. Mr. Rich.] How long was the first year you have mentioned subsequent to the appointment of the police?—The police was established in December 1839; the first year in which this register of crime was kept was 1847.

15. Chairman.] Do you know, of your own knowledge, whether similar returns are kept in other counties?—I should imagine they are kept, but I do not think they are printed.

16. They are printed with you?—They are printed with us.

17. For the use of the magistrates?—Yes, for the use of the magistrates.

18. Will you put in that return?—

[The Witness delivered in the following Return:]

SUMMARY of the Number of FELONIES affecting Property that have been Committed during the undermentioned Years, within the Jurisdiction of the *Hants* Constabulary; showing the First Amount of Loss, and the Amount Recovered, the Number of Persons Committed for Trial, and the Number of Undetected Offences.

Year.	Number of Felonies.	AMOUNT OF LOSS.			Number of Persons Committed for Trial.	Number of Offences Undetected.	Per-centage of Undetected Crime on the Number of Offences Committed.
		First Loss.	Amount Recovered.	Total Loss.			
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.			
1847	709	1,880 5 3	541 11 11	1,338 13 4	334	388	54
1848	687	*3,405 9 9	†523 19 1	*2,933 10 8	374	329	47
1849	678	869 1 - $\frac{1}{2}$	316 - 8 $\frac{1}{2}$	553 - 4	369	348	51
1850	615	777 13 5 $\frac{1}{2}$	201 19 3 $\frac{1}{2}$	515 14 2	350	290	47
1851	609	723 9 10	246 14 8 $\frac{1}{2}$	476 15 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	316	281	46

\* 2,141 *l.* of this amount was timber stolen from the New Forest.  
† 52 *l.* of this amount was stolen in Berkshire.

19. Can

19. Can you form any comparison with reference to the proportion of the detection of crime in Hampshire, as compared with that in other places where there is what is considered an efficient police force?—Yes, if I compare the state of crime in Hampshire with that of the metropolitan police district, considered to be the most efficient force in Great Britain, I find, whether in respect to the prevention or the detection of crime, we are not behind the metropolis; whilst the number of men in London is as 3½ to 1. Take the metropolitan police district, they have one offence to 214 inhabitants; in Hampshire we have one to 438 inhabitants. In the metropolis there is one prisoner convicted to every 4  $\frac{39}{100}$ ths offences, in Hampshire we have one prisoner convicted for every 2  $\frac{58}{100}$ ths. In the metropolitan police district there is one constable to 457 inhabitants; in Hampshire one constable to 1,571 inhabitants. I should say, that this calculation is based on the census of 1851. As London, however, might be considered the focus of crime, and Hampshire simply a rural district, I have drawn a comparison between the metropolis and Gosport, rather a disorderly place, from the large number of licensed public-houses there.

20. What is the police force at Gosport?—Gosport is a part of the county, and we have five men stationed there. There are 85 public-houses; 35 beer-houses licensed to consume on the premises, and three licensed to consume off the premises; making a total of 123 houses of public entertainment in that town alone, the population of which, according to the last census, amounted to 16,908. This is my reason for selecting Gosport to compare with the metropolis. As I mentioned before, in London there is one offence to 214 inhabitants; in Gosport one to 286 inhabitants. In the metropolis there is one prisoner convicted for every 4  $\frac{39}{100}$ ths offences; in Gosport one for every 2  $\frac{58}{100}$ ths offences. In London there is one constable to every 457 inhabitants; in Gosport one constable to every 3,381 inhabitants; or seven times the number in London to what we have in Gosport.

21. Mr. Rich.] Have you any comparison between Hampshire and any county in which the police does not exist?—No; I do not think there is any possibility of making a comparison where there is no police.

22. Chairman.] Do you conceive that it would be conducive to the efficiency of a county constabulary if the several forces were united with it?—Most decidedly.

23. Mr. Fitzroy.] What principal boroughs are there in Hampshire?—There are several boroughs in Hampshire; but Portsmouth and Southampton are the most important.

24. Chairman.] You would call them first-class boroughs?—Yes; there are likewise the boroughs of Winchester, Andover, Newport, Basingstoke, Romsey, and Lymington.

25. In which of those boroughs has the police force been consolidated with the county police?—Andover for some years, and Lymington recently.

26. Sir J. Trollope.] Can you separate the payment for those boroughs which have been consolidated with the county?—In the case both of Andover and Lymington there is merely an arrangement made by which 65 *l.* per man is paid to the county, which is the average cost of the whole of the constables.

27. Do the separate charges for the performance of extra duties fall upon the county?—The only extra charge made to the borough of Andover is for the conveyance of prisoners. In Andover they have a separate court of quarter sessions, and their gaol not admitting of separate confinement, their prisoners are committed to Winchester, to which place they are conveyed by the county constabulary. The charge of conveyance is made according to the table of fees.

28. Do you charge that to the borough?—We charge the borough with the conveyance of the prisoners; that is the only additional charge to the 65 *l.* per man.

29. In fact, the county is borne harmless from those extra charges by the allowances from the boroughs?—By the allowance of 65 *l.* a man, and in that superannuation is included.

30. Chairman.] Do you think the expense of the constabulary in the county and boroughs together, would be materially increased by the union of the boroughs with the county?—No; if the whole were consolidated into one force the expense to each would be lessened.

o.71.

A 2

31. Do

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

Captain  
W. C. Harris.

26 May 1853.

31. Do you think it would be increased to both?—I think the whole expense per man would be decreased.

32. Sir J. Trollope.] In the case of boroughs there are a great number of officers to a few men. If the principle of amalgamation were adopted, a separate superintendent could be allocated, who should be responsible to some inspector for the county?—The borough of Andover, for instance, has a sergeant and four men allotted exclusively to do duty within the borough, and that sergeant and four men are all under the direction of the superintendent of the Andover division.

33. Does the 65 l. per man cover the increased pay which you would give to the higher ranks of the constabulary?—It does.

34. Mr. Rich.] You have stated that you think it would be conducive to an efficient police, if the police of the boroughs were incorporated in the police of the county; will you state the inconveniences which now result from those boroughs not being incorporated?—The want of co-operation between boroughs and counties is a great evil; if the forces were consolidated fewer men would be needed. The boroughs are generally the central points from whence criminals issue into the surrounding districts to commit offences, and to which they return with their plunder; the town force having no interest in the prevention or detection of offences committed in the county, parties are allowed to pass unquestioned.

35. Mr. Fitzroy.] Can you tell the Committee in which of the boroughs in Hampshire there is a police force separate from the county?—Portsmouth, Southampton, Winchester, Newport, and Basingstoke.

36. Mr. Rich.] You say you find there is a want of co-operation in the police force?—Yes, there is a want of co-operation; there is no denying that a jealousy exists between the two forces, but not in my opinion to such an extent on the part of the county as the boroughs, the county constabulary being the larger force of the two. Our men are always willing to afford assistance to the borough police. I will mention a case of the want of co-operation which recently occurred: one of the superintendents of the Hants constabulary was proceeding on duty from the Southampton terminus in plain clothes, when he saw in the train a desperate character, who a year and a half previously had effected his escape by violence from two of the constables of our force; the superintendent immediately seized him, and brought him out of the train; the superintendent sent to the borough station to borrow a pair of handcuffs to secure his prisoner; the loan of these was refused; "they had none to spare;" and the only mode of securing the prisoner was by his leaving him in charge of the railway officials, and proceeding into the town to call upon one of the borough police to aid and assist in the Queen's name, and thus he obtained the handcuffs.

37. Are your superintendents in communication with the superintendents of the borough police?—Not in constant communication.

38. In the event of the occurrence of a crime, do your superintendents immediately communicate the fact of that crime having been committed to the superintendents of the various boroughs?—Certainly they do, if it is a matter of importance; they would not perhaps mention a petty depredation.

39. Inversely, do the superintendents of the boroughs communicate with your superintendents?—Very rarely.

40. Mr. Phillips.] In the case of a borough like Andover, where you have five men, do you change them?—They are constantly changed.

41. Chairman.] You stated that Lymington had lately joined the county; can you state any facts illustrating the benefits of the arrangement?—Only this; last week there was a fair at Lymington; as many as 11 of the swell mob of London came there for the purpose of committing depredations. The superintendent of the New Forest division, who was there on duty, immediately recognised the party. He told some of them that they had better go, that they were not wanted there. They replied, "We did not know that the borough was under your jurisdiction, we were not aware that the borough had joined the county." The superintendent replied that they had just come in, and that they had better go. Most of them took his advice and left, but three remained, who were apprehended, and after being dealt with under the Vagrant Act for being there for an unlawful purpose, were committed for trial for a felony.

42. Is

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POLICE.

5

42. Is the borough of Romsey consolidated with the county?—No.

43. Can you give the Committee any information with regard to the state of crime in the borough of Romsey?—Yes, I have returns.

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

44. Mr. Fitzroy.] Is there a municipality in Romsey?—Yes; but they have no separate Court of Quarter Sessions: there is a mayor and magistrates separate from the county. I beg to put in these two returns, showing the state of crime in the Romsey division, extending to 50,980 acres, and 11,426 inhabitants; and the borough of Romsey, the acreage of which is 380, and the population 1,919. I mention 1850 because it is the only year in which I have been able to obtain a return. There were 16 offenders committed in the county, and eight in the borough. The value of the property lost in the county was 6*l.* 11*s.*, in the borough it was 10*l.* 3*s.* The number of prisoners committed for trial in the county was 14, and in the borough there were two, both of which were detected by the county constabulary, one by the superintendent of the Wilts, and the other by the superintendent of the Hants constabulary. The number of offences undetected in the county was three, and in the borough it was six. There were eight offences committed, and the only two detected were by the county constabulary.

[The Witness delivered in the following Returns:]

RETURN of the Number of FELONIES affecting PROPERTY that have been Committed in the Romsey Division; the First Amount of Loss, the Amount Recovered, the Number of Persons Committed for Trial, and the Number of UNDETECTED Cases, between the 1st January and 31st December 1850.

DESCRIPTION of FELONY.	Number of Felonies.	AMOUNT OF LOSS.			Number of Prisoners Com- mitted for Trial.	Number of Offences Unde- tected.	
		First Loss.	Amount Recovered.	TOTAL LOSS.			
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.			
Burglary - - - -	1	3 11 -	3 1 -	10 -	2	—	
Breaking into a dwelling-house -	1	2 - -	2 - -	- - -	1	—	
„ „ Building, &c. -	2	- 15 -	- 3 -	- 12 -	1	1	
Sheep stealing - - - -	2	2 1 -	- - -	2 1 -	-	2	
Simple larceny - - - -	1	- 2 -	- 2 -	- - -	1	—	
Larcenies. From the In a Dwelling House. Common.	Goods, &c. exposed for sale - - - -	3	- 18 -	- 17 -	1 -	3	—
	Tools, lead, glass, from unfinished houses - - - -	1	- - 6 -	- - 6 -	- - -	1	—
	Poultry, &c., exposed in an outhouse -	2	- 14 6	- 14 6	- - -	2	—
	By servants - - - -	1	3 - -	- - -	3 - -	1	—
	* By doors being left open - - - -	1	- 1 6	- 1 6	- - -	—	—
Picking pockets -	1	2 9 -	2 2 -	- 7 -	2	—	
	16	15 12 6	9 1 6	6 11 -	14	3	

\* Prisoner apprehended, but the Owner declined to prosecute.

Population - - - - - 11,426.

Acreage - - - - - 50,980.

RETURN of the Number of OFFENCES against PROPERTY that have come to the knowledge of the *Hants* Constabulary, as having been committed within the Borough of *Romsey* during the Year 1850.

Upon whom Committed.	Description of Property Lost.	AMOUNT OF LOSS.			Committed for Trial.	Undetected.	REMARKS.
		First Loss.	Amount Recovered.	Total Loss.			
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.			
Eliza Roberts, inn-keeper.	7 fowls - -	- 10 -	- - -	- 10 -	- - -	1	
Arthur Cooper, carpenter.	2 tame rabbits -	- 3 -	- - -	- 3 -	- - -	1	
William B. Crockford, draper.	- - 30 yards plaid silk, and a quantity of ribbon.	5 - -	- - -	5 - -	- - -	1	
George Sharp, timber merchant.	- - 5 fowls and 2 tame rabbits.	- 10 -	- - -	- 10 -	- - -	1	
Moses Pepper, draper	- - A quantity of ribbon.	- - -	Value unknown	- - -	- - -	1	
William Pointer, inn-keeper.	A silver watch -	4 - -	- - -	4 - -	- - -	1	
Chas. J. Robinson, bootmaker.	A pair of boots -	- 10 6	- 10 6	- - -	1 - -	- -	- - Detected by superintendent of the Hants constabulary, seven years' transportation.
George Moore, dealer	A dog cart - -	1 10 -	1 10 -	- - -	1 - -	- -	- - Detected by superintendent of the Wilts constabulary, 6 months' hard labour.
		12 3 6	2 - 6	10 3 -	2	6	

Population - - - 1,919

Acreage - - - 380

45. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Have the magistrates and authorities of the boroughs which have coalesced with the county any voice at all in the appointment, or promotion, or dismissal of the constables?—None whatever; not in the borough of Andover.

46. Or in Lymington?—Or in Lymington. They are all county constables. The chief constable of the county appoints them, and he has the general disposition and government of them.

47. Have you ever considered any plan for compulsorily joining the boroughs with the counties with reference to the appointment of the officers?—I have considered such a plan in my own mind.

48. Would you contemplate in such a plan giving the borough magistrates any voice at all in the election or dismissal of the officers?—Not unless the borough contained a population of 100,000.

49. Do you think it would very much facilitate the arrangement if you were to give them any voice at all in the appointment of the officers?—No, I do not consider that it would facilitate the arrangement. My impression is that such boroughs as Southampton and Portsmouth ought to be considered in the light of separate divisions of the county. We have 14 divisions in Hampshire; Portsmouth and Southampton would therefore be two additional divisions.

50. Sir *J. Trollope*.] What petty sessional divisions?—We have 14 petty sessional divisions in Hampshire, and I should consider Southampton and Portsmouth as two more.

51. Have you at all considered, in case of consolidation, whether the county magistrates should have the appointment of the constables, or of the chief constable solely?—Solely the chief constable.

52. If the borough police were consolidated with the county police, would you still consider it advisable to continue the appointment in the same form as at present?—I do not consider that the service can be carried on satisfactorily if the chief constable has not the appointment of the men, for the performance of whose duty he is responsible.

53. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Would you consider that the rate raised in Southampton and Portsmouth should be expended solely upon the men employed within those boroughs, or would you spread the rate over the whole of the county, and make those towns contribute their quota?—I should say that a fresh valuation of all property

property in boroughs and counties should be made; and that all should contribute equally to one general rate.

54. *Chairman.*] With regard to Southampton and Portsmouth, would you give the magistrates the power of choosing their own chief constable?—Not in such small boroughs as those named.

55. Only in boroughs above 100,000 inhabitants?—Yes; such as Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, and Bristol; I think those are the only five boroughs in England with a population of 100,000.

56. How would you propose to deal with those large boroughs?—I should consider them as separate counties.

57. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Would you give a separate force to those boroughs, or change the men from different parts of the county into them?—With regard to the five boroughs named, I should treat them as separate counties.

58. What is the total number of your police force in Hampshire at present?—One hundred and seventy-six.

59. What is the number of parishes?—I am not prepared to say off-hand.

60. Do you know what the police rate in Hampshire is in the pound?—Two-pence halfpenny.

61. Am I right in thinking that you intend, supposing such an arrangement to be made, to have a force located in Portsmouth and Southampton, which should be a distinct force from the rest of the county, specially devoted to that service, although under your command?—I am merely giving an opinion; my impression is that a borough containing less than 100,000 inhabitants ought to be considered a part of the county in which that borough is situated, so that you may have the opportunity of changing the men from the county into the borough, and from one borough to another, so that the men may not become locally connected.

62. Do you think, after consolidation in point of expenditure, that the rate generally in the county would be lightened or increased?—My impression is that the Government would derive so much benefit from the consolidation, that they ought to contribute a proportion of the expense.

63. I ask you simply as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, whether you think the result of such an arrangement would be to lighten the rate, or increase it?—The greater the number of men, the more it must lighten the rate; the staff is thrown over a larger surface, and therefore the individual cost of the constables must be diminished.

64. *Sir J. Trollope.*] You would save some of the higher classes of appointments if you consolidated the boroughs with the county, you would save having a higher class of officers over each separate borough as at present?—You would be obliged to have a police superintendent at Portsmouth and at Southampton.

65. How many superintendents have you?—Fourteen.

66. What is your next grade?—Sergeants.

67. How many sergeants have you?—Fifteen; I should say that there is one chief clerk who ranks as a superintendent.

68. He is entirely confined to office work?—Exclusively.

69. In the cost of these operations in the counties, have you any table of fees for extra duties performed by the constables, such as attending the assizes or quarter sessions sometimes out of their own district; for instance, when they have to take prisoners to other counties, or attend other courts of jurisdiction?—We have no scale of allowances.

70. Is that left to the magistrates, or to the judges of assize?—To the chief constable; I allow the men what I conceive will cover their bare expenses.

71. Supposing some of your men are taken to another county with prisoners for trial, and have to attend to give evidence against them, are they allowed to make out a bill *ad libitum*?—I stop their pay whilst they are absent on the duties of another county, and they receive their allowances as ordinary witnesses.

72. How are those allowances regulated?—In the county to which they go, for mileage and attendance; I stop their pay as long as they are in the service of another county.

73. What is your stoppage per head, per man, for the superannuation fund?—Two and a half per cent.

74. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] After how many years are the men entitled to superannuation?—Not till they are 60 years of age.

0.71.

A 4

75. What

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

75. What is the amount of the police force now in Southampton?—I am speaking from recollection; but I think it is 28 or 30. Not more than 30.

76. Is that an efficient force?—I should imagine not. The subject of an increase of 10 men to the force was only brought before the Council last week.

77. Mr. Rich.] With regard to the aggregate expense to the whole county, in case the police were put under one authority, do you imagine in the county of Hampshire, by adding to the present expenses of the county the expenses incurred by all those boroughs which are independent of the county, that it would exceed the expenses which would be incurred by the amalgamation of the new police in the county and in the boroughs included under one head?—No, my impression is that it would not be so much.

78. You said that you would shift the constabulary?—Yes.

79. Do you attach much importance to that?—Very great importance. I would not allow a constable to remain for a day after it had come to my knowledge that he was locally connected. If it was reported to me that a police constable had got into low company, I should shift him immediately.

79\*. In bringing those other boroughs, which are now independent of you, under your authority, you would be able to exercise the same power of shifting the constables in these boroughs?—Yes.

80. Do you consider that mischief arises to the boroughs from the constables not being shifted?—Yes; it is impossible that a man can do his duty if he is locally connected. If police constables become acquainted with beershop keepers, for instance, it is impossible they can do their duty. If I see any indication of intimacy of that kind, I remove the constable to another part of the county, perhaps 40 or 50 miles away.

82. Are there any counties bordering on Hampshire without a constabulary police force?—Berkshire and West Sussex have no police force, and Dorsetshire is without one. Wiltshire has a police force.

83. Do you observe whether there is any difference between the parts contiguous to those counties which have not a police force, as to the commission and non-detection of crimes, compared with those which have it?—I recollect previous to the establishment of the constabulary in Surrey, that occasional depredations were committed on our borders. I attribute that, however, in a great measure to offenders not knowing the line of demarcation.

84. Do you remark any difference between the parts of Hampshire bordering on Wiltshire, where they have a police force, and the other parts contiguous to counties which have not a police force?—I think any person going from Hampshire into Dorsetshire might know when they were without the county, by the swarms of gipsies which they see encamped.

85. Do you find any inconvenience in Hampshire from having those bad neighbours?—Occasionally we do. I recollect, in the north of the county, there was a party came from Reading, and committed a burglary in Hampshire, in the parish of Heckfield. They were immediately followed up by the superintendent of the Odiham division, and were all brought to justice, and I believe seven transported. They had committed burglaries all round Reading, without a single case of detection.

86. Chairman.] I think you have stated that the amount of expenditure was 2½ d. in the pound?—Yes.

87. What amount do you carry to the credit of the county for the services performed, on the other hand?—I have here the treasurer's account of our county for the last year, and I find the total amount carried to the credit of the police rate was 2,537 l. 18 s. 11 d.

88. What was that for?—From the Government, for the conveyance of prisoners, 332 l. 18 s. 2 d.; from the general county rate for the same purpose, 700 l. 7 s. 6 d.; inspecting weights and measures, 550 l. 14 s. 6 d. There are several other items, such as the sale of cast horses, the attendance of the constables at the sessions and assizes, &c. The total amount is 2,537 l. 18 s. 11 d.

[The Witness delivered in the following Paper:]

13

RECEIPTS:		£.	s.	d.
From Government, for conveying of prisoners	- - - - -	332	18	2
From general rate	- - ditto - ditto - - - - -	700	7	6
From - ditto - inspecting weights and measures	- - - - -	550	14	6
From - ditto - for medical attendance on prisoners	- - - - -	9	18	-
From the borough of Andover, for services of constables	- - - - -	251	1	8
From the sale of cast horses	- - - - -	90	2	6
For service of process	- - - - -	206	10	11
From stoppages from constables absent on leave	- - - - -	22	7	3
From - ditto - ditto - for medical attendance	- - - - -	36	19	4
From constables, for lodgings provided at stations	- - - - -	126	6	3
From Government, for attendance of constables at sessions and assizes	- - - - -	191	15	1
From the Customs, for conveyance of smugglers	- - - - -	9	19	5
From sale of old harness	- - - - -	4	18	-
From other sources	- - - - -	4	-	4
		£.	2,537	18 11

Capital  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

There are several other items; such as the sale of cast horses, the attendance of the constables at the sessions and assizes, &c. &c.; the total amount is 2,537*l.* 18*s.* 11*d.*

89. Sir J. Trollope.] Has not there been a saving under another head in Hampshire since the establishment of the police; I apprehend, before the establishment of the rural police, you had high constables or chief constables, who were paid officers?—No; the high constables are not paid officers in Hampshire; in some counties they are.

90. Had they no chief constables or high constables who were paid out of the county rate?—Not in Hampshire.

91. Mr. Phillips.] I think you said you shifted the constables from Andover in order to avoid the evil of local connexion?—Yes.

92. Do not you think you incur in some degree the risk of want of local knowledge from such a practice?—No.

93. Sir J. Trollope.] You do not move them all at once, I presume?—No, we only move one man at a time; we seldom move a superintendent.

94. Have you any difficulty in finding residences for the men?—Where the county has not built or provided stations, the men take private lodgings.

95. Has the county of Hampshire built any stations for the accommodation of the police?—Yes.

96. What number?—Several divisional stations have been built; in divisions where there is no station the property of the county, stations are rented.

97. Where there are stations with buildings attached to them, have the constables lodgings found by the county?—They pay for them.

98. Then when there is a change of men there is always a residence for them?—Where there is a station built.

99. Are those men provided for in other houses?—The men provide their own lodgings, and pay generally about 2*s.* a week.

100. Mr. Fitzroy.] What do the men pay to the county for lodgings?—The same amount.

101. What is their weekly pay?—Our constables are in four classes, at 15*s.*, 17*s.*, 19*s.*, and a guinea a week.

102. Sir J. Trollope.] If the county do not find the lodgings, do they hire them, and stop the cost out of the pay of the men?—No.

103. What is the system which is adopted?—The men find their own lodgings; but if there is a county building, then we stop the amount from their pay at the rate of 2*s.* a week; I see the amount stopped for lodgings last year was 126*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.*

104. Have the whole of the lodgings which are found by the county been built out of the county rate?—Latterly we have invested the superannuation fund of the constabulary in building stations; we have upwards of 4,000*l.* in the superannuation fund.

105. Then the rent of those lodgings furnishes the fund; is that so?—The county pays the interest of the money invested, and we stop a certain amount for lodgings from the pay of the constables; but only 2*s.* a week.

106. Is it intended by degrees to find lodgings for the whole force?—No; I do not consider it possible. The only thing I contemplate is the building of

0.71. B divisional

Captain  
W. C. Harris.

26 May 1853.

divisional stations for the superintendents; the constables in Hampshire are scattered through the villages, not concentrated in stations, as in some counties.

107. You would build stations only at the head-quarters of the division?—Only at the head-quarters of the division.

108. *Chairman.*] You have stated the amount carried to the credit of the county; can you state any other items of deduction relative to which you can form an estimate?—By giving notice to the coroners, the expense of the coroners' inquests has been reduced 313 *l.* 10 *s.* 2 *d.*

109. I understand, from another source, that there was a report from a select committee on county expenditure; have you got that report?—I have.

110. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] When you speak of the expense of the coroners, do you mean that the police have given notice of deaths, have summoned the jury, and so on?—Yes; in place of the parish constables giving notice of any sudden death, the county constabulary (having previously made some inquiries) give notice to the coroner.

111. Have you had any representations as to that duty not being efficiently performed by the constabulary?—No; I have had representations made by the coroners of the satisfactory manner in which the evidence has been brought before them, and the trouble they have consequently been saved.

112. Has it at all checked the number of inquests held?—I do not think it has materially; it has lessened the expense.

113. *Mr. Burroughes.*] What sum do you save by the police giving those notices?—£.313. 10 *s.* 2 *d.*

114. Do you inspect the weights and measures?—We do.

115. *Chairman.*] Will you state who were the members of the committee on county expenditure?—Melville Portal, Esq., M.P., was the chairman; the Right Honourable the Speaker, the Right Honourable Lord Henry Cholmondeley, Sir William Heathcoate, Bart., Henry C. Compton, Esq., M.P., Henry Beaumont Coles, Esq., M.P., John Simeon, Esq., M.P., John Bonham Carter, Esq., M.P., William Hans Sloane Stanley, Esq., William Crawley Yonge, Esq., F. Jervoise Ellis Jervoise, Esq., John Willis Fleming, Esq., Edward Hulse, Esq., George Haynes Jones, M. D., Henry Joyce Mulcock, Esq., Rev. John Thomas Maine. If you will allow me, I will read a portion of the report. "Your Committee have not been able to ascertain the amount that was yearly paid by parishes to their constables prior to the establishment of this force; but it is calculated that not less than 1,500 *l.* per annum must have been expended in this respect, which is now altogether saved to the ratepayers. But besides these sums, which before the establishment of the constabulary were payments actually out of pocket, it must be remembered that considerable saving is indirectly effected to the public by means of this force. The value of the constables' lost time (before the establishment of the county constabulary), for which he was never adequately remunerated, must not be left out of the calculations in estimating the advantage of a paid police. It may also be observed that, coincident with the employment of police constables as assistant relieving officers in unions, there has been a very great decrease in vagrancy, and that without any additional cost to the unions; a considerable credit ought therefore, in their opinion, to be taken in favour of the constabulary under all these heads, as well as under that of saving to the public by the diminution of business at petty sessions, by the recovery and protection of property, by the absence of the necessity for associations for the prosecution of offenders, and by non-payments to special constables; and, although it is impossible to estimate with any accuracy the amount of indirect expense thus avoided by the county, yet when it is recollected that a saving of only 1 *d.* per acre would amount to a sum of 4,154 *l.*, it may be safely asserted that the actual additional cost to the ratepayers is very trifling in comparison with the advantages which accrue to them from the maintenance of the police force. In illustration of the expenses in which the county may be involved when unprotected by the police, they would refer to the burden thrown upon the rates by a short period of rioting in 1830, which appears, by Table No. 1, to have amounted to 9,235 *l.* 15 *s.* 3 *d.*, a sum exceeding the cost of paying the police force for a whole year, and to which must be added the amount of the damage and destruction of property at that time."

116. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] What is the average area which each of your constables have to watch and superintend?—The area of the county, including the boroughs of Andover and Lymington is 1,006,210 acres, and we have 176 men to that acreage.

117. *Chairman.*]

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POLICE.

107

117. *Chairman.*] Supposing the Rural Police Act were made compulsory, and the counties and boroughs were consolidated, have you made any calculation as to what number of men would be required in England and Wales?—The police force of England and Wales (exclusive of the Metropolitan and City Police) amounted in 1851 to 7,381, and were supported at a cost to the rate-payers of 445,084*l.* 0*s.* 10*d.*

Captain  
*W. C. Harris.*  
26 May 1853.

118. *Mr. Mackie.*] Does that include Wales?—It does. If a force were raised upon the basis of acreage and population, taking in the rural districts, 4,000 acres, and a population of 1,200 to each constable (in boroughs a population of 1,000 to each constable, except under an Order in Council), it would give a force (based upon the census of 1841) of 12,307 men for England and Wales. It might be necessary, for instance, to have more than one constable to 1,000 inhabitants in such boroughs as Liverpool and Manchester.

119. *Sir J. Trollope.*] That is something greater than you have in Hampshire?—Yes; it would give us a larger number of men.

120. Your proportion being 1,571 inhabitants, your police is about one to 4,000 acres?—It is more than 4,000 acres to each constable.

121. *Chairman.*] Do you take one constable to 1,000 inhabitants as the maximum for the force?—Yes; except under an Order in Council, when it might be necessary, as in Liverpool and Birmingham, to have a greater number of men to the population.

122. Your calculation is made upon two maximums; 1,200 in counties, and 1,000 in boroughs to each constable?—Yes, with a small reserve force in each county in addition; that would amount (exclusive of the chief constables of counties) to 12,307 men. The cost of this force would amount to 773,799*l.* 5*s.* 2*d.*

123. *Mr. Mackie.*] Is not that considerably more than it is at present?—The present charge is only for 7,381.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Returns:*]

SUMMARY of the Number of CONSTABLES proposed to be appointed in each County.

COUNTY, &c.	Acreage.	Population.	Number of Constables proposed to be stationed in each.						Existing Force.
			Chief Clerks.	Super-intendents.	In-spectors.	Serjeants.	Constables.	TOTAL.	
Bedford - - - - -	207,632	107,036	1	4	1	5	83	94	30
Berks - - - - -	473,920	161,147	1	6	1	13	138	159	51
Bucks - - - - -	463,820	155,983	1	6	-	9	121	137	18
Cambridge - - - - -	536,313	164,459	1	8	-	13	139	161	144
Chester - - - - -	640,050	305,600	1	11	-	16	257	285	81
Cornwall - - - - -	849,200	338,697	1	12	-	14	236	263	36
Cumberland - - - - -	969,490	178,698	1	13	1	17	198	230	26
Derby - - - - -	603,180	272,217	1	10	1	14	200	226	43
Devon - - - - -	1,636,450	593,460	1	22	3	33	456	515	150
Dorset - - - - -	627,220	175,043	1	8	-	16	161	186	51
Durham - - - - -	679,530	324,284	1	9	2	14	222	248	209
Essex - - - - -	925,260	304,088	1	13	1	20	239	274	229
Gloucester - - - - -	780,600	309,087	1	11	1	16	225	254	271
Bristol (City) - - - - -	9,870	122,296	1	2	4	9	118	134	252
Hereford - - - - -	543,800	113,878	1	7	1	6	112	130	17
Hertford - - - - -	374,380	146,720	1	5	-	8	108	122	80
Huntingdon - - - - -	241,690	68,540	1	2	1	4	53	61	5
Kent - - - - -	911,490	423,717	1	13	5	28	307	354	104
Lancaster - - - - -	1,105,890	1,137,584	1	18	4	26	636	685	688
Liverpool (Borough) - - - - -	5,300	286,487	1	2	5	9	283	300	806
Manchester (ditto) - - - - -	6,070	242,983	1	2	5	9	239	256	445
Leicester - - - - -	511,340	215,867	1	8	2	12	168	191	114
Lincoln - - - - -	1,663,850	362,602	1	20	3	30	351	405	51
Monmouth - - - - -	324,310	134,355	1	4	-	6	95	106	21
Norfolk - - - - -	1,292,300	412,664	1	20	3	31	361	416	279
Northampton - - - - -	646,810	199,228	1	9	1	15	165	191	77

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE

C O U N T Y, &c.	Acreage.	Population.	Number of Constables proposed to be stationed in each.						Existing Force.
			Chief Clerks.	Super-intendents	In-spectors.	Serjeants.	Con-stantles.	TOTAL.	
Northumberland - - -	1,165,430	250,278	1	16	2	21	260	300	110
Nottingham - - -	525,800	249,910	1	8	3	14	191	217	153
Oxford - - -	407,230	161,643	1	7	-	10	130	148	44
Rutland - - -	97,500	21,302	-	1	-	3	19	23	1
Salop - - -	864,360	239,048	1	11	2	18	214	246	83
Somerset - - -	1,028,090	435,982	1	15	1	21	325	363	108
Southampton - - -	1,018,550	355,004	1	16	4	23	302	346	206
Stafford - - -	736,290	510,504	1	10	2	16	303	332	303
Suffolk - - -	918,760	315,073	1	13	1	19	251	285	209
Surrey - - -	385,580	118,867	1	5	-	7	120	133	86
Sussex - - -	907,920	299,753	1	14	3	19	254	291	146
Warwick - - -	549,150	218,793	1	8	2	12	174	197	78
Birmingham (Town) - - -	18,780	182,922	1	2	4	9	179	195	327
Westmoreland - - -	485,990	56,454	1	6	1	9	82	90	7
Wilts - - -	868,060	258,733	1	12	1	16	212	242	213
Worcester - - -	459,710	233,336	1	7	1	13	109	191	121
York (East Riding) - - -	711,360	194,936	1	10	2	15	184	212	154
York (North Riding) - - -	1,282,870	204,122	1	18	1	22	232	274	8
York (West Riding) - - -	1,633,830	1,040,368	1	23	2	32	433	601	328
Leeds (Town) - - -	21,460	152,054	-	2	5	9	149	165	145
TOTAL of England - - -	31,355,475	12,777,011	44	440	82	704	10,054	11,333	7,213
TOTAL of Wales - - -	4,752,000	911,603	12	18	-	60	854	974	168
	36,107,475	13,688,614	56	497	82	764	10,908	12,307	7,381

## RETURN showing the EXPENSE of carrying out the foregoing Proposition.

R A N K, &c.	Rate of Pay.	Number.	£. s. d.	
			£.	s. d.
Chief Constables, 1st Class, at per annum -	700	19	13,300	- -
Ditto - ditto - 2d ditto at ditto -	600	19	11,400	- -
Ditto - ditto - 3d ditto at ditto -	500	19	9,500	- -
			34,200	- -
Chief Clerks, at per annum - - -	100	56	-	- -
Superintendents, 1st Class, at per annum -	110	106	18,260	- -
Ditto - - 2d ditto at ditto - - -	100	106	10,000	- -
Ditto - - 3d ditto at ditto - - -	90	165	14,850	- -
			49,710	- -
Inspectors, 1st Class, at per annum - - -	75	28	2,100	- -
Ditto - 2d ditto at ditto - - -	70	27	1,890	- -
Ditto - 3d ditto at ditto - - -	65	27	1,755	- -
			5,745	- -
Serjeants, 1st Class, at per week - - -	25/	255	16,575	- -
Ditto - 2d ditto at ditto - - -	24/	255	15,012	- -
Ditto - 3d ditto at ditto - - -	23/	254	15,189	4 -
			47,676	4 -
Constables, 1st Class, at per week - - -	20/	3,636	189,072	- -
Ditto - 2d ditto at ditto - - -	18/	3,636	170,164	16 -
Ditto - 3d ditto at ditto - - -	16/	3,636	151,257	12 -
			510,491	8 -
Average yearly amount of clothing - - -	-	-	-	- -
Divisional expenses and contingencies (say 10 per cent. on the pay and clothing) - - -	-	-	-	- -
			70,345	- -
			12,364	- -
			£. 773,790	5 2
Average expense of each constable - - -	-	-	£.	62 17 5

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

124. Mr. *Sotheron*.] That is 65*l.* per man?—No; 773,779*l.* would give only 62*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.* per man, on account of the larger number of men.

125. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Then the constabulary would be cheaper consolidated in the way you propose?—It would cost 62*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.*

126. That would be less than it now costs in the county of Hampshire?—By about 3*l.* per man.

127. *Chairman*.] That you think is the amount of saving by consolidation?—Yes.

128. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Does the 773,779*l.* include the horses and the remounts?—The remount of 500 horses.

129. What is the total number of horses you propose to have?—Five hundred.

130. *Chairman*.] Notwithstanding your calculation being 773,779*l.*, do not you think that consolidation, and the facilities it would give for the detection of crime, would lead ultimately to a still further saving?—Yes, it might; I think myself there would be a decrease in the expense of prosecutions.

131. Mr. *Rich*.] You state the gross saving upon the whole plan: I apprehend there are also incidental expenses into which you do not now enter?—Yes.

132. *Chairman*.] After having saved the sum of money you have stated, if this number of men is necessary now, do you not think, with the decrease of crime, that a less number of men would be ultimately sufficient?—No: I do not myself think that you can do with a less number of men, because the population is increasing.

133. Mr. *Sotheron*.] How do you make out that 62*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.* per man is the probable cost of the constables if they were established throughout the whole of the kingdom?—I have put down the actual number that would be required of every rank, and I have calculated according to a rate of pay which is in this return, and 62*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.* is the total amount that it would come to

134. I understood you to give as a reason, that you would obtain a larger number of men at a lower rate of pay than according to the present proportion?—No; I think the difference will arise in this way, that the staff at head quarters will be thrown over a larger surface.

135. Therefore what may be called the staff charges, or the charges of the superior offices, will not be increased in proportion to the number of men?—No.

136. Consequently, per head, the rate would be smaller than it is at present?—Yes.

137. Mr. *Rich*.] Your estimate of the expense per man is based upon your experience?—Yes.

138. Sir *J. Anderson*.] Would not the expense vary in different counties; would it be necessary to have a uniform rate of pay all over the country?—I should say one uniform rate of pay would be desirable throughout the whole of England.

139. *Chairman*.] Would any part of this additional outlay, in your opinion, giving a very large accession of force, and better organized, be repaid to the Government by any saving in other departments?—Yes; in all maritime counties where the force is now established, the men are armed with deputations from the Customs for the protection of the public revenue; if the force were thus augmented, a reduction in the number of men employed in the coast guard would be warranted.

140. Do the counties receive anything for those services so performed from the Customs?—Nothing whatever; I find by a Return recently presented to Parliament, that the number of men in the coast guard amounts to 5,770, of which 810 are employed afloat; the annual cost of this force, according to the same Return, amounts to 460,963*l.* 19*s.* 5*d.* Of this number 3,232 are stationed in England and Wales. If 1,000 of this number were retained to do duty in boats, 2,232 would be available for duty elsewhere, and might be drafted on on board our steam guard ships (the coast guard being already drilled to great gun exercise). The value of the services thus obtained may be shown to amount to more than 158,000*l.* a year.

141. Can you state, of your own knowledge, the number of coast guard in Hampshire?—On the Hampshire coast there are four inspecting commanders, 25 officers, 34 chief boatmen, and 273 men; total, 336; the cost of this force is about 23,930*l.* a year.

142. You say that your men have been employed under deputations. Have seizures been made by your men as well as by the coast guard?—I cannot say what number of seizures have been made by the coast guard; I have applied

0.71.

B.]

officially

Captain  
W. C. Harris.

26 May 1853.

officially to the Controller-general of the coast guard for information on this subject, but have received no reply; I have not, however, heard of a single seizure having been made.

143. Have your men made any seizures?—Yes, two; the parties were fined 100 *l.* each.

144. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Does the constable get any benefit from those seizures?—He does.

145. Is a portion of the reward given to him?—A small portion; one moiety of the reward, but it does not amount to much.

146. Do you pay the men, or do they take it from the Customs?—One moiety is paid by the Collector of Customs to the constable, and the other to the Superannuation Fund.

147. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Have you heard any objections on the part of the rate-payers, to the constables being employed in aid of the coast guard?—Not the slightest.

148. Mr. *Burroughes.*] Do you continue their pay during the time they are so employed?—Yes, they receive their pay.

149. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Do you take the constables out of their district to perform this duty?—No, we have 50 men stationed along the coast within two or three miles; if the men happen to fall in with a smuggler (now they have received deputations), they stop him.

150. Mr. *Rich.*] You mean that they form an inner circle behind the coast guard?—Yes.

151. Mr. *Phillips.*] Do you apprehend any interference with the discipline of your men from their being employed in aid of the coast guard, which might bring them into connexion with smugglers?—No, I do not think they are likely to become connected with smugglers.

152. You do not apprehend any interference with the discipline of the force from their being so employed?—Not the slightest.

153. Mr. *Rich.*] In places where such deputations are not given, after the smuggler has passed the coast guard, he considers himself safe?—Yes.

154. Now he is liable to be taken by the police?—Yes; the whole of our men, in every part of the county, have deputations.

155. Sir *J. Trollope.*] It is not confined to the 50 men on the coast?—No.

156. Mr. *Rich.*] In the event of the coast guard being called off for any active pursuit of offenders anywhere, your police would be competent to act for a time as coast guard?—Yes.

157. *Chairman.*] Do you think if the police were employed in the maritime counties in place of the coast guard, that you might save the expense of the coast guard entirely?—I think if you were to retain 1,000 men to do duty in boats, that the police could do the whole of the other duty.

158. Do you think the 12,000 men you have calculated upon would be sufficient to do that duty?—Quite.

159. In that case, as there would be a great saving to the Government, you think that the Government ought to contribute something?—The Government would save close upon 160,000 *l.* a year.

160. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Do you contemplate the duty being performed in the same manner as it is performed by the coast guard; that your men are to keep incessant watch, day and night, on the coast?—If the number of men I contemplate were appointed, we should have almost sufficient to watch the coast in the same manner as the coast guard do at present; retaining 1,000 men of the coast guard to do duty in boats.

161. Had you contemplated this duty when you fixed the number at 12,364?—No, I had not.

162. Mr. *Rich.*] You have viewed them more as auxiliaries to the coast guard?—Yes; in the event of the coast guard being withdrawn.

163. Sir *J. Trollope.*] The coast guard have to act in concentrated bodies; have you the power of concentrating your men in large numbers?—Yes.

164. In the same way in which the coast guard is now assembled?—Yes.

165. You do it now for the preservation of the peace?—Yes.

166. *Chairman.*] Do you consider that any benefit would arise from training the police to the use of arms?—Most certainly; from the very superior intelligence of the constabulary, their height, youth, and athletic pursuits, they are peculiarly

147  
 Captain  
 W. C. Harris.  
 26 May 1853.

peculiarly adapted to act as light troops; they might be trained to the use of arms, but yet not carry them, except under an Order in Council.

167. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Are not your men drilled at present?—Yes; I withdraw one or two from each division of the county at a time, for the purpose of drill. I have found so short a time is necessary to make them efficient soldiers, that their absence from their beats is hardly felt.

168. To the use of arms?—No, only to sword exercise.

169. As regards the constables being a charge upon the ratepayers of the county, do you not apprehend it would be taking them beyond their duty if they had the entire protection of the revenue of the country as coast-guard officers?—At the present moment they assist the coast guard, but if they had the entire protection of the revenue of the country, the Government should contribute towards the support of the force.

170. Would it not be an injustice to the ratepayers of Hampshire?—Decidedly, if the Government did not contribute.

171. You do not contemplate that they should undertake this duty without a contribution on the part of the Government, as an Imperial measure?—I am of opinion that the Government ought to provide the excess of expenditure beyond the amount produced by a rate of  $1\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the pound, levied equally on counties and boroughs. A rate of  $1\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the pound would produce 445,737 *l.*, so that the Government would have to provide 328,062 *l.*

172. How is that to be provided for?—From the Consolidated Fund.

173. Mr. *Rich.*] Do you practically find that the present performance of their duty, as auxiliaries to the coast guard, interferes with the performance of their routine duty as police of the county?—Not in the least; the patrols do not watch for smugglers.

174. That being the case, there would not be any strong claim for paying for the duty which is now done, which does not appear to be a duty required by the county?—I think the constabulary have a claim upon the Government.

175. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Is it compulsory upon the constabulary to act in this manner, to assist in the apprehension of smugglers in the way in which they do now?—No; the Customs made an application to the magistrates at quarter sessions to allow the men to be associated with the coast guard.

176. In fact, it is a private arrangement between the magistrates and the Customs?—Between the Customs and the court of quarter sessions; the magistrates consented to the appointment.

177. Upon what ground do you claim anything from the Government on account of services which are merely the result of a voluntary arrangement?—We do not claim anything whatever; I am only speaking in the event of the force being made general.

178. I understood you to say you had some claim upon the Government on account of those services?—We perform the duty, and are not paid for it.

179. Mr. *Rich.*] How many counties have received such deputations?—I imagine all the maritime counties.

180. How long is it since you received yours?—In February 1852.

181. Do your men like the duty?—Yes; they do not object to it in the slightest degree.

182. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Is it within your knowledge that such an arrangement exists in other counties?—In Essex I know it does, and I believe in all the maritime counties.

183. Sir *J. Trollope*.] I wish to call your attention to one particular class of duty performed by the constabulary, and to know how far it has been available in the suppression of vagrancy; in your county you have a district in which both vagrancy and petty offences against property were very prevalent; I speak of the New Forest District; I wish to know whether the establishment of the police force has totally put an end to the encampment of gipsies, and encroachments upon the property in that district?—We have very few gipsies now in the county; I am not prepared with a return.

184. Do they venture to come within your jurisdiction?—No, except at fairs.

185. In addition to gipsies, there are many other persons who go about living in carts and so on?—Yes.

186. Do you permit them to be in the lanes and commons?—No, certainly not; we impound their cattle, and move them upon all occasions.

0.71.

B 4

187. Have

Captain  
W. C. Harris.

25 May 1853.

187. Have petty offences decreased since the establishment of the police, such as stealing wood, breaking fences, and those minor offences which come before the petty sessions?—To a great extent.

188. Have you any table to show that?—There is a difficulty in proving the fact; I have been informed by large occupiers of land, that in sheep alone they have saved their police rate; whilst others have said that dead fences would cover the amount of theirs. I recollect a gentleman residing near Winchester (Mr. Bailey, of Worthy), assuring me that he had annually to replace a dead fence previous to the establishment of the police, but that now it was never touched.

189. You have alluded to a higher class of crime; has that decreased since the establishment of the police?—Very materially.

190. Have you any returns to indicate whether the property of the farmers has been more protected from incendiarism since the establishment of the rural police?—I have no such returns.

191. Has not that been a prevailing crime in Hampshire?—We have had no case of incendiarism for some time.

192. For some years do you mean?—I do not like to speak to any particular period; two or three years.

193. Is it on the decrease?—I cannot call to mind a single case for the last two or three years.

194. *Chairman.*] You stated that there were but few gipsies and vagrants in Hampshire; are they much more numerous in the lanes of the adjoining counties over the border?—Very much more numerous.

195. Where there is no police?—Yes.

196. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Have you made arrangements that your constables shall take charge of vagrants who apply to the union workhouses?—Our constables are appointed in many unions assistant relieving officers for vagrants, and they perform that duty without any charge whatever upon the union.

197. Do they take charge of all vagrants upon their first coming into a town, and march them out the following morning?—No.

198. Will you describe what course they take?—The vagrant, instead of applying to the relieving officer of the district, applies to the superintendent of police, or whoever is appointed assistant relieving officer, for a ticket of admission to the union, and the officer exercises his discretion whether he thinks the applicant is a fit subject for relief.

199. *Chairman.*] Was that in consequence of a recommendation from the Poor Law Commissioners?—Yes.

200. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Are those vagrants searched?—They are seldom searched.

201. Was not that one of the instructions from the Poor Law Commissioners?—It was merely a suggestion thrown out.

202. *Mr. Sotheron.*] The vagrants having been housed in the union-house for the night, do you take charge of them the following morning?—No.

203. Your officers are not in the habit of marching them out of the town?—If the officer was to march them out of the town he would only convey them into his own district; it would be useless, unless he could march them to the borders of the county where there was no constabulary.

204. Do your constables in any way prevent those persons who pass the night in the union-house from going back to receive any money which they might have deposited with any person in the town?—No.

205. Practically do you think that the employment of your constables has tended to decrease vagrancy?—Very considerably indeed.

206. Could you give any return showing the decrease?—No, I have no return upon that subject.

207. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Has sheep stealing been a very prevalent crime in Hampshire?—Formerly it was a very prevailing crime; the number of cases in 1851 was only 30.

208. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Although you may not have this return with regard to vagrancy, it would be very easy to obtain it, would it not; and can you furnish a return of the number of vagrants relieved in the workhouses in the county of Hampshire the year before your constables were appointed, and the last year, for instance?—Yes, I will furnish the return.

209. *Mr.*

21  
 Captain  
 W. C. Harris.  
 26 May 1853.

209. Mr. *Rich.*] Is the police force popular in the county?—Very; at least I do not know anything to the contrary; we have no petitions for a decrease of the force, but we have many petitions presented to the court of quarter sessions for an increase.

210. Is the feeling of the masses of the people favourable or unfavourable towards the police?—I know nothing to the contrary of the feeling being favourable.

211. Have you had any remonstrances from the ratepayers as to the expense?—I cannot call to mind having heard of any.

212. You stated that you would recommend that the constables should be drilled to the use of arms?—Yes.

213. Do you consider that that would be an additional means for the preservation of the peace of the county?—I consider that it would not only tend to the preservation of the peace of the county, but it would form a great element of national defence, if the men were drilled to the use of arms. The men are young, energetic, and active, and patrolling for seven hours every night of their lives, are in splendid condition for marching.

214. Do you think that it would tend to make the force itself more popular, and that the men would feel additional self respect?—I think it would myself.

215. Do you think that there would be any germ of unpopularity in the idea of constables being armed?—I do not indeed.

216. You are not afraid that accustoming them to the use of arms would raise a feeling of jealousy on the part of the population of the county?—No.

217. *Chairman.*] Do you contemplate using them as a military body for police purposes?—I merely suggest that the men should be drilled to the use of arms, but not carry them except on the occasion of a threatened invasion, or when some serious disturbance of the public peace has taken place, or is apprehended, when an Order in Council might be given.

218. You mean that they should be armed only on such occasions as a military force would be employed?—Yes.

219. Mr. *Rich.*] For the suppression of riots, for instance?—Yes.

220. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Are the constables allowed any cutlasses?—The whole body is drilled to the use of the sword.

221. Is the night patrol armed?—Some few constables are supplied with cutlasses, whose beats are so situated, that in the opinion of two justices of the county it is necessary for their personal protection in the performance of their duty.

222. Are they armed when they assist the coast guard?—No.

223. *Chairman.*] Do they never carry arms except under an order from two magistrates?—Except on any sudden emergency, when I have issued orders for the men to be armed; when I report the same, and the reasons for such order, to the Secretary of State, and any two justices of the peace, as soon afterwards as is practicable.

224. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Are the constables drilled to the use of the cutlass?—Yes, to the use of the sword.

225. Mr. *Rich.*] Are many of the constables old soldiers?—No; I have an objection to old soldiers.

226. You prefer young men?—I do not like to take men who have been soldiers, even after three or four years' service; they are invariably addicted to drinking.

227. Have any of your men suffered injuries from collisions?—Yes; one man was overpowered and wounded.

228. Have you any further suggestion to make as to the development of the police force?—I have not made any statement with regard to the amount that might be saved in the cost of prosecutions by the establishment of an efficient police. The cost of prosecutions at the Assizes and Sessions (paid by the Government) amounted in 1850 to 217,324 *l.* 17 *s.* From this sum, with an efficient constabulary, may fairly be deducted at least one-third (the diminished cost of prosecutions consequent upon the decrease of crime); this will give a saving of 72,441 *l.* 12 *s.* 4 *d.* In this calculation I have not taken into account the amount now expended in the punishment of offenders; viz., in the maintenance of delinquents in gaols, in transports, and in the penal colonies. And here I may mention that a decrease in the number of committals would tend to solve the difficulty attending the disposal of transports. I would wish to call the

0.71.

C

attention

Captain  
W. C. Harris.  
26 May 1853.

attention of the Committee to one important fact; that by the adoption of some such measure as that I have proposed, the country would have at its disposal a force which, ordinarily employed in the suppression of crime, would, in case of invasion, be equal to 13 regiments; the pay alone of which, as a part of the standing army, would amount annually to 351,777 *l.* 6 *s.* 11 *d.*; whilst the total cost would be little short of 500,000 *l.* a year.

229. Mr. *Phillips.*] There is no definite age at which they cease to be policemen; you judge by their health, do you not?—Yes; but I never take a man above 30.

230. What is the age of your oldest man in the police?—We have men as old as 50, who came into the force when it was first established.

231. Mr. *Rich.*] I see in your letter to Lord Malmesbury you state that you contemplate forming the police into something like a military organisation?—Yes, I propose to ingraft the discipline of the Irish constabulary upon the system of doing duty in this country.

232. Do you still adhere to that opinion?—Yes, I consider it would be extremely advantageous for the country.

233. Sir *J. Anderson.*] How do you account for the jealousy which you have stated exists between the borough and county police, so that they do not co-operate well?—I have no mode of accounting for it.

234. Would a general system applicable to all those boroughs having under 100,000 inhabitants, work well in those towns?—I certainly think it would. I cannot conceive any reason why it should not work well.

235. If there were a county police instead of borough police?—It would be a general police.

236. Mr. *Mackie.*] You are of opinion that if a national police were established, jealousy would cease?—It is my opinion, that if there was a national force there would be no jealousy whatever.

237. You have stated that the policemen find a difficulty in tracing a culprit from the county to the towns; do you mean, find any difficulty in following a criminal from Hampshire to Berkshire, or any of the other adjoining counties?—If he goes into Berkshire, we have no force to assist in tracing offenders.

238. In fact the police, in a national point of view, is most inefficient in that respect?—Yes, most certainly.

239. At present it is merely a county police, and however active the policemen are within your county, when you come to follow a criminal without the county, you find that you have no power?—We have no person to go to for information but the parish constable.

240. Mr. *Sotheron.*] Supposing an offender should go into a county which has an existing police, do you find that the fact of that police existing affords a facility of following him up?—We have always found the greatest assistance from the police in every county in England which is upon the same footing as ourselves.

241. Mr. *Rich.*] Have you turned your attention to the establishment of electric telegraphs in the counties?—No; but it has struck me that in the event of a general police being established, we should derive great benefit from having detective police constables at the terminus of every railway, to observe all persons departing from great towns and returning; and we might avail ourselves of the electric telegraph to report to these termini any depredations which were committed.

242. If the electric telegraph were in communication with all the police-stations in Hampshire, do you not apprehend that you would be more likely to detect and deter crime?—It might be useful; indeed it could not fail to be useful.

Sir *William Heathcote*, Bart.; Examined.

Sir *W. Heathcote*,  
Bart.

243. *Chairman.*] You are the late Member for Hampshire and the late Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, are you not?—Yes.

244. Has your attention been frequently directed to the working of the police system?—To a considerable extent.

245. Perhaps you will state to the Committee your opinion of the result, in a moral point of view, of the appointment of the police as to the detection of offences and the prevention of crime?—I think it has been very successful with us. The point in which it is most-successful, namely, the diminished amount of undetected

undetected crime, is one which cannot be tested by numbers, because there is no return of those offences, in respect of which no person was committed for trial before the establishment of the police, but it is a matter of common notoriety that there is much less of undetected crime than there was before. With respect to the criminals who have been brought to justice, Captain Harris has given you returns showing the comparisons; and with reference to them, I have examined two periods of five years: five years immediately before the establishment of the force in our county, and five years immediately before I ceased to be Chairman of the Quarter Sessions; and I find that the proportion of convictions has risen from 64 to 69 per cent. of the whole number committed for trial, while the expense of prosecutions has become lower per head, and this last result has followed notwithstanding that the prosecutions have become in one respect more expensive, from its being the habit at the Sessions to allow briefs to counsel more liberally, both in the number and in the amounts of the fees. The cases are got up with more care and intelligence, which will account for the larger proportion of convictions, and there are fewer unnecessary witnesses, which will account for the diminished expense.

246. Will you state your opinion of the result of the appointment of the police in an economical point of view?—It is difficult to test the amount of the economical advantage, which consists very much in the saving of the immense waste which takes place from successful depredation; but it is to be remarked that this advantage falls to the share of the poorer classes especially, because they, in proportion to their property, are greater sufferers from depredation, in a district without police, than their wealthier neighbours. Farmers and other men of property have servants on their premises, and gentlemen of large possessions have usually an efficient police in their gamekeepers; but labourers, whose whole families may be out at work, are obliged, in a district where there are none but parish constables, to leave their cottages practically unprotected. It often happened to me, before the establishment of the police, to take measures for tracking the offenders, when any of my poor neighbours were robbed; but I do not recollect that it ever occurred to me to think of the parish constable as a person likely to throw light on the subject; my own keepers could do what was required much better.

247. Do you think the value of property has increased in the neighbourhoods where a well regulated police has been established?—I have no means of judging whether there is any difference in the market value; but if I were myself buying a property, I would give much more for it in a county which had a police force than in one which had not.

248. Perhaps I need hardly ask whether, in your opinion, the parochial constables are efficient for the protection of property and the prevention of crime?—I am sure that they are not, and cannot be expected to be so, except at a ruinous loss to themselves. They are men whose time is fully occupied. The position of parochial constables would appear to be this, that they must either be inert, or in proportion to their activity they must be expensive. If they do nothing there are no allowances to be made to them; but if you have occasion to employ them in cases of real intricacy, they must be paid more than you would give to a policeman: you must pay them at a higher rate per day; you can only escape from their being expensive by not employing them at all.

249. Do you think the parochial constables are to be depended upon for the good regulation of beerhouses and public-houses?—No; they are under the influences of neighbourhood; it is not fair to call upon them to perform the duty; without there being an actual collusion, they will be slow to interfere with their neighbours.

250. Do you think they are to be relied upon for what is more important, the suppression of vagrancy?—I should think not; it is not their business to patrol and fall in with vagrants. I apprehend it is quite out of their way.

251. You are aware as to the arrangement that is made in Hampshire, by the constabulary being assistant relieving officers?—I have not considered the effects of that at all; I am not able to give any opinion upon it.

252. Do you think the parish constables could be rendered more efficient, or made really efficient by the appointment of superintendent constables in each division?—No, except at a very great expense; you cannot withdraw them from their usual occupations except at a grievous hardship, unless you remunerate them sufficiently for their time in proportion to their activity. The mere

22  
Sir W. Heathcote,  
Bart.

26 May 1853.

Sir W. Heathcote,  
Bart.

26 May 1853.

putting of a superintendent of police amongst them would no more make them efficient constables, than the residence of a drill sergeant among them would make them soldiers. It is only by constant practice and great expense to the county, and a grievous hardship to the men, that you would make them good police constables.

253. You stated that in your opinion you thought it was desirable for the poorer classes of society that there should be a rural police?—Yes; there are several aspects in which it is so. If a depredation is committed, the police constables are able to engage in the search at once, without reference to the wealth or poverty of the person injured; but if there are only parish constables, such reference is necessary. Perhaps a very long and laborious search may be required; if that be successful, no doubt an allowance for the expense and time may be made, under a magistrate's certificate, at the trial in the Court of Quarter Sessions, or Assizes; but if the search is unsuccessful and there is no committal, there can be no allowance, and the cost will fall on the person who has employed the parish constable. It can only be a rich man who can venture in an intricate case to employ a constable of that sort. I have alluded in a former answer to one kind of depredation to which, in the absence of efficient police, the poor are especially exposed, namely, housebreaking in the day time. That offence has been greatly diminished in Hampshire since the establishment of the police. If we had the means of reckoning up the cases in which the perpetrators used to escape detection altogether, the difference between the two periods of five years which I mentioned before would be enormous; and even in the cases brought to trial there is a diminution of 14 per cent. in the latter period, although in this scarcely any have escaped detection.

254. Do you think in the absence of a well regulated police system, that justice is denied to the poor man, by his not having the means to employ a constable?—It falls more heavily upon the poor man than upon the wealthy farmer or gentleman, both with reference to prevention and to redress.

255. Are you prepared to state whether a uniform system of police would be desirable?—I am less able to tell you than a person who is actually employed like Captain Harris. It is obvious that a facility of communication between the different forces would be an advantage in the apprehension of offenders, for the small jurisdictions in the midst of the county police afford places of safe retreat for bad characters.

256. Mr. Rich.] You stated that cottagers would derive a great benefit from the establishment of police; has not the property of farmers in Hampshire derived great benefit from the establishment of police?—I apprehend they have, particularly in sheep; I very rarely hear of sheep-stealing now, whereas we used to hear of it very frequently.

257. Is there any diminution in the destruction of the fences?—I have not turned my attention much to that subject, but I have not heard complaints of it.

258. You stated, did you not, that a great benefit would arise from the destruction of the subordinate jurisdiction of the boroughs as to the police; do you think that a similar benefit would accrue from having a compulsory Act for the establishment of police in those counties which have it not?—That would be still more important than the other consideration.

259. Could you point out to the Committee any way in which that could be made acceptable to the other counties?—I should think that the course of inquiry upon which the Committee are now engaged will make it acceptable to persons who have not been called to consider the facts of the case. This inquiry will make known the advantages which certain counties have derived from the establishment of the police.

260. Could you state from your own knowledge whether those parts of Hampshire which are contiguous to counties which have not the police, are or are not less subject to depredations than those adjoining counties which have the police?—I am not able to tell the Committee of my own knowledge, as I live rather in the centre of the county; but I know, from the reports which I have from time to time received from Captain Harris, in the course of business, that on the borders of Sussex and of Surrey, before they established a police, we were exposed to a lawlessness not to be found elsewhere, and were in consequence obliged to keep a strength of police there which was beyond our average.

261. In fact, the objections which apply to the smaller jurisdictions within the

the county, extend to the non-establishment of police without the county?—They are very much greater; the only difficulty with the boroughs is, that their police, even if doing its duty under their own jurisdiction, does not appear to work very cordially with ours. In the other case there is an entire lawlessness.

262. Are you acquainted with the working of the police with regard to their assisting the coast guard in the manner which has been stated by Captain Harris?—Not at all.

263. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Have you found any inconvenience from there being a separate jurisdiction existing in the boroughs as contradistinguished from the counties?—Certainly, I am sure that there is less efficiency in a small police than there is in one which is organised on a larger scale.

264. Have you found any inconvenience from the want of concurrent jurisdiction generally?—No; on the contrary, it occurs just as much in some boroughs where the county magistrates have a concurrent jurisdiction for the purposes of committal for crime.

265. In the case of the larger boroughs having separate jurisdiction, is there any jealousy of action?—I have understood that there is: it has not come under my own observation; there may be difficulties from some little jealousies.

266. Are you aware of the amount of the police rate in the pound in Hants?—I do not recollect exactly; it is about 2½*d*.

267. During the time that you were chairman of the court of quarter sessions, had you any remonstrances upon the subject of the county expenses in consequence of the establishment of the police?—I will tell the Committee the circumstances attending its original establishment: the question was referred to a committee consisting of one magistrate from every division, who conferred with his brethren. In each division the magistrates conferred and voted upon it, and all the divisions agreed to it; some unanimously, and some by a great majority; the committee so deputed came to the same conclusion, and it was finally adopted at the quarter sessions without a division. Afterwards one or two magistrates, who although they had not decided, were not entirely satisfied with the arrangements, were desirous of abolishing or reducing the force; but it never in fact came to a question, because the concurrence of five magistrates in the manner prescribed by the Act could never be obtained. With respect to representations, we have had several; but they have generally been not complaints of the amount of the force, or of the amount of the expense, as being too great, but complaints that of the existing force the petitioners did not get a sufficient share in their own districts, and sometimes even applications for an increase in the force. About two years ago, one of the magistrates thought some of the expenses incurred had been excessive, and called the attention of the quarter sessions to them; but after debate they were approved by a large majority, 34 to 4. Practically it may be said that the county has been unanimous from the beginning in the establishment and maintenance of the police force.

268. Mr. *Phillips*.] From your experience of the court of quarter sessions, and being a person well conversant with the condition of Hampshire, you are decidedly of opinion that the vast mass of the cases in which the police have been useful have been cases of small ratepayers, and small holders of property, far beyond the proportion which would naturally exist between gentlemen's houses and smaller houses; still setting that out of the calculation, you think that the largest number of cases in which the police have been a benefit, have been those of the poor?—I have not sifted the cases so as to be able to say how many belonged to the very poorest class. Probably a large number were those of little shopkeepers, and others a little above the cottagers.

269. Far beyond that of a higher grade?—Certainly; and the point to which I particularly desire to call attention is, that in a county where there is no police, a poor man is not only exposed to more depredation, but is exposed to the risk of much greater expense in obtaining redress than where there is such a force.

*William Hans Sloane Stanley, Esq.*, called in; and Examined.

270. *Chairman*.] YOU are a Magistrate for Hampshire, are you not?—Yes.

271. Have you turned your attention to the effect which has been produced by the police force in the county since its establishment?—I have.

272. Will you state your opinion upon the subject, with respect to the boroughs

of 71.

c 3

boroughs

*Sir W. Heathcote,*  
Bart.

26 May 1853.

*W. H. S. Stanley,*  
Esq.

W. H. S. Stanley,  
Esq.

26 May 1853.

boroughs in Hampshire?—I can speak particularly to the borough of Romsey, near to which I reside. I consider the police there, under the control of the corporation, to be quite inefficient; it consists merely of two men for day work and night work, and I think that is not at all efficient, being neither detective, nor does it prevent crime being committed; it has no supervision over the beerhouses, which are kept open, I may say, for nights and nights together without being closed.

273. Is that the case at all in the districts in which the county police exists?—No; I believe there a rigid supervision is exercised over all the public-houses and beershops. The consequence of this want of supervision in the town of Romsey is, that the rogues, thieves, and vagabonds are driven from the rural districts into the borough of Romsey.

274. You mean that Romsey is a sort of Alsatia?—Quite so.

275. Sir J. Trollope.] You have a town police?—Yes; under the control of the watch committee of the corporation.

276. How many men are there?—Two, for both day and night work; so that if a man is ill, there is really but one.

277. What is the population of Romsey?—About 1,900.

278. Chairman.] Does any material inconvenience arise from the want of co-operation between the county and borough police in Hampshire, in your opinion?—I think so.

279. Will you state why you think so?—I think if Captain Harris, as the chief constable, had the power of control over the constables of the borough of Romsey, that the borough of Romsey would be in a different position from what it is now.

280. Do you know anything with regard to the borough of Andover?—I can state with regard to the borough of Andover, that since Captain Harris has had the control of it within the last two or three years, they have had three maiden quarter sessions, there being no prisoners for trial at all.

281. Mr. Fitzroy.] Can you tell the Committee anything of the condition of Hampshire as to crime before the introduction of the police?—The parish constables were very inefficient in the discharge of their duties; it could be hardly expected that they would be otherwise. A great number of them were labourers that were selected, and they had their own work to look after, and their own occupations, and any time that was devoted to constabulary purposes was so much loss to them unless they did detect a culprit, and then certain allowances were made.

282. Can you furnish any statistics as to crime in Hampshire before the introduction of the police, as compared with the state of things since that introduction?—No, I cannot do that; I had been only in the commission of the peace for a few years previous to the introduction of the police.

283. Chairman.] Do you think that the number of undetected offences has greatly decreased?—It has greatly decreased of late; about three per cent. in the last year, compared with the preceding year.

284. Mr. Phillips.] You stated, did you not, that there were two policemen in Romsey; do you know what they are paid?—£.120 a year; about 60 l. a year each; they are locally connected with the place, and therefore are ineffective.

285. Mr. Rich.] The whole of the town of Romsey is not under the management of the borough?—Romsey consists of two districts, Romsey Infra and Romsey Extra; and it is only Romsey Infra that is within the borough. In the same town we have two distinct polices. Attempts have been made by some persons in the town of Romsey to consolidate the two forces, but the corporation do not like to give up their petty privileges, and combine with the county force; besides which (I believe it is not the case in Romsey alone, but in many boroughs) the brewers have great power; they possess the public-houses and supply the beerhouses, and they have great power with the corporation in preventing the amalgamation of the forces.

286. In the same way they would prevent any rigid enforcement as to the closing of the beerhouses at earlier hours?—It would be against their interest to do so.

287. If the police were under the control of the county, they would possess greater power, which the brewers would find it difficult to resist?—Yes.

288. Chairman.] Is the police force generally popular with the ratepayers of Hampshire?—I think it is; every amount of taxation is onerous to the ratepayers, however small it may be.

289. The

W. H. S. Stanlev,  
Esq.

26 May 1853.

289. The expense is a direct tax?—Yes.
290. Do not you think that the indirect savings are very great?—The indirect savings are great. I think the police rate is about  $2\frac{1}{2}d.$  upon the old valuation. We are just entering upon a new valuation; and I think it will not come to more than  $2\frac{1}{4}d.$ , as we have increased the basis of the valuation.
291. Are you at all prepared to state what the expense was previous to the establishment of the police?—I cannot do that.
292. Can you give the Committee any notion of the cost of the parochial constabulary?—I think you might state the round numbers from 1,500 *l.* to 1,600 *l.* a year.
293. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Was there not a plan which was very prevalent, of having a private rate to pay the constabulary in the villages?—I do not know that there was such a plan in the county of Hants.
294. No instance of that kind has come to your knowledge?—There were associations for the prosecution of offenders, which are now saved, to which the farmers used to contribute.
295. Are those associations entirely given up?—I have heard of none lately.
296. *Chairman.*] Do you know of your own knowledge that they did exist before?—I know that they did exist before, and that is a saving.
297. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Can you suggest to the Committee any improvements upon the present system, either in the decrease of expense, or the better arrangement of the force?—I think our force ought to be increased.
298. So far as the system is concerned, can you suggest any improvements or alterations?—Not in our own force; I think it is admirably conducted under Captain Harris.
299. Mr. *Mackie.*] Would you approve of a national police?—Yes, I should, decidedly so; I think that what is good for one county, would be good for all the counties in England.
300. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] By a national police, do you mean a force on the same principle, paid for in the same manner as that which you have at present?—When it comes to be a national force, it ought to be under the control of the Government, and the Government ought to contribute a portion of the expense.
301. What control do you propose to give to the Government?—I think that there ought to be some central control, like that which the Poor Law Commissioners at present have; the whole force should work systematically throughout the whole of the country. Of course the officers would be appointed by the Government.
302. Do you recommend that the appointment of the chief constable should rest with the Government, instead of the magistrates?—I have not considered that point.
303. Mr. *Rich.*] Is it your opinion that the compulsory enforcement of a system of police, similar to that which exists in Hampshire, would be generally beneficial?—I think so.
304. Do the counties which have it not prejudicially affect those which have it?—I think so.
305. Mr. *Phillips.*] Have you ever heard any complaints of petty and vexatious interference by the police in matters which it would be wiser for them to leave alone?—No, I never have; I always find the policemen ready to assist in every possible way, both in the detection and prevention of crime.
306. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Do the constabulary take any part as to the preservation of game?—None.
307. Are they allowed to assist if their services are required?—If their services are called for, they would be allowed to assist, I have no doubt.
308. Mr. *Rich.*] With a view to the protection of life more than of game?—With a view to the preservation of the life of the gamekeepers.
309. Mr. *Mackie.*] Night-poaching is now a crime by statute law; do your constables consider it a part of their duty to assist in repressing a crime of that kind by apprehending night-poachers?—Certainly; if they see a man with a gun go into a wood at night, they will pursue him.
310. Then to a certain extent, they are employed in the preservation of game?—I mean they are not placed at the cover's side.
311. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] They have no directions to abstain from apprehending a  
 0.71. c 4 person

*W. H. S. Stanley,*  
Esq.

26 May 1853.

person whom they see prepared to commit an offence against the game laws?—No.

312. *Sir J. Anderson.*] Do you know how much the rate in the borough of Andover is in the pound?—I do not.

313. *Mr. Rich.*] On the whole, is there a kindly feeling entertained in Andover towards the police?—Yes, amongst the respectable classes of all ranks.

314. Do you know what the rate in the borough of Romsey is?—No; I have not been able to ascertain that. I do not know what it is in the pound.

315. *Mr. Phillips.*] What is the average of the county rate in Hampshire?—I can tell the Committee that by the return, but I cannot tell off-hand.

316. *Sir J. Anderson.*] Do not you think that it would diminish the efficiency of the police if the Government had the appointment of the superintendents or the head constables; would not that be considered an interference?—It would by the counties generally, especially if the Government were not to contribute to the expense. The magistrates in quarter sessions only appoint now the chief constable, and the chief constable makes all the other appointments in the police force (the magistrates do not interfere at all), and he is held responsible for the appointments. I think if the whole expense was to fall upon the Consolidated Fund, that the Government ought to have the appointment of all the officers.

317. *Mr. Rich.*] Has the nomination by the chief constable only worked thoroughly well in your county?—Yes.

318. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Has the appointment of the subordinates by the chief constable been satisfactory to the magistrates?—Very much so. I never heard a single complaint.

319. *Mr. Rich.*] Does the chief constable hold his appointment from year to year?—No, he is a permanent officer.

320. You mean permanent so long as he gives satisfaction?—Yes.

321. *Sir J. Trollope.*] In your opinion, has the present system worked well?—Very well.

322. *Mr. Phillips.*] Is there any anxiety on the part of the population to get employed in the police?—Yes, amongst the young men.

323. Amongst what class?—Farmer's and tradesmen's sons.

324. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Are the police taken from the labouring classes?—No, generally a degree higher than that.

325. What are the qualifications that they must possess?—They must be able to read and write, and they must have a certificate of good character from a clergyman and their neighbours.

326. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Are the wages of policemen much higher than those given to agricultural labourers?—Yes, they are higher.

327. What is the rate of agricultural labourers' wages now in Hampshire?—It is 9 s. now; it has been raised 1 s. lately.

328. *Sir J. Trollope.*] The ordinary constables have 15 s.?—Yes; I believe there are some slight stoppages to the Superannuation Fund.

329. Is there any stoppage for clothing?—I am not aware. Captain Harris could give the Committee better information upon that subject than I can.

330. *Mr. Phillips.*] Are the majority of the men in the Hampshire police Hampshire men, or are they men from different counties?—I believe the majority of them are Hampshire men.

331. *Mr. Burroughes.*] Can you tell the Committee how the expenditure is controlled; do the accounts go direct to the sessions, or what control is there over the expenditure?—The expenditure is brought before the court of quarter sessions regularly every quarter, and the accounts are audited by the finance committee.

332. Is there a general finance committee?—Yes.

333. Not a committee appointed specially to supervise the police accounts?—No.

334. *Mr. Phillips.*] The magistrates occasionally get applications from young men to be recommended as policemen, do they not?—Yes; and if a magistrate knows a young man to be a respectable person, he recommends him to Captain Harris.

24

*Fielder King, Esq.*, called in ; and Examined.

335. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside ?—At Buriton, near Petersfield, in Hampshire.

336. Are you a large occupier of land ?—I farm 2,500 acres in the counties of Hants and Sussex.

337. Do you think, as a large occupier of land, that you have derived much benefit in regard to the protection of your property from the establishment of the police in Hampshire ?—I derive much benefit from the establishment of the police in Hampshire in the protection of my property, and also in the better regulation of our villages and beershops.

338. In what species of property did you suffer losses most, previously to the establishment of the police ?—Sheep particularly.

339. Can you state to the Committee the number of sheep you lost before the establishment of the police, compared to the numbers which you have lost since ?—Since the establishment of the police I have lost none ; before that my average used to be seven, or eight, or nine in a year.

340. *Mr. Phillips.*] How many years is it since you have lost any sheep ?—I think it is 10 years ; some years I lost 10 or 12, but I think the average was about seven or eight.

341. *Chairman.*] In what other species of property did you suffer loss ; did your fences suffer ?—In the fences, poultry, turnips, and so on ; farmers' property is liable to depredation from exposure.

342. Before the establishment of the police, was your loss great in the species of property which you have named ?—The heavy loss was particularly in sheep.

343. Have your losses in agricultural property decreased since the establishment of the police ?—Very materially.

344. In fact, do you think you save your rate ?—Yes, I think I save double my rate, if I take every kind of property into consideration.

345. *Sir J. Trollope.*] You speak of Hampshire only, I presume ?—I speak of Hampshire only.

346. You say that you occupy land in Sussex as well as in Hampshire ?—I do.

347. I believe there is no police in the western division ?—No, but the rate-payers of the parish are so convinced of the advantage of a police force, that they have established a private watchman for some years.

348. Are you as well protected by that system as you would be by the rural police under the Act of Parliament ?—No.

349. Do you consider that you still continue to lose property in Sussex to a greater extent than in Hampshire ?—Since we have established our private policeman, losses have diminished.

350. What is the area which that private policeman watches ?—Only one parish.

351. What is the extent of that parish in acres ?—I think about 3,000 acres.

352. Is that man on duty in the daytime only ?—Day and night, but then he is his own master ; there is no one to control him.

353. There is no regulation as to what duty he shall perform ?—No.

354. Is that a faulty system ?—Yes.

355. Is he responsible to any one ?—No.

356. Does anybody know when he goes out at night ?—No.

357. *Mr. Phillips.*] How many persons contribute to that private policeman ?—The whole of the ratepayers, by a voluntary rate.

358. What is your proportion ?—Mine is a small farm of about 300 acres ; 120 acres of this farm are in the adjoining parish, which has no constable. I think my rate would be about 3*l.*

359. Do you know the difference between the voluntary rate in Sussex and the compulsory rate in Hampshire ?—No, I have made no comparison.

360. *Chairman.*] Besides this 3*l.*, have you all the expenses to pay of the local constabulary ?—We save nothing, but we are so convinced of the advantage of a police force, that we have established a private policeman.

361. *Mr. Rich.*] Would you not willingly see that man displaced by the general police force for the county ?—Certainly.

362. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Is that the general feeling in the parish ?—Yes, as far as my knowledge extends.

c.71.

D

363. Mr.

F. King, Esq.

26 May 1853.

363. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Have any other parishes adopted the same system?—Medhurst, I think, has. There are some small parishes which have not any police.

364. Have any representations been made by the ratepayers in West Sussex in favour of establishing a constabulary in that part of the county?—I am not aware of any.

365. Mr. *Phillips*.] At how much is your farm in Hampshire rated for the purpose of the county rate?—I am rated at about 1,000 *l.* a year, I think.

366. And how much for the Sussex property?—About 200 *l.* a year.

367. Mr. *Rich*.] Is your property in Sussex near Hampshire?—It is within three or four miles of the border.

368. To a certain extent, I presume, it has received benefit from its contiguity to a county that is under the police system?—We receive a benefit in this way, that the vagrants all go over from Hampshire into Sussex.

369. *Chairman*.] Can you speak, from your own knowledge, of the great decrease in vagrancy in Hampshire since the establishment of the police?—In Hampshire, particularly in my own neighbourhood, there has been a very great decrease; indeed we have no vagrants encamping in the lanes or in the commons in the county; but immediately over the borders, when you get into Sussex, we have a great number.

370. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Have those persons which encamp in Sussex carts, and horses and donkeys?—Yes.

371. Do they commit depredations?—Yes, in the way of breaking the fences and stealing the turnips.

372. Do they turn their cattle into the fields, or rob the haystacks at night?—Yes.

373. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Did you suffer much from sheep stealing on your Sussex farm before you established a private watchman?—At that time I had no farm in Sussex.

374. *Chairman*.] Have you lost sheep within the last 10 years in Sussex?—I have.

375. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] From your knowledge of West Sussex, is sheep stealing a prevalent crime in that division of the county?—I do not think it is in my immediate neighbourhood.

376. What were the losses which you feared in your farm in Sussex which induced you and your neighbours to establish this system of a private watchman?—The depredations upon the fences, and the loss of turnips and poultry.

377. Is not it a thinly populated neighbourhood?—Not in Sussex.

378. Near what town are you?—The nearest town is Midhurst.

379. At Midhurst they have a voluntary system of police, the same as you have in your parish?—They have.

380. Is there in any part of Western Sussex what is called the parish constable system?—I think all the parishes have it.

381. Is that under any superintendence?—No, not of the police.

382. Mr. *Rich*.] Have you any incendiary fires in Hampshire?—We have had none for several years past.

383. Do you recollect Hampshire at the time of the burnings?—Yes, I do; we had two or three incendiary fires at that time, but we have not had any since.

384. Nor in Sussex?—Nor in Sussex.

385. Mr. *Phillips*.] You do not know exactly what you pay for this voluntary rate in Sussex?—No.

386. You said that you paid about 3 *l.* —About 3 *l.*

387. Sir *J. Trollope*.] How long has that voluntary rate existed?—I think for the last seven or eight years.

388. Does the whole of the parish pay *pari passu*?—Yes, according to the rate.

389. Have you any opponents to the voluntary rate?—No.

390. Are there some who pay and some who do not pay?—Perhaps a beer-shop-keeper is rather opposed to a rate of this kind.

391. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Has the question of the rural constabulary ever been mooted in the western division of Sussex?—Yes.

392. When did that take place?—Some few years ago, but the Lord Lieutenant was very much opposed to the establishment of police.

393. Is

393. Is he still opposed to it?—I do not know.
394. Do you think, but for a feeling of deference which was paid to the wishes of the Lord Lieutenant, that the rural police would have been established before now in western Sussex?—I really think it would.
395. Mr. *Rich.*] Would the establishment of police be popular with the farmers?—Yes, in my own neighbourhood; I have asked the question of a great many of my neighbours, if they wished to see the police done away with, and their opinion is, that the police is of the greatest possible benefit.
396. From knowing the opinions of those persons in Sussex, with whom you are acquainted, do you think the establishment of a police in Sussex, similar to that in Hampshire, would be popular?—I am quite sure that that is the feeling of my own parish.
397. *Chairman.*] You say the police is popular with the occupiers of land; is that growing feeling the result of experience?—I think so, decidedly.
398. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Has any step been taken to ascertain the feeling of the people in Sussex, beyond that of the Lord Lieutenant?—I am not aware.
399. Did not the magistracy decide not to introduce the Act?—I cannot answer that question.
400. *Chairman.*] Has the parish in Hampshire in which you reside become more orderly?—Certainly, particularly on the Sunday.
401. Mr. *Wulpole.*] In Sussex, since you have had a watchman who is paid by the voluntary rate, which you have mentioned, has any difference taken place in the parish with reference to plundering or with reference to the beershops?—I am not prepared to answer that question, being only occasionally there.
402. *Chairman.*] In Hampshire, where you do reside, you say you have observed a great difference as to the public-houses and beerhouses being better regulated?—I speak for my own parish. I see a great improvement in the parish on the Sunday; if our constable is away on duty, we see a change in the order of the village.
403. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Has the person whom you have appointed and paid by the voluntary rate in your parish, any power to inspect public-houses or enter beershops?—Yes, he does inspect the beershops and public-houses.
404. How has he the power to do so?—He is sworn in as a parish constable.
405. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Do you clothe him as a policeman?—We do not.
406. *Chairman.*] Have you heard of any cases of burglaries or highway robberies in Hampshire recently?—Not in my own division.
407. Were there cases to your knowledge before the establishment of the police?—Yes, there were.
408. Do you reside on the borders of the county?—Yes.
409. Do you hear of any offences of that sort being committed?—Two or three years ago we had several cases of burglary in the adjoining county.
410. Mr. *Rich.*] Were those cases of night burglary?—Yes.
411. Have you had instances in Sussex of cottages being plundered during the absence of the labourers in the day, whilst they have been working in the field?—Not latterly.
412. In neither Hampshire nor Sussex?—No; it used to be of frequent occurrence in both counties, particularly in the summer months.
413. Previously to the establishment of the police?—Yes.
414. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Are the farm houses in that part of Sussex and Hampshire isolated, and scattered singly about the country?—Not so much so as in the parish in which I reside.
415. Before the introduction of the police, were you annoyed by vagrants when all the servants were away, by their alarming the females in the house and obtaining alms from fear rather than from charity?—Constantly.
416. Has that nearly subsided?—I do not recollect a case for some time past.
417. Was it of frequent occurrence formerly?—Yes.
418. Mr. *Phillips.*] In round numbers, your farm in Sussex is about a third of the value of your farm in Hampshire?—About that.
419. Mr. *Rich.*] You pay double for your bad watching in Sussex that you pay for your good watching in Hampshire?—Yes.
420. *Chairman.*] Do you pay more for your watchmen in Sussex, in proportion to your rate, than you do in Hampshire for your police?—Yes, much more.

Mr. Henry Thompson, called in ; and Examined.

Mr. H. Thompson.

16 May 1853.

421. *Chairman.*] YOU are the Mayor of Andover ?—I am.
422. Have you ever held that office prior to the present period ?—I have, in 1843–44.
423. Previously to the establishment of the police ?—Yes.
424. In Hampshire ?—In Andover, in Hampshire.
425. It was established in 1841, in the county, was it not ?—I think it was, or thereabouts.
426. Is the police of Andover consolidated with the county ?—It is.
427. When did that consolidation take place ?—In the year 1846.
428. Can you describe the state of the town of Andover as to crime previously to the establishment of the police ?—I can give you some description as to the state of the town when I first held office ; I found that there was a great amount of petty theft, very few cases of which were detected ; that a great portion of the poorer population was very much demoralized ; they had little or no idea of moral responsibility ; the controul of the town, therefore, was in a very inefficient state ; the means for detecting offences and keeping the peace were quite inefficient.
429. In consequence of that state of things, did you advocate the establishment of the police, and the consolidation with the county ?—I did, strongly ; as soon as my term of office was over, I had been led to notice the good effects of the system of police adopted by the county ; and having seen the sad state of things in our own town, I was anxious that the benefits derived in the county should be participated in by us, and I used every endeavour with my fellow townsmen to induce them to adopt the measure.
430. Did you succeed in your endeavour ?—I did at last.
431. Was there much opposition ?—Opposition arose from many of the respectable inhabitants having a jealous feeling of the rights of the borough being interfered with, and a great dread of the amount of expense.
432. Do you think that that feeling still exists ?—I do not think it is quite obliterated ; but I am satisfied that the very persons who objected to the police at that time, if by any possibility the establishment of the police could be rescinded, would oppose the measure entirely. The gentlemen who voted in the town council against the police at the time of its establishment would now support its being maintained.
433. You think experience has made them converts ?—Yes.
434. Before that time you had had no police at all ?—We had a beadle and a paid constable ; but they were very inefficient indeed, and there was no one to control them.
435. Mr. *Walpole.*] What force have you in Andover now ?—Four constables and a sergeant, and the addition of a superintendent, Andover being the local depôt for the county.
436. *Chairman.*] In point of expense, is your expense greater now than it was before the consolidation of the borough with the county ?—No doubt ; but then the benefit is concomitant.
437. Do you think the benefits are equal to the additional expense ?—More than equal.
438. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Is there any arrangement made as to the proportion you are to pay ?—We pay 65*l.* per man ; it is a charge of 360*l.* a year upon us.
439. Do you pay that out of the borough rate ?—()at of the borough rate.
440. *Chairman.*] Are there any complaints on the part of the ratepayers as to that borough rate ?—They were very jealous as to its being imposed upon them at first ; but I think no ratepayer would vote for the police being abolished ; no respectable man would wish to see the police done away with.
441. Mr. *Walpole.*] Has the question been brought before the town council ?—No.
442. As a matter of fact, the question never has been mooted ?—No.
443. Sir *J. Anderson.*] What is the rate in the borough per pound ?—Sixpence in the pound for the year is the amount of cost of police.
444. Mr. *Phillips.*] Do you know what the actual expense of the police of Andover was before the adoption of the present system ?—About 75*l.* was paid to

to the constables; and there were other charges which did not come under the amount paid to the constables.

Mr. H. Thompson.

445. *Chairman* (to Captain *Harris*.) Do you know what it is in other boroughs?—No, I do not.

26 May 1853.

446. Do you know what it is in Lymington?—I do not. (*Witness*.) The cost of the police is mixed up with other payments, but when it is deducted the police charge has been 6*l.* in the pound. I think the better way would be to say that, whereas it might have cost 100*l.* a year formerly, it now costs 350*l.*

447. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Was the former police good for anything?—Not one farthing. I am bound to say that I think we save money.

448. *Chairman*.] Do you think the property saved is equal to the additional 250*l.*?—I am satisfied that, in comfort to the inhabitants and the property saved, it far exceeds the difference of the amount paid to the police.

449. Can you give the Committee an idea of the number of offences committed prior to and since the establishment of the police?—I have here a statement of the number of cases convicted before the magistrates in petty sessions, and committals for trial.

450. When did you adopt the police?—In 1846.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

CASES Convicted before Magistrates in Petty Sessions, and Committals for Trial:

1843	-	-	-	-	-	48	1848	-	-	-	-	-	33
1844	-	-	-	-	-	78	1849	-	-	-	-	-	62
1845	-	-	-	-	-	67	1850	-	-	-	-	-	41
1846	{	5 months' old constables	23	}	41	1851	-	-	-	-	-	41	
	{	7 months' police	-	18	}	41	1852	-	-	-	-	-	14
1847	-	-	-	-	-	65	1853	-	-	-	-	half-year	16

*Witness*.] The Committee will observe, that there is a relative increase and decrease after the adoption of the police, for this reason; they found the cases out, and they have been decreasing regularly ever since.

451. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Can you give the Committee any reason for the extraordinary diminution in the last year, as compared to any other year?—Although the police has had a good effect in the town, I find that last year was a cheap year, and a cheap year is a year in which we have less crime.

452. Was last year cheaper than the present year?—Yes.

453. Mr. *Walpole*.] Was last year a year of full employment?—Yes.

454. That return would not lead the Committee to suppose that the decrease in crime is entirely in consequence of the establishment of the police?—No, certainly not; it has relatively had a good effect.

455. *Chairman*.] That return does not give the number of cases brought before the magistrates and dismissed?—No, there are very few discharged. The numbers that escaped prior to the establishment of the police were very enormous.

456. Mr. *Phillips*.] At what time were the railway works carried on in Andover?—I think 1849.

457. Will you give the number of cases in 1849?—Sixty-two; in 1848 it was 33, in 1850 it was 41, and in 1849 it was 62.

458. Sir *J. Trollope*.] The railway works ceased in that year?—I think they did.

459. And then they were resumed in a few months?—Yes.

460. *Chairman*.] Has the business at your sessions declined?—We have had five maiden sessions, and only one committal to assizes; that was a post-office robbery; we have now one prisoner for trial at the sessions, and only one at the assizes; but we have had five consecutive sessions without a prisoner. There is another return which I should like to place before the Committee, which is a return of the cost of crime from the year 1841 to 1852; the expenses of sessions, prosecutions, maintenance of prisoners at Andover, conveying prisoners to Winchester, maintenance of prisoners at Winchester; in 1841 it was 251*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.*; in 1842, 114*l.* 6*s.* 1*d.*; in 1843, 164*l.* 2*s.* 3*d.*; in 1844, 210*l.* 1*s.* 1*d.*; in 1845, 209*l.* 6*s.* 11*d.*; and in 1846 it was 132*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.*; then the new police came into operation, and you will observe that immediately

0.71.

D 3

the

Mr. H. Thompson. the cost increased. In 1847 it was 211 *l.* 2 *s.*; in 1848, 213 *l.* 16 *s.*; in 1849, 297 *l.* 1 *s.* 1 *d.*; in 1850, 172 *l.* 19 *s.* 6 *d.*; in 1851, 123 *l.* 11 *s.* 1 *d.*; and in 1852, 26 May 1853. it was 112 *l.* 3 *s.* 5 *d.*

[The Witness delivered in the following Statement:]

	1841.	1842.	1843.	1844.	1845.	1846.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Expenses of Sessions -	18 14 7	17 2 1	37 10 6	25 2 6	19 19 6	23 19 6
Prosecutions -	84 17 4	17 10 -	23 18 -	79 13 -	44 1 8	37 18 -
Maintenance of Prisoners at Andover -	17 15 10	20 6 6	17 10 -	27 5 9	35 8 10	9 16 1
Conveying Prisoners to Winchester -	6 7 -	9 9 -	5 15 -	10 7 -	15 11 6	8 0 -
Maintenance of Prisoners at Winchester -	123 11 9	49 18 0	70 8 9	67 12 10	94 5 5	51 17 9
	£. 251 6 6	114 6 1	164 2 3	210 1 1	209 6 11	132 - 4

  

	1847.	1848.	1849.	1850.	1851.	1852.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Expenses of Sessions -	17 5 10	33 12 4	22 19 -	23 5 5	28 4 7	12 19 10
Prosecutions -	56 3 1	44 16 -	47 8 -	12 12 6	18 5 4	17 4 5
Maintenance of Prisoners at Andover -	16 10 4	15 7 7	56 2 5	15 3 11	15 3 -	12 12 4
Conveying Prisoners to Winchester -	6 18 11	25 2 9	35 13 9	13 - 6	11 6 11	7 17 3
Maintenance of Prisoners at Winchester -	114 3 10	94 17 4	134 17 11	108 17 2	50 11 3	61 0 7
	£. 211 2 -	213 16 -	297 1 1	172 19 6	123 11 1	112 3 5

461. That return corresponds with the return which you gave before, showing that immediately after the establishment of the police the expenses for a period increased, and then rapidly decreased to the present time?—Yes, they have regularly decreased.

462. Mr. Mackie.] What is the population of Andover?—Five thousand.

463. Mr. Rich.] Have the bad characters left the town?—Yes; they are kept in control, and they go elsewhere, those that have not been convicted; we have had some heavy prosecutions; we have got rid of several bad characters who had always evaded justice.

464. Now they have quitted the town?—Yes.

465. Mr. Burroughes.] Some of them were transported, I suppose?—Yes.

466. Chairman.] Are you an occupier of land?—To a small extent.

467. Do you consider that as many depredations have been committed on your property recently as before the establishment of the police?—I am a merchant, and I felt it more in that respect than in my farming proceedings; I used to leave small matters about upon the premises in the hope of saving the loss of larger ones; we had no means of controlling and detecting them; it was impossible, unless I had kept a watch.

468. Sir J. Anderson.] Is this 6 *d.* in the pound upon the gross rental of the borough?—Not upon the gross rental, I think it is upon two-thirds of the house property.

469. Is not that more than the rating in the county?—I do not know exactly; the rating upon land is generally to the full amount; the rating upon house property is generally two-thirds, I believe.

470. Mr. Rich.] Would not the rate be lower than 6 *d.* in the county?—Yes, considerably lower than in boroughs.

471. Sir J. Anderson.] Do you think the difference in the rate is the reason why the boroughs object to the amalgamation of the police?—I do not know that that reason operated in our own case; the objection was more from a jealousy of the rights of the town being interfered with than a dislike to join with the county; now they have felt the good effect of it, the whole of that feeling has worn

J.C.

worn off; no really respectable inhabitant of the town would wish to see the division again. Mr. H. Thompson.

472. Mr. *Walpole*.] From what source are those accounts taken?—From the book of the treasurer of the borough. 26 May 1853.

473. *Chairman*.] You said that you had great losses in your property; have those losses ceased?—Yes; directly I find I have any loss, I give notice to the police, and it is generally corrected immediately. We have no small offences comparatively to what we had: the state of the town is now agreeable and pleasant, whereas formerly it was very disreputable.

474. Mr. *Phillips*.] Do you ever hear any complaints of vexatious interference or over zeal on the part of the police?—On the contrary, I have found very great attention whenever I have required the police to attend to anything.

475. Are not the men shifted constantly?—Yes, they are; and I think it is an excellent plan in a town with such a population as ours, or they would get into habits and connections which would render it very undesirable that they should remain. I think one of the great points in the effectiveness of the police is that they are changed.

476. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Within your borough do the police execute all processes, and serve summonses?—Yes.

477. Do they attend upon the petty sessions?—Yes.

478. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Do they serve the notices for coroners' inquests?—Yes.

479. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Have you any saving to set against the expenses of the police beyond the pay of the persons whose services you formerly had?—The abovenamed expenses must be saved in reality.

480. Have you made a per contra account, to show what the gain or what the loss is?—No, I have not.

481. Do you think it is anything considerable?—I can hardly answer that question.

482. Have you any officers called town serjeants or town mace-men?—We have; they are wearing out.

483. You permit them to die off?—Yes.

484. You do not intend to fill up the vacancies?—We have not done so.

485. Then there will be a further saving to set off against the expense of the police?—Yes.

486. *Chairman*.] You think there has been a great saving of property?—I should say double the expense. If any one were to say to the people of Andover, "Will you pay double for the police, or will you do without it," I think they would say they would pay double: I would.

487. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Is there a great difference in the public-houses and beer-shops?—Very much so. If a complaint is made (which is seldom), a caution not to renew the offence has had the desired effect.

488. Do you believe, from the inspection which goes on, that a complaint would be made by the police if there were any irregularity on the part of beer-shop keepers or publicans?—I am satisfied of that; we had one or two complaints in the country, and a caution has acted efficiently.

489. Mr. *Phillips*.] Is there a coroner at Andover?—Yes.

490. Is he the local coroner?—The town-clerk holds the office of coroner.

491. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Have you any lodging-houses licensed under the Act?—We have not.

492. You have none registered under the Common Lodging-house Act?—There are two or three lodging-houses, and we inspect them.

493. Under the regulations of the Lodging-house Act?—We have not brought the Lodging-house Act into force; in short, it is not necessary for Andover.

494. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Have not you a tramps' lodging-house at Andover?—No; to a great extent the tramping has ceased.

495. That class of people do not come to Andover?—Not by any means so much as formerly.

496. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Do the police inspect the lodging-houses?—Yes.

497. Mr. *Rich*.] To what do you attribute the cessation of tramping?—I think they find there is a better control in the town; that the town is kept in better order, and they do not find it answer their purpose to come there.

498. Can you give the Committee a debtor and creditor statement of the cost and of the saving with regard to the police which has been established?—I do not think I could exactly do that; the cost of the police is so much mixed

Mr. H. Thompson.  
26 May 1853.

up with one thing and another, that it would not be a fair account. I would rather state it from having watched the thing myself, from having lived all my life in the town of Andover, and been somewhat observant.

499. With regard to the 6 *d.* in the pound, is that upon a rating of two-thirds of the value?—The greater part of the property in the town is house property, which is rated upon two-thirds of the value.

500. In comparison with the 2  $\frac{1}{2}$  *d.* in the county, it is not so high?—Certainly it is not so high.

*John Reynolds Beddome, Esq., M. D. ; Examined.*

J. R. Beddome,  
Esq., M. D.

501. *Chairman.*] Do you reside in Romsey?—Yes; I have resided there upwards of 40 years.

502. Do you hold any official situation in Romsey?—I am one of the two senior aldermen; I have held the office of mayor four times, and I am permanent justice of the peace.

503. Is there a separate jurisdiction in Romsey?—We have no sessions at present; we had under the old Municipal Act. We petitioned not to have any sessions, because it would involve a great additional expense.

504. What is the condition of the police at Romsey?—For the purposes of the prevention and detection of crime, it is anything but satisfactory. In the year 1845, at the request of many of the most respectable ratepayers of the town, I brought the subject before the town council; but it was summarily rejected, upon the plea that no application had been made from the ratepayers, and the matter then remained quiescent for some years. Being aware of the importance of the subject, I have continually urged some of the most respectable inhabitants to memorialise the town council. Last year, when I was in the office of mayor, a memorial was sent to me, headed by Lord Palmerston, who is resident amongst us, and signed by the vicar and many of the respectable inhabitants of the town, requesting the town council to amalgamate the borough police force with the county. Another counter memorial was at the same time put into my hands, which I also brought before the town council, signed by a party of the smaller ratepayers, and by nine beerhouse-keepers, and two or three publicans. One of the beerhouse-keepers, to my knowledge, has said, that if the county police was in the town, he should be had up every day of his life. I brought these memorials before the town council, and myself urged the council to amalgamate with the county. A great deal of discussion took place upon the subject. The present mayor of Romsey moved a resolution, that it was neither expedient nor desirable to amalgamate the borough force with the county, and that resolution was carried by a majority of five. But the agitation of the question did a great deal of good, for the watch committee, under the recommendation of the town council, determined to do away with all the old police force, and to have one day constable, and one night constable; and they paid our efficient chief constable, Captain Harris, the compliment of saying, that they should like to have two men whom he had educated as policemen; and accordingly we had two, one of whom resigned his place in the county force, in order to come into the borough, and the other I believe was requested to resign. I think there was something of that kind, and those are the only two officers we have now.

505. Do you find them efficient for the protection of the property in the borough?—Not at all; the protection of property in the borough is most unsatisfactory; we have but one officer by day, and one by night. Whenever either of those officers is ill, which happened to the day constable for several weeks this last year, we have no protection, and but one man to do day and night duty. If either of our officers takes a prisoner to Winchester, the town is left the whole day; or if a coroner's inquest is to be summoned, he is away the whole of the day, and the town is left. The protection of the town with those two officers is, in my opinion, most unsatisfactory; it is so considered by the respectable inhabitants. I have nothing to allege against the men themselves, but the system appears to be wrong. Those men are always the same; they get acquaintances in the town; and there has not been a single instance for six years of a beershop-keeper being summoned before the magistrates, though many of those houses are most irregular; one of them is a common brothel; and I was urged last year, when mayor, to take every step I could to put it down, but I could get nobody to inform. I desired our own constables to inform,

inform, but they said they could not. Nothing has been done, and the house is open to this time. It was said to me only a few days since, without the parties knowing that I was to appear before this Committee, "If, sir, you had carried the measure about the county police, and had only put down that house, it would have been a blessing to the place." One of our publicans in October came up for his licence, but as we had very good information that the house was an irregular one, and that he had been repeatedly fined or warned, we refused to give him his licence; he bade us defiance, and he said he would immediately get a beerhouse licence, which he did. He is the only beerhouse-keeper who has been summoned before me for the last six years. He was summoned last Thursday; and it was proved that the constable had demanded admittance at 11 o'clock at night, and he hesitated so long in giving him admittance, that there was no doubt, and it has since been proved, that a person escaped at the back door. The mayor fined him 20 s. On Monday morning I said to one of the neighbours, "How is that man going on?" and he said, "Worse than ever, sir; you did not fine him half enough; the house is quite as irregular as it has ever been."

506. Mr. Fitzroy.] You spoke of discharging all your former police; of what did they consist?—The old police was formed under the paving commissioners; there was a clause in the Paving Act allowing us to watch and light the town, but it was worse at night than anything that has occurred since. There were four watchmen who, as far as my recollection goes, were appointed, not for their efficiency, but for their being willing to watch for 1 s. 6 d. a night. They were men who had been hard at work all day. I myself, being professionally out in the night, have seen them asleep under the gateways: they were of no use. About 17 years since, I had seen so much of the evil resulting from the unprotected state of the town, that I went myself to the parish vestry, to urge upon the vestry to appoint a town beadle. There appeared to be a good deal of difficulty in it, but it was agreed that the parish should pay a man 7 s. 6 d. a week to get rid of the vagrants, and the pavement commissioners should give him 7 s. 6 d. to be also the inspector of the pavement, and I was to swear him in so as to make him a day officer; but he turned out such an intemperate man, that he was of no use whatever. I think it has been remarked by Mr. Stanley, in his evidence, that the thieves congregate in our borough. That is very much the case; they are driven out of the rural districts and reside in the borough, and then sally out at night.

507. What do you pay to your two constables?—The one is paid 18 s., I think, and the other 16 s., a week.

508. Out of what fund are those men paid?—From the borough rate; there is 30 l. a quarter for the payment of those men and a few incidental expenses.

509. Who has the appointment of the men?—The watch committee.

510. If representations are made to the watch committee of the inefficiency of those men, will they take steps to remove them, or require them to do their duty?—The difficulty has been, that the watch committee say you must prove it; there is no evidence of their inefficiency, and the difficulty with us has been the opposition to the county police, and the unwillingness on the part of certain persons to find anything against our police, for fear we should get the county police amalgamated with ours. A large proportion of the respectable inhabitants now are in favour of the amalgamation between the borough and the county police.

511. Supposing the police to be as inefficient as you represent, is it not in the power of the respectable inhabitants to inform the watch committee of their inefficiency?—It is in their power; I have informed the watch committee, and they have said, "You are only able to give information from current opinion." I am not satisfied with our watch committee. The mayor of the town is *ex officio* the chairman of the watch committee, but the whole time I was mayor, I was not called to one single committee meeting.

512. Are there any brewers in Romsey?—Yes.

513. Are they members of the watch committee?—One of the brewers is the managing secretary.

514. Does he appoint the police?—My own idea is, that the secretary is the acting man; for when I complained to him that I, as mayor, had not been summoned to a single meeting of the watch committee, his reply was, "Why, really, we are so unaccustomed to have a chairman, that I did not think of it."

o.71.

E

515. In

  
 J. R. Beddome,  
 Esq., M. P.  
 26 May 1853.

*J. R. Beddome,*  
Esq., M. P.  
26 May 1853.

515. In fact, it would be against the interest of the gentleman who manages the watch committee if any information were laid against the beerhouses?—I do not know whether he supplies the beerhouses or not; I have heard that he does; but it has been stated that our police are unwilling to inform against the beerhouses for fear of offending the watch committee.

516. Therefore, for all useful purposes, the borough of Romsey is totally devoid of police?—It is devoid of an efficient police.

517. *Chairman* (to Captain *Harris*).] What number of policemen would be required at Romsey if the borough were incorporated with the county?—Three at the most.

518. The expense, if they were incorporated, would not be more than a third in addition to the present expense?—Certainly not.—(*Witness*.) Our police costs about 120*l.* a year; then there is the average of nine guineas a year for taking prisoners to Winchester, and three guineas a year for serving summonses; the two latter would be saved if we had the county police. I should state that the borough of Romsey is only one-third of the town; two-thirds are out of the boundary of the borough; and in that part of the town which is not in our jurisdiction there is a most efficient station of the county constabulary, and an active, energetic superintendent and officers.

519. Is it your opinion that the establishment of police would be more efficient for the prevention of crime in Romsey if it were united with the county constabulary?—Most decidedly.

520. Do you think that with a cost of one-third more the saving of property would be more than a compensation?—Yes.

521. *Mr. Phillips*.] Do you know how much the police rate in the pound would be?—I do not know how much our rates are in the pound; they vary so much; our borough rate is uniform.

522. How much is that?—£.30 a quarter; that is, for the police; we do not employ the borough rate in lighting at all; it is only in watching. My argument with the town council was that our police was totally inefficient, and, as an individual, I would rather pay twice what I did, to have an efficient force. The state of our police is a serious injury to the trade of the town; ladies of rank in the neighbourhood have told me that they are unwilling to come in and deal in the town, and have almost determined to abandon Romsey to its fate, because our police is so bad; they are infested with beggars.

523. Do you think Romsey is infested with vagrants to a great extent?—Very much. Attempts have been made within the last month to build a new town hall, and applications were made to the gentry to assist, but they said it could not be expected that they would assist the town of Romsey when it was so notoriously defective in its police arrangements. I think it is essential for us to have the county force.

*Veneris, 27° die Maii, 1853.*

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Rice.  
Mr. Mackie.  
Sir James Anderson.  
Mr. Sotherton.  
Mr. Rich.  
Mr. Walpole.

Sir John Trollope.  
Mr. Burroughes.  
Lord Lovaine.  
Mr. Howard.  
Mr. Phillips.

EDWARD ROYDS RICE, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

*Mr. Andrew Robert Fennick*, called in; and Examined.

*Mr. A. R. Fennick.* 524. *Chairman*.] WHERE do you reside?—At Netherton, in Northumberland.

27. May 1853. 525. Are you a large occupier of land?—I am; I may also state that I am a visiting magistrate of Northumberland.

526. Will you state to the Committee what the nature of your police is?—We have

Mr. A. R. Fennick.

27 May 1853.

have a riding police, the persons in which are allowed 100 *l.* a year, and out of that they are obliged to keep a horse.

527. What number have you in the county?—Twelve.

528. Do they extend over the whole county?—They extend over the whole county.

529. What area has each of those men to superintend?—There is one man to each petty sessional division; there are 12 petty sessional divisions in Northumberland.

530. Is that under the Parish Constables' Act?—Yes.

531. Mr. *Phillips*.] Have you lock-up houses?—Yes.

532. *Chairman*.] Do you find your police force efficient in Northumberland?—Very much so; we have no complaints; they have no fees.

533. Do you mean that they have no fees for the apprehension of offenders?—They have no more than the common expenses, and we scarcely allow them to keep the lock-up house.

534. Is the lock-up house under the direction of another constable?—It is, generally.

535. Under the same Act?—Yes; we have not had a single complaint about the men from the farmers, or people in towns, or anybody, so far. I think it would be an improvement if there were one superintendent over the 12.

536. Are you aware that that is proposed in a Bill which is now before Parliament?—No, I am not aware; I should also recommend that they should report occasionally.

537. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do your men make any reports at present?—They report once a month at the petty sessions what has taken place during that time; they are mostly old policemen taken from the different police forces.

538. Mr. *Howard*.] Do you find any jealousy existing between your police and the police in large towns?—Not the slightest; we have had no complaint whatever.

539. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do your men find their own horses?—They find everything; they are allowed no uniform.

540. Mr. *Sotheron*.] What has been the result with regard to the diminution in offences?—I was not aware that I was to be called, and therefore I am not prepared to answer that question. I can only state, that I was in the prison at Morpeth the other day, where the prisoners generally average about 100, and there were only 60 or 70.

541. *Chairman*.] Is the number of prisoners less than it was?—Indeed I never knew it so low.

542. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Is it your impression, and that of your brother magistrates, that since the establishment of this police force, of which you are speaking, the offences have been more detected, and the number of offenders is diminished?—I only speak for myself; but I think the offences are more detected.

543. Mr. *Phillips*.] Are these men appointed in quarter session?—About three years ago, since the vote of the whole of the magistrates, this situation was advertised, and then there were arrangements made to give one man to each petty sessional division, one to Morpeth, one to Alnwick, and one to Belford, and so on; the men were all examined by the magistrates who attended locally to those places.

544. Do they receive their appointment from the court of quarter sessions?—Yes.

545. How are they selected?—There were about 20 or 30 men came; of course each petty sessional division recommended one person, and they were all selected by a very large meeting. I must say that I do not know a single exception to their acting remarkably well: most of the men were recommended from the police at Newcastle, and other different places.

546. Mr. *Sotheron*.] What authority do they exercise over the other constables, if they exercise any?—You can scarcely say that they do exercise any; they are sent to give notice to the parish constables that they are to attend; we had some disturbance last year where I live; we summoned them all, and they were sworn in as special constables; but we think the parish constables are a very inefficient body of men.

547. Have those constables any men under them?—None.

o.71.

E 2

548. In

Mr. A. R. Fennick.  
27 May 1853.

548. In case more force is wanted than one constable, to whom have they the power of applying for assistance?—They would first apply to the parish constables, and then they would apply to the magistrates to swear in special constables.

549. For the ordinary purpose of looking after offenders, have they any assistance whatever?—None whatever, without there is any serious case, and then they can apply to the magistrate in another division, and if there is a clever intelligent person, that person is sent; in an important case we send two or three to look after it. There was a large fire took place not long ago, and the person who resides in one of the petty sessional divisions was sent 30 miles off.

550. What is the nature of their duty; is it the ordinary duty of common constables?—Their duties are to attend in the morning and go round the district, as much as possible, to see if there is anybody at any particular point.

551. *Chairman.*] What is the extent of a district?—Some of the districts are about 20 or 30 miles.

552. Do you mean 20 or 30 miles across?—Twenty miles one way and 15 another; there is a district close to me that is not more than five or six miles one way and three or four in another; in that district there is more to do, from the works which are there.

553. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Is it part of their duty to serve summonses?—Of all kinds.

554. Do they serve all the warrants and all the summonses which are issued by the magistrates in their respective places?—Very generally.

555. Therefore they perform the whole of the duty of constables?—Some of the parish constables and other constables sworn in are more active than others, and they get a little business to do.

556. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Is there any high constable or chief constable?—No; they are all upon a level.

557. Had you any chief constable before this force was established?—No.

558. By whom are the precepts served?—By the high constable.

559. Then you had a chief constable?—We had a party to serve the precepts.

560. Was he paid by salary or by fees?—By a very small salary or fee.

561. Was not that some expense to the county?—I do not know I am sure; I should think it was very small; the parish constables only serve once in their lifetime, in one neighbourhood, and they are very unwilling to serve.

562. *Mr. Phillips.*] Have any vacancies occurred in your force?—I think there was one.

563. Was the man discharged?—I do not recollect now.

564. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Is it part of the duty of these constables to take charge of the prisoners, to remove them either from the place of examination to the gaol, or from one gaol to another?—Certainly.

565. They do the whole of that duty?—Sometimes, and other duty too. There is one thing I should mention to the Committee, that our men are not allowed to do anything with game; that was particularly laid down at the time of their appointment.

566. Do you mean by their not being allowed to do anything with game, that they have nothing to do with the apprehending or taking before a magistrate a person who had committed an offence under the Game Laws?—Certainly; it was supposed at the time that gentlemen might get them out to assist the keepers, and it was specially provided that they were not to do it. If they see a man committing a breach of the peace, it is their duty to apprehend him, but it was particularly taken care of, at the time they were appointed, that they were not to do anything in the preservation of game.

567. *Mr. Mackie.*] Did you say that there were only 12 policemen for the whole of the county of Northumberland?—Twelve riding policemen.

568. How many others?—I do not know; the Board of Health in the different towns have the appointment of the police.

569. You only speak of the county police?—Yes; the other men are paid by the towns; and then there are parish constables still; every township in Northumberland has a parish constable.

570. Mr.

570. Mr. *Sotheron*.] So far as a paid constabulary is concerned for the county of Northumberland, you have only these 12 men?—We have only one attached to each petty session division.

Mr. *A. R. Fennick*.

27 May 1853.

571. *Chairman*.] Are you aware that the magistrates of the county of Northumberland have applied sometimes to the police authorities at Newcastle for assistance?—I am almost certain they have on one or two occasions; they applied at the election last year at Hexham.

Sir *Robert Sheffield*, Bart., called in; and Examined.

572. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You reside in the county of Lincoln?—I do.

Sir *R. Sheffield*,  
Bart.

573. Are you the Chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions of the parts of Lindsey at Kirton?—Yes.

574-5. Have you been long in that office?—I have been chairman at Kirton in the parts of Lindsey many years, about 25.

576. What is the acreage of the parts of Lindsey?—A million acres or thereabouts; but perhaps you will allow me to state, first of all, the mode in which the business of the court of quarter sessions is conducted in the parts of Lindsey, and if I state that shortly to the Committee, it will enable them better to understand what the magistrates have done with regard to the police in the parts of Lindsey; the parts of Lindsey is divided into two subdivisions for quarter sessions, the Kirton subdivision taking the western side, and the Louth and Spilsby subdivision the eastern side; Kirton is made the original quarter sessions, which are carried on by adjournment alternately at Louth and Spilsby; they have each a chairman and a deputy-chairman, the same clerk of the peace, one county rate in common, and the accounts are alternately inspected on one side and the other, and occasionally, though rarely, the magistrates find it necessary to hold a general meeting of all the magistrates for Lindsey. When the Act of Parliament of 1839, which we call the Rural Police Bill, was passed, we had a general meeting at Lincoln to discuss the propriety of adopting the provisions of that Act, and then it was agreed by the magistracy that there was no necessity for it at that time, and we did not act under it at all.

577. *Chairman*.] Was that decision unanimous?—It was not unanimous, I think it was not carried by a large majority.

578. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You were chairman of that meeting?—Yes; and the Lord-lieutenant attended, although he did not take any part; he was pleased to express himself satisfied with the decision of the magistrates. Another Act was passed in 1842, to regulate the payment of parish constables, which gave the power to the magistrates in quarter sessions, on the requisition of five magistrates, to build lock-up houses; and when that is done, requires them to appoint superintendent constables, having the management of certain districts; that Act of Parliament was put in force, first of all, on the Spilsby side; the magistrates of the Kirton bench soon followed the example, and did the same thing at Gainsborough; and they eventually decided to have one at all the petty sessions of Lindsey, 13 in number, the parishes placed under the superintendent being made nearly commensurate with the petty sessional district. The superintendents were appointed, and were put under regulations, of which I have a copy here; each superintendent has a salary of 120*l.* a year; they have a small light cart, found by the county; they find a horse themselves, and keep it themselves; they have to visit all the parishes in their districts every fortnight, and attend and report to the petty sessions held every fortnight throughout the division; to take persons to gaol when not on other duties; and to assist, advise or direct all the parish constables in the different districts. This plan, as I said before, has been gradually adopted now throughout the whole of Lindsey; and the expenses for the year ended 5th January last is 1,860*l.*, of which I have a return here showing the expenses of each of the lock-up stations.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

Sir R. Steinfeld,  
Bart.  
27 May 1853.

LINCOLNSHIRE—LINDSEY.

AN ACCOUNT of the CHARGES and EXPENSES of LOCK-UP HOUSES and SUPERINTENDING CONSTABLES, in the Parts of *Lindsey*, for the Year ending January Sessions 1853.

LOCK-UP or DISTRICT.	APRIL SESSIONS, 1852.			JULY SESSIONS, 1852.			OCTOBER SESSIONS, 1852.			JANUARY SESSIONS, 1853.			TOTAL for the Year.
	Salary.	Extras.	TOTAL.	Salary.	Extras.	TOTAL.	Salary.	Extras.	TOTAL.	Salary.	Extras.	TOTAL.	
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Alford - - - -	30 - -	9 16 9	39 16 9	30 - -	5 3 -	35 3 -	30 - -	16 5 11	46 5 11	30 - -	15 10 9	45 10 9	166 10 5
Barton - - - -	30 - -	6 13 8	36 13 8	30 - -	8 19 -	38 19 -	30 - -	4 10 5	34 10 5	30 - -	9 2 10	39 2 10	149 5 11
Brigg - - - -	30 - -	9 10 9	39 10 9	30 - -	9 12 11	39 12 11	30 - -	7 19 6	37 19 6	30 - -	5 13 6	35 13 6	152 16 8
Burgh - - - -	30 - -	7 17 7	37 17 7	30 - -	8 12 7	38 12 7	30 - -	4 5 -	34 5 -	30 - -	10 3 3	40 3 3	150 18 5
Epworth - - - -	30 - -	8 - 10	38 - 10	30 - -	7 6 7	37 6 7	30 - -	1 6 6	31 6 6	30 - -	17 18 3	47 18 3	154 12 2
Gainsbro' - - - -	35 - -	13 14 3	48 14 3	35 - -	2 8 4	37 8 4	30 - -	17 9 2	47 9 2	30 - -	5 4 2	35 4 2	168 15 11
Grimsby - - - -	30 - -	16 3 6	46 3 6	30 - -	6 5 10	36 5 10	30 - -	6 2 10	36 2 10	30 - -	4 12 9	34 12 9	153 4 11
Horncastle - - - -	30 - -	9 17 2	39 17 2	30 - -	13 14 2	43 14 2	30 - -	12 13 11	42 13 11	30 - -	8 9 9	38 9 9	164 15 -
Market Rason - - - -	30 - -	18 3 9	48 3 9	30 - -	9 2 8	39 2 8	30 - -	11 16 3	41 16 3	30 - -	9 13 9	39 13 9	168 16 5
Lincoln - - - -	30 - -	5 8 9	35 8 9	30 - -	6 8 11	36 8 11	30 - -	4 19 -	34 19 -	30 - -	8 7 4	38 7 4	145 4 -
Burton - - - -	30 - -	4 14 7	34 14 7	30 - -	6 6 4	36 6 4	30 - -	8 17 1	38 17 1	30 - -	7 - -	37 - -	146 18 -
Stather - - - -													
Wragby - - - -	30 - -	3 12 3	33 12 3	30 - -	2 17 4	32 17 4	30 - -	6 16 4	36 16 4	30 - -	4 14 11	34 14 11	138 - 10
												£.	1,860 4 8

38 MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE

43

Sir R. Sheffield,  
Bart.

27 May 1853.

579. Sir J. Trollope.] Have you made any calculation of the comparative expenses between that system and the system under the General Rural Police Act of 1839?—I have read of the expenses, and seen the expenses reported in other counties. I should think the expenses of this system is not above one-fourth of the expense of the rural police; I take that as the highest. Then in 1850, there was another Act of Parliament passed to amend the Act of 1842, and which repeals the 23d section of that Act, which requires a superintendent to be appointed with the control of certain parishes wherever a lock-up is built, and instead of that section, directs that the superintendent shall be appointed to the special sessional district, and also that whenever a lock-up is built, a paid constable shall be appointed, which makes this difference, as we understand the Act of Parliament; whereas by the first Act of Parliament, which confines the magistrate to appointing one superintendent with the control of parishes where a lock-up is built, a district of parishes being allotted to that superintendent as nearly as possible commensurate in area with the special sessional district, the expense is defined and limited; we know the extent of the expenses. The second Act of Parliament, by repealing the 23d section of the first Act, and directing superintendents to be appointed to special session districts, and adding that, whenever a lock-up is built, a paid constable is to be appointed, has the effect of giving a power to magistrates to build a lock-up in any place they think proper, with a paid constable besides the superintendent; and this has opened the door to an undefined and unlimited expenditure, and under this power the magistrates on the Louth side have built a lock-up, costing 600*l.*, and appointed a constable at 60*l.* a year. In consequence of this alteration, the magistrates considered that it would be expedient to have a general meeting, and another general meeting took place of the magistrates for the parts of Lindsey, at Lincoln, in July 1851. A committee was appointed to have the management of the police of Lindsey formed of four of the magistrates on one side and four on the other, and this was done in order to secure an equal expenditure in the two divisions, and that the same mode should be adopted by the one and the other. The magistrates then agreed that they would not build more than one lock-up house in the same district without having a report first of all upon it from the police committee; that committee meets at Lincoln at the assizes in the spring and in the summer. The rules for the guidance of the superintendents which had been in force were afterwards confirmed by that committee, and are the rules and regulations under which they now act. With this alteration in the Act of Parliament, if the law remain unaltered, the probability will be that lock-up houses and paid constables will be established at a few other places in the parts of Lindsey, and that will run the expense up from 1,800*l.* to 2,500*l.* or thereabouts. I think if, under this last Act of Parliament, lock-up houses are built at two or three places on a smaller scale, with constables' houses, it will run the expense up to 2,500*l.* With regard to the commission of crime since this alteration, I have not any accurate information, but judging from a little paper which I have in my pocket, showing the county-rate for the last 20 years, I should say there is not much difference in the crime; the money paid for prosecution by the Government amounts to much the same for the last six years. I have observed, at several of the last sessions, that many of the prosecutions have been for trifling offences; perhaps they are looked up better than they were.

580. *Chairman.*] Do you think the amount of undetected crime is less?—Yes; I have not any accurate data to go by, I only judge of that by the offences being trifling which have been tried at the quarter sessions of late years.

581. This return, which you have put in, was for 13 divisions?—Thirteen divisions. Louth has not got one; Louth has a police of its own; there has not been a county superintendent appointed for it.

582. The cost for the lock-up houses alone was 1,860 *l.* 4 *s.* 8 *d.* per annum, and you think the cost of the system under the new Act would amount to about 2,500 *l.*?—I think it would; I have here a paper which shows the area of the districts in acres, and the population of those different districts which the superintendents look after.

[*The Witness delivered in the following statement :*]

Sir R. Sheffield,  
Bart.

LINCOLNSHIRE LINDSEY.

27 May 1853.

A RETURN from the Parts of *Lindsey*, in the County of Lincoln, in which SUPERINTENDENT CONSTABLES have been appointed, under the Acts 5 & 6 Vict., c. 109, and 13 & 14 Vict., c. 20, stating whether as Superintendents of Lock-ups solely, or as Superintendents of Parish Constables, or as acting in both capacities, with the Pay and Allowances of each Superintendent Constable, and the Area and Population of the Petty Sessional Division to which he is appointed, together with the Total Expense incurred in the said Parts, for the Year ending January 1853.

Petty Sessional Division.	Whether Superintendent of Lock-up solely, or of Parish Constables, or both.	Pay and Allowances of each Superintendent Constable.	Area of District, in Acres.	Population.
Alford - - -	Both - - -	- - Annual salary of 120 <i>l.</i> , including the purchase and keep of a horse; 1 <i>s.</i> on serving each summons; 10 <i>s.</i> a day for attending as a witness at assizes or quarter sessions.	58,670	11,752
Barton - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	45,000	10,065
Brigg - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	72,370	12,405
Burton Stather - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	80,970	12,734
Epworth - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	50,590	13,111
Cainsburgh - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	55,710	15,830
Grimsby - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	66,450	12,713
Hornecastle - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	98,850	21,140
Lincoln - - -	- - Superintendent of parish constables.	- - The like, with an allowance of 10 <i>l.</i> per annum for house-rent.	98,100	14,520
Market Rasen - - -	Both - - -	- - Annual salary of 120 <i>l.</i> , including the purchase and keep of a horse; 1 <i>s.</i> on serving each summons; 10 <i>s.</i> a day for attending as a witness at assizes or quarter sessions.	57,230	9,206
Spilsby - - -	Both - - -	The like - - -	116,860	22,710
Wragby - - -	- - Superintendent of parish constables.	- - The like, with an allowance of 10 <i>l.</i> per annum for house-rent.	58,900	7,383
Binbroke, in the Market Rasen district.	- - Constable in charge of lock-up.	60 <i>l.</i> per annum.	-	-

*Note.*—The Population Returns of 1851 not being yet published, the population is given from the Census of 1841; if 10 per cent. is added to these figures, it is supposed a fair approximation to the population of 1851 will be attained.

TOTAL EXPENSE.

The Total Expense incurred by the Parts of *Lindsey*, for lock-up houses and superintendent constables, for the year ending January 1853, was 1,860*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.*

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Spilsby, }  
14 May 1853.

John H. Hollway,  
Clerk of the Peace for the Parts of *Lindsey*.

583. Can you state from that return the largest amount of population in any division in any district, under one superintendent constable?—The largest is Spilsby, which is 116,860 acres; the parishes vary very much.

584. Sir J. Trollope.] Is not Spilsby a thinly populated district?—Yes, it must be; there are 22,710 population.

585. Chairman.] Is that under one superintending constable?—That is under one superintending constable.

586. I presume he is a mounted officer?—Yes, he is a mounted officer; they each of them have a horse and cart.

587. Does the return of 1,800*l.*, which you have put in, include the expense of the horses?—Yes; they keep their own horses.

588. Do not you find the carts very useful?—Yes.

589. And they make the constables much more efficient?—Yes; when constables,

45

stables take parties who are reluctant to walk, the carts save the county some expense.

590. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Are the carts fitted up with proper security for the conveyance of prisoners?—Yes.

591. Is the conveyance of prisoners included in that expenditure?—When the superintending constable is not engaged in any other duty, he takes all the prisoners from the petty sessions which he attends off to gaol without any assistance whatever, or any expense to the county.

592. Have you ever had any escapes?—I do not recollect any; we had a determined sort of man taken last autumn; he was sent to gaol afterwards for a breach of the peace; he ran away from the petty sessions; as soon as the chief constable had bridled his horse he mounted and went after him, and being on horseback, he soon retook him.

593. Mr. *Phillips*.] What does a cart cost?—I should think about 20 *l*. There was one complaint made last winter in the neighbourhood of Caistor, of there being a good many depredations committed there; there were a good many sheep stolen, and the complaint was that the offenders were not apprehended quickly enough, or not looked after sufficiently. I do not know whose fault it was, whether it was the superintendent in that district or not; special constables were appointed for a time, and it was put down again. Caistor is one of the places where a lock-up will be made, and an additional constable appointed, if we go on upon this present plan. All I can say further about it is, that the advantages which already seem to arise from the plan are, that in the towns and places where the superintendents are stationed there is much more orderly behaviour than there was before; the beerhouses, alehouses, and vagrants' common lodging-houses, are better looked after; the peaceable and well-disposed inhabitants are protected and the bad characters are kept in check; indeed I can speak from my own knowledge with reference to Winterton, where many of the principal inhabitants have expressed their great satisfaction upon the appointment of the superintendent, and the different order of things since that has taken place. At one time in last year there was a complaint made of a great many depredations on the river Trent; some parties in boats committed depredations on each side of the river, to a large extent, upon the farmers. By putting the superintendents of the adjoining districts into communication with each other, three men of these parties were taken, and that put an end to it. I am only speaking as far as the system seems to have been serviceable to us. Our men were employed at Lincoln on the occasion of the large meetings which we had about two years ago, when there were about 7,000 people in the castle-yard, and the only police force were the superintending constables, with special constables under them. Last year there was a contested election, and that went off very well under the same police. After all it can only be said to be an experiment, but it is an experiment which we are desirous of carrying out to see whether it will answer. I do not pretend to say that it would be efficient in populous districts, but ours are only agricultural districts; and we are in great hopes that the system will be efficient if time be given for it to be carried out.

594. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Can you give the Committee any account of the comparative saving you have made upon the other system, under the 5 & 6 Vict. c. 109, as regards the salaries and payments to the chief constables?—We have made some saving in that respect by doing away with the chief constables. The only duty which the chief constables are legally entitled to be paid for is collecting the county rate.

595. *Chairman*.] To what did the whole cost amount under the old system of chief constables?—The chief constables, when I was first chairman, were paid by fees from parishes, which was totally illegal; that cost 1,500 *l*. a year; afterwards, when the new poor law came into operation, the auditors would not allow those accounts, and then the magistrates were obliged to pay them legally, and they paid them under the Act of Parliament for collecting the county rate; that amounted to 1,000 *l*. a year.

596. Mr. *Mackie*.] It was reduced from 1,500 *l*. to 1,000 *l*.?—When the parishes paid it was 1,500 *l*., and as soon as the magistrates paid it it was reduced to 1,000 *l*.

597. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You saved that 1,000 *l*. subsequently?—We saved 500 *l*. per annum subsequently, and shall save the rest as vacancies occur. We do not want them now, because the superintending police supply their places.

0.71.

F

598. In

Sir *R. Sheffield*,  
Bart.

27 May 1853.

Sir R. Sheffield,  
Bart.

27 May 1853.

598. In fact you are gradually increasing the credit to the county?—As far as 500 *l.* goes.

599. Are you aware that by the Act of Parliament the poor-law boards are only authorised to collect the rates where there is absolutely no chief constable at all; where both have died, or been removed?—I think it is so.

600. If both die you cannot fill up the vacancies?—Not for the purpose of collecting the county rate.

601. Then you have a considerable sum to set off against this system of constabulary?—Yes, and an increasing sum.

602. On the whole, is the system satisfactory to the district?—I have heard no complaints against it; I can only mention the complaints from Caistor and Barton, which I have before stated.

603. Have you not a superintending constable at Barton?—Yes.

604. And you are about to place one also at Caistor?—An application has been made for a lock-up and paid constable there.

605. Did you consider, when that is done, that the whole of the arrangements under this Act of Parliament will be complete, as far as you consider them necessary?—With two or three others, or a few additions.

606. And you think the whole expense will not exceed 2,500 *l.*?—That will cover the whole of the expense, as far as I can judge.

607. As regards the discipline of these superintending constables, have you any regulations beyond the reports to the petty sessions once a fortnight?—The regulations are contained in the paper which I have handed in to the Committee.

608. Do you find that a sufficient supervision is exercised over the men?—There is no head constable.

609. Do you consider that a defect in the system?—Yes; I think it might be desirable that there should be one still; I cannot speak with confidence about it; ours are all men of a certain age; good selected men, between 30 and 45; and I do not know whether they would work better under supervision than they do at present.

610. On the whole, are you satisfied with the system as it is?—Very well, so far as we have gone; we do not know what the result of the experiment will be with regard to crime; we expected it would increase at first, but we were in hopes it would diminish afterwards; certainly the country looks to the superintendents very much as protectors; they send to them directly if any offence is committed.

611. *Chairman.*] You think the feeling of the neighbourhood is in favour of the system?—From what I can judge I think it is; I think the ratepayers are anxious not to have any more expense put upon them.

612. You have stated that the magistrates resolved not to adopt the Rural Police Act, the 3d & 4th Victoria; was that chiefly on the ground of expense?—Yes, chiefly on the ground of expense.

613. Are your prisoners which are conveyed to gaol, all conveyed by these superintending constables?—No; they have directions to take the prisoners to gaol whenever they are not on any other duty.

614. When the superintending constables are on duty, are the prisoners conveyed to gaol by the parochial constables?—Yes.

615. Can you state to the Committee what the expense of conveying prisoners to gaol by the parochial constables is in your division of the county?—No; not the total annual sum.

616. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Have you a table of fees?—Yes.

617. *Chairman.*] What is the amount paid to the parish constables?—The superintending constables have not any pay for these services at all; it is included in their salary, and the whole of the costs for the conveyance of prisoners to gaol that we incur in the county is paid to the parish constables.

618. Can you state at all what is paid to the parochial constables in proceedings before justices?—No, I cannot do that; but there is a scale of allowances.

619. Can you state at all what is the expense paid to parish constables for serving summonses and warrants, which they do sometimes, I presume?—Yes; they serve some of the summonses and warrants, but I am not prepared to state the cost; it is all regulated by a scale.

620. Do your parochial constables attend the assizes and sessions?—They attend only when required as witnesses.

621. Are they paid for it?—Yes, according to the scale.

622. Are

47

Sir R. Sheffield,  
Bart.

27 May 1853.

622. Are you prepared to state what the cost of those parochial constables is for attending on those occasions?—No; there is a table of allowances.

623. Do your paid policemen summon the coroner's juries?—No, I think not.

624. You are not prepared to say what the payment of the parochial constables is under any one item whatever?—No, not as a whole annually; they are paid by the scale.

625. Then all the amount that is paid to the parochial constables for the purposes which I have mentioned to you, must be added to the expense of the 2,500 *l.* a year, whatever it may be?—Certainly.

626. Mr. *Sotheron*.] In other words, the 2,500 *l.* is paid in the county of Lincoln, in addition to the amount which was previously paid for the constabulary work?—No, it would save a part of it; the carts and horses which I have mentioned take a great many prisoners to gaol, for which service the parish constables would have been paid.

627. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Are the superintending constables allowed to receive anything?—Only 1 *s.* for serving summonses.

628. *Chairman*.] You give no reward to any paid constable for apprehending a felon?—No.

629. How is he paid for his attendance at the sessions?—He is paid 10 *s.* a day, let him be employed in as many or as few prosecutions as he may.

630. Do you mean to say that your constables are paid 10 *s.* a day for their attendance at the sessions?—The superintending constable has 10 *s.* as a witness.

631. Mr. *Sotheron*.] In addition to his ordinary salary?—Yes.

632. Mr. *Mackie*.] Is that included in the 2,500 *l.* a year?—No.

633. Where does that come from?—That will come in the expenses of the prosecution in which he is concerned, and is eventually paid by the Treasury.

634. Sir *J. Trollope*.] It is only for quarter sessions; is there anything allowed for petty sessions?—No.

635. Mr. *Mackie*.] Supposing a serious riot were to take place in the county of Lincoln, do you consider that your police force is sufficient to check it in the commencement?—We have not had any serious riot occur.

636. Have you had any riot?—No; it is a rural population.

637. Mr. *Phillips*.] Are your superintending constables appointed inspectors of weights and measures?—No; we have a separate inspector of weights and measures. I have a little memorandum in my pocket of the county rate for the parts of Lindsey for the last 20 years, though, perhaps, it is not exactly applicable to this inquiry. I first took this account down at the different annual inspections which were made into the county rate. I have taken down for every year, for the last 20 years, what the expense of the county rate has been. I began in 1833. In 1833, it was 16,616 *l.*; then it was thought heavy, and a finance committee was appointed to inspect the books. The next year it was reduced to 13,678 *l.* The reason of the first year being so high was that there were a great many county bridges repaired. In 1852 it was 16,229 *l.*, and deducting 3,987 *l.* received from the Treasury for prosecutions, &c., it leaves the county rate only 12,242 *l.*, including the expense of police and lock-ups.

638. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Therefore it is very nearly the same; it is less than 20 years ago?—If you make allowances for the expenses under the new Acts of Parliament for the establishment of police, and the inspection of weights and measures, you may put down about 3,000 *l.* less. If I take 3,330 *l.* from the 16,200 *l.* I bring it down less than it was 20 years before; but altogether our county rate is pretty much the same.

639. Do you know what the county rate is in the pound?—A farthing in the pound raises between 1,400 *l.* and 1,500 *l.*; I think the whole of the county rate is 2 *d.* in the pound.

640. If you had the Rural Police Act, the 3d & 4th Victoria, put into execution, it would more than double the county-rate, would it not?—It would, take it under the most favourable circumstances, taking the amount at 65 *l.* per man; we have a population of about 200,000, and if you take one to every 1,000 inhabitants it will increase our expenses to 13,000 *l.* for police.

641. Mr. *Howard*.] What effect has been produced upon vagrants by the appointment of superintending constables?—It has reduced the number of vagrants, but they are still numerous; there are one or two places where the vagrants are numerous; I do not attribute that to the want of police, so much as I do to there not being a vagrant ward at all the poor-law unions; it

Sir R. Sheffield,  
Bart.

27 May 1853.

is optional with the ratepayers whether they will have it or not; there is a disinclination to have a vagrant ward at one place I know, and the consequence is, that they are obliged to give some out-relief, although that is made as low as it can be made.

642. Sir J. Trollope.] Some of your union houses have not vagrant wards?—No.

643. Do you think that tends to encourage vagrancy in the district?—I have told them so over and over again.

644. Mr. Howard.] Do your police examine the lodging-houses?—They do; under the Act of Parliament they are paid for it separately by the parishes; I do not know the amount.

645. Mr. Phillips.] Have you any superannuation fund or retiring allowance for these men?—No.

646. Do you anticipate any difficulty in dealing with them when they become old and infirm?—We have not contemplated that.

647. Mr. Sotheron.] Has not every parish in this district at least one parish constable?—I think they have all two, and some more.

648. For all the services performed by those constables payment is made from the parish funds and not from the county, except only the allowances which they receive when they bring prisoners before the magistrates?—They are paid according to a scale; the losing party pays in many cases where a conviction takes place.

649. Have you any means of giving any information to the Committee as to the amount of money which is paid by the parishes in your district to their parish constables, either at this time or at any past time?—No.

650. Chairman.] Is not the amount to be received by the constables in cases of non-conviction generally settled by the parties with the constable out of court?—Yes; where a conviction does take place, then the expenses are included in the judgment.

651. Mr. Sotheron.] In making a comparison of the expense of your constabulary force, such as you describe it to be, with the expense of the paid police in the counties, in which it is established under the Act of 1839, ought you not to make a considerable allowance for sums not paid out of the county rate, but by the parishes to their parish constables?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the rural police to answer that question.

652. But in truth the 2,500*l.*, which you say will be the expense of your system when completed, is a sum in addition to, and exclusive of, whatever may be paid by the parishes to the parish constables?—Except as to taking prisoners to gaol.

653. Chairman.] Are all your officers appointed by the magistrates?—Yes, in quarter sessions.

654. Are the persons now holding the appointment of parochial constables generally small tradesmen, or industrious persons?—Yes; we have a number to select out of: we make some inquiries when we appoint them, and we take them in rotation, as far as we can.

655. Is it not an inconvenience to those persons to hold the office of constable?—Yes.

656. Is not their time money to them?—Yes.

657. Is not holding the office of parochial constable a money charge upon them?—Yes, certainly it is a loss to them; they are pretty well paid for their services, according to the scale of allowances.

658. Are they paid from other sources than those which you have described?—From no other sources.

659. Lord Lovaine.] Is not the parish constable open to local influences of every description?—Yes.

660. Mr. Sotheron.] With regard to the supervision of these constables, I think you said that there was no chief above them?—No; we have made a regulation now that we are to have a report once a year to the quarter sessions, from the magistrates of petty sessions, upon the conduct and behaviour of the superintendents.

661. Have you any other source to which you can look, except that which you have now mentioned, to enforce the attendance and attention on the part of these men to their duties?—No; we have always given notice that we desire to hear any complaints against them at quarter sessions.

662. Supposing one became lax in the discharge of his duty, and did not turn out

40  
 Sir R. Sheffield,  
 Bart.

27 May 1853.

out sharp in the performance of his duty, what could the magistrates do?—Nothing beyond the regulation we have made, calling upon the magistrates to report upon their exact behaviour for the last year. We have made a regulation now that the magistrates in petty sessions should send a return once a year to the quarter sessions of the behaviour, during the preceding year, of the superintending constable in that respect, whether he has been active and alert in the discharge of his duties.

663. Have not you said that you thought that it would be an improvement if you had a chief constable to keep control over the others?—I have a little doubt about it; I cannot come to a decided opinion upon the subject; these men are all chosen men, of between 30 and 45 years of age; they are well-conducted active men; and I doubt whether they would be better at that age under superintendence.

664. Although these men, while they are young men, just chosen, and up to their duty, may require no control, do not you think 10 years hence, for instance, it would be a desirable thing that there should be some person to keep them up to their work?—Probably it would be best to have one appointed as superintendent; I have no doubt of the description of men that we do employ being all picked men.

665. *Chairman.*] Is it any part of the parish constables' duty to patrol either by day or night, for the purpose either of preventing or detecting crime?—No direction has been given of that sort.

666. *Lord Lovaine.*] Legally, I apprehend such directions could hardly be given?—No, I think not.

667. *Chairman.*] Have you anything further to state to the Committee?—I may observe that we have built all these lock-up houses with the sanction of the Secretary of State.

668. How do you pay for the lock-up houses?—They have been paid for out of the county-rate.

669. Have you borrowed money at all for the purpose?—No.

670. *Sir J. Trollope.*] What has been the cost for each of the lock-up houses, on the average?—They vary; the general run of them have been built with a magistrates' room; they cost 1,200 *l.* in that case, some less, without that accommodation.

671. For the petty sessional divisions?—Yes.

672. *Chairman.*] The average is about 1,000 *l.* for each division?—Yes, as near as I recollect.

673. *Mr. Sotherton.*] Is the cost of the lock-up houses included in the sum you have given the Committee as the expense of the police force?—No; I have mentioned that in accounting for the county-rate.

Captain William Charles Harris, called in; and further Examined.

674. *Chairman.*] I THINK you stated, after your examination yesterday, that you wished to add something to your evidence, as to the efficiency of the county constabulary over the superintending constables, in following in pursuit of criminals?—I wish merely to mention one case which occurred in Hampshire, illustrating the advantages of a county constabulary over that of superintending constables. A poor man's house in the parish of Sherfield English was broken into during the absence of the family at church; the circumstance was reported to the superintendent of the Romsey division, who proceeded at daylight the next morning to examine the premises; and having found the tracks of several individuals, he made inquiries, and ascertained that four men and two women had been in the neighbourhood the day before. From inquiries, he was led to believe that they had taken the Salisbury road, and he tracked them through White-parish and Whaddon into Salisbury. From further inquiries he found that a party answering the description had slept in Salisbury the night previous, and were gone on the road to Wilton. Beyond Wilton he overtook the party, and, pulling up his horse, he waited until they came to a wall, when he drove alongside of them, and turning his horse's head sharp into the wall, directed the constable who was with him to jump out before, whilst he got out behind, thus enclosing the party between the cart and the wall. The party showed fight, but he knocked two of them down, and throwing their sticks over the wall, he handcuffed the four men, and made them and the women get into his cart, and thus

Captain  
 W. C. Harris.

671.

F 3

conveyed

Captain  
*W. C. Harris.*  
27 May 1853.

conveyed the whole back to Salisbury. All the stolen property was found in the possession of the persons apprehended. I merely mention this fact to show that whether a poor or a rich man is robbed, the county constabulary proceed at once to do their duty; whereas a superintending constable would have to stop to inquire who was to pay him his expenses. So it is with the borough police; they have no means of recovering their expenses if they are unsuccessful in pursuit; and thus many a zealous officer, who is anxious to discharge his duty, is deterred, by risk of losing his money, unless the prosecutor or person robbed is sufficiently wealthy to guarantee him his expenses.

675. You mean that the difficulty in following in pursuit in this case was from its being a poor man's house that had been robbed?—Yes; in the case I speak of, the man would not have been able to furnish the superintending or parish constable with the means of following in pursuit.

Captain *John B. B. M'Hardy*, R.N., called in; and Examined.

Captain *J. B. B.*  
*M'Hardy*, R.N.

676. *Chairman.*] ARE you Chief Constable of the county of Essex?—Yes.

677. How long have you been chief constable of the county of Essex?—Thirteen and a half years chief constable of Essex; I had been eight years inspecting commander of the Coast Guard in different parts of England previously to becoming the chief constable of Essex, which I deemed my apprenticeship, qualifying me for the chief constableness.

678. Will you state to the Committee the number of your force, its classification and grades?—Two hundred and two men, including myself and the deputy; 14 superintendents in three classes, 20 inspectors, and constables in three classes.

679. Do you consider that number calculated to insure efficiency?—I consider that it is calculated to insure the greatest amount of efficiency practicable under existing arrangements.

680. What do you mean by existing arrangements?—I mean that we have not a sufficient co-operation between the existing police forces, nor between the controlling authorities, and that better arrangements in this respect would be a great benefit, and would tend to a saving of expense.

681. Do you mean between the authorities in boroughs?—Yes; and imposing additional duties upon the police it would tend still more to lessen the gross expense, and thus would justify an increase in the numbers.

682. What do you consider, as a chief constable, to be the principal objects of the police force?—The prevention of crime, the detection of offenders, and the preservation of the public peace.

683. Have you directed your attention to the existing system of constabulary throughout Great Britain?—I have, ever since my connexion with the constabulary, making my leading object the producing of the required qualities at the least expense, expense being the instrument solely used by its opposers to render it unpopular; but I never knew a ratepayer in my experience who could state what the expense to him individually was.

684. *Lord Lovaine.*] Do you mean under the old system?—Under the present system; I never knew a person in any class of society who could tell me what he paid for the police.

685. *Chairman.*] What is your opinion of the fitness of the present system for the objects you have described?—I consider the present system requires a greater union of action, not only between the boroughs, but also between the counties; not only a greater union of action between the boroughs and the counties in which the boroughs are situated, but a greater union between the counties themselves.

686. Have any of the counties adjoining Essex adopted the police force?—On the establishment of our force none of the adjoining counties had adopted the Act, but the effect of an efficient constabulary in Essex obliged the adjoining counties, with the exception of Kent, that is, Suffolk, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire, most reluctantly to follow our example.

687. Are you aware of the causes which led to the adoption of the police in Cambridgeshire?—I believe it was not only from their being overrun with vagrants, but also the extraordinary number of fires, which I think have almost entirely ceased since the adoption of the police there. Kent not having been supplied with a constabulary, filled Essex with vagrants; they moved across from Kent by Grays in such numbers that there was a regular track. This circumstance led the Board of Guardians to give way to my struggle for years by allowing

allowing the police of the county to be appointed assistant relieving officers for casuals.

Captain J. B. B.  
M<sup>r</sup> Hardy, R. S.  
27 May 1833.

688. Was not that system adopted in consequence of the recommendation of Mr. Buller, at the time he was President of the Poor Law Board?—It was. I had recommended it for years myself, and they did it then reluctantly, and only partially. It effected a difference in one union in Essex, namely Chelmsford, in the first year of 5,000 and odd.

689. Do you mean vagrants?—Yes; the first year of the adoption of the police as assistant relieving officers for casuals made that difference.

690. Can you state the numbers relieved before, and the numbers afterwards, which will show the difference?—I can show it for one half year; the half year in 1849, while the police did the duty, there were 79 relieved, and in the half year previously 2,605; falling from 2,605 to 79.

691. Lord *Lovaine*.] Was not there a circular issued by Mr. Buller, enabling the Boards of Guardians to judge of the conditions of the vagrants, and not to relieve if they did not think them fit subjects for relief?—I have read that minute carefully, but I do not find that it armed the Boards with any authority which they did not possess before.

692. Did not Mr. Buller's circular recommend the enforcement of the authority which they possessed?—They had not the means of enforcing it without resorting to the police; if they had attempted to do so, and had refused those parties relief, who were mostly thieves and depredators, they would have met with great difficulty; the vagrants attempted it with us, and we had a great deal of difficulty in the commencement. It was a delicate duty, and required to be discharged with great caution, and very discreetly. Had one person died from want of relief, we should have been placed in a very uncomfortable position.

693. *Chairman*.] Do not you think the numbers were reduced from another reason; that the vagrants have a great objection to come at all into contact with the police?—The check was from a variety of causes; we have a regular form, and every vagrant is regularly entered, and almost his description taken, before he has relief given to him; and that prevents his return, particularly if he has committed any offence; therefore he does not come a second time.

694. Lord *Lovaine*.] Do you search the vagrants?—We discharge that part of the duty with delicacy; we are authorised to do so, but we thought the less offensively the police discharged the duty the better.

695. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Were not the vagrants subjected to some processes in the union houses, which were more disagreeable to them than anything you did to them?—I am not capable of judging; I should not have supposed so.

696. Did not they go through other processes in the union houses; were they not washed when they were admitted into the unions?—I have not the least idea.

697. *Chairman*.] Did not those processes apply to the 5,000?—Not that I am aware of.

698. Do not you suppose that they were subjected to all those regulations?—No.

699. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You do not know what occurred within the walls of the union?—No.

700. Do you attribute the diminution of vagrancy to the police regulations?—Entirely.

701. Were not other things which took place within the walls of the union as likely to diminish the number of vagrants as anything you could do to them, in the way of inspection?—Not knowing what applications were used in the union houses, I cannot say.

702. You say that you only searched them delicately; do you mean that you did not search them in all cases?—No; I attribute the diminution, principally, to their objection to coming in contact with the police. I do not believe there are 100 deserving characters worthy of relief out of the whole number, and with the examination they undergo, they see the possibility of being detected, or traced, if they have been guilty of some offence. These are imaginary causes; all I can speak of is the effect; the causes would be a mere matter of speculation.

703. Lord *Lovaine*.] You are not aware of any difference of treatment in the workhouse subsequently to your undertaking the charge of the vagrants?—No; if I were to give an opinion, I should say that I believe there is no change.

704. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Were the duties of your police who were appointed

o.71.

F 4

assistant

Captain J. B. B. assistant relieving officers, merely to examine those persons who applied for relief  
*McHardy, R. S.* at the unions?—That was an additional duty, and it also rendered them more  
 efficient in discharge of their police duties.

27 May 1853.

705. They do not stop vagrants who do not beg or demand relief?—No.

706. Their duties only relate to those who want to get into the union house?—I had tried stopping them, and had about 1,000 committed in three years; but it produced no effect, except to increase the magistrate's clerk's fees, and increasing the expense in gaol, and as it was an unsuccessful attempt, I thought it desirable to try something else.

707. *Chairman.*] What is the nearest union to Tilbury, when they cross from Kent?—Orsett; then they go down to Billericay, and then to Chelmsford; that was the principal route for vagrants.

708. I am speaking of the first union at which they would be relieved?—Orsett.

709. Can you state, previously to the appointment of the police as assistant relieving officers, what numbers were relieved at that union in one year coming from Kent?—In half a year the decrease on the total number was 1,678.

710. What was the gross number of vagrants relieved at Orsett previously to the police acting as relieving officers?—One thousand six hundred and ninety-four in the preceding year.

711. What was the number after the appointment of the police?—Sixteen.

712. Then the difference between 1,694 and 16 was thrown back upon the county of Kent, were there was no police?—That was my object; that was what I endeavoured to do.

713. You said that the counties of Cambridge, Herts and Suffolk, which are adjoining counties to Essex, had adopted the police?—Yes, they have adopted the police.

714. On the same system as yours?—The police of Cambridgeshire is exactly on the same system; each of the others is different.

715. *Mr. Marlie.*] At what dates were the police adopted in Essex and the adjoining counties?—In Essex, in February 1840; Suffolk followed, and Hertfordshire next.

716. In what year was the police adopted in Suffolk?—I am not positive; and lastly, Cambridgeshire about a year and half ago. I believe all those three counties were induced to adopt it from necessity, not voluntarily.

717. *Chairman.*] What was the necessity in Cambridgeshire?—The great number of fires and robberies; we rendered every assistance that we could. Our police bordering on Cambridgeshire, were continually acting in Cambridgeshire; and I believe that gradually reconciled the parties to having a police, from the services which they saw performed in their own county.

718. Did your police act in Cambridgeshire under any requisition from the magistrates?—I directed them to do so. Many of the magistrates on the borders of our county are magistrates for the adjoining counties. I felt it my duty, when these things occurred, to follow them up, as far as I could in self defence, because the bordering counties not having a police is a great disadvantage to our own county; they harbour robbers who commit depredations in our county, and then run out of it, and once out of the county the offender has every chance of escape, in consequence of our imperfect system of police. As a proof of that, I may mention that a farmer on the borders of the county told me that he was obliged to drive his sheep into Essex to feed them at night, previously to their having a police in Suffolk.

719. What is his name?—Mr. Viall.

720. *Mr. Burroughes.*] Were any police employed from the metropolis, or any other place in Cambridgeshire, previous to their adopting the constabulary?—I do not know. I think sending policemen to places where they have no local knowledge is very little benefit.

721. *Chairman.*] Is there a satisfactory system of mutual co-operation between the police in different counties and boroughs?—There certainly is not.

722. Do you think it is possible by any means to enforce a system of mutual co-operation?—I think if the spirit of the Act of Parliament under which we are acting at this moment were strictly carried out, it would be effected. There are certain sections in the Act of Parliament under which the county constabularies are established, which permit the boroughs to unite with the counties, but they are very jealous of doing so. I took very great pains to effect the object, but always failed.

The

Captain J. B. B.  
M'Hardy, R. S.

27 May 1853.

The want of combination is chiefly known in the boroughs, where they are incapable of keeping the peace themselves, and then they are glad to take our services.

723. Lord *Lovaine*.] Is there a great jealousy existing between the police of boroughs and the police of counties?—On both sides.

724. *Chairman*.] Do you think it would be remedied if the adoption of the police were made compulsory?—I think it would; the intention of the Act of Parliament was to leave it discretionary; the Act of Parliament under which we are acting not only permits the boroughs to unite with the counties, but enables the magistrates, if they think proper, to appoint one chief constable for two or three adjoining counties, which, if carried out, would tend to lessen the existing jealousy.

725. Supposing, by any system of legislation, boroughs under a population of 100,000, which now have a police of their own, were still left, in a certain degree, independent as to the management of their police, can you suggest any means by which co-operation might be insured under those circumstances between the county police and the police of those boroughs?—I think if sections 14 and 15 of the Act 3 & 4 Vict., cap. 88, were made imperative instead of discretionary, the object you refer to would be effected; and, with reference to remedying the want of union between the counties, I think that would be done if the intention of section 4 of the Act 2 & 3 Vict., cap. 93, were carried out.

726. What is the marginal note of that section?—"One or more chief constables of the county to be appointed, who may serve for more than one county." I would make that section compulsory which is now discretionary; I would propose, as a remedy for want of union between the counties, that England be divided into four districts; that there should be a general constabulary, and a chief officer as director, appointed and paid by Government for each district, with a responsible director-general; that would be carrying out the spirit of this 4th section, which is left discretionary with the magistrates; if I may go so far, I may say that I deem it an evil appointing two chief constables for one county; where counties are formed into two divisions for Parliamentary purposes, it is discretionary with the magistrates to have two chief constables instead of one, and I think it is productive of much evil because it increases the evil which arises from the want of union.

727. Mr. *Burroughes*.] I believe that is done in very few instances?—Suffolk has two chief constables, and Cambridgeshire has a separate one for the Isle of Ely; they are both small forces.

728. *Chairman*.] In speaking of four divisions, do you include Wales and Scotland?—No; I would have one for Wales, and two for Scotland.

729. And only two for England?—Four for England; north, south, east and west; Wales one, and Scotland two.

730. In proposing the appointment of these inspectors, am I to understand that you are not in favour of centralization in London?—Decidedly I am not in favour of entire centralization. I think, for numerous reasons, it would be anything but advisable; you would lose the great advantage of local supervision; for every police constable has several superintendents, particularly with the smaller ratepayers, who are ready to point out any irregularity.

731. Do you know of any instance of adjoining counties having been consolidated for police purposes?—No.

732. Is there any prospect of such a provision being carried out?—Certainly not, when counties avail themselves of the opportunity of dividing, as Cambridge and Suffolk have done.

733. You have mentioned the number of policemen in your force; are you enabled to train recruits thoroughly before entrusting them with the responsibility of their duties?—No, from the constant demand for constables.

734. By whom is that demand made?—By the public; it is an increasing demand; I generally pass them from the head-quarter station, where I reside myself, through those stations which are occupied by superintendents, which enables me to remove constables, to meet the demand, who do not so much need the eye of the superintendent.

735. From your experience, do you think that the police has become popular in Essex with the ratepayers?—Yes; those persons who were most opposed to it, and who took great pains to obstruct its progress, even after its introduction, are now its strongest supporters; and in some instances, when I am under the necessity of removing a constable from their immediate locality, they write to say that they cannot leave home comfortably unless I replace the constable.

o.71.

G

736. Do

Captain J. B. B.  
McHardy, R. N.

27 May 1853.

736. Do you think that a separation of the police forces leads to unnecessary expense?—Certainly.

737. Why do you think so?—From requiring a greater number of staff officers; the boroughs suffer most, in consequence of there being no prospect of advancement. When I am applied to to supply boroughs with recruits, or parties to fill up vacancies, my men give that as one of their principal reasons for objecting to go, even with the increased pay, and also there being no superannuation fund in most of the boroughs.

738. Have you any station houses, or strong rooms built?—We have station houses and strong rooms in every division of the county; there are three not quite complete; we have two in some divisions.

739. What do they generally cost?—They vary from 1,000*l.* to 2,000*l.* The head-quarter station, where I reside, cost 4,000*l.* and odd.

740. Does that include barracks for the men at the stations?—Yes; and I have been enabled to prove that they produce a greater interest than the capital invested, and paid for by the county.

741. Do you mean to say that there is a profit carried to the credit of the county?—Yes, equal to the interest paid by the county on the money borrowed, to be repaid in 20 years, thereby showing that the county derive advantages from becoming security for the property. I do not believe it to be possible to organise a creditable constabulary without stations, and that was the principal difficulty I had in organising the Essex constabulary, from the general belief that it was involving the county in a large expense.

742. Take the most expensive of the stations, the one at which you reside, which cost 4,000*l.*; I wish to ascertain from what sources the payments are made by which you pay the interest upon the cost of those buildings?—I have it here; but the most expensive station does not always produce the most revenue; it depends upon local circumstances; if you will permit me, I will give you the total sum invested in the stations, which is 18,325*l.*, borrowed in instalments; the rent during the last eight years upon those stations has amounted to 3,347*l.* 9*s.* 3*d.*; the cash received from Government for prisoners remanded amounts to 3,871*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.*, making a total of 7,219*l.* 8*s.* 9*d.*; whilst the interest paid during that period was 4,846*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

743. Lord Lovaine.] That item would hardly enter into the consideration, because the Government would equally have paid if the prisoners had been remanded to prisons?—The Government have been relieved, by the erection of the stations, of 2,179*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.* in mileage for conveying prisoners remanded to prison and back again before the magistrates during the last eight years; that is, the mileage would have been charged upon the Government in the specification for conveying remanded prisoners to gaol and back again before the remanding magistrates; therefore the Government is benefited to that amount by the erection of stations.

744. What I mean is, that you can hardly charge that in your account to the credit of the police stations, inasmuch as the same amount would have been paid by the Government for the confinement of those people in prisons?—No, it would not, because for the prisoners that are remanded there is no charge made in the gaol to the Government; one of the great advantages of the station is, that our physical force is improved by economizing the time of our men, without increasing them numerically. I would rather have 20 policemen less with stations, than 20 policemen more without the stations.

745. I am talking of it as a matter of money; you claim for the credit of the police certain sums which the Government pay for remanded prisoners?—I should not claim it under any other circumstances without the stations.

746. It would have gone into the county's pocket if these prisoners had been remanded into the county gaols instead of the police stations?—No, you would not only lose the money, but you would lose the time of the constables in travelling backwards and forwards over the county.

747. Would not it have been charged to the subsistence of the prisoners?—The subsistence of the prisoners is a different thing; this is for safe keeping; the subsistence is a trifling charge of a shilling for the 24 hours; it used to be 2*s.* 6*d.* when the old parish constables were established; I looked at all these expenses for the purpose of making a balance-sheet to meet the gross expense of the stations.

748. Those sums are paid for the safe custody of the prisoners in your stations?—Yes.

749. Chairman.]

Captain J. B. B.  
M. Hardy, R. N.

27 May 1853.

749. *Chairman.*] How many boroughs in Essex have separate police forces?—Four; Maldon, Harwich, Saffron Walden, and Colchester.

750. Are any of those boroughs consolidated with the county?—No, none.

751. How are the police in the boroughs appointed?—They are appointed, I believe, by the watch committee; but I have nothing to do with the boroughs, and have very little information about them; the watch committees are generally composed of individuals who are interested on different sides, and in different parties.

752. *Mr. Burroughes.*] Do not you think one reason why there is, what has been generally stated with reference to the boroughs, a jealousy and an indisposition to place themselves under a consolidated constabulary, is losing the appointments in the police?—They object to losing the appointments in the police; their police are very inefficient in many cases; I could read letters to the Committee attributing the safe keeping of the peace at Colchester and Harwich, at the time of the elections, entirely to the county police; I consider the certainty of having the police of the county as a reserve upon which to fall back in times of difficulty is one of the reasons why the boroughs have not joined with us; if they had not had our force at their disposal in times of difficulty, I think they would have joined with us.

753. *Chairman.*] Do you know the description and the number of police officers which there are in the boroughs in your county?—Colchester has 11 and Harwich has four.

754. Do you know Colchester well?—Yes.

755. Supposing Colchester were consolidated with the county, what number would be sufficient, in your opinion?—I should say 15 would be sufficient, from the union of action giving them the benefit of the county police in times of difficulty. When they last required me to come and keep the peace they wished me to come with 60, and I told them I would not come with less than 100.

756. Do you think that the ends of public justice are frustrated by the existence of separate jurisdictions?—Yes.

757. In what way?—From the want of co-operation more particularly; our constables have no authority in the boroughs, whilst the borough constables have authority in our county; showing how advisable it is that the county constables should have authority in the boroughs, if it be necessary that the borough constables should have authority in the county.

758. Are any of the boroughs in Essex known as the resort of offenders?—The boroughs are always the places of rendezvous for the principal offenders, and they require a large force in the neighbourhood, and therefore cause the county to pay for protecting the boroughs.

759. Has your constabulary force been requested to act at any time, in any borough within your county, for the preservation of the peace, or on any other emergency?—Yes.

760. When was that?—Principally at the last election; the authorities attributed the keeping of the peace and the legal termination of the elections to the assistance of the county constabulary.

761. What number of men did you send?—I took one hundred and twenty to Colchester, and I did not find that I had one man too much. My object is always to have a sufficient force to prevent parties being tempted to a breach of the peace.

762. Had the men extra pay from the borough?—They were paid merely their expenses of going; the county paid them their usual weekly pay, but as this was a special service, and the men were put to expense, they were paid 2 s. a day, and 1 s. a night, to cover their expenses.

763. What are the constables paid for attending quarter sessions?—Two shillings a day and 1 s. a night. My object is to guard against the police officers profiting in any way by crime; one of the greatest evils which can exist in a system of constabulary is to permit any member of it to have an interest in crime; my object is to confine his interests solely to the prevention of crime.

764. Then you think, if at any place, in any police force, the system is to give a reward for catching a thief, that is objectionable?—Decidedly, because it is an encouragement to the men to have an interest in crime; my rule ever has been never to give a reward; excepting a man risks his life, under no circumstances do I give a reward.

765. Do not you think, under the old system, the parochial constables must have had an interest in the increase of crime?—That is the principal evil of the

0.71.

G 2

parochial

Captain J. B. B.  
McHardy, R.N.

27 May 1853.

parochial constable system ; there are many other evils, but that is particularly the evil of any system which does not remove an interest in crime ; I think a great recommendation of the county constabulary is, that the poor man is protected, and the same interest is taken to follow up any injury he may receive as in the case of the rich man ; whereas, in the other system, unless the party can produce the funds the parochial officer will not follow up the case, and it cannot be expected that he should at his own expense.

766. In anticipation of any disturbance in the boroughs, what system has generally been adopted for the prevention of those disturbances :—Generally they have sworn in special constables ; they have written to me since we have had the county police ; the special constables are little more than useless, and that was my reason for giving the boroughs the assistance of the county constabulary ; I think the special constables are useless on such occasions for many reasons.

767. Do you know any cases in which they have been found so ?—I never swore them in but once, and that was to prevent their tending to disorder during the Chartist meetings. I thought it advisable to swear those men in, because then I had them under my immediate supervision.

768. Have you ever tried the system of parochial constables, under superintending constables ?—I have, under much greater advantages than under the Act of Parliament by which the superintending constables were appointed ; upon my appointment to my present office, I pointed out to the magistrates that it would be very desirable to ascertain whether parochial constables could be rendered effective if they were properly paid, because it was said that the only difficulty in procuring the article was money. Upon the amended Act passing, which provided that the parochial constabulary were to be paid according to the opinion of the court of quarter sessions, I recommended the magistrates of Essex to establish a very liberal scale of fees indeed, which they did. Perhaps the Committee will allow me to put in this Report—(*the Witness delivered in "Report of the Chief Constable to the Magistrates of the County of Essex, in Quarter Sessions assembled, April 5th, 1842."*) Under that Act of Parliament, with great pains and with the assistance of the parochial officers, clergy, and gentry, I supplied for Essex 600 local constables, of the best material that could be found, but the difficulty being to induce a superior class of persons to act as local constables, the office having got into disrepute, I induced several of the leading yeomen to become local constables. There are advantages in establishing the parochial constable system under the name of local constables, under our Act, which do not exist under the Parochial Act ; the difference is, that under our Act no parochial officer could submit a list of constables to the magistrates in special session, which is done by the chief constable. Practically, there is no difference, except in the party submitting the list ; but the advantage of the system under our Act over the other is, that there is a central power in the chief constable, and the superintendents are amenable to that chief constable ; whereas under the other Act they are all appointed by the same authority, and consequently there is no centre ; and even if the proposed Act were passed for appointing a chief constable, that chief constable, in counties, would be without any power ; he would not have the appointment of the subordinates and superintendents ; it is totally impossible that that can act well ; I took the liberty of recommending to Mr. Deedes the appointment of the chief constable under our Act, as more likely to produce a sound state of things, by the union of the two Acts of Parliament, although I do not think this is at all practicable.

vide Appendix.

769. Have you any constables at the head-quarters to fill up vacancies :—We cannot afford it. I move the constables so as to bring the inferior constables under my eye and superintendence ; the men distributed are the better men, and the men in whom I have most confidence.

770. You say the boroughs are unwilling to adopt your police ; do you think they rely upon the assistance of the military in cases of disturbance ?—Particularly, which I think is a dangerous thing to trust to, more particularly from the military acting only in a body, and the constabulary acting disjointedly, that is singly, or two or three together, as well as in a body.

771. Are the police in Essex trained to arms ?—No, I would not do so, for fear of rendering the force unpopular.

772. Are the police required to assist the coast guard in the prevention of smuggling ?—I endeavoured to get them armed with the necessary powers, under the 33d section of the Custom House Act. I did not succeed until I put in evidence that

Captain J. B. B.  
M<sup>r</sup> Hardy, v. s.  
27 May 1853.

that we fell in with waggons laden with contraband goods; subsequently 200 policemen were armed with the power, and with the result I had anticipated. As I told the Board of Customs, on their having that power, we should never see a contraband article. One of my objects for urging it particularly was, that the Government was paying 9,000 *l.* for 127 men upon the coast of Essex, and if the county of Essex could give them a force of 200 men without cost, they might ultimately have a claim for a part of the expenses of the constabulary.

773. I want to know, generally speaking, the result of the experiment which you tried of having local constables under superintendents?—We had 15 superintendents to give the experiment a fair trial, because I was anxious for my own credit's sake to produce the greatest protection at the least expense. I told the magistrates that the prospects of success would be much improved if they would give 20 inspectors to assist the superintendents in carrying on their duty.

774. Did the magistrates do so?—They did; I wished to give it a fair trial; and therefore we had a large body of officers.

775. Did the experiment fail?—It did; the magistrates were satisfied that every thing had been done, and they augmented the rural police force.

776. They gave up the appointment of local constables?—They were never afterwards sworn in; but I should have felt it imperative upon me to have complied with the Act of Parliament had not the Parish Constables Act subsequently passed.

777. What other supplementary duties do your police perform in Essex beyond the maintenance of the peace?—The inspection of weights and measures; that was a duty which was unsatisfactorily performed at much expense, and, on my representation to the magistrates, they transferred the duty to the police; that has produced an annual saving of 562 *l.* 10 *s.* during the last eight years, which is one of the items I take credit for as a set-off against the gross expense of the county constabulary.

778. Have they performed any other duties?—Yes; besides the relief of vagrants, and assisting the revenue officers, they act as inspectors of nuisances and common lodging-houses, under some of the local Boards of Health.

779. Mr. *Burroughes.*] Did you adopt the inspection of weights and measures by the police from the commencement?—No; on the introduction of the police the system was new, and I thought we had better supersede those local employments gradually; there are many duties which the police might do exclusively of those which they perform in Essex, and which, I hope, they will be permitted to do in addition.

780. *Chairman.*] You mention those additional duties?—I am satisfied, from my experience, that the police might collect all the rates and taxes, and, from the extension just now of the post-office establishment, that all the letter carrying might be conducted by the police in patrolling; and by passing them from the different parishes, you might almost have a post-office in every parish; those duties would then be performed by trusty characters, and it is very difficult in the country to get such characters to perform the duty of moving the letters about and delivering them.

781. Are there any other duties which you would suggest should be performed by the police beyond what you have named?—I have turned my attention to the subject a good deal, and I have considered that the police might undertake the inspection of the highways; I was anxious to take the turnpikes, but there was a feeling against the turnpikes; in my opinion, nothing more is wanting to make the Highway Act perfect than that suggestion being put in motion; I think the police being employed as road surveyors would render the present Act perfect, and remove the present difficulty upon that subject, by an extension of the Highway Act, and the consequent abolition of the turnpike gates, with all their attendant expenses.

782. Do you think it would be possible to employ them as road surveyors?—I do.

783. Mr. *Rich.*] Do you think that would afford them additional means of detecting vagrants?—Yes; my idea is, that the more you can employ a local policeman the more efficient he is; all the persons upon the roads, if you had an efficient system, might be special constables, to act with what I may call the more intelligent constables; every member of the police force must be not only a man of high physical power, but he ought also to have great mental qualities and mental qualifications. I do not mean to expect that a special constable would have those

Captain J. B. B.  
M'Hardy, K. S.  
27 May 1853.

qualities, but he would be able to act in conjunction with and under the guidance of the intelligent constables. I also think if a national constabulary were established it might be made the nucleus of a very valuable defensive force. I would take care to keep all those arrangements under the local authorities. I do not think it practicable to carry this out without keeping the constabulary establishment strictly local, excepting in so far as would be necessary to secure complete efficiency and uniformity of system.

784. *Chairman.*] Do you think a night patrol is necessary for the prevention of crime?—I think prevention of crime cannot be effected without a night patrol, and without this all other establishments are merely detectives, who have an interest in offences being committed rather than prevented.

785. Are you able to carry out a night patrol with the force you have at present?—We are, but not in so perfect a manner as if we had more men.

786. Is your force employed at all in any way, directly or indirectly, for the preservation of game?—By law they have no power, and however great an advantage might be derived by our exercising a power with which we are not armed, I never permit it, and therefore the police never exercise any authority with which they are not armed; even in bringing offenders to justice I never countenance any act but what the law justifies, however favourable the result might be.

787. *Mr. Rich.*] In the event of a riot, or a collision between gamekeepers and poachers, would not the police interfere?—That is a case where parties have assembled for an illegal purpose. I merely confine my observations to the fact, that the law arms us with no powers for the protection of game. If parties assemble for a breach of the peace, then it becomes the duty of the peace officer to exercise his authority.

788. *Chairman.*] Do you think the escape of criminals is facilitated by the uncertainty of detection?—Yes; because thieves calculate, like smugglers, upon the chances of escape before they commit the offence, and inasmuch as a smuggler is prevented by an efficient protection of the public revenue, so is a thief by the existence of an efficient police.

789. Do you think the appointment of a general and efficient system of police would tend to shorten the criminal career of offenders?—Yes, I think it would undoubtedly have this effect; because detection would more certainly and speedily follow the offence. I would notice here that the criminal returns do not supply a satisfactory index to the actual state of crime, inasmuch as they only show the number of persons apprehended, and consequently the establishment of a national constabulary would cause an apparent increase; and this would be only temporary.

790. Is the escape of criminals facilitated under magistrates' warrants, from the inconvenience of having the warrants backed?—I believe it is, to some extent, but most of our magistrates are also magistrates for the adjoining county, and they were induced to become so from being aware of the inconvenience and of the delay arising from the necessity of backing warrants.

791. Are you of opinion that the establishment of a national constabulary on a more uniform system is practicable, and would be nationally beneficial?—I think it would be the greatest blessing that could be conferred upon the country. I do not say so hastily, for I have given it my closest attention; I am satisfied there is no other means to be adopted. From the inquiry I have made of the superintendents, appointed under the Parochial Constables Act, I have never heard anything favourable of it; my opinion was asked prior to its being established, and I unhesitatingly said it would be the most inefficient and the most expensive mode that could be adopted; but as it was popular, I thought the opinion of the public should be respected.

792. I think you have said that you would give no rewards to constables for detecting offences?—No, nor for attending at fires; it is against my rule to give a reward under any circumstances, except where a man risks his life.

793. You think such a course objectionable?—It operates objectionably in every sense of the word. I think the predominant evil in the different police establishments is giving the members of the establishment an interest in crime; it is the thing most to be guarded against in every arrangement.

794. *Lord Lovaine.*] Do you mean to say that you do not allow your constables to accept any reward which may be offered for capturing an offender?—By the regulations they can receive no reward without my permission. Now and then,  
but

Captain J. B. B.  
M'Hara, R. S.

27 May 1853.

but very rarely, parties do offer small rewards. One of the great difficulties I find in our constabulary system is caused by the defect in our criminal code of having no public prosecutor; we find a great difficulty from this defect, because few people will prosecute if they can avoid it.

795. Have you found that there is any great diminution in the cases of ordinary violence and petty assaults?—There has been a very great reduction in most of those cases. The establishment of a permanent and perfect police force in Essex has been a great check to sheep-stealing; in two divisions out of 14 in the county of Essex 140 sheep were stolen the year previously to the establishment of the police; that number has never been taken in the whole county subsequently.

796. Do you think that any modification of your system could be adapted to the wild districts of counties which are thinly inhabited, where the distances are too large for the men to travel over except on horseback, and the districts too thinly inhabited for much crime to go on in them, but in which there might be places for the concealment of stolen goods, and so on?—The principle upon which policemen are distributed over a county is, that the county is separated into divisions; the divisions into detachments, and those detachments are subdivided into guards or beats; in dividing them, it requires a local knowledge; a place thinly inhabited would not have anything like the number of men that there would be in a place thickly inhabited; those places would be inspected during the day, to guard against the practices which your Lordship refers to. A horse patrol is most inefficient in the detection of crime; the very noise of a horse's feet upon the road will disturb a depredator, and he will conceal himself; it is a beacon for him to avoid, and I would never recommend the introduction of a horse patrol, except for supervision.

797. My question was put with reference to the county I represent, which is Northumberland; that is now under the Superintending Constables Act; it is a district in which for 15 miles together you will hardly find a cottage, but, nevertheless, upon the farmers a considerable amount of depredation in the way of sheep-stealing has gone on hitherto; I wish to ascertain whether, with any modification of your system, you could meet the necessities of such a situation without incurring a very great expense?—If it was under my supervision, I should erect a building in the centre of it, and let one or two men who occupied the centre traverse the district in opposite directions; they would surround the spots referred to by your Lordship, each man going half way round the circle; they would cover it both ways by one or two men coming from the centre to both sides; if they went their rounds at 10 o'clock at night and two o'clock in the morning, that would insure their passing over the ground; those are local arrangements that must be left to the parties.

798. You will observe, that in Northumberland the distances are so enormous, that it is impossible for the men to patrol them unless on horseback?—The only thing which I should suggest would be, that a party should be located as near the centre of the place as possible; I do not suppose it is more than 15 miles.

799. Suppose it is a district of 50 miles?—The only way to protect that is to occupy it by different parties; thieves do not occupy it; they would possibly be in the parts thickly inhabited, and by watching the resort for depredators you would prevent the commission of offences.

800. Are you of opinion that there is any use in swearing in common constables in counties where there is a rural police?—No. I have had experience many years as inspecting commander of the coast guard, and what I saw in that capacity led me to believe that I was preparing to fill the office which I now hold; on the coast the common constables could not be sworn as assistants, and I have never seen an instance of special constables being of any avail.

801. Are not the common constables still retained in some counties, though they are not allowed to act?—Yes; the ordinary parish constables are still appointed in all counties, and cause considerable expense by performing petty duties which might be easily and much better performed by the police.

802. Is there any additional protection to the public from the existence of common constables?—I have no hesitation in saying no; I say it without prejudice.

803. With regard to the boroughs, is there any possibility of amalgamating the forces without taking away altogether the power of the inhabitants to appoint their own police?—I do not speak hastily upon the subject, for I have fully considered it; I am satisfied, whilst you leave the appointment of constables in the

0.71.

G 4

local

Captain J. B. B.  
*Mr. Hardy, R. S.*  
 ---  
 27 May 1853.

local authorities in boroughs, you never can render the force efficient; there are clauses in Act 3 & 4 Vict., c. 88, which make provision for your doing so. I always have said to our magistrates, should the boroughs wish to unite their force with the county, I trust you will never consent, except upon their placing themselves in the same position as that in which the magistrates of the county have placed themselves; that is, by leaving the subordinate appointments to the chief constable.

804. Mr. *Rich.*] Would you object to giving the authorities in the boroughs a voice in the election of the chief constable for the county?—That is a thing upon which I am unprepared to give an opinion. I should consider that the large proportion which the magistrates bear to the authorities of the boroughs would guard against the evils which I inwardly apprehend.

805. Might not an objection justly exist on the part of the boroughs if they had no voice in the management of the police, and if it were entirely absorbed by the county, and if the boroughs had a concurrent voice in the election of the chief constable with the magistrates, that jealousy might be done away with?—That is a subject for your consideration; if there were an equal number of controlling parties in the boroughs and an equal number of county magistrates, I should think it was very injurious, but if the magistrates had a safeguard by having a predominant number I should think it worthy of consideration.

806. Have you many fires in Essex?—No, we have but few compared with what we had.

807. When you were appointed there were more than there are at present?—Much more.

808. In what part of Essex do the fires occur?—The recent fires have been about Hallingbury, not far from Bishop's Stortford. I find great reluctance on the part of the insurance offices to take any steps, to detect incendiaries.

809. You think there should be a public prosecutor?—I think a public prosecutor is indispensably necessary, for the purpose of carrying out our criminal code; nothing calls more for interference and immediate remedy than the expenses attending the conducting of prosecutions.

810. Mr. *Phillips.*] What is the total expense of the police in Essex?—The total expense was 16,000*l.* in the year 1852.

811. Do you know what that is in the pound in Essex?—A penny rate raises 6,125*l.* 9*s.*; therefore it is a little more than 2*d.* I wish you to understand that we have a great set-off.

812. Sir *J. Trollope.*] What is the total amount of the set-off, from allowances from Government, and other sources?—I will put in this return of the heads under which the different savings and earnings are effected; they amount to 15,805*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.* In a report, dated October 1850, I used these words: "And I am satisfied that this court will readily acknowledge, although there may be in the minds of a few a difference of opinion on some of the items now submitted, that the Essex constabulary does not actually cost the county one-third of its apparent expense."—(*The Witness delivered in "Report of the Chief Constable to the Magistrates of the County of Essex, in Quarter Sessions assembled, 15th October 1850."*)

*Vide Appendix.*

813. Mr. *Howard.*] Do you think there is anything peculiar in the habits of the people of Essex, with reference to smuggling, which renders a larger force necessary than in any other counties?—I do not think the revenue force in Essex is equal to that in Sussex and Kent, as to the distance occupied. I think there is a difficulty in connecting the Essex coast, from its irregularity; where there is a straight coast you are enabled to link the patrols together, but you cannot link the patrols where the coast is intersected by rivers, as in Essex.

814. May not the result of that be the introduction of lawless habits among the people?—I do not know.

815. Mr. *Rich.*] Do you think the establishment of electric telegraphs would tend to the efficiency of the police force?—If you ultimately carried the electric telegraph to all the different superintendents' stations, you might, of course, communicate an offence of importance to them, and then, by carrying it to the head quarters of the chief constable, you may telegraph to those points; you would be able to circulate information by that means; the information would get before the depredator. Those are points of detail to be left to subsequent arrangement.

816. Is the feeling of the majority of the people of Essex kindly or not towards

Capt. J. B. D.  
M<sup>r</sup> Hardy, R.N.

27 May 1853.

towards the police, in your opinion?—Particularly so; there was a great feeling at first against it, but I think that has quite subsided.

817. Lord *Lovaine*.] When you spoke of your police becoming surveyors of roads, I presume you only intended that they should report upon the state of the roads in the districts which they patrol?—I intend that they should see the duties carried out, because in the discharge of their other duties they must be upon the roads; they could give it proper supervision, and they could have the advantage of all the constables under their superintendence in explaining where water-courses are stopped, or where there has been any breach of the Highway Act. An individual acting for that purpose, except a member of the police force, would not have that assistance and co-operation; that is the principal reason why I recommend the members of the police doing it.

818. Sir *J. Anderson*.] Do you know what the police rate is in the borough of Colchester, for instance?—I do not; I think it is worth mentioning, that at Maldon, at the last election, from the want of proper peace officers, there were a number of boxers brought from London to protect one party, whilst the gipsies protected the other; I mention that to show the want of peace officers.

819. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Is there not a police force at Maldon?—One man; they wrote to me to nominate a man I could recommend, but our men would not accept borough employment.

*Maurice Swabey*, Esq., called in; and Examined.

820. *Chairman*.] ARE you a Magistrate for Buckinghamshire?—Yes.

821. And also for Surrey and Middlesex?—Yes.

822. Were you formerly a police magistrate?—I was for 11 years.

823. Where do you reside now?—Langley Marish, in Buckinghamshire.

824. What is the system of police in Buckinghamshire?—There are 10 superintending constables, and no system at all; they do exactly as they please; there are magistrates in different parts of the county with different views; there is no one system.

825. Is the whole of the county under superintending constables?—Yes, 10 in number.

826. How many divisions are there?—For police purposes, 10 divisions.

827. For magisterial purposes, how many are there?—A great many more; in many hundreds there are petty sessions held legitimately, according to acknowledged divisions, of hundreds and half hundreds, and in others they are held as a matter of convenience, and not properly held, according to my opinion.

828. You mean that the county has been divided, for police purposes, into 10 divisions?—Only 10 divisions.

829. Is there a superintendent for each of those divisions?—Yes.

830. Are they mounted police?—They have a horse and cart.

831. Do you know what they are paid?—I think they are paid about 90*l.* a year.

832. Have they to keep their horse and cart?—I think they are allowed for that; I am not quite certain.

833. Are the parochial constables entirely under their direction?—Yes; but in almost every parish there is a man paid two or three or four or five pounds a year; other men are sworn in, but they never do anything.

834. You mean that every parish has a paid constable besides the superintending constable?—Yes, a great many parishes; the larger ones chiefly.

835. Is that paid constable paid for the whole of his time, or only for a part of his time?—He is paid a sort of a retaining fee; he is to be at the call of any of the inhabitants who want him. We do not see these men for months and months at the magistrates' meetings, and I do not consider them of any use adequate to the money they receive.

836. From your experience as a police magistrate and as a magistrate for a great many years in Buckinghamshire, do you think that the parochial constables are of any use?—Not the slightest; we could do quite as well without them.

837. Do you think they are to be depended upon for the control of public-houses, or beershops?—Not in the slightest degree.

838. Do you think vagrancy has been much checked by the appointment of those superintending constables?—I think it has had that effect in some degree, and very much more where they have sworn in the superintending constables as

0.71.

II

assistant

*M. Swabey, Esq.*  
27 May 1853.

assistant relieving officers for that purpose; the vagrants are afraid of going near them, and that certainly has had a good effect; it lessens the number of vagrants' applications at the union houses.

839. Was not that done under the recommendation of the Poor Law Board?—Yes; and it has had a very good effect.

840. Has the adoption of the rural police ever been proposed in Buckinghamshire?—It was proposed about 10 or 12 years ago by Sir William Young, who was one of the members for Buckinghamshire, and myself; we took a great deal of pains, and the expense seemed to be the objection; we were in a decided minority at the sessions.

841. Do you think it was opposed on the ground of expense alone?—Expense was the principal ground of opposition; there might have been a little admixture of politics, but I think I may say generally it was on the ground of expense it was rejected; that was the avowed ground.

842. Do you think it would be desirable to have a more general system of police in Buckinghamshire?—I think so.

843. Do you suffer from your contiguity to places which have a police force, to which the Metropolitan police extends?—Yes; there is the borough of Windsor, which is in Berkshire; and there is Uxbridge; the vagrants get driven out from Uxbridge into Buckinghamshire, and we have no means of coping with them; the borough of Windsor sends hundreds into our county; the river Thames merely divides the two counties; it is a great expense to the county, independently of police matters, in the numbers we have to relieve; at Windsor they point our union house out to them, and they say there is a union house where they will relieve you; they never relieve anybody in Windsor; they can see our union house, and their own happens to be further distant, in the part of the county called Old Windsor.

844. From your experience as a police magistrate, do you think that vagrancy is a great source of crime?—I have no doubt about it; they begin by being vagrants, and they end by becoming thieves.

845. Are not the majority of vagrants thieves?—I cannot say that; I have experience enough to say that I think, very probably, they are. In my opinion, the want of a public prosecutor is a very great denial of justice; I am aware that there is an objection to increase new appointments, but the subject occurred to me when I was speaking to one of the Honourable Members for Lancaster this morning, and his view was, that the appointment should not be given to the Government of the day, but should rest with the Judges in the Court of Queen's Bench, which I approve of.

846. As far as your experiences goes, the system of superintendence does not render the parochial constables more efficient?—I think not; I think we are not much better off, having the superintendents, than we were without them; there is a want of co-operation; there is a jealousy among many of those people; there is no avowed head. I think the system has hardly had a fair trial as it is carried on in Buckinghamshire.

847. Mr. Rich.] You have said that the vagrants are driven out of Windsor and Uxbridge into Buckinghamshire; that the magistrates rejected the proposition for having a police force in the county, on account of their fear of the expenses; do you think subsequent experience has modified that opinion on the part of the magistrates?—I think on the part of a great number of individuals it has; I have my doubts whether the sessions would listen to it; they would use this argument: "We have gone to a considerable expense since that time by having paid superintendents, and we have established a system, we have a system that we had not then;" that would be the answer that would be urged against the more expensive system.

848. Do you think, on the whole, the resistance to the adoption of a police force would be less strong now than it was 10 years ago?—I am fearful it would be resisted; there are a great number of causes which would operate upon the minds of individuals.

849. Do you hear complaints from parties of small depredations on their property?—No, I do not. The farmers are very careless and very negligent about their property. There is one thing I will take the liberty of mentioning with reference to farmers; the farmers do not care about fires; they are no losers, for they get the best market price for their corn; and instead of old and bad barns, they

they have new ones built at the expense of the insurance offices. The insurance offices have been extremely liberal, and have given the farmers the best price for their corn, even though the corn might not have been sold at that price; the farmers do not look much after fires.

850. Are fires frequent?—In the northern part, about Newport Pagnell and Olney, I have had conversations with the magistrates, and they complain very much of the want of co-operation.

851. Mr. *Howard*.] Is there a chief constable amongst those superintending constables?—No, there is not; that is one thing of which I complain.

852. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Is there a lock-up built in each district?—There may be in as many as eight out of ten.

853. Is it proposed to have one in each district?—They propose doing so. I need not tell the Honourable Members of the Committee, many of whom are country gentlemen, the local feelings in one division unless they have as much public money laid out upon them as another. The case is seldom met upon its own merits. There are a hundred reasons why we do not advance under the present system.

854. You have stated that the quarter sessions would not entertain any project for altering it?—I fear not. I do not think it will be brought forward, from what I see at present.

855. What is the feeling amongst the ratepayers of Buckinghamshire: are they satisfied with the present protection to their property, or do they desire it to be more extended?—I do not hear any complaints.

856. Their property is protected as much as they require?—Yes, it should seem so.

857. Do you think, under the system in Buckinghamshire, detection follows crime, or the contrary?—I hardly know how to answer that question; a great many crimes are not detected, but that is not the fault of the police; there is a great unwillingness to prosecute.

858. Do you find that is general?—I think it is general throughout the whole country, that people would rather suffer the loss than be at the trouble of going to the county town.

859. At your sessions and assizes, are not your prosecutors' expenses allowed?—Yes, the same as they are in other counties; but there are many expenses that they do not cover.

860. Mr. *Phillips*.] You say that you are a magistrate of Surrey and Middlesex; have you any local acquaintance with those counties?—Very little; I have a small property in Surrey.

861. They have a police in Surrey, have they not?—Yes.

862. Can you speak to the comparative state of a county with a police, and of yours without a police?—No; I should be more able to compare Oxfordshire with Buckinghamshire; I am not intimately acquainted with Oxfordshire; they have constables in Thame, who drive the vagrants into Buckinghamshire.

863. *Chairman*.] You think, generally speaking, the counties where there is a police drive the vagrants into the surrounding districts which have no police?—Very much so; it is part of their instructions to get rid of them.

864. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do you wish that the Rural Police Act should be introduced in its entire force in the county of Bucks?—It would be my wish.

865. Do you think it would tend to the benefit and protection of personal property?—I think it would knock up a great number of separate systems.

866. Is it not under one system now, the 5th & 6th of Victoria, cap. 109?—It is extremely disjointed; we seem to change every six months.

867. Have you any municipal towns within the county of Bucks which have a town police, for instance, Amersham or Aylesbury?—Wycombe has a small police, so has Buckingham, being borough towns; Aylesbury an inadequate one.

*Jovis, 2<sup>o</sup> die Junii, 1853.*

## MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Rice.  
Sir John Trollope.  
Lord Lovaine.  
Mr. Mackie.

Mr. Burroughes.  
Sir James Anderson.  
Mr. Moody.

EDWARD ROYDS RICE, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

*James Parker, Esq., called in; and Examined.*

*J. Parker, Esq.*  
*3 June 1853.*

868. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Great Baddow, in Essex; I carry on business as a Solicitor in Chelmsford and in London.

869. Was your father clerk of the peace for the county of Essex?—Yes.

870. For how many years did he hold that office?—He was about 25 years clerk of the peace for the county of Essex.

871. Were you associated with him during any part of that period?—I was, for 20 years.

872. Were you the clerk of indictments?—I was clerk of indictments in the years 1846 and 1847.

873. In the execution of the offices which you have described, have you received effective assistance from the police in Essex?—I have received great assistance from the police.

874. Will you state to the Committee in what way you have received assistance?—When I first took office, I found the greatest delay in preparing bills of indictment, from the witnesses not being forthcoming, and from the depositions being imperfect; it was impossible for me to prepare the bills of indictment without seeing the witnesses. I applied to the chief constable, to allow the police to assist me; they invariably collected all the witnesses together, and gave me their names, and made a sort of analysis of their evidence, so as to enable me to prepare the indictments at future sessions with far greater facility; and so much so that generally in one day the whole of the bills were prepared, and the grand jury discharged; they having been formerly, generally speaking, two days.

875. Have you had considerable experience in the conduct of prosecutions?—I have had very great; and in the conduct of those prosecutions, through the chief constable and his officers, I have been enabled to get further information for the completion of the evidence; the depositions themselves frequently being so very imperfect that crime, in many cases, could not be established against the prisoners without further evidence.

876. Therefore you think you have derived great advantage from the police in the collection of evidence?—Very great.

877. Has that been the means of saving expense to the county?—It has been the means of saving expense, as the police were enabled, by their knowledge of men and localities, to obtain evidence with far greater facility than I could possibly have done, and saved the expense of my professional journeys.

878. Have the police effected a saving in any other respects?—A saving has been effected in their being inspectors of weights and measures, and the duties of that office they have performed to the entire satisfaction of the county at large. The importance of that office I need not describe to the Committee; I believe the poor have saved a vast sum of money by the weights and measures being kept in proper order.

879. Do you think those duties have been more efficiently performed than they were by the persons who performed them before?—Yes.

880. Were the inspectors of weights and measures generally local constables?—They were not always local constables; the duties are far more efficiently performed now; there is a greater detection, at least there was at first, in false weights

*J. Parker, Esq.*

2 June 1853.

weights and measures, and a saving of expense, because the superintendents of police, who have been appointed the inspectors of weights and measures, are enabled, with their carts and horses, with great facility to travel the county; and to examine from time to time the weights and measures in the different parts of the county.

881. Do you think there has been a greater certainty of detection of offences by the police as compared with the parochial constables?—Certainly; the one gives his whole time and has his whole attention occupied in the duties of his office; whereas the old parish constables were frequently shopkeepers in the parish, and for the most part they were very ignorant men; in addition to which many of the parish constables made a kind of living of it.

882. In what way?—They kept the different cases with which they had to do to the very last part of the sessions; and increased the expense from the witnesses being kept longer than they ought to have been.

883. Do you think that criminals ever escaped through the neglect or ignorance of the parochial constables?—Not only through the neglect and ignorance of the parochial constables, but also through other means, in the shape of bribes, interest, affection or regard for perhaps some of the criminals, and if not for the criminals, for some of their friends.

884. From local connexions?—Precisely so.

885. Are there any other services in which the police, as established in Essex, are more efficient than the parish constables?—I think as relieving officers they have caused a great saving to the county.

886. Do you mean as relieving officers for the vagrants?—As relieving officers for the vagrants, I think there has been a considerable saving to the county; also, we are not troubled with those vagrants which we were before troubled with. They went about from union-house to union-house; but since the police have been appointed to that office we have not had nearly so many vagrants as we had before.

887. Do you think the establishment of the police has caused a decrease of crime in Essex?—I think so, certainly.

888. Do you think that petty depredations in Essex have been decreased by the establishment of the police?—I think they have been decreased; I think the police force has prevented a great deal of crime; and, through the unity of action, and the way in which crime is communicated from one policeman to another, there is far greater certainty of detection; but the system is not so perfect as it might be made by the Legislature.

889. Do you think the establishment of the police has increased the value of property at all to the occupiers, and, consequently, to the owners?—I do; as in proportion as crime has diminished and security insured, property has increased in value.

890. Have you the management of any properties in Essex?—Yes, of large estates.

891. Do you also act as the agent of other persons?—Yes.

892. Do you know whether those persons for whom you act as agent approve of the appointment of the police?—I should say, certainly, in all cases; I do not know of any disapproval.

893. Has there been any public expression of opinion on the part of the magistrates on the subject of the appointment of the police?—Yes; just after the July Session of 1840 there was an expression, on the part of the grand jury, of their extreme approbation of the manner in which the police had conducted all matters when they had appeared before them.

894. Do you know what that was?—I have not got it.

895. Do you speak of the fact of your own knowledge?—Certainly; in 1850 there was some talk, in consequence of the reduced price in corn, that there ought to be a proportionate deduction from the amount of the stipend given to the different officers; and there was, at the general court of quarter sessions, an expression of opinion.

896. *Sir J. Trollope.*] When was that?—In October 1850: "That the Essex constabulary is highly valuable, and is essentially necessary to the protection of the public property and the proper administration of public justice."

897. Was that passed by the magistrates unanimously?—It was unanimously. It is made an order of the court and entered upon the records.

898. *Chairman.*] Do you think that the parish constables could be depended upon

*J. Parker, Esq.*

2 June 1853.

upon for investigating cases without any reward?—Decidedly not. I think in cases where the prosecutor was not tolerably well off, and was unable to pay them, very little investigation took place, as the parish constable could not afford to give up his time.

899. Was the police force unpopular at its first appointment?—It was.

900. Do you think that feeling has decreased?—Entirely so. The general feeling I know is, that there are not a sufficient number of policemen.

901. Do you think the county expenditure has been lessened or increased by the establishment of the police?—I do not suppose the county expenditure as regards the police has been lessened. I consider their services are more than equivalent to the expenses incurred, and there are considerable sets off to these expenses.

902. Do you think the local constables are of any use in cases of public disturbance?—No, I never found them of the slightest use.

903. Had you any machine breaking in Essex, in 1830?—There were some few instances.

904. Machine breaking was not general in Essex, was it;—There was a slight disturbance in the Tendring district.

905. *Sir J. Trollope.*] You had not the advantage of the police at that time?—We had not the police, but the coast guard assisted.

906. *Chairman.*] Do you think crime has increased from criminals calculating upon the chance of escape?—I do not think they calculate upon escape now as they did before. I think they did generally calculate upon the chance of escape in the little petty crimes.

907. Do they calculate upon the chance of escape into other counties where there is no police?—No doubt; we keep a vast number out of the county by having a police.

908. Supposing a uniform system of police were established in the different counties of England generally, do you think the chance of escape would be much decreased?—Decidedly; if there was unity of action between the counties in the same way that there is unity of action between the different parishes throughout the Essex. If each county had uniformity of action in the same way that every parish in the county has, I think the chance of escape would be less.

909. If it appeared in evidence before the Police Commissioners, that the undetected career of thieves and rogues on the average was six years, do you think that would be very much decreased by the establishment of a uniform police force?—I think, after a year or so, they would find it impossible to escape detection.

910. If there were a uniform system of police throughout the kingdom, and the career of thieves was decreased, do you or not think that the expense of the police in each county might be decreased?—No doubt about it.

911. *Sir J. Trollope.*] What was the year in which you ceased to assist your father as clerk of the peace for the county of Essex?—He died in 1847.

912. You have stated that the police have assisted you in preparing indictments, and that the depositions upon which they were founded very frequently came before you imperfect, and that you were obliged to get up further evidence through the police; was it the practice to get up evidence when the parties who were charged were not present to hear it?—No.

913. Did you take further evidence in the way of depositions in cases upon which the persons committed for trial were not present?—If I was acting as solicitor for the prosecutor, and I found that the depositions did not substantiate the charge, I should take further evidence. As clerk of indictments, I have frequently found that the depositions were insufficient to substantiate the case.

914. Did you think it your duty to take further evidence when the party who was under charge was not present to hear what that evidence was?—I did not take further evidence in his absence, and never upon oath.

915. Was that evidence made use of upon the trial?—Certainly.

916. Still it was not included in the return to the court?—Precisely.

917. Is not that an irregular proceeding as clerk of indictments?—The prosecutor or the prisoner could have a copy of the depositions; if I found that the depositions did not make out the case clearly, as clerk of indictments I obtained further information to enable me to prepare the indictment, and without which I could not have done it.

918. Did

918. Did you include them in the depositions handed up to the court?—I did not; they were merely for my own information.

919. Did the imperfection in the depositions which you have spoken of arise from the magistrate's clerk taking them down imperfectly or irregularly?—No; the recorded depositions might be quite sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case, but not sufficient to support a case before a jury.

920. You have stated that the parish constables had an interest in prosecution; have the police no interest in prosecutions?—Not the slightest.

921. Are they not allowed expenses for attending quarter sessions and assizes?—A very slight sum, I could not tell exactly what that is.

922. Are they not allowed a daily sum?—I am not aware of it; I believe they are allowed expenses out of pocket.

923. But they are allowed their expenses, are they not?—Yes; expenses out of pocket.

924. Have you any records from your office to give this Committee, showing the amount of increase or decrease of criminal offences in Essex?—No.

925. Lord *Lovaine*.] Can there well be a worse system of police than one which gives the police officer, whoever it is, a decided interest in crime?—Decidedly not; I think it goes to the root of destroying his usefulness, and the good of his office.

926. Does not the parish constable exist in a great measure by fees which he receives for apprehending criminals, and attending prosecutions?—He is paid a slight salary in many parishes.

927. Is not the great amount of the emoluments of the parish constable calculated with regard to the crime which is likely to prevail in his parish?—Precisely.

928. Have you ever known cases in which a parish constable has refused to serve a summons or a warrant from personal fear?—I have not; I do not call any such instance to my recollection.

929. Are there not a great number of commons and wild districts in Essex?—No, we are very cultivated; there is a wild district in my own parish, but crime there has very much diminished. In my own case, I think so much of the police, I have a house close to my own garden, which I had let for 15 *l.* a year; but I was glad to take a constable at 5 *l.* for protection.

930. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Is that one of the rural police?—Yes.

931. Do you act as a magistrate for Essex?—No.

932. Lord *Lovaine*.] Do you believe that the present inspectors of weights and measures are open to local influence at all? I mean, whether the inspectors of weights and measures are occasionally inclined to overlook fraudulent weights and measures?—I believe in no case; I think every case is brought forward.

933. Do you believe there was any collusion at all under the old system?—Certainly; both from their own acquaintances and connexions, which the police are utterly independent of; they have a duty to perform, and they think of nothing but that, and they have performed it with extreme satisfaction in Essex.

934. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You are not aware of any instance of their having overlooked cases of fraudulent weights?—No.

935. *Chairman*.] Have you had any individual charges brought against the police?—I never recollect any.

936. Sir *J. Trollope*.] I think you have stated that at one time there was an impression that the salary of the police ought to be reduced, owing to the diminished cost of the necessaries of life; was it effected or not?—It was not carried; that resolution which I have referred to was made an order of the court of quarter sessions.

937. Was October 1850 the time when that attempt was made?—Yes.

938. Upon the whole have you reason to believe that the ratepayers of the county are satisfied to bear the expense, considering the benefits they are supposed to receive from the system?—I am quite certain they are.

939. You are satisfied that there is no feeling against the great cost of the police?—Certainly.

940. Are you aware of the total cost of the police for the county of Essex?—I am not.

941. Is it about 10,000 *l.*?—I could not say.

0.71.

H 4

942. You

*J. Parker, Esq.*

2 June 1853.

942. You do not know what amount of rate in the pound is required to pay for the police for the county of Essex?—I do not.

943. Do you know what proportion it bears to the county expense as regards the county rate?—No; I have never heard anything but satisfaction of the police, and very much so of the chief constable.

944. *Chairman.*] You are not prepared to say that there is no difference of opinion upon the subject?—I never heard any.

945. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Do you generally reside in the county?—Entirely.

946. Do you come backwards and forwards to your office in London?—Yes; my chief business lies in Essex.

947. Does not your business take you a good deal in the daytime away from the county?—No, I am generally in the country.

948. Have you the means of knowing the feelings of the country?—Yes.

949. Are you engaged in any professional business in the county?—Yes, principally.

950. *Lord Lovaine.*] Your business in London is only a branch business?—Yes.

*Mr. Robert Baker, called in; and Examined.*

*Mr. R. Baker.* 951. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Writtle, near Chelmsford, in Essex.

952. Are you a land agent?—I am a farmer and land agent; I have been all my life in general country business.

953. Are you a large occupier of land?—I have occupied upon an average about 600 or 700 acres for the last 10 years. I used to occupy more.

954. Do you act as a land agent?—Yes. I have had the general management of Writtle parish matters, which is one of the largest parishes in the county.

955. What is the size of that parish?—I think the number of acres is upwards of 8,000 acres, between 8,000 and 9,000 acres; I was assistant overseer for several years; I have been churchwarden for same period.

956. Is your occupation in the parish of Writtle?—Yes, principally; I had also the management of Boreham parish, in Essex. I have been more or less in parish office for 35 years without cessation.

957. Have you, as an occupier of land, received benefits from the establishment of police?—Yes.

958. In what respect?—Depredation is not so frequent as it used to be; in fact, our village was rather notorious for the amount of depredations committed in it; we very rarely could say that we had not some one belonging to our village in the county gaol; now I do not believe we have had for several years a person there; in fact, I now hardly hear of a theft in the parish within the last two or three years; so far as my own property has been concerned, I do not think I have had a prosecution before the bench for the last ten years, which I attribute entirely to the presence of the police. The loose part of the community about us find that they are so closely watched, it is not worth their while to go out, and there is such difficulty in getting home with stolen property that they do not venture out; I think that is the chief benefit.

959. You think property has been much benefited?—I think property has been very much benefited.

960. Do you think it has had a good moral effect upon the character of the population?—Very great; our parish, before the establishment of police, was a most dissolute parish; there was scarcely a night passed but there were some petty offences, such as throwing gates off the hinges; I believe for some years the coping-stones of the bridges were thrown off wantonly by persons, but now we never hear of anything of the kind.

961. Therefore your opinion is, that the offences against persons and property have both decreased?—Very much so. I was averse to the police in the first instance; I took a decided objection to it; in fact, I headed an opposition against it, but I have become so thoroughly convinced of its utility that I have done all I could to support it. It was supposed that it was something in the character of espionage upon us. I do not think it was so well arranged or so well understood; there was a prejudice against the principle of it by English people; I believe that  
prejudice

prejudice, even with the labourers themselves, has subsided; I think all the best of the labourers approve of the police as well as the farmers.

962. Is it your opinion that the poor man's property is peculiarly protected by the police?—Undoubtedly it is; his property was always subject to depredations; the allotment gardens were frequently pilfered; persons used to cultivate allotment gardens, both private and public gardens, and they were mostly pilfered, but we never hear anything of it now.

963. Do you think, from your experience, that the increased expences of the police have been more than repaid by the advantage which you have derived from it?—I am quite certain of it; I do not think the increased expense is near as much as is imagined; I know, practically, it is not; when I came to dissect matters, which I did for my own information, I found it was very little more than, I think, as two to five, of our constable expences; the general expences were about three-fourths of the whole of the present expenditure; I know, from having paid the bills for many years, that the sum we used to pay to our parish constables was about 30 *l.* per quarter. There are four divisions in the parish, and the police expenditure was about 40 *l.* to 45 *l.* a quarter. I find, having been assistant overseer, after the police force was established, the county rates we then paid were about 80 *l.* a quarter; that was about the proportion they stood us in.

964. Now, as the occupier of land, and as agent for other property, are you of opinion that the value of land has been increased to the occupier, and consequently to the owner, by the establishment of the police in Essex?—Whatever would give protection to property must give an increased value to property. I have no hesitation in saying that the value of property is increased; as a farmer, I would sooner take a farm, all other things being equal, where a good police force has been established, than I would where there was not one; previously we were liable to sheep-stealing and horse-stealing, when I commenced farming.

965. Do you mean to say, if you were about taking a farm in Essex, that you would give some trifling addition in rent if you knew there was a good police force, more than you would if there was not a police force?—Yes; I am more satisfied with things as they are than I was before the police was established.

966. Mr. *Burroughes*.] You are equally well satisfied that your opinion, with regard to the establishment of the constabulary, was wrong in the first instance?—Yes; there were a great many prejudices; farmers look at expenditure, and never at the principles of a thing.

967. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You stated that you have been 35 years as a parish officer in various capacities?—Yes.

968. Have you not encouraged education by schools, and other means?—Yes; the whole tone of society has been improved; I think the introduction of the new poor law has had an astonishing effect.

969. Do you attribute the moral improvement in your parish to other causes besides the establishment of the police?—Not entirely to the police.

970. You attribute it to the measures of improvement, besides the measures of restraint?—Yes.

971. There has been a general improvement from other causes besides the establishment of police?—Undoubtedly.

972. You have mentioned schools and the new poor law; can you attribute the improvement to any other sources?—I think there is a better system of farming pursued; more labour is taken up, and there are not so many dependent upon the poor rates. Under the old poor law there was a large number of idlers that depended upon the poor rates; they would rather remain in idleness than work.

973. Are you a poor law guardian for the parish?—I am.

974. Have you been so since the introduction of the new poor law?—Not all the time continuously.

975. Is the labour of the idlers absorbed?—It is; a very large proportion of our labour has been withdrawn, not as emigrants, but to fill up gaps which emigrants have made; they get up to the metropolis.

976. Has the population decreased in your parish?—No, I think not.

977. Have you seen the Census of 1851?—Yes; we have an increase upon that.

978. You have stated that the constabulary under the old system cost you 30 *l.* per quarter for your parish?—No; the constables' bills averaged about 30 *l.*

979. Was that a charge upon the parish or upon the individuals?—Upon the parish.

Mr. R. Baker.

2 June 1853.

980. In what way did that arise?—Entirely upon the poor rates.

981. In what way did that arise?—From the occasional attendance of the constables before the bench of magistrates; to show the difficulty we had in the management of the parish at that time, I have known sometimes 40 applications made in a week from the idlers and dissolute part of the population out of employment.

982. Were your constables paid by salaries or by fees?—By salary and fees; they were paid for all their attendances.

983. The difference of cost, therefore, between that system and the present is 10 *l.* per quarter?—I am only speaking vaguely as to what the cost immediately is; at the time I paid it as assistant overseer I know the sum we paid to the police commonly was about 40 odd pounds, and the old constables have been 30 odd pounds per quarter.

984. Do you know the amount in the pound you have paid towards the police force in your own parish?—Two-pence farthing.

985. Has it always been the same since the institution of police?—It has not much varied.

986. Do you know what your county rate for other purposes amounts to?—I cannot say exactly; at the time when I paid the county rate it was about doubled by the police rate; each payment was about twice 40 *l.*, or 80 *l.*

987. Is the county rate in Essex about 4 *d.* in the pound?—I do not know; at that time, I should think seven years ago, perhaps it might be longer than that, when I was assistant overseer, it was about 80 *l.*; I only know from the sums I used to enter.

988. Your contribution to the county rate was double what the contribution for the same quarter was for the police?—I should hesitate speaking positively upon that point; whether originally it was 40 *l.*, or 80 *l.* including the police rate, I am not able to say now; one would be as much as the other; when we paid the police rate it was incorporated in the county rate.

989. Do you think the 4½ *d.* would include the police, or is it without the police?—I think the 4½ *d.* would include the police; I could have ascertained these points, but I did not know it would be necessary.

990. Have you lost any sheep lately in your district from thieves?—Not one.

991. Have you heard of such cases?—Not one.

992. Is sheep-stealing a prevailing crime in Essex?—We used frequently to lose sheep; I have lost several myself; to give some idea of the extent to which that went on: I was member of a society for the prevention of crime and for the apprehension of offenders; I frequently have received money from that society, before the police was established, towards my expense for prosecution; since the police has been established I have not had a single prosecution, nor an application from the society for any rate, which shows that crime has decreased.

993. Do you know of any cases of horse-stealing since the establishment of police?—Very few; I heard of nothing lately; I have not heard of one in our district for several years being lost.

994. The other species of farmers' property which is subject to depredation is the poultry; do they take your poultry still?—I have never lost any but in one instance.

995. Was that since the establishment of police?—Yes; that was from one of our own servants.

996. Was the person taken?—Not at the time, but it turned out afterwards who it was, after finding him out in some other crime; we did not suspect him in the first instance.

997. Lord *Lovaine*.] How long is it since the police was established in Essex?—I think, from my recollection, 12 or 14 years. I cannot speak positively to that point.

998. You mentioned that an improvement had taken place in the moral character of the inhabitants; was there a marked improvement immediately after the establishment of the police?—A very marked improvement. I do not think there was a more dissolute class in any parish in Essex, and I do not think that there is a more orderly class than they are now.

999. My question was directed more as to the immediate consequences of the establishment of the police?—Of course it was gradual; it was not apparent at once, but I know we have been gradually improving.

1000. Do you think that the main instrument in this improvement was the police?—I do. I think, as I stated in the first instance, those who are badly inclined

inclined are afraid to move at night, because if they are not detected in anything, or if they are found out after certain hours, it creates a suspicion towards them, and they are looked to afterwards.

1001. Do not the police prevent the spread of crime?—They prevent the spread of crime; it is thoroughly known with our labourers, if there is a suspicion that there is anything going on wrong, we can get the assistance of the police. They are quite aware that they are looked after closely. In fact I had a notification of a depredation taking place in my cornfields last year; we knew of it, and at my suggestion Captain McHardy had the field watched for me. The thief got intelligence of it, and he told me when I accused him of it, that he saw the shining hat over the hedge, and he knew that they were looking after him.

1002. Was that system of watching ever practised with the old constables?—Never; the difficulty with the old constable was that he was generally a person in the parish who was mixed up with relatives and acquaintances; and it was quite notorious, if a supposed transgressor or person was detected, not one-half of those cases went before the Bench; the constables, from either pecuniary motives or from some motive, managing to make up matters, as it was termed; matters were compromised. That I have known in several instances; and in two or three, particularly, the parish took it up, after the constable had, not refused to do so, but had failed to do so.

1003. You have been asked a question as to the increase in the value of property: I put it to you, as a farmer, would you take a farm, supposing all things equal, with the addition of a police rate paid for an efficient police, in preference to one at the same rent where there was no police?—I would greatly in preference; I think that the benefit I directly derive from the police force having been established, is more than equivalent to the sum I pay; I would pay it as an insurance to have the same protection to my property as I receive at present.

Mr. William Hamilton, called in; and Examined.

1004. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Wendover, Bucks.

1005. What are you?—Superintending constable.

1006. What is the system of police in Buckinghamshire?—Parish constables under superintending constables.

1007. In each division?—Yes, recently; they had only nine, until the last quarter sessions; now they have appointed one for each petty sessional division.

1008. How long have you been superintending constable?—Eighteen months.

1009. Have served in any other police force?—Yes; in the Irish constabulary, the Lancashire county constabulary, and the Essex county constabulary.

1010. For how long?—Sixteen years altogether.

1011. Do you consider that the system of superintending constables, with parish constables, is an efficient system of police?—I do not.

1012. Have you had much experience of it?—I had 18 months; and nine years in the Essex constabulary under Captain McHardy.

1013. In Essex there was a different system, was not there?—Yes; that is a very efficient force.

1014. Do you think, from your experience, that a police force, consisting of superintending constables, with the aid of parish constables, is not an efficient police?—Nothing at all like it.

1015. Why do you think so?—In the first place, there is no chance of detection; you do not receive information often for two days, and perhaps you reside 10 miles from the place where the robbery has occurred; and the property is not traced; the parish constable happens to be out for a considerable time, and sometimes constables are very careless in giving information.

1016. Have you had any experience with respect to police in boroughs and towns?—Some slight experience; not very much.

1017. Have you ever been in the borough police?—No; but I have gone into the adjoining boroughs.

1018. In what way have you gone into adjoining boroughs?—When I was in Haybridge, in Essex, I was sent into the borough of Maldon.

1019. Were you sent into Maldon by your superior officer?—No; frequently duty called me there.

0.71.

I 2

1020. What

Mr. R. Baker.

2 June 1853.

Mr. W. Hamilton.

Mr. W. Hamilton.

2 June 1853.

1020. What was the result of your experience in boroughs?—I very seldom found them work in co-operation; there is generally a jealousy between the county and town forces.

1021. Notwithstanding that jealousy they are willing to avail themselves of your services?—Generally so.

1022. Are there any other boroughs into which you have ever been as a police officer?—I am inspector of weights and measures for the borough of Aylesbury; there is a sergeant and two men, appointed under the Lighting and Watching Act, stationed in the town there.

1023. But the borough of Aylesbury is not under the system of police in Buckinghamshire generally?—No; they find their own police; it has nothing to do with the county, and there we do not find them very often co-operate.

1024. If they have a separate police in Aylesbury, do not their own officers inspect their weights and measures?—No.

1025. You, as one of the superintending constables of the county, do that duty?—Yes.

1026. Have you formed any opinion as to the manner of the appointment and control of the police in Buckinghamshire; do you think that is efficient?—No, I do not think it is.

1027. Why not?—They are generally under the control of the tradesmen, such as grocers and drapers, and such persons as form the town council.

1028. I am speaking as to the county police?—They are only parish constables, with the exception of the superintending constables. I have got 70 parish constables, but no paid policemen.

1029. How many parishes are there in your district?—I had 30, but since this last alteration I have had about 15; the district has been divided.

1030. Do you receive any effectual assistance from the parish constables?—Very little.

1031. Are they ever unwilling to obey your directions?—I have had one or two fined for neglect of duty. In fact, there is a case in another division, not in my own, in which a parish constable was called out in the night, and he refused to act, because it was not in his parish. A gamekeeper went to another constable in the parish, and he said his wife was ill, and he refused to get up. A sheep was stolen in the place, and in consequence of the neglect of duty the parties got off. One stated as his reason that it was not in his parish where the offence was committed, and the other stated that his wife was ill; and so neither of them acted.

1032. In those cases in which the offenders escaped justice in consequence of the neglect of the parish constables, do you think if there had been an efficient police force, as there is in Essex, that they would have been detected and taken?—No doubt they would, at once.

1033. Are you aware of any boroughs in which the police officers are permitted to pursue their own trade and calling?—When I served in Lancashire they were allowed, in Liverpool, to follow their own occupations.

1034. Is not that the case in Buckinghamshire?—No, not in Buckinghamshire at the present time; they canvass at the elections at Wycombe.

1035. Sir J. Trollope.] Do you mean the superintending constables?—No; the borough police.

1036. Lord Lovaine.] What do you mean by their canvassing at elections at Wycombe?—They go round to the different voters.

1037. To ask for votes?—Yes.

1038. Chairman.] Do you believe that, under those circumstances, the police officers can perform their duties faithfully and impartially?—I think not.

1039. Why not?—They are under the control of the aldermen and town council; they have too many masters; it is not like having one regular head.

1040. You have stated that both in Essex, and as a superintending constable in Buckinghamshire, you have had occasion often to go into the boroughs?—Yes.

1041. Have you, upon those occasions, found the officers in those places willing to co-operate with you in effecting your object?—Sometimes; on some occasions I have found a little jealousy amongst them.

1042. Has the chance of the escape of a prisoner been increased, in consequence of that want of co-operation?—I think so.

1043. Do you know any instance of that sort?—Not particularly, but it is my opinion.

1044. Have

1044. Have you ever considered the parochial constabulary, as compared with the county police?—I have.

1045. What is your opinion of their usefulness and efficiency?—I think it is a very inefficient force; I consider the county force far superior and less expensive, according to the efficiency of its members.

1046. From your experience in the county of Buckingham, do you think the parochial constables have been rendered more efficient and better police officers from having superintending constables?—They are certainly better than they have been, but now they are very deficient.

1047. In what respect are they better?—Because they are guided by the superintending constables; in cases of robbery they co-operate with them. There was no one formerly to control them, and they took no notice of trifling offences; the first question they asked was, who was to pay them.

1048. Are the constables tradesmen?—Generally so; tailors, shoemakers, grocers, and so on.

1049. Do you think that a person exercising a trade or calling can efficiently discharge the duties of a constable?—I have no doubt that they cannot. I have frequently had opportunities of knowing that, in respect of disorderly conduct at public-houses. When I have called upon them with respect to those houses, they have said that they would be willing to get information about the conduct of the house if I did not call them as witnesses; they did not wish to offend their customers, and so they did not wish to be called as witnesses in the case.

1050. If you had reason to think that a house was disorderly, have you been unable to act from finding them very unwilling to give information?—I have had several cases; I have got constables reprimanded for neglect of duty.

1051. How many are appointed in your district?—I had 70; I have now about 30.

1052. That is about two to each parish?—Some have six; it is according to the size of the parish.

1053. Do you know what has been paid to them at all?—Not positively; I should say about 15*l.* a year each parish, taking one with another; some parishes pay as much as 40*l.* a year.

1054. How much do you mean to say that the expense of the parochial constabulary is to the parishes?—There are 30 parishes; Aston Clinton pays as much as 35*l.* or 40*l.*; in Great Missenden parish they pay one of the constables 10*l.* (who is the fixed constable), and there are five or six others; Risborough amounts to about 35*l.*

1055. Sir J. Trollope.] Are those parishes within your district?—They are.

1056. Are your superintending constables mounted?—Yes; we have a horse and cart.

1057. Are you obliged to find your own horse?—We find the horse, and the county finds the cart and harness.

1058. What is your salary?—£. 80., and 35*l.* is allowed for keeping the horse, and the cart and harness in repair; I have half the fees paid for stamping weights and measures, and half the fines which are paid for convictions for false weights and measures.

1059. What do your total receipts amount to?—I should say from 130*l.* to 140*l.* a year.

1060. Are you allowed anything for serving summonses, or for any other duties?—We do not serve summonses, nor execute warrants of apprehension.

1061. When you attend assizes or quarter sessions, or petty sessions for prosecutions, have you any allowances?—Six shillings a day, without any regard to the number of cases.

1062. You are paid for a day if you have half a dozen cases; you do not charge for them separately?—We get paid from the Government, and we give an account to the county of what we receive in each case, and they allow us 6*s.* a day.

1063. Does that cover all the expenses of the horse and cart whilst you are from home?—That is the whole of the allowance which they make.

1064. You have been so recently appointed, that probably the county of Buckingham has hardly got into working order, under the 5th & 6th of Victoria, chapter 109?—I think it is impossible for them to get into order under that system; in fact, if you get a parish constable that is good for anything, the parochial

Mr. W. Hamilton.  
2 June 1853.

authorities grumble about his expenses, and they want to throw him off the next time; they say, "His bill is so expensive, and we will appoint another who will do it for less money."

1065. Were you one of the first superintending constables appointed?—  
I was.

1066. When was the whole county re-organised and divided?—At the last quarter sessions, in April last.

1067. About two months since?—Yes.

1068. Do you think a system perfect which has been working two months?—  
I do not consider it could be perfect.

1069. Is that because you have been bred under another system in Essex?—  
—Yes.

1070. Do you consider the Essex police more efficient?—I consider there is not a more efficient police in England at the present day.

1071. In how many police forces have you served?—I have served in Lancashire, and I have had great experience in the adjoining districts to Essex.

1072. Do you consider the Essex police better than the Herts police?—I do.

1073. In what respect?—If an officer in Essex is good for nothing he must perform his duty; there are so many checks upon him he has no opportunity of skulking; but in the adjoining districts they do their duty as they like.

1074. In Essex they keep a man whether he is good for anything or not?—  
No; they make him do his duty, or else discharge him; one man is a check upon another.

1075. Mr. Burroughes.] Are you the only mounted constable?—Each superintendent has a horse; we are each appointed an inspector of weights and measures, and high constable; the superintending constables convey in all practicable cases, all prisoners to gaol who are committed at the petty sessions.

1076. There are nine altogether mounted, are there not?—Fifteen.

1077. Sir J. Trollope.] Are you thinking of giving up your situation?—I am not dissatisfied with it.

1078. Are you aware that a subsequent Act of Parliament, the 15 & 16 Vict., c. 20, has been passed, by which additional constables may be appointed to undertake the duties in your absence?—Yes.

1079. And to take charge of the lock-up?—We have no lock-up except at a few places.

1080. Are not they contemplated in all the divisions?—I believe they are.

1081. Have you any at all?—I have a lock-up, but it is only a temporary cage.

1082. Was it built for the purpose?—No.

1083. Is it inefficient?—Very inefficient; there is no accommodation for the superintending officer to live in.

1084. There is no house?—No.

1085. Are none of the superintending officers found residences?—No.

1086. Is it not contemplated to build efficient lock-ups with proper residences? The lock-ups and the residences they have built are only qualified for a constable to reside in, and not for a superintending constable.

1087. Have you a resident constable?—Where they have an appointed lock-up they have a housekeeper.

1088. Have the authorities appointed resident constables under the last Act?—In some places they have, and at quarter sessions they are going to appoint four or five more.

1089. Have you no lock-up?—No; I am near Aylesbury Gaol; I have only 10 miles, the furthest journey, to convey my prisoners.

1090. Is it not required that a constable should be in charge of the lock-up during your absence?—Yes; I always apprise the parish constable of my absence; I have no paid officer.

1091. You put the parish constable in charge while you are out; is that the plan?—That is the plan.

1092. Chairman.] Do you think that motives of private interest sometimes interfere with the performance of their duty?—I do.

1093. Have you met with any direct obstruction from the want of confidence on their part?—I have; once when I went in search of a stolen sheep I put confidence in a parish constable, and I found out afterwards that the man I supposed

to

to be the thief was his brother-in-law; and I found out in the morning that the suspected person was acquainted with the case before I went to search his house.

1094. Do you think, looking at the different systems of police in the adjoining counties, that they can work well together; for instance, where there is this system which you have in Buckinghamshire, and, in the adjoining counties, a system similar to that which there is in Essex?—They cannot work together.

1095. Have you ever had an opportunity of seeing the use of special constables in cases of disturbance?—I have; during the time I was on duty in Lancashire in elections, and I found them of very little use.

1096. You know that they have police in Lancashire?—Yes; I have been on duty there.

1097. Was that before the appointment of the Lancashire police?—This was the police force; we found that we got but little assistance from the special constables; it is a difficult matter to prevent them getting drunk, and they are therefore more injury than good.

1098. Do you mean that in Blackburn they did swear in a certain number of special constables?—Yes.

1099. And they were of very little use?—Yes.

1100. Lord *Lovaine*.] Can you conceive of any plan by which the parish constables can be made effective under the present law?—I cannot.

1101. The parishes which you have named pay, as you say, an average annual amount to their constables of 450 *l.*—I should say about that.

1102. Supposing you divided that by the cost of a rural constable, you will find that that comes within a few shillings of what eight efficient rural constables would cost. Would those eight be sufficient to look after a district?—I should prefer four regular paid constables to the 70 parish constables I have got; and certainly eight efficient rural constables would be far preferable to the present force.

1103. What do you give to the keepers of lock-up houses?—They generally get 5 *s.* a day allowed; if it is a parish constable he charges 3 *s.* 6 *d.*

1104. Have you any lock-up houses which are in the charge of the man dwelling in the house?—There is one at Chesham, another at Wycombe, and one at Slough.

1105. What do you pay him?—He had 5 *s.* a day, but I think he has now 20 *l.* a year.

1106. Do you think that, in rural towns and boroughs, the police ought to be independent of the rural constabulary?—No; I should think they would work together better under one head. I have known several cases in borough towns, in which they have been afraid to offend some of their inspectors, as they call them; that is, the tradesmen in the town. If they saw them committing an offence they would not mention it. In many cases they would say, "We must not offend them."

1107. The appointment is a matter of partiality and favour in the borough, is it not?—Exactly so.

1108. Mr. *Maachie*.] Who appoints the constables in the county of Buckinghamshire?—There is a list of qualified persons agreed to at a vestry, and published according to the Act, and laid before the magistrates in petty session, who make the appointments annually; but I have a list sent to me, and if I object to any one I get him discharged; I pick one out of the list. There is a list sent of all the persons qualified to serve as constables, and it is submitted to me, and if any constable is in the list that I object to, I strike him off the list.

1109. Have you the power of dismissal?—Yes, with the confirmation of the magistrates; the magistrates do not generally object to anything of that sort.

1110. Were those constables, at the place to which you have referred, who refused to leave their beds to pursue a criminal, dismissed?—That was not in my division; they were fined.

1111. How many have been dismissed?—I had two men dismissed for neglect of duty.

1112. *Chairman*.] By the magistrates?—Yes.

1113. What you mean to say is, that a list is submitted to you, and you have an opportunity of correcting that list?—We hold office as high constables; and all those lists are submitted to us, and the magistrates ask us what remarks we have to make; and the appointments are generally made according to our advice or recommendation.

Mr. *George Marris*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *G. Marris*.

2 June 1853.

1114. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Caistor, in Lincolnshire.

1115. What is your occupation?—I am a solicitor.

1116. Have you held any office which has particularly directed your attention to the subject of offences committed in that district?—I am clerk and treasurer of a large association for the prosecution of felons; and offences against property have come under my notice, of course.

1117. During the last winter, has the neighbourhood of Caistor been much infested with bad characters, and has there been much depredation?—Very much indeed.

1118. What has been the character of those depredations generally?—We have had every species of offence against property: burglary, sheep-stealing, breaking into granaries and outhouses, and stealing from all those places. I should think offences against the property of the members of the association has averaged one a week; and taking into account the offences against the property of those persons who are not members, I might venture to say together they have averaged nearly two a week.

1119. Have the cottages of the poor people been broken into?—Many attempts have been made upon the cottages of the poor; and when they have killed a pig, in many instances they have been obliged to sit up all night to prevent its being stolen from them.

1120. To what do you attribute that prevalence of crime in your district?—We have no one to prevent it; we have nothing but parish constables.

1121. Have you no lock-up house?—None.

1122. Have you represented this want of protection to the magistrates?—I did, in a memorial very numerous and respectably signed.

1123. What was the result of that memorial?—It was referred from the Kirton sessions to the police committee at the Lincoln assizes.

1124. What did the police committee do?—The police committee then came to a certain resolution; but I may mention that, in the first instance, crime was so extensive, that a detective policeman was had down from town.

1125. By order of the police committee?—No; Lord Yarborough and some of his friends and tenants had a policeman at their own expense.

1126. As a private watchman?—Yes.

1127. Did the police committee do nothing for you?—Hitherto they have not. The magistrates at Brigg, when I went before them, at my request and at the request of others appointed the same policeman for three months.

1128. What was the name of the policeman?—Henry Matthews.

1129. When you had Matthews did he do you any good?—While he was in disguise he did not do us any good; he could not get into the secret haunts of the parties; the area was too large. As a detective he did not do much good. When he was appointed publicly, and his office became known, it had a sensible influence upon crime.

1130. Is Matthews still with you?—No.

1131. Why did he go away?—The magistrates refused to continue him. He was appointed under the Act of Parliament only as a special constable for three months, and when the time was about expiring I applied to the petty session for a renewal of the appointment.

1132. Did they renew it?—No.

1133. Why not?—They said the expense was too heavy.

1134. What was the expense?—Thirty shillings a week or 18*l.* a quarter.

1135. In consequence of that expense, the magistrates refused to reappoint Matthews?—So the magistrates told me.

1136. From what source did that money come?—From the county at large.

1137. He was merely appointed from time to time?—He was appointed once only.

1138. Mr. *Burroughes.*] Was he paid from the county rate?—Yes.

1139. *Chairman.*] When Matthews went away did the depredations again commence?—The following day after that they began.

1140. How far are you from the nearest police establishment?—Nine miles.

1141. You have a superintending constable, I presume?—There is one in the division of Yarborough.

1142. How far is that from you?—He is nine miles off.

1143. What

Mr. G. Morris.

2 June 1853.

1143. What is the extent of his district?—Speaking in round numbers, I should say about 25 miles long by 15 or 18 miles broad.
1144. How many parishes are there in the district?—I could not say.
1145. Do you think it is possible for any one man to protect such a district with the assistance of parochial constables?—I think not; I am sure of it.
1146. Do the robberies in your neighbourhood come to your knowledge?—Yes, generally; and certainly if upon members of my society.
1147. Do you offer handsome rewards?—Yes.
1148. Have you paid rewards?—Occasionally; they are only paid on conviction for the crime, that is, where the parties are prosecuted and found guilty.
1149. In pursuing an offender against the property of one of the members of your association, supposing you pursued him unsuccessfully, how are the expenses paid?—Out of the funds of the society.
1150. That is paid out of your funds, and not out of the county rate?—Yes.
1151. Mr. *Burroughes*.] I understood you to say that you paid the reward only upon conviction; but you pay the expenses, I understood you to say, of prosecutions, and all the other circumstances attending the apprehension of non-offenders, from your funds, although conviction does not take place?—There may be a few expenses if there is no conviction.
1152. Do you know the amount per annum?—No.
1153. *Chairman*.] Do you think the establishment of railways has increased the facilities for crime?—No doubt it enables parties to come and land at small railway stations to reconnoitre the country, and to commit depredations, and they are off again before they can be at all noticed.
1154. Have you any protection beyond parish constables?—None, save the police nine miles off.
1155. Have not they other duties to attend to?—They are very respectable men, as a body; but the more respectable they are the more inefficient they are.
1156. Is that because they have other duties to perform?—Yes.
1157. Is not the time of the class of persons appointed as parish constables valuable to themselves in their own business?—Yes, very.
1158. Is not their time money to them?—Of course it is.
1159. If they are put to the inconvenience of acting as parish constables, is not that a loss to them individually?—Certainly.
1160. Therefore acting as parish constables is money lost to a large and useful class of persons?—Yes; and not only so, but they do not like the duties of the office.
1161. Mr. *Machie*.] What do you pay the constables?—I do not know what pay they get at all; they perhaps are paid so much a day from the parish rates.
1162. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You have stated that when all these crimes took place in your neighbourhood in the course of last winter you made an application to the magistrates for a superintending constable, or for some police assistance?—I did.
1163. Did you do that in the form according to the Act of Parliament; I think you said that you sent in a memorial?—I made an application, I think it is under the 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 41, for a special constable, and my application was granted by the magistrates in petty sessions by appointing Matthews.
1164. By bringing down a detective from London?—By appointing the man who was then down from London.
1165. You have stated that you sent in a memorial for some other purposes?—I sent in a memorial to the Kirton sessions for a lock-up and policeman, and it was referred there to the police committee at Lincoln assizes; and it turned out that we ought to have had the recommendation of five magistrates.
1166. Is not that the law?—It is.
1167. Have you looked at the statute?—That particular section did not catch my eye.
1168. That Act is the 5 & 6 Vict. c. 109; you probably have since referred to that Act?—I have.
1169. If you had set it in motion legally, have you any reason to apprehend that the magistrates would have refused you?—I do not know.
1170. Have you never had a direct answer from the magistrates, that if the application were made in conformity with the Act, they would attend to it?—I have not had a direct answer; there has been a resolution come to by the police committee in the grand jury-room at Lincoln.
1171. Have you a copy of that?—I have.
1172. Perhaps you will be good enough to state what it is?—“Lincolnshire: Lindsey.

Mr. G. Marris.

2 June 1853.

Lindsey. Resolution passed at a meeting of the committee held at the Grand Jury-room, Castle of Lincoln, 1st March 1853. The committee took into consideration the application made at the last Kirton sessions for a second lock-up house in the wapentake of Yarborough, to be erected at Caistor, and which application was, according to the rule in such cases, referred to this committee; and thereupon it is resolved,—That this committee sees no objection to the erection of a lock-up house at Caistor, provided the building, and the expenses of the constable to have charge of it, be kept strictly within the limits of the Act of Parliament; and that such constable be not, in fact, constituted a superintending constable, with a district of parishes assigned to him, there being already a superintending constable having jurisdiction over the whole wapentake.”

1173. Then the magistrates did not refuse you the assistance you applied for?—They neither refused it nor agreed to give it. It is a mere passive resolution that they see no objection, provided this, and provided that.

1174. Did they not refuse your application because you applied for the appointment of a stranger?—Certainly not.

1175. Have you any reason to suppose, if your application is made in the proper form, that it will be refused to you?—I do not know; I think if the subject is kept alive it will be granted; if it is not kept alive the application will be refused.

1176. *Chairman.*] May the Committee understand that the refusal only was to re-appoint the London constable?—No; expense was the objection.

1177. *Sir J. Trollope.*] That would depend upon the local bench at Brigg?—Yes, the refusal.

1178. Are you within the petty sessional division of Brigg?—Yes.

1179. What is the population of Caistor?—It is between 2,000 and 3,000.

1180. Have you any petty sessions held there?—None.

1181. Is all the business of the hundred transacted at Brigg?—For Caistor it is.

1182. That is a distance of nine miles?—Yes.

1183. You have stated that there is an association for the prosecution of felons. Were they at any expense in protecting the country by additional means when these robberies took place last winter?—No, not the society; some of the members were.

1184. They paid something out of their own pockets for additional protection?—Yes.

1185. To what purpose are the funds of this association devoted?—Advertising for the apprehension of offenders and prosecuting them, and then when I get the county allowance I give credit to the society to that amount.

1186. Do you take any other steps besides advertising?—Occasionally some person who has lost property may send his men, or go himself in pursuit, and communication is made by post to the distant police by me, as clerk.

1187. Do you know anything of a system of aiding one another in the pursuit of felons?—No.

1188. Do you meet annually?—Once a year, to settle; when the members of the association dine together.

1189. Out of the funds of the association?—No, they contribute; there is a certain allowance out of the funds of the association, but it is not enough for the dinner; and they pay themselves the rest.

1190. Are not a great portion of the funds devoted to entertainment?—I think there is nothing, but to ensure the landlord remuneration for a large provision; the absentees pay a little, that is all.

1191. You think that a police force would be a much more effectual mode of protecting property than anything you could do by your association?—Judging from such little experience as I had in the case of Matthews, I think it would.

1192. What did he do?—He prevented crime entirely.

1193. Did he catch anybody?—There were no crimes committed during his appointment.

1194. You have stated that there was one crime a week with respect to members of the association, and two with respect to non-members?—Before he came.

1195. Did he find out none of those cases after he came?—There were none committed whilst he was there.

1196. Did he find out any of the cases of sheep-stealing which had been previously committed?—No.

1197. Had any horse been stolen in the neighbourhood?—No.

1198. What

Mr. G. Morris.  
2 June 1853.

1198. What were the crimes which were committed?—Sheep-stealing, burglary, breaking into granaries and outhouses, stealing bacon, and so on.

1199. Were none of those offenders taken?—There was one conviction for sheep-stealing at the Spilsby sessions, and only one.

1200. Do you think, if you had a superintending constable stationed at Caistor, in the same mode as in other divisions of the county, it would be sufficient for the preservation of property?—It would be a preventive to crime, and improve our condition.

1201. Should you be satisfied with that force for the preservation of property, without carrying the Police Act into effect?—I do not profess to give an opinion upon the Police Act throughout the kingdom.

1202. Lord *Lovaine*.] What is the average subscription of your members to your association?—It comes to about 7 s. a year for each member.

1203. Are you of opinion, from the state of crime in your district, that the payment of a county rate of 2 ½ d. in the pound would be deemed a very heavy burden?—I really think, looking at the losses which people sustain, that it would not.

1204. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Were the persons who committed those crimes last winter chiefly people of the locality, or were you invaded by people from a distance?—Only one conviction took place, I think, this last twelvemonth, and that was a person in the neighbourhood. I have no means of judging who they were who committed the other offences.

Mr. *Alfred Hughes*, called in; and Examined.

1205. *Chairman*.] WHERE do you reside?—In the City of Bath.

1206. Are you the head of the police in Bath?—I am chief of the police in the city and borough of Bath.

1207. How many men have you?—Eighty-two.

1208. How are they appointed?—They are appointed by the watch committee of the city.

1209. You have a code of regulations, I suppose?—Yes.

1210. By whom were they drawn up?—Some of them have been drawn up by myself, by the previous chief of the police, and some by the watch committee.

1211. Has your force ever been found inadequate to the maintenance of the public peace?—No, not since I have been there.

1212. Has the military force ever been called in, in cases of disturbance?—No.

1213. Do the members of your force ever receive any reward or fee?—Not without the sanction of the watch committee. When gratuities are reported to the watch committee, they sometimes allow half the gratuity to the men, and the other half to be applied to the sick fund.

1214. When the watch committee reward an officer, do they do that with your concurrence, and from information which they receive from you?—I never knew any case of the watch committee rewarding an officer; I have known them allow him compensation for injuries, when he has been injured in the execution of his duty.

1215. In case they are not performing special services, where are those earnings carried to?—They are carried to the borough fund by the cash-in-hand book, and shown by me every week as cash in hand, and that amount is deducted from the weekly bill.

1216. Have you any regulations as to rendering assistance to other police forces?—No; when officers from other places apply to the inspectors under me, they generally give assistance.

1217. Where from, do you mean?—Let them come from anywhere else; when they come to Bath we generally give them assistance.

1218. What are the adjoining police forces to Bath?—There is no police in the county of Somerset; if a constable were to come from anywhere else to Bath, and say, "I want a man, so and so;" we should send a man with him, to show him, if possible, where he was.

1219. Therefore if a criminal is supposed to be in Bath, and a police officer comes in pursuit of him, you give him all the assistance in your power?—Yes.

1220. Do you think that your present force is sufficient?—Yes, for the city.

0.71.

K 2

1221. Have

Mr. A. Hughes.

2 June 1853.

1221. Have you served in any other police force?—Yes, I was for 12 years in the Metropolitan police, and I have served as superintendent in the Surrey constabulary.

1222. Has crime decreased in Bath?—Materially.

1223. Can you state any fact in illustration of that?—I have two reports of the Bath Quarter-sessions, and I was likewise in court when the recorder delivered this charge to the grand jury at the July sessions, 1852. He stated that his experience of crime in Bath extended over a period of 20 years, and he had known the calendar at the Quarter-sessions amount to between 50 and 100. Since I have been in Bath I do not think the calendar has exceeded 30; it has generally been about 18 and 22 each Quarter-sessions; I have been there a year and a half, and I am certain there has been only one burglary effected, and that only to the amount of 14*l.* The recorder likewise said that he attributed the difference to the establishment of an effective police. I have also another report.

1224. What is that?—To the same effect, as regards crime in Bath. The recorder then stated that the present calendar exhibited a smaller number of prisoners than usual, and the nature of the offences was of a very trifling character.

1225. When was that?—In April 1852.

1226. Under whose control are your police?—Under the control of the magistrates and the watch committee.

1227. By whom were you appointed?—By the watch committee.

1228. Have they the power of dismissing you?—Yes, and the magistrates also: the watch committee or two magistrates.

1229. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Is the watch committee composed of magistrates?—The watch committee is composed of magistrates, tradesmen, and professional men, such as surgeons and solicitors.

1230. Are they all members of the Town Council?—Yes.

1231. The watch committee is composed of the magistrates and the Town Council?—Yes, they are members of the Town Council.

1232. *Chairman.*] Do you find any inconvenience from being under those two jurisdictions?—I do not myself, but the officers under me do.

1233. Can an officer under you be dismissed by the watch committee, if they choose?—Yes.

1234. Without giving any reasons?—That is one of their regulations, but I never knew it enforced.

1235. They can do that without the consent of the magistrates, can they not?—Yes.

1236. And without the consent of the Secretary of State?—Yes.

1237. Without the consent, in fact, of any superior authority?—Yes.

1238. *Mr. Burroughes.*] Is the appointment under those conditions?—Yes.

1239. How are your officers paid in Bath for pursuing offenders in the county?—If they succeed they are paid in the ordinary way their expenses, included in the magistrate's certificate. If they do not succeed, and they are not acting under the order of a justice, which occasionally occurs, there is no means whatever of paying them. There is no provision for special service. That is provided in the county, under the head of "special service;" and likewise in the Metropolis, under the head of "extraordinary expenses."

1240. Have officers of the same rank various rates of pay?—Various rates of pay.

1241. Is that from the period of service?—No; I cannot account for it. It was upon the re-organization of the force previous to my going to Bath.

1242. Supposing an officer is appointed at a certain rate of pay, have the watch committee arbitrary power of increasing his pay?—Yes, subject to the approval of the council.

1243. Without the approval of the magistrates?—Yes.

1244. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Has your force ever been called upon to act beyond the jurisdiction of the city?—Yes.

1245. In the county of Somerset?—Yes, I receive precepts from the county justices of Somerset to send a sufficient force to Lansdowne fair and races, which last four days, two days the races and two days the fair, each year; and that requires a force of about 40 men and officers to preserve order there.

1246. Is that day and night?—No, from morning till night.

1247. Is there any night duty?—At night they call in the parish constables.

1248. Have you a separate charge upon the county for that duty?—No, I have

no

no charge upon the county; the race committee generally pay the expenses of the officers during the time they are doing duty there.

1249. Should you see any difficulty in acting with the rural police if it were established in the county of Somerset?—Not if the whole force were amalgamated with the county.

1250. Otherwise you think there would be difficulty?—Yes.

1251. Is it your opinion that if a county police were established in the county of Somerset it would be advisable to amalgamate them with the city of Bath?—Yes.

1252. And to amalgamate all the other cities and boroughs as well, to insure uniformity of action?—Yes, because police officers, generally speaking, are jealous of each other. If a police officer applies to another place for assistance, each officer generally endeavours to get the offender for himself.

1253. Does not that feeling act as a stimulant to exertions on both parties?—It does; but sometimes it has a contrary effect.

1254. Lord *Lovaine*.] Did not you once serve in Northumberland?—Yes.

1255. Were not you there in the position of superintending constable?—Yes.

1256. In your opinion, is it possible to bring that system into effective operation?—No, I do not think it could ever be brought into effective operation, especially in that county.

1257. Why do you say in that county especially?—Because I may have experienced more inconvenience there than perhaps the generality of men in my position; in that county there is a very strong antipathy to what they call south countrymen, and as I am a south countryman, that may account for my having experienced more inconvenience from them than perhaps others would.

1258. Was that prejudice testified by the refusal of the constables to obey you?—I found them so corrupt there that I was obliged to have nothing at all to do with them, and act entirely on my own hands. I found that some of them had been convicted of felony, and others were continually drinking in company with the most notorious thieves and poachers, and they had likewise relatives who were so, and licensed dealers in game.

1259. You are speaking principally of the towns, are you not?—I am speaking principally of the towns; after I had been there a little while I would not have anything at all to do with them, and I acted generally on my own account. If I was obliged to use them at all I never let them know what I wanted them for; I brought them right to the spot, without letting them know what I was going about.

1260. Do you know enough of the county to say whether the same thing prevails to the same extent in the wild districts of Northumberland?—I believe it prevailed all over that county.

1261. It would appear from what you have stated, that the rivalry of the constables of the different police forces is extremely likely to conduce to the escape of a prisoner?—Yes, sometimes, and sometimes it will operate the other way, and stimulate the men to exertion. I could show many instances in which a jealousy exists between one officer and another. During the time I was in the metropolitan force I took a man down to King's Heath, about 10 miles from Birmingham; for the superintendent of the county force had been previously in London for him, and had been an hour too late at Cold Bath Fields when he was discharged; he came to me at Paddington, and said, "If you can get him, do so." I got him, and took him down to King's Heath, and as soon as I took him into the police station, the superintendent shook his head, and said, "That is not the man." I said, "Not the man? that is the man you told me to take; how do you know he is not the man?" He said, "I have known him from his childhood, he was bred and born near me." I said, "If you will undertake to say that he is not the man, I will not detain him any longer;" upon which he put his hand in the desk, and gave the man a shilling, to get some bread and cheese, at a public-house next door. The man went there, and while the man was getting his refreshment, I noticed that the superintendent was particularly uneasy, and occasionally going to the window, and looking out; he left me, and not returning soon, I went out, and walked up the road towards Birmingham, and there I met the superintendent bringing the man back. If that man had taken to the fields, instead of keeping on the road, he would have escaped, and I should have been minus my expenses; and he was the right man after all.

1262. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Had you taken him as a prisoner?—Yes; the super-

Mr. A. Hughes.

2 June 1853.

intendent vouched for his not being the man, and on that statement I released him.

1263. Lord *Lovaine*.] And then he apprehended the man himself?—Yes.

1264. Sir J. *Trollope*.] Was there a reward at issue?—No.

1265. Mr. *Burroughes*.] The Committee are to understand that you did not go away, that you met the superintendent, and then he had taken the man prisoner?—He had brought the man back; the man had gone from the public-house; he expected that I should return by the next train, and then he would take him himself, but in the mean while the man might have escaped; when I met him he was bringing him back.

1266. As his prisoner?—As his prisoner.

1267. Lord *Lovaine*.] You have served in the Surrey county police, have you not?—Yes.

1268. Had not you a wild district allotted to you?—Yes; but it was nothing in comparison with the North.

1269. Had you a district very notorious at one time for burglaries and depositions of every description?—Yes, I had; the first few months I was there I had a great deal more trouble than during the latter part of the time.

1270. If I recollect rightly you apprehended some persons there whom no parish constables would have dared to seize?—There were many.

1271. Did they not threaten to murder one of the police constables afterwards?—Yes.

1272. Do you find that the method of the appointment and payment of the police of the borough of Bath militates against its efficiency?—I do; I find that the borough system is more conflicting than the metropolitan or the county system.

1273. Do you think it would be a good thing to give jurisdiction over the city police to some authority who would also have under his government the police of the surrounding counties?—I do; I consider that that would be the best measure that ever was introduced.

1274. Is there much crime in the county of Somerset?—Yes, a great deal; I was in court at the Somerset assizes last August, when Mr. Baron Platt made some very strong comments on the calendar of the county; he said they had murder most prominently, and manslaughter; they had brutal assaults, and almost every other crime, indicating the absence of education and the prevalence of drunkenness, unbridled lust, and revenge; I was in court, and heard him say that. I was in court again at the assizes, in March 1853, when Mr. Justice Erle also observed, that, from the number and nature of the crimes in the calendar, the jury would have a grave and serious charge to perform. Again, Mr. Miles, the chairman of the court of quarter sessions of the county of Somerset, at the same time that the recorder of Bath was congratulating the city on the decrease of crime, said, at the county sessions, that there appeared in the circumstances of the present time great reason to hope that crime would diminish, but he found, from some cause or other, it was evidently increasing.

1275. Do you know anything of the Gloucester police?—I do not.

1276. You do not know the state of crime in that county?—I do not; to show that the co-operative system is necessary, about a fortnight ago one of my inspectors wanted to go into the country, as he had some information. He said he had information that was sufficient for a remand, if not for a committal, and in consequence of having been myself engaged on county business, and having had to wait perhaps 10 or 12 months to be reimbursed my actual expenses, we now never interfere in county matters, except by order of a Justice. This case he wanted to go about was a case where a stable was broken into at Somerton, Somerset, and two valuable cart stallions were hamstrung and cut to pieces. Since then this Bill has come out, offering a reward of 100*l.*, signed by 100 different farmers and yeomen. If a police force had been established in the county, I have no hesitation in saying that this offence could have been brought home; and so it would have been if I had allowed the inspector to go into the county and investigate the case.

1277. In your own force it appears that you have no power to dismiss?—No.

1278. And no power in fact to punish?—I fine for trifling offences, but at the same time that I do fine I give the men the option of going before the watch committee if they think proper.

1279. Has

*J. C.*  
 Mr *A. Hugh* & co.  
 2 June 1853.

1279. Has the watch committee the whole power of the administration and government of the police?—The Act of Parliament vests rather more power in the magistrates than in the watch committee.

1280. As regards yourself, you have no other power than slightly fining the men under your orders; but the whole of the punishment and the whole of the administration is entrusted to the watch committee?—Yes.

1281. Does not that watch committee consist of tradesmen in the town?—Yes.

1282. Do they attend the watch committee regularly?—There is generally a full committee.

1283. Do they attend to your representations?—Generally; but the evils which we experience are not perhaps in their power to remedy.

1284. At all events, you think it is not the proper body to govern the police of either the county or city?—I consider that if we were placed under a committee of magistrates we should not experience the evils which we now do from being amenable to two bodies; in fact, we are subject to three, being obliged to obey the precepts of the county justices as well.

1285. I suppose you would prefer being under one body, or even one individual?—One body, or one individual.

1286. Do you give it as your decided opinion that it is impracticable to carry on the superintending constable system with the help of parish constables?—I am certain it never can be efficient, because under the superintending constable system the superintending constable has a large area of ground, and he has to depend mainly upon the efficiency of the parish constables, and the duties which they have to perform are so contrary to their interests, that you would never get them to do it. I know from what I have observed in the counties of Somerset and Northumberland that they are completely useless.

1287. What does the police rate amount to in the pound?—The watch rate is 4 *d.* in the pound.

1288. Do you think that rate is paid without reluctance?—It is paid reluctantly by some; but I think the generality are satisfied with it.

1289. Are you sufficiently acquainted with the feeling of the trading classes of the county of Somerset to give an opinion as to their willingness to pay an additional rate of 2 *d.* in the pound for the purpose of protection?—I am not. I know that many of the county magistrates are aware of the necessity for a police force in the county of Somerset, and they are likewise aware of the evils which exist in the county. The supervision in the city is almost useless where there is no system beyond it in the environs; I know by the public-houses in Bath; we have a very strict supervision over them; yet before one o'clock in the day on the Sunday, drunken people are coming into the city from the outside. I have seen no less than eight individuals from Bath admitted into a public-house on a Sunday morning, during divine service, about a mile out of Bath. I mentioned it to one of the most active of the county magistrates; he said he knew it was so, but that he could not get any one to take it up.

1290. Then the evils of the absence of police in the surrounding counties are felt in the towns, very largely?—Yes; more perhaps than outside itself as regards the public-houses; they go from the town, where they cannot get drink; you may see the roads like a fair on a Sunday morning.

1291. Is it not the fact that thieves and depredators of every description very often reside in a town and leave it for the purpose of committing depredations and burglaries outside?—Yes; Isaacs, the captain of the Frimley gang, located himself, the whole of the time that the officers were after him, at Frome; he was taken at Frome, and from the inquiries I have made since I find he was daily in company along with those three men, Maggs, Hurd, and Sparrow, who were tried for the Frome murder. I have no hesitation in saying that he was organising another gang for the county of Somerset.

1292. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Have not those men all been apprehended?—There is one or two of them left.

1293. Are not the men whose names you have mentioned all convicted?—Yes; Hurd is out again. To show that the parish constabulary and the county parish constables are not of the slightest use, two parish constables followed one of the Frome gang named Whimpey. A burglary had been committed in Frome in a draper's shop; a roll of cloth was part of the stolen property; they followed this man on a Sunday evening going towards Bath; they passed him on the road;

Mr. A. Hughes.  
2 June 1853.

he was then carrying the stolen property under his arm ; and although he was by himself, they passed him and came into Bath and asked me to get him for them, and they had lost sight of him. I took an inspector out with me ; we walked about the town for half-an-hour, and we apprehended him and went back to the public-house where he had been, where we got the property. I may observe that he had his hand in a sling ; he was tried and convicted.

1294. *Chairman.*] Was he disabled?—I believe he had got his hand severely cut in breaking through the fanlight of the door.

1295. The two parish constables refused to take this disabled man?—They said he was such a desperate fellow ; and that he had been previously convicted of felony. There was another case occurred about three months ago. A parish constable made an application to the Bath police ; he had a man given in charge for stealing pork ; he took the man to a public-house, and the man, by some means or other, made off ; he missed the man, and when he came back he found the pork was gone too ; he had lost the property as well. At the last assizes for the county of Somerset, a man of the name of Thare was apprehended by one of the inspectors under me in Bath ; he was tried and convicted of a burglary in the vicinity of Burnham. He had property in his possession which he had taken in five burglaries. When he was taken I should say that he had 150 keys that would open any place. Ten robberies and burglaries were traced to him, and that man had made arrangements with the Government emigration agent to sail to Australia ; he was to have left the very day after he was apprehended. That man would have escaped had it not been for the Bath police. We have frequent cases in the county of Somerset of apprehensions, by the assistance of the Bath police, and other towns, and by the magistrates' precepts in the county, Somerset being without a county constabulary.

1296. Do you think, in a county where the rural constabulary exists, the presence of separate jurisdictions in the towns, having separate police forces of their own, is not a very serious evil?—It is ; if the boroughs were amalgamated with the counties, and the chief constables of such counties were amenable to a commissioner, I think it would remedy all the evils, because it must ensure co-operation.

1297. Would not a great diminution take place in the amount of the police force, both in counties and towns, if there were one uniform system of police?—Not in the towns ; you must bear in mind that a system of duty which is applicable to the towns is not applicable in a rural district ; the town forces must always be upon a different system from the rural police force. Since I have been in Bath I have, as nearly as I possibly could, adopted the metropolitan principle, and by so doing I have effected a saving of about 500 *l.* a year ; but a constabulary system of duty the same as the rural police could not work well in a large town ; it would be a moral impossibility.

1298. My question was directed to the possibility of diminishing the numbers, and, therefore, the cost of the rural police and of the city police, by putting a certain number of counties and towns under the same chief constable?—Yes, the cost would be decreased.

1299. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Would not you derive another advantage from having the power of removing the men from the town to the county, and *vice versa*, so as not to permit the men to form local connexions?—That is an evil in the present system ; a man is, perhaps, a native of the city, and he applies for employment ; if it were left to the will of the chief constable I would not allow it, but the watch committee have not sanctioned my refusing.

1300. Do you prefer strangers?—Yes.

1301. Are your men in the police force in the city of Bath chiefly natives or strangers?—There are some strangers ; I do not take more natives than I am obliged.

1302. You feel the local connexion to be an evil in those who are above you, and those who are below you?—Yes.

1303. Would it not be a great advantage to the service, if you could shift the men about to more distant places, where they have no local connexions?—Yes.

1304. Do you do that as far as you can within the limits of the city?—They are frequently changed, but that is of very little effect, because the locality is not wide enough.

1305. *Lord Lovain.*] Do you think the rural police system, as it is established in Surrey and Essex, is as perfect as the limited cost will permit?—I do ; I consider

*Mr. A. Hughes.*  
2 June 1853.

sider the Surrey constabulary is as perfect as a rural police can be; but the rural police must always be, in my opinion, a separate system of duty from that in a town.

1306. But that would not prevent the two forces being put under the command of the same person?—Decidedly not; you would always require a larger number of police in a town.

1307. Sir *J. Trollope*.] There would be no difficulty in apportioning both the men and the cost, if amalgamation took place?—None whatever.

1308. Mr. *Mackie*.] Am I to understand you to say, that a uniform system of police, such as an amalgamated force, would be a great improvement upon the present system?—Most decidedly; none of the evils could exist then which exist now; it would be a very good thing for the police officers and for the public, especially for the public, because it would ensure co-operation; now if one chief of police writes to another, requesting special inquiry into a robbery, I have no doubt it is afforded, but it is not unless it is particularly requested; they are generally engaged in investigating offences committed in their own localities.

1309. Do the 82 men under your charge perform night and day duty?—Yes.

1310. The same men?—Yes; that is to say, they are on night duty for so long, and then on day duty, and so changing about.

1311. Lord *Lovaine*.] In the county of Northumberland, could a police force be established in your opinion without a very heavy expense, considering the extraordinary character of the district?—Yes; I consider that a very good and efficient police might be established in the county of Northumberland at almost the same cost as the parish constables. You cannot imagine the cost to the county of the parish constables, nor the frauds which are practised by them upon the county.

1312. *Chairman*.] It is difficult to ascertain?—You cannot ascertain it; I know I was at an inn at the last assizes, and an offender was tried whom the parish constable had previously wanted; this parish constable, finding that the man was about to be tried, went and made a declaration that he had been engaged for 30 or 40 nights after this man. After he came back to the inn I heard him myself say that he had not been over the threshold of the door; and in that case he drew a sum of nearly 10 *l.*; it was all momentary; he never thought of it before.

1313. You do not think that the existence of great tracts of country, where there are hardly any fields, and yet peculiarly exposed to the depredations of sheep and horse stealers, is necessarily any objection to the establishment of a rural police?—No, I do not; because where the district is wide, and there are not many inhabitants, you have nothing to do but to put fewer men. The more the population, of course, the more the force must be.

1314. I suppose that, in your opinion, the amalgamation of such a district as that which borders the Tyne from Newcastle to Tynemouth, would be a matter of interest and importance to all those places?—Yes.

1315. Are not the police forces of all those places very inefficient?—Particularly so. Bath is universally admitted to be the best borough police force in England.

1316. With reference to Tynemouth, Shields, and Newcastle, is there not a very inefficient police force in those places?—Yes, in my opinion. I think on inquiry you will find that in particular boroughs they are very corrupt as regards police matters. I knew one place, not far from Bath, where the parish constables actually fine the prisoners without their going before a magistrate; I mean only for drunkenness.

1317. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do you refer to the rural police?—The superintending constable used to levy a fine when the prisoners came out of the cell without taking them before a magistrate; they do not do so now.

1318. When they were placed there for custody or safe keeping?—Yes. The present superintending constable there has told me that he has been offered the same thing by them; he has immediately said, "I cannot do anything of this kind." They have said, "Come, take it. We never used to go before the magistrates; we used to pay so and so." I do not think the salary of that party is above 30 *s.* a week, and by fees and emoluments his salary amounts to nearly 200 *l.* a year; I am sure it amounts to 170 *l.*

1319. Lord *Lovaine*.] The receipt of those fees does not make the constables particularly anxious to inspect the beerhouses?—No.

1320. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do you think that system is in operation still?—I do not think it is, as regards the fining of the prisoners; but the fees must be considerable for 30 *s.* a week to be increased to 170 *l.* a year.

0.71.

L

1321. Have

Mr. A. Hughes.

2 June 1853.

1321. Have you ever known any cases of the police under your orders taking money to hush up offences?—Never. I do not remember a case of bribery against a police constable in the whole 16 years I have been in the police. I cannot call one case to my mind.

1322. Sir J. Anderson.] Is it your opinion, if the watch committee were to vest in you the power of appointing and discharging the men, it would not go far to remedy the difficulty of which you speak?—I consider the borough force, by being amenable to two bodies, has a very conflicting effect; in fact, it puts the men in jeopardy, and likewise renders them very insecure, because if they do right they are called to account, and if they do wrong they are liable to punishment.

1323. If you had the entire appointment and dismissal of the men would not that go far to remedy the objections of which you have spoken of the men being under local control; are you aware that that is the case in Scotland?—I am not aware of the practice in Scotland.

1324. In the case of the amalgamation of the borough and county police, could not you secure co-operation if you had the men entirely under your control?—If it was the same as the county, where the chief constables are under the control of a body of magistrates, that would place the boroughs upon the same footing as the county constabulary, and the whole would be amenable to the police committee.

1324.\* Lord Lovaine.] When you served in the Surrey constabulary, did you ever meet with any obstruction from the magistrates?—I never met with any obstructions from the magistrates in Surrey, or in Northumberland, or in Bath.

George Warry, Esq., called in; and Examined.

G. Warry, Esq.

1325. Chairman.] ARE you a Magistrate for Somerset?—Yes, I have been a Magistrate for some years.

1326. For how many?—More than 20.

1327. What is your system of police in Somerset?—We have no system of police; we have only the appointment of constables under the Parish Constables Act.

1328. Have you not adopted the system of superintending constables?—No.

1329. You have no police except the old parish constables?—No.

1330. From your experience have you found them efficient as a police force?—Certainly not.

1331. Will you state in what respects?—They are unqualified for the performance of their duties as ministers of the law, and also as conservators of the peace. They are persons who are very loath at all times to set themselves in motion for the prevention of crime and for the detection of thefts which have been committed, and they are altogether certainly very inefficient.

1332. Holding that opinion, do you desire to obtain a better system of police?—I have taken a very great interest in the question, from the very commencement of the inquiry into the police of the country. At the time when the constabulary commission was issued in 1837, inquiries were directed under the constabulary commissioners. I took a great interest in it; a string of questions was sent to the Bridgewater Board of Guardians, over which I presided, and individually, as a magistrate, I forwarded my opinion, which they did me the honour to notice in the Appendix to their Report.

1333. Did you ever endeavour to obtain the adoption of the Superintending Constables Act?—Yes; I attempted, when the Police Act, 3 and 4 Vict., passed, to persuade the county of Somerset to adopt it.

1334. Failing in that, did you ever attempt to get the appointment of superintending constables?—Yes; I co-operated with Mr. Langton, one of the Members for Bristol; I did all I could to get some amendment of the system.

1335. You have referred to the parochial system; do you think there is an interest in the increase of crime given to those officers by paying them for the apprehension of offenders?—I cannot say that I have positive proof from any instance of the kind; it must necessarily lead to it: it is the only way in which a parish constable can get paid. If a crime is committed, and followed up by commitment, he gets paid for his services. If he interests himself to prevent the commission of that crime, he gets no pay.

1336. Mr. Moody.] Was not the attempt of Mr. Langton, the Member for Bristol, to which you have alluded, the partial introduction of the measure with

with reference to the neighbourhood of Bath and Bristol?—I rather think it was for that division; the crime of that division more particularly urged him to the attempt.

1337. And not extending over the whole county?—No; I co-operated with him because I was inclined to think, if we could make a move in any direction, it would be an improvement on the present system.

1338. *Chairman.*] Have you found difficulty in offenders being brought to justice under the parochial constable system?—I have found difficulty in detecting the perpetrators of offences; after the offender has been pointed out and marked as being the person, I do not think there is any difficulty in laying hold of him; but there is great difficulty in following up offences and in detecting them.

1339. You mean to say there is great difficulty in the pursuit of criminals?—Yes, certainly, if a person has been robbed. A grazier in my neighbourhood, about two years ago, lost as many as eight sheep; those sheep were stolen and driven all across the county through Bristol into Gloucestershire; as soon as he got into Gloucestershire he was within the operation of the Police Act. The policeman then on duty, seeing this man with the sheep, entered into conversation with him, and from conversation he was led to suspect there was something wrong in his statements. Finding that he had stated that which was not true, he took him into custody, searched him, and found a letter with an address leading to the locality near me in Somersetshire. He made further inquiry, came down, and found out the grazier who had lost those sheep. The man was discovered, prosecuted, and convicted, and the property restored to the owner.

1340. You mean to say that the pursuit of the offender in this case in the county of Somerset, was ineffectual?—There was no pursuit at all.

1341. Then the prisoner would have escaped altogether if there had not been a police force in the county of Gloucester?—I think so, certainly.

1342. Have you formed any idea of what the expenses of the parish constables are?—I took occasion the other day to ask the clerk of our union at Bridgewater, the expenses that had been paid for the Bridgewater division for the year ending Lady-day 1852.

1343. What is the number of parishes in the division?—Forty parishes in the union, 37 in the division; the population is about 33,000; the expenses paid under the present system of parish constables in 1852 was about 168*l.* 10*s.*; the expenses of the constables were 65*l.* 5*s.* 9*d.*; attending proceedings before magistrates in the preceding year, it was 82*l.* 11*s.* 10*d.*, and the expenses of the constables, 90*l.*, before the justices.

1344. In speaking of proceedings before magistrates, do you mean cases where convictions took place?—No; there are certain expenses paid to the justices' clerks for the orders and appointment of constables: various expenses are paid out of the same fund.

1345. Are you chairman of the Bridgewater Board of Guardians?—I was chairman at the formation of the union for the first two years; I have been three years chairman again since that; now I am vice-chairman.

1346. As chairman of that Board of Guardians, can you give any information to the Committee as to the necessity or the utility of the police in the suppression of vagrancy and tramping?—I think it would be very desirable; a police force is the most effectual way of repressing vagrancy altogether.

1347. Does vagrancy abound in that district?—I think so. A case occurred not long since to a neighbour of mine who happened to be with me: he had left his house; we were watched out of his premises, and a vagrant, a very clever fellow, in conjunction with two others, went to his house, and having got hold of our names he obtained 5*s.* or half a sovereign, I do not know which, from the lady of the house, on a false statement; I forget exactly what it was. Those three vagrants went on imposing upon various parties. When the gentleman came home he found, of course, that his wife had been imposed upon, and he being a man with more energy than his neighbours, followed those men from his house, tracing them to Glastonbury; from Glastonbury to Somerton; from Somerton to Langport, where we got near them. His horse was very tired; and whilst he was stopping to give it some food, his servant, more eager than discreet, with the constable whom they had taken at Glastonbury to assist them, went on a little outside the town of Langport; they came upon these three men, and very rashly laid hold of one of them and the other two escaped; they took the third into custody, and in coming over the bridge he managed to throw his

G. Warry, Esq.  
2 June 1853.

papers into Langport river. The man was brought before me afterwards. I have no doubt he was one of the party; but the person who went to the house and imposed upon the lady escaped; there was no means of connecting him with the person we had in custody, consequently all three escaped. All that resulted from it was, that the gentleman had to pay, in my presence, a considerable sum of money for the expenses he was put to in prosecuting the case.

1348. In your experience is there a great deal of expense incurred from the depredations of tramps and vagabonds?—I am a great sufferer myself.

1349. Are you aware of the magistrates being put to expense by the want of police?—I remember an instance which I stated to the constabulary commissioners. A case of arson, of very strong suspicion, was brought before me, and it was necessary to remand the prisoner, thinking that clearer evidence might be supplied by further inquiries; it was not so, and I was obliged to discharge the man; certain expenses were incurred which were paid by myself and others out of our own pockets.

1350. In the case of a robbery being committed on your property, you, having the means, could employ parochial constables in order to pursue the offenders at your own expense?—It would be at my own expense.

1351. A poor man with no means would not have the same facility to employ constables?—Certainly not; that, I think, is the hardship.

1352. If there were a paid constabulary, the poor man would be on the same footing as to the recovery of his property as the rich man?—Undoubtedly. I should feel satisfied in contributing to his relief.

1353. Sir J. Trollope.] Do you take any means to check vagrancy at your Poor-law union?—We do.

1354. Do you put in force the regulations of the Poor-law Commissioners?—We have few vagrants to what we had.

1355. Do you attribute the decrease to the mode in which you deal with the vagrants who apply for relief at the union-house?—I cannot say; there are very few applications in that way.

1356. Are you as much infested with them in the county?—I think there are as many about the county.

1357. Has not vagrancy decreased since there has been better employment throughout the country?—There are a great number now.

1358. Has not the number of vagrants decreased throughout the country?—No, I think not in our district; I think we have as many as we always had.

1359. Mr. Moody.] Is not the number of applications by vagrants at the union-house a strong indication as to whether vagrancy is increasing or decreasing?—No; I think the professional vagrant rather abstains from applying at the union-house. I think they do a better business by confining their operations to families.

1360. Do you find that those who go into the union-house object to working, after their night's rest, in the morning?—My attention has not been called to that subject; we have so few applicants in that way. On my last visiting the work-house the master informed me that the vagrants' beds were seldom occupied.

1361. Do you know the population of the Bridgewater division?—I think it is more than 30,000.

1362. Sir J. Trollope.] Have you considered the advisability of incurring the expense of the police in Somerset?—I have no hesitation in saying that the advantages would be quite commensurate with the expense.

1363. Chairman.] Supposing the expense incurred were 2½*d.* in the pound, do you think the advantages to be derived from the police would be equivalent to that expense?—Certainly 2½*d.* in the pound in our county would produce upwards of 20,000*l.*

1364. Do you think that the value of land to the occupier, and consequently to the owner, would be increased by the establishment of a well regulated police?—I think it would; I confess, individually speaking, that I should consider my own property more valuable, and my woods more valuable, by being freed from the depredations which I suffer from the high road passing through them, and the damage I sustain in the plantations by the sapling trees being cut, and wood of various kinds being cut for the supply of things which these men make, such as clothes-pins and other things, and for fuel.

1365. Sir J. Trollope.] As a proprietor of woods subjected to these depredations, if this loss is so great, would it not be worth your while to have an individual

87  
G. Warr, Esq.  
2 June 1853.

vidual watchman over your own property, such as a woodman?—It would not pay me to do it.

1366. Would it pay you to have the county police?—My contribution to the county police would be far less than the expense of a private watchman. I will give the Committee an instance which occurred not long since. A party of tramps and gipsies, with a great number of horses, came and pitched their tent very near my wood; the keeper was going through the wood, and he fell in with a fellow who had cut a lot of young oak saplings, which he carried across to the place where the tent was pitched; the man, being single-handed, could not go and take this person away from the party; he came home; it was evening. I went to the parish constable, and we proceeded to the place where the parties were encamped; when we got there every single male person in the party was gone. Some of these oak saplings were thrown over the hedge, and others were upon the fire half burnt; and of course all the party went off.

1367. Did not you deal with them as tramps and vagrants?—No.

1368. You might have done so by law?—I must have been the prosecutor, and it would not have been satisfactory to me. I knew the name of the party, for I took the name on the cart; and if there had been any police in the neighbourhood I could have given notice in which direction they had gone. I have often been subject to the same thing. It adds to the expenses of property, and I think by mutual insurance we should be able to defend each other.

1369. Lord *Lovaine*.] If you had had a private watchman, and he had followed these parties, would not your property have been left unprotected?—Yes.

1370. Mr. *Burroughes*.] I presume it would have been a very heavy expense to have sent a parish constable to Gloucester after the eight sheep to which you have referred, but if you had had a police force they never would have got so far?—No; I think that we in Somersetshire ought to be able to requite Gloucestershire with like service.

1371. Mr. *Moody*.] It would appear from your evidence as though there were no attempts at detection in Somersetshire?—Really there is not a great deal of attempt at detection.

1372. Was the farmer who had lost the eight sheep so apathetic that he did not attempt to follow them?—He had no means of knowing which way to go; he must have gone to the neighbouring towns and published handbills, and that is a very inefficient way of detecting crime; he had no one to tell his loss to whose services would have been at his command, without aggravating his loss.

Mr. *Thomas Heagren Redin*, called in; and Examined.

1373. *Chairman*.] WHERE do you reside?—At Carlisle.

1374. What are you now?—The governor of the county gaol.

1375. Had you previously served in the Liverpool police force?—I served 5½ years in the Essex county constabulary, and 4½ years in the Liverpool borough police force.

1376. What situation did you hold in the Liverpool borough police force?—I was chief superintendent of the north division.

1377. Why did you leave that situation?—On my promotion as governor of the county gaol, at Carlisle.

1378. Were you the head of the force at Liverpool?—I was the second; the chief constable, or commissioner, is the head of the force; there are two divisional superintendents, each with 500 men under their charge.

1379. Have you directed your attention to the different systems of police now existing throughout Great Britain?—I have.

1380. What are they?—At the time I was connected with the Liverpool police force, we prepared a great mass of statistics, with reference to the police force generally, there being a hostile feeling existing between the magistracy and the watch committee, the superintendent had the statistics prepared for some years, in the event of anything transpiring; and I was employed by the commissioner to procure that information, showing a comparison between the county constabulary and the borough police, and the working of the two systems. I of course formed my opinion mainly from the working of the Essex constabulary. I have also observed the working of another county constabulary.

1381. In what other county?—In Lancashire, which is extremely good.

1382. Therefore you have a specimen of two counties, one in a purely agricultural county, and the other a large manufacturing county?—Yes. The Essex

0.71.

L 3

system

Mr. *T. H. Redin*.

Mr. T. H. Redin.

2 June 1853.

system worked extremely well; at the commencement there was vast opposition to the force, but it gradually subsided.

1383. Does the Lancashire system work well?—It does as a rural police, very well; still there is a want of co-operation between the Liverpool borough force, and the Lancashire men. A system of jealousy exists for which I see no remedy, except putting the two forces under the chief constable; I would put all the borough establishments under the same authority as the county; I would take the county, for instance, and amalgamate the county constabulary with the borough forces.

1384. Might not there be a jealousy in Liverpool in placing the head of the constabulary in the county?—There would be on the part of the watch committee, but not on the part of the magistracy.

1385. Supposing the system were adopted of placing two or three adjoining counties, classing the larger counties as boroughs, under one head, would not that remove any jealousy on the part of the boroughs?—I do not think it would remove the jealousy of the municipal bodies.

1386. Would not they be placed upon one equal footing with the counties?—Not if you delegated the power to the magistrates, in lieu of the chief constable.

1387. If you placed the borough of Liverpool under the direction of the chief constable for Lancashire, do not you think that would remove the jealousy?—I think the two forces would work harmoniously and well together.

1388. Do you think there would be no jealousy on the part of the magistracy?—It might exist for a short period, but it would soon subside; they would work as one family.

1389. Sir J. Trollope.] Would not the family be too large?—I think not.

1390. What is the number of county police?—Upwards of 500.

1391. What is the number of police in Liverpool?—It was 900, but it has been reduced to 800.

1392. Could that large body be worked as well under one head?—It would work well under one head.

1393. Would not there be a difficulty in passing the accounts of so large a body?—Not at all.

1394. Do you think it practicable to work a city of any size with the county?—I do.

1395. Do you propose to extend it beyond the limits of the counties, and put two or three counties together?—Lancashire would be an exception to the rule, there being Liverpool with the force I have mentioned, Manchester having 400, and there is a police force at Bolton and Preston.

1396. Would you, as a rule, put two or three counties together?—I would.

1397. What would be the total force you would have in counties and boroughs?—I think from about 1,700 to 1,800.

1398. You would not exceed 2,000?—I think not; Preston has not more than 23.

1399. Manchester has 400?—Yes.

1400. And Liverpool 900?—It is reduced now to 800.

1401. And 500 in the county?—Yes.

1402. Making 1,800?—Yes.

1403. Would that be too large a body to work together?—I think not.

1404. Have you ever been in the metropolitan force?—I was stationed at Dunmow, and I have been occasionally ordered to come into London to act.

1405. Having acted with the metropolitan police force, you see no difficulty in working the force on a more extended scale in the county?—Not the slightest.

1406. *Chairman.*] Do you believe that the establishment of county police forces has been attended with beneficial results?—I am quite satisfied of it.

1407. Will you state some of the objects thereby effected?—In the north Hinckford division of the county of Essex, the police was established in 1840, and in the article of sheep alone the farmers in that division in 1839 lost 99; some farmers refused to give me any information. I have the means of ascertaining that they had lost some 8 or 10, but for 99 I have an honest return. The first year the police force was established their loss amounted to five, and two parties were transported for sheep-stealing; I have every reason to believe that they stole the five, as they were all stolen in a small area. In the following year the loss was one or two. Burglary was not known after the establishment of the police; the vagrants vanished by magic, and we had scarcely any in the county. The Rev. Mr. Gooch, a very active magistrate near Topesfield, gave me a certificate

on

on leaving Essex; and he stated in the certificate that "what had been the rule was then the exception," (with respect to crime). Those are the very words he made use of.

1408. Sir *J. Trollope*.] What office did you hold in the Essex police?—I was a superintendent of the first class.

1409. Have you any rural police in the county of Cumberland?—We have four men stationed in the Derwent division; one at Keswick, two at Cockermouth, and one at Maryport.

1410. *Chairman*.] Is there any chief constable?—There is one at Cockermouth, a superintendent in charge of the three. They are efficient as far as they go; but it is too wide a district.

1411. Are they sufficient for a night patrol?—No.

1412. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Of course the Keswick policeman has no communication with the others?—No.

1413. Is the superintendent at Cockermouth?—Yes.

1414. What is the distance from Keswick to Cockermouth?—I am not aware; it is a considerable distance.

1415. Is there any police at Whitehaven?—There is one, which is supported by the Town and Harbour trustees.

1416. There is no rural police?—There is no rural police. The eastern parts of Cumberland and the borders of Northumberland are infested with vagrants; robberies are rife, and the farmers frequently turn out in a gang and attempt to secure the depredators; but before they can be secured they have gone to the borders of Scotland, and vanished from Cumberland.

1417. Can you give the Committee the number of prisoners in the gaol, to show the state of crime?—With reference to the state of crime in the county, the numbers are low; that is particularly the case as regards the natives; three-fourths of our prisoners, as the statistics will show, both for felonies, larcenies, as well as misdemeanours of a milder description, are strangers.

1418. Have you not a mixed population in the city of Carlisle itself?—We have.

1419. Are there not a considerable number of Irish and Scotch?—There are.

1420. Being on the borders you have idle characters from all the counties?—We have very few Scotch prisoners; our prisoners are principally Irish, or persons born of Irish parents, resident in Cumberland. In the average of the last seven years, the committals for trial have been very light. In 1846 it was 144; in the last year it was 138; but that is no criterion, I am sure more crime was committed.

1421. Do you mean to say that it remains undetected?—It remains undetected purely from the want of some channel to apply to.

1422. Is it not the fact, that the condition of the people in the county of Cumberland is remarkably good as regards wages?—The agricultural labourers board in the farm houses; they are hired for a term, and they get from 6 *l.* to 7 *l.* and 10 *l.*, according to their capability. The married men's wages average about 8 *s.* or 9 *s.* a week, at present I believe 9 *s.* to be about the average. The number of vagrants that slept in Carlisle in the year ending November 1852, which number was registered, and every information procured by the police, was 45,718; for the present quarter, ending the other night, the numbers amounted to 10,236; that is wholly independent of those who pass through Carlisle during the day-time; those are the parties that actually slept in Carlisle.

1423. Mr. *Moody*.] Of what class were those vagrants generally?—Itinerant thieves.

1424. Sir *J. Trollope*.] The whole of them?—I asked the superintendent, and he said they were itinerant thieves principally; three-fourths of my prisoners are of that class.

1425. What is the state of the police force in the city of Carlisle?—It is established under the Municipal Corporation Act, paid for from the corporation funds.

1426. What is the number of the police?—Twenty-two.

1427. Is it well managed?—Yes.

1428. Are the lodging-houses in the city of Carlisle placed under the Lodging-house Act?—Yes; this is a return from the police officers of the lodging-houses; the vagrants will not apply to a union; the professional thief never applies for a ticket at the poor-house; he prefers the low lodging-house.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Return:*]

Mr. T. H. Redin.

2 June 1853.

## LODGING-HOUSE RETURNS, from 23d November 1851 to the 20th November 1852.

DATE.	Males of full Age.	Females of full Age.	Males from 8 to 21 Years.	Females from 8 to 21 Years.	Males under 8 Years.	Females under 8 Years.	TOTAL.
1st quarter -	7,917	2,811	154	231	356	240	11,709
2d „ -	7,506	2,667	121	102	288	165	10,849
3d „ -	8,044	2,924	142	125	175	153	12,463
4th „ -	8,027	2,314	33	76	100	147	10,697
TOTAL -	32,394	10,716	450	534	919	705	45,718
For the present quarter - - - - -							10,236

1429. Have you many of such low lodging-houses in Carlisle?—I am not prepared to state the number, but there are a great number.

1430. Have many of those low lodging-houses been abandoned since more stringent regulations have passed?—No; they have generally managed to get their license.

1431. Do you consider those low lodging-houses to be receptacles for stolen goods?—Unquestionably they are receptacles for stolen goods; according to the term made use of by the thieves they act as a “fence;” if the thief does not know of any other method, he manages to dispose of his property through the keepers of those houses.

1432. Were not some portion of this vast number of vagrants Irish, who were driven by the state of their own country into England or Scotland?—I think so.

1433. Is it fair to class the whole of them as thieves?—I am confirmed in that opinion by the superintendent of police. I have a great many in my custody; we have about 600 prisoners in the year committed to gaol.

1434. Is Carlisle Gaol the only gaol in the county?—There is none other.

1435. What has been your daily average of prisoners for the last few years?—In 1851 it was 101, last year 94, and the present year 88.

1436. The numbers have been on the decrease?—Our recommittals have decreased, but we have the same class of persons constantly coming into the gaol.

1437. Mr. *Moody*.] Supposing these vagrants to live as thieves, you detect a very small portion of the felonies that are committed?—Yes; especially in the neighbourhood of Bewcastle, on the borders of Scotland.

1438. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Seeing the position of Carlisle, which is the gate into Scotland, is it not inevitable that you must have a great number of vagrants passing to and from England and Scotland?—I think so, as a matter of course.

1439. Are not many of those persons coming from Glasgow, to seek work in England, at the large manufacturing places?—They are wanderers upon the face of the earth; that was the expression of the superintendent.

1440. Are the same parties in the habit of passing to and fro?—Very probably; it is a neighbourhood where many live in the fields; and those men steal where they can.

1441. *Chairman*.] Do not you think that parochial constables are perfectly inefficient for the purpose of remedying this evil?—Quite so, from the fact that I very seldom receive a prisoner from a parochial constable, in any form or shape.

1442. Do you think they are capable of performing their duty?—I think it is utterly impossible, from their local connexion, and their own interest; they are generally small tradesmen, such as tailors and shoemakers.

1443. Are they unwilling to accept the office of constable, generally?—I cannot give any opinion upon that point; we find it to be the case.

1444. Did you give any rewards in Liverpool?—The watch committee, upon the representation of the Commissioner, if a man exerted himself, would give him 10 s. or a pound.

1445. Did

1445. Did they do that without the assent of the superintendent of police?—*Mr. T. H. Redin.*  
No.

1446. Does the system of paying constables by fees and allowances become oppressive to the sufferers from offences, particularly as regards the lower classes?—I conceive, under the present system, the poor man receives no protection at all; if he is robbed, he must put up with the loss; but where there is a policeman he is equally protected with the rich.

2 June 1853.

1447. Were the public-houses and beer-houses well controlled in Liverpool?—Not in a satisfactory manner; far from it.

1448. Are those places generally the chief resort of thieves in the town?—They are; there are some 18 or 20 houses in Liverpool which are notorious as the resort of thieves.

1449. You have spoken of the inefficiency of the parochial constables; have you had any means of calculating the expense of parochial constables in any districts?—I made the attempt to analyze it, but I found it impossible to arrive at the exact amount paid. I arrive at it in this manner, that a meeting, assembled to oppose the police, went away satisfied that the expense was not greater than that incurred by the parish constables.

1450. *Chairman.*] Where was that?—At North Hinckford, in Essex.

1451. Considering the question of efficiency, do you believe that the direct and indirect expense of a parochial constabulary is equal to, or greater than, the cost of a well-organized police force?—I think the inhabitants at large would save the expense of a police from the absence of vagrants; the toll they levy is enormous.

1452. You are aware of the Act by which there is the middle system of appointing constables for each division of a county; are you of opinion that parochial constables can be rendered efficient, or more efficient than they are at present, by the appointment of superintending constables?—Knowing the material with which you have to deal, I think not; I have never seen the working of the superintending constable system; I have heard of it, but it is not satisfactory, because a parochial constable will not co-operate; there is always some interest clashing against the proper discharge of their duties.

1453. You state that uniting counties with towns would not be productive of jealousies?—I cannot see any jealousy which could arise; the pay would be the same, and the promotion would go on the same.

1454. *Sir J. Trollope.*] If it could be shown to the boroughs that they would save something by it, would not they be inclined to adopt it, in your opinion?—I think they would.

1455. Do not you think, practically, the expense of superintendence would be saved?—The expense of the staff would be reduced.

1456. You think that would induce the boroughs to consent to amalgamation, without jealousy of feeling?—Yes.

1457. *Chairman.*] Could it be done without increasing the expense to the county?—I think it could; you would merely take the cost and divide it amongst the respective boroughs and counties.

1458. Do you think that the boroughs depend upon the assistance and aid of the military when the police force is found to be inefficient?—At the time I was at Liverpool, in 1848, we anticipated a serious outbreak with the Chartists; the men in the police force were all drilled to the use of the cutlass; a certain number of constables of the rural police were mounted and armed in the outskirts; we had 100 picked men trained to the use of the carbine; we depended upon our own force; the military came into Liverpool, but they took no part in the arrangements.

1459. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Had you any mounted police?—No.

1460. *Chairman.*] Do you know anything of the police in Blackburn?—No.

1461. Have you experienced or observed any inconvenience or delay in the discharge of police duties from the restriction of the constable's power within certain limits?—That is particularly the case when a man knows that he is not a constable beyond a certain limit.

1462. Supposing the large boroughs, such as Liverpool, Leeds, and Birmingham, with a population of more than 100,000, were placed in the situation of separate counties or districts, do you think there would be any advantage in adding certain districts round those boroughs to their districts, irrespective of absorbing them in the whole county?—We found in Liverpool this fact, that the thieves seldom committed a serious robbery in the borough.

0.71.

M

1463. Assuming

Mr. T. H. Redin. 1463. Assuming that those boroughs were considered as separate counties, with a chief constable at their head, with an independent police force the same as a county, would it be desirable to add any district round those boroughs to those boroughs?—I say in Liverpool we found it to be the fact that burglaries were rarely committed; they were committed in the outskirts, at a distance of two or three or four miles; if our men had had liberty to patrol as far as that, I think the thieves would have been defeated, and they would remain at home rather than go eight or ten miles for nothing.

2 June 1853.

1464. Have you had any experience as to the beneficial results of transferring local duties to the county constabulary?—The Essex constabulary were the first that performed the duties of inspectors of weights and measures; it effected a very great saving on the whole; it used to be a sum of 600*l.* An expense was saved to the county by transferring the duty to the county constabulary, and it is the opinion of the county generally that the superintendents have discharged that duty very satisfactorily; they have discharged it satisfactorily in this way, that a shopkeeper never knows when the superintendent is coming into his shop. The parish constable used to acquaint all his neighbours: “The inspector of weights and measures is coming, and you must look out.” The superintendent of police can walk in at any time and detect the fraudulent dealer. Also with reference to sanitary matters, all the duties in connection with the Board of Health are far better discharged by the police, in Liverpool, than by the inspector of nuisances, as he is termed; the whole of those duties are performed by the police much better than the limited staff which they keep.

1465. Under whose direction is the police in the borough of Liverpool?—Entirely under the watch committee, from the head to the lowest constable.

1466. Have the watch committee the power of dismissing?—They have.

1467. And also the power of appointing constables?—Yes.

1468. Mr. *Burroughes.*] Is the watch committee a portion of the town council?—They are members of the town council. The watch committee consists of 25 members selected from the town council.

1469. Is it an annual appointment?—It is; the election takes place on the 9th of November.

1470. *Chairman.*] Did any inconvenience arise from that?—Constant interference:

1471. What was the nature of that interference?—We have had several cases of positive interference, and three or four conspicuous ones, in members of the watch committee. We had one case where an officer was active in apprehending a number of boys for breaking the collegiate windows; it was a paltry affair in itself, but he chanced to arrest two sons of an elector in the ward. As soon as the father discovered that, he posted off to the member of the watch committee of his ward, and requested that he would interfere and get the constable removed from his beat. I thought it was such an outrageous interference that I declined to listen to him. I said, “It is a preposterous interference; the man has done his duty properly, and I shall continue him on his beat.” That gave great offence, and that member of the watch committee never spoke again to me while I remained in Liverpool.

1472. Has there been any interference with the police in the borough of Liverpool in consequence of their inspection and control of the public-houses and beer-houses?—Yes; we found a very significant fact, that the houses belonging to the members of the watch committee who were publicans, brewers, and spirit merchants, were seldom reported.

1473. Do you mean to say that any members of the watch committee were publicans?—In 1845 there were several members of the watch committee who were brewers and spirit merchants; that is the leaven that does so much mischief. In the year 1846 the chairman of the watch committee was a brewer.

1474. Sir *J. Trollope.*] And the owner of public-houses?—A vast number. In 1848 there were several brewers and spirit merchants on the watch committee. In 1849 the deputy chairman was a brewer. In 1850, on the nomination of the watch committee, a considerable discussion took place in the town council as to the impropriety of having brewers and publicans on the committee; the magistrates had given some hint that they objected to the body; it resulted in only one or two being appointed. I am not prepared to say the number. In 1851 and 1852 the number was increased again; this year there is only one brewer, the owner of several public-houses. In the year 1847 a publican, who had an information

information laid against him by one of the police constables, came to the station attended by a member of the watch committee of the ward in which his house was situated, for whose election this publican was chairman of the committee, and impudently threatened to take the policeman's coat off his back if he dared to interfere.

1475. Was that a member of the watch committee?—No; he had beaten up his friend to come to the station and endeavour to interfere; many other matters occurred.

1476. *Chairman.*] You are of opinion that it would be better that the police should be placed under some more independent power?—Yes. I really do not think that the men can conscientiously discharge their duty under many circumstances.

1477. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Do you mean under the present system?—Exactly. If he saw the most flagrant case, if it belonged to a member of the watch committee, he would be a marked man if he reported. If once a prejudice is raised in a committee it is difficult to overcome it.

1478. You think it would be an improvement if the police were under the magistracy, with no control on the part of the watch committee?—Yes; the fact of the watch committee being an elected body, and depending upon popularity, must lessen their independence.

1479. You mean that the policemen might be severely handled by the watch committee from the representations of the constituents of that body?—Exactly. It is nothing more or less than dread and intimidation. The watch committee would listen to a case which the magistrates would scout.

1480. Can you suggest what you think would be the best mode of acting with such cases; under what authority would you place the police?—I think there is no better power than the magistrates, who are a permanent and responsible body; which is not the case with the town council.

1481. *Lord Lovaine.*] Do you think even the magistrates would be a fit body to appoint the police?—I think not; I think the head of the police is the best judge of the qualities of the men he would accept in the service; I have known most improper men appointed in the Liverpool police force.

1482. *Mr. Burroughes.*] Do you know any instance in any county where the appointment is not vested in the chief constable?—I believe it is vested in the chief constable by the Rural Police Act.

1483. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Do you think the police in Liverpool were appointed from corrupt motives?—I have reason to believe they have been appointed from political motives.

1484. Are the police in Liverpool chosen by the whole body of the watch committee, or by a sub-committee under them?—By the whole body; the sub-committee sit daily, and their proceedings are submitted to the whole body each Saturday before the final appointments take place.

1485. Have the superintendents any voice in the matter?—For the last two years they were allowed to come before him from a list; he submitted his list of approved candidates, supposing there were four vacancies; they had virtually the selection after all, because he was bound to send more candidates than there were vacancies.

1486. By that check improper men could not gain admission?—It was felt to be an improvement, but not a sufficient check.

1487. *Lord Lovaine.*] The persons appointed would be those whom the superintendent had sent up as candidates?—No doubt, but still he felt the pressure from without.

1488. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Did they come before you in the first instance?—No; I never saw them till they had their uniform on, and reported themselves as being appointed.

1489. Have you had occasion to report those men as unfit for duty?—Yes.

1490. Did the watch committee attend to your representations?—They used to fine them sometimes. I have frequently reported men as being incompetent for the duty, and the watch committee have asked me in what particular manner the man was incompetent. I would say, "The man has not common intelligence," or, "He is not an active man." And they would say, "Give him a further trial; the man is anxious to get his living;" and by that means we were encumbered with men who were perfectly useless.

Mr. T. H. Redin.

2 June 1853.

1491. What was the cost of the police force to the borough?—About 40,000 *l.*; they are paid out of the corporation funds, and by a small rate, the eighth of a farthing only.

1492. Were your men employed in assisting the civil power in the collection of the Customs dues at Liverpool?—The whole of the north docks were under my charge; we had 200 men there, and they were allowed, with the sanction of the Customs, to arrest any person passing through the gates with contraband goods, for which they received a reward.

1493. Had that any effect upon the discipline of the men?—I think they looked more after smuggling than after theft.

1494. Do you think the reward was a stimulant to that species of duty?—Yes; if I had my will, I would never give rewards in such cases.

1495. You saw no objection to their performing that duty if they had not had that stimulant?—No.

1496. You think rewards have rather a demoralizing effect upon the police?—Yes.

1497. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Do not you think the Government ought to pay something for that protection to the revenue, and that the expense ought not to fall entirely upon the ratepayers?—Of course; they are a protection to property as well. A man may be taken up for smuggling goods; if the police see a man rather more bulky than usual, and they are induced to search him, it may prove that he has stolen cotton about him.

1498. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Was it not the duty of the police also to look after the shipping and the goods, and to protect property generally?—Yes.

1499. Did they ever go on board the ships?—Only at tide-time, to see that each vessel had its proper watch, which was in conformity with the bye-laws of the borough. The docks were all closed, and the constables were stationed as sentinels at the gates.

1500. Is there not a dock police at Liverpool?—They were amalgamated with the town force in 1836, with good effect. Previously to that time they used to act as two distinct forces; one would act directly hostile to the other.

1501. Lord *Lovaine*.] Do you believe it possible to establish the rural police in the mining districts of Cumberland?—I do. The mere fact of constables patrolling would act as checks, and vagrants would not come into the county.

1502. Is there not a good deal of crime at Alston and the mining district of Cumberland, in poaching and otherwise?—Yes.

1503. Are there not desperate characters in that district, who commit crimes in broad daylight, setting the law at defiance?—Yes.

1504. Do you believe those parties would be checked by the establishment of a rural police?—The uncertainty of the movements of the rural policeman is the terror to thieves.

1505. Could you collect a body of policemen to oppose the armed gangs which go about in broad daylight in that district, on the spur of the moment?—A policeman would not properly discharge his duty if he were not acquainted with the residences of the suspicious characters; he ought not to allow a gang to be so organized that he could not get assistance.

1506. You think mining occupation is not a bar to the establishment of police?—I think not.

1507. You say that you have never known the magistrates interfere in the conduct of the police?—No; I have never heard the magistrates interfere with the conduct of the policemen.

1508. Have the magistrates ever dismissed men for misconduct?—Mr. Rushton dismissed several of my men.

1509. Have the magistrates ever threatened them with dismissal?—Never to intimidate them.

1510. With reference to the rural constabulary, are you aware whether they have ever met with undue interference on the part of the county magistrates?—I never heard of it.

1511. Sir *J. Trollope*.] When you were in the Essex rural police, did you entirely dispense with the services of the parish constables?—I only remember one instance, in a village where I was stationed: I requested a constable to take charge of a prisoner; that constable was a decent respectable man.

1512. They were not altogether dispensed with by the magistrates?—They were appointed by the vestry.

1513. Were

1513. Were they entrusted with no duties whatever?—No.  
 1514. Did they never attend at the sessions or assizes?—No.  
 1515. Were the entire expenses of their services saved to the county?—Yes.  
 1516. Then the appointment of constables was a mere formality, and not attended with any advantage?—I only on one occasion required the assistance of a parish constable, in which he had a case at the sessions.  
 1517. Is it your opinion that, under a perfect organization of a rural police force, it would be possible entirely to dispense with parish constables?—Yes.  
 1518. In fact, the law requiring their appointment might be repealed?—Yes, because their duties might be discharged by the police.  
 1519. If they were in sufficient numbers?—Yes, such as serving precepts and minor matters.  
 1520. The law contemplates not more than one policeman to every thousand inhabitants. Are you of opinion that the maximum number would be sufficient to discharge all the duties of the parochial constables as well as those of police?—I think it would.  
 1521. Lord *Lovaine*.] Is there any utility, in your opinion, to be derived from continuing the law as it now stands, that there must be a parish constable for every parish?—I cannot see the slightest utility in it, except in counties where there is no police. They would be a nuisance if they were appointed in conjunction with the police.

Mr. T. H. Redin.  
2 June 1853.

Veneris, 3<sup>o</sup> die Junii, 1853.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Rice.	Sir John Trollope.
Mr. Burroughes.	Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Fitzroy.	Sir James Anderson.
Mr. Charles Howard.	Lord Lovaine.
Mr. Rich.	

EDWARD ROYDS RICE, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Thomas Heagren Redin*, called in; and further Examined.

1522. *Chairman*.] WILL you state your opinion as to the comparative expense of prosecutions under the rural police, and under the old system of parish constables?—The expense of prosecutions averages in Cumberland 18*l.* each, and in Essex it is a few shillings under 8*l.*  
 1523. Are there any local circumstances which would increase the expense in Cumberland?—I think it is to be attributed entirely to the heavy expense of the parish constables in the pursuit and securing of prisoners; their bills are very heavy in Cumberland.  
 1524. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do you mean for sessions and assizes together?—Yes.  
 1525. Cannot you separate them?—No, I cannot.  
 1526. Lord *Lovaine*.] You have stated that the remuneration of police constables at Liverpool is under the Watching and Lighting Act; to whom, in your opinion, ought the remuneration to be given?—I think to the head of the police.  
 1527. Do you think the police should be irremovable except at his pleasure?—The magistrates have the power under certain Acts to remove the men for misconduct; under ordinary circumstances the appointments and dismissals ought to be in the hands of the chief constable.  
 1528. You think the management of the police should be concentrated as far as possible in the hands of the head of the police?—Most decidedly; that is my opinion.

Mr. T. H. Redin.  
3 June 1853.

Captain *John Woodford*, called in; and Examined.

Capt. *J. Woodford*.

3 June 1853.

1529. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Preston, in Lancashire.

1530. You are the chief constable?—I am chief constable of Lancashire.

1531. Can you state what is the number of your force, and its classification?—We have, exclusive of supernumeraries, 546; and we have 13 supernumeraries.

1532. Do you know what proportion the number of your police bears to the population?—The proportion of men to the population varies in the different districts; each petty sessional division of the county of Lancaster is in itself a police district.

1533. Do they pay their expenses separately?—They pay their expenses separately; their accounts are kept separately.

1534. What is the reason for that?—It originated upon the attempt to abolish the police in 1842; upon the failure of the proposition to abolish the police a resolution was come to to separate the county into districts, under the provisions of the Act of the 3 & 4 Vict., c. 88.

1535. Was the objection to the police that the expenses were greater in proportion to the wants of the different divisions?—Precisely so. The rural districts considered, if they were called upon to pay an equal rate, they were supporting the police of the populous districts.

1536. Do you think that is just?—I think it is just that each district should be called upon to bear its own expenses, and no more; I could not devise a better plan to give general satisfaction.

1537. Do you think that objection would apply to a county purely agricultural?—I should imagine not.

1538. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Are the appointments, and promotion, and the general discipline of the men carried on in the same way as if the rate were paid equally over the whole county?—Precisely so; the men are as completely under my direction as if it was one single district, and removable from one place to another.

1539. Do you mean that they are removable from one police force to another?—If I find a man does not work well in one district I place him in another.

1540. *Chairman.*] Have not you the power, in any one of those manufacturing districts, in the case of an outbreak, to remove any number of men that you think proper into that district?—Yes.

1541. What boroughs have you in your county?—The boroughs in Lancashire are Lancaster, Preston, Blackburn, Bolton, Oldham, Ashton-under-Lyne, Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, Warrington, and Wigan.

1542. How many of those boroughs have a police of their own, and how many have not?—All of them have police forces of their own.

1543. Has Blackburn a police?—Yes, since it separated from the county it has a force of its own.

1544. When was that?—Last year.

1545. Have you ever been called in to assist the police in any of those boroughs?—In several of those boroughs, in cases of disturbance.

1546. Which of them?—In Preston.

1547. When?—At the last general election in 1852, and at former elections.

1548. How many men did you send to Preston at the election?—I think about 40 or 50.

1549. Into what other borough have you been called?—To Bolton; we sent but a few men there. We have also sent men to Wigan and Warrington.

1550. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Was that also at the time of a contested election?—Yes.

1551. Are those the only occasions on which the county police has been asked for by the magistrates of the boroughs?—Not the only cases in which we have been asked, but the only cases in which we have acted; we have been asked to go in to suppress ordinary disturbances in a borough.

1552. Have you had many applications of this description?—We had one from Wigan immediately following the last general election.

1553. Consequent upon that election?—Consequent upon that election; a disturbance took place the day after the declaration of the poll. We could not afford them help, and they were obliged to call for the aid of the troops, as our hands at the time were completely full at Bury and elsewhere.

1554. -Have

1554. Have you had repeated applications from the magistrates of the different boroughs to assist them with a detachment of your men on any other occasion than contested elections, or riots growing out of contested elections?—No. Capt. J. Woodford,

3 June 1853.

1555. *Chairman.*] Was there a disturbance at Blackburn?—There was a disturbance at Blackburn at the last election.

1556. Were you applied to for assistance then?—We were.

1557. Did you give it?—We did not give it.

1558. Why did you not?—Because Blackburn is not in our charge.

1559. Had you not acted in places which were equally not in your charge?—Wigan was not in our charge; Blackburn had been, but they left us.

1560. What did they do at Blackburn?—They appointed special constables.

1561. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Has Wigan any police of its own?—Wigan has a police force of 10 men.

1562. *Chairman.*] Were the military called out in the borough of Blackburn?—The military were called out.

1563. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Will you explain why you had no objection to furnish men in the case of Wigan when you had an objection in the case of Blackburn, where they had a separate police force neither under their control?—I felt myself in a difficulty, Blackburn having relinquished our connexion; I therefore laid the case before the constabulary committee, and the committee, upon consideration, came to the conclusion that it was not expedient to take the men from the duties for which they were paid, to preserve order in the town of Blackburn, which contributes nothing towards their support.

1564. The same circumstances seem to have occurred with respect to Wigan; why was the decision different in one case from the other?—I never appealed to the committee in any other case.

1565. Did you deal with it on your own responsibility?—Yes.

1566. Are the Committee to understand that the only reason why you refused to grant the application of Blackburn was because you thought they had better have remained under your control; in fact, it was by way of signifying to them your displeasure?—I think they would have acted more wisely to have remained under our charge, and perhaps it was thought desirable that they should be allowed to feel their weakness.

1567. *Lord Lovaine.*] In other words, you thought that, having refused to pay their proper share towards the general police rate of the county, they were not entitled to any assistance?—I considered, that having so refused, they were no longer entitled to any assistance.

1568. *Chairman.*] Are the Committee to understand that there was this difference between Wigan and Blackburn, that Wigan never had been consolidated with the county?—Never.

1569. And Blackburn had?—Yes.

1570. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] What is the number of the police force in Blackburn?—Thirteen; when we had charge of the town it was 22.

1571. *Sir J. Trollope.*] What is the population of Blackburn?—Forty-six thousand five hundred and thirty-eight.

1572. Are 13 policemen adequate to preserve the peace and discharge the ordinary constabulary duties, in a general way?—I have already mentioned to the Committee that I had 22 in the town, and I did not consider that number more than sufficient, aided as it might have been by any necessary augmentations in cases of emergency.

1573. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Has the police force been increased since the last election, or has there been any proposal for increasing it?—Since this Committee has been appointed, they have, I believe, added six to their number.

1574. On the occasion when you were called in to aid in suppressing the riots were the county constabulary paid by the borough authorities?—Their extra expenses were defrayed, and their expenses in being conveyed from place to place; there was the ordinary allowance given to the constables to defray the expenses to which they were put.

1575. Was it stated, when the application was made to you for this additional police force at Wigan, that they would be called upon to pay?—They were fully aware that they would be called upon to pay.

1576. Was the same offer made in the case of Blackburn?—The same offer was not made; I do not bear the thing perfectly in mind, but I think the impression in Blackburn was, that the constabulary of the county would be received as

*Capt. J. Woodford.*

3 June 1853.

special constables, and the expense borne by the county at large, and not by the borough; I think also that that was one reason which actuated the committee in refusing assistance.

1577. *Mr. Howard.*] Were not the county police lately called upon to act at Clitheroe?—Yes, at the last election; a few days since.

1578. What is the number of their police?—They are in charge of the county; it was my duty to go in there and preserve order.

1579. *Lord Lovaine.*] How many men did you take to Clitheroe?—Two hundred men.

1580. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Was that number adequate for the preservation of the peace?—Quite.

1581. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Was order kept at Clitheroe last week?—Perfectly.

1582. Was there any disturbance or annoyance to any person?—No; there was not even a pane of glass broken.

1583. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Was there a demand for the county constabulary at the last election at Oldham?—Not at the last election; at the general election a demand was made.

1584. Was it acceded to?—It was not acceded to, for this reason, that they refused to bear the expenses; the borough declined to bear the expenses.

1585. Was the assistance of the police refused on that ground only?—It was, I believe, refused on that ground only.

1586. *Sir J. Trollope.*] There was scarcely a contested election in Lancashire at which there were not serious disturbances, was there?—There were none at Bury.

1587. Did you send men there?—Yes. Bury is in our charge, and therefore entitled to our services. Neither did any disturbance take place at Wigan while we were in charge of the town.

1588. Would there have been a disturbance if you had not sent a force into Bury?—A most serious disturbance, without any question.

1589. You think that the presence of your force prevented it?—Yes, most certainly.

1590. Have you considered the question with reference to the county of Lancaster, whether it would be desirable to amalgamate the police force placed under your control both in the counties and boroughs?—I think there is some peculiarity regarding Liverpool which would require consideration.

1591. Are you aware of the number of men now employed in Liverpool?—Yes; they have 886.

1592. Do you consider that Liverpool has so large a force that you could not deal with it in conjunction with the county police?—I do not say that.

1593. Do you consider that you could arrange matters so as to superintend the whole of the county?—I think any one man could manage the police of Lancashire with better effect, as a whole, than divided as it now is.

1594. Including the whole of the boroughs?—If it became necessary to place it under one man it could be done, and I have no doubt well done.

1595. Would it be desirable to leave out such boroughs as Liverpool and Manchester?—I think it would be desirable to treat Liverpool and Manchester as districts by themselves, and treat the county as another, and rule under one head.

1596. You think that you can find sufficient force to preserve peace in the boroughs and in the county?—Yes, without the aid of a single soldier, except under most unusual circumstances.

1597. *Chairman.*] You mean according to the 3 & 4 Victoria, placing different counties under one head, and making Liverpool one of them?—Yes; I think Liverpool would necessarily be separate, because the expenses are defrayed out of the borough funds, and not out of the rate.

1598. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Have you any reason to imagine that the police force of Liverpool is insufficient?—No; I think generally it is a sufficient establishment, even for extraordinary emergencies.

1599. You think the number sufficient?—Yes.

1600. Has it latterly been reduced?—It had been reduced, but recently has been increased 80 men.

1601. *Sir J. Trollope.*] What was the original force?—I cannot remember.

1602. Was it much larger than the present force?—I do not think it was much larger.

1603. Do

1603. Do you consider that the force, as now managed, for the protection of the peace and property in Manchester and Liverpool, is sufficient without calling in the aid of the rural police?—Liverpool has never looked to us for any help except in 1848, and then we aided them only by sending some additional force to the outskirts, ready to help in case of need. Capt. J. Woodford,  
3 June 1853.

1604. Have you ever given any assistance to Manchester?—Never, except in a similar way.

1605. Mr. Fitzroy.] You stated, did you not, that you have never been called upon to give assistance to any of those boroughs except in the case of contested elections, or in the case of a riot growing out of a contested election?—I beg to correct myself. In 1842 there was a general insurrection, as it may be termed, and then we were called in to the borough of Preston, but not until after the borough police force had been found to be altogether defective, nor until after the troops had been called upon to act, and had fired, and killed and wounded several men.

1606. Where there is a separate police force in the boroughs, have you found any difficulty or hindrance in the administration of justice, in consequence of that separate and distinct force?—We have found a disinclination to co-operate with us in the detection of offenders; assistance has not been given with cordiality, and rarely with effect.

1607. Do you think that there is any feeling in those boroughs against the amalgamation of the borough police with the county constabulary?—I think there was a very much stronger feeling against it than exists at present, but I think there is a growing feeling in some of the smaller boroughs to come over to the county.

1608. Do you think that the fact of the repeated occasions in which they have called in the assistance of your force, and in which such assistance has been given to them, has induced them to alter their minds on the question?—I think that would probably be one reason; I think, moreover, they find now that the expense is not so great as was anticipated.

1609. Lord Lovaine.] Supposing the boroughs were to come over to the county police, would the present force of the boroughs be sufficient?—No, decidedly not. In some of the smaller boroughs, if they were to come over to the county, there would be, or there ought to be, a very considerable increase in the numbers.

1610. Evidence has been given before the Committee that the manner in which the police of Liverpool and those other boroughs are appointed is a serious impediment to the proper performance of their duties; are you of that opinion?—Most decidedly; I think no more prejudicial system to the working of a good establishment of police can exist than for the management of the men to be vested in a fluctuating body, such as watch committees or town councils.

1611. You are of opinion, are you not, that in the case of such amalgamation of the forces it would be absolutely necessary for the head of the police to do that which the Watching and Lighting Act vests in the hands of the watch committee?—The power should be vested in some competent person, some individual, either some officer appointed by the magistrates, or by the Government if they choose to take the matter in hand.

1612. You are of opinion that a committee of the magistrates themselves would hardly be a safe body to whom to trust the appointment?—I think it is desirable that the chief man should have the appointment, being held accountable for the men he may appoint.

1613. Would the arrangement of the county into petty sessional divisions answer where there are a great number of large towns?—I think it answers well in Lancashire.

1614. But the large towns are not included?—We could include them all with good effect; some towns of considerable magnitude are already included.

1615. When you speak of large towns, do you mean Liverpool and Manchester?—We could include the large towns, such as Liverpool and Manchester, in those petty sessional arrangements, but my answer to the last question referred particularly to the other boroughs or towns.

1616. Do the magistrates in those petty sessional divisions fix the number of men to be employed, or is that arranged in quarter sessions?—It was done thus: in the first instance, in 1842 an attempt was made to abolish the police; that failed, and then a resolution was come to by the magistrates dividing the county into districts, and the magistrates of each district were called upon to fix the

0.71.

N

number

Capt. J. Woodford

3 June 1853.

number of men for their respective districts; upon those returns being sent in to the quarter sessions, they were generally adopted, upon which a reduction of the establishment took place from 502, which was the original establishment, to 355, upon the 1st of August 1842.

1617. Is it your opinion that those petty sessional divisions were fairly represented by the numbers which they assessed themselves?—No; as a clear proof of that, we have been augmented from time to time, on account of the growing wants of the districts, up to 546, which exceeds our original number by 44.

1618. Does not it appear to you that great injustice might be done to one part of the county, by reason of one or other of the petty sessional divisions refusing to appoint a sufficient number?—We have not found it so; I think the magistrates generally have appointed very sufficiently; now they rarely appoint additional men, except upon the strong representations of the ratepayers that more protection is required.

1619. Would not the amalgamation of the boroughs and the county necessitate an additional expense?—I do not think it would upon the county.

1620. Would it enable you to do with fewer men in the rural part of the county?—The immediate effect would be to increase the men in the boroughs; I think it would enable us in the course of time to reduce our numbers in the county, because as the boroughs are now managed they are the nurseries of crime, and we have to keep a larger force in the immediate neighbourhoods of those boroughs, in order to protect ourselves from their thieves.

1621. Mr. Fitzroy.] Was the attempt to reduce the police made before the insurrection?—On the 1st of August the reduction took place; the insurrection commenced on the 9th, and we felt ourselves completely crippled.

1622. Chairman.] Is Ashton-under-Lyne one of your divisions?—Ashton-under-Lyne is a division so called; we name our divisions from the principal boroughs, or from the names of the hundreds; but the town of Ashton-under-Lyne is a borough having a police force of its own, 14 in number.

1623. Is there not a great variety of different police systems in Ashton-under-Lyne?—There is the county constabulary in the out townships, and the police establishment in the borough.

1624. Have they the county constabulary?—Not in the borough itself, in the petty sessional division.

1625. Have they also the borough police?—They have the borough police.

1626. Has Stayleybridge a police force?—Stayleybridge is partly in Cheshire and partly in Lancashire; it does not come under the operation of the Act; that town is entirely under a local Act.

1627. In those three immediate districts you have three different systems of police?—Yes.

1628. You have got in that immediate neighbourhood the police of Cheshire, the county constabulary; in Ashton-under-Lyne you have got your rural police, and you have also got a police force in the immediate neighbourhood of Stayleybridge, under a local Act?—Yes.

1629. What do you think is the effect of the different systems in that district?—I think it is impossible they can act with effect or cordiality, or benefit to the public; there is no unity of action, nor can there be with so many diverse systems.

1630. Mr. Fitzroy.] Do you consider the objection entertained on the part of the boroughs to join in the county constabulary arises chiefly from the fear of increased expense, or principally from the fear of losing patronage?—I think the main fear is the loss of patronage by certain members of the town councils; other members of the town councils would be perfectly content to put themselves under the county, but they are resisted by some who are more influential or more talkative.

1631. Do you think it would be desirable to devise a plan by which a portion of that patronage might be preserved to the borough authorities, if the appointment and control of the police were vested in the chief constable?—I think the divided authority would be very hazardous; I should myself be sorry to share it.

1632. You think it is an essential part of the scheme for amalgamation, that the nomination and promotion of the men should rest, as it does now in the rural constabulary, with the chief constable?—I think so, especially in order that the men may not be under local influence, which they sometimes are.

1633. Chairman.] Have the railways also in the district a separate police?—Yes.

1634. Therefore

1634. Therefore there could be five or six separate police forces in the district? *Capt. J. Woodford*  
—Yes.

1635. *Lord Lovaine.*] Would it be possible to amalgamate the railway police with the rural police?—I see no difficulty in it.

3 June 1863.

1636. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Have you any means of knowing generally the state of the police within those boroughs where you have no control?—I believe it to be very defective in the small boroughs.

1637. Have you any means of ascertaining whether beer-shops and public-houses in those boroughs are worse regulated than those more immediately under the control of your officers?—I have not the means of ascertaining, and I am not prepared to state at this time, but that they are under a worse supervision I have no doubt.

1638. Can you state that positively as a fact?—I believe the fact is that they are not under proper supervision; I think it is hardly possible that they could be, because it is well known that in town councils brewers and licensed victuallers have become members, and those men must have an influence over the constables whom they appoint; it is a necessary consequence.

1639. Are frequent reports made to you of the bad order of the beer-shops and public-houses within your own district?—We have frequent reports; publicans are frequently brought before the magistrates for misconduct, upon the reports of the police of the county, and those publicans are invariably punished, so far as my recollection goes.

1640. You have no means of judging of the comparative numbers reported by the borough police, and those reported by your men?—No, not at all; I receive no information from the boroughs.

1641. *Mr. Rich.*] Have any of the boroughs been transferred from the local authority to your authority?—Not any.

1642. Has any effort been made to transfer them?—No decided effort has ever been made; two boroughs have removed from us.

1643. What were the circumstances under which that took place?—They have obtained charters of incorporation, and have established police forces of their own.

1644. *Mr. Mackie.*] Is the police force popular in the county of Lancaster?—I think it is becoming popular, for this reason, that applications are frequently made for an increase of police in various districts by the ratepayers.

1645. It was not popular on its first establishment?—Not at all; there was a strong prejudice against it, but I think that has nearly died away.

1646. Has crime decreased in consequence of the establishment of the police?—No question of it.

1647. Is the decrease of crime one of the great causes of the force becoming more popular in the county?—I think it is, and the confidence people feel; they feel more safe, more secure; there are districts where it is well known that doors are left unbolted, and clothes are left out now without fear, which could not have been done in former days.

1648. *Chairman.*] You have mentioned that you have seven different systems of police in Lancashire, near Ashton-under-Lyne; do you know Mr. Hall, the clerk to the magistrates there?—Yes.

1649. Has he ever expressed any opinion to you that there was great difficulty in managing the business in consequence of those different systems?—He has never so stated to me.

1650. It is your opinion that there is great difficulty?—I should say so; I should say there must be difficulty.

1651. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] What is the rate of pay in your force?—It varies.

1652. Will you give the Committee the different grades?—A scale of pay was established at the January sessions 1847, which has been in existence ever since; the chief constable receives per annum 500*l.*

1653. *Lord Lovaine.*] Including all allowances?—No; his travelling expenses are defrayed; that is, actual expenses out of pocket.

1654. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Has the chief constable received any increase of pay?—No; that is what I received in the first instance; there has been no variation in my pay; an assistant was appointed at 200*l.* upon this scale, after three years' service he will receive 250*l.*, and after a further service of four years 300*l.*, and that is the maximum.

Capt. J. Woodford. 1655. Lord *Lovaine*.] What class of person is your assistant chief constable?  
 —He has served as a lieutenant-colonel under General Evans.  
 3 June 1853. 1656. Does he fill your place in case of your absence?—Yes.  
 1657. Has he all your power on such occasions?—Yes, during my absence.

1658. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] What are his duties when you are present?—To visit the various districts, to inspect closely the books and proceedings, and to examine and report upon the interior economy of the divisions. The superintendents upon appointment, or promotion from an inferior rank, receive 100 *l.* a year; after a service of three years in that rank, they receive 130 *l.*; after a further service of four years, making upon the whole seven in that rank, without reference to previous service, they obtain 150 *l.*, and that is the maximum.

1659. Have you a superannuation fund?—We have. We have two clerks; the chief clerk is paid as a superintendent: the next in rank are the inspectors; they have a daily pay, upon appointment, or promotion of 4 *s.*; after a service of three years they receive 4 *s.* 6 *d.*; and after a further service of four years, 5 *s.* The sergeants are the next in rank; the sergeant receives 3 *s.* on first appointment and promotion; after a service of three years he receives 3 *s.* 3 *d.*; and after a further service of four years, 3 *s.* 6 *d.* The sergeants are also admissible to a class which we call the class of merit; that is, the men who distinguish themselves are permitted to wear a badge, and upon this badge being granted to them they have a further additional pay of 2 *d.* per diem. Constables of the first class receive 2 *s.* 7 *d.* per diem; after a service of three years, 2 *s.* 8 *d.*; and after a further service of four years, 2 *s.* 9 *d.* They are also eligible to the class of merit upon the same rate of pay, 2 *d.* per diem. The two other classes are the second-class constables, at 2 *s.* 5 *d.* a day; and the third class at 2 *s.* 4 *d.*, and they receive no more until they become first class; their service does not tell till they are first-class constables.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Paper:*]

COUNTY OF LANCASTER CONSTABULARY FORCE.

SCALE OF PAY.

R A N K.	On Appointment or Promotion.			After Service of Three Years.			After further Service of Four Years.			Class of Merit.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Chief Constable - - per annum	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assistant Chief Constable - ditto -	200	-	-	250	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-
Superintendent - - - ditto -	100	-	-	130	-	-	150	-	-	-	-	-
Chief Clerk - - - ditto -	100	-	-	130	-	-	150	-	-	-	-	-
Inspector - - - - per diem	-	4	-	-	4	0	-	5	-	-	-	-
Assistant Clerk - - - ditto -	-	4	-	-	4	0	-	5	-	-	-	-
Sergeant - - - - ditto -	-	3	-	-	3	3	-	3	0	-	-	2
Constable, 1st Class - - ditto -	-	2	7	-	2	8	-	2	0	-	-	2
Ditto - 2d Class - - - ditto -	-	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Ditto - 3d Class - - - ditto -	-	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2

1660. Is that a higher rate of pay than is generally given in boroughs?—I think in boroughs it is larger generally; our highest rate of pay does not come up to the ordinary rate of pay of a borough constable.

1661. What deduction is made from their pay for the superannuation fund?  
 —Two per cent.

1662. Lord *Lovaine*.] In what state are the lock-up houses in your district?—We have a very considerable number of stations; we have some which have been built, and others which are hired; we have ten which have been built at a cost of 8,575 *l.* odd; they have 26 cells for the safe custody of prisoners; we also rent 99 station-houses, having in them 150 cells for prisoners.

1663. Do

1663. Do those buildings comprise good lodging-rooms for the constables?—*Capt. J. Woodford.*  
Yes, and for the superintendents and other officers.

1664. Are they a species of barracks?—Yes.

1665. Are all your men lodged?—No; some find and pay for their own lodgings.

1666. Are all the men quartered in barracks?—No.

1667. Would it be an advantage if they were to be so quartered?—We have found it so advantageous that we have adopted the practice as far as we can; at all the principal stations there are men so quartered, and at all places where prisoners are kept in custody.

1668. Do the men pay for their lodgings?—Yes.

1669. *Mr. Rich.]* Are your men subjected to any drill on joining the force?—A very slight portion of drill; we are not in a condition to give them as much as we should otherwise do, in consequence of not having a sufficient reserve, and again, not having charge of the town where the head-quarters are stationed. We have therefore no means of instructing the men so well as I could wish before they are sent out to divisions.

1670. If you had a larger force and better means should you subject the men to drill?—Decidedly; they ought to be able to move in compact bodies. I should not recommend that they should be drilled as soldiers.

1671. Would you drill them to the use of arms?—To the use of the sword only; I would not place fire-arms in their hands at all.

1672. *Chairman.]* Have your men cutlasses?—Yes; to be used only in cases of emergency.

1673. From the peculiar character of your population, where you are more likely to have popular outbreaks, is it not more necessary to have the men armed than in other counties?—I think it is not necessary in the agricultural districts, but in Lancashire it is desirable, so far as I have stated.

1674. *Chairman.]* What other duties besides the maintenance of the public peace do your men perform?—Partially the inspection of weights and measures, but not entirely.

1675. How is that?—Because those inspectorships fall to us as they become vacant.

1676. Invariably, when the office becomes vacant, has it been transferred to your force?—Not invariably. There is one instance in which it has not been so, and another in which a constable was removed from our force to put him in that situation.

1677. Does not that arise from there being a different number of managements in certain divisions?—Yes; it is the recommendation of the general court of quarter sessions that these appointments should be held by the constabulary.

1678. *Lord Lovaine.]* Do you agree in that opinion?—It is my opinion that it would be beneficial to the public.

1679. *Mr. Fitzroy.]* Do you mean as a saving of expense, or in the way in which the duties are performed?—As a saving of the poor man's pocket; I do not mean a saving of expense to the public always; I mean that it would save the poor man from fraud; and I am of opinion that the duties generally would be more efficiently discharged.

1680. Do you think that the duties are better performed by the police?—Some of the existing inspectors do their duties admirably.

1681. *Chairman.]* Do you perform any other supplemental duties?—Partially we are inspectors of lodging-houses.

1682. *Mr. Fitzroy.]* Has the Lodging-house Act been adopted in Lancashire?—Yes.

1683. In which of the towns of Lancashire is that Act in operation?—I cannot enumerate them, but I fancy pretty generally.

1684. Is it in operation at Preston?—Yes.

1685. Is it in operation in Bury?—Not under our charge; nor in Preston under our charge.

1686. Is it at Preston in the charge of the corporation?—I think it is; it is not a matter to which I have turned my attention.

1687. Do the police give notice to the coroners upon deaths taking place?—Yes, in all cases.

1688. Is that duty in your district universally performed by the police, for which no extra charge is made to the county in consequence?—Yes, without charge.

0.71.

N 3

1689. Lord

Capt. J. Woodford.

3 June 1853.

1689. Lord *Lovaine*.] Therefore it is a saving of the salaries of the parish constables?—It is a saving of the salaries of parish constables.

1690. *Chairman*.] What is the nearest district of Yorkshire to you?—Todmorden, Clitheroe, and Colne are Lancashire towns upon the border.

1691. Have your police ever been employed in Yorkshire?—They have occasionally gone into Yorkshire, and the cases that they have observed or acted upon have been adjudicated upon in Lancashire.

1692. Before the magistrates?—Yes.

1693. Of course for the benefit of the clerk of the magistrates?—That led to some very sharp observations upon the part of the inhabitants of that part of Todmorden which is in Yorkshire; it was more than insinuated that those Lancashire constables went into Yorkshire for the purpose of getting cases for the clerk of the magistrates; and it was also insinuated that they did so for their own benefit; so soon as this came to my knowledge I thought it my duty to put a stop to a matter of that kind, and I directed that they should not in any case, except in the absolute pursuit of thieves, act at all in Yorkshire; the consequence has been, that disorders which were heretofore noticed by the county constabulary of Lancashire are now left unnoticed, owing to the want of a proper police establishment in Yorkshire; reports have been made to me showing how many cases have occurred within a very recent period, which would otherwise have been noticed by our men, if I had not checked them, as I felt it my duty to do.

1694. Was an application made from any individuals in Yorkshire for your men to go into Yorkshire; what was the cause of their going over the borders?—Because they noticed the disorders; they observed them under their own eye; they could not fail to see them; it is but across an imaginary line; and they went into Yorkshire to suppress those disorders.

1695. What was the nature of the disorders?—Cases of drunkenness and fighting in public-houses; cases of public-houses being kept open at unseasonable hours, or cases of vagrancy; in another case it was a pugilistic fight; I thought, and think still, that it was the business of the Yorkshire people to keep order in their own county.

1696. Did your men go into Yorkshire by your orders?—No; as soon as it became known to me, and that these insinuations were cast upon them, I thought proper to stop it.

1697. Was there a police force at that time in Yorkshire?—I believe they had only parish constables.

1698. Had they no superintending constables?—I do not know of any superintending constable at Todmorden, or within eight or ten miles.

1699. Do you think there is great disorder and rioting in Yorkshire, immediately over the borders of Lancashire?—Yes.

1700. Have you witnessed it?—My constables have reported it to me; I have not with my own eyes seen it.

1701. Mr. *Howard*.] What is the system in Yorkshire?—Superintending constables with parish constables under their directions.

1702. Lord *Lovaine*.] A suggestion has been made that it would be possible to recruit for the army through the means of the police; do you think such a suggestion could be carried out?—I have hardly given the subject a thought; we collect the men together for the militia very rapidly and simply.

1703. It has also been suggested that the police should superintend the highways and turnpikes; do you think that could be carried out?—I think it would be attended with very considerable advantage if every turnpike-gate keeper was a constable.

1704. *Chairman*.] Under the chief constable of the county?—Yes; and bound to report to him.

1705. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Would not the adoption of police as turnpike-gate keepers take away the system of letting the turnpikes as they are let now?—Yes; I would let the Government take them in hand.

1706. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] What do you mean by saying that the police get the men together for the militia?—We serve their notices upon them individually.

1707. When they are enlisted?—We fill in the notices in some cases, in which the clerks of the lieutenantancy refuse, because they are not paid for it; they have thrown a good deal of trouble upon us; the notices were sent to us at so late an hour that we had men up all night to get them ready.

1708. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do the police induce volunteers to join the militia?—  
They

They did in the first instance; a reward of 5 s. was offered by Act of Parliament. Capt. J. Woolford.

1709. Were the men permitted to take that 5 s. per head?—I should have been very sorry to have deprived them of it, as I thought no means should be left untried to obtain volunteers.

3 June 1853.

1710. Have you allowed them to receive it?—I never interfere with a reward which is given to the men by the Government.

1711. Was the reward of 5 s. to get recruits for the militia acted upon?—In some few districts; it was not generally acted upon; I think it was only in two or three districts.

1712. Do you discourage your men receiving rewards?—I take no steps to discourage it on procuring recruits for the militia.

1713. Have you received any instructions to do so from the police committee?—No.

1714. Do you not think that the police would be very valuable assistants in obtaining persons to volunteer in the militia, from their mixing so much with the poor?—I think they might be made to do so. Perhaps there might be some feelings of jealousy go forth if they were made to recruit for the army; for the militia I think it might be done with good effect.

1715. Lord *Lovaine*.] You consider it is not impossible for the police to recruit for the army?—It is not impossible for the police to recruit for the army; I think it a little foreign to their present duties, and not unlikely to induce bad habits.

1716. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] As they are entitled to receive 5 s. for the men they induce to volunteer for the militia, is it not the case that they have used all the exertions they can for the sake of that reward?—I do not think they have exerted themselves much; they might be made to do so.

1717. Sir *J. Trollope*.] You have stated that you discourage your men receiving rewards from Government; do you allow them to receive rewards from any other sources; in cases of felony, for instance?—There have been cases in which rewards have been offered by parties, which reward has been backed by the offer of a reward from Government; in such cases, where the men have been successful in convicting, I have looked upon it as a Government reward, and the whole has been divided amongst the parties who have been instrumental in bringing the offenders to justice; but I approve of none, and I discourage as much as possible the giving of rewards by private persons, being fearful that the constables might be disposed to pay too much attention to the property of those persons who would give money, rather than turn their attention to the property of those who are unable to give. I consider it would have an evil effect if they were allowed to receive rewards indiscriminately.

1718. Would it not encourage the police to get up prosecutions?—I am satisfied it would.

1719. You never permit the men to receive rewards without your knowledge and concurrence for services rendered?—Some two or three cases have come to my knowledge in which the men have received rewards without my sanction, and I have discharged them.

1720. Have you any difficulty in obtaining recruits for the police?—Latterly the men have been more slack in coming forward than they were in former days. We have no great number of vacancies; we have only 12 just now, which is not a material number in a body like ours. I must say, for the last six or seven months, I have not had so good a choice of men as I had formerly, but then there are various causes to account for that.

The Rev. *John Holmes*, called in; and Examined.

1721. *Chairman*.] ARE you a Magistrate for Norfolk?—I am.

1722. Have you a police force in Norfolk?—Yes; it has been established since the year 1840.

1723. Have you a police committee in Norfolk?—Yes.

1724. Were you the chairman of the police committee?—Ever since the original establishment of the police force I have been on the police committee, and the chairman since 1845. I am not quite sure as to the period, but I think it was 1845 when I became chairman of the police committee.

1725. What is the gross expense of the police in Norfolk?—The amount raised in the county amounts to 1  $\frac{7}{8}$  d. in the pound, which is equal to 9,698 l.

0.71.

N 4

1726. Is

The Rev.  
*John Holmes*.

The Rev.  
John Holmes.  
3 June 1853.

1726. Is the whole of that expended, or is there a balance?—There is a very small balance; it is nearly expended.

1727. What are the other general expenses of the county?—I am speaking of the year 1852; the general expenses of the county were  $1\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the pound, which amounted to 11,084 *l.*

1728. What was the amount of the rate raised altogether?—About 21,000 *l.*, including the police rate and the county rate.

1729. Do you think the ratepayers generally are acquainted with the amount of rate which they contribute to the police force?—I think not generally; I think the better informed are; many more are now informed than they were at the original establishment of the police force, from this circumstance, that within a few years it has been ordered by the magistrates that a book shall be made public, with a very detailed account of the police expenses in all its forms, both as to the general expenses and the police expenses; a copy of the expenses is sent to every board of guardians in the county, and all those ratepayers who feel any interest in it, all the large occupiers, have the means of seeing this book, and I have no doubt that in consequence they are better informed upon the subject.

1730. From your knowledge as a magistrate, do you think the ratepayers dislike the force?—I think they have been converted from the original feeling which existed amongst them; I have very little doubt the feeling was against the police; there were one or two largely signed memorials from the ratepayers, but I think that feeling has very much subsided.

1731. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] What is the amount of your force?—The present amount of the force is 132 policemen, 1 inspector, 13 superintendents, one of whom is the deputy chief constable, and the chief constable himself.

1732. Lord *Lovaine.*] Is that force sufficient?—I do not think it will be right for me to say; there has been a committee sitting to consider the condition of the police, on a report which has been made by our present chief constable regarding the police; we have taken into consideration a farther increase of the force.

1733. Sir *J. Trollope.*] Is that increase recommended by the present chief constable, Captain Black?—Yes.

1734. Does not he recommend another item of expense, in building lock-ups and residences for the police?—Certainly.

1735. Lodging-houses for superintendents, and lock-ups to a considerable extent?—Lock-ups, which are to comprehend lodgings for the superintendents.

1736. Do you recollect the number of men Captain Black recommends to be added to your force?—Two additional superintendents, six additional inspectors, 23 additional policemen, and three, under the name of sergeants, to be used as detectives in the three principal towns in Norfolk.

1737. In fact, Captain Black recommends the addition of 34 men of different grades?—Yes.

1738. Have you entered into a calculation of the additional expense to be incurred; the buildings which he recommends?—Yes.

1739. What is the amount of it?—We think, having considered the subject tolerably accurately, it will be something like 9,000 *l.* I think the amount of money we propose to suggest to the quarter sessions, to allow an expenditure in order to be quite sure that we may cover the whole, is as much as 10,000 *l.*, to be borrowed and paid in a certain number of years, and not to be raised in a year; he recommends about 18 stations.

1740. Mr. *Burroughes.*] Does not the chief constable contemplate considerable annual savings in consequence of these new arrangements which he is about to make?—Very large savings indeed, and I confess I am much of the same opinion; by the adoption of the plan proposed, by building lock-ups, and the further adoption of the plan of having county horses and carts, a very large saving will be effected to the county.

1741. Does not Captain Black contemplate charging rent for all the stations?—Certainly.

1742. *Chairman.*] Will the rent pay a sufficient interest for the money borrowed?—Certainly not a sufficient interest for the money borrowed for building the lock-ups.

1743. Sir *J. Trollope.*] As you seem to speak favourably of this recommendation, as being necessary to make the force thoroughly effective in the county of Norfolk, have you calculated what the annual expense to the ratepayers, in addition

addition to the  $1\frac{5}{16}d.$ , will be?—Taking into consideration the savings which will be made, as we suppose, we have reason to conclude, from the use of horses and carts in conveying prisoners, and other objects they may be used for, and the other things which are suggested, such as appointing the superintendents inspectors of weights and measures, we consider the whole of the additional force may be obtained for a sum within three-sixteenths of a penny in the pound additional to that which is now raised in the pound.

1744. Do you think  $1\frac{1}{2}d.$  would cover the police rate?—It would more than cover it.

1745. Including the buildings?—I am imagining the buildings to be already made; I mean only including the maintenance of the police after those buildings have been erected and paid for.

1746. Supposing the buildings cost 10,000*l.*, will there not be an additional charge for that money?—Till it is paid.

1747. And also a certain amount of principal to be repaid in each year?—Yes.

1748. *Chairman.*] Will not some of those buildings pay rent?—They will all pay rent: I think the calculation of the net rent that will be received for those buildings, after the necessary deductions shall have been made for meeting the necessary expenses belonging to the county, such as warming, lighting, cleaning, and so on, I calculate a net revenue will be derived of 160*l.* a year.

1749. *Lord Lovaine.*] Will not the 160*l.* a year be added to the amount of the savings which you contemplate making?—Yes; that forms a part of what I call savings.

1750. Therefore, in round numbers, you will have to pay about 600*l.* a year additional for interest and sinking fund for the 10,000*l.* borrowed?—I do not know what it will be, not having made the calculation.

1751. *Sir J. Trollope.*] What is the estimate of the expense of each separate lock-up, with the buildings attached to it?—There are two classes; the inferior classes would be 400*l.*, the superior 600*l.*; and there is one central lock-up, which is a station of a larger description, which it is proposed to put in the neighbourhood of Norwich, and which will cost 1,000*l.*

1752. Does that include stabling for the mounted police?—Yes.

1753. Are any of those lock-ups intended to be built in petty sessional divisions for magisterial purposes as well?—There is no magistrates' room with them whatever.

1754. They are to be built entirely for the use of the police?—Yes.

1755. *Chairman.*] You have stated that this expenditure, whatever it is, is so published that all the ratepayers have an opportunity of knowing what it is?—Undoubtedly.

1756. Was not there a time when this expenditure was very unpopular?—At the first establishment of the police it was unpopular.

1757. Do you think experience has made it more popular?—Certainly.

1758. Do you think that feeling has increased to a great extent?—To a considerable extent.

1759. What will be the expense to an occupier of property of a net rental of 100*l.* a year?—Supposing the rate to be raised to that which I have now said, namely, to  $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ , it will be 12*s.* 6*d.* on 100*l.*

1760. Then an occupier of 200*l.* a year would have to pay 25*s.* a year?—Yes; that is, on the net rating, not the gross.

1761. Do you think it would be the opinion generally of occupiers of land to the amount of 200*l.*, that that 25*s.* a year would be more than repaid by the security of property?—I have had an opportunity repeatedly of speaking to the more enlightened and better informed of the ratepayers, who were ignorant of what they had to pay, who simply looked at the sum of money spent in gross, amounting then to 10,000*l.* or 11,000*l.* a year; when I had explained to them exactly the sum of money they would have to pay upon 100*l.* they were satisfied to pay it for the benefit which they would receive, setting aside all moral considerations; merely in a pecuniary point of view, the answer has been that they thought the money extremely well spent.

1762. You think, in an economical point of view, it is the opinion of the ratepayers, as well as of yourself, that the establishment of police has been of great advantage to the county?—I have no doubt it is the general feeling; if I have a right to express an opinion, judging from the sentiments expressed by individuals

The Rev.  
John Holmes.

3 June 1853.

viduals I have talked to, I have never found a person dissenting from that opinion.

1763. When you speak of 12 s. 6 d. upon 100 l., which the occupier would have to pay, have you or not taken into consideration what the cost of the old system was?—No.

1764. Do you think the cost of the old system bore any proportion to the present system?—I have never calculated it; I have no doubt it is a great deal more.

1765. Mr. Burroughes.] Perhaps you may be able to give an instance of the operation of the old system, which arose in some districts where there was no protection to property?—It has happened to me individually, when I have had coals stolen from a barge, to put a warrant into the hands of the parish constable to execute; that parish constable has been actually afraid of going amongst the people to serve the warrant, and it has been obliged to go into a different district, where the constables are established under the Watch and Ward Act; they dare not meddle at all.

1766. Lord Lovaine.] Are any of the large towns included in the rural police force?—The only towns which are exempted are Norwich, Yarmouth, Thetford, and Lynn; I think, excepting those four places, all the other towns in Norfolk are included in the police.

*Henry Dover, Esq., called in; and Examined.*

H. Dover, Esq.

1767. *Chairman.*] ARE you the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions in Norfolk?—Yes, I have been Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for 22 years.

1768. When was the police established in Norfolk?—In 1840.

1769. Can you state generally your opinion as to the advantages or disadvantages which the county derives from the police force?—I can, quite decidedly. At first, I doubted about the policy of establishing a police force; after considering it, I thought that it deserved a fair trial. I watched it as much as I could, and I compared it as much as I could with the old system, and I have no doubt that the county has derived advantage in every way from it.

1770. Are the Committee to understand that you were opposed to its adoption?—When I first heard of it I felt disposed against it. Upon considering that it deserved a fair trial, I watched it; and ever since its establishment I think great advantage has been derived from the change.

1771. What is the result of your experience, having watched the working of the police system?—That it is a great improvement upon the old system, and capable of more improvement; I think the area which our police have to go over is more than they can do justice to. I think, with the extension which the Committee have heard proposed, we shall be able to do the system of police at an expense altogether of from 1½ d. to 2 d. in the pound.

1772. For buildings and all?—Yes.

1773. Upon considering the question, were you at all able to ascertain what the expense of the county was under the old system?—It varied so very much; I have not a doubt as to the mere question of vagrancy, for instance, a very large proportion, I should say certainly more than half the expense of the present system has been saved to the county.

1774. From the dishonest practices of the vagrants?—Yes; which fell chiefly upon the poor; I had more than once gipsies and other vagrants brought before me by the police shortly after their establishment, and they said at once, "Let us go this time; we did not know there was such a force; we will go to Cambridgeshire or to Lincolnshire;" and, as far as I know, they kept their word.

1775. Do you consider that vagrancy is a great source of crime?—Certainly.

1776. Is it not your opinion, that under the old system of parochial constables, pursuit could be only made after offenders by persons capable of paying them?—Certainly.

1777. The poor man, being incapable of paying them, had not the same protection as the rich man?—He could not start the constable at all in a doubtful case; if it was a clear case the constable would get his expenses at sessions or at assizes, but in a doubtful case there was not much care taken about it; there was nobody to pay, and the consequence was, that a great deal of unpleasant duty was thrown upon the magistrates, the chief constable, or upon active farmers; but the most hopeless resort was the old parish constable, in five cases out of six.

1778. It

1778. It was stated by an experienced magistrate for Hampshire, that if a robbery were committed, the parish constable was the last person almost that he should think of applying to; that he should as soon think of sending for an old woman; do you agree with that opinion?—I can go to that extent; the parish constable was generally appointed from some local interest, and was very frequently the most unfit man in the parish; perhaps I may state that I have seen a good deal of the criminal justice; I was at the Bar 11 years before I became the chairman of quarter sessions, and I have had a good deal of criminal practice; therefore I have been able to look at crime almost in all ways.

1779. You have stated that when the police was first proposed in Norfolk you had great doubts as to its adoption being desirable; do you think that those doubts were shared by other proprietors?—Yes, of all ranks.

1780. Do you think that that feeling has been diminished by experience?—Very much indeed; I should say, if I represented it by figures, two-thirds; if you took the whole county, you would find two-thirds in favour of the system.

1781. Do you think, in consequence of the establishment of a well-regulated police in the county of Norfolk, that the value of land has been increased to the occupier to some extent?—Yes; I think this will be found to be the case from witnesses who live on the borders of the county, or in other counties, that they would give a higher rent for the land with the police in the county than in neighbouring counties where there was no such establishment. There is one part of the farmer's property of very considerable importance which is very much exposed, namely, his sheep, and they constantly move them from one place to another; they move them from where they will not be looked after to where they will be; and the great benefit is this, that immediately any property is lost in a county which has rural police, the police is gone to at once, and there is fresh pursuit; that is not the case where there is only the old constable; everything, in cases of sheep-stealing, depends upon fresh pursuit.

1782. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Of course you can state, from your experience as chairman of quarter sessions, the mode of conducting prosecutions; has not there been a saving of expense from unnecessary witnesses not being brought up?—Yes; the police are better witnesses, and they know better how to get up the cases; you have not the same number of witnesses called, and you have better witnesses; the police very commonly carry a case from beginning to end.

1783. In your opinion, is there a saving of time as well as of expense?—Indeed I think so.

1784. Have you had any opportunity of considering the benefit which might be derived from amalgamating the police of the towns with the police of the county?—Only generally; I have had no opportunity to send for papers. I have considered that subject; unless you mean a very large town, where they could have a chief constable as good as we could in the county; in all the small boroughs the greatest advantage on both sides would be derived from such an amalgamation.

1785. Mr. *Howard*.] Did not the parish constables receive fees on prosecutions?—The parish constables would not move very commonly without they received money in hand. The police is bound to move, but the parish constable was his own master; you could hardly say that he was responsible to the magistrates; he would not move in a doubtful case unless he was paid for it.

1786. Was not there a great addition thereby to the county rate?—There was a good deal of money spent, and I think badly spent.

1787. Mr. *Mackie*.] Do you think that it would be beneficial to have one uniform system of police, taking in more counties than one in your neighbourhood?—Ours is a very large acreage, and I do not think it would. I think the county of Norfolk is quite as much as one chief constable can manage, as chief constable.

1788. My question refers generally to a system of police embracing England and Wales?—That is a subject I have never considered; I should not like to give a rash answer off-hand.

1789. *Chairman*.] Do not you think that a uniform system, creating unity of action between adjoining counties in the pursuit of offenders, would give greater facilities in the detection of crime?—So far as I know, were the force *ejusdem generis*, they would be all eager and anxious to help one another. There is some little difficulty where there are other parties to deal with, but never with police constables.

1790. Mr. *Mackie*.] Is there any county adjoining Norfolk where they have  
 O 2 not

H. Dover, Esq.  
 -- --  
 3 June 1853.

H. Dover, Esq.

3 June 1853.

not a police?—No; I had a great correspondence with a friend of mine in Cambridgeshire; they resisted it a long while, and were very much opposed to it; but they gave in at last, for they found that all our rogues went to them.

1791. Before they adopted a system of police I presume you found great inconvenience?—Certainly; you could not follow anything up, everybody was against you; you had nobody to communicate with; and directly offenders got across the borders you could find nobody to tell you anything.

*John Wybergh, Junior, Esq., called in; and Examined.*

J. Wybergh, jun., Esq.

1792. *Chairman.*] ARE you Clerk to the Magistrates at Liverpool?—I am.

1793. What is your system of police at Liverpool?—The police are appointed by the watch committee of the town council of the borough, and they are under their regulation and management.

1794. What is the number of police in Liverpool?—I believe there are about 880 this year, which is an increase of 80.

1795. What is the population of Liverpool?—Three hundred and seventy-four thousand four hundred and one.

1796. Do you know what the expense of the police force is?—About 40,000*l.* a year.

1797. Do you know how much that is in the pound upon the rating?—There is the power to levy a watch rate in Liverpool, but I believe of late years that rate has never been collected. The expense of the police is borne out of the borough fund.

1798. You state that the police are appointed by the watch committee?—Entirely.

1799. Have you a chief constable?—There is a head constable, who is also appointed by the watch committee.

1800. Does the head constable appoint his subordinates, or does the watch committee appoint them?—The watch committee have the appointment; I suppose they delegate some of their power to him, but to what extent I do not know; very likely in the selection of the candidates for office.

1801. Who has the power of dismissing the men?—The watch committee.

1802. Does the power of dismissal rest entirely with the watch committee?—The magistrates exercise a concurrent jurisdiction in dismissing the police for misconduct before them, but the watch committee have the power of dismissing any constable, irrespective of complaints, if they choose to exercise it.

1803. You have said that the magistrates have the power of dismissing the constables for offences by complaints before them?—Yes.

1804. Have the watch committee also that power?—Yes.

1805. Is that power arbitrarily exercised, without giving any reasons?—They may exercise an arbitrary power of dismissal under a clause in the Municipal Act.

1806. Do you consider it an inconvenience that the police of the borough of Liverpool should be under two jurisdictions?—I think the evil of divided authority is very great.

1807. Have you experienced evil from it?—We have.

1808. What evils have you experienced?—It has given rise to several disputes between the council and the magistrates, in reference to the police.

1809. In consequence of what?—In consequence of the state of the law. There is a clause in the Municipal Act which confers upon the town council, or upon the watch committee of the town council, this power over the police concurrently with the magistrates.

1810. Are the duties of the police generally to superintend public-houses and beer-shops, to see if there is anything going on wrong?—Yes; and the preservation of order generally.

1811. Are any of the watch committee the owners of beer-shops and public-houses?—I believe there are members of the watch committee who are owners of public-houses, and largely interested in them. I do not think there are so many persons connected with those trades on the watch committee as there were formerly. A few years ago the chairman of the watch committee was the owner of public-houses to a great extent in Liverpool.

1812. Do you think inconvenience has arisen from those interests on the watch committee?—

committee?—I think so. I think it is the tendency of the system that the police officers will not lay informations; they will be indisposed to prosecute offenders against the licensing laws where the houses to be informed against belong to members of the town council, or members of the watch committee.

*J. Wybergh, jun.,  
Esq.*  
3 June 1853.

1813. Without asking you whether the members of the watch committee would dismiss constables who inspected the public-houses, do you believe this to be the case, that the constables so employed would not do their duty, from fear of giving offence to certain members of the watch committee?—I think that is the tendency of the present system.

1814. Supposing, from your knowledge, as magistrates' clerk at Liverpool, of the offences committed in the neighbourhood, under a uniform and more general system of police, Liverpool was formed into a separate district like a county, do you think there would be convenience in adding any of the districts round Liverpool to that district?—No; I think Liverpool is a town of so much importance, and has such a large population, that it would be very much more simple to confine the district to Liverpool only, and let the county provide for its own wants.

1815. Do you think, supposing Liverpool was a separate district, that the county of Lancaster and Liverpool might be placed together under one head or chief constable?—I think they might, but he would have a very large force to command in that case. I think it will be more efficient to have two chief constables, one for the county and one for the borough.

1816. *Lord Lovaine.*] Evidence has been given before this Committee that certain local jealousies exist between county and borough police forces; are you of opinion that there is any feeling of that nature between the county and the borough police forces of Lancashire?—I am myself not cognizant of any such feeling; I think it is likely to be the case, but I have not observed anything of it in Liverpool.

1817. Has not the metropolitan police district been extended to 13 miles round the outskirts of London?—Yes; and I think it would be a great improvement if that system were extended to the whole country.

1818. *Sir J. Anderson.*] Is there not a separate police system at Birkenhead?—Yes.\*

1819. Do they co-operate with the Liverpool police?—Yes, when the occasion may require it. The Birkenhead police are under the Town Commissioners of Birkenhead, and chiefly under their management.

Major *George F. White*, called in; and Examined.

1820. *Chairman.*] YOU are Chief Constable of Durham?—I am.

*Major G. F. White.*

1821. What is the strength of your force?—One hundred and seventeen of all ranks, including myself.

1822. What is the population of Durham?—The population of the county in the rural districts under my jurisdiction is about 320,000.

1823. What proportion does each constable bear to the population?—Two thousand seven hundred and fifty persons to each constable.

1824. Do you conceive that force to be sufficient?—I do not, for all purposes.

1825. In what way is the force insufficient?—As far as the prevention of very serious crimes is concerned the force is perhaps sufficient, but not for general police purposes.

1826. Is the force sufficient for an efficient night patrol?—It is not so efficient as I should wish, for want of numbers, each constable's beat averaging nearly nine square miles.

1827. Is it not desirable that there should be a night patrol?—Quite so; particularly in a county like Durham; I have established it partially, and with advantage.

1828. Are

\* The fines and penalties on police informations are paid by the clerk to the magistrates into the borough. After deducting all the expenses of the magistrates' office, including the salary of the stipendiary magistrate and the salaries of the clerks to the magistrates, it leaves a clear balance in favour of the corporation of upwards of 3,500 *l.* per annum. In any alteration of the law it is suggested that the magistrates should have the power of paying their own expenses out of the fees for business done by the clerks, and hand the balance over to the borough fund, or any other fund which may be chargeable with the maintenance of the police.

Major G. F. White.

3 June 1853.

1828. Are you capable of stating what the feeling with regard to the police force is in Durham; is it popular or unpopular?—I make every effort to inquire into that; I ride about the county, and I make inquiries from those people who do not know who I am, and who will therefore give an unbiased opinion, and I think the force is popular with the county; I never hear a different opinion expressed.

1829. Has there been any attempt in the county of Durham, from its expense, to abolish the police force since it has been established?—Never since I have been there; I have been there four years and a half, and there has never been a petition against the force; nor since the first five years, to my knowledge; but they were frequent at one time, at the early establishment of the force.

1830. Have you experienced any inconvenience from the want of a uniform system in the adjoining counties?—I have, constantly; we cannot communicate readily with them when a thief escapes beyond the border of our own county; we immediately lose all trace of him for a time; it is a matter of chance if we get further information.

1831. You mean to say that the pursuit of criminals is much more difficult in consequence of the want of a uniform system in the adjoining counties?—Very much so indeed, and we fear to encounter the expense, where the probability of success is so remote.

1832. What boroughs are there in Durham which have a police force?—Sunderland, Gateshead, South Shields, Hartlepool, and Stockton-on-Tees.

1833. Are they incorporated with the county?—Stockton-on-Tees has been for two years consolidated with the county force, and with great advantage and satisfaction to the place.

1834. Have they a corporation at Stockton-on-Tees?—Yes.

1835. Are they satisfied with the result of that incorporation?—Yes; during the last two years I have never heard the slightest complaint; I think I must have heard of it if there had been a complaint.

1836. Do you make any use of the parochial constables?—None whatever; they are almost obsolete in our county.

1837. Are they still appointed?—They are still appointed, but it appears to me to be a useless expense incurred.

1838. Have you had any experience of the use of special constables in cases of disturbance?—We have occasionally sworn them in more for the sake of appearance than anything else, when a combination of workmen has been going on, and perhaps it has a good effect to see a certain number of those men take the side of the law. So far it has had a good effect, but as for any amount of physical assistance we have received from them on those occasions, I think it was very little.

1839. You have sworn them in as a demonstration?—Yes; rather as a demonstration.

1840. Do you perform the duty of the inspection of weights and measures in your county?—We have inspected the weights and measures for four years now, and with great saving and advantage to the public, directly and indirectly.

1841. Is not that general in all the counties where there is a police force?—No; I think there are some that do not do it.

1842. Do you know any counties where they do not?—I am sure there are several. I do not think the police inspect the weights and measures in Norfolk or Suffolk.

1843. Do you think a uniform system of police would be as beneficial to the boroughs as to the counties?—I think the advantages would be reciprocal, particularly in the small boroughs.

1844. Are there any farmers' associations in your county for the prosecution of felons?—They are diminishing every year; there are a few still existing.

1845. Do you know how many there were when the force was first established?—No; I have not a correct account of it; there were many existing before; they were numerous then. It appears to me a useless expense now, and I think they will die away. If an adequate police force existed, I conceive that beyond the payment of his police-rate, no inhabitant should be called on to pay anything further towards bringing offenders to justice. The rate, if regarded as an insurance against crime affecting life and property, would be paid cheerfully to any moderate amount.

1846. Do you think that the establishment of the electric telegraph would be useful?—I have often thought it would be, if the expense could be lessened.

1847. Would

1847. Would the expense be very great?—At present it is more than 2d. a mile for a short message; we have occasionally used it. Major G. F. White.

1848. You have to go to the places where it is established?—Yes.

3 June 1853.

1849. Would it be useful if the electric telegraph were established in the different divisions in your county?—Yes, to the chief places; I can only judge of the expense by what it costs where it now exists.

1850. Your opinion is that it would be very useful, but very expensive?—At present; but I think, if it were more generally made, a contract might be entered into which would lessen the expense, so as to make it available.

1851. Do you think, if any contract could be made to establish a general communication by electric telegraph between the police stations, it would be an expense which would be repaid by its advantages?—I think that is quite practicable.

1852. Lord *Lovaine*.] What is the state of the Gateshead and the South Shields police; is it sufficient?—I have heard no expression of dissatisfaction from those who appoint them.

1853. Was not there a robbery committed lately at Ravensworth, in which there was a little difficulty in obtaining evidence between the Gateshead police and your own?—Nothing to remark; there was a little difficulty, as there always is in those cases; there was some little jealousy, but not more than we usually have when the rural police go into a borough in search of information. I cannot say that it exists on the part of the heads of the departments.

1854. Do you think that is a difficulty which constantly occurs?—I think it is a constant thing.

1855. Have you ever employed your men in boroughs as assistants to keep the peace?—We have occasionally been asked to render assistance. At the last Durham election a force of 20 or 25 men were asked for, and with the permission of the magistrates I granted it. A previous election had taken place two or three months before, and there was a severe riot in the town, which very nearly led to a disputed election. At the election which followed we gave assistance with this number of rural police, and the greatest quiet prevailed throughout the town. I was thanked by the borough magistrates for the assistance which we had rendered.

1856. Do the habits of miners, and the power which they have of withdrawing their persons from the grasp of justice, interfere much with the efficiency of the police?—It certainly increases the difficulty of detection.

1857. Would a larger number of police be required in consequence?—I think so, in proportion; to work the thing efficiently, and to give it a fair chance with a mining population, we ought to have a larger force in our county than in a totally rural district.

1858. Do you think the proportion of one man to 1,000 inhabitants would be sufficient?—I think it would be ample; and in this event, various other duties, such as inspectors of nuisances, or of common lodging-houses, or of roads and highways, might with advantage be undertaken by the police, so as to more than counterbalance the expense.

1859. Is not the mining population generally a quiet population?—Except during strikes and combinations, which are frequent; almost every year.

1860. Is not some of your district a very wild country?—The westward.

1861. Do you find any difficulty in maintaining order?—No; there we have very few police; crime is more rare in those districts.

1862. The facility of concealment, therefore, does not increase the difficulty of maintaining the rural police in a wild district?—No; I think we are generally successful in the wild districts. A new comer is soon known to the policeman into whose beat he comes, whereas he would be lost sight of in the dense population of a pit district.

1863. Do you think it is essential for the general advantage of the county that there should be an amalgamation of the police in the borough with the rural constables?—Having tried the experiment with Stockton-on-Tees, I do not see why it should not answer for all moderately-sized boroughs; such places as Liverpool and Manchester might form exceptions.

1864. And even the larger boroughs, if this jealousy exists?—I think the benefit would be mutual; moreover, I feel certain, from my own knowledge and experience, and from the experience of others, greater than my own, that any

Major G. F. White. system of police will be defective unless made uniform ; each county under one head, and the whole under some proper control or inspection.

3 June 1853.

1865. Mr. *Howard*.] Is there much vagrancy in Durham?—It has very much decreased during the last five years, and more especially since the rural police have partially acted as assistants to the relieving officers.

1866. Therefore the applicants for relief must be subject to the inspection of the police?—The applicants must pass the ordeal of the inspection of the police officer, whom they avoid, for fear they should be recognized as amongst their list of suspected characters.

1867. Lord *Lovaine*.] What is the police rate in Durham?— $1\frac{1}{8}$  *d.* in the pound ; a  $2\frac{1}{2}$  *d.* rate would give a fair force.

1868. Have you any police stations?—We have a great many of one sort or another.

1869. Have they been built at the public expense?—Yes, chiefly so ; we are now progressing with the stations ; the larger ones combine justice rooms with the police accommodation.

1870. Have you quarters for the men in the police stations?—One or more in all of them.

1871. Do they serve as barracks?—Yes ; the greatest amount we have in any one station is five.

1872. Do the men pay rent for those lodgings?—They do pay rent ; it is almost a self-paying arrangement ; it is merely the interest of the money so expended. In speaking of the preservation of the peace of the district, I may mention that there are frequent riots, and now they are often suppressed by the police without calling in the military, which used formerly to be a matter of more frequent occurrence.

1873. *Chairman*.] Do not you think it is much more desirable to call in the police than the military for the suppression of riots?—Yes ; the timely presence of the police will generally render the military unnecessary.

1874. Is it not frequently the fact that the police, in the suppression of a riot, go into the crowd and endeavour to persuade the men to desist from their proceedings?—Yes ; and I have known a superintendent of our force go into a crowd of upwards of 1,000 men, a great number of those men being armed with picks, and some with guns, and merely from the fact of his being dressed as a policeman, and seeing that there was another force of policemen at hand, captured the ringleaders, for whose apprehension he held a warrant, and the crowd have been too terrified or astonished to offer any opposition.

1875. Would not a policeman, if he only used his truncheon, always have one arm at liberty with which to hold a man?—Exactly.

1876. Is it not the fact, if a soldier is employed with a musket in his hand, that both his hands are engaged for that purpose, and he has no means of securing the prisoner?—Yes ; and the musket may be used fatally, as probably it would.

1877. Lord *Lovaine*.] Do you arm your men in cases of riots?—With cutlasses ; but they have never had occasion to draw them.

1878. Do you continue that practice?—Yes, occasionally, with the permission of the magistrates.

1879. Is that with the view of awing the mob?—Yes ; the mob knowing that the men are armed has an effect, without obliging the men to use their arms. We have never had any instance of a fatal accident, although we have had repeated rencontres with the mob.

1880. Have you not some very desperate characters in that county, upon the borders?—Yes.

1881. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Do not you consider that the local knowledge that the police have of the different persons concerned in those riots renders a police force more effective in preserving peace than a military force would be?—The police generally find out those who are the ringleaders.

1882. You have mentioned an instance of one of your superintendents going into a mob and apprehending the ringleaders ; do not you consider the local knowledge which he had of those parties was of considerable assistance to him, whereas a soldier would have no local knowledge?—Without that local knowledge, the superintendent could not have done what I stated ; the mob perceived that they were watched, and confidence in themselves was shaken.

Mr.

Captain *Henry Fowler Mackay*, called in ; and Examined.

1883. *Chairman.*] ARE you Chief Constable of Sussex?—Of East Sussex.
1884. What is your force?—Fifty-two, all hands.
1885. What is the population?—About 140,000, exclusive of the boroughs.
1886. Was the force always of the same amount?—They commenced with 18 and 3 superintendents.
1887. What proportion would 18 have borne to the population?—I think the population was then about 127,000 ; it was about 1 to 6,000.
1888. What proportion does your present number bear to the population?—One to 2,600 and odd.
1889. Then your maximum of police force is one man to 2,600?—Yes.
1890. Do you think that force is sufficient?—No.
1891. Have you represented that to the magistrates?—I have.
1892. *Lord Lovaine.*] Do they show any indisposition to increase the number?—They show an indisposition on account of the expense.
1893. What is your rate in the pound?—The last rate was 2*d.*, which produced 4,425*l.*
1894. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that the force of one man to 2,600 of the population of your county has cost 2*d.* in the pound?—Yes, because we employ besides local constables, and it includes payments for buildings.
1895. For what purpose do you employ the local constables?—They are employed occasionally during the hop-picking season, and for night watching.
1896. Do you know what they cost?—About 220*l.* a year.
1897. What are your buildings?—The buildings are lock-up houses ; there was one built this year ; we have four.
1898. Do you contemplate building any more?—One more this year.
1899. How many divisions have you?—Eleven petty sessional divisions and three police divisions ; in the course of the year I should propose more lock-ups to be built, for I consider a station is as good as a police officer.
1900. Do you think the time will come when your force will become more efficient?—I should hope so.
1901. *Lord Lovaine.*] Have you any expectation of obtaining an increase of men?—None whatever at present.
1902. Can you give any reason why you are so far behind other counties?—We originally had a 3*d.* rate, that was reduced to 1½*d.* ; now we have got a 2*d.* rate. A 3*d.* rate would make us more efficient ; there was an increase three years ago of 10 constables, the actual increase of expense was about 200*l.* a year ; there was a saving in other items which I contemplated at the same time.
1903. Is there more crime than there ought to be, in your opinion?—Crime decreased last year ; the larcenies were 299, and the year before 442.
1904. *Chairman.*] Is Brighton in your division?—It is in my division of the county.
1905. What is the police force at Brighton?—Sixty men.
1906. Under what authority is that force?—Under the chief officer.
1907. By whom is that chief officer appointed?—By the commissioners ; Brighton is not a borough.
1908. Are they commissioners of pavement?—Town commissioners, under a local Act.
1909. Is there any difficulty with respect to co-operation between your force and the Brighton force?—Not with the heads ; I think there is a feeling of jealousy amongst the men frequently ; the head officers are willing to give us every assistance, and we are ready to assist them.
1910. Has it ever happened to you to have given them assistance?—Very frequently.
1911. In what way?—In apprehending people in my division ; on information sent from them we co-operate.
1912. Have you ever sent your men, at their request, in consequence of any local disturbance?—No ; I have had occasion to apply for assistance, which they could not afford.
1913. Under what circumstances?—A disturbance took place at Lewes, and the metropolitan police came down.
1914. Was that owing to the hop-picking?—It was an excitement on the 5th of

Captain  
*H. F. Mackay.*

3 June 1853.

Captain  
*H. F. Mackay.*

3 June 1853.

of November; there was a disturbance at Lewes on the 5th of November; there was a conversation about applying to Brighton, and some of the magistrates said they could not send us sufficient assistance.

1915. Did you get any assistance from London?—Eighty men came down.

1916. Did those 80 men answer the purpose?—For that night.

1917. Could you have done without them?—We could not, certainly.

1918. When they went away, did you find the want of them?—Yes, for nearly three weeks we had disturbances.

1919. Do you think those disturbances would not have taken place if you had had a sufficient force?—Yes.

1920. Lord *Lovaine.*] Could you have checked those disturbances if you had had a force on a more perfect footing?—I could; I had only 40 men in the whole county.

1921. Mr. *Mackie.*] You have mentioned that crime has decreased, in consequence of the establishment of the police; is it your opinion that as crime has decreased, property has increased in value?—I consider a police force is like an insurance of property, and thus indirectly rendered more valuable.

Mr. *John Wayte*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *J. Wayte.*

1922. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Calne, in Wiltshire.

1922\*. Has your attention been directed to the state of the police from any office you have held?—Yes; for many years, at least from the year 1817, I have given my services gratuitously to the suppression of vagrancy; it was my fancy. I have given up a great deal of time and money to it. I had not money to pay officers, therefore I have made use of the governor of the poorhouse. It runs to a considerable expense.

1923. During the time you were mayor of Calne, did the police render you much service?—Yes; in reducing the number of vagrants from 4,749, that frequented the town, in the year 1819, to less than 400; and although the numbers were so reduced not one destitute person was refused relief.

1924. Had you a Mendicity Society, and by whom was the relief given to the vagrants?—When the thousands visited our town they were relieved by the master of the workhouse; when reduced to less than 400 yearly they were relieved by the policemen, who also enabled us to detect those vagrants that were getting money from the overseers by false passes.

1925. Has the vigilance of the police lessened the number of the lodging-houses that were frequented by the thieves and beggars in your town?—Yes; there were three, but now only one.

1926. What was the number relieved at the adjoining union of Chippenham, for the first nine months of the year 1847, and at Calne, for the same period in that year?—The master of the Chippenham Union informed me that he had relieved 1,530. The number relieved by the policemen at Calne, for the same period, was under 240.

1927. How do you account for this great difference?—By the vagrants being more strictly examined by the policemen in our district, who have more time to do so, and the dislike they have to policemen. The master of the Chippenham Union told me that one man had called on him from Bristol, stating that he was going to Cheltenham, but in a few weeks he returned again for relief, and when questioned he acknowledged that he had been wandering about the neighbourhood of Melksham, Devizes, Pewsey and Marlborough, and had been relieved at each union. If this vagrant had been taken by a policeman to the railroad for Cheltenham this imposition would have been prevented.

1928. Do you think the police may be made more efficient if employed in the suppression of vagrancy?—I quite believe that with the aid of the constabulary force this kingdom may be freed from vagrants, and thousands of thieves now raised by vagrants prevented, at a saving of tens of thousands of pounds yearly. I am of Mr. Patrick Colquhoun's opinion, that the sending vagrants to their parishes is the best and cheapest mode of providing for them. I would, with all due submission, recommend all destitute persons to be so disposed of.

Mr.

Mr. *John Dunne*, called in; and Examined.

1929. *Chairman.*] ARE you the Chief Officer of the Police Force at Norwich?  
—I am.

1930. How long have you held that office?—Two years the 29th of next August.

1931. Had you previously served as a superintending constable?—Yes, in the Bearstead division of the county of Kent.

1932. For what period did you serve in that capacity?—Thirteen months.

1933. Why did you leave it?—In consequence of getting the appointment at Norwich, which was superior.

1934. When you went to Norwich you went with testimonials from the magistrates in Kent, where you had acted?—Yes.

1935. Had you served in a police force before you were in Kent?—Yes. I joined the Manchester police in 1840, and there served for one year under Sir Charles Shaw; I served seven years as constable and inspector in the Essex County Constabulary, under Captain M'Hardy; I served two years as inspector of the Bath Police, under Mr Oakley; I served 13 months as superintendent in Kent, from which I succeeded to my present position at Norwich.

1936. You had been in a borough police twice before your present appointment; seven years in a rural constabulary, and 13 months as superintending constable?—Yes.

1937. You are now the chief of the police at Norwich?—Yes.

1938. Will you state your opinion of those different systems of police in which you have served; take the borough police first; do you think the borough police is generally efficient?—No, I consider it inefficient; it is impracticable to establish an efficient police in any borough town, in accordance with the present divided system of organization and government; want of uniformity and cordial co-operation and communication in the pursuit, apprehension, and conviction of offenders tends to render it most inefficient.

1939. Do you think the borough police, in which you are serving, is inefficient?—It is not in such a satisfactory state of efficiency as I should like to see it.

1940. For what reasons?—When I was appointed to the office of chief of the police of the city of Norwich, I found existing there two distinct bodies of police; one was termed the day police, and the other the night watch; the day police consisted of 27 men, six supernumeraries, six inspectors, and one chief officer; the night watch consisted of an equal number; I found that in the day police the inspectors and constables received nearly the same pay; the inspector received 16 s. and the constable 14 s.; they were permitted to receive fees and allowances for all special duties which they performed, which were considered sufficient to make up for any deficiency that existed as regarded their pay; the most ordinary duty which they were called upon to perform by any inhabitant they were paid for; and a similar system was connected with the night watch; those men were not at all supervised during the night; they checked themselves by a clock, an old system, which I believe existed in connexion with the constables in London previous to the establishment of the metropolitan police; in the course of inquiry I ascertained that it was possible for one man to attend to the clocks of three or four; the mode of ascertaining whether a man had attended to his clock was by the superintendent going round the city every morning and examining the face of the clock, which revolved; there was a peg which moved on the dial, which, on examination, showed whether the man had pulled at the time laid down in the regulations for him to do so. I found that nearly all the men were in trade and business in the city, and they generally used to attend to it every day. It was the opinion of many of the respectable inhabitants that receiving fees by the watchmen and policemen was an indirect incentive to the commission of crime. If a policeman or watchman apprehended any party he received a fee for it, and was allowed to retain that fee and appropriate it to his own uses. Viewing it, then, as a whole, I considered it to be in a most inefficient and defective state; I stated so to the watch committee, to whose authority I am subject, and also to the magistrates, and explained everything in connexion with both forces, particularly alluding to the want of co-operation and communication existing between both bodies, especially as they were allowed to receive fees. If one of the night watchmen saw any

0.71.

P 2

suspected

Mr. *J. Dunne.*

3 June 1853.

Mr. J. Dunne.

3 June 1853.

suspected parties during the night, and observed anything which he ought to have communicated to the day policeman, so as to give the public the advantages of the services of an efficient police, he would attempt to do that duty himself, for the purpose of getting the fee, thereby frequently frustrating the ends of justice; so it was *vice versa* with the police force as regards the watchmen.

1941. Has that system been altered? - Yes; I drew up a report in reference thereto, which was adopted.

1942. Does that report contain more in detail the objections which you have now stated?—Yes.

1943. Was the system altered in consequence of that report?—Yes; both the bodies were amalgamated and established, similar in detail to the Essex constabulary and the metropolitan police force.

1944. Do you think the force is more efficient?—I do; serious crime has greatly decreased; pursuit, apprehension, and conviction of offenders facilitated; life and property better protected; the system insures the performance of the duties; the respectable inhabitants have expressed themselves gratified with the change; considerable savings are effected; my report, however, has not been fully carried out, particularly as regards the appointment and promotion of the men, and other circumstances, which render the force still defective.

1945. Mr. Fitzroy.] Have the numbers been increased?—No; the consolidated force is equal in numbers (80) to the two bodies previously existing.

1946. What is the population of Norwich?—Between 70,000 and 80,000.

1947. Chairman.] Do you know what the cost of the old force was?—About 3,687*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* per annum; the new about the same.

1948. Lord Lovaine.] What is the rating in the pound?—About 2*d.* police rate.

1949. Mr. Fitzroy.] Will you point out in what respects the police forces in boroughs are deficient?—I consider that the police force of a borough being placed under the divided control of the magistrates and the watch committee, tends to render effectual action almost impossible. In many instances the watch committee lay down instructions, and give orders which the magistrates countermand. One of the magistrates in Norwich, recently, ordered a policeman to perform a certain duty, and while in the performance of that duty another magistrate came up and found fault with him, and spoke to him in the street in such a way that the man resigned. Every borough has some system or other peculiar to itself; there is no uniformity, no co-operation, no communication, no effectual action; thereby the ends of justice are frequently defeated; they are generally defective in numerical strength, unequal to any emergency, and rely too much upon military aid; local interests and influences are brought to bear.

1950. Chairman.] Do you think the rural police in Essex is efficient? I do; I consider it the most efficient rural police force in England. The establishment of station-houses and police districts in connexion with that force have been attended with most advantageous results, and to meet the gross expense, a variety of duties have been engrafted on the force, which, whilst adding materially to its efficiency, has considerably reduced the net expense, which example has been followed in Hampshire and other counties.

1951. What is your opinion of the efficiency of the superintending constable system?—I consider the system inefficient; it is quite impossible to ever become effective.

1952. What difficulty did you find in carrying out your duties there?—I found that the men from whom the rural constables were chosen, under Act 5th & 6th of Victoria, were men generally disinclined to serve as constables; they never voluntarily or cheerfully accepted their office. In the general performance of the duties they are called upon to exercise there appears to be a reluctance on their part to do their duties, particularly in consideration of their being brought into collision with the parties from whom they obtain their livelihood. They are generally chosen from tailors, blacksmiths, agricultural labourers, and men who keep little shops in the parish in which they may reside. I found that it was quite impossible to carry out any system so as to ensure the performance of the duties appertaining to a police force.

1953. Did you find any difficulty in pursuing offenders?—I did; I often found great obstruction in the pursuit and apprehension of offenders, which often entirely frustrated their detection, and defeated the ends of justice.

1954. Have you any means of stating to the Committee what the expenses of the

the superintending constables were in the county of Kent?—The expense of the superintending constable system I consider to be far greater than any person is able to show by statistics which can be obtained, inasmuch as the performance of the duties by the constables is generally paid for, indirectly, by individuals and by the overseers of the parishes; there are no accounts kept, and this makes it almost impossible to conceive the extreme expense incurred by the system; the superintending constables' salaries amounted to 85*l.* a year, and 25*l.* a year as an allowance for horse, cart, and re-mount; then for the performance of special services there was a quarterly contingent account made, which was taken before the constabulary committee to be approved by them; in many instances charges were disallowed on examination by the constabulary committee; subsequently the salaries were increased to 150*l.* per annum, with other allowances.

1955. Were those charges independent of the fees paid by order of the magistrates to the local constables?—Entirely.

1956. Have you the means of stating what those fees were in your division?—The expense for the performance of any occasional duty required under a written order of a justice was at the rate of 2*s.* 6*d.* a day, and 3*s.* a night; and all other fees and allowances were paid in accordance with a table laid down, and approved by court of quarter sessions.

1957. Had the magistrates any power of ordering a watch?—Yes; on the application of the superintending constables, or other person, on his apprehension that any offence was likely to be committed, the magistrates had the power to order as many constables as they thought necessary to remain on duty, both day and night, as long as they deemed proper, at that rate of payment.

1958. Do you know at all what the expense in your division was of a watch, under orders of magistrates?—I tried what the effect might be of calling out the constables on one occasion; the neighbourhood was infested with a great number of vagrants and reputed thieves, and I considered that the calling out of the constables might have the effect of watching those parties, who were continually prowling about, and be thereby attended with the prevention and detection of crime; I made an application to a magistrate, and on his order I placed a great many constables on duty, but in the working out of the system I found it to be most defective; if I gave any orders to the constables to watch certain parties or to supervise beershops or public-houses, I found that they deceived me and rarely performed the duties necessary to enable me to discharge my duty with any advantage to the county. The expense of 10 constables on duty for one month under this system would be 77*l.*

1959. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Under what Act was power given to magistrates to order parish constables to watch?—The 5th and 6th Victoria, c. 109, and 13th and 14th Victoria, c. 20.

1960. Does it give the magistrates power to call out constables to watch, in case of apprehended danger?—Yes; it was exercised to a great extent. The indirect expense thereby incurred was very large. There was no return made of it; and it is impossible to conceive the excessive amount caused by this and other circumstances in connexion with the superintending constable system.

1961. Is that expense paid out of the county rate?—Out of the poor rates; an order is made out by the magistrates' clerk, signed by the magistrates, and paid by the overseer of the parish.

1962. So far as your knowledge of that system goes, do you think that one great drawback to its well working is the want of a chief constable at the head of the whole of the superintending constables?—Certainly not; I consider that a chief constable at the head of the superintending constables would not at all improve the system. I cannot see how it can be improved by having a chief superintending constable. He could not possibly establish an efficient system of supervision. The superintending constables are subject to no control, except to the court of quarter sessions. I have known instances of the superintending constable acting in such a manner as could not be allowed in a police force, where there was any system, so as to insure the legal and due discharge of his duty.

1963. Would it not probably be the case that the appointment of a chief constable would introduce more system into the working of that plan?—I do not think it is practicable, particularly for the want of having a proper class of men as local constables, such as the superintending constables could derive assistance from.

Mr. J. Dunne.

3 June 1853.

1964. Lord *Lovaine*.] You mean that it is impossible to make a parish constable an efficient officer?—It is impracticable to do so.

1965. *Chairman*.] Do you mean that in your opinion a superintending constable could not make the parish constables efficient police officers?—I do; it is quite impossible.

1966. If the superintending constable under whose immediate direction they were could not improve them as police officers, do you think that one chief constable over the whole would make any difference in their efficiency as police officers?—None whatever.

1967. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] How long were you employed in the police in Kent?—Thirteen months.

1968. From your knowledge of the system, you would pronounce it to be a totally inefficient system for the purposes of police?—Quite so. I think it is attended with great evils. There is a system in Kent—I am not aware of its being carried out in any other county—under the 3d and 4th William the 4th, chapter 90, the vestry has the power of appointing paid watchmen, who act as police officers for the parish for which they are appointed. In 12 parishes in the division of Bearstead the provisions of this Act were carried into effect, and for those 12 parishes there were no parish constables appointed under 5th and 6th and 13th and 14th of Victoria; the men appointed under that Act were quite independent of my control; they were not under my jurisdiction in any way; the consequence was, that if I wanted any assistance for the supervision of beerhouses or public-houses, or the performance of any other duty, I had no person to assist me, for those men generally acted against me instead of giving any cordial co-operation.

1969. *Chairman*.] Was the appointment of those persons made in consequence of a direct recommendation of the magistrates from the bench?—They were appointed upon the recommendation of a majority of the vestry in consequence of the feeling which prevails in that county among the middle classes in favour of an efficient police force, and finding the parish constables so inefficient, the vestry, under this Act, appointed those policemen.

1970. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] How long did they continue?—They were there during the whole of my service. The Act provides that if it is once adopted it cannot be discontinued for a period of three years. The men were under no efficient control; the inspectors who supervised them were selected by the vestry, such as farmers and shopkeepers, who knew but little of the duties.

1971. Were not those duties more efficiently performed by those paid watchmen than by the parish constables who were not paid?—In some respects they were; still there was a want of supervision and a want of uniformity in the system which rendered them ineffective. They felt independent; they were under no control; and if applied to for assistance they would not generally render it. They were in no way subject to my control. I made an application to the magistrates at the Bearstead petty sessions on account of the want of assistance and co-operation on the part of those men.

1972. Were not those men under the control of a superintendent?—No.

1973. Had the superintending constables nothing to do with their appointment?—Nothing, directly or indirectly.

1974. Lord *Lovaine*.] Did you ever make a calculation of the expense incurred for parish constables in the division over which you presided?—I did.

1975. What did you make it come to?—Taking the expenses as a whole, direct and indirect, connected with the superintending constabulary system and police, from 1,000 *l.* to 1,300 *l.* a year.

1976. How many constables had you under you?—I had 35.

1977. With how many rural policemen could you have effectually watched and guarded the district?—Judging from the extent of the division, and comparing its area with divisions of counties where police forces are established, if I had had 20 good active men, one inspector, and two serjeants, I could have carried out an efficient system in that division, providing the force was general.

1978. Taking the average cost of a rural policeman to be about 60 *l.*, which would amount to 1,200 *l.*, upon your calculation of 1,300 *l.* the county would be a clear gainer of 100 *l.*?—I feel confident it would.

1979. Are you of opinion that it is impossible to make the superintending constable system act efficiently?—I am.

1980. And you deem it to be quite inefficient?—Quite so.

1981. *Chairman*.] Do you know the whole extent of the divisions in Kent under

under the superintending constables?—The largest division in the county of Kent is Wingham, which consists of 56 parishes.

1982. Do you know how many superintending constables they have for that division?—Only one.

1983. Do you think it possible that one man can superintend such a district?—It is not possible to do it efficiently; even in my division, which was composed of 32 parishes, I was very frequently obliged to go out with three horses a day, in the performance of my duties; when I returned home from one part of the division, I would find waiting for me some communication from another part of it, to the effect that I was required; that there had been a serious robbery, or something requiring my attention, and the magistrates had sent me an order to go immediately; I have never, in one instance, met with effective co-operation or assistance from the local constables; they would not subject themselves to any control.

1984. Could you pursue criminals with the assistance of the local constables? Certainly not; with regard to the supervision of beerhouses and public-houses, I have frequently arranged to make a visit at an appointed time for the purpose of visiting some house, and the parish constable has gone and told the publican or the beerhouse-keeper that the superintendent was coming at such a time. They are so much mixed up with local connexions in their general business that it is impossible for them to act independently; it is imposing upon them duties which they cannot perform consistently with their own interests, viewing it as a money question.

1985. Do you know that it is the fact that no police constable can get into a public-house unless he is called upon by the publican?—I know that is a regulation of the police.

1986. Do you think that parish constables would generally consider it an invidious duty to have to enter public-houses for the purpose of control if they were called upon?—I have known many instances in which they have skulked out of the way to avoid it.

1987. Lord *Lovaine*.] You have stated that under the method of appointing the police in the boroughs, it is hardly possible to make the force efficient?—Yes.

1988. Is it your opinion that it would be an advantage to those boroughs that they should be amalgamated, as far as regards the police, with the counties?—I do certainly think that it would tend to render them more efficient. I think consolidating the borough police with the county forces would be attended with the most beneficial results.

1989. Would you give the appointment of the men to the head officer of the police, whoever he might be, or to any body or committee, either magistrates or town council?—I think it is absolutely necessary that the chief officer of the district should have the entire control of the force.

1990. In the same manner as in the rural constabulary?—Yes.

1991. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] By whom were you appointed at Norwich?—By the watch committee.

1992. Does the watch committee appoint the whole of the other constables?—Yes.

1993. Have the magistrates the power to dismiss or suspend the men?—They have; the control is divided between the watch committee and the magistrates; the watch committee and the magistrates frequently differ as to the merits of cases in connexion with the police which may be brought before them. I have known instances occur in which the magistrates have suspended a policeman, and recommended his dismissal, and when before the watch committee, the watch committee reinstated him. When that same officer again appeared before the magistrates to give evidence in court, one of the magistrates who suspended him stated on the bench that he would not believe the man upon his oath, and if he saw the man in a court of justice he should think it his duty to stand up and state that he thought the man was not worthy of belief on his oath. I reported that to the watch committee; but, notwithstanding, the man was retained in the service.

1994. Is there any complaint on the part of the inhabitants of Norwich that a sufficient supervision is not exercised over the beerhouses?—Yes.

1995. Is there a complaint that information is not laid by the police when the publicans are known to transgress the law?—Yes.

0.71.

P 4

1996. Is

Mr. J. *Dunn*.

3 June 1853.

Mr. J. Dunne.

3 June 1853.

1996. Is that attributable to the manner in which they are appointed?—I believe so, in some measure.

1997. Lord *Lovaine*.] How many brewers are members of the watch committee?—Three; the late chairman of the watch committee was a brewer; there are in Norwich 670 beerhouses and public-houses.

1998. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] When did you get that return?—Last Monday. There is one fact in connexion with these houses which is, I think, peculiar to Norwich; of this number, 344 took a spirit license, 107 a wine license, and 219 are little better than beerhouses, inasmuch as they receive the magistrates' license to sell beer, but they have no spirit license, nor wine license; after receiving a beer license they save about 3 *l.* by not taking out a spirit license from the Excise.

1999. Do not you know that they do not take out a spirit license from the Excise?—They pay 3 *l.* 6 *s.* 0  $\frac{3}{4}$  *d.* to the Excise for the spirit license, and 1 *l.* 2 *s.* 0  $\frac{3}{4}$  *d.* for the magistrates' beer license.

2000. Lord *Lovaine*.] Are the Committee to understand that these 670 beerhouses, alehouses, and wine-shops are all under the control of one individual?—No; there are eight owners of houses, exclusive of free houses.

2001. Under the control of the brewers there are 670 houses, exclusive of free houses, and those houses where spirituous liquors of one sort or another are sold are all under the control of eight individuals?—Yes, exclusive of free houses, which are about 120.

2002. Mr. *Burroughes*.] When you speak of control, do you mean ownership?—Yes; and with respect to the control exercised by the police, I have caused informations to be laid against some of them for disorderly conduct; I have had the parties summoned, the offence has been proved by the police officers, and the party has been called upon to assign his answer to the charge; he has pleaded guilty, and notwithstanding, the case has been dismissed. One was a case of a man keeping a disorderly house on Sunday morning during the hours of Divine Service.

2003. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Do you mean that he opened his house?—Yes, and I felt it my duty to bring the case before the magistrates.

2004. Do you mean that an information had been laid before a bench of magistrates?—Yes, and the party summoned.

2005. Had you received any instructions from the watch committee with respect to the public-houses?—The watch committee told me not to summon any public-house-keeper or beerhouse-keeper without first submitting the report for their approval, and to receive their orders and instructions thereon.

2006. The information being laid; before whom was it laid?—Before the magistrates.

2007. You say that the information has been laid before the magistrates, the case has been heard, the man has pleaded guilty, and then the information has been dismissed?—In two instances.

2008. Were any of those magistrates who heard the information members of the watch committee?—They were.

2009. *Chairman*.] Of how many members does the watch committee consist altogether?—Eighteen.

2010. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Were any of the magistrates who heard the information, to which you have referred, brewers, connected with the public-houses in the town?—I cannot say.

2011. Had those informations which were laid before the magistrates been first submitted to the watch committee, and had you received their directions upon the subject?—No; there were so many complaints from respectable inhabitants and the clergy, of the state of the public-houses, that to remove the responsibility from myself and to see what the magistrates would do, I laid those informations upon my own responsibility, and the result is what I have told you.

2012. Are the Committee to understand from the statements you have made, that the influence exercised by these members of the watch committee who are connected with the publicans, over the other members of the watch committee, is sufficient to insure a decision such as will be convenient to the members of the watch committee who are connected with the public-houses?—I am unable to say so.

2013. Do you mean to say that these two cases in which informations were dismissed, although the parties pleaded guilty, are an example of the influence which the watch committee have over the conduct of the magistrates?—I cannot say

say that those two cases were dismissed by the magistrates in consequence of the influence of the watch committee. I do not know the cause; there are only two of many cases I could refer to, to show the difficulties experienced by the police in the performance of their duties under the present system.

2014. Do you mean to say that there is generally a total want of interference with the regulation of the public-houses?—It is very difficult to efficiently supervise them.

2015. Is it your impression that it is the wish of the magistrates that the public-houses and beershops should not be interfered with?—Judging from the difficulty of carrying out strictly an information, it appears so.

2016. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Has there been any application for a stipendiary magistrate at Norwich?—I am not aware; I believe it is the feeling of the inhabitants generally that it would be a very great advantage to the city to have a stipendiary magistrate. I was told that some of the leading gentlemen in the city have got up a petition to the effect that a stipendiary magistrate is necessary for the advantage of the city, and the protection of the public.

2017. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] But as a stipendiary magistrate would have nothing to do with the dismissal or the appointment of the police, would the evil to which you have referred, namely, the want of proper regulations of the public-houses and beershops, be remedied at all by the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate?—No, I consider it would not; assuming the police to remain under the same control and jurisdiction; but if an information was brought, the party would be punished as he deserved, and justice impartially administered.

2018. Lord *Lovaine*.] Which, in your opinion, is not the case now?—In my opinion it is not.

2019. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Are any directions issued to yourself to prevent the police interfering with these public-houses?—None, excepting what I have stated.

2020. It is your impression that such a course is understood on the part of the watch committee?—It is my impression, as Inspector Peck informed me that an order was put up in the station-house, previous to my being in Norwich, prohibiting interference unless in flagrant cases.

2021. Lord *Lovaine*.] You have said that no information is to be laid without having previously undergone the sanction of the watch committee?—These instructions were given. I took the responsibility of laying informations against some houses.

2022. And brought them direct before the magistrates of the city?—Yes. In some cases the parties were fined.

2023. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Is Sunday trading carried on to a great extent at Norwich?—Not so much now as it used to be.

2024. What are the principal offences which are committed by the public-house and beershop-keepers in Norwich?—It is said that in the city of Norwich, there are 200 houses that are used for the purposes of prostitution; it is difficult to supervise them.

2025. *Chairman*.] Do you mean that those houses are the resort of hired prostitutes?—The resort of prostitutes; some of those houses are kept by returned convicts, or by men who have been convicted of felony; and in many of those low public-houses crime is fostered; many of them I suspect to be receivers of stolen property; I recently found a quantity of stolen goods in the house of a returned convict, and also an illicit still.

2026. Did you take any measures in that instance to bring the offenders to justice?—Yes; I had the man taken before the magistrates; but one of the magistrates, who is a practising barrister, has two sons, solicitors, and his sons appear before the bench; he adjudicates in cases where his sons appear as solicitors; he was there that day, and he suggested that the case was got up by the police; that it was a set-up robbery.

2027. Was the case dismissed?—Yes.

2028. Upon the representation of the magistrate that it was a got-up robbery by the police?—I cannot say that it was dismissed upon that statement; that remark was made by that magistrate. The men vote at elections; there are generally from 20 to 30 men who vote at parliamentary and municipal elections; at the last election I submitted to the watch committee the impropriety of allowing the men to interfere in the election, directly or indirectly, only in the performance of their duties; that both parties were entitled to protection, one as much as the other. The committee met my proposition with a direct negative.

0.71.

Q

2029. Lord

Mr. J. Duane.

3 June 1853

Mr. J. Dunne.  
3 June 1853.

2029. Lord *Lovaine*.] Have you ever found it necessary to call in further assistance during elections?—No; my experience only extends to one election at Norwich, and there was no occasion then to apply for further assistance, excepting posse-men; the military were ordered to remain in barracks, and they were in readiness to come out if called upon. I had been informed that they were obliged to avail themselves of military aid when a disturbance took place. During the riots in Manchester in 1841 the military were called out; large bodies of special constables were appointed; I was detached with a party of police and special constables on three occasions; when called into action the special constables ran away; three active policemen were beaten; in a day or two afterwards they died in the hospital. It is my opinion that special constables are unequal to any emergency.

2030. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] On the occasion to which you refer, regarding Norwich, did those members of the police vote?—I am informed they always have done so.

2031. *Chairman*.] You have spoken of the expenses of the parish constables; have you any scale of fees?—Yes.

2032. What is the scale of fees?—It is laid down in this Form.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which is as follows:*]

#### KENT.

TABLES of FEES and ALLOWANCES to the CLERKS to the JUSTICES for the County of Kent, for the performance of their Duties, under the Acts 5 and 6 Vict. c. 109, for the Appointment and Payment of Parish Constables, and 13 Vict. c. 20, for amending that Act, and to the CONSTABLES for the performance of their Duties.

#### JUSTICES' CLERKS' FEES.

	£	s.	d.
For every precept to high constable for convening a special petty sessions, —to be paid by each parish	—	1	—
Notices to justices when required,—to be paid by each parish	—	—	6
Precept and notice to overseers to return lists to special sessions, including abstract of duties,—to be paid by each parish	—	2	6
Each form of list of persons agreed to at vestry, when required by overseer	—	—	3
For every other precept and notice issued under these Acts	—	1	6
Verification and allowance of each list returned, including hearing objections thereto	—	2	6
Appointment of constable, if only one	—	—	6
Each additional constable in the same appointment	—	—	6
Copy of appointment for overseers,—one half.	—	—	—
Every appointment of paid constables (exclusive of the stamp)	—	5	—
Every duplicate of the above, or copy, if required	—	—	6
Every summons and duplicate	—	—	6
Oath of office	—	1	—
Certificate	—	1	—
Lists of constables for justices and clerk of the peace, not exceeding 20 names	—	2	6
For every additional 10 names	—	1	—
For every order of justices to unite parishes, under sect. 4,—to be paid by each parish included therein	—	2	—
For every copy	—	—	—
For every information and examination, if in writing	—	2	6
For each witness examined on hearing, including oath	—	1	6
Confession	—	1	—
Conviction (as form is not prescribed)	—	5	—
Distress warrant	—	—	6
Commitment	—	—	6
Other orders and allowances not provided for	—	1	6

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POLICE.

127  
123

Mr. J. Dunn.  
3 June 1853.

CONSTABLES' FEES.		£.	s.	d.
Serving summons or written order of justice when within the parish	-	-	1	-
Executing warrant	-	-	2	6
Executing warrant to search	-	-	2	6
Distraining, when not otherwise directed by statute	-	-	2	6
Pressing carriages for baggage (up to 10) each	-	-	1	-
For every one in addition, to be paid by the county	-	-	-	6
For attendance in making a return, or obeying a legal order of justices	-	-	2	-
For attendance with prisoner	-	-	2	6
For assistance with prisoner when necessary	-	-	2	6
Travelling expenses actually incurred, when out of the parish	-	-	-	-
For taking a prisoner into custody, or before a justice, per mile	-	-	-	3
Subsistence of prisoner, per day	-	-	-	9
Subsistence of constable, after one day	-	-	2	-
Assistant, when ordered, same as constable.	-	-	-	-
Lodging of prisoner	-	-	-	9
Lodging of constable	-	-	2	-
Assistant to constable	-	-	2	-
For the performance of any occasional duty which may be re- quired under a written order of a justice, or which having been } per day	-	-	2	6
performed without such order is afterwards sanctioned and } allowed by justices in petty sessions, a sum not exceeding } per night	-	-	3	-
while actually engaged)	-	-	-	-

At the annual general session holden by adjournment at Maidstone, in and for the county of Kent, on Monday the 14th day of October 1850, the above tables of fees and allowances were settled by the justices of the said county there assembled, subject to the approval of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.

Whitehall, }  
5 November 1850. }

(signed) Wm. Deedes,  
Chairman.  
Approved,  
G. Grey.

*Witness.*] I should refer to my experience during seven years in the Essex County Constabulary; I had an opportunity of making myself thoroughly acquainted with the working of that force, and the items of saving effected there, and comparing them with the expenses of the constabulary system in the county of Kent, I feel confident in saying that an effective police force could be carried out upon a similar principle to that of Essex at a less real cost to the county than a superintending constable system, giving to the poor man the protection which he does not enjoy under the parish constable system. If a man applies to a local constable he may have to pay him for the duty performed.

2033. Was not the police force in Essex very effective for the suppression of vagrancy?—Yes, most effective.

2034. Was the superintending constable system in the county of Kent efficient for the suppression of vagrants?—Certainly not.

2035. Why not?—Because the constables were seldom on duty, and the superintendent was unable to superintend the extent of ground placed under his supervision, therefore there was but little check upon vagrancy. Hordes of vagrants travelled from one part of the county to another; there was a regular migratory population which tramped from one county to another; previously to the establishment of the Surrey constabulary that county was infested with gangs of gypsies, and those parties immediately on the establishment of that force came into Kent, and in Kent the number of vagrants increased to a great extent.

2036. When you were appointed superintending constable in the county of Kent, was not it one of your duties, as far as you had the means, to suppress vagrancy?—It was my duty to suppress vagrancy, but in consequence of the want of efficient constables I had not the means to do so.

2037. Do you mean, having used your best endeavours during the period you were in Kent, that vagrancy was decreased?—I think the appointment of superintending constables, to a certain extent, did tend to decrease crime as regards the apprehension of offenders; but to suppress vagrancy was impossible; the man was utterly unable, both physically and morally, to perform the duties which were expected of him. In Essex the performance of the duty and the strict supervision of all grades of the officers, arises from the superior uniformity of the system ad down in that county.

2038. Lord *Lovaine.*] Would there be a very violent opposition on the part of the city of Norwich to their police being amalgamated with the rural police?

0.71.

Q 2

—Not

Mr. J. Dunne.  
—  
3 June 1853.

—Not with the inhabitants generally. I do think there would be some opposition by the watch committee; I think they would feel the taking away from them the patronage; but that would ultimately subside, and the advantages derivable from the consolidation would render it a very popular thing with the public. In Cambridge I know the chairman of the watch committee is a brewer, and I know that there are orders that the superintendent shall not proceed against any public-house-keeper without previously having submitted the case to the committee.

2039. Mr. Fitzroy.] Have there been any complaints on the part of the inhabitants of Norwich with reference to the misconduct of the public-houses and the inefficiency of the police?—There was a very great complaint, when I went there, of the inefficiency of the police, and the want of assistance, without they were paid, exclusive of their regular pay. They were principally paid by fees, and they were allowed to receive all fees and rewards; there was a fee for the most ordinary duty.

2040. Is that system done away with now?—Entirely so. I recommended the watch committee to abolish that system, and I considered it essential, for the efficiency of the service, that I should have the appointment and promotion of the men, that is, the selection, and their ultimate promotion. I divided the men into classes.

2041. Lord Lovaine.] The Committee may conclude from what you have stated, that you would prefer yourself to be subject to the control of one individual, rather than be placed in the position in which you are with reference to the watch committee and the magistrates?—I would.

2042. Mr. Fitzroy.] Do you think the present method of appointing the police in Norwich tends much to impair its efficiency?—It does; I have often recommended men whom I have considered efficient, and instead of taking the man whom I recommended, the watch committee have chosen another man; I have recommended men for promotion from one class to another, and instead of taking the man I recommended they have taken others. At the election the Marquis of Douro applied to me for some protection; I was obliged to place men specially on duty to give him that protection which he required, and I believe the consequence of my doing so was to cause considerable opposition to me in the performance of my duties. As regards the expenses of prosecution in Essex, the average cost was between 7*l.* and 8*l.*; in the county of Kent it was considerably more; I find that in Norfolk it is less.

2043. Mr. Burroughes.] Do you know the relative proportion of the expenses of prosecution between the county prisoners and the city prisoners?—I am told the average expense of the prosecution of a city prisoner is one half more than a county prisoner.

2044. You are not speaking now upon any precise information?—No, from information I received from the auditor. With regard to the superintending constable system in the Dewsbury division in Yorkshire, there is a population of 80,000, and only a superintending constable with parish constables in substitution of the police establishment.

*Jovis, 9<sup>o</sup> die Junii, 1853.*

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Rice.	Sir John Trollope.
Mr. Sotheron.	Mr. Moody.
Lord Advocate.	Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Fitzroy.	Mr. Charles Howard.
Mr. Burroughes.	Sir James Anderson.
Lord Lovaine.	Mr. Phillips.

EDWARD ROYDS RICE, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

*George William Blathwayt, Esq., called in; and Examined.*

G. W. Blathwayt, Esq. 2045. YOU are a Magistrate for Gloucestershire?—I am a Magistrate for Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and the city of Bath.

9 June 1853. 2046. In which of those counties do you act?—I act as a magistrate for Gloucestershire,

Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, and the city of Bath regularly; I do not act in Wiltshire; I am constantly acting for Gloucestershire, and occasionally for the city of Bath.

G. W. Blathwayt,  
Esq.

9 June 1853.

2047. Are you chairman of the court of quarter sessions?—Chairman of the Bath division of Somersetshire petty sessional division.

2048. Do you reside on the borders between Gloucestershire, Wilts and Somerset?—Upon the borders of the whole of the three counties, about seven miles from Bath.

2049. Have you had some experience of the system of police, and the state of crime in those three counties?—In Gloucestershire and Somersetshire; I know but little of Wiltshire.

2050. In the county of Gloucester there is a police?—A rural police.

2051. Can you state at all what the expense of that police is in the pound?—Nine farthings in the pound; we have three halfpenny rates and a three-farthing rate.

2052. Are you acquainted with the police in the county of Wilts?—I know nothing of the police of Wiltshire, except that there is a police.

2053. Can you speak of the comparative advantages or disadvantages in the county of Gloucester where there is police, and in the county of Somerset where there is none?—I should say decidedly, that there is a very great advantage in the police. I will give an instance: at Lansdowne, which is about three miles from Bath, in the county of Somerset, there are annual fairs held; and the rioting at those fairs, and the felonies which were committed, were so bad that people were almost deterred from going. Being lord of the manor of Lansdowne I naturally took an interest in it, and summoned a quantity of special constables to attend; I found they were of little use to preserve order.

2054. Was there a riot?—The people at the fairs were regularly robbed at noon day; there was a riot upwards of four or five years ago.

2055. Was it in consequence of any riot or apprehended riot that you swore in special constables?—Yes, and upon sworn information.

2056. What number of special constables did you swear in?—Twenty-four, I believe.

2057. Did you call in the aid of any of the parish constables?—I summoned the parish constables and ordered the high constable to attend with them, and I found they did more harm than good.

2058. What was the effect of swearing in the special constables?—The special constables generally created disorder; I thought they did more harm than good.

2059. What class of people did you swear in as special constables?—People of all descriptions; I afterwards availed myself of the Act of Parliament; and with the assistance of another magistrate, upon some sworn informations, I called upon the city of Bath to send up a certain number of police; they have regularly attended the fairs and races since that time, which is now, I believe, about four or five years ago; the fairs are conducted quietly, and there is very little felony committed; at the races all the thimble riggers and all those vagabonds are completely got rid of, that is, by the assistance of the police of the city of Bath.

2060. Have you experienced any advantages from the establishment of police in the county of Gloucester?—A case took place last year: there was a very serious riot at Bridge Yate, in the county of Gloucester, at one of the polling-places; there was a magistrate there and some police; the police were brought in too small a number, and the riot was so bad that the police were severely beaten, and the magistrates could do nothing. Sworn informations were taken afterwards against some 27 of the ringleaders of the riot, and the magistrates sent a special messenger to the chief of the police at Cheltenham, who ordered 50 men down that night, and 23 of the 27 rioters were taken in their beds, brought before the magistrates, and the whole 23 were sent for trial, with the exception of two that were let off, because they were not shown to have been so bad or actively concerned in the riot; 21 out of the 23 were tried at quarter sessions and were convicted. The consequence has been, that that part of the country has since been quiet, and I am certain that that could not have been done by parish constables.

2061. What distance had you to send for the police?—We sent by rail to Cheltenham, which is about 30 miles.

2062. Can you state how soon you got them down?—As soon as we wanted them; and the police executed the warrants in the night.

2063. You think you could not, without having had those policemen from  
0 71. Cheltenham,

G. W. Blathwayt,  
Esq.

9 June 1853.

Cheltenham, have maintained the peace, by swearing in special constables, or by calling in the assistance of parochial constables?—Certainly not; these parties would have resisted the parish constables.

2064. What is your opinion of the efficiency of parochial constables?—Parochial constables are very well in their way, but they are very inferior to the police. Some of them do their duty very well. I do not mean to say one word against the parish constables, but they are very far from being efficient; they are changed in Somersetshire almost every year; a fresh batch comes in, which makes them of very little use.

2065. Are you aware whether the parochial constables are still appointed in Gloucestershire?—Yes, certainly; in the month of March.

2066. Do you ever make any use of them?—The men come and are sworn in; they get their certificate and are paid their fees, but their services are seldom required.

2067. Is there any expense and trouble in swearing in the parish constables?—They are summoned to attend at the petty sessional divisions; there they are sworn in; and that is all we hear about them. The Act of Parliament obliges us to do it. They act as a sort of reserve in the case of a riot. The police know upon whom to call in the case of riots.

2068. Mr. *Moody*.] What is the expense paid on swearing in?—Three shillings and sixpence; being the scale of allowance of the quarter sessions.

2069. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Do you know the precise annual expense of swearing in those parish constables in Gloucestershire?—No, I cannot tell the cost; we only do it for our own division.

2070. What is the expense in your division?—It varies very much; some parishes have two, and some half a dozen. There are 25 parishes in our division.

2071. What does each constable cost?—Each constable costs 3*s.* 6*d.*; they give the man 3*s.* for the loss of his day's work, and there is 6*d.* for the clerk for making out the order to him.

2072. There is a police in the county of Gloucester, but there is no police in the county of Somerset?—No.

2073. Do you think the police in the county of Gloucester would be more efficient if you had the assistance of a similar system of police in the adjoining counties?—Undoubtedly; a link in the chain is broken; and if a thief gets into Somersetshire he is often lost sight of, because you cannot depend upon the parish constables for information. My idea is, to have no police in Gloucestershire, or have them in all three counties.

2074. Have you found any evil to arise from the continuance of the parish constables in Somersetshire?—No, I cannot say that we have. I think there is not so much crime detected by the parish constables as by the police; and I think there is a less amount of crime altogether.

2075. Do you think the proportion of undetected crime is much greater in Somersetshire than in Gloucestershire?—Certainly.

2076. Mr. *Moody*.] Have you any particular data upon which you give that answer?—I go upon the returns which I have had from the police in Gloucestershire, that the amount of undetected crime has decreased about 15 per cent. the last five years. For the last two or three years we have not had a single case of sheep-stealing or cattle-stealing. I believe there have been cases in Somersetshire, from all I can learn.

2077. Have you had any similar return from Somersetshire?—No; mine is only the police return from Gloucestershire.

2078. *Chairman*.] Do you know whether there are many cases of sheep-stealing in the county of Somerset?—There are cases. There are large farms in Somersetshire, and lately I heard of half-a-dozen being stolen from near a magistrate's house; Captain Scoble's house. I merely heard in Bath that six sheep had been stolen, and the people had never been heard of.

2079. Were they Captain Scoble's sheep?—It was in his neighbourhood. Perhaps the Committee will allow me to mention a case of sheep-stealing which occurred in Gloucestershire, about three years ago. I remember the time, because it was the very year that I was sheriff of Somerset. A Gloucestershire policeman was upon patrol at night, and against my park wall he saw a very large bonfire; he quietly darkened his lantern, and went up; he found a bonfire of faggots with a sheep roasting whole. He very quietly went to a neighbouring village,

village, and knocked up half-a-dozen able-bodied men; the party came down, and surrounded those men, and took them all into custody; they found the skin, and he discovered from my bailiff to whom the sheep belonged. Those fellows were all taken off to the assizes and were convicted, and thus a gang was broken up just by the individual exertions of that young policeman.

2080. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Can you give the date of that case?—It was in the year 1849; it was during the spring assizes. I remember it perfectly well, because I happened to be sheriff of Somerset at the time.

2081. *Chairman*.] Do you think that the want of a police force is felt more by the poorer classes of society than any other?—I think it is in this instance; if a poor person wants a summons executed he must look up his halfcrown to the parish constable; whereas, if there is a policeman to serve it, he does it at once for nothing. I do not mean to charge the parish constables with neglect of duty or being unnecessarily harsh; but I know that that is the case.

2082. If an offence is committed and pursuit is necessary, that pursuit must be paid for by the parties robbed in the first instance?—Yes; the parish constable will not move till he gets his halfcrown.

2083. A poor man has not the facility of paying him that a rich man has?—No.

2084. Has not a rich man an opportunity of employing other parties, such as gamekeepers or servants, to aid the parish constables?—Yes.

2085. Therefore a rich man has facilities in the detection of crime if he is robbed, which a poor man does not possess, excepting under a good police system?—Certainly.

2086. Have you ever considered the subject of an uniform system of police being established throughout the country; do you think it would be desirable?—I think so; I have had an opportunity of seeing the working of the Irish constabulary, and I have often thought it was a pity that we had not an universal police on the same system all over England.

2087. If there were an uniform police system all over England, and crime was diminished in consequence, do not you think that in all counties the expense of the staff might be decreased?—Most decidedly.

2088. If it were universal, it would be generally cheaper?—I think so; I believe our police in Gloucestershire is considered an expensive police; in Gloucestershire the sub-constables range from 15*s.* the second-class men, to 18*s.* the first-class men, and 1*l.* the serjeants. The chief constable has 506*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; he has one deputy who has 116*l.* 12*s.* Three superintendents at 148*l.* 11*s.* each; seven inspectors at 135*l.* 5*s.* each, which includes a horse to each of those persons, which they provide themselves. Then there are 55 serjeants at 20*s.* a week each; 120 first-class constables at 18*s.*; and 55 second-class at 15*s.*; which with clothing, boots and hats, amounts to about 16,500*l.* per annum; that is about 2½*d.* in the pound, which is more than equal to the county rate.

2089. What boroughs are there in the county of Gloucester which have a police force?—I do not think there are above two that have a police force; Tewkesbury and Gloucester.

2090. Are the police force of any of those boroughs consolidated under the Act of Parliament with the police of the county?—Cheltenham, Stroud and Cirencester are; Gloucester and Tewkesbury stand by themselves.

2091. Can you state which of those boroughs was first consolidated with the county?—I believe all; Cheltenham is the head quarters of the police, where the chief constable resides.

2092. How soon after the establishment of the police in Gloucestershire was Cheltenham consolidated with the county?—I think about two years afterwards.

2093. When was Stroud consolidated with the county?—I think about the same time; the police was established before I became a resident magistrate in the county, two or three years.

2094. Do you think it would be desirable, if there were an uniform system of police, that the boroughs should be consolidated with the county?—I should say so, decidedly; we have a police in Bath; I have been a borough magistrate, and have acted occasionally, I do not act so much as I did. There was a very good police, but I do not think it is so good as it was; I think if that police were consolidated with the county it would be better for both the borough and the county.

O.71.

Q 4

2095. Is

G. W. Blathwayt,  
Esq.

9 June 1853.

G. W. Blathwayt,  
Esq.

9 June 1853.

2095. Is not the Bath police under the direction of the watch committee?—It is, and I do not admire the direction; I think there is too much jobbing.

2096. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Is not the Bath police under a chief constable?—It is under a chief constable, but the chief constable is the subordinate of the watch committee.

2097. Do you suppose that the advantage of consolidating the police of the city of Bath with the police of the county would be, that the force would be placed under the superintendence of the chief constable, or under a different set of magistrates?—I think if the police of the city and the police of the county were all one it would work very well, as it is part of the county; the division for which I act is frequently obliged to avail itself of the assistance of the police at Bath.

2098. Mr. *Howard*.] Have you any check in Gloucestershire by which you ascertain that the policemen are upon night patrol?—We have; I will explain it: in each division probably there are at least three constables, that is, one serjeant and two men; those men are sent out to patrol six hours in the night. When a man goes out he is furnished with a ticket; this ticket is entered in a book; he is desired to go a particular house and leave this ticket, and two days following another policeman goes round to collect those tickets; those tickets are brought back and filed. In the course of the week the superintendent visits the station, and examines all the tickets in order to see that they are all delivered; my servant, if it is brought to my house, writes his name upon the back of it. Those particulars are stated in the reports, and then the reports are brought before the magistrates in petty sessions once a fortnight, and all the journals are open to their inspection.

2099. Do you find that there is much evasion of the duty?—No; there have been evasions; I recollect one evasion, in which an Irish serjeant sent a boy round with the tickets; the fraud was discovered, and the man was dismissed immediately. I consider the Gloucestershire policemen work very hard indeed; they are out every night for six hours, and they are frequently out on patrolling duty during the day. I should say that the district for which I act extends over an area of about 60,000 acres, containing a rural population of about 14,000; we have only 16 policemen at different stations, three and four to a station.

2100. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Are the Committee to understand that the Gloucestershire police is founded on the model of the Irish police?—Yes.

2101. Does not that system consist of having certain stations distributed over the county, and a certain number of policemen, under a superintendent, at each of those stations?—Yes; a serjeant or superintendent.

2102. Therefore the police stations would not necessarily be in the different parishes?—No.

2103. The parishes in fact come into a circle drawn round from the centre of the station; is that the Irish system?—I fancy it is.

2104. Have you had any experience in any other form of rural police, such as distributing the policemen in the different parishes?—I am not aware of that system.

2105. Therefore you are not in a condition to make a comparison between the two systems?—No.

2106. Speaking of that which is in Gloucestershire, you think it works very well?—Yes.

2107. Supposing a parish were four or five miles from a station, and a poor man lost a duck, in what way would he proceed to recover his property or detect the offender?—Frequently a man comes to me, and I give an order to the police, or he goes himself direct to the policeman.

2108. Whether you give him an order, or whether he goes himself, he would have to travel four or five miles in some cases?—Yes.

2109. So far as the distance is concerned, he is not so well off as when he had a parish constable at home?—He has a parish constable at home now to go with him.

2110. Have you had complaints made from persons who have suffered loss of having so far to go?—No, I have not.

2111. You do not think, taking a broad view of the system, that that is a disparagement to the efficiency of the police?—I do not think it is.

2112. With the same amount of efficiency, would you consider it an improvement to establish a policeman in every parish, or nearly so?—Certainly, the poor would

would be benefited by that, if it did not make the policeman idle; probably the policeman would have too little to do.

2113. The efficiency of the force is the first point; supposing it could be shown that in a neighbouring county the policemen are found in the different parishes, would you think that was an improvement?—I do not think in our district each man is more than three miles from the station; I would observe that Mr. Lefroy, who has the charge of those police, and who has framed them upon the Irish constabulary, was for 20 years in the Irish constabulary.

2114. Mr. *Moody*.] In a large area of 60,000 acres, are all the police of the district concentrated at one point?—No, at different stations; a serjeant and two men at each station; at some stations there are more.

2115. What is the greatest distance which the night patrol would have to go?—I suppose he would patrol between three and four miles each way from the station.

2116. Lord *Lovaine*.] In the case which has been suggested of a poor man losing some trifling article, would it not be perfectly possible for him to apply to the policeman at the time he was making his rounds in the day?—It might happen that he would not come in the daytime.

2117. If he did he could make his case known?—Yes; and at all events he would have only three miles to go to the station.

2118. Mr. *Mackie*.] You are of opinion that a general system of police would be very desirable in England and Wales?—Decidedly so.

2119. Do you think a system of police such as that would enhance the value of property?—I think so.

2120. By giving greater security?—I think it would.

2121. Mr. *Moody*.] Do your parish constabulary serve any processes?—No; the police serve all the summonses, and everything; the only thing which the parish constabulary do is to give notice to the coroner for an inquest; if there is a case requiring an inquest, the parish constable is sent off by the churchwardens.

2122. Mr. *Phillips*.] Are you acquainted with the town police in Gloucestershire?—In the town of Gloucester they have a police of their own. I do not know anything of them. I merely see them when I am going to the assizes.

2123. Mr. *Moody*.] Are not the police sent annually from Bath to Lansdowne fair?—We do so now.

2124. Who pays the police in that case?—They are paid by the borough, but the parishes make some allowance for refreshments in the case of the fair; but at the races the whole of the expense is paid from the race fund.

2125. Under a special Act?—The Bath police are employed under the 76th sec. 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 76.

2126. Lord *Lovaine*.] Have you any personal knowledge of the manner in which the lighting and watching committee influence the management of the police in Bath?—I should say that the police in Bath are entirely in the hands of the watch committee.

2127. What are the evils of that system?—In the first place, I think that one of the greatest evils in Bath is, that the police there still retain their right of voting both at municipal and Parliamentary elections; the consequence is, that there is a good deal of jobbing, I had almost called it. I remember an instance in which a member of the watch committee had canvassed a policeman, and told him, "If you will support me as a member of the town council, I will do what I can to get you promoted when I get into the council."

*John Thomson Gordon, Esq.*, called in; and Examined.

2128. *Chairman*.] YOU are the Sheriff of the City of Edinburgh?—I am.

2129. And Mid-Lothian?—Yes; the jurisdiction runs over both city and county.

2130. Will you shortly state to the Committee what the system of police generally in Scotland is?—The system of police in Scotland is different in the cities and the counties; the large cities, like Edinburgh and Glasgow, have police statutes of their own, under which their police is constituted. In the year 1839 there was an Act passed which permitted, but did not enjoin, the counties to levy assessments for maintaining a constabulary force; that was only permissive, and some counties have adopted the Act, and others have not.

0.71.

R

2131. By

*G. W. Blathwayt,*  
Esq.

9 June 1853.

*J. T. Gordon, Esq.*

W. Gordon, Esq  
June 1853.

2131. By whom was that discretion exercised?—By the commissioners of supply of the county.

2132. What are the duties of the commissioners of supply?—They are the proprietors; they are the heritors of the counties; freeholders, in fact.

2133. They are not necessarily magistrates?—No.

2134. In what counties under your immediate observation has that Act been adopted?—I know that a police force exists in Mid-Lothian, in Aberdeenshire, in Fife, in Stirling, in Dumfries, and, I believe, in many other counties.

2135. In which of those counties has that system of police come most under your observation?—In Mid-Lothian.

2136. What is the nature of the force in Mid-Lothian, and its extent?—The force in Mid-Lothian consists altogether of 31 persons.

2137. Will you state the population of Mid-Lothian?—The population of the county may be about 260,000, but from that number must be taken about 130,000 or 140,000 for the city of Edinburgh.

2138. The remainder would be rural district?—The remainder will be the rural district; that is about 120,000; but this includes several small towns or burghs, as Dalkeith, Musselburgh, Portobello.

2139. How many men have you for this district?—Thirty-one; there is one superintendent, one inspector and clerk, one serjeant, one criminal officer, two police serjeants, two first class constables, 18 second class constables, and four probationers; those are men that are on the move for promotion; and one messenger; that is the whole establishment.

2140. Has the superintendent the appointment of the subordinate officers?—Yes.

2141. What you call the superintendent would be the same description of officer as the chief constable of the counties in England?—I suppose so; perhaps I had better state, when it is resolved in any county (I am now speaking more particularly of Mid-Lothian) to raise this constabulary force, a county meeting appoints what is called a police committee, and that police committee appoints a superintendent, the head of the police, and maintains a general superintendence over the whole force, although practically it never interferes with any of his appointments, unless there is some gross case of mismanagement to call for their interference.

2142. The appointments would rest with the superintendents, subject to the approbation of this committee?—Yes; I may perhaps as well say also, that practically the appointments are made with the approbation of the sheriff of the county, who is the chairman of the police committee.

2143. Is the chairman of that committee appointed from the commissioners of supply?—Yes.

2144. What number of commissioners of supply is there in Mid-Lothian?—I can hardly tell you; they are a very numerous body; the police committee varies from 12 to 14 members; a list of the commissioners of supply I think is annually published.

2145. Lord *Lovaine*.] What are the duties of the criminal officer?—His duty is principally, I think, that of a detective officer.

2146. Does the criminal officer go round to all the courts of petty sessions?—There are only two places in which courts are held for the trial of offences in Mid-Lothian, one in Edinburgh and the other in Dalkeith, about eight miles from Edinburgh.

2147. Can you explain a little further the duties of the criminal officer?—His duties being regulated under the direction of the superintendent, I cannot precisely define them.

2148. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Does this man take any part in the duties of the constabulary?—He is employed when he is needed; he is generally resident in Edinburgh.

2149. You have stated that the Edinburgh police was a separate body?—Quite.

2150. But still under your jurisdiction?—In combination with the magistrates of the city.

2151. Lord *Lovaine*.] Does not there arise considerable confusion and impediment in the administration of justice from those two separate bodies being engaged in the same purpose?—No; because under the Act of Parliament, a copy of which I have here, constituting the city police, the police boundaries are so clearly marked that there is no conflict of jurisdiction or any annoyance.

2152. Is

2152. Is there any jealousy existing between the forces?—I dare say there is a little jealousy; I am bound to say that the county police are much superior men to the city police.

2153. From what does that arise?—From the greater care in the selection of the men, from higher pay, and also from the superintendence generally of the whole body being very different in the one case from the other.

2154. From which I conclude you are of opinion that the body which has the power of appointing and managing the police in Edinburgh is not a proper one?—I do not think it is a proper body for that purpose.

2155. On what account?—It is a body called the police commission, consisting of 32 members, who are annually elected to represent different wards in the city; it is a body elected every year by a popular election, and although the head of the commission is stated in this Act to be the Lord Provost, or, in his absence, the sheriff of the county, there is much divided superintendence, not very easily reconcilable with the duties of a very efficient police force.

2156. Do you apprehend that a considerable amount of jobbing goes on?—I should not certainly use the word jobbing; but there are obvious reasons to show that it is an improper body to manage the police; and that the superintendent of the city police is necessarily subject to influences from which such an officer should be free.

2157. Do you believe that 31 constables are sufficient to carry on their duty in a population as large as 120,000?—I should say it is not a sufficient force; especially for night patrolling, if that were necessary.

2158. Do you believe night patrolling to be necessary?—I think certainly it is very necessary.

2159. Is there much complaint of the weight of the assessment?—No, there is not; the whole amount of the assessment is 2,047 *l.* 14 *s.* 6*d.* for the whole expense of the establishment of the county constabulary.

2160. Amounting to a rate in the pound of how much?—I cannot exactly tell you what the rate is; but I think 2*d.* in the pound sterling.

2161. Mr. Mackie.] Are not the assessments in Scotland laid upon the old valuation?—Yes, generally, I believe they are.

2162. The assessment of 2,000 *l.* odd is passed on the 30th of April annually?—Yes.

2163. Upon what property is that laid?—It is laid upon all the landward part of the county, excluding Edinburgh and Leith and Portobello.

2164. Is it not chiefly upon the landed property?—Yes.

2165. What does a shopkeeper in Edinburgh, with 1,000 *l.* or 1,500 *l.* worth of goods in his shop, pay upon that assessment?—Nothing; but a shopkeeper in Edinburgh has to pay for the city police; the burden undoubtedly falls upon the land.

2166. Is not that the principal cause of some of the most important counties in Scotland not having adopted the police system?—I dare say that is one of their main reasons.

2167. Did not that cause operate in Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire?—Lanarkshire I know has refused to adopt the police over and over again.

2168. Lord Lovaine.] Has the establishment of police caused a great diminution of crime in the county of Mid-Lothian?—I have not a doubt that the establishment of police in the county of Mid-Lothian has been attended with a great repression and diminution of crime.

2169. What counties are there adjoining Mid-Lothian, which have not a police force?—Lanark.

2170. Confine yourself to the county of Lanark, where there is no police; do you think there is more crime in that county, where there is no police, than in Mid-Lothian, where there is a police?—I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I think there is a greater amount of crime over the border; it is not very easy to exaggerate the state of matters upon the borders of the county.

2171. Lord Advocate.] The county of Lanark adjoins Edinburgh?—Yes; I am now speaking of the parts of Lanark which adjoin Mid-Lothian.

2172. What is the state of matters there?—There are seasons of the year when there are very large bands of poachers, who come regularly across the border from Lanark into Mid-Lothian and commit great depredations. I am not entitled to speak from my personal knowledge, but I believe the depredations that are carried on in that part of Lanark upon the farm-houses and dwellings about the

*J. T. Gordon, Esq.* country are to an extent that it would be very difficult indeed to exaggerate. That I speak of upon the report of Lanarkshire gentlemen, not of my own knowledge.  
9 June 1853.

2173. *Chairman.*] Have you reason to believe that that is the fact?—Every reason.

2174. *Lord Advocate.*] Do you find that criminals escape across the border from your jurisdiction into Lanarkshire?—Unquestionably they do; and that thieves come thence into Mid-Lothian

2175. Are not those parts of Lanark and Peebles the haunts of thieves who have been expelled from the counties where there is a police force?—Very frequently indeed.

2176. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Is the superintendent of the police of the city of Edinburgh removable by the police committee?—He is appointed and removed by the Lord Provost and the Sheriff of Mid-Lothian; if they differ, then the ultimate decision of the appointment rests with the Lord Advocate of Scotland; he is the arbitrator between the two.

2177. Is the superintendent totally free from the control of the police committee?—So far, that his appointment is made not by the police commission, but by those two magistrates.

2178. Has he the power of nominating the men under his control?—Yes.

2179. And of dismissing them?—Yes.

2180. Irrespective of any recommendation or advice from the police committee?—Certainly.

2181. *Lord Lovaine.*] Under those circumstances, if he is a perfectly independent officer, it does not appear that there should be any pressure which would affect him?—It is not perhaps very easy to explain in a few sentences how it is, but there are so many masters in one respect holding the purse-strings, with a superintendence going on at all times of the different departments of the institution, that it is not very difficult to see that the superintendent of police is not so independent as in my opinion he should be.

2182. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Does his salary depend upon the police commission?—The minimum of the salary is fixed by the Act of Parliament; by the 73d section of the statute it is enacted, that the salary to be paid to the superintendent of police shall not be less than 300 *l.* per annum.

2183. What does he now receive?—Three hundred and fifty pounds.

2184. Who fixed that increase?—That increase was fixed by the vote of the police commissioners, but upon the recommendation of the Lord Provost and the sheriff.

2185. Would the police commissioners have the power of reducing his salary to the minimum?—They cannot reduce it lower than 300 *l.* a year, but to that sum they may at any time reduce it.

2186. *Lord Lovaine.*] What power have the police commissioners over the private constables and the serjeants?—The superintendent has the entire control, speaking generally; but the number and remuneration of the force may be altered at any time by the commissioners.

2187. *Mr. Sotheron.*] You think that there is great disorder in Lanarkshire, at least on its borders, as compared with Mid-Lothian?—Unquestionably; I should say so.

2188. You say that the proposition for establishing a paid police in Lanarkshire has often been mooted and always rejected?—So I have understood.

2189. Can you give the Committee any reason why it should have been so rejected, except upon the ground of expense?—I do not know that I am entitled to speak to the reasons which have actuated the landholders in Lanarkshire; I have no connexion with that county whatever; I know at this moment as a fact, that they very often send in times of trouble requisitions to the city police of Glasgow to obtain assistance from them, which would have been hardly required if there had been a constabulary force constituted in the county.

2190. Are the Committee to understand that whatever the expense may be of this paid police force, it is entirely raised from the land, as distinguished from trades or houses?—Yes.

2191. Consequently, the 2,000 *l.* paid in Mid-Lothian, though a very small amount of rate in the pound, is not paid by those persons exclusively who obtain the advantages to be derived from the existence of a police force?—No.

2192. Is not that one great reason why they do not establish a police force in Lanarkshire?—

Lanarkshire?—I think I have already said that that operates in some counties as a reason for not establishing a police force. *J. T. Gordon, Esq.*

2193. *Mr. Mackie.*] Are you of opinion that an uniform system of amalgamated police force in the whole of Scotland would be desirable?—I have not the least doubt of it. *9 June 1853.*

2194. In your opinion would it enhance the value of property, from giving greater security?—I can state that in the county of Mid-Lothian property has risen in value, and that sales have been effected upon the strength of the police reports made on the state of the district. As to the uniformity of the system, perhaps you will allow me to mention, that at present, as I said before, there are various counties in Scotland which have adopted the Act of 2 & 3 Vict. c. 65; the rates of payment or remuneration of the police are very different; it has frequently occurred that an application has been made to Mr. List, the superintendent of the county of Mid-Lothian, for men to be drafted to other counties, in consequence of their experience and training enabling them to do good elsewhere; the answer has been frequently on the part of those men, "We are not going to change from a very good force into one that is much worse, and where the pay is so much lower, and there is no hope of promotion."

2195. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] What is the number of police in the city of Edinburgh?—Three hundred and twelve.

2196. *Chairman.*] Can you tell the Committee the amount of police assessment for the city of Edinburgh?—The amount of police assessment for the city of Edinburgh, for the year ending Whit Sunday 1852, was 35,963 *l. 10s. 5d.*; but this includes cleaning, lighting, and other departments, besides watching.

2197. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] You are nominally the head both of the watching committee and also the head of the police commission, but you state that jealousies do exist, you think, to a certain extent between the two forces?—I think they may to a small extent.

2198. Do you think that jealousies exist to a sufficient extent to frustrate the ends of justice?—Certainly not.

2199. Do you think that the jealousy would be very much done away with if they were both put under the same superintendent?—I do not think I can safely say that jealousy exists to that extent; I do not feel it would be a very easy thing to amalgamate those two forces under one head, because in such a city as Edinburgh the duties of the superintendent of the city police are so onerous, that I should hesitate a little before adding to the duties which now devolve upon him.

2200. You think the charge of 342 men and the area of ground which those men cover would be too much for one head constable to superintend?—As the office is at present constituted I think it would, on this account, that the superintendent of the city police is also the public prosecutor of all police cases; he is obliged at the end of each day to prepare the charges which are to be brought into the police court the next morning, and superintend the prosecution of those cases before the Judge. I know that that is a task which takes up a very great deal of time, and often tries his strength very much.

2201. Supposing that the chief constable remained with his existing duties in Edinburgh, and that there were an assistant superintendent who acted under him to superintend the whole of the force, do you think that would facilitate the administration of justice?—I do not know that there would be practically any objection to that; it might get rid of some of the jealousies which do exist, though I do not think they are very serious at this moment.

2202. Do you not think that the detection of crime would be very much facilitated by the two forces working thoroughly in a good spirit together?—I cannot doubt that it would be so.

2203. That would be very much brought about by the forces being placed under one head, would it not?—I beg to state that personally I have no objection to seeing the two forces under one head.

2204. Do you think the facilities in the detection of crime would be so much increased as to enable a reduction in the number of constables to meet the extra expense of an assistant superintendent?—I am not prepared to say that there could be much reduction, because I for one believe that the establishment of the city police is by a great deal too small in point of number.

2205. *Sir J. Anderson.*] Do you think it an advantage to have the city police under the police commission rather than under the town council or the magistrates?—

J. T. Gordon, Esq.

9 June 1853.

trates?—I am bound to say that it is my firm belief that it would be for the public advantage if the police commission did not exist.

2206. *Lord Advocate.*] In your opinion, is not the police commission a body very little calculated to manage the police department with efficiency?—I think I have already stated that it is not by any means the body the best calculated to administer such affairs as those of police.

2207. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Is there any qualification requisite to enable a person to serve upon the police commission?—Commissioners must be electors within the ward, whose houses, shops, &c. are valued at least at 15*l.* of actual yearly rent.

2208. *Sir J. Anderson.*] Do you think the power of the police commission should be vested in the town council?—I have not the least hesitation in saying that it ought, in preference to a separate police commission.

2208. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Are any of the members of the town council members of the police commission?—They are.

2210. *Lord Advocate.*] Will you state to the Committee generally your view of what a uniformly organised system of police throughout Scotland ought to be, and on what principles it should be maintained?—I should say if you still keep for the great cities a separate police, it would be better to let that be administered by a committee, consisting of magistrates of the city, and the sheriff, and one of the sheriff substitutes; that in each county there should be a police committee; and I should almost like to propose, if it were possible, that *ex officio* the Lord-advocate and the Solicitor-general should be members of every such committee throughout Scotland, or that the sheriff, who might communicate with them directly, should be *ex officio* chairman, because, I was going to conclude by saying, that I think there ought to be a certain payment out of the Consolidated Fund for the establishment of an uniform system of police, and if that were so, there would require to be some kind of control, and some means of knowledge on the part of the Crown as to how the funds were administered, and how the force was maintained.

2211. *Lord Lovaine.*] What powers would you give to the watching committee?—Very much the powers which they now have.

2212. Would you give them the power of interfering with the pay of the private constables, or the pay of the superintendents?—You cannot very well regulate it in any other way, unless you leave it in the discretion of some single public officer, which I am afraid is not a very easy thing to manage.

2213. *Sir J. Anderson.*] Would you suggest that the committee should be selected by the commissioners of supply?—They should be appointed as they are in Mid-Lothian; each committee is nominated on the 30th of April.

2214. If you propose to make the assessment more general, do you think the commissioners of supply would still be the proper body to appoint?—If you are going to change the basis of the assessment, and bring it upon the shops and other tenements, that would open a larger question; I am only speaking of things upon their present footing.

2215. *Lord Advocate.*] Do you think a general system would be much more economical, as well as more efficient, than the system which prevails at present?—I have no doubt it would.

2216. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] You have stated that in Mid-Lothian the assessment is not complained of as being too heavy?—I am not aware that it is.

2217. In the event of a general system being introduced throughout the whole of the kingdom, would not a reduction of the police be the necessary consequence in many counties, so that the assessment would be comparatively lighter?—Everything might be easier than at present, when many counties have no police, or a different assessment.

2218. Consequently there is much greater difficulty, and a more arduous duty falling upon those constables who are appointed?—Unquestionably, and upon the counties which have a police, in the rating to maintain the constabulary.

2219. You have stated that the value of land is enhanced by the establishment of a police force?—Yes.

2220. Taking these two facts into consideration, is not it to be inferred that the advantages to be derived from a general system would more than counterbalance any extra charge upon the counties?—I should say so, without any hesitation.

2221. *Mr. Howard.*] What system is adopted in the counties where a police force has not been introduced; are constables appointed?—There are some sheriff officers, and there may be parish constables in those counties.

2222. Mr.



2222. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Do you mean that in Lanark there is no constabulary force of any description?—In a large part of Lanark there is no police such as we have been speaking of; Glasgow has a large force; in the upper ward of Lanark they frequently send messengers to Glasgow for assistance to check disturbances.

J. T. Gordon, Esq.

9 June 1853.

2223. In those counties in Scotland where there is no paid police force, what is the ordinary constabulary force for the administration of justice?—There are, as I said just now, some sheriff officers, and perhaps parish constables.

2224. Mr. *Howard*.] You have said that you thought it would be desirable to introduce an uniform system all over Scotland; do you think that is requisite in the thinly peopled districts?—I should say so; even under the Act to which I have before referred, there is a clause enacting that it shall be lawful for one or more counties to unite in taking measures for establishing a county force; if the system were still more uniform than that, you might make arrangements by which two counties, by combining together, would have a force applicable to each other.

2225. You have said that a good system of patrols is required; do you propose to establish patrols over the moors?—That must be judged of very much by the superintendent of the police of the district.

2226. *Lord Advocate*.] It is only at certain times of the year, and under certain circumstances, that you would require patrolling in the moors?—Yes.

2227. Mr. *Howard*.] Would it not be necessary in those districts to build a great number of stations?—That will depend upon the nature of the county the police have to traverse; if it is a thinly inhabited county, and there is nothing very tempting to depredators, it may not be necessary to have those stations so numerous or the patrols so frequent.

*Edwin Corbett, Esq.*, called in; and Examined.

2228. *Chairman*.] ARE you a Magistrate for Cheshire?—I am.

E. Corbett, Esq.

2229. Are you the chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions?—No, I am not; I have acted as vice chairman for some few years.

2230. Have you taken considerable interest in the police in Cheshire?—Yes; we have two Acts in Cheshire; in consequence of finding how ineffectual the first was for the purpose for which it was intended, last year I prevailed upon the magistrates to apply for a revision of the Act, and we obtained a new Act in 1852.

2231. Will you state the date of the first Act?—The 1st June 1829; this Act was passed with the approbation of Sir Robert Peel, who at that time was very anxious to introduce a police force into the country, and he was glad of this experiment being tried in Cheshire, and he gave all the encouragement he could to the passing of this Bill.

2232. You are perfectly aware that your Act of 1829 having been in operation 10 years in the year 1839, was one material element in the information which was given to the Commission which was appointed, of which the Speaker was the chairman?—I presume it was.

2233. Will you state what the system of police was, under that first Act?—Under this first Act, and it is similar now, we have no general superintendent of the police, but we have one special high constable for each hundred, or each petty sessional division; in the hundred of Macclesfield there are three high constables; that is a very populous manufacturing part of the county. The petty sessional divisions are divided into three, and there is one for each division; we have one high constable for each of the other hundreds in the county. The appointment of the constable is rested upon the recommendation of the magistrates in petty sessions to the quarter sessions, and then they are appointed for certain townships, but at the time of the passing of this Act there was a considerable jealousy on the part of some gentlemen in Cheshire. In 1829 there was a good deal of opposition made to the Bill, in consequence of their thinking it not right that the townships should be charged for the payment of the constables except with their own consent. The impression was that there should be limited payment in each township. I beg to observe, that the parishes in Cheshire are many of them extremely large; the townships are similar to parishes in other counties, in every respect; the poor rates, highway rates, and everything else, there being a jealousy in charging the township, without the approbation of the township itself. The payment of each constable was limited to 20 *l.*, and the consequence was that

0.71.

R 4

the

*E. Corbett, Esq.*

9 June 1853.

the force was very ineffective, as I can show by the population and the value of the property in particular townships; some townships were unfairly charged, to make up the salary of a constable, but not in the same proportion according to the value of the property; they were forced to be charged a higher rate to make up the salary of 50 *l.* a year to the constable. Therefore I suggested to the magistrates in quarter sessions last year, that it would be very desirable to pay the constables by a hundred rate. I can state many instances where it operated very unfavourably; and perhaps it would be as well that I should state the particulars now before I go on, if it is the wish of the Committee. I can show an instance where a township is valued at a very large sum, namely, at 63,000 *l.* a year; and another township is attached to that which is only assessed at 16,000 *l.*; it would be impossible to put any rate upon that township proportionately to make up the salary for the constable. Therefore we went to Parliament last year, and we obtained another Act which makes it a hundred rate, and not a township rate, and we find it works remarkably well. It was originally paid out of the poor's rate; now by the hundred rate the hundreds are assessed according to their proportion, and I think it seems to have given very general satisfaction as a system of working the police. I have got a letter from the clerk of the peace which he wrote to me unasked, in which he says that it acts a great deal better than where the constables are under a superintendent for the whole county. They are therefore separate jurisdictions, the high constables being of course in constant communication with the magistrates of the hundred; the police of every hundred is entirely a separate thing, the constables under the Act of 1829 were forced to be appointed for particular townships. Now they are appointed for the whole hundred, and the magistrates appoint the particular districts to which they are immediately to give their attention; for instance, in some cases, two constables will have a jurisdiction in the same township. We do that from local knowledge, so as to make the police as effective as possible.

2234. *Mr. Phillips.*] How many hundreds are there in the county of Chester?—Seven; one hundred is in three divisions.

2235. *Mr. Sotheron.*] In each of those hundreds are the police under the superintendence of one chief constable?—We have no chief constable at all, nor do I think it is at all requisite. I think it works well as independent jurisdictions, the circumstances of the several divisions being so different. From the experience I have had for many years, I do not think it is possible for any police force to work better than it does.

2236. *Chairman.*] You say it works independently; what is the distinction between the hundreds?—In the first place some of them are entirely agricultural districts; they do not vary so much in point of size, but I will show the difference of value of the different hundreds, which perhaps will give you some information.

2237. Will you take the case of a manufacturing hundred and an agricultural hundred?—The Macclesfield hundred is rated at 537,609 *l.*; it is divided into three divisions; the lowest is Broxton, which is wholly an agricultural district; in point of acreage there is very little difference. Broxton hundred is rated at 118,281 *l.*

2238. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Will you be so good as to state generally the difference of the acreage between those two hundreds?—Macclesfield hundred is 110,113, Broxton is 68,793.

2239. Therefore, in order to make a comparison, you ought to look at Broxton as about 200,000?—No, it will not be double by a great deal.

2240. *Chairman.*] That is on account of the difference of the population, the one being purely a manufacturing hundred and the other an agricultural hundred; you think it is desirable that they should be under separate jurisdictions?—I think if they were all agricultural it works better, and more within itself, and more satisfactorily in general, than if they were always subject to one superintendent. I do not know it from experience, but I cannot conceive that one superintendent can have that supervision of the force which is requisite.

2241. Have you had any experience of one superintendent over a county force?—No further than what I have heard, from which I do not think I am much in favour of it.

2242. Have you a separate police for each hundred?—Yes.

2243. Who is at the head of that police?—The high constable.

2244. Is he a paid officer?—Yes, appointed under this Act of Parliament.

2245. Do

2245. Do you employ parochial constables at all?—Very little indeed; the police do all the work. E. Corbett, Esq.

2246. You rely entirely upon the paid constabulary?—Entirely; in fact we have done so since the year 1829. 9 June 1853.

2247. Mr. *Phillips*.] Can you give the population of those two districts?—Not under the last census. At the census of 1841 the Macclesfield hundred was 178,117, and Broxton was 16,233; the population has not extended to any great degree; if anything, it has a little increased in Broxton, but it would be very much increased in the Macclesfield hundred.

2248. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Will you state to the Committee, shortly, the mode in which the constables in the different hundreds are disciplined, and under what supervision they are placed?—They are under the supervision of the high constable, who visits them very frequently; I believe not less than once a week.

2249. Is he a paid officer?—Yes, he is a paid officer. In the Macclesfield hundred the salaries are rather higher. If the Committee wish, I can give the number of the police constables in the several hundreds. In the Broxton hundred there is one high constable at a salary of 80*l.*, and an allowance of 60*l.* for the purchase of a horse and cart, and the keep of the horse. There are six assistant petty constables at 52*l.* a year each. In the Macclesfield hundred, Prestbury division, there is one high constable at 170*l.*, including the horse; he has eight assistant petty constables at 60*l.*, and one at 52*l.* In Macclesfield hundred, Stockport division, you observe the constables are not quite so numerous as you would be led to suppose are requisite. Stockport and Macclesfield have their own separate police; the special high constable has 170*l.*; eight petty constables, 60*l.*; and one, 10*l.*; this man is also paid a salary as lock-up keeper under the county rate.

2250. *Chairman*.] You have mentioned that Stockport and Macclesfield have an independent police; will you tell the Committee whether under the Act of last year, or under the Act of 1829, you have any power of incorporating the police of those boroughs with the county police?—The boroughs that have a separate police do not pay towards the constabulary rate of the hundred; in the Macclesfield hundred, Hyde division, the high constable has 190*l.* a year; five petty constables at 60*l.*; three at 50*l.*, and one at 40*l.*

2251. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Do those three divisions constitute the hundred of Macclesfield?—Those three divisions constitute the whole of the hundred of Macclesfield.

2252. Have you now given the force for the Macclesfield and Broxton hundreds?—Yes.

2253. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] What is the number of the Macclesfield borough police?—Macclesfield has 13; Stockport, 11; Birkenhead, 30; Chester, 20; and Congleton, 8. The total of our constables are 9 high constables and 69 petty constables. The way in which the other Act worked in the Hyde division, in fact, generally speaking, in the Macclesfield hundred, it was impossible, from the salary in each township or parish being limited to 20*l.*, that they could appoint as many constables as they positively required. In Dukinfield, where they have no constable in their own township, they have only a part of one; two or three other townships were forced to contribute to have a petty constable; our petty constables amount to 91.

2254. Lord *Lovaine*.] Are they all governed by the same internal regulations?—Yes, they are. I have a book, which perhaps the Committee may desire to retain, being the instructions which are issued by the court of quarter sessions to the constabulary force. (*The Witness delivered in the same.*)

2255. Is not the force of 12 policemen for Stockport ridiculously small?—I think it may be; but the county have nothing to do with it.

2256. Are you of opinion that it would be an advantage to the public if these boroughs were placed under the same management with regard to the police as that which the county is under?—I do not know that it would, because there is a sufficiency of constables in the county; I am not well acquainted with the Macclesfield hundred, but I should think there were enough constables to do all the rural work; those parties who are wanted for the town police I should conceive are always better under the control of the town, which, if it were made a general thing for the whole of the county, they could not be.

2257. Are you aware that the metropolitan police force comprises a distance of 13 miles around London?—That is a regular organized police, and more completely organized than we should be able to establish in the rural districts.

0.71.

S

2258. Mr.

*E. Corbett, Esq.*

9 June 1853.

2258. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Do none of those 91 police constables do any duty in the boroughs?—I fancy not in the boroughs; they are not precluded from the boroughs; they are not under the control and the authority of the boroughs, but only of the county magistrates.

2259. Are there no instances in which they act with the borough police?—I think they do upon particular occasions; I cannot speak positively about that. Chester has a separate jurisdiction, and the county constabulary has no power within the city of Chester.

2260. *Chairman.*] In your opinion you would prefer a system of constabulary separate in each hundred in your county, under a superintendent, to having a consolidated county police under one head?—I think it decidedly operates better.

2261. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Will you state to the Committee the reasons why you think so?—I think you have always a responsible officer upon the spot, and a man who is only acting under one general superintendent in the county is not in a position to be so responsible to his superiors, though there should be a superintendent of police, for not doing his duty. I do not think he would be so independent a person; he could not act upon his own authority if he was under a superintendent.

2262. Did you not say that you thought the circumstances of the county of Chester rendered this institution advisable, although it might not be advisable elsewhere?—I think it is the best system of police, in my opinion, that can be established.

2263. Are you of opinion that in an entirely rural county a division in hundreds, with a separate police in each division, would be better than having the police all under one authority?—I think so, because the officers are under the superintendence of resident magistrates; and from the reports which the men are obliged to make, the magistrates see whether those people are active and attend to their duty; they see the magistrates constantly, and I think they are better acquainted with what is going on than one superintendent of police in a county could be with what his subordinates were doing.

2264. Do you mean that practically the magistrates are acquainted with all the movements of these constables from week to week?—No, not exactly; I know, as far as my hundred goes, we hear from time to time whether the constable is visiting his different posts from different parties, and from personal inquiries.

2265. Do you know whether your constables patrol at night?—Yes, they do.

2266. Who ascertains whether they perform their duties at night?—The only way in which it is done is this: they are obliged to keep regular routes of what they do, and of such parties as they meet; those are received by the high constable every week, and if he has any opportunity he makes inquiry of those parties; or if he has any reason to believe they are not doing their duty, he then would go to those parties whom the constable says he has met upon the road; that is frequently done; I mean from the different residents in different parts of the country, where the constables have attended upon their duties. They go round to farm-houses. An instance was mentioned to me the other week, that a man had not locked up his cheese-room; fortunately there were no rogues there, but there might have been; and the constable called him up, and told him of it.

2267. Are the regulations of the different hundreds identical?—Yes. I have just handed in a copy of the orders and regulations of the police; there was one drawn up by a barrister, a chairman of the court of quarter sessions, and we had a committee some time ago to revise the rules; they were printed the year before last.

2268. Is there any supervision over the high constables of the different hundreds to see that they adhere to these rules?—None, but of the magistrates of the hundreds.

2269. Practically, you trust to the magistrates of the different hundreds to see that the high constables and the other constables under them are doing their duty?—Yes; I have every reason to think that that supervision is well attended to.

2270. *Chairman.*] Do you know the cost of the whole force?—£.6,461.

2271. Do you know what the rate is in the pound?—I cannot tell you exactly; I can tell you what the amount of the valuation is, which is only waiting for confirmation at the next quarter sessions; it amounts to 1,675,458*l.*

2272. *Mr. Burroughes.*] What is the amount in the pound?—I cannot tell you; I have given you the total.

2273. Sir

2273. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Have you not some other source from which you derive a portion of those payments?—No; it is from the hundred rate entirely.

2274. Do you raise each rate from the hundred separately?—Yes.

2275. Not equally in the whole county?—No; some of these hundreds require a more expensive police; in the rural districts they pay less.

2276. Is that the reason you give the preference to the system which you have adopted in Cheshire?—In fact, there was no reason for adopting this particular plan in the year 1829, any further than it was considered requisite that there should be a police force; we had further powers by the Act of last year, and we had found it work extremely well, and I know that it is the opinion of the magistrates of the county; they prefer it to the Rural Police Act. I was so taken by the passing of the Rural Police Act, that I brought a proposition twice before the quarter sessions that it should be adopted in the county of Chester, and I was beaten by a large majority. There is one objection, I think, to the Rural Police Act, namely, that the policemen should be in uniform. It may be very useful in towns, where there a great number of police always parading about, but in the country, where they are only moving about the county, and particularly when they have any object in view, they should pass unobserved, which at other times they would not. I know several instances in which constables have gone to watch at night, when a burglary has been suspected, and where they have been successful in apprehending the burglars; if two or three policemen had been found coming to a given point, there would have been an alarm raised, but a man in coloured clothes could come without exciting any observation.

2277. Lord *Lovaine*.] Is it not rather an advantage that a burglary should not be committed?—Decidedly; but you cannot apprehend a man that is going to commit a burglary.

2278. May you not prevent it?—I do not know; if four or five extremely bad characters were seen going to a particular place, and it was suspected that they were about to commit a robbery, if they met a policeman in uniform I dare say they would turn round and go home. It strikes me as much more advisable, if these men are bent upon committing a burglary, that they should be apprehended. Another burglary was proved against these men, which had been committed a short time before, a few miles off.

2279. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Do you not think it better that crime should be prevented by the fear of detection, than that it should be committed and the criminal apprehended?—Decidedly; if you can by moral force prevent the perpetration of crime, it is extremely desirable; I think there can be no doubt about it.

*George Kitson*, Esq., called in; and Examined.

2280. *Chairman*.] ARE you a Magistrate for the county of Somerset?—Yes.

2281. And also have been Mayor of Bath?—Yes; and I am a member of the watch committee of the city of Bath, and have been for years.

2282. Is not the police of the city of Bath entirely under the control of the watch committee?—Entirely.

2283. Is the police of Bath in an efficient state?—I should say it is; my own opinion would be, that a short time since it was more efficient than it is at present.

2284. Have you found, as a member of the watch committee and mayor of Bath, any inconvenience to arise from the police being under the control of the watch committee?—When I was the mayor of Bath it was under the old system, before the Municipal Act.

2285. As a member of the watch committee, are you of opinion that there is any practical inconvenience from the police being under the control of the watch committee?—Practically I believe the inconvenience to be little. It is unnecessary to state to the Committee, that in all boroughs political bias will obtain; and in Bath we have as much to do with politics as most other places; still my opinion is, that under all the circumstances, whether one party or another were supreme in the town, there has been so much discretion shown in the election of the members of the watch committee, that I am not aware of any considerable inconvenience arising from the mode in which the police is conducted.

2286. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] You stated just now that the police had been, in your opinion, more efficient than they are at present; can you give any reason for the

o.71.

s 2

falling

*E. Corbett*, Esq.

9 June 1853.

*G. Kitson*, Esq.

G. Kitson, Esq.

9 June 1853.

falling off in its efficiency?—We have reduced our police somewhat, though not considerably, but below what I should consider to be well.

2287. What was the cause of that reduction?—Merely a wish for economy, and nothing further.

2288. When was that reduction made?—It has been but a slight reduction, within the last year.

2289. Do you attribute any alteration in the efficiency of the force to the change of the superintendent, or simply to the reduction of the number?—My own opinion is, that our late superintendent was peculiarly fitted for his position. He was a man in every way particularly well qualified. I do not know that you have a right to expect that all men in that situation should be as well qualified as I consider him to be. I do not consider our present superintendent to be inefficient, but I cannot consider him to be so efficient as our late superintendent.

2290. To what amount have you reduced the force?—Not above three during the last year. I should state that the late superintendent made a reduction in point of number, and with the full sanction of the watch committee; but the watch committee considered that the duty was quite as efficiently performed with fewer men on Mr. Oakley's suggestion as before with a greater number.

2291. You do not find that the duty is as efficiently performed now?—Perhaps that would be going too far; I think the number is lower than it should be.

2292. Was it in consequence of any representation from the inhabitants of Bath that you reduced the number?—No, certainly not; it arose from this, that there were out-stations, one of which it was considered might be given up; at that out-station there was a man, having the rank of a sergeant, whom we withdrew, and one police constable, and there was also one man reduced from another station which was not discontinued.

2293. What is the amount of your police rate in the pound?—Four-pence farthing. I must take care not to mislead the Committee in this respect; the police rate is assessed at, say 4½d. in the pound, but that does not cover the whole expense of the police; the police rate and the borough rate are in fact assessed on the same property; there are 4,423 l. regularly collected in the form of police rate; the deficiency I believe, amounts to between 500 l. and 600 l. a year, which has been paid from the borough rate. The Committee will understand that the parties contributing to each rate are the same, and the properties are assessed in the same way; it is a mere difference in name.

2294. What is the object in having that distinction?—I know it has been from the very commencement; I will leave the Committee to understand why it is done under the Municipal Act; and we have had the sanction of our legal advisers.

2295. Has there been any objection made to the amount of the police rate as it stands now?—No, I am not aware that there has; there will be always people who object to expenses of every kind; there has been no decided objection to the police rate, or to the manner in which this rate has been levied; it has been done so, I might say, from the commencement, and the deficiency in the 4,400 l. has been collected as a borough rate. I am not quite sure that it may not arise from another circumstance. There is a neighbouring ward, the ward of Lyncombe and Widcombe, where they had not originally watching or lighting, and the council took upon themselves to furnish a watch and light in the parish of Lyncombe and Widcombe, and assess the parish at a certain amount, and certainly for some years (it no longer exists) the borough was assessed, I might say illegally, for lighting the adjoining parish of Lyncombe and Widcombe; it is very likely between 500 l. and 600 l. a year; I know that it came to that; and the deficiency may be accounted for in that way.

2296. Was any objection made on the part of the members of the watch committee to the reduction of the men?—None whatever; it was done with the full consent of the watch committee, at the recommendation of the chief of police.

2297. How are the watch committee appointed?—Under the Act of Parliament, by the council.

2298. Are they elected?—The town council are called on every year to elect the watch committee; that watch committee has discretionary power; they are elected for that year, and have the supreme power over the police, I might say, except over the funds; for the expenses they must have the sanction of the council.

2299. Is there any qualification necessary to becoming a member of the watch committee?—

committee?—No further than the qualification of a councillor; any alderman or councillor is qualified for the watch committee.

2300. Lord *Lovaine*.] Has there been any reduction of the police subsequently to the appointment of your new superintendent?—Yes; it has been done within the last year, arising from the circumstance of one of the police stations being given up, and one man taken from another station.

2301. The reduction was not made upon the recommendation of the late superintendent?—It was done on the recommendation of the present superintendent.

2302. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] What was your force prior to the reduction?—The force is at present 84; 87 was the force before the reduction; that includes the superintendent, serjeants, and everything.

2303. What is the population of Bath?—According to the late census, we have not much increased in population; between 50,000 and 60,000.

2304. Have the watch committee anything to do with the appointment of the police constables?—Strictly speaking, they have not. The watch committee appoint the chief constable, and it has been the custom for the chief constable to appoint the subordinates, submitting them to the approval of the watch committee. There is a printed paper in which every man's name is entered who is a candidate for the place; he is bound to give certain certificates of conduct, and to state how he has been employed, and so on. The chief constable selects the men, and he brings them up for the approval of the watch committee. After they have been examined by the surgeon, it is not usual for the watch committee to object to any man whom the chief constable brings up; but they have the power to do it if they think proper, but they do not do it.

2305. They have a veto upon his appointment, but no power to appoint themselves?—In point of fact, the men are appointed by the watch committee, on the recommendation of the chief constable; they do not interfere with the nominations of the chief constable, but they have the power to do so should they think fit.

2306. Is that power ever exercised?—I do not recollect that it ever has been; the regular mode is this: the man is brought up with his recommendation by the chief constable; he has been examined by the surgeon, and he is then submitted to the watch committee. It has occasionally happened that some of the members of the watch committee thought that the man could not read or write well enough, and that he did not appear to be sufficiently educated for the police, and he has been objected to on that ground.

2307. In those cases has the man been refused?—Wherever the watch committee think fit to refuse a man they have full power to do so.

2308. Did not you say that the watch committee have not exercised the power, except in cases where a man has appeared not sufficiently educated, and that he has been rejected?—Certainly, but that has been rarely the case.

2309. Although he has been recommended by the superintendent?—Certainly.

2310. Can you tell at all in what number of instances that has occurred within the last few years?—I should say very few indeed; I could not call to my mind more than one or two during the time I have been on the watch committee. I must say it has never been capriciously exercised, but that the superintendent has been in all the cases I can call to my mind quite satisfied that the watch committee have come to a just decision; that is to say, that circumstances have come out before the watch committee of which he himself was not aware.

2311. Do you think the superintendent himself thinks it is a better system that the nomination of the police constables should be subject to the veto of the watch committee than that he should have the sole and entire control over them?—I apprehend he has never had any reason to be discontented; I have never heard any dissatisfaction on his part. You will have an opportunity of examining the late superintendent, and you will find that he has not been dissatisfied, nor is the present superintendent.

2312. Have the watch committee the power of suspending and dismissing the police?—Yes, they have full power to do so. The mode in which the business is done is this: if any misconduct is reported by the chief constable to the watch committee, the case is considered by them, and they determine what penalty should be inflicted.

2313. Then the superintendent or chief of the police has no voice with respect

0.71.

s 3

to

G. Kitson, Esq.

9 June 1853.

G. Kitson, Esq.

9 June 1853.

to the suspension or dismissal of the men?—None; he may recommend, but he has no positive power to dismiss; it is not very often that the committee would interfere with him; I should say that his opinion is nearly always followed, but that the decision rests with the watch committee.

2314. Then, in fact, the whole power of appointment of the police constables rests with the watch committee at Bath?—Decidedly so; I believe, by the Act of Parliament, it is intended that it should be so; that is the way in which we read the Act at Bath.

2315. Is there any restriction as to the position in life of the watch committee, or as to the trade they follow?—Nothing more than what the Act of Parliament points out as the qualifications for a town councillor; the watch committee is indiscriminately selected from the council, whether aldermen or councillors.

2316. Would there be any objection to a brewer forming a part of the watch committee?—None whatever.

2317. Would there be any objection to a publican being on the watch committee?—No, supposing he was in the town council.

2318. Are there any persons in either of those trades forming a part of the watch committee?—I think no brewer; but certainly but one publican has ever been on the watch committee since I have been. I have been a member of the council from the commencement: I think I can state from memory that there never was but one publican; I do not know whether there has been a brewer, but I believe not.

2319. Is there any brewer upon the watch committee now?—Certainly not; the watch committee is selected from the council, consequently if there were no brewer in the council there would be no brewer on the watch committee.

2320. Of what number does the watch committee consist?—Fifteen.

2321. *Chairman.*] You have referred to the administration of police under the former chief constable; was there any different system of appointing the constables under the administration of the former chief constable to what there is now?—I should state, that on the late chief constable coming into office, the watch committee were fully aware that things were not in the state in which they ought to have been, and that a change must take place; the change was deferred till the appointment of another chief, from deference probably to the feelings of the then chief constable. I am speaking of the appointment of the late chief constable, Mr. Oakley. Before Mr. Oakley's appointment, for some time the more active members of the watch committee were satisfied that things were not on the best footing; many of the men were superannuated, and were taken from the old constabulary force, when the new force was formed, and they were unfit for their situation. There were some other circumstances which the watch committee, or the more active members of it, considered it would be necessary to reform, but they thought it best to leave those matters till we had a new chief constable. I may state, that on the appointment of that new chief we found we had a man thoroughly conversant with his business, a man who submitted to us such a statement in writing, that although we were a committee composed of the most heterogeneous materials, all his propositions were carried unanimously by the watch committee, and also when submitted to the council. Whatever propositions it was necessary to submit to the council were equally approved by them.

2322. Is there any publican on the watch committee now?—None whatever; I believe I am correct in saying so. There is no publican, strictly speaking, in the corporation; no common public-house keeper since I have been in the council has ever been in the corporation.

2323. Is Mr. Hancock a publican?—No, he is a spirit dealer and a wine merchant; he is an alderman, and has been in the council from the commencement; he does not keep a public-house.

2324. Is he a member of the watch committee?—Yes, an old member.

2325. Is any member of the watch committee a pawnbroker?—There is one pawnbroker on the watch committee, and a very active member. I did not quite understand the question with respect to a publican. I understood the question to refer to the keeper of a public-house. Mr. Hancock does not keep a public-house; he is a wine merchant, and has a spirit-shop under a licence.

2326. Do you mean a retail spirit-shop?—He has a retail licence.

2327. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Does he sell spirits over the counter by the glass?—Yes; he is not merely a man who has a gallon licence, but he sells glasses.

2328. In

2328. In fact, he keeps what is commonly called a gin-shop?—Yes, you may call it a gin-shop.

2329. Mr. *Sotheron*.] You do not call a man conducting such a business as that a publican?—I do not consider him as ranking in that class; he has a gin-shop, and sells by retail, it is true; there is a difference between a man that has a licence to sell by the gallon, and a licence which is granted by the magistrates to hotel-keepers, which enables them to sell spirits if they like.

2330. When you say there is no publican on the watch committee, you mean that there is no person keeping an inn or a public-house, but you do not include in that description a person selling spirits?—No; this man is a spirit dealer, and also a wine merchant; the licences of wine merchants in general are such, that they may sell spirits if they like.

2331. Mr. *Howard*.] Where are your assizes held?—At Taunton, Bridgwater, and Wells.

2332. When the Bath policemen go to the assizes, do they receive fees?—They receive no fees, they only receive their travelling expenses. I should state, on the score of fees, there is a decided order that no policeman should receive any fee or gratuity whatever beyond his general wages, which order I think was made when Mr. Oakley came into the force; what they have for attending the assizes is what they pay for their expenses, necessarily incurred in going.

2333. Are they paid by the county?—They are paid by the county their travelling expenses.

2334. Are they paid for the conveyance of their own prisoners?—They have nothing to do with the prisoners after they are committed; there is much to be said on that score; the prisoner does not go to the assize towns till he is committed, and then he is in the custody of the gaoler, and the police have nothing to do with him.

2335. Mr. *Sotheron*.] For what purpose do your policemen go to the assizes?—To give evidence.

2336. They do not go in charge of the prisoners?—No.

2337. Mr. *Howard*.] Have there been complaints of prisoners having been sent for trial to the assizes instead of the quarter sessions?—No, I think not; the Act of Parliament determines that there are certain offences which must go before a judge.

Captain *Samuel Meredith*, called in; and Examined.

2338. *Chairman*.] ARE you Chief Constable of Wiltshire?—I am.

2339. Will you state to the Committee of what your force consists?—It consists of 200 men, one chief constable, 10 superintendents, 10 inspectors, 25 serjeants; the remainder are in two classes, but not any stated number to each; they are simply termed first and second-class constables.

2340. What proportion do the men bear to the population?—The population is 240,000, and there are 1,200 inhabitants to each constable.

2341. What is the cost of that force?—The average cost for the last 10 years has been 10,833*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.*, as charged to the police-rate; the average proportion to each man is 54*l.* 3*s.* 3½*d.*; that is the average cost to the county of the whole force; it is the lowest in England.

2342. Do you find that force sufficient?—Yes, we find that force quite sufficient.

2343. Are the boroughs in the county of Wilts all consolidated with the county?—There are five boroughs in the county, four of which are consolidated.

2344. What are the four boroughs which are consolidated with the county?—Chippenham, Devizes, Marlborough and Calne.

2345. Which is the borough which is not consolidated with the county?—Salisbury.

2346. What is the reason that Salisbury has not joined the county?—They had a force of their own, established some years before the county police was formed, and I believe they are attached to their own force.

2347. Do you know the number of the force in Salisbury?—A superintendent and 10 constables.

2348. If Salisbury were consolidated with the county what number should you have there?—Six men would perform the duty.

2349. Therefore you think they have a sufficient number now?—I think if they were to consolidate with the county there would be a considerable saving, and the force would be efficiently worked.

o.71.

s 4

2350. How

G. Kitson, Esq.

9 June 1853.

Captain  
*Samuel Meredith*.

Captain  
*Samuel Meredith.*  
 9 June 1853.

2350. How would the county be affected?— I think we might engage, without any additional expense to the county, to take charge of Salisbury.

2351. You have four boroughs consolidated with the county, you think there is great economy in that arrangement, and you think if that arrangement were carried out to Salisbury, it would be a saving to that borough, and also to the county?—There would be no increase of expense to the county; I think it could be done by the same force which we have now.

2352. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] You state that the duty would be more efficiently performed if Salisbury were under your charge; and at the same time you state that the number of men which is now employed is more than sufficient for the purpose?—No, I do not think I stated so.

2353. Did not you say there were 10 policemen in Salisbury?—I think eight men might perform the duty; we have a great number of men round the suburbs, and of course they might assist in the performance of the duty; we should have our head-quarters of the county force there, and they would act with the borough force; the county force around the borough would come into it to assist when required, without stationing so many men in the borough.

2354. At all events, you think you have a sufficient number of men to perform the duty?—Yes.

2355. In what way do you mean that the duty would be more efficiently performed if you had Salisbury under your control?—The whole of the force of that division would co-operate with each other; at present they are under distinct governments.

2356. Have you found any difficulty from want of co-operation?—Yes.

2357. Will you state the chief difficulties which have occurred in consequence of that want of co-operation?—Felons and other offenders from the county escape into the borough, and we have not the means of tracing them out, from the want of local information; we do not know the parties to whom to apply; there is also a little jealousy always existing between one force and the other.

2358. *Lord Lovaine.*] Do you think, if a system of consolidation were carried out throughout the counties of England, there would be consequently a diminution of the police force?—I think so, and also a very considerable diminution of crime.

2359. Do you mean that diminution would take place, owing to the superior efficiency of the police acting as one body?—Yes.

2360. *Mr. Sotherton.*] Can you give the Committee any account of the state of crime before your force was established and what it has been since?—I can give you the state of crime since the force was established; you will then see the working of the force. To save the time of the Committee, I have just made an extract of the number of serious offences. In the year 1841, immediately after the force was established, there were 12 highway robberies committed, three were brought to justice, and nine escaped; there were 19 burglaries, eight were brought to justice, and 11 escaped; there were four cases of housebreaking, neither of which were brought to justice; there were nine cases of cattle-stealing, each of which was brought to justice, and the cattle recovered; 12 cases of horse-stealing, six were brought to justice, and six escaped; there were 95 cases of sheep-stealing, 26 were brought to justice, 69 escaped. In 1852 the returns are only made up to the end of the year: there were three cases of burglary, which were brought to justice, six were undetected: those were small articles stolen from the cottages of poor people, which were entered in their absence, such as a shirt, or a coat, or something of that sort; there were two cases of cattle-stealing, both of which were brought to justice; there were three cases of horse-stealing, two of which were brought to justice, and one escaped; there were eight cases of sheep-stealing, five of which were detected, and three were undetected. The number of persons charged in 1842 were 3,006 in the county; the whole number of persons charged which came under the cognizance of the police in 1852 was 2,350. The Committee will be pleased to recollect that we had taken charge of the boroughs subsequently to 1842, and there were nearly 20,000 inhabitants thrown upon the service of the police; the actual deduction is much greater than shown in the figures. The number of offences which were reported to the police in which the parties were not taken into custody in 1842 amounted to 147, in 1852 there were 34, taking into account the increased population of the boroughs which I have before mentioned.

2361. *Chairman.*]

2361. *Chairman.*] When there were 147 cases undetected, the four boroughs were not included, and now the four boroughs are included, the number of cases undetected is 34?—I have given here the number of persons brought under the cognizance of the police.

2362. Do you think there have been any complaints in those boroughs in which the police has been adopted?—No; I have in fact received testimonials of the highest character from each of the boroughs.

2363. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Can you state to the Committee what has been the difference of expense to those boroughs?—I cannot.

2364. Do you know whether, to the inhabitants of those boroughs which have been consolidated with the county police, there has been a saving in expense?—There has been a very large saving in the borough of Devizes; the saving amounts to 100*l.* per annum; they pay 150*l.* per annum to the county for the services of the police, and formerly they paid 250*l.* per annum; the 150*l.* includes the whole cost of their police protection.

2365. *Sir J. Trollope.*] What is the number of men in Devizes?—Three men exclusively for the borough; the head-quarters of the force is established there also.

2366. Do you shift your men often in the boroughs?—Occasionally.

2367. Do you shift them in the rural districts?—Yes.

2368. Do you permit men to reside for any lengthened period in the boroughs?—That depends entirely upon circumstances; if it is found that a man is getting too intimate with the inhabitants and not sufficiently attentive to his duty, another man is selected; and that is the case in the rural districts; if a man is found to be too intimate with the inhabitants, he is removed at once.

2369. *Chairman.*] Those arrangements could not take place if the police were under the management of the different magistrates of the division?—Certainly not.

2370. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] Do you find it necessary to change the men often?—No, not very often.

2371. How long do you leave the men stationed in the borough?—Sometimes two years; we have one inspector in Devizes who has been there five years; he has charge of the town, and when an offence is committed he knows where to put his hand upon the party; he has nothing to do with the watch committee; he is entirely under my directions, and subject to the superintendent, who resides in the borough; the superintendent having charge of the whole division.

2372. The borough authorities have nothing to do with the government of the police?—Nothing whatever; that was the understanding, that the boroughs should not interfere with the government of the police when they incorporated themselves with the county; that the police were to be placed under the authority of the chief constable.

2373. *Chairman.*] What counties joining Wiltshire have no police?—Somersetshire and Berkshire.

2374. Can you give the Committee at all an idea of the difference in crime within the borders where there is a police force, and over the borders where there is no police force?—I can give a statement of the number of prisoners committed for trial in the adjoining county of Somerset for the year 1852; namely, Somerset 585; Wilts 283.

2375. Are you aware that there is a great number of vagrants over the border of the county?—Yes; we do not allow gypsies in Wiltshire to pitch their tents, or squat about the roads; if you go into Somersetshire or Dorsetshire, where they have no rural police, you will find hundreds along the borders.

2376. Have you got rid of vagrants in Wiltshire?—The superintendents of police, in 11 out of 17 unions, have been appointed assistant relieving officers; a return has been made to me showing a reduction of 6,000 during the years they have been in operation on the applications which have been made to them.

2377. *Mr. Sotheron.*] Do you mean an annual reduction?—That is the reduction altogether from the first year when they commenced operations up to this last year.

2378. How many years is that?—Since 1847; five years.

2379. *Mr. Phillips.*] Have you a superannuation fund?—We have.

2380. *Chairman.*] Do you give rewards to any of your constables for apprehending offenders?—No, except in two cases; there have been rewards given to them by the judges of assize; now they can be given by the court of quarter sessions.

0.71.

T

2381. Mr.

Captain]   
 Samuel Meredith.

9 June 1853.

Captain  
Samuel Meredith.  
9 June 1853.

2381. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] Do your police give notice to the coroners in cases of death?—They do not generally; that is casually done by the parish constables.

2382. *Chairman*.] Do your men act as inspectors of weights and measures?—Yes; they took charge of the weights and measures in 1845, and in the following year there were 14,942 found defective; 408 prosecutions took place, the fines amounting to 15*l. 2s. 6d.* In 1852 there were five informations, and the fines inflicted amounted to 4*l. 0s. 6d.*; that is the difference in seven years.

2383. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Can you state what has been the saving to the public by the police taking charge of the weights and measures?—The salaries paid to the former inspectors of weights and measures were smaller in Wiltshire than in other counties; it is the saving of the salaries of the different inspectors, about 160*l.* a year.

2384. Lord *Lovaine*.] Were the inspectors reduced at once?—All except one; they had been recently appointed, with an understanding they would be required to resign when the police were appointed; there is one of the old inspectors in the neighbourhood of Salisbury acting as inspector of weights and measures.

2385. Mr. *Sotheron*.] What is the general system of the arrangement of your police; is it the same as in Gloucestershire and in Ireland, with respect to the stations, or in any other way?—I ought to state to the Committee that I commanded districts of the coast-guard for six years before I took the appointment in the Wilts constabulary, and on forming the force I adopted what appeared to me to be the best system for the protection of the public; it is a system entirely my own. I stationed the men in the rural districts, giving each man, as near as I could, a beat of a certain extent. I divided the county into nine police divisions; those were again subdivided into a certain number of subdivisions, at the head of which there is an inspector or serjeant; the men were placed in districts, and each man was responsible for the good order of that district, the men meeting at points given to them, varying every night. The inspector or serjeant is expected to visit those points occasionally during the week; and if anything has occurred during the day to prevent a man attending to the night meetings at the proper point, he would have to report the cause; and it would be the duty of the serjeant to ascertain that his statement was correct.

2386. Do you place your policemen in different parishes, or do you put them in different stations?—In different parishes, in proportion to the population; in some there are two or three.

2387. In what manner do you combine those different policemen in the different parishes?—They are to be on duty 12 hours out of the 24; during that time they have to visit the different places or farms in their district, to see if there have been any depredations or complaints. The patrols at night are arranged so as to go sometimes in one direction and sometimes the other, so as to meet the other constables; but these meetings vary nightly.

2388. Do they practically in the 24 hours meet the neighbouring constables, so as to keep up the chain of communication?—Yes, every night.

2389. In what manner do you ascertain that the men have properly performed their duty?—The man has to state his reasons in a book why he was not at the place of meeting; the serjeant's duty is to satisfy himself that his statement is correct; there is a night meeting every night; the serjeant of the subdivision has the whole list of the meetings weekly; he goes to the spot, and if he does not find his men there, he invariably reports them; it is also the duty of the other constable to report that the meeting has not been kept.

2390. Lord *Lovaine*.] Is not that a better system than the Gloucestershire system?—I think so; no other county in England has adopted the Gloucestershire system. The same system as my own has been adopted by Captain MacHardy, who is an old coast-guard officer, and by other chief constables who had not had the advantage of serving in the coast-guard.

2391. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Is there not an advantage if you are able to collect your men readily at any particular part of the county where there may be any emergency?—In two hours we can throw a body of 50 men into any part of the county. A case occurred some time ago of a strike of labourers for wages at West Lavington; a man came to me on horseback at midnight, and in two hours I had 35 men in the place; and in a short time the remainder came up.

2392. How many parishes are there in Wiltshire?—Three hundred.

2393. Consequently, you have not a constable to each parish?—No.

2394. You arrange, as well as you can, to place your constables for two or three

three parishes, as the case may be?—Yes; so as all may be visited regularly by the constable.

2395. Mr. *Fitzroy* ] Do you take the parishes as the basis of your arrangement?—Yes; the men are strictly ordered to visit the outlying farms; the superintendent also visits them to know if there is any complaint.

2396. Mr. *Sotheron*.] If a poor man loses any article, will he, under your system, have a distance of three or four miles to go before he can meet with a policeman?—Certainly not; all the constables are especially ordered to give every possible protection to the cottages of the poor when the occupiers are absent.

2397. Do you find that is practically an advantage?—Every case is reported to the policeman; at once he makes his inquiries, and follows up the offender immediately; to that system I attribute our good fortune in keeping down crime. Every constable is responsible for his district; if an offence is committed, and he does not give a satisfactory account of it, he is suspended, or if I find he has been negligent in the discharge of his duty he is immediately suspended, and probably dismissed.

2398. Lord *Lovaine*.] Captain MacHardy, in his evidence, has said that it was an immense advantage to keep the men in stations?—That, I apprehend, is where there are station-houses built, and one or two constables are residing in them, in order that the prisoners may be properly visited. I have had no communication with Captain MacHardy on the subject; but I apprehend his view is this, that where there are prisoners they should be regularly visited during the night, and that a man should be always ready for any emergency.

2399. Mr. *Sotheron*.] I believe when the force was established it was complained of on account of the expense?—It was; and a very powerful opposition organised.

2400. Were not some motions made at quarter sessions for its reduction?—Yes, frequently.

2401. At that time what was the feeling amongst the farmers generally about the police?—The objection was not to the force itself, but to the expense; and this was very general.

2402. Do you consider that that feeling has altered?—I think it has entirely subsided; I think if the county were canvassed you would find six to one in favour of the police, by the occupiers of the land; a case came under my observation some short time ago when the subject was mooted in a rural Board of Guardians.

2403. *Chairman*.] What Board of Guardians?—The Devizes Board of Guardians; I am informed that the farmers at once said, “We will not reduce the police; that is money very well bestowed;” and they resisted the motion.

2404. Lord *Lovaine*.] Comparing the amount which is raised for the police rate with that which is raised for all other county purposes, is it about the same, or not?—It is about the same.

2405. Therefore the establishment of the police in that county doubled the county rate?—It did, or nearly so; the county rate is now very much reduced.

2406. Notwithstanding that, you are still of opinion that the farmers who contribute towards this rate are satisfied to continue to make that payment?—From the information I have obtained, I am of that opinion.

2407. Are you aware of any attempt having been made within five or six years to make any proposition at the court of quarter sessions for a reduction of the police force?—Not any.

2408. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] What is your police rate in the pound?—Two-pence farthing. In speaking of cost, perhaps the Committee will permit me to place before them this statement; I have made a rough estimate of what the county was paying, under different heads, for protection before the police force was established. (*The Witness delivered in the same.*)

2409. Lord *Lovaine*.] What do you reckon the average payment to the parish constables?—Nine pounds.

2410. Mr. *Burroughes*.] How do you arrive at that result?—From an estimate of the number of summonses which they served, and the fees they received; they received money of course from individuals; but taking the average, they received about 9*l.*

2411. Is the 9*l.* an assumed sum?—There is no means of getting at the money they were paid; they were paid largely out of the poor's rate for the services they performed.

0.71.

T 2

2412. Sir

Captain  
Samuel Meredith.

9 June 1853.

*Vide Appendix.*

Captain  
Samuel Meredith.

9 June 1853.

2412. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do you include the expense of fetching the coroner?  
—Yes; that is paid by mileage.

2413. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Do you know what the exact fees are, assuming that the parish constable does nothing at all, and is called upon to perform no duty; what are the fees of the clerk of petty sessions necessary for his appointment?—One shilling is usual for swearing him in; the fee for the notice and precept I think is about 2 s. 6 d. altogether; I think for each parish constable, in some places, he is allowed a certain sum for coming to be sworn in.

2414. Lord *Lovaine*.] Do the police perform the services gratuitously, as assistant relieving officers?—There is a small allowance made to men who are appointed assistant relieving officers.

2415. Suppose a policeman had to pursue a man who had absconded, leaving his family chargeable on the parish, whom would you charge for those services?—A constable who is employed on that service makes out a bill, which is submitted to me, and signed by me; he then takes it to the union, and is there paid his expenses. The intention of the bill being submitted to me is, that there should be one uniform system of charge throughout the county.

2416. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Will you state in what mode your constables proceed who have been appointed as assistant relieving officers, with regard to vagrants; supposing a vagrant comes to the town of Devizes, what is the course pursued?—He has to apply immediately to the assistant relieving officer, whose duty it is to ascertain that he has no means of providing for himself, and then he is authorised to find him food and a bed for the night.

2417. Where does he do that?—There is a place provided in the union. I understand there is a room fitted up, which is cut off from the union altogether, but still under the same roof to a certain extent; he visits that place frequently during the night; there is a separate place for males, and another for females.

2418. What happens the following morning?—He receives his breakfast, and then he is seen out of the place, and handed over to the other constables, and so he is followed out of the county.

2419. Do you mean that the constable sees him fairly out of the town?—He sees him fairly on his route.

2420. Do you know whether your constables have ever detected any money on the persons of those vagrants?—Very frequently, in large sums; as much as 23 l. was found on an Irish vagrant who applied for relief; we generally find a considerable sum of money upon the females.

2421. Mr. *Phillips*.] Was not it a case where one person was bearing the purse for a number?—It was; that is a common practice; if they have no other means of concealing their property, they send one of the party down to a lodging-house with their property. It is the duty of the police to go down to these lodging-houses where the parties are, and, as far as they can, to discover who belong to the same gang that may be lodging there.

2422. Whatever may be the result, has not experience shown that the vagrants do not like this system?—We rarely see any vagrants now in Wiltshire, the numbers are so much reduced from the surveillance that is kept up by the police; there is a great reduction of thieves, also, as well as vagrants. Wherever a vagrant finds a poor cottager's house left, or insecurely fastened, they enter it, and they carry off the little bread and cheese from the cupboard, the clothing, or something or other. A large portion of the offences committed in our rural districts were committed by vagrants; at one session we had as many as 14 vagrants committed for trial for robbing cottagers' houses during the time that the occupiers were at work in the fields. There is another point which I omitted to mention to the Committee, with respect to the expenses of police constables and parish constables. A case came before the magistrates of Devizes on the 14th of last month. A boy had stolen a pair of boots from a barge; he was followed up by the party that lost them into Somersetshire, and there he was apprehended and handed over to a parish constable; he brought him to Wiltshire, and the boy was convicted under the Juvenile Offenders' Act, which only authorises 40 s. to be paid for expenses; the parish constable's expenses amounted to 4 l. 16 s. 7 d. I have a copy of the bill here. Now, the party had to pay the difference between 2 l. and 4 l. 16 s. 7 d.; consequently, it operates as a rejection of justice to a certain extent. The man said he would rather have lost the boots than  
paid

paid the constable. This is the sum which the parish constable says he should have been allowed if he had apprehended the party in Somersetshire.

Captain  
Samuel Meredith.

9 June 1853.

[The same was read, as follows:]

	£.	s.	d.
To apprehending prisoner - - - - -	-	2	6
Maintaining ditto two days - - - - -	-	3	-
Guard watching ditto one night - - - - -	-	2	6
Conveyance of prisoner at 9d. per mile, and allowance to constable, 8d. per mile (37 miles) - - - - -	2	12	5
Three days' loss of time - - - - -	-	15	-
Hire of conveyance, coach and other fares - - - - -	1	1	2
	£.	4	16
			7

2423. Mr. *Sotheron*.] Is the difference between these two sums the difference between the cost of the same amount of protection in a county which has a rural police, on the one hand, and a county with only local constables, on the other?—The 40s. is regulated by Act of Parliament; you cannot make the cost of a juvenile case more than 40s.; therefore the complainant had to pay the difference between 2*l.* and 4*l.* 16*s.* 7*d.*

2424. What is the inference that you draw from the statement you have now made?—The inference is that the parish constable making his own charges in his own county is a much more costly person than a police constable.

2425. Lord *Lovaine*.] Do not parish constables charge 9*d.* a mile, whether they go by railway or not?—I believe so; this bill appears to be the cost of taking a prisoner into custody in his own county and taking him before a county magistrate in another.

2426. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Do your men convey prisoners out of your district into other counties?—Not frequently; but when they do there is a regulated charge.

2427. How is that charge regulated?—They are allowed their actual costs for conveyance; each constable, when out of his district, is entitled to 2*s.* 6*d.* per day in addition to his travelling expenses; if he travels by rail he is allowed 1*d.* per mile; all constables can travel on the rail at 1*d.* per mile.

2428. That is by Act of Parliament?—Yes.

2429. Are you allowed to make out a bill against the county to which the prisoner is taken for trial?—Yes; that is the usual practice.

2430. Upon what scale do you make out that bill?—On the scale I have before mentioned.

2431. Do the men receive their pay in full, and the 2*s.* 6*d.* in addition?—Yes; when they attend at the sessions they are allowed 5*s.* a day, and their pay is stopped; when they are employed as witnesses in Wiltshire they are allowed 5*s.* a day, the same as an ordinary witness, and their pay as constable stopped.

2432. With regard to rewards, you have stated that judges of assize order certain sums to be given to policemen occasionally; have you known any instances in which private persons have tendered reward?—Very frequently.

2433. Do you permit your men to receive them?—Yes; under certain regulations.

2434. Whatever the sum may be?—If it is a moderate sum.

2435. Do you require the rewards to be reported to the superintendent?—To me, on all occasions.

2436. Is it left to your discretion whether the men have the whole or a part of the reward?—Yes.

2437. What is your practice with respect to rewards?—No constable can receive any money over and above his pay without the authority of the chief constable.

2438. Is it your practice to permit the men to receive rewards?—When I consider their services have been such as to entitle them to receive rewards, I permit them to receive rewards.

2439. Are not rewards sometimes offered by associations for the prosecution of offenders, and at other times by private individuals; in that case does the reward go to the policeman?—The policeman would receive two-thirds, and the other third is carried to a fund to meet contingencies which cannot be charged in any other way.

2440. To the sick fund?—No.

o.71.

T 3

2741. Have

Captain  
Samuel Meredith.

9 June 1853.

2441. Have you a sick fund?—We have not a sick fund.

2442. Supposing a man is disabled, either by accident or sickness, is he permitted to receive the whole or a portion of his pay?—If a man is wounded in the execution of his duty he receives the whole of his pay.

2443. What fund have you besides that?—A superannuation fund; a great portion of our men belong to a county club, from which they receive a certain sum in illness, and medical assistance.

2444. Is that under your control?—I manage that part which our men belong to.

2445. In what way have you invested the superannuation fund?—£. 5,000 is lent to the county.

2446. On the security of the county rates?—It is lent for the purpose of building a lunatic asylum.

2447. What number of lock-ups have you?—We have some hired places, which we use for lock-ups. We have not expended anything in Wiltshire upon the building of lock-ups.

2448. Have you recommended the building of lock-ups?—Yes, I have.

2449. Have the magistrates rejected your recommendation?—No; it will be decided at the next quarter sessions.

2450. Will not that add materially to the expense of the police force?—Not materially; the amount of expense will be very small, because we shall save the rents we are now paying.

2451. Do you intend to have magistrates' rooms attached to the lock-ups?—To some of them.

2452. And lodgings for the men?—Yes.

2453. Has any estimate been made of the cost of those lock-ups?—It has.

2454. Are they to be on one uniform scale?—They are to be nearly on a uniform scale; there are to be first and second-class stations.

2455. What is the cost that you propose for each?—About 1,500*l.*, or something like it, for the first-class stations.

2456. What is the total number of first-class stations?—The total number at present proposed is five.

2457. How many second-class stations, and at what cost are these to be?—Only one, at a cost of about 800*l.*; I am not prepared with the items; I have no estimate of the amount; it is a rough calculation which I have made.

2458. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] What number of men do you propose to lodge in these lock-ups?—A head superintendent and two constables will be lodged, and they will pay rent for those stations.

2459. What rent?—According to the rank of the officer; we have three classes of superintendents; the first class will pay 10*l.*, the second 9*l.*, and the third 7*l.*

2460. Mr. *Sotherton.*] What will be the amount of money payable to the county in the shape of rent for the outlay in building these stations?—I should estimate the rent at about 30*l.* a year altogether for each station.

2461. Mr. *Phillips.*] Upon what plan are those lock-ups to be built?—The lock-ups must be all the same. The Secretary of State's regulations distinctly apply to all lock-up houses; they must be built with concrete, and with heated flues. There is a plan sent by the Secretary of State from which you cannot deviate if they are built under his authority.

2462. Mr. *Howard.*] Do you think your police is sufficient for other services than those they have to perform as policemen?—In Wiltshire they have recruited three-fourths of the militia; they are also employed as inspectors of nuisances and lodging-houses. I think the police might be employed in recruiting for the army with great advantage, both to the country and to the army, if they were so employed.

2463. It has been suggested that the police should inspect the roads?—That is a subject to which I have not turned my attention; but I think it would require practical men.

2464. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] You say that your men were employed in raising recruits for the militia?—We raised three-fourths of the militia in Wiltshire, and served all the notices gratis.

2465. Have the police received the bringing-money?—They have received the bringing-money which is allowed to every person who brings a recruit, but all the other duties connected with the militia have been performed gratis.

2466. Mr.

2466. *Mr. Sotheron.*] What is your opinion with regard to putting your men in uniform; it has been suggested that in some cases it would be much better that they should not be clothed in uniform?—I think it is important that they should be in uniform, and it checks many irregularities, which could not be checked otherwise. A policeman has no right to be in public-houses; if a policeman is in uniform, and he goes into a public-house, every one knows that that man is a policeman, and that he has no right there.

2467. Therefore the conduct of the men is to some extent checked by their being in uniform?—Yes; and I think also that crime would not be more efficiently detected by a man in plain clothes than by men in uniform, in the present state of crime throughout the country.

2468. Do you think that the presence of a policeman in uniform contributes very much to deter people from crime, or making a riot or disturbance?—Yes, most certainly.

2469. *Chairman.*] Would it not give him more authority in suppressing a riot?—No question; I think it would be utterly impossible to conduct a police establishment properly without the men being in uniform, or to enforce discipline.

Captain  
*Samuel Merzdith.*  
9 June 1853.

*Sir Baldwin Leighton, Bart.*, called in; and Examined.

2470. FOR what counties are you a Magistrate?—For Shropshire and Montgomeryshire.

*Sir B. Leighton,  
Bart.*

2471. Have you a police force in Shropshire?—In both counties; Shropshire and Montgomeryshire.

2472. Have you always taken a great interest in the subject of police?—I have always taken a great interest in the subject. I am chairman of the police committee in Shropshire; I am a member of the police committee of Montgomeryshire, and chairman of the court of quarter sessions in Montgomeryshire.

2473. Can you state to the Committee of what the police force consists in Shropshire?—The force in Shropshire is 58 men, including the chief constable and all the officers, excluding the boroughs which do not belong to the rural police; we have two boroughs which have joined us, therefore the 58 men include the whole of the rural police and the police which serves the two boroughs.

2474. Was the number of the police force increased when these boroughs joined the county?—Yes; the borough of Wenlock joined in 1842; we then applied to the Secretary of State for an increase of seven men; we did not increase the force to that extent, although we got the order to do so; we increased the force four, but afterwards we have increased the force three more, one of which went to Bridgnorth when that borough joined us; we have increased the force for the county, I may say, four, since it was originally formed, and three for the boroughs that have joined us.

2475. What is the expense to the county of the whole of that force?—The expense is about a penny in the pound in Shropshire; during the 12 years we have had eight rates at a penny, three years a penny farthing, and one year at three farthings, which I ought to say includes the expense of the lock-ups, which have come rather heavy.

2476. Do you think the force which you have in Shropshire is sufficient?—I think it is quite sufficient.

2477. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] What is the population of Shropshire?—199,467.

2478. Does that include the two boroughs which have joined with the county?—Yes.

2479. *Mr. Burroughes.*] What is the amount of assessment upon which the rate is raised?—£. 1,027,000.

2480. *Chairman.*] What is the number of the force in Montgomeryshire?—The number in Montgomeryshire is 14.

2481. *Mr. Phillips.*] What is the total cost of the force in Shropshire?—The total expense last year was 4,865 *l.*; but I ought to say that we deduct from that 879 *l.* which the police treasurer received in actual cash from the constables for duties performed, and that would leave what he paid about 4,000 *l.*

2482. *Chairman.*] Do the 4,000 *l.* with that 800 *l.* constitute the sum raised by the rate of a penny in the pound?—Besides that, there is a saving of about 500 *l.* a year, which is not carried to account, for conveying prisoners to gaol, and for

0.71.

T 4

keeping

Sir B. Leighton,  
Bart.

9 June 1853.

keeping courts of quarter sessions, and the serving of jury lists; the 4,000*l.* includes the lock-ups; 200*l.* is for lock ups.

2483. Mr. *Burroughes.*] Is that sum merely the current outlay, or for building the lock-ups?—It includes what was spent upon the building, which I find was about 200 *l.* for that year.

2484. *Chairman.*] Have you made any calculation of the comparative expense of your present system and that of the parochial constable system?—I tried to form some estimate before the police was established; but putting aside the diminution of crime, the police force is an expense to the county; that is a thing you cannot calculate; there is no data of that sort, I fancy, in any county before the police was established, to enable you to know what the amount of crime was, because the number of prisoners in gaol affords no data of the amount of felonies actually committed.

2485. Do you think the amount of property which has been saved by having an efficient police force is equal to the cost of the police in the county?—I have no data which will enable me to answer that question.

2486. Do you think there has been a great saving of property?—I think so.

2487. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Do not you think it would be very desirable to increase the number of your police force?—Perhaps the best answer I can give to that question is, that two years ago an inspector of weights and measures died; we had to appoint one temporarily; I said to our chief constable, “I think the man in our neighbourhood can be spared; you had better appoint him for three months, and if he does his duty well, he can be appointed as inspector of weights and measures; if not, you can keep the place open for him.” There was not the slightest inconvenience, although that constable was taken away.

2488. *Chairman.*] Do you think you were able to spare that man from having had a well-organized police force for a considerable time?—When I was treasurer of a local police, before the rural police was established, we had only one constable, and that man did the duty perfectly well, whereas now we have two police officers. So efficient did I find that one man, that I was able to send him to other parts of the county in which parties applied for his assistance; during the last year he served in my hundred he was absent two months, the parties paying him the same wages that I paid him.

2489. Mr. *Fitzroy.*] Is the population less dense in your neighbourhood?—I find there is about one constable to 4,000 in the county; that is about the average in my hundred; my hundred is about 8,000.

2490. Do you think your force is sufficient?—I think it is more than sufficient in my neighbourhood.

2491. Do you think one policemen to 4,000 inhabitants is sufficient?—It must depend entirely upon the district; if you have a thinly populated district you have a great acreage; perhaps you would require more constables than where there was a dense population and less acreage. Allow me to say that Shropshire has districts containing a dense population, and districts just the contrary. We have mines, where the population is very dense; they are not quite towns, but there is a succession of villages, over eight or nine or ten miles; in other parts there are hills, where the population is very slight.

2492. Taking the whole of the country, do you think that 58 men afford sufficient protection?—Perfectly so, looking at the number of felonies; one man has a felony a month to look after; not a conviction, but an actual robbery committed.

2493. *Chairman.*] It appears by the return to which you have alluded, that previously to the appointment of the police, that in the hundred of Ford the number of robberies was 65; that is in 15 months; the amount of property lost was 139*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.*; do you think the number of robberies which have been committed since the appointment of the police has been much less in that district?—It has in that district. I believe I have a return of the felonies which have been committed; it shows perhaps favourably to the police; it begins in 1841, when there were 554 felonies; it goes gradually down to 1846, when there were 334.

2494. In what year were the police appointed?—In 1840. In the year 1841 the number of felonies committed were 554; in 1842, 584; in 1843, 657; in 1844, 573; in 1845, 460; in 1846, 334; in 1847, 407; in 1848, 513; in 1849, 565; in 1850, 651; in 1851, 810; in 1852, 738. There are two reasons for that increase. Our railway works began in the year 1847, and we had a great number of offences committed by the railway labourers; we had a great many crimes

crimes committed in the county by the Irish labourers; we had also an immense increase of vagrancy, owing to the alteration made in the administration of the poor law; the workhouses were dreadfully crowded, and there were great complaints about the relief given to vagrants. I find that this increase of felonies commenced just about the time that those two things happened in our county, therefore that is the reason why there is that increase. Since 1851 they have decreased to 738. Since the railway has been opened to Shrewsbury there has been a very great increase of crime; in Shrewsbury there are an immense number of pickpockets; they can come from Wellington for a penny, and for sixpence from Wolverhampton; they constantly come to Shrewsbury on fair days.

2495. Shrewsbury not being incorporated with the county police, what police force is there at Shrewsbury?—The borough police amounts to 17 men, and they talk of increasing it to 20.

2496. Is that force under the corporation?—Under the watch committee of the corporation.

2497. Do you think the police force of Shrewsbury is sufficient?—I do not think it is; they do not work very well with the county, at least none of the boroughs do.

2498. They do not give reciprocal assistance?—No; I do not think they work nearly so well as the two counties of Shropshire and Montgomery; but perhaps I may say one reason is for my being an influential magistrate in each of the counties. I say to the men, "You must catch the thief; never mind which county catches him. We have just now come to an arrangement in Shropshire and Montgomeryshire to do away with the boundary of the counties, and to draw a line; the counties go in and out; there are one or two parts of Montgomeryshire which have never been patrolled; one owing to the borough of Poole surrounding it in a great measure, and the other, the county of Shropshire. In another part of Montgomeryshire one of our Shropshire policemen resides.

2499. In fact, there is a cordial co-operation between the police of the counties of Shropshire and Montgomeryshire?—Yes; I attribute it in a great measure to my being myself an influential magistrate over both the chief constables, and if they were not to work well they would know that I should report them to the quarter sessions; my office would carry considerable weight with it in either county. I am bound to say that the chief constables are working very well; I think the knowledge that there is a person interested in both counties is a very great tie over them.

2500. Do not you think a cordial co-operation between the two counties of Shropshire and Montgomeryshire enables you to do with a smaller force in Shropshire than if the adjoining county had no police force?—No doubt; I live on the borders, and I can order the Shropshire police to go into Montgomeryshire.

2501. And the Montgomeryshire police would come into the county of Shropshire if they were wanted?—Certainly. My Shropshire policeman lives two miles off, and my Montgomery policeman six miles off; that is the reason why I employ the Shropshire man more than the Montgomeryshire man.

2502. Do you think it would be desirable to establish a uniform system of police throughout the country?—It would be very desirable. Bridgnorth applied to the county to unite with us; the magistrates said, "We are willing to unite, and you shall pay the same rate as the county rate is." The agreement was signed; the borough authorities wanted particularly to appoint their own policeman. We said, "The county magistrates do not appoint their policemen themselves, but it is left with the chief constable to appoint them." It was agreed that if the Bridgnorth policeman was efficient he should be appointed. The chief constable reported to the police committee that he could not appoint the man because he could not read writing. We met the mayor of Bridgnorth, and there was a great discussion; the poor man wrote in our presence, and certainly very badly; the mayor said, "He is nervous." There was a letter written by the mayor lying on the table, and I said, "Let him read the mayor's letter, which is very plainly written." It was handed to him, but it was evident he could not read it. The mayor said, "I have nothing more to say, gentlemen, will you allow us to break our engagement, and not to unite with you?"

2503. You mean to say the mayor and corporation broke their engagement for the sake of that one man?—I can only say that they did break it; it was mutually understood that we did not want to hold them to their engagement. They had actually paid the first instalment of 20% to our treasurer. We said we had no wish

0.71.

U

Sir B. Leighton,  
Bart.

9 June 1853.

Sir B. Leighton,  
Bart.

9 June 1853.

wish to keep them to their bargain; it was merely on the part of the borough, from a good feeling towards the man, because he would have been sent to the right-about, and not know how to maintain himself. In six months after they found the man some other situation, and they asked us to join, and have joined us.

2504. Mr. *Burroughes*.] Your chief constable has the appointment of the police in the boroughs?—Yes.

2505. In a similar manner to the county?—Yes; with this proviso, that the mayor may report a man to the chief constable, and the chief constable is then bound to remove him, but not to dismiss him.

2506. Is there any proviso as to the appointment?—No; he must be approved of by the mayor.

2507. Sir *J. Trollope*.] Are your police officers allowed to assist as relieving officers to the unions by way of checking vagrancy?—Not generally. In my own union we have had a great deal of difficulty; at last it was agreed that if the governor of the workhouse had any doubts about any able-bodied tramp, he should send him to the policeman before he took him in, whoever gave the order. The policeman was then to countersign the order if he really thought he deserved to be admitted; if he could find any act of vagrancy against him he was to take him immediately to a magistrate; that has considerably checked vagrancy in the union. It was getting into a dreadful state; in the year 1840 we had three vagrants in the union house; it gradually increased, till in 1848 we had 250. Our workhouse is the country, in a hamlet. We had 56 this last year.

2508. *Chairman*.] Do you think the certainty of detection of crime is much greater now than it was before the establishment of the police force?—Certainly, very much greater; we detect about half the crime that is reported, or hardly half now; but I ought to say before the police was established I used to attend the quarter sessions very regularly, and I took an account of the number of vagrants who were tried, and they amounted to a third or a fourth of the total number of prisoners tried; at the last session and assizes they amounted to about one-ninth.

2509. Lord *Lovaine*.] Does it not militate against your opinion of the efficiency of your force, that so few detections should take place compared with the number of crimes which have been committed?—I am not aware what the proportion has been in other counties, but a good many of the crimes are committed by the trampers. The difficulty in our county is to take up vagrants legally; a man is not justified in taking up a trumper, and whenever they see a policeman they take care not to commit an act of vagrancy. Hardly any ratepayer will go to the trouble of prosecuting a vagrant, although it is no expense; even myself, I do not like the trouble, although an active magistrate; it is a great trouble; you must go and give evidence at the court four, five, six, seven, eight, or nine miles; of course that deters people from prosecuting a vagrant for merely asking for a halfpenny. There is one thing which has been mentioned by the last witness about recruiting for the militia; our force have been used a little in that respect; they have not brought up a great many men; however, they have been useful in it. In regard to the men wearing uniform I think there has been something stated to the Committee; my opinion is, that it is desirable to have the men in uniform. Our policemen are allowed, whenever they think proper, to go out of uniform, but they must write it down in their journal; if it is not written in the journal, it is an offence for which they will be fined; if it is entered in the journal, stating the reason, they are permitted to go out of uniform. They frequently come to my house out of uniform; I ask them the reason, and they give me the reason.

2510. Mr. *Fitzroy*.] You heard the statement made by the last witness as to the decrease of vagrancy in Wiltshire; do you think that the same system might not be adopted in Shropshire which has been pursued so successfully in Wiltshire for the suppression of vagrancy?—I always like to have figures; it is a matter of experience.

2511. *Chairman*.] Are your officers appointed assistant relieving officers?—No; my union extends a very large distance; I think we have only four constables; and the workhouse being in the country, I do not know how they could be appointed assistant relieving officers; the workhouse is 14 miles from my house.

2512. Sir *J. Trollope*.] How near is there a constable to the workhouse?—The man is a mile and a half off to whom we send our vagrants.

2513. If you appointed the police in the capacity of relieving officers to attend  
the

the vagrants, they would be required to be in attendance daily at the workhouse? —No; we had only 56 applications in the year.

2514. Does it follow that that is the total number required in relief at your workhouse?—Yes.

2515. Were not there more than 56 that made application to the relieving officer?—Yes, a few more made applications.

2516. Were they rejected?—I ought to say that a vagrant seldom applies for relief where there is no union house.

2517. Perhaps your union house is not in the direct highway in their line of march?—We are the greatest highway out of Shrewsbury.

2518. Between Shrewsbury and Wales?—Yes, if there is no workhouse they never think of applying for relief; the workhouse is 14 miles off.

2519. *Chairman.*] Before the appointment of the police had you considerable experience of the efficiency of the local constables?—I had experience of their perfect uselessness.

2520. You think the parish constables were perfectly useless for the purpose of detecting crime?—Perfectly so; I consider it is a waste of money appointing them; it is a mere trifle to the county, but it is a great loss to the men themselves, because we do not pay them in my hundred; we appoint about 40 now, and those poor men lose, no doubt, 1s. 6d. a day by coming there, at least.

2521. Are they not paid for attendance the day they come in to be sworn?—No; that is a large sum for people of that class to lose. I think they are perfectly inefficient; and if I were to commit a prisoner from my own house, I should swear in my own gamekeeper to take him to gaol; I would rather trust my own servant to take him to gaol than a parish constable.

2522. *Sir J. Trollope.*] Are you not aware that under the last Local Constable Act that a gamekeeper is forbidden to be sworn in as a special constable?—I merely accidentally mentioned the gamekeeper, but I would swear in one of my garden labourers.

2523. *Chairman.*] With respect to the expense incurred by conveying prisoners by parochial constables, do you think, upon the whole, that the old system of parochial constables which you had in the county of Shropshire before the appointment of the police, was as expensive in point of money as the present system?—If you will put out of view the amount of crime and depredation that was committed; I think I reckoned the constables cost 800 *l.* or 1,000 *l.* a year; they now cost 4,000 *l.* a year, but I believe none of the magistrates would at all wish to do away with the police. We have frequent applications from the ratepayers to increase the police; we have been pressed very much for an increase by a parish in Montgomeryshire lately; we have had some very pressing memorials sent to increase the police.

2524. Then, in the opinion of the ratepayers, it is desirable to increase the force? —I find every one wants to have a policeman at his own door; that is the universal feeling throughout both counties.

2525. *Mr. Burroughes.*] Do you find that the ratepayers are willing to pay for the force?—As they memorialize us so often, I think they must be willing.

2526. *Chairman.*] So far as you are aware, in Shropshire and Montgomeryshire there is no complaint of the expense of the police?—No, not in the least.

2527. *Mr. Fitzroy.*] What proportion does the number of men bear to the population?—I think about the same proportion to the population as in Shropshire, but not to the acreage.

2528. What do they pay the superintendent?—I think 120 *l.*, and 50 *l.* for a horse.

2529. What is the pay of the chief constable in Shropshire?—£. 300, and 100 *l.* for a horse; 400 *l.* altogether.

2530. *Chairman.*] Do you wish to make any further statement to the Committee?—I think it is desirable to employ the police as much as possible; there is one thing in which they might be employed in courts of justice; at present the sheriff keeps the court at assizes with javelinmen; if the policemen were made to keep the courts, a great expense would be saved to the sheriffs.

2531. *Mr. Phillips.*] Has it ever been suggested that they should keep the toll-gates?—I do not think that is possible.

Sir B. Leighton,  
Bart.

9 June 1853.

F I R S T R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

P O L I C E ;

WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

---

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,  
10 June 1853.*

---

[*Price 1 s. 8 d.*]

603.

*Under 24 oz.*