

24. Did you recommend Gantley's removal from Wellington?—I think I did. I think I told Colonel Hume he was not doing his work properly.

25. What do you do with the men who are detected in drunkenness, or who are lazy—what do you generally do with them?—Well, if a man commits himself—gets drunk, or is under the influence of liquor, he is brought before me. I seldom deal with cases of drunkenness. Latterly I have not done so at all here; I send it on to the Commissioner. But a man may still be conducting himself apparently all right, but not doing his work efficiently.

26. Is it not the practice, as a punishment, to shift them to some other station—almost the invariable rule?—No, I cannot say that. I do not know that is the rule.

27. Well, is it the rule to dismiss them?—For a first offence, no.

28. But for inefficiency?—Well, as to inefficiency, if you are in a position to prove it; and it is very difficult to prove. You must prove your case clearly. It will not do to suspect. You must prove your charge against him.

29. Take Gantley's case; there was nothing proved against him, and yet he was removed to Oamaru. Why?—Of course he was in plain clothes here in Wellington, and Colonel Hume thought perhaps it was doing him an injustice to put him in uniform, having been some time in plain clothes, and he sent him off to Oamaru.

30. Take the case of Sergeant Shirley; do you remember him?—Yes.

31. Was he a very efficient officer?—Not very efficient.

32. As a matter of fact, was he not very inefficient?—I would not say that. Shirley was not what I would call an inefficient man.

33. Was he a sober man?—I think so. I never saw a sign of liquor on him.

34. If he was not very efficient, and not inefficient, what was he?—He did very well for some time, but the place was getting large and more important, and I found that Shirley was not quite up to the work. I do not think he was a good Police Court man, to begin with, which is very important; and I do not think he thoroughly understood the getting up of cases.

35. How long had he been in the Force—do you know when he joined?—No, I do not.

36. The register shows he had been a second-class sergeant since 1884?—I do not know.

37. Do you not think that between 1884 and 1895 a sufficient time had elapsed for him to become efficient as an ordinary police-officer?—Yes, I should say so; but there is a good deal to be said about Sergeant Shirley. I believe he was not in charge of stations during the most of that time. I think he was second at one of the head stations in Dunedin, and in that capacity they do not learn much—that is the sort of work I have been speaking of, having practice in the Courts.

38. Now, as to the question of tote-shops in Wellington: are there any tote-shops in Wellington?—It is not long since I wrote to Chief Detective Campbell on the same subject, and he assured me there was not a single tote-shop here to his knowledge.

39. *The Chairman.*] Not a tote-shop?—Not a tote-shop; not a gambling-place.

40. *Mr. Taylor.*] How long ago is that?—Probably a couple of months ago. It may be, I am not quite sure.

41. Within the last six months?—Oh, yes.

42. And Detective Campbell declares there is not a single tote-shop in Wellington?—He wrote to me that he did not know of one.

43. Did you believe that report?—I had no reason to believe otherwise. I do not know one myself.

44. Do you know Shotlander's place in Willis Street?—No.

45. *Mr. Poynton.*] Near where the Empire Hotel is situated.

46. *Mr. Taylor.*] Right opposite where the *Evening Post* used to be?—Yes, I know that place.

47. Did you know Shotlander when he was in Christchurch?—No, I do not recollect him.

48. You do not remember his being there in the book-making class?—I do not think I recollect him.

49. And you definitely say you do not think there is a tote-shop in Wellington?—I do not know of one—what I would call a shop. They come out on the streets. I do not think they do anything in shops. They come out on the streets and meet people, and make bets there.

50. Did you do anything to suppress that evil?—We had the principal man up not long since for loitering on the footpath, and he was fined £2; and I have had a man out in a sort of disguise trying to catch them.

51. And so far you have failed?—Well, in getting what I would call a case.

52. Do you think Wellington is practically free from the gambling evil so far as tote-shops are concerned?—So far as betting in shops is concerned. They go back and forward from the shops into the streets, but I do not think there is any established shop.

53. *Colonel Pitt.*] You think they are still betting in the streets?—Yes; we cannot stop them. They have a way of evading the law by betting "straight out," as they call it. A man has a book, and you go up and say you want to put 5s. on a horse. He puts down your name; but, instead of putting it down as a tote-bet, he puts it down as a "straight-out" bet, as they call it. It is understood, of course, amongst these people that as soon as the race is over, and you have won, you may go and draw your money according to the totalisator odds.

54. That is all done on the street, as far as you know?—I do not mean to say there is a crowd on the street, but they are doing it.

55. *Mr. Taylor.*] Colonel Hume said he thought gambling was worse in this order—Hastings, Christchurch, Wellington: do you confirm that?—I have never been in Hastings. It is not in my district, and I know nothing about it. Christchurch I know of, five years ago, and I do not think that at that time tote-betting was as rife in Christchurch as it is here.

56. *The Chairman.*] In 1892?—In the beginning of 1893. But there is no concealing the fact there is betting going on, and we try all we can to put it down.