

917. Have you any suggestion to make with regard to boundaries?—You must make your boundary. It would not be difficult at the Waiau. The Waiau is itself a definite boundary. What is complained of is, that an owner who may have held a clean certificate for years is placed in the same position as the man who holds a certificate only since yesterday.

918. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] Do you mean to tell me that in taking a lot of sheep—supposing a few scabby ones had been among them—you would be able to say that the scabby ones were taken out; or, if the scabby sheep were taken away, upon seeing the remainder, could you say they were clean?—If they had one dip on the station that would remedy the evil. If the sheep were infected in that way there must have been an adjacent run that was scabby.

919. Do you mean to tell me that you can take sheep out of a scabby district with the perfect certainty that they are clean?—It has been done repeatedly on the south side of the Waiau.

920. Were they not dressed?—No; and they were taken from stations adjoining a scabby run.

921. *Mr. Buchanan.*] You state that in some cases clean sheep were taken from the north side of the Waiau, and, although two or three clean flocks stood between them and any infected country, they had to go through the same ordeal—twice dipping and a week's quarantine—the second dip as if they had come from a flock adjoining that that was scabby?—Yes; whether they held a certificate for three months or ten years.

922. You have stated your opinion as to clean sheep travelling through a clean country; what is your opinion about this: taking sheep from a flock adjoining scab; how would it be possible to give them one dipping on the station?—That is what I suggest. The Inspector should see the sheep dipped once on the station, and after an interval of fourteen days he should see the second dipping also on the station, and then allow the sheep to travel right away. In the case again of a flock one remove from a scabby flock—a flock, that is, holding a clean certificate intervening—on my suggestion they should be dipped only once on the station; but the Inspector at present has no discretionary power. A man therefore adjoining a scabby flock and holding a three months' certificate is placed in the same position as a man who holds a clean certificate for years, and does not adjoin scab.

923. *Mr. Dodson.*] Do you think it desirable to give the Inspector a discretionary power?—If you have a practical man like the man we have in our country, Yes; but in many cases Inspectors are not practical men.

924. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you any remarks to make about Inspectors?—Nothing, except that I have known Mr. Foster for a long time. I think he is a thoroughly practical man. I do not think he can be surpassed. I know there are some Inspectors that are not up to the mark. I know that for many years Mr. Foster has been associated with the administration of the Scab Act, and that he is a thoroughly practical man.

FRIDAY, 19TH SEPTEMBER, 1884.

Mr. FOSTER, examined.

925. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are Inspector of the North Canterbury District?—Yes; I am also Inspector of the Amuri and Kaikoura Subdivisions, Marlborough District.

926. I was going to ask you first as to the Canterbury portion of the district: how long have you been there?—Between eight and nine years.

927. Was there scab in any portion of this district?—Yes.

928. In what portion?—At Glenmark, Mr. Moore's property.

929. Is that clean now?—Yes; it has been clean for seven years.

930. Was there difficulty in cleaning that?—None whatever.

931. I was referring more particularly to the northern portion of this Canterbury District, the Amuri part of it: was that scabby when you took it?—Yes.

932. Is that clean now?—Yes.

933. Was that part of the Amuri south of the Waiau infected?—At the time that I took charge there was scab in the greater portion of the country at the head of the Waiau—some of the roughest country in New Zealand.

934. You say that is clean now?—Yes.

935. Was there difficulty in cleaning that?—There was a great deal of difficulty: we had to slaughter a great many thousands of sheep before we could do it.

936. Were the owners of these runs put to great expense in cleaning them?—Yes; they were.

937. Was the Act of 1878 strictly enforced?—It was strictly enforced in every instance.

938. In enforcing the Act, was there occasion for convictions and fines?—Not in that portion.

939. The owners willingly obeyed the Act according to instructions?—Yes; they put up a great deal of fencing and killed off a great many sheep; but the cleaning was done at very great expense.

940. Does the same apply to the other districts, to Cheviot and Ashley?—We had no scab in Cheviot, and the Ashley District has been cleaned for many years.

941. You also have the superintendence of the Kaikoura and Amuri Subdivisions of the Marlborough Sheep District?—Yes.

942. You know them well?—Yes.

943. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] Does Cheviot include Parnassus and Highfield?—Yes; your run is in Cheviot.

944. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You know, then, this country, the Amuri north of the Waiau and the Kaikouras?—Yes; nearly the whole of it I know very intimately.

945. That is an infected district?—Yes.

946. Are there many flocks in it that are clean?—Yes; a considerable number. In fact, at this moment, the whole Amuri Subdivision is clean.