

947. In regard to the Kaikoura?—There are only three actually scabby runs there.

948. Well, now, going back a few years: were these flocks clean at that time? Was the Amuri all clean?—Some of the Amuri flocks were. The Hawkeswood, Parnassus, and Leslie Hills Runs have been clean for some seven or eight years; Highfield rather less, about four years.

949. You say the whole of the Amuri north of the Waiau is now clean: how many infected runs are there in the Kaikouras?—There are three actually scabby, and there are two or three others on the infected list, from the fact of infected sheep adjoining them. They are small flocks.

950. Have those flocks in the Amuri portion of this district been cleaned since you have been in the district?—Several of them.

951. Was there difficulty in cleaning them?—Yes; great difficulty.

952. What sort of country is that?—Very high mountainous country, with a good deal of bush on portions of it.

953. Country difficult to fence?—Yes; very difficult.

954. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] What district are you speaking of?—The country which has actually been cleaned—Mr. Low's country and that end.

955. *Hon. the Chairman.*] I simply wanted to know whether, in cleaning these flocks, the owners have been put to large expense?—Yes; they have in every instance at that end—in fact, all over the district they have.

956. They have had to kill sheep and fence?—Yes; one of the first things they had to do was to kill portions of their flocks and erect fencing.

957. At great expense?—Yes.

957A. In regard to the Kaikoura District there have been several flocks clean, I think?—Yes.

958. Since the Act came into force in 1878?—Yes; since this Act came into force Mr. Bullen's and the Swyncombe Run and Mr. Robert Tinline's have been cleaned.

959. Was that at great cost to the owners?—At very great cost indeed, in fencing and destruction of sheep.

960. In regard to those runs that remain scabby at this time: can you give the reason for their being scabby?—No, I cannot; they ought to have been cleaned years ago.

961. Do you know any reason why they should be still scabby whilst these others are clean? Are they in such a position as to make it more difficult to clean them?—There may be a little more difficulty with them than with some runs in the Amuri, such as Mr. Low's and Mr. Macarthur's.

962. Have proper steps been taken, in your opinion, for cleaning these runs?—No; I cannot say that there have—not in every instance, at any rate.

963. Is the department taking steps to compel them to clean the runs?—Yes; we have brought the Act into force. They have been fined on several occasions, at least convictions have been obtained in Court, but the fines I believe have been remitted.

964. Have the fines been remitted in every case?—Not in every case. The first informations that were laid under the 23rd section were against Messrs. Ingles and Gordon Gibson. These were for not taking proper precautions to clean their sheep.

965. That is under the 23rd section?—Yes; that was last May twelve months.

966. Were fines inflicted in these cases?—The fines were remitted, I believe.

967. They were convicted, but the fines were remitted?—Yes. I was not in charge of that district at the time.

968. Since you have had charge of the district, have there been many convictions?—The first was against Mr. Ingles and the owner of the Waipapa sheep. Mr. Gordon Gibson was not the owner at that time; Mr. Tinline paid the fine. Mr. John Tinline came into possession of the sheep as mortgagee. Those were the only two cases at that time—the 10th December. In those cases we had to put a bailiff in possession of a portion of Mr. Ingles's sheep to recover the amount of the fine, and he applied to the Supreme Court in Wellington for an injunction to stop proceedings. The Chief Justice, I believe it was, granted the injunction on the condition that the fine was paid into Court, which was done. Afterwards an appeal case was heard last April, when Mr. Ingles lost it, and the fine was paid.

969. I do not quite understand. Mr. Ingles was fined by the Resident Magistrate and appealed to the Supreme Court?—Yes. He refused, in the first instance, to pay the fine. We put the bailiff in to seize a certain number of sheep. Then he applied for an injunction to stop our proceedings, which was granted on condition that the fine was paid into Court, which was done.

970. Then, of course, you gave up possession of the sheep?—We gave up possession of the sheep.

971. After that he appealed?—Yes: he obtained an injunction. I suppose it was an interim injunction, pending the result of the appeal.

972. It seems a long time afterwards. Notice was given at the time?—Yes, or immediately afterwards.

973. Of course that occurred in Wellington?—I do not know anything, of that of my own knowledge.

974. With regard to the Kincaid Run, will you state what sort of country it consists of?—It is a double limestone range, in the midst of very dense bush. It is surrounded by many miles of bush: this bush is full of wild sheep. Mr. Ingles has done no fencing, and taken no steps whatever to clear that portion of his run.

975. Do you consider it more difficult than other parts to clean?—It is very difficult to clean, but it is simply a matter of fencing and reducing the stock, the same as any one else would have to do.

976. It could be done?—No doubt it could.

977. Probably at no greater expense than other portions of the country?—No; I should not think the expense would be greater: it is quite easy to fence.

978. Is there no difficulty on account of the great gullies?—I have heard that there are some rough gullies at the extreme end of the run, but I have never been so far. Mr. Reese, owner of the