

1044. Was he not liable to the penalty under the Act?—The information should have been laid by the Inspector who had charge of the district previous to my taking charge.

1045. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] Does not the Act provide a penalty for every day that the rams are with the ewes?—Yes.

1046. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Would it not have been your duty, coming into charge of the district, and finding proceedings had not been taken in a case like this, to move in the matter?—I suppose, strictly speaking, it would; but, having taken charge of the district from Mr. Bayly, I thought it would be unnecessary.

1047. Had you instructions not to do so?—No; I had no instructions bearing on the case.

1048. Perhaps you would not object to stating what instructions you had?—I do not think I had instructions further than that I should exercise supervision over the district.

1049. I suppose you must from time to time have communicated with Mr. Bayly as to what should be done: was the general tone of his instructions to the effect that you should carry out the Act strictly?—Yes; I have never had any instructions otherwise, at any rate.

1050. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] He gave you no direct instructions?—I had no direct instructions from the head of the department. I was moved there as being, I suppose, a man of experience to be in charge of the district, and to carry out the Act.

1051. *Mr. Pearson.*] You were instructed to carry out the Act?—Yes.

1052. There are wild rams on Gibson's run, are there not?—Yes.

1053. If Gibson kept his rams out of the flock, they would cease breeding?—There would be sure to be some in lamb. The great fault of Mr. Gibson's fencing has been that it is incomplete. He put up a fence from the Clarence half-way up the range and left it there, where it is useless.

1054. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] Can you positively warrant any of these flocks in the North Amuri as being clean, so long as these sheep remain scabby?—The only flock in danger is the Cloudy Range flock of Sir Norman Campbell.

1055. That adjoining Highfield?—Yes. If that got infected, Highfield, Mendip, and Lyndon would be also in danger.

1056. Then, do you consider, or do you not consider, any of the flocks free from danger?—So long as this nucleus of scab remains, most undoubtedly the sheep are a menace to the whole district.

1057. You cannot warrant any of these runs as being clean, the sheep from which could go through the scabby run?—No; I should be very sorry to do so.

1058. Do you consider it necessary, or do you not, to enforce the present precautions that are taken with sheep crossing out of this infected district into a clean district? Do you think it necessary to dip these sheep twice before they come out of the infected district into the clean one?—There are some flocks, such as Hawkeswood and Parnassus, that have been clean so many years, that should be dealt with quite differently from such as Lyndon and Mr. Low's, that join infected country.

1059. If you take Parnassus, why do you not take Highfield?—I would: I am only mentioning these as illustrations. I should make a difference between flocks that have been clean for three years and do not join infected country, and those which have not been clean for that time and which do adjoin infected country.

1060. I understand you to say there is a risk?—Yes; but I should say one dip would be quite sufficient to protect Hawkeswood and Parnassus.

1061. If one dip is sufficient, why dip at all?—There might be so little scab that one proper dip would be sufficient to eradicate it.

1062. *Mr. Walker.*] With reference to the division of the Ingles property: have they got a clean certificate for the lower country?—Yes; for the lower farm, which is all fenced in, and in English grass.

1063. There is no condition attached?—There was a condition attached that they should erect a new wool-shed and dip for dealing with the scabby sheep.

1064. They got a certificate before they erected the wool-shed?—Yes.

1065. Do you not think it more advisable for the department, in future, before granting a certificate, to absolutely require the erection of these buildings?—I take it that, once having agreed to the separation of the properties, we have no power to refuse, provided that the Act is carried out. We do not inspect the sheep until three months after the last dip. They were clean at shearing time.

1066. *Hon. Mr. Waterhouse.*] Are the Messrs. Ingles still in partnership?—I am not aware how they stand in that way: they simply give us certain sheep returns.

1067. You have seen no notice of dissolution of partnership?—No.

1068. You get the *Gazette* regularly?—No; I do not get the *Gazette*. This arrangement was entered into entirely by myself for the protection of the Kaikoura farms. I thought it a great point to gain to prevent Ingles from bringing scabby sheep right into the middle of the district.

1069. Have you recommended the remission of penalties in any case where fines have been remitted?—Never.

1070. Have there been many cases of remission of penalties?—The only ones I know of are these Kaikoura cases. They are the only cases in my own knowledge.

1071. Upon whose recommendation were the penalties remitted?—I am not sure, except as regards the extract I have read in answering Mr. Gibson's petition.

1072. You were not consulted?—I was not consulted in this matter.

1073. You were not consulted prior to the fines being remitted?—No.

1074. You recognize that it is your duty, under the 66th clause, to lay an information every six months, regardless of all other considerations?—Yes.

1075. If you had not done so you would be failing in your duty?—I should think so.

1076. *Mr. Pearson.*] Did Gibson put his rams in again this last autumn?—No, certainly not. They were withdrawn at shearing time, last December. I shall send an Inspector over when the