

but when they came to the Waiau they had to be dipped twice. In my opinion there should be some provision made in the Act to provide that, at the discretion of the Chief Inspector, sheep travelling in an infected district should be dipped before removal from the run, if the Inspector should require it. Of course there are cases where it would not be necessary, such as Hawkeswood and Parnassus.

1094. Take such an instance as this : what would be the position if a Tarndale sheep got out of a travelling flock on Hammer Plain and afterwards proved to be scabby?—Mr. Low's flocks would have to be declared infected.

1095. What would be the liability to the Tarndale sheep?—The liability would be under the 45th section for allowing sheep to stray, the penalty being not less than £5, nor exceeding £100.

1096. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] Does that clause use the word "negligently : " you would have to prove that?—We can in most cases prove negligence. I had four cases against Mr. Gibson a few weeks ago and proved it.

1097. In any part of this district, is there really a defined boundary?—No, none.

1098. *Mr. Buchanan.*] In your opinion, would this secure the safety that is absolutely necessary. Suppose the owners of Tarndale run wish to travel their sheep to Canterbury, and upon the sheep being dipped you brand them ; in a fortnight afterwards, or whatever time you think necessary, you order these branded sheep to be dipped a second time and then let go : would that meet the case?—You mean to have the first dip on the station?

1099. The second one also ; both on the station?—It would depend a great deal on the country to be gone through. I should prefer the first on the station and the second at the boundary, both dippings to be under the supervision of the Inspector.

1100. The boundary of the infected district?—Yes.

1101. Would you consider it necessary in the case of the Hawkeswood sheep?—Hawkeswood has been clean some ten years.

1102. And there is no reasonable suspicion of their carrying infection?—None whatever.

1103. Would you consider, in the exercise of your discretion, that it was necessary to have those sheep dipped twice?—Certainly not ; but then the Act does not allow any exception to be made. I should be quite satisfied for the sheep to be dipped once.

1104. I am speaking with a view to considering the expediency of altering the Act. If you take my question as being put again with that view, would twice dipping on a station, in your opinion, insure reasonable safety?—No ; I should prefer the sheep to be dipped once on the station and once at the boundary.

1105. And in that case travelling to a common centre, as is done now?—Yes.

1106. Would there not be still an extra risk with that practice of infecting any one of those four flocks as compared with the practice of having two dippings done on the station?—We have to remember that we have no power to control the driving of the sheep in an infected district. A flock of very doubtful sheep might possibly have been driven from one part of the infected district to another without the knowledge of the Inspector. Some of these sheep might be dropped and might join a travelling mob, therefore I think that it would be far the safer plan for the last dipping to take place on the boundary.

1107. Is there any reason why, say, in the case of the district under discussion, you should have a boundary involving so much apparent unfairness as in the case of the Hawkeswood Run?—A wire fence is of no use as a boundary between an infected and a clean district.

1108. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Do you take the natural boundary in all cases?—We take the natural boundary ; a deep river, such as the Waiau, is to all intents a sheep-proof boundary.

1109. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Is it so in the upper part, say, about the Hammer Plains bridge?—Yes ; quite equal to what it is below : it becomes a narrower, more rapid, and gorgy river.

1110. Would you not be able to compass a good boundary for the infected district, excluding all the clean runs, putting such a place as Hawkeswood, for instance, outside the infected district?—You could not do it without injustice to other flocks. The Leslie Hills Run, for instance, has been clean almost as long as Hawkeswood.

1111. Is it as far removed from actual scab as Hawkeswood?—Yes, I should think so, only in a different direction.

1112. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] Have you any other reasons to give to the Committee for not having enforced the 26th clause of the Act against Mr. Gibson than that your predecessor had not done so—the one about the rams, I think, being in the flock?—Well, as a matter of fact, when I took charge was in September ; of course the ewes were lambing at the time, and the mischief was done. I had no instructions whatever about it, and did not know the rams were in the flock until November. I knew that the Inspector had given them notice to withdraw their rams, but whether it had been done or not I was not aware of my own knowledge.

1113. Would not that have been rather a reason for proceeding in the matter?—Yes ; I must confess I think a mistake was made ; perhaps I ought to have proceeded ; but it was a matter that did not strike me on taking charge of the district freshly. If I had known what I do now I should have proceeded.

1114. You had no instructions?—No.

1115. Can you say what instructions were given to the bailiffs put in charge of Mr. Ingles' stock to recover the amount of the fine. Were they instructed to realize or to wait?—They were instructed to sell. I arranged for the dipping of the sheep. I was there myself to look after it.

1116. *Hon. the Chairman.*] To sell at once?—At once.

1117. Not to wait?—Not to wait.

1118. How then was it that the sheep were not sold?—Because Mr. Ingles went up to Wellington, and applied for an interim injunction—I believe it was called—which he obtained.

1119. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] You were speaking of natural boundaries : is there any natural boundary in this infected district, such as you speak of, that would divide the clean flocks in