

owner could have dipped and taken them through one infected district in one day, the Act was not properly administered in this case. The owner was prepared to take all precautions that were necessary, but the Inspector would not allow him to move his sheep, but preferred that they should be kept alongside scabby sheep for two months.

1697. Would you put this down to an error of judgment?—Yes.

1698. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] Is this of your own personal knowledge?—Yes; but Mr. Dillon is here; he will be able to tell you.

1699. But the 46th clause: would not that clause justify the Inspector in refusing to permit them to pass?—I think the effect of that clause is that necessary precautions should be taken. It is not for preventing sheep travelling.

1700. Surely under that clause the Inspector might think himself justified in saying that you could not take sufficient precautions. It might be an error of judgment on his part, but he could refuse to give the permit?—I think not. I think the word “may” there means “shall” if sufficient precautions are taken. If he is not competent to say what are sufficient precautions, he is not competent to hold his appointment; but there are many who think that the word “reasonable” would be better, instead of “sufficient.” The Inspector insisted on those clean sheep being kept for two months alongside scabby sheep, thus helping to spread infection, when they might have been dipped, and every precaution taken to go through one infected run in one day.

1701. What eventually became of these sheep?—They were taken to the eight hundred acres belonging to Mr. Dillon.

1702. What is the next case?—That is the Waioronga case. In this a certificate was given for the sheep: it was on the 28th June, 1882. I think it was two thousand one hundred that got certificates. In the following May, 1883, the certificate for Riversdale sheep (9,970) was cancelled on examination. Scab was found in the northern flocks in May, 1883. Riversdale Run is divided into several flocks. My brother made several applications between June and August for a permit to remove his six fat sheep to market from Waioronga. The permit was refused under the 46th clause.

1703. Because they had to travel through infected ground?—In October, when fat sheep ruled at a high price, my brother gave notice that he would shear and drive to market. After shearing the lot, Messrs. Benter came to purchase. To prevent my brother making the sale, Inspector Drummond gave him notice to brand S. My brother refused. The case was brought to Court. Mr. Drummond lost his case, and he had to give a permit.

1704. *Mr. Buchanan.*] What date was that when he had to give the permit?—It was in December, 1883.

1705. On what ground did Mr. Drummond call on him to mark his sheep under the 25th section?—Mr. Drummond had examined them three or four times previously, and he never called on my brother to brand S. It was not until my brother said, if Mr. Drummond would not give him a permit, he would take the sheep *via* Flatpoint and Tupurupuru to Carterton.

1706. Was it on the ground that the Riversdale Station was infected, and that this was supposed to be a portion of the sheep of that station?—That was Mr. Drummond's opinion. He considered the whole were infected. He was shown certificates that were still in force for Waioronga. They are worked by two managers, although my brother is the owner of one, and the lessee of the other.

1707. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Then, the portion your brother leased was infected?—Yes.

1708. And the freehold was not infected?—Not infected.

1709. Then, in making the return under the Sheep Act, it would be made separate for the separate parts?—Yes.

1710. Do they adjoin each other?—They are divided by the river and by fences.

1711. Were they worked from the one station?—No; they had separate yards; they had separate means for everything that was to be done.

1712. Do you know, as an actual fact, whether Mr. Drummond knew that they came from one run or separate runs?—Mr. Drummond insisted that the sheep were worked together because the two flocks belonged to the one man.

1713. But the sheep were from the same run?—No; the sheep were worked separately. Mr. Drummond wanted to show that they had been worked from the one yard. On dipping the sheep to the satisfaction of Valance, permit was refused unless the broad-arrow was put on. They had the station-brand. On receiving the permit it was found that, although filled up by Inspector Valance, it was signed by Mr. Drummond; thus certifying that he had examined 1,600 which were examined by Mr. Valance, while Mr. Drummond never was present.

1714. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] Do you say, then, that this was a false declaration on his part?—Yes; he signed a permit which certifies that he had examined these sheep on that day, when he did not do so.

1714. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you anything further to remark?—There is another case. When Riversdale became due for certificate on the 26th January this year—they were due before—Drummond had examined the sheep three months before—some sheep had been due for certificate then for four months. He never found anything wrong with the sheep. But he asked to have some of the sheep dipped, and said that he would come and see them again; but he did not come until three months later, and then we could not get him to come to time. When he examined the sheep for certificate on the 26th January last, having examined two thousand, he then called on my brother to put the letter S on them. My brother refused, and said “They are clean and are due for their certificate. If, however, you find scab upon them, I will put the S on them; but they are clean. If you put the S brand on them it defeats the object of the Act. It depreciates their value; it is tantamount to putting S on with one hand and giving a certificate with the other. What do you ask me to do?”

1716. He could only put that on when the sheep were infected?—But Drummond said they are infected until such time as I shall give a certificate,