

consequence was that he (Mr. Munro) stopped the sheep and kept them in quarantine until the seven days' notice was given Inspector Drummond. Mr. Munro, as I stated, examined these sheep and saw them go through the boundary. When Mr. Paisley heard that these sheep had gone into another district out of his district, without a certificate, he wired that the certificate would be sent by mail, as he did not know they were going out of his district.

1730. The man took them out without a certificate?—There is nothing in this Act which says that, if these sheep were clean before the passing of this Act of 1878, they should have a certificate. When Mr. Drummond heard that the sheep had come through the boundary-gate without a certificate, he sent to Mr. Harvey to demand the certificate, which he knew Mr. Harvey had not got. He laid an information, and Mr. Harvey was fined £10.

1731. Under what clause was that?—Clause 40. He was fined £10, notwithstanding the Hawke's Bay District being a clean district. There is nothing in the Act that says clean sheep shall have a certificate at all.

1732. Was that prior to this Act?—No; there is nothing in this Act which says that sheep which were clean before this Act shall have a certificate. Mr. Harvey was fined, notwithstanding that Drummond had the seven days' notice. By the regulation under the Act it is necessary that sheep should have a certificate to go through. It was Mr. Munro's duty to give that certificate. It was Drummond's duty to see they had that certificate, and therefore that the regulations under the Act had not been complied with. The fault was the Inspector's, not Mr. Harvey's. Mr. Munro should have given a certificate when they came to the boundary. Mr. Drummond's duty was to indorse that certificate when they came through the boundary.

1733. But did Mr. Drummond get the necessary notice?—Drummond had seven days' notice that they were waiting there to come through.

1735. What did Drummond do?—He did not take any notice at all; when he found that Mr. Harvey had not the certificate on paper he laid an information and had him fined £10.

1736. But he was obliged to have it?—The Inspector did not give it him.

1737. A person purchasing clean sheep gets a clean certificate with them?—They have no clean certificate in Hawke's Bay; that is a clean district.

1738. How is it with the purchaser of sheep, say, in Otago, for instance?—It rests simply with the Inspector. If the Inspector knows the sheep are going out of the district he gives a certificate; but there are no certificates within the district.

1739. No Inspector would refuse to give a certificate for sheep going out of the district?—He should not.

1740. Should not the purchaser have applied to get a certificate when he knew that he was—or, rather, the sheep were—going out of the district?—Not necessarily.

1741. Clearly, he was obliged to have a certificate, and should have taken steps to have obtained it. Do you not think it was Mr. Munro's duty not to have allowed those sheep to go through unless he had examined them?—The whole of the onus falls on the Inspector.

1742. Is there anything in the Act that will throw the responsibility of keeping them on the boundary on the Inspector?—I think there is in introducing sheep from infected into clean districts; for instance, that they cannot travel a certain distance without being dipped. They ought to be dipped within three miles. Mr. Harvey's fence was a part of the boundary between Wellington and Hawke's Bay District. He had merely to open his gate and let them through. He did not drive them the three miles. When the case was over Mr. Harvey applied to Mr. Drummond for a certificate. Mr. Drummond said it was not necessary, because they came under his run certificate the moment they were through his gate—the provincial boundary gate.

1743. When was that case?—It came on at the same time as the last case of my brother's. It was about the end of April or the beginning of May. But when the case came on these facts did not come out—the facts under the regulations for the Inspector, and the facts of the run being the boundary fence.

1744. You draw a distinction between a run certificate and a sheep certificate: what is your suggestion as regards that?—I suggest that every run should have a certificate. It is necessary that every run should be examined at least once a year. There are runs in our district which have not been examined for eight or ten years.

1745. Is there no scab at all on them?—It is difficult to say with so much lice about. I do not know that there is any; I do not think so. I am talking of runs within infected subdivisions.

1746. Are there any that are not inspected and have no certificates?—Mine is the only one I know of.

*Mr. Buchanan:* It is proved that the old Provincial certificate shall hold good until it is cancelled.

1747. *Hon. the Chairman.*] I wanted to ask you as to several flocks on the same run: Take the case of its becoming infected and scab breaking out in one corner. If that run is cut up and leased to other persons, can the persons on the other portions of the run retain a clean certificate, although, if the whole of the land remained in the hands of one person, the whole runs would be an infected run?—Yes; it can be done.

1748. Do you know a case?—I know Mr. Andrew's case.

1749. What was that case?—The whole of his run became an infected run. There was scab in the flock. All the sheep were dipped. Mr. Andrews sold two or three thousand sheep to his son, and leased to him a portion of the property. When the sheep were examined for certificate, only that portion which he leased to his son was clean.

1750. In nine months?—When the sheep were three months from last being dipped he examined all the sheep, and found that only those which had been on the run leased to Mr. Andrews's son were clean. They got the certificate.

1751. The whole of the sheep and only those sheep on the leased run were found clean?—Yes.