

2301A. Look to that clause 68: "As to what sheep shall be deemed to be treated as infected sheep:" that may be read in a sense that he was not compelled to do anything in the way of giving a certificate, because the sheep were lousy?—I think the Inspector must have been told that these sheep were lousy; he must have satisfied himself in some way as to that.

2302. He acknowledges as to that, but he says why withhold it from me while all the adjoining sheep are lousy?—I cannot say what reason the Inspector might have for withholding it. His flock may have been the last infected.

2303. How do you mean the last infected?—That he was exhibiting his sheep for their certificate, and the Inspector discovered that they were in that state.

2304. But he was clean as regards scab?—The sheep were lousy, and, according to that clause (68), he has to exercise all the powers under the Act as if they were infected with scab.

2305. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] You put a weapon into his hands which he can use against one and not against another, for you say he must use discretion in certain cases?—I think there are cases where a man must use his own judgment.

2306. *Hon. the Chairman.*] There were a considerable number of wild sheep in the bush?—There were.

2306A. And steps were taken in the summer-time to kill them off?—There were.

2307. Did they get rid of them entirely?—I do not know whether they have got rid of them. I know there is an account for a number of them being killed.

2308. What steps are taken to get rid of them?—There is a man who gets so much a head for all he can kill.

2309. How much?—Half-a-crown, or something about that, I think; I could not say unless I had the documents with me. I should not like to commit myself to say exactly how much.

2310. Are they left to catch them as they please?—No; there is only one man that is permitted to do it. He can only do it with the full consent of the neighbouring owners. He has dogs that can be depended upon. He alone is allowed to go out for this purpose.

2311. We have had evidence that some of the adjoining owners have fears that these sheep may be rushed into their flocks?—That might be so if any one but an expert were employed for this work. I should have an objection to any one being permitted to do it who was ignorant of the country.

2312. I want to know whether you gave instructions to the Inspector to see what work is done, that there might be no danger to neighbouring owners?—We have discussed the matter. I have spoken to the Inspector and also to the neighbouring owners, so that nothing of the kind could be done without their consent.

2313. How long do you think it will be before the Wellington District will be clean?—I hope it will be clean by the end of this year at the outside; at all events, I hope to see the greater part clean by that time. Whether there may not be any left on the verge of the bush country I cannot say. I hope to see the whole of the North Island clean very soon.

2314. Making application to have "separate" flocks on the same run—has that matter been brought under your notice: we have heard that runholders having several flocks divide their run in each case into two, three, or four sections, fenced off?—There is a provision in the Act to the effect that such flocks may be considered separate flocks, provided the premises are distinct—yards, and so on.

2315. When applications are made to the Inspector for this purpose, do such applications come before your notice, or are they left to the local Inspector?—I do not recollect a case in which that has been brought under my notice. I have heard of it, and I have been written to on the subject. The Inspector mentioned to me a case somewhat similar as having occurred—the Ica case—in which a whole station was owned by one owner; that owner cut it up into one, two, or three parts, and divided the responsibility with other people.

2316. *Mr. Walker.*] The 29th section is the one under which is taken the power to divide?—But the Act gives no such power. Actually, it says you shall not give a certificate. Doing so is simply to evade the Act.

2317. *Hon. the Chairman.*] It was stated that it came under the interpretation clause?—Where did it occur?

2318. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] In Wairarapa?—Will you say when?

*Hon. Captain Fraser:* The evidence is here.

*Mr. Walker:* The interpretation clause rather strengthens the clause in the Act.

2319. *Hon. the Chairman.*] With regard to these separate flocks, are you content with the fact that in some cases they are virtually allowed?—No.

2320. Then, you have not given your consent?—Never, to my knowledge; I might, in fact, say never.

2321. *Hon. Mr. Campbell.*] Have you given instructions to them not to do so?—I think I can say distinctly that I did to Mr. Drummond not very long ago.

2322. *Hon. the Chairman.*] In the Ica case you say that the run was cut up into parts and the flocks were separate: why was that?—It was done to hand over a portion to another owner.

2323. You mean that it was passed from one to another?—I instructed the Inspector to deal with it as one flock.

2324. Have you the power of deciding that, in acting in that way—that is to say, if a man divides his run and leases a portion of it to another person—can you say that there were not two runs, but that it was still the same run?—Unless he puts up separate wool-sheds, and that piece that he sells or leases is worked separately, unless he is separated by a sheep-proof fence, I think it would still be part of the run.

2325. What I want to come to is this: whether a person producing a lease or transfer of a portion of a run from another person, whether that compels you to treat that portion as a separate run and the sheep as a separate flock, or whether it is optional to treat it as a separate portion or