97 I.—5.

as a part of the whole run?—If he has all the conditions of working that place separate—everything being separate, yards and so on-I do not see how the Inspector can do otherwise than treat it as

2326. If it is not necessary to have a shearing-place, it seems to me that it amounts to this: that he can exercise discretion of that description in this case of the Ica?—I do not see how it can be

separated from the run in that case; I cannot see it at all.

2327. Do you know anything about the outbreak of scab on the Mataikuna Run?—Very little. 2327A. We have heard this stated here: that a portion of a flock of about fifteen hundred, called the "river flock," was infected; that the owner did not give notice to the adjoining flockmaster that he had scab in that flock; consequently, that this flockmaster was not put on his guard, and did not take all the precautions that he would otherwise have done. His land joins a portion of the Mataikuna Run, but not that portion in which that scabby flock was. The Mataikuna sheep not being branded with the letter S, one of these sheep got in among the sheep of this adjoining owner and scabbed his sheep. He had to give information that he could not clean within the specified time. He was summoned, and had to pay a fine of 6d. a head for his sheep. The charge against him was failing to clean his sheep within the prescribed time. He contended that, one flock being infected, the whole run should have been declared infected. This was only the other day?—The Mataikuna original outbreak must have occurred before that.

2328. That has not been drawn under your attention?—It has been held, I think by the Crown Law Officer, that the Inspector has power to declare whether sheep going and mixing with S-branded sheep, but not scabby, shall be proclaimed infected. The "mixing" shall determine

whether the sheep in question should be declared infected or not.

2329. Hon. Captain Fraser.] Where is that?
2330. Hon. Mr. Campbell.] I should very much like to see it?—That was the opinion of the Law Officer of the Crown. I will send for it. It can be had in a very short time.
2331. Hon. the Chairman.] I gather, from what you have said about separate flocks, that you would hardly have considered this one of the Mataikuna Run a separate flock?—I should not think so.

2332. Suppose the case stated was correct, was there something wrong in the circumstance that fifteen hundred sheep, among which scab existed, were the only sheep on the run not marked with S?—There should be something requiring explanation there.

2333. If that was correct it should have been communicated?—Yes.

2334. I asked you whether your attention was drawn to that?—No.

2335. Has your attention been called to the case referred to in this petition of Mr. Edwin Meredith to His Excellency the Governor?—I have no recollection of it; anything brought to my notice would be found referred to in my own handwriting, with my own opinion upon it.

2336. The petition is for the remission of a fine of £50, which was inflicted on Mr. Meredith for driving sheep without a certificate. He says the Inspector had been requested to be present to see the sheep dipped, and to give a permit for travelling. It was stated that the Inspector promised to give the certificate, or rather the permit for travelling, but he witheld or postponed giving it because the number of sheep from those runs had not been made out. He was to have called and given the permit, but he did not call and he did not give the permit. When the sheep were moved the man was proceeded against and fined?—I have not heard all the particulars, but I have heard something about it. I think he denies about the appointment.

2337. He did not attend to see the dipping?—Yes; but the second appointment was not

demanded.

2338. The only reason he did not give a permit was that some of the sheep were not going; all had to be put on the same footing. I am asking these questions to see how far the matter was brought under your notice?—If I happened to be in Wellington it might be referred to me. These matters are generally referred to me, but not invariably.

2339. Now, with regard to the Marlborough District, there has been a large increase of scab in that district?—No, not a large increase; some time ago there was an outbreak through wild sheep

being driven in upon them.

2340. The district has been infected for many years, has it not?—Yes.

2341. Are you satisfied that the Act has been carried out there in a proper manner?—No. 2342. In what way?—I think I have documentary evidence to prove what I state. When the first suspension clause ceased, then was the time to insist on fines, instead of extending the time any It was then suggested by men who had not received clean certificates that certain stations should be picked out as being the ones to which further extension of time should be allowed. was requested to do so, being in charge of the district. I condemned any such arrangement. this could not be done, further extension of time was given: I think it was nine months. That was where the first mistake was made in carrying out the Act.

2343. Who was the author of that mistake?—I was only Chief Inspector of Marlborough. My Fetter on the subject is, I think, before the Committee.

2344. Hon. Mr. Waterhouse.] You refer to the extension of nine months given by the Legis-

lature?-Yes.

2345. What was the period of two years, during which it was suspended, allowed for?—When I was moved to Marlborough—that was in 1879—there were, I think, a million of sheep on the infected list. Previously to my taking charge the two years' extension had been granted. It was a part of the Act that such concession should be made to Marlborough.

2346. When did you go to Marlborough?—I arrived there in the latter end of November or the

beginning of December, 1879.

2347. Then, about twelve months of the two years had elapsed?—The letter to which I refer will show the exact date. I found that the Amuri was being worked with all the clauses in full force; no fencing existing on the greater portion of the Amuri County. The boundaries were