

property or other property: if you proposed to remove such a man as that for some cause or other, would you not run the risk of losing a thoroughly good man, because if he removed he would have to sell off his property?—Of course you might run that risk.

2621. So that really this periodical removal would have to be very carefully exercised?—Very carefully.

2622. The Chairman put a question to you with regard to Mr. Bayly's visit to another district in connection with Mr. Sutton's inspectorship?—Yes.

2623. Are you aware that one or more public meetings had taken place in the district, at which bitter complaints were made of the state of scab in the district?—Yes; I am aware that there was one meeting, at any rate. I can remember it quite well.

2624. Were other general complaints made, in addition to those emanating from this meeting, as to the existence of scab in the district?—I think there was, if I remember rightly.

2625. Do you know that it was urged that Mr. Bayly, owing to the general dissatisfaction, should personally visit the district and see as to the state of affairs?—Yes; I think I said so.

2626. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] Do you not think, when the removal of an Inspector is necessary, that the removal should be from the employment altogether?—My own feeling in the matter is that the only case in which removal is required is where a man is not doing his duty, and my own opinion is that if he is not doing it in one district he will not do it in another.

2626A. I would ask you whether removal from the employment altogether would not be the most effectual?—In many cases it would, but I do not think that would apply to all cases.

2627. Do you know why Mr. Orbell was removed from Poverty Bay?—Yes; because a better man was required in Wairarapa.

2628. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Was he not removed to Nelson?—Yes; I should have said Nelson. He was removed to Nelson, and then he was sent to Wairarapa.

2629. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] Why remove an Inspector at the expense of the colony?—If a man is doing his duty where he is, I should not remove him at the expense of the colony unless he is wanted elsewhere.

2630. *Hon. the Chairman.*] If you do not remove him at all there is no prospect of promotion?—No.

2631. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] If he is not doing his duty he should be removed altogether?—I do not intend to say that an Inspector should be removed from one district to another because he is not doing his duty, but when I thought it would be for the benefit of the service that he should be removed. It frequently happens that he forms acquaintanceships, and it is better for himself and for the service that he should be removed.

2622. *Hon. the Chairman.*] It has been recommended here that fines inflicted under these Acts should be remitted only on petition to the House of Representatives: do you think there is any objection to that, or would you recommend it?—No; I see no objection to it: but what is to be done in the meantime? Suppose a man is fined immediately after the session, and six or eight months elapse before the next session comes, would you take his money from him, or would you take a bond from him to abide by the decision of the House?

WEDNESDAY, 1ST OCTOBER, 1884.

Mr. BAYLY, examination continued.

2633. *Hon. the Chairman.*] I asked you yesterday about sheep in the Marlborough District?—Yes; you asked me why a certain clause in the Act was not put in operation.

2634. What clause was that?—The 66th clause.

2635. In respect of the Marlborough District, is there any instance in which you have prevented the Inspectors laying information where there has been a breach of the Act?—None that I am aware of. The extent to which I have gone has been in withdrawing the information in one case.

2636. What case was that?—That was the case of McRae's. There were some rams running with his flock. He was fined between £200 and £300. There was another case brought against him, and in this I allowed the information to be withdrawn.

2637. What was your ground?—On the ground that this was a very small case to bring on when he had been convicted in a very heavy penalty.

2638. Do you know of no other instance in which the proceedings were withdrawn?—No; I know of no other case where they have been withdrawn under the same circumstances.

2639. Have you instructed the Inspectors to proceed wherever breaches of the Act occurred?—There was that one case of Mr. McRae's, in which I may say I convicted myself out of my own mouth, and for which I am responsible. The act unwittingly occurred. There was another station adjoining him; they had put their rams to their ewes. It was reported to me by Mr. Cook, never dreaming but what these sheep would be clean within three months. It slipped my memory. That is the only case in which I know of during my course where I omitted to carry out the Act.

2640. Whose sheep were they?—Mr. Richmond's, the Upton Downs. As Sheep Inspector of Marlborough, and so long as I held that position, I held myself accountable. I may also be allowed to make a statement: As far as these Upton Downs sheep are concerned they are placed in a peculiar position. They are bounded by scabby sheep, namely, wild sheep. There was nothing to prevent him bringing in foreign sheep. I never dreamed but that they would be clean within three months, and there would be an end of the matter. Although I had no doubt they would be clean they were still scabby at the end of six months.

2641. You say that the owners of this run could have brought in other sheep in place of lambs, and therefore kept up his number—in one case he would have to buy sheep, in the other case he would be breeding them—there is a difference. Would not the proper course be to enforce this Act, and to recommend that it should be amended so that they could not bring other sheep into scabby