

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

DEAR SIR,—

Te Rangituman, Masterton, 22nd September, 1884.

I am sorry I am unable to attend before the Joint Sheep and Rabbit Committee on the 24th instant. As it was uncertain if I could attend or not, I did not answer your telegram ere this.

I should be sorry if any action of the House should in any way prevent the speedy extermination of scab in the Wairarapa, or should in any way allow sheep to be moved where there is the least risk of their spreading scab. The present Act is hardly strict enough in this, as only two years since scab was brought to the racecourse here, where it remained undiscovered for months. I feel sure that some settlers will not exterminate it until they feel the pecuniary loss entailed by harbouring it.

With respect to rabbits, I feel sure the only way to cope with them is their natural enemies, particularly the stoat. I have had many years' experience with rabbits in England, and have not known an estate in England, where the natural enemies have had free run, where the rabbits have increased to do damage. On the other hand, where game is preserved, and stoats, weasels, and cats are destroyed, I hardly know an estate where rabbits do not do damage, in spite of all efforts to keep them down.

There is a tendency in this district to limit owners or occupiers to certain means of destroying rabbits. This, I think, would be a mistake. Every man should be allowed to use any means in his power, on his own land, to destroy them; but should be compelled to keep them down. And, I think, a rabbit-proof fence should be a legal fence under the Fencing Act, either wire 3ft. high, 1½ mesh, or slabs not less than 4ft. in each case, let into the ground 6 inches.

G. Randall Johnson, Esq., Wellington.

I have, &c.,

JAMES STUCKEY.

APPENDIX B.

DEAR SIR,—

Wellington, 26th September, 1884.

As I am obliged to return to-day, and as I ascertain that the time of your Committee will be fully occupied, I have written out the evidence I wish to have given, and trust that the same will be accepted, in lieu of my giving it in person.

The nature of my case is reported in the *Wairarapa Star* of the 22nd June, 1884. I was summoned by Inspector Drummond for driving fourteen sheep. The case was given in my favour, and I think it should have rested with the decision of the Court.

Inspector Drummond has appealed. I think it very hard that I should be subject to the annoyance, loss of time, and expense of defending another action.

It costs the Inspector nothing, while indirectly I find the money to prosecute myself.

It would be better for me to pay the fine he wishes to abstract from me, for I am not a wealthy man, and I cannot afford to follow the case into every Court at the whim of the Inspector. If the Inspectors had to pay their own costs they would not appeal.

I would draw your attention to another case of the same nature—Inspector Richardson *versus* E. Barber; the defendant's costs in this appeal was £40, the fine £10.

Inspectors do not carry out the instructions of the Act as regards "Conduct to owners." (See page 74.)

Feeling, now, that my case will receive consideration at your hands,

The Hon. Randall Johnson.

I have, &c.,

JOHN CROSS.

APPENDIX C.

AMENDMENTS proposed to be made in "The Sheep Act, 1878," suggested by a Committee of Sheep-owners in the Wairarapa North Subdivision.

Interpretation Clauses: Word "run" to be expunged. "Flock" to mean and include any sheep such as the owner shall be in the habit of having shepherded in one flock, or depasturing in one paddock or enclosure, and separated from other sheep by a sheep-proof fence or secure natural boundary. "Infected sheep," definition same as in Act of 1878, except subsection (4) of section 5 of interpretation clause. "Infected flock" to mean any flock in which there are, and have been within three months, any infected sheep.

Section 13, Act 1878, to be amended by the addition of words, "by the usual means in use by the owner or person in charge."

Section 20, Act 1878—Proposed Amendment: The Chief Inspector shall register a distinctive colour, with which all infected sheep shall be branded. If any person shall, without authority, use any such colour to brand sheep, he shall be liable to a penalty of ———.

Section 25, Act 1878—Proposed Amendment: Every owner of any infected sheep shall, as soon as practicable, cause the same to be distinctly wool-branded on the back with the colour registered by the Chief Inspector for that purpose, and such colour shall from time to time be renewed as occasion shall require, so that the same shall be distinctly recognizable.

New Clause suggested: When any owner of sheep shall have several flocks depasturing upon any run or upon any adjoining run, and only one of such flocks is infected, he shall have power to call upon the Inspector to examine any other flock or flocks in his possession for the purpose of obtaining a permit for removal of such sheep; and, if upon such inspection, no infection shall be found in the other flock or flocks, the Inspector shall grant such permit: Provided, however, it shall be lawful for the Inspector, if he sees fit, to require the owner to dip all sheep he desires to remove.