

1359. Do you think that the Act is clear and intelligible, and one that it is advisable should be put in full operation, so that thereby sheep should be cleaned?—The Act, if it is worked stringently and carried out in its integrity, is a very good Act, and will clean any district.

1360. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are of that opinion?—Yes; I should say so.

1361. Can you make any suggestion as to any amendment or alteration it would be desirable to propose?—No.

1362. Do you think there should be any alteration in the Act at all?—Not the slightest.

1363. From your knowledge of the Act, are you satisfied that it is quite sufficient to force people to clean their scabby sheep?—I consider it a very good Act, and that it does not require any amendment with regard to scab.

1364. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] Will you look at these suggested amendments from the District of North Wairarapa. It would require me to compare them with the Act before I could give any opinion upon them. My opinion is that there is not the slightest necessity for any amendment in the Act.

1365. What I wanted to elicit was, if you could see any tendency which would enable you to say that it would endanger the cleaning of flocks, or encourage non-cleaning in any particular direction, if the Act were altered: that would enable you to inform the Committee whether the alterations suggested would be an injury rather than otherwise?—If you once begin to amend or alter an Act you do not know where the change may end.

1366. I would ask you whether, in a different district in which there are numerous small flocks—in a case where scab is discovered and a slaughterhouse is near that place—would you not think it a benefit where sheep had not been driven through a clean country: would it not be an advantage, if the owner of these sheep wished to kill them, that they were properly dipped and taken to the slaughterhouse and killed?—It could not be done where there are large runs.

1367. You would leave it to the discretion of the Inspector?—It would be his duty to see that they were properly dipped, and that no danger could arise in driving to the slaughterhouse.

1368. My reason for asking the question is, that there is quite a different state of affairs with us from that which you refer to in large runs. In case of small owners it would be of advantage to them if it could be done. There are persons of opinion that it could be done, even with more safety to the public.

*Hon. Mr. Robinson:* The witness would understand the question better if the question were put in this form: Whether, if Mr. Boyne's sheep were to get scabbed, it would not be safer to take them to the slaughterhouse and slaughter them at once.

1369. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] Is it so?—There can be no difficulty about cleaning a small flock of sheep.

1370. But the sheep being fat, the owner would suffer: the question is whether the public safety would be endangered from driving these sheep when dipped to the slaughterhouse?—I am strongly of opinion that infected sheep should not be allowed to travel.

1371. Not from a place, say, within three miles distance?—No.

1372. Do you think they could leave any infection in being driven from the dip to the slaughterhouse?—Yes; it is very easy for them to leave infection, specially upon a road where they meet all sorts of conveyances.

1373. I could understand that where you have large flocks. I am asking your opinion?—My opinion is that it could not be done with safety.

1374. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Put some definite number, say the case of a flock of sheep numbering more than five hundred and less than five thousand?—

1375. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] With five thousand sheep the case would be different. It is only where the flocks are small that it could be adopted. Where the owner is agreeable that they should be killed the public would run less risk than they would from the attempt to clean them?—I am quite opposed to the removal of any infected sheep. I cannot see that they would be fit to slaughter after having been dipped.

*Hon. Mr. Williamson:* But they are slaughtered every day in the year with us. Every sheep is bound to be dipped when it arrives.

1376. *Captain Russell.*] You are opposed to any patent dips?—Yes; as far as infection from scab goes.

1377. You think none of them are efficient for the cure of scab?—None of them.

1378. Have you had any experience of Thomas's and Cooper's dips?—I have no experience. But some of the patent dips might perhaps be used for lice or ticks.

1379. Not for scab?—Certainly not.

1380. You say you have no experience?—No; I never saw Cooper's dip.

1381. Or Thomas's?—No.

1382. Do you think that lime and sulphur is the only specific?—It and tobacco and sulphur is the only reliable curative that I know.

1383. You could not say, from your own knowledge, whether any other dips would answer the same purpose?—No.

1384. You have never used them?—No.

1385. *Mr. Buchanan.*] It appears that in the Amuri infected district there are three flocks holding clean certificates, which have to come through fourteen other flocks before they get to the Government dip. Now, supposing any of these flocks infected when coming down to the Waiau, you would consider it necessary to dip them in lime and sulphur?—It is my opinion that, if they are not dipped in lime and sulphur, you might as well pass them over the boundary without dipping at all.

1386. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] Do you not think that the Inspector in charge should live in the neighbourhood, or at the station where there are infected sheep; if it were intended that the district should be cleaned, ought he not to reside in the neighbourhood?—Yes; I think he should.