

1387. *Mr. Lance.*] Is it not a fact that there is an Inspector resident in the Kaikoura always?—Yes; there is an Inspector resident there.

1388. You say the Act itself does not require amendment, but has it been brought under your notice that, under the description of the word “run” in the interpretation clause, if the owner has one portion of his property infected with scab while the other portion is clean, can he, by transferring his interest in the infected portion to some other person, get the other portion declared clean, while the remainder is scabby: thus making two runs. That is actually the case of Mr. Ingles. There are wild sheep in the bush in his neighbourhood, and there is great difficulty in getting rid of them. His own sheep kept in paddocks are clean, but, apparently, to prevent danger from other neighbours, the run has been subdivided; but it is still under one management. It is supposed to consist of two runs, and upon that the return is made?—If two persons send in one return they are considered to have one run.

1389. *Hon. the Chairman.*] I would point to another case. In Mr. Gibson's property there are included three runs and a public reserve, all returned in one return. The sheep are able to move about from one run to the other. Now, taking these two cases into consideration, I should like your opinion as to the right construction of the Act?—With regard to Gibson's country, is it continuous?

1390. There are three runs and a public reserve held by him, which are all returned as one?—If it is one continuous country, although it may be three runs, you cannot prevent him driving his sheep there.

*Hon. Mr. Robinson:* I think this is what you mean: Suppose the same kind of change to be made in Gibson's case as is made by Ingles. Here would be three runs, and he would put into them three individuals. Then, at the same time, Gibson, if he became clean, would he be able to get his certificate?

1391. *Hon. the Chairman.*] We want to find out whether you consider that any alteration should be made in this respect, that is, according to the return made by an owner as to the land over which his sheep can travel. We have also had evidence in regard to a run through which goes a road for the purpose of driving. I want to know whether you consider this interpretation that has been put upon the clause is a fair interpretation, or whether it is at all stretched. Do you recognize it as the ordinary interpretation put on the clause?—Yes.

1392. On the other hand, he cuts up his run into different parts, and makes different returns for them: there may be a cluster of runs?—Adjoining?

1393. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] A portion of the same run?—In that case No. I should consider it the same. He has only put up a fence between them, and it is all one.

1394. *Hon. the Chairman.*] At the present moment Mr. Ingles is holding a run which has been, until within a few months, one run—under a certain management—still under the same management. He has divided it into two runs—one clean, the other scabby?—I think it is contrary to the spirit of the Act. If they join, he cannot get a certificate.

*Hon. Mr. Williamson:* I think the run is under one management.

1395. *Hon. Mr. Robinson:* But supposing them to be one run. Suppose, then, he divides into two, and sells one?—Then he changes the position; there ceases to be a common centre.

1396. Would you give a certificate if he divides?—It is no longer his property, having sold it.

*Hon. Mr. Robinson:* It is no longer his property, but the sheep are the same, although another person has got it.

1398. *Hon. the Chairman.*] It is according to the return made by the sheepowner. Some persons have two or three different runs, but they make only one return?—You perceive that, when they become the property of different owners, they do not go to the one centre.

1399. Are there any points to which I have omitted to draw your attention, and to which you would like to refer?—No.

1400. Have you any evidence to give with respect to rabbits?—No.

1401. *Mr. Buchanan.*] You are of opinion that the Act as it stands is quite sufficient?—Quite.

1402. I would put such a case as this: it is one just bearing on the question that the Chairman has been asking you: There is a group of runs numbering, we will say, from one to twenty. We will say that number ten happens to be scabby; number eighteen holds a clean certificate

*Witness:* Are they the property of one person?

1403. *Mr. Buchanan:* No, they are the property of several. Look at this sketch; number ten goes scabby, and loses his certificate. In consequence of that, you declare this an infected district. Number eighteen, holding a clean certificate, can he go to market after dipping twice, although only a fence separates the clean run from the scabby one? The whole of this block, I suppose, is a single station belonging to one man. Now, we will suppose the block is divided into fifty well-fenced paddocks. Scab breaks out in half a dozen flocks, between these and where fattening sheep are kept?—You cannot stop number eighteen from sending his sheep to market if he is clean.

1404. But this man is completely tied up. Do you not think the Act requires some amendment so as to relax in a case of this kind. I may, however, state that this is wholly an imaginary case?—The man cannot take his sheep away if he is on one continuous country. In that case the whole of the sheep are infected according to the Act.

1405. Notwithstanding eight or ten first-class fences?—One man is supposed to bring the whole of his sheep to one centre; when they get into different hands each man has his own shed and his own centre.

1406. I do not wish to elaborate. I wish to put the simple question whether you would not suggest amendments which would give the Chief Inspector discretionary powers, so as to allow such an administration of the Act as would save a person so situated against a loss of several thousand pounds?—I am not sure that I follow you. I think the Act a very good Act, and I do not see the necessity for any alteration.