

1607. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What do you use for cleaning sheep?—I think the only thoroughly reliable dip known is lime and sulphur.

1608. That is your opinion?—Yes; that is my opinion.

1609. Would you consider any of these patent dips a guarantee against scab?—If there was disease.

1610. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] Suppose the disease were in an incipient state, as those were of which you speak?—I would not rely on anything but lime and sulphur.

1611. Certainly not on patent dips?—Certainly not; but I would use Little's or carbolic acid, in preference, to travel with.

1612. *Hon. the Chairman.*] In preference to lime and sulphur: why: would it be to prevent their contracting disease?—It is easier to wash out lime and sulphur than carbolic acid, which lasts for some time, if the wool is permitted to dry before being immersed in water (*i.e.*, a river).

1613. Is yours a very scabby district?—My property lies to the south of the Whareama River. I do not think there is any scab south of that river.

1614. Then, your opinion is that the Inspector ought to have no discretionary power in administering the Sheep Act?—I think he should.

1615. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] But you said he showed favouritism?—Yes.

1616. If a man has no discretionary power he cannot show favour?—Some of the sections are so impracticable and undesirable that if the Inspector were to put them in force he would ruin people, but he would not clean scab.

1617. The discretionary power it is which allows him to show favouritism: that is your complaint?—I cannot quite follow you.

1618. The Inspector could not show favour if an Act took away his discretionary power. He must then administer the Act. If he has discretionary power, he may make you dip twice, me once, and that gentleman opposite three times. If the Act were so drawn that the Inspector has no power?—By discretion I mean that he would not put into force an impracticable section of the Act, such as I have referred to. I said that it was impossible to herd sheep in some cases, and in such like cases an Inspector should have and use discretion.

1619. You say that he does not treat you as he does your neighbours: that he has used his discretion, and you complain of that?—When I say discretion, I mean that he would not attempt to put into force those sections of the Act that would be prejudicial to good effect being given to it.

1620. *Captain Russell.*] When you use the word "favouritism," do you use it in its corrupt sense?—Yes, I do.

1621. You speak of the patent dips, and think them unreliable: have you had any practical experience of many of these dips?—No; I have not had any practical experience recently, but some years ago I had some faith, and I tried Cooper's dip. But I have found them unreliable. My reason for giving this positive answer is that I know sheep subjected to Little's dip for lice in Hawke's Bay are found to be infected with lice notwithstanding.

1622. Do you not think the cause of failure is because of want of care in using them?—Not in this case. It was my son who bought sheep in Hawke's Bay. He made it a condition with settlers before giving delivery to have them dipped. He said that he saw the sheep, in one case in particular, thoroughly well dipped. On one of these sheep after ten days travelling lice were found.

1623. Is there not a difference between patent dips as great as the difference between Little's and lime and sulphur: Cooper's is a poisonous dip, and Little's is not?—I do not wish to be dogmatic; I merely wished to express an opinion.

1624. On what do you base your opinion?—Merely on hearsay: I have no practical experience.

1625. When that scabby sheep was dipped, or, say, previously to the finding of that scabby sheep which you mention, how long before since you had been clean: had you been cleaned for five years?—No; I think less than a year.

1626. Did you dip all your sheep, or only one flock?—Only one flock.

1627. Did you get a clean certificate with the one dipping?—No; I did not. As all my neighbours dipped at shearing, I also dipped my sheep off the shears (not till then); but my sheep were clean.

1628. You attribute favouritism to the Inspector?—I am referring to only one Inspector.

1629. Do the Inspectors go over the whole of each district, or has each a part to himself?—I believe the whole is under one Inspector, and under his direction.

1630. *Hon. the Chairman.*] With regard to stopping the sheep at the Ruamahunga bridge, did Mr. Orbell assign any reason for stopping the sheep?—My son will be able to tell you more about that.

1631. Will you be good enough to repeat the reason which Mr. Drummond stated why he would not give you a certificate under clause 29?—He said that, if he gave me a pass, Mr. Orbell would stop them when they got to his district.

1632. He assigned no other reason?—No.

1633. He did not assign the reason why Orbell should stop them?—No.

1634. *Mr. J. C. Buckland.*] Was this outside?—It was outside, near the boundary.

1635. Have the districts been altered since then?—Yes; that is, the boundary of the subdivision; not the district.

1636. Was Orbell's subdivision at that time a clean subdivision?—Yes; I believe it was.

1637. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Is there any rule with regard to removing sheep from one subdivision to another: is it necessary that, in coming from a clean to an infected subdivision, they should be dipped?—Not that I am aware of.

1638. Is the subdivision treated in the same way as the district is treated?—I think so.

1639. Then, in the case of districts, if you want to move sheep from one district to another, you have to dip: what I want to know is whether subdivisions are treated in the same way?—If you mean that they are subject to dip, or any particular restrictions, they are not.