

therefore it could not be scabby. But I never received a clean certificate for the run. I went to Napier, and bought sheep in Napier. I got a certificate for them. I brought them with me. The certificates were examined by Inspectors.

1669. As you passed over the boundary of Napier your certificate was examined?—That was considered sufficient by the Inspectors.

1670. You were allowed to pass through all subdivisions until you got to your run on the strength of that certificate?—Yes; in the same manner I got fifteen certificates.

1671. That is to say, you had fifteen lots of sheep brought on to this run?—Yes.

1672. In a similar manner?—Yes. Having so many certificates for sheep, I asked the Inspector, Mr. John Drummond, to take these certificates and to issue me a fresh one. I had no run certificate, as I have stated, but I had for sheep. Mr. Drummond examined the sheep in May last with the purpose of giving me a run certificate. He refused to give me the certificate, because he said the sheep were lousy. I then asked him to cancel the certificate I had, and to put them in the infected list. He said, "Will you dip them, and I will give you a certificate?" I said, "No; but if you will make every one else dip for lice I will do so." Drummond would not cancel my certificate on account of lice, because he would have to do the same for other people. That was fifteen months ago. I have repeatedly applied for a certificate by letter. I have applied to the department. The department wrote and told me that I must dip. I pointed out that every sheep in Wairarapa right through to Hawke's Bay was more or less in a lousy condition. The department declined to interfere with Mr. Drummond. They will not give me a certificate. He will not let my sheep go to market. He refuses to give me a certificate. There is nothing in the Act which compels him to give me a certificate. I think that if my sheep are not fit for a certificate the owners of other lousy sheep have no right to hold a certificate.

1673. How long ago do you say it is since Drummond refused to give you a certificate on account of lice being in your flock?—Fifteen months.

1674. What is the state of your flock now: is it entered in the infected list?—No.

1675. It stands, then, in rather a peculiar position, does it not?—Yes; a very peculiar position. I have certificates that embody forty thousand sheep, and I cannot take a mob of sheep away.

1676. Can you say what mob they belong to?—No; for the ear-marks vary.

1677. Do you own all those sheep now?—I have now only four thousand five hundred.

1678. What has become of the balance?—I have sold them.

1679. How did you manage to get them off the run?—I sold them on certificates which I got.

1680. From Hawke's Bay?—Yes.

1681. On the strength of those certificates, were the purchasers allowed to move the sheep?—Yes.

1682. Was there no objection to your being without the certificate of the Inspector of your district?—Mr. Orbell tried to obstruct them at the Ruamahunga River. He brought his man to prevent me driving over the bridge.

1683. On what grounds?—On three grounds; the first was that he had had no notice.

1684. Had you not sent notice?—No; I am not required to send notice under the Act. The Act requires the Inspector of the subdivision to do so.

1685. Then, this was a moving from subdivision to subdivision?—Yes.

1686. This was not going from one district to another?—No. He tried to treat the sheep as if they were going from one district into another.

1687. What is the clause of the Act?—No; it is under no clause of the Act. It is in the instructions to Inspectors, which directs that it shall be the duty of the Inspector to examine, and he shall then send notice of the "approach." I have the copy here, which I hand to the Chairman.

1688. Then, you say that it was no part of your duty to send the notice, but the duty of the Inspector of the next subdivision. What were the other objections?—The next was because the sheep had not the Government brand upon them.

1689. Why?—He said it was necessary.

1690. Why necessary?—I said it was not necessary. I said the Government brand only applied to sheep from port to port; that that was the shipping clause.

1691. And the third objection?—That was because the sheep had been certified by Mr. Pasley. It was on account of this obstruction that I applied again and again to Mr. Drummond, seeing that Mr. Orbell would not let the sheep go over.

1692. Let me understand you: the third objection was that the certificate was from Mr. Pasley, and not from the Inspector of the district?—Yes.

1693. Then, you think that the Act in that case was carried out improperly?—Yes, I do. I drove over. I would not stop. He called on me not to drive over, and tried to stop. I told my man to get a sheep and take it over, and if the Inspector put a hand on him I would try the case with him. The sheep passed over.

1694. Do you find fault with the Act itself or with the administration of it?—It is the way it is administered that I complain of.

1695. Do you wish to draw attention to any other case?—Yes; I wish to draw attention to two or three other cases. One is that of Mr. Dillon, who has two properties—one in Te Nui of about seventy acres, and one of about eight hundred acres farther back in the country. He purchased a number of clean sheep—sheep with a clean certificate.

1696. Where?—In Masterton. He then applied for a permit under the 46th section to be allowed to take these sheep through Johnson's Matikuna Run. He had to go through this run to get to his property: he could go no other way. The Inspector refused to give him a permit. He was obliged to hold these sheep on his seventy acres for two months alongside scabby sheep, because the Inspector would not give a permit for him to move his clean sheep under the 46th clause, thereby showing to my mind that, by holding these sheep alongside scabby sheep, when the