

1717. When were they last gazetted as infected?—In May, 1883, the certificate was cancelled. The sheep were shorn three weeks. The brand had been shorn off. He (Drummond) wanted the brand renewed. Then he went to Masterton to lay an information. He (Drummond) stated to me what his case was. I told him the department would never allow such a case to be taken. Then subsequently, on the 11th February, he returned. On the 11th February he commenced to examine all the sheep. On the 15th February he gave a certificate. I asked Drummond how it was that he gave a certificate without compelling the letter S to be put on. He, said "I was advised to examine the sheep and take my action, if I found scab, against your brother for not branding his sheep."

1718. Legally he was bound to brand; but later he got the certificate. But the intention of the Act is that the S should be put only on those sheep that are actually diseased with scab. The introduction to the clause says that "scabby sheep are to be branded with the letter S." What is the meaning of "infected" sheep?—Sheep which may have become infected by interpretation of the Act, but which are not part of a diseased flock.

1719. Turn to the 8th interpretation clause, which says, "Any sheep which, having been infected within six months, shall be considered," &c.?—The inference I draw is that it does not follow that an infected sheep need be a scabby one.

1720. Were they on a run where other sheep were?—"Any sheep that have been within three months infected with scab, and are depastured on ground on which there have been scabby sheep," &c.?—Yes; but I do not think the intention of the Act was to apply that clause to sheep removed twenty or thirty miles away, and divided by a number of fences and wire netting.

1721. It appears to me that the intention of the Act is contrary to what you contend; but that will be a question for the Committee to consider. The Act appears to require that all sheep in the same holding, or that are worked from the same station, shall be considered infected sheep, even though they may be in paddocks miles away. They have to be treated in the same way—that is, there is no difference in regard to them from those which are actually scabby?—I contend that it should not be so. We have suggested an alteration in the Act as regards that—namely, that actually diseased sheep shall be branded with the letter S; that flocks shall be branded with the station-brand, and shall be kept branded; each flock should be branded differently.

*Hon. the Chairman:* That involves an alteration that will properly come under the notice of the Committee.

1722. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Have you another case?—Yes; when the certificate was given by the Inspector for the Riversdale sheep, on the 15th February, they were dipped. I and others interviewed Mr. Drummond as to simultaneous dipping; for all the sheep in our part of the infected district between Whareama and Kaihata Rivers, all south, were then clean. I asked the Inspector if he would interview the settlers and get them to have one simultaneous dip. He agreed to this, and saw my brother on the subject. At first my brother would not agree, because he had only recently dipped his sheep; but subsequently my brother agreed. My brother dipped as agreed; but some others down south would not do it; then there were people in the north who would not do it. There was an Inspector to see that every one did it. When my brother was dipping these sheep at the instance of Inspector Drummond for one simultaneous dip, he asked Inspector Valance to supervise the dipping of some fat sheep that he wanted to send to market. It was necessary the dipping should be supervised. He had then a certificate of two months and a week old. It was not necessary for him to dip at all. Inspector Valance saw them dipped. They were in a mob of four thousand. There was a day appointed when Inspector Valance was to come and give the necessary permission. He did not keep his appointment. They had but one day's journey before they could travel. My brother thought he would get the written permission on the road. They were travelling on the certificate. Information was laid against my brother, and he was fined £50. Mr. Wardell asked Inspector Drummond, in view of the fact that Mr. Valance had seen the sheep dipped, and that the sheep were being dipped at Drummond's instance for a simultaneous dipping, to withdraw the case. Drummond said he could not, and Mr. Wardell had to fine my brother £50, saying he had no option in the matter.

1723. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Under what section of the Act was that?—Under the 29th section.

1724. Was that on the ground that your brother had several flocks depasturing on the same run, one of which flocks was infected?—Yes; but nearly three months after being granted the certificate.

1725. The words of the clause, "unless with written permission of the Inspector, he shall be liable to a penalty"?—We thought that, having been dipped under supervision. He promised to come, but he did not come to give permission. I ought to have stated here that one of the reasons assigned for Valance not giving a permit under the 29th section was, that Drummond had not supplied him with a form signed in blank; another was, that they wished to trap my brother into a fine.

1726. Have you no remedy against the Inspector?—We have no remedy. We cannot get written communications from the Inspector. We have written a number of letters, but they will not reply to them. The Act requires them to send written communications, but they do not.

1727. What was the date of those proceedings you mention before Mr. Wardell?—I cannot give you the exact date; it would be about the end of last April.

1728. Is there any other case?—Yes; there is another: Mr. Harvey's case. Mr. Harvey purchased, through his agent, Mr. Bishop, in Hawke's Bay, sixty rams. Hawke's Bay is a clean district. They were driven to the boundary. They came through various subdivisions, until they got to the boundary of Wellington and Hawke's Bay. Seven days' notice was given to Mr. Drummond.

1729. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Seven days being the required time?—Yes; but Mr. Munro, who lives on the boundary, has charge of the boundary. He examined the sheep when they came to the boundary-gate. Mr. Harvey omitted to give the seven days' notice to Mr. Drummond. The