

1752. Then, dividing his one run into different runs enabled him to treat them as separate properties?—Yes; they had all that was necessary: they had separate yards, separate dip, and separate house.

1753. Is there anything else that you would suggest?—I would propose that the Fencing Act should be worked with this Act: that we should know what constitutes a sheep-proof fence. It is always left to the opinion of the Inspector. I think that an eight-wire fence, with posts 9ft. a part, should be constituted a sheep-proof fence.

1754. Seven wires are used now?—If a man should put a wire fence round every block in compliance with a Fencing Act, that fence being the same in every respect as that provided by Fencing Act; if that man keeps his sheep separate he should have a separate certificate for every flock: let him have the necessary yards and dip; if all his sheep are clean he can keep them on his run, if they are infected let him keep them divided. It should be insisted that there should be a separate brand, so that there should be no mixing of the flocks. That is what settlers are now doing. They are beginning to work their runs separately. That the Inspectors have acknowledged to be sufficient, and it should not be necessary to have two leases.

1755. *Mr. Lance.*] In our parts we never use wooden standards: which would you recommend, wood or iron?—Iron and wood.

1756. *Mr. Buchanan.*] I should like to put a question or two, under the 46th clause, relating to the case of Mr. Dillon: What was the class of sheep which Mr. Dillon purchased?—Merino ewes.

1757. Were they old sheep?—I believe they were.

1758. Do you know whether the place—this eight hundred acres of back country—was fenced?—I cannot say that; I believe not.

1759. You say he drove them to Te Nui?—Yes; he was compelled to keep his sheep there.

1760. In what sense; because they were old sheep?—I cannot say because they were old sheep.

1761. Was he free to drive them back to Masterton if he chose?—I believe so.

1762. These sheep being old ewes, do you think it was possible to keep them without straying over the adjoining country?—I think almost impossible. I think it was undesirable to have kept them for two months alongside scabby sheep. I think they should have gone through. It was better to have let them go through, being perfectly clean, than holding them in that position for two months and then letting them go.

1763. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that it was, in Mr. Drummond's opinion, the danger of these old ewes getting infected and carrying scab about the country that led to his detaining them?—I do; but the risk must have been intensified a thousandfold by holding them against scabby sheep for two months; and, by Matikuna getting its certificate, Drummond lost his power over clause 46.

1764. Is there not considerable damage arising from sheep straying on to Government lands?—Yes. I think the Government ought to take steps to prevent sheep straying on to scabby Government land.

1765. Where is this land?—Near Puketoe. I think the Government ought to take steps to buy those sheep that are surrounded by scabby Crown-lands sheep, and have them all destroyed. In Mr. Leverton's case he has about two thousand. He is employed by Government in killing wild sheep. While he is doing that he drives many on to his own run. He is not able to get all his sheep in. He is breeding sheep that go wild, and then killing them at 5s. a head for the Government.

Mr. JACKSON, examined.

1766. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you anything to say with respect to scab in sheep?—I have been looking through the Scab Act. I have no scab in my sheep. I have only dipped for ticks and lice; but I think that some one or two of the sections might be altered with advantage. I refer particularly to the section where there is an infliction of the penalty of 3d. a head. That is too much in a rough country. I think it ought to be a 1d. instead.

1767. *Hon. Mr. Robinson.*] You have no experience of scab yourself. Have you neighbours that have had scabby sheep?—I have never been scabby myself. I only look at the practical thing which a man can do. I think it is a great injury to the great majority of settlers that stoats, weasels, and ferrets should be turned out to destroy one industry for the sake of pampering another. I am speaking as a sheep-farmer. You have no right to turn such animals out unless you can keep them on your own land. There are several places where the settlers have had all their poultry destroyed by ferrets—sometimes in one night.

*Hon. the Chairman:* We can understand and sympathize with those settlers; but we are considering a different matter. We are now considering the Sheep Act.

1668. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Do you know of ferrets having killed lambs?—In a letter written by a friend of mine (Mr. Bennett) he said that he had nineteen motherless lambs, and a bitch ferret got in one night and killed eight.

1769. Who told you this?—My neighbour told me.

*Mr. Dodson:* No doubt he heard it.

1770. *Captain Fraser.*] You never saw a ferret kill a lamb?—I never saw a ferret kill a lamb; but Mr. Bennett told me it was a fact.

*Mr. Buchanan:* This phase of the question has been brought out only to a very little extent before the Committee. It is a serious aspect of the whole subject. I think we ought to get all the information on this view of it that is possible.

*Hon. Captain Fraser:* We have it in evidence that the ferret has never been known to touch a lamb, and they are employed in all parts of Marlborough.

1771. *Hon. the Chairman.*] I shall ask the witness one or two more questions: Do you find any difficulty in catching these ferrets when they come on to your ground?—No.