

dipped, generally under the supervision of an Inspector. Seldom is there a failure of cure in small lots.

1836. Are they ever allowed to be moved to sell?—No, never to sell them. The butchers would not buy, as they would be afraid of their trade being injured. We would not give them permission to be taken to the saleyards.

1837. Then, there is a good deal of bush land?—Yes, there is in the neighbourhood of one flock in the Marsden Subdivision.

1838. Is it to that, do you think, that the continuance of scab is due: but let me first ask you whether the Inspector allows the owners of these scabby sheep to be outside fences?—I think not; I think that the law is strictly enforced in that respect; but with these small owners in a rough country they will not give notice to the Inspector. They would rather run the risk of prosecution than give notice and put themselves into the hands of the Inspector.

1839. Have you had many prosecutions?—Not more than three or four.

1840. Have you succeeded in convicting?—Yes; I was up in Marsden, and found upon a road some half-dozen sheep diseased; they were branded; the owner was fined.

1841. Were there any fines remitted?—A year ago I had some cases for not giving notice. Four were convicted and fined £10. One-half of the penalty was remitted on my recommendation, because these persons were wholly ignorant of the nature of the disease or the proceedings.

1842. In what subdivision was that?—In the Auckland Subdivision.

1843. What staff have you?—I have an assistant in each subdivision. There are two Inspectors, myself and an assistant, in the Auckland Subdivision.

1844. Do they make periodical visits, and qualify themselves with the necessary knowledge to tell the state of the flocks?—Yes; to a certain extent. In Marsden and Auckland they require to be constantly on their guard.

1845. You state that some persons whom you prosecuted and convicted were ignorant of scab: does it not follow from that that the Inspectors should constantly keep their eyes on these flocks?—Certainly, they should do so. But the working of these small flocks takes a great deal of time. A man may be running from one to the other without doing any good. When there is anything suspicious, the Chief Inspector instructs a man to go to the place. Among these small farmers there is a great indisposition to disclose the real case to the Inspector. They prefer to take themselves the chance of curing.

1846. Have you ever given instructions to the Inspector to proceed?—Yes; in every case where scab has been discovered, and notice has not been given by the owners themselves or through their servants.

1847. How long has scab been in the district?—It has been in the district for fifteen or sixteen years. It has broken out repeatedly from various causes which we cannot tell. There was one flock of eight ewes; there was a ram running with them; the ram has been destroyed. In this case the owner of the eight ewes bought the ram five months before, and put him in with the ewes, which were clean; there was not a spot on the ewes, but the disease was all down the back of the ram.

1848. The ram was scabby when he was put in?—It was purchased before any scab was discovered in the rest of the flock.

1849. Is there any inspection of sheep before they are moved?—Not if they are clean. These were not in the infected list, and were considered clean.

1850. Did they not have a certificate?—We do not give clean certificates for sheep upon farms; when sheep are condemned for scab they are put on the infected list.

1851. Is it not customary to give a clean certificate when they are moved?—To drive them from one subdivision to any other does not require a permit; you cannot compel them to have a permit.

1852. This is an infected district, is it not?—Yes.

1853. Does not the Act provide for that in an infected district?—No; there is nothing whatever in it. You could not prosecute a man for not having a permit between the North Cape and the Hawke's Bay boundary: being within the one district he may drive them where he pleases; but, if he has to put sheep across an infected run, then he is obliged to have an Inspector there to dress them.

1854. Is there no danger in passing clean sheep through an infected district?—Roads are frequently a great source of scab. I have seen clean sheep pass within a hundred yards of scab, but nothing could be said to the owner of the clean sheep.

1855. What would you suggest as a remedy for this evil?—When sheep have been condemned, or where it is known that there is scab in a flock, the Inspector might have power to cause them to be dipped three times, if necessary. After that he might have permission to let them go, instead of keeping them back for three months. The owners of these small flocks have a great fear of putting them under the surveillance of the department.

1856. You mean that they are afraid to give intelligence when scab breaks out?—Yes; they would rather try to cure it themselves.

1857. Then, do they set to work and dip for scab themselves?—Yes; they dip, but they do not cure.

1858. Without giving notice?—Yes.

1859. Is not that a provision of the Act that notice should be given, which should be enforced?—Yes, if it is known; but it is not known until afterwards. No proceedings can be taken after six months. A man might tell what he had done seven months before, and the Inspector would have no power to take legal steps against him.

1860. Do you know Mr. Bainbridge's sheep?—Yes; very well.

1861. Had he scabby sheep?—Yes; it was from his flock that the ram went to the eight ewes.

1862. There has been evidence given here of a case where, about seven years ago, some scabby