

1948. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] Sheep from the West Coast are driven four miles before they get to the dip; if they have scab they leave it on the road?—Yes.

1949. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Is not Taranaki a clean district?—Yes, I believe the sheep are clean there; but sheep come by rail to Waitara, where they are shipped to the Manukau. I think the Inspector of the subdivision which the sheep leave should give the certificate. The owner might not be able to make any declaration. The Inspector of the Hawera District should take the declaration of the owner.

1950. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] If it is necessary to dip sheep coming from any place, should not the dip be near where the sheep are landed: if they landed at Onehunga, and require dipping, the dip should be there?—Yes; it would be convenient.

1951. Where is the Government dip?—Two and a half miles from Auckland, and four miles from Onehunga.

1952. Should there not be a dip for each port—one at Onehunga as well?—Yes.

Mr. BELLIS, examined.

1953. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Where do you live?—At Te Nui.

1954. You wish to draw the attention of this Committee to some circumstances in the working of the Sheep Act: will you state what they are to the Committee?—What I complain of is this: In August, 1882, scab was declared to be in the river paddocks of the Mataikuna Run. The Mataikuna adjoins my property. I never received any notice of scab being there; but in April, 1883, Inspector Drummond found a strange sheep in one of my paddocks with a spot of scab, the same sheep belonging to the Mataikuna flock. Had I received notice that these sheep were infected I would have been prepared when the disease appeared among mine. I had called Inspector Drummond's attention to the Mataikuna Run, and considered that he ought to be there at the time they got their sheep in. But he declined to go, as he had not received instructions.

1955. Do you mean that he had not information that scab was in the flock?—I do not know; scab was in a portion of the flock.

1956. Was it not his duty to go?—I considered that it was his duty. I had no scab in my sheep for seven years. When he did inspect it was found to be a strange sheep belonging to an adjoining run, and not one of mine. I thought it his duty to go there, as their certificate was not cancelled, only for some portion of their flock. The reason that I called attention to the Mataikuna flocks was because they were mustering over my boundary. I do not believe they were inspected until after they were dipped. There were about fifteen hundred on the Mataikuna on the other side of the run from me, but the remaining part of the flock was not under the Act. When any sheep on a run is scabby the whole of the flock is declared to be infected.

1957. Then, the other sheep were not, as required to be by the Act, marked with S?—No; under the Act they were supposed to be branded, but they were not branded.

1958. Did you call the attention of the Inspector to that?—I called his attention at the time they were mustering. I said he ought to be there. The answer he gave me was that he had not received instructions.

1959. Was this scabby sheep which you found among yours branded with S?—No.

1960. Where could it have come from; from the scabby portion of the flock? Are they outside?—I contend that the whole flock must have been scabby. It must have gone through the scabby flock; it was not branded with S.

1961. Then, you say the Inspector, when he saw that sheep, must have known that it came direct from that flock on the Mataikuna Run, which was known to be scabby?—Decidedly.

1962. Did he take any steps to compel those other sheep to be mustered and branded for scab?—None whatever.

1963. You wish to draw attention to this case as an example of want of proper action on the part of the Inspector?—Yes; he refused to go. Some time after these sheep were inspected, and there was nothing found.

1964. Do I understand you to say that they picked out the scabby sheep before he went there?—I thought it his duty, when he knew the sheep were going to the yard, to be there.

1965. These sheep being mustered on your boundary: was this portion of the flock not branded with S supposed not to be scabby?—Yes.

1966. Anything further?—Yes; the Inspector, at the time he found that sheep among mine, failed to find out where it sprang from. He did not know whether it came from Mataikuna or from Castlepoint.

1967. *Hon. Mr. Waterhouse.*] Was there no ear-mark?—I did not see. The scabby sheep that came among my sheep belonged to the Mataikuna. All these runs adjoining mine are large properties, comprising each from twenty to thirty thousand sheep. I think it was his duty to have called upon all these to muster their sheep. I think the spread of scab in the district was caused by this neglect.

1968. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What date was this?—Between August, 1882, and April, 1883. On account of that neglect I consider that I was a great sufferer. I was pulled up to Court and was fined 6d. a head. I applied for an adjournment of the case, but, by some means or other, the business was delayed.

1969. What was the information laid against you?—Failing to clean within nine months. The scab broke out in my flock in April. It was found that I got the material for dipping. I got tanks and other dipping material; in fact, I got everything necessary within the month. Then the bad weather set in. I suppose I was six weeks getting through one thousand sheep. I dipped three times. I intended to have got shorn. He asked me to get them shorn.

1970. Is your land fenced?—I fenced all about; a portion of it is very rough.

1971. You ought to have had no difficulty in mustering?—Portion of it is very rough indeed,

1972. Within the fence?—Yes.