

2133. You supervised some dipping after shearing?—Yes.

2134. Did you give a certificate then?—No.

2135. He asked you to give a certificate?—I have no recollection of it.

2136. He states that you refused to give a certificate until three months after dipping, but you promised to go over and examine the sheep on the 21st January, 1884?—I have no recollection whatever of that.

2137. Did you go there on the 26th January?—I have been there a number of times.

2138. Do you recollect examining two thousand sheep there, and not being able to find any scab?—No; I think that when I examined the sheep at Riversdale I went through the whole of them both times.

2139. The statement is this: that, when you had gone through two thousand and could find no scab, you ordered him to brand these two thousand with the letter S. He declined on the ground that it was not fair, because the whole flock was clean; and he refused to brand them unless some were found scabby among the remainder of the flock. You threatened to summon him, he says; and then, on the 15th February, you returned and examined the sheep, but did not find any scab, and you granted a certificate?—I think it was that date; but I believe the two thousand sheep were at Waironga.

2140. He states it was Riversdale, but there is so much confusion about the flocks that it is difficult to ascertain what are the facts. I merely draw your attention to the statement, because there was an expression of opinion that as one side had been stated the other side should be heard. Mr. Meredith complained that, although you could not find scab in the flock, you refused to give a clean certificate: that refers to Beaumaris; that is another flock?—Yes; that is R. R. Meredith's.

2141. Was that so?—I examined the sheep twelve months ago last winter. I found them lousy. He did ask me for a clean certificate. I said, "How can I give you a clean certificate when your sheep are infected with lice? You dip them and I will give it." The sheep were then under Mr. Sutton's charge. I said, "I do not think I can give it to you without Mr. Sutton's authority; I will not do so, at any rate."

2142. Then, you are not responsible?—I was not responsible when I inspected the sheep of R. R. Meredith.

2143. Did you declare that the sheep were not clean and put them into the *Gazette*?—No.

2144. Then, if the sheep were scabby you would have declared them so?—Certainly; and given him an order to clean them. I would not declare them infected. Mr. Sutton, then being in charge, would give notice in the paper.

2145. Then, you left them in that position: they were neither clean nor were they scabby?—No; he held a clean certificate.

2146. Then, why did he ask for a clean certificate?—Because he wanted a fresh one. He tells me he has fifteen certificates altogether.

2147. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Some from Hawke's Bay?—Yes; he is always selling.

2148. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Do you think it was right to withhold the certificate because you did not consider the flock clean, and yet not declare it infected?—Well, there is so much lice about, and he promised to give them a dipping.

2149. Was this the only lousy flock in the neighbourhood?—No; I am sorry to say most of the Wairarapa flocks are lousy.

2150. Do you treat them all in the same way?—Yes; I told them to dip the sheep. It was in the winter-time, and Mr. Meredith promised to have a dip put up. He has not done so to this day.

2151. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Although he is alongside a scabby run?—Yes.

2152. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you not compelled him to dip?—No; because his sheep have not been infected with scab for some three or four years. It was on the infected list when Mr. Sutton took charge.

2153. It is beyond my comprehension; it is a mixed-up affair?—Yes; it puzzles me.

2154. What I wanted to know is this: In carrying out the Act, do you enforce the law in every way the same in respect to every one?—I do. If I saw a man with infected sheep, and he would not take steps to clean them, I should certainly be inclined to go for him.

2155. Have you, for instance, in any case not laid an information when you knew of a breach of the Act?—I do not know that I have, if I knew that I had a good case. I certainly have seen some doubtful ones, that I could not prove.

2156. You spoke of Mr. Sutton having given evidence to show that this flock—Waironga, I think it was—was a separate flock, and was so treated, and so you lost your case?—Yes.

2157. Take the Ica Run, how does that stand?—They want to make out separate flocks there.

2158. Have you not made them separate flocks?—No.

2159. Did they not hold a clean certificate for a portion of their flocks?—No.

2160. Surely we have evidence to that effect. It was stated, I think, by one of the Messrs. Meredith that only a portion of the flock was proved to be actually scabby in the first instance, but they were all running on the same run, and were all held to be scabby, and that then the division took place. The Ica Run, you say, is treated as two?—No; not now. I will tell you how to clear the case up. Mr. Willie Andrew, Mr. Andrew's son, came up on the station. I had heard that the old gentleman intended to give him a portion of the run, to try him, and see how he would shape. He had been a surveyor. Mr. Andrew, sen., did make over a portion of this run to him, and I thought it was really a *bona fide* run. He put up yards, erected a dip, put up a cottage for the son to live in, and had two men living there, and there was every appearance of a separate run. I gave a certificate to him, thinking it was a separate run. He signed a declaration that they were his sheep, and under his charge. Soon after I gave him the clean certificate he sold most of those sheep to Mr. R. Meredith, some of them were given over to the father, and I think about one hundred and fifty or one hundred and seventy were left on the run; and Mr. Andrew told me that it was very likely he would re-purchase these sheep back from his son, and take them all to the run,