

and very likely the son would surrender the lease. There was nothing to prevent him from doing that. I said, "No; if you do that I will not grant a certificate until I grant it for the whole of the run." Young Mr. Andrew did surrender his lease, and sold his sheep back. Then the old gentleman instructed some more sheep to be put on this run, and they became infected. He now says he has sold these sheep to his son, and wants a clean certificate. I will not grant him a second one. I said, "I was certainly under the impression that it was a separate run, but now I will not grant you a certificate, as the run now is all alike."

2161. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Are you, then, of opinion that these sales or leases have only been made for the purpose of selling sheep?—Certainly; as a way to get over the Act, and for nothing else. I told them so.

2162. *Hon. Mr. Williamson.*] In the case in which you summoned Meredith the case was dismissed: that was for Waironga?—Yes.

2163. Were you of opinion that you were right?—I was.

2164. You did not appeal?—No; I did not think I had a strong enough case.

2165. They are rather a terror, I suppose, these people?—By Jove, they are a terror. It would have been right enough if I had got Mr. Sutton to go straight, but Mr. Sutton went crooked. I suppose it suited his purpose.

2166. *Hon. the Chairman.*] There was one other question I wanted to draw your attention to, that was with regard to passing sheep from one subdivision of a district to another subdivision. It has been stated that Mr. Orbell has objected to the sheep passing, as if they were passing from one district into another district: is that so? Are you aware of any case in which Mr. Orbell has improperly tried to stop the passage of sheep from one subdivision to another subdivision?—I think there was a dispute at Te Oreore bridge about some sheep. As far as I know, I do not think he did actually stop them.

2167. In your opinion, was the action taken by Mr. Orbell beyond the law?—I think perhaps Mr. Orbell stepped a little over the mark. I do not think he actually stopped the sheep.

2168. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Have you been in charge of any other district than the one you have at present?—I have not been in charge of any other district, but I have been in charge of a subdivision. In the old days I had first charge of the North Wairarapa Subdivision, then, afterwards it was changed, I had charge of the South. I cleaned that. Mr. Sutton was sent up, and a change took place.

2169. That is, you cleaned a subdivision of the Wairarapa District?—I did.

2170. How long, approximately, had that subdivision been scabby prior to your taking charge?—South Wairarapa?

2171. Yes?—I think ever since it was Wairarapa.

2172. How many years?—I suppose it must have been thirty years, if not more; I think over thirty years.

2173. Looking over the *Gazette* I find that one station, called Riversdale, with slight intervals apparently, was continuously scabby from the 30th September, 1879, to the 31st December, 1883: whose run is that?—That is Edwin Meredith junior's. It is known as his now. It belonged to Mr. Meredith, sen., but it is cut into four runs now.

2174. This Mr. Meredith is the one who has sent the petition that has been the subject of discussion here?—I believe it is.

2175. Can you tell the Committee how it is that this run appears to have been almost continuously scabby for such a long time? Are there any insuperable natural difficulties, or any other difficulties, that should cause it to be continuously scabby?—The only way in which I can account for it is through bad management. It is an easy run, and I could soon clean it for them.

2176. How long do you think has that run been scabby?—It has been so for many years. They have had clean certificates on several occasions; but I should think that during twenty years or more they have had scab on that run. Of course they have had certificates at different times.

2177. Yes; and changes have taken place as to ownership and as to occupation by way of leasing?—Yes.

2178. As between the separate members of the family similar to what you have been describing as having taken place in the case of Mr. Andrew?—Yes; in the same way.

2179. Is this run now clean?—Yes, it is.

2180. Do you believe it is in reality clean?—I do; I certainly should not grant a certificate if I was not satisfied. I am perfectly satisfied now.

2181. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Is there anything further you wish to mention in connection with the working of the Act?—I believe there is a feeling against me, because people say I am too severe with them. They say I am too sharp—too smart. I reply, "If you can read the Act in any other way, the Resident Magistrate and I must be radically wrong."

2182. You think the Act works well if carried out properly?—I think so; but there is no doubt it would be more satisfactory if it were amended.

2183. In what direction?—Several of the sections want altering, some of them are rather confusing. There are some of the sections regarding which I do not think you would get two men to agree as to the meaning.

2184. You are not prepared to suggest any amendment to the Committee?—No, I am not now; some time ago I was.

TUESDAY, 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1884.

Mr. BAYLY examined.

2186. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are Chief Inspector under the Sheep Act?—Superintending Inspector under the Sheep and Rabbit Acts.

2187. Have you held that position since the Acts came into operation?—Allow me to hand in my letter of appointment. [Letter put in.]