

runs?—That was my intention. I have laid on the table papers on the subject, so that the Government might amend the Act if they saw fit, but it has been postponed.

2642. *Hon. Mr. Campbell.*] Did it never cross your mind as to the public injury that might be done in connection with this run?—Which.

2643. This one you referred to?—It was simply that it slipped my memory, the fact of these rams being put in. When I took steps to have the matter remedied we could only see five rams.

2644. *Hon. the Chairman.*] With regard to the run you speak of as adjoining the open country, is there any reason why it should not be fenced out?—It was fenced out; on two occasions rams have broken in. About the time these rams were put in a contract was entered into. The whole of the lower part of the country has been cleaned. Every sheep that could be got hold of was killed. There were about twelve hundred sheep.

2645. There is a great number of wild sheep there?—There were; but there are a few still scattered about.

2646. How many of these pieces of unoccupied land are there: is one in the Clarence—that between Mr. Gibson's and ?—Yes; there is one at Awatere. There were three in Awatere, but two have been cleaned. One requires to be seen to.

2647. I suppose you have often considered this matter of the wild sheep?—Yes; it is my greatest difficulty.

2648. Have you any plan to propose?—None other than to let contracts to kill them to certain men who are trustworthy runholders, supplementing some portion of the expense. The work has been done so far under supervision. The time of year has prevented the work being pursued. One job has been concluded for a portion of country. Between this and the next month or two it will be necessary to take steps to clear another portion.

2649. Are you prepared with the means for that purpose?—Not as yet.

2650. Do you know that you will be able to get the necessary authority?—I cannot be sure of it. The time of year has not arrived when it can be done properly. There is yet much snow on portions of the ground.

2651. I think it only right to ask you in regard to one statement that has been made in evidence before this Committee: It has been stated that you said you wanted to administer the Act benevolently; to clean the country so as not to ruin anybody?—I cannot recollect anything of the sort. I have said that if I could clean the country without fining I would do so; but, when it becomes necessary, fines ought to be enforced. If it were possible to do it without enforcing fines, I would do it.

2652. Did you ever check Mr. Passau in his wish to carry out the Act?—I do not recollect doing anything of the sort.

2653. Have you specified, or have you instructed the Inspectors to specify, what materials should be used in dipping?—I have always repudiated anything except lime and sulphur as the recognized cure for scab. We have always tried to prevent, if possible, the use of any patent dips; but we cannot compel people to avoid using them. I do not know whether we can compel people to use lime and sulphur. It is not stipulated by the Government.

2654. You are aware that Mr. Ingles at the present time has a separate flock on his run; that a part of his flock has a clean certificate, while the other portion is scabby?—I was made aware of that last month.

2655. Are you satisfied with that?—Not satisfied at all unless the conditions under which a clean certificate can be given are carried out.

2656. Mr. Ingles has stated his intention of separating his low lands from the high country. To do this and prevent his sheep being worked together, he was to put up new sheds and yards adjacent to the low country. There was a double line of fence and the main road between the two flocks. I think Mr. Foster, who must have understood the matter, led us to suppose that Mr. Ingles made a greater convenience of one portion of the run for another portion: that such was his object?—I am not aware.

2657. I am asking you the question because in other cases the right to keep separate flocks has been refused. The rule in one case, should it not be applicable to the other?—If he has put up a separate woolshed, separate yards, with an extra line of fence, and a main road between, I cannot see how it can be objected to.

2658. Then, you think the Inspector has a discretionary power in that case?—He has law for it, for it becomes a second property: two separate homesteads.

2659. *Hon. Mr. Waterhouse.*] In this case the clean certificate, should it be granted, was to be granted on the intimation of Mr. Ingles of his intention to erect a second homestead?—Then it should not be granted.

2660. *Hon. the Chairman.*] There is a clause in the Act to the effect that you should not give a certificate for any portion of a flock, one portion being scabby?—That clause is evidently absurd in the working, if it is looked at. A man who has only one flock can move his sheep at once, but if he has two flocks three months have to elapse, and then to be inspected before he can move them.

2661. *Hon. Mr. Campbell.*] Why should you say it is absurd if it has not been brought in force?—No; we have not carried it out.

*Mr. Walker:* I think it comes to this: There was in Mr. Foster's opinion no option; the two places were different; that, being different, they would have two separate returns, and two registered brands; and, consequently, that they were two properties.

*Hon. Mr. Waterhouse:* In the case of Mr. Ingles the certificate was to be given on the expression of his intention to erect a second homestead.

2662. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Is it your opinion that, if a man makes separate flocks on the same run, he can demand that these flocks should be regarded by the Inspector as separate, for one of which he could give a clean certificate?—Decidedly not, unless all the conditions I have mentioned are fulfilled.