

2663. Can you state where the funds of the department come from?—Out of the sheep-rates.

2664. What are the expenses as a whole—about £32,000?—Yes; last year: that is under both Acts, the Sheep Act and the Rabbit Act.

2664A Last year the expenditure exceeded the estimate, did it not?—Yes, having to deal with so much Crown lands under the Rabbit Act; also, with the desire to get rid of these evils as far as possible, extra measures were used and extra men employed.

2665. You do not know how they were drawn?—No.

2666. With regard to the case which you put before the Committee yesterday as to your position, which, you say, was defined in the evidence given in the inquiry as to Mr. Telford's case, are your answers regarding the department applicable at the present time: since that happened Mr. Maunsell has left the department I believe?—He has.

2667. What change has taken place in consequence of that?—None whatever, except that a clerk is now discharging his duties..

2667A Has he been substituted in Mr. Maunsell's place?—I suppose it can be said so.

2668. So that you now stand in the same position as regards the department that you stood in at the time of the inquiry in Mr. Telford's case?—Yes. I would wish to rectify one error I made yesterday in putting in a paper. I was asked if any officer had been appointed without my recommendation. In the answer given by me to the Committee on Mr. Telford's case it was stated that there were only two appointed, but there was one only recommended by myself.

2669. I understood you to say that there was only one appointed without your knowledge and recommendation?—Only one; and I think I answered that he did not suit, and that he left the department.

2670. Then, no change has been made in the department itself. I see here a recommendation made to that Committee. It appeared then as if this branch of the department was not in a satisfactory state: has any change taken place, such as Mr. Maunsell referred to?—No other change has taken place; the organization is now what it was then. It is a part of the Colonial Secretary's Department.

2671. Is the Minister or Mr. Cooper, as Under-Secretary, the head of the department?—Mr. Cooper is the permanent head of the department.

2672. You are the permanent head of the outside work?—I can hardly define what my position is. I am sometimes attending to office-work and sometimes travelling through the colony; if anything occurs in a place I am supposed to see what is going on.

2673. *Hon. Mr. Campbell.*] Then, you do not exactly know what position you are in?—I stated so yesterday.

2674. *Hon. Captain Fraser.*] There is no change in the department except that Mr. Maunsell has disappeared?—No. [Legal opinion of law officers handed in by the witness.]

2675. *Mr. J. C. Buckland.*] I would wish to ask you if you know, from experiment made, that these patent dips are useless?—The same account is given of them by the Inspectors as accords with my own experience, where you cannot use heat, which is the case with most of the patent dips. You cannot tell what the immediate effect is. You cannot tell the effect on scab. For lice and ticks some of them are pretty good, but for scab I would not use them.

2676. *Mr. Walker.*] Are you of opinion that it would be a good thing for the department that the Inspectors should be removed, like policemen, periodically?—No; the better a man knows the country the better he can do his work. Even where he is well fitted for the work it will take two or three years to acquire the necessary information as to the existence of scab in the district.

2677. Is it not possible that personal likings and dislikings may effect the best officer in the discharge of his duty?—It is quite possible. When that occurs it is proper that he should be removed; but a good deal has to be done before a person new to a district can administer the Act with the best possible results.

2678. When officers are put in charge of scabby districts, is their credit or discredit involved in their cleaning or failing to clean the district?—Decidedly.

2679. And they feel that?—They are generally put on their metal, most of them; they have quarterly reports showing what has been done.

2680. Whether fencing has been done?—Yes; whether fencing has been done. They are supposed to look after minute details, and to acquaint me with the state of the district every quarter.

2681. And yet the same districts remain scabby?—That applies only to the Kaikoura, which has been scabby on account of the reasons stated; to the Wairarapa, which I expect to see very soon clean; and to Auckland, where the state of things is exceptional, there being so many small owners, with small flocks, which they can move without giving notice; and the climate, which is favourable to the spreading of scab.

2682. *Hon. Mr. Waterhouse.*] Mr. Sutton said in his evidence that he had withdrawn several informations: that these withdrawals had been reported to you?—I do not recollect the circumstances. If they were reported to me, and the circumstances stated, reasons would be given for the withdrawal or otherwise.

2683. Under the Act it is imperative to lay information against the owner at certain periods if sheep are not clean; at the end of every six months after the nine months allowed?—Yes.

2684. If the informations are withdrawn after they have been once laid, is not that, in point of fact, to defeat the intention of the Act?—I am not aware of any withdrawals.

2685. There is distinct evidence to the contrary: to the fact that there have been withdrawals?—I do not recognize withdrawals.

2686. Are you aware that there is a clause rendering it imperative for the owner to "herd and yard" where the land is unfenced: did you give notice to Mr. Ingles under the Act?—I think notice was given to him when the Act came into operation.

2687. Did you give notice to all other sheep-farmers similarly placed?—I think so. My instructions can be produced as issued at the time.