

the stallions would be debarred from travelling on account of possessing hereditary unsoundness, perhaps even many more.

Asked whether, if the diseases were to be scheduled in the Bill, it would be necessary to include the whole he had mentioned; Mr. Gilruth stated that certainly the whole must be included, adding that no member of the profession would give a clean certificate to any animal affected with any one of the diseases specified, whether they were scheduled or not. Witness did not agree with the opinion reported by the Chairman as being current in America that roaring was due to training in the early hours of foggy mornings. The disease being one primarily of the nerve, the weather and climate could have no effect. No scientific authority supported such a theory. He agreed that a noise might be produced after strangles, occasionally due to swollen glands, or a similar impediment which could be detected by the examiner. As stated by the Chairman, roaring frequently followed strangles or influenza; but this was more apparent than real. These diseases only hastened the development of unsoundness—they did not of themselves cause the roaring, unless as previously stated.

Mr. Buddo stated that he did not find much fault with the list of diseases, except in the case of "side-bone." Mr. Gilruth agreed that, in the case of plough-horses, side-bones occasionally resulted from treads; but with stallions the same causes were hardly operative, and frequent treads, or, rather, injuries, were very unlikely to be received. In any case, one could not say that a stallion affected with side-bones was free from "hereditary unsoundness."

Asked about racing-stallions, Mr. Gilruth (rather than see the Bill dropped) did not think it absolutely necessary to include them in the Act, provided they were only used for racing-mares. Racing was a business by itself, and owners could look after themselves; but it was different with the general public, the majority of people knowing nothing about horses. In fact, few knew when a horse was lame, unless it was almost going on three legs only.

Witness agreed with Mr. Buddo that farmers often described roarers as "broken-winded"; but, as a matter of fact, the two diseases were different, and had no connection, the latter being due to a diseased condition of the lungs. Witness had never seen a roarer get within 25 per cent. as much as a sound horse from a man who knew that he was a roarer. Would be surprised to see a good farmer riding a horse badly affected with roaring, unless he could not avoid doing so, and agreed that a hunting-man would be soon laughed off the field if he rode a roarer. Would not consider the fact that a horse won a race any proof of his soundness. Did not think a purchaser—even a colonial purchaser—of a valuable horse at Home would be satisfied with the seller's certificate of soundness. The practice of purchase at Home was to have an examination by a veterinarian after the bargain had been made, and if a "sound" certificate was not given the bargain would be off. For animals imported into the colony at present the only certificate required was one to show that the animal was free from "contagious" disease.

To the Hon. Mr. A. Lee Smith, Mr. Gilruth stated that, so far as he knew, the tendency to the reproduction of these unsoundnesses was about equal in both sire and dam. Hunters were usually sold in Britain with a guarantee of soundness if at auction, or permission was given for examination before the sale. At Tattersall's, so far as witness was aware, opportunities for examination were available before the sale. On Mr. Lee Smith stating that he did not understand such to be the usual practice, the witness stated that he had frequently known buyers to take their own veterinary surgeons to the sale when purchasing. The Hon. Mr. A. Lee Smith stated that in the early "sixties" he had seen twenty-five thousand pounds' worth of horses sold at Lord Stamford's place without any guarantee; at another sale he saw one sold for £750 which was a roarer.

To Mr. Massey, Mr. Gilruth stated that he would permit a private owner to use any stallion for his own mares, but would prevent an owner travelling an unsound animal for use by the general public. A roarer might win the Liverpool Grand National, but not if he were badly affected. To win would be impossible except in the very early stages of the disease, probably when only an examination by a skilled person could detect it. Did not agree that some of the very best steeplechase horses had been bad roarers, or even roarers at all.

To the Hon. Mr. A. Lee Smith witness admitted that the great point in connection with a horse was conformation, but that was a matter into which the Bill as now before them did not go. The first idea was to have a Board of two lay experts with a veterinary surgeon, and decide on conformation as well as soundness. There was no doubt that breeders under certain circumstances used stallions which possessed unsoundnesses, and even were roarers; but as the progeny were generally sold before reaching the adult stage, when the unsoundnesses were more likely to develop, they were not the people to suffer, but the unfortunate purchaser. The breeder got the stallion cheaper and took his risk. The Bill would not interfere with him, but it would prevent him selling the services of such a stallion to the general public. Witness considered it was certainly to the advantage of the country that the Bill should become law, and added that there were probably more "crops" in this country than in any other under the sun, as could be seen by the reports of its veterinary officers.

To Mr. Massey, Mr. Gilruth stated that the clause in the Bill dealing with unsoundness was an error in the drafting; that he himself had only seen it when it came to the Committee, but that it was intended to only apply to hereditary unsoundnesses.

Mr. Ritchie, Secretary for Agriculture, supported this statement.

Mr. Massey urged that the Bill did not discriminate between hereditary and accidental unsoundness.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the Bill was virtually as recommended by the Agricultural Conference in Dunedin, with the exception of this point which had been accidentally omitted.