

1898.  
NEW ZEALAND.

---

# JOINT AGRICULTURAL, PASTORAL, AND STOCK COMMITTEE.

REPORT ON THE SLAUGHTERING AND INSPECTION BILL, TOGETHER WITH THE  
EVIDENCE THEREON AND APPENDICES.

---

*Report brought up on 18th October, 1898, and ordered to be printed on 28th October, together  
with the evidence.*

---

*Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.*

FRIDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1898.

*Ordered, "That the Slaughtering and Inspection Bill be referred to the Joint Agricultural, Pastoral, and Stock Committee."*—(Hon. Mr. J. MCKENZIE.)

---

## REPORT.

THE Joint Agricultural, Pastoral, and Stock Committee, to whom the above-mentioned Bill was referred for consideration, have the honour to report that they have duly considered the same, and recommend that the Bill be allowed to proceed, subject to the amendments as set forth on the annexed copy of the Bill.

18th October, 1898.

C. JOHNSTON,  
Chairman.

---

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

THURSDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1898.—(Hon. J. D. ORMOND in the Chair.)

JOHN EDWARD HANSON, of Canterbury, butcher, stated that he was there to represent the butchers of Christchurch and Lyttelton, and also the Christchurch City Council. We have gone through the clauses of the Bill, and a few of them that have affected us we have discussed. But I must say I am put in a rather awkward position, because Mr. Forrester, who was our last year's delegate, will be unable to get here for a few hours longer, as his vessel has not arrived; therefore I feel I have rather a big burden this morning. I will do the best I can, however, and make my statement as concise as possible. The first clause that we have to find fault with is clause 3, subclause (2). But before that I must present to you this petition from the butchers of Christchurch City, and also from the Selwyn County Council districts, all of whom would be affected by the Act as it is now made out. [The witness here read and put in the petition in question, Exhibit A.] I feel that this clause 3, subclause (2) has not had the consideration and thought that it ought to have had. We are here to-day from all parts of New Zealand, in accordance with what has been brought before the House, to obtain pure, well-bred, clean meat for the people. We have accepted the fact that the voice of the people is so strong now, and so urgent on the members of the House, that they are ready to make a step in the direction of giving the country public abattoirs. We do not object to the abattoirs, and we feel, in fact, that they have come to stay, and will do good in the long-run. But there are some clauses in the Act which may make it rather peculiar if we have to prepare meat under the inspection of a veterinary surgeon. We shall have all meat slaughtered in public slaughter-yards, or, rather, abattoirs, for public consumption. But this clause, you will notice, gives a farmer the right to kill, in round figures, one bullock, weighing 800 lb.—we have put it at that as being a fair average; and he is allowed to kill five sheep also, weighing on an average 60 lb.

or 300 lb. altogether. Thus, a farmer is allowed to kill 1,100 lb. a week, and distribute it through his district or any other. And it is likely enough that the next farmer, or any other farmers, may be doing the same thing. Thus these farmers are allowed to kill meat for sale—not necessarily for consumption on their own farms, or we would not grumble. What is the use of us being sent to the slaughter-yards? What is the good of a little butcher being inspected who would be content to sell half that quantity of meat, when one farmer is allowed to sell treble the quantity without being inspected? You are leaving the door open to a very strong abuse by this thing, because if a farmer is allowed to kill sheep and cattle, and has not to submit to inspection, there is nothing in the world to prevent that farmer creating and making a trade of that kind. It sounds too risky that any farmer should take a beast to the public sale-yards, where he would run the gauntlet of Inspectors. He would go to those farmers in his own district, and he would say, "If you can give me a little less—say, £1 10s. or £1—then I will say no more about it."—I think this shows it is so contrary to common-sense that I do not think we shall have any difficulty in getting that erased. We do not wish to prevent the farmer killing for himself. We butchers in Canterbury had ourselves brought some time ago under an Act of the Selwyn County Council, whereby, our slaughterhouses being inspected, we are to pay a fee which the farmer does not have to pay—viz., 3d. per head for all our large cattle, 3d. per dozen for small, and we have also to pay £1 a year for a license, to find fences, drainage, water-supply, and all the rest of it, and in all these things we had this Act to protect ourselves, so that a farmer should sell not even a quarter of mutton, but might kill a sheep, and if he could not get through the whole, he could lend it, or give it away to other people; and they have, by doing the above, got over difficulties in hot weather, &c. This Bill as it stands will be responsible for making the farmer a competitor. We prevented this in Selwyn, where the farmer is confined to killing his own meat, and not selling it without all these precautions and inspections. The next thing I would like to refer to is clause 15, subclause (1). I ask you to strike out the whole of the subclause. My hands are very much strengthened with regard to this clause, because I have before me an extract from the *Lyttelton Times* bearing on the subject, from which I will read to you a few of the salient details. In plain words, we wish, if there are to be abattoirs built in any locality, that they shall be abattoirs, and abattoirs only, for the use of the butchers occupying that particular district. We wish to veto having the authority deputed to some other concern—factory, or whatever you may like to call it—in the neighbourhood; and having to go there to kill our stock, or, rather, having them to kill our stock, we do not wish that the premises should be under the control of any particular company or other. We find that the meat companies both here and at Christchurch have already a very big power, if not almost a monopoly. We do not wish the meat companies to be allowed the privilege of killing our stock for us while we should be very much better otherwise. We feel we are in their hands, and we feel it would be a very unjust thing to give them more power and have to go to them, seeing that their competition with us is so great. They can swamp the town with their "rejects"—and you know how very little you have to give for rejects, but the poor butcher has to stand the worry and loss of the competition. The Christchurch City Council is very much with us in this question. At their last sitting the Chairman drew attention to the Inspection and Slaughtering Bill now before the House. The Bill, if passed in its present form, would, he said, hamper and restrict the Council, and, although they were compelled to work an abattoir, the Council would be prevented from deriving any revenue from it. The butchers held a meeting, and appointed Messrs. Hanson and Forrest to take the matter in charge. Subclause (1) in clause 15 we desire should be amended as follows: "In lieu of itself establishing an abattoir, a public authority may delegate to any fit person the power to establish the same, upon such terms and conditions as, with the previous approval of the Minister, are agreed on." We wish that to be struck out. We have struck out the whole clause. Clause 16 is something of the same kind. It is very much bearing on the subject we have before us. We have not come here, I believe—any of us—as delegates to act on the offensive in this matter. We leave the export meat companies to do exactly as they choose, but we do ask the same privilege for ourselves. We do not want to hamper them; we do not ask the privilege of slaughtering in their public slaughter-yards. We want to be independent entirely of any other factory or public slaughter-yard. I need not say anything more on that subject.

1. *Mr. Wason.*] You might explain why you want to strike out "human" for "local"?—We think that "human" is a far broader view. We think that "local" means simply in New Zealand. We have no desire to hamper the meaning of the word. We think it reads better "local." That is the only reason. In clause 18 we propose to strike out the last eight words—"and by the licensee thereof or his workmen." You will then read it, "Subject to the provisions of this Act relating to abattoirs and meat-export slaughterhouses, it shall not be lawful in any district to slaughter any stock for human consumption, or to dress any carcase for sale, except in a registered slaughterhouse." Perhaps the backward way of reading that is simply that we do not wish to be sent to these public slaughter-yards. It is very much the same subject again.

2. *Mr. Brown.*] Then the clause would stop at slaughterhouses?—Yes.

3. *Mr. Wason.*] I do not understand your objection to that, or why you strike out those words?—I thought it was a short subject, and it had already been turned down by the section before. We want opportunity. If we have abattoirs we want to have the privilege of going there to some reason. We know very well that there are plenty of master butchers who can find work for the men in getting the meat ready in the morning, and in the afternoon they have to find time to do their killing. Otherwise we have nothing else to do but send our cattle to the public slaughter-yards; we cannot teach our sons and apprentices, and we are simply becoming meat-sellers. We shall have nothing for our men to do in the afternoon. We want the right, in fact, of killing our own meat.

*Mr. Buchanan:* That is quite reasonable.

*Witness* : Here is another [reading clause 26]. It is the license of a meat-export slaughter-house. It is nearly time to upset that. We ask that, if they do slaughter at all, it should only be slaughter for export. The last affair I have to speak to is a clause that affects us very particularly. We do not wish to affect the Government in this matter. It refers to the question of compensation. It is not in the Bill. This is a question we want introduced. It will be, and there is not the slightest doubt it is, far and away the best way to inspect meat after it has been killed. We know already that lots of cattle may pass the Inspector alive all right, but when they get to the slaughter-yard there is something radically wrong with them. I wish to bring before you that, although ours is the most likely place where the Inspector will have to stay, seeing that is where the meat will be slaughtered, the fault will be found after the butcher has paid for it and it is condemned. It will be a severe hardship, not only once or twice, but for ever. We feel it a severe hardship on us. We do not say what should be done, but we bring this matter before you showing you that, if this is the case, we have to pay the piper. We would very much prefer for you to put your Inspector in front of us. But we know that cannot be. I wish to draw your attention to one of our reasons—to the fact that if a butcher goes into a public market, and he has his cattle penned before him to see if the bullocks or sheep please, and after he has weighed and gauged their values, then he tries to buy them for what is as near a value he can get; and, consequently, the question of tuberculosis does not crop up, though it may occur. But something may happen even worse than that. When he goes on to one of these large runs, and when he sees a mob of cattle, what chance has he of seeing tuberculosis? When one of this kind of cattle is brought in and opened, then we say it seems very hard for us to stand the expense, whereas the grazier may be more to blame. He may have had it for a year or two, and he has far more leisure and opportunity of seeing whether his cattle are in a fit state for the market or not. Therefore, with regard to compensation, we feel that we may leave the question of compensation very safely in your hands, because, although we feel we are the people who ought to be inspected, we are not the people who ought to pay the piper. Some evenings ago Mr. Taylor, member for Christchurch, asked the Government to appoint a veterinary surgeon to inspect the Christchurch meat-factory. The reply was to the effect, I think, that, should the Slaughtering Bill be not passed, the question would be favourably considered. That is a very serious wrong. The Dunedin factory has proved such a success that it has set people asking that more public inspection places and abattoirs should be put up. Several people would not go to the abattoirs, and fought the question out in Court. Owing to those people who have been slaughtering in the abattoirs having their meat properly inspected, those people who had stood out have been glad to have their meat slaughtered in the abattoirs without further coercion. Not long ago the Christchurch Meat Company, following on the steps of these, advertised that their meat was all inspected. We are unable to find that ever there was a veterinary surgeon or an inspector there. It is possible enough that their butchers or their meat-grader there—the latter especially—might have inspected the meat, and seen it all right. But, you see, it is the little straws that show where the wind blows, and if they could follow on, and get even one day's advantage, they would have the privilege of having a veterinary surgeon. Their meat would be inspected, and our meat would be tied up, and we should not get the benefit of inspection. Therefore I wish to put that very plainly—that if we are to be inspected, no matter when it is, we should be all equally and favourably inspected by an unbiassed person. I wish, however, to state that, although it is possible that the Government might not allow the meat company to engage a veterinary surgeon as an inspector, they might not do that, but they might contribute towards the inspection. But we all know that the man would have to do what he is wanted to, or else he would get a walking-ticket. The Inspector would not be a free person if he were under a company which was paying his wages. We also know that smaller animals, such as sheep, &c., do not all go to pot; and, without telling secrets, I may say that a lot of meat is sold and eaten in Christchurch that it would be impossible to go through inspection with. One veterinary surgeon would have to be on the spot. We wish the meat company would have to kill for local consumption in the abattoirs like ourselves, so that the Meat Inspector could carry the key, open the slaughterhouse, and afterwards shut it, so that we should have inspection, and it should be real. That is all we have to ask.

4. *Mr. Wason.*] With reference to that question you raised about the inspection of meat after killing—the question of compensation. The same difficulty arose in the Homebush yards, in New South Wales, eight or ten years ago. Can you tell the Committee how it was settled there?—I cannot.

5. But it has been settled there. There are three distinct parties in question—the butcher, the breeder, and the grazier—and I understand that there they all contribute?—I do not know.

6. Are you of opinion that the money should be paid between those three parties, divided in some equitable manner?—Well, we have gone perhaps a point further than you have gone. We say this inspection of meat is entirely for the public good, and we say the public ought to pay for this in some manner or form. It is not for the good of the grazier. We thought the butcher should pay one-third, the public one-third, and the grazier or dealer one-third, whichever it might happen to be.

7. The man who directly sells the stock?—We should have to go back to him—there is no doubt about it. He might sell through a dealer.

8. Then you object to the various meat companies slaughtering and selling meat in the various towns?—Unless through the abattoirs.

9. Even although their places are inspected?—Yes, I said that just now. You can scarcely keep the export companies from being more or less biassed.

10. You think that any rejects the meat companies are going to dispose of should be sent to the abattoirs and killed?—I do. It would be no greater hardship for them than it would be for any other large butcher to have to kill at the abattoir, where the one Inspector could do the whole work.

11. There is no desire whatever on the part of the butchers to stop the meat companies?—None whatever, but we wish them to be put entirely on the same footing as ourselves.

12. *Mr. Buchanan.*] You say that the meat companies should put the rejects through the public abattoirs, and not kill them at the freezing company's own establishment?—Those for local consumption.

13. But, knowing, as a practical butcher, that rejects to a very large extent only crop up after killing—that is, the points on which they are rejected are only shown after killing—what would you do in such a case as that?—Of that kind, where there is a question of overweight? In case of underweight their grader would see to it through the outer yards, because they are not quite their weight. With regard to the other questions—those of underweight and under-quality—there is no doubt they would not be consumed.

14. *Hon. the Chairman.*] As to compensation, you start with the butcher, and you say it would not be fair that he should bear the loss. You go and state further, in the case of the dealer, that he buys from the grazier and may sell to another dealer, and so on. What about compensation to these people?—I think I have already put that—that we do not wish to dictate to you as to the way compensation should be allowed, but we do say, because you bring us to be inspected we had much rather you took it to the grazier; and after we get our cattle clear of all diseases we shall have nothing but pure cattle, and shall not need the Inspector. Therefore we ask that we should not have to pay for the whole thing.

*Hon. the Chairman:* The object of my question was that you, as a practical man, would give us assistance to get the Committee out of a difficulty.

*The witness:* That is all I have to say.

Mr. H. Moony, of Auckland, representing sixty Auckland butchers, stated: During our discussion we have found this—that from Wanganui south the position of butchers is entirely different from those of the Auckland Province. A very large proportion of the meat from Wanganui southward has not the inspection for either live or dead meat as compared with what we have in the Auckland Province. Therefore our position is somewhat unique—we have both a live and a dead inspection; and I am here to-day to urge reasons before this Committee against the abolition of private slaughterhouses. I think we will come to that later on. I think I can corroborate the arguments laid down by the previous speaker with regard to clause 2, to the extent that the Auckland Association are of opinion the Government should have a more thorough inspection of swine in the Auckland market. A very large quantity of swine are sent into the public market that have had no inspection, and they are of anything but good quality. It is known to those in the Auckland Province that there are numerous pig-farms. The refuse is deposited in the paddocks, and if the farmers have not a sufficient supply of pigs on hand to eat up this refuse decomposition will set in. My instructions were to lay that before you and ask you to do what you think best. Turning to the whole question of slaughterhouses, clauses 18 to 23, these clauses evidently apply to private slaughterhouses only. What is lacking through this Act is, there is no provision made for the renewal of present slaughterhouse licenses, as far as we could see; and that is unfair to us, if, by the passing of this Bill, private slaughterhouses are of no value. Will you consider the latter part of clause 19, which says, "No license shall be granted in respect of a slaughterhouse in any district in which there is established a registered abattoir available for slaughtering stock." I can understand that. That means that if there is an abattoir in my district I must be bound to slaughter my cattle at such abattoir, and not at a private slaughterhouse. But clause 22, subsection (2) says, "The license while in force shall authorise the licensee to slaughter, in the slaughterhouse specified therein, stock in any part of the colony outside a district where an abattoir is established, but not for export beyond the colony." Now, we take, for instance, a slaughterhouse that is under a local body or district adjacent to the City of Auckland. If this Bill comes into force he shall be allowed—and the Bill provides for it—he shall be allowed to hold his license until such time as an abattoir is established in that district. But mark this, gentlemen: that, as my slaughterhouse is situated outside Auckland City, I would not be allowed to dispose of my meat in the City of Auckland, because of their having public abattoirs there. Neither would Messrs. Hellaby, who have a very large and complete plant in the Newton Borough—they would not be allowed to sell in the City of Auckland. That is our interpretation; and that would not be right. And, another thing: It would seem hard for a butcher who has his private slaughterhouse, and is carrying on a business in the city, that he should not be allowed to sell his corned beef there. There are butchers in Parnell and other districts who have private slaughterhouses. These provisions prevent them sending corned beef away, because it is slaughtered in a private slaughterhouse. If that has inspection surely it is in the same position as a public abattoir. It is the same with Messrs. Hellaby Bros. and their tinned meat, because they have a private slaughterhouse. I can understand the reason that this clause—section 15, subsection (1)—is being inserted, because it is apparent to those who have a personal knowledge of this Bill that the largest abattoir in any district, if there are more than one, will be the favoured private slaughterhouse to be converted into the abattoir. On behalf of the smaller butchers, who have not reached a position in their experience when they are able to launch out into bone-mills and blood-manure plant, at which we are all aiming—and none of these firms are enabled to get to the position they are in to-day if they are not to have private slaughterhouses, which this Act seems to be trying to do away with. But I would endeavour at this time now to lay before the Committee argument in favour of the private slaughterhouses, if I am in order. It has been admitted by all the Inspectors and delegates that cattle require rest, and feed, and water previous to being slaughtered, and our contention is that the animals will receive better and more considerate treatment in the owner's own hands, and under his own personal supervision, than they will at any Government abattoir. We are applying now to our own province. I wish my remarks to be construed as only meaning our own province—the province we have a personal interest in.

We have had the experience of abattoirs with a vengeance, and if you could possibly get any other Auckland butchers to state what is their aim and object, the reply would be, to have their own yards. And why? It is because their interests are not looked after in the present City Council abattoirs. Your stock is never your own. You might go in the morning for beef. You find it down town, and the rats have been on the track. All this kind of thing. There is no grass in the paddocks, though I admit there is abundance of water. All these things can be looked after more effectively under our own control. I believe it to be admitted by the Inspectors that a bullock, if heated when he is being killed, is as bad as diseased. Let us take the case in the abattoirs of a small butcher, whose weekly killing may be four head of cattle. He sends four over to these abattoirs. He wants one in on the Monday. Where are his remaining three? They are still standing in the pen, or perhaps in the yard, with all the rest of the butchers' beasts, at the mercy of all classes of cattle, to be horned and knocked about. The consequence is that when he goes to kill again the meat will kill dark, and is not nearly the quality of meat he would have if he were at his own slaughter-yards. I think we have, even in Wellington to-day, an ocular proof of it. I did not know, but I was going round the town this morning and saw it, and, without any butcher's experience, I believe it is quite possible for any one to take out from the Wellington butchers' shops to-day the meat that has been slaughtered at a private slaughterhouse. We do not shirk inspection. We invite the Inspectors, and the most rigid inspection the Government may choose to set up, and we are prepared to pay the cost. But we do say that while there is no complaint in Auckland and district we should not be meddled with; and we ask you, in the name of liberty, to give us the right to manage our business from start to finish. That is with regard to our private slaughterhouses. We take exception to sections 30 and 31 as being unworkable. I would qualify that by saying that the words after "without fee," be struck out of section 31. We object to any individual person being enabled to go into our business affairs without paying, or some such arrangement. We likewise take exception to subsection (3) in clause 31 as being unworkable. I think it is hardly necessary for me to advance arguments against that: I have no doubt some members of this Committee are conversant with at least some portion of a butcher's business. We could not manage to go to an Inspector to get a permit to kill a sheep or a lamb. We have not weather that Wellington butchers have. Wellington butchers can get meat in to-day to last to the end of the week. But take, for instance, the Auckland butchers: A very large number of them are obliged not to give their Saturday orders until Friday night. We leave our orders for killing until the very last thing; then we have to kill directly. With regard to the sheep, we get them in on Saturday morning. People will have hot dinners on Sunday. I am sorry that, in regard to compensation, I cannot support the question at issue as laid down by previous speakers. It is a very warm question in the Auckland Province. I wish to touch on compensation in two phases—that is, compensation to the butchers who have erected plants and have conformed to every fancy of the local authorities and Inspectors. I would ask, is that to be overlooked? If so, it does seem extremely hard; and we ask you to favourably consider that, gentlemen, when the time comes. With regard to the compensation on stock, we have spent more time over that question in Auckland than on any other. We contend this: that the butcher practically is a servant of the public; and why should we be expected to bear the loss? Briefly, our contention is this: What is this Bill but a Bill brought forward in the interests and for the safeguard—practically for the insurance on the whole—of the public? The public should pay. And if the public are clamouring for it, it is only fair and just that they should pay the whole of it. That is the recommendation from Auckland. With these remarks I am pleased to draw to a close with a last injunction. The Auckland butchers, if you can see your way, say, By all means let us have our private yards, notwithstanding what rigid inspection you may choose to make.

15. *Mr. Lawry.*] How many butchers in Auckland do you represent?—Approximately, sixty.

16. Do you say that they were absolutely unanimous in the desires you have expressed having legislative effect given to them?—Unanimous.

17. Are you aware that recently in Auckland a private butcher has gone into a very large expenditure in erecting an abattoir?—Yes.

18. How much money do you think he has expended on a private abattoir?—Between £2,000 and £3,000 he must have spent.

19. Do you know whether any local body in Auckland has taken up the question "of slaughtering and inspection" now before the House?—Yes; the local body I am a member of is strenuously opposed to it.

20. Have you received any official notification since you have been in Wellington?—I have seen a telegram asking one of the members to oppose it.

21. That is, the Hon. Sir Maurice O'Rorke has received a telegram from that local body asking him to support you to the utmost in what you say to-day?—That is quite right.

22. The Committee, I suppose, are given to understand that there has been no complaint lodged against the butchers or the way the inspecting is conducted?—None whatever.

23. In other words, the Auckland butchers are perfectly satisfied to let things remain as they are?—Yes.

24. *Mr. Flatman.*] I did not understand whether you had any objection to subclause (2), clause 3. The only objection to it is so far as pigs are concerned?—No, we object to cattle as well; we object to it right through.

25. *Mr. Wason.*] You have public abattoirs at Auckland?—Yes.

25A. But they are not giving satisfaction?—No.

26. There are a number of cattle and sheep killed there?—Oh, yes.

27. But they are not giving satisfaction?—No great satisfaction.

28. I understand from your remarks that you have no objection whatever to the Bill, and to public abattoirs, so long as private slaughterhouses are allowed to exist besides them?—Oh, no! That is quite correct.

29. And you are perfectly willing to come under all inspection?—Quite so.

30. You want to be left alone?—Yes, provided they do not cancel our licenses.

31. *Mr. Massey.*] With regard to clause 3—this clause which allows farmers to slaughter a certain number of stock—are you aware that under the present law they are not allowed to sell such stock in their own district, or within five miles thereof?—I do not know. I know that dressed lamb, mutton, and veal have been sold by them in our public auction markets in Auckland.

32. Allow me to call your attention to clause 4. My point is this: that farmers cannot possibly come into competition with butchers?—We realise that fact, but I think it may fairly be assumed that imputation is cast on the butchers that they are the medium through which this contamination is being caused, of flesh-diseases. On the other hand, we say, Here is a loophole for all the contaminated meat in the colony to find an escape. That is our contention.

33. *Mr. Symes.*] Do I understand you to say that you expect the Government or the public to pay you compensation for the loss of your slaughterhouses, supposing this Bill became law and you had to kill at the public abattoir?—The Government has been kind enough to take into consideration the leaseholder. I respectfully ask that the freeholder be entitled to the same consideration. If I have just previously renewed my lease, the fact of my license being cancelled cancels my lease. I may state that I am not personally affected under this compensation question; but I ask on behalf of those who have spent a large sum of money—they are entitled to every favourable consideration.

34. With regard to any butcher that has a slaughterhouse, if you kill at a public abattoir it is by the public you expect compensation to be paid?—We expect favourable consideration.

35. You do not think the butchers should pay anything towards compensation for diseased cattle which have been condemned?—The butchers should bear no loss.

36. Do you also consider the salaries of the Inspectors should be paid outside the butchers?—Oh, no! On that question it was suggested that we should leave the position of the Bill, as far as it affected local bodies—we should deal with the Bill from a trade standpoint. I was in hopes that the local bodies would send representatives here; but, unfortunately, they could not send delegates in time, or you would have had as many opponents against the Bill as from the butchers' standpoint. Butchers in our district are prepared to pay the Inspectors.

37. You object to the farmers killing. You say it is through that operation that to a great extent the disease is spread. You object to the farmers killing for their own home consumption, I suppose?—Oh, no! we do not say that; we say, for sale. But we take exception to the 3rd clause.

38. One of your contentions in favour of private slaughterhouses as against abattoirs was that your cattle would be fed, and that sort of thing. Do you feed them in the slaughterhouses?—Yes; we have grass paddocks. I can only speak at present as regards our present local abattoirs. There is not enough grass in the whole of the paddocks to supply feed for one butcher's cattle, and the best paddocks have been let to Chinamen. But in connection with our own slaughterhouses we can find grass sufficient. All this sort of evil is going on at public abattoirs. In case of a private slaughterhouse it is a matter of one man attending to his business, and having it personally inspected and attended by him from start to finish. If the Committee could see meat slaughtered at a private slaughterhouse and also some slaughtered at a public abattoir, that has possibly been jumbled about outside, and they see the heated and inflamed condition of the latter, they would notice the difference.

39. *Hon. Captain Morris.*] In the case of farmers killing, you say their meat should not be allowed to compete with inspected meat?—That is so, but we do not think it is a large order—one bullock and five sheep.

40. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Is the witness aware that, as regards some of the beef that may have been pointed out to him as slaughtered by some freezing companies here, that they rest the cattle for several days before they are killed?—I know all that. It has not been pointed out to me. We have had freezing-works in Auckland, and we have had large slaughterhouses; and in our own cases, wherever we have a large supply we try to isolate the cattle. We do not leave any large numbers together, because of horning, jostling, and being heated.

41. I thought the witness told us that he would give evidence through his own knowledge as relating to the Auckland Province?—That is correct.

42. *Hon. the Chairman.*] The department asked me to ask this question. This is the report of the Auckland Inspector, and he reports as follows: "The butchers in Parnell and Newmarket slaughter all cattle, sheep, and pigs in the yards at their shops." Is that true?—They slaughter the small cattle, but not pigs.

43. Do they slaughter sheep?—Yes; a privilege has been extended there to those butchers, and it has not been abused. There are butchers in Parnell and Newmarket who have killed over twenty years behind their premises, in a thickly populated district, without a single complaint; and I think that is a very strong argument in favour of our having our private slaughterhouses.

[At the close of his examination the witness handed in a list of the number of butchers who avail themselves of the public abattoirs, and the number of those who slaughter their own beasts (Exhibit B).]

GEORGE RAYNES, representing the butchers of Auckland and suburbs, said: I hardly think it worth while repeating the same thing as the former witness, because it will be only going over the same ground again. As being the individual myself who got the licenses in the private slaughterhouses in the borough—that is, being allowed to kill lambs, sheep, and calves in separate premises at the back of my shop—I have now carried this on for twenty years without complaint. My brother butchers also have the privilege in my district, when they found I carried it on successfully.

It is carried on the same as in the Old Country. It should be done in all warm climates. We want to get the animals into the shop, and we clear away the refuse immediately. There is no disease in the district, though the locality is the centre of Parnell. I have had members from this House and shown them through the place. They were astounded to find how I could carry it on. I put in the sheep forty or fifty at a time. We feed them on hay and water. They are not jostled about as in the public abattoirs. There you might find ten of yours and twenty of mine, and they would be continually rousting the animals about to pick out yours from mine. People have remarked that my meat is as good as the best-dressed meat, and people could not say otherwise. In London, where I learnt my trade, we were allowed to kill in the centres; and I am sure I can carry on my trade just as well as they can in London. The Local Board and Borough Council have given their support against this Bill.—Referring to clause 16, subclause (1), witness said: I read it that we shall not be allowed to kill our own stuff. It would be hardly fair for us to be compelled to have our meat killed at the public abattoirs when we have a better class of men than they have. I might say that, if that is to become law, how are we going to get the rising generation to learn the trade? If boys are forbidden from starting from the floor to the block in the slaughterhouses, I do not see how it can be done. I do not see that I can go any further. I thought it would be as well to let you know how I have carried on this small license. I may say Newmarket people have got their license for killing in the back-yard, and they have had it for seven or eight years; but I have had it for twenty years, and have never had a complaint yet.

44. *Hon. the Chairman.*] The Committee also understand that, as you represent the Auckland butchers, you represent them as being opposed to this Bill?—Yes.

45. And you have the same opinion as the Auckland district butchers with regard to public abattoirs?—Yes.

46. And when slaughtering at the back of your premises how do you proceed with regard to the blood, &c.?—It is received into a pit 2 ft. deep, and, after killing, carted away.

47. *Mr. Lawry.*] That is, you have appliances for carrying the blood off after the beast has been killed?—Yes.

48. I suppose you are aware that Messrs. Hellaby Bros., the biggest firm, is situated in a very thickly populated place?—Yes.

49. And you have never heard complaint of them?—Only on one occasion, when they were spreading manure.

50. You are of opinion, as a practical man, that every slaughterhouse is a business, and should be so considered?—It should be studied.

51. I think you have a slaughterhouse at Ellerslie?—Yes.

52. Prior to your taking possession of it there were continual complaints from people?—Yes.

53. Since you have had it these complaints have entirely ceased?—They have ceased. I have had it now some six years.

54. You are satisfied from your experience as a butcher that with the paddocks around your slaughterhouse, and killing the meat there, you can bring it into better condition than by killing it in the public abattoirs?—Far better. I have plenty of water in my paddocks, and a river too.

55. You are of opinion that the local body there is entirely opposed to public slaughterhouses?—I am.

56. *Mr. Flatman.*] You think it is the right thing to be able to kill cattle at these slaughterhouses?—Yes; lambs, sheep, and calves—not swine.

57. There has been no complaint with any of you who have that privilege?—Not one that I am aware of.

58. *Mr. Lang.*] I would like to ask if the witness holds the same view with regard to destroying cattle as the last witness?—Yes, I think it is a very unfair thing, if he has bought the cattle the butcher should be the sufferer. I think the farmer who brings them into the market should be responsible.

59. But you say the public should bear the cost, according to the last witness's opinion?—Well, I say the public should pay for it. They are asking for this, and they should pay for it.

60. *Mr. Buchanan.*] There are not many businesses where the stock bought are put up by auction, and sold as they stand?—I presume there may be things of that sort, but I think it is very arbitrary that a man who never saw an animal before, buys it, and, if it is condemned, has to bear the whole loss of it. For instance, if I buy half a dozen bullocks, and the Inspector condemns three of them, then I have only three to go on with instead of six. It is not fair that I should bear all that loss.

61. But with compensation that complaint would be disposed of?—Oh, yes!

62. But, supposing the farmer buys a lot of cattle, and tuberculosis develops, in, say, 2 per cent., 3 per cent., or 4 per cent. of them, would you provide compensation for him too as against the seller?—You mean that these cattle had been to the market to the butcher?

63. Yes, but he presently finds them diseased?—I find under the present condition of things he can only get half of their value from the Government.

64. Where do you slaughter your cattle?—At Ellerslie, six miles away from my shop.

65. You say that by killing your cattle in ones and twos and small lots you are able to dispose of them nicely. Are you not aware that when cattle are at all shy you have more trouble with them when you get them in little lots? So that the abattoir could deal better with that class of cattle than a small butcher?—I do not think so by a long way, because I might buy a couple of bullocks and take them away without any trouble.

66. *Mr. Symes.*] Do I understand you to say that the public of Auckland are asking for the inspection of meat?—Not that I have heard of. It is the people here in Wellington who are asking for it.

67. But you are speaking of Auckland?—Yes; we have it already. We have inspection of both dead and alive. I have had it ever since I have been in business.

68. Of course you believe in inspection?—I do.

69. How do you think it is possible for the Inspector to inspect all the dead meat if every butcher or two kills in his own back-yard?—How is it done in England?

70. I only ask you if it is possible; I do not know?—Oh, yes! it is possible.

71. Supposing all the butchers wanted to kill at different hours, he could not be inspecting them all at the same time. The last witness said he represented sixty butchers. Now, it is utterly impossible for an Inspector to inspect them all at the same time. Say they all wanted to kill, he could not go round the sixty in an hour?—I do not suppose he would, because these butchers do not want it. There are only five licenses, and the whole five come within a mile.

72. Then, a lot of butchers kill at the same slaughterhouse?—No. I say only five—three in Parnell and two in Newmarket.

73. Could the man get round these within an hour or so?—Well, I kill beasts myself for five butchers in Newmarket and Parnell at Ellerslie slaughterhouse.

74. Then, of course, that is five out of sixty?—Yes.

75. If he stayed there half the day inspecting five he could not do the balance in the other half-day?—He might arrange that I should kill one day and the others kill another. Of course, in the summer-time we have to do the best we can.

76. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Do half the butchers kill at the public abattoir?—Yes, about half—that is, the smaller butchers.

WILLIAM BAYLY, representing the butchers of New Plymouth, stated, in reply to the Chairman, that he represented three butchers. I think the other witnesses have left me scarcely anything to say. They have gone through every section very carefully. I indorse the remarks of the two previous speakers, though I do not belong to their district. As far as New Plymouth is concerned at the present time, we have three private slaughterhouses. There is no public slaughterhouse in New Plymouth.

77. *Hon. the Chairman.*] And what inspection?—No inspection whatever, and there never has been.

78. Not of the killed meat?—No, nor yet the cattle before they have been killed. The only Inspector there is Mr. Orbell, who inspects cattle at the sale-yards. He is not appointed to inspect slaughterhouses, nor yet cattle that are slaughtered. I may state that I have been carrying on the business of butcher for the last seventeen years. I have never had a complaint. The public are not asking, so far as I know, for this Bill—for us all to kill at one slaughterhouse. I have been at my business for the whole of that time. I have 300 acres of land in connection with my slaughterhouse, where I can rest my cattle before they are killed. But I might state we are perfectly willing to have the strictest inspection for the benefit of the public at large. What we ask for is that the County Council or Borough Council should recommend three licenses instead of all killing at one place. I may state that my slaughtering establishment has cost me something like £700. I have water laid on, and I have a bone-mill and everything else up to date as far as it is possible to have it. As far as the great cry about diseased cattle is concerned, you must understand it is the old cows that are the diseased cattle of the district, not the cattle that are slaughtered. I instruct my foreman to destroy every beast that he sees is diseased, and during the last two years all we have come across were three, and I have killed 1,600 cattle. But I must also state that I am not situated quite as those gentlemen who have just given evidence. I graze my cattle myself, and I am most particular in buying young and good cattle. There has scarcely been any sign of tuberculosis seen in any of them.

79. Do you have to take out licenses?—Yes, we take out licenses from the County Council, as I am just outside the borough.

80. About how many butchers are employed in Taranaki altogether?—There are only three.

81. *Mr. Lang.*] That is, in New Plymouth?—Yes, I am not taking in the country.

82. How far does the sale with carts go on in New Plymouth?—There is nothing of that from the country.

83. *Mr. Flatman.*] I think I understood you to say you agreed with the two previous witnesses. You do not agree with the former witness, from Christchurch?—I was not in the room when he gave evidence.

84. Do you agree with subclause (2) of clause 3 in the Bill?—Well, I would say the farmer should be allowed to kill as much as he required for his own use.

85. But not for sale or barter?—No, not for sale or barter.

86. *Mr. Brown.*] In addition to the question just asked by Mr. Flatman, did Mr. Bayly notice that there is a proviso to this, that if a farmer kills one head of cattle and five other head of stock per week, he cannot sell any of his meat within any borough or town district, or within three miles of the nearest boundary thereof? You are aware of that?—Yes, I am.

87. You have no objection in the case of a person residing a long way off?—I would not object when they are in their own district. It does not interfere with me in my district.

88. Then the Committee is to understand you have no objection whatever to this inspection?—I have asked the County Council to inspect.

89. *Mr. Lang.*] I ask the witness whether he considers the loss caused by cattle-disease should be borne out of the public revenue or by the butchers?—Speaking of it personally, I would not ask it to be paid, because I do not buy my cattle out of the public yards, but take them off my own lands. I am quite willing to bear all the loss of any beast diseased on my farm. I have been in the grazing line all my days, and I think I am a very good judge of cattle. Any that are suspicious I shoot and bury, and, as far as I am concerned, they are done away with before they come to my slaughter-yard.

90. *Mr. Buchanan.*] What do you do with your offal?—All the entrails I clean, boil, and give to the pigs; the blood I make into manure; and the bones, of course, I crush up for selling for manure.

91. How far from the borough is your slaughterhouse?—It is two miles from the boundary of the borough to my slaughterhouse.

92. Where do you feed your pigs with the offal?—About half a mile away from my slaughterhouse. My slaughterhouse is as clean as this room—no smell whatever. The offal is carted away at once every day.

93. Does that not involve so much expense as to prevent your selling your meat at as low a price as if you had the best appliances in the place for disposing of the offal, such as some of the largest freezing companies have?—Well, I was giving myself credit for having the very best of appliances. At any rate, to give you an idea of how I do my business, I am getting for my sheepskins this month 4s. 5d.; I am getting for my cow-hides 14s.; for ox-hides 21s., put into the trucks; and £15 per ton for my tallow, put into the trucks, casks returned. It would be extremely inconvenient to slaughter our cattle in an abattoir. I want to do my business in my own way.

94. *Mr. Symes.*] In connection with this subclause (2) of clause 3, I suppose you know that in the back districts, where there are no butchers, that farmers often have to kill to supply bushmen or contractors, and if it were not so these could not get their meat. Do not you think it would be a very great hardship if these people were debarred by Act of Parliament from killing and the men from getting their meat, because, as you may know, it is absolutely impossible for butchers to send meat back there and get their price? I understand you to wish to have this clause altered—for farmers to be allowed to kill one head of cattle and five head of sheep a week?—For myself I have no objection. I look upon the killing far back in the bush as a necessity.

95. You would only allow this to apply to back districts?—Yes.

96. Is it not your opinion that a farmer should be liable himself for his own diseased stuff?—Yes. I think it would be hard on the butchers who have to buy from a yard that they should have to pay for the loss. In my own case I graze the cattle myself, and I consider that I should be responsible for the grazing of those cattle.

97. Of course, in New Plymouth it is easy enough for an Inspector to inspect all the meat?—Yes; in the three slaughterhouses he can do it all in an hour.

#### FRIDAY, 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1898.

JAMES FORRESTER, of Christchurch and Sydenham: My evidence will be quite on a par with that of Mr. Hanson's which was given yesterday. We take exception to clause 3, subclause (2); clause 15, subclause (1) (we ask that that subclause be struck out). We also take exception to clause 16, subclause (1), and ask that the whole of the first line and up to the word "it" in the second line be struck out, and that the word "local" be inserted for the word "human" in the fifth line, and the words "or for export" be erased. In clause 18, we object to the last part—namely, "and by the licensee thereof or his workmen." In clause 26 we desire the words "for human consumption throughout the colony" to be taken out. In clause 56, with reference to the compensation for buildings, there is no provision whatever in this clause, and I think there ought to be up to a certain extent. For instance, my premises are leasehold, and I should have to leave everything on the ground all in thorough working-order, and it cost me several hundreds, and, of course, it is pretty hard to be wiped out and get no compensation whatever. We feel we should be dealt with in a reasonable manner. That is all I have to say so far as the Slaughtering Bill is concerned. I would also say something about compensation in the Bill for diseased stock. There is nothing whatever in the Bill to provide for compensation. It is simply a question, I suppose, of having to take proceedings in a law-court to get redress for anything of that sort. I think provision should be made in a Bill of this kind so as to save a great deal of trouble and expense on every occasion that one may have to take steps through having anything condemned. I think the proper thing to do is to have a clause dealing with that.

1. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you come to any conclusion as to how the loss is to be proportioned?—Well, there are different ways.

2. I mean, have you an idea of your own?—I believe I gave evidence last December on the lines that it should be met jointly by the butchers, the producers, and the Government; but since that I think it would be a very good way when an abattoir is erected that the fees should be so arranged that the local body would have a balance in hand, after defraying ordinary working-expenses, and that balance should be supplemented from the Consolidated Fund, which would simply mean the public were paying half the cost of all condemned stock. The butchers themselves, through the fees they pay would be paying the half to the local body; the Government would be paying the other half from the Consolidated Fund, which, I think, would be a very fair way to meet the case.

3. The producer in that case would not suffer at all?—The public would pay half, and the butchers, through their fees paid to the local body, would be paying the other half.

4. Would you now tell the Committee whether the abattoir arrangements in Canterbury and Christchurch are satisfactory?—We have none; it is all done by private slaughterhouses.

5. Have there been any complaints as to these places?—Oh, no! with the exception of letters appearing in our local papers, and these more especially since the Dunedin folks had their place erected.

6. How far is the inspection of meat carried on in Christchurch?—Properly speaking, we have no inspection. The Inspectors are entitled to go over the live-stock, but not the dead meat. Of course, the Sanitary Inspectors in the city and the surrounding boroughs are authorised to inspect at any time, but, of course, it is not generally carried out. I understand that the Christchurch Meat Company or the Islington Company have made application for an Inspector for the works. They have lately gone into the retail trade on a very large scale in Christchurch—that is, the

Islington Freezing Company; and it is commonly reported throughout Christchurch and the suburbs that they are pretty sure of having this Inspector. I would like to point out, in the event of this Bill not passing, and if an Inspector is granted them, they will have a great advantage over all retailers, for no sooner will they have this Inspector granted them than they can state that they are the only people dealing in the retail trade who have an inspector. This association of master butchers is greatly against an Inspector being granted them unless we have an Inspector granted to us. We are in favour of a thorough inspection, but, whatever is done, we must be put on a level footing. The trade is getting in the way of a monopoly, for they have seven retail shops now. That is what I press very strongly on the Committee—the question of an Inspector. Whatever is done with them must be done with us.

7. *Mr. Lawry.*] Have you heard any expression of opinion from the local bodies as to the desirability of passing this Bill?—The City Council, I may state, will not borrow the money to build under the present Bill.

8. Generally speaking, from your knowledge you can corroborate what Mr. Hanson said yesterday—viz., that the Christchurch City Council was opposed to the Bill?—They are not opposed to the building of the abattoirs if the Bill is so amended that all stock slaughtered for local consumption shall pass through a public abattoir, so that a guarantee of revenue shall be given to them. Under the present condition no guarantee whatever is made. In the event of the Bill passing as it is, the Belfast Company are prepared to slaughter for the trade, and the butchers can be accommodated there better than at the abattoir. But we prefer being outside either of the companies.

9. Would you prefer to be as you are?—With inspection, yes.

10. And I understand you not only do not object to, but rather invite, inspection?—We invite inspection.

11. *Mr. Flatman.*] You answered a question from the Chairman on the subject of compensation for diseased cattle. I did not understand who you said you thought should pay this, or who ought to be responsible for any such bullock—whether butcher, farmer, or grazier?—In the event of a public abattoir being put up, I said I thought that the fees could be so arranged that an amount could be charged to the butcher, so that a balance would be on hand at the end of each year, and this could be supplemented from the Consolidated Fund by the Government.

12. Oh! you would create a fund?—Yes.

13. I do not understand whether you said anything relating to clause 30 in the Bill. Does it meet your views?—Well, it gives a deal of trouble, but there can be no good objection to it. It would be much more easily done at an abattoir than in one's own place, because we are not likely to have such a large amount of stock on hand if we slaughter at an abattoir. We have our own paddocks now, and we may buy, say, a couple of hundred sheep and they are not all slaughtered out, and the following week we get another couple of hundred, and they would be mixed up. But in an abattoir the amount of stock kept would be simply from hand to mouth.

14. You consider the question of inspection could be better carried out under an abattoir system than with a butcher slaughtering on his own premises?—I think so.

15. *Mr. Brown.*] I think you represent about seventy butchers?—Seventy-four.

16. Do they kill at private slaughterhouses?—All at private houses.

17. Do they all kill for themselves?—No; we have some butchers who kill for six or eight. I myself kill for several.

18. Could one Inspector do the inspection?—It would require at least two extra. That is what I suggest if the Bill is not passed—that additional inspection should be provided to satisfy the public taste at present.

19. Leaving the public out of the question, which do you prefer—to have all the cattle slaughtered at one abattoir, or at private slaughterhouses as at present?—They are in favour of an abattoir in preference to the present system, in regard to the competition we have at present.

20. *Mr. Massey.*] Did I understand you to say you were in favour of the Bill as a whole?—With the objections that I have stated.

21. If they were removed you would support the Bill?—Yes; I may say the City Council would support the Bill.

22. *Hon. Mr. L. Walker.*] With regard to clause 30, do you think all these precautions are necessary. All these four subclauses would give a great deal of trouble, would they not?—They have always been that; and they have never been carried out, to my knowledge.

23. They are vexatious, are they not?—Yes; and they are prying into one's business too much.

24. *Mr. Symes.*] I do not know if any one has asked what the effect of subclause (3), clause 32, would be?—Well, during hot weather that might lead to trouble. I may state that in Christchurch there is likely to be a freezing-chamber connected with the abattoir, and that would meet the difficulty.

25. *Mr. Buchanan.*] How many butchers kill for themselves round about Christchurch—or rather, the number of private slaughterhouses?—I cannot say.

26. About subclause (3) of clause 32. You have no doubt in your mind, roughly, the distance an Inspector would have to cover to meet the butchers needs in hot weather? Do you imagine, consistently with that clause, that two Inspectors could do the work?—Three Inspectors, with the one we have. That is, if they had the districts fixed.

27. Supposing Belfast declared an abattoir, with exactly the same advantages as you imagine would govern a public abattoir—that is, a butcher perfectly free to do his own work, and anything he liked with his offal, everything for his own benefit. Supposing Belfast under those conditions, what, then, would be the objection to the delegated powers; or would you have any objection?—We have very strong objections to do anything whatever with any meat-export companies at their works. To begin with, the distance is too far from Christchurch.

28. With regard to Islington and Belfast?—Yes; the one is seven, and the other eight miles off—too far to run in the morning. And it would be the same with regard to the offal—they would take no trouble with offal, except to get the most of the offal.

29. I want you to note the conditions I am supposing that a City Council would impose upon the Belfast Company—conditions under which a public abattoir erected by itself and the City Council would be governed—namely, that the butcher would have his own pens, slaughter for himself if he so chose, do anything he liked with his own offal, and do things just as if it was a municipal abattoir?—They have already dealt with that—both committees of the local County Council and the City Council. They have both passed resolutions that they will have nothing whatever to do with the companies.

30. That these are to work abattoirs for themselves?—Yes, themselves, at the request of the butchers.

31. Has the City Council appointed anybody to speak for it?—Here. This is the resolution that they handed to me on Tuesday [passing it over to the Chairman]. [Exhibit C.]

*Hon. the Chairman:* This is from the Town Clerk, saying that they have.

32. *Mr. Buchanan.*] I did not know that; I had only heard a rumour. Is it true that the Christchurch Meat Company has offered to kill sheep or cattle, or both, simply for the offal?—I have not heard so.

FREDERICK BRYANT, representing the butchers of Palmerston North, said: From clause 3 I would strike out subclause (2). I believe in a farmer killing for himself, but not to sell. There is a lot of bartering and selling done in the country—perhaps as much as is done by the butchers. In Palmerston we should like to have our own yards with inspection, otherwise a public abattoir. We, like the Christchurch people, do not believe in freezing companies. It is much better for a man to kill in his own yard. He has his own paddocks; you drive the stock in from the paddock to the yard and kill it. It gets knocked about when with the freezing companies. In clause 18, on page 6, I would strike out the words “by the licensee thereof or his workmen.” In clause 24 I would include the words “export only.” If we have the abattoirs, I think the freezing companies should kill at these abattoirs, the same as the small butchers, and be on an equal footing with them, so that they could not sell their rejects in town at a cheaper rate than what the butcher could really sell his meat at. I also think compensation should be paid the butcher for the loss of buildings and plant. In my case it would mean £400 loss to me. Of course, I am only in a small way. I do not think these places should be done away with without some compensation. As for the condemned meat, I think the Government should pay for it. The people are asking for it, and I should only agree for the Government to pay it, instead of having this different system of two or three paying. On page 9, clause 30, mention is made of keeping a slaughter-book. I have always done it, and I do not find any inconvenience in it. I would agree to that. In clause 32, subclause (3), it says the written authority of an Inspector is required for slaughtering any stock. I should be in favour of striking that out. I think that a butcher should be allowed to remove all his offal if he think fit, and if abattoirs are built it would be better for each man to have a stall of his own, and have his own men to slaughter. I think the Council should have the right to make certain by-laws—if the butchers in a town consider it necessary for their own men to slaughter—for them to be allowed to do so, or for them to have it done by contract; because in some places we have men who have very little to do in the afternoon, and they can easily do the killing. Of course, it is not the same in every town.

33. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Would you say now generally whether those you represent would be in favour of the Bill if it were amended as they point out?—Yes.

34. You prefer that to the present system?—Well, of course we agree with inspection. Our method would be to have the slaughterhouses built to the satisfaction of the Inspector, and then register them. That would be much better for the butchers in Palmerston North generally.

35. What about the inspection now? Is there any inspection now of dead meat?—Yes, the Stock Inspector goes round the shops.

36. Regularly or very irregularly?—Pretty regularly.

37. Are there many shops in the town where they slaughter?—None in Palmerston North.

38. How far is the Palmerston district interfered with by cart business all round?—About ten miles all round.

39. *Mr. Flatman.*] When, in your opinion, should an Inspector inspect an animal?—in the shop or in the abattoir?—In the abattoir.

40. Are there any butchers in Palmerston who have their slaughterhouses in the back-yard in close proximity to the dwelling or to the shop?—No.

41. Would you think that was an objection from a health point of view?—Not at all. They do it in London yet, and they are kept just as clean—cleaner, in fact—than some back-yards are, and there is not so much smell as there is from a stable.

42. So that if a slaughterhouse was properly kept it would not matter if it was alongside your kitchen or bedroom?—Not so long as there was proper sewerage.

43. If not proper sewerage there would be danger?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Massey.*] What do you think of Mr. Forrester's suggestion that a fund should be created from the slaughterhouse fees for the purpose of compensating owners of stock that should be condemned?—I do not agree with that.

45. *Hon. Mr. Lee Smith.*] I understand you to say that subclause (3) of clause 32 is unworkable—that referring to the written authority of the Inspector?—Yes.

46. Does your objection apply to the abattoir and the meat-export slaughterhouse, or only to one of them?—Well, I think it would apply in all cases. It seems very unnecessary where you have the Inspector on the premises, as he would be.

47. How would you insure competent inspection, then?—The Inspector would see the meat as it is killed. That is how I take it if this Bill is passed. He would not want to give his written authority; he would stand there and see it was correct.

48. Well, I do not see how the point you object to makes it unworkable?—It is not altogether unworkable, but still, I think it is unnecessary.

49. You have no suggestions to make as to compensation for bad stock?

*Hon. the Chairman:* Yes, he says he thinks the Consolidated Fund ought to pay.

50. *Mr. Symes* (to witness).] I think I understood you to say that subclause (2) of clause 3 should be struck out—that you objected to it. I suppose you object to it on the ground that farmers and breeders enter into competition with butchers?—Yes; very considerably in the country districts.

51. Do you not know as a matter of fact that back-bushmen, and also contractors, have to depend on the farmers for their meat?—No, I do not—not in our district.

52. How long have you lived there?—Thirteen years.

53. You do not have to go into the back-blocks?—No; there are settlers all around.

54. But do you not know men have to work where there are no settlements?—Well, even then they can pack it to them—say, a distance of twenty miles.

55. But if there were settlers in such a place, and they were willing to kill their bullocks, would you prefer the packed meat or the meat killed near?—I would prefer the settlers' meat certainly, but would not object to settlers killing outside the boundary as proposed in the Bill.

56. Do you not think that settlers should be allowed to kill their meat within a certain distance?—Yes, but not to compete with butchers who have to comply with this Act.

57. You do not think five miles far enough?—No, certainly not.

58. You also say that butchers with slaughterhouses should be compensated if public abattoirs be erected: and who do you expect to pay this?—The Government.

59. You say it is the people who are asking for these. Are the people in Palmerston asking for public abattoirs and inspection?—To a very great extent they are.

60. Does it strike you, then, that the city authorities or County Councils should provide for this sort of thing if it is the people themselves who ask for the abattoirs?—Well, the Councils are not passing the Bill, but I dare say if they were they would provide some compensation.

61. But I am asking how it would be in the case of a County Council. Do you think they ought to find compensation if any is necessary?—No, I think the Government ought to do it; the Council have no money for that purpose.

62. You do not, I suppose, object to farmers killing for their own use?—No, certainly not.

63. But you would object to a farmer, if he killed a bullock, and it was rather too much for him, giving some to his neighbour, and the latter afterwards giving him meat in return?—Yes.

64. *Mr. Buchanan.*] You say that the butcher's killing-place is kept clean and sweet. What is done with the offal?—It is carted away.

65. What is done with it then?—Do you mean in the colony.

66. In Palmerston?—In Palmerston it is all outside the borough. There is no slaughterhouse within the borough.

67. What becomes of the offal then?—Pigs eat the offal; all the offal goes to the paddock.

68. The butcher keeps the pigs himself?—Yes.

EDMUND PERRETT, of Wanganui, representing the butchers of Wanganui, said: We object to line 20 on page 3. We wish that struck out altogether. We also wish subclause (1) in clause 15 struck out, so that they cannot delegate their powers to any freezing company. In clause 16, subclause (1), we want meat-export slaughterhouses to kill for export only, and that all stock for local consumption shall be killed at one slaughterhouse—a registered abattoir provided for each district. A registered abattoir is what we request. We are perfectly in accord with most of the others of the trade—that is, to have inspection—registered inspection, in fact. We do not object to that at all. All we ask for is that we should be dealt fairly with, and that no large companies like the freezing companies should have any advantage over us. Of course, with reference to private slaughter-yards, we would like to have our slaughter-yards also. But we are perfectly satisfied to go to the public abattoirs built by the Government or the Corporation, as the case may be, and have our meat inspected by proper inspectors appointed; provided that freezing companies are not allowed to retail in the borough or other districts, as the case may be. If they do, we say they ought to have their meat killed at the same place as the ordinary butchers—viz., at the public abattoirs—and have it inspected the same way. We ask for nothing else.

69. *Hon. the Chairman.*] About compensation: In the event of abattoirs being established, how would that affect butchers in Wanganui? Would they be under a considerable loss?—I may say we are already under that abattoir inspection. We have had a public abattoir for the last nine or ten months. The Government appointed an Inspector, and we are working under that inspection now.

70. Did you suffer loss by having to remove to the public place?—Yes: a very big loss, too.

71. And you had no compensation?—No. I must say we are in favour of compensation; and we say the Government ought to compensate us out of the Consolidated Fund, for the reason that it is for the public benefit. They get the benefit and we pay. They ought to pay for it; and that is the simplest and easiest way of dealing with the matter.

72. Was there any considerable sum involved in loss to individuals in Wanganui?—Yes, something considerable, but I have not the figures.

73. We are talking about the premises?—Not so much in Wanganui as in other places, I believe. Personally, I did not suffer much loss, because my lease was a very short one; but the others have suffered more than I have.

74. Now, about compensation for condemned meat: You say it ought to be borne by the public out of the Consolidated Fund?—Yes.

75. *Mr. Flatman.*] You say you object to subclause (2) of clause 3 on page 3?—Yes.

76. Will you give your reasons for objecting to that?—We do not object if you increase the area. I think the Act says five miles. Well, I myself send carts ten miles from the Borough of

Wanganui; and it is not right, when carts are travelling amongst the public there, and they can get whatever they like—it is not fair for the farmers to be killing and selling meat. It is not fair to trade. Of course, I am not speaking of places where they are so far away that they have no chance of getting this meat there fresh.

77. You do not mean from a public point of view, that it might be detrimental to the health of the people on account of the meat not being inspected, but simply from a trade point of view?—That is another objection. I do not think people should be allowed the chance of getting these diseases; I think they should be protected, even if they are living some distance away in the country.

78. *Mr. Massey.*] Did you read clause 24, page 7? I ask the question because one of the previous witnesses suggested that the words “for export only” should be put in after the word “slaughterhouses”?—Yes; we have no objection to that.

79. Would you recommend the insertion of those words?—Yes; we agree with that.

80. You recommend compensation for stock: do you mean for stock not killed in your slaughterhouses, or stock condemned?—More particularly for stock condemned.

81. Have you any insurance charge in Wanganui on any stock?—No; farmers will not agree to such a charge.

82. As regards freezing companies: You agree that the freezing companies, if inspected in the same way as yourselves, might enter into fair competition?—Yes.

83. As to farmers killing meat like yourself, and selling it, is that detrimental to you?—Yes, I have experienced that.

84. What do you suggest to get rid of that difficulty?—That they should not be allowed to sell.

85. Not to any extent?—No. Well, not altogether. I would say, not within ten or twelve miles of a licensed abattoir.

86. Within ten or twelve miles of any borough?—Yes, I would say, about that.

87. Have you heard of butchers killing in the yards near their shops? Do you think it would be a wise thing?—No, I do not think so myself.

88. Such a thing as that has never been done in Wanganui?—Not that I know of.

89. Suppose you were living just outside a ten-mile radius. If you could get meat from a farmer, would you buy it coming it out of a butcher's cart which had come a distance of ten miles?—Well, it depends on circumstances. If it came out of the butcher's cart properly dressed and in good condition, I would, probably.

90. Well, of course, you must know that some little distance from Wanganui it was—if it is not now—absolutely impossible for people to get their meat unless it was packed?—That would be within ten or twenty miles.

91. That may be your experience in your time; I have known it in my time. Who pays the Inspector at Wanganui at the present day?—The Borough Council pays him part, the freezing company pays part; but he is responsible to the Borough Council and he is responsible to the Government.

92. You now have to kill at Castlecliff. Do you think that to be in the interest of the butcher or the consumer?—Well, in the interest of the consumer, but not the butcher.

93. Certainly, you would say it was not in the interest of the grower?—No; I would not say that.

94. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Is the Inspector at Castlecliff a veterinary surgeon?—Yes; fully qualified.

95. Did you say he was responsible to the borough?—Yes.

96. In what sense?—That he has been appointed to the Borough Council under the seal of the Governor. The Borough Council applied to His Excellency to appoint him under the Act.

97. What distance is Castlecliff from Wanganui?—About five miles.

98. Do the butchers find it inconvenient?—It is expensive; we have to go by rail.

99. Do the butchers find any objection to killing their meat there on the ground that it is a freezing company that works it?—Well, we do object. We would strongly object to having our meat killed by a freezing company if we could alter it; but the arrangement has been made with the Borough Council, and we have no objection at all. But in framing a new Bill that is another matter. We say it is not our wish to go to any freezing company to get our work done, because we are at a disadvantage.

100. Are you allowed to kill your own stock?—No; they do it, and charge a fee.

101. Whose property does the offal become?—Most of it goes to the freezing company.

102. Are you free or not to give it away?—No. We get a small portion of it.

103. Supposing a definite pen was allotted to yourself and to each of the other butchers, each pen for a particular butcher, and liberty given each butcher to kill his own stock; that each particular butcher could do anything he chose with the offal; and the situation of the abattoir was convenient—closer to Wanganui, we will suppose—would there be any objection then?—Well, with all those concessions, I do not think we would object, but I do not see how it is workable. We could not get the whole of our offal: a certain amount of it—blood and other portions, for instance—could not be taken away.

104. We have had it in evidence that some private butchers take their blood away to a considerable distance from their slaughtering-place and make use of it and of the other offal to advantage. It was stated in evidence that this had been the practice for years by these particular butchers. What would you think of that?—I cannot speak from experience on that point, but I should not say it was very workable myself; it would not be convenient.

105. *Mr. Symes.*] Were all the butchers in Wanganui unanimous or agreeable that the abattoir should be at Castlecliff?—Not all.

106. As a matter of fact, one stuck out?—Yes, there was one exception.

107. And had to fight the matter in the law-courts?—Yes.

108. Have the freezing company at any time sold meat in Wanganui?—No, not that I know of.

109. And, of course, they do not sell now?—No.

110. Was it not a threat from the freezing company that induced the butchers to give in—that they would sell in competition with the butchers if the abattoir were not established at Castlecliff?—Not that I am aware of. If you will allow me, it was a threat from the Corporation. The people determined to have an abattoir, and the Council gave us to understand that they would make arrangements for the abattoir and compel us to go there. It was not our own wish to go there.

111. It was not the wish of the butchers that they went there, and it is not in the interests of the grower or consumer. Is it not a well-known fact that the Wanganui Meat-freezing Company and the Castlecliff Railway Company are running this sort of thing in copartnership in order to please the general public?—No; I do not think there is anything of the kind.

112. *Mr. Flatman.*] Having been forced into the position—you have practically admitted you were forced into the position—of resorting to abattoirs, in your experience has not that been beneficial to yourself and the public?—Not to ourselves, but to the public.

WILLIAM J. GARRETT, of Wellington, representing thirty-two of the smaller butchers in the City of Wellington, some of whom killed for themselves and some of whom did not, said: The principal clauses we object to in the Bill is one that has already been gone over—I mean subclause (2) of clause 3—and I should like to support the objection to it that farmers should not kill or sell anywhere near large towns. I think the radius is rather small at present. I would prefer the radius to be extended a little. In clause 15 I should like to object to subsections (1), (2), and (3), because subsections (2) and (3) are partly bearing on (1). Then there is subsection (1) in clause 16. I object to the clause, “Subject to the provisions hereinafter contained relating to meat-export slaughterhouses,” and further down, in line 5, to the words “or for export.” And in clause 18 several object to it, and I would like to support them, and put in the words “practical workmen” instead of “his workmen.” I think, if a man is a good workman there should be no objection to him killing even in a public slaughterhouse.

113. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Are there licensed men?—Not at present.

*Witness* (continuing): The next clause to which I take exception is No. 19. I would like to add here that the license should be granted—that they would come under the Act provided they would be properly regulated as regards cleanliness, &c.

114. *Mr. Massey.*] What you suggest is this: No licenses except those already in existence, and a clause might follow that they should be properly inspected under proper regulations?—Yes.

*Witness* (continuing): In clause 24 I would support “for export only,” as the previous witness did; and in clause 26 I would support the previous witnesses in crossing out the words “human consumption throughout the colony,” so that it should read, “for export beyond the colony” only. Clause 30, I think, as regards Wellington, is very unworkable. A lot of our stock comes from a distance in the train, and you cannot distinguish the different brands; and even in the sale-yards here, with a small pen of thirty or forty sheep, you will see about a dozen or more different marks. Each particular sheep would have to be looked over. I think it is very unworkable, situated as we are here. In clause 31 I would like to cross out the words “and by any other person on payment of a fee of one shilling for each inspection.” I think no one but a Justice of the Peace or some other authorised person should be allowed to inspect any of the slaughterhouse books. With regard to clause 42, subclause (2), where it is made unlawful “to cut off, remove, or destroy any ear on such skin” the observing of that would be found troublesome. A slip of the knife might leave a portion of the ear on the head. In a large slaughterhouse it would be very troublesome. In clause 49, subclause (3) implies that we are not allowed to buy pigs from the farmers dead; they must be bought alive: and should they arrive here by train in the evening heated and knocked about, they are not fit to kill that night, and if they were, you could not salt the meat. That clause is very much against the butchers, and very strongly against the bacon-factories. Clause 56 I support as far as it goes, but I do not think it goes far enough. Not only the person who leases the slaughterhouse, but the person who has a freehold slaughterhouse, should have the same compensation if the license is abolished. Then, how will this Bill affect the Wellington butchers’ slaughterhouses? Clause 15, subclause (1), gives the local bodies power to delegate. By clause 19 their licenses are abolished. Clause 26 gives the meat-export companies power to kill their own meat for local consumption; therefore we might have to pay our fees to them: and that, we maintain, might create in Wellington a big trade monopoly, and wipe out all the smaller butchers. It would also make a monopoly in the purchasing, and of course it makes a difference to the small farmer. The export companies in buying their sheep go to the large runholders, because they have not the time to collect small parcels. And there are other small interests supported by the butchers. When I speak of the butchers I mean those who are slaughtering their own stock. Then, there are the dealers in sausage-casings, tallow, soap, and sheepskins, who depend on the butchers. If our slaughterhouses are abolished and are wiped out, these also must be wiped out, as they are living on us really. In a large slaughtering-place they monopolize everything, they utilise all the by-products. I believe these works round here utilise the blood and everything else. But the smaller butcher is also doing good work—especially those who have well-appointed slaughterhouses, like several who appeared before you yesterday. In Wellington we are slightly different from other places in having very little back country to draw our supplies from, and we have to kill a great deal of our meat from a distance. I am now killing meat from Te Aute, near Napier. These cattle are necessarily knocked about on the road, and if we all killed at one abattoir we would not have proper resting-places

to put them in when they get here, as we have not the level land round Wellington. The freezing companies could not properly rest our stock, and to centralise large bodies of stock in one place is very detrimental to the stock itself. As a butcher of thirty years' experience, I can say the smaller slaughterhouses have advantages over larger companies by taking care of their own stock, by seeing that it is properly rested, and turned out from killing in a brighter and better manner than in any large slaughtering-place. I think gentlemen may see this in Wellington. Of course it might be said you could rest the stock and then take it to an abattoir; but if you have any wild stock you cannot do so, because the beast will be unsettled, and it will waste away. If stock is not properly rested it causes bone-stink. Of course, there might be certain differences in other matters, but that is caused to a great extent through not properly resting. If we had a large area of green country, or even a small area, we could properly rest our cattle. And the noise near the abattoir makes a difference. It will not do the work so well as a private slaughterhouse. Those who have erected private slaughterhouses and boiling-down works to carry on their trade will find it very hard if they are abolished without compensation. As regards compensation for diseased cattle, I think it opens up a big matter, because you must draw the line at fat cattle; and what about those for tinning? It is a most difficult matter to touch. For my own part, I think the owner who breeds these things should bear the loss. We ought to strike at the root of the evil, and condemn all the cows, and not let them be bred from—those that are diseased—and so rear up flocks and herds free from disease.

115. *Hon. the Chairman.*] How is Wellington provided for now in its killing arrangements?—The Gear Company have several large shops of their own.

116. *Mr. Buchanan.*] How many?—Four in the town and one in the suburbs. The Meat Export Company also supply many of those butchers who have not got their own slaughterhouses. There is a private firm at Kaiwarra, Mr. Banks, who supplies several butchers. Another one supplies four butchers in town, and allows several to have the use of his slaughterhouse at Miramar. Those living at the extreme end of the city prefer to kill there because it is nearer than those slaughterhouses at the north side of the city. Then there is myself; I kill for one or two besides myself.

117. *Hon. the Chairman.*] And what inspection is there?—Very little except by surprise visits in the slaughterhouse when the meat is dead. Mr. Gilruth some ten days ago visited my slaughterhouse just as a surprise.

118. But what about the local authorities?—They take no notice in the matter; but the Government have an Inspector of Stock. Mr. Johnson goes round the slaughterhouses very carefully.

118A. *Mr. Lawry.*] As I understood you spoke of the impossibility of carrying out the provisions of clause 30—that is, with regard to the slaughter-book?—Yes, that would be almost an impossibility here; you cannot discern brands in train sheep.

118B. Do I infer from your remarks that it would take an experienced butcher—a fast slaughterman—as long to find out the marks as to kill his sheep?—Yes.

118C. And you look upon this as a dead-letter, even though it become law?—Most decidedly.

118D. In subclause (3) of clause 49 do you think there is any objection in keeping pigs near a slaughterhouse to eat up offal—that is, if the sanitary arrangements are provided for?—I think I object to that.

118E. Do you not think they act as scavengers?—Well, they do within moderate bounds, but I should keep the pigs away at a certain distance from the slaughterhouse, so that no smell should reach the slaughterhouse from the pigs.

119. *Mr. Flatman.*] You only object to subclause (3), clause 4, on account of the limited distance allowed?—I think that in the back-blocks, where there are no butchers, it must be allowed, but where there is means of killing meat at a properly appointed slaughterhouse they should not kill without inspection.

120. What radius would you suggest?—About ten miles.

121. And that is the only objection you have to that clause?—Yes.

122. You do not object that the public should have the meat inspected?—No, I would agree with that. Rather than not have meat at all they had better have it without inspection.

123. In clause 19 you say the present licensees should be allowed to retain their licenses?—Yes.

124. And could the Inspector inspect the meat under that system as well as he could under the abattoir system?—I think the Inspector could go to the slaughterhouse and inspect the meat. Otherwise he could order the pluck—*i.e.*, liver, lungs, heart, &c.—to be left in the animal, and then he could afterwards pass it or condemn it according to the regulations.

125. You think an Inspector should be appointed; but it would probably mean an extra man?—Yes.

126. I think I understood you to say it was only casual—this inspection. If this Bill comes in it must be necessary?—Yes; but the butchers have been paying for inspection and have not had it.

127. What I mean is, would the butchers be willing to pay for the extra inspection if they retained their licenses?—Most decidedly.

128. In the case of pigs, if they came down by train each night and were trucked to the abattoir, and stayed there until the next morning, would you call that immediate slaughter?—Well, I would like that defined; the Inspector might think differently.

129. *Mr. Brown.*] Has the Borough Council of Wellington no Inspector of Slaughterhouses?—No, the Borough Council has not an Inspector. Slaughterhouses are situated outside our borough.

130. And does the local authority where the slaughterhouses are inspected have the meat inspected?—Yes; they have an Inspector, and we pay the fees.

131. And they do not inspect the slaughterhouses?—The local body gets the fees. If our fees went to the City of Wellington, then they could appoint their Inspectors.

132. Do not you think it advisable that the local authorities in whose district the meat is sold should appoint the Inspectors outside?—Yes, they should have that power.

133. *Mr. Massey.*] Though you have no inspection of abattoirs in the Wellington District, I suppose the stock is inspected before being sold in the sale-yard?—Yes; I have seen Mr. Johnson repeatedly.

134. Are they inspected privately?—No.

135. Can you give us any idea of the percentage of stock condemned purchased in the sale-yard?—About 1 or 2 per cent.—very few indeed.

136. A suggestion was made by one of the previous witnesses that a fund should be established for compensating owners of stock where they are condemned. I want to know what percentage would be necessary. Do you think a charge of 2 per cent. would be sufficient for that purpose?—If it only applied to fat stock; but in our sale lines a large number of culls are bought and purchased for potting.

137. By speaking of “culls” you mean sheep?—I mean old ewes and old cows, which might be bought for preserving purposes, or for their bones and hides, to make manure, &c.

138. What do you think of the establishing of this fund for the purpose of compensating?—I think the producer of the stock should be held responsible.

139. For the whole of it?—If he sells a diseased animal he should bear the loss.

140. But he may sell it without knowing?—Yes; but I think the tendency now is to teach him better.

141. Is it not possible for an animal to have tuberculosis without the disease being visible?—It is.

142. Did you say anything about compensating owners or lessees of slaughterhouses in case of establishing abattoirs?—Yes, I did.

143. What is the feeling in Wellington generally among the butchers with regard to the proposals of this Bill?—Those butchers who have slaughterhouses would like inspection; but if they were abolished they would certainly like a public abattoir and all put on one footing—that is, the public supply of meat for Wellington should all come through that one channel.

144. Is there any feeling in Wellington about inspection of meat?—One or two doctors seem to be driving the matter forward.

145. *Hon. Mr. Lee Smith.*] I suppose I am right in assuming that the chief objection to clause 16 is that the butchers as a body are afraid the export companies might enter into competition with you and supply for local consumption?—Yes. One company is entering into competition with us already; it has four or five shops in the town.

146. Well, of course you would naturally be against that. In the case of private slaughterhouses you would be at a great disadvantage in competing with them?—Most decidedly.

147. You say the butchers have been paying for inspection. How have you been paying?—We have been paying for inspection, and have never had it; and we pay £1 a year for license, 3d. for every bullock and calf, and ½d. for every sheep, &c.

148. But it has not been done. But how about compensation?—I think the grower should be responsible for that, as the butcher only has them in his hands for a few days.

149. Do you understand that when they are established towns distant twenty or thirty miles away may send for their meat. For instance, you are not aware that towns forty miles off are sending to Dunedin for their meat—such as Palmerston South, Lawrence, and all those places?—No. I might also state that we do not agree with chilling meat. The temperature is often too cold, and when it comes into the warmth the meat tends to drip.

150. *Mr. Symes.*] You say you have paid fees to the County Council. That is only what they call slaughtering fees?—That is intended to cover the cost of inspection; but we have never had that inspection.

151. But one of the local bodies, as a rule, had to see that everything was kept clean, and collect the fees?—Yes, the fees principally.

152. Has that been done for a number of years?—Ever since I have been killing in a private slaughterhouse.

153. Now, during your long experience, how many beasts have you condemned? During the past five years, say?—I have only had one cow.

154. Have you ever seen swine affected with tuberculosis?—Yes, I have.

155. Do you think it would cost a very great amount more to inspect the meat as the slaughterhouses are now situated than at the abattoir?—It would cost one more Inspector, at least.

156. But it could be thoroughly inspected with one more Inspector?—Yes.

157. You have no Inspector now, so you would require two?—They require two for the private slaughterhouses here, and one for each of the companies—they require at least four.

158. Do you think one could do the work?—Well, I would like to say two, to meet the case of outside butchers.

159. Now, supposing that done, who do you consider would pay the cost of inspection?—The butchers would pay in the first instance.

160. But do you consider it is the grower or consumer who actually pays?—The cost of inspection? Well, I think it would all come out of the grower in the long-run, because we should buy accordingly.

161. You have been in business a great many years in Wellington: have you ever known any butcher in Wellington kill meat behind his shop?—No; but I have known it done in London.

162. Do you consider it an advantage, killing behind the shop?—No, I do not think it is. It is the driving of stock through the streets I most object to. It really means the question of cleanliness. In London they remove the blood and everything else, and when night comes there is nothing left whatever.

163. *Mr. Buchanan.*] I suppose you have invested a good deal of money, time, and labour in your business?—Yes, considerable.

164. If this Bill came into force you would lose heavily?—I should lose about £2,000.

165. And you therefore do not think you should be called upon to pay that amount for the general public benefit?—No, I do not.

166. Are there many in the neighbourhood of Wellington in a similar position?—Three or four of us.

167. We have had it from yourself and other witnesses in evidence that the small butchers, through advantages that have been described, such as paddocks, resting-places, and personal attention, and so on, are able to present their meat in better condition—better dressing, better colour, and the like. How do the butchers who buy by the carcase—say, from any of the freezing companies, or from Mr. Banks, or from Hellaby Brothers in Auckland (whose extensive business you know something about)—how are they able to compete in their shops with the butchers who slaughter for themselves?—I may tell you I have seen very few butchers in New Zealand who have ever got on by buying dead meat. All those firms like Hellaby's started with private slaughterhouses. The meat does not look so attractive in the meat companies' shops as meat killed in a private slaughterhouse. I could give you ocular demonstration any day you liked; in fact, so might also your manager. Mr. Moore, of Ngahauranga, one day asked me how it was my meat looked so nice in the shops.

168. I want to get at things that puzzle me. Has the number of butchers round about Wellington who kill for themselves increased or decreased?—They have slightly increased within the last six or eight years, but not to any great extent. I think that two or three more are killing for themselves now than five or six years ago. I may say that at one time there were only three—the Gear Company, Messrs. J. and H. Barber, and Messrs. Pollock and Young.

169. Are there any butchers who previously slaughtered for themselves who are now buying slaughtered meat?—Yes, there is one gentleman—Mr. Barber. He is the only person I know of—the person I worked for when I first came to the colony.

169A. If the practice of slaughtering in a small establishment goes on and, as you say, the producer is held responsible for all diseased stock, how would you suggest butchers' claims for diseased stock being checked—that is, a butcher claims damage for an animal, say, from the west coast or the Wairarapa; the butcher kills it at Ngahauranga and sends in his claim? How would you suggest that claim being met?—He would have to leave the skin on the neck of the animal until the Inspector had noted the brand and ear-mark.

170. When you buy your stock from the farmer do you buy different sorts—that is, suppose there is a lot in the yard, and they want to dispose of them? If you buy them do you buy them as they stand—stock that is only fit for preserving mixed with different other sorts?—No, I never touch those lines; I only buy fat stock. There are always buyers from both companies to buy these lines, and I do not touch them.

171. The freezing companies buy in that way?—Yes, both of them.

172. And it necessarily is a great advantage to the producer?—Possibly so.

173. I am speaking now of purchases on the farm. If the freezing companies are prevented from selling locally, what would you suggest should be done in case of a little bruise on the leg from a nip in the trucks, or other causes—defects that are only disclosed after the skin is stripped off? What would you suggest should be done with such defective sheep?—That is, if this Bill goes through in its present form.

174. And if the suggestions are carried out that freezing companies are prevented from selling locally?—Then they would have to be used for tinned meat. Some butchers in Patea are buying nothing but meat for tinning.

175. Supposing the carcase is worth 8s. or 9s. for local consumption, and worth only half that for preserving. Who is to stand the loss?—That must be a question between the freezing company and the grower.

176. Would not the producer have to stand the loss in the same way as you suggest he should do in the case of diseased cattle?—I think it would come to him in the long-run.

Mr. J. JARMAN, Inspector for the Selwyn County Council, and also for the City of Christchurch, said: I was asked by the butchers of my district to say something upon the compensation clauses of this Bill. I may say that under the existing Slaughterhouse Act there is nothing stated about compensation. Unfortunately for the butchers, in the many cases condemned in the sale-yards, and the few cases in the slaughterhouses, the onus has come on the butcher, which, I think, is very unjust. They have not the opportunity to inspect the cattle at the yards, as they are so closely penned together, and their idea is not so much to look out for tuberculosis, but rather to look out for the weight and for what they are going to get out of the cattle. Unfortunately for themselves they are not in a position to detect these animals, and therefore they asked me to mention these facts to this Committee. I have condemned a large quantity of cattle during the past nine years, and the onus has come on the butcher. I have not only condemned cattle connected with the butcher, but also those of the dealer. In one or two instances I have assisted the butcher in getting his cheque returned from the auctioneer. The latter gets it from the seller. But there is generally a great fuss in the matter; and, for my own part, I think that under this new Bill if there was a clause inserted concerning compensation for butchers, it would save Inspectors a great deal of trouble. It is unfortunate for us that we have to run against these gentlemen; but we have to do our duty to the public. We thought perhaps the Bill would work better if we could have a clause inserted making provision for compensation. I have no more to say on compensation, but I am going now to a clause in the Bill concerning myself. This is part of clause 27. It is the latter part of it. I have been for nine years with the Selwyn County Council (I can send

you my testimonials if you wish) as Inspector, and I am also Inspector for the Woolston Borough, the City of Christchurch, Linwood Borough, and assist in St. Albans. I feel, although I am not a veterinary surgeon, I may claim to be an expert. I have been all my life brought up with stock, and I have testimonials testifying to the efficiency of my duties from the Selwyn County Council, and also from the City of Christchurch and others. I thought that, if a clause could be inserted in the Act similar to that of 1894 (page, 127, clause 48), my position might be secured. As it is my livelihood, I should be heard, therefore I think that I may ask for your consideration in this matter. I was with a veterinary surgeon three years in my younger days, but, losing my father, I could not go on with the veterinary experience. I may say I was the first Inspector who condemned any cattle at the Addington Yards. I have in every possible manner helped and assisted the Government Inspector at the Addington Yards, also by advising him, and calling his attention to many cases during the last seven years. Therefore, I merely ask that you will consider me in this matter.

177. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are, you say, acting for several of the local bodies—Christchurch City and several of the out-districts?—Yes; but I am chiefly interested in the Selwyn County Council.

178. Is your inspection confined to dead meat?—I am Inspector of both live and dead meat in these places under the Act.

179. Are you able to get over the work of all those districts?—Not properly.

180. How far, for instance, are you able to properly inspect the slaughterhouses around Christchurch?—I do those, some weekly, some fortnightly. If I think there is anything wrong, I go to a place frequently.

181. But the inspection in the ordinary way would not be more than weekly or fortnightly?—Yes.

182. Practically that would be no regular inspection of meat?—No. On Saturdays I am around the Town of Christchurch, in the sale-yards and in the shops.

183. To what extent have you had to condemn meat last year killed for Christchurch, generally speaking?—I cannot quite say. I think I condemned eighty-eight last year. During the last month I have had to condemn twenty wholly. These include some which were killed by one of the factories for potting.

184. But I want to get the result from the butchers first?—Only three during this month, in slaughter-yards.

185. Can you give us for the year?—Thirty-one at sales and slaughteryards.

186. And the eighty-eight you referred to just now were animals slaughtered partly for preserving?—Yes, and from dairies as well.

187. And in the country slaughterhouses to what extent, more or less?—I have condemned none.

188. That might be by your infrequent visits possibly?—Yes.

189. How far has your inspection gone with regard to live animals? Has it been confined to sales in the yards?—No. Driving round and looking through farms and dairies.

190. Does not the officer do any work?—Oh, yes!

191. How does your work go along with his?—I inspect the fat cattle at the markets.

192. Have you any authority with regard to the farms to go there and inspect?—Yes, under by-laws.

193. What condition are the slaughterhouses in that are being used at present for Christchurch?—They are rather dilapidated. The question of abattoirs has been hanging over the butchers so long that they could not see their way clear to spend money in improving their premises.

194. How far are these establishments efficient for their purpose now?—Well, they have to kill under difficulties in some places.

195. Does that apply to the larger establishments?—No.

196. About what number of places are there for slaughtering for Christchurch at present?—One factory—the Christchurch Meat Company—and nineteen all under the Selwyn County Council, one at Woolston, and two at St. Albans, or twenty-three altogether. We have also two bacon-factories, two freezing companies, and twenty-one in the country.

197. That is, in addition to the others?—Yes. On the whole I have forty-five under the Selwyn County Council.

198. And you try to inspect all these?—As far as I can.

199. You have no assistance?—None whatever.

200. Will the people who are at present engaged in this slaughtering business incur considerable loss if this abattoir arrangement becomes law?—Yes, in some instances.

201. Would it be a large matter to give them compensation?—In some cases it would be a large cost, in others not.

202. You say the probability of this Bill becoming law is preventing them making improvements they would be making?—It has done.

203. *Mr. Lawry.*] Do you inspect the meat that is being sold by retail by the big companies in Christchurch?—Yes, but not all; I am at Islington once in the week.

204. It has been stated here that the companies that sell retail should be subject to the same inspection as those who are small retail butchers. Are you of that opinion?—Certainly.

205. Have you met any local bodies that are dissatisfied with the present arrangements? For instance, in the Selwyn County Council, are they opposed to the existing state of affairs?—The Selwyn County Council prefer abattoirs, as also do the City Council.

206. You have spoken of the question of veterinary surgeons. Are you aware that in the Bill none but duly qualified veterinary surgeons should be appointed Inspectors? How long have you been in the business?—I have been nine years, in New Zealand.

207. In your opinion knowledge acquired from practical experience is better than mere technical knowledge?—I should think so.

208. Do you take it that a man of your experience is sufficiently qualified to know, when he sees a carcass of meat, whether or not it is fit for human consumption?—Yes.

209. Generally speaking, you find the quality of meat very good quality?—I do.

210. Have you any experience of the Old Country?—I have.

211. How does the quality of meat compare with that sold in the Old Country?—I am apt to think the meat is better in the Old Country—it is better fed.

212. I am speaking from a health point of view. Do you think the meat is less dangerous for health and for human consumption than in the Old Country?—I think it is quite as good here.

213. *Mr. Flatman.*] How many sheep have you condemned during the last twelve months?—Twenty-two.

214. Was that for tuberculosis?—No : hydatids, congestion of the lungs, and pleurisy.

215. They would be old sheep, I suppose?—Mostly old.

216. You do not find much disease with the young sheep?—No.

217. Practically none?—Yes.

218. Out of the eighty-eight cattle you condemned there were thirty-one of them that were beasts for butchers?—Yes.

218A. And of the fifty others some of them were dairy cows?—Yes; and some of them were for potting.

219. Would you find the major portion in the dairy cows or in the potters?—In the potters.

220. Then you have not been able to inspect all the meat that is sold in Christchurch, either alive or dead?—It is an impossibility.

221. *Mr. Massey.*] You are not troubled much with tuberculosis in the country?—In some cases.

222. What proportion did you condemn?—They were two old ones.

223. About this clause 27 : Did I understand you to say that none other than duly qualified veterinary surgeons could be appointed as Inspectors?—I read it as such—or to pass an examination. Of course, I am not aware what the examination would be.

*Mr. Massey :* I think it is rather an important point that an Inspector should pass an examination to obtain a certificate to be duly qualified in connection with his office.

224. *Mr. Symes.*] I suppose you are appointed by the local body?—I am.

225. Chiefly, I suppose, for collecting fees in the first instance, and to see that they keep their slaughterhouses in proper order?—No; the treasurer collects the fees.

226. Who pays your salary—the local body?—Each pays its own.

227. You get a "screw" from each?—Unfortunately not from all, and a very small one from Woolston.

228. You say you have recommendations from these local bodies. Have they any one competent to give you a certificate?—Yes.

229. Would you consider any of these people were competent to judge?—Yes.

230. There are none of them "vets.", I suppose?—No, not "vets."

231. You say you have condemned certain live cattle: do you get authority from the local body or the Government for this?—From the local body.

232. How many fat cattle have you condemned under the Selwyn County Council within the last twelve months?—The greater quantity—I should say, thirty-one.

233. *Mr. Massey.*] Out of eighty-eight?—Yes.

234. *Mr. Symes.*] How many old cows have you condemned within the last twelve months that have been bought by the freezing companies?—I think it was forty.

235. That was at the freezing-works?—Yes.

236. How many carcasses have you condemned within the past twelve months at the various slaughterhouses?—About three.

237. I think I understood you to say that your duties, of course, could not be very strictly carried out, as any one must know, because it is impossible you should do all this work? How many Inspectors, do you think, could thoroughly inspect the slaughterhouses in the district you now represent?—I should say four could do it thoroughly. I do not think, myself, that the inspection can be carried out properly unless it is centralised—say, in one abattoir.

238. Why?—The Inspector could be on the spot, whereas otherwise he would have to drive from one slaughterhouse to another, and it would be very inconvenient to wait in other places until the Inspector comes.

239. You say there are something like forty slaughterhouses?—Yes.

240. I suppose they generally kill in the morning or in the evening; they do not kill in the middle of the day?—Not in the summer; but in winter, at all times.

241. The meat is hung up after being killed until it is branded?—Not until you see the internal organs. I may say the greater number of my butchers hang up the internal organs for my inspection. The largest quantity of meat is killed on Thursday.

242. Is there any great difficulty for the thorough inspection of meat at abattoirs?—No.

243. Do you consider that inspection should be paid for by the butchers?—Yes, as it is already. I am paid from the fees.

244. Would you consider that there should be a fee charged—a slaughter fee, or something of that sort? I am speaking of the case of thoroughly appointed Inspectors for the payment of their salaries, and for the payment of the losses of those who have condemned slaughterhouses and condemned cattle. Would you suggest that a fee should be charged for the abattoir?—I would

suggest that the Government should pay for it. I may say our fees and licenses come to a very small amount. They have not the means to pay for compensation.

245. You have seen yourself there has been more condemned cattle at the freezing-works, where they are not inspected, than where they are under inspection at the private yards?—I have seen these animals at the sale-yards, and I have given notice to the buyer that I must see the animals killed.

246. *Mr. Buchanan.*] For what purpose are these cows bought by the freezing company—boiling down or what?—Potting and boiling down.

247. What do they do with their old cows that are not fit for anything except boiling down?—They boil them down. They are killing the potters on the same day.

248. I suppose the freezing companies buy thousands of old ewes for the same purpose of potting. Do you inspect these?—I inspect the cattle and look through the sheep at the same time.

249. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What is done with the animals that are condemned?—They are boiled down for manure; the diseased parts are buried.

TUESDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 1898.

JOHN ROD examined.

1. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Your name?—John Rod, butcher, residing at Johnsonville. I have a shop in Johnsonville as well as in Wellington.

2. You represent others besides yourself, do you not?—Yes; I am representative for Petone and the Hutt as well as Porirua.

3. Will you please make your statement?—I have been butchering for twenty years in the colony. My business extends from Pahautanui to Wellington, a radius of twenty miles. I have a slaughter-yard at Porirua, some twelve miles from my shop in Wellington. My shops and slaughterhouse will compare favourably for cleanliness with any place in the colony. I always buy the very best meat obtainable in the market, and I have gone to a lot of expense in connection with the trade. I have gone to a lot of expense to bring water right through my slaughter-yards, and have provided all the latest appliances. I think it would be hard indeed that I should be deprived of the use of my yards, for, under the present Bill, this would be the case, and I would be allowed no compensation. I am entirely in favour of the views of the Auckland delegates, Messrs. Raynes and Moody. They have had in Auckland the privilege which no other towns in New Zealand have had. They have had both dead- and live-meat inspection there, and it has been satisfactorily carried out. I do not see why we should not keep our present slaughterhouses under the same conditions of inspection as in Auckland. One Auckland delegate said he had been killing for twenty years at the back of his shop, and there never were any complaints. That is not allowed here. In my shop I used to kill a few lambs occasionally.

4. Was that in the town?—No, at Johnsonville. The police came in, and said if I did not continue they should take the matter up under the Police Offences Act. I think this is unfair, as it seems to me a case of two laws—one for each end of the colony. Under the present Bill I can still kill for Porirua and Johnsonville, but I will not be able to bring the meat to Wellington for sale there. If I do wish to retail in Wellington, as now, I shall require to kill at a public abattoir. I think this would be unfair. My principal place of business is situated in Courtenay Place, Wellington. I have always carried on business successfully there. My turnover is something about, say, £12,000 a year, and I have always bought and killed my own meat. I buy most of my stock from the graziers in the country, and a little from the sale-yards. I object to subclause (2) of the Bill in clause (3). I think the words “for barter or sale” should be struck out. I also object to subclause (1) clause 15, and I think it should be struck out altogether. I object to part of subclause (1) clause 16. I would be in favour of deleting the words “subject to the provisions hereinafter contained relating to meat-export slaughterhouses,” and I would alter the words “human consumption” to “local consumption,” and strike out the words “or for export.” In clause 18 I would strike out the words “and by the licensee thereof or his workmen.” By leaving these words in the clause mentioned our men would be deprived of the privilege of killing our own stock at meat-export slaughterhouses. We could only drive them there, but we would have no control of them afterwards. In clause 24 the words “export only” should be added. In clause 26 of the Bill the words “for human consumption throughout the colony” should be struck out. Under clause 30 we are compelled to enter up all ear-marks, brands, and colours. This would be impossible, as we have so many different marks from different owners, all mixed together. Under clause 31 any person by paying 1s. can inspect our books. I strongly object to such being done.

5. You think that should be restricted to official people?—I have no objection to that. As far as subclause (3) of clause 32 goes, I think in hot weather it would be a case of very great hardship if, say, in the sudden absence of an Inspector, we should be unable to shift our meat without a written authority from the Inspector unless an Acting Inspector were provided. I object strongly to clause 56. If we are deprived of our private slaughterhouses, which cost hundreds of pounds, and compelled to leave them we should be paid compensation in some form or other. I think another subclause should be added to this clause providing for compensation for condemned meat. I think it is a hardship both for the butcher as well as the grazier to bear losses for condemned meat. I am in touch with the farmers who fatten the cattle, and there is only one farmer out of ten who does breed cattle as well as fatten them. They buy forward bullocks and finish them, and their stock goes, perhaps, through a dozen different hands before they get them; so that I consider the farmer is exactly in the same position as the butcher who buys direct. Often when stores are high, and after keeping them, say,

for twelve months, the farmer has to sell for almost the same money as he gave for them. I think in cases like this the Government should bear the loss. So far as farmers are concerned they still have the privilege under the Bill of killing stock for themselves. I think that privilege ought to be sufficient. But if they want to sell they can still take their stock to a public abattoir, and have it under public inspection. The farmers themselves—that is, speaking of a great many farmers through my own district—do not object to this clause. With regard to back sections of country, I think there should be a clause inserted to meet these extreme cases where no butcher can reach them.

6. Is there any inspection in the Wellington District?—No, there is no real inspection. We asked for it.

7. At the present time there is absolutely none?—Well, only occasionally; now and again when the Stock Inspectors go through.

8. Do they take any note of the conditions of the houses?—Yes; but only if there are any complaints. If there are, they come and inspect them. Some few years ago there were complaints made about my slaughterhouse, and they wrote me a very stiff letter. I replied and asked them to come and inspect before writing, and they did so. They said there were no grounds at all for the complaints made, as everything was perfectly clean and up to date.

9. Have you noticed any bad stinks by any other slaughterhouses?—No. Mr. Golder takes the Hutt Road and the country beyond Ngahauranga.

10. These places cannot be properly inspected, judging by the stenches?—I have not travelled that road much of late. There is always a little smell, but no more than what there is at the export places or any other slaughterhouses. I think if the licensees were made to keep their slaughterhouses clean and up to the Act there would be no need for public abattoirs. With proper inspection the whole thing could be settled.

11. Is there any attempt at inspection in the country?—No; no more than what is done by the County Council. We ask for inspection, and we uphold this clause of the Bill regarding inspection.

12. Your general feeling is that if public abattoirs are established you should be entitled to compensation?—Yes.

13. Are there many butchers, to your knowledge, in the Wellington District who have provided accommodation?—Well, there are several. I do not know exactly how many.

14. Does the cart-business at present interfere with butchers?—Yes. There is the farmer, for instance. After we have looked at his stock, and find it unsuitable for our business, he sets to, kills this stock, and hawks it in the city, where people soon buy it up, when they would not take such a class of meat from our carts.

15. Can anybody hawk in the city?—Yes, by paying a £1 killing-license.

16. What is your experience about the quantity of meat condemned? Is it large or small?—Well, I have had very little, but I have seen dairy-cows condemned where there was no reason for it.

17. *Mr. Lawry.*] I suppose the Committee must infer that you are your own inspector?—Yes. I am, to a certain extent. The Stock Inspectors go around occasionally, but beyond that there is no more inspection.

18. As the result of your experience in selecting your cattle, you have found very few infected?—Very few. I always buy the best of stock. You may get an odd one now and again in any lot.

19. Do you buy mostly bullocks or cows?—Bullocks.

20. From your knowledge of the trade, do you think that disease is more common in the male than in the female animal?—I think it is more in the female—that is, in cows.

21. Do you buy sheep?—Yes.

22. There are many diseases in sheep?—Yes; it is mostly prevalent in ewes and young sheep, lung-worm more especially.

23. What part of the sheep is generally most diseased?—Well, you find the lights grow to the side in the majority of cases.

24. But generally you find very little disease?—Very little.

25. *Mr. Mills.*] What do you mean by saying, if the inspection were carried out, we would have a great many cattle condemned?—Well, I recently saw some valuable cows tested by the tuberculin test. I saw the cattle and examined them, and I could see nothing wrong with them. At any rate, it would take a good man all his time to find anything wrong with them. These cattle were killed for tuberculosis, for they did not stand the Government test. I think, if cattle are condemned on the same grounds as they were, there would be a great many condemned in the colony.

26. *Mr. Lawry.*] You, as a large retail butcher, do not object to the most rigid inspection?—No.

27. *Mr. Mills.*] After these beasts were slaughtered you did not see any signs of disease?—None at all. There were two doctors there who said they were slightly diseased. Let me tell you gentlemen, those cattle were put straight away into my pot—my boiling-down vat.

28. Can you, after your practical experience, offer any suggestions to the Committee as to the best way of providing inspection? Well, I think two men could do the whole of it very easily. If it is delegated to an export company one man could not do it. I think it is impossible for any one man to examine, say, three thousand sheep, besides other stuff, and do justice to the work; therefore, I do not think it would be any saving of Inspectors.

29. How do you suggest that they should be inspected in the smaller places?—Well, I think the Inspectors could go from one place to the other, so long as they were not too far apart. It has been proved to be satisfactorily carried out in Auckland, where they have been inspected very strictly, and I think the same sort of inspection could be carried out here on the same lines.

30. Do you think it would be possible to erect a central abattoir in these country districts where the small butchers could manage to get their stock killed?—Yes, I think they could have them central.

31. Do you think it would work well with the smaller classes of butchers in country districts to have their meat killed in one central spot?—I do not see why it should not, if they had proper paddocks.

32. Do you think driving their small stock backwards and forwards would increase the cost?—Well, it would all depend upon whether there were paddocks or not. I have seen companies' sheep in a paddock, with nothing to eat for three days. Sometimes these paddocks, where I have seen these sheep, are like a ploughed field. That sort of thing would not permit of the meat killed being nice and bright. It would not come out well.

33. *Mr. Lang.*] I understand you object to subclause (2) of clause 3. If this is struck out one farmer cannot sell to another?—I am talking about back-country sections, where they say they could not get meat from a butcher. There could be a clause put in to meet these cases, but I do not object to any farmer killing twenty sheep a week, so long as he does not sell them in the district. It would be very unfair to allow a farmer to kill stock and sell to the public without stringent inspection, similar to that which we would have to undergo in the towns. They could then kill a diseased beast and bring it into the market, and no one would be any the wiser.

34. I understand you to say a clause could be inserted?—Well, some exception could be made to meet these back-country cases.

35. *Mr. Buchanan.*] You say that the meat companies have no facilities for bringing the meat out nice and bright. You kill for yourself, do you not?—Yes.

36. Do you buy from the meat companies any carcasses when it suits you?—I have bought a few legs of mutton occasionally. I do not think I have bought any beef from the companies, but if so it has been very little.

37. Any tails?—Well, yes, a few tails, and kidneys and tongues.

38. When prime parts are required, do you fall back upon the meat companies?—I generally have enough of my own, so far as prime meat goes.

39. So that the meat killed by the companies is not bad enough to take part in your business?—No.

40. It has been stated in evidence that there was only one butcher who had previously killed for himself in the Wellington District had dropped killing for himself and had taken to carcass-butchering—that is, buying his meat by the carcass from the companies. Do you agree with that?—In what way?

41. *The Chairman.*] He means are there many small butchers who have dropped killing and now buy for themselves?—I think there are two that I know of.

42. *Mr. Buchanan.*] You know all these butchers [names enumerated]?—Yes.

43. Is it true that these butchers were killing for themselves and are now buying by the carcass?—Some of them, but not all of them.

44. It has been stated that these butchers who buy by the carcass are only little people who have scarcely any shop at all. Do you agree with that?—No; it is a free country, and every one should have a right to live.

45. Is it not true that some of these carcass butchers are now in a first-class position?—Yes, some of them.

46. Would you be surprised to find that some of these butchers were the only ones who went Home to the Jubilee?—I am not surprised at that; but one man before he went Home was killing his own stuff.

47. Did not [names enumerated] go Home?—Yes.

48. Did not they buy carcasses?—Yes.

49. How many butchers carry on their business by buying carcasses?—I cannot answer that question. I have not counted them.

50. Would you be surprised to find that there are twenty-one of them? Can you give the Committee any reason why these twenty-one butchers have not taken to killing for themselves if they found they were unable to buy meat sufficiently good to compete with butchers who killed for themselves?—Well, it amounts to this: When they go to the country for stock they have to put their cheque down. But some of the farmers go so far as to telegraph to the bank to see if the cheque is all right before they let the stock out of the paddocks. Therefore, for the small butcher, it pays him better to buy dead meat instead of going to extra expense in the erection of slaughterhouses.

51. Do the butchers who buy from the meat companies get long credit?—I do not know.

52. Would it surprise you to know that their credit is very short indeed?—No.

53. Would it surprise you to know that they do not need it?—Well, I think some of them do need it. It has not been all honey in their business.

54. What do you do with your offal?—I give it away.

55. And you are unable to get anything out of it?—No.

56. What do the freezing companies do with it?—They make manure with it.

57. Can they, therefore, sell at a much cheaper rate, or give the producer more for the stock?—I cannot see that at all. It is a great expense making manure; but, of course, every branch should pay its way and show a profit.

58. Are you sure that every branch does not pay its way and show a profit?—I cannot say. I do not know.

59. If the meat companies are able to make a lot of money out of by-products, would they not be able to correspondingly pay more for the stock, or sell at a lower rate to consumer?—No.

60. Will you explain why?—Well, the company does a much larger trade, no doubt; but there have to be in each company some five or six managers, a lot of buyers and directors—with their

clerks—with big salaries attached; and then, again, buyers and directors are provided with first-class yearly railway-tickets. Therefore, the small man can easily compete with any company that is under such extra expense, if he buys direct.

61. Do the companies' buyers not pay for their own railway-tickets the same as any one else?—No; the companies pay for these buyers, as far as I know.

62. Would not you be surprised to find that they pay in some cases?—I do not know.

63. You object to delegation by the city authorities to the companies?—Yes.

64. On what ground?—Well, if we delegate our power to a company, I contend we would not have that privilege which we might have in a public abattoir to kill our own stock the same as we would in a private slaughterhouse.

65. Supposing it is provided in the Bill that the delegation to a freezing company would mean, as far as the butcher was concerned, just as if a city erected an abattoir for itself, absolute liberty to the butcher to kill in his own pen, giving him also absolute right to do what he liked with his offal, &c., would you object then?—Well, the only objection then is the want of paddocks.

66. But would you expect a city abattoir to have paddocks?—Yes.

67. Do you know of any abattoirs in the world that have paddocks?—No, I do not know. In some parts of England, and in towns with a much larger population than Wellington, they are still killing in the middle of the city.

68. Supposing the freezing company was able to offer you good money for many of the by-products—having machinery to turn everything to account—say, in the case of rejected sheep or cattle, or any part of the offal—would you not be in a much better position in a delegated abattoir than in a city abattoir that could not have every facility for treating the by-products?—Well, I do not know. There are a lot of questions to go into—there is tallow, for instance.

69. I am supposing you to be a perfectly free agent, able to do anything you choose?—I certainly object to delegating any power to any company whatever.

70. Would you expect a city abattoir to have facilities for manipulating the fat and preserving the portions not fit for shop-use and so on, the same as the meat companies now possess?—A small butcher would have a very limited amount of that kind of thing. I would like to know what you mean. I would like the point defined.

70A. But the rejects being hung up in the shop the public have their eyes open, and know what they are doing. Let us suppose a nip in one leg from a dog, or an injury from a railway-truck—you would not send such meat Home to England? Would you not say at once, "This must be realised locally"?—As far as injury in the trucks is concerned, I consider they are only fit for the pot. Any sheep or cattle damaged in this fashion are not fit for human consumption.

71. You buy at Johnsonville?—Very little. I buy mostly in the Manawatu district.

72. The greater part of the mutton consumed in Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin are ewes, are they not?—I do not say that. I buy mostly wethers. I cannot say that I kill all wethers; but if I buy ewes they must be good.

73. Are not the majority of the sheep killed for Wellington ewes?—Yes.

74. The same is true, is it not, of Christchurch and Dunedin?—Yes.

75. Suppose you buy, say, fifty ewes at Johnsonville, what do you do with the rejects?—Well, I take care I do not have any rejects as a rule, but if there are any I put them into the pot.

76. Supposing they are fit for preserving?—I contend that if sheep or cattle have been trampled on in the trucks it is impossible to preserve them. I have heard people say you can preserve them, but I maintain that you cannot. I should ask you to define rejects.

77. What is not fit to go Home, I mean?—Well, I contend if you send Home first-, second-, and third-class mutton to England, rejects must be fourth-class here; and therefore, if it is not fit for the poorer classes in England it is not fit to put in our shops for sale in New Zealand.

78. Would you be surprised to know that I have often received only the sum of 1s. for sheep which arrived dead?—That would be a shorn sheep. Well, the skins are mine; but for the carcase, a very good price, too.

HENRY BARBER, butcher, Lambton Quay, Wellington, examined, said: My opinion is that under this Bill it will not be all gain, because there will be a loss of care and supervision in the treatment of cattle which under the present condition of things many butchers are able to give—that is, in the way of providing paddocks and slaughtering by their own men, the result being that the beef is better and brighter than cattle that do not get such treatment. There are very few people who have those advantages. To take the various sections of the Bill, there is clause 3, for instance, *re* farmers slaughtering on their farms and bartering for sale. I think, in fairness to the trade, a farmer should take his stock to the nearest abattoir, otherwise there would be practically no inspection. The farmer is the first man to discover if a beast is bad. Practically, "he killed it to save its life." With regard to clause 5, I think there should be separate apartments in the abattoir, to enable each butcher to have one for his own use, or two or three butchers could join together in using one place. It would also be a distinct advantage to have a boiling-down plant in connection with the public abattoir. Regarding clause 15, I have every sympathy with it.

79. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are in favour of clause 15, then?—Yes, partly on account of knowing that there is no place in Wellington suitable for an abattoir. Regarding clause 26, I will pass that for the present and go on to the smaller matters. Regarding clause 30, I think this clause very difficult—in fact, it is almost impracticable on account of sheep arriving in a dirty condition by the railway. So far as clause 31 goes, I consider it very objectionable that any private person should have the right to overhaul another man's books for inspection. If anything would drive the small butcher into dealing with the companies that would. With regard to subclause (2) of section 32, I consider this would be very objectionable on account of the exigencies of trade requirements,

especially in summer, when a butcher might require meat killed, and upon getting it in from his paddock would be unable to find the Inspector, perhaps, to get the necessary permit. Now, regarding clause 26, I am in favour of this clause as it stands. To excise the clause would be ridiculous, if it were not so serious in its effects. It would be ridiculous for the Government to stultify itself by saying that meat good enough for export was not good enough for local consumption. At present it is very much to the public benefit. Wellington, as a large centre and the seat of Government, is a wealthy place with a large passenger traffic, and there is a great demand in it for prime meat, a demand, I might say, greatly in excess of what the ordinary trade can supply. In addition to that, there are those small things which are really the luxuries of the trade—that is, such as tongues, tails, and kidneys—to the use of which the people of Wellington have been accustomed to in unlimited quantities. To cut these off by not allowing them to be sold locally would be a very great hardship. If there was any fear of a monopoly in consequence of this clause remaining in, the way to meet that would be not by restriction, but by leaving the clause as it is, and by allowing the works of other districts to send their stuff into Wellington. Whereas if the clause were excised altogether they would be forbidden to do so as well as the local companies. In connection with the export trade, the meat-preserving trade is an adjunct of the freezing business, and my opinion is that it will assume much larger proportions than at present. The essential feature of that business is that it shall have a ready sale for the primer parts of the meat. Preserving as a business is not possible unless you can sell the prime meats at the highest rates obtainable. I have been in business for some forty years. More than twenty years ago I wrote to Chicago to a friend who got into touch with the meat business there, and the reply I got was that he did not see how preserving could pay in New Zealand, because we had here no large cities to take the surplus stuff. In Chicago they first of all supply the local market, and the residue goes to the large cities on the east coast, such as Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Baltimore, &c.—in fact, to all those places where there was an unlimited demand and where good prices were obtainable. Unless that condition of things existed here meat-preserving could not pay. In connection with the preserving there was, so the reply went on to say, also a salting business, where the briskets and similar parts were salted down for the navies of the world. The very best qualities went to the British navy, and to the Government navies generally. If the clause were excised even the very bushmen, who depend upon tinned stuff, would be unable to get it; and the gum-diggers of the North, who generally use it, would be in the same position; while, to crown all, at Christmas time the ordinary citizen could not buy a tin of preserved tongues to take with him to a picnic. So I think I have proved that the excision of the clause would be absurd. Another thing I should like to point out is, that with the pressure that is put on a tradesman to get those luxuries, such as tongues and tails, no one, in my opinion, could resist the temptation to smuggle these contraband goods in order to gratify a perfectly legitimate demand.

*Mr. Buchanan* : That is a new way of looking at it.

*Witness* : To show that the thing has a universal application, when the Central line is put through the various companies on the coast will only be too glad to serve Auckland with prime meats in the same way as Wellington is supplied. There are two or three companies there, one of which is essentially a preserving company. It would add very much to such an establishment if they could take advantage of the Central route and supply Auckland. Interference with the clause would tend to raise the price of meat locally, and for this reason: No ordinary butcher's business can supply all the prime meats he wants. He would have to kill extra cattle, and to make it pay him he would have to charge more for that meat, because he could not get rid of the inferior parts. No matter how times may be, there is always a great demand for prime meats, and the trade difficulty is "clearing your shop of the rough meat." I do not think I have anything further to add.

80. *Hon. the Chairman*.] Touching upon that point in connection with the sale of inferior joints, is there a great deal of that class of meat sold—I mean at 2½d. and 3d. per pound?—Yes, a great deal of it. It has become the custom to ticket it up lately, and it is "catching on." Of course, it is meat really of the best quality, and deserves a better price than it is sold at, being without bone. It is getting near the shoulder.

81. What amount of inspection do you get?—I do not know of any other inspection except that the County Council have a man whom they send round at intervals. I believe the Inspector of Nuisances can come into your shop, and if he sees anything wrong condemn it, and take action accordingly.

82. Practically there is no proper inspection?—No, none.

83. Is there any inspection of the live animals?—I do not know of it in the Wellington market. Of course, the Government Stock Inspectors are about the country.

84. Practically, then, the inspection is very meagre?—Yes, that is so.

85. Upon the question of compensation, will it be a large question to compensate those in the trade who have erected buildings?—There are a lot of people who are no doubt entitled to compensation; but if the public want inspection they should pay for it. My own opinion of the thing is that if a person has a suitable place, and can comply with the sanitary arrangements of the Bill, I do not see why he should not be allowed to retain it. If a man has his paddocks alongside his yard, for instance, he has very great advantages.

86. With reference to the question of compensation for loss by diseased meat condemned, is there much loss of meat in this way?—My impression is that 1 per cent. would cover it all. Stock in this country are much healthier than in the Old Country.

87. Does that apply both to cattle and sheep?—To both.

88. Do you think it would be at all reasonable that that should be charged to the grower more than to the butcher?—My own opinion is that where it can be traced the farmer should be held responsible. Where it cannot be traced the municipal authorities should have a fund to compensate the butcher.

89. In general practice it would be very difficult?—Yes—that is, to trace it to the farmer.
90. *Mr. Lawry.*] Are you carrying on business in a practical way?—Yes.
91. Without endeavouring to pry into private affairs, are you associated with or interested in any meat company?—No, but I am dealing with one.
92. You find it satisfactory to yourself?—Yes.
93. You used to kill for yourself?—Yes, many years ago.
94. Do you find it just as good now as when you killed for yourself?—Yes.
95. Now, *re* compensation, I suppose you are aware that we have in Auckland a system of rigid inspection in the saleyards there?—I have heard so.
96. Do you not think that after a beast has passed inspection in the saleyards the butcher should be responsible after it is condemned in the slaughterhouse? Do you think the general consumer—that is, the consolidated revenue—should compensate the butcher?—I think the municipal authorities should see to the matter of compensation.
97. After the beast has passed the Government Inspector the responsibility of the farmer should cease, and the responsibility be cast upon some one outside?—I still think the municipal authorities should see to it.
98. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Do you think the farmer should be held responsible after the animal has passed the Government Inspector?—I certainly think it would escape the notice of the farmer if it escaped the Government officer. At the same time, as the farmer reaps the whole of the profit he must take some of the risk, and it is debatable really whether he should not pay the cost.
99. *Mr. Lawry.*] Do not you think the farmer takes sufficient risk when he takes his beast into the market?—I do not know.
100. Do you know that if a farmer brings in sheep and they pass the Government Inspector he cannot be summoned afterwards?—I do not know that.
101. I suppose you are aware that very frequently what are commonly termed “crocks”—ewes—are bought up?—Yes.
102. Do you think these would be fit for human consumption?—They do not go into human consumption.
103. Well, what about the tongues, kidneys, &c.: is it right to sell them?—I do not think any serious consequences would follow such sale.
104. Then you are not aware whether the tongues and kidneys would be better fit for consumption than prime wethers?—Of course, if there was a law preventing the killing of all “crocks” for human consumption in any way it would be better.
105. Do you think the tongues and kidneys are fit for human consumption?—Well, if they are good enough for export trade, surely they are good enough for human consumption. But in any case the lessened value of the sheep would fall upon the farmer if only boiled down.
- 105A. Has there recently been a reduction in the prices of meat supplied to the carcass butchers?—There is one about to take place, I believe.
106. Is there a reduction of cattle prices in the public market just now?—I think so. I have attended two sales, and things were, I thought, very much easier.
107. Do you think the reduction in the live-stock market justifies the company in reducing the price to you?—My opinion as a buyer is they have not reduced it enough.
108. Beef is about £1 a hundred now in the market?—It is very near that—about 19s. The price was reduced on account of the pressure of the twenty-one butchers dealing with the company.
109. In your experience as a butcher have you ever known a reduction in the price of beef to take place in the month of September before?—I cannot say positively. It is not the time of year one expects it. I think the market is getting easier, however.
110. During your forty years' experience you have known beef to rise in this month?—Yes, very often.
111. *Mr. Flatman.*] If all the butchers take their meat from the companies would not that create a monopoly—that is to say, the companies would be the sole purchasers of cattle from the farmers, and would get them at their own price?—I do not think so. There are two companies competing keenly against one another. There is also one at Wanganui, one at Patea, and there is another at Longburn. I doubt whether if the whole of the trade were dealing with the two local companies here it would have that effect.
112. You think, then, probably if one company bought all the cattle that would not have any effect?—Well, we know what human nature is.
113. You think that 1 per cent. would cover the loss for all cattle condemned?—I think so. Of course, I do not take in those old cows we hear of; they are just the same as old “crocks.” They are more for boiling down. Get what tallow you can out of them and make them into manure.
114. Is there any cow-beef sold in Wellington?—Yes; I had some last week, and it was good; it was heifer-beef.
115. Not old cow-beef?—No.
116. If the companies were to reduce the meat to the butchers, and did not reduce the manure to the farmers, would not that be an injustice?—Well, I really could not undertake to give an opinion on that subject. It appears to me you buy your manure at £3 10s. per ton, and I consider that very cheap.
117. Do you know that manure can be adulterated?—Well, I have heard so. I do not know as a fact.
118. Were you in business in England?—My people were in business there, but I was not.
119. Is there much more disease there than here?—Yes, much more.
120. You think farmers who kill meat should have it slaughtered at the public abattoir?—I think they should be on the same level as the butchers.

121. *Mr. Lang.*] Are you aware that many farmers are a long distance away from the place where an abattoir would be erected?—Yes, I know that. But there should be special clauses provided in the Bill to meet their cases.

122. Are you aware that in subclause (3) it states that it shall not apply if such farm is within three miles of a borough?—Well, I have seen that. I do not think it a very great hardship.

123. But does not that meet your case?—That acts as a protection, no doubt. I think it might be increased.

124. Would not that cover your objection?—Well, I think it should be increased to seven miles.

125. You say that if the line were opened through it would be a great advantage to Auckland?—Well, it would be a great advantage both to Auckland and the West Coast in enabling prime meat from preserving-works on the coast to be sent through.

126. Are you aware that there are very large preserving-places in Auckland? Do not they send stuff to the South Island?—Yes; but there in Auckland the preserving business is an adjunct of the butchering.

127. It is the prime meat from the West Coast companies that comes to Wellington?—Not now; they have done so, but I have ceased to deal with them.

128. What do they do with it?—They use it for local consumption, I suppose.

129. *Mr. Buchanan.*] On the question of compensation, supposing a dealer buys from a farmer, and the Inspector meets him on the road and discovers a diseased beast and condemns it, who should pay for the diseased beast?—Well, I think the farmer, the person who produces the article—that is, the person getting the major profit.

130. Supposing a farmer bought a lot of steers to fatten, and found subsequently that one or more were diseased, who then should bear the damage?—If it was quite evident that the disease was in the animal at the time of the sale I certainly think the original owner should bear the cost.

131. How would you ascertain whether a claim was correct or not in a case like that—the person purchasing might make a wrong claim?—I cannot say; my remarks only apply to diseased animals coming into the public abattoir.

132. You buy your carcasses instead of killing for yourself. Supposing you buy at Johnsonville yards or in the country whatever you wanted, would not the use of public abattoirs (either delegated or not) prevent any attempted monopoly by the freezing companies or carcase butchers?—Certainly it would.

HUGH M'ARTNEY, examined: I represent the Wellington Butchers' Association. I am in business in Wellington in Courtenay Place. The first clause in this Bill that I object to is subclause (2) of clause 3. I do not consider it right to allow a farmer to kill one bullock and five sheep in a week. This means about 1,100 lb. of meat in a single week, and that, I take it, is really a small business by itself. I knew of eight farmers between here and Porirua who were killing meat and hawking it all over the town, and most of this meat was not really fit for human consumption. With regard to clause 15, subclause (1), I consider it is not right that the city authorities should have the power to delegate their right to any company. I am against this altogether, for it means that there will be put into the market only two buyers to buy stock, and it would be very detrimental to the smaller farmers. In fact, if this were done, and the power delegated, it would simply result in shutting up all the little butchers. The reason there are not more small slaughterhouses is that land is almost prohibitive in price, and a small man is almost unable to get hold of it. Now, in connection with clause 16, I am of opinion that the word "human" should be struck out altogether, and the word "local" inserted in its stead. And if we are to have abattoirs, which I hope we will, I consider that the companies should be made to kill there, the same as other butchers, what stock they wish for local consumption. I cannot see where the point comes in of it being any hardship upon them, seeing the large staff of men they keep. It would only mean to them a little extra driving of the stock. If men like Mr. Rod and Messrs. Banks and Garrett have to kill at the public abattoir and shut up their own slaughterhouses they will be big losers, but the companies, on the other hand, will lose nothing. In connection with section 18 of the Bill, I consider that the words "and by the licensee thereof or his workmen" should be struck out altogether, for the reason that there are just as good slaughtermen working for small butchers as those working for the companies, and under this section of the Bill those working for the small butchers would simply have to stand and look on while their masters' work was being done. They could do this work, and would be getting paid, and it would deprive many lads of good opportunities when learning the butchering trade. They would get no chance to kill, and therefore could not become practical butchers without that teaching. In clause 24, I think, the words "export only" should be added. *Re* clause 56, the companies are growling now because they are asked to go and kill at an abattoir. But a little butcher has to go and do so under the Bill. After he has built a slaughterhouse he must give it up at a great loss to himself, and is compelled to go to the abattoir and have his meat killed there. I think the small butcher should have some slight compensation for the loss when the abattoirs are established and the small slaughterhouses closed. I think there should be a clause in the Bill providing for compensation in the case of condemned diseased meat. If there was an insurance per head on bullocks and sheep, &c., this might meet the case, and a sinking fund might be arranged, so that when cases did crop up there would always be enough in the fund to meet such cases. I think the matter could be worked in some way by an insurance fund. I do not think I have anything else to say, except that the butchers are very strong on the subject of delegation. They object altogether to letting the City Council have the power of delegating to companies, and, for my part, I do not think it would be right.

133. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Do you slaughter for yourself?—No; I buy dead.

134. Do you know anything about the system of inspection here?—There is absolutely none. The small butchers are asked to pay a fee now, according to the by-law, but they get practically no inspection at all for it. Small men are asked to pay about £20 a year, and the large companies about £50 a year. The latter, however, kill about a thousand times more stock. They kill as much in a day as a small butcher kills in a year, and they are only asked to pay a little more than double fee.

136. Under the Bill you are aware that inspection would have to take place with regard to the companies just the same as with others?—Yes.

137. Well, why do you say it would be necessary they should go to the public abattoirs to kill?—Well, if small men are compelled to go to the public abattoirs to kill, why should not the companies be compelled also? The companies should not have the extra advantage of being able to kill in their own private places.

138. In other words, if they were allowed to kill on their own premises it should be only for export?—Yes, that is so.

139. Do you know if abattoirs were established all small farmers would be prevented from sending meat into the district?—Yes.

140. *Mr. Lawry.*] I suppose you are aware that in Wellington and in other parts of the colony there are carcase butchers who are making a good living, and they would not be able to carry on, because they have not sufficient capital? You are not opposed to those who kill and sell dead meat to the retail butcher?—No; I want them to be put upon the same footing.

141. You represent a number of butchers?—Yes.

141A. They must realise that the export companies are doing great good in sending away surplus stock frozen?—Yes.

142. You mean that if they enter into competition with you they must kill, and be subject to the same inspection as you?—Yes, that is so.

143. *Mr. Symes.*] You say there should be some sort of insurance. You could not have an insurance-fee. The only way would be to have a slaughter-fee. Is not that what you mean?—No; if a farmer has, say, twenty head of cattle ready to send away, he would only have to insure those twenty. Then it would only be the butcher would pay.

144. Do you mean to tell me that it is only the butcher—it must be the farmer? If there is a slaughter-fee you offer the farmer so much less naturally to cover that fee?—I do not know.

145. You must know that such will be the case?—I do not know.

146. Would you have it an insurance against disease?—The Government should take the matter of inspection up. I only suggest this. You, gentlemen, should work it out.

147. What sort of inspection do the local bodies provide for the inspection-fees?—Absolutely none.

148. You said you would place them all on the same footing—the butcher who kills for himself, the freezing company, and the man who buys the whole carcase and retails it. How can you do that?—By making them all kill at registered abattoirs.

149. What advantage will the small butchers gain by having an abattoir pure and simple, as against establishing an abattoir at the freezing companies?—Well, more care would be taken, but if this power were granted to the companies they would simply give us what they liked.

150. It has been pointed out that the companies have their works there?—Yes, but there are others in the district who have also works, and it would shut them out altogether. I think that would be very unfair.

151. But would not a public abattoir shut these people up just the same?—No, certainly not. Let each one run on his own account.

152. *Mr. Lang.*] One question *re* compensation for diseased stock: Is it not in the interest of the general public that the stock should be inspected?—Yes.

153. Do you not think that the consumer, which really means the general public, should pay the inspection-fee?—Well, it would be better if it were paid out of the consolidated revenue; but I was led to believe that there would be no way of getting that done. I consider, though, that if the public want this they should pay for it. The butchers I am representing want inspection as much as the public want it.

154. Well, it is a question of cost?—I consider the Government should take it up.

155. That is, compensation for diseased stock?—Yes. I think, as I said before, some insurance idea might be arranged.

156. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Do you know that as a matter of fact the Wellington freezing companies do not want this delegation?—I do not know about that.

157. Does that surprise you?—It does.

157A. Do you know that they want nothing but to go on as they are doing at present?—Well, why should they want anything else? There are any amount of little butchers who have slaughter-houses of the very best—clean and nice places—and if they are to be shut up and made to go to one place, why not the companies?

158. Can you state any reason why I, a grower, and representing other growers, should not want as much competition as possible?—Well, I think you should see there is nothing delegated to the companies.

159. You suggest that the freezing companies should be made to drive stock intended for local consumption to the public abattoir, slaughter, and have it inspected there instead of at their own works, and carry back the carcasses and the various products to their own premises again, or put an extra man in the public abattoir to dispose of these things in open market?—Yes, that is the process.

160. You said the companies would give you whatever they liked if the powers were delegated to them?—Yes.

161. That they might, in fact, give you whatever they liked for fat and offal, for instance?—Yes, that is so.

162. You heard Mr. Rod say he gave his offal away. Do you imagine that a municipal abattoir would possibly put up a plant to turn into money all the by-products so successfully dealt with now by the freezing companies?—Well, it all creates competition.

163. Are you aware that there would frequently be a difference of 5s. or so per head between the value of a sheep's carcass for the pot and its value for preserving?—Yes.

164. Would you expect a city abattoir to have preserving appliances also?—No.

165. What, then, would become of the 5s.? It would be lost, would it not?—Well, all I can say is, if the meat is not fit to be sent into the towns it is not fit for preserving and sending away.

166. Are you aware that there are sometimes plenty of carcasses to which no exception can be taken for preserving that would not pay to take into the town for ordinary consumption?—I know that.

THURSDAY, 6TH OCTOBER, 1898.

JOHN GRAHAM, M.H.R. for Nelson, examined.

*Hon. the Chairman* : We are taking evidence on the Bill now before the House, Mr. Graham. We understand you would like to give evidence?

*Witness* : I am not a butcher, nor am I connected with any establishment of that kind. I am not connected with any meat-preserving works, nor am I an owner of stock. A fellow-member has asked what did I know about the subject. Well, I simply explain that I am not connected with the trade, but I appear here as the representative of the Nelson butchers, who are not able, for various reasons, to attend before the Committee. I received a telegram from them a short time since, informing me that they were fully aware of the position taken up towards the Bill by their fellow-tradesmen in Wellington, and they asked me to see if I could support them in the same direction. They stated that they were thoroughly in accord with the attitude taken by the Wellington butchers. I might say that all the butchers in Nelson, with the exception of, I think, one, met me there recently, and they were unanimous that in the interests of public health it was desirable that public abattoirs should be established, and that there should be careful and rigid inspection of all meat intended for human consumption. They object, however, to the provision in the Bill that the local bodies might delegate their authority. They are entirely in accord with the idea of the local bodies providing public abattoirs, but they are unanimous in their objection to the delegation of that authority to any one else. I wish to be clear upon that point. A section of the Bill also provides that the licensee might appoint certain persons to kill and dress meat. Now, the Nelson butchers object to that. They have their own men, and could do the work perfectly well themselves. They asked me to state their opinion before the Committee, and also to oppose that provision if the Bill came before the House, and I promised to do so. They want to see public abattoirs established, so that each butcher should be able to kill his own meat there under proper public inspection. Another thing the Nelson men objected to was the provision which gave meat-preserving companies special facilities to kill meat on their own premises—that is, meat which is intended to be consumed in the colony. One reason was that these companies kill for other butchers as well as for themselves. If abattoirs were established in the colony a certain number of butchers would start at first to kill at the public abattoirs and comply with specified conditions, but these, if the companies were allowed the privilege which the Bill now proposes, might be gradually absorbed by the companies, and thus throw the cost of maintaining the abattoirs on a reduced number. The Nelson butchers think that these meat companies should have to do their killing for consumption within the colony at the public abattoirs established by the local bodies, and that they should be under exactly the same conditions as the butchers outside. Another point of hardship is that some of these butchers have at present—erected at much cost to themselves—excellent slaughterhouses. They have made every provision there for killing and dressing their meat, and they consider it would be a very great hardship if they were compelled under the provisions of this Bill to vacate those premises without receiving any compensation. There is no doubt that it would result in a very considerable loss to them, after providing everything that is possibly required for trade purposes. Another point I wish to mention : In clause 48 it is made unlawful for any person to subject any meat to the process which is commonly known as blowing or spouting. Well, the Nelson butchers think this clause objectionable. There are proper machines now provided for this process, and if a penalty clause were provided in the Bill to the effect that the blowing and spouting shall be done with the machines and not by objectionable methods the appearance of the lambs would be vastly improved, and the process would not be in the slightest degree deleterious. I think that is all I was asked to mention. The principal point the Nelson butchers wished me to urge upon the Committee was that they are totally opposed to the delegation by the local bodies of the powers conferred upon them by the Bill to other persons.

1. *Hon. the Chairman*.] What amount of inspection is there in Nelson at the present time?—They are subject to inspection, I believe, under the Municipal Corporations Act; they are liable to inspection under that Act in the same way as dairies are; but, generally speaking, the inspection is, I think, incomplete and unsatisfactory.

2. What is the condition of the slaughterhouses in Nelson?—Generally they are kept clean. I have made it my business at times to view them, and I have found them in good order.

3. What is the feeling in Nelson upon the subject of these public abattoirs?—I think the public feeling is distinctly in favour of the establishment of public abattoirs, and of a system of proper and perfect inspection of meat. The butchers themselves are quite in accord with this feeling.

4. The butchers did not ask you about the competition by farmers in selling meat, did they?—Yes, they did say something about that. Their general feeling, I know, is that if private persons

were allowed to kill to the extent of one beast and five sheep per week, and to sell it without inspection, it would largely discount the advantages of establishing abattoirs, and permit unfair competition with those who were subject to supervision and inspection. Of course, there are, I know, several guarding clauses in the Bill in this respect.

5. Is there much of that kind of competition in Nelson?—I am not aware of it recently, but there has been at times a good deal of it.

6. *Mr. Lawry.*] Was there any expression of opinion from the Nelson butchers regarding the subject of compensation?—Yes; the feeling was that it would be a great hardship if they were compelled to suffer in this respect after going to much expense to provide slaughterhouses and other conveniences to carry on their business.

7. *Mr. Flatman.*] Regarding subclause (2) of clause 3, I think you said the Nelson butchers only object to that clause on the ground of undue competition?—Yes; and also on the ground that farmers and all persons who sell meat for human consumption should be under the same system of inspection as at the public abattoirs.

8. That would be a second objection?—Yes.

J. T. SAPSFORD, butcher, Ngahauranga, examined: I represent the Wellington Master Butchers' Association and the trade at Petone; that is, about forty butchers in all. Now, with regard to clause 3 of the Bill, subclause (2), I would strike out the words "for barter or sale." In clause 4, subclause (3a), I would strike out the word "three" and add "ten," or, in the alternative, "where no butcher plies his trade." With respect to clause 15, subclause (1), I would strike out the whole subclause. In clause 16, subclause (1), I would strike out the whole of the first line, also the four first words in the second line. In the fifth line I would strike out the word "human" and replace it with the word "local." Also, in the same line I would strike out the words "or for export." In clause 18 I would strike out the last eight words. In clause 24 I would add the words "for export only." Regarding clause 26: this section I would strike out altogether, and replace it with another exempting freezing companies from the operation of clauses 16 and 24 (amended as I suggest), respecting all blemished carcasses for preserving purposes, providing always that such carcasses were killed under Government inspection, all yellow sheep to be treated as diseased sheep. In clause 32, subclause (3), I would strike out the whole subclause. Regarding clause 48, which makes it unlawful for any one to subject meat to the process of blowing or spouting, I am of opinion that with proper inflators and spouting-machines, and in a clean and well-kept killing-room, this custom might be allowed with safety to the public health. Respecting compensation for diseased stock, I suggest that a small charge be made on all stock slaughtered at the public abattoirs, and that half the cost of condemned animals be paid from this fund and the other half from the consolidated revenue, after deducting any value such condemned animals might represent. Another suggestion I would make is a compromise between freezing companies (who are killing for export and also for the local market) and those who wish to separate the two branches of the trade, seeing that the freezing companies object to running stock for the local trade to be killed some distance away from their own buildings. I would suggest that part of their killing premises should be handed over to the abattoir authorities, and, in the case of Wellington, so create two or more abattoirs. I have reason to believe that one of the companies in Wellington would not object to that. This would meet the case so far as the small butchers are concerned; and I might here say that my views have been fallen in with, to some extent, by a representative of one of the companies concerned, and a number of those I represent. I also suggest that all butchers should have control of their own offal. A previous witness has stated that he gave his offal away. I think he should have gone a little further and told the Committee that he received a substantial equivalent for that giving-away; and this, I have reason to believe, will be shown in Mr. Rod's corrected evidence. In other words, he really receives a first-class price for his offal. With his permission I make this statement. In conclusion, I am requested by those I represent respectfully to urge upon this Committee their recommendations that this Bill be passed as soon as possible. Every one I represent is anxious that these public abattoirs should be established, and that this Bill, in the amended form I have just suggested, be passed into law this session if practicable.

9. *Hon. the Chairman.*] How much inspection is there in Wellington at present?—There is not efficient inspection here at all so far as I am concerned, and, as far as I see, with others there is also very little. The whole time I was killing no inspector came to me at all, with the exception of an occasional call. The slaughterhouse inspector of the Hutt County Council was the officer I allude to. There is a great deal of meat comes into Wellington, and will come into Wellington, that will be without proper inspection, and if not in Wellington it will be distributed in the suburbs, unless the Abattoir Act is passed. I know a number of farmers who are ready to distribute their flocks in Wellington in the shape of dead meat. There is one or more at present bringing meat from Petone to Ngahauranga and distributing it among the residents to the detriment of the butchers. Five lambs were killed under my very eyes this week to be distributed retail in the same place and in the same way. These lambs were taken to the sale-yards, and the only bid they could command was 2s. 6d. per head, so that they could not have been much better than the rejects.

10. Under whose supervision are the slaughterhouses along the Hutt Road?—They all come under the Hutt County Council. There are really none past Ngahauranga except Ryder Brothers, of Petone.

11. Is there any slaughterhouse out Miramar way now?—Yes.

12. Are there any butchers slaughtering about Wellington with good premises where the question of compensation should be considered?—Yes, and I think the compensation should be considered.

13. How will the trade stand in respect to compensation? Will it be a considerable item?—I do not think it will be excessive.

14. What proportion of butchers are buying by the carcase in Wellington?—A great majority.

15. Where do they buy from?—From the wholesale butchers. There are a number combined who do their killing at Miramar, and a number buying dead from the companies and wholesale butchers. The companies are large local traders—the Gear Company, for instance, is a large retailer.

16. The Wellington Meat Company do sell by the carcase, do they not?—Yes.

17. You recommend that there should be two abattoirs, one at this end of the city and one at Miramar. Why two?—I think there should be two abattoirs—this end of the town so as to meet the companies half-way in the matter; and also, for the convenience of the other end of Wellington, there should be an abattoir at or near Miramar.

18. Your plan would be to delegate the abattoir-power—to have an abattoir at each of the two companies?—No; I object to delegation most strongly. What I say is that an offer should be made for part of their killing-plant, which would then be taken over by the abattoir authorities.

19. Would you let the public go in there also?—Yes.

20. Do you think the butchers would be satisfied with that arrangement?—Yes; all I have spoken to are in accord with that suggestion.

21. *Hon. Major Harris.*] What is the meaning of “yellow sheep”?—This is a matter I have thought a great deal over. I have gone through the various organs, and in the great majority of cases where a sheep has been yellow the gall has been practically empty; and I take it that it is simply a case of jaundice, and if that is so it may transmit that disease or something else to the human being, and to be on the safe side in this matter I would treat all yellow sheep as diseased.

22. *Mr. Symes.*] Have any butchers you represent private slaughterhouses of their own?—They have had, but not now, with a few exceptions.

23. You have a knowledge of the different slaughterhouses in Wellington?—Yes, all except Miramar.

24. We have had evidence here that one slaughterhouse was valued at over £2,000?—I would not be too sure upon that point. Most of these buildings could be turned to other account—into, say, farm-buildings, &c. At the present time I know one butcher has been approached respecting a bacon-factory being erected at his slaughterhouse. The only thing that delays him is the abattoir question respecting the killing of his pigs.

25. You told us about some meat that was distributed recently that was little better than rejects. I thought the law prevented this sort of thing?—The law does not seem to operate.

26. You know that the inspection now is delegated to one of the Councillors, or to some one they may appoint?—No; it is the slaughterhouse inspector, whose duties comprise road inspector, inspector of works, bridges, and other duties to the Hutt County Council.

27. A general handy man?—I suppose so.

28. His inspection, then, consists chiefly of collecting the fees?—Yes; it is his duty to collect the fees. As a rule the person holding a license is reminded through the post that the fees are due. I should say he knows nothing about meat; in fact, I am not aware that he claims to know anything about it. He is simply a nonentity as regards meat-inspection.

A. D. CRAWFORD, Miramar, examined: I wish to make some remarks, generally, upon this Bill, because I stand in rather a peculiar position with regard to some of its provisions. I have slaughterhouses, also yards, at Miramar, and the butchers kill there. I practically act as their agent. I keep the slaughterhouses as they should be kept, so far as proper provision for killing, cleanliness, &c., is concerned. The butchers kill at my place under private arrangement, and pay me certain fees for killing. Generally I buy their stock for them, and they either employ me to kill and cart their stock, or they do it themselves. It is a system of my own, and, as far as I can see, it seems to work very well. Stock are so very dear now, that where wholesale butchers are delivering dead stock in town at prices under what is given at the sale-yards, it does not pay any small butchers to kill their own stock when they get it cheaper otherwise. Regarding sections 3 and 4, with reference to *bonâ fide* farmers, I will take my own personal position, because it shows how it will affect others besides myself. Practically any farmer is exempt from killing anything at all for sale if he is within three miles from town. If he happens to be five miles out he can kill one body of beef and five head of sheep, besides pigs. So that those who are within three miles, and have the honour of paying heavier rates and taxes, cannot kill for sale; but the farmer who is further out can kill, and still pays less rates and taxes. I might say that the distance of the Miramar slaughterhouses is within a mile and a half of the city boundary. Section 15, on page 5, of the Bill allows the city authorities to delegate their powers. If this is allowed they will have no expense in putting up public abattoirs: and, reading the Bill as I understand it, it will give a monopoly to the large companies wherever there happen to be large companies. At any rate, I think you will find it will give a monopoly in a very short time, if not at once. It might not do so within the first year, but after that it would undoubtedly give a monopoly to the freezing companies. It points in every way to giving the freezing companies the work of providing abattoirs; and they will, in a short time, provide the meat dead in town to the small butchers, and the small butchers will then be in the same position as tied publichouses.

29. *The Chairman.*] Supposing the killing were done wholly by the small butchers, this would mean that they would be shopmen and slaughtermen combined?—Yes, in a sense; the small butcher looks after his own shop. He employs a man, who does a certain amount of town or retail work and does what killing is required also. Now, with reference to the abattoirs, if an abattoir is erected for any town—take the present position of Wellington, for instance: There is a very large quantity of meat eaten here which comes from the meat-export companies. If they put up public

abattoirs, the charges, no doubt, will be fixed either by the Government or by the local body. In either case, if only a very few butchers killed there, then the charges, which, I presume, would be based upon paying interest upon a certain amount, would be prohibitive.

30. The local bodies would not put up abattoirs and allow others to compete with them?—Well, what I mean is this: Take Wellington: Supposing the export companies were sending meat in as they are doing now, then they would undersell the small butcher who was killing his own meat. It would simply ruin the small butcher. Then, with reference to sections 24 and 26, the definition of a freezing company is a company that kills the majority of its meat for export. That means that it would have to kill five-eighths of its output for export. Therefore it is very hard on the small butcher if a company in the district can kill five-eighths of its stock for export, and the rest for local consumption. There is no doubt it is to the companies' interest to buy large mobs. They get a certain number of sheep or cattle that are not quite fit for the London market; the majority of these are sent into the local market, being quite good enough for ourselves, but not for London. With reference to sections 30 and 31, one has to send in returns with the brands and ear-marks of stock specified. No doubt this is a most necessary clause, but it is practically impossible to do such a thing. In buying stock you may buy a mob of sheep, for instance, with many brands and ear-marks, and many of them are unreadable. The same with cattle. I know from experience many brands are unreadable, and ear-marks in both sheep and cattle are the same, and having this clause in the Bill simply means that it would be impossible to comply with it. I myself have had a good deal of difficulty with this kind of thing in the ordinary station stock. The clause, to my mind, is unworkable. So far as the Bill relates to taking the various ear-marks, brands, ages, and sexes of stock in mixed mobs, it would mean telling a man off specially to do that class of work before they were killed, and this might cause vexatious delay and expense. With regard to the clause in the Bill which gives an Inspector or Justice of the Peace the right to inspect books, I consider that quite right, but it is absurd to allow any one to inspect the books on payment of a shilling, unless they are accompanied by a Justice of the Peace or Inspector. If a person is accompanied by a Justice of the Peace it is not so bad; but I have heard that in another district the present system of inspection has been carried out to the detriment of those concerned in the trade. Regarding that clause of the Bill on page 12 which compels all the small slaughterhouses in the district to be closed without any compensation whatever, while the meat companies can still go on as before, I think it unfair. Of course, I have nothing to say against the export companies, but I think compensation should be allowed in this matter. Certain butchers have gone to great expense, and they are small butchers, with not too much money. They have put their money into their own slaughterhouses, and if they are to be compelled to let their premises lie idle and useless for anything else, I think, being small men, they should be allowed something for their loss. With reference to condemned stock, I know most of the butchers in Wellington, and I have spoken to them and to others in other districts upon this question. They all want inspection, and I never heard a butcher yet say anything against inspection. I myself begged for inspection. I have asked for a man to come out to my place and tell me what he wished done, if anything. So far as I know no one has ever been out to Miramar upon business of that kind. I have always paid slaughterhouse license-fee besides slaughtering fees, which is supposed to pay for inspection.

31. How do they do it, then?—Well, they generally send me a debit note. If this Bill is passed, and all condemned stock buried or burned, they should be allowed to take the hides or skins off them. If a man goes to the sale-yard and buys stock, and then some are condemned, is he to lose the total amount, because it takes an expert to tell if a beast is unsound before he is killed? The auctioneer will not guarantee the stock sound, and the farmer will not guarantee them either. Therefore, the loss presumably falls on the butcher, who should not stand all the loss. At any rate, it seems to me that if a man is killing, say, four to six bodies of beef per week, besides sheep and pigs, and gets part condemned, it is extremely hard on him, and takes him a very long time to make up his loss again. With reference to the immediate slaughter of pigs, I cannot find the clause, but I am told there is something about it in the Act to the effect that as soon as pigs arrive they must be immediately slaughtered. This, I consider, a hard provision, because it stands to reason that the pigs ought to be slaughtered when perfectly cool. If they come down by train, for instance, they must rest a day or two. If they are immediately slaughtered the pork would not be so good; and the butchers very often cannot get the pigs delivered when they want it if for immediate slaughtering.

32. What borough are you in?—I am in the Hutt County Council. I pay the fees to them.

33. How do animals get to your slaughter-yards?—Well, sheep we bring through practically any time of the day, because they are not much trouble. Cattle start from Kaiwarra about 11 o'clock at night. One matter I would like to refer to in connection with public abattoirs for Wellington, on account of its peculiar situation and extreme length. I heard one witness speak about Miramar. I certainly think there should be two abattoirs, one at each end of Wellington. Wellington is growing very much out Newtown way, and I think will grow that way very considerably, and it would be very hard on a butcher if he has to kill his stock at the north end of the town and cart it through the streets on a hot summer's morning to the other end of the town. There are more butchers' shops to the south end of Wellington than in the north end, and I think there is every evidence that more meat will be sold at the Newtown end as population increases. So that, all things considered, there should be an abattoir at each end of the town.

34. You spoke about the companies being able to get rid of part of their stock which was not diseased, but was hardly good enough for the London market. How would you alter this?—Well, in the first place the companies ought to buy closer; and if they did not sell the quantities which they do now in the towns they would buy closer. Anything they have on hand after buying closer they could make into potted meat or manure.

35. Would not that make considerable difference in the value of the animal?—Yes; but the same quantity of meat would be eaten in Wellington.

36. Supposing the inspection were equal in the abattoir and the freezing companies' works, would that objection still continue?—Yes, if the companies still bought as they do now. My idea is to see a larger number of men employed in local trade. I should like to see all the small butchers in Wellington working on their own account as master butchers, instead of buying their meat wholesale.

37. In other words, you are afraid of a monopoly?—I am afraid of monopoly. There are at present export companies doing a very large wholesale and retail trade in town.

38. Regarding compensation: It has been stated there are private slaughterhouses about Wellington that have cost a lot of money; is that so?—I do not know. I do not think there are any that have cost a large sum; my own are not expensive slaughterhouses. I keep them as clean and as tidy as I can, and on this account a little more expense is undoubtedly incurred.

39. *Mr. Flatman.*] With respect to rejects from the freezing companies: you have no doubt seen many of these. Is it not a fact that many of these occur through the bite of a dog or from bruises in transit?—Well, a large number of them are too fat to send Home, or they may be torn when being skinned, or yellow, or a bit too light. The majority are sheep not in sufficient condition for the Home market.

40. Being too fat would not make them unfit for human consumption?—Oh dear, no.

41. Have you any idea what causes the yellow colour, and are they fit for human food?—Well, I have been in nearly every part of New Zealand, principally managing station properties. I have heard argument on the subject of these yellow sheep for the last fourteen or fifteen years, and everybody has got a different opinion.

42. You would not object to a joint from a yellow sheep for your own dinner?—I would sooner not see it before it was cooked, but I do not think it diseased. That is a matter for an expert, however, and even he would have a difficulty over his decision.

43. You say freezing companies should buy closer. You do not think they at present buy fairly in your judgment?—They may buy fairly enough; but if buyers are limited to buying for export they will buy a much more even line.

44. That would be detrimental to the farmer, would it not?—No.

45. You were speaking of clause 3 just now. I understood you to say that a farmer, within three miles of a borough, would not be allowed to kill anything. Do you mean for his own consumption?—No; only for the town. A farmer five miles out from the city boundary can kill a certain quantity for sale in the town.

46. *Mr. Lang.*] I understood you to say that large companies were delivering meat in Wellington at lower prices than the stock could be bought for?—Not in the summer-time but during the winter, and at the present time, for instance.

47. How do you account for that?—Well, I presume they wish to keep the trade going; they therefore have to supply at a lower price now, and trust to making it up during the summer.

48. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What is the difference in value?—Experts state that at the local sale at Johnsonville and on the West Coast cattle are bringing, at any rate, £1 a hundred pounds. Beef is being delivered wholesale at present in Wellington at from 16s. to 17s. 6d. a hundred. This includes tongues, tripe, heart, tail, and that sort of thing thrown in.

49. How long has this been going on?—Only for a few weeks at the lower quotations, but practically the whole winter at the higher.

50. *Mr. Lang.*] Regarding compensation for slaughterhouses that would be closed, who do you think should pay such compensation?—As the Government were going to enforce the Bill, they should pay compensation.

51. Regarding compensation for condemned stock, you say it is unfair that the butchers should stand the loss?—Well, no one but an expert can tell whether the stock is diseased or not before it is killed. The butcher certainly should not bear it.

52. Then, in your opinion, who should bear the loss if they enforce the law?—As the stock were condemned for the benefit of those in the city, the local authority should undoubtedly pay such compensation, if they enforce the law. It is very hard if the farmer has to bear it, seeing that he is the backbone of the country. The auctioneer, again, would not sell if he had to give a guarantee, and in the end you would ruin the butcher if he had to bear it.

53. The provision regarding condemned meat, do not you think, is more in the interest of the people who have to eat it than any one else?—Yes; if you made the small butcher bear it, it would kill him.

54. *Mr. Symes.*] Are you acquainted with the prices of fat stock on the West Coast?—Well, I saw both beef and mutton sold on Thursday last at Palmerston North. I have bought considerable numbers of stock from the West Coast, and they have panned out very badly indeed lately.

55. You do not, of your own knowledge, know that beef is being bought up Taranaki way at from 10s. to 15s. a hundred?—I shall be very glad to deal with you if you can supply me at that price. I have had beef from Hawke's Bay and right from the other side of Wanganui, and the price was very much higher than that there.

56. You have spoken about the freezing companies entering into competition with the small butchers: Is it not a fact that one of the freezing companies is one of the oldest butchering businesses in Wellington?—Yes, I believe so.

57. Well, would it not be hard to shut these people up because they have increased their business?—Yes, but—

58. Will you say you would stop this man's business because he has added something to enlarge its ordinary revenue?—Well, he has become an export company, and the export company is quite sufficient to bring him in a large remuneration, and, without saying anything unkind of the

Gear Company, I do not think it would be a hardship if that one part of the business were stopped. I should be sorry to see it stopped, but if there are twenty or thirty butchers in Wellington concerned it would be hard to ruin them simply for the benefit of one man.

59. You say you would endeavour to make the freezing companies buy closer?—Yes, in the interest of the small butcher.

60. Do you not think that would be very detrimental to the farmer?—No. If a farmer has, say, a thousand fat sheep, if they are of a certain quality he gets a certain price, if they are of a lower quality he gets a correspondingly lower price.

61. *Mr. Flatman.*] You do not think it would be detrimental to the grower?—No.

62. You think the slaughterhouse-owners should be compensated. How would you arrive at the value of the plant?—I would put on an expert, and allow a certain amount off its cost for depreciation.

63. How would you suggest that the compensation be paid, or who should pay it?—I think, where slaughterhouses are shut up the Government should pay compensation; if meat were condemned I presume it would have to be paid for by the local authority, because they are the people who are gaining the advantage.

64. You know the different slaughtering plants in Wellington?—Yes; but not very well.

65. You do not know, do you, if they are of great value—you said you did not think so?—I do not think they are of great value.

#### EXHIBIT A.

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives of New Zealand in Parliament assembled.

THE petition of the undersigned butchers, carrying on business in Christchurch and its surrounding districts, humbly sheweth,—

1. That your petitioners have had under consideration the provisions of the Slaughtering and Inspecting Bill introduced to your honourable House during the present session of Parliament.

2. That your petitioners are of opinion that the Bill as submitted to you is likely to do your petitioners injustice, and inflict great hardship upon them.

3. That your petitioners are of opinion that the Bill requires amendment as follows:—

(a.) The words “for barter or sale” in section 3 (No. 2) should be struck out.

(b.) Subsection (1) of section 15 should be struck out.

(c.) The word “registered” in section 16 should be struck out, and the word “public” inserted in its place.

(d.) The words “and by the licensee thereof or his workmen” in section 18 should be struck out.

(e.) The words “for human consumption throughout the colony” in section 26 should be struck out.

4. Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will amend the Bill in the direction indicated.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

#### EXHIBIT B.

NAMES of butchers that have their own slaughterhouses: J. H. Hall and Co., at Otahuhu; — Johnston, at Otahuhu; — White, at Panmure; George Raynes, at Panmure; D. Neilson, at Onehunga; R. Salmon and Co., at Mt. Roskill; E. Wood, at Mt. Roskill; H. Moody, at Mt. Albert; R. and W. Hellaby, at Newton; J. Benstea, at Auckland; G. White, at North Shore; Robert Bevan, at North Shore.

Licensed to slaughter behind their shops: G. Raynes, Parnell; R. Briggs, Panmure; W. Griffiths, Panmure; J. Lumpkin, Newmarket; W. Kilgour, Newmarket.

The killing of these butchers represents 75 per cent. of the whole killing of the district represented.

H. MOODY (Witness).

#### EXHIBIT C.

GENTLEMEN,—

City Council Offices, Christchurch, 28th September, 1898.

I have the honour, by direction of the Council, to forward to you the amendments to the Slaughtering and Inspection Bill passed by the Council at its meeting last night, viz.:—

Clause 15, subsection (1): To be struck out.

Clause 16: To be altered so as to read “public” instead of “registered” abattoir.

Clause 18: The last eight words of the clause to be struck out.

Clause 26: Strike out the words “for human consumption throughout the colony.”

That this Council empowers Messrs. Forrest and Hansen to lay these amendments before the Minister in charge of the Bill.

I have, &c.,

Messrs. Hansen and Forrester.

W. HASDUNS,

Town Clerk.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,625 copies) £19 10s.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1898.

Price 1s.

5—1. 8B.

