

14. I am not referring to extensive dairies, but a class of dairy in a country where they send in butter made by themselves to a city like Wellington. They have to deal in many instances with sites of very limited size. Do you think in such cases it would be reasonable to apply the 30 ft. apart conditions?—I do not think it implies a hardship. There might be instances, but I think where it was really the case the Inspector would be able to use his discretion.

15. *Mr. Macpherson.*] Clause 29 refers to no other animal being allowed in the cowshed. Would you consider it a hardship for an owner not being allowed to bring into the byre a young heifer coming to the milking?—I could not read that clause to prohibit me. I would do it. It is a dairy cow, although it may not have had a calf.

16. If the clause is interpreted the other way, that a heifer coming to calving would not be considered a cow, would you consider it a hardship?—I would, decidedly. In the winter-time we must put them in two or three weeks before, or they would be very little good after.

17. Where it is required that the cowshed shall be 30 ft. from the road, would you consider that a hardship—that is, where it is difficult to get level ground?—In some instances it would be hard.

18. There are many places in the North Island and elsewhere where suitable level ground is not possible to get, and under these conditions would you consider it a hardship that an owner would not be allowed to erect a shed within a lesser distance than 30 ft.?—Yes, in the event of very hilly ground. I know of byres where the cattle are driven in from the road, and good places too.

19. Have you within your own knowledge where the water for stock was not possible to get further away than 30 ft.? Do you know of any places? You stated in your own case you had to water your cattle sometimes when it was not possible to water them in the paddock?—I could shift the trough.

20. Suppose it is not possible to shift it without considerable expense?—I do not think it is necessary to keep cows away from the byre when not milking.

21. You disapprove of the rule of keeping animals 30 ft. away?—A cow is not wandering when on her owner's property. She cannot do any harm when coming within 30 ft.

22. You are of the opinion that regulations are required?—I think it is very necessary something should be done. The man who is careful and sanitary in his methods may suffer through the filthy methods of others. He may get second-grade butter through the faulty milk of one or two suppliers.

23. In your own experience, has administration of the present regulations been carried out with discretion in Otago?—Yes, I think so.

24. *Mr. Lang.*] You mentioned in your opening remarks that things six or eight years ago in Dunedin were far from satisfactory, but that now it has the best milk-supply in the Dominion?—Yes.

25. And to what do you attribute that change?—I attribute it to the harmony that has existed between the Stock Department officials and the Dairymen's Association. The association was ready for inspection when it came, and we have supported the Department's officials even against our own members. Consequently we have brought them into line with us.

26. You state the output might be doubled throughout the Dominion?—Yes.

27. In what way do you mean?—The Department has done a good deal for the industry in the way of grading and cool-storage, but there is a great deal more it could do in regard to instruction in deterioration in cattle—many other means the Department might take to build up the industry. At the present time, some of us contend, the cattle are deteriorating at an alarming rate. The Department has experimental stations and stud-stock. By distribution of these and advice given, and providing regulations not enforced too harshly, the Department may build up the industry to such an extent that the output might be doubled.

28. By aid from the Department and by regulations?—Yes, by aid from the Department.

29. You want amendments in some of the regulations?—The regulations are an improvement on the existing ones, but there are several clauses that could do with a little further amendment.

30. In regard to the appeal: you approve of the appeal to the Chief Inspector?—Yes.

31. You are aware, in regulation 33, it only deals with three clauses?—Yes. These are the regulations which were always offensive to us. They are now left to the Inspector's discretion, with right of appeal.

32. Do you not think that all cases of dispute between the dairyman and the Inspector ought to be settled by appeal?—Where the regulation is cast in definite terms there is no occasion for an appeal.

33. You are aware there is often a difference of opinion between Inspectors. One may say one thing and the other another?—That is interpretation of the regulation by an Inspector. In cases of that sort arbitration would do no harm.

34. In that case do you not think both sides should be represented?—Yes.

35. In the case of a dispute you would not allow the other side to decide it?—No.

36. It should be done in this case?—If it could be done.

37. In regard to the milk-cart, you are aware the dairyman could not cart a dressed pig or a live calf in his milk-cart?—That might in some instances be a hardship. Personally, I say there is some necessity for the regulation. Were it not a milk-cart might be used for carting live pigs, which would be most objectionable.

38. Would it not be better to enforce cleanliness of the cart instead of specifying things they may or may not carry?—A cart may be dirty and not really offensive. A man should not be allowed to cart live pigs in it. The practice is objectionable. It is difficult to remove the smell of bonedust.

39. And the same remark applies to calves?—More or less.