

35. A question is suggested by a reference of Mr. Okey to the backblocks settler, and, further, by consideration of the position of the supplier to a dairy factory as opposed to the supplier of milk to a city. Can you suggest any modification of the regulations to meet the case of the former, especially those in the backblocks, which would be better than leaving it to a wise administration?—The shed-floors could be formed of wood blocks—that is, well paved, with sufficient slope. This is a most important thing, and is not in the regulations. A drain of some smooth material impervious to water should be provided, and this should have sufficient slope to carry everything away.

36. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] In regard to Mr. Witty's question about the inch behind where the cow's hind feet would stand?—Where her leg would come to in the case of leg-roping.

37. But some draw them back a good deal further than others?—A good length of a stall from bail to gutter is 6 ft. 6 in.

38. How much between the back wall and the shoulder of the cow?—Twenty inches.

39. And that would leave 4 ft. 4 in.?—I am speaking of the actual bail, or from the cow's neck to her heels.

40. Would there not be a likelihood of the cow slipping into the drain and making a splash?—I have found it so if the bail is made 6 ft. 6 in.

41. *Mr. Ballard.*] Do you think Inspectors should have discretionary power in regard to buildings already in existence if they are reasonably clean? Would it not be a hardship if a man having reasonably clean premises had to pull them down?—I am not inclined to leave much to the discretion of the Inspector. His duties should be defined as nearly as possible. It would be a good thing for the Department to give advice in regard to new sheds, but where sheds are sufficient for the purpose, with good floors, and are kept clean, it should meet the case till new sheds are built.

42. I was referring to sheds and yards already in existence?—Of course, it is quite necessary that the Inspector must have discretion to say whether premises are clean and in a sound state. If rain was coming through the roof you could not milk under sanitary conditions. Or if a shed was close to a sandpit, and the wind blew the sand into the shed, the Inspector should, of course, have power to call attention to it and require an alteration.

43. I do not think you grasp the question. Say the dairyman has good premises fairly up to the mark but not according to the regulation, do you not think the Inspector should have discretionary power to allow that man to go on?—I certainly do.

44. But when a man is starting he should abide by the dairy regulations?—Yes.

45. In regard to appeal: Who would you suggest should be associated with the Chief Inspector? Do you not think the man himself should be represented?—Yes, providing it would not complicate matters too much. The appeal might be abused.

46. You think the arbitration might be abused?—I think the Chief Inspector ought to meet the case.

47. You believe in arbitration under such circumstances in the case of disputes?—Yes.

48. Who would you suggest besides the Chief Inspector as arbitrator?—In most of the centres there is a Chief Stock Inspector. If there is a dispute between the dairy-farmer and the Dairy Inspector it could be referred to the Chief Stock Inspector, or some one appointed by him.

49. Would you give him the sole power?—I think so. Everything is provided in the regulations. The appeal would come in where the Inspector was found to be straining the regulations.

50. What of the case of an established dairy not quite up to the regulations, but in a fairly clean condition?—There should be provision made in the regulations for dairies established and which have been allowed to go on under the Act of 1898. As long as the premises are kept clean and sound they should be allowed to go on.

51. Is it possible to make regulations to meet the case?—It is done in the case of the Fencing Act.

52. Suppose the piggery is 45 yards away, instead of 50 yards. If allowed to remain it would not be in accordance with the regulations. In that case do you not think the Inspector should have discretionary power?—Yes, the Inspector should have a certain amount of discretionary power.

53. That is what I want to come to. The Inspector should have some discretionary power?—The Inspector could say, "The premises are not at the right distance away, but if you keep them clean they can remain."

54. *Mr. Buddo.*] You favour dairy-inspection?—Yes.

55. In regard to the appeal, would you suggest that some one should be associated with the Chief Inspector of Stock, or would you leave it finally to his decision?—I think it might be left to his decision.

56. With your experience, would you suggest any other material than concrete where concrete is too costly?—Only in the case of paving with wooden blocks. Of course, there are a great many of the backblocks districts I have no experience of, and my experience in that case would be of no value. Where shingle is available concrete is the most suitable thing. Bricks are splendid. In the North Island, where it is difficult to get shingle, bricks properly laid would be very good.

57. Could you suggest any other method of getting dust out of the shed than that suggested by clauses (1) and (2) of section (b)? Would you suggest holding the cows in small enclosures some distance away, or do you favour a yard close to the shed?—It should be left to the discretion of the farmer. If the yard is close to the shed the man should be compelled to erect a fence 6 ft. high and closely boarded. If he wants the race he should have the race provided in the regulations. The option of the race or the fence should be given—that is, where there is not a closed-in shed. I see no objection to the yard being close, given the fence, and the yard in concrete or brick, partially or wholly paved.