

1908.  
NEW ZEALAND.

## AGRICULTURAL, PASTORAL, AND STOCK COMMITTEE: PROPOSED DAIRY REGULATIONS

(REPORT ON); TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE.

---

*Report brought up on the 9th October, 1908, and ordered to be printed.*

---

### ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

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

FRIDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF JULY, 1908.

*Ordered*, "That a Committee be appointed, consisting of ten members, to consider all matters pertaining to agricultural and pastoral industries and stock; with power to confer and sit together with any similar Committee which may be appointed by the Legislative Council, and to agree to a joint or separate report; the Committee to have power to call for persons, papers, and records; three to be a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Buddo, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rutherford, and the mover."—(Hon. Mr. McNAB.)

WEDNESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1908.

*Ordered*, "That Standing Order No. 219 be suspended, and that the names of Mr. Bollard, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Macpherson, and Mr. Witty be added to the Agricultural, Pastoral, and Stock Committee."—(Hon. Mr. McNAB.)

FRIDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1908.

*Ordered*, "That paper No. 224 C, 'Proposed Regulations under "The Dairy Industry Act, 1908,"' be referred to the Agricultural, Pastoral, and Stock Committee."—(Hon. Mr. McNAB.)

---

## REPORT.

THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS UNDER "THE DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT, 1908."

1. The Agricultural, Pastoral, and Stock Committee, to whom was referred the proposed Dairy Regulations, have the honour to report that they have carefully considered the same, and recommend that the regulations as amended, with the evidence and minutes of the Committee, do lie on the table and be printed.

2. That the regulations as amended be referred to the Government for consideration.

F. LAWRY, Chairman.

9th October, 1908.

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

THURSDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Ritchie, David Cuddie, Dairy Commissioner, and John Leslie Bruce, Inspector in Charge Otago District, were also present, as well as Mr. Rowley, shorthand reporter.

Orders of reference transmitting the proposed regulations under "The Dairy Industry Act, 1908," to the Committee, and also that the petition of Donald Kerr be sent direct to the Committee, were read.

Regarding the proposed regulations under "The Dairy Industry Act, 1908," the Hon. Mr. McNab suggested that the Committee sit every day next week.—Agreed to.

Mr. Hornsby moved, That representative witnesses whom it was decided to call should be paid their expenses.—Agreed to.

Mr. Witty moved, That Friday, the 25th instant, be the time for closing evidence.

Mr. Okey moved as an amendment, That Tuesday, the 29th, be inserted instead.

Mr. Okey's amendment having been put, a division was called for, when there voted—

*For.*—Messrs. Hogg, Kidd, Lang, Lawry, Okey, Rhodes, Rutherford.

*Against.*—Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Witty.

Mr. Okey's amendment carried by seven votes to five, and date altered accordingly.

Mr. Hornsby moved, That a sub-committee, consisting of the Hon. Mr. McNab, Messrs. Lang, Lawry, Rhodes, Okey, Witty, and the mover, be appointed to select representative witnesses to attend to give evidence.—Agreed to.

Witness No. 1, Mr. David Cuddie, Dairy Commissioner, Customhouse Buildings, gave evidence and answered questions; and also witness No. 2, Mr. John Leslie Bruce, Inspector in Charge Otago District, Dunedin.

The Committee then adjourned to 10.30 a.m. on Friday, the 18th instant.

WEDNESDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The sub-committee, consisting of the Hon. Mr. McNab, Messrs. Lang, Lawry, Rhodes, Okey, Witty, and Hornsby, then met, and, after discussion, the chairman was authorized to give the Press Association of the Dominion the information that the Committee would receive evidence up to Tuesday, the 29th instant, referring to the proposed Dairy Regulations, and that those desirous of giving evidence should communicate by telegram or otherwise with the chairman.

Mr. Witty read and handed in a telegram from the President of the Dairymen's Industrial Union, Zetland Hotel, Christchurch, notifying deputation approved, coming Thursday's boat if suitable.

The sub-committee then adjourned.

FRIDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Greenslade and Ell, M.P.s; Ritchie, Clifton, Cuddie, Bruce, Department of Agriculture; and C. Cumming, shorthand reporter, were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting, as well as those of the sub-committee which sat subsequently, were read and confirmed.

The following witnesses gave evidence and answered questions: Third witness, Mr. John Parlane, dairy-manager, Cashmere, Canterbury; fourth witness, Mr. Edward Thompson, dairy-farmer, Belfast, Canterbury; and fifth witness, Mr. William Lewis Wright, dairyman, Cashmere.

Mr. Parlane was allowed, by request, to supplement his original statement.

At its conclusion the Hon. Mr. McNab moved that the Committee adjourn to Monday, the 21st instant, at 10.30 a.m.

The Hon. Mr. Duncan opposed the motion, and, on the question being put, called for a division, when there voted:—

*For the motion.*—Hon. Mr. McNab, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Witty.

*Against.*—Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Lang, Mr. Macpherson.

Hon. Mr. McNab's motion carried, and the Committee adjourned accordingly.

## MONDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Lang, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Ritchie, Clifton, Harkness, and Cumming were also present.

The Hon. Mr. McNab moved, and it was agreed, That Mr. Hogg be Acting-Chairman in the absence of Mr. Lawry.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Sixth witness, Mr. John Watt Deem, Inspector in Charge West Coast District, North Island, Wanganui, gave evidence and answered questions.

Seventh witness, Mr. James R. Scott, secretary, National Dairy Association, South Island, Dunedin, gave evidence and answered questions.

Eighth witness, William Nicholson, Hampden, Otago, Director of the Taieri and Peninsula Company, Dunedin, gave evidence and answered questions.

Ninth witness, Mr. Deem, recalled, and answered questions and handed in numerous letters favouring the "race."

On the motion of Mr. Witty, Mr. Okey was authorized to consult the dairy-farmers in his district and ask them to select three representatives to give evidence before the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

## TUESDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Ritchie, Clifton, and Cumming were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following gentlemen gave evidence and answered questions: Witness No. 10, Mr. George Harkness, secretary, National Dairy Association of New Zealand; witness No. 11, William Fisher, farmer, Carterton; and witness No. 12, W. Fuge, dairy-farmer, Kaiwairai.

The Committee then adjourned.

## THURSDAY, 24TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes. Mr. Graham, M.P., Messrs. Cuddie, Ritchie, Clifton, and Cumming were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Hon. Mr. McNab read and put in letters, dated March, 1898, and February and August, 1902, from Mr. J. Moncrieff, jun., secretary, Dalefield Co-operative Dairy Company, each requesting that inspection be made by an officer of the Department of Agriculture on several of the farms in his district with a view of reporting thereon.

The following gentlemen gave evidence and answered questions: Witness No. 13, Mr. Henry Ernest Carey, managing director, Riverdale Dairy Company, Lower Hutt; witness No. 14, Mr. F. W. Beechey, Utiku; Mr. Carey, by his own desire recalled, gave further evidence; witness No. 15, Mr. David Thomson Roy, dairy-farmer, Dunedin; and witness No. 16, Mr. Robert Thomas Souness, Inspector of Dairies, Eltham.

The Committee then adjourned to 10.30 a.m. on Friday.

## FRIDAY, 25TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Remington and Major, M.P.s, and Ritchie, Clifton, and Cumming were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following gentlemen gave evidence and answered questions: Witness No. 17, Mr. A. E. Remington, M.P.; witness No. 18, Mr. James Burgess, farmer, Warea; witness No. 19, Mr. Angus John McCurdy, secretary of the Dairymen's Union, Upper Hutt; and witness No. 20, Mr. C. E. Major, M.P.

The Committee then adjourned.

## MONDAY, 28TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Rhodes. Mr. Graham, M.P., Messrs. Ritchie, Kirk, and Hallam were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Hon. Mr. McNab proposed that the time for receiving evidence *re* the proposed Dairy Regulations be extended to Thursday, the 1st proximo, inclusive.—Agreed to.

The Committee then adjourned.

TUESDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Ross and Field, M.P.s, Clifton, Ritchie, and Cumming were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Papers were handed in by the Chairman and Messrs. Witty, Hogg, and Rhodes, relating to the proposed Dairy Regulations, for the consideration of the Committee.

The Hon. Mr. McNab notified certain amendments which he intended to move in the proposed regulations.

The following witnesses gave evidence and answered questions: Witness No. 21, Mr. Isaac Gray, farmer, Papatoetoe; witness No. 22, Mr. Alexander McFarlane, chairman of directors, Ballance Co-operative Dairy Company, Palmerston North; witness No. 23, Mr. John White Foreman, chairman, Dairy Company, Tikorangi; witness No. 24, Mr. James George Brechin, dairy-farmer, Scarborough; witness No. 25, Mr. Alexander Redpath, dairy-farmer, Nireaha; witness No. 26, Mr. Joseph Brown, farmer, Inglewood; witness No. 27, Mr. James Southey Fowler, dairy-farmer, Manakau; witness No. 28, Mr. Joses Griffith, dairy-farmer, Otaki; witness No. 29, Mr. A. Wing, dairy-farmer, Manakau; witness No. 30, Mr. William George Yardly, dairy-farmer, Hautere Cross; witness No. 31, Mr. David Judd, dairy-farmer, Otaki.

The Committee then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Hall, M.P., Ritchie, Clifton, and Cumming were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following gentlemen gave evidence relating to the proposed Dairy Regulations, and answered questions: Witness No. 32, Mr. William Louttit Falconer, farmer, near Masterton; witness No. 33, Mr. Edmund Clifton, Chief Inspector of Stock, Wellington.

The Hon. Mr. McNab read and put in a memorandum from Mr. Cuddie showing the grading scores of the "Glen Oroua" brand of creamery butter for the past three years.

The Committee then adjourned.

THURSDAY, 1ST OCTOBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Witty. Messrs. Ritchie, Clifton, and Cumming were also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

*Re* proposed Dairy Regulations, The evidence of witness No. 34, Mr. Harold Burgoyne, farmer, Clevedon, was taken; after which it was decided that no more evidence be taken.

The Committee then proceeded to consider the proposed regulations.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2: Paragraph (1), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, amended by striking out the figure "8" in the fourth line, and substituting "9" therefor, and by the insertion of the word "July" before "1909" in the same line.

Paragraph (2) amended by striking out the last four lines.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, proviso struck out.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 4: First paragraph agreed to. Second paragraph agreed to. Third paragraph: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, *Resolved*, That the transfer fee be 1s. instead of 2s. 6d.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6: First paragraph having been put, Mr. Lang moved, That after the word "dairy" in the second line "1s." be inserted as fee; and on the motion being put there voted—

*For.*—Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Lang, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes.

*Against.*—Hon. Mr. McNab, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Witty.

The motion was therefore lost.

Mr. Hogg then moved, That after the word "be" in the same line "5s." be inserted; and on the motion being put there voted—

*For.*—Mr. Hogg.

*Against.*—Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lang, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Witty.

The motion was therefore lost.

The subclause was then put and agreed to.

On paragraph (a) of the same subclause being put, Mr. Duncan moved, That the word "two" be omitted in the first line, and "three" substituted therefor.—Agreed to.



This caused a consequential alteration in the following paragraph, lettered (b), which was agreed to; as also, on motion of Mr. Witty, the substitution of the word "twenty" for the word "ten" in the following line, and a corresponding consequential alteration in paragraph (c).

Paragraph (2) of clause 6 put and agreed to.

Clause 6 as amended was then put; and, a division being called for, there voted—

*For.*—Hon. Mr. McNab, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Witty.

*Against.*—Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Lang, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes.

The clause was therefore carried as amended.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8: Paragraph (a), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, struck out.

Paragraph (b) agreed to.

Paragraph (c): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, after the word "concrete" the insertion of the word "wood," agreed to.

Paragraph (d), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, struck out.

Paragraph (e): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the insertion of the words "once a year" after the word "coated" and the deletion of the words "and be recoated" as well as all the words after the word "necessary," agreed to.

Paragraphs (f) and (g), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, struck out.

Paragraph (h), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the words "to be" inserted before the words "kept" and "used" in the first and second lines respectively; and the deletion of the word "be" after the word "shall" and the substitution of the words "hereafter be erected," agreed to.

Paragraph (i), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, struck out.

Paragraph (j), on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the words "hereafter to be erected" inserted after the word "cowshed" in the first line.

Proviso agreed to.

Paragraph (k): First five lines agreed to.

Part (i): Mr. Buddo moved, That the word "all" in first line be omitted.—Agreed to.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the words "concreted or paved" in last line, and the substitution of the words "laid with concrete, wood, or other suitable material" instead thereof were agreed to.

Part (ii): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the omission of the words "concreted or paved" at the end of last line, and the substitution of the words "laid with concrete, wood, or other suitable material" instead thereof were agreed to.

Paragraphs (l), (m), and (n) agreed to.

Paragraph (o): Mr. Hogg moved the insertion of the words "where practicable" after the word "provided" in first line.

This was objected to, and a division called for, when there voted—

*For the motion.*—Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson.

*Against.*—Hon. Mr. McNab, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Lang, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Witty.

The motion was therefore lost by 6 to 5.

Mr. Rhodes moved, That the word "wholesome" be substituted for the word "pure" in second line.—Agreed to.

Paragraph (p) agreed to.

Paragraph (q): On this paragraph being put, Mr. Hornsby moved the omission of the words "for cleansing the floor of the shed."—Agreed to.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clause 9 having been put, it was agreed, on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, to substitute the word "seven" for "fourteen" in the second line, and the words "to his cowshed, milk-house, or-milk-stand" for the words "in or about his dairy premises" in the third line.

Clause 10: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, it was agreed to omit the words "suitable and" before the words "clean clothing" in the last line, and to insert the word "himself" in the middle line.

Clause 11: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the striking-out of this clause was agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to.

Clause 14. Paragraph (a); On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, it was agreed to insert the word "thoroughly" at the commencement of the sentence, and to delete all the words after the word "milk."

Paragraph (b): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of all the words after the word "it" was agreed to.

Paragraph (c): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the omission of all the words after the word "cream" was agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 15: On motion of Mr. Hornsby, the omission of all the words after the word "stock-yard" was agreed to.

Clause 16 agreed to.

Clause 17: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the insertion of the word "thoroughly" before the word "cleansed" and the striking-out of the words "by first rinsing" down to the words "boiling water" inclusive, were agreed to.

Paragraph (a): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the words "commenced within one hour of the" and the substitution of the words "finished as soon as possible after the" therefor, as well as the omission of all the words after the words "milking operations" were agreed to.

Paragraph (b): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the words "within one hour of" and the substitution of the words "as soon as possible after" were agreed to.

Paragraph (c): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the words "within two hours of" and the substitution of the words "as soon as possible after" were agreed to.

Paragraph (d): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the words "within one hour" and the substitution of the words "as soon as possible" were agreed to.

Paragraph (e) agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 18: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the clause was agreed to.

Clause 19: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the insertion of the words "after giving the dairyman fourteen days' notice" before the word "impress" was agreed to.

Clause 20: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the clause was agreed to.

Clause 21: On motion of Mr. Witty, the words "or sterilised" were inserted after the word "scalded" in the fourth line.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, it was agreed to insert before the word "milking-machine" in the second last line the words "parts of the," to delete the words "when not in use" and substitute the words "which come into contact with the milk."

Clause 21 as amended agreed to.

Clause 22 agreed to.

Clause 23: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the words "to the satisfaction of the Inspector" where occurring in the clause, was agreed to.

Clause 24: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the clause was agreed to.

Clauses 25 and 26 agreed to.

Clause 27: Paragraph (a) agreed to.

Paragraph (b): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the omission of all the words after the word "milk," and the insertion of the words "drawn from a cow within four clear days after the date of calving, or within any longer period thereafter during which the milk is unfit for use" were agreed to.

Paragraph (c): On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the insertion of the word "or" before the word "offer" and the deletion of the words "or give away" were agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 28 agreed to.

Clause 29: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the deletion of the word "cows" and the substitution of the word "cattle," the striking-out of the word "or" after the word "animal," and the insertion of the word "including" instead, and the omission of the words "enter or" were agreed to.

Clauses 30 and 31, on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, were struck out.

Clause 32 agreed to.

Clause 33, on motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, was struck out.

Clause 34 agreed to.

Schedule. Form 1: On motion of the Hon. Mr. McNab, the word "general" was struck out.

Regulations as amended agreed to.

The Committee then adjourned.

#### THURSDAY, 8TH OCTOBER, 1908.

The Committee met at 10.45 a.m., pursuant to notice.

*Present:* Hon. Mr. McNab, Hon. Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bollard, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Hornsby, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Lawry, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Okey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Witty. Mr. Ritchie, of the Stock Department, was also present.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

*Re proposed Dairy Regulations,* Mr. Okey moved, That a copy of the report and evidence taken on the subject be sent to each witness, and that the Chairman be authorised to write an explanatory letter informing them why he could not carry out his promise of sending them copies for revision.—Agreed to.

Mr. Hogg moved,—1. That the Agricultural, Pastoral, and Stock Committee, to whom was referred the proposed Dairy Regulations, have the honour to report that they have carefully considered the same, and recommend that the regulations as amended, with the evidence and minutes of the Committee, do lie on the table and be printed. 2. That the regulations as amended be referred to the Government for consideration.—Agreed to.

Mr. Witty moved, That the Committee desires to place on record its high appreciation of the manner in which the Chairman, Mr. F. Lawry, has conducted the proceedings, in view of the importance of the work done during the session; and that this resolution be reported to the House.—Agreed to.

The Hon. Mr. McNab moved, That the Chairman be authorised to sign the minutes of the proceedings.—Agreed to.

The Committee then adjourned.

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

[NOTE.—*The evidence has not been corrected by the witnesses.*]

THURSDAY, 17TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

DAVID CUDDIE examined. (No. 1.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your full name?—David Cuddie.

2. And your occupation?—Dairy Commissioner.

*Witness:* Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I understand that the information you wish to obtain from me is something about the dairy industry in general, and as to how the question of milk-supply affects that industry. Of course, so far as our butter and cheese are concerned, we have reached a fairly high stage in regard to quality, but there has been very little improvement in that connection for some years now. The progress of the industry was very rapid for a time, but since then it has been very slow, until, as I say, we have reached a stage when there appears to be practically very little improvement indeed, if any. The dairy-farmers of New Zealand have certainly done exceedingly well in connection with the equipment and building of dairy factories both for cheese and butter, and think I can say we are practically second to none in that connection. The farmers have spent large sums of money in that way, and made a great deal of progress as regards the manufacture. The men engaged in the business as makers have also greatly improved their methods, and they are still improving. As a general rule, they are all anxious to turn out an article that will arrive on the Home market and sell for a good price, and give no rise to complaint whatever. Now, while that has been the case, we have made very little progress at all in connection with the farm end of the business. I admit that much has been done in some districts to improve the conditions under which milk has been produced, and I think I am right in saying that the majority of the dairy-farmers in New Zealand are doing their best to send in milk that is clean, and pure, and sound; but there are others, the minority, who are not so careful, and there is no doubt that the men who are looking after their milk are suffering on account of what may be called the careless people who will not take the care they should to deliver the milk in a sound and sweet condition. Now, that milk is sent forward to the factory. It is all mixed together, and the ultimate result depends a great deal upon the purity of the whole. One can of bad milk is quite equal to spoiling a whole vat of cheese or a whole churn of butter, provided it is taken in. And it sometimes works out in this way: that milk that has been handled carelessly does not show up until after the butter or cheese has been in store for some time, or shipped to the Home market. That came under my notice very clearly when I was in the Home-country, where I went to see something about the dairy industry and our dairy progress. While we sometimes hear little about the faults of milk at this end, my experience was that there are a good many faults in our butter and cheese, and it seems to be impossible to improve that unless we can make sure of getting milk in a thoroughly sound condition. Unless we can get the whole of the milk in a fairly sound condition we are not going to make any progress at all. So far as other countries are concerned in connection with milk-supply, some of them are ahead of us to some extent, but the conditions in these countries, of course, are different. Take, for instance, Denmark. There the people have been in the industry for many years, and the farms are occupied by the families of the farmers. They are handed down from one to another. Some do change hands, but not so much as in the case of New Zealand. Here we have a great many people who have been in the business for many years, but there are others who have had no experience whatever in connection with dairy matters. They have taken up land, and they never had any opportunity to acquire the necessary information to enable them to produce milk in the condition it should be produced. I believe in many cases that it is not through any want of honesty, but it is the want of knowledge, and in other cases—they may be few, but there are at least some, more in some districts than others, who have the knowledge, but will not take the care, and I think that if anything can be done to improve the quality of our produce, it will be money well spent, and will be returned to the farmers fourfold. I do not think I need say any more. So far as the regulations are concerned, I have not yet had an opportunity of going into them thoroughly since they have been in print, although I had something to do with the drafting of them, but I might just say that, as regulations go, I think they are satisfactory for general working. I might add that we have regulations under the Dairy Industry Act in connection with the manufacture of dairy-produce for export which we are working under, and some of them are very stringent, but we have had no difficulty whatever in working with the people in the industry. I might point out that for the last five years we have never even had a Court case. When we approach the farmers we find, by pointing out that it is to their advantage to do certain things, they generally agree. In fact, the position is this: that when any changes are to be made in connection with water-supply, or drainage, or dairy-factory buildings, we are sent for to advise them. And so far as the other branches of the industry are concerned, we have absolutely no trouble in connection with the regulations. They seem to work well, and I think I am right in saying that the result of the Department's work has been highly beneficial to our produce. It has been one of the means of placing our produce in the position it is in to-day, and if anything can be done to further improve that position, I feel it will be a great benefit to the people engaged in the industry, and to the country generally. What is wanted in connection with the dairy industry is a strong forward movement in order to place us at the top of the tree with regard to quality on the British markets, and I consider that, if the proposed regulations are given effect to, these results would be obtained in the near future.

*The Chairman:* Mr. Buddo, do you wish to say anything?

3. *Mr. Buddo.*] Could you, without giving any names, give instances in which you have had reason to believe that the detriment of the output was caused by contaminated milk?—So far as that is concerned, that is almost a daily occurrence at dairy factories, because we find that when produce is made from well-cared-for milk the quality is very much superior.

4. Is it confined to any particular districts?—Very often we find that there is more trouble in a factory that has been run for some time than in an absolutely new one; and the reason is that the flooring is clean in a new factory, and the first season they seem to go along all right. The reason is that when dairying commences in a district, the conditions at first are, as a rule, more conducive to the production of cleaner milk—that is, the cans and utensils of the suppliers are new in the first season. In some districts they have made improvements in the milk-supply, and the main reason, I think, is that the yards and sheds have been improved, and they are kept in better condition than they were formerly.

5. Is your difficulty principally confined to the yards and the sheds, or rather the sheds and the yards adjoining, or do you find difficulties in bringing the herd to the yard?—We do not have very much to do with the actual working at the farms: that comes under the control of the Stock Division of the Department. Our duty begins when the milk is delivered at the factories.

6. When you have found an unsatisfactory supply, do you follow it up? Do you find it is practically always the conditions of the yards and sheds?—As a general rule the faults in the milk are due to defects or to carelessness in handling. In some cases where inferior milk is detected on the weighing-stage by the instructors an effort has been made in the past to visit the farms, but very little of this work could be taken in hand owing to the magnitude of the undertaking and the limited number of men at our disposal.

7. The paving in my district is confined to the yards, but we find a difficulty in providing in some cases concrete for yards. Could you suggest any other material more or less equally suitable for flooring?—Concrete, of course, is the best, but where it is not obtainable some other material should be used. Tight wood floors made impervious to moisture, with close joints, would, I think, prove satisfactory, if kept clean.

8. Would bricks suit if they were cemented with concrete?—They are not as good as concrete. Bricks are porous, and do not make an ideal floor for milking-sheds.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Rutherford?

9. *Mr. Rutherford.*] You said, Mr. Cuddie, that there had been no prosecutions under the Dairy Act within the last five years; but has your attention been drawn to the case of Dr. Levinge, in Christchurch?—I was speaking in connection with the export dairy regulations.

10. Could you prosecute the dairy for bringing in bad milk to the factory? Have you had any prosecutions?—Yes, we could prosecute owners of insanitary dairy factories for breaches of the regulations with reference to branding, stamping, and shipping. If the buildings for the dairy factories are not sanitary we have practically power to close them down.

11. You referred, however, to the farmers' buildings?—We do not touch them. We have no control over that end. That comes under the Stock Division.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Okey?

12. *Mr. Okey.*] Mr. Cuddie, we have factories in the Taranaki District grading as high as 97 points. Do you think these regulations will affect these factories? 97 is their average?—I think that is incorrect. Our highest average, I think, was something under 94 for the whole season, and the quantity of butter grading up to 97 is infinitesimal.

13. You do not think factories grading up to 97 points can be improved?—Well, there would not be very much need for any further improvement.

14. Then there is another point, Mr. Cuddie, with regard to the feeding-flavour which we have in the spring-time. These regulations will not affect that in any way?—No. It seems to me that there is a great deal of misapprehension about feed-flavours. It gets a great deal of blame that it is not really responsible for, although I freely admit that the flavour of the milk is affected to some extent by the kind of feed given to the cows, and it is more noticeable in some districts than in others.

15. The dairy-manager cannot at the present time send back inferior milk?—Yes, and most of them carry out that to some extent, but it does not seem to have the effect of improving the supply; and, besides, milk that is returned is a heavy loss to the owner. It is also a loss to the dairy company, because their working-expenses are just as high, whether they work up that milk or not. Then, again, it is also a loss to the industry. The value of the milk rejected or returned every year is a heavy tax on the farmers, and if the regulations proposed are enforced, I believe that a very large proportion of this present loss will be avoided.

16. Do you not think there should be some different conditions for settlers in the back country that make their own butter? It is almost impossible for them to comply with the regulations?—In some cases it would be, but this is where the discretion of the Department would come in, in dealing with dairies so situated.

17. Do you not think there should be some special regulations?—I hardly think so.

18. It is almost impossible for them to get the cement floors. We have cases, Mr. Cuddie, where they have to pack their butter on pack-horses, and there is no means for making concrete. It is impossible in that case for a man to put down a cement floor and yard?—I quite agree with you.

19. Do you not think there should be provision in the regulations to have a backblocks area in some cases?—I do not see why. The difficulty can be got over by making allowances under such circumstances.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Witty?

20. *Mr. Witty.*] You say, Mr. Cuddie, that the farmers have made great improvements. Are they in most cases satisfactory?—Yes, I believe they are.

21. The milkers have also greatly improved their methods. Are you satisfied with most of their improvements?—In cases where they have improved their yards, and altered their methods, I say Yes.

22. You say that the regulations under which you work as stringent?—Yes.

23. And they are all carried out to the letter practically?—We have no difficulty whatever.

24. What is the chief cause of complaint?—Butter and cheese being defective in flavour. In the main due to faulty milk.

25. Caused by what?—Contamination in one form or another.

26. Do you prefer a race to a large yard?—I would not care to venture an opinion upon it, as I have had no personal experience as between race and yard.

27. With regard to the lease tenants, do you think the regulations should be carried out in their entirety? Say a man has only six, nine, or ten months to run, do you think some measure of leniency should not be shown in cases like that, so long as he keeps his place clean?—That will be a case for the landlord to help that man.

28. Do you not think that the Department in a case like that would show a certain amount of leniency so long as the place is kept clean?—So long as it is kept clean, I should say that we would do so.

29. What is your opinion upon giving verbal instructions for improvements? Do you not think everything should be put down in writing, so that the dairyman has everything before him?—I think that a great deal of good can be done by verbal discussion, but the main points should be put down in writing.

30. I think you stated that good clay would make a good floor. Do you not think that when it became moist it would break up, and when dry would blow all over the place and carry the germs?—Where material for concrete cannot be obtained, the only thing to be done would be to select the best material available in that particular district. A close and tight wood floor, or one made of hard clay, might meet the case. I do not recommend clay where any better material is obtainable.

31. Do you think that the byres are built on good lines?—Many of them are.

32. Do you not think there is too much distance between the drain and the cow?—It is a very difficult matter to regulate that.

33. Could not the byre be put up much cheaper if the space was shortened between the cow and the drain? Do you think that the byres should all contain a bail for each cow that is to be milked?—My experience has been that where a farmer has a bail for each cow the surroundings are very much more satisfactory than in cases where cows are yarded.

*The Chairman:* Have you anything you wish to ask, Mr. Rhodes?

34. *Mr. Rhodes.*] With regard to the tainting of the cheese on account of contamination, do you find this applies both to private cheesemakers and to factories?—Yes.

35. To which does it apply most?—To a few private-dairy cheesemakers. The flavour of some cheese is very defective. But there are very few private cheesemakers. By far the greater portion of the cheese is factory-made. Only a small quantity is made at the private cheese dairies, and most of this is sold on the local markets. The defects in cheese which came under my notice were those in the factories' outputs.

36. What about Banks Peninsula—there are some there?—Yes, but I would not say that it applies to them any more than to any other district.

*The Chairman:* Do you desire to say anything, Mr. McNab?

37. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You were recently in England, Mr. Cuddie?—Yes.

38. And when there you examined a number of difficulties that were brought under your notice as Commissioner, and looked into the condition of the trade, did you not?—Yes.

39. Did you form any general opinion as to the cause of these difficulties?—There is no doubt in my mind whatever that the cause of the majority of the difficulties which came under my notice in England in a very large measure were due to faulty milk.

40. Would the effects of faulty milk be more patent at the London end, after the butter had gone round the world, than they would be in New Zealand?—It shows up at that end much more than it does here. When the produce is newly made it is more difficult to detect off flavours also, but after it has been held for a time they seem to develop.

41. Had you any opportunity of noticing the condition under which milk is produced in the English and Scotch milk-producing districts?—Yes, I had the advantage of seeing the conditions at those places.

42. How did the conditions there compare with ours?—I was there during the winter-time, and the stock, of course, were all housed, usually in buildings with cement floors, stone in some places, but many were of cement—hard floors—and, of course, the farmers were able to keep them in a very much cleaner condition than we can.

43. And that, do you think, had a very important bearing on the condition of the butter and cheese which was produced?—More especially the cheese. They keep the cheese a very long time before they market it, and the flavour was a revelation to me, and I feel sure that the good flavour was due to the fact that more care was taken with the raw material—because the makers do not appear to be more skilled than those in New Zealand.

44. If you were asked the question along what lines can the greatest improvement take place in our dairy-produce, would you consider it was in connection with the precautions of the milker rather than the manufacturer?—Yes.

45. You do not express an opinion, do you, on the question of individual regulations—it is the policy?—Yes, it is the policy.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Kidd?

46. *Mr. Kidd.*] Mr. Cuddie, I understand that you have not gone thoroughly into the regulations, and that the evidence you are giving is in support of the necessity for the regulations. It is your belief that in order to bring our industry up to a high standard in regard to the quality of our butter and cheese—that we would all like to see regulations like these adopted?—Most decidedly.

47. As to the question of regulations, I fail to see that Mr. Cuddie can give us any direct evidence. Do you think, Mr. Cuddie, that compliance with these regulations will pay those who have to go to the expense?—Yes, I think it will ultimately pay dairy-farmers well.

48. I think, in your evidence you justify the necessity of better provision for cleanliness, but your remarks with reference to the floors of milking-sheds were not entirely right as applied to districts such as mine, where there are swampy lands.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Macpherson?

49. *Mr. Macpherson.*] I should like to ask one question. You have mentioned your experience during the winter months at Home. Are you of opinion that the conditions are more favourable to the winter months than the summer months?—No, I would not say that.

50. You would say that the conditions in summer are equally as favourable as winter?—Yes, because most of them have their yards paved or properly metalled there.

51. You stated that the surroundings of the buildings were kept very clean owing to the fact that the cattle were all housed in winter. Is there the same tendency during the summer months?—I have not been there in summer, but, judging from the appearance of the yards, I should say so.

52. Are the conditions in summer-time very different from the conditions here with regard to cleanliness about the buildings?—I would say Yes.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Hornsby?

53. *Mr. Hornsby.*] Mr. Cuddie, when you were in the Old Land did you visit the Channel Islands?—I did not.

54. You are aware that much of the milking takes place outside there?—I understand that is the custom in the Channel Islands during the summer months.

55. Is there any real reason why a farmer—a very small farmer, say—with a few cows, should not be permitted to do his milking in the open, if he chooses?—I do not see any strong reason why not.

56. Are you aware that these regulations would absolutely prevent that?—No, but I do not think that the provisions should be enforced to that extent in the case of the supplier to a factory.

57. With regard to these regulations, might I ask you if you think it would be any great detriment to the trade of the dairy industry, so far as it affects this colony, if twelve months' notice were given of the coming into operation of such a set of regulations as these?—In my opinion, it would keep back the good that might be done in the meantime.

58. You do not think it would be a great detriment to the trade?—It would only mean the loss of time. We should lose the opportunity of having made a certain amount of progress during that time.

59. Might I put it this way: Do you not think it would remove the feeling of irksomeness, and which some men call injustice, in having these regulations put on at once? Do you not think it would tend to remove that feeling if due notice were given—we will not say twelve months?—Yes, I suppose it would to some extent, but even then there would still be a certain amount of opposition from a certain section.

60. Now, will you give the Committee your opinion (perhaps this is rather a difficult matter to deal with at a moment's notice) why there should be the overlapping which is apparent from your evidence this morning? Now, would it not be for the betterment of the whole business if this overlapping were to cease?—Can I be allowed to say there is practically no overlapping, Mr. Hornsby. We begin at a certain stage with our milk, and attend to the manufacture, instruction-work, grading, and inspection of shipments. There is no overlapping whatever, so far as the work I am connected with is concerned.

61. Let me put it to you this way: You have said in your evidence that the whole trouble arises between the period of embarking and landing. Why should you not, as Dairy Commissioner, have command of the whole business?—That is a question of policy.

62. With regard to the substitute for concrete, brick has been mentioned. Would you not advise that vitrified brick would make a very much better floor than the ordinary burnt brick—a brick which is overburnt—almost like a salt glaze?—The difficulty in connection with a brick floor is in keeping it a solid mass, and preventing leaks.

63. Do you not think it would be a good thing that these regulations should embrace a recommendation to put in vitrified brick floors where concrete is not available? Would you look upon that favourably?—I should, if properly laid down on a solid foundation.

64. There is just one other question. You say that in the Old Country it was apparent to you that the defects of the faulty milk show themselves at the other end more than they do, or can do, at this end. Is there any danger, where there are bad cases of faulty milk, of ptomaine poison developing? Has any accident ever come under your notice?—There might be, provided the manufacture was extremely poor.

65. You have never seen any well-defined condition showing any measure of development?—No.

66. You are aware that prosecutions have come about in the Old Country, and that it has been blamed upon New Zealand produce?—Nothing of that nature has come under my notice.

*The Chairman:* Have you anything you wish to ask, Mr. Hogg?

67. *Mr. Hogg.*] Do you know whether there are a great number of defective cowsheds at the present time?—I am sorry to say there are a great many.

68. Do you think enforced compliance with these new regulations would severely test the policy—I mean financially and otherwise?—I think not if they are carried out in reason, which they would be under the proposed scheme.

69. Appreciating how many are mortgaged, and really working for landlords, do you think they would be able to stand the cost?—I believe that, although the cost might seem heavy at the outset, the expenditure would be recouped in the end, and that speedily.

70. A good many dairymen are working on shares, and others are virtually working for the landlord or mortgagee. In the case of a badly kept dairy that required thorough renovation, do you think the penalty under these regulations should be imposed on the landlord or on the dairyman?—In a case where a man is working on shares, it would, of course, be on the landlord.

71. I think some reference has been made to the dairyman in the backblocks, and you are aware there is a great deal of difficulty in getting concrete and good suitable material, and, in some cases, appliances?—Just so.

72. In such a case as that, do you think the regulations might be suspended?—Yes, I believe that in cases of that kind every consideration should be shown.

73. And in the case of giving twelve months' notice, I presume you would be inclined to deal with each case according to the circumstances?—So long as the milking shed and yard was kept in a fair state of sanitation, and not a menace to the welfare of others.

74. When I was in Auckland the other day I noticed on the Waikato some very fine dairy farms. The paddocks were covered with turnips, and the cows were feeding on turnips. When turnip feed is used is the milk generally badly flavoured?—The feeding of cows with turnips seriously affects the flavour of the milk, and it is almost impossible to make a good product from that class of milk.

75. Does that account for the deterioration of butter and cheese?—No. It is nearly all grassed butter that we export. It sometimes obtains to a small extent in the South. Perhaps the first shipment at the beginning of the season and the last shipment at the end, but it is scarcely mentioned in the Home market.

76. Turnip feeding does not prevail during the whole year?—No.

77. I suppose you have seen places where the dairying is carried on in the open air?—Yes, I visited some where this was done.

78. Do you approve of that system yourself?—Well, no, not in our climate. There is too much rain, for one thing.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Lang?

79. *Mr. Lang.*] I understood you, Mr. Cuddie, to say that you had never had a Court case for the last five years, and I understood you to qualify that by saying that it is only with reference to the export regulations?—That is so.

80. But there have been many Court cases under the Dairy regulations?—Yes.

81. Then I understood you spoke about Denmark sending the best dairy-produce imported into Great Britain. Do you know whether the dairy-farmers in Denmark work under similar regulations to what are now proposed?—I could not say.

82. You spoke about the cattle being housed in winter in the Old Country, and compared the accommodation in New Zealand rather unfavourably with it. Is it not a fact that here the same accommodation is not so necessary as where cows are kept continually housed?—They would certainly not require the same class of building for milking in New Zealand, but it is just as important that the surroundings should be clean.

83. Do you think if these regulations were carried out strictly it would inflict a great deal of hardship?—If the spirit of the regulations were carried out, I take it there would not be any hardship.

84. What do you mean?—I feel sure that reasonable amount of time would be given to have the necessary alterations made, where necessary. If the farmer does his best and makes every effort to comply with them according to his means, then the Department would not expect him to carry out to the letter every clause in the regulations.

85. And if they were enforced they would inflict a good deal of hardship?—Yes, in some cases.

86. *Mr. Witty.*] Mr. Cuddie, I think you said that the cheese that was manufactured at Home was superior to the cheese manufactured here?—Yes.

87. Is not that a good deal owing to the feeding at Home? At Home it is artificial feeding, which may have a good deal to do with it?—The bulk of cheese is made in the summer-time, when the cattle are in pasture; consequently the feeding of cattle would not be very different from what it is in New Zealand.

88. *The Chairman.*] When you were in the Old Country, did you visit the Cheddar Valley?—No.

89. Would you be surprised to know that for twenty square miles in that valley, celebrated for making cheese, there is not a single cowshed?—I was not aware of it.

90. And I think you will be prepared to admit that there is no better cheese made in the world than the Cheddar Valley cheese. That is all. I thank you for your evidence.

JOHN LESLIE BRUCE examined. (No. 2.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your full name?—John Leslie Bruce.

2. You are an Inspector of Dairies?—I am Inspector in Charge of the Otago District. Regulations under the Dairying Industry Act of 1898 came into operation in 1901, and I have been continuously since that time connected with the administration of these regulations of 1901—

that is, for seven years—and, although having practically had nothing to do with dairies supplying milk to creameries and butter-factories, my attention has been almost exclusively directed to those suppliers supplying milk direct for human consumption to the cities and boroughs. At the present time in Otago the position roughly is this: There are between 1,100 and 1,200 registered dairies—that is, supplying milk direct for human consumption. They range from one cow up to dairy herds of considerable magnitude. I should say that the gross number of cows of these dairies is between ten and eleven thousand. The old regulations, some people say, bristled with the opinion of the Inspector. Inasmuch as the whole world had been endeavouring to do something to provide the consumer with pure milk, the question of defining that by law was such an indefinite thing. No doubt the original regulations bristled with the opinion of the Inspector, and consequently a very great responsibility rested upon the official administering the same, he having to protect the consumer and at the same time to guard against any undue oppression to the supplier. Now, gentlemen, the position, so far as my evidence will be concerned, is that while endeavouring to carry out these duties, I had to do what was right to the consumer without injuring the supplier. During these seven years there has been in Otago extremely little friction—in fact, I should say the friction in Otago during that period has been practically nil. I believe that abundant evidence can be produced from both consumer and supplier that, although the conditions are not perfect yet by any means, we have nevertheless achieved a very great deal indeed. The condition of these cowsheds and the intelligent management of cattle, I say, has improved very much indeed during these seven years. The question might be asked how these improved conditions were obtained. Well, with any official approaching his duties with the honest endeavour to do what is right between the two sets of people—that is, the supplier and the consumer—I admit that a very great deal of tact has been necessary. I may tell you this, gentlemen, that, while I admit that the tact and consideration is perhaps the leading point, this must not be forgotten: Times do arise when there is a dispute that cannot be amicably settled, and the person with whom the difference of opinion arises is absolutely and clearly wrong, then, after giving him due and fair notice, I have never hesitated once, when all other means had failed, to enforce the provisions of the regulations in the Magistrate's Court. I take it the position is this: that when it comes to sound argument, if the point which is a reasonable request is absolutely refused and no reasonable understanding can be arrived at, it would be weakness on the part of the official to do otherwise—in fact, he cannot ignore the laws that are laid down for his guidance. Since the regulations came into force in 1901, a little over seven years ago, only thirty-five informations have been laid in Otago. Of these, one-third were purely of a technical nature—namely, for failing to register dairies—while another fourth of the balance was for offences under the public health laws for adulterating milk, &c.; leaving only sixteen informations, which might really be termed “offences under the Dairy Regulations.” I might mention also that I have given the question of regulations a good deal of thought. First of all, are these regulations really necessary? I have thought the thing out from all points of view. The Dairy Industry Act of 1898 provides for everything contained in these proposed regulations. The Act is brief and very much to the point, and it provides for a very large penalty indeed for an offence. The maximum penalty is £50. These proposed regulations, which are the outcome of experience, are of very great assistance in this way. Take the new ones, for example. They set a standard which is higher than we are able to attain at present, but which is a good standard to keep in view and work up to. For example, a dairy might not be all that is desired at present, but if the farmer would keep the place in as sanitary a condition as possible, he would not be compelled to commence any elaborate alterations until next season. He might say, “I intend to build a new byre,” and the Department would assist him in every way in the selection of a site, supplying him with plans, and giving him any other information to guide him in spending his money wisely. Another point in favour of these regulations is that they secure a uniform standard throughout the Dominion. Secondly, they are a standard that we are steadily working towards, and hope to accomplish at some future day. Thirdly, by these regulations the farmer knows exactly how far the Department can ask him to go. Putting all these points together they demonstrate on broad lines that with solid judgment and sound common-sense the result cannot fail to be beneficial to all concerned. I think, if we can go cautiously forward with these regulations, without causing any great harm or undue severity to the supplier, and if we take them from a broad point of view, and endeavour to administer them with care, that in a few years' time the condition of our dairy industry will be a long way ahead of what it is to-day.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Okey?

3. *Mr. Okey.*] Did you find that the regulations in Otago took considerable time to be given effect to?—Yes. We are still steadily going ahead.

4. Did you find the dairymen were generally willing to comply with the regulations?—Yes. Sometimes when it was a question of building new premises time had to be given. When a cowshed is delapidated, it is much better for the official, if he can arrange amicably with the farmer to keep his place as clean as he can during the current season.

5. And there is another matter—using the dairy-cart for other purposes. Is there really any harm in using the cart for any other purpose so long as it is cleaned out?—I take it this way, sir, that in framing regulations you have got to frame them to meet extreme cases, and in drawing up regulations it is just as well to provide the machinery for an aggravated case. Supposing this clause was not there at all. I have heard of some very aggravated cases indeed, and had such power not been provided, the offender might go scot-free.

6. One man might use his dairy-cart for ordinary farm purposes, and keep it clean, where another man might use it and not keep it clean. Would it not be difficult for you to proceed against one man and not against the other?—It requires very great discretion.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to ask any questions, Mr. Witty?



7. *Mr. Witty.*] I would like to ask two or three questions. Do you think it is necessary to have a bail for every cow?—It is not absolutely necessary, so long as you keep in mind that the main object is cleanliness. When a milking-shed is large enough to hold a reasonable percentage of the cows, there could not be any harm in the balance standing by in any properly made yard.

8. Do you prefer a race to a large yard?—At the present time I have only seen one race. I have not had much experience with them, but from what I have seen I like them.

9. There are always fighting-cows in every herd. Do you not think that a boss cow would be always blocking a race?—When the cows are dehorned there is less fighting; but I certainly agree with you that unless the race is at least 6 ft. wide these boss cows would interrupt the others in a narrow race.

10. With regard to tenants: I am very pleased with your remarks about using common-sense in dealing with the regulations. You get tenants under short leases. Do you think that it is fair to go to much extent beyond cleanliness—that is to say, to make them go and put up new dairies when they have only nine or twelve months or two years for their leases to run?—Certainly not; but I would endeavour to compel the owner to come to the rescue.

11. Do you not think that a good deal of common-sense should be used where there is a short lease, and they should not be compelled to follow out the strict letter of the regulations?—There are a few short leases round Dunedin, and I instructed the Inspector to insist upon them being kept in as good sanitary condition as possible, to see that the milk-supply is not being injured, and just to work away quietly—not to make much noise, but to get the very best results from the tenant.

12. You think that some tact and judgment should be allowed in cases like that?—The whole thing is a question of judgment.

13. Do you think a verbal notice should prove sufficient for improvements to the byre?—I have great faith in personal interviews. I prefer to discuss the thing fully, together with other minor points that are hardly worth putting in writing; but major improvements certainly should be put in writing.

14. What is the worst feature, as a rule, in connection with these stockyards and dairies?—I think it is carelessness.

15. Now, there is another question with regard to milking in a paddock. Supposing a person has only one or two cows, do you not think it is just as cleanly to milk anywhere in the paddock, so long as it is a clean grass paddock?—The position is this: In the wet climate that we have in some parts of New Zealand you find the water trickling down the cow's flanks and dropping into the milk-bucket.

16. Would not this occur in the shed?—If the cow came into the shed wet she would shake the wet off.

17. There is another thing with regard to section 27—that is, giving away milk. Now, there are a number of places where a person has one or two cows, and has no idea of selling milk, but there are a few poor neighbours, and he gives milk to them. I am not speaking of a town, but in the country?—I believe I had some slight responsibility for that clause being inserted in the regulations. In administering these laws it was found that unscrupulous people frequently disposed of milk surreptitiously, much to the detriment of poor people with a registered dairy, and who were dependent upon the sale of their milk for a livelihood; but the main object was to bring all dairies under inspection and under good sanitary conditions.

18. We have got a few people round our district who do not keep cows, and we give it to them. You must not give away any milk from any cow under the new regulations. It seems very hard that a person cannot give away milk when it is practically wasting, without coming under the Act. Do you not think that is going too far?—In order to protect the small registered owner the regulation prohibiting the giving-away of milk became a necessity.

19. But in the case I am thinking of there is not a milk-seller within five or six miles?—It is one of those little things of common-sense.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to ask any questions, Mr. Rhodes?

20. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You have a general knowledge of the dairying conditions throughout New Zealand as well as Otago?—I have been in Otago for a good many years. I have also seen dairies in other parts of New Zealand.

21. You think that these regulations would apply to all the dairies throughout New Zealand?—Yes; I think they are very good.

22. They do not require modification?—No.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to say anything, Mr. McNab?

23. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] Supposing you heard of a cow which was on the place where milk was being given away from—without going into the question at all suggesting that a special bail should be put by for milking in—would it not be necessary that the officers should see that she was not affected with tuberculosis? Would you not consider it necessary for one of your officers to see the cow, even if nothing further was done—to examine her?—Just so.

24. Has it come under your notice that cows have been milked when simply rotten with tuberculosis?—Yes.

*The Chairman:* Mr. Kidd, do you wish to ask anything?

25. *Mr. Kidd.*] Mr. Bruce, section 8, clause (c), reads as follows: "The floor of every cowshed shall be of an even surface, and formed of concrete or other material impervious to water. A suitable gutter shall be provided and connected with the outlet-drain." What "other material" do you suggest? Take a shed that has a good boarded floor, would you recommend that it be pulled up in order to have some other material substituted, especially in swampy country?—What are the conditions, Mr. Kidd?

26. So far as many sheds in swampy lands are concerned, the floors are above the surface of the ground, and the drainage is provided for by outlet-drains. In some cases, however, this condition does not obtain, and hard clay floors are used, and you cannot get material for concrete. Would not a boarded floor do if it were tarred? Would not that be as good a floor as you could get?—I certainly should not condemn it.

27. I do not say it is as good as a concrete floor, but where this is not available, would you in your position as Dairy Inspector order the floor to be pulled up and another put down in its place?—Certainly not. A boarded floor well cramped up and tarred should be impervious to water. For example, the deck of a steamboat is impervious to water.

28. Now, in reference to clause (k) in the same section, which reads, "Every cowshed in which more than six cows are to be milked at either the morning or evening milking, and which is not provided with sufficient stalling accommodation to hold all the cows at one time, shall have either—(i) a yard, sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at any one time for milking, attached thereto but divided therefrom by a partition or fence, the floor of such yard to be properly concreted or paved; or (ii) a yard of such dimensions as aforesaid situated at least 30 ft. from such cowshed, and connected therewith by a race the floor of which is properly concreted or paved." You will notice it says "a yard sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at any one time," and in the second section a yard should be situated 30 ft. away from the shed and connected with a race. That means the shifting of every stockyard from its present position, and having it connected with a race. Do you consider that an essential?—The previous subsection provides for the yard being quite near the byre. It is an alternative section.

*The Chairman:* Do you wish to ask any questions, Mr. Macpherson?

29. *Mr. Macpherson.*] Mr. Bruce, you said that you believed it was not necessary to have a bail for every cow. I would like to ask you, What proposition would you be satisfied with? Take, for instance, a herd of forty cows?—While I would prefer to see half the cows bailed up at one time, if I could not obtain this I would be contented with bails to hold one-third of the total number.

30. With regard to the giving-away of milk, there is a point which I do not quite understand. Would you approve of a clause being inserted in the regulations to enable a farmer, who is not registered, to give away milk for which he had no use?—The object is that by registration the farmer's herd is brought under inspection. Now, we all know that in herds where it is least expected there are sometimes several highly tuberculous animals. In my experience I have found this frequently, and I prefer registration just to bring that place in touch with the Department's officers. I would further point out that the interpretation of the word "dairy" is far-reaching, inasmuch as in the case of any person selling butter and cheese, or any other dairy-produce, his place becomes a dairy within the meaning of the Dairy Act, and therefore would have to be registered.

31. I admit that, but there are many cases where they never sell butter or milk. I keep three or four cows generally in milk, and we often have a large quantity of milk that is absolutely superfluous to us, but it is of considerable value to others. Would you not think it would be a considerable hardship if that had to be thrown away?—This is another question of discretion.

*The Chairman:* Have you anything to ask, Mr. Hornsby?

32. *Mr. Hornsby.*] Mr. Bruce, with regard to having a stall for every cow, how would it be in the case where milking-machines are used?—I do not see any difference.

33. Where milking plant is erected for only six cows, would there be any necessity for more than six stalls for the cows?—How many cows do you estimate you would have?

34. Supposing you have as many as a herd of forty to a hundred?—Yes. Then you mean to bring in six cows.

35. Yes?—The objection is, if you are continually letting out and taking in cows during milking operations the animals become restless and do not give their milk freely. I would therefore recommend a larger milking plant, but according to the method you mention, in which you are continually bringing in one or two, it is not a good thing.

36. But how can that be avoided where you are using a machine?—To provide more bails and extend your plant.

37. They are practically a fixture where I have visited?—The suction-pipe goes along the wall, and could easily be extended, provided your plant has sufficient capacity.

38. If a farmer has got a yard concreted for his cows to stand in, would you say then that there was any necessity for a race?—No.

39. The race should be dispensed with where there is a properly concreted yard?—Yes.

40. With regard to another element. Would you, from your practical experience, where there is in a district a cooling-station for milk where the milk is treated before it goes away for human consumption—such as, for example, in the case of milk for the City of Wellington—be in favour of putting in any regulation making it compulsory for all the milk that is produced in that district to go through the public cooling-station's process before it is used for human consumption?—Provided there was a cooling-station; it would depend upon how soon the milk could be treated at a public cooling-station.

41. We have in Featherston a cooling-station of the most approved kind. From Featherston a large quantity of milk is sent to the City of Wellington. A number of farmers cool their milk there. Would you be in favour of making it compulsory for farmers to cool their milk there?—And not make cooling on the farm compulsory?

42. Yes?—I have had no experience of a cooling-station. I like the sound of it. There is just one point, where the dairyman's farm is too far away from the cooling-station, and several hours might elapse before the milk is cooled, and considerable harm might be done through its being cool before it has reached the cooling-station; but where it can be delivered to the cooling-station quickly it must have a great deal to recommend it.

*The Chairman:* Do you desire to ask any questions, Mr. Lang?

43. *Mr. Lang.*] I understand that the regulations were framed to protect the consumer?—Yes.

44. Do you not think that the consumer should pay the registration fee?—I do not.

45. It is the consumer who derives the benefit?—What is of benefit to the dairy industry must of necessity be of benefit to the suppliers.

46. I see there are certain fees charged—registration fees—and why the fee should fall on the dairyman is the point. You say that the regulations are framed to protect the consumer?—That is so, but, speaking personally as a consumer, and not as a supplier, my personal experience is that the supplier is very well paid for his products. Milk is sold by the pint in Dunedin at the rate of 1s. 4d. per gallon, and by the quart at the rate of 1s. a gallon. I think, therefore, that the producer ought to be quite in a position to pay a small fee.

FRIDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

JOHN PARLANE, Cashmere, Christchurch, examined. (No. 3.)

*Witness:* I congratulate the Minister and the Department on the attempt they have made to deal with this rather difficult matter. There are not many things we take exception to, but a few things require alteration. We can fall in with the regulations till we get to section 8, paragraph (c), "The floor of every cowshed shall be of an even surface, and formed of concrete or other material impervious to water. A suitable gutter shall be provided, and connected with the outlet-drain." We are not quite sure what that "even surface" means. An even surface may be a perfectly level or a smooth surface. It does not say which. We think the floor should have a slope. If thoroughly even the cow cannot get a hold, and is apt to slip. We would like it like this: "The floor of every cowshed shall be floored with concrete or some solid material constructed with sufficient slope to give efficient drainage." In paragraph (h), "No cowshed or building where cows are kept, or milking-yard or stockyard used in connection with the milking of cows shall be within thirty feet of any stable, fowlhouse, fowl-run, calf-pen, trough from which calves are fed, manure-heap, cesspool, closet, urinal, or liquid-manure tank, or within fifty yards of any piggery." The "milking-yard" is put in in such a way that we can hardly understand it. It says earlier in the regulations that every dairy shall be provided with a suitable cowshed; then a milking-yard. We do not know what a milking-yard is. Then it says a stockyard must not be within 30 ft. of a stable. We wish to make this point: There are a great many places which have been brought pretty well up to date with the last regulations, and the stables are adjoining the stockyard. It would cause a certain amount of hardship if a man had to shift the whole of his stables. No exception would be taken if it was said the milking-shed had to be 30 ft. away from the stables; that would be sufficient. In one place it says the whole of the premises must be kept clean, and that, of course, would apply to the stables. We think the new requirement may cause a certain amount of hardship. We are quite willing such a provision should apply in connection with any new premises. In paragraph (j) it says, "No cowshed shall be within thirty feet of any dwellinghouse. Unfortunately, in our district there are a great many dwellinghouses within 20 ft., and good sheds, well floored with concrete, model places in every way, and it would be a great hardship if the sheds in these cases had to be shifted. It would mean the shifting of the whole of the buildings. We have no objection to the regulation applying in the case of new premises. Then, again, subsection (1) of paragraph (k) says, "A yard sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at any one time for milking, attached thereto, but divided therefrom by a partition or fence, the floor of such yard to be properly concreted or paved." We do not quite understand what "properly" means. Who is to give us a definition of "properly"? Is it left entirely to the satisfaction of the Inspector, or what is to be considered a properly paved stockyard? Is it to be paved with bricks, with concrete, or with stone? Then, there is another thing in part of paragraph (k) which provides for a race: We think that if the yard is divided with a closely boarded fence, at least 6 ft. high in the case of open sheds, between the stockyard and the shed, it should be sufficient—that is, provided the stockyard is floored in a reasonable way. In (l) it says "properly constructed." We have no definition of what a properly constructed dairy is. The clause reads, "Every cowshed, milkhouse, or other building where milk is kept or stored shall be properly constructed, lighted, ventilated, cleansed, and drained; and no such cowshed, milkhouse, or other building shall be connected by a covered drain with any liquid-manure tank or other place into which any offensive matter is discharged, or with any sewer, unless such drain or sewer is properly constructed, trapped, and ventilated." I think if the word "properly" is put in we should have a definition. Section 9 says, "Every dairyman shall notify the Inspector at least fourteen days before commencing to make any structural alterations in or about his dairy premises, and shall in such notice give brief particulars of the proposed alterations." We think that is hardly necessary. "Dairy premises," in the first part of the regulations, says that a dairy includes "farm, stockyard, or stable." If that is allowed to stand, and if we are going to make any structural alterations in any of the buildings, we should have to send to the Inspector. We object to that particular part. We are satisfied with everything else down to section 14: "Every dairyman shall, immediately after milking, (a) strain all milk through an approved strainer." That is all right. "(b) Where the milk is not immediately separated, cool it by a method approved by the Inspector." We think there should be a method generally approved by the Department; a standard method and a fixed temperature that the milk should be cooled down to. An Inspector may come and say, "It is not cooled down to my satisfaction." If we had a thermometer, and showed it was down to 65°, it would end there. It should be stated, as in the old regulations, that the milk should be cooled down to 65°. Section 18 says, "No dairyman

shall use, or suffer to be used, in connection with the handling or storage of milk or cream in or about his dairy any can or other utensil the joints or other parts of which are not properly soldered, or any can or other utensil in or on which there is any appearance of rust." This would entail very great hardship. We have no other material at present except the ordinary tinware, and a great many dairymen stand their milk overnight in running water in the dairy, and the outside of the can, especially the bottoms, show rust in a few days. It would be far better to say "the inside of which has become coated with rust." In the morning there may be an appearance of rust, but after washing there is no appearance. It is too drastic. I may say, in explanation, that I represent the Canterbury Dairymen's Union of Employers. We wish to do everything we can to assist the Department, and we are not taking an antagonistic view. We desire to assist them in turning out a good article. Coming to section 18, this reads, "No dairyman shall use, or suffer to be used, for the purpose of removing milk from his dairy, any can that does not bear a conspicuous metal label distinctly marked with his name." I think, if a man is delivering milk in the town and his own name is on the cart that should be sufficient, but in the case of where a man is carting other milk than his own, that the name should be on, and the can be locked. No man can be responsible for milk after it has left his own premises unless it is in his own cart. There would be no advantage in labels unless the cans are locked, but in the case of a man living in the suburbs, and having his own cart with his name on, that should be quite sufficient. In section 21, "Every dairyman in whose dairy a separator or milking-machine is used shall immediately after every use of such machine thoroughly wash, clean, and scald, or cause to be washed, cleaned, and scalded, all rubber parts and every other part thereof which comes in contact with the milk." The only exception I take to this is the scalding of the rubber. It is found in practical experience that scalding perishes the rubber. It causes the outside coating of the rubber to crack, and it is then a very hard job to clean it. It would be very much better to have in the case of the rubber parts "otherwise sterilised." I have had a good deal of experience of machines, and have carried out experiments. Some of the experiments appeared to be very satisfactory, but it takes a long time to tell. There is something, we think, should be here inserted: "All leg-ropes or other appliances." Leg-ropes get in a very filthy condition, and require washing in some disinfectant and exposing to the air. Towels also get dirty, and cause contamination. No mention is made of these things in the regulations. We then agree with everything down to section 30: "No dairyman shall permit any cow, calf, or other animal to be at large within thirty feet of any cowshed, milkhouse, or other building used in connection with the handling or storing of milk." It seems to me that if a man had a dog for getting in his cows he would not be allowed to let that dog get within 30 ft. of his milking premises. We are not sure whether it refers to the stockyard only: in that case it would prohibit us bringing in our cows within 30 ft., except by a race. Section 29 says, "No dairyman shall, except in the case of dairy cows brought into cowshed for milking or housing, permit any animal," &c. It should be "dairy cattle." It is very often necessary, if you have stud cattle, to bring in heifers to train them to the bail, or to bring in a bull to ring him. Section 31 reads, "No vehicle used for or in connection with the conveyance of milk from or to or about any dairy premises shall be used for the purpose of carrying any live or dead animal, or any manure, excrement, filth, pigs' wash or feed, brewers' grains, or any other matter likely to injuriously affect milk." It seems to me that this is a rather drastic clause. I think a man going to town with milk could not bring home a leg of mutton. It is quite necessary brewers' grains should be prohibited, but in the case of food, such as a little fresh fish or anything of that sort, there should be no objection. I think I have voiced the views of our association in regard to the regulations.

1. *Mr. Rutherford.*] How do you manage to keep manure out of the buckets when the manure is in a liquid state in early spring?—If you have a particular man, he can do it. It is necessary to wash the udders. When the cow is actually making deposit and a man notices it, he will quickly turn his bucket away. That is the only way I know by which the manure can be kept out.

2. *Mr. Okey.*] Have you had any experience of dairying in the backblocks?—No: that is, the backblocks of the North Island, where it would be difficult to get shingle for concrete. I have been there, and have taken notice of the conditions. I have a brother there.

3. From what little experience you have had you say it would be difficult for many people in the North Island to carry out these conditions in regard to flooring?—No, I should say as to the flooring of the cowshed it is absolutely necessary there should be some flooring. I missed the word "impervious" in the regulations. It is necessary to have a solid floor in the cowshed, but the yard in the backblocks may be overlooked.

4. Do you consider there is any objection to the flooring in wood if properly constructed and jointed?—Liquid manure will percolate through joints unless the floor is properly constructed and regularly cleansed.

5. Is it wise to crush mobs of cows into yards? Do you see the difficulty?—It is unwise.

6. Under these conditions the cows are supposed to be placed in a concrete yard all at once?—We do not read it like that. We take it we could bring in two or three cows at a time.

7. They are supposed to be brought into a yard 30 ft. away, and then through a race?—We do not read it like that.

8. Is there any harm in having a yard right against a shed?—We see no harm if there is a close-boarded fence between the yard and the shed.

9. As to the name on the cart: The farmer will often take his milk in his ordinary trap. Is it necessary to have your name on all the carts?—I do not think it is a matter of great necessity in the case of supplying a factory, but it is a matter of importance in the case of supplying milk to towns. We do not think the regulations should be so stringent in connection with factory milk.

10. *Mr. Witty.*] Are you in favour of a race in preference to a yard?—No, I am not in favour of a race in any shape or form.

11. Why?—Because it is very unhandy in working cows in large mobs, especially in connection with horned cattle. We, ourselves, handle a great many Ayrshires, very sensitive little animals, and often a cow will stand in a race and defy the others, and unless you use a lot of force you cannot shift her.

12. You are not in favour of even floors. Why?—On account of the slipping of the cows. We think the particular clause should be better defined. Our floor is concrete, but we had it cut, before it had set, every 3 in., so as to make a place for the cows' feet to catch, and the even surface of the regulations, it seems to me, would prevent this. A rough concrete floor with sufficient slope should be better.

13. How far should the drop be behind the cows?—In the housing of cattle the drop should not be less than 3 in.

14. I mean the distance from the back of the cow to the drain?—It should stand up as close to the heels of the cow as it is possible to leg-roped. It should always stand up as close as possible.

15. If a house and stockyard are now within 30 ft. of each other, would it be a hardship to remove them?—I think it would be a very great hardship. I know many dairies, short leases, and even freehold farms, with up-to-date houses and good cowsheds having concrete floors. In these cases it would be a great hardship.

16. What of the case of a new place?—It is all right then. It is a mistake to have animals too close to the house.

17. You have had a good deal of experience. Could there be any improvement in the matter of inspection?—That is a very difficult question to answer. I have no experience of inspection except in one district, and in that district a very great improvement could be effected.

18. Where do you think there might be an improvement?—I think Stock Inspectors should have their duties properly defined, and it should be an Inspector's duty to visit a dairy periodically. It should be the Inspector's duty to give advice wherever he possibly could. I think a man of tact and ability should be employed who could give advice on many subjects. I know even, in other districts, where Inspectors have apparently not been eager to advise farmers. A man in that position should be able to advise and tell you how to detect disease of the udder. I think the Dairy Inspectors should be under closer supervision.

19. You would rather welcome inspection?—I would welcome inspection if there was a thoroughly qualified man who could give us help. I thoroughly approve of the work the Department is doing in giving the Inspectors instruction.

20. There should be a boarded fence, you say, between the yard and the shed. Would not corrugated iron be as good or better?—Yes, anything to prevent the dust.

21. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You take exception to section 29—that is, in respect to housing any other animals. Were you referring to calves?—No.

22. Even where there is an open shed, do you object to boxes for calves at one end?—Yes, it is not a good plan to have the calves too close. Calves fed on new milk have a rather disagreeable odour.

23. What is the general custom in Canterbury?—I believe that in some cases they have calves in part of the cowshed. As far as the general custom is concerned I can hardly say. I very often find calves out at tether. Not so many calves are reared about Christchurch, and my experience has been mainly there.

24. As regards calves, you approve of the regulations?—Yes.

25. Section 30, in regard to calves being at or near the cowshed: Is it a fact that very often the cowshed is in the open paddock, with the yard at one side, and the calves are in close proximity on the other side?—Occasionally, but not a practice.

26. Even at the back of the shed?—No. If they are not confined they take the back of the shed for shelter, and may deposit there, which would be objectionable.

27. It would mean putting the fence 30 yards away?—I think most dairymen recognise that they should have a calf-paddock, and that the calves should be kept separate from the cows.

28. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You say that regulations should be framed dealing with dairy inspection?—Yes, I really believe they should. Unfortunately, many dairymen are not particular, and you must have regulations.

29. Is it possible to draft one set of regulations, or even two, that would meet all the conditions and cases we know exist?—Well, I think the only thing to do is to strike a happy medium. Get some practical man, and make the regulations suitable as far as possible. The main point is to educate the farmer.

30. But under any style of regulations, whether you strike the happy medium or not, must not a great deal rest on the wise administration of the regulations?—Yes, a very great deal, but in any case there should be power of appeal before action is taken in the Court, unless in any very clear breach of the regulations.

31. What form of appeal would you suggest?—Arbitration. The Chief Stock Inspector for the district or two Stock Inspectors.

32. You see the system of appeal in clause 33?—Yes.

33. Could that be modified or altered to meet your views of arbitration?—Well, I think so. Of course, it is a very knotty problem. What we are referring mostly to is in the case of the old Act of 1898, where everything must be to the satisfaction of the Inspector, and no redress can be got even at a Magistrate's Court.

34. Clause 34 states, "Any person committing a breach of any of these regulations is liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds." There is no opinion of the Inspector about that, except in three cases, and in these cases there is a modified form of appeal. In regard to one of them you suggest a standard form of cooling?—Not quite a standard form. You could use different methods as long as the milk is cooled down immediately to 65°.

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.

58. In the event of the Inspector requiring substantial improvements to the milking-shed and the yards, and the occupier being a tenant, who do you think should stand the cost of the improvements, and what proportion do you think the tenant should bear compared with his length of tenancy?—It is a very difficult matter to give a decision on. It depends on the length of tenure. If the man has only a short tenure the whole matter should be worked out on a proportionate basis between the landlord and tenant. Then, there is another very difficult matter. Perhaps the owner might be a widow woman, or some one in rather poor circumstances, and perhaps it would entail very great hardship on them if they had to make extensive improvements. Then, they might not intend to run the farm any longer as a dairy farm.

59. There must be a very wide interpretation of the regulations to meet exceptional circumstances?—Yes.

60. *Mr. Macpherson.*] In respect to the conveyance of milk: Do you consider it a hardship on the dairy-farmer who supplies a factory, where he uses the ordinary dray to cart the milk to the factory and takes advantage of the cart and the work of his men to cart back to the farm material from the railway-station?—Yes. It is an entirely different thing from supplying milk to a town, when the milk is continually changed in the cart. There is no necessity for the regulation where the milk is taken to the factory and is never changed. A man should be allowed to bring back a load of barbed wire, but it would not be a good thing to bring back a load of fertiliser.

61. Take an average clean farm dray. For the purpose of utilising horses you take back a load of fertiliser?—You would have your cans to take back. I do not see any objection except in exceptional cases, provided the cart is clean. Carting skins would not be a good thing, because the man handling the skins would also be handling the milk.

62. *Mr. Hogg.*] Assuming you were a Dairy Inspector, and you found a good hardworking thrifty dairy-farmer with a delicate wife and a family of young children, very heavily mortgaged, unable to raise more money, deep in debt, lots of mud in his yards, badly constructed premises, no concrete, timber all burnt, no metal, extremely bad roads, and you had these requirements to enforce, what would you do?—I should be on to give my horse the spur and get past.

63. You would give him time?—Yes, in cases of great hardship I do not think it is the intention of the Department to force matters.

64. There are cases of the kind?—Oh, yes! but I think if the Inspector made representations to the Department surely they would not enforce any hardship in cases like that.

65. Then, after milking in the morning that man had to travel over those bad roads to the creamery, a distance of several miles, and it took him at least five or six hours before he could return, do you think it would be fair to require him to remove all manure within two hours?—As I have already said, in cases of suppliers to factories I do not think the regulations should be so drastic as in connection with the city milk-supply. Where there are delicate invalids and infants, and life depending almost on the supply of pure milk, I think it is necessary. I know of what appears to be really good-quality butter made in some cases from rather inferior milk. One reason why I think the regulations in connection with farms supplying factories should not be so drastic is because I notice our butter that is exported compares very favourably with Danish, and our cheese with the best Canadian. There has been no inspection in the backblocks, and education in connection with the factories is all that has been done. Our milk-supply in connection with the large towns has not improved under inspection to the same extent that the dairy-farmers have improved their products in connection with their factories. That is one reason why I think the Inspectors should be men of tact and ability, and be able to give sound advice.

66. You are not particularly acquainted with the country districts of the North Island?—No.

67. Have you seen any dairy farms where a homestead-site, owing to the nature of the country, was so limited in size that the farmer's residence and his buildings had to be almost virtually packed together?—Yes, I have.

68. Do you think that under such circumstances as that it would be possible or practicable to comply in any way with the regulations required—a race and 30 ft. between the yards and the shed?—In the case of new buildings those sites should not be chosen; but if it is found by scientific men that it is absolutely necessary to have that distance apart it is well to provide it. But in the case of buildings in existence, provided they are kept clean, I do not think the regulations should strictly apply.

69. Is there any great harm in continuity of buildings, if strict cleanliness is observed?—No, provided there are no calves, or pigs, or poultry-houses.

70. Then, you think the regulations should be modified to suit the particular circumstances of the case?—Yes, I do.

71. *Mr. Lang.*] There is no appeal except in three matters. Do you think, in every case there should be right of appeal?—In the case of where it says a man must cool his milk to 65°, and the milk is not cooled to 65°, no appeal would be possible or necessary. If the Inspector was unprincipled enough to take you to Court, the Magistrate should be given discretionary power.

72. Taking the regulations generally, you think an appeal should be heard by a Magistrate?—Yes, I certainly do. Of course, if it is purely a matter of difference of opinion about floors, it should be an appeal to the Stock Inspector; but in the case of breaches of the regulations the Magistrate should have power to give a decision on the amount of evidence brought forward.

73. *Mr. Rutherford.*] From your experience of Dairy Inspectors, do you question their competency to deal with all phases of inspection?—Well, I have not had experience of many Dairy Inspectors.

74. But one?—No. I should say from my experience of Inspectors that they were not competent.

75. *Mr. Okey.*] In regard to air-space in a shed: The regulations require 600 ft. in a well-ventilated shed. Do you not think 400 ft. sufficient? The cows are not kept in?—If cows are not



housed it is not necessary to have 600 ft., but where the cows are not housed I do not think the regulations apply. As long as you have sufficient room to work, it does not make any difference, provided the shed is well ventilated.

EDWARD THOMPSON, Dairy-farmer, Belfast, examined. (No. 4.)

*Witness:* I cannot do more than congratulate the Government on the measure. I would like to refer to one matter. I think, in the formation of rules, an eye should be kept on the future of machinery for milking. This is progressing at such a rate and is becoming so simplified that in the near future most of the milking will be done by machinery, and I believe the system is far superior as far as cleanliness is concerned to hand-milking. It must modify the great need of cleanliness to a considerable extent. I think machine milking has come, and I believe it is necessary it should be so. I fully indorse all Mr. Parlane has said in regard to the alterations.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Are you supplying the city?—Yes, only wholesale.

2. You have had no experience of supplying a factory?—Yes, in the summer, and wholesale to the city in the winter.

3. Your country is open?—Yes.

4. No experience of bush country?—No.

5. You do not know the difficulties people in new countries have to contend with?—No, I have only heard of them.

6. Do you think having a man's name on a cart has anything to do with supplying clean milk?—Yes, I think it is necessary. People may use the cart for other purposes, and defy the regulations.

7. Do you think it would help clean milk by having the name on the cart?—I do not think there should be any objection to it.

8. As to the appeal: Do you call an appeal to the Chief Inspector a wise appeal, considering he is the head of the Dairy Inspector?—Yes; my answer to that is that the Stock Inspector should be a qualified dairy-farmer. I believe in the Stock Inspector in another form. Both sides should be represented. I do not think it should be entirely left to the Stock Inspector.

9. What is your opinion about air-space where the cows are not kept in? The regulations say that there must be 600 ft.?—I have never worked the matter out. 600 ft. is not a very large space when measured out.

*Hon. Mr. McNab* pointed out that the regulations only applied to sheds in which the cows were kept overnight.

10. *Mr. Okey.*] Have you had experience of large dairies?—Yes, fairly large. I have been over thirty years among cattle.

11. What-sized herds?—The most I have seen milked at once was fifty.

12. Is it wise to crush cows in the yard?—No, especially not with horned cattle. If dehorned you can herd them up like sheep. Cattle with horns want more space, and that is one reason against the race. I use a race myself, and I often have to go to their relief.

13. You see no objection to the yard adjoining the shed?—No objection, provided it is a closed-in shed. The 6 ft. fence Mr. Parlane referred to would be quite sufficient. The height of the front of the shed is seldom more than 6 ft., and with such a fence it would practically mean a closed-in shed.

14. *Mr. Witty.*] What would be a fair number of cows per bail? Do you think three would be sufficient?—Yes, that would be a fair number.

15. Would it not be a hardship on the tenant on a short lease to make the improvements required?—I think it would be better for him to clear out than make the alterations. I know a case where a man was asked to make improvements, and it would have been better for him to have gone out of the business than make the alterations.

16. Do you think discretion should be given the Inspector?—Yes, he should have power to allow a man to stop to the end of his lease, provided the place was kept clean.

17. What about the place where the stockyard is within 30 ft.?—In a closed shed I think it would be a hardship to ask a man to remove it.

18. In the case of a new shed?—No.

19. It would be no hardship then?—It would be very necessary to have the house away.

20. Could any improvement be made in the methods of Inspectors?—Inspectors should have a periodical round. I would prefer to see them like the School Inspector. Once a year you knew he was coming, and once a year you did not know. Some Inspectors had only a year's experience, which makes me think the discretionary power of the Inspector should be watched.

21. You think twice a year would be sufficient?—Yes: that is, once when you were looking out for him, and once when you were not. Once when he came to instruct, and once when he came to see if you had followed out his instructions. I think he should inspect a dairy once every year, and at a time when it was known.

22. You object to the race?—I believe you would be better without it.

23. As regards the gutters, is not 6 ft. from the back of the cow much too far?—Certainly it is. I consider it almost useless.

24. What about the even floor? Is it possible to have an even floor, and get the cows in without risk of injury?—Cattle are apt to slip on a smooth concrete floor. Concrete requires to be roughened. There is a lot of turning about in a bail, and a really level or smooth floor is dangerous.



25. If no animal was allowed to come within 30 ft. of a milking-shed, would not the space become overgrown with weeds?—I do not know why the cows should not be allowed to come up to the back of the shed.

26. Under these regulations they could not?—I do not see why they should not. You make provision for cattle being housed every night. I do not see any objection to stock depasturing in the paddock and coming as near the back of the shed as they like.

27. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You mentioned the case of some dairies not being inspected?—I believe that is right. They were not inspected for years. They were in out-of-the-way places.

28. Do you know of the cases of your own knowledge?—No.

29. Were you told they were registered dairies?—Yes.

30. Can you mention one that was a registered dairy and had not been inspected for years?—I would not like to mention anything that would injure any one.

31. A dairy was named to you?—I have heard of a dairy an Inspector did not go to.

*Hon. Mr. McNab* asked that the name should be supplied to him privately. To this the witness agreed.

32. You do not believe in the race?—No.

33. You know the regulations do not make the race compulsory?—Yes.

34. In the form in which the clause appears, do you think it satisfactory?—To me it is.

35. *Mr. Buddo.*] I understand from your evidence that you favour regulations for dairy-inspection. Would you favour putting the race further away, and only using it for driving purposes?—I would not favour putting the yard any further away, so long as the shed was closed and the yard was kept clean.

36. Are there any dairy-yards in your district artificially made up to keep them out of flood-water?—I do not personally know of them.

37. I take it that you find considerable difficulty in concreting yards like that?—Yes, a yard made up like that would require a long time to enable it to settle down.

38. In other words, it would be a costly process?—Yes.

39. You have noticed the clause which does not permit the vehicle which has taken the milk to town to be used for any other purpose?—Yes.

40. Supposing the farmer was not allowed to carry manure or other strong odorous matter, would there be any objection to him carrying ordinary goods?—No, it is straining the matter too far. According to the section you cannot carry your own food in the cart.

41. You think, by the omission of manure or strongly odorous matter, there would be no objection to carrying ordinary goods?—Yes.

42. Of your own knowledge, do you know of any hardship being caused to a tenant of a dairy farm by the new regulations?—No. But I know they have been asked to carry out improvements, but have been allowed to go on to the end of their term. Had they been forced they would have had to go out of the business.

43. Do you think a proportion of the cost should be borne by the landlord?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Macpherson.*] You state you would favour the landlord paying a portion of the cost of improvements in the case of a short lease: would you not consider it a hardship on the owner of that farm being compelled to pay any proportion of it, seeing that within perhaps eighteen months he may relet the farm to a new tenant who might not go in for dairying?—It would be if the farm was not to be continued as a dairy farm.

45. In the absence of that knowledge, he has no guarantee that he can relet to another tenant going in for dairying?—If the tenant is improving the property the landlord has a right to pay a share.

46. In your opinion, are the Inspectors in your district competent?—I have a doubt about it.

47. How many does your reference apply to?—I have not experienced more than one.

48. In regard to arbitration, what representation would you give the farmer in the event of a dispute?—I should say half-and-half. If you appoint one officer from the Department and a representative of the farmer, they should have a right to call in a third.

49. In regard to rust in cans, would you consider it a hardship if this clause was put into effect?—I would.

50. Would you consider the Inspector would be doing his duty condemning a new can which by friction had become rusty?—It might be rusty from the dew in one night.

51. Do you think there would be difficulty in drawing a comparison between clean black iron and rusty iron?—Yes.

52. Do you think that would lead to friction unless a wide distinction was made?—Yes.

53. Section 18 would be a distinct hardship?—Yes.

54. *Mr. Lang.*] You have read the proposed regulations?—Yes.

55. What would be the effect of them being brought into force and carried out to the very letter?—It would be a serious blow in many cases.

56. You are in favour of appeal in case of dispute: do you think the Court of Appeal should be guided by the circumstances of the case, or should they be bound by the regulations?—I should say, the circumstances of the case. In my opinion it is impossible to make regulations to suit every part from the North Cape to the Bluff.

WILLIAM LEWIS WRIGHT, Dairyman, Christchurch, examined. (No. 5.)

*Witness:* In the proposed regulations I consider the Department has made a big effort to meet the dairymen, and with a few amendments they will be satisfactory. In the first place, I think the Inspector should be a qualified dairyman. If they were qualified dairymen, in the first

place they would, with the help they are getting from the Department, be able to give valuable information to dairymen, and dairymen would rather welcome their presence than otherwise. People supplying the cities require the Inspector pretty often during the year. The first thing in the regulations the Canterbury dairymen took exception to was the concrete surface: they wanted it rough. I am absolutely against any race whatever. In regard to open and closed sheds, I think it is quite possible the dairyman could have a yard sufficiently large outside the door to hold the surplus cattle. In regard to the provision for whitewashing the inside of the shed twice a year, I think the partitions between the cows should be coated with lime once a month. We do not agree with the provision to keep the stable a certain distance from the cowshed. We consider there is no necessity for it. In regard to notifying the Inspector before making any structural alterations to dairy premises, I fail to see why, with the dairy regulations before him and being a practical man, he should be interfered with. I quite agree with Mr. Parlane that milk should be cooled to 65°. There should be a fixed standard. If this was so the Inspector could come to the dairyman at any time and correct him for not doing as the regulations specified. It says in section 17, (a), that the work of cleansing the utensils should be commenced within the hour. I would like to point out in that case that there are a number of farms where the husbands and wives do the whole business themselves. In such cases some latitude should be given, provided the buckets were washed out at once with cold water. The same thing applied in section 17, (b). In regard to rust, I do not see that rust would be detrimental, provided it is not allowed to remain on the inside of cans. We quite agree they should not be rusty on the inside. In regard to the rust on the outside, a little discretion might be allowed. In regard to section 20 (No dairyman shall use a can that does not bear a metal label with his name thereon), I retail milk, and I have about a dozen cans in my cart. I do not think it would be necessary only in the case of the large cans. It would be right in connection with the large drums.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] You have no experience of factory-supply?—No.
2. You do not know the difficulties of the backblocks where there are no roads?—No.
3. In the case of a tenant, do you think it would be hard on the tenant having to pay 5 per cent. on the improvements?—No; it would be a fair thing. I have had to pay 10 per cent.
4. *Mr. Witty.*] Can you give an instance where there has been hardship in the case of a short-lease tenant?—Yes. It has cost me a few pounds, and our leases are out in nine months. My expenses were in the neighbourhood of £20. Some of the improvements I had to do myself, and the trustees did the rest.
5. Was it because of negligence, or because it did not please the Inspector?—I had no grievance with the Inspector.
6. Was it because of the regulations, or because your dairy was not clean?—The regulations applied to the stable adjoining the shed. I was ordered to shift it. I went to the trustees, and they agreed to put a new stable if I paid 10 per cent.
7. Who do you consider are the proper persons to fill the position of Dairy Inspector?—He should be a qualified dairyman. He should be able to give dairymen advice in respect to cattle, in the first place. If an Inspector was qualified he would be able to get rid of certain cattle which were not profitable, which could be fattened off. A neighbour is fattening all his cows and buying in springers.
8. Cans get knocked about in a cart. New cans would get bruised, and consequently rusty?—I have had cans for five years, and there is no sign of rust upon them.
9. Is there any hardship in regard to the clause dealing with rust?—No, not in regard to the inside of cans. If allowed to stand on frosty mornings you soon see the rust.
10. How many cows should there be to the bail?—If a man has twenty cows he should have at least six bails.
11. That is about one to three?—About that.
12. How often do you think the Inspector should come round?—I would not care if he came once a month. With people supplying towns the Inspector should come at any time.
13. Taking the regulations in all, you are satisfied?—Yes, with the exception of the few amendments mentioned.
14. *Mr. Rhodes.*] If a man has six bails for twenty cows, should he increase the bails in proportion if he has a hundred cows?—I think with a hundred there should be thirty bails. In one case I know there are sixty bales for a hundred. We were supplying the town, and it was necessary to have as many in as possible at the one time. It is no advantage to a man to have a small shed.
15. Have you gone through these regulations with other dairymen, and discussed them? Yes, as far as the city-supply dairymen are concerned.
16. Were their views in accordance with the views expressed this morning?—Yes.
17. You are really their mouthpiece?—Yes.
18. *Mr. Buddo.*] You favour regulations generally to control the industry?—Decidedly, for the city.
19. Would you suggest any method by which the regulations regarding the yard and shed accommodation could be improved, especially in subsections (1) and (2) of (k)?—In the case of an open shed I think it would be better if the yard were at the back of the shed, because that would prevent the dust from blowing in, providing the yard is paved. If it was at the back it would save a considerable amount of dust.
20. Do you favour a race in any way to bring in cows from a distant yard or from a paddock? Would it be beneficial to the industry?—I do not believe in races at all, except in the case of the entrance to the sheds, which might be very bad. Something should be done to prevent mud being carried into the shed.

21. You object even to the narrow race?—Yes. When milking once we had a race, and lost a good number of cows through it, by horning and hooked udders. It is especially bad with horned cattle.

22. You have already expressed the opinion that one bail should be sufficient for three cows?—Yes.

23. Could the number of cows be increased in the case of factory-supply?—Yes. I do not think there need be so many bails in connection with sheds in a dairy supplying a factory, provided the shed is kept clean.

24. *Mr. Macpherson.*] You approve of the necessity of regulations, especially for city-supply? Is it equally essential to have it for the country?—I do not think they should be so stringent for the factories. There should be some latitude.

25. Do you believe in the dehorning of cows?—Yes, provided they are dehorned young.

26. Would you suggest it would be a wise thing to include this in the regulations?—In some instances it would be, though it spoils the appearance of a cow.

27. Supposing your cows were dehorned, would you then favour a race?—No, not under any circumstances. A race to be a success would have to be 10 ft. wide. If 10 ft. wide and 30 ft. long it would cost £10. And a man would probably have to put this race up who would only be milking twelve cows. A small race would be detrimental, a large race would be costly.

28. Do you think it would be possible to frame regulations to suit the whole of the Dominion?—Yes, provided we have qualified Inspectors. One of my strong points is that the Inspector should be able to advise any one on dairying. He should be an authority on it.

29. Do you think it would be possible to draft a set of regulations for the various dairies of the Dominion?—Yes, I do.

30. Do you consider section (f) of clause 8, about removing manure within two hours, a hardship in the case of some farmers milking their own cows and having to cart the milk to the factory?—I do not know that it would be detrimental in the case of a factory-supply: it would be in the case of a city-supply. It could be stated that the man should clean the yard out two hours before he milks.

31. How would that apply to morning milk?—In the case of city-supply those who have not men at home do it as soon as they come back, within two to two and a half hours, but in the majority of cases it is one of the first jobs.

32. In the case of country dairies would it do if the shed was cleaned out after the midday meal, or before the afternoon milking?—Yes, it would be reasonable in the case of factories.

33. Should the regulations be retrospective and apply to all existing cowsheds?—If they were enforced as they stand they would cause a lot of dissatisfaction. It would be an unnecessary hardship to shift buildings for the sake of a few feet.

34. Would you suggest that the Department should circulate a set of plans, so as to establish a uniform style in the buildings to meet the regulations?—In regard to the city dairies it may be all right, but it should not be necessary in the case of factory dairies.

35. *Mr. Lang.*] You laid stress on the question of having qualified Inspectors. Would you allow the Inspectors to have discretion, or be bound by the regulations?—If qualified they could be allowed discretion; but some of the things put before dairymen lead dairymen to doubt their qualifications.

36. You consider, if these regulations were enforced they would cause a considerable amount of dissatisfaction?—Yes.

37. With dairymen supplying cities?—Yes, and with factory people in our district.

38. More so in connection with factory dairies than with city dairies?—Yes, in regard to concreting the floors.

39. Are you in favour of a Court of Appeal?—I think, with the Chief Inspector, the dairyman should have the right to appoint a practical farmer.

40. Should the Court decide according to the printed regulations, or take into consideration the conditions of the case?—I think it should decide on the particular circumstances.

41. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] You say the Inspector should be able to tell the dairy-farmer what cows he should get rid of: Do you not think the farmer would know better than the Inspector what were the best cows to get rid of?—Probably they would wait till they were told.

42. *Mr. Okey.*] Were you referring to inferior cows or to cows affected with disease?—I was referring to cows affected. In my district a good many supplying the town trade were women. A cow might have mammitis, and the woman would not know how to treat it. If the Inspector was qualified he would be able to advise her what to do. There were many cows which should be passed out.

43. Are there any Dairy Inspectors who go round and cannot tell that?—I have not heard of any being condemned lately.

44. Have you been in dairying for any length of time?—Yes, all my life.

45. About Christchurch?—Yes.

46. And do you not know that several cases have been taken to the Court?—For diseased cattle?

47. Yes, some for diseased cattle?—I did not know there had been any taken to the Court lately, except for impure milk. I know some cattle were condemned at Addington when exposed for sale.

48. Do you state that, in your opinion, there are Inspectors who are not capable of telling whether a cow is affected with disease of the udder?—I could not swear the cattle I saw belonged to licensed people. I believe they were supplying factories.

49. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You did not say the cattle you referred to were owned by proprietors of licensed dairies?—No, I could not say that they were. The point I wish to make is this: A

lot of people keep cows till a great age, and keep them in low condition, and when a cow gets over fifteen years of age it is time she was got rid of.

50. Then some of the cattle you referred to, when replying to the Hon. Mr. Duncan, were owned by the proprietors of dairies which may not have been registered?—Yes. They may not have been. I have seen cattle which should have been passed out.

51. You spoke a good deal about Dairy Inspectors. How many Dairy Inspectors have you come in contact with in your capacity as a dairyman?—I have come in contact with two in Christchurch.

52. Do two different Inspectors in Christchurch come in contact with your dairy?—I was stating the reason why I doubted the qualifications of an Inspector. An Inspector visited a dairy when a man was milking a cow. As droppings from the cow fell on the ground the man moved around with his bucket to hold it away. The young Inspector made the remark, Should he not get up and wash that manure away? When this was mentioned to me I said, "I wish he had said it to me, for I would not allow a man to use a broom in my shed when milking was going on."

53. You did not see it?—No.

54. Is it hearsay?—Yes, it is hearsay.

55. Your doubt is based on hearsay, not on your own observation?—Yes, I do not doubt my own Inspector.

56. He is one of the two you come in contact with?—Yes.

57. *Mr. Witty.*] In regard to the diseased cows, you led the Committee to believe that they were mostly outside registered dairies?—There were some in the other dairies as well.

*Mr. J. Parlane*, a former witness, said: In answer to a question of Mr. McNab, I will supply Mr. McNab privately with the name of dairy herds that have never been inspected by a Dairy Inspector with a view of discovering disease. And I will supply him with the name of a person who applied to the Department to have a herd inspected.

1. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] Will you state if this dairy was supplying milk to the town?—Yes.

2. Have you any idea of the number of cattle?—Yes, there would be forty on the premises.

#### MONDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 1908.

JOHN WATT DEEM, Inspector in Charge of the West Coast District of the North Island, Wanganui, examined. (No. 6.)

*Witness:* I have been ten years in Taranaki, and during that time I have been intimately connected with dairying in the capacity of Inspector of Stock. Right from the beginning I have taken a keen interest in the improvement of cowsheds and their surroundings. About five years ago I worked at the question rather keenly in the Hawera district, and endeavoured to do it as systematically as possible with the time at my disposal. Working it up by degrees, I found that fully 95 per cent. of the people were ready to meet me, and were always anxious to get any suggestions or carry out improvements to the best of their ability. We did not hurry them. Where a man had a place and had done fairly well for a year or two, we allowed him to go on. Invariably the floors were renewed with concrete. I think in that district at the present time 65 to 70 per cent. of the floors are of concrete. Having got the floors into fairly good condition, the question of yards and surroundings was taken up. We were almost at a loss to know what to do. In the winter-time it was mud and in the summer dust. Where it was impossible to concrete the yard we suggested putting in races. A number of people have put them in. The object of the race is to keep the mud and dust back from the shed. Very good results have followed the installation of the races. I have not found a man yet who has tried them and is not satisfied. This year a lot more have been put in. I have here copies of nearly forty letters from farmers who have put in races, giving their opinions on them. [The letters were handed to the Chairman.] I may safely say that 90 per cent. of the farmers in Taranaki welcome some form of inspection. A number of the companies have drawn up very drastic regulations, and have endeavoured to enforce them. As they point out, it is all very well for those who are inclined to do something, but the dilatory ones say, if you want these things done we will go to another company, and so suppliers, when faced with factory regulations, leave their own company and go to another. This naturally disheartens those who would be inclined to improve. Under present conditions it is no use the factory trying to do anything.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Your experience has been mostly round the Hawera district?—Yes, during the last four or five years, but, as you know, Mr. Okey, I have been working right through Taranaki.

2. You say settlers have made considerable improvement in that district?—Yes.

3. Settlers there are mostly in a good position?—Yes.

4. On good land?—Yes.

5. Do you think it would be possible for a family going into new country with little money, borrowing to get cows, to comply with these regulations?—They could comply with them within the meaning of the Department.

6. I am not dealing with the Department, but with the regulations. In a district where there is a difficulty to get gravel for concrete—there are places, as you know, where they have to pack out their butter—no roads—what would you do in cases like that?—I would substitute something else till the roads were there.

7. Would it not be quite sufficient if the Inspector had power to educate farmers—not to insist on the carrying-out of regulations, but gradually bring the farmers up to them?—That is what we are doing. I do not think any of the Inspectors carry out the regulations to the strict letter. It would be just as obnoxious to the Inspector as to the farmer.

8. That is, you leave it in the hands of the Inspector?—I do not see how you can do anything else. If you do not allow the Inspector to use his discretion, how are you going to do it?

9. Do you think there should be a backblocks area, and leave that in the hands of the Inspectors to gradually bring the farmers up to the right standard?—I do not think it is necessary. Considering our experience of other regulations, the backblocks settler could well be left in the hands of the Inspector.

10. These are the same regulations for town and factory dairies?—Yes.

11. Do you think it has anything to do with clean milk, having a man's name on his cart?—Yes, because if a man's name is on the cart it will have a tendency to make him keep it much cleaner. An Inspector may meet a farmer carting a dead animal or pigwash in his cart, and the farmer might deny it is his milk-cart.

12. I know of men who would have to carry back sugar and flour or bonedust. Do you see any harm in taking back bonedust?—Yes, I should say so.

13. In the cart with his skim-milk?—Yes.

14. The cans would be washed and steamed?—They should be.

15. The regulations demand they should?—You cannot have a man supervising every farmer all the time.

16. Could a person in the backblocks carry out these regulations?—Yes, to the satisfaction of the Department.

17. The question is, what does the Department want?—The backblocks man will be left to the last. When we come to a man badly situated it will be our place to show him and help him to the best of our ability.

18. *Mr. Witty.*] Do you think there should be any difference in the regulations for the town-supply dairyman and the backblocks settler who has not the same facilities?—There would be considerable difference in the administration of them.

19. Are there not Inspectors who do not use that discretion?—I do not think so. They are all working under one head. An Inspector may abuse it once, but he would be very short-lived if he did so.

20. Could it be safely left to the Inspector in all cases?—I think so. A case or two may crop up, but they would soon be rectified.

21. When an Inspector gets a position it is hard to turn him out?—He is under the supervision of superior officers.

22. If you saw a man doing his best you would be satisfied?—Yes.

23. You would not penalise him?—No. The regulations outline the conditions we hope to reach by educating the farmer, and by getting any new work done on a system. If the farmer works on this principle we shall finally arrive at the right conditions.

24. You believe in educating the farmer as to what is required?—Yes.

25. Can you suggest any improvements in the regulations?—No, except a regulation to provide for the covering of the cans, to prevent dust entering and prevent the milk being heated by the sun-rays. When the milk is being conveyed from the farm to the factory the lid goes down four or five inches. The recess becomes a receptacle for dust. The covering would require to be put on a simple frame fixed on the cart.

26. You would cover the whole cart?—Yes.

27. How many cows should there be to the bail?—From three to four.

28. You would not enforce the bail for every cow?—No.

29. In regard to cooling, it is stated that it must be some approved method. Would it not be better to have a fixed heat?—I think that would be impossible. A great many of our backblocks people could not do it at all.

30. You may approve of a system and the next Inspector may not?—It is the intention of the Department to leave it to the individual Inspectors.

31. In regard to rust, if they show rust the cans are, of course, to be condemned?—I do not think it necessary at all. I do not think the cans would be condemned unless in a very bad state. It would be straining the regulations, because there was a little rust, to condemn a can. It would only be condemned if unfit for use.

32. Suppose concrete was out of the question, what would be the next best material?—Two-inch timber or burnt bricks.

33. Are you in favour of having the floor perfectly smooth?—What do you mean?

34. It says here "perfectly smooth"?—I am in favour of having the floor made smooth, not smoothed by means of an iron trowel, but done over with a wooden trowel. The surface should not be polished. If left really rough it is a means of accumulating filth.

35. Suppose grooves centre into the channel, would that do?—Oh, yes! if a man would clean them.

36. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You say the carrying-out of the regulations must be left to the Inspector?—Yes, to a great extent.

37. Do you think it wise to leave it to the individual Inspector?—They would have their instructions as to carrying out the regulations. In my district I have eleven Dairy Inspectors. I would instruct each Inspector in his respective district as to how he should carry out the regulations, taking into consideration the character of the district.

38. Then the enforcement is really left to the Department in Wellington?—Yes.

39. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You say you have eleven Dairy Inspectors under you?—Yes.

40. Some of the Inspectors would have backblocks country to deal with?—Yes.

41. Others would have fairly open, settled, and well-off districts?—Yes.

42. And do you wish the Committee to understand that you would issue instructions guiding the Inspector in the backblocks district as opposed to the Inspector in the central district?—Yes.

43. Do you believe it is possible to carry out regulations dealing with different conditions of one industry in any other way than that?—I do not think you can in any other way.

44. Would you consider the system you have suggested more satisfactory to the dairyman than to try to have one set of regulations for backblocks and another for the city-supplier, or supplier to the large factory?—Yes. In the back country you would have to deal with every place on its individual peculiarities and situation.

45. I gather from you that if you are going to have inspection at all you must give discretion in the enforcement of it to some central authority—that is, to produce satisfactory results?—Yes.

46. Coming to the question of the race. The regulation, as you will notice, specifies the alternative of concrete yard or race. Which do you think will be selected by dairymen when they come to see the working of the concrete race and concrete yard?—I am quite sure 90 per cent. will select the race.

47. Have you had much experience of the race?—Yes. There are between eighty and a hundred in work in Taranaki, and, without exception, the owners are pleased with them.

48. *Mr. Buddo.*] With the race?—Yes.

49. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You have handed the Committee expressions of opinion from thirty-nine farmers, all in favour of the race?—Yes.

50. Were these actually using the race?—Yes.

51. In interpreting these regulations, would you regard them as being an ideal to be aimed at rather than to be enforced straight out?—Yes, it is the ultimate point to reach.

52. Do you think it would be more satisfactory to the dairyman, having the aim of the Department set out distinctly, or the system that is at present in vogue, giving wide powers to Inspectors and not letting the dairyman know exactly what is wanted?—As to cleanliness, it is better to state the definite thing.

53. Have you found a desire throughout the country among dairymen to know exactly what is wanted, rather than have the present regulations?—Yes; they would like to know exactly the lines we desire them to run on.

54. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] Have you had any prosecution in your district lately?—Only one or two during the last twelve months.

55. What did they consist of?—A man had a very filthy place, and started selling milk to the Town of Stratford. The Health Department had also warned him, but he went on selling. The local authorities questioned him, but he said he had a license. We visited him again, and found his place in a very filthy condition, and he was milking two diseased cows.

56. What is the usual length of the race?—They vary from 30 ft. to 100 ft., according to the locality. Some people have a nice site for a yard, and have put in a 100 ft. race to get to it. In one of the reports I have put in it will be noticed a man has one 95 ft. long.

57. What is the width?—They vary from 2 ft. 6 in. to 9 ft.

58. What is the most useful width?—Anything from 2 ft. 6 in. to 3 ft., or from 6 ft. to 8 ft. Between 3 ft. and 6 ft. should be avoided. The cow is liable to turn round.

59. Do you find they injure themselves in the race?—I have never seen it. I may also state we have in Taranaki a large number of race-sheds. In these the cow has to go from 150 ft. to 200 ft. through a 2 ft. 4 in. race. These have been in use for seven or eight years, and I have never heard of a cow injuring herself.

60. Has any instance come under your notice where injury to a cow had been caused by a cow being forced into the race by a hostile cow?—No. I have never heard of a case.

61. Is dehorning largely followed in Taranaki?—In some localities they are dehorning, but in other localities they are not dehorning at all.

62. Is a good race ample substitute for a concrete yard?—Yes; it keeps the mud and dust away from the shed.

63. What objection have you to the milk-cart of the small supplier being used for his general work, especially in the work of conveying manure?—Unless anything obnoxious is carried I know of no objection. The regulations do not make any objection.

64. Provided the cart is kept clean?—Yes.

65. You mention that very great latitude must be allowed to backblocks settlers?—Yes.

66. You do not suggest that any loose methods of milking and yarding be looked for?—No. Not loose methods. Anything that can be done in the way of cleanliness is required. Where it comes to structural improvements he may have to get time.

67. In the event of shingle for concrete, or burnt bricks, not being available, have you any suggestion to make of any other flooring for a milking-shed?—Nothing but the best wood.

68. Would you suggest that the timber flooring be raised off the ground?—It is better beaten down solid.

69. Any method of joining the joists together?—Putting them in with tar and sand and using 2 in. timber, tongued and grooved.

70. *Mr. Macpherson.*] I understand you to say that you do not think it is possible to carry out the regulations without a considerable amount of discretionary power being in your hands to distinguish between milk-production about the large centres and in the backblocks?—Yes, we have to use discretion.

71. Would you be in favour of setting up different regulations for the various provincial districts where there is a big difference in physical surroundings?—One set is sufficient, as long as they are administered with local knowledge.

72. Then there must be a large amount of latitude given in their interpretation?—Yes, as to some of the regulations.

73. You would not be in favour of more than one set of regulations?—No.

74. Would you be in favour of the Department issuing a model set of plans for the guidance of Inspectors and dairymen?—Yes. I think the Department has the plans provided now.

75. You consider that a considerable means of assistance?—Yes, especially to the farmer.

76. In regard to the removal of manure or offensive matter within two hours after milking, do you think that is absolutely necessary in the case of small country settlers, where perhaps the dairyman has to do the milking and take the milk to the factory?—No. We would expect him to do it as soon as he got back. It is meant as a general guidance.

77. Do you not think this section is rather stringent?—I do not think so. It is put down as a general guide. You must state some time. You may find a man not clearing it away till the next milking-time.

78. You consider an Inspector taking exception to this sort of thing would be exceeding his duty?—Yes, if in the backblocks.

79. What do you consider would be a reasonable distance from the gutter behind the bail to the uprights of the bail?—It would depend a good deal on the length of the bail from the upright.

80. From the point at which the cow's neck is caught in the bail, about the horns to the channel?—I think, about 6 ft. That is a point you have to vary according to the kind of shed.

81. *Mr. Lang.*] I understand you to say that you would not enforce the regulations straight away, but work in the direction of gradually improving the position?—Yes.

82. Would it then not be difficult for the Inspector to discriminate between different farmers. One farmer may be a moderately wealthy man, able to put in a concrete floor, while the other man alongside would not be able to do so. In that case would it not be difficult for the Inspector not to enforce the regulations?—It is one of the difficulties we have to meet. Generally the man alongside realises the position.

83. In reply to Hon. Mr. McNab you said the dairymen would like to know the lines they were expected to run on?—Yes.

84. That is, in regard to the regulations?—Yes.

85. If it is left to the Inspector they do not know?—That is it.

86. There is a great deal of difference between Inspectors?—The instructions will come from the head of the Department.

87. You must deal with the individual cases?—Yes.

88. Did I understand you to say that the regulations did not prevent a man from carting certain things in his milk-cart?—The regulations puts it very clearly that no vehicle can be used for carrying any live or dead animal?—That is so.

89. That is not only at the time of carting the milk, but at any other time?—Yes.

90. Some settlers have only one vehicle?—Yes. I raised the question myself. Where a man wants to cart pigs he would not be able to do so.

91. Under the regulations he could not do so?—That is according to the strict letter of the regulations.

92. I know where they have to supply milk by means of a sledge. You would not be able to brand your name on the sledge?—A sledge is hardly a vehicle.

93. Do you not think it would meet the case if they were told to keep their carts thoroughly clean, and have the liberty of using the cart for ordinary purposes?—They would be given the liberty as long as they did not cart any offensive matter.

94. There is the Inspector to see that they keep it clean?—He cannot be there every day.

95. In regard to the regulation requiring cans to be cleaned within two hours after being emptied, do you think in some cases this would press harshly?—In some cases they would not be able to do it. That is where the Inspector would have to exercise discretion.

96. In a case I know, ten dairymen were supplying milk in one wagon. In the evening these cans were not returned till 8 or 9 o'clock. According to this regulation the dairyman would have to get his water boiling to wash his cans after 9 o'clock at night?—Was it morning milk?

97. It must have been evening milk. In this case they had separate cans, and the cans which came home late at night were not used for the morning's milk. Would it not be sufficient if dairymen were required to have the cans washed and aired six hours before being used?—If you allow the milk to dry on cans, it is difficult, almost impossible, to get it off.

98. It is possible to get it clean, but it takes more time?—The time is not usually put into it.

99. Do you think cans would be more carefully washed in the morning than at night?—In the case mentioned they would be more easily washed at night. The case is exceptional.

*Hon. Mr. McNab* pointed out that the case was met by subsections (c) and (d) of clause 17.

*Mr. Okey*: I would like to see the regulation read "six hours before being used."

100. *Mr. Okey.*] Do you think, in the case of a dispute between the dairymen and the Inspector, that there should be some appeal?—Yes, to the Chief Inspector or the Inspector in Charge.

101. Do you not think the dairyman should be represented?—I do not think so.

102. When you refer a case to arbitration you have both sides represented?—I think the appeal would be best.

103. Sufficient to one side only?—I think the dairyman would always get satisfaction if the matter were left to the Department.

104. In the case of a dispute the Chief Inspector could scarcely give it against the Deputy Inspector?—I should think so.

105. *Mr. Macpherson.*] In regard to the regulation in connection with providing a supply of pure water for watering stock, does that mean that water for the stock should be provided in the various paddocks?—I take it that is the idea of the regulation, and, where there is any obnoxious water, to have it fenced off.

106. There are many cases where that would be almost impossible. I do not see how this can be carried out in its entirety, and even where there is good water. Take my own case as an

example; and I have received letters in connection with the same matter. The water on our farm is supposed to be very bad—not fit for domestic purposes. It seems perfectly pure, but is heavily charged with magnesia, sulphur, carbonate of lime, &c.; but the stock become so fond of it that they will not drink anything else. Horses leaving the district will go two days without water, and so with other animals. Yet we cannot use it for domestic purposes. The Inspector might take exception to this water?—I do not think you can have regulations perfect in every way.

107. I will state a case. A creek flows more or less, and at times becomes stagnant. The water would not be considered fit to use. What would the farmer do?—He would have to do his best.

108. Suppose it was not fit to use from a dairy point of view?—It would be better to take his cattle away to drink.

109. But that is an impossibility?—It is a question as to what is meant by “not fit.”

110. It would depend on your interpretation of “fit”?—We would call it “unfit” where we found the milk contaminated.

111. In North Otago and South Canterbury conditions obtain when the water is not good, but the dairymen are very glad to have it such as it is?—The true interpretation of the clause is where dirty stagnant water is allowed to lie around, and cows get access to it.

112. *Mr. Okey.*] You state you would instruct Inspectors in the different districts to carry out the regulations according to the district?—That is so.

113. Supposing there were half a dozen dairymen in a district not in a position to carry out the regulations where the bulk of the settlers were carrying them out?—We would endeavour to advise them to the best of our ability how to get along in the meantime.

114. You require almost two sets of regulations?—You could not apply one set in one case and the other in the other.

115. *Mr. Witty.*] In every case where improvements had to be made do you not think the dairyman should be served with a notice in writing giving the nature of the improvements?—That is our intention. We are having books prepared with a carbon sheet, one copy to be given to the farmer and the other retained in the office.

116. In the case of short leases is it wise to enforce regulations, providing the place is kept clean?—You would allow him to get along as best he could, providing he will make a reasonable attempt to keep the premises clean.

117. You would not force him?—No. We always ask a man his tenure.

118. Do you know whether it is done in all cases?—It is done in my district.

119. *Mr. Buddo.*] The milk-cans in your district are those with a lid set deeply in from the top. Do you think that the best possible construction for a milk-can to keep the dust out?—No, it is not a good style.

120. Have any suggestions been made to you that it is unsatisfactory?—Some have suggested that there should be a proper lid locked down.

121. Is such a lid more useful for keeping the milk from splashing, provided a float is inserted, than the present system of putting a lid deep in the can?—It is very obnoxious in its present form.

122. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] From your knowledge of conditions of dairying over New Zealand, have you formed any impression of the losses sustained by the supply of filthy milk to factories?—It is very considerable. I think 60 to 70 per cent. of our farmers are carrying the other 30 per cent. on their backs at the present time.

123. *Mr. Hogg.*] You would leave the question of race or yard entirely to the dairy-farmer?—Yes, but I would favour the race.

124. Do you think it advisable to have any definite length or width for the race?—I think it is desirable to have the minimum length stated, but not the width.

125. What do you consider a reasonable minimum length?—The minimum length is put down at 30 ft. in the regulations. The race could be put down for £5 in almost any shed.

126. Are the races you refer to floored?—Ninety per cent. of them.

127. In what way?—Mostly concrete.

128. Have the farmers a gravel-supply where this concrete is used?—In some cases, but in other cases they have to rail it and then cart it ten or twelve miles over muddy roads.

129. Is timber very scarce?—They have to go to town for it. They are finding now that concrete is cheaper.

130. Where the yards and appliances are unsatisfactory, and the farmer is working under difficulties, do you not think it would be only fair to give him notice of what you require?—Yes; they always get that. We endeavour to show them how to improve their places at a minimum of cost.

131. Then you would only institute prosecutions in aggravated cases?—Yes, only in very serious cases, where negligence was shown and the conditions were a menace to the industry.

132. You do not think it would be wise to institute proceedings where the fault was due to want of means or ability?—No.

133. Where prosecutions are instituted, do you think that before starting the prosecutions it would be well for the Inspector to report the matter to his superior authority?—He has to do so. He has to state the whole circumstances. In my case if I was not quite satisfied I would see the premises myself.

134. Where there is a want of cleanliness, and repeated warnings have been given, would you suggest that the premises should be cleaned at the expense of the owner?—It would be a very hard thing to carry out.

135. But it would be an effective measure?—But I am afraid it would be very costly.

136. Costly to the owner or the Department?—I take it that the cost would ultimately fall on the owner.



137. Do you think that would be better than a fine?—It would be effective on the individual man, but would not have the moral effect on his neighbour.

138. *Mr. Macpherson.*] In regard to the cleaning of cans, Mr. Lang asked you if making the regulation read cleaning them six hours before milking would not be reasonable. I said it was too long. Mr. Lang had in his mind dairymen who come home late at night. There are other cases where six hours would be too long. Many men do not get back from the factory till 12 o'clock, and then have to start milking at 3 o'clock. That means only three or four hours. Then, you may slip a shoe and get back later. Do you think the three or four hours would be sufficient? In regard to your statement that it is more difficult to clean cans when the milk has dried, I doubt it. In hot weather milk will dry quite hard in half an hour in the sun?—That is open to question.

139. Well, within an hour. Do you think three hours before milking would be sufficient?—I think the regulation would be better. It is impossible in most cases to comply with it. It is impossible to lay down regulations which would apply in all cases.

140. It could be put in?—Some definite time must be put in.

141. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You do not believe in taking home the whey in the milk-cans?—No, I do not approve of it.

142. *Mr. Okey.*] How could you get it back?—Farmers use old cans for the purpose.

143. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You know that the large cheese-factories prohibit their suppliers taking home whey in their cans?—Yes.

144. *Mr. Witty.*] If the whey is taken back, would it not come under the definition of pig-wash, and therefore you could use the cart?—No, I do not think so.

JAMES R. SCOTT, Secretary of the National Dairy Association, South Island, examined. (No. 7.)

*Witness:* I have been secretary of the National Dairy Association since 1891, and previous to that was connected with the dairy industry. I sent the first frozen butter Home in 1883. This shows I have known the dairy industry in New Zealand, as an export business, since its inception. With regard to the regulations, I may tell you that three or four years ago our people in the South commenced an agitation for the Government to bring in measures to carry out the inspection proposed. We have always in our resolutions stated that the inspection should be in the direction of educating the farmer, but that the powers proposed to be conferred on the Department were absolutely in cases where drastic action was necessary. At the Dunedin and Invercargill Conferences of the association during the past two years we have carried motions urging the Government to carry out the regulations now proposed, and it was passed unanimously that the farmers in the South were willing to pay 10s. or 15s. a head as a tax for the purpose. It is absolutely necessary to bring about an improvement in the milk. Our experience is that perhaps 60 or 70 per cent. of the suppliers have been gradually improving, keeping their milk clean and carrying out improvements in their stockyards. Then, there is another 30 or 40 per cent. who will not do anything. These are simply a drag on the industry. The factories have tried various measures for improving the milk-supply. They have instructed factory-managers to reject all inferior milk. But sometimes it was the chairman's milk, and sometimes a director's. There was trouble anyhow. I am certain there is no person capable of doing it effectively unless an Inspector under the Government. That is the view of our people. They want an independent impartial man to carry out the regulations. Some two years ago Mr. Clifton visited Dunedin at the time of the Winter Show, and explained the policy of the Department. This was before the Minister for Agriculture had announced, as he did definitely at Palmerston, what he was going to do under the Bill. Mr. Clifton then met a very representative body of men, from Canterbury, Otago, and Southland. Mr. Clifton explained the proposals, and they met with the entire approval of the dairymen present. Mr. Clifton came down last year. Then, when the Minister announced his policy at Palmerston in regard to dairy-inspection it met with the entire approval of the gathering. This year we got Mr. Clifton down again. The Conference waited a day for him, and all present took great interest in the question. He went into the thing exhaustively, giving all the salient points in the requirements of the Department. He answered many questions in regard to difficulties in complying with the regulations—similar difficulties to those Mr. Deem has been talking about. I may tell you, as far as my people are concerned, they were thoroughly satisfied, and were quite willing, as far as I could see, to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Department. It was thoroughly understood by the Conference that it was not a policeman's Act—that it was not the object of the Department to gain convictions, and that an Inspector would not gain *kudos* by being too sharp. The main idea was to bring the ruck of the farmers up to a proper standard. Many farmers were struggling to do their best, but did not know how to improve their conditions. These men would be assisted, educated, and given the necessary information. This is what Mr. Clifton laid down in Dunedin, and this, I believe, is the policy of the Department. What I have said is the opinion of our members, and they represent all but three factories in the South Island—Okain's Bay, Temuka, and Belfast. We have had many conferences, and the regulations were brought into existence at the urgent request of the dairy factories in the association, as they felt it was absolutely necessary. I examine all the cheese shipped by my association at Dunedin and the Bluff. We find that all the faults in the cheese are in connection with the flavour, and the unsatisfactory flavours are distinctly traceable to bad milk. Every one in the business knows that we cannot get any further till we bring the ruck of the men up to supply a proper standard of clean milk to the factories. The factories tried inspectors of their own, but there was always friction and rows—fighting with the factory-manager,

the directors, and all sorts of trouble. This is the reason why we in the South are anxious to see the regulations carried out. If Parliament passes these regulations in their entirety, in a few years' time everything there will be done with a hearty goodwill by the dairy-farmers of New Zealand, because they will find it pays. I have heard a great deal of discussion about the expense. While I sympathize very fully with the farmer in every way, I am certain of this: it is up to him, and it is good for him, to do something to improve the milk-supply, even if it costs him a little. For instance, I believe that in three years concrete yards would recoup the farmer for the cost by the convenience and saving of labour alone. We have heard a good deal about the condition of dairying and the nastiness of it; but, if concrete yards and modern premises were adopted, the business of milking would become less arduous and dirty, and generally people would take more kindly to it. In some places it has been very bad—so much so as to dissuade people from embarking in it. We have the same variety of conditions in the South as in the North. Take Canterbury: it is more difficult to deal with than Otago. In and around Christchurch it is very flat, and drainage must be difficult in many cases, and special attention would have to be there paid to cleanliness in connection with the city milk-supply. You will remember when the old Dairy Industry Act was brought into force, in Sir John McKenzie's time. Farmers were up in arms against it, as well as the trade. London men said they were the best judges of the butter, but now they were buying according to the grade. I have been in communication with Mr. Swinburne, Victorian Minister of Agriculture, and he informs me that they are quite satisfied we have been going on right lines in this country. If these regulations are, however, effectively carried out they will place us on a footing better than we have ever occupied before. We want to get up-sides with Denmark in the matter of cleanliness. We want to educate the farmer up to it, and that is the object of the Bill. There is nothing in the requirements which cannot be safely intrusted to the administration of the Department. If you are going to hamper the Chief Inspector with many restrictions, or not give him full power, I do not think a great amount of good would be done.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Your experience is not as a supplier?—No.
2. More of a business nature?—Yes. They look to me to organize conferences and generally take an interest in the industry.
3. You have had no experience of milking?—No.
4. The object of the regulations is to improve the standard of our dairy-produce?—Yes.
5. If I said we have factories of 140 suppliers grading from 95 to 97 points, do you think that could be improved?—I very much doubt if factories would grade that consistently throughout the season.
6. One of the difficulties in spring-time is feed-flavour?—Yes.
7. Will regulations help to get feed-flavours out?—I dare say cooling the milk would assist very materially.
8. That is done at the present time?—Most factories want it done, but the regulations will enforce it. I would like to say this: that a great mistake is made by even small farmers—that they are apt to be a little too parsimonious about expenditure.
9. *Mr. Witty.*] You have no actual experience. You say that if the regulations are carried out effectively it will raise the standard of the milk produced?—We would generally improve all the milk. I do not want you to misunderstand me. There is a large percentage of dairy-farmers who are doing good work and supplying good milk, but there are from 30 to 40 per cent. who are not so careful. By the mixing of the two milks in the factory-vats the quality of the former is reduced to that of the worst milk in it.
10. Do you believe in the regulations in their entirety?—Yes.
11. Could you suggest any improvements?—No. They would not, of course, apply to everybody.
12. You said they could not be carried out in their entirety?—Not with every one.
13. Could there be some modification made in regard to backblocks and town-suppliers?—It would be much better not to weaken the hands of the Department at all. It should be left to the discretion of the Inspectors. It would never do to have two sets of regulations.
14. It wants tactful administration?—Yes, the whole success of it lies in tactful administration.
15. Suppose you get a tactless Inspector?—He should be turned out of the service. But I do not think you would get him. In the South many of the regulations have been quietly and willingly carried out.
16. I think the regulations are carried out with tact in Otago, but they are not carried out with tact everywhere?—In some places it is much more difficult than in others. Probably the conditions were worse in some cases than in others.
17. I am speaking of individual tactless men. What is required is a tactful man who will get the farmer to carry out the improvements without friction?—That is so.
18. I am not blaming the Department?—My experience of Inspectors has been that they have all been men thoroughly enjoying the confidence of farmers.
19. *Mr. Lang.*] I understood you to say that you approved of the farmer paying a tax of 15s., or thereabouts?—That was the resolution we passed.
20. I take it that these regulations and the inspection generally are with the view of assisting the consumer as well as the producer?—Yes.
21. Then why should the tax fall on the dairyman?—It is not a very heavy tax.
22. I ask you the reason why the tax should fall on the dairyman when the regulations are more for the sake of the consumer?—It is for other people to say who shall be taxed. I made a remark about my people saying they were willing to pay a tax to indicate the readiness of our people to have the thing done, and rather than not have it done they were willing to be taxed.

23. It seems fair that it should fall on the people most interested?—I quite agree with you. If suppliers are put to great expense to carry out the absolutely necessary regulations, the public should pay more for their milk. The life of the dairyman is a very hard one, and the consumer should remember this.

24. Do you represent an export association?—Yes, instituted mainly for educational purposes, also for the concentration of shipments.

25. The export season has nothing to do with the local trade?—No.

26. Do you not think the regulations for those supplying factories and those in the backblocks should be different? Though they may be very advisable and necessary to one party, they may be very irksome to the other. Do you not think there should be sets of regulations to meet each branch of the industry?—In the Dunedin and Oamaru districts there is a good deal of milk which goes to the factories in the flush of the summer, but in the winter is supplied for local requirements. The T. and T. Milk-supply Company, of Dunedin, has a large butter-factory, and supplies the city with milk.

27. What I am referring to is the difference between the struggling settler and the man with an established business in the city. Is it desirable to enforce the same regulations in regard to both?—It would be better to leave it to the administration. Mr. Clifton, I am sure, would not ask any man to do the impossible. The Department quite recognise that what is necessary in one case is not necessary in another.

28. Under these circumstances it would not be necessary to have regulations at all, but it could be left to the Inspector?—He must have some regulations laid down for him to go by.

29. Some limit?—Yes.

30. These, I take it, are the limits of his powers. You think, if enforced straight off they would be very oppressive?—Yes, decidedly.

31. You say we ought to work up to the standard of Denmark. Have you any knowledge of how dairies are worked in Denmark? Have they regulations?—Yes.

32. How do they compare with these?—I cannot say, but some of their regulations are very strict.

33. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You say the cost should be paid by the consumer?—What I mean to convey is that if the producer has to bear the expense of complying with these regulations, and thus produce an absolutely pure, clean, and safe milk, the consumer ought to be prepared to pay a better price for it.

34. I am asking the question Mr. Lang asked as to who should pay for the administration of the Act?—The dairy-farmer.

35. *Mr. Lang.*] I wanted to put it this way: The regulations were more for the benefit of the consumer, and I asked would it not be fairer for all to bear the expense?—I misunderstood. What I meant was that eventually the dairyman would pass on any extra cost to the consumer.

36. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] Suppose the 30 per cent. who produce bad milk raised the standard of their supply as a result of the regulations, would the quality of the whole supply be improved in value?—Assuredly.

37. So that the profit from the effective working of these regulations goes to the settlers?—Yes.

38. *Mr. Okey.*] You said, suppose there was expense in improving the milk-standard, the consumer should be prepared to pay more for his milk?—That is in connection with the general supply.

39. *Mr. Hogg.*] Can managers of dairy factories reject milk?—Nominally they can, but in practice they cannot.

40. Have you known any instances where they have done so?—Yes, I know where they have done so, and have lost their billets.

*Mr. Hogg:* Just what I expected.

*Hon. Mr. McNab:* It probably happened to be the chairman's milk.

41. *Mr. Hogg.*] On what ground do you know the milk to be rejected?—Dirty and almost thick; generally sour.

42. At the present time, if a manager knows positively that a supplier is bringing milk from extremely dirty premises or from diseased cows, can he safely reject it?—I know places where he could safely reject it. I know a few factories which are supporting their manager through thick and thin, and I know those who will not; and that is why the factory directors and the managers want an outside man to do it.

43. Would the milk from one dirty supplier injure the whole lot?—Yes, the whole of the vat into which that milk went would practically be of the same value as the bad milk that went into it.

WILLIAM NICHOLSON, Hampden, Otago, Director of the T. and P. Supply Company, Dunedin, examined. (No. 8.)

Witness said he had been director of the Taieri and Peninsula Milk-supply Company for fourteen or fifteen years, and was one of the largest dairy farmers in the South Island. He then made the following statement: I have gone through these regulations, and I quite agree with them. The great majority of dairy-farmers are working up to them now, but there are a number who will not, and those who have improved their milking sheds and yards in order to supply a first-class article are simply carrying them on their shoulders. In connection with our company, nine or ten years ago we appointed an inspector for ourselves. His main duty was to go round the different suppliers and find out where the dirty milk was coming from. In several cases he got into trouble himself, and he also got directors and managers into trouble. Pretty well each dis-

trict is represented by a director, and when the inspector went to his district the director brought mischief on himself. He was blamed for everything, and when he stood for director again the suppliers put their heads together and put him out. The inspector was practically useless, and we had to do away with him. Then we had a man appointed in the main factory in Dunedin, to see if he could trace where the bad milk came from, but it was impossible to find out. Our manager was continually complaining to us about the milk. He declared we were purchasing over a ton of dirt a year, which ran into a considerable sum of money for the T. and P. Company. I was pleased to hear the Minister say at Palmerston last year what he intended to do in regard to dairy inspection. We realised it would do an immense amount of good to dairy-farmers. I would make careless suppliers do their duty and enhance the general value of the produce. Coming to the regulations, concreting outside the shed has not been done in the south, so far as I am aware. I quite agree with it, however. The amount of money for the concrete would be a mere nominal sum: 30 ft. by 10 ft. of concrete would mean 100 ft., or something like four or five yards, the cost of which would be £4, at the outside. Any man with any common-sense could put the concrete down himself. In connection with the T. and P. Company, I may say that the majority of our suppliers have been over twenty years at the business, and we find some of the oldest-settled ones are the worst ones we have. I have heard a great deal of talk here to-day about those settled in the backblocks, and the hardship the regulations would be on them. You will find that the men in the backblocks are delivering cleaner milk than the old hands, for their premises and plant are clean. The old hands have got into such a slipshod manner that they will not do anything. Men in the new country will naturally try to do their best. In regard to the cooling of milk, there is a considerable amount of trouble. It is almost impossible in every place to get a suitable supply of water. The trouble is that the man who produces the clean article only gets the same price as the man producing the dirty article. A man who milked for a factory used to milk with his hands in such a state that you could take the dirt out with a knife, but when he milked for his own house he washed his hands and washed the udder of the cow. Dairy Inspectors going round and noticing these things would enhance the value of the butter and cheese going out of the country. In many cases we have trouble with the separators, which have to be cleaned out in the middle of the separating operation to get out the dirt. In cheesemaking all that dirt would have remained in the vats.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Have you had any experience of the race?—No.
2. Is your evidence what you have found in the South Island?—Yes.
3. I do not like this statement about our suppliers in the North Island?—I have no doubt it is as bad.
4. You have no experience of concrete flooring in the back country of Otago?—Yes, at Catlin's bush the country is worse than in the north.
5. Do you not think timber would do as well as concrete in the back country?—No, by no means.
6. Where is the man to get it?—He will do the best he can.
7. Do you think these Inspectors should have power to put a cow out? Have they experience enough to tell if a cow should be destroyed?—I should think not.
8. Are they veterinary surgeons?—I understand that if an Inspector desires to condemn a cow he has first to consult another officer of the Department.
9. *Mr. Witty.*] Are you a dairy-farmer?—Yes, for twenty or thirty years of my life.
10. You say there are no concrete yards in the south. What do they use?—They use gravel, but in some cases there are no yards at all. I have none; I bail up ninety-six cows.
11. It will not allow us to do that?—It does not say so in the regulations. Where there are yards I would be strongly in favour of the race.
12. Which do you prefer—the race or yard?—It all depends on the number of cows.
- Mr. Witty:* In the case of the connection of yard and shed.
- Hon. Mr. McNab:* The witness is speaking of a shed where there is a bail for every cow.
13. *Mr. Witty.*] There are no cows standing out at all?—No.
14. Are all the farmers in your district working on your system?—No.
15. What do they use for the yards?—Generally shingle.
16. A great deal depends on the Inspector as to compelling you to do anything?—I suppose a little depends on it.
17. Have you had any complaints of the Inspector?—No; but I know there are some complaints.
18. Do you think the complaints are justified?—Some of them are, I know; but it would take longer to fight the Inspector than to do what the Inspector wants.
19. Suppose you had a short lease, and the Inspector wants you to make improvements?—That was a trouble that cropped up at Palmerston twelve months ago. I spoke to Mr. McNab about it, and suggested that it would be advisable for the Government to advance a certain amount of money for improvements under the circumstances.
20. Suppose the Government advanced to the settler of a short lease?—It would not do under a short lease.
21. Do you believe in the regulations in their entirety?—Yes, they are very good. There are some people who want working up to a higher standard.
22. Can you suggest any improvements?—The first gentleman who spoke suggested covering the milk-cart. In the south we use a can, the lid of which covers the whole of the can. It would be a good thing, however, if the cart was covered.
23. You must not allow stock to depasture within 30 ft. of the shed or yard?—I do not think there is much in that.

24. A great many who cart milk to the factory only use their carts for a certain part of the year, and the cart would have to lie idle in the shed?—I do not think the Department would enforce that.

25. In that case the regulation could be improved?—No Inspector would object. I do not read the regulation in that light.

26. Supposing, for instance, you brought a sheep home for human consumption?—It is anything objectionable which the regulation aims at. I should certainly prohibit the carrying of pigs, but not a dressed sheep or butcher's meat.

27. It largely depends on the tact of the Inspector?—Yes.

28. If you get a good Inspector he can carry out the regulations without hurting any one. If you have a tactless man it would make it very hard for farmers?—No, I do not think he could make it very hard. I do not think there would be any trouble working up to the regulations.

29. You do not know of any cases where there has been any hardship?—No.

30. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You said most dairy-farmers were working under similar conditions?—A great many.

31. *Mr. Witty.*] What do you think of the regulation preventing the use of a certain space around the shed?—You should not allow the cows to tramp about the place, and make a mess of it as some people do.

32. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You say there is nothing in the rule that no animal shall be at large. Could it be easily enforced?—What I take that to mean is that the cows may not be turned out around about a shed to make a mess. It is better to have them away. I agree with that.

33. And no sheep or horses to be within 30 ft. of the cowshed?—Pigs should be kept 100 yards away.

34. You think this regulation is correct, that there should be a fence 30 ft. off from the shed?—All the better for it. You could use the ground for growing cabbages.

35. Would that not create a lot of dust?—I do not think so.

36. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] How many cows do you milk?—Over 100.

37. *Mr. Buddo.*] Your experience does not extend to the small settlers who cannot afford to put up a large shed. Have you any experience of that class of settler?—I had a shed once which only held four cows.

38. Do you think it would be desirable to allow a concrete yard to be right close against the milking-yard, supposing there was a dust-proof fence between the two?—I do not know that the dust-proof fence would be much good. A strong wind would blow the dust right over the fence.

39. *Mr. Macpherson.*] I made some reference to the peculiar nature of the water in the Oamaru district?—Yes, I know of the water. We have numerous creameries there, and we have butter from that district better than from any other part. We put it down to the grass and the water.

40. And that water has been declared by one of our principal analysts as unfit for human consumption, and yet it makes the best butter?—That is so.

41. Do you think it wrong to bring in young heifers with the cows, for the purpose of quieting them, or heifers coming to calve?—It is a thing I would not do myself.

42. In your opinion the regulation is necessary?—Yes, I would strongly object to it for a certain reason?—It might lead to cows slipping their calves.

43. Supposing you have a heifer within a month of calving, and you want to get her to the pen, would it not be a good thing to bring her in?—I would not think of it.

44. *Mr. Lang.*] You think there is no trouble in working up to these regulations?—No.

45. I suppose you only speak of people in a large way of business?—Oh, no! There is not so much in them even to the man in a small way.

46. Do you get cleaner milk from the backblocks places than from the more central places?—Yes.

47. Do you know that no one settler in the backblocks could apply the regulations? Do you not think it would be a hardship to prevent a cow or calf to be at large within 30 ft.?—I should not have them as near as that.

48. Every milk-supplier I know would have to fence 30 ft. out around the four sides of his cowshed. That would be one hardship. Then, not allowing the farmer to use his milk-cart for anything else. A great number of dairymen have only one vehicle, and this would mean that they could not cart one dead pig, and could not take a sheep home for their own use. I am only giving these instances to show how very heavily the regulations would press on the struggling settler?—You are stretching the point a bit too far. No one with any common-sense would prevent a man taking home a dressed sheep.

49. I am speaking about the regulations?—I understand the regulation to read "any unclean thing."

50. Do you think it wrong for the settler with only one conveyance to take a pig, if properly dressed, to the works in his milk-cart?—No.

51. You object very strongly to timber being used?—I do not object strongly. I said concrete by all means. In some parts of the North Island it may be necessary to use timber.

52. But that is outside the regulations?

*Hon. Mr. McNab* pointed out that it was not outside the regulations, which read: "concrete or other material."

53. *Mr. Macpherson.*] In regard to the distance at which buildings are required to be apart. I saw a place last year, 1,070 acres, on which there was not sufficient ground for the owner to build. He had to get permission from the local authorities to come a few feet on to the road-line. What would you do?—I should erect a shed back in a gully.

54. I was just as sceptical as you formerly, but there are many places in the North Island

where it is necessary to give the farmer permission to erect his cowshed in the best possible place, provided he took reasonable means for observing cleanliness?—The distance is only 30 ft.

55. But if you have to come 30 ft. on the road-line?—Well, I would not like to have a cowshed within 30 ft. of a dwellinghouse.

56. *Mr. Witty.*] In the old days many sheds were put up within 30 ft. of a dwellinghouse. Would you compel the owners to move them if they were kept thoroughly clean?—If things were kept perfectly clean I do not suppose they would be compelled to make any alteration.

57. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] What is the value of your company's annual production?—We have a turnover of over £300,000.

58. *Mr. Hogg.*] Have you any experience in connection with the manufacture of cheese?—No. The biggest part of our business is butter.

59. Can you say that greater care has to be exercised in connection with cheese than with butter?—Yes, most decidedly. The separator takes a considerable amount of dirt out of it.

60. The cheese is the more sensitive?—Yes.

61. And that accounts for our butter standing so high, while our cheese is more indifferent?—Yes.

62. Then, you think some fault is attached to the makers?—Yes.

63. In regard to the regulations, you say they should not be administered in a cast-iron manner?—It is like the laws of the Medes and Persians.

64. In the case of a restricted area for a man's buildings, you would not expect him to do impossibilities?—No.

65. The Inspector should be then given a very free hand and should modify the circumstances according to the peculiar circumstances?—Yes, to a certain extent, and I have no doubt they will from my experience of them.

66. *Mr. Macpherson.*] The district I referred to before is to the north of Waverley. In that district there is a ridge being opened up. There is no level land for a distance of forty square miles. Would you not consider it a very great hardship for a settler in that country not to be allowed to erect a cowshed right abutting on the road-line?—They would not be allowed to do that in Otago.

67. Would you consider it a hardship with no other ground available?—A man would be in a corner.

68. Do you consider it right that he should be allowed to erect his cowshed near the road-line?—Yes; I see no objection to it.

69. *Hon. Mr. McNab* (to *Mr. J. W. Deem*, Inspector in charge of district referred to).] Do you know the class of country referred to by *Mr. Macpherson*?—Yes.

70. In that class of country where it is impossible to get a sufficient level area, what use is the country put to?—It is sheep-country. I could not see a case where dairying could be carried out. I have been in 90 per cent. of the dairy sheds in Taranaki, and I cannot recall one in a situation as that referred to.

Mr. DEEM further examined. (No. 9.)

1. *Mr. Lang.*] Does it occur in that district that any large number of farmers put their yards close against the road for the convenience of carting to the factory?—Yes; but it is bad, because they get the dust from the road into the shed.

2. According to these regulations they would have to shift their buildings, because stock would get within 30 ft. of it?—That is not in regard to the road.

3. *Mr. Macpherson.*] Do you know the country I was referring to? One of the cases I cite is a property leased by *Mr. Symes*, which I was on?—He has a number of properties. I cannot recall the one you describe.

4. You do not know the property?—I know most of *Mr. Symes's* properties, but not one of the description stated.

5. Do you know the road I refer to—the road runs along the main ridge? I was informed it extended for forty miles, and the country was identical?—I do not think there is dairying done for that distance.

6. There is some milking going on?—Only milking one or two cows.

7. Would not these regulations apply?—No; they are exempt.

TUESDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER, 1908.

JOSEPH GEORGE HARKNESS, Secretary of the National Dairy Association (Limited), examined. (No. 10.)

*Mr. Harkness* made the following statement: I desire to speak, in the first place, as a dairy-farmer who has had experience for the last eighteen or twenty years, especially in the Taranaki District, also as a factory secretary and manager for seven or eight years before coming to Wellington. In the first place, I desire to say that we have made a distinct advance in the manufacture of our butter and cheese during the last twelve or fifteen years, but I regret to say, from my experience, we have not made a corresponding progress in the control of the raw material. It is on this point that it is desirable more stringent measures should be taken in connection with the dairy-farmer, that he may give a good and a pure article to the dairy factory, so that we may make an article of the highest quality. It has been urged by some that this at present is not desirable, because we are making an article to-day almost equal to the Danish and bringing in some cases almost an equal price. The answer to this argument is that the butter and cheese made in New

Zealand is absolutely a grass article, and it has to compete in the English market with Danish butter which is practically made in the winter season. Though our butter may reach within a few shillings of the Danish article, that is no reason why we should not improve the standard of our produce. It has been further urged that some factories have graded so well during the season that there is no necessity for any further improvement, and, therefore, the raw material furnished the factory must be of an excellent character. I would point out in connection with this that whilst the "pointing" may be high, that is only the standard we have reached at present. It would be absurd for us to say that there is no further standard of excellence we are called upon to reach. As a matter of fact, placed as we are at such a distance from our best market—thirteen thousand miles away—we need to make a better article than the Danish, and make a cheese equal at all events in quality to the Canadian. Therefore I urge the necessity of some such regulations as we are considering to-day is a logical outcome of the Dairy Industry Act, which has been of such incalculable benefit to the industry. True, at first sight, it may appear as a whole that the regulations are very stringent, but the same complaint was practically urged against the grading regulations some years ago. And there is no dairyman to-day throughout New Zealand, nor a factory-manager, who has a word to say against the regulations which were framed under the Dairy Industry Act for the purpose of controlling the grading of our produce. It is to be hoped the application of the regulations by the Department would not be made in a punitive manner, that the farmer would not be punished; that it would be on educational lines, and therefore would be helpful as a whole to the industry. As to the regulations, I would point out in the first place that the principal points are contained in clause 6, which has reference to taxation so far as registration of dairies is concerned. Then, in paragraph (a) of clause 8, we have the construction of buildings on the farm—that is, the cowshed, stockyard, &c. Then, we have in clause 14 the care of the milk; in clause 31 the use of the farm vehicle for other purposes than the conveyance of milk; and in 33 we have disputes which may arise between the Inspector and the farmer, but certain matters which are to be relegated to the Chief Inspector of Stock. These are the cardinal points of the regulations. The others are matters of detail. In regard to clause 6, I would state at once that I think the price proposed as a registration fee is too high. In support of my contention I would point out that in the Auckland Province there are 3,322 suppliers to dairy factories or owners of dairies. Assuming 10 per cent. of these suppliers own herds of under ten cows, that will give 2,992 over and above who will pay 10s. for each registration, or a sum of £1,496. In Taranaki there are 2,875 suppliers. I am thoroughly conversant with the conditions in Taranaki, and I think 5 per cent. will represent the number with herds under ten cows. This will leave 2,735, or a total for all registration fees of £1,362. In the Wellington District there are 3,095 suppliers in all, of these 10 per cent. are in a small way, so the total receipts should amount to £1,399. Writing off 10 per cent. in Otago and Southland, the money from registrations in that district would amount to £1,420. This makes a gross total of £5,675. This calculation takes in only the five principal dairying districts. I have not taken into account the dairies which would pay 1s. or 2s. 6d. Taking these, I believe I am correct in saying that the sum of £5,765 for annual registrations is rather an excessive amount. It will be one of the things which will be resented by farmers, especially as it is an annual fee.

*Mr. Okey:* That is without transfers. The transfer fee is 2s. 6d.

*Mr. Harkness:* I have not taken that into account. In paragraph (c) of clause 8 there is absolute necessity for this work being done, but I recognise that in some districts it is utterly impossible to procure the material for concrete. Discretionary power should be given Inspectors to allow, in districts where concrete is not procurable, or too costly, the use of sawn boards. I am not a believer in blocks or bricks. The blocks cannot be worked close enough together to prevent leakage, and the bricks, unless very hard burnt, are very porous. The floors in such cases should be of sawn boards tongued and grooved, and should be worked in with tar. In regard to paragraph 8, I will say at once that the best floor is a concrete floor. We have used a concrete floor in our own shed for sixteen or eighteen years. In regard to paragraph (f) of the same clause, it has been urged that the time for the removal of the manure—two hours—is too short. The point is that if manure is allowed to remain for a long period in the cowshed it undergoes a chemical change. There is nothing offensive or tainting about manure when first dropped, either manure or urine, but after a certain time it undergoes certain chemical changes and tends to become very strong. If allowed to remain in the cowshed for any length of time it adheres to the floor, and is almost impossible to be removed satisfactorily. In paragraph (g) no mention is made of the necessity of covering the milk-stand on the farm. Of course, we understand the milk-house to be roofed over. It is very important, especially in wet districts, that the milk-cans should be covered on the stands. The provision that no cowshed shall be within 30 ft. of any dwellinghouse is, in my opinion, essential for this reason: that pure air is one of the essential things in connection with dairying and the manufacture of butter, and if you do not have the places sufficiently apart one from the other, you cannot get that proper and pure ventilation so essential in order to maintain things in a sanitary state. In regard to the regulation which states that a yard for the holding of the cows shall be provided, it is not always essential you should have a yard to hold the balance of your cows, though wherever there is a yard I believe that yard should be constructed on the principle laid down in the regulations. In regard to the clause referring to cooling of milk, it does not state in this that the milk is to be cooled to any particular temperature. I believe milk should be cooled down to 65° or 70°, as soon after milking as possible, and I am a strong believer in milk railed considerable distances for town supply being reduced to a very much lower temperature. In clause 16 it does not clearly define that the milk should be securely covered. As far as the butter-factory is concerned, it is very essential that cans of milk shall be covered from the influence of the sun's rays. We sometimes talk about "fishiness" in butter, the cause of which is so difficult to determine. Every one would readily realise what happened to a pound of butter



which had been put in the sun and allowed to remain there for half an hour or a little longer. You will readily find it develops fishiness. I have often seen cans of milk waiting to be taken in at the factory, and the cans have become so hot that they would be too hot to place one's hand on them. That cannot conduce to the making of a high-class butter. The interpretation of dairyman you will find in the interpretation clause. It means the occupier, &c. Surely it does not mean by this that the dairyman shall do this work himself. That is the interpretation of the regulation. The same applies to "dairyman" in paragraph (c). Then, coming to paragraph (e)—the returning of skim-milk and whey in the factory-carts—I am strongly of opinion that whey ought not to be sent back from a factory in the cans which have carried the milk. The regulation as to rust on cans is a very important one. It has been urged that cans may be perfectly rusty on the outside but that they may be clean in the interior. I contend if rust is allowed a permanent hold on the outside of the tinned steel you will probably have some indication of that rust on the inside of the can. This is the chemical action of rust on milk. It dissolves the oxide of iron, and this forms, with the lactic acid in the milk, what we call lactate of iron. This always has a bitter taste. This is the result of rust. In regard to the care of milk I have omitted one point. I believe there should be a stringent regulation against the use of all preservatives in the whole milk to keep it sweet. I think the clause requiring a man to have his name on his cart should be deleted. It is only put on for identification. The same result could be obtained by giving the dairyman who is registered a number. This is one of those pinpricks in connection with the regulations which dairymen will feel very keenly. The farmer is a peculiarly constructed being, and resents very much little things and small troubles, while he bears with equanimity a serious trouble. I have known a farmer growl for a month over losing 6d. on a cheque of £19, and, after losing two cows in a drain and another two by falling in a drain, come to the factory smiling. This is one of the clauses which will not allow the regulations to work smoothly. The clause preventing the wandering of a calf in the vicinity of the cowshed is, to my mind, too drastic—it will be found impossible to carry it out in practice. The regulation in regard to carrying no dead animal in the milk-cart is impossible of enforcement. It will undoubtedly be a hardship on the "small" man who cannot afford a second cart. There will be a great number who will not be able to observe it. I strongly believe that no tainted material should be taken in the same cart as the milk is carried in, but if the farmer is allowed to use his milk-cart for ordinary farm-work, providing it is properly cleaned afterwards, it should amply meet the requirement. In regard to the right of appeal, this is only provided for simple matters of fact; but, in regard to the question of heavy expenditure in connection with the removal of buildings or the construction of new cowshed, yard, and so on, he has no right of appeal. I think these matters at all events should be allowed to be referred to the Chief Inspector of Stock. I am not in favour of arbitration, for the reason that there would be no end of litigation. Personally, as a dairyman, I should be quite content, after stating my case, to leave it to the discretion of the Chief Inspector of Stock in Wellington. I have endeavoured to look at the regulations from a dairyman's point of view, and with the few amendments I have indicated, I am in thorough agreement with them.

1. *Mr. Rutherford.*] You said you had a long experience with the farm end of dairying and also at the factory end?—Yes.

2. You wish to convey to the Committee that everything that was possible had been done at the factory end?—Yes.

3. That nothing more could be done there?—Yes.

4. That there was a difference between Danish butter and Canadian cheese and New Zealand butter and New Zealand cheese in price in favour of the Danish and Canadian articles, and to what do you attribute that difference—to dirt or to artificial feed? You mentioned that in Denmark the cows were fed in the winter-time. Do you attribute it to dirt or feeding, or both—grass-fed against artificial feed in Denmark?—In my opening remarks I said I believed we had reached every improvement that was possible in connection with the manufacturing end of the business. That had made for progress. But we had not made proportionate progress at the other end, or in connection with the farm—that is, the milk end. This can only be done by delivering at the factories milk in a condition suitable for the manufacture of a first-class article. This is the end we must improve if we would manufacture a better article.

5. I asked the question because you said Danish cows were stall fed?—That is one of the reasons New Zealand produce demands a high price. We send it Home in the summer, when it receives a winter value. The Danes are hand-feeding at that period of the year, and our produce is made from grass.

6. Do you think that butter made from grass is better than butter made from artificial feed?—Yes, I do not think any fodder that can be given to cows will equal the best English grasses.

7. *Mr. Okey.*] Your experience in Taranaki has not been in the back country?—Yes, I milked for two years twenty cows in an open paddock.

8. You are acquainted with the grading of the different factories?—Yes.

9. One of the great complaints is feed flavour?—Yes.

10. Can you suggest the regulations will do any good in connection with that: loss of points through feed flavours in the spring-time?—The loss of points is generally due to defective flavours, but not always feed flavours.

11. Do you not think that section 23 is a sufficient guarantee for clean carts and utensils, without sections 24 and 31?—No, I do not. There is nothing in that clause to prevent a man carrying bonedust or manure with his skim-milk or whole milk.

12. Do you see any harm in carting back general produce with skim-milk?—It is advisable, as far as possible, to prevent anything being carried in the cart which will cause a taint to the milk.



13. So that a farmer could not go back to the town and bring home his produce in his milk-cart?—That is not my contention. I would forbid all tainted material being carried with the whole or skim milk.

14. We have seen in the papers all kinds of costs of what it would take to put up one of these sheds to comply with the conditions. Could you give any idea of the cost of sheds and yards for fifty cows to comply with the regulations?—That would depend very materially on the size of your cowshed.

15. You could not give evidence on that point?—I have not worked out the details.

16. What would you do with suppliers who have sufficient sheds for their use, and possibly a stable within 30 ft.: would you interfere with them?—No. I have already said it is advisable to have a cowshed standing by itself from other buildings, and I would not be arbitrary in connection with that matter. It is very much better for the buildings to be some distance apart, principally for the sake of ventilation.

17. Do you think it right that a man going on to new country, with no roads, should be asked to comply with these conditions?—If the regulations are carried out in the spirit as the Government purposes carrying them out, I think you must have some definite line to go upon. You are working up towards an ideal. We do not suppose in a case such as that that the Department is going to be severe. When they started the grading system they were not so strict as they are to-day, and during the last ten years we have improved our dairy produce by great strides simply owing to that.

18. Under the regulations the chairman of directors would be responsible for unclean cans just the same as the owner, according to the interpretation given to "dairyman"?—I do not see that in the regulations.

19. In the interpretation of "dairyman"?—I do not interpret it that way.

20. "Dairyman" means "occupier of dairy, and includes," &c.?—There is no reference to a factory.

21. It refers to "dairyman"?—It simply means that I may have a large farm and manage it by my agent, or I may be in a company owning a farm, but that does not refer to a factory. The regulations have nothing to do with factories.

22. It is to do with the supply of milk?—Yes, from the farm, not to the factory. Factory directors have nothing to do with the matter.

23. *Mr. Witty.*] You think these regulations absolutely necessary?—Yes.

24. You say there is still room for improvement?—Yes.

25. Chiefly at the farm end?—Yes.

26. You have been speaking purely from the factory end?—No.

27. You have had experience of the wear-and-tear and turmoil of the settler except for the few years you mention?—I have been on a farm practically all my life. I milked for two years in the backblocks, where there was neither shed nor yard. I was then milking for four or five years twenty cows night and morning myself.

28. Was your milk as clean when you milked out in the open as to-day in a shed?—Milking out in the open was better, only for the bad weather.

29. In regard to clause 6, you say the registration charge of 10s. is heavy. Would you call it a heavy charge where a man had a hundred cows, which would come to 1½d. per cow per year?—Then graduate it.

30. If there is a hardship it is on the smaller man?—No, I do not think so. The amount of 10s. is too heavy. It will bring in a considerable income to the Government.

31. What about the man with 100 cows?—It is the man with fewer cows who would have to pay it.

32. It applies to all?—It simply means in a case of a factory of £100 or so off the profits.

33. Have you any idea what it costs the Department for inspection?—No.

34. Then you think the Department should do all this for nothing?—No, I do not say that.

35. Unless you are going to get fees, where are you going to get a return? You must have some charge. You object to blocks or bricks for flooring. Would not blocks be all right if tarred and sanded, and be as good as boards?—No.

36. Nor bricks, if cemented hard down?—Yes, hard-burnt bricks; but bricks, sooner or later, become exceedingly porous.

37. Do you think clay would do for a floor?—It would do, but you want the best and most serviceable floor.

38. Do you think the floor should be perfectly smooth?—The floor we are using is perfectly smooth. The cows stand with their hind feet on the pavement, and it slopes from each cow towards the centre, and from one end to the other. We have milked sixty or seventy, and have had no accidents.

39. How far should the grip be from the back of the cow to the drain?—We have our drain right in the middle of the shed.

40. Yours is a double shed?—Yes.

41. How far would that be?—2 ft. 6 in. or 3 ft.

42. In regard to the dwellinghouse being within 30 ft. of the dairy, would you compel those who now have their dwellinghouses closer than that to remove them, providing the sheds are kept fairly clean?—No. It would be advisable for them to have them removed, but I would not compel them.

43. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You think discretion ought to be given the Inspector in the matter of flooring?—In those districts where it is impossible to get metal for concrete.

44. You think discretionary power should also be given in regard to the other regulations?—In reference to what?

45. To the general regulations?—He has a great deal of discretionary power now.

46. Any dairyman reading these regulations would look upon them as hard-and-fast rules?—Probably he would.

47. Do you think the case would be met if a clause were inserted when the regulations were gazetted that the regulations should be carried out according to the discretion of the Inspector?—I would candidly say if I was in the Department that I would not agree to it.

48. And yet you say discretionary power should be given the Inspector?—It should be left to the discretion of the Inspector.

49. You think the regulations will be workable if the Inspector works with tact and exercises his discretion?—I am quite sure of it. The regulations can be efficiently carried out if the Department goes out with the idea that they intend to do all they can for the farmer with the farm under his control rather than to punish him. Consequently they must have regulations such as these upon which to work. It would not do to give them the discretionary power you suggest, as they would let the regulations go altogether.

50. In regard to the few pin-pricks?—Yes, the painting of a man's name on his cart would be an objectionable thing, and he would take it seriously.

51. They often use the milk-cart for going into town?—Yes.

52. Even to go to church?—Yes.

53. In such cases I would quite understand he does not want his name on the cart?—It is one of those things the farmer would feel most keenly, and more than the most drastic regulations.

54. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] I understood you to object to one of the regulations on the ground that it would tax a factory with 200 suppliers to the extent of £100?—Yes.

55. If the regulations are effective, do you anticipate any improvement in the product?—Undoubtedly, and a higher return to the supplier.

56. In the factory of 200 suppliers you refer to would that increased return be less or more than £100?—It might probably be more than the £100. I believe the supplier would reap unquestionable benefit in an increased price, but you are not going to bring about that increased price in one or two years. It will take time to work up to the standard of the regulations. My idea is to make the regulations acceptable to the farmer and then gradually work up to them.

57. Have you formed any idea what the enforcement of these regulations will mean financially?—No.

58. Would it be a ridiculous estimate to calculate an increase of value in the total output of £25,000?—I should not like to say it would bring about that increase. A much greater increase could come from improvement in the herds.

59. Then, the increased return owing to the carrying-out of the regulations might not reach £25,000?—Certainly not the first year; it might eventually.

60. In spite of what you have said as to the enormous importance of effecting further improvement in the milk-suppliers' end of the business, you are not positive in your mind whether the forward movement such as you suggest would produce more than £25,000?—No, not for the first year.

61. Ultimately?—I should say it would.

62. What do you estimate would be the cost of enforcing the regulations per annum?—I have not formed any estimate.

63. If you knew that it would cost not less than £12,000 a year, probably £15,000, would you consider the expenditure warranted?—Yes.

64. Although you cannot say that 25,000 pounds' worth of improvement would follow?—Probably more than that as the years went by.

65. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] What do you think of the regulation which says that no animal shall be at large within 30 ft. of the cowshed? You said you had milked a number of cows in the open?—Yes.

66. Is any harm likely to come having a cow grazing in a paddock abutting on the cowshed?—No, I do not know that.

67. You do not think there would be any detriment to it?—No. One of the regulations is that the calf-house should be a certain distance away, and that should be insisted on.

68. And not allow a calf or heifer to get in? You would have some difficulty to get the cow in?—They come in fairly well with the herd after the first time.

69. But the first time is the principal time?—The regulations do not prevent that.

70. *Mr. Macpherson.*] You expressed the opinion that you thought the registration fee would be a tax on suppliers. Do you consider 1s., the minimum fee, is not large enough?—I do not object to the shilling.

71. You say the shilling is not too much, the minimum for two cows. In your opinion, is 5s. too much or too little for ten cows?—I should start with the registration fee at 5s. If found necessary to raise it it could easily be done.

72. You suggest, then, that a uniform fee should be adopted in preference to a graduated fee?—I am in favour of a graduated fee.

73. Do you consider the graduations suggested here are reasonable?—No.

74. Would you point out where they are unreasonable?—I think that the larger dairy should pay the larger amount, and that the graduation should not be so small.

75. That is to say, you do not think a man should pay the same for ten as for a hundred cows?—No.

76. Do you think it right and proper to tax suppliers to this extent for the purpose of paying the cost of supervision by the Department?—I think the registered dairies should pay some portion of the cost.

77. Do you consider this portion too much?—I say so, to start with.
78. What proportion would the proposed scale provide towards the cost of the supervision?—I do not know what the cost of the inspection is.
79. What relation would you suggest one should bear to the other?—That is a difficult question to answer.
80. Would you be satisfied with half?—No; suppliers could not be asked to contribute half.
81. Less than half?—Yes.
82. Would you say 25 per cent.?—A third might be reasonable.
83. With regard to giving-away of milk or butter: would you consider it a hardship in back-country districts if a farmer could not give away a portion of his milk or butter to a deserving individual or neighbour?—At first sight it seems somewhat drastic. The idea is that everything sold should come under the direction of the Department.
84. In regard to giving away: there are many farmers who do not supply any factory or creamery, and if they desire to give away some milk or butter to deserving people in their own neighbourhood would you prevent it being done?—Is that an unregistered dairy?
85. Yes?—Well, they can do what they like with it.
86. Not according to the section. Do you consider it too drastic?—"To give it away" might probably be struck out.
87. *Mr. Lang.*] In regard to the registration fee, does not the consumer benefit by enforcing cleanliness in milk even more than the producer?—No; the producer will benefit the most. He will get a higher price for his products.
88. Do you not think people receiving benefits should pay something for it?—It will never be welcome to the producer.
89. Why not pay a certain amount of the fees?—I should think they should.
90. If the produce was enhanced to the extent of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a pound it would benefit the whole colony as well as the producer?—Of course, the benefit goes to the man who is the farmer.
91. In speaking of the floor you referred to boards, tongued and grooved and tarred. Do you understand, in subclause (c) of clause 8, that the dairyman will be allowed to put down a wooden floor?—It could be amended.
92. To make it clear?—Yes.
93. Do you know of dairymen who have had to take up wooden floors and put down concrete?—Yes.
94. In regard to cleaning of cans within two hours of being emptied, do you not think in some cases that would be a hardship? Some suppliers who do not get their cans home till late at night: would it be a better regulation that they should be compelled to have them cleaned two hours before being used?—No, certainly not.
95. Do you think if these regulations were enforced to the very letter it would cause a great deal of hardship on a great number of suppliers, more particularly in new districts?—It would.
96. *Mr. Hogg.*] What would be a reasonable maximum fee for registration?—There should be a graduated scale up to the 10s.
97. Do you think the regulations generally are too drastic?—Not with the amendments I suggested.
98. Are farmers, apparently doing their best to keep their places clean, to be prosecuted?—I do not think the regulations in any case would do that.
99. Assuming he cannot comply with the regulations, and is doing his best?—No.
100. You would not prosecute in that case?—No.
101. You would give beginners who usually have great difficulties a little breathing-time?—Yes, a certain amount of latitude.
102. Would you extend that breathing-time for years?—That would depend on circumstances.
103. You have had experience of the backblocks?—Yes.
104. Have you seen a case where a farmer erecting a new building has had to use an unoccupied room for storing his milk in?—Yes, that is possible.
105. Do you think there is anything very improper in that?—Yes. It ought not to be allowed if the milk can be kept anywhere else. It would be very much better kept outside.
106. Have you ever known a struggling dairyman being compelled to convey his milk in kerosene-tins, place it in a wheelbarrow, travel over a log fallen across a river, through some swamp land to the dairy factory?—No.
107. You have never seen illustrations of that kind?—No.
108. Would you be surprised to learn that such things as that occur not very far from Wellington?—Yes, it is possible.
109. Do you consider in cases like that there should be a good deal of allowance made by the Inspector?—In the first place, I do not think it is advisable to milk in such a place.
110. *Mr. Buddo.*] Do you think the contribution to the fees of town and factory suppliers should be the same where with the former the inspection is far more frequent?—The benefits probably would be the same, and I think the same fees should be paid in the two cases.
111. Would you say the maximum for town supply should be 10s.?—That would depend on the scale of fees you fixed.
112. You have experienced backblock dairy-farming?—Yes.
113. You have also extensive experience in the management of dairy factories?—Yes.
114. Generally, you approve of these regulations?—Yes.
115. *Mr. Rutherford.*] With the elimination of the pin-pricks, do you consider these regulations would improve the value of our butter?—Undoubtedly. The raw material would improve, and with it the quality of the butter.

116. Could you make a shot at an estimate?—I do not know that I should be prepared to do that.

117. Would it improve to the value of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d.?—Yes.

118. You previously said you did not think it would improve by £25,000 a year. Would you be surprised to know that this would mean over £25,000?—

119. *Mr. Okey.*] Would £1,250 be sufficient for the average farmer to meet the regulations in the erection of sheds and yards?—I think it would.

120. What do you think would be a fair estimate?—It would be much less than £150.

121. I am taking a concrete shed and making everything favourable?—Yes.

122. You have given the number of suppliers at 6,000. Take those at £150 each, this runs into £1,000,000 of an expenditure for the dairy-farmers of the country. Do you not think that expenditure is rather heavy to get an improvement of £25,000 per annum?—I did not give you those figures.

123. Do you not think we could more easily increase the returns from dairying by culling the herds?—No; you will not increase the value per hundredweight of your produce, but you will increase its quantity.

124. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] You are pretty well acquainted with the dairying-conditions in Taranaki: how many of the farms would stand the investigation of a strict instructor working under these regulations? Supposing he went to get convictions, how many do you think would escape?—There are over three thousand suppliers to factories in Taranaki alone. In the district I was connected with I should say there were 10 to 15 per cent. of the suppliers who should be compelled to alter the conditions under which they are working.

125. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] Mr. Duncan asked if the regulations were strictly enforced how many could escape conviction. Do you, Mr. Harkness, know the regulations we are working under now?—Yes.

126. How many would escape conviction if we prosecuted under these existing regulations?—Just as many convictions should be secured.

WILLIAM FISHER, Farmer, Taratahi, Carterton, examined. (No. 11.)

*Mr. Fisher* made the following statement: I represent the four factories around about Carterton—Taratahi, Dalefield, Belvedere, and Parkvale. In the first place, we decidedly object to the fees charged for registration, as we look upon that as purely a class tax. You know how much agitation there was to get the sheep-tax taken off, and I think the 10s. for a herd of eleven cows is a much more serious tax than a sheep-tax. On that account we object to the tax. We recognise that there should be some small tax—say, a minimum of 1s. and a maximum of 2s. 6d. The regulations are framed fully as much in the interest of consumers as the settlers, consequently settlers should not be penalised. The great bulk of the clauses seem to me to be made for town suppliers, and not for factory suppliers at all. The great bulk of them would come very hard indeed on the factories. For instance, one clause says you cannot carry pig-wash in the milk-cart. We have to take home whey, and that is pig-wash. If it is literally interpreted that is what it means. There is another clause which prevents the farmer killing a dozen pigs to-day, and taking them to the station to-morrow. This is a common occurrence. And they are taken to the station in the same cart as the milk to the factory. There are several clauses, especially in connection with the floor business, which require amendment. Where we put up new sheds there is not one in the Wairarapa who would not go in for concrete, but a great many have wooden floors, and these are good for years. Under one clause we would have to pull them all up, as has happened during the past few weeks. The Inspector says our good wooden floors are not impervious to water. There is another clause that says that a stable must not be within 30 ft. of a cowshed. There are any number of good buildings in the Wairarapa, good stables and sheds close together. Now, we would have to take the shed 30 ft. away, and the present stable or cowshed would be useless. Every yard must be large enough to hold all the cows got in at one time. No dairyman with any common-sense at all would dream of putting thirty, forty, or a hundred cows in at the one time. Twelve to fifteen are considered quite enough at the one time. "Every cowshed in which more than six cows are to be milked at either the morning or evening milking, and which is not provided with sufficient stalling-accommodation to hold all the cows at one time, shall have either—(i) A large yard, sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at any one time for milking, attached thereto, but divided therefrom by a partition or fence, the floor of such yard to be perfectly concreted or paved; or (ii) a yard of such dimensions as aforesaid, situated at least 30 ft. from such cowshed and connected therewith by a race, the floor of which is properly concreted or paved." You can read it in two ways. We realise that you want a large yard and a smaller one to bring in twelve or fifteen at a time. The great bulk of us, situated as we are, would be quite impossible to get 30 ft. away from the shed to put the stock in the race. He reckoned at the factory that 10 ft. instead of 30 ft. would be quite sufficient where they had not a paved or cemented yard. Of course, pure water should be supplied for stock. I am sure that many farmers, if they could get good water, they would be very glad to have it. As to the whitewashing of the cowshed twice a year, or as often as the Inspector orders, we realise, and have always done so, that a good whitewashing in the winter or beginning of milking-season is what every cowshed requires. Whitewashing in the middle of the season would not be very much good, and would not be necessary. Water for washing the floor is all very well if you have a plentiful supply, but how about those who have to get water from a well? We find that where there is not sufficient water to wash the floors a good sweep is the next best thing. Every person must wash his hands before milking every cow. This will be honoured more in the breach than the observance. The Inspector could not enforce it. Another thing we take strong objection to is straining the milk through

an approved strainer. Who is to be the judge? The Inspector seems to be the sole judge, though if he happens to be a man like we have in the Wairarapa it is a bad thing for the dairy industry. Washing must be done 30 ft. from the cowshed. What about washing a milking-machine? The shed is the only place where it can be washed. It should not be aired or stored in the milking-shed, but why should washing not be done there? Then a farmer may not use a can except it has a metal label on it. This is all very well for the town supply, but absolutely useless for a factory. We like to get a can as smooth as possible. The cans are steamed at the factory. As to preventing a man selling or giving away butter from an unregistered dairy, this would come very hard on a few folk in the Wairarapa. This is carrying things a bit too far. None of the regulations would give a bigger pinprick in the Wairarapa than that a man is not to be allowed to give away a quart of milk. Then, no poultry, pigeons, &c., are allowed in the cowshed. How are you going to keep them out? These are things which could be administered with common-sense, but the trouble is to get them administered with common-sense. Then, no cow, calf, or other animal shall come within 30 ft. of the cowshed. This means we will have to erect a fence 30 ft. away to prevent cows crossing near the shed. No. 31 in its present form would prevent us bringing home whey in the milk-cart, or even skim-milk, as these are pig-foods. I agree that if the cart is used for carrying live pigs it should be thoroughly washed. The last clause is the one that I most strongly object to. I consider that in all disputes there should be a board of arbitration elected by the suppliers, to which all disputes should be referred. If milk-suppliers cannot elect three gentlemen to settle their disputes I have not much faith in country residents. We have found to our cost just lately that an Inspector can be very arbitrary indeed. We have been working under stricter regulations than these. Unfortunately we did not know that they existed till a fortnight ago. Half of us have been ordered to take up our wooden floors. I would urge that all disputes should be referred to the committee I have suggested. Probably it would be better if the members of the committee were not suppliers. The committee could give just consideration to a case, and see that things were carried on smoothly. These regulations would be all right if they were carried out sympathetically. The Inspector who has lately come to the district has upset the whole of the Wairarapa. The Magistrate has to decide on the law.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Could you give us an estimate of a shed to hold fifty cows, built according to the regulations?—We have not such a shed in the Wairarapa. We do not put up a shed to hold more than ten cows—a ten-bail shed.

2. You could not give evidence on that?—No reliable evidence.

3. Should there be the same regulations for people supplying towns as for those supplying the city?—No.

4. We have had considerable evidence as to dirt in milk: is it not a fact that suppliers to factories get their own butter from the factories?—Yes.

5. And if farmers were so dirty as some people make out, they would not buy butter from the factory?—Even with the cheese-factories the suppliers purchase factory-butter.

6. Is a label on the can going to help in the supply of clean milk?—No.

7. *Mr. Witty.*] You object to the maximum fee being more than 2s. 6d.?—Just enough to say it is a fee. We regard 10s. as a tax.

8. Would it do just as well to make it a shilling?—Yes.

9. If your milk-supply after inspection is improved, there should be no objection to pay something for the inspection?—I do not think, except in very limited cases, there will be an improvement. We had our own inspection. If a supplier is bringing dirty milk then he has to take it home again.

10. You object to labels on cans: how are you to find out whose milk it is unless there is a label?—There would be no trouble in regard to that matter at the factory.

11. It would be much easier, would it not, if every man's can were branded?—It would probably not be on a month. We object to anything that will hold dirt. A label will hold dirt. We want a can as smooth as possible.

12. You object to all the cows being brought into the yard at once. Would you object if the regulation read: "A yard large enough to hold all the cows brought in at once"?—In milking forty or fifty cows we do not yard up more than ten at once, and then in a yard in front of the byre. It is universally used.

13. You say an arbitration board should be selected by the dairymen themselves?—Yes.

14. Would you not allow any one from the other side to appear?—I would reckon the board I say would be absolutely impartial, not on the law, but what would suit the particular case.

15. The arbitration should be on common-sense lines?—Yes.

16. Therefore, it would only be fair some one from the other side should be appointed?—Yes.

17. You said you had your own inspector so as to prevent a supplier sending in bad milk?—Yes, to a certain extent.

18. Has every manager power to refuse milk owing to its condition?—He has.

19. The factories in your district object to carrying out regulations similar to these?—Yes.

20. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] How often during the past season was milk rejected on the receiving-stage of your factory?—Last season was an exceptional season.

21. Take the season before?—Very rarely indeed. There might have been a few instances.

22. Has the factory-manager unlimited power in this respect?—We do not question his decision at all.

23. Suppose he rejected the chairman's milk?—It would be just the same.

24. What do you say to the statement of witnesses that the power of the manager is a dead-letter?—I do not think it is so with the bulk of the managers.

25. Would you contradict a man who is representing a number of factories if he said that in practice they found that they could not apply that?—No.

26. If all the milk that went into a factory was equal in cleanliness to the 60 per cent. of the milk that was the best, do you not think it would materially improve the value of the product in London?—Well, I do not know.

27. You know Mr. Cuddie?—Yes.

28. What is your opinion of him?—A very high one.

29. If Mr. Cuddie declares that the faults in our dairy-produce on the London market to-day, from his own observations on the spot, are largely traceable to the defects in the production of milk and not the methods of manufacture, you would treat that with respect?—Yes. Unfortunately, he was Home at the worst season.

30. If Mr. Cuddie says that a system of inspection which will eliminate the man who is sending in dirty milk to the factories will very materially raise the value of our manufactures—if he says that, you think it is entitled to the greatest respect?—Yes. At the same time I do not think it would affect any of the supply in the Wairarapa.

31. That must be read as applying to factories outside the Wairarapa. Suppose we limit it to factories outside the Wairarapa, that would mean a substantial money improvement. If that is so, why should not those who get that increased money pay something for the cost of producing it?—Did Mr. Cuddie say it would get a better price?

32. Yes?—One thing I do know is that cheese produced in the autumn, which is better than spring cheese, brings a better price.

33. Then, you are challenging Mr. Cuddie's opinion—that is, in regard to the Wairarapa? You spoke of subsection (c) of clause 8. Did you base your objection to the subsection on the ground of notices being circulated at the instance of an Inspector in the Wairarapa?—Yes.

34. You see he could not force you under these regulations to take up the floors?—He did.

35. But under these regulations he could not compel you to lift these floors. In giving your evidence were you not under the impression that if a man was milking a hundred cows he would have to have a yard capable of holding a hundred? If the regulation means that the yard must be sufficiently large for the cows put into it for the milking you might cram a hundred cows into a yard only capable of holding forty. It "must be sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at one time." Then, there is another meaning to it. That is the meaning, though you do not see it. The yard must be sufficiently large, and more cows must be crowded into it than the yard is capable of holding?—If that is what it means it would be all right.

36. In regard to section 31, there are some of the things mentioned which should not be allowed to be carried?—Yes, unquestionably.

37. You speak of the powers of the Inspector under section 33. You will notice there are only three cases there where the Inspector can order things to be done. In regard to clause 8, subsection (c), you think the Inspector should not be allowed to compel the shed to be lime-washed more than twice a year?—We think it should be done in the winter or the beginning of the season.

38. In clause 14, subsections (b) and (c), (b) reads: "Where the milk is not immediately separated cool it by a method approved by the Inspector." Is it possible to specify a method of cooling that could apply to all cases. Might not that put an undue hardship on the dairyman?—We had to abandon cooling because we could not get a cooler which would not expose the milk to the dust, and after cooling the milk was worse.

39. What system of cooling do you adopt?—We put the can into cold running water or into a creek. We do not expose the milk to the air, because it catches the dust.

40. You have fixed a regulation of your own about cooling?—Yes, that is the regulation. Where it is possible the cans are put in a running creek.

41. Could you let the committee have a copy of that regulation. Have you any regulations written out?—No.

42. Could you write out any adopted by the factory?—Yes.

43. You deal there with systems of cooling?—Yes; that is, cooling without exposing to the air.

44. It would not do to specify in all cases that it should be reduced to a given temperature?—No. It should be as low as possible.

45. *Mr. Lang.*] I understood witness to object to the registration fee being too high, and also take up the position that it was a class tax—that dairy cows should not be taxed any more than any other stock of the farms?—Yes.

46. In reference to regulation 8, subsection (c), would you read it that the Inspector could not prevent a man putting down a wooden floor?—In our district no man would think of putting down a wooden floor. It is only where places have been down for some time, and are good that we object to being interfered with.

47. Under the present regulations you have known cases where they had to pull up wooden floors and put down concrete?—Yes.

48. Would not this clause read as not being impervious to water?—A concrete floor, unless well put down, is not impervious to moisture.

49. In reference to regulation 30, do you not think this regulation would be a great hardship on a large number of dairymen in country districts—that is, where it states that any cow, calf, or other animal shall not be at large within 30 ft. of a cowshed? Would it not mean that all cowsheds would have to be fenced off? Are there any cases where farmers have sheds adjoining the roads, on a boundary-fence in a paddock?—Yes, certainly.

50. If this was brought in you would have to run a fence around it?—Yes.

51. You think there should be an appeal board?—Yes; in our opinion that would smooth matters more than anything else.

52. Do you think any drastic inspection would make any difference to the purity of the milk-supply?—A gentle pressure which will proceed in the direction of a pure-milk supply is certainly very necessary.

53. Yes, but could you make a vast amount of difference in the quality of your produce?—I do not know.

54. *Mr. Buddo.*] You mentioned it would be a great hardship for the dairy-farmer if he was not allowed to take dressed pigs to the station when he was going to the factory? Do you not think some little blood falling on the cart would be the worst kind of taint?—I think it would be so infinitesimal it would not matter.

55. You favour using the cart for general purposes so long as the commodity carried is free from taint?—The cart should be thoroughly washed. The bulk of dairymen have only one cart. It would be a great hardship.

56. You suggest a concrete race of 10 ft. would be quite sufficient between the yard and the shed. If I mentioned that a witness has given the cost of a 30 ft. by 6 ft. concrete race at £4 where shingle was available, what would you say to that?—He would not get much for his labour.

57. He said it could be done by the farmer himself. Suppose it was £5, would you consider it a serious outlay?—The greatest objection we see to it is where the buildings are already up. We consider you should have the concrete yard immediately in front of the cowshed.

58. Do you think the greatest danger to milk is from the dust flying into it owing to the movement of cattle in front of the cowshed?—I believe it is.

59. One witness said he was in favour of a dust-proof fence, 6 ft. high, in front of the cowshed or the yard. Would you approve of such a fence?—No.

60. Would you approve of a concrete yard in front of the shed alone?—Yes.

61. *Mr. Okey.*] You are on the directorship of your factory?—Yes.

62. Is it a general agreement to back up the manager?—Yes.

63. And is it not to the interest of the manager that he should have pure milk?—Yes.

64. It works two ways?—A manager may be working on contract.

65. It is to the interest of the manager?—Yes, and it is backed up in that direction.

W. FUGE, Dairy-farmer, Kaiwaewae, Wairarapa, examined. (No. 12.)

Mr. Fuge made the following statement:—

I am representing practically the South Wairarapa, and both large and small dairy-farmers, and mostly small men. Mr. Fisher, the previous witness, is a colleague of ours. Different chairmen of different factories met centrally and conferred on these matters, and we are quite in accord with the evidence just given. For my own part, I have been in the dairy industry for twenty-four years. I started with seven cows, and now I have eighty or ninety; so you see I have been through the mill. I may say that these regulations, or the thought of them being put into force, is causing a lot of irritation, because dairymen are wondering what they are going to be. They would like to see some simple regulations they could all read and understand as well as the Inspector. It is the Inspector's power they feel. At present the regulations have not been out, and they are at a standstill. They do not know what to do. I am in accord with Mr. Fisher in regard to the registration fee. In our district there are a good number of dairy-farmers registered every year for consigning milk to Wellington. I myself registered last March, owing to the scarcity of milk. That was 5s. Then the period was put back to July, and I had to pay again for selling from March to August. To some the matter of the registration fee would be a mere bagatelle, but, again, to those just starting every shilling tells. No one likes dairying if they can possibly get anything else to do. It is only this: it is the first essential on the land—that is, a man can get regular work and keep his family around. He does not take it up for the love of it. He cannot get rich on it. My people are asking for some one to explain the regulations to them. I may mention that I started with a shed with two bails. I then enlarged it to twelve bails. I now have two sheds bricked floors throughout. At the end of the shed I have a place for cooling the milk. Most of the large dairy-farmers in my district cool their milk here, as it is there where they have their water-supply. If we had to shift the milk-stand 30 ft. away it would be a great hardship. They have no complaint whatever about their produce, and they would not improve their produce did they shift their buildings away. In regard to the interpretation of the race. No one seems to understand what the race means. As I understand it to-day, any one with concrete yards is not required to have the race. If anything wants to be put in about the race it wants to be put in very clearly. If you have to make a race it is a very expensive idea. There is a concrete bottom to it, and altering existing yards and fencing. The fencing against cattle would be almost as great an expenditure as making the race itself. Where you are a long way away as regards material, and where you have to pay for haulage, it comes to a mighty expense—more than any of you would credit.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Your experience is with both the town supply and factory?—Yes.

2. Do you think there should be the same regulations for both town and factory?—Yes, you need to supply as good milk to the factory as to the town.

3. You think there should be some regulations?—Yes.

4. Do you think it would inflict hardship to carry out the regulations in the back country?—Yes.

5. In the general carrying-out of the regulations?—Yes.

6. Could you give me any idea of the cost of a shed necessary to comply with these regulations?—Generally, in our district a shed of twenty bails for fifty cows, with a place at the end of the shed for washing hands, with concrete floor, would cost him £100.

7. With 6,000 suppliers that would mean a cost to the farmer of £600,000?—Yes; and that would not include the milk-stand. It is not only your cow-shed: it is your water appliances, pump, tanks, milk-cooler, &c.

8. Is the estimate given here of an improvement of £25,000 in the quality of our dairy-produce per year resulting from the inspection a high one?—I do not think we will get any benefit. Everybody in our district tries to bring his milk to the factory in as good condition as he can, and all the inspection in the world will not make it any better.

9. What are we going to get for putting farmers to this expense?—We might have 2 to 3 per cent. of bad farmers. A good instructor is far better than an Inspector.

10. An instructor would do better than these regulations?—Yes.

11. *Mr. Witty.*] You consider that there should be no inspection at all?—There should be a certain supervision. All the inspection wanted would be from September to March.

12. You could not sack the Inspector for six months and then take him on?—If you selected capable men from the district who are suppliers.

13. Then there would be good inspection?—If you selected a man whom the suppliers know is a good farmer they would be more satisfied.

14. Have you known cases where milk has been rejected by the manager?—We give our manager full power to reject all milk.

15. Do you know cases where the manager has been sacked because he rejected milk?—I have not heard of it.

16. What is your method of inspection?—We give the manager full power, and hold him responsible for the quality of the produce. I am chairman of the Featherston Dairy Company, and we graded the highest in New Zealand last year.

17. The manager will not see the surroundings of the shed: he will just see the milk?—The manager will often go out of his way if there is something the matter. He will go out and look around himself.

18. If it is not very clean?—He will refuse it.

19. You hear regulations have been in force for ten years, and more drastic than these regulations?—Yes, and I was surprised to hear it.

20. If these regulations were carried out on common-sense lines?—They would be very useful.

21. All it wants is a tactful instructor?—Yes; not a man who just goes round to show his authority.

22. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] Can you suggest in what way subsection (*k*) could be made any clearer—that it must apply to either a yard or a race?—I would simply say a yard, because every dairyman makes a yard to suit his own herd. For instance, Mr. Fisher, in his evidence, says he does not put his cows in a yard. He has different country; it is shingly country, which will not cut up. In my district it is swampy and soft country. We are therefore bound to have yards. It is an advantage to us to have yards.

23. You think the regulations should be so worded as to state that a man should have a yard?—Yes.

24. If there is a man who says I prefer to have a race and have no specially made yard, would you give him the privilege of having the race?—Yes, certainly.

25. What other way can you do it without putting it in as an alternative: the race may be cheaper?—It may. I would make it clear.

26. I ask again, what way would you suggest, except in bringing out “either” or “or” in italic type?—What other way could it be put more simply?

27. *Mr. Lang.*] In your district some dairymen have only one vehicle?—Most of them.

28. So they have to use it for every purpose, as well as for taking milk to the factory or creamery?—Yes.

29. Would it not meet the case if a clause was inserted saying that the cart must be cleaned thoroughly?—Yes, I think so.

30. You have read the regulations?—Yes.

31. Could you give the Committee the average cost if they had to carry out the regulations to the very letter?—Anything from £20 to £100, according to the size of the farm.

32. As to the registration fee: it has been argued that it is right dairymen should pay it, as they would derive benefit from the regulations. According to your statement, they would have to pay a good sum to bring their premises up to the requirements of the regulations?—Yes.

33. *Mr. Buddo.*] Do you favour any inspection other than your own factory manager's inspection?—We could do without it.

34. That is to say, you are satisfied your output is equal to anything it could be made into without supervision?—If we were Home on the spot we could get the full value.

35. At present it does not?—I believe every dairyman brings his milk to the factory as good as he can. There might be about 3 per cent. you have to improve. The dairy industry is a struggle to get a start.

36. We have evidence that the value of a vat of milk is of the value of the lowest grade milk put into it?—Oh, no! It may deteriorate a little.

37. You would not deteriorate it to the worst class of milk?—Oh, no!

38. How many cows would you suggest should go to the one bail? What number would you suggest for fifty cows?—From fifteen to twenty.

39. A bail for two and a half or two cows?—It is to the dairyman's interest to have a certain number of bails for feeding his cows.

40. Assuming the dairyman was not ready to erect extensive sheds?—He could do with one bail to five or six cows.

41. With fifty cows you would do with eight bails?—Yes.

42. You have been asked a question as to the cost of erecting a shed. You said that a dairyman would have to spend £100 on a shed for fifty cows. You do not presume your district requires any such expenditure?—I do not.



43. How many would require new premises to-morrow if the regulations were enforced?—I could not say.

44. Would it run into 10 per cent.?—About that.

45. Would not some slight alterations get over the difficulty?—I believe every dairyman will do everything he possibly can. There were many anxious to do something, but the regulations were not out; consequently they were at a standstill all last winter.

46. If the regulations were introduced in a reasonable spirit the cost to your district would not be a serious one?—No.

THURSDAY, 24TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER.

The Hon. R. McNab made the following statement:—

A statement has been made by a witness that the owner of a dairy in the Christchurch district applied to have his dairy inspected and that an inspection had not been made. The witness supplied me with the name of the dairyman. I have made inquiries into the case, and this is the reply I have received from the Inspector in charge at Christchurch: "The dairy of ——— was inspected on the 13th of April, 25th of June, and the 18th inst. On all occasions it was found to be in a clean condition. The dairyman had applied to have his dairy reregistered this year, and on complying with proposed additions to the premises and race leading up to the shed, which he is agreeable to carry out, will be granted the license."

HENRY ERNEST CAREY, Dairy-farmer, Lower Hutt, examined. (No. 13.)

Mr. Carey made the following statement:—

I would like to say that, as far as I am concerned, I am speaking solely as a man engaged in the producing of milk for the city supply. I have nothing whatever to do with supplying factories. The difficulties I have to contend against are common to any one supplying Wellington. We have to rent highly priced leasehold land. The position I take up in regard to the proposed regulations I embodied in the following letter I sent to the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture on the 28th July last. I received a reply from him saying he had forwarded it to the Committee. The letter is as follows:—

"As you have often expressed your wish to have the views of those interested in supplying milk to the public as regards the proposed new regulations to govern the dairy industry, we trust this letter needs no apology.

"We wish to draw your attention to one or two facts, and to submit one or two suggestions.

"1. On the 31st March last all existing licenses for dairies (or, at any rate, dairy farms) expired, and, as the whole of the old regulations applied to "licensed" premises, they have been legally of no effect during the last four months.

"2. In the four months referred to your departmental officers have publicly stated that efforts are being made by farmers in practically every direction to improve the surroundings in which milk is produced, and (in some cases, at all events) the herds from which it is obtained.

"We suggest, therefore, that there be no gazetted set of regulations issued for the control of the industry; that the question of allowing milk to be sold for human consumption from any dairy-farm be left entirely to the discretion of the Dairy Inspector for the district, with, of course provision for appeal from his decision. We refer to the method of this appeal later on. As you are aware, particularly near Wellington, configuration of country, alteration of suburban land to grazing sites, and consequent questions of land-values, &c., makes it almost impossible to fix a code of regulations that will justly apply to each and all.

"To an Inspector these considerations may be explained, and his assistance sought as to the best manner of attaining to the standard of excellence necessary before a farm may be licensed for producing milk for a town supply. Some of the Inspectors, at all events, have had practical experience of what may be termed the business difficulties of dairy-farming, and given such an Inspector, we feel that every dairyman in his district would consider his decision on what conditions must obtain on any farm much juster and more likely to meet difficulties of individual farms than any attempt to enforce a rigid set of regulations.

"We are aware, of course, that this is apparently putting a good deal of power in the hands of an Inspector, and yet, after all, if the new gazetted regulations are to be effective, as much power must be given to the Inspector to enforce them, and he will have no power to modify any one of them even where his knowledge of individual difficulties might commend such modification to his judgment. We are equally aware, too, that in the hands of an unscrupulous Inspector favouritism might be possible. We mentioned previously that some means of appeal from the Inspector's decision should be available. We suggest that such appeal be made to the Government Veterinarian of the district, and for these reasons: The difference of opinion, were it not frivolous, can be practically only regarding a question of hygiene of premises or health of stock. With all due respect to the Inspectors, they are only laymen like ourselves. Their opinion on the two points we mention is therefore as liable to error as is our own. Further, we understand that neither dairy-inspection nor the Inspectors are under the control of the Veterinary staff, and the decision of a Veterinarian would be therefore absolutely unbiassed towards either party, and would be final on any points of hygiene of buildings or health of stock. We think there is some such appeal to a Veterinarian allowed as regards stock proposed to be condemned under the Stock Act. According to Press reports, the only appeal from an Inspector's decision proposed in the new regulations now under consideration of the Government is to his superior officer. This we think unfair to the dairyman and to the officer who has to hear the appeal. His natural inclination will be, and perhaps rightly, to stand by his subordinate, and that he would do so would be the opinion held by most who had a conflict of opinion with an Inspector.

"Reverting again to the suggestion that there is no rigid set of gazetted regulations, we submit the following instance of the difficulty of framing general rules to cover individual cases. In the Dairy Industry Act the whole of a farm may be a dairy within the meaning of the Act. The regulations under the Act and the Act itself provides that a privy must not be within a certain distance of a dairy. In other words, it must not be within a certain distance of the farm itself, which is manifestly absurd. To summarise our suggestions, we think,—

"1. There should be no gazetted general regulations, but that the question of issuing a license be left entirely to a Dairy Inspector.

"2. Right of appeal from an Inspector's opinion to that of a departmental Veterinarian should be granted.

"We trust that this letter in itself proves that no reflection upon the Dairy Inspector for this district is intended. On the contrary, we have pleasure in assuring you that his suggestions and assistance regarding certain part of dairying work has been most valuable, and have been given most cheerfully. Nor do we wish you to think for one moment that we wish in the slightest degree to plead for any relaxing of the attempts your Department is making to improve conditions on dairy farms. On the contrary, we think that every improvement made will in time mean more profit to the dairy farmer, as well as being more beneficial to the public.

"If you desire to have any further expressions of the opinion of dairymen on the suggestions we make, we have no objection to the publication of this letter, provided our name is kept out of the Press; otherwise we may be accused of seeking cheap advertisement.

"Yours, &c.,

"THE RIVERSIDE DAIRY COMPANY."

In the letter, proceeds Mr. Carey, I have made the suggestion that there should be no regulations whatever, and that the question of regulation of dairies should be left to the Inspector, with right of appeal as indicated. Seeing that the regulations are drafted, I should like to make a few comments on them seriatim. In regulation No. 1, the definition of a "dairy": It appears to me in the second part to conflict with that in the Act. I am presuming that the regulations were issued under the Dairy Industry Act of 1898. Paragraph 1 of the regulations says, amongst other things, that the dairy does not include any milk shop or factory, &c., whereas in the Act (section 3) it says it does. We do not know quite where we stand, as that is the regulation. So far as registration is concerned, I have not very much to say, but I think the fee of 10s. is altogether too high. Coming to regulation A, section A: Apart from my standpoint of this, I was asked by a man who has a half-acre section, and is milking one cow, what objection would there be to his milking a cow for his own use while not supplying neighbours. He has no milking-shed, but he maintains it is better for him to milk in the open paddock than to have a very cheap shed or stop altogether. In paragraph C of 8 it says the floor of every cowshed shall be of an even surface, &c., and that a suitable gutter shall be provided and be connected with the outlet drain. I would like to know where the outlet drain is to be, or if you can do what you like. This is the biggest difficulty in connection with the yards. Further down in paragraph (p) of the same regulation it says, "No liquid manure or other offensive matter shall be discharged or allowed to flow into any watercourse or other place whereby the water-supply of any stock is like to be contaminated." As a matter of fact, where we are there is no other place you can take it except into a creek or on to flat land; so I do not know exactly what that outlet drain means. Then, paragraph (h) of the same regulation: "No cowshed, or building where cows are kept, or milking-yard, or stock-yard used in connection with the milking of cows shall be within 30 ft. of any stable, fowl-house, fowl-run, calf-pen, &c." I do not know whether that means you cannot have a calf-pen opening off the stockyard; if it does, it is pretty severe. I do not see what objection there is to having the calf-pen opening off the stockyard. In regulation 9 it says that every dairyman shall "notify the Inspector at least fourteen days before commencing to make any structural alterations in or about his dairy premises, and shall in such notice give brief notice of the proposed alterations." I would like to suggest that it would be very much wiser to make it in the case of new buildings, so that the approval of the Department could be obtained to the plans before the buildings were started. Then, regulation 13: "No dairyman shall place, or allow to be placed, in any milk-house or cowshed anything of a character likely to endanger the purity of the milk." There is nothing to say as to who is to decide what will endanger the purity of the milk. In the next regulation, paragraph A: "Strain all milk through an approved strainer." Who is to approve? Then, regulation 16: "Every dairyman shall, immediately after the milk is cooled, keep it in a cool place, and at all times thereafter while it is in his possession securely cover it and protect it from the sun's rays." I do not know what is meant by that phrase "securely covered." Regulation 17 provides, amongst other things, that everything is to be allowed to air. We deliver the bulk of our milk in bottles, and it would be absolutely impossible after taking bottles out of the steam chest to put them to dry in the air, as it would then be impossible to prevent them becoming covered with dust. It is difficult enough in the factory to keep them free from dust. Does the regulation mean we must do them outside? In paragraph (e) of the same regulation it says, "In the case of cans or other utensils used in the conveyance of milk or cream consigned by a dairyman by rail or otherwise to a factor or milk-vendor, milk depot, or other place, such cans and utensils shall, within one hour after arriving at the consignee's premises, be emptied and cleansed by the person to whom they are consigned." How does that apply to the case of milk sent into the city over night? We send every night twenty gallons in bottles in locked crates. Does this mean that the bottles would have to be emptied within two hours? If it does, the whole scheme of bottled milk falls to the ground. In regulation 27, paragraph (h), it says you must not give away "any milk from any cow that has calved until four clear days at least have elapsed from the day of calving." As a matter of fact, men come to our place for the sake of this milk for their pigs and calves, and, provided it is not

fit for human consumption, it does not seem there is much to object to in that. One does not like to be told you cannot give away what you have. Going back to paragraph 9. There is the question of stable within 30 ft. of the cowshed. Well, although if one were putting up new buildings one would not have a stable nearer than that, in our case we have a short lease, a high rent, and we have to take the premises as we found them. If the stable cannot remain within 30 ft., it seems we will be at the cost of a new stable for an eighteen-months lease. Although our stable is within 30 ft. of the cowshed, any one would agree that it is satisfactory. If there is discretion with the Inspector it is not much good. We have a farm in the Wainui Valley, ten miles from the milking-place. We have only a small herd over there. We keep but one cart there, and the man brings in separated cream from there. Is there any objection to me taking back feed for calves and pigs, providing the cart is washed? Regulation 32, postage of notification by Inspector. This should be by registered letter. The only occasion I had a dispute with the Department it did not reach me till five days after it should have. Paragraph 33, question of dispute being referred to the Chief Inspector. This I must very much disagree with. The man to whom the appeal should be made should not be in the same Division. The greatest drawback in the whole of the regulations is that they do not give a man who has tried (as we are trying to do) to keep a herd free from disease. Last year the herd we had purchased we had tested with tuberculin. We had to throw out 40 per cent. the first year. The only thing we got by way of compensation was the value of the animals at the works. This year we tested the same herd again, and 8 per cent. went out. Of those 8 per cent. the average cow cost us £5 10s., or £22 10s. for the four cows, and we have received from the works £20 16s. In the whole of the regulations there is nothing which gives you assistance in stamping out disease, and that, I think, is a good deal more important than a good deal of these regulations. It is a good deal more important that your herd should be free from tuberculosis than that you should have your name on your cart. In the report from the Bureau of Animal Industry, issued last year, there are some very striking illustrations of the dangers of tuberculosis, and cases are given showing how it is possible to pass on infection. We had hoped there would have been something which would have stimulated work in this direction. Though I do not profess to know anything about the work from a butter-manufacturer's point of view, there is this stated in the same bulletin: "It was found that the danger of tuberculosis amongst cows was not confined to milk as a beverage. By experiments it was proved that the bacilli could remain alive in butter for a period of over seven weeks. That means very nearly the time it would take for our butter to reach England. If there are any stories of the sort I have given, there are plenty of opponents of New Zealand who would be only too glad to circulate them. That would come in as a benefit to the butter industry, which the adoption of these regulations is never likely to do alone. Referring again to the exception being taken to the calf-pen being near the stockyard, in the same publication of the American Bureau of Animal Industry of 1906, a plan of a model milking-shed is published, and, amongst other things, they have a calf-pen under the same roof and with only a 6 ft. partition. Surely if it is good enough for America, where they have to keep stock in for five months, it should be good enough for New Zealand to keep them near the shed. There is another thing here I would like to know what is meant by it. Cans and other utensils must be cleaned by the dairyman. Under the regulations I happen to be the dairyman in question. I would like to know there is no personal responsibility on me. In regulation 18: "No can or other utensil shall be used on which there is any appearance of rust." Is not that a little too drastic? It is difficult to keep the appearance of rust off. Using a can for three or four months in the winter makes it impossible to keep the appearance of rust off. I admit it will not be actual rust. In regulation 25 it says that every dairyman shall "forthwith notify the Inspector if he or any member of his family, or any person on or about the premises, is attacked by or is suffering by any contagious or infectious disease, or is a member of any household wherein any person is affected with any such disease." Supposing I have a man working for me who I find had slipped me up in regard to this: I speak to him about it, and he replies, "I didn't know it was infectious. I did not feel ill enough to go to the doctor." Would not the use of the word "suspect" be better than "attacked"? You cannot expect the ordinary milker to go straight to the doctor. He keeps away as long as he possibly can.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] You have no experience of supplying factories?—No.
2. In regard to stamping out disease, did you not get half the value?—Absolutely none. I think you will find in the Act—I am not quite sure it is on the printed form you get sent you—that you cannot get compensation for cows condemned as the result of a test.
3. I did not understand that part?—That is so.
4. *Mr. Lang.*] You think some of the regulations unnecessary or irksome. What is your opinion as to the effect of these regulations if they were enforced to the letter?—As far as we are concerned, it means you would have to shut up.
5. You spoke of the vehicle use?—Yes.
6. Do you not think it would meet the purpose if it was made to read, "provided it must be kept clean for conveying milk"?—That is what it will come to, whether the regulation exists or not.
7. Then, there are one or two other regulations in which a set time is put down for doing certain things. The cowshed must be cleaned within two hours. In many instances would not a stated time be very inconvenient?—I very much question if we could ever do it.
8. I believe the practice in many cases is that the man who returns with the milk does certain cleaning-up?—The position is that immediately milking is over the place is flushed out, and the men go home to breakfast. On very few mornings it is cleaned out within two hours of milking.
9. Have you any knowledge of established dairies where the buildings would be contrary to these regulations?—A good many of them.
10. They would be within the specified distance?—Yes.
11. It would mean a great deal of alteration?—Yes.

Mr. Carey made the following statement at a later stage:—

In the section referring to milking-machines the last paragraph reads, "The milking-machine when not in use shall not be stored in the cowshed." Could not that read "those portions of the milking-machine"—that is, those portions coming in contact with the milk. The average man using the machine accepts as part of the machine the machine used for driving it. Regulations 25, 28, 14, (a) and (b), 9, and 23 are left to the discretion of the Inspector. Without reflecting in any way on any of the Inspectors, we maintain we are just as able to give an opinion as to what will damage milk as the Inspector. If the regulations are to be administered in this way, there should be a regulation requiring the Inspector to acquire some qualification for his work. I have seen great conflict of opinion between two Inspectors. I have heard one man hold that having bacon in the shed would contaminate milk, and I have heard a medical man say it was rubbish; and I think it is clear by the evidence given by the witnesses that there should be some condition of this sort.

F. W. BEECHER, Farmer, Ohutu, Utiku, examined. (No. 14.)

*Mr. Beecher* made the following statement: In regard to the regulation concerning concrete floors, in my district there is no gravel suitable within very many miles. It would have to come by train, and then be carted at a very heavy expense. It is absolutely impossible in the Taihape district for the average farmer to put concrete in.

*Hon. Mr. McNab* pointed out that the regulations allowed wood.

*Witness:* You cannot say that is impervious to water. What other substance but concrete is impervious? The removal of manure and other offensive matter within two hours was utterly impossible. A man may have to milk fifteen cows on a very small holding, and two or three miles from a factory. The man has to go with the milk. You cannot ask the wife to clear away the manure. Then, the man has his calves, animals to attend to, and he has to get some food himself. It would be an offence in the eyes of the Inspector every day. Then, the regulation requiring a yard sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at any one milking, or the yard be 30 ft. away and connected by a concrete race. The conditions of my district make this impossible. You could not point out one stockyard on level ground. The land has to be terraced to get the cows into the byre. Another regulation which is impossible with us is that requiring that no liquid manure shall be allowed to flow into a watercourse. Ours is rolling country, and you cannot get away from the natural watercourse. You cannot get away from the drainage difficulty unless you stop the milk industry in the district. I would like to ask why the Inspector should be notified about alterations to dairy premises. Then, the milk must be cooled in a manner approved by the Inspector. We do not know what the Inspector will approve. Then, there is no water-supply perhaps, and the milk has to be cooled by the ordinary system of aeration. Then, there is a regulation that no dairyman shall use a can on which there is any appearance of rust. If this was to rule I venture to say a dairyman in particularly rough country would have to get new cans every three weeks. They are bumped about over particularly rough country, and a can that may be clean in the morning after coming from the factory will show rust before night. We do not consider a little rust is a detriment as long as the cans are clean. One regulation says that a label must be on the can. We think this is very unnecessary. An Inspector can easily find out the owner of a milk-cart. Then, every dairyman shall have his name painted on his cart. For three months of the season you would not see it, even if 2 ft. deep, unless the cart was cleaned down twice a day. In the Taranaki District, where it is unfortunate that they have a lot of factories close together, there is a clause, if this Bill is carried, that should be included to meet an abuse there. This is that when milk is refused at one factory it should also be refused at another. In the Taranaki District referred to the milk refused at one factory is taken in at the next. Taking the regulations as applying to my particular country, we feel we cannot possibly act up to them. It would kill the industry in that district and in many others of a similar nature. I would like the Committee to call Mr. Remington, who knows the district, and has been on nearly every farm in it. The Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones has been with me over our country, and could point out the difficulty in regard to drainage. We maintain under these regulations it would be useless for the Government to cut up land of a rolling nature into dairy-farms. There is nothing in the Bill to help the unfortunate farmer in a small way, who earns every shilling he gets. There is not a man in our district milking cows who is in a position to spend £150 on dairy-shed and yards. In many cases the cream has to be taken to the factory on pack horses. Would you have to paint your name on the pack horse?

1. *Mr. Okey.*] In the bush district where there is no gravel I take it that the farmer has to put down a wooden floor?—Yes; wooden blocks or slabs, whichever is most handy.

2. Have you found the present drainage affect the milk in any way?—No. I may say that my particular factory since it has been co-operative has not shipped a box of second-grade butter.

3. Has your factory-manager power to send back inferior milk?—He has not returned one can in four years.

4. Has he the power?—Yes. He has sole charge.

5. Have you ever heard of a factory-manager being discharged for doing his duty?—Yes; I have heard they have been threatened.

6. You have not heard of a factory-manager being discharged for doing his duty?—No.

7. You think it would be a hardship if the small farmer could not use for ordinary farm-work the cart he uses to take his milk to the factory in?—Yes.

8. What is your experience of the Taranaki District?—I lived in Taranaki some eleven years.

9. Would you be surprised to know that the shareholder of a factory has, according to the by-law, to supply only his own factory?—Yes, I would.

10. You made the statement that if one factory would not take in the milk the supplier could go on to an adjoining factory?—It has been done.

11. Is it usual?—It may not be usual, but it is done. You have proprietary factories. A man can go from the co-operative factory to the proprietary factory if he pays the penalty to his own factory.

12. It is not a usual thing in Taranaki. You are going by hearsay?—In some parts it is.

13. I would like to get more evidence on this point. You have made the statement about milk being refused at one factory being taken in at another?—Not at the present time. I could send you an instance.

14. It is hearsay?—Some of it.

15. You cannot say it is a fact?—I can say it is a fact. I cannot instance a case at present.

16. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] It is a matter of notoriety that in some parts of New Zealand it is carried on to an extreme—the taking in of milk at one factory that has been refused at another?—Yes, it is a fact.

17. It is well known?—Yes.

18. Instead of a regulation prohibiting this, as you suggest, would it not be better to raise the standard of milk amongst the bad suppliers to such an extent that a factory-manager would never have occasion to reject it at the receiving stage?—If it is possible, that is all right.

19. Do you not think it is possible by looking after the men who are negligent in their work?—We do not cavil at general inspection. It is those clauses which are drastic that I object to. It would hardly be a fair thing to go to my neighbour and say you must do certain things while I may be left alone, because I am sending in good milk.

20. Some form of inspection would be a good thing for the industry?—Yes.

21. Coming to the kind of inspection. I take it from what you have said that one of your objections was that a lot of alterations would have to be made in present conditions. If the regulations provided that where men had sheds and yards erected, and providing they kept them clear, that the requirements about distance apart would only apply in the case of new sheds and yards. Would not that remove a considerable proportion of your objections?—Yes, in a general way. I think when a man is in a position to build he will build for comfort and convenience.

32. But when it comes to building new sheds and yards it would not be harsh to compel a man to put his shed, if it could be done, so many feet away from the dwellinghouse and stable?—No.

33. So there is a certain amount of control which could be wisely exercised in that direction?—Yes.

34. You admit that if there is a man supplying dirty milk that it must injure suppliers like yourself, who go to some trouble?—Yes, naturally.

35. Then, it really comes to a question of opinion as to the best method to adopt?—Yes; in different districts where the conditions are so widely different.

36. You are prepared to say that good regulations wisely administered would be of great value to the industry?—I am prepared to say it will help the industry.

37. *Mr. Hogg.*] You consider the regulations are somewhat drastic?—Yes; taken as a whole in particular districts.

38. Do you think there would be a great deal of difficulty experienced in trying to enforce them at once?—Yes, in cases you would want an Inspector on every farm, and he would get a case every day.

39. So many of the farmers being unable to comply even if they wished to carry out improvements?—I venture to say they could not. They would have to sell their herds, especially with men of ten to twenty dairy cows—they have not the means.

40. Do you think it fair to expect a farmer to put down concrete floors if he manages to keep them clean without concrete—that is, where they have good hard ground?—With some floors it is necessary to have concrete. A man cannot keep a clay floor clean.

41. Have you seen the race system tried instead of having yards leading to the bails?—Leading from the holding yard to the byre? No, I have not.

42. With reference to the position of the managers. I suppose they are nearly all co-operative factories you have in your district?—We have only the one. It is co-operative.

43. Then, you have two kinds of manager. The factory-manager and the creamery-manager?—Yes.

44. Can these men exercise their judgment freely with regard to rejecting bad milk?—Yes.

45. Notwithstanding the fact that they are under so many employers?—Yes; they exercise their judgment. We expect them to only take the best of stuff and manufacture the best article.

46. When milk is rejected is not the manager placed in a very unfortunate position?—I do not think he is, if he has a board of directors with backbone.

47. A supplier cannot make it hot for him to the directors?—In such a case the supplier has to make a statement in writing and back it up.

48. In cases like that, when you have found complaints made, have you found the manager to be supported?—Yes, always.

49. Then, I presume the regulations would be all right if not rigidly enforced?—If simply enforced by degrees, as old places have to be renewed?—Yes.

50. You think the regulations would be a great advantage if enforced in this way?—Yes; provided the man has saved sufficient.

51. The dairyman should have time given him and reasonable opportunities given him before he is compelled to erect new premises?—Yes.

52. *Mr. Macpherson.*] Do you consider that the fees proposed to be charged would be a tax on the supplier?—No, I do not think so. If you are going to benefit the consumer and the Dominion as a whole, I do not see why the Dairy Inspector should not be classed with the Stock Inspector.

53. There should be no charge?—Yes.

54. You think the Department should pay the total cost, and the farmer should not pay anything?—Yes; the farmer is not asking for the regulations.

55. You stated it would be a hardship if milkers were compelled to remove offensive matter within two hours?—I do.

56. Do you think if that was made to read “within two hours of milking” that it would meet the case?—That would apply to afternoon milking.

57. If the time in which the offensive matter must be removed was extended to mid-day, would that meet the case?—In many cases no.

58. Would you suggest two hours before night milking would be quite reasonable?—Yes. You would have to let the night milking stand to the next afternoon. It would have to stand.

59. Is it the case that sheds are cleaned out after the evening milking?—No.

60. It is not the custom?—No.

61. Would you suggest in regard to the cooling of milk that a specified degree of temperature should be set forth instead of leaving it to the discretion of the Inspector?—Where you have the water-supply you could get the temperature.

62. Would you sooner have this matter settled by saying that it be reduced to a certain temperature instead of leaving it entirely in the hands of the Inspector? You could then show him by means of a thermometer that it had been reduced?—If you tell me what you consider a fair average coolness I might tell you.

63. Would you consider 65°—if this was named, would it be better than leaving it to the discretion of the Inspector?—In our country we could not reduce it to that unless we had a very cold night.

64. In regard to notifications by Inspector, do you think they should be registered?—I do not know it would be more satisfactory to the settler—it may be to the Department.

65. Is there not a possibility of that letter going astray by being delivered to a lad or other employee? Would it not be more satisfactory if the letter was registered than delivered in the ordinary way, when it could be shown that it had actually been received?—I cannot see much advantage in it.

66. You are satisfied with the particular clause as it stands?—Yes; I think it would be perfectly safe.

67. In regard to the question of disputes settled by the Chief Inspector of Stock: would you suggest that arbitration would be more acceptable to farmers than being left to the final decision of the Chief Inspector? Would you suggest any means of arbitration? Would you consider it in the interests of the farmer if he was represented on an appeal board?—I think the Chief Inspector of Stock would do his duty to the farmers.

68. *Mr. Lang.*] You quoted regulation 8, subsection (c). Did you understand by that that wooden floors could be put down?—No. I did not.

69. You would not understand that from reading the regulation?—No.

70. In a good many of the regulations a matter has to be approved by the Inspector: in three cases the Chief Inspector of Stock may be appealed to. Do you not think it advisable in cases of dispute that the matter should go to arbitration between the Inspector and the dairyman?—Arbitration between the Department and the farmer?

71. Each party appointing one, and the two appointing a third?—It would lead to a lot of trouble.

72. You think it would lead to more trouble than if left to the one side to decide?—Yes.

73. In regard to the use of the milk-cart for other purposes. Do you not think that would be difficult to enforce in many districts where the dairymen have only one vehicle?—Yes. You could not enforce it.

74. Under the regulation a man would not be allowed to cart a dressed pig, or a live calf, or a crate of fowls. Do you not think it would meet the case if the dairyman was compelled to keep his cart clean when using it for other purposes?—Yes, apart from matters like manures and excrement.

75. As long as it is kept clean, what does it matter what it is used for at other times?—Yes, that should be sufficient.

76. What sort of floor would you suggest where concrete is not obtainable?—There is nothing else I know of except wood.

77. What about burnt bricks set on edge in good mortar?—Not as good as wood. Not as impervious to water as wood. Bricks will absorb water.

78. What sort of wooden floor would you suggest?—Some New Zealand hardwood, such as matai.

79. How would you lay it down?—On stringers.

80. How would you fix the boards?—You would need a double-boarded floor, close boarded.

81. Suppose you had 2 in. boards properly laid, and tongued and grooved?—That would be very well, but the two single-inch boards laid double would have a better chance of turning drainage than the 2 in. board, tongued and grooved.

82. *Mr. Okey.*] Do you not think inspection of an educational nature would be sufficient for the present?—Yes.

83. If all the milk is made into good butter, is that not sufficient?—Quite sufficient.

84. These regulations would in no way stop milk being taken from one factory to another?—No.

85. *Mr. Macpherson.*] You consider having the farmer's name on his cart would be of no value. Do you not think, for the purpose of identification, that it would be wise to have the name on the cart?—I do not think it would be any benefit.

86. Do you not think it would prevent disputes in regard to the ownership of a cart?—I do not think so.

87. It would be no assistance to the Department?—I do not think so.

DAVID THOMPSON ROY, Dairy-farmer, Dunedin, examined. (No. 15.)

Mr. Roy made the following statement: I have had very considerable experience of dairying, and have been engaged on my own account for fifteen years in the retail sale of milk to the City of Dunedin, and to a certain extent supplying the surplus to a butter-factory. I had experience of the milk-supply before the last regulations were framed and before the Department took over the inspection. At that time conditions in Dunedin were anything but satisfactory. I will quote from the minute-book of the Dunedin Dairymen's Association of a meeting held on 4th August, 1897: "A sub-committee was appointed to wait on the City and Suburban Councils, asking that arrangements be made with Mr. Snowball, M.R.C.V.S., to inspect and report on all dairies supplying milk for local consumption. This was complied with by the City Council, but the suburban councils took no part." This meant the work was only done in part. On the 20th July of the following year "the Secretary was instructed to write to the city and suburban councils drawing their attention to the fact that only dairies sending milk to the city were inspected, and asking their co-operation in securing competent inspection for all dairies and stock, to insure a pure and healthy supply of milk." In the following September the secretary was instructed to write to the City Council "asking if Mr. ——— had a license, and on whose authority it was granted; also to mention that the Inspector blames the Association for giving him extra work in inspecting carts, shops." These were the conditions existing in Dunedin before the Department took over the inspection. After the appointment of Inspectors there was considerable improvement, and, although the regulations were far from being perfect, the conditions existing before were done away with. This very matter of carting pig-feed in the milk-cart: I have personally seen a man cart pig-food in his milk-cans. I saw him bring kerosene-tinsful of pig-food out of a place in the city and empty them into the very cans in which he had brought his milk to town. That was ten years ago. Now, we contend that Dunedin has the best milk-supply of any city in the Dominion. Our Association took up the matter of dairy inspection when the Stock Department appointed an Inspector. We went through the regulations, and had considerable fault to find with them. These faults were brought before Mr. Ritchie, and those which were unworkable have been held in abeyance, and the others had had a very satisfactory effect. The association I represent is quite prepared to admit that the dairy inspection, so far as the city supply is concerned, has been a fair success. One matter we find fault with in the new regulations is in the words which conclude many of the regulations—"to the satisfaction of the Inspector." This particular matter caused us a considerable amount of anxiety. We do not know exactly the qualifications of the Inspectors. We would rather have regulations cast in definite terms, so that a man would know at once where he was without leaving too much to the Inspector's discretion. Regarding the matter of extending the inspection to the whole of the dairy industry, my association and I personally consider it very necessary that inspection should be extended to the whole of the dairies of the country. The dairy industry is the biggest wealth-producing industry in New Zealand. I contend that with careful administration the Department can benefit the industry to such an extent that it might double the present output from New Zealand. I consider the basis of success in the dairy industry in the very near future will be mechanical milking and home separation. These are matters that will come before very long, when if prices were lower you would not be able to meet the extra expense of the creamery business. We must separate our milk at home. At the present time under present conditions the factories, or the bulk of the factories, will not accept home-separated cream. The conditions on the farms will not admit of it, but with proper inspection the system should obtain. While we are quite prepared to admit that inspection applied to the whole of the industry will be beneficial, we do not exactly approve of all the regulations that are here brought forward. For instance, clause 8 says that "every dairy shall be provided with a cowshed suitable for milking purposes." Is it to be inferred from that that milking in the open is to be abolished entirely, and that all milking must be done in a suitable shed? Where settlement is young it is very often a serious matter, for the dairymen would require to have a sufficient building erected before going on with his work. In some instances they require to milk in the open air until such time that they can get a place erected. In regard to the air-space required in the shed, 600 cubic feet would mean a very big building for a considerable number of cattle, and if winter dairying is to be carried on it means that the cattle must be housed every night. Asking for a very large building would result in a very few going to the expense of it. They would rather milk in a smaller shed accommodating only part of the herd, and leave the rest out over night. Sufficient ventilation could be obtained with 500 cubic feet, as provided in the present regulations. Then, the provision to limewash the shed twice a year, in July and January: the times might be amended to more suitable months. The months of October and April would be more suitable in Otago, and for this reason: In January we are in the middle of haymaking and turnip-thinning, and in July, in such a season as the last, we would have the cattle in the byre the whole of the month, only being put out for an hour a day. In the month of October we start putting out our cows every night after being housed all the winter. If the byre is limewashed as soon as the cattle are put out every night it will keep nice and sweet during the hot weather. Then, in limewashing in April it would be done just before the cows are housed during the night again. It would thus sweeten the byre for the winter. It is not a matter of finding fault with the demand, but in pointing out that the months of July and January are not the two most suitable months for doing the work. Then, subclause (f): "All manure and other offensive matter shall be removed to a position distant not less than 30 ft. from every cowshed within two hours after each milking, and the floor of the shed thoroughly cleansed." If this is rigidly enforced we would be in the same position as with the old regulation, which demanded that the cleaning should be before milking. We could not comply with the "before milking" on account of the cattle being in the byre overnight. Now we are in the same position in regard



to the evening milking. We can clean the byre in the morning, but not in the evening, as the cows are kept in overnight. I have never seen a byre cleaned twice a day. The byre is always swept down to the grip, and is left there till the morning cleaning. When cattle are in overnight it is impossible to clean it after each milking. Coming to subclause (g)—“No milk-house, &c., shall be within 30 ft. of cowshed,” &c.—the cooling-stand being 30 ft. away is what we object to. This seems to infer that the milk must be taken immediately it is milked to a place 30 ft. away to be cooled, not when the milking is completed. This would mean that milkers would have to run across a 30 ft. yard, even in wet weather—a most difficult matter. If the regulation said that the milking should not be within 30 ft. I would not find fault with it. I would willingly put up a shed further away, but as I have my premises arranged at present the cooling-room is right against the end of the byre, the ventilation being independent. We have the tank there, and the room has a concrete floor. The cooling is done without the necessity of going from under the one roof—that is, we can get along in any weather. The 30 ft. requirement is really inflicting a hardship. Then, the requirement that no shed where cows are kept shall be within 30 ft. of other farm buildings is a hardship in the south. If the clause is to be enforced in regard to new buildings I should find no fault with it, but at present, especially in the south, you will find that dairy farmers try to have the steading as compact as possible, the stable usually abutting on the cow-byre. It is a hardship if we have to remove a stable, but if it is only to be enforced in the case of new buildings we find no fault with it. A good deal has been said about cooling to the satisfaction of the Inspector. I consider that is an important clause. In a factory supply it is most important, but with the city supply it is imperative. The clause is better than in the old regulations. The old regulation says it should be cooled to 65°, which in many cases was impossible. “Approved by the Inspector” should be satisfactory when there is a clause providing that the Chief Inspector can be appealed to on this point. I would not find any fault with the regulation. The regulation in regard to the race might be deleted. As to rusty cans, we do not want rusty cans. We do not want milk to come in contact with rust in any way. The regulation must, however, be administered carefully. We stand our cans overnight in a trough of water, and we have rusty water. Under these conditions a clean new can will rapidly show rust. If an Inspector is to find fault with a little rust on the outside or a can it would inflict a hardship. If it meant having no rust on the inside of cans I would support it. In regard to clause 30, which does not permit a cow or a calf to be within 30 ft. of the byre, I cannot see what objection there is to a man having a cow at large adjacent to his own byre. If pigs are there, find fault with him, by all means. A good many have their water-troughs within 30 ft. of the byre. Are the cows coming for water to be considered at large? This is making a hardship. Clause 33 refers any dispute to the Chief Inspector of Stock. This I am quite satisfied with. My association has suggested at different times that there should be an arbitrator. But my experience of Dairy Inspectors during the last eight years is that they are sufficiently capable and have sufficient discretion not to inflict any hardship. As in the case of cooling and other matters, if there is an opportunity to appeal, I would be quite content with it.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Your experience is of the city supply. You have no experience of the back country?—No, not in bush country. I have been in the Catlin's district, where things are very bad, but have not been dairying there.

2. Would you think whitewashing a shed once a year sufficient, in the slack season?—I have not whitewashed more than once a year, and it has always kept sweet and clean.

3. Cleaning the byre once a day would be quite sufficient?—Yes, quite sufficient.

4. *Mr. Hogg.*] Do you think the requirements should be plainly specified?—Yes.

5. And that would prevent Inspectors being too exacting?—So much would not be left in the Inspectors' hands.

6. Do you think the Inspectors should have a very free hand in carrying out the regulations?—On the side of leniency, the Inspector should be allowed to use discretion—that is, where he sees people are doing their best.

7. Do you know of your own knowledge places where it would be absolutely impossible to carry out the requirements of the regulations in reference to yards and distance between one building and another?—I do not know any place where the formation of the country would prohibit it. The extent of the dairyman's pocket would in many cases.

8. Have you seen farms where the sites were extremely limited, where the land was hilly, and the yards had to be formed on the hillside?—Yes, on the Otago Peninsula. There, when they want to build a byre, they have to cut a piece out of the hill.

9. Could these regulations be complied with under those circumstances?—In those circumstances the dairyman would be housing his cattle. There is no occasion for yarding.

10. You referred to home separation. Have you seen any instances where the milk is brought from the bails warm, and immediately separated alongside the dairyman's residence?—Yes.

11. Do you think there is any fault to be found with the process?—No, providing the milk is milked under clean conditions, and the cream thoroughly cooled. There should then be no trouble in the manufacture.

12. And scrupulous cleanliness observed. Under these conditions first-class butter could be manufactured?—Yes. The system is in vogue in Victoria, where they have climatic conditions worse than in this country.

13. Under these conditions would you consider it necessary to disturb the dairyman and make him place his buildings farther apart?—Where milking is done by machinery and a separator is driven by the same engine it would be a very hard matter to have the separating done 30 ft. away.



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.

40. A large number of milk-suppliers have only the one cart. It has been the practice to take young calves to the sale in the same cart as the milk. Would it not be a hardship to prevent them?—Yes, it might be a hardship.

41. *Mr. Okey.*] What is your experience as to disease in dairy herds in Dunedin at the present time?—I would not say what percentage. Tuberculosis is the main trouble, but it is not very extensive.

42. What is done in the way of compensation. What proportion do they allow for the beast?—You get half-value up to £6.

43. You find no difficulty in that way?—We have never had a beast condemned.

ROBERT THOMAS SOUNESS, Inspector of Dairies, Eltham, examined. (No. 16.)

*Mr. Souness* said: I think the regulations are very necessary. I say this from a considerable experience of dairying, having been a dairy-factory manager for seventeen years, and having been brought up on a dairy-farm. The administration of the regulations must prove of great benefit to the industry, as their natural result will be an improvement in the milk-supply.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] What is the usual thing with a farmer getting his groceries. Are they not delivered at the factory, say, a few miles from the town?—Yes, the storekeepers usually send them to the factory.

2. Do you not think it would be a hardship if the farmer could not take these things home in his milk-cart?—Yes, but there is nothing to prevent him.

3. Do you think taking home bonedust, if the cart was afterwards well washed, would do any harm?—Yes. It would be very hard getting the taint off the cart.

4. Do you think a name on a cart and tags on cans will be an assistance?—Yes, it would save a lot of trouble.

5. Do you think it would do any harm to take a dressed pig to the butcher in the same cart?—It would not if the cart was properly cleaned out afterwards.

6. The farmer would not clean it?—A number would not: that is my experience.

7. Do you think it would be an advantage to have tags on the cans? Would they not collect dust?—Not if the tag is soldered on properly.

8. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] This regulation does not prohibit taking the groceries back?—No.

9. Your experience has been in Taranaki?—I was four years manager in other districts, but my principal experience has been in Taranaki.

10. One part of your duty as manager would be examining the milk as it comes into the factory, to see whether it was good or bad?—Yes, on the receiving stage.

11. How do managers generally like that part of their duty?—They do not like it at all.

12. They do not find it very agreeable work?—No.

13. You would not like to condemn the chairman's milk?—You might do it once, but you would not care about doing it a second time.

14. Then, if men come here who are suppliers, and even chairmen, and say that the managers have unlimited power to condemn, and will not be interfered with, you suggest that that is not strictly the case? Do factory-managers feel confident that this is the case?—No.

15. From your knowledge on the receiving stage of the factory and your experience in condemning milk, which do you think the more effective, leaving it to the manager to condemn or having the question of clean milk under the control of the State?—Under the control of the State entirely. My experience in Taranaki has been that the manager has very little power. The chairman will say to him: "Run along as smoothly as possible; if you reject a man's milk it only goes to the next company." That is my experience. I could not improve the milk-supply, or we would very soon be without suppliers.

16. And you know of your knowledge that men would leave one factory and go to another if their milk was rejected?—Yes. I have known it to take place on several occasions.

17. Was your own experience in cheese or butter?—Both.

18. What portion of suppliers would you say sent milk perfectly satisfactory?—About 60 per cent.

19. About 40 per cent. of it is then of a lower grade?—Yes.

20. Have you ever formed any idea as to what extent that 40 per cent. reduces the value of the whole 100 per cent.?—2s. or 3s. a hundredweight in butter.

21. *The Chairman.*] Has it the same effect on cheese?—It has more effect on cheese. You want better quality milk for manufacturing cheese than for manufacturing butter.

22. And the loss is all the greater where you have cheese?—Yes.

23. *Mr. Hogg.*] Do the managers often come in conflict with the suppliers?—Yes, very often.

24. What is usually the cause?—Asking the supplier to improve his milk-supply.

25. I suppose suppliers are not always satisfied with the result of the tests?—That is so.

26. Is that a frequent cause of trouble?—Sometimes it is.

27. Is the milk-supply liable to be adulterated in any way?—Yes.

28. No advantage by adding water to it?—The only advantage is in a butter-factory, where a man might do it to get a little more skim-milk.

29. *Mr. Lang.*] You said you are a Dairy Inspector: would you allow a wooden floor to be put down?—Yes, certainly—that is, if it was not convenient to get gravel for concrete.

30. You are aware that in many parts of the Dominion that dairymen have been ordered to take up wooden floors?—In my district I have never ordered a good wooden floor to be taken up.

31. And you would allow a wooden floor?—Where it was not possible to get concrete.

32. Would you allow a dairyman to take dressed pig, a live calf, or fowls in his milk-cart?—A dressed pig in canvas covering would not harm.

33. A live calf, too?—Yes.

34. In many cases dairymen would be compelled to buy another cart?—I think in my district the dairymen have all two carts.

35. Then it would only affect poor men. Do you think that if these regulations were enforced as printed they would cause hardship to settlers?—Not if tact and judgment is used.

36. That is, if not enforced?—Yes.

37. But if enforced as printed, would it not cause hardship to a large number of milk-producers?—Yes; but I do not think it is intended to enforce them strictly.

38. *Mr. Bollard.*] What standard do you set up in receiving and rejecting milk?—In some districts, where the factories are close together, you cannot set up any standard.

39. How do you judge between good and bad?—By smell and taste, and also for acidity by the alkaline test.

40. What was your output of butter in the season?—In our factory we made cheese for three seasons. We turned out over 16,000 tons of cheese.

41. Butter?—The output was five or six hundred tons. We had at Kaupokonui seven outside branches besides the main factory.

42. How was it treated in the grading?—I think the percentage of second-grade was 5 to 6 per cent.

43. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] Do you think you will have to insure your life if these regulations were enforced? Could you enforce them without trouble?—It just wants tact and judgment. I do not find dairymen hard to get on with if taken in the right way.

44. *Mr. Okey.*] In your grade-cards did you lose many points by feed-flavours?—Very seldom feed-flavours were mentioned in the grade-notes.

45. Even in the spring months?—No.

46. Have you had any experience of the selling end of the business?—No.

47. You say in your evidence that this is going to affect prices by 2s. to 3s. a hundredweight?—If the managers of New Zealand had a good raw material to work with they would be able to turn out a better article than they are able to turn out now.

48. Would you be surprised to hear that we have evidence before this Committee that it will not affect butter by  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a pound?—In my opinion it would affect first-grade butter by 3s. a hundredweight, and by bringing second to first it would affect it by 4s. or 5s. a hundredweight.

49. That means bringing it up to Danish?—Very near. There is a big difference between New Zealand and Danish.

50. If you get the milk-supply up to the standard of the best 60 per cent., is there any reason why you should have any second grade at all?—No. I am quite certain our factory-managers are competent, with a proper raw material, to turn out a high-grade article.

51. You are expressing the opinion of the trade in saying that.

FRIDAY, 25TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

ARTHUR EDWARD REMINGTON, M.P., examined. (No. 17.)

*Witness:* I may say, Mr. Chairman, that, in response to the letter I received from you stating I might be able to give some information regarding the configuration of the country in which dairying is carried on in the Rangitikei, and some of the conditions dairymen are there working under, I attended this morning. One of the points I would like to draw attention to, from a very extensive knowledge of dairying in that district, having visited during the last three years most of the dairy-farms in the Rangitikei, is regulation (c) of No. 8, relating to the flooring. It says that the floor of every cowshed shall be of an even surface and formed of concrete or other material impervious to water. When I tell you it is almost impossible over a large area of that country to get shingle, except by rail, and to the dairying districts it would have to be railed forty to a hundred miles, it would be very expensive indeed to concrete the floor of every cowshed. I know instances where dairymen have attempted to do it, and they have told me that if they had to do it on a large scale they would have to go out of the business. They have tried it as an experiment. I had the privilege of giving to the Minister of Lands and Agriculture a letter sent to me by a dairyman at Mangaonoho, in which he speaks of the excessive cost of the railage of cement. He had to pay 4s. a barrel railway freight on cement. I was over his country. I know all the roads are very bad—in fact, during the time of year concreting could go on—that is, when dairying was not going on—it was impossible to cart shingle or cement. They could not cart a bucketful over some of the roads over which they have to cart their milk. And I do not know if there is a possibility of these roads getting metalled. I have brought it under the notice of the Roads Department, and they say it is impossible to provide the money for the roading. (f) of the same regulation says the manure must be removed 30 ft. from the shed within two hours of milking. I have spent two or three days in one part of the district—the Ngawaka district—and have stayed overnight in a settler's house. I saw the milking operation after the cows were got in over broken country; then getting the milk away either by cart or packhorse. By the time they have got back with the skim-milk it has been past 1 o'clock. Had they waited to clear up after milking, as stipulated, they would not have reached the factory in time. In (k) it says a yard sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at one time, properly concreted or paved, must be provided. There, again, it is an impossible regulation. If they wished ever so much to comply with it in this back country they could not do so. In the Mataroa, Raetihi, and other districts in the Rangitikei it would be impossible. Any officer of the Department who went over that country after the month of May, and saw the condition of the roads, would himself realise it was an impossibility. Another

aspect I would point out is that if, by reason of the stringency of the regulations, you compel certain of the small dairy-farmers to cease operations (men milking ten, fifteen, and twenty cows), and you cause only six to eight of these people to give up dairying by reason of the regulations, a whole factory might have to close up, because the others would not be able to keep it going. These factories are depending largely on the small suppliers. At Rata there may be a few men milking sixty to a hundred cows, but the number milking ten, fifteen, and twenty is very large. As soon as you shut off the supply of the small milkers you would find the factory could not continue. When the regulations are to be dealt with some provision could be made in which dairymen who wish to comply with the concreting could communicate with the Department of Agriculture naming the distance from which they had to get the necessary material by rail and road, and an arrangement could be made with the Railway Department that the gravel could be conveyed at a nominal rate, and the same with cement. There are certain portions of the district, fairly close to the railway, where they would make an endeavour to comply with the regulations, but then you would have to assist them in this direction for a year or two. If there is to be a hard and fast regulation of this character, however applicable it may be to flat country where there is decent access, it is impossible of application in back broken country, where dairying is now carried on under great disadvantages. In regard to the configuration of this country, the Minister of Lands saw, when in it, how it slipped up and down, and that they had to exercise considerable ingenuity to make stockyards at all, while it is ideal sheep-country. They have made the best of their conditions, and place their sheds and yards in the best positions. They are, of course, not ideal, and would not comply with anything in these regulations. If they had to shift their cowshed they would not have any place to put it. They could not go to the expense of making large excavations.

1. *Mr. Lang.*] In regard to the conveyance of other material in the milk-cart, are there many dairymen in your district who have only one cart?—There is hardly a dairyman who has two carts. Some have to take their cream on a packhorse. Those who have a vehicle have only one.

2. Under these regulations they could not take a dressed pig or live calf in the same cart as their milk?—That would be so. They would be absolutely prohibited from carting anything but milk.

3. What would be the effect of these regulations in your district if they were brought into force?—At the present time they would destroy the dairying industry.

JAMES BURGESS, Chairman of the Warea Dairy Company, Warea, Taranaki, examined. No. 18.)

*Witness:* I may say I have been a thorough advocate of something being done to bring about an improved milk-supply. I supported the movement at Palmerston. I say this as a preliminary, so that you will not think when I make objections that I am against dairy regulations being introduced. They have been required for years. I shall follow very much on the same lines as the last witness. With almost everything he said I quite agree. The first objection I have to make is that in regard to the removal of manure 30 ft. away from the shed within two hours of milking. In the morning it is advisable to do it, but in the evening on the small farm with only one man to do the milking it is generally quite dark, and he has no time to attend to the carting of manure. I quite agree that the manure should be cleared out of the shed: it could be shoveled out in a few minutes, but being left to the morning should make no difference. It has been stated that the cows would tread through the manure and bring it into the shed. In my experience they did not touch it. It is shoveled out in a heap, and the cows do not tread on it except when horned by another cow. My next objection is in regard to the yards being concreted or paved. In my opinion there are many materials in different localities which can be got to answer the purpose. Some of the formations around our coast from a perfectly clean and dry area, and as good as a paved yard, or even better. I have always had an objection to a paved yard. It has always appeared to me impossible to keep it clean unless it is uncommonly well paved. No shovel will clean between the crevices. The next point I would like to refer to is the provision that before commencing to milk the udder of each cow must be washed. I am perfectly certain that, though it may be desirable, if passed it will be evaded far more than it will be observed. If a man has to milk twenty to twenty-five cows it is late enough before he has milked. Suppose it took two minutes to attend to each cow, it would make him nearly an hour late starting for the factory; and it is a most essential thing to the factories that they should get their milk in good time. The harm resulting would be more than the good. Then, "every dairyman shall notify the Inspector before commencing to make structural alterations." Well, now, no man can always be certain as to when he is going to make improvements. He is obliged to fit them in with the time he has on his hands. It is almost impossible to know a fortnight before that he is going to do it at that particular time. Then, there is no necessity for the notification. If the improvements are there they are there, to be passed by the Inspector afterwards. The next item is in regard to the washing-up. It is provided that buckets and cans used in milking shall be washed up within two hours of milking, and in the case of cans and other utensils used about the farm within one hour of being emptied. In the case of washing the cans within the specified time, it would be very hard on the small farmer. In such a case the man who takes the milk to the factory has to wash the cans when he comes back, and in nine cases out of ten he does not get his breakfast before starting for the factory; consequently I consider the limit allowed is too short. The principle that the cans should be washed up as soon as possible is quite right, but the limit named is quite impracticable. The regulation which deals with rust on cans is very, very sweeping. I believe three cans out of four after being used only one season will show some signs of rust. If you are going to condemn a can when it shows a speck of rust it means we shall have to buy new cans every year. Whether it is intended to be literally interpreted I do not know, but that is what it would amount to. Then the cans must have

their owner's names on. I do not know whether there is much objection to that, but it seems to me scarcely worth while putting people to the trouble of doing it. Every one is known to each other. The manager also knows all the suppliers. Why the regulation is necessary I quite fail to see. Then, the name on the dray. As the last witness told you, many small farmers have only one conveyance. It appears to me a pin-prick which is hardly worth giving. Then, in regard to 30, "No dairyman shall permit any cow, calf, or other animal to be at large within 30 ft. of any cowshed," &c. To carry that out would involve considerable outlay. I do not think the Department can really require that. I have a milk-stand fully 30 ft. from the shed—more than 40 ft.—but when the cows come out they walk by it; but under the regulations I should have to take them out some other way and fence the stand off. Then there is the regulation which does not allow a man to use his milk-cart for conveying a dead animal or material likely to taint the milk. The same remark applies to this as to the previous regulation regarding the cart. Many men have but the one conveyance. In the company I am chairman of the majority of the suppliers do not milk more than twenty to thirty cows. In the case of these it would be very hard to force them to keep two vehicles. If the dray is properly cleaned it should meet the case. Beyond this I have no objection to make. I was very pleased to know regulations were being made, and I should be glad to know that those who were neglecting to put their places in order would be made to improve their methods: it would be only fair to the rest of the suppliers.

1. *The Chairman.*] In the course of your evidence you said there was a material in your district equal to concrete. Do you mean the metal taken out of the mounds around Opunake?—Yes; it forms a very fine surface when it is properly set.

2. *Mr. Okey.*] You think some form of inspection is necessary?—Most decidedly. I have been advocating it for years.

3. Do you not think it would be better if it were of an educational nature?—Certainly. The Minister will bear me out when I say that last year he gave us to understand that for the first year it would be largely education, but if farmers would not be educated then it would be enforced. That is the impression we got at Palmerston.

4. In regard to the fee: do you not think the farmers would object to it? Would they not regard it as a tax?—There is a feeling of the sort, but as far as I am personally concerned I do not object to it. I feel we ought to pay something for what is being done. I do not think it will be a strong point.

5. Supposing an existing cowshed is within 30 ft. of a dwelling or a stable, do you think the owner should be compelled to shift it?—I do not know if in many cases it would be a very expensive process.

6. In regard to the milk cart and cans: do you not think a general clause to insure cleanliness would be sufficient?—I do.

7. You said it would be a hardship in not being able to use your cart for other purposes?—Yes.

8. Can you suggest anything beneficial which could be done for the farmers, say, in the testing of cows? Could you give us your experience for the benefit of farmers?—Last year I thoroughly tested each cow in my herd. I weighed the milk of each cow night and morning one day a week, and took composite samples, and tested them at the end of the month. Far more could be done by example than by talking. The effect of my work is that four or five suppliers to our company are going to take up the testing of their herds this season. I was asked at a meeting of the agricultural society in New Plymouth what was my recommendation in regard to testing, and I replied, "Start it in your own district, and others will follow."

9. You think the Inspectors could help in that direction?—I think they could help, most decidedly. I am fully convinced it is one of the most important things about the dairy industry.

10. You object to notifying the Inspector about any alterations?—I do. If my yard is in a bad condition it does seem absurd that I must give fourteen days' notice before I can improve it.

11. *Mr. Witty.*] You think concrete should be used wherever possible?—Yes, most decidedly.

12. You think these regulations, if modified slightly and carried out in a common-sense way, would be a hardship on the farmer?—No; except in the cases I mention, I am quite in favour of them.

13. In a modified form?—I should like to see them carried out in a modified form rather than be dropped.

14. It would be better carried out by a Government officer than by the companies themselves?—In my opinion, inspection by the company is quite out of the question. The dairy companies are little democracies. The suppliers elect the directors, and if the directors make themselves obnoxious the result would be that at the next election directors would be put in who would not trouble about these things.

15. Do you think it necessary to have the name on the cart and cans in delivering milk to the city?—I was only referring to factories.

16. Every one is known there?—Yes.

17. In the city the name should be on?—Yes, I think so.

18. You object to not being allowed to make alterations to yards without first notifying the Inspector. The regulation only applies to rebuilding a shed or making extensive alterations. That is the way I read it?—Yes.

19. *Mr. Rhodes.*] Do you represent the milk-suppliers to a factory?—I am chairman of a co-operative dairy company, and have been so for the last ten years.

20. You stated your objection to certain clauses. Are your objections the objections of the suppliers in your district?—Yes, except that mine are far more modified than those of the majority of the suppliers.

21. Are they small or big men?—Quite as many of the big men as the small.

22. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You were under the impression when giving your evidence that if not made of concrete the flooring had to be paved. Is that not a slight misunderstanding?—I was under the impression a yard had to be paved.

23. With the modifications you suggest you think the regulations would be workable?—Yes.

24. Supposing that, in connection with the structural alterations—the distance from the shed of dwellinghouse or stable—we were to make it a condition of the regulations that the distances apart were only to apply to new buildings, would not that relieve a little of the soreness in regard to the regulations?—Most decidedly.

25. You spoke of my remarks at Palmerston: you understood I intended the regulations to be tentative before being put finally into operation?—Quite so.

26. I will just quote in connection with this a statement I made in reply to a deputation in regard to the dairy regulations: “The representations of the deputation would be carefully considered, and the regulations, when they were issued, would be for trial for one season, after which they would be finally reviewed. He promised that before extreme action was taken under the regulations he would look into the circumstances himself, so as to be fully acquainted with the facts.” Was not that the idea conveyed to the meeting by myself?—Most of us thought that at least two years would be given before much would be enforced.

27. I spoke of that when addressing the meeting. You are satisfied that regulations for the dairy-factory suppliers of the Dominion are required?—Yes, I am quite satisfied. It will be the best thing that could happen for the industry if working regulations could be enforced.

28. *Mr. Hogg.*] You think some of the regulations are somewhat stringent?—I think so. If enforced they would have the effect of making people give up milking. Very often farmers, especially the smaller one, are inclined to be a little combative. If some of the regulations were forced on them straight away, the effect would be that they would milk no more.

29. If the Inspector tried to make the farmer comply with them he would get a very rough time?—Quite so.

30. I presume from what you have stated that you believe the regulations on the whole would bring about a great improvement?—I do.

31. Are they reasonable in this way: that they explain the model of what a dairy-farm should be?—Yes.

32. Something to work up to?—Yes.

33. But I suppose you would give the Inspector very full discretionary power?—Yes. But if passed as they are I would not like to give the Inspector that discretionary power. I will admit there are good Inspectors, but they are not all built on the same lines. If wide discretion were allowed, then you would have very different results in different districts, according to the Inspector.

34. Do you think that in some cases it would be impossible to comply with the regulations in regard to the distance between the buildings?—It would be most difficult, but to say “impossible” is rather wide of the mark: it would be impracticable.

35. *Mr. Lang.*] I understood from what you said that some dairymen would actually give up the business if the regulations were enforced as proposed?—I feel certain of it. If the regulations were fully enforced they would milk no more.

36. And you understood from the Minister that it would be one or two years before they would be enforced?—Yes.

37. If the regulations were adopted there is no guarantee that they would not be enforced?—No.

38. The dairyman would be liable, there only being the statement of a certain person that he does not intend to enforce them?—Yes, that is exactly the point.

39. You speak about the Inspectors not being built on the same lines—having differences of opinion. Do you not think it would be wise to have right of appeal from the decision of the Inspector?—Most decidedly. That is one point wanted for a long time.

40. You see in Regulation 33 there is right of appeal—appeal to the Chief Inspector of Stock; but that it only applies to the three cases?—I do not think that the majority of farmers would have much confidence in that. I would prefer an Appeal Court.

41. Do you not think it would be more satisfactory if the Court was representative of both sides—one person to represent the farmer and one the Inspector?—That, in my opinion, would give dairymen very great confidence in the Court.

42. *Mr. Okey.*] You have been chairman of a dairy-factory for some time: what instruction is generally given the factory-manager as to sending back inferior milk?—Personally, every fresh manager we get we tell him it is his first duty to look after the chairman’s milk and send it back, then the directors’, and then the suppliers’. Whether this is always done I am not in a position to say. It is done with us.

43. *Mr. Witty.*] Would he not get sacked?—No. I had my own milk sent back once.

44. *Mr. Okey.*] Is it a general thing in the district for a supplier to take his milk to another factory when it has been refused at his own?—Yes, in some cases; not in my district. It happens where factories are competing against each other. I have actually known of a case of a manager being instructed not to be particular about the milk, in case it might be taken to the other company.

ANGUS JOHN McCURDY, Secretary of the Dairymen’s Union of Employers, Upper Hutt, examined.  
(No. 19.)

*Witness:* I may say I only received a copy of the proposed regulations from the Stock Office this morning, consequently I am somewhat at a loss to deal with the matter, as I have not had an opportunity of consulting my union. We have had a number of abstracts published in the newspapers, and at a meeting held yesterday week certain instructions were given to me, to attend here

and give the views of the union. I may say that in February of this year, when the regulations were being somewhat rigorously enforced in our district, the union had an interview with the Hon. the Minister of Lands on the subject, and we specifically stated our objections to or approval of existing regulations. His statement to us then was that the regulations, which had not been submitted to us, and which we could not get a sight-of, although we wanted them, would be tried for one season, and at the end of the season would be submitted to our union and similar organizations for expression of opinion before anything was decided finally. I find, in going over these suggested amended regulations, that a great deal objected to by my union has received attention by the Department, and the objections to the regulations on the part of farmers, which had resulted in the formation of our union, have borne fruit. With regard to the regulations, we notice that not only town milk-supply dairies, but also factories, are included, which was not so before. We consider that perfectly correct, perfectly warranted. The other definitions we also approve of. Section 2 we approve of. Section 3 we approve of, except that we consider, when a farmer applies, instead of having to wait, as is the case in our district, for inspection to be made before the license is issued, that a temporary certificate should be issued to the farmer if the inspection of the premises is not made in seven days. Section 4 we approve of. The certificate of transfer we approve of. The matter of renewal we approve of. The fee for registration has been discussed. We consider that, as, after considerable agitation, the sheep-tax was abolished as a class tax, a merely nominal fee for registration should be sufficient, and that the five-shilling fee in operation before was a fair one. We do not think it matters much how many cows a man milks. The idea is to get clean milk. It is a question of the dairy and its surroundings. A man milking two cows would require as much, and probably more, attention as the man milking ten. Further, there are other cases where a man will milk right through the year for the town-supply, and there are those milking a larger number for the factory-supply. The discrimination does not appear to be warranted. Section 7 we approve of. Section 8, subclause (a): Here we get into a difficulty, because some of us term the shed in which the cow is milked the milking-shed, and the shed where they are housed a cow-shed. We think the term "milking-shed" should be used in the regulations wherever the shed is used solely for milking. Section (b) we approve of. Section (c), Concrete yards: This has been brought under my own notice both from the union and outside. I have travelled practically the whole of New Zealand, and I have found places where there was practically no material suitable for concrete. In what is termed the Roadless North district the only material fit to be put on the road was burnt pipeclay. It is only obtained at very great cost, and is porous. I have never seen any information from any one that it can be rendered impervious to water, and so make a good floor. This suggests the question that burnt pipeclay in other districts might be made into an impervious flooring. Subsection (d) we approve of. The whitewashing of the walls we approve of. As this is one of the clauses in which an appeal is allowed, I will deal with it when I come to the question of appeal later. Clearing away offensive matter from the shed within two hours: That is a difficulty in our district, owing to the refusal of the Department to run a train for a short distance on Sunday afternoons. The engine runs up the bank in fifteen minutes every other day in the week. Our settlers in the Mungaroa are told that they would have to pay £5 a trip. The men in this case are being paid wages, standing idle, and steam is up. And settlers are denied the use of this engine for a fifteen-minutes run. This means that the settlers have to drive eight miles every Sunday afternoon and eight miles back. Some have not been able to get married, and have to do the milking themselves. It is utterly impossible to milk, harness up, drive to the station, land their milk, get back again, and clean up within two hours. It cannot be done. This is not an isolated case. We have a number of farmers living some distance from the railway who must be on time at the station, consequently it is impossible for this work to be done within two hours. We had suggested to the Department that four hours would be a reasonable time. The question of the location of the milking-shed: We have three prevailing winds. We do not see how we can put up our sheds and shift them round with the prevailing wind. This is a stumbling-block to us. I was asked to call your attention to this. In the morning it blows off the sea, and in the evening off the shore. Subsections (i), (j), and (k) we approve of. The question of paving: I fortunately heard the previous witness speak of this. The question is a difficult one—the question of cleaning spaces between the paving-blocks, and the difficulty of the farmer, not being an engineer, getting the foundation level and even. Subsections (l), (n), (o), and (p) we approve of. The question of supplying water in the milking-shed for the milkers' hands we approve of. We do not see, however, how we are to meet the demand in regard to a sufficient supply of water for cleaning the floor. We had a drought last year, and water was at a premium. We had to go a long distance for it: 5s. for 200 gallons within twenty miles of Wellington. In that case we anticipate the difficulty if a drought occurs again. If there was an Appeal Board, such as my union has suggested, there would be a possibility of reviewing the circumstances. We do not see any objection to notifying the Inspector before making structural alterations. It does not limit a man to the time. We do not anticipate any trouble. Section 10 approved of. Section 11, washing the hands after milking each cow. Some of our members think that is entirely unnecessary, others say it is absolutely essential, and they would even go so far as that a certain amount of disinfectant should be utilised, because we have men who have suffered considerably by milking cows with contagious mammitis. Unknown to the farmer they have spread disease through the herd. The usual thing is to keep the affected cow to the last, and milk the others first, the milk being retained for some other purpose. I know it is so on most of the farms I have visited—almost model farms. In one case the farmer had been a railway guard. He lost his billet through the great strike. He is milking near Dannevirke. They wash their hands and have clean towels. The man had no worry about getting to the factory. Sections 13 and 14 are all right. We approve of 15, 16, and 17 until we get to the question of time, and then the objections in regard to time apply equally in sections (a), (b), and (c). Last year we asked for four hours for cleaning the utensils, the time



allowed in the old regulations. In making four hours we asked that it should be the maximum. If there is no possibility of the utensils being cleaned or the manure being removed within the specified time it should be a matter for local adjustment, with the Appeal Board we suggest. We believe in cleanliness, but in cases like these it is almost impossible for the regulations to be carried into effect. With Inspectors working on the give-and-take principle, and with the Boards of Appeal, we believe the difficulty can be surmounted. Section 18, rusty cans and broad arrows: It is suggested in our district that if any man's can arrives with a broad arrow on it it will be sent on to Wellington Gaol. There is a possibility of them being repaired by a chemical treatment. Our position in regard to cans is very different to that in country districts. We have to put our cans on railway-platforms, and they are handled by porters who have never practised weight-lifting. It applies equally to the Manawatu Company's line. Thus the cans get a little bit of a kink, and where that takes place they will rust, because the tinning is, like beauty, only skin-deep. Some arrangement should be made whereby the extent of the condemnation should be referred to the Board we have suggested. Where the cans are clearly rusty they should be put out of action. With regard to moving milk without a label on the can, we agree with this. In a good few cases you will not get back your can at all. Then, with a label on the cans an official who wishes to test the milk would have an opportunity of suing the man who was liable. With cans travelling indiscriminately without labels on there is a possibility of the whole of the people disowning the can of milk if they have a suspicion it is not up to the mark. Section 21 we believe in. Also 22 and 23. In regard to 24, the local by-laws and other rules only require it to be 1 in. high. In connection with the town-supply we find there is a local by-law that the names of owners shall be on vehicles engaged in trade. I should like section 27 to go a little further. "No dairyman shall sell, barter, offer for sale or for barter, give away, allow to be used for human consumption." You should add to that "or permit to be removed." I know a case where a man had his license stopped, but gave his milk away. It was stopped. Then he put the milk in a place where it could be stolen, and it was stolen. There should be no possibility of milk going away except from a registered dairy. In regard to an appeal against an Inspector's decision, if there is an organization, a registered union of employers, they should be permitted to nominate one person on behalf of the dairymen of the district. The Department could appoint another. A third person could be appointed as presiding officer, and disputes could be settled by this Board. In regard to clause 8, section (a). We know cases where men have one or two cows, and instead of wasting time going out into the paddock to bring them into the shed they take the milking-bucket out to the paddock and milk there. And I know districts where people do this as the cleanest and best method, and they have been called upon to build a cowshed and a milk-house where there is but one cow and the milk is held in a washing-jug. I may say, in regard to bringing the regulations into force suddenly, we fear a difficulty, inasmuch as there was one Inspector who had given a considerable amount of satisfaction in the district. He was succeeded by another who, with certain modifications, might be considered a fair man, but a third man came along and made such a commotion that there was a threat that all the farmers were going out of the business. But none of them have gone out of the business. They have made the improvements. They met the union, and we waited on the Minister and placed their views before him. The union received from the Minister the statement that the regulations would be put in force for one season, and that my union would have an opportunity of reviewing them at the end of the first season.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] As to white-washing, do you think there is any necessity to have it done twice a year?—There is a great deal about the floor and not much about the roof. I know where existing sheds would require whitewashing more than twice a year, because the damp gets in. This is a matter left to the Inspector, and would be left to appeal.

2. Your experience is from a town-supply and not from a factory-supply point of view?—Yes. We had a factory, but we found the town-supply more profitable.

3. From a dairyman's point of view it is just possible a man might have two farms, and during a dry season he might require to get milk from the farm where he keeps his dry stock. Do you not think there might be some regulation so that a man might not be called upon to comply with the regulations in the case of the second farm?—We were in that position. Our treasurer has two farms—one where he keeps dry stock. He notified the Inspector that he was going to milk on the second farm. He fitted it up with concrete, whitewashed the shed, and conformed with the reasonable requirements laid down by the Inspector, making other improvements as time permitted.

4. Can you suggest any clause which would assist in the city supply?—One thing I have just dropped across in the case of improvements, and that is that something should be done by which a tenant on a leasehold property should not be saddled with the whole of the cost of improvements. In *Hansard*, page 50, in dealing with the Sanitation Bill, the Council made an amendment reducing the amount to be paid by the tenant from 10 to 5 per cent. Our union considers the tenant should be responsible for 5 per cent. for substantial improvements for each year of his lease.

5. Can you not see some difficulty in forcing the landlord to effect these improvements where the land is let for a short term, and he has no intention of further leasing the land for dairy purposes. Perhaps he intends to cut up the land?—We saw that, but could not see why the tenant should pay the lot.

6. Do you not think the requirements should be relaxed under the circumstances?—I have no instruction to express an opinion.

7. *Mr. Witty.*] You said you did not object to the 5s. in the old regulations as a registration fee?—We consider that a nominal fee for inspection.

8. Do you not think, taking it on the average, that it will be less than 5s., because there are far more cows less than five than over five or over ten?—The man who is milking more than two cows is not doing much business.



9. You must not object to putting it on the smaller man?—We object to a discriminating charge.

10. Do you not think it would be a less charge on the small man than the large one?—I know half a dozen cases in my district where people are milking two cows and keeping boardinghouses. The difficulty has been that the Inspector could not keep track of these people in the past, and we consider they should be liable to inspection just as much as others.

11. You think the man with a hundred cows is entitled to pay more than the man with one?—No, because the man with a hundred cows is paying more in expenses.

12. And has a greater profit?—It does not follow.

13. Do you not think the Inspector could give good advice to the farmer as regards his herd?—If our present Inspector was rewarded for good advice in that way, and generally shepherding the farmer, he would get a gold medal.

14. In regard to appeal, you would not object to some one named by the farmer working in conjunction with the Inspector of Stock?—That is what we are asking.

15. Could this be carried out with a little modification by an Inspector having judgment and tact?—Yes, absolutely. The regulation in regard to time of moving offensive matter does not give the Inspector any option. We ask that that might be made optional, and an opportunity given of referring it to the Board of Appeal.

16. Cleansing yards and removing the manure?—Yes.

17. Would you not be appealing every day?—No; we consider ourselves fairly reasonable.

18. Would it not be better to put a fair limit than leave it to the discretion of the Inspector?—We say, not exceeding four hours. The Department says one and two hours.

19. You object to the branding of cans not fit to be used. How would you mark them unless you branded them? Unless there was a distinct mark there would be nothing to indicate that they had been condemned?—What we object to is branding without consulting the owner, because there may be a possibility of retinning.

20. It says, when an Inspector says this can is not to be used he condemns it?—What we got from the newspapers was that can had to be condemned when rusty.

21. You said you would not allow a man to give away milk at all. What would you do if you were miles away from a factory, and your neighbour's life depended on him getting milk? Would you prohibit it?—Not under these circumstances. We are not objecting to the clause.

22. You would grant the Inspector some discretion?—We want it shown if modified.

23. Do you not think, if you were on the road, and very thirsty, and went to a place, and they were not allowed to give you a drink of milk, it would be carrying things too far?—From an unregistered dairy?

24. Yes?—What is the definition?

25. It includes the lot. Supposing a swagger came to your place and asked for a piece of bread and butter or a drink of milk, or a family next door might be starving, and you were not allowed to give any milk away: do you not think it would be carrying things too far?—No.

26. You do not see any objection to milking in the paddock?—None whatever. We milk in the paddock ourselves.

27. *Mr. Rhodes.*] I would like to be quite clear about giving away. You say a dairyman ought not to be allowed to give milk away?—Yes.

28. Then, as regards pure milk, you have no objection to that being given away?—It is in connection with clause 27—that is, from diseased cows, or produce from an unregistered dairy.

29. No objection to pure milk?—No.

30. You went very systematically through all the regulations down to 28. I did not hear you say you approved of this?—I went right through to 33, which we approve of.

31. This one of the regulations referring to clean material?—We think should not be objected to.

32. The previous one deals with animals being about the milking-shed. It would compel fencing 30 ft. around the cowshed?—That was not discussed by us. We had no copy of the regulations. We will discuss that to-morrow night.

33. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] From the dairyman's point of view, which of the alternatives I am going to suggest would be the better one? There are many cases in the regulations where a modification of time and distance, or something, has to be made. Which do you think dairymen would prefer—a general direction in the regulations, and let the Magistrate decide whether the regulation was not being carried out, or a form like we have in section 33, an appeal from the Dairy Inspector to the Chief Inspector of Stock?—We are very keen on the Appeal Board. In the matter of the Magistrate's decision, the Inspector's decision being final, it has been eliminated from the regulations. We consider the regulations are satisfactory with certain modifications.

34. You are suggesting that the Magistrate should not come in at all, only the Appeal Board?—If the supplier was dissatisfied with the Appeal Board he could then take it to the Magistrate.

35. Would it not be costly to the dairyman? Would it not be better to allow the Magistrate to decide everything?—I am of that opinion.

36. If you think the dairyman would prefer the Magistrate to settle all disputes, and the putting-in of more detail than we have here, there is no objective in the appeal?—That would involve solicitors and considerable legal expenses. Or would the Magistrate be acting as an arbitrator, instead of as in his judicial capacity?

37. There is no reason why provision should not be made in the regulations that if the farmer does not employ a solicitor the Department would not?—I am afraid I cannot give you a satisfactory answer to that question.

38. Is it not the case that if the farmer gave up the right of having counsel he would be like the other man?—

39. *Mr. Hogg.*] I think you mentioned in regard to the removal of manure and keeping the sheds clean that the time allowed is not sufficient?—Not in the bulk of cases. We think provision should be made to meet isolated cases.

40. Is the time generally exceeded?—In our district we find that men living within reasonable distance of the station, or having assistance, carry out the regulations, but that with men milking by themselves, in the Mungaroa Valley, and having to take their milk eight miles on Sunday, it cannot be done.

41. Up country they have long distances to go over bad roads?—Yes. I know several cases where it is absolutely impossible to get within the time.

42. Do you not think simple regulations requiring them to clean their sheds once a day would be quite sufficient?—I do not care about that, as if the work is left to the evening there would be a fertiliser there for deterioration of the milk.

43. Is a fee of 5s. reasonable?—Yes, I think so.

44. You object to anything in the shape of a cow-tax?—Yes.

45. You do not think a fee should be imposed beyond that necessary for the trouble of registration?—It should be a general charge, as for the Rabbit Inspector, Noxious Weed Inspector, &c.

46. Do you think there is more trouble in inspecting large or small herds?—Generally, I think a man with a large herd finds he must keep up to date.

47. As far as the Inspectors and Department are concerned, would the trouble be much greater in one case than in another?—I do not think there is much difference—more trouble in inspecting premises for one or two cows.

48. In enforcing these regulations would you give the farmer ample time and opportunity to build?—Reasonable time. We have always had reasonable time with the present Inspector, but not with his predecessor. There has been no continuity. A man might do a reasonable thing for the previous Inspector which would not meet with the approval of the next man. It is lack of continuity which gives trouble.

49. In cases of dispute would you rather refer it to a Board than to an officer of the Department?—We would rather settle the matter amicably by a Board.

50. You consider fair consideration would be given by a Board?—We think there would be a greater amount of give and take by the parties.

51. In your opinion, where there is a dispute the dairy-farmer should be represented as well as the Department?—Yes. The matter should be settled by the two parties appointing a third.

52. Would not the appointment of a Board have a beneficial effect where the Inspector was inclined to be arbitrary?—Yes.

53. Then the effect would be deterrent, in applying a brake to the Inspector?—We look upon it as a safeguard.

54. And the Magistrate would only be appealed to when prosecutions are made for a penalty?—That is the instruction from the union, and that evidence should be offered for the defence.

55. The Magistrate would not be a competent man to deal with disputes between the farmer and the Inspector?—He would take it more as a question of law.

56. *Mr. Lang.*] In regard to the appeal, I take it from your remarks that you are in favour of all dispute between the farmer and the Inspector going to the Board of Appeal, not merely the three cases provided for appeals?—In my opinion, the applying of section 3, the flooring of sheds, the cleansing of utensils, and section (f) of 8, the removal of offensive matter—these are the matters that would practically have to be decided.

57. Are there any other matters?—We have not discussed it.

58. You think the Magistrate would be guided by the regulations, whereas the Board of Appeal would take the case on its merits?—We consider the Magistrate would take a legal view of it.

59. He would have no discretionary power, but would give way to the Inspector on the regulations?—Yes.

60. The Minister referred to the farmer being represented before the Magistrate: do you find the farmer an unreasonable man?—We dodge lawyers all we can in our district.

61. Going back to the registration fee. You are connected more particularly with the city milk-supply?—Yes. Personally my people are engaged in producing butter for local consumption; but the bulk of our farmers are engaged in producing milk for the city supply.

62. Were not these regulations brought in for the purpose of getting clean milk? Is it not a most important thing in the trade referred to that the consumer should get clean milk? More advantageous to the people who are going to drink the milk? Therefore, should not they pay their share of registration, instead of, as here, the registration fee falling on the dairyman?—Of course, because we pay a fee we do not see why another man should pay a fee too.

63. The fee should be taken off entirely, just as the sheep-tax was removed?—We have no objection to the 5s. in the past, or no objection to its continuance.

64. You object to it being 10s.?—Yes.

65. You do not object to the other, on account of its smallness?—That is so.

66. In reference to the time of cleaning utensils, yard, &c., you think it would be better to decide the question by local circumstances?—Yes. There are cases of local circumstances which would make it impossible.

67. The regulations should not say a particular time, but as long as they do it in a satisfactory manner it should be sufficient?—We stated four hours.

68. Might not this be inconvenient in some cases?—Yes.

69. There may be things in different localities that alter it. Would it not be better to allow it to be altered according to circumstances—that is, so long as the Inspector was satisfied proper cleanliness was observed?—If done in a reasonable time, yes.

70. You know of a man who was milking in the open and was called upon to put up a shed?  
—Yes, but he has not done it yet.

71. Rust: You are of opinion that as long as the inside of the can is free from rust it is fit for use?—Yes.

72. In regard to the vehicle. I do not know whether that affects people near the towns, but in many cases the dairyman has only one vehicle, and under the regulations he could not take a dressed pig to the bacon-factory in the same cart he carts his milk in. Do you not think that very irksome?—We have not discussed that. We object to the word “animal”: it should be “deleterious.”

73. Would it not meet the case if the Inspector had power to insist that the cart should be thoroughly clean while it was conveying milk?—I do not care about that.

74. *Mr. Buddo.*] You represent a dairy association at the Upper Hutt?—Yes.

75. Is your association in favour of a system of inspection?—We consider it is necessary.

76. Do you object to the fee as proposed?—We think a nominal fee would be sufficient—5s.

77. Irrespective of size of dairy?—Yes.

78. You would not consider that a man who has a hundred cows would require more frequent inspection than a man with five?—The man with a hundred is usually a man with experience, and is not likely to do anything to damage his business.

79. It is more the individual you look to?—Yes. We can only speak of our own district.

80. Have you any objection to the alternative proposal of a yard or a race?—One of our members objects altogether to the race, but he is not very clear about the regulations.

81. You are aware that if you have a 30 ft. concrete race you do not require a yard at all. Would you consider that a hardship on the dairyman to put down 30 ft. of concrete to allow a cow to pass along?—Personally I do not, but I cannot give evidence on behalf of the union on the point.

82. Would you give us your personal opinion of the race. It has been stated that a race 30 ft. long and 6 ft. wide can be put down for £4 where shingle can be readily obtained. Do you consider that a hardship where many races are now in?—No.

83. Speaking of the district you represent, do you consider any considerable number of farmers would have to make any alteration at all?—Our men are practically complying with the present regulations.

84. After reading the regulations do you consider that any dairyman at all will require to make any alteration at all in their dairy conveniences?—Very few, I should say. They have made no objection to them, except the personal statement I have made in regard to the difficulty where concrete was unobtainable.

85. Are you aware that there is no objection to wooden floors, tongued and grooved timber, where concrete is not obtainable?—No, we have not heard that. The Inspector has been complaining on account of that.

86. What about bricks?—The Inspector objected to them.

87. Can you give any expression of opinion how many would be affected in the Hutt district, inside and outside your association, in their expenditure on buildings and conveniences?—Very few.

88. Could you put it down at 5 per cent.?—Not much more than that.

89. Do you think, if reasonable time was given these 5 per cent. to make the necessary alterations, it would be wise to delay the regulations on this account?—No.

90. There has been no expression of opinion antagonistic to the regulations except in regard to the question of time for doing certain work?—No.

91. Your objection is that sufficient time will not be given to dairymen?—Not in regard to the buildings. In regard to alterations the present Inspector has given time.

92. If some modification of the time referred to was made, the regulations would not be harassing in their nature?—If we could have the right to appeal.

93. *Mr. Rutherford.*] What do you do with your milk?—The bulk of it is sent to Wellington for the retail trade.

94. You do not retail it?—It goes to consumers in town.

95. *Mr. Okey.*] You have travelled about the country as much as any one, and you have experience of the general farmer's conveniences for milking: do you think they will be put to considerable expense in applying these regulations?—The question comes in of loans to farmers. We think, as loans are made to workers, so they should be made to suppliers. We would like provision made, where farmers are so circumstanced that they cannot carry out the work owing to lack of funds, for the granting of loans to them.

96. Do you think it would take a considerable amount?—I know some places where it would be difficult for them to do so.

97. Would it not be an advantage if the Department had plans at its different district offices—plans which would comply with the regulations?—We are promised those plans. We understood when we interviewed the Minister that plans would be supplied.

CHARLES EDWARD MAJOR, M.P., examined. (No. 20.)

*Witness:* A number of dairy-farmers in the Hawera district have asked me to explain their views on the question at issue. Their chief concern is in reference to the administration of the regulations. I may say few sensible men take exception to the regulations themselves. No matter how the regulations may be drafted, some would find fault, rightly or wrongly, but the great majority will realise that the regulations are directly in the interests of the dairy-farmer. There has been a misconception in regard to the race. They were under the impression it was compulsory. They saw in the race a danger to cows crowding in. When first mooted, copies of the regulations were not available, and a number of alarming reports had reached the country districts.

It was said they were so drastic that it was impossible for dairy-farmers to comply with them, and that it would mean harassing to such an extent that an almost cessation of dairying would result. I learn that the race can be any width. The 600 cubic feet required as air-space would be a serious handicap in the construction of sheds. It seems a number are of the opinion—and their opinion should bear weight—that 500 ft. of cubic space should be sufficient, and they ask that that should be considered. A great deal of the work required to be undertaken is done by the employee of the farmer, and the average employee is always inclined to take the view that his own necessities must be considered before any one else's. He would object to carry the milk 30 ft. to the shed for the purpose of putting it into a can before carting it to the factory. That regulation should be altered, it is contended, because it would expose the worker to the weather and the milk to the dust. In regard to the cartage question, it would be very awkward if the farmer could not take a calf or a dressed pig to market in his factory-cart. These are all the matters to which exception is taken.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Can you give us any evidence from the leaseholder's point of view—short leases just running out, and the owner does not intend to let the land for dairying again?—That is a question which has been largely discussed, but none of those who have discussed it have been able to arrive at a solution of the difficulty. It should be left to the officers of the Department. They would learn the position, and it should be left to their discretion as to what course to pursue.

2. Do you think the regulations should be interpreted into the Native language?—Yes. The Natives are beginning to realise that they can earn good money at milking, and are taking an interest in it. Their translation would have a good effect. Generally, on the average the Native is cleaner than the European in the business.

3. They usually milk on the grass?—Yes.

4. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] Are the dairymen of your district prepared to work under the regulations?—The majority of them realise that it is to their interest to do so.

5. These regulations or a modified form?—Not particularly these regulations. Not many have had time to study them.

6. You are speaking of sheds where the cows would be stalled overnight?—No. In the course of time farmers may go in for winter dairying.

7. In regard to the regulations, do you not think the plan of bringing them up for review again after they have been tried for twelve months would be well?—Yes.

8. Do you know that is the plan I stated would be adopted?—No.

9. *Mr. Lang.*] The Minister was suggesting trying the regulations for twelve months. If these regulations were to be put into force for twelve months everybody would be liable to carry out what is stated in the regulations?—That is so.

10. For instance, "every dairy shall be provided with a cowshed suitable for milking purposes." It has been said by a witness that an order was given for a man milking in the open to put up a shed.

*Hon. Mr. McNab:* That is not under these regulations.

*Mr. Lang:* It may be. If the Government had control, people may have to do these things.

*Hon. Mr. McNab:* It was an extreme case.

11. *Mr. Lang.*] Under the regulations you have to keep stock 30 ft. away from your yards. Everybody would have to put a fence 30 ft. around the buildings. Cows and calves must not approach within 30 ft.?—But the regulation does not mean that you have to put a fence around the shed.

12. How else are you to do it? Then, in your district are there any people supplying the creameries that have buildings for conveniences' sake abutting on the road, so that the cart can drive up to it?—Yes.

13. Then you could not be responsible for stock running on the road?—There are very few built flush on the roadside. They are within two or three cart-widths.

14. There are other regulations of the same kind. If this was tried for a year a dairyman may be compelled to make extensive alterations, proving just as irksome as if the regulations were actually brought into force?—The whole question devolves upon the administration of the Department. The officers will have to use their wise discrimination as to what course to pursue. By reason of the experience gained we may be able to get regulations which may not need alteration for a long time. To enforce them in their entirety would be a hardship on many farmers. The big man would be in a position to bear the burden of any expense necessary in carrying them out.

15. In regard to using the milk-cart for other purposes, would it not meet the case if the regulation was altered so that the dairyman was compelled to keep the vehicle in a very clean state?—It might go further and compel him to keep disinfectants on the premises, to use in case of articles having been carried likely to lead to contamination.

16. If it was clean while he was carting milk it would not matter what he used it for at other times?—Thoroughly clean is pretty elastic.

17. Do you not think it would be a hardship not to be allowed to take a dressed pig to the factory?—That is what I was taking exception to.

18. *Mr. Buddo.*] Have you any strong objections to the inspection of dairies in your district?—No, not likely. When first the inspection was started there was a lot of exception taken to it, but people are being educated to the fact that it is in their interests.

19. *Mr. Bollard.*] Have the large majority of farmers in your district seen the regulations, and do they understand them?—I have forwarded a number of copies to farmers throughout my electorate, and what I have stated to the Committee is the outcome.

20. Suppose the regulations are modified, do you think it desirable that they be extensively circulated throughout the Dominion before being brought into force?—I am a great believer in getting one's house in order. The more speedily it is done the better. I would be in favour of getting to work as speedily as possible.

21. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] As representing a very large number of dairymen in New Zealand, Mr. Major, do you think this plan which I described to the deputation which waited on me on the 8th February last as the one the Department would follow—I ask you if you think it is not an equitable one: “The regulations when issued would be applied for one season, after which they would be officially reviewed. He promised, before extreme action was taken under the new regulations he would look into the circumstances himself.” Do you not think that with that safeguard the interests of dairymen would be conserved?—That is a wise course to pursue, and it meets the objection raised by Mr. Lang. It would govern “extreme action being taken.”

22. *Mr. Okey.*] Following on Mr. McNab’s statement, would it not be wise to have plans at the different centres showing what would apply under different conditions?—Farmers reading regulations soon know what is required. It would not be a difficult matter putting diagrams on the regulations themselves.

23. Would it not be interesting to the farmer?—Yes.

*Mr. Lang:* The position I take up, if these regulations are adopted, is that every dairyman is liable to carry out regulations to the very letter. I do not mean to cast any doubt on the Minister’s promise. When the regulations are carried it will not always rest with the Minister.

*Hon. Mr. McNab:* There is no other way to give them a trial.

---

MONDAY, 28TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

*Mr. Witty* asked leave, and it was granted, to have the following information included in the evidence. He said: When Mr. J. G. Harkness, secretary of the National Dairy Association, was giving evidence he gave the number of milk-suppliers in the North Island and Otago. Referring to the milk-suppliers of Canterbury, he said they were too small in number to be worth bothering about. I have asked the Department to give me the list of suppliers to Canterbury dairy factories. The reply is as follows: “With reference to your request for the number of suppliers to Canterbury dairy factories, I have to state the number is 1,591.”

ISAAC GRAY, Farmer, Papatoitōi, Auckland, examined. (No. 21.)

*Witness:* I am delegated by the Auckland Wholesale Milk-suppliers’ Association to come as their representative to lodge a few objections to what we consider the more objectionable features of the regulations. I may say the association of which I am a member is composed entirely of men who supply the City of Auckland with milk. I am going to say this at the outset: We are of the opinion that the public who consume the milk require it to be in a sanitary state. Milk is an indispensable article of diet. The first thing we object to is the registration fee. I find, from being 5s. it has been doubled. It is not a very large matter, but I think if you take all those who supply milk to the different cities it would run into a very large item. Then there is nothing particularly striking till we come to regulation 2, paragraph (f), Manure shall be removed to a position 30 ft. from the cowshed within two hours. Under the old regulations it is not quite clear whether the time specified is four hours or immediately after milking. It is a little conflicting. It is a moot point whether four hours is not allowed. Two hours is a little short. The method generally adopted (whether for city-supply or factory) is that the boy who drives the milk-cart to the station or the factory then goes on with the cleaning-up of the shed and putting in the hay. In nineteen times out of twenty it is cleaned within the specified time of two hours, but there may be other times when it would be exceeded. The members of my association think it is not practicable to have it cleaned out within the two hours. Paragraph (g) says that the milk house or stand shall not be within 30 ft. or, on the leeward side, 60 ft. of the cowshed. I think you will admit that 60 ft. is rather far to expect a man to carry his milk. I may say my cooling-house was erected under the old regulations, and it is 30 ft. away. Clause (h) says that the cowshed shall not be within 30 ft. of a stable. This is going to cause a good deal of expense in some parts of the district around Auckland. A good many of the stables are sort of lean-tos, or the cowsheds are lean-tos on the stable. Clause (g) says that a cowshed shall not be within 30 ft. of a dwellinghouse. Only the other day I was spoken to by a tenant who had only three years of his lease to run. He lodged a very strong objection to me in regard to this and other regulations. He said, “The position I am in is that if this regulation in regard to the shed having to be 30 ft. from the dwellinghouse is enforced I will probably have to give up dairying. My landlord will not do anything, and I cannot afford to do it.” Paragraph 1 of (k) says there must be a yard sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at one time, attached but divided by a fence, the floor of which must be concreted or paved. There must be a great diversity of opinion in regard to concrete. Situated as we are around Auckland, the country being of a hilly nature, there is very good drainage, and we have any amount of gravel. We can easily make a macadamised road. All the objections I have lodged with regard to the removal of buildings, the concreting of stock-yards, and other expenses should be passed on at the expiration of the lease of the owner of the property. It is a permanent improvement and adds to the value of the property, and no tenant should be placed in the position of spending a considerable sum of money on what is not his own property. Then comes regulation 31. We are working a good deal under many of these regulations at present, so far as suppliers to the city are concerned. The milk-cart may not be used for carting dead animals or other offensive matter. It seems to me under this regulation that you cannot take a calf to market (even wrapped up in a sack) or a dead pig down to the train without having an extra cart. It seems to me quite unnecessary. Around Auckland all our calves are taken into the market, and, of course, the milk-carts are all used for this purpose. The cans are thoroughly washed and cleansed on their return from market. The calves are not more than a

month and a half old when carted, so the dairyman is not likely to contaminate his cart. He will keep it clean. It is a mode of protection he has in keeping his milk clean and sound. There is another phase of inspection. We have a great difficulty nowadays in getting suitable labour, and if we are to enforce these regulations in their entirety it would certainly add a good deal to the cost of and trouble with labour. Dairymen are in a very different situation from any one else. It is a case of working seven days a week, no half-holiday on Saturdays, and no returning to work till the following Monday; there are no holidays. In connection with this I do not intend to touch on matters in connection with the factory system. I just wish to speak as one who is supplying milk for human consumption. I should like to see the powers of Inspectors a little more defined. There seems to be too much power placed in their hands. They seem to have the making of their own law. So far I have got on very well with any Inspectors we have had in Auckland, but there is a risk to be run at all times when they have so much power in their hands.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Your experience has been with the city-supply. Have you no experience of supplying factories?—Formerly I did.

2. Do you consider the regulations too stringent?—Altogether.

3. For factory-suppliers?—Yes.

4. You are in favour of handing on the cost of improvements to the landlord: how would you manage with a landlord who had no intention at the end of the lease of leasing the farm again for dairy purposes? Do you not think it would be a hardship?—It would be a great hardship on the part of the tenant.

5. In that case do you not think it would be a mistake to enforce the regulations?—Most decidedly.

6. *Mr. Witty.*] Have you seen the old regulations?—Yes.

7. Are they more stringent?—No.

8. They leave more in the hands of the Inspector?—That is so.

9. And he can make them as stringent as he likes?—That is so.

10. With regard to 30 ft. from a dwelling, if that did not apply in the case of existing buildings, only in the case of new premises, would you have any objection to offer?—No, I would have no objection.

11. Or in the case of new ones put 30 ft. away?—No, I would have no objection to that.

12. In regard to the number of cows in a yard, are you under the impression that the yard has to be large enough to hold all the cows in the herd?—We get all our cows in at the one time.

13. The yard under the regulation is only to hold all the cows comfortably; therefore your stockyard need not be a large one?—It is a great inconvenience if you have to bring your cows in twice.

14. *Mr. Lang.*] You mentioned the tax or fee for registration. Is not the object of inspection to insure a pure milk-supply to the consumer?—Yes, I should say so.

15. Would it not be more fair that the consumer should pay the fee, if any fee is charged?—Yes; but it seems a wrong thing that a fee should be charged at all.

16. They might just as well charge you a tax on your horses and other stock?—Yes.

17. In your opinion there should be no tax charged?—No.

18. You spoke about the vehicle. I suppose even in a settled district, if one was not allowed to cart a dressed pig in a sack, or a calf, many would have to invest in a new vehicle for the purpose?—That is so.

19. Even in a settled district, and I suppose it would be much worse in the back country?—Yes.

20. In the question of dispute between the dairyman and the Inspector do you think there should be some form of appeal?—Undoubtedly.

21. Different inspectors have different views, and one may be more drastic in his inspection than others?—That is so.

22. As to the appeal to the Chief Inspector of Stock, do you not think it would be better if there was a proper Appeal Court composed of a representative of the farmer, a representative of the Inspector, and another appointed by the two?—I would prefer to go to a Magistrate direct.

23. You mentioned something about the different hours for doing certain things. You pointed out under different conditions it would be very irksome in some cases. Would it not be better if left more open? For instance, if the dairyman had kept his cart thoroughly clean, without stating the hours in which it should be done?—I pointed out that in nineteen cases out of twenty it is cleaned within the specified two hours. Very often it is cleaned after breakfast—that is, within the hour.

24. *Mr. Hogg.*] Have you much objection to the present registration fee of 5s.?—No, because it has never been in operation except in the case of those supplying milk to the cities.

ALEXANDER MCFARLANE, Chairman of Directors of the Ballance Co-operative Dairy Company, examined. (No. 22.)

*Witness:* While agreeing that inspection is necessary in many cases, I think that the proposed dairy regulations are rather arbitrary and will have a bad effect on the ordinary dairy-farmer. We all recognise that in sending in sound milk it is to our advantage; that we can manufacture a better article, and therefore get a better price. I may say that every dairy-farmer is trying to improve his dairy and his yards as he can afford it, and to try and enforce any arbitrary regulation or anything that is going to be much expense on the farmer who is just starting would practically kill the industry in a new district. Considering first the power of the Inspector: Clause 3 provides that the Inspector may withhold the certificate, &c. I think that would be rather arbitrary that an inspector could withhold this without the farmer having some Court of Appeal. The Inspector may have some objection in the way of cement pavement and refuse a certificate. Then,

again, "on receipt of such application may issue a transfer." A fee of 2s. 6d. is charged for that. It is quite enough to be charged a registration fee without having to pay a transfer fee in the event of any one selling. Then, another clause deals with the fees for registration. It seems harder on the small man with ten cows to pay 5s. than on the man with a hundred cows to pay 10s. I think when this was referred to at Palmerston it was mentioned that 5s. would be all that was necessary. In a factory like ours it would mean £100 a year for registration fees alone, a big handicap on the farmer. Then, in the clause dealing with the floor of the cowshed, the question is, what is a material impervious to moisture? Some farmers who cannot get metal within twenty to twenty-five miles have a good floor laid down with concrete. You could not say that floor was impervious to moisture. It would be left to the Inspector, I suppose. It is laid down that the inside of the cowshed shall be whitewashed twice a year. The times stated are not at all suitable. January especially is a very busy time with the farmer. The regulation might say once a year, and leave the date open. Then there is a regulation which says that the manure shall be removed 30 ft. away within two hours after milking. In some cases the farmer and his wife do the milking. The husband has to take the milk to the factory, and the wife has to get the breakfast. Perhaps the man is not back for over two hours. In the evening milking is not concluded till after dark. If the regulation said cleaning once a day it would be sufficient. A regulation says that the milk house or stand must be 30 ft. away from the shed. If "collected" was struck out it would not have the same effect. "Collected" means having a platform just outside the shed, on which you strain your milk into the cans, and take these away to the milk-stand. In wet or windy weather having to carry the cans 30 ft. away would be a hardship on the man milking; but if "collected" was struck out it would enable him to empty his milk into the cans and then cart it to the milk-stand. A yard must be provided sufficiently large to hold all the cows brought in at the one time, the yard to be concreted or paved. If there is a yard concreted or paved, what is the necessity to have it fenced off between the shed and the yard? Then, there must be a yard of such dimensions as aforesaid situated at least 30 ft. from such cowshed, and connected therewith by a race, the floor of which is properly concreted or paved. I have never seen a race, but it seems to me that if you have a big crowd of cows it would take three times as long driving them through the race as bringing them in from a concrete yard adjacent to the shed. Then, "every dairyman shall notify the Inspector before commencing to make structural alterations." I think most dairymen who have been at the business for the last ten, fifteen, or twenty years will, when they are going to build a shed, do so with the object of trying to better the work they are doing. He should be able to build one quite as well as the Inspector. The clause referring to the method of cleaning the cans and where they shall be cleaned is impracticable. I do not think there are many dairymen who have the steam for scalding the cans. This overlaps somewhat the regulation that says the cans must be cleaned to the satisfaction of the Inspector. As long as your can is clean, what does it matter? At our factory we provide hot water and a steam jet for the suppliers. Then, on being taken home the cans are only cleaned with cold water. Then, in regard to cleaning buckets and cans used in milking within two hours, I do not think this is necessary in any way. A great many clean as soon as possible, but it may happen that they could not do it within the time specified. The "rust" clause is also unnecessary. You may have a can in use for two or three months and it may not show rust. It may get a bit of a scrape and the rust will at once show. This could be altered to "properly soldered and in a fit state of repair." Requiring the name on cans should not, I think, apply to the factory-supply. I do not see where the necessity for it comes in. It should only apply to the town trade. The same thing applies to requiring the name on the cart. The keeping of cows or calves 30 ft. away from the shed would have little effect in improving conditions. Then, the cart must not be used for other purposes specified. In our district the majority of suppliers, especially the smaller ones, have only one cart, and under the regulation, if they wanted to take a calf or dressed pig to the station, a matter of two or three miles, they would have to get another cart. Why should a man be debarred from carting pork as long as he keeps his cans in good order?

1. *Mr. Okey.*] You are a supplier to a factory?—Yes.
2. Do you think a fee of 2s. 6d. for ten cows and less, and 5s. above that number, would be sufficient?—That would be quite sufficient.
3. Do you think the farmer should pay a fee?—No.
4. Where a transfer of a farm takes place, do you think the registration should go with the farm, and that there should be no transfer fee in that case?—Yes.
5. Do you think that timber would be suitable for flooring where gravel or concrete is not to be got in the vicinity?—I think that, where they cannot get metal to make cement, timber would be sufficient, especially where the boards are placed close together.
6. Have you had experience as director of a dairy factory?—Yes.
7. What is your experience of the power given the factory-manager?—I may say their instructions are to refuse any one's milk if it is unsuitable for making good butter. We give the manager a premium for turning out a first-grade butter, which is an incentive to him. It does not matter whether a director or not brings bad milk, it is refused.
8. Have you known a manager lose his position by sending back the chairman's milk?—No, I have never heard of it.
9. You think some of the regulations would be a hardship?—Yes, whitewashing sheds, &c.
10. If these pinpricks were taken out, would the regulations be satisfactory?—Yes. The principal thing is to have a shed either concreted or boarded. If you had 12 ft. from the shed concreted you would allow the cows to come to the shed in fairly good order.
11. Do you think it would be an assistance to the farmer if the Government had plans of the different sheds required to comply with the regulations attached to a copy of the regulations?—Yes, if they just pointed out improved methods. Farmers are generally on the lookout to improve.



If a man puts in half his time in a cowshed he naturally wishes to improve its condition. They do not desire drastic regulations, especially as they are not in a position to carry them out.

12. If there was no regulation in regard to present sheds when these were erected there should be no interference with these buildings?—I do not think so.

13. *Mr. Lang.*] In regard to section 8, subclause (c), would you understand in reading that that the Inspector would have power to allow a man to put down a wooden floor?—Well, it is very hard to say what floor is impervious to water. I have heard of one man with totara floor being compelled to take it up.

14. *Mr. Hogg.*] Taking your last reply, did you think that matters which can be insisted on should be properly defined?—Yes.

15. Consequently the present regulations in that respect are an improvement on anything we have had?—Yes.

16. Everything should be specified?—Yes, and we want a Court of Appeal.

17. In regard to regulation 9, you object to the delay that must occur if fourteen days' notice has to be given?—Yes.

JOHN WHITE FOREMAN, Chairman of the Tikorangi Co-operative Dairy Company, President of the National Dairy Association (Limited), examined. (No. 23.)

*Witness:* In reference to the regulations, I should like to make the attitude I adopt towards them clear to the Committee. I am not in any way hostile to inspection by the Department of dairy sheds and yards, as proposed here. I have, when the matter has been discussed at meetings of our association in years gone by, opposed it, not because I thought it was undesirable, but because I feared the Department's officers would be rather too insistent on improvements which the majority of our settlers would be unable to comply with, and that it would create a lot of trouble. At present the position of our industry, and I may say a great many people engaged in it, is somewhat different to what it was a few years ago, and I believe the time has arrived when inspection, provided it is not made coercive and unreasonable, would be an assistance to the industry. That is the position that I hold. While doing so I gave some time to the consideration of these regulations, and I also attended a very representative meeting of delegates last Wednesday held at Stratford. The meeting went into the regulations pretty exhaustively, and I generally approve of the suggestions made at that meeting. Where they are different to the views I hold myself I shall tell you. We approved of Nos. 1 and 2, also 3 except the latter clause, which provides that an inspector may withhold a license. I should like to say in connection with that that there is no definite style of cowshed set out. It simply says "shed suitable for milking," and it is left entirely to the Inspector to say what that shed shall be. I think that should be deleted: it is giving far too much arbitrary power to the Inspector. It is provided later on that if a dairyman offends against the regulations he is liable to a fine before a Magistrate, and that gives ample power to enforce conditions of cleanliness. Then we get to the transfer. I agree with the last speaker, and so did the meeting at Stratford. The license should be given the farm. In regard to the registration fee, the meeting at Stratford thought this should be deleted. They regarded the inspection very much in the same light as inoculation of calves for black-leg. In the early stages of the grading of our butter it was also free. This has established a principle. At Palmerston the Chief Inspector of Stock outlined the scheme, stating the fee would be a nominal one and would not exceed 5s. A man with ten cows would have to pay a tax of 1s. a cow, but the man having a hundred would pay 1½d. Paragraph (a) of clause 8: This declares that every dairy shall be provided with a cowshed suitable for milking purposes. An officer of the Department explained to the Stratford meeting that, although it was going to be insisted on that a cowshed should be provided, it need not be an elaborate one. I dare say that is so. The regulations may not be enforced in their entirety, and may not be read literally by the Inspector. But I am going to say, and I speak from personal knowledge of this, that there are a few milk-suppliers, though there are not a great many about, who, if they were compelled to put up a shed, would be placed in a very difficult position. We have two or three in our district. They manage to get a living milking two or three cows off a small holding, but it would be a very difficult matter for them to put up a shed and yards. As a matter of fact, and I may as well be candid with you, these people (one has six and the other eight cows) have to come to our company—and do it as regularly as the spring comes—to borrow money to buy a couple of cows. How these people would put up a shed I do not know. My own opinion is that it is entirely desirable, especially where families are engaged in milking; but there are these isolated cases. I do not know whether you can provide for them. I will pass on to paragraph (e), which refers to the whitewashing of the cowshed. At Stratford it was held that if it was done once a year in the winter-time probably that would suffice. They struck out January, but left in "or oftener if directed by the Inspector." That is, if the shed got into a bad state in the summer—in fact, most men would willingly whitewash it. January is one of our busiest months, and to have to do it at that time would cause inconvenience. Coming to the yard, concreted or paved, this is a very burning question with dairymen in some districts. As many of you are aware, if you get inland in Taranaki you get out of stone country. We thought wood should be accepted in those districts where gravel for concrete is not available. I have no doubt it will be. I believe the Department will be reasonable. It would, however, be better to have the regulations as definite as possible. Section 2 of the same paragraph refers to the race, which has been so much discussed. I have had no experience, nor has there been any experience in my district, of driving cows through a race, but what is universally used in my neighbourhood is the race-shed. My experience is that the cows do not go into this so willingly and freely as where they are bailed. The sheds are made somewhat narrow, and a big cow has to squeeze through. It is my only objection to the race-shed, and I have used one for a long time. It was held that the boss cow would do a lot of worrying, and that this would lead to a diminution in



the milk-yield; but the principle that where there is not a paved yard there should be a space between the shed and the yard that was paved and concreted was proved to be sound. But what a "race" signifies was condemned. Some of those present at Stratford said they had a V-shaped entrance to the shed paved with wood, and thus found they could have the desired cleanliness. Probably the Department would hold that this V-shaped entrance would be a race and would meet the requirements. We still hold that this approach from the yard to the shed should be allowed to be formed of wood where gravel for concrete is not available. Of course, in the coastal districts, where there is no difficulty in getting gravel, no one would put down wood. The concrete is cheaper and more durable. In regard to the regulation requiring a cowshed to be supplied with water for washing hands, &c., I should like to see inserted after hands "and if obtainable." My reason is that, while in nearly all districts over New Zealand a plentiful supply of water can be got, there are some districts where it cannot be obtained, and, unfortunately, Taranaki, where I live, is one of them. On account of the formation of the country—a submerged swamp underneath—it is almost impossible to get good water. Some seventeen or eighteen years ago, when I purchased the farm I have been living on since, I dug a well to get a water-supply, but at the time I wanted it, in the summer, the water became rotten, and I could not use it. Under this regulation it would be in the power of the Inspector to compel water to be carried to the shed. The requisite cleanliness in cases like that could be obtained without the water. Regarding the regulation that notice must be given the Inspector when alterations are contemplated, at Stratford we deleted that provision, and I agree with that view. There is no provision in the regulations as to the kind of shed as long as it is suitable for milking, unless people are going to stall-feed their cows overnight, when a certain air-space is required. It is left to the sweet will of the Inspector to say what suits him. And it was mentioned this morning that what would suit one inspector would not suit another. A question has been asked by Mr. Okey that plans of sheds and yards should be provided by the Department. They have done that for dairy factories, and I may say that our dairy factory last winter was rebuilt on plans supplied by the Department. Clause 17, in regard to time and method of cleansing cans: we ask that that should not apply to dairy factories. Paragraph (a) (Milking-cans must be cleansed within two hours of milking) we thought should be excised, as it is covered by other regulations. In regard to the rust clause, we ask that the latter part of the regulation, which specially refers to the rust, should be deleted and these words substituted: "Which is not in a good state of repair." No. 19 gives the Inspector power to prevent the use of cans not considered fit for use, and to impress a broad arrow on them. We think the supplier should have fourteen days' clear notice to enable him to get new ones. No. 20 provides that no dairyman shall use or suffer to be used a can that does not bear a label with his name thereon. We ask that dairy factories should be exempted from that. It was stated at Stratford that it was a very desirable regulation for those vending milk in the towns, but I fail to see where it is going to serve any good service if applied to the country milk-supplier. With regard to 21, it was held at Stratford that the milking-machine should be allowed to be stored in the shed. I confess I am not competent to give an opinion on that. I am simply stating the opinion of the Stratford meeting. As to the name on the milk-cart, we also ask that the country supplier should be exempted from this regulation. In regard to milk from newly calved cows not being sold until four days after calving, we ask that this should be increased to six days. I am quite sure it is in the best interests of the industry that this should be so, or longer if necessary. It has been a rule in some factories that it should be seven days. Experience has taught us that butter made in the spring when the cows have just calved is the worst-keeping butter we manufacture. If we could get all suppliers to keep away from the factory for one week a decided improvement would be effected in the keeping-quality of our butter made at that time. We ask that clause 30 should be deleted. It is covered practically by another clause which says that a piggery shall not be within 50 yards. The regulation means that cattle shall not be allowed to stray near the cowshed. We ask that the regulation providing against the carriage of dead animals in the milk-cart shall be deleted. This is going to cause immense irritation if it remains, especially amongst small people, who cannot well afford two carts. And they do not need two carts as long as the carts are well washed afterwards, which would meet any sanitary requirement. In regard to the appeal, we ask that that should be deleted, and that a clause such as this, or something similar, should be substituted: "In the event of any dispute arising out of any of the matters referred to in these regulations, the dairyman may appeal to a Board to be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture, such Board to consist of the Stock Inspector of the district and a dairy-factory director, who may appoint an umpire, whose decision shall be final." It is felt that in these regulations there is much discretionary power vested in the Inspector, and it is not right there should be no appeal except on one or two specified heads. I think if something like these suggestions were adopted it would take away the causes of irritation which are being voiced very loudly throughout the Dominion at present, and would still leave the regulations effective for the purpose for which they were designed.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] In regard to the fee, you think it should not be above 5s. for any number of cows?—Yes, that is my feeling. This feeling is due largely to what was said at Palmerston, and it was probably one of the reasons for inducing a resolution in favour of inspection being carried there.

2. The farmer has an objection to anything like a cow-tax?—Yes, they generally object to taxes if they can get out of them.

3. Would you allow the farmer to milk on the grass?—I was pretty clear that the shed was desirable. What are we to do with the exceptional cases I have mentioned? These are matters which should be dealt with in your discretion. I realise the difficulty.

4. What is your experience of the factory-manager and the power given to him in regard to rejecting milk?—The manager has absolute power to reject any milk he thinks unsuitable. In our factory they have that power. I have not heard of a factory where they have been interfered with yet.

5. We have had evidence that factory-managers have been discharged for sending back the chairman's milk?—I have never heard of it.

6. In regard to the Appeal Board, who should pay the expenses?—I should think the Department.

7. The same as the Arbitration Court, out of the fees they get?—Yes.

8. *Mr. Rhodes.*] You think the regulations should be as definite as possible. Do you think they should be defined and enforced as printed, or the Inspector given discretionary power?—I spoke of the wood paving. From that point of view you must give discretionary power to the Inspector; it would be very difficult to define in every case.

9. You must give discretionary power?—Yes; you must in some cases. Not in reference to wood; they must use wood in some parts. There should be no misunderstanding on the matter.

10. Where there is no gravel would you allow anything else to be used?—Yes, wood should be accepted then.

11. *Mr. Bollard.*] Do you believe in giving the inspectors discretionary power? In reference to the difficulty of getting material for concrete, would you give them discretionary power to authorise the use of wood or other material?—Yes.

12. And in the case of dispute as to whether it was reasonable to use concrete or not would you refer it to an Appeal Board?—Yes. I was asked a few years ago by the Taranaki Agricultural Association to act as judge in a dairy-farm competition. I visited a number of farms which had entered. The prize was won by a farm the shed of which had a wooden floor. And I am quite certain that if properly put down it can be maintained in a perfectly clean condition. Mind you, I do not defend them. I think the concrete is preferable.

13. Supposing a case is taken to a Court of Appeal, and it is decided that the farmer is greatly to blame, do you think the Government should bear the expense in that case?—That is a matter for you to consider.

14. *Mr. Lang.*] What is your opinion of the result of the regulations if they were enforced as printed?—It would spell disaster right away.

15. With regard to the regulation that the floor shall be of concrete or other material, would you understand by this that the dairyman should put down a concrete floor?—Distinctly not.

#### Statement by the Hon. Mr. McNAB: Proposed Amendment of Regulations.

I may assist the examination if I inform the Committee what clauses I intend to strike out. I am only dealing with the larger ones. The first big amendment will be that the conditions of section 8, regarding the requirements of structural conditions of cowsheds, will only apply to new cowsheds after the regulations come into operation.

Then I propose to ask the Committee to strike out the whole of the following sections: 11, 18, 20, 24, 30, and 31; also all references in the clauses to the "satisfaction of the Inspector," wherever they occur, or "approval of the Inspector," and strike out clause 33, as the references which are grounds for dispute have been withdrawn. These are the larger questions.

TUESDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

JAMES GEORGE BRECHIN, Dairy-farmer, Scarborough, examined. (No. 24.)

*Witness:* With Mr. McFarlane, I represent a very large dairying district, and one which will appeal to you particularly, as a number of the farmers within the district are on leasehold lands held by the Government Crown tenants. These men feel quite alarmed at the turn of things in the industry. Some of them have such small places that they are unable to buy a vehicle for the conveyance of their milk to the factory, and have to pay their neighbours to take it for them. When the regulations were distributed in our district, meetings of indignation were held, but I venture to say that had we known that a Committee such as this was meeting and discussing the whole matter we should not have held the meetings. We should have recognised that the Government was doing its very best to put the industry on a better basis than it at present is. We did not know so much interest was being taken by the Government in what the Stock Department was doing, and so we were alarmed. You will have noticed that it was stated a very indignant meeting was held in my district, and we were indignant. I wish to remove any impression that we were indignant at all with the Stock Department and the Dairy Industry Act which is at present on the statute-book. What the Minister has said simply cuts from under our feet our grounds of protest. We are quite prepared to have the Stock Department make a thorough inspection; we believe in that. We believe in the moderation of the Inspector in our district. He has been a real educator. He has come round like a man who understands his business, an educator of the dairy-farmer. My manager says his visits have been quite beneficial. My farm is a milking-machine farm, and I am not speaking with any degree of authority. At the same time I trust you will in your considerations remember that our district, as well as many others, will have to be leniently dealt with in order to prevent people leaving the industry. There are many in a small way that if the regulations were drastic would have to give up dairying. One regulation I would like to draw your attention to is that dealing with milking-machines and the washing of the rubber parts. It is quite impossible to scald rubber as the Department desires, as if so it would be completely ruined. The Dunlop people say the best way to deal with rubber is to allow it to soak in lime-water. In regard to milk from newly calved cows, it should be delivered at the factory in less than a week after the cow is in. I am quite sure, after what Mr. McNab has said, that my people will be satisfied.

1. What is your opinion about the fee?—I do not think a fee should be charged for those milking five cows. A nominal fee of 2s. 6d. might be charged for over five cows.
2. What do you think in regard to floors of sheds in bush districts?—Any one who has had any practical experience of sheds knows that concrete cannot be surpassed. In some cases, however, it is impossible, unless concrete flagstones were used. I should say this plan would be far better than boarding with tongued and grooved.
3. Have you any objection to milking outside?—Not the slightest.
4. There should be allowance made for this in the regulations?—Yes, I certainly think so.
5. What do you think of giving notice to the Inspector before making any structural alterations?—I think it is right. It should be of benefit to the farmer.
6. In regard to condemning of cans, do you not think you should be allowed to use them for seven to fourteen days afterwards?—Yes, I think some time should elapse—probably a month. It is quite impossible to get a can without rust. A can put away for the off season will come into use with rust on, but the rust will wear off in the course of a day or two.
7. *Mr. Bollard.*] You see no harm in milking outside on the grass—milking a cow in the open when it is raining heavily and the rain washing the stuff off the cow's body—is that no harm?—They would wait till the rain ceased when possible. It would mean, if the proposed regulations were passed, that a man milking one cow would have to have a shed with a concrete floor.
8. It would be better to have a shed of some sort. In regard to fees, do you think a man with less than five cows should not pay a fee? Do you think, in the case of a man having four or five cows and selling the milk to his neighbours—do you think a fee would press too heavily on him?—It is just a question of getting a fair proportion.
9. You think a man with a hundred cows should not pay more than the man with ten?—His liabilities are greater.
10. Are not his profits greater?—Yes, probably.
11. Would 10s. press heavily?—I would gladly pay it myself. I have 120 cows.
12. Why do you think a small fee?—Unless you pay a *pro rata* fee, and that would be a tax.
13. *Mr. Lang.*] You think no milk should be sent from a cow till seven days after calving. Is there not a great difference in cows: milk may be right in four days in some cases and not till seven days in other cases?—It would be safer for the sake of the industry to make a specified time.
14. Why should the dairyman be taxed more for his cows than for his horses?—I understand, to enforce these regulations it requires an expensive Department, and the dairyman is getting a benefit, or expected benefit: he should at least subscribe something towards the cost of it.
15. In regard to the supply to the city, is not the benefit almost entirely the consumer's?—I should say so.
16. Then, they should be the people to pay the fees?—Yes.
17. *Mr. Hogg.*] Do you not think the consumer pays quite a sufficient fee when he pays 1s. 6d. a pound for butter?—Yes.
18. That should include all expenses?—We only get 11d. a pound for our butter-fat.

ALEXANDER REDPATH, Dairy-farmer, Nireaha, examined. (No. 25.)

*Witness:* I represent the Nireaha Co-operative Dairy Company. We had a meeting about the proposed regulations. We are in the backblocks, and we approve of the Inspector all through. Of course, there are some clauses which I had to object to, but the Hon. the Minister has taken my leading points of objection away. We realise it is a very hard thing to make regulations to suit everybody. Some of our men have land at 9s. rent for about 40 acres. It takes them all their time to clear their way, let alone erect a good shed. An immense amount of good has been done by the free and easy way the present Inspector has come about. He seems always to have taken into account the conditions, the state of the particular man is in, and has only expected him to do the best he can under the circumstances. We let our cheesemaking by contract, and we do not sack our manager when he refuses a director's milk. That has always been the way, even with a salaried manager; he has a free hand. If a man gets a can or two of milk refused, besides the disgrace, it hits him financially, and he goes to the Inspector and tries to find out the cause. Things are working very well with the inspection in our district. I have a list of objections here, but they are pretty well all concerned with the clauses the Hon. the Minister said he intended to strike out. In regard to a calf coming into the shed, we sometimes get a calf into the shed and leave it there a little while in order to quieten the cow. If an Inspector came along when this was going on we should be transgressing. A certain amount of discretion must be allowed, or the regulations would press very harshly. As far as the race is concerned, I personally approve of the race as proposed in the regulation. I think it is the only way in a wet district to keep the mud away from the shed. I like the race 30 ft. by 6 ft., and then as big a yard as possible. A large yard is a saving in expense, because if it is large enough it need not be metalled. As far as the wooden floor goes, we have dairymen in our district who have just put down splendid wooden floors. In one case a farmer has built a cowshed with a wooden yard. It is by a creek, and the yard is 2 ft. above the water, which flows under it. There are these exceptional cases cropping up, where if the regulations pressed too hard they would cause suffering.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Those starting in the backblocks have to get assistance from the auctioneers to buy their cows?—Yes, most of them.
2. Any stringent regulations would be a hardship?—Yes.
3. If the suggested clauses are deleted and several of the clauses modified you think there would be no objection to the regulations?—Yes, if the inspectors were instructed to use their discretion.
4. The regulations should be more of an educational character for some years?—Yes, it has been that without the regulations. It has been very successful.

5. *Mr. Hogg.*] What is your opinion in regard to the fee? Is it too heavy?—No. Some do not like it, but a great number are prepared to pay it, and recognise that they are getting some return for it. I suppose the country gets the benefit of the inspection.

6. You think yourself it is quite reasonable?—Yes.

JOSEPH BROWN, Chairman of the Maketawa Dairy Company, and a Dairy-farmer of Inglewood, examined. (No. 26.)

*Witness:* I am representing the suppliers to my factory, as well as being a delegate from the Dairy Employers' Union meeting at Stratford. I have been engaged in dairying for twenty-six years, and my farm was a bush one when I took it up, only 4 acres cleared. I am not altogether in agreement with the statement that any inspection is wanted. Any one who has been at the game as long as I have been, twenty-six years, knows the improvements the farmer has made for himself without any compulsion by the Government or any one else. He simply does it for his own benefit and comfort. I do not know one farmer who has put money in the bank. If he is making a few pounds he is spending it on his farm. I myself am not making any money, only in the increased value of the land, which if I wanted to sell would return me something for the time and money I have spent on it. The dairy-farmer, with the aid of the freezing-machine, has worked out his own salvation. I remember when I made butter and sold it for 3d., and then had to take it out. This season the butter of our factory sold at 156s. a hundredweight. Our butter has graded, week in and week out, 96 and as high as 97. We have been at the top of the grading for New Zealand with 93 and 94. The winter butter will not, of course, grade as high as the summer, and this brings down the average. It is impossible for any dairy-factory manager to make stale milk fresh. If the Inspector could give us that extra three points it would be a good thing, but I do not believe all the inspection in the world will give us the extra three points. I recognise from what I have heard this morning that a great many are in favour of inspection, and I am willing to abide by that feeling. In regard to the Stratford meeting, clause 3 provides that an inspector may withhold a license. I do not think that is right, for if an inspector withholds the right what is a supplier to do with his milk? He could not sell it. Then, the transfer fee. This is adding insult to injury. You charge us 10s. for registration, and then charge us 2s. 6d. for a transfer. The license should go along with the farm. Then we come to clause 8, paragraph (e): Lime-washing once a year should be sufficient. In regard to removing the manure, I should like it to read "once a day, and the floor of the shed thoroughly cleansed." Then, in the provision that the yards shall be sufficiently large, &c., I should like the words "divided therefrom by a partition or fence" struck out. Then I object to the dairyman being required to give notice to the Inspector of his intention to make structural alterations. Mr. McNab thinks clause 11 (washing hands after each milking) should be struck out: many in my district think it should be retained. Clause 10 (every person shall keep his person clean) should, however, cover it. Then, as to clause 17, the opinion of the Stratford meeting was that the clause should read something like this: "Every bucket, can, or other utensil used in the handling of milk or cream shall be thoroughly cleansed," and all other words cut out. Clause 19 says that when the Inspector forbids the use of a can he can brand it. If that clause was kept in it would be a great hardship, because if you could brand them and forbid their use there would be a great difficulty in our factory, because if we have a bad can we have to give a fortnight's notice before we can get a new one. A man should be allowed to use a can for fourteen days after notice has been given that it is unfit for use. As to not sending milk from a newly calved cow for four days, as Mr. Foreman pointed out, we agreed this should be six days; but it does not matter what number of days you put in, it would be a difficult matter to detect it. Our own manager has tried time after time to detect it, and the only way to discover it is when cleaning the separator. In regard to the appeal, I certainly think in the case of a dispute that power should be given to apply to the Minister to appoint an Appeal Board, to consist of the Inspector for the district and the director of a factory.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] What is your opinion of the charges for registration?—I think they are too much. I think it should be 2s. 6d., to cover the clerical expenses and pay for the cost of keeping the register.

2. Not above 5s.?—No.

3. You do not think it should be in the nature of a cow-tax?—No.

4. In regard to transfers: You have had considerable experience in the transferring of properties in connection with rates. Do you not find a difficulty in getting notice of transfers?—Yes.

5. There would be the same difficulty in these transfers?—Yes.

JAMES SOUTHEY FOWLER, Dairy-farmer, Manakau, examined. (No. 27.)

*Witness:* I am one of a party which has come down from Otaki and Manakau. I admit we came down full of indignation. We intended to lay before you the feeling of the meetings which have been held. But the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture has deleted so many of the clauses we objected to that there is not a great deal to say. We considered that the whole thing was too drastic, and farcical in the extreme, and that if carried out in its entirety it would no doubt kill the industry, together with the prosperity of the country. I should like to object, on behalf of our meetings, to the registration fee. We think this is altogether out of proportion. A man with 150 cows pays the same as the man with ten. A poor man milking ten or twelve cows has to pay 10s. It is not fair. As to the clause providing the milk-stand, if on the leeward side, to be 60 ft. away: According to this there are many small holdings where it would take nearly 2 acres for the necessary buildings. You require to have a fence right around your buildings, and no man can be expected to make a garden of all that. In regard to the cleansing of utensils, it is impossible for many dairy-farmers to obtain all that is required. In regard to the concrete, there are many places where it would cost £1 2s. for a yard of metal. If other floors are available they

should be allowed, not at the discretion of the Inspector altogether, but if put down in a proper workmanlike manner they should meet every requirement. Concrete would be too expensive altogether for a poor struggling farmer. I quite agree with the last speaker in regard to the cans. It would take quite fourteen days to get a new can in place of one condemned. There is one thing I have been asked to object to. This is that no person can give away or sell milk unless he has a registered dairy. There are some places where there are one or two cows milked and where it has been the habit of employers to give married couples working for them some milk. They could not do so under this regulation. It is extremely drastic. A man milking only one or two cows and not able to give some milk to his employees to take home is not what it should be. Or if a man comes to your house and you give him a small bottle of cream you are liable to a fine of £5. Then, the regulation in regard to preventing the use of a cowshed, &c., for other purposes should be amended. In the case of a small farmer, who can without much extra expense put up a small lean-to for his cart, he would have to put up a separate building. This would be very hard on him.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] You favour a cow-tax?—No, I do not. It should be taken off altogether. It was taken off the sheep-farmer and now it is put on the dairy-farmer.

2. You said a man should be registered?—I say a man milking 150 cows does not pay in proportion to the poor man

3. You are not, then, in favour of a cow-tax?—No.

4. With the clauses suggested to be abolished you do not think there will be much objection to the regulations?—Not altogether, though I agree that inspection is quite necessary, but there are inspectors and inspectors.

5. Provided it is carried out with tact?—They are not uniform.

6. If the inspectors have not the power to cause trouble to the farmer?—It is to be hoped not.

7. What do you think of the Department issuing plans?—It is an excellent idea. It would educate the farmers and save them a certain amount of expense.

8. *Mr. Lang.*] Notwithstanding the Minister's suggestions you still think several of the clauses are too drastic?—They could be improved on.

9. Do you think in the case of a dispute there should be an appeal?—Certainly, as it is intended no farmer could call evidence on his behalf.

10. Do you think the dairyman should be called on to pay a tax on his cows any more than on other classes of stock?—Certainly not.

11. *Mr. Hogg.*] Would you strongly object to defining how cans and utensils may be cleaned?—I object, because some of the small farmers could not do it.

12. Would you leave it to the dairy-farmer?—It is to the interest of the dairy-farmer to keep his cans sweet and clean.

13. Whether he uses a brush or cloth or what not?—His own judgment would tell him that.

JOSES GRIFFITH, Dairy-farmer, Otaki, examined. (No. 28.)

*Witness:* I am a representative from a meeting at Otaki. I may say that I am not opposed to a system of inspection, but I cannot approve of a system of inspection carried out by the State, for this reason, that I believe there should be a system of inspection carried out by the dairy-farmers' associations themselves. But, as they have not undertaken to do this, I recognise that a system of inspection by the State is necessary. But there are a great many difficulties. Being a director of a factory, I have been made acquainted with the difficulties which have arisen. We have had difficulties in dealing with bad milk, and there is always trouble in getting over that difficulty. If the manager has instructions to refuse bad milk they simply take it over to the other factory, and the evil is still going on. As chairman of directors of the Otaki Dairy Factory it came to this in some cases: Where a man brought bad milk, and, on it being refused, he went over to the other factory, I had to give the manager instructions to be very careful in refusing a man's milk for the future. I said, "If it is not fit to make good butter from, send it down the drain."

1. *Mr. Okey.*] And you paid him for it?—Yes. It was not only losing that particular supplier's milk, but the effect the loss of a supplier would have on other suppliers, causing them to leave without any cause whatever. It was necessary to do it. While I agree it is needful under a system of inspection to have regulations to guide the Inspector, it seems to me it is hedged round with many difficulties. It is difficult to make hard and fast rules that are going to apply equally in many different circumstances and many different conditions in regard to yards and so forth. It may be necessary in some cases to have certain conditions to apply to make a yard in a state so that good clean milk can be taken from it. In other cases it may not be necessary to apply those rules to get the same results. It is all summed up in the word "cleanliness." That is a thing you cannot provide for by regulation. How are you going to regulate and make people cleanly in their habits. I have noticed in my experience of dairying that people that are cleanly in other respects fall into a habit of dirtiness in milking. You can have a yard-bail according to the best regulations you can make, you can take the shed on the Weraroa Experimental Farm, but the dirty milker would get dirty milk. This is a subject bristling with difficulties, and the only thing better than the State taking it up is for the dairy-farmers themselves to tackle it. Being better acquainted with the many difficulties that are in existence, they would be able to meet them without injuring the industry or the individual dairy-farmer. The trouble with hard and fast rules is that different men have different opinions as to efficiency, and while you have these men scattered over the whole of New Zealand it is impossible that they are all going to carry out just the same style of inspection. What may satisfy one may not satisfy another who would succeed him. There are certain sections in the regulations that I am not in favour of. I propose not to go into them. They have been referred to by other speakers, and I am in favour of the objections raised.

2. Have you had any experience of a manager being discharged for sending back the chairman's milk?—No.

3. Is the manager generally backed up by the directors?—As far as my knowledge goes, yes, and very much so.

4. You think the inspection should be in the direction of educating the farmer up to certain requirements?—Yes.

5. We have had evidence here of persons being filthy in milking cows for the factory supply, but who have cleaned their hands when milking a cow for their own use?—I have never had such a case come under my notice.

6. *Mr. Witty.*] You sometimes paid for milk going down the drain? Did the person who owned the milk see it done?—I cannot say it was done. We lost several suppliers at the time. Whether the manager used proper tact in handling the suppliers I could not say. A man brought bad milk to the factory and the manager sent him a sample of it. The man never brought any more milk to the factory. In a case like that we would rather put the milk down the drain than send the supplier away to another factory.

7. *Mr. Lang.*] Are you in favour of a tax on dairy cows?—No. I would have no tax at all.

8. Should the dairyman have the right of appeal?—Most decidedly.

9. What kind of a board?—Each party should be represented.

10. *Mr. Hogg.*] You do not think inspection by the Department is necessary?—Yes, I do. Except that inspection by the Department may not be as good as inspection by the dairymen themselves.

11. Do you not think State inspectors would be more independent and would be more likely to carry out their duty?—That is just where it comes in. If the dairy associations took up the matter there would be more give-and-take. I prefer the system they have in Denmark. The dairy associations there take up the matter themselves.

12. *Mr. Lang.* Inspection in Denmark is by the farmers and not by the Government?—Yes.

#### A. WING, Dairy-farmer, Manakau, examined. (No. 29.)

*Witness:* We hold that for the town-supply there should be inspection, but the dairy industry has proved a success in recent years without inspection, and we fail to see why, sooner or later, every man who milks cows should have an inspector visit him. The inspection in Denmark is not by the Government. There are various institutions, and if the farmer wants information he has only to apply to them. Otherwise inspection is done through the factories. Officials are appointed who pay surprise visits to the skimming-stations and factories. They judge each man's milk, together with the man in charge. They sample and test it and give points, just as would be done in a show. At the end of each month each man is credited with a certain number of points. That inspection, if you may so call it, goes far enough. It prevents a man being too dirty. As far as the city-supply is concerned we quite agree that there should be inspection in connection with it. But there are several of these rules from which we differ. Altogether I quite join in with those who have spoken. It says manure should be removed within two hours. This is impossible. A man does not finish milking till about 7.30 a.m. Then he has to take his milk to the station, and he cannot get home till 8.30. Then he cleans his shed. It would be a very hard matter to control it. Then, every dairy must be provided with a sufficient supply of pure water for watering stock, &c. Several farmers in the Manakau district have great difficulty in the summer to get running water for stock. It leaves rather much power in the Inspector's hands if a farmer has a number of cows to water or bring water to them. Cans used in milking must be washed within two hours of milking. This is practically impossible. We do not get our cans till the 9 o'clock train. Sometimes the cans are left about the stations for three days.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] You supply a factory. Have you had any experience of factory-work?—I have been eleven years in a factory in the colony.

2. What is the average grade of the factory you supply?—97 to 98.

3. Would you lose points by feed-flavours in the spring-time?—There would be loss of milk brought in too soon from newly calved cows.

4. Do you think you could get the 100 points if the regulations were carried out?—No.

5. If the Government wanted to increase the value of the exports do you not think it could better be done by testing cows for farmers?—I think that is where the trouble lies. The cows at the present time are below the average.

6. And education in that direction would be beneficial to the farmer?—Very much so.

7. *Mr. Rhodes.*] Danish butter always brings more money than New Zealand in British markets?—New Zealand butter would realise better value if there were refrigerator-cars on the trains. The railway accommodation here is a scandal for any dairy-produce carried.

8. As the closeness to the market and the better carriage on the railways the only advantages the Danes have?—They have better accommodation on the railways certainly. New Zealand has topped the highest price for Danish on the London market.

9. Do you attribute anything of the Danish quality to the method of inspection?—I cannot say.

10. You think we are equally clean in this country?—I am sure.

11. You favour the regulation in regard to the proximity of other buildings to the dairy?—No, not at all.

12. This statement that the byre is at the back of the dwellinghouse in Denmark?—I have never seen it.

13. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] What was the name of the factory you said you supplied and which graded the points you named?—Glen Oroua.

14. What were the points, the average points?—97.

15. Then if Mr. Cuddie says there is no factory grading on an average within three points of 97 he is wrong?—I do not know so much about it.

16. *Mr. Hogg.*] Have you any reason for preferring the inspector appointed by a factory to the Government Inspector?—My reason is this: that you would be able to get inspectors who would be able to judge as to local conditions. If you send a man from Wellington to Taranaki he does not know the conditions as well as the local man.

17. Do you not think men travelling from one district to another would be more conversant with the regulations in every part?—That may be so.

WILLIAM GEORGE YARDLEY, Dairy-farmer, Te Horo, examined. (No. 30.)

*Witness:* Paragraph (a) does not include milk shipped from a factory or skimming-station, and I maintain that no skimming-station, factory, or any other premises engaged in that business can come under these regulations. There is a creamery in my district—it may be all right or it may be all wrong—which receives milk for the city-supply. Milk is taken to that creamery, placed in the creamery-cans, and is sent to the city. Samples are taken, and it may be condemned by the Inspector or the Health Department. But if these places receiving milk for distribution were placed under inspection inspectors would be able to go and inspect the milk in the cans as they receive it. One day the milk is separated, and the next day it is sent to the city. The cans are rinsed with cold water, and the next day our milk is placed in them. The creamery receiving milk for town distribution should be placed under the same inspection as ours. The clause regarding the withholding of a certificate should be deleted. That is giving the Inspector very great power. The license should be granted for one year to the dairy itself. If I sell out, my license should go with the property, the license to be renewed at the beginning of the next season. I think a fee of 5s. is ample. It is not a cow-tax, therefore the smaller fee should be sufficient. As to whitewashing, it need not be done more than once a year. In regard to the 60 ft. distance, this is going to be very hard on the small dairy-farmer. Then we have to notify the Health Officer of the existence of a contagious disease. We have to do this at present. As to washing buckets, it is impossible for me to get at my buckets an hour after milking. I have to do the bulk of my work myself. You have to catch your horse and then drive off to the factory. The rule should be, within one hour of returning from the factory.

DAVID JUDD, Dairy-farmer, Otaki, examined. (No. 31.)

*Witness:* For twenty years I was engaged in producing milk, for retail in Wellington, in the Hutt district, and I have been for five years producing milk in the Otaki district, for supply to the factory in the summer and the city in winter. One point I wish to make clear is that the cans are often overcarried, and are consequently out for days and weeks. When they return they are very rusty. According to this clause the Inspector could then condemn them, and this where it is not our fault at all. As to cleaning the shed twice a day, I myself have not a very big herd, and I have to feed them in two relays. This is the only thing possible unless I had a stall for every cow. It does not pay to feed dry cows, and some are not much better than stores. You must feed in the stalls. I bring the first lot of cows in at 3.30, and it is 6.30 when the last lot have finished feeding. If I asked my man to clean out after that he would not do it seven days in the week. We could clean it thoroughly once a day, which should be quite sufficient. In Southland they could not do it, as the cows in winter are brought in in the afternoon and are kept in till the following morning. Then, regarding the supply of water: If this regulation were enforced I have not a running stream and therefore would have to provide artificial reservoirs to hold water. The Government should supply plans of sheds. If I am willing to comply with the regulations the Government should supply the money at a nominal rate of interest.

*Mr. Hogg.*] You could get that from the Advances to Settlers Department?—But a great many of us have been struggling for years.

WEDNESDAY, 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1908.

WILLIAM LOUTTIT FALCONER, Farmer, Masterton, examined. (No. 32.)

*Witness:* At the present time most of the factories in the North Island have by-laws empowering their managers to inspect the places from which their milk comes, sheds, yards, and also the dairy utensils. They have also given them power to reject any milk which would be likely to make second-grade butter and cheese. There is no doubt that milk which is drawn in an unclean state is a very bad thing for the health of the public. I may say I am chairman of the Kaituna Dairy Company, and our manager, Mr. Saxelby, is a man of experience, and has occupied the position for four years. All his cheese except one lot went first grade. That showed that there was little further desired. Some of the cheese shipped from the Dominion is shipped in an immature state, and that is likely to affect the quality, and sometimes its sale. If the dairy regulations were carried out as proposed it would mean the shutting-down of a great many factories—in fact, our factory had decided to shut up in that case. If a pigeon comes into the shed a farmer is subject to a fine. It would be necessary to have a glass roof over the yards. It would also be impossible for the dairy-farmer to erect yards such as those at the experiment farm. I am very much in favour of experimental farms. They are very good things for the farmers of the country. But if we had to run our farms on the same principle we should soon be in the Bankruptcy Court. I would suggest in place of the regulations that there be two veterinary surgeons appointed for each district in the colony. Then, with managers capable of producing first-grade dairy-produce and the



veterinary surgeons to inspect the cattle for disease, that is all that should be required. As to enforcing concrete, the cost would be so great in some cases that the farmers would have to give up dairying. In such cases paving with wood blocks should be allowed, or bricks. My own yard is concrete, but it would not be passed by an inspector because it abuts on my woolshed and my stable. In some seasons we bring our cows in in the summer to give the best result in the winter. This is only advisable when supplying the towns, for winter feeding is very expensive. I think it would be a great mistake to allow these forty inspectors who would not have anything like the experience of factory-managers to go around among farmers. I realise it would be very undesirable to milk cows diseased and likely to injure the health of the people of the country or the produce we export. I recognise it would be a very bad thing. I think it would be very much better to allow the people to manage their own affairs. We certainly get very valuable assistance from the Agricultural Department and also from the experiments carried out on the Government farms. But circumstances alter cases, and we have to carry on our business to make it pay. We should be allowed to manage as far as possible on our own system.

1. *Mr. Buddo.*] You are going to shut the factory down?—Yes. In fact, we held a meeting to discuss the whole matter. In regard to the tins, they are entitled to put a broad arrow on them if the slightest bit of rust is seen. The factory-manager would not take the milk in rusty cans. It was wrong to practically put a broad arrow on the farmers of the country because they did not do a certain thing. I admit dirty milk is a very bad thing, and that every milker should wash his cows' teats, but if we had to submit to these regulations it would be an end to the great dairy industry, which has been of such a benefit to the country. The Farmers' Union branch in our district emphatically protested against the regulations. We hope that you will see the wisdom of altering them to such an extent that they will be workable and practicable, or fire them out altogether. It would be far better for us that the £7,000 were pitched in the harbour.

2. *Mr. Okey.*] Have you known a factory-manager discharged on account of doing his duty?—No.

3. And you have never known a factory-manager discharged for sending back the chairman's milk?—No: it may have been.

4. We have had that evidence given here. Do you disbelieve it?—I will only state the circumstances which obtain in connection with my factory.

5. Will the regulations be acceptable if the present sheds are allowed to remain as long as they are kept clean?—Yes, certainly.

6. And the pinpricks taken out—the name on cart and cans, and especially not using the cart for other purposes?—It would be useless to put the name on the cart.

7. It would not improve the milk?—No.

8. You have sufficient inspection?—Yes, we give the manager power to condemn milk.

9. If the Department wished to assist the dairy-farmer, could it not do it better by assisting him to test his cows and so enable him to weed out inferior beasts?—If you had two veterinary surgeons they would take a sample of all the milk. The principle of testing cows should be adopted, and it should be seen that no cows having tuberculosis or any other disease should be milked.

10. Is your country a bush district?—It used to be.

11. Have you a shed for milking in?—I have ten bails and a concrete yard. The bails are not concrete.

12. Has your manager ever had to send any of your milk back?—Yes, he has sent milk back. He points out to the people that it is impossible to make first-grade cheese out of inferior milk. As one man's tainted milk would spoil the milk of twenty other suppliers, it is a very bad thing to allow such milk to be used. The factory-manager should have absolute power over the milk.

13. Do you know of a man taking his milk to another factory when his milk was refused at his own?—Our factory is too far from other factories for this to apply.

14. You do not believe in Government inspection of dairies at all?—No, I do not.

15. You believe in going as you please?—As long as we are able to produce a first-class article I think it is just as well to retain that power in our hands. The country is infested with inspectors. We have had enough of them. The inspectors are rarely good men.

16. And you would sooner see a factory throw milk down the gutter than have inspection?—I would, sir.

17. Could not the inspection be worked without hardship and the inspection be beneficial?—If you would employ veterinary surgeons to inspect our cows, but men with a fortnight's experience cannot do this.

18. If the Inspector condemned half your cows you would want to come back to the dairy regulations. You would then sing out about the veterinary surgeons?—If a man had practical experience and could distinguish between sound and diseased stock it would be all right.

19. Inspectors will tell you a farmer is not likely to admit any case as long as he can get out of it?—You do not want to hurt the produce of the country and injure your fellow-man.

20. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You do not think inspectors are doing very good work?—I would not like to give them sole control over our dairies.

21. Your experience has been that there has been a little too much of them?—At the present time I have had nothing to complain of. The Inspector at Masterton, Mr. Halligan, is a man of great experience and absolutely fair. If he said you had to do a thing it had to be done. I do not think a man in that district would say his judgment was unfair.

22. You know people in some parts of the country are very well pleased with the work done?—How is it there is an outcry from dairy associations from one end of the colony to the other?

23. Have you heard of farmers presenting a gold watch to an inspector?—Yes, I was the man who made the presentation. It was a rabbit inspector.

24. I thought rabbit inspectors were the most objectionable of all?—A man who does his duty in a fair and impartial manner should be treated fairly.

25. A great number of farmers in the districts subscribed to the watch?—Yes, and a lot subscribed who were not dairy-farmers.

26. That indicated a fairly widespread satisfaction with the Inspector?—If you had left that man there in that capacity it would have been all right.

27. You would not be here if that man was still in the district?—I was in Wellington, and I had not intended coming.

28. The farmers realise that in many cases the inspectors do good useful work?—Well, it would practically be handing over the management of our farms to inspectors. I was an experienced man when I came to the country, and I would not like to hand over the management of my farm to any man you would appoint as an inspector.

29. And give him a gold watch?—If a man served me well I would not mind presenting him with something to encourage him.

30. *Hon. Mr. Duncan.*] I suppose this Inspector did not prosecute any one?—He kept the rabbits down, and managed his affairs without fear or favour. He did his duty. He treated all hands alike. He gained the respect of the farmers of the district, and that is a good deal.

31. Is your company quite satisfied with the supplier whose premises are not in a good-enough state?—I have seen premises very dirty, and would not like to drink the milk that came out of them. There is nothing like being candid. It is the duty of the whole of the factories of the colony to give more power to managers and make them inspect the premises of suppliers. If the Government gave us veterinary surgeons and make us kill diseased cows it would be conferring a greater benefit on farmers, for the veterinary surgeons could also inspect our premises.

32. *Mr. Bollard.*] You saw some very dirty premises. Do you not think the Inspector ought to visit that man's premises and make him toe the mark?—Of course, if that state of things existed at present the factory-manager would make him keep things clean. Dairy-farmers are generally poor people, and could not meet the regulations at all. Even a poor woman could not keep a couple of cows.

33. You say you saw a dairy so dirty that you would not like to drink the milk from it: do you not think the Inspector should visit that place and force the owner to keep it in a better state?—Our managers have power to refuse milk, and that is better than the work of the inspectors you appoint.

34. Inspection is necessary?—We have inspection at the present moment, and all that is necessary.

35. *Mr. Okey.*] And yet there is the dirty yard you spoke of?—I do not say there are dirty yards at present. We are improving them.

36. *Mr. Bollard.*] You say you have dirty yards?—Yes.

37. Then inspection is necessary to put these dirty yards in order?—It is going to ruin the industry if you let these forty inspectors loose. It would shut the farms down.

38. Suppose they are reasonable men like the rabbit inspector you are talking about?—He was an exception to the rule. He is naturally a good sort.

39. I do not say in every case a man with a dairy should comply with the regulations, but surely it would improve that man's position to make him supply cleaner milk?—When appointed to the Agricultural Department the Inspector gets so much red tape that he becomes obnoxious to the farmer.

40. *Mr. Buddo.*] What brings the better price—New Zealand or Danish?—But our butter has to go 14,000 miles, and is likely to deteriorate. If our butter was as near the market as Danish it would be second to none in the world.

41. If an experienced dairy-farmer told you that it was his opinion, judging by experience, that the reason our butter was not equal to Danish was by reason of some defect in the milk, what would you think?—It may be, for the slightest bad flavour reduces the grade in both butter and cheese.

42. If having more careful supervision gave a better milk to manufacture from and thereby raised the value of our butter, would you not think it worth while to put on inspectors to secure that desirable result?—No.

43. You do not think our butter is as good as Danish?—It is quite as good.

44. You said the Government wanted to put a broad arrow on your farm?—Yes.

45. Do you think it would be wise to withdraw inspection of butter so that it would not be graded?—The grading of the butter and cheese is a guarantee of its quality. I am in favour of grading.

46. Supposing the regulations were in force, what proportion of your neighbours would have to make any alteration to their premises?—They would all have to concrete their yards and do other things—a glass roof over the yards to keep the pigeons out.

47. Do you think many of them would have to make any alteration at all, leaving out the pigeons?—Yes. I was made to put up an up-to-date shed, and subject to the inspector when put up. I said, "Will that comply with the dairy regulations?" He said "Yes." Now the Inspector says, "You have ten bails abutting on the woolshed, and you will have to shift the whole thing." I said, "I will sell the cows and close the factory down."

48. Assuming this is so, do you think there are many farmers in your district whose shed would not comply with reasonable requirements?—Were the regulations modified so that concrete or sawn timber might be used, and the yards paved with stones or properly made bricks.

49. I was going to say you are not prevented from using wood, only that it must be impervious to moisture. How long is it since you saw the dairy not fit to drink milk from?—It is fairly clean now. They have not good foundations perhaps, but they have metalled yards.

50. With a decent inspector, like the Rabbit Inspector you spoke of, none of you would have to make alterations?—You would not get a man, except a hoary-headed man, like that man.

51. *Mr Rutherford.*] I would like to know if the watch was given the Inspector as a man or as a rabbit inspector on account of the way he did his work?—The man was in our district for a good many years. If the cattle were bad he was always ready to assist us and give us advice. We have not much dairying in the district. It was for his duty altogether outside dairy-inspection we made the presentation. He was transferred or promoted to Wellington.

52. In connection with rabbits or dairying?—In connection with his general duties.

53. You have experience of rabbits. Did he come out early in the morning or late at night? You have complained that an inspector came out early in the morning?—I would not have the time to give him too early in the morning.

54. You had complained that he did?—Yes, at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning.

55. That is when the rabbits were about. That was not the Inspector to whom you gave the watch?—No. What I complained of was the gross partiality. The Inspector I am talking of was as early as any of them. I was prosecuted for rabbits and fined very heavily.

56. You think the 14,000 miles we are away from Britain is the reason our butter brings a lower price than Danish, and not by reason of impure milk delivered at the dairy factories?—That is really my opinion.

57. You have stated that the bulk of the dairies would be closed down if these regulations were brought in?—A good many of them: not all.

58. Generally speaking, what would it cost to alter the existing dairies that are not in compliance with the Act? Would it cost £200 or £300?—It depends on their size and a lot of things.

59. Dairy land in Taranaki is worth £20 to £30 an acre?—Yes.

60. Is there any other purpose to which it could be put which would give a better return than dairying?—If you had a family and treated them as slaves perhaps it would pay.

61. *Mr. Okey.*] Are children milking cows not equal in physique to any other?—That does not prevent the fact that many are working for nothing.

62. Is there any other purpose to which land could be used to greater advantage?—I can speak of myself. I pay men for milking £1 5s. a week, and give them show holidays, &c. I maintain, if I abolished dairying and went in for sheep and cattle fattening I should make more money.

63. *Mr. Lang.*] Was the gold watch given to the Inspector because he was a different inspector to other inspectors you have a knowledge of?—It was not exactly the gold watch. It was just to show appreciation of the fact that a public officer had discharged his duty for a number of years in an able and efficient manner. It was nothing to do with the question before us at the present time.

64. He carried out his duties in an exceedingly just and proper manner, and that was not your experience with other inspectors?—I am not going to condemn the other inspectors.

65. Are you in favour of a tax on dairy cows?—No. You have taken it off the sheep and put it on a harder industry. The sheep-farmers are a wealthy class and more able to bear it.

66. Do you understand by the wording of this that you could put down a wooden floor if impervious to water?—Yes.

67. You understand that Danish butter realises the highest price on the market?—Generally about 2s. a hundredweight higher than New Zealand.

68. Are you aware that they have no Government inspection, and that all the inspection is done by farmers' associations?—I do not know who does the inspection.

69. It is not Government inspection?—I am not sure.

70. You are not in favour of Government inspection?—No.

71. But in favour of inspection by the farmer?—Yes.

72. And you would like to have veterinary surgeons for each province?—Yes.

EDMOND CLIFTON, Chief Inspector of Stock, examined. (No. 33.)

*Witness:* The supervision of the dairy industry, of the milk-supply of the Dominion, is not a thing initiated by the Department itself, or asked for by it. It really comes about at the request of the leaders of the dairy industry. It commenced a good many years ago in Dunedin, where the representatives of the farmers, through their associations, asked this to be undertaken, and they were so anxious that they offered to pay a rate of 6d. a cow towards the cost of the supervision. That was the position for some time. The immediate beginnings of the supervision bringing about these regulations was a request made at the Conference of the National Dairy Association at Palmerston North about two years ago. I was asked to attend the meeting, the object of the discussion being to improve the general milk-supply of the Dominion. The industry was represented by many of its leaders. They pointed out that in their estimation there was, from a manufacturing point of view, no great improvement to be made; but their factory-managers found great fault with a great proportion of the milk presented to them. The general opinion of that meeting was that the improvement should begin at the farm end—that the supply should be under supervision. That, too, was the decision of the meeting. That was the beginning of the present proposals culminating in the offering to you of these regulations. After that I met by request the Dairy Association in Dunedin. The position was explained there. It held the same view as the delegates at the Palmerston Conference. The next meeting at Palmerston indorsed the previous action, and the leaders in the industry were very anxious to have the supervision carried out. One of the points they brought forward as leading up to this subject was the fact that where dairying was intense, as in Taranaki, there were rival factories and creameries in the neighbourhood of each other, and if at one of these places the milk was refused it was taken to the other. This became so acute that it was even suggested that legislation should be introduced to deal with it. That seemed very difficult to arrive at, and the suggestion favoured was the possibility of cutting off the supply of unsatisfactory milk by starting at the farm end. After this, dairy inspectors were appointed (thirty-four). All have had experience on dairy

farms, and a great many of them have also the qualification as dairy-factory managers. Since their appointment they have undergone a short course of training, and a second class is now in Wellington, the object being to bring them up to one standard of action. They are not uncontrolled even then. One hears it said here that such-and-such a thing is left to the sweet will of the Inspector. That is not so. The Dairy Inspector is immediately assisted by the local Stock Inspector. Then the Dairy Inspector is absolutely under the control of the Inspector in Charge, and the Inspector in Charge again deals with me, and the administration is carried out on the lines approved by the departmental and ministerial chiefs of the Department of Agriculture; so that an inspector going off on a wild career of his own is impossible. A man might do a wild thing once, but it would not occur again. The general idea in carrying out the regulations was that it would not be in any shape coercive. Tactful assistance and advice has been the guiding line from the very commencement. And I believe it will be found generally that it will be carried out on these lines. I should feel exceedingly gratified if in five years' time we find an obvious improvement in the general condition of the dairies supplying the factories. If we can do anything in that time we should be satisfied. If we do it in less time it would lead to hardship. If we see what line the Department has taken in other cases and see no indication of hardship, there is greater proof that it will be carried out in a tactful manner. Take the Rabbit and Noxious Weeds Acts. If we carried these out to the letter every man owning land would be continually in trouble. The regulations are not to be acted up to, but the widest discretion is allowed, and that is in the way of assistance, not coercion. Since 1901 the Department has controlled the supervision of milk for human consumption. It is admitted by the community generally that considerable improvements have been made in that direction, and that has been done, I can assure you, with a very minimum of coercion. The suppliers of milk for city consumption are 1650, and the total number of prosecutions for that number since 1901 has been 259, an average of 37 per annum. Of these 37 yearly prosecutions, 9 or 10 have been in connection with registrations, other 8 or 9 have been for adulteration of milk. These were quite apart from sanitation conditions: they were wilful. This leaves eighteen prosecutions which might come about under these regulations—that is, in connection with sanitation. Now, this sits pretty lightly on the people when not one-fourth of 1 per cent. have come before the Courts under prosecution by this Department. It may be fairly admitted that the grade of milk for human consumption has been improved with a minimum of coercion. From the questions put to many people here one would imagine that these regulations may become harassing. When you consider the proportion I have named this can be hardly understood. If these regulations come into force we shall protect 90 per cent. of suppliers who endeavour to comply with the Act, and whom we should endeavour to assist. There would be 5 or 7 per cent. we should have to push along, and not 3 per cent. would be put to any serious expense. The regulations were wanted. We speak about the backblocks districts, where so many hardships might apply. I know a backblocks district, and when they tell me in Taranaki they can bring in milk it makes me think of the northern cases. I know dairymen who can only take in cream. They are in a worse position than any dairymen I know, and in spite of that they make a fairly good living. I have seen women and children milking in log yards in the early and late part of the season. The misery of it at these seasons is incalculable. Is it supposed that the regulations, even coming in in their more drastic form—that any one with ordinary common-sense would apply them under these conditions, which would have the effect of driving the farmers off the farms? If regulations come before us which may appear drastic, there is that great factor of common-sense and public opinion which prevents their misuse. The short lease, no doubt, offers a great difficulty. We have to meet that with great care. There are two places in my mind where to try and force the farmers to comply with the regulations would simply force them to give up the business. There is, at the same time, another factor which must not be lost sight of. If these people are supplying milk for human consumption, if they are doing it under conditions which endanger public health, we may have to step in. The public health must be considered before the supplier's interest. So in the case of supplying the factory. The milk from one or two places is injuring that of the whole. There the Department has to step in and strike hard and stop that. I am not supposing that the inspectors are going about as dumb dogs. They are going about as reasonable, discreet men. They have to hold the balance. I claim we have done that fairly satisfactorily. It was suggested that the city and factory suppliers should be separated. This is becoming more and more difficult. Wellington to-day is drawing its supply from sixty miles from the city. Some send it to the factory as well as to the city. It is very difficult to disassociate the two. Further, I take it that the factory-supply should come up to the city-supply. One is required to be as pure as the other, only we should be much longer in bringing up the factory-supply to that of the city. A much longer time would naturally be required. The only other question is that of appeal. The appeal I would recommend, the one that appears most desirable, is that to the Stipendiary Magistrate's Court. In the Rabbit Act of 1882 the Inspector's opinion decided the matter. Then it was "to the satisfaction of the Inspector." This was altered in 1901, when the case was decided on its merits by the evidence before the Court, as provided in the ordinary course of law. That would be better than setting up a separate Board, which would require considerable machinery, and the decision of which could not be made final.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] Where was this meeting held that suggested a tax of 6d. a head?—Dunedin.

2. Was the suggestion of 5s. made at Palmerston?—The statement was somewhat open, that it would be about 5s.

3. From your knowledge of farmers do you not think there would be great objection to a cow-tax?—The question of taxing you should put past me: it is a question more of policy than administration.

4. But you can give an opinion?—Naturally we all object to taxation.

5. Most of your inspectors were appointed from factory-managers, were they not?—Yes, but they have the farm experience as well.

6. Have you any idea as to what it would cost to build a shed and yards according to the regulations?—To have fifty cows in at the one time in the shed?

7. Sufficient to have a third of the cows in at one time?—I should say for seven bails you could build what you want at from £7 to £8 per bail—say, £8 per bail. It depends very much on conditions and whether the farmer supplies his own labour. I can give you an instance of a shed to accommodate fourteen cows in Taranaki. It is a double shed with a 6 ft. gangway. It has a 30 ft. race. It is described by the Inspector as eminently satisfactory. The expenditure on that is claimed to be only £100. I take it that the owner carted all the material.

8. Do you not think it would be an advantage to have plans of sheds?—They are being prepared.

9. Do you not think cleaning the byre out once a day is sufficient?—Once a day may comply with the exigencies of the position, but it is most unfortunate that it cannot be done twice.

10. And the milk-cans that are to be condemned—do you not think a man should be allowed fourteen days?—I cannot accept that the cans were to be put out of use to the inconvenience of any dairyman, whether provided for in the regulations or not.

11. What about issuing the certificate to the farm?—It is a detail which is comparatively immaterial.

12. How would you interpret suitable and clean clothing? Would a person be allowed to milk in his usual clothing?—Ordinary working-clothes, decidedly.

13. What about rust?—Inside the can any rust interferes with the condition of the milk.

14. Does not section 23 cover several others?—It answers most of our requirements.

15. In my district we have Natives milking cows in the open. Is there any objection to that?—Yes, undoubtedly. I have already told you that where European women and children were concerned there was no intention to interfere with them. When you see cows lying down in a wet paddock, and it is raining, what is the position? A man puts on an oilskin coat, and the water may be seen running down into the bucket.

16. As to lime-washing the shed, do you not think that would be sufficient once a year?—In many conditions, yes; in other conditions, where the roof is low and where the cows have been very relaxed, it is desirable the walls should be treated more than once. The Department expects once a year.

17. Washing the hands after each cow: would it not be sufficient to say that the hands must be kept clean?—The milker who once accustoms himself to washing his hands after milking each cow manages it very easily. It is very quickly done, and a man who once adopts it would not milk in any other way.

18. Prohibiting an animal coming within 30 ft. of the shed?—This is used in any case it is desirable. It is one of those things in which one must use great discretion. One often sees that the milk-shed is left quite open, and all the animals congregate in it, and it is not unusual to find it converted into a hen-roost.

19. *Mr. Witty.*] If Mr. Clifton had spoken to the witnesses as he has to us it would have cleared away much misconception?—So far as the explanation of the relation of the Department to milk-supervision is concerned, the leaders of the industry represented that it was at the dairy end where the improvement was required.

20. Your inspectors under these regulations will have a great deal of power. Do you instruct them to use tact? Because more depends on the tact of the Inspector than anything else, and it gets more out of the farmer?—Absolutely so. I am at the close of the instruction classes very often, and the one thing I impress upon the inspectors is that they must use tact. The first thing we ask them to do is to make themselves known to the dairy-farmer, and become acquainted with him, making any suggestions as a friend and adviser rather than as an inspector.

21. There have been cases where inspectors have been rather arbitrary, and this has led to a good deal of friction where tact might have been of use?—They occurred more before the work was so specialised and before they were brought together to understand better the duties we owe the settler.

22. With regard to the short lease, tact especially should be used so as to compel cleanliness without putting a burden on the short-lease tenants?—This is the only line we can work on.

23. You would not force them in the case of a short lease to make extensive improvements so long as they kept their places thoroughly clean and up to date as far as they were able?—I would agree to that so long as they did not conflict with the public health.

24. You prefer an appeal to a Magistrate rather than an appeal to yourself?—I object to the appeal to myself very much. Speaking of the appeal to the Magistrate I do not want to set him up as an appeal. Let the Inspector bring the case before him when necessary, and let him decide on the evidence presented. The Inspector is just as much on his trial as the settler. There is nothing more against an inspector than bringing an unnecessary prosecution—a position brought about by irritation, or harassing a man, or want of tact—I take it the Inspector is equally on his trial.

25. You know the Magistrate goes by the Act, and the Act says the Inspector should be the judge practically?—I do not want him to be a judge. There are certain things which are purely matters of fact that must in any case come before the Magistrate.

26. In one case at Christchurch the Magistrate said he must convict because he was bound by the Act?—A certain case was tried there in which the counsel for the Department objected to bring evidence in support of the Department's contention because the law was on his side. The case was heard on these conditions. If it were possible to put such a case before the Magistrate where the facts on each side might be considered, that complies more with our general ideas of justice than anything else.

27. As far as possible, you would try to work under the regulations than under the Act—that is, as far as sanitary conditions are concerned?—Yes.

28. *Mr. Rhodes.*] The regulations are to be enforced at the discretion of the Inspector?—I do not quite say that. At his discretion, guided by the general principles of the Department.

29. Do you not think a statement to that effect should be included?—There are many things one might like to put in as directions. Some explanatory notes might be attached.

30. Any dairyman taking up these regulations would read them as hard and fast rules?—They apply in the same direction as many of our other Acts.

31. It might be obviated by adding explanatory notes?—I should be unwilling to do anything of that kind.

32. You would rather leave it to time and tact?—I would rather leave it to the proof of action.

33. There seems to be some irritation in regard to the transfer fee. Is it necessary to make it 2s. 6d.?—It is an unimportant point. The object was to make people register transfers. Something attached to it brings them quickly to the mark.

34. A good many object to the license fee for ten cows?—It is not a serious thing. It is a question of policy rather than administration.

35. Have you looked through these letters which have been handed in? One of my constituents said he had held over building a dairy for some years pending the regulations. He has machinery for other purposes, and he wants to use the same machinery for milking. He uses it for a sausage-machine and for purposes of that sort, and it would preclude him from using it. If there are fairly clean conditions what can he do?—I am setting up a plant at Ruakuta where the machine will be 40 ft. from the engine itself. I have seen instances where it is carried further.

36. In which case it would be advisable to communicate with the Inspector?—It must be judged on the conditions applying.

37. The great complaint from Banks Peninsula is in regard to the race?—The race is an alternative, and it is offered the farmer as the most reasonable means we know of to enable him to keep mud in winter and dust in summer at a reasonable distance from the cowshed without having to go to the expense of a large concrete yard. It is answering very well in certain parts of Taranaki. This morning I have received another batch of appreciative letters in regard to the race. The race is one of those things people appreciate when they know it.

38. Is this required more on account of mud than of dust?—Dust applies very seriously; in fact, I take dust to be a greater cause of milk-impurity than mud.

39. In regard to allowing other animals than cows in the milking-shed, should this be strictly enforced?—Certainly not strictly.

40. The regulations would not apply to existing buildings?—Certainly not.

41. *Mr. Bollard.*] After the explanation of Mr. Clifton there is very little to say about the regulations, especially as they are going to be modified. I think there is no occasion for dairymen to be alarmed, especially with Mr. Clifton's well-known tact and ability. One response struck me in connection with the Appeal Court. You say you would like the dispute to go direct to the Magistrate. You know perfectly well that if you go before a Magistrate he would take the law and the regulations together, and there would be no give-and-take. Do you not think it would be better to have friendly arbitration between the disputants before going to the Magistrate, leaving the Magistrate as the final Court of Appeal?—Friendly arbitration by all means, if the two gentlemen can arrange between themselves to have a consultation, not to make a statutory matter of it. The only things which would lead to disputes are the sanitary conditions of the shed and a few other matters of that description that are not defined by any regulation. It is in that case a Magistrate would have to judge, apart from any question of law. It is decided by the evidence.

42. Suppose a case of that sort arose in regard to sanitation. The Inspector might say to the dairyman, "You are sufficiently near material to put down concrete." The man cannot say it is too expensive?—The dairyman can do either.

42A. The Inspector has no discretion?—He cannot dictate as to which the dairyman must use.

43. *Mr. Buddo.*] As to the arbitration, would a representative of the farmer and the Inspector appeal to you as an arbitration tribunal that would be likely to give good results?—I do not think it would, because the person who would appeal in that case would be almost always the impractical.

44. Do you not think it should go to conciliation before going to the Magistrate?—I think it would only cause delay.

45. You would prefer to go to the Magistrate?—Yes, because both defendant and Inspector are on their trial.

46. In the number of prosecutions you have mentioned were there any cases where a certain amount more latitude would have reduced the prosecutions outside the definite faults of dairymen? Has there not been found any great difficulty in controlling the inspection?—Considering the difficulties and the state of the supply it has been done with a minimum of annoyance.

47. With your experience, and considering the system of production of dairy-produce, do you consider the system of production—do you think the produce would have been benefited by withdrawing Government inspection and throwing it back on the dairy associations?—It could only lead to deterioration. At the meetings I referred to it was stated that the companies had either appointed inspectors or had made their managers inspectors, and they had been compelled to give it up because of the difficulty of enforcing the necessary improvements. It was better, they had decided, to have outside independent Government inspection.

48. Is it your opinion that the produce would bring higher value in Britain as the result of the inspection?—Yes.

49. Your opinion is in that direction?—My opinion must necessarily be that, as formed by the opinion expressed by the leaders of the industry.

50. *Mr. Lang.*] Would it not be in the power of the local Inspector to make it harassing?—He might do it once.

51. Have you heard of cases where local inspectors in the past have been wanting in tact in enforcing things which were unnecessary?—We have found officers who have not been tactful, but they have not been allowed to continue.

52. With reference to Danish methods, a witness stated here that there is no Government inspection in Denmark, the inspection being done by farmers' associations?—I have no knowledge of it.

53. In regard to the time for cleaning sheds and cans, do you not think the local conditions and the position of the farmer should make a difference?—A difference will be made. Different cases require different treatment. In the case of milk conveyed by train the Inspector would deal with it as he thought best, although it says it must be done within two hours. The discretion enables one to prevent harm coming from neglect. We had a case in Wellington where maggots were found in a railway can. If you visited twenty dairy farms on one morning and a good many were not complying with the regulations in question, it would not follow that the Inspector would take action, but in a case where things were bad and the milk was intended for city-supply action would be demanded. In one case the retailer and not the farmer was prosecuted. Cans had been picked up in the course of the afternoon from perhaps twelve different farmers and taken into the city, emptied, and put back on the wagon without being cleaned. There the vendor was prosecuted; the farmer was not at fault. The regulations would enable an officer to act when he sees the necessity for it.

53A. Have you heard of a man taking his milk home at 12 at night, and because his cans were not washed then he was fined for it?—I do not know of such a case.

54. Under these regulations you would not take action under such circumstances?—No.

55. But the man who is working under them cannot take into consideration the view of the Minister or the Administration. Who is the dairyman to look to?—I do not suppose any one thought of the matter; but the official administrators the regulations with common-sense.

56. Do you know a case of hardship?—No; I do not believe there has been one.

57. Under the present Noxious Weeds Act if a man is taken to Court the Magistrate has no option, no matter what trouble a man may have taken to clear his weeds?—A Magistrate often dismisses cases. We have repeatedly dismissals. They are dismissed on the grounds that a man is doing his best.

58. I have heard cases where it was not so. Under these regulations if any disputes were taken before a Magistrate would he not be compelled to decide whether the dairyman was complying with the regulation or not?—There are two points, one a matter of fact and the other a matter of judgment. A question of sanitation or cleanliness might go before a Magistrate, or the milk has been adulterated, or there has been failure to register. He has to convict on these. You go before him because a floor is not properly constructed, and here he would adjudicate according to the weight of evidence. A matter is open for decision on the evidence brought before him, and on that the appeal is unnecessary.

59. Some of these regulations deal with distance-apart of buildings, and you say the regulations should be administered with tact and discretion. Would not the Magistrate have to decide?—That is a question which appeal could not help. These are questions which the Inspector would deal with according to his discretion.

60. You could not take any question of discretion to appeal?—Reasonable compliance would rest with the Inspector. Where the officer takes a case to Court and there are conditions which are declared to be inimical to the production of a decent supply, that is certainly open for evidence. Or there is a case where there is an implement-shed. There is no harm in it, says the defendant: it is only an implement-shed attached to the byre. The Inspector may show there were manure and sheep-skins stored in the shed. Then it is open for the Magistrate to punish for a breach of the Act. If, on the other hand, the farmer showed he only used the shed for his buggy he would win.

61. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] Judging by the question asked by Mr. Lang about the specific statement of everything to be done, would it be possible under those conditions to carry on the administration of the country for twenty-four hours?—I cannot conceive such a condition that it would be possible to carry on any administration.

62. As the executive officer of a large Department, are there not fifty things your officers are called upon to do which are not covered by any Act of the General Assembly, or regulations of Minister, or laid down in black and white?—The Acts are our guide, but the administration is according to discretion, and I see no other way of doing it. If we take the Noxious Weeds Act and if we act up to it the whole countryside would be in the precincts of the Courts.

63. And these are the Acts the Parliament of the country has passed?—Yes; and we are doing this against every meeting of farmers, every union and agricultural and pastoral association: we are holding a fair line in administration.

---

THURSDAY, 1ST OCTOBER, 1908.

HAROLD BURGOTNE, Dairy-farmer, Clevedon, examined. (No. 34.)

*Witness:* I have been asked by several factory-managers and dairy-farmers in our district to give evidence on this matter. We thought the regulations impracticable, and after a lot of persuasion I decided to come down. Mr. Duncan, Inspector in Charge at Auckland, informed me that certain clauses which we considered objectionable have been deleted. As to the feeling in the district, in the first place we held a meeting of suppliers and factory-managers in our district, when the following resolution was unanimously carried at three or four different centres: "That, while we agree with the principle of reasonable inspection, free of charge, and registration of dairies, we consider that the Act, in its present form, would prove harassing and impracticable,



and would seriously diminish, if not destroy, the dairy industry in the Dominion." This was carried at three or four different meetings in the Clevedon and the Waikato districts. The first thing I wish to talk of is the cost of registration. There was a lot of discussion on this, and we thought that as you have recently done away with the sheep-tax it would be an unfair thing to put a tax on the dairy cow. The dairy cow, as we all know, is one of the causes of the prosperity of the Dominion. And we hold that the dairy industry should be encouraged as much as possible. We could see no reason why a tax should be put on the dairy cow. In fact, it would pay the country to pay a bonus on every cow kept. Not only the farmers but every one would benefit thereby. Then, the roof of every cowshed must be swept once a month. We thought it would be impossible to comply with that. In regard to whitewashing the shed we thought once a year should be all that is necessary. To force the stable to be 30 ft. from any cowshed—that would inflict a hardship on many existing sheds. I would like the following proposal adopted: "That, where existing cowsheds are kept clean, and the factory-owner is satisfied the milk arrives in a clean and pure state, no structural alterations shall be enforced for at least three years from the date of the passing of the regulations, but that in future all new buildings shall be erected according to the regulations." If that could be carried I think it would do away with the difficulty. In regard to the regulation requiring a sufficient supply of water in the shed for the cleaning of the milkers' hands, it would be rather difficult in some districts to comply with that, though I quite agree with it where it is possible. Then, every dairyman must notify the Inspector before commencing to make any structural alterations. We thought it would be very hard if we could not alter a bail or make any slight alteration without going to all that trouble. In reference to washing the hands, we quite agree that the hands should be washed before milking, but after each milking would be impossible to enforce with our employees. In regard to the regulation concerning the state of the can: We quite agree as to the can being properly soldered, but we cannot agree with the provision concerning rust. You all know that that could not be carried out to the letter of the law, for after sending a can a few times to the creamery it is bound to get a few rust-specks on it. I have put a cross against that regulation. Then, clause 19 we consider would give an enormous amount of power to any inspector. We think the clause requiring the name to be on the can would be a hardship in regard to cans already in use. Then, in regard to the method of cleansing the milking-machine, personally I am keeping a milking-machine, and the instructions are that hot water is not to be used in connection with the rubber. According to the instructions of the agents it would ruin the machine. The latter part of the regulation says that the machine must not be stored in the cowshed. At night it is often late before the milking is finished, and the machine is stored in a clean corner of the cowshed, which does it no harm. Clause 23 says that certain cleansing shall be done to the satisfaction of the Inspector. That gives the Inspector a lot of power. Clause 24 says the name shall be painted on the cart. We thought that very hard. Clause 29 says that no other animal but a cow shall be permitted to enter the cowshed. You all know poultry. It would be difficult to prevent them from entering a shed. You would have to give up dairying. We do not believe in allowing fowls to roost in the shed. In regard to the regulation preventing the use of the cart for other purposes: We do not think it should be used for carrying manure. These carts are very largely used for the purpose of taking dressed pigs to the steamer or station. In this we think there is no harm to the cart or anything else.

1. *Mr. Okey.*] What do you think of the registration fee? Do you object to any fee?—Yes, to any fee whatever.

2. You have had meetings of factory-managers?—Yes.

3. What are the objections of the factory-managers to the regulations?—They think the regulations would have the effect of making farmers give up dairying. They have had that effect already.

4. The factory-managers have taken it up in that direction?—Yes.

5. What power has a factory-manager in your district? What power have they over the milk? Have they power to send it back if unfit?—Yes. We have two different factories, Whitford and Clevedon, with eight different creameries.

6. Have you known of a factory-manager being discharged on account of sending back milk?—No.

7. *Mr. Buddo.*] In regard to the rubber of the milking-machines: Assuming that your statement is correct, that scalding water is detrimental, what method of cleaning would you suggest?—Lukewarm water in which a little "Wyandotte" is placed is a good cleanser.

8. You can get any other substance?—A weak solution of lime-water.

9. *Mr. Hogg.*] In regard to the factory-managers, are they allowed to object to the milk, although they may know it comes from a notoriously dirty farmer?—They would object if they knew it was not satisfactory.

10. Suppose it was sweet and clean and they knew it came from a dirty dairy?—If there was no defect in the milk there would be no necessity to send it back. If unfit it should be sent back.

11. It is only sent back when sour or dirty?—Yes.

12. Although the manager may be quite aware the farmer is very dirty. He cannot object to it if the milk is sweet enough?—If a manager thought such was the case he would have the power to call in the Government Inspector to his assistance.

13. In that case it is only since Government inspectors were appointed that that is possible?—I quite agree with Government inspection.

14. Have you known a manager get into trouble for complaining of milk?—No.

15. *Mr. Lang.*] In case of a dispute between a supplier and an inspector would you think it advisable to have a Court of Appeal as distinct from a Court of law?—Decidedly I think there should be a Court of Appeal.

## APPENDIX.

DEAR SIR,—

Dalefield Dairy Company (Limited), Carterton, 4th March, 1898.

During last season ('96/7) this company's manager had considerable trouble during the very hot weather with tainted milk, and in order to ascertain and remove the cause my directors established a system of inspection with the result that great improvements have been made, from a sanitary point of view, in the farm premises of suppliers. Some of the suppliers were only too pleased to adopt the suggestions of the inspector, and had their bails concreted and surroundings improved, while others were very careless and would hardly do anything—in fact, a small minority have almost refused to do anything, and while the milk from these farms is delivered free from taint, &c., my directors feel they have no power to enforce improvements, although they are exceedingly anxious that anything likely to taint the milk should be removed.

To attain this highly desirable position I have been instructed to solicit the assistance of your Department by asking you to instruct one of the Inspectors under "The Dairy Industry Act, 1894," to inspect and report on several of the farms.

At the present time owing to the extra dry season all the farms appear to be in very fair order, but should the season break with a heavy fall of rain several of them will be bad enough.

Trusting you will be able to give assistance in the direction asked,

Yours faithfully,

J. MONCRIEFF, Jun., Secretary.

The Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Wellington.

Dalefield Co-operative Dairy Company (Limited),

Carterton, N.Z., 5th February, 1902.

SIR,—

As the dairying season is pretty well advanced, and nothing having been done in this district by way of inspection of dairy premises of farmers by your Inspectors, I am directed by my directors to ask if you could allow, say, the local Stock Inspector to inspect a few of the worst places while going through the district on his ordinary business, on a list of such places being supplied to him.

Some three years ago my directors inaugurated a system of inspection, which resulted very beneficially until the farmers learned that the directors had no power to enforce their recommendations so long as the milk was delivered in good condition, as far as it could be ascertained at the time of delivery. The system of inspection in the South Wairarapa by your Department has been a great success, and no doubt would have a similar result in this district.

Thanking you in anticipation,

Yours faithfully,

J. MONCRIEFF, Jun., Secretary.

The Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Wellington.

Parkvale Co-operative Dairy Company (Limited),

Carterton, N.Z., 21st August, 1902.

DEAR SIR,—

I shall be glad to know if an officer from your Department could inspect the cow-bails, &c., of suppliers to this company before the season commences.

Yours faithfully,

J. MONCRIEFF, Jun., Secretary.

The Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Wellington.

Per A. P. S.

Department of Agriculture (Dairy Division),  
Wellington, 29th September, 1908.

The Secretary.

WITH reference to our telephone conversation of this afternoon, the following are the highest, lowest, and average grading scores of "Glen Oroua" brand of creamery butter for the seasons mentioned:—

Season.	Highest Score. Lowest Score. Average Score.		
	Points.	Points.	Points.
1905-6	92	85½	90·03
1906-7	92	85	90·16
1907-8	92	86½	89·80

D. CUDDIE,

Dairy Commissioner.

COPY OF RESOLUTION passed at a Special Meeting of Directors of Tai Tapu Dairy Company, held on Tuesday, 22nd September, 1908.

THAT this meeting of directors of Tai Tapu Dairy Company considers that some regulation and inspection of dairies is necessary to improve the conditions of dairying, but are of opinion that the proposed new Dairy Act is too drastic, unworkable, and practically prohibitive, and means ruin, especially to the small farmer. The farming community has by careful attention in the past brought the dairy industry up to its present high standard, and if such a stringent and unwarrantable change is to be forced upon it at this juncture it will give a great set-back to the industry in this country.

Tai Tapu, 23rd September, 1908.

W. K. WATSON, Secretary.

Cambridge Co-operative Dairy Company (Limited),  
Cambridge, 23rd September, 1908.

DEAR SIR,—

Replying to your wire of the 21st instant the following are objections which we think should be amended:—

Clauses 4 and 6: No fees should be charged.

(d.): Should be deleted.

(e.): Once a year, in August.

(g.): 15 ft. ample if on the south or south-west side of milking-shed, otherwise 60 ft. The remainder of this clause quite necessary.

(h.): "No new erection of buildings shall be," &c.

(k.) (1) and (2): If cowshed is properly paved or concreted and drained, no other condition necessary.

(m.): Included in other clauses.

2. A milker may commence operations clean, but certainly would not finish so.

Subclause (11): The latter portion would not be carried out.

(15): Provided for in clause (g).

(20): This should not be retrospective.

(29): "Enter" should read "remain."

(31): This clause would prevent skim-milk being returned in factory-cart. The words "excrement, filth, and pigs' wash" are all that should remain. Section 23 provides for condition of conveyance.

(33): Too arbitrary. The power practically in the hands of one man.

I may say that we fully recognise the importance of the industry, and that it is necessary to have regulations as to cleanliness of handling, &c., and that a short Act is necessary; but the Bill now circulated, if carried into effect, will drive a good many of those, especially of the better class, out of the industry. Many of the settlers in this part have already spent a good deal of money in concreting their sheds, and there is a decided improvement in the surroundings of their sheds, and at the present time any additional burdens would be detrimental.

Another point is that there are practically no cows housed, and they are in the sheds for such a short time that the removal of the milk to a safe point after being milked is quite sufficient.

We, with other colonists, are proud of the position gained by the New Zealand dairy-produce in the world's markets, and if this has been brought about when the methods of handling the raw material were very questionable, the advance that has taken place in the condition during the past year in this district must still enhance its merits.

I have, &c.,

Hon. R. McNab, Wellington.

MARTIN BUTLER, Secretary.

Mauriceville Dairy Company (Limited),

Mauriceville West, 25th September, 1908.

DEAR SIR,—

The dairy-farmers of Mauriceville, Mauriceville West, Hastwell, and Mangamahoe met at the A.O.F. Hall, Mauriceville West, yesterday afternoon for the purpose of considering the regulations of the new Dairy Act. The meeting was an unusually representative one of the whole district.

Mr. E. Pedersen, chairman of the dairy company, was voted to the chair, and in opening the meeting gave the reasons for calling the meeting.

The Secretary read the copy of the new Act, and, after some discussion, Mr. E. W. Nielsen moved, and Mr. H. E. Thorley seconded, "That a committee be set up to consider the regulations, and make a strong protest against those which were not found workable."

A committee of nine was appointed, and went into the matter, clause by clause, with the following results:—

Clauses 1, 9, 14, 20, 24, 29, 30, 31, 33 were objected to in their entirety.

Clause 8: Part (c), not objected to, provided three years are given in which to complete the concreting.

Part (g) objected to.

Part (h): No objection, except to the stable.

Part (j): Restrictions too drastic in regard to piggery.

Part (k): Objected to.

Clause 19: Branding process objected to.

Clause 27: Part (c) objected to.

I am instructed to forward the protest to you as our representative in the Parliament, and ask that you will be good enough to bring the matter before the Stock Committee, and to use your influence to prevent the Act from being passed in its present form.

I am also directed to say that if evidence is required we will give same.

Yours faithfully,

L. MATTSON, Secretary.

Mr. A. W. Hogg, M.H.R., Parliamentary Buildings, Wellington.

Waitohi Co-operative Dairy Factory Company (Limited),  
Tuamarina, N.Z., 25th September, 1908.

SIR,—

The directors of the company have instructed me to inform you that the proposed new dairy regulations have their general approval on the whole, with the exception of those paragraphs enclosed herein, and which, in the opinion of the directors, require modification.

I am, &c.,

Mr. Lawry, M.H.R., Wellington.

A. F. REDWOOD, Secretary.

Every shed or stable where cows are kept shall have the walls and roof thoroughly coated with a sufficient coating of lime whitewash, and shall be recoated in a similar manner at least every three months, or oftener if directed by the Inspector.

All cans or other vessels whatsoever used in or about any dairy, whether for receiving or storing or in the distribution of milk, shall be thoroughly cleansed within four hours of having been used for any purpose whatsoever, by first being rinsed with cold water, then scalded with hot water (or steamed), scoured, and afterwards rinsed with clean water and carefully dried.

All conveyances used in or about any dairy for the conveyance of milk shall from time to time be thoroughly cleansed to the satisfaction of the Inspector.

Every conveyance used for the conveyance of milk for sale shall have the name of the owner legibly printed thereon.

No person shall take milk from any cow whose milk is intended to be sold or used for human food, nor permit any such milk to be taken, until the udder and teats of such cow have been thoroughly cleansed.

Before commencing to milk any cow the hands of the person milking must be thoroughly washed and kept cleansed until the milking and handling of milk is finished for the time being.

Every owner or occupier of a dairy shall provide in, upon, or about his dairy premises, and shall upon demand show to the Inspector, sufficient facilities for boiling the water required for all the purposes mentioned in these regulations.

All milk intended for human food shall, immediately after milking, be removed from the milking-shed or stockyard, and once at least carefully strained through some apparatus sufficient for the purpose, and then cooled to a temperature of not more than 65°.

Wyndham Dairy Factory Company (Limited),  
Wyndham, 18th September, 1908.

DEAR SIR,—

The enclosed rule regulating the carting of whey is in force at Wyndham and Glenham. We consider it advisable that whey should not be carried in milk-cans on any account.

JAMES McLAUGHLAN, Secretary.

F. Lawry, Esq., M.P., Chairman Stock Committee, Wellington.

Per B. McL.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,400 copies), £39 2s. 6d.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1908.

Price 1s. 9d.]