heaps of dry pulp. Would you give the Committee your opinion as to how you think that would work?—First of all, how much ground would the enclosure take up?

2. I should imagine that about a square chain would be a fair experiment. One can only draw upon one's imagination as to what would be the best?—You must remember that the water would go to the tank in a pulpy state, and by the time it reached the drain might be just as black as if the debris were in it.

3. Do you think that a plan of that sort—comparatively inexpensive—would succeed in arresting the pulp?—I do not know. The meshes might get blocked, and the water run over just the same as now.

4. That would be the very thing required, because as the meshes at the lower level got blocked the water would rise, and would be continually flowing over the top, as the pulp at the bottom rose?—No, the pulp would go with it—it is so light.

5. Assuming that the enclosure was sufficiently large to produce dead-water, would not that mean a settling of the pulp?—I do not see how you are going to create dead-water, because it will get round the outside of the enclosure. Do you mean it to be an enclosure, or simply fenced?

6. It would be enclosed right round, and there would be dead-water within the enclosure; it would be of sufficient area to produce practically dead-water. Would not your pulp settle?—Some of it might, but I think some would still go over.

7. As a matter of fact, does not the pulp in your swamp at the end of your trough settle to such an extent that your channel gets blocked and requires cleaning now and again?—Occasionally, yes; but very little considering the quantity that goes down it.

8. Yet it is not dead-water, because the water is running along all the time; but the pulp settles?—Some of it.

9. Do you think that my plan would be worth trying as a remedy?—I think you would have but a slender chance of a permanent remedy if you relied upon that. I might tell you that the pulp does float; it is very light.

10. It floats in a current?—Almost in dead-water.

11. *Mr. Baldwin.*] Would the effect of the plan suggested to you be increased if you had wire mesh on the top to prevent upward filtration as far as possible?—I am afraid that to allow the water to get out the mesh would have to be so large that you probably would not catch much pulp. Some of the debris would still come out. Probably some would be caught, but not very much. If you had the mesh small enough to catch the debris the water would be blocked.

12. But the water must find its way out?—It might be so blocked that it would not get in.

13. You, I think, will admit that the public health must be paramount even to the flax-milling industry?—It should be equal in importance, anyhow.

14. From a national point of view it should be paramount?—It should be considered first.

15. I think you will agree with me also that the agricultural industry is a large industry and should be paramount to the flax-milling industry?—I do not think it should be paramount.

16. Do you think it a fair thing that flax-millers should take every precaution that the Public Health Department and the Agricultural Department consider right for the purpose of keeping this pulp out of the rivers?—It just depends on what they require. The Department may require something which it is not possible for a flax-miller to carry out and also carry on his industry.

17. *Mr. Buick.*] I understood you to say that the vegetable matter from the flax is lighter than water, and therefore floats on the top?—Yes.

18. It only sinks when it gets saturated with water and becomes of the same weight?—Yes, and when there is sufficient quantity of it. I should like to say that at the present time a flax-miller may be milling on a stream that passes through his property and goes on through his neighbours' properties, who are farmers. It is quite possible under the present condition of things for one farmer down below to take an injunction out which would ultimately mean the flax-miller's ruin. The farmer could complain about the state of the water, and he could make it so warm for the miller that the latter might be ruined. That farmer might have his eye on the flax-miller's property, and might lay some information against the miller and get an injunction which would mean the miller's ruin. He might make it so hot for him that he would have to sell the land. The man desiring the land might not appear, but indirectly he could buy the property. It seems to me that flax-millers on small streams are in that position to-day. The farmer seems to me to have great power in this direction.

19. *Mr. Pearce.*] If the water from a mill was run over an acre of ploughed land, say, for three days or even for a week, and was then turned on to another acre of ploughed land, and the first acre was ploughed again, the water soaking away from that acre of land would be as clean as it was before it went into the mill?—No, it would not. I say unhesitatingly that the water would be infinitely worse after it left the ground than it was before you used it.

20. Supposing the pulp-water was run through a drain and there were blocks of gorse or tea-tree put in in places: if I said that that would stop 3 to 4 tons of pulp a day from a single-stripper mill, after the effluent had run through a grating, would you contradict me?—It might. I do not know.

21. It would be a very cheap thing to dig a ditch 2 or 3 chains long, and while that was being cleaned out run the water into another ditch?—Yes. Of course, some millers are so situated that they cannot spare the ground.

22. *Mr. Broad.*] If Mr. Pearce's suggestion of filtration by gorse in a drain were carried out, the water would be longer in getting back into the stream. Would that water be in as good condition when it got back to the stream as it would be if it were put back immediately into the river?—No, I do not think it would. It would be running over dead matter.

23. It would be more objectionable?—Without doubt.