

I thought that there was to complain about on the Manawatu—the artesian water. If you had water there like there is on the Waimate it would make a difference of 25 per cent. in the value of the land.

*Mr. Baldwin:* With the permission of the Committee I would like to put in the evidence I mentioned previously, the evidence taken in the Supreme Court case. This is the Judge's notes on the case [put in]. I would also like to send you a draft copy of a Bill which I suggest would meet our difficulties. I will get it properly typed, and send it to you. And if Mr. Morcamb can give evidence, that is all we will trouble the Committee with.

169. *Mr. Sykes.*] You say that your stock which you lost and which had access to the Oroua River died of blood-poisoning?—Yes. Mr. Morcamb has also lost some of his cows, and others have lost stock through the same cause.

170. Through drinking the water out of the Oroua River?—Yes, when the river is not in flood.

LEONARD OWEN HOWARD TRIPP, President of the Associated Acclimatization Societies of New Zealand, examined. (No. 22.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Your profession, Mr. Tripp?—Solicitor.

2. Will you make a statement to the Committee?—I would like to make a short statement. I may say that I am president of the Associated Acclimatization Societies of New Zealand, and I am chairman of the Wellington Society. My council has considered this Bill, and they have asked me to come here and make a short statement. I may say that on our council we have business men and we also have farmers. One farmer attended this meeting from Eketahuna. They have asked me to point out to you that they consider that any alteration of the law in the direction of allowing the pollution of river-water is dangerous from a public health point of view. In a young country like New Zealand you have always got to consider that it is going to have a large population, and that you will want a pure-water supply in the future. This is a matter, I admit, for the Public Health Department, so I will not say anything more about it. Coming to the Bill, I would point out that, according to clause 4, if a farmer has two streams running through his property, each of which contains a sufficient supply of suitable water, no injunction can be obtained through the pollution of one of the streams. That is to say that one stream may become at some time or other a sewer; and the question may arise, and will arise probably, that when that farmer wants to cut up his property he may find it is almost impossible to do so, because he has not got a sufficient pure water-supply for each section. The next point I am asked to call your attention to is the fact that, according to clause 4, you cannot get an injunction unless you can show that the water is unfit for the use of human beings or animals, and also that he has not got a sufficient supply of good water available. Take water that is coming down from, say, a flax-mill or a sawmill: that water may not be in such a condition as to be absolutely undrinkable. The Court would then hold that that water is not unfit for human beings or for animals; and, therefore, in that case you cannot get an injunction though the water is polluted. Now, say some industry starts on the banks of that stream, and pure water is required. This water is not unfit for human beings or animals, but it may be unfit for the use of this particular industry; and, therefore, I am asked to point out that that industry should be considered. Now, we thought at our meeting that the dairy people might fall in if this Act was passed. That is to say, a dairy factory might start, and a sawmill might start up above, and pollute the water; and yet, because it is not unfit for human beings and animals, the dairy factory could not get an injunction. Mr. Nathan pointed out to me that if necessary a dairy factory need not use water from the river in such a case, but that artesian-well water could be used. In reply to that I am told by an engineer—and I am also told so by a practical dairymen—that you cannot be certain that there will not be some pollution of the so-called artesian water. It depends entirely on the condition of the soil whether the water cannot percolate from the stream to the water-supply for the dairy factory, and also, of course, as to where the so-called artesian water comes from. I am just mentioning this point to show the danger there is in trying to deal with this question. There is another point: in several districts in New Zealand, and in one that I am particularly well acquainted with, water-races are used by people for the supply of water for their stock, and in many cases for drinking-water also. Now, what is to prevent, say, a sawmill throwing this refuse into the stream, and partially polluting that water? It may be that it is not unfit, mind you, for human beings and for animals, but still it is not good water to drink, and not what one would call wholesome water. That would apply to a great extent to Canterbury, or places where they use water from water-races for drinking purposes. Now I would like to say a few words with regard to the fish in our streams. I would like to point out, first of all, that the fact of having fish in our streams encourages many town men, who are working hard in town, to go out into the country for week ends and for holidays to fish and to keep them in health. That is an important consideration, because I am glad to say there are a great many fishermen in the towns. Then, again, the fish-supply should be considered as a food-supply. To-day the fish from the rivers is only a small food-supply, but still it is a food-supply; and you, gentlemen, should take that into consideration. Furthermore, with the means of delivery being improved in the future, the fish from our rivers will be a very large and important food-supply. In the South the Government have gone to considerable expense in connection with the quinnat salmon, and you all know what the quinnat salmon means to Canada. It means there is an important industry started there, and we hope in the future that something similar will be started here. I mention these facts because, of course, it will be stated that fish must give way to industries. My point is that I ask you to consider the fish as an industry, and it is an industry which should become a very important one. I say, cannot provision be made so that any industry can be carried on near a stream and allow no pollution?