

nected with the town sewerage. Some protection may be needed, and no doubt is needed, with reference to the cases Mr. Nathan mentioned; but those are not typical cases of dairy factories throughout New Zealand. My opinion is that there is an element of danger in that Bill as it stands to-day to the majority of the dairy factories. If some modification is not made in regard to the discharge of refuse into the rivers and streams by other industries, dairying is likely to suffer.

*Mr. Buick:* The only one allowed in this Bill is flax.

46. *The Chairman.*] In England, Mr. Cuddie, the law there is just the same as it is here—in other words, English law is our law?—Yes.

47. And despite that law being in force in England, we know what England is as a manufacturing country?—Yes.

48. We want to put the dairy factories in the position of being able to say, “Go ahead, we defy you; there is nothing here against which the Supreme Court would grant an injunction,” to the person who is inclined to proceed?—Yes. I candidly admit that dairy-factory drainage is not troublesome where you can get an outlet for it.

49. We do not want to say to the Rongotea man, “You are only a cipher in the whole business—we cannot take any account of you, because you are the only one who is so far distant as eight miles from a stream”?—No. I am quite willing to admit candidly that this Bill would benefit a few of the dairy people, but while benefiting them, in some cases it may prove detrimental, in that it opens the door to other industries coming in and polluting the streams and water-supplies.

50. At the same time can you tell us that as far as the dairy industry is concerned its circumstances are such that it stands out on a different footing to any of the thousand-and-one industries which in England do not or have not required a special Bill like this to protect them?—Of course the conditions are totally different.

51. Will you explain how?—I take it that at Home, where large industries are at work, they have a very large capital, and they are able to go to perhaps an enormous expense in treating their drainage. Of course, in New Zealand the companies are small, and if they were called upon to provide similar facilities for handling drainage as they have in England it would mean shutting up the concerns. They would not be able to afford it.

52. *Mr. Sykes.*] Are you familiar with the law in Denmark with regard to water-pollution?—No, I am not. Of course, it is a country where there are very few streams indeed.

53. *Mr. Buxton.*] They treat the land with the waste, and use it in the shape of manure?—Yes.

54. *The Chairman.*] That is the ideal remedy, if it were practicable to enrich the land by what is going to waste?—Yes. I saw that system in vogue at quite a number of places, and it was apparently quite a success.

55. *Mr. Buxton.*] You have stated, and I think fairly emphatically, that if this Bill becomes law it will probably do the dairying industry considerable damage. You are of that opinion?—Yes, sir, I am.

56. You can see the possibility of the Bill damaging the industry?—Yes, defeating the ends it is sought to gain.

57. Take, for instance, freezing-works: they have to provide their drainage now, and are not allowed to put it into a stream?—Yes.

58. Take meat-boiling-down works and manure-works: those industries would be allowed to pollute the stream under the Bill?—These works are not included in the Bill.

59. *Mr. Buick.*] You know that the law now as it stands gives power to apply for an injunction if there is any deleterious matter put into a river?—Yes, I understand so.

60. You do not know of any way whereby it is possible to work a dairy factory without putting a certain amount of matter into a stream?—No.

61. In this special case before us the farmers sought the sum of £500 for damages going on for some time, and they got £5 damages; but they had the right to apply for an injunction?—Yes. I admit that an injunction is a very severe method of taking action.

62. *The Chairman.*] Well, there is another point: you say that the question applies more to the Health Department?—Well, yes, the question of sewerage, of course, does; but we have to do with the sanitary arrangement in connection with dairy factories, which includes drainage.

63. Take these Manawatu people who are between polluted water by flax and inferior water from the artesian wells: the cheese comes down for your inspection, and do you not come in then if damage arises from the use of impure water?—It would be very difficult to ascertain where it came from.

64. Your duty would be to take some marks off that cheese, would it not, and your further duty would be to go to the factory and find out how it has come about?—Oh, yes, that is our duty. We do attend to those things.

65. Then it is plain that bad water would put you on the *qui vive* straight away?—Yes, that is one of the first things we look at if there is a chance of the supply being contaminated.

66. *Mr. Buick.*] In your experience have you been able to filter artesian water with iron in it to make it suitable for dairy factories?—I do not know if it has been tried.

67. *Mr. Nathan.*] It has been used. We have a system of filtering. The manager of one of our factories was anxious to compete at the Palmerston Show, and we sent all the water down to Bunnythorpe to be filtered and to take all the iron out, but that, of course, was only a small quantity. We may use 7,000 gallons of water per day, but only a small portion of that would be for butter, the rest would be for cleaning?—Yes.

68. Those filters would never deal with the quantity of water required for a butter-factory or cheese-factory?—I should think not.