

suggest that the Government should pay for it. I may say our fees and licenses come to a very small amount. They have not the means to pay for compensation.

245. You have seen yourself there has been more condemned cattle at the freezing-works, where they are not inspected, than where they are under inspection at the private yards?—I have seen these animals at the sale-yards, and I have given notice to the buyer that I must see the animals killed.

246. *Mr. Buchanan.*] For what purpose are these cows bought by the freezing company—boiling down or what?—Potting and boiling down.

247. What do they do with their old cows that are not fit for anything except boiling down?—They boil them down. They are killing the potters on the same day.

248. I suppose the freezing companies buy thousands of old ewes for the same purpose of potting. Do you inspect these?—I inspect the cattle and look through the sheep at the same time.

249. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What is done with the animals that are condemned?—They are boiled down for manure; the diseased parts are buried.

TUESDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 1898.

JOHN ROD examined.

1. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Your name?—John Rod, butcher, residing at Johnsonville. I have a shop in Johnsonville as well as in Wellington.

2. You represent others besides yourself, do you not?—Yes; I am representative for Petone and the Hutt as well as Porirua.

3. Will you please make your statement?—I have been butchering for twenty years in the colony. My business extends from Pahautanui to Wellington, a radius of twenty miles. I have a slaughter-yard at Porirua, some twelve miles from my shop in Wellington. My shops and slaughterhouse will compare favourably for cleanliness with any place in the colony. I always buy the very best meat obtainable in the market, and I have gone to a lot of expense in connection with the trade. I have gone to a lot of expense to bring water right through my slaughter-yards, and have provided all the latest appliances. I think it would be hard indeed that I should be deprived of the use of my yards, for, under the present Bill, this would be the case, and I would be allowed no compensation. I am entirely in favour of the views of the Auckland delegates, Messrs. Raynes and Moody. They have had in Auckland the privilege which no other towns in New Zealand have had. They have had both dead- and live-meat inspection there, and it has been satisfactorily carried out. I do not see why we should not keep our present slaughterhouses under the same conditions of inspection as in Auckland. One Auckland delegate said he had been killing for twenty years at the back of his shop, and there never were any complaints. That is not allowed here. In my shop I used to kill a few lambs occasionally.

4. Was that in the town?—No, at Johnsonville. The police came in, and said if I did not continue they should take the matter up under the Police Offences Act. I think this is unfair, as it seems to me a case of two laws—one for each end of the colony. Under the present Bill I can still kill for Porirua and Johnsonville, but I will not be able to bring the meat to Wellington for sale there. If I do wish to retail in Wellington, as now, I shall require to kill at a public abattoir. I think this would be unfair. My principal place of business is situated in Courtenay Place, Wellington. I have always carried on business successfully there. My turnover is something about, say, £12,000 a year, and I have always bought and killed my own meat. I buy most of my stock from the graziers in the country, and a little from the sale-yards. I object to subclause (2) of the Bill in clause (3). I think the words “for barter or sale” should be struck out. I also object to subclause (1) clause 15, and I think it should be struck out altogether. I object to part of subclause (1) clause 16. I would be in favour of deleting the words “subject to the provisions hereinafter contained relating to meat-export slaughterhouses,” and I would alter the words “human consumption” to “local consumption,” and strike out the words “or for export.” In clause 18 I would strike out the words “and by the licensee thereof or his workmen.” By leaving these words in the clause mentioned our men would be deprived of the privilege of killing our own stock at meat-export slaughterhouses. We could only drive them there, but we would have no control of them afterwards. In clause 24 the words “export only” should be added. In clause 26 of the Bill the words “for human consumption throughout the colony” should be struck out. Under clause 30 we are compelled to enter up all ear-marks, brands, and colours. This would be impossible, as we have so many different marks from different owners, all mixed together. Under clause 31 any person by paying 1s. can inspect our books. I strongly object to such being done.

5. You think that should be restricted to official people?—I have no objection to that. As far as subclause (3) of clause 32 goes, I think in hot weather it would be a case of very great hardship if, say, in the sudden absence of an Inspector, we should be unable to shift our meat without a written authority from the Inspector unless an Acting Inspector were provided. I object strongly to clause 56. If we are deprived of our private slaughterhouses, which cost hundreds of pounds, and compelled to leave them we should be paid compensation in some form or other. I think another subclause should be added to this clause providing for compensation for condemned meat. I think it is a hardship both for the butcher as well as the grazier to bear losses for condemned meat. I am in touch with the farmers who fatten the cattle, and there is only one farmer out of ten who does breed cattle as well as fatten them. They buy forward bullocks and finish them, and their stock goes, perhaps, through a dozen different hands before they get them; so that I consider the farmer is exactly in the same position as the butcher who buys direct. Often when stores are high, and after keeping them, say,