

16. *The Chairman.*] Have you completed all you have to say?—Yes.

17. I only wish to ask one general question. You recommend that in place of the Act which is now proposed the English Act should be adopted in its entirety?—Well, as close as it can be to meet the requirements of the colony.

18. You also say that regulations—which I understand you to say are not in existence at present—are absolutely necessary?—I believe so. Most of the points of detail provided for under this Act would be better provided for by regulation as far as possible.

19. What about the English regulations? Would the English regulations be applicable to this colony?—I think so.

20. *Hon. Mr. T. Kelly.*] As I understand it with respect to the Bill we are now considering, you do not consider it is in the interests of the farmers?—The Bill as printed is certainly not in favour of the farmers. The farmer would have numerous difficulties to contend with under the Bill. There would be the difficulty of the Inspector obtaining the samples, and the inability of the farmer to have the sample analysed; and there are other difficulties. As this Bill lies before you it is absolutely hopeless for the farmer. I have advised that the words “unit-value” should be deleted. The words “materially differs” would have to be fought out between the Analyst, the vendor, and the Magistrate—

21. It would be difficult to say what the unit-value was to be?—That is so. It would be better if left to the regulations and the Analyst.

22. Do I understand that these amendments proposed by the Department are not all that is required?—I think not.

23. Could you amend the Bill in the direction that you wish for the Committee—

24. *The Chairman.*] You recommend the English Bill?—Yes. The existing Bill as altered by the Stock Department, with the additional alterations which I have suggested, would bring it so closely to the English Act that practically it would be the English Act.

25. *Hon. Mr. T. Kelly.*] You would prefer that the Act should be assisted by regulations on many points which it is proposed in this Act to include in the Act?—Yes.

26. I understand that the English Act could be easily applied to the colony?—Yes.

27. *Hon. Mr. A. L. Smith.*] You recommend that the manufacturer should be left out?—I think so. You cannot deal with a man who is out of the colony.

28. But there are many manufacturers in the colony already?—But if he is a manufacturer he is a vendor also, and a vendor is liable under the Act, unless he has a warranty from the manufacturer, and then the manufacturer suffers.

29. Well, now you say, Do away with the words “unit-value.” How are you going to indicate unless you fix a unit-value?—That is, the proportion or percentage you mean, not value. The value is the selling-value.

30. You said it was a problem fixing this which many people—especially farmers—could not do?—I am sure they could not. If you take three points of varying percentages, and attempt to calculate the whole three as against one fixed sum, you have really a serious problem.

31. Is there no method by which there could be a well-known established value?—Oh, yes. We all use unit-values; but these unit-values, as fixed, for instance, by the Gear Company, are just 50 per cent. above what was calculated as the actual value.

32. Then, you recommend that these words should be struck out. What would you put in place of them?—I would follow the English Act.

33. Please read the clause again?—Fertilisers Act, clause 3, (c): it says, “A general description of the fertiliser, and its price; a full statement of its composition, showing the minimum percentage of the following ingredients when present, and the unit-value attached to each of them.” It does not say, however, that the manure shall be calculated as under “The Manure Adulteration Act, 1892,” clause 11, which says, “The certificate of analysis shall also state the total value of the manure sampled, on the basis of the value per unit per ton published by the vendor, any difference between such total value and the price charged for such manure to be allowed for by the vendor at the unit-price specified in invoice.”

34. If it is less, that is to say?—That is so; but then all the vendor has to do is to put up his unit-values and cover himself.

35. Then you think that this clause should indicate the ingredients only?—Exactly; it should be a guaranteed analysis. The unit-value in the Bill is no criterion. Take the instance I have mentioned of——, where the total values were £8 1s., while the selling-value was £4. There is no criterion of what the unit-values are in that case. If you are going to have the unit-value in the Bill, then, as I have already stated, you should have it made plain that such values when calculated should be equal to its selling-price.

36. That is to say, the more simple it is the better?—Exactly. I would like to add a word or two. It has been suggested by some of the vendors that reverted phosphate should be considered—that is, dicalcic phosphate not soluble in water. They want to put “dicalcic phosphate soluble in citrate of ammonium.” This is likely to cause trouble amongst chemists. It would be better to leave it as it is in the English Act—phosphate of lime soluble in water, and phosphate of lime insoluble.

TUESDAY, 13TH OCTOBER, 1903.

HENRY WILLIAM LAWRENCE, Acting Chief Chemist to the Agricultural Department, examined.
(No. 3.)

1. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you read the evidence of Mr. Pond with regard to this Bill?—Yes, I have.

2. He lays great stress upon the uselessness of including the unit-values in the Bill, as this would lead, he says, to complications?—That is a point on which I have very strong opinions—that the unit-values provision should remain in the Bill.