

25. If no animal was allowed to come within 30 ft. of a milking-shed, would not the space become overgrown with weeds?—I do not know why the cows should not be allowed to come up to the back of the shed.

26. Under these regulations they could not?—I do not see why they should not. You make provision for cattle being housed every night. I do not see any objection to stock depasturing in the paddock and coming as near the back of the shed as they like.

27. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] You mentioned the case of some dairies not being inspected?—I believe that is right. They were not inspected for years. They were in out-of-the-way places.

28. Do you know of the cases of your own knowledge?—No.

29. Were you told they were registered dairies?—Yes.

30. Can you mention one that was a registered dairy and had not been inspected for years?—I would not like to mention anything that would injure any one.

31. A dairy was named to you?—I have heard of a dairy an Inspector did not go to.

*Hon. Mr. McNab* asked that the name should be supplied to him privately. To this the witness agreed.

32. You do not believe in the race?—No.

33. You know the regulations do not make the race compulsory?—Yes.

34. In the form in which the clause appears, do you think it satisfactory?—To me it is.

35. *Mr. Buddo.*] I understand from your evidence that you favour regulations for dairy-inspection. Would you favour putting the race further away, and only using it for driving purposes?—I would not favour putting the yard any further away, so long as the shed was closed and the yard was kept clean.

36. Are there any dairy-yards in your district artificially made up to keep them out of flood-water?—I do not personally know of them.

37. I take it that you find considerable difficulty in concreting yards like that?—Yes, a yard made up like that would require a long time to enable it to settle down.

38. In other words, it would be a costly process?—Yes.

39. You have noticed the clause which does not permit the vehicle which has taken the milk to town to be used for any other purpose?—Yes.

40. Supposing the farmer was not allowed to carry manure or other strong odorous matter, would there be any objection to him carrying ordinary goods?—No, it is straining the matter too far. According to the section you cannot carry your own food in the cart.

41. You think, by the omission of manure or strongly odorous matter, there would be no objection to carrying ordinary goods?—Yes.

42. Of your own knowledge, do you know of any hardship being caused to a tenant of a dairy farm by the new regulations?—No. But I know they have been asked to carry out improvements, but have been allowed to go on to the end of their term. Had they been forced they would have had to go out of the business.

43. Do you think a proportion of the cost should be borne by the landlord?—Yes.

44. *Mr. Macpherson.*] You state you would favour the landlord paying a portion of the cost of improvements in the case of a short lease: would you not consider it a hardship on the owner of that farm being compelled to pay any proportion of it, seeing that within perhaps eighteen months he may relet the farm to a new tenant who might not go in for dairying?—It would be if the farm was not to be continued as a dairy farm.

45. In the absence of that knowledge, he has no guarantee that he can relet to another tenant going in for dairying?—If the tenant is improving the property the landlord has a right to pay a share.

46. In your opinion, are the Inspectors in your district competent?—I have a doubt about it.

47. How many does your reference apply to?—I have not experienced more than one.

48. In regard to arbitration, what representation would you give the farmer in the event of a dispute?—I should say half-and-half. If you appoint one officer from the Department and a representative of the farmer, they should have a right to call in a third.

49. In regard to rust in cans, would you consider it a hardship if this clause was put into effect?—I would.

50. Would you consider the Inspector would be doing his duty condemning a new can which by friction had become rusty?—It might be rusty from the dew in one night.

51. Do you think there would be difficulty in drawing a comparison between clean black iron and rusty iron?—Yes.

52. Do you think that would lead to friction unless a wide distinction was made?—Yes.

53. Section 18 would be a distinct hardship?—Yes.

54. *Mr. Lang.*] You have read the proposed regulations?—Yes.

55. What would be the effect of them being brought into force and carried out to the very letter?—It would be a serious blow in many cases.

56. You are in favour of appeal in case of dispute: do you think the Court of Appeal should be guided by the circumstances of the case, or should they be bound by the regulations?—I should say, the circumstances of the case. In my opinion it is impossible to make regulations to suit every part from the North Cape to the Bluff.

WILLIAM LEWIS WRIGHT, Dairyman, Christchurch, examined. (No. 5.)

*Witness:* In the proposed regulations I consider the Department has made a big effort to meet the dairymen, and with a few amendments they will be satisfactory. In the first place, I think the Inspector should be a qualified dairyman. If they were qualified dairymen, in the first