

their owner's names on. I do not know whether there is much objection to that, but it seems to me scarcely worth while putting people to the trouble of doing it. Every one is known to each other. The manager also knows all the suppliers. Why the regulation is necessary I quite fail to see. Then, the name on the dray. As the last witness told you, many small farmers have only one conveyance. It appears to me a pin-prick which is hardly worth giving. Then, in regard to 30, "No dairyman shall permit any cow, calf, or other animal to be at large within 30 ft. of any cowshed," &c. To carry that out would involve considerable outlay. I do not think the Department can really require that. I have a milk-stand fully 30 ft. from the shed—more than 40 ft.—but when the cows come out they walk by it; but under the regulations I should have to take them out some other way and fence the stand off. Then there is the regulation which does not allow a man to use his milk-cart for conveying a dead animal or material likely to taint the milk. The same remark applies to this as to the previous regulation regarding the cart. Many men have but the one conveyance. In the company I am chairman of the majority of the suppliers do not milk more than twenty to thirty cows. In the case of these it would be very hard to force them to keep two vehicles. If the dray is properly cleaned it should meet the case. Beyond this I have no objection to make. I was very pleased to know regulations were being made, and I should be glad to know that those who were neglecting to put their places in order would be made to improve their methods: it would be only fair to the rest of the suppliers.

1. *The Chairman.*] In the course of your evidence you said there was a material in your district equal to concrete. Do you mean the metal taken out of the mounds around Opunake?—Yes; it forms a very fine surface when it is properly set.

2. *Mr. Okey.*] You think some form of inspection is necessary?—Most decidedly. I have been advocating it for years.

3. Do you not think it would be better if it were of an educational nature?—Certainly. The Minister will bear me out when I say that last year he gave us to understand that for the first year it would be largely education, but if farmers would not be educated then it would be enforced. That is the impression we got at Palmerston.

4. In regard to the fee: do you not think the farmers would object to it? Would they not regard it as a tax?—There is a feeling of the sort, but as far as I am personally concerned I do not object to it. I feel we ought to pay something for what is being done. I do not think it will be a strong point.

5. Supposing an existing cowshed is within 30 ft. of a dwelling or a stable, do you think the owner should be compelled to shift it?—I do not know if in many cases it would be a very expensive process.

6. In regard to the milk cart and cans: do you not think a general clause to insure cleanliness would be sufficient?—I do.

7. You said it would be a hardship in not being able to use your cart for other purposes?—Yes.

8. Can you suggest anything beneficial which could be done for the farmers, say, in the testing of cows? Could you give us your experience for the benefit of farmers?—Last year I thoroughly tested each cow in my herd. I weighed the milk of each cow night and morning one day a week, and took composite samples, and tested them at the end of the month. Far more could be done by example than by talking. The effect of my work is that four or five suppliers to our company are going to take up the testing of their herds this season. I was asked at a meeting of the agricultural society in New Plymouth what was my recommendation in regard to testing, and I replied, "Start it in your own district, and others will follow."

9. You think the Inspectors could help in that direction?—I think they could help, most decidedly. I am fully convinced it is one of the most important things about the dairy industry.

10. You object to notifying the Inspector about any alterations?—I do. If my yard is in a bad condition it does seem absurd that I must give fourteen days' notice before I can improve it.

11. *Mr. Witty.*] You think concrete should be used wherever possible?—Yes, most decidedly.

12. You think these regulations, if modified slightly and carried out in a common-sense way, would be a hardship on the farmer?—No; except in the cases I mention, I am quite in favour of them.

13. In a modified form?—I should like to see them carried out in a modified form rather than be dropped.

14. It would be better carried out by a Government officer than by the companies themselves?—In my opinion, inspection by the company is quite out of the question. The dairy companies are little democracies. The suppliers elect the directors, and if the directors make themselves obnoxious the result would be that at the next election directors would be put in who would not trouble about these things.

15. Do you think it necessary to have the name on the cart and cans in delivering milk to the city?—I was only referring to factories.

16. Every one is known there?—Yes.

17. In the city the name should be on?—Yes, I think so.

18. You object to not being allowed to make alterations to yards without first notifying the Inspector. The regulation only applies to rebuilding a shed or making extensive alterations. That is the way I read it?—Yes.

19. *Mr. Rhodes.*] Do you represent the milk-suppliers to a factory?—I am chairman of a co-operative dairy company, and have been so for the last ten years.

20. You stated your objection to certain clauses. Are your objections the objections of the suppliers in your district?—Yes, except that mine are far more modified than those of the majority of the suppliers.

21. Are they small or big men?—Quite as many of the big men as the small.