

9. You must not object to putting it on the smaller man?—We object to a discriminating charge.

10. Do you not think it would be a less charge on the small man than the large one?—I know half a dozen cases in my district where people are milking two cows and keeping boardinghouses. The difficulty has been that the Inspector could not keep track of these people in the past, and we consider they should be liable to inspection just as much as others.

11. You think the man with a hundred cows is entitled to pay more than the man with one?—No, because the man with a hundred cows is paying more in expenses.

12. And has a greater profit?—It does not follow.

13. Do you not think the Inspector could give good advice to the farmer as regards his herd?—If our present Inspector was rewarded for good advice in that way, and generally shepherding the farmer, he would get a gold medal.

14. In regard to appeal, you would not object to some one named by the farmer working in conjunction with the Inspector of Stock?—That is what we are asking.

15. Could this be carried out with a little modification by an Inspector having judgment and tact?—Yes, absolutely. The regulation in regard to time of moving offensive matter does not give the Inspector any option. We ask that that might be made optional, and an opportunity given of referring it to the Board of Appeal.

16. Cleansing yards and removing the manure?—Yes.

17. Would you not be appealing every day?—No; we consider ourselves fairly reasonable.

18. Would it not be better to put a fair limit than leave it to the discretion of the Inspector?—We say, not exceeding four hours. The Department says one and two hours.

19. You object to the branding of cans not fit to be used. How would you mark them unless you branded them? Unless there was a distinct mark there would be nothing to indicate that they had been condemned?—What we object to is branding without consulting the owner, because there may be a possibility of retinning.

20. It says, when an Inspector says this can is not to be used he condemns it?—What we got from the newspapers was that can had to be condemned when rusty.

21. You said you would not allow a man to give away milk at all. What would you do if you were miles away from a factory, and your neighbour's life depended on him getting milk? Would you prohibit it?—Not under these circumstances. We are not objecting to the clause.

22. You would grant the Inspector some discretion?—We want it shown if modified.

23. Do you not think, if you were on the road, and very thirsty, and went to a place, and they were not allowed to give you a drink of milk, it would be carrying things too far?—From an unregistered dairy?

24. Yes?—What is the definition?

25. It includes the lot. Supposing a swagger came to your place and asked for a piece of bread and butter or a drink of milk, or a family next door might be starving, and you were not allowed to give any milk away: do you not think it would be carrying things too far?—No.

26. You do not see any objection to milking in the paddock?—None whatever. We milk in the paddock ourselves.

27. *Mr. Rhodes.*] I would like to be quite clear about giving away. You say a dairyman ought not to be allowed to give milk away?—Yes.

28. Then, as regards pure milk, you have no objection to that being given away?—It is in connection with clause 27—that is, from diseased cows, or produce from an unregistered dairy.

29. No objection to pure milk?—No.

30. You went very systematically through all the regulations down to 28. I did not hear you say you approved of this?—I went right through to 33, which we approve of.

31. This one of the regulations referring to clean material?—We think should not be objected to.

32. The previous one deals with animals being about the milking-shed. It would compel fencing 30 ft. around the cowshed?—That was not discussed by us. We had no copy of the regulations. We will discuss that to-morrow night.

33. *Hon. Mr. McNab.*] From the dairyman's point of view, which of the alternatives I am going to suggest would be the better one? There are many cases in the regulations where a modification of time and distance, or something, has to be made. Which do you think dairymen would prefer—a general direction in the regulations, and let the Magistrate decide whether the regulation was not being carried out, or a form like we have in section 33, an appeal from the Dairy Inspector to the Chief Inspector of Stock?—We are very keen on the Appeal Board. In the matter of the Magistrate's decision, the Inspector's decision being final, it has been eliminated from the regulations. We consider the regulations are satisfactory with certain modifications.

34. You are suggesting that the Magistrate should not come in at all, only the Appeal Board?—If the supplier was dissatisfied with the Appeal Board he could then take it to the Magistrate.

35. Would it not be costly to the dairyman? Would it not be better to allow the Magistrate to decide everything?—I am of that opinion.

36. If you think the dairyman would prefer the Magistrate to settle all disputes, and the putting-in of more detail than we have here, there is no objective in the appeal?—That would involve solicitors and considerable legal expenses. Or would the Magistrate be acting as an arbitrator, instead of as in his judicial capacity?

37. There is no reason why provision should not be made in the regulations that if the farmer does not employ a solicitor the Department would not?—I am afraid I cannot give you a satisfactory answer to that question.

38. Is it not the case that if the farmer gave up the right of having counsel he would be like the other man?—