

39. *Mr. Hogg.*] I think you mentioned in regard to the removal of manure and keeping the sheds clean that the time allowed is not sufficient?—Not in the bulk of cases. We think provision should be made to meet isolated cases.

40. Is the time generally exceeded?—In our district we find that men living within reasonable distance of the station, or having assistance, carry out the regulations, but that with men milking by themselves, in the Mungaroa Valley, and having to take their milk eight miles on Sunday, it cannot be done.

41. Up country they have long distances to go over bad roads?—Yes. I know several cases where it is absolutely impossible to get within the time.

42. Do you not think simple regulations requiring them to clean their sheds once a day would be quite sufficient?—I do not care about that, as if the work is left to the evening there would be a fertiliser there for deterioration of the milk.

43. Is a fee of 5s. reasonable?—Yes, I think so.

44. You object to anything in the shape of a cow-tax?—Yes.

45. You do not think a fee should be imposed beyond that necessary for the trouble of registration?—It should be a general charge, as for the Rabbit Inspector, Noxious Weed Inspector, &c.

46. Do you think there is more trouble in inspecting large or small herds?—Generally, I think a man with a large herd finds he must keep up to date.

47. As far as the Inspectors and Department are concerned, would the trouble be much greater in one case than in another?—I do not think there is much difference—more trouble in inspecting premises for one or two cows.

48. In enforcing these regulations would you give the farmer ample time and opportunity to build?—Reasonable time. We have always had reasonable time with the present Inspector, but not with his predecessor. There has been no continuity. A man might do a reasonable thing for the previous Inspector which would not meet with the approval of the next man. It is lack of continuity which gives trouble.

49. In cases of dispute would you rather refer it to a Board than to an officer of the Department?—We would rather settle the matter amicably by a Board.

50. You consider fair consideration would be given by a Board?—We think there would be a greater amount of give and take by the parties.

51. In your opinion, where there is a dispute the dairy-farmer should be represented as well as the Department?—Yes. The matter should be settled by the two parties appointing a third.

52. Would not the appointment of a Board have a beneficial effect where the Inspector was inclined to be arbitrary?—Yes.

53. Then the effect would be deterrent, in applying a brake to the Inspector?—We look upon it as a safeguard.

54. And the Magistrate would only be appealed to when prosecutions are made for a penalty?—That is the instruction from the union, and that evidence should be offered for the defence.

55. The Magistrate would not be a competent man to deal with disputes between the farmer and the Inspector?—He would take it more as a question of law.

56. *Mr. Lang.*] In regard to the appeal, I take it from your remarks that you are in favour of all dispute between the farmer and the Inspector going to the Board of Appeal, not merely the three cases provided for appeals?—In my opinion, the applying of section 3, the flooring of sheds, the cleansing of utensils, and section (f) of 8, the removal of offensive matter—these are the matters that would practically have to be decided.

57. Are there any other matters?—We have not discussed it.

58. You think the Magistrate would be guided by the regulations, whereas the Board of Appeal would take the case on its merits?—We consider the Magistrate would take a legal view of it.

59. He would have no discretionary power, but would give way to the Inspector on the regulations?—Yes.

60. The Minister referred to the farmer being represented before the Magistrate: do you find the farmer an unreasonable man?—We dodge lawyers all we can in our district.

61. Going back to the registration fee. You are connected more particularly with the city milk-supply?—Yes. Personally my people are engaged in producing butter for local consumption; but the bulk of our farmers are engaged in producing milk for the city supply.

62. Were not these regulations brought in for the purpose of getting clean milk? Is it not a most important thing in the trade referred to that the consumer should get clean milk? More advantageous to the people who are going to drink the milk? Therefore, should not they pay their share of registration, instead of, as here, the registration fee falling on the dairyman?—Of course, because we pay a fee we do not see why another man should pay a fee too.

63. The fee should be taken off entirely, just as the sheep-tax was removed?—We have no objection to the 5s. in the past, or no objection to its continuance.

64. You object to it being 10s.?—Yes.

65. You do not object to the other, on account of its smallness?—That is so.

66. In reference to the time of cleaning utensils, yard, &c., you think it would be better to decide the question by local circumstances?—Yes. There are cases of local circumstances which would make it impossible.

67. The regulations should not say a particular time, but as long as they do it in a satisfactory manner it should be sufficient?—We stated four hours.

68. Might not this be inconvenient in some cases?—Yes.

69. There may be things in different localities that alter it. Would it not be better to allow it to be altered according to circumstances—that is, so long as the Inspector was satisfied proper cleanliness was observed?—If done in a reasonable time, yes.