

very satisfactorily. There is an acclimatisation society in Otago; that society is under Government to some extent, but they manage their own affairs.

78. But still you recognise the necessity of inspection either under the Government or some other authority?—Of course if you make an Act like this you must carry it out. The difficulty is who is to carry it out. It would always cause more or less dissatisfaction to be mixed up with Government inspection.

79. You have mentioned that milk condemned should be sealed up and sent to an analyst?—Yes.

80. Where would the analyst reside?—We have one in Dunedin and one in Christchurch. I suppose there is one in each large centre—not necessarily a Government analyst. Besides Professor Black in Dunedin, there are one or two others—men who would be perfectly independent and unbiassed.

81. *Mr. Lawry.*] What is your opinion of clause 11?—I do not see what particular harm a man would do in bringing milk from an infected cow. It would be bad milk. The Inspector or factory manager would discover that it was bad, and it would be rejected.

82. Suppose the milk from a cow suffering from tuberculosis?—That ought to be stopped. I think that that could be stopped.

83. Do you not think the clause would have a wonderful effect in showing the consumer that there could not be bad milk used?—In that way I think it would have a good effect. Of course every factory existing at present has something to the same effect in their rules and regulations.

84. *Mr. Wright.*] The difficulty would be to ascertain the cause of the mischief when it is done?—Yes; I think it would be a good thing to put that in.

85. *The Chairman.*] You think that the most important part of this Bill is that which relates to branding produce for what it really is?—Yes.

86. Do you think it would assist the industry more if we confined our legislation this session to that extent?—That is a matter for lawyers; at present I cannot see the necessity for all these provisions, except the clause pointed out to let the public know what we are doing.

87. Do you think the passing the whole Bill, or passing those parts in reference to branding, is most in the interest of industry?—I think the parts relating to branding are most in the interest of the industry decidedly.

88. You have said you thought the inspection should be under the dairying associations?—Yes.

89. You think that those people most directly interested in the industry would be best able to select the export butter?—Yes.

90. Is it not the fact, just now, that the difficulty with dairy factories is to secure a sufficient supply of milk?—Yes; that is so with some of them.

91. If this Bill should pass in its entirety, do you think that would secure a better supply of milk, or would it rather tend to diminish the supply of milk?—In some districts it would cause irritation among the farmers, and prevent them sending in their milk. I should think if this Bill were brought into full force against them they would not risk it.

92. You think that dairy factories in the South have much benefitted by Government inspection?—No; I do not think they have; not to any great extent. They are all very good cheese makers. They are all first-class men.

93. Do you think that the enterprise of the people down there has had a good deal to do with the success?—Certainly it has.

94. Exception has been taken to the word “blended” for mixed lots?—I may explain that some people gather up the lots which farmers or storekeepers have on hand; they work it altogether. According to the Act, they have to mark it “blended.”

95. Is there any other brand that would be sufficiently distinctive?—Yes; I think the word “packed” (packed butter) would be better. “Blended” butter would indicate—at all events, people would say so—“mixed” butter. Looking under that head people might assume that it was mixed or “blended” with margarine, or oleo, or other matter. “Packed butter” is mostly known as collectors’ butter—that is, distinguishable from the ordinary cottage-made butter.

96. *Mr. Wright.*] Do you think the public would prefer the title of Instructor to that of Inspector?—In a Bill like this it would have to be Inspector.

97. *Mr. Lawry.*] Do you consider that this Bill, if passed in its entirety, will prove more oppressive to the suppliers of milk than to those who buy it and manufacture it afterwards?—Yes; it is more vexatious to the farmers than to the man who is getting the milk. No honest man has anything to fear from this Bill, except clause 10, which you say is taken out.

98. Do you know of a case where a man has erected machinery, bought butter from neighbours, and then made it into one blend or quality?—That there are cases of that sort I do not doubt, but I do not know that the butter so treated would be of the one quality; it might come near to it in some cases.

99. *Mr. Wright.*] If butter from various makers is “mixed,” why not designate it “mixed butter”?—I think “packed” is the best word—“packed butter.”

100. Would not “pure mixed” or “pure blended butter” do?—Yes; if you put in the word “pure.” The objection is to the word “blended.” Some people would say that is simply a “mixture.” There is an article known as mixed butter at Home. A man might sell margarine or oleo under that name. If you use the word “pure” it might do, but I would prefer the words “packed butter”—pure packed butter—if putting in the word “pure” were thought desirable. No good maker has anything to fear from this brand, for the article will sell for what it really is. There are cases where dairy butter will fetch more than factory butter. There is plenty of dairy butter of first-class quality. You want protection not from the skilful, but from the careless and unscrupulous. To show you what can be done in the way of imposition, I may state that there was a man in Dunedin who sold skim-milk cheese, which he said came from a factory in the North