

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 1935

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 7 NOVEMBER, 1935.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. G. Pollock, *Gregory*) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.

QUESTION.

ABORIGINALS' SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Home Secretary—

“(1.) What was the total amount to credit of Aborigines' Savings Bank Accounts at 30th June, 1935?”

“(2.) What amounts of Aborigines' Savings Deposits, exclusive of interest, have been appropriated for departmental purposes in each of the last ten financial years, and for what purposes were these amounts used?”

“(3.) In what year was the practice adopted of appropriating the interest on Aborigines' Savings Bank accounts for departmental purposes, and what amounts of such interest have been appropriated in each financial year?”

“(4.) What trust funds exist which comprise moneys held on behalf of aborigines (exclusive of Savings Bank accounts), and what was the amount at credit of each such fund at 30th June, 1935?”

“(5.) Have any of the trust moneys held on behalf of aborigines, including Savings Bank deposits, been invested in Government securities, and, if so, in what securities and amounts respectively?”

“(6.) In the case of aborigines' moneys invested in Government securities, to what fund is the interest on such securities credited?”

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) replied—

“(1.) £254,410 2s. 4d.

“(2.) Nil.

“(3.) Interest on Aborigines' Savings Bank Accounts has since 1933-34 been paid into Standing Account, and used solely for the benefit of destitute aborigines, and not in any way for departmental purposes. The amounts paid in each year were as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
1933-34	8,364	14	1
1934-35	8,990	11	10
1935-36	9,291	0	0

“(4.)— Credit Balance.
£ s. d.

1. Aborigines' Protection Property Account ...	18,581	4	5
2. Aborigines' Provident Fund	6,222	13	3
3. Standing Account ...	8,471	3	2

“(5.) Yes, as follows:—

(a) Country Savings Bank Accounts, £200,000 Australian Consolidated Stock: £12,000 Settlement Aboriginal Trust Accounts, Australian Consolidated Stock.

(b) Aborigines' Protection Property Account—£14,000 of the above balance (£18,581 4s. 5d.), Australian Consolidated Stock.

(c) Aborigines' Provident Fund—£2,060, included in above balance (£6,222 13s. 3d.), Australian Consolidated Stock.

Also £20 Government Bond.

Also £5,000 not included in the above balance loaned to Aboriginal Industries at 5 per cent.

“(6.) See Answer to No. 3.”

PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

Annual Report of the Land Administration Board on the operations of the Department of Public Lands (Sub-Departments of Prickly-pear Land Commission, Irrigation and Water Supply, and Forestry) for the year 1934-35.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

PASSAGE OF BILLS THROUGH ALL STAGES IN ONE DAY.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. P. Pease, *Herbert*) [10.35 a.m.]: I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the receiving of Resolutions from Committees of Supply and Ways and Means on the same day as they shall have passed in those Committees, and the passing of Bills through all their stages in one day.”

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [10.36 a.m.]: I could quite understand the reason for this motion if it made provision for the passage of non-controversial measures in one day, and we were well advanced in the session. The hot weather is then with us, and members are desirous of getting away for their Christmas vacation. Under such circumstances there may be some excuse for putting through a non-contentious measure in the one day. During the early part of the session we dealt with a number of Bills that were entirely non-contentious—most were merely machinery Bills, and there was no objection to passing them through all their stages in the one day—but, as usually happens, the Government have delayed the contentious legislation until the latter part of the session. They now propose to bring down most important Bills and rush them through all their stages in one day. The Home Secretary informed us yesterday that he will be bringing down a Bill dealing with hospitals. To-day we have to deal with an amendment of the Liquor Act, with the contents of which we are as yet quite unacquainted. We have only seen suggestions in the Press as to its provisions. The Treasurer proposes to bring down an amendment of the Income Tax Acts to bring the law into conformity with the Federal Act. That amendment may contain a number of important clauses, and have very far-reaching effects.

The principle of rushing important measures through in one day is wrong. Indeed, the rushing of Bills through all their stages in the one day is contrary to the purpose of parliamentary procedure, which is set out in the Standing Orders.

Mr. Moore.]

These specify the time for the introduction of a Bill, order a delay between the introduction and the first reading, another between the first and second readings, and a third between the second reading and the committee stages. Those delays are provided for the purpose of giving hon. members an opportunity of knowing exactly what the Bill contains. You, Mr. Speaker, must know that when we have a Bill handed to us we have often to read more than half-a-dozen amending Acts to find out where the different clauses of the Bill fit into the Act. We shall have to read four or five amending Acts when dealing with the amendment to the Dairy Produce Acts that it is proposed to bring down. If these Bills are to be rushed through all their stages in one day, we shall not have a fair opportunity of discussing them.

I cannot understand why hon. members on the Government side agree to this motion, because there is no urgency about the matter, and if the motion is agreed to we shall not have a proper opportunity of thoroughly discussing the measures. When Parliament lays down certain rules and regulations as to the procedure for passing a Bill we should not break away from them unless some very urgent reason makes that course necessary. Will there be any advantage in adopting this practice? Should not the desire of the Government be to have every measure dissected and properly discussed? Because these measures have already passed through caucus it does not follow that there is not a mistake somewhere. These mistakes cannot be discovered unless we have a full opportunity to discuss them, and we cannot discuss Bills properly unless we have ample time to find out exactly what they contain. The Minister in charge of the Bill likes to have amendments placed before him in print so that he may know the exact effect of the proposal, but what chance have Opposition members to let the Minister have these amendments if the measure is to be rushed through in one day? The principle is entirely wrong, and I object to it.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [10.41 a.m.]: No doubt the Minister moving this resolution will say that the course he proposes is customary; that it has been followed either by the Moore Government or some other party. The Bills that have already been introduced this session have only been formal amendments of the law. Only one day remains for the discussion of the Estimates, and there is ample time between now and the Christmas holidays to consider all the Bills carefully. I appeal to the Acting Premier to reconsider his decision in this matter. I also suggest that the Standing Orders, which were framed largely when Queensland had a house of review, should be amended to suit present requirements, that is, to prohibit any Government from passing Bills through all their stages in one day without the consent of the Opposition. They could provide that the Opposition should consent to the passage of a Bill through all its stages in the one day, if urgent reasons made that course necessary.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS conversing in loud tones.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult to hear the hon. member for Dalby because of the conversation that is taking place in the Chamber.

[*Mr. Moore.*]

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Liquor Act Amendment Bill is a very important one, affecting the interests not only of brewers and hotelkeepers but also all the people. If a Bill is passed through all its stages in one day, hon. members do not have an opportunity to discuss it thoroughly, to frame appropriate amendments and to consider whether it is going to have a detrimental effect upon the people generally. The people should have the right to say whether the Liquor Act Amendment Bill should be passed, but how are we to know their views unless an opportunity is afforded to them to convey their opinions to their respective members of Parliament? There is no desperate hurry for the measure. No attempt has been made by the Opposition to stonewall any Bills that have been passed this session, nor do I think that they will stone-wall any Bills in the future. Notice has been given of a number of bills that must seriously interfere with the liberty of the subject, and the people should have an opportunity to instruct their members what they wish them to do in connection with them. The Liquor Act Amendment Bill is said to be a very contentious measure. Hon. members on this side do not know its contents, although the Press appears to have some knowledge of them. We are the paid representatives of the people, but we know less about the Bill than does the Press: nor are we to be given an opportunity to move appropriate amendments.

Notice has also been given of a Dairy Produce Acts Amendment Bill, which I understand will seriously interfere with the rights of the people engaged in the dairying industry. The various agricultural organisations should be given an opportunity to meet and consider the effect of the proposed legislation, but they will not have that opportunity if Bills are to be passed through all their stages in one day. I warn the Government to hasten slowly in these matters and particularly to remember that they have met with serious difficulties in connection with their legislation owing to the absence of a second Chamber in this State. Legislation imposing fees on motorists was passed three years ago, but owing to faulty draftsmanship its meaning was in doubt until a few days ago. We are paid by the people to consider all these matters thoroughly. There is no reason why we should hurry. We should take our time and consider all legislation line by line and word by word. The members of the Government Party do not experience any difficulty in passing their Bills through all stages in one day. They have various committees within their caucus to consider the Bills that are to be introduced, and thus can give consideration to them that we cannot. The Opposition have rights in this Parliament, and we must stand up for our rights. I hope that the Acting Premier will reconsider his decision.

We are not desirous of prolonging the session. I do not desire to sit right up to Christmas Day any more than any other hon. member, and without doing so we have at least a month to consider the legislation to be brought forward. So far as I can see the only Bills we shall be called upon to consider are the ones I have mentioned. Why not adopt the usual procedure and allow them to pass through their stages in the ordinary way? The Deputy Leader of the Government will find that there will not

be any attempt to delay their passage. I am not here to stonewall and delay the legislation of the Government. I am here to express an opinion on it, and I should have the right to draw up amendments for consideration on the Committee stage of every Bill. If the Bills are to pass through all stages in one day we shall be deprived of that opportunity. Most likely the Deputy Leader of the Government will say that the Moore Government or some other Government of the past were responsible for introducing this procedure, but if it was the time has arrived when such a system should be altered. I have always held that view. I have been opposed to Bills being passed through all stages in one day on principle. The Liquor Acts Amendment Act is a Bill of paramount importance to the people. I hope the Minister will not use his brutal majority on that measure, but give the Opposition the opportunity to which they are justly entitled, as well as the people outside, of carefully scrutinising its provisions. The interests of the people are more important than the Opposition, because it is the former that will be compelled to live under this particular piece of legislation. Nevertheless, the Opposition should also have an opportunity of expressing their opinion in order to register an intelligent vote. This motion will, no doubt, be carried, but I hope the Deputy Leader of the Government will nevertheless refrain from bringing forward important measures and forcing them through all their stages in one day. Some of the amending Bills to be introduced are of a trivial nature, and we will not object to them, but I hope the Deputy Premier will not adopt a course that will prevent the Opposition from preparing amendments on important Bills and having them fully debated.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. P. Pease, *Herbert*) [10.51 a.m.], in reply: It is refreshing to hear the Leader of the Opposition talking about principles and the rights of the Opposition to debate legislation in this Chamber. When he was Premier he used the gag more frequently than any previous Premier did to put legislation through all stages in one day. (Opposition dissent.) I sat in Opposition and am very sensitive as to the truth of my statement. Let any hon. member consult "Hansard," and he will see for himself how many times the gag was used by the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier, especially when Bills were being discussed involving the rights and liberty of the subject, unlike the Bills we are discussing to-day. The Opposition apparently had no rights when the hon. member for Aubigny was Leader of the Government. I agree with the hon. member for Dalby, however, that because the hon. member for Aubigny did something wrong that is no reason why we, as a Government, should perpetuate that wrong. Labour Governments do not believe in perpetuating wrongs. (Opposition laughter.) They always stand for the interests of the people.

There is no intention on the part of the Government to pass the Liquor Act Amendment Act through all its stages in one day. The Bill will be initiated in Committee to-day, and hon. members will have an opportunity of discussing it again to-morrow.

The hon. member for Dalby made reference to faulty drafting of Bills. I should

like him to quote some concrete instances. Since the unicameral system of legislature has operated in Queensland not one Act passed under that system of Government has been contested in the law courts. That is a complete answer to the hon. member's statement. The idea of the unicameral system was that legislation should be passed in such a manner that it would not be subsequently challenged. No Government in Australia can make a similar boast. The hon. member for Dalby apparently had in mind legislation passed under the bicameral system. The legislation passed in this State under the unicameral system stands out in excellence, both as regards draftsmanship and principle. (Opposition interjections.) The facts are as I have stated. That is because the legislation was carefully scrutinised both before and after its introduction. That is why our legislation is pre-eminent over that enacted by other State Governments.

The idea underlying this motion is to enable the Government to maintain control of Parliament. We are approaching the end of the session. The Premier will, in the near future, be leaving for England on important matters affecting Queensland, including the sugar industry. This matter is vitally important to Queensland. We desire the House to rise before he leaves. There will be ample time for discussion. As I pointed out during the early stages of this session, the Opposition deliberately wasted the time of this Chamber. (Opposition dissent.) Two or three issues of "Hansard" are taken up with speeches of the Opposition that were absolutely valueless and a waste of time. (Opposition dissent.) Had the Opposition not wasted time in the early stages of the session we should have reached a more advanced stage than we have. (Opposition interruption.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Opposition have deliberately wasted the time of the Chamber.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: That is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the interruption will cease.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Opposition have wasted the time of the House and as a Government we cannot allow that to continue, and that is the reason for this motion. I am quite satisfied the Opposition will have ample time to discuss any Bills that are introduced. The taxation Bill referred to by the Leader of the Opposition will be handled by the Premier on his return, and members will have ample time to discuss it. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, most of the matters contained in that Bill have been the subject of a conference of taxation experts, including our own Commissioner of Taxes. All its major provisions have been discussed in the Press and members opposite know pretty well what the Bill will contain. The Health Bill has also been discussed in the Press, and members opposite have an idea what that also will contain. The idea of moving this motion is to do as I said—give the Government control of the business of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [10.56 a.m.]: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Acting Premier has closed the debate.

Hon. P. Pease.]

Mr. RUSSELL: I want to refute his statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Had the hon. member risen to speak at the same time as the Acting Premier he would have been called by the Chair.

Question—"That the resolution (Mr. Pease's motion) be agreed to"—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Brassington	Mr. Jesson
" Brown	" Keogh
" Bulcock	" King
" Clark	" Larcambe
" Conroy	" McLean
" Cooper	" Mullan
" Copley, W. J.	" O'Keefe
" Dash	" Pease
" Donnelly	" Power
" Dunstan	" Taylor
" Foley	" Walsh
" Gair	" Waters
" Gledson	" Wellington
" Hanlon	" Williams, H.
" Healy	
" Hilton	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Hislop	" Kane
" Hynes	" Llewelyn

NOES, 13.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
" Deacon	" Russell
" Edwards	" Walker
" Maxwell	
" Moore	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Morgan	" Clayton
" Muller	" Plunkett
" Nicklin	

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Stopford	Mr. Daniel
" Bruce	" Bell

Resolved in the affirmative.

LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Hanson, Buranda, in the chair.)

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) [11.4 a.m.]: I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to provide a measure of liquor reform and to amend 'The Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1932,' in certain particulars, and for other purposes."

This measure is a very important one. The proposals of the Government are that the administration of the liquor laws in this State shall be changed completely. I doubt whether any duties have devolved upon a Minister of the Crown in any part of the Commonwealth that are more distasteful to him than those of administering the liquor laws. I am no exception; the administration of these Acts has certainly been a very difficult part of my duty.

When approaching any alteration of the liquor laws one must dissociate oneself entirely from each of the conflicting parties who generally occupy the stage in any debate upon liquor. In the community are certain people who are interested in the sale of liquor and to whose advantage it is to increase the sales thereof by any means whatsoever. On the other hand are another section who regard liquor as a social danger and endeavour by every means in their

power to prevent its sale. Every Government must endeavour to view the matter in the right perspective and act in the interests of the whole community. They must endeavour to deal with the liquor laws in such a manner as will make for the wellbeing and serve the interests of the whole community. In doing so they may cause dissatisfaction to both sections who are so often violently and intemperately in conflict. That is what we have endeavoured to do—to look at the position as it is, to review the very unsatisfactory condition that exists in the liquor trade in Queensland to-day and to endeavour to correct the disabilities that exist and to make the hotels of this State—which after all exist to give a service to the people—provide a better service. Anyone who travels in Queensland will agree that this is necessary.

The object of the measure is to secure better distribution of the services provided by hotels and the erection of a better class of hotel. Ever since the return of the present Government there have been complaints about the manner in which the licensed victuallers have observed the law. There must be something wrong with an industry that causes the people engaged in it to use every means at their disposal to circumvent the law. When one looks at the history of the licensed victuallers in this State one readily perceives that there is a reason for this condition of affairs. The whole fact of the matter is that too many hotels have been crowded into a place where there is not room for them, with the result that many of the people who invested money in those hotels have not been able to get a satisfactory return for their investment. On the other hand, the hotelkeeper who does desire to give good service to the community and provide the right class of accommodation has no guarantee that another hotel will not be erected beside him in the very near future to compete for his trade. Nor has he a guarantee that some local option poll will not close him down completely. Those circumstances have rendered it almost impossible to obtain financial assistance for the industry from those financial houses not directly engaged in it, with the result that the hotelkeepers have not been able to give the service that the Government claim should be given.

The visitors whom we are endeavouring to encourage from other States are at the mercy of the hotelkeepers of Queensland, and the Government desire that the accommodation provided to those visitors shall be of such a class as will encourage people to travel and so assist in bringing money into the State. Any member of this Committee who has travelled in Queensland must admit that in most cases the accommodation provided for the travelling public is not what it should be. It is possible to find big hotels with earth closets, poor bathroom accommodation, and a lack of conveniences that are essential to the comfort of the travelling public. We shall never have the tourist traffic to this State that we should have until we amend the Liquor Act so that the proper accommodation will be provided for tourists. No other country in the world offers such a paradise to holiday makers as does North Queensland during the winter months. In fact, the whole of Queensland is a holiday maker's paradise during the winter season. It is impossible

[Hon. E. M. Hanlon.

to encourage tourists to this State owing to the very inferior accommodation provided by the hotels. No one will leave a State where there is every modern convenience in life to come to a place where it is necessary to tolerate the inconvenience to which tourists are subjected in Queensland. Our endeavours to attract tourists to Queensland by advertising the State and establishing the Tourist Bureau must be of no avail so long as we have this poor class of accommodation.

Looking over the history of the last few years, we find that in 1912 there were 1,653 licensed victuallers in Queensland. The number steadily decreased until in 1934 there were 1,546—a decrease of 207 hotels in twenty-two years. It must be remembered that during that time 116 new licenses were granted, so that altogether 423 licenses were surrendered in those years—which shows that the average hotelkeeper has not been making a fair living at his trade. Undoubtedly the hotelkeeper in a big centre of population whose hotel becomes popular does do well, but the average hotelkeeper has not been so fortunate. An amusing illustration of the position that exists in some parts of Queensland to-day was given this week when the Department of Labour and Industry refused intermittent relief to an applicant because he was the holder of a licensed victualler's license. That gives an idea of the condition of some of the hotels of Queensland to-day. Wine sellers' licenses have decreased from fifty-four to thirty-three between the years 1915 and 1934, wholesale spirit merchants' licenses have decreased from 155 to 137, and club licenses have increased by two during that period.

This brief outline of the events of the last few years is indicative of the difficulties that the trade has had to contend with in the past. The State is growing and developing and nobody can say with any degree of accuracy what its population will be in twenty years' time or where big cities will be established outside of the capital. There is no doubt that many big cities will spring up. It is impossible, for instance, to prevent the illicit sale of liquor in an important mining field like Cracow—and it should be remembered that the illicit sale of liquor is one of the most dangerous of social evils. It is far better to control the sale of liquor by a system of licensed houses. If provision is to be made for that section of the community who wish to buy alcoholic liquor in their respective districts, we must insist that the licensed houses provide adequate accommodation for the people who require it.

The temperance organisations have failed in their attempts to reduce the number of hotel licenses. The local option polls have resulted in further licenses being granted and thus caused greater chaos in the industry. In the majority of cases applications for new licenses are made in areas where hotels already exist—and where the applicants are sanguine of some success at a local option poll. That is the factor that is considered by the applicant, not whether an additional hotel is required in the area. If an applicant is successful in obtaining a license to establish a new hotel in an area where hotels already exist he makes confusion in the industry worse confounded.

The Bill proposes to abolish the present system of granting licenses by a licensing court, which has been a failure. It has not

even prevented breaches of the law, which was otherwise considered to be water-tight. The Act provides that a hotel may be removed only a certain distance but this section has been interpreted differently by different magistrates. At the present time I am considering a complaint to the effect that a hotel was moved 8 miles in one move although we understand the law to mean that the maximum distance in one move shall be 2 miles. When I made inquiry into the matter I was met with the argument that a precedent for the longer move already existed because such-and-such a hotel had been moved $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles and another hotel had been moved such-and-such a distance, and so on. The different magistrates have interpreted the Act in different ways. There has been no central direction of policy and this has resulted in the Act's being interpreted differently from what is considered to have been the intention of Parliament. We propose to abolish the Licensing Court and to set up a commission charged with the responsibility of administering the Liquor Act. It will exercise all the functions now exercised by the Licensing Court, with the exception of the imposition of punishment on offenders against the law.

MR. BRAND: Who will be the members of the commission?

THE HOME SECRETARY: I do not know. We have not yet reached that stage. It is essential to see that the members of the commission enjoy the confidence of the public and that their integrity shall not be challenged. That fact will not be overlooked by the Government when the commission is appointed. This move will obviate the possibility that a number of magistrates will each interpret the liquor law in a different way.

Local option polls will be abolished. They have only resulted in increased licenses. It would be foolish to set up a commission to administer the liquor laws and dealing with the issue of licenses and the provision of adequate accommodation if another authority could negative its decisions.

The Bill will declare that the existing number of licenses in the State shall be the maximum. That may appear to be a drastic provision at first sight but it is our desire to provide that there shall be a larger population per hotel than is the case now. At the present time the average is 700 people to each hotel in the State, but that is not sufficient to enable any hotelkeeper to provide proper accommodation for travellers. If that maximum is fixed, then as the population increases the number of people to each hotel will also increase. At some future date it may be necessary for Parliament to alter the maximum number of licenses, but we consider that the present maximum will be sufficient for this State for some years to come.

MR. MOORE: Will the new commission have power to close hotels?

THE HOME SECRETARY: Yes. It will have power to resume and close any hotel, provided compensation is paid. It is only fair that a person who has invested his money in a hotel should be compensated if his hotel is closed. We are not asking that compensation shall be paid from consolidated revenue. In any district wherein the commission decides that a new hotel is necessary the right to conduct it will be sold by public

Hon. E. M. Hanlon.]

tender. The money received by the commission for the right to conduct a hotel in a new area will be paid into a trust fund from which compensation will be paid in respect of existing licenses that may be resumed.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Do you think that will be sufficient?

The HOME SECRETARY: That trust fund will be more than sufficient for the purpose. In fact, at some future date Parliament may be asked to transfer portion of that trust fund to consolidated revenue! Obviously no good purpose will be served by keeping large sums of money in that fund idle in perpetuity. I have every confidence that in the course of a few years there will be a heavy credit balance in the trust fund. Is it not obvious that if the commission resumes a hotel in an unprofitable area the compensation to be paid would be infinitesimal, and that the tender price for a new hotel at, say, Cracow, will be large? I suppose that in any place in Queensland where no hotel exists to-day the commission will get many thousands of pounds for the right to conduct one. The important point is this: Under the existing law it is possible for a hotel to be shifted from an unprofitable to a profitable area. A speculator may purchase such an unprofitable hotel for a few hundred pounds and by taking advantage of that provision in the law remove the building a few miles at a time until it is established in a profitable district, where it may be worth many thousands of pounds. Under this Bill any unearned increment will go direct to the people. That is only right, because the enhancement in value is a community-created value. This Bill will preserve to the public the increase that might accrue in the value of a hotel by its transfer from one area to another. The commission will have the right to say to a hotelkeeper in an unprofitable district, "We will take your hotel under certain conditions." The conditions are set out in this Bill. The compensation paid will be based on a formula, which will be set out in plain and unequivocal terms. Under those conditions the licensee, or sub-licensee, or mortgagee will be given the right to lodge his claim. Full and ample compensation, under adequate safeguards, will be paid to all interests concerned in the hotel. That resumed hotel will then cease to be licensed, and the license will then become the property of the licensing commission. All persons will have their claim satisfied, and, therefore, will have no further interest in the license. If the ex-licensee desires to conduct the hotel when it is removed to another area he will have the right to do so provided he is the successful tenderer. The difference between the value of the hotel in the non-paying locality and the one licensed in the paying locality will go back to the community, and from that fund compensation for resumed hotels will be paid.

The matter of compensation has received a good deal of thought. This was the only difficulty I found in framing the Bill. We have no desire to deprive any person in a legitimate industry of anything that is his due. At the same time we must take precautions to protect the public purse, and see it is not plundered. We all know that certain people look upon the Treasury as fair game, to be plundered if they get the opportunity. We have arrived in this Bill at what we

consider to be a fair and liberal basis of compensation.

It is proposed to alter the present method of assessing license fees. License fees will in future be fixed on the basis of a percentage of the liquor purchases. The license fee is now based on a multitude of considerations, and very often it penalises a man who provides accommodation in his hotel. It is proposed under the provisions of this Bill that the license fee shall be borne entirely by the liquor sold, and that it will not be increased because a licensee provides the accommodation required by the public. The commission in assessing the fee will not take into consideration the cost of foodstuffs, soft drinks, furnishings, or any other equipment: it will only take into consideration the purchases of alcoholic liquor. Under this provision some licensees will pay larger fees than at present while others will pay smaller ones. The Government will receive from licensed victuallers very little more in license fees than they do to-day.

We are also bringing all clubs within the ambit of this provision, which to-day operate on a very unfair basis. Now all clubs pay a flat rate of license fee, say £10 or £20. They have not the added responsibility of hotels of providing accommodation for the public. Under this Bill fees of clubs will be fixed on the same basis as fees for hotels—on the amount of the purchases of alcoholic liquor; an increase in revenue will take place as a result of bringing clubs under this permission.

The commission is to have power to demand from any hotelkeeper better accommodation for guests. We have not laid down in the Bill, as in the present Act, that a definite amount of accommodation must be provided. By this measure the commission will have power to say to any hotelkeeper—if it is not satisfied that the accommodation is sufficient—that additional accommodation must be provided. It must be remembered the commission will be in a better position to decide those questions than any licensing magistrate is at the present time. The commission will be clothed with the powers of a royal commission under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, which will give it access to documents in order that it may be in a position to decide whether a hotel is bringing sufficient return to the owner to enable him to carry out the necessary work. No licensing magistrate has access to that information; time after time the proprietor tells a story of poverty and in some cases "gets away with it." No magistrate or Minister would desire to put people insolvent who have their money invested in a hotel.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: When tenders are called will it be specified whether the building shall be brick or wood?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. The commission has power to sell by tender the rights to build a hotel according to specifications, which it will supply. It will be able to frame the specifications it requires. The tenderer will have to tender for the erection of a hotel within those specifications.

A further provision of the Bill is, that the license will not be endorsed by the commission until the hotel is completed and ready for occupation, and another that the tenderer must hold the license for three

[Hon. E. M. Hanlon.]

months after the completion of the hotel. One of the evils associated with the present system is that where a new license is to be granted applications are made to the licensing court and the person whose application is in first is given priority by the magistrate. After the magistrate grants an application for a new license, the licensing inspector—probably the local sergeant of police—writes out a document and hands it to the successful applicant; and cases have happened where even before leaving the verandah of the court house the successful man has sold that piece of paper for £1,000. In the case of a hotel on the South Coast the license changed hands three times before the hotel was built. All that unearned increment went to people who never conducted any business or supplied any service, but to someone who happened to draw a right that belonged to the people and not an individual. This measure will abolish all that form of juggling with licenses.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Will brewers and wine and spirit merchants be allowed to tender for the hotels?

The HOME SECRETARY: There is a list of disqualifications in the Bill. A public servant, a policeman, a brewer or a distiller—these are disqualified under this Bill as in the existing Act. No alteration has been made in that respect. The only alteration is in allowing a company to hold a license. Owing to modern developments in regard to hotel buildings there are very few individuals who could pay for the erection of a modern hotel. This difficulty can be overcome by a company supplying the money, but under the present Act such a company cannot hold its own license. It puts somebody in as manager who holds the license, but the hotel is owned by the company. Under this Bill the company will be allowed to hold a license. The main reason for the change is a decision of the court that a company could not hold a wine and spirit merchant's license. Any number of companies have held them for years.

We have retained the provision for a prohibition poll every seven years, if demanded—that is, a State-wide poll. If the people in one State decided on prohibition it is debatable whether it could be put into operation. The opportunity is provided, however, for the people to decide. The local option poll is being abolished because it would conflict with the administration of the commission. Obviously it would be inconsistent to give the commission the power to sell the right to conduct a hotel and then confer on another body—the people in a local area—the power to say that no hotel shall be conducted there.

The whole object of the Bill is to make the industry stable, to close unnecessary hotels where there is no chance of successfully carrying on or supplying a service to the community, and to provide accommodation in areas where there is no accommodation now. We have included a provision that before the commission grants a license in an area where existing licenses exist the existing licensee or licensees must be given an opportunity to provide the accommodation required. The commission will not capriciously throw here, there, and everywhere licenses that may come into conflict with the existing licenses. It would be advantageous to the whole of the community if hotels were larger and provided

better accommodation and facilities for the travelling public. This is what we desire.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Is there any alteration in the hours of trade?

The HOME SECRETARY: No alteration in the hours of trading is contemplated at all. The principal advantage of this Bill in the immediate future will be the facility of administration. To-day the Liquor Acts are most difficult to administer. Whole sheets of sections in the existing Act will be wiped out by the passage of this measure and this will make administration simpler for both the officers of the Home Department and the police. It will make it simple for the commission. We contend that it will prevent the tendency for additional licenses to be granted at places where they are not really required and thus cause the insolvency of people already engaged in legitimate trade. It will give stability to the industry.

We have made provision for silencing that old bedtime story that a license is granted only for a year. At the present time a licensee has to apply to the Licensing Court each year for the renewal of his license. I am not aware whether an application has ever been refused but the licensee is put to a certain amount of legal expense each year in going through that procedure. Notwithstanding the fact that a license has to be renewed every twelve months we see people selling twenty, thirty, or forty-year leases of licenses and purchasers paying high prices for them.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Will there be a check on dirty premises and accommodation?

The HOME SECRETARY: Adequate safeguards are provided. The Bill makes provision for the commission to appoint inspectors. These inspectors will not be merely policeman but inspectors of accommodation. It may be desirable to appoint various officers of the Tourist Bureau as inspectors of accommodation. They can report on the living conditions of each hotel. The commission will have power to demand an improvement in the service. That power already exists but no power is provided to ascertain whether the hotelkeeper is in a financial position to make the improvement or otherwise. Consequently the administration of the law in that direction is lax. Certainly it is administered sympathetically when the existing proprietor of the hotel is unable to carry out the necessary improvements. Under this measure the commission will be given power to ascertain the financial position of the hotelkeeper, the amount of trade being done, and the prices charged and whether the hotelkeeper is in a position to provide the accommodation.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Will the commission have power to limit the prices charged for accommodation or liquor?

The HOME SECRETARY: That is a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Prices. We are not proposing to make the commission a price-fixing commission.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Therefore they will have a monopoly.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Commissioner of Prices to-day is the only officer controlling prices. We do not propose in this Bill to alter the existing law in that respect.

Hon. E. M. Hanlon.]

The Bill does not give each and everybody all he desires—that would be an impossibility on the liquor question—but it is framed with a view to giving the great majority of the community a better hotel service than has been the case in the past, and it is framed with a view to keeping out of the liquor trade the malpractices that are now being indulged in as regards the transfer of licenses, the buttonholing of Ministers in an endeavor to obtain privileges for hotelkeepers and so on. The Bill places the administration of the law in the hands of a commission. On the work of that commission will depend the administration of the whole of the Liquor Acts. The commission will consist of gentlemen whose integrity is beyond question. It is quite obvious that we shall be able to obtain gentlemen competent to carry out this work and with the courage to stick to their opinions. We are making the decisions of the commission on matters within the ambit of this measure final. Decisions as to whether hotels shall or shall not be closed or opened and as to the accommodation required will be entirely beyond appeal. The chairman of the commission must be a judge of the Supreme Court or of the Industrial Court of Queensland. He will be able to advise the other members of the commission as to the correct method of administering the law.

I anticipate that this system will greatly improve the standard of service rendered by the hotelkeeper to the community. It will prevent the unrestricted competition that is at present taking place among hotels in the areas that are already served. The commission will have an opportunity of providing a hotel where one is needed, and the system will relieve police magistrates and policemen in outlying districts of the right of saying whether a license should be granted or refused. The Bill will be handed to all hon. members, and they will have an opportunity of reading it with a view to seeing if it can be improved in any way.

Mr. PLUNKETT: How many commissioners do you propose to appoint?

The HOME SECRETARY: Three.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [11.36 a.m.]: There can be no cavilling at the main objective of the Bill put forward by the Minister—the improvement in accommodation and service offered to the public by licensed victualliers, but there will be differences of opinion as to the methods adopted by the Bill for achieving that desirable goal. As the Minister has stated quite frankly, there are many hotels in Queensland where the accommodation is shocking, and it certainly will be desirable if those hotels can be conducted on such a basis as will bring about improved service to the people.

The Bill contains some extraordinary provisions, and it appears to me that some of them will provide a veritable gold mine to certain individuals in this State. There can be no objection to the proposal to grant a license in a district where there is no hotel at present, but the Minister suggests submitting the licenses for sale by tender. Difficulty may be caused by the paying of too high a price by a tenderer, which would be reflected in his inability to meet his obligations, and provide the required service to the community.

[*Hon. E. M. Hanlon.*]

The provision that occurs to me as being most extraordinary is that wherein an opportunity is to be given to the present hotelkeeper to provide the necessary accommodation in a district in which the commission considers another hotel is warranted. What will be the position in a place like Tully, where agitation has been going on for quite a long time for another hotel? There are two there at present.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They want another dozen there.

Mr. MOORE: What will the position be there, where the commission will give the two present hotels a monopoly?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Who says that the commission will give them a monopoly?

Mr. MOORE: The Minister said that before any further licenses are granted, the hotels that are already in the district must be given an opportunity of enlarging their premises to prevent other hotels being erected. That provision will give the two hotels that are already at Tully an opportunity of securing a "gold mine" in that monopoly. The licenses they already hold, which they secured under entirely different conditions, will increase tenfold in value. The position in cases like that will be extraordinary. They will not be called upon to tender, and as they are in possession no one else can come in.

The HOME SECRETARY: They have possession under the existing law.

Mr. MOORE: That is so. That is what I am pointing out—that that will apply in the future. In what a position these people are placed!

The HOME SECRETARY: I cannot go back and correct what happened years ago.

Mr. MOORE: I am not suggesting that the Home Secretary should go back and break contracts already entered into, but these people are placed in a very fortunate position in being protected against any competition—except in the remote possibility that a seven-year prohibition poll might take away all the licenses.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is no licensing area in Queensland where better accommodation is provided for the public than in the area you spoke of. I know that, being the member for that district.

Mr. MOORE: And not a very satisfactory one!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: I have heard a great deal in that district as to the Minister's evasions on licensing questions, and so on.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I got the best vote in the whole of my history there last election.

Mr. MOORE: The extraordinary thing is that last year we passed an Act that postponed the local option polls, because the Government did not want to have them taken at the time provided in the Act because the election was coming on. It was decided it would not be wise to mix up a local option poll and an election.

Mr. O'KEEFE: You approved of that.

Mr. MOORE: I did.

Mr. O'KEEFE: The Act provides for it.

Mr. MOORE: That is so, I am not cavilling at that. On page 17 of this year's "Hansard" is recorded this question, which I put to the Home Secretary:—

"When is it proposed to hold the local option polls which were postponed last year under the provisions of 'The Local Option Votes (Liquor Acts) Postponement Act of 1934?'"

I received the answer—

"A proclamation is being issued this week fixing the 30th November, 1935."

That proclamation appeared in the "Government Gazette." It was as follows:—

"Whereas by 'The Local Option Votes (Liquor Acts) Postponement Act of 1934,' being an amendment of 'The Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1932,' it is among other things enacted that notwithstanding anything contained in the Principal Act or in any Act or law or rule or process of law to the contrary, no Local Option Vote which otherwise would, pursuant to the Principal Act, have been required to be held in the month of May, 1935, shall be taken in such month of May, 1935; but the taking of any such Local Option Vote shall be postponed until such date, being not later than the thirtieth day of November, 1935, as the Governor in Council shall fix by Proclamation: And whereas it is desirable to fix Saturday, the thirtieth day of November, 1935, as the date for the purposes of taking any such postponed Local Option Vote."

If the local option polls had been taken according to the Act last year some fortunate people in Queensland would have secured licenses in good areas, and that would have meant better accommodation in those areas, and they would have been in the same position as those fortunate individuals who already happened to be there. Owing to the postponement, and notwithstanding the fact that the proclamation states that the polls are to be taken before 30th November, all the preparations that had been made by interested parties are wiped aside, and a Bill of this kind is brought in. Its object is good, but it can be seen what a benefit it will be to a small section of the community.

Mr. O'KEEFE: The board may not allow it.

Mr. MOORE: We all know that breweries in Queensland have been buying hotels extensively, taking all the risk of local options and competition. Anyone with a hotel has to provide certain accommodation. That is necessary before any license can be granted.

Mr. KING: Is that not reasonable?

Mr. MOORE: But what position does it put these people in? No other industry in Queensland will be so favourably treated.

Mr. O'KEEFE: They have that treatment already.

Mr. MOORE: They cannot have it already when the Minister can quote a case of a hotelkeeper's applying for relief work.

Mr. O'KEEFE: They have the monopoly.

Mr. MOORE: The position is that in certain circumstances further licenses can be granted in any area, but under this Bill that cannot be done, as the commission must give the people who are already trading

there the opportunity to provide the increased accommodation. That will add enormously to the value of what they have already.

Mr. DUNSTAN: New licenses can be granted if the commission thinks it necessary.

The HOME SECRETARY: The power to grant licenses is preserved and there will be no appeal from the decision of the commission. It may decide that it is in the best interests of the people to grant another bar license; and it will have power to do that.

Mr. MOORE: I am only going on what the Minister has said.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is the guiding principle. Where there is a faulty hotel—

Mr. MOORE: I did not have in mind a faulty hotel.

The HOME SECRETARY: The opportunity is to be given to the existing hotel.

Mr. MOORE: Let us consider a case where the hotel is not a faulty one and is providing a service up to the standard required. Let us also consider that it is in a growing place and the trade increases. The hotel becomes more and more valuable. Before a new license is granted an opportunity is given to the existing hotel to provide improved accommodation.

Mr. KING: If it can do it.

Mr. MOORE: It can do it. There is nothing to stop it from doing it. It can get the money.

The HOME SECRETARY: What stops it from doing it now?

Mr. MOORE: The fear that another license will be granted and that it will have to share its trade.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is impossible to get into a hotel in North Queensland when a tourist boat is in.

Mr. MOORE: I dare say that is so, but it does not follow that because trade is brisk during a tourist season of three months people can afford to build a palatial hotel and have it unoccupied for the rest of the year. Have we not the experience of the shipping company that constructed a large hotel at Kuranda? It did not pay. It had to close up the hotel.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Do you know that at the present time the shipping companies of Cairns are providing accommodation for the tourists on the boats instead of allowing them to go to the hotels?

Mr. MOORE: I am not concerned with what the shipping companies are doing. A shipping company did construct a fine hotel at Kuranda.

Mr. KING: That is all right.

Mr. MOORE: It is all very well to say, "That is all right." I am pointing out that this hotel did not pay and that it had to be closed up. Do hon. members opposite think that anyone will build a palatial hotel in North Queensland just to cater for tourists during a season of three months?

Mr. KING: Don't blame me.

Mr. MOORE: I am not blaming the hon. member, but he should at least display a little intelligence when a Bill of this kind is being discussed. The tourist season does not extend the whole year around. A good

Mr. Moore.]

deal of the Bill is camouflaged. Its object, to a very large extent, is to get the Government out of an awkward position—out of the obligation of taking local option polls in accordance with the amendment of the liquor law in 1926 and probably for another purpose altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is beside the question.

Mr. MOORE: It is not. Anybody can see that under this Bill advantages will be conferred on some people.

The HOME SECRETARY: On all the people.

Mr. MOORE: Not all the people. A blind man can see that advantages will be conferred upon some people. It will confer wonderful advantages on the present hotel-keepers. I believe that the principle that was adopted in Victoria was an excellent one. The Licensing Board in Victoria could go round the districts to see where new hotels were required, and whether the existing hotels were up to standard, and it could close hotels that did not conform to it. This Bill will create monopolies.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Queensland commission will be able to exercise all the powers exercised by the Victorian Licensing Board, and, in addition, it will have power to grant new licenses, a power that is not conferred on the Victorian Board.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister stated that the temperance organisations had not been successful in reducing the number of licenses by carrying local option polls. He should remember that in 1917 the temperance organisations were successful in four districts, but the result of the polls was disallowed by the High Court. There is a case where the temperance organisation was successful in four instances, but it was not allowed to reap the results of its efforts.

Mr. O'KEEFE: It cost the State a lot of money to hold the local option polls.

Mr. MOORE: I dare say that it did. But if people are prepared to find money for the conduct of local option polls they are entitled to do so.

Mr. DUNSTON: Does not a local option poll create a monopoly?

Mr. MOORE: Of course it does not. It may be decided under a local option poll to increase the number of licenses in an area. Under this method that does not happen. The existing licensee, or licensees are granted a monopoly. The whole argument of the Minister was, that the man who puts his money into a hotel is entitled to a fair and reasonable return on his investment.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Quite right.

Mr. MOORE: It is quite right; I am not objecting to that.

Mr. KING: Do you favour the Bill?

Mr. MOORE: Partly. It is good in parts. I see parts of it that may become extremely dangerous. It is rather unfair to postpone the taking of local option polls that should have been taken earlier in the year and then provide under this Bill for their abolition, and empower the commission to decide whether new licenses should or should not be granted. The fact that there has been a decrease in the number of licenses since 1912 proves nothing. That is entirely dependent on the movement of traffic. For instance, I remember that in my district when there was a coach service between

Jondaryan and Cooyar there were four hotels on the route. After the railway was built and the coach ceased running three of the hotels went out of commission. The licenses just disappeared.

Mr. TAYLOR: You do not think that the railway would run round all those hotels?

Mr. MOORE: No, I am only pointing out reasons why licenses disappear.

The HOME SECRETARY: We are drinking less now than in those days.

Mr. MOORE: I could not afford to drink anything in those days, so it did not affect me.

There is another thing the Minister did not make quite clear. When the commission sells a license by tender in a district in which a hotel is required, is there to be a guarantee by the commission that it will not grant any further licenses for a period of years? Is such an area to be a prohibited area like Babinda, in which no other licenses are to be granted? If not, the successful tenderer must take a big risk. If the Government are endeavouring to get the most money for the Crown out of such licenses, then the commission must give the successful tenderer a guarantee that no further license will be granted in that area for fifteen or twenty years.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Your Government gave that guarantee to the successful tenderer for the Babinda hotel.

Mr. MOORE: We had to sell the Babinda hotel. It was the hon. member's Government that established that hotel and created the prohibited area. They also provided that no local option poll could be taken in that area for five years. What a gold mine that man will have under this Bill!

Mr. O'KEEFE: I do not believe it is a good thing to give a monopoly. It is a bad principle.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: That licensee has a wonderful monopoly, and will have a far greater protection now than previously.

Mr. O'KEEFE interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Cairns to observe my call to order.

Mr. O'KEEFE: I did not know that you called me to order.

Mr. MOORE: My Government sold the Babinda hotel under the law as it stood at the time, and the successful purchaser anticipated that the law would be carried out. Now he gets a present. In the same way many other hotel licensees get presents. In the same way, too, the breweries will get a present. Some people considered that prices paid recently for hotels by the breweries were too high. It now turns out that they are "on that pig's back," as it were, that they did not pay too high a price, that they have a wonderful proposition. They are to be congratulated on their business foresight. Although the Bill was framed with some very excellent objectives in view, those excellent objectives are smothered by many other clauses under which opportunity will be given to people to make vast sums of money.

We are all agreed that better accommodation and better service would be welcomed by the community. More up-to-date sanitary and bathing accommodation would be a

[Mr. Moore.

benefit to the travelling public. A few years ago some of the supposedly best hotels neglected to provide proper accommodation in that respect. A few years ago in the month of January I went into the best hotel in Innisfail and asked for a bath, and when I went to the bathroom I found the bath consisted of a square tin tub and there were two or three inches of greasy water in the bottom of it. Conditions have certainly altered since, because competition has forced proprietors to improve accommodation. I know perfectly well that licensing and local authorities have considerable power to compel licensees to provide decent accommodation, but it is one of the hardest things to enforce.

Parts of the Bill appear to be good and parts of it are excellent—for a small section of the community. If I had happened to be in the "know" before this Bill came in, there would be no reason for me to stay in Parliament or on a farm, I should have been able to travel the world for the rest of my life.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [11.57 a.m.]: I agree with the Minister that this is a very important Bill; and I appreciate his clear explanation of its contents. The Minister gave the Committee all the information he thought advisable, and much more information than is usually given by Ministers when introducing Bills. As a representative of the people I am not concerned about the extremists on either side—those connected with the temperance movement or those interested in the liquor business. I consider it is our duty to consider the public as a whole and not any particular section, because they are the people who pay the piper. That being so it is essential that a Bill of this nature should be so framed as to meet with the approval of the people as a whole.

It has evidently been known by some people for some time that a Bill of this nature would be introduced, and probably they endeavoured to profit by that knowledge. During the last few weeks a large number of hotels have been purchased by breweries. The breweries have such control that people can be put in and put out as they desire. I should like to see a Bill introduced that would contain provision making it impossible for a brewery to have any control over hotels, monetary or otherwise. I am of the opinion that when this Bill becomes law a huge majority of the hotels will be under the control of those connected with the liquor business—breweries and others. In Sydney the control exercised by the breweries is so complete that only weekly or monthly tenancies are granted to people to conduct hotels, and all liquor consumed must be purchased from the brewery owning the hotel. If a good business man obtains a lease of a hotel owned by a brewery and his efficiency increases the trade, the property becomes more valuable to the brewer and the rent is increased. There are many instances of hotelkeepers having to obtain financial assistance from a brewery. One of the conditions of the agreement is that the licensee shall sell only beer the product of that particular company. The result is the brewery has the monopoly of the liquor sold in that locality. Often the particular brew is unpalatable to the residents, but the hotelkeeper is prohibited from stocking another. He is at

the mercy of the brewer from whom he obtained the loan. He must sell that brew whether he wants to do so or otherwise. I should like to see the measure contain some provision which would prevent this virtual granting of a monopoly to brewery companies. It is a well-known fact that the hotelkeepers of Queensland are indebted to various brewery companies to many hundreds of thousands of pounds. The continuation of the practice adopted by the breweries of confining hotelkeepers indebted to them to their own brew will mean that eventually every hotel in Queensland will be under the control of a brewery. That will not be in the best interests of the people generally.

For many years past I have advocated a policy of transfer of licenses somewhat similar to that enunciated by the Minister and for which provision is being made in this Bill. Certainly I did not advocate the adoption of the same procedure. Many hotels were established in mining and timber areas, and because of the abandonment of the field or the cutting out of the timber, the necessity for a license has disappeared. There are very few people left to take advantage of the service. The community has vanished, and instead of letting the hotel stand until eventually it catches fire and the insurance money is collected it is preferable that the license shall be transferred to another locality in dire need of a hotel service. Application can be made to a police magistrate who investigates the desirableness of leaving the hotel at its existing location. If he decides that it is no longer required, the license may be transferred to some other locality from which an application for a license has been received. For instance, a hotel is absolutely necessary in Cracow. The license of a hotel no longer required in another locality could be granted to Cracow. There are many localities that to-day require the services of a hotel. Glenmorgan and Cecil Plains, in my own electorate, are examples of communities justly entitled to a hotel service. A local option poll would be carried at either place almost unanimously. The passage of this measure will prevent the holding of this poll. So far as the transfer of licenses is concerned the proposed measure is an advancement over the existing statute.

The hon. gentleman knows that sly grog selling takes place in such towns as Cracow, and the liquor sold is generally adulterated. The people of those towns have as much right to a glass of pure whisky as have the people in towns where hotels are established. Until the people of Queensland decide in favour of total prohibition, we must treat the people in all parts of the State with equal consideration. The Government should take some action to prevent sly grog selling by providing legitimate hotel service in the new towns that are springing up. The proposed commission will be the proper tribunal to deal with these matters, and it will be less subject to rebuke than are the police magistrates at present.

The Minister is correct when he says that the compensation will not be great in instances where the commission decides that there are too many hotels, because it is obvious that the goodwill of the hotel to be closed will be of practically no value.

Where the commission decides that another hotel is warranted, and submits the license

Mr. Morgan.]

for sale by tender there will be the danger of interested brewers obtaining a monopoly. They will finance the existing hotelkeepers to enable them to provide the extra accommodation, but in return they will take mortgages over their licenses and in that way obtain the monopoly. They should not be allowed to do that, because the breweries will tender exceptionally high figures for the licenses, being prepared to conduct the hotels at a loss until the additional business is derived from the extra accommodation. The private individual will have no opportunity of conducting a hotel, because the breweries will make it impossible for him to tender for a license and provide the extra accommodation.

The HOME SECRETARY: Under this Bill he will have better security to offer a bank or other financial institution than he has under the existing Act.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The banks and other financial institutions will advance only a certain amount of the value of the security. They estimate the value of the business and advance a certain percentage of that value. The breweries are prepared to make a loss on the hotel for a time. Naturally the loan would be made on the assumption that business prospects were favourable. The breweries, on the other hand, will not concern themselves with business prospects in the first three or four years, or more; they simply go into the business and make a high tender knowing that they will have a monopoly. The breweries will consider only the fact that they can make a profit, not from the money they lend, but out of the sale of liquor to those hotels. The banks and financial institutions, on the other hand, would consider whether the licensee could pay interest and redemption on the property, and would advance the loan on that basis. It will be found, if something is not done to amend the Bill, that all these hotels from the very commencement will be tied houses. It will be necessary for them to take the whole of their liquor from one brewery. Something could be done to protect those places, and I should be pleased to support it.

We know that there are some hotelkeepers who would like to disregard the trading hours, but I contend that the law must be put into effect. The Minister has said that there will be no alteration in that respect in this Bill. Where trading hours are considered to be right and proper they should be enforced. Personally, I am in favour of 10 o'clock closing in the country districts, as I know the difficulties they have; seaside places, too, might desire an alteration. However, if we expect the people of Queensland to respect the laws of the land and to have confidence in our police force, we must endeavour, irrespective of what Government are in power, to ensure that the law is obeyed. If the law is wrong and the people are justified in breaking it, we should bring about an amendment in it. While the law stands it must be obeyed, but we should be prepared to alter it to make it conform to the best interests of the people generally, without studying any section or class.

I do not intend to speak further on the Bill at this stage. The Minister has given a very full explanation, but the Bill is one that must be studied carefully, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not seek to pass it

[Mr. Morgan.

in one day. On the second reading, which is the most important stage, I hope that he will give us at least one day to study the Bill, and not go right into Committee on the same day. A large number of amendments may not be necessary, but the Bill is of such importance that the Minister should be prepared to allow at least one day between the second reading and committee stages, so that hon. members may have an ample opportunity of considering any amendment that may be moved from either side of the Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL (Hamilton) [12.16 p.m.]: I hope the Minister will give the Opposition ample time to study this important measure, which involves many innovations of a sweeping nature. I hold the view that the question of liquor control should be removed from the sphere of party politics. In this country and in other countries of the world the question has been the football of opposing political parties, and I should like to see it removed from the influence of party politics. I think that the Bill will have that effect. At any rate, the provision for the appointment of a commission should remove the whole question from party political influence. If it does that then it will have achieved a very desirable end.

The Government propose to adopt a method similar to that which obtains in Victoria, and which I think has worked fairly successfully, by appointing a commission to control the liquor traffic. The question to be considered is whether the work of the commission will be sufficiently continuous to warrant the appointment of three members who will devote the whole of their time to the work and whether good results cannot be obtained if they apply themselves to the work only at frequent intervals.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is all that will be necessary once the administrative machine is working.

Mr. RUSSELL: Therefore, it will not be necessary to appoint three commissioners to devote the whole of their time to the business and its members may be appointed from the Supreme Court bench, the Industrial Court bench, or from Government departments. It is important that they should be men of ability and integrity, in whom the public will have the fullest confidence.

The main defects that I see in the Bill is the proposal to remove the control of the licenses from the people themselves. The Minister said that it was proposed that the number of licenses in the future shall be limited to 1,300 odd—the number now in existence. That is to say, a monopoly will be created for the present 1,300 odd licensees. It will not be possible to increase that number—

The HOME SECRETARY: Without an amendment of the Act.

Mr. RUSSELL: I consider that to be a defect in the Bill. I concur in the appointment of a commission, but I think it is wrong to deprive the people in the respective areas of some voice in the question whether a new license shall be granted. I should like to see some system of local control continued—some provision giving the people in the respective areas the right to be consulted before a new license is granted or an existing license is cancelled. There should be some provision whereby the commission would be able to ascertain from the people interested

whether an increase or reduction in the number of licenses is required. I do not believe in giving the commission such extraordinary powers that it shall be the final arbiter as to what is actually needed. For instance, the commission might say—I do not say from any wrong motive at all—that it is wise to have a hotel in a certain area. It might be quite a paying proposition. That is not the point. If the people in that area do not want the hotel, why should it be forced on them?

The HOME SECRETARY: Provision is made for objections of residents, local authorities, progress associations, and so on, but the commission is not bound to accept them.

Mr. RUSSELL: I want to go further than that. It might get opinions of local authorities, progress associations, and other bodies, but what it ought to get is the consensus of opinion of all the people in the area. Whether it is wise to confine that expression of opinion to a ward in the city or the whole electorate is a matter to be considered, but the people interested should be consulted before the commission exercises its arbitrary powers. I do not think the commission will exercise those powers with any malice aforethought. At the same time it is a step in the wrong direction to deprive the people interested of the opportunity of having a direct vote on the question whether a license shall be granted, or whether a hotel shall be closed.

Mr. FOLEY: You did that on the railway superannuation scheme. The railway men voted against the scheme and then your Government forced it on them.

Mr. RUSSELL: My friend lives in the past.

Mr. FOLEY: The principle is the same.

Mr. RUSSELL: It is not. I want the people to retain the right of expressing their opinion on the matter. I am sure the commission will respect the opinion of the people interested, and some provision should be made to enable it to ascertain that opinion. I commend to the Minister that he incorporate some provision whereby the people will be consulted before a license is granted.

Mr. KING: You want a poll taken?

Mr. RUSSELL: I do. I object to the extreme powers given to the commission of saying "Yea" or "Nay" to the question whether a license should be granted, without consulting the people interested. The commission might consider it desirable to have a hotel in a certain area notwithstanding that the bulk of the people did not want it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Under the present Act the people immediately concerned have no say, because other people miles away from where the hotel is proposed to be erected might decide the poll.

Mr. RUSSELL: The people in the area may be content to live in it without a hotel. The point is not whether it may be a paying proposition.

I believe this Bill will put the whole business of hotelkeeping on a better footing. There has been a big depression. Large sums of money were paid for the goodwills of hotels. The value of that goodwill depreciated very considerably because of the depression. As a large section of the community hotelkeepers are entitled to as much protection as can be given them.

Mr. KING: You cannot give a hotel any more protection than it is worth.

Mr. RUSSELL: This Bill will give hotels some value.

The HOME SECRETARY: It will stabilise the business.

Mr. RUSSELL: I do not wish the Government to stop there and say there shall be no more licenses. I want that to remain an open question. I want the commission to consult the people in the district before granting or refusing a license.

This Bill will certainly stabilise the industry and put all hotels on a much better footing. It certainly will improve their standard. There is no doubt the standard of most of the country hotels in Queensland is very low. If one goes to Victoria, where a similar system is operating to that now proposed here, one will find that country hotels offer good accommodation to visitors. The Victorian Government have constructed good roads throughout that State, and during the week-end people travel to the country, and they have the guarantee that wherever they pull up they will get decent accommodation. The standard of hotels in that State has been brought up to a higher standard than existed before. If this Bill has that effect in this State it will confer a great benefit on the travelling public. With very few exceptions the Queensland hotels are not up to that standard that is desirable. Probably the hotelkeeper is not to blame, because he has to pay tremendous amounts for goodwill, and many of them are finding it difficult to meet their commitments; but with the aid of this Bill hotels will be brought to such a standard that they will be more readily patronised than they are at the present time.

The Minister gave the Chamber a very lucid explanation of the measure, and we are very grateful to him for it. It is not customary for many of his colleagues to do as the hon. gentleman has done. When the Bill reaches the Committee stages it will be the subject of a good deal of debate. In the main I think the Bill is a good one, and will make for the betterment of the trade generally.

I agree with the hon. member for Dalby that we cannot associate ourselves actively with either the liquor interests or the temperance interests. Both have claims for recognition, and it is the duty of Parliament to observe an equal balance between all sections of the community. If the temperance party was successful and prohibition was carried, we should have to put up with it; but it would mean a tremendous amount of compensation would have to be paid to those people who were put out of business—because it is only fair that people who are conducting a legitimate business should receive compensation if they are compelled by Government interference to abandon that method of earning a livelihood. We must be fair to every section of the community, and the owners of businesses that have been interfered with unduly by Government action should be compensated for their loss, and that fact should be borne in mind when dealing with the question of prohibition. However, the majority of Australians have not come to believe in the principles preached by the prohibitionists, and so long as the conflict goes on the Queensland Parliament must

Mr. Russell.]

be prepared to preserve an even balance between all sections.

In introducing this measure I think the Government are doing something that will be looked upon as very fair by most people. I think it will have the effect of raising the standard of this important industry, and it will probably lessen many of the evils that have been associated with it for many years. We all know there have been flagrant breaches of the law, but I do not think the average publican is anxious to break the law. When the causes of those malpractices are removed, the calling should be looked upon as an honourable one that will afford those engaged in it a fair return for their industry and enterprise.

In the main we are in accord with the Bill. It contains one or two provisions that we should like to see modified considerably in Committee.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [12.29 p.m.]: The full and clear explanation of the Bill given by the Minister was appreciated by hon. members generally. I shall reserve most of my comments on the Bill until I have had an opportunity of studying it.

I understood the Minister to say that the commission will have power to grant licenses in any area. I consider the old licensing courts have carried out a great work in Queensland, and in the majority of cases their decisions have been fair and just.

At 12.30 p.m.,

Mr. O'KEEFE (*Cairns*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. NIMMO: The Bill provides for the establishment of a commission. The commission is responsible to the Government in power and it must not be forgotten that from time to time Governments are changed. The Government in power can dominate the actions of the commission.

The HOME SECRETARY: In the last analysis that applies to everything.

Mr. NIMMO: That is so. A court has always to uphold its honour. It hears evidence, the evidence is published in the Press and thereby is made public. The court makes a decision on the evidence and naturally if the decision is not just the public are at liberty to rise in arms against it.

The HOME SECRETARY: We should not consider appointing a commission that would do anything dishonourable or dishonest.

Mr. NIMMO: I do not think the Minister would do anything like that, but he must remember that his successors will also have to administer this law and the personnel of the commission will change from time to time. Many attempts have been made to establish a hotel in the Graceville, Sherwood and Corinda districts in my electorate. The residents have opposed them.

The HOME SECRETARY: In most instances it is an attempt to wangle a license. This Bill is designed to prevent such wangling.

Mr. NIMMO: Although many of the individual residents do like an occasional drink it is an area where no license can be granted and the residents have kept it so. They would not have a hotel established in their suburbs. According to the Minister the commission to be appointed under this Bill

[*Mr. Russell.*

could decide to grant a license in that locality.

Mr. KING: If it is required.

Mr. NIMMO: I consider it is wrong. It is against the interests of the residents of the district to give that power to any commission and I protest against it. The residents in an area should have the right of deciding whether or not they require a hotel service. Under the provisions of the Bill the commission can force a hotel proprietor in any area to provide certain accommodation. I have travelled extensively in Queensland and have found that some of the poorer hotels supply remarkably good accommodation. Of course the Licensing Court insists on cleanliness, but there is no doubt that in some hotels the accommodation cannot be described in any other way than as awful.

The HOME SECRETARY: And that is not always in the country districts.

Mr. NIMMO: I agree with the Minister. The point is that if a hotel in a country area is over-capitalised it may be very bad for that district. There are all classes of travellers. Some can afford to pay the high charges required by the palatial hotels that are situated in some country districts, whereas others cannot. The result will be very awkward indeed for some travellers.

I reserve any further comment until I see the Bill, but I view with alarm the giving to a commission a power to force a license on a suburb where the residents do not want or need it.

Question—"That the resolution (*Mr. Hanlon's motion*) be agreed to"—put and passed.

The House resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) presented the Bill; and moved—

"That the Bill be now read a first time."

Question put and passed.

Second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. O'Keefe, Cairns, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.*)

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) [12.35 p.m.]: I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend 'The Cremation Act of 1913' in certain particulars, and for other purposes."

This Bill is introduced to correct a fault that has been discovered in the existing Cremation Act, which was passed in 1913. In that Act provision was made to make sure before cremation that there was no probability that foul play caused the death. Before a body could be cremated, authority had to be given by the Registrar-General, after receiving a certificate from the medical officer attending the patient and the Government medical officer, or another medical

officer, but no provision was made for anyone to act on behalf of the Registrar-General in the event of that officer's being sick or on leave. It must be borne in mind that cremation will not be confined to Brisbane for all time. It is quite obvious that crematoria will be established in all the cities in the State in the very near future, when it will be necessary for statutory authority to be given to officers to issue certificates on behalf of the Registrar-General granting permission to cremate the bodies. This Bill eliminates the necessity of the Registrar-General's signing every certificate and provides that the medical officer attending a patient before death shall issue the certificate of death in the ordinary way, which shall then be submitted to a Government medical officer appointed for the purpose, who will then, if satisfied that everything is in order, issue a certificate for cremation. In the event of a death where no medical officer attended the patient, the usual post-mortem examination must be conducted, and upon receipt of the result of that examination the Government medical officer may issue permission to cremate.

The Bill provides for the cremation of the remains after exhumation not less than one year after burial. Instances have occurred in the past when it has been desired to exhume a body for the purpose of cremation, but there is no provision in the present Act setting out the minimum time after burial at which remains may be exhumed for that purpose.

The Bill also contains powers authorising the issue of regulations to fix the fees that may be charged for a certificate. It is not desired that the Act should allow an unnecessary exploitation of the relatives of the deceased person when there is only one officer in the town to issue the certificate. The fees to be charged will be fixed by the Governor in Council at a moderate amount.

That is all that is contained in the Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) presented the Bill, and moved—

“That the Bill be now read a first time.”

Question put and passed.

Second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

DENTAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. O'Keefe, Cairns, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.)

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) [12.44 p.m.]: I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Dental Acts, 1902 to 1933, in certain particulars.”

This amending Bill, is rendered necessary by the establishment of a Faculty of Dentistry at the Queensland University. Its whole object is to transfer to the faculty the

powers to teach and examine students of dentistry. At present that power is reserved to the Dental Board, though for some years past the board has delegated the exercise of those powers to the Joint Board of Dental Studies. The joint board was created to represent the Dental Board, the Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board, and the University, and operated more or less successfully until the establishment of the Faculty of Dentistry. The establishment of a Chair of Dentistry at the University greatly increases the prestige of the profession and makes for a higher standard of education and training. A new agreement has been entered into with the Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board giving the student and the University certain rights to space at the Brisbane Dental Hospital. The power of the University is confined entirely to teaching.

Mr. MOORE: Have all the students to go to the University?

The HOME SECRETARY: All future students will have to attend the University but students who commenced their training before the introduction of this Bill will be accepted in the ordinary way. All registrations previously issued are preserved.

The only power that is reserved from the University is a power reserved to the Dental Board. If the Dental Board considers that in certain circumstances a person should be examined, and he is successful, he will on passing the examination be registered. If a student commenced his training before the introduction of this Bill and then went out of training the board may recommend that he be given permission to sit for an examination to allow him to qualify for registration. One or two cases have come under my notice where it was considered desirable to register such a person, and if this power were not reserved to the board there would be no opportunity to do so. There are a number of fully qualified dentists who have given up their practice to enter other callings, perhaps on the land or in business. If they fail in business they have only their profession to enable them to earn a living, and it was considered necessary to reserve power to the board to re-register them and allow them to do so. An important case came under my notice about two years ago. A dentist came to this country from overseas where he had practised as a dentist for many years. He invested large sums of money in the pastoral industry in this State, but, unfortunately, immediately prior to the collapse of wool prices, he found himself poverty-stricken, unable to earn a living except as a labourer or a dentist. His qualifications were all right. He had spent a large sum of money in this State, and it would have been unfair if we had not taken some action to enable him to earn a living in a profession in which he was fully qualified. That was done.

Mr. MOORE: He did not have to pass an examination?

The HOME SECRETARY: No. He had the necessary diploma from America, and he was registered by the board. We must consider the effects of the bad years through which the country has passed. We must be prepared to do things that perhaps would not be done in normal times. There are other instances where youths were apprenticed to dentists and their apprenticeships were broken. These youths should be given

Hon. E. M. Hanlon.]

an opportunity to continue their studies and qualify. Quite a number of apprenticeships were broken in trades and professions during the depression, and it would be quite unfair if we did not allow the apprentices to pick up the broken apprenticeships and carry them on to a successful end. This power is reserved to the board, but adequate protection is also given. The Minister may consider the recommendation by the board, and after hearing it and the applicant, shall decide whether it is right to allow the apprentice to continue his studies. If the board refuses to grant a hearing to the applicant he may appeal to the Minister. I do not think that this provision will lead to any abuse because the Minister administering an important law like this is very jealous of the standard of the profession. He will not act contrary to the recommendation of the board unless for some very grave reasons.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) presented the Bill, and moved—

“That the Bill be now read a first time.”

Question put and passed.

Second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

WHEAT AND WHEAT PRODUCTS BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. O’Keefe, Cairns, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.)

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [12.53 p.m.]: I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced relating to Wheat and Wheat Products.”

This Bill involves the application of an old principle to another industry. We in Queensland stand for organised marketing as a means of collective bargaining perhaps to a greater degree than any other State of the Commonwealth. A meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council took place recently. The Council is constituted by the secretaries of Agriculture for each State and the appropriate Commonwealth Minister. The conference was presided over by Dr. Earle Page. Consideration was given as to how the wheat industry could best be stabilised. The methods suggested, as the Committee might readily glean, were wide and varied. It was definitely indicated, however, that the Commonwealth desired to be relieved of its responsibilities so far as the imposition of the flour tax was concerned. The flour tax is equal to 1s. 1d. a bushel of milled wheat. In addition to the fund thus obtained the Commonwealth, under the system that has operated for the past few years, has been compelled to make some contributions from consolidated revenue to support a fund for necessitous wheatgrowers. The necessitous wheatgrowers in Australia, generally speaking, are cared for from a fund created as a result of the recommendations of a royal

commission, which assessed the debt structure of the industry at many millions of pounds—if my memory serves me rightly, at £87,000,000. It is obvious, therefore, that some action was necessary.

I frankly say that bounties or subsidies, which in effect are payments from consolidated revenue, do not relieve the condition they set out in the first instance to relieve. If a bounty is introduced, as was the case with the wheat bounty one year, it is expected by growers to be permanent, and that tends not to promote efficiency in agriculture, but rather to produce a dead level with its concomitant of resting responsibility on the shoulders of the central organisation.

From my knowledge of agriculture I do not think any permanent success can be achieved if help is extended to such industries year in and year out; and I very steadfastly, as a member of the Australian Agricultural Council, opposed perpetual application of subsidies to industry. I believe that if money is available for agriculture it can be applied in infinitely better ways than in the form of subsidies. The success that has attended the dried fruits legislation, in spite of the very many challenges launched against it, encouraged some of us to believe that we could establish a similar organisation so far as butter was concerned, aiming at the stabilisation of dairy products. Hon. members will recollect the passage in 1933 of the Dairy Products Stabilisation Bill. We have achieved stabilisation in other directions also, particularly, of course, in the sugar industry—were it not for the stabilisation it could be argued that our industry would be in a very difficult position now. We see manifestations of such organisation in many of the major primary industries of Australia. The necessity for that course is obvious because of the economic conditions over which the grower has absolutely no control. After all, the grower of Australian wheat is a vassal, and he is at the mercy of the Chicago “pit” or Liverpool “futures” market, as the case may be. Since we have established in Australia a definite principle of Australian standards of livelihood, we have created and accepted the marketing organisations generally; but if you are prepared to give a standard of living to one section of the community, then you should be prepared to give, as far as possible, a similar standard of living to other sections of the community also. We must not, of course, lose sight of the fact—although it has been said so frequently it is apt to become somewhat lost sight of—that the farmer is the backbone of the social and economic structure of Australia, and he is worthy of all the consideration that Parliaments in Australia can accord to him.

The Australian Agricultural Council believes these things. There are no dissentients so far as the general principle that is enunciated in this Bill is concerned, but there was a good deal of dissention about how that principle should be applied. New South Wales produced a scheme which, on careful examination, was abandoned by the Government that produced it. South Australia also produced a scheme which was not acceptable to the conference, and once again we had to revert to the Commonwealth scheme. That scheme as originally conceived was cumbersome, and it was suggested that the representatives of the

[Hon. E. M. Hanlon.]

various branches of the industry should meet and endeavour to formulate a scheme that would be acceptable to everybody. However, they were unable to do so.

At 2 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN took the chair.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Butler, the Premier of South Australia, is now apparently making reservations in connection with the general principle of wheat stabilisation that he did not make during the progress of the negotiations. I cannot understand how a State like South Australia, which really has more to gain by the passage of this Bill than has Queensland, should offer any opposition to a general stabilised home consumption price. It is an accepted axiom in Australian agriculture that it is necessary to have this stabilisation of price.

Passing from the general to the specific I desire to say that all the schemes submitted to the conference broke down on one ground or another. The principal objection to most of the schemes was that no finance would be immediately forthcoming to operate them. Of course Queensland was not particularly concerned about that aspect of the problem, inasmuch as we have always been able to make satisfactory arrangements with the Commonwealth Bank for the financing of crops prior to sale. However, some States felt that the difficulties associated with finance would be a menace, and as the Commonwealth scheme by the sale of warrants—which is in practice in New South Wales, although not understood very well in Queensland—provided for the immediate payment of what we term a first advance, quite obviously that scheme was more acceptable to the majority of the States at the time of the conference than any other put forward.

There are many reasons why Queensland should be a party to the scheme. It may be reasonably said that Governments, recognising a very definite responsibility in regard to the economics of primary production, have in some directions given material aid. For instance, had it not been for the joint action of the Commonwealth and State Governments dairy stabilisation would not be an accomplished fact; had it not been for the co-operation of the Commonwealth and State Governments, sugar stabilisation—a different form in practice but stabilisation nevertheless—also would not be an accomplished fact. So far as dairy stabilisation is concerned there are some points to which I desire to direct attention. I believe that 85 per cent. of the people who are producing wheat in the wheat areas of the State are also engaged in dairying. It is true that although other States reap a benefit out of stabilisation—if they did not do so obviously they would object to the scheme—Queensland does obtain material benefit, in common with the other States, but perhaps a little greater benefit than some of the other participants enjoy under the scheme. It has been very properly remarked that Queensland cannot play with a double-headed penny: that we cannot have dairy stabilisation with its attendant benefits or sugar stabilisation and standardisation and reject the wheat scheme. We were faced with the alternatives of acceptance or rejection. If we accept, as we are doing by this Bill, it is obvious that the general average price for Queensland may

be reduced a little, although satisfactory safeguards may be taken and will be taken for the maintenance of those equality standards that characterise Queensland's payments. We cannot expect to have it all our own way, and when one considers that 85 per cent. of the people growing wheat are benefiting as a result of dairy stabilisation, one cannot reasonably object to another form of stabilisation that will give the Queensland wheatgrowers security so far as their dairy scheme is concerned, and Southern growers some relief so far as their debt structure is concerned.

The wheat market is low at the present time. No one can tell what may happen from day to day. A month ago it appeared that the market was rapidly firming throughout the world and that the natural law of supply and demand would overcome the difficulties that had been besetting the wheat farmers of Australia for a number of years. The latest official reports indicate that the wheat market is weak and variable and that it is not possible to gauge either its latent strength or potential weakness. Therefore, there is stronger argument to-day than there was a month ago in favour of some form of stabilisation.

It is obvious that we cannot stabilise overseas. We are completely at the mercy of the overseas markets, and since that is the case, we can only deal with that portion of the wheat that is under our direct control that is consumed locally. Statistics compiled over a number of years indicate that we export about 75 per cent. of our wheat and consume about 25 per cent. The 75 per cent. that we export is beyond our jurisdiction as far as price control is concerned. The 25 per cent. that is consumed locally—if the present interpretation of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution is sound—is the only portion upon which we can bring some measure of relief to bear.

This Bill provides for the allocation of export and home consumption quotas. No export quota and no home consumption quota can be confined to any one State. As the hon. member for Albert knows, by means of transference and equalisation, the machinery that the Commonwealth Dairy Products Equalisation Committee evolves can be employed for the purpose of administering this Act. The whole point at issue is that 25 per cent. of the total wheat grown in Australia under normal conditions will attract home consumption prices and 75 per cent. will not, because it is an export commodity. It is proposed to provide warrants that will bring 4s. 9d., or whatever the price may be, but that price is not definite, arbitrary, nor fixed. I understand it is subject to review, but whatever the home consumption price may be, it will be paid in respect to 25 per cent. of the total wheat crop of Australia, irrespective of where the crop may be grown. So that if Queensland produces 4,000,000 bushels of wheat, 1,000,000 bushels of that wheat will attract home consumption prices and 3,000,000 bushels will attract overseas parity prices as they exist from time to time. The proceeds from home consumption will be pooled with the proceeds from the export wheat and warrants distributed amongst the whole of the growers of Australia. I believe that that is the only sound and practicable way of accomplishing what we desire.

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

The enunciation of a principle is generally fairly simple, but the translation of that principle into practical effect is infinitely more difficult. In New South Wales the Bill is already before Parliament, and I understand that the Commonwealth has introduced its Bill. Queensland is to-day following suit. I should have preferred that the whole of the Commonwealth would be agreeable to a compulsory pool or pools under a joint State and Commonwealth authority. Whatever may be said against the Queensland Wheat Pool, it is a fact that it has achieved more for the wheat-growers than would have been achieved had that pool not been in operation. With all the limitations of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution and all the difficulties that have beset the Queensland Wheat Board from time to time, it has undoubtedly accomplished something that could not have been accomplished if the old law of supply and demand, the jungle law of tooth and claw, had prevailed as it did before the Wheat Pool came into operation.

Queensland is the only State in the Commonwealth that has a compulsory wheat pool, and after meeting many of the growers' representatives at the protracted conference I attended in Canberra, I believe that in the main growers are definitely in favour of compulsory organisation, with its natural corollary, a compulsory wheat pool. Although large sections of the growers and representatives of influential wheatgrowers' bodies definitely stood for a compulsory form of wheat organisation, although Mr. Stevens, of New South Wales, stated that the growers, by not having a compulsory scheme, sacrificed threepence on every bushel of wheat they sold, and in spite of the assurances given by representatives of the industry that a compulsory pool was their aim and objective, unfortunately political influences were allowed to intrude. Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland favoured the principle of pooling, while Western Australia and South Australia especially were violently antagonistic to it. Our attitude is to let the growers decide their own fate in these matters and take a ballot if they decide to do so. My view is that it was unfortunate that politics were dragged into it. The Governments of South Australia and Western Australia were not prepared to allow a ballot to be taken.

It is suggested that it would court failure to take a ballot, but our experience with ballots has been otherwise. We are prepared to take the action involved in passing this Bill and let the matter go. This is really a substitute for a system of compulsory organisation. I believe that unfortunately this may become the accepted structure, whereas compulsory organisations and pooling would be the more satisfactory structure. Once an organisation is set up it is difficult to break it down.

MR. EDWARDS: Is the Wheat Board in favour of this legislation?

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is just one point I should like to make, and I think it answers the question asked by the hon. member for Nanango. I suppose the hon. member has heard of the "three tailors of Tooley street"? I do not desire to compare the Wheat Board with the three tailors of Tooley street, but the Wheat Board cannot be allowed to dictate

matters of policy to a Government. The Wheat Board says, in effect, that the growers are going to lose 2d. to 3d. a bushel. I said that at Canberra and the Wheat Board is only repeating what I said. I said that I came to Canberra to try to improve the economic lot of the wheat-growers of Queensland, not to depress their earning capacity, and as a result certain compromises were agreed upon in connection with home consumption prices and payment for quality.

I said at the outset that we could not play with a double-headed penny. I am not prepared to play with a double-headed penny. I stand for organised marketing and the Government stand for organised marketing. We shall take the good with the bad. Even though it does mean a sacrifice of 2d. a bushel, it means that stabilisation is achieved and is perhaps the forerunner of a definite and satisfactory system of reorganisation in wheat marketing. It means also that the Dairy Products Stabilisation Act is secured by our co-operation with the other wheat-growing States of the Commonwealth. It means more than that, because 85 per cent. of the men growing wheat also participate in the benefits of the dairy stabilisation scheme. At the appropriate time I shall give hon. members some idea of the amount of money that has gone into the Darling Downs and the wheat areas of the State generally as a result of the application of the Dairy Products Stabilisation Act.

I have had the Wheat Board in conference with me on these matters. Suppose that we did not come to an agreement. What material benefit could we gain? We can say that we will stand apart, that we will not be subscribers to a common wheat policy in Australia, and at the same time expect New South Wales, Victoria, and other States meekly to acquiesce in our policy of dairy stabilisation or sugar stabilisation? Can we do that for the sake of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum? My figures are a little exaggerated, because our average wheat production over the past decade has been only 3,500,000 bushels of millable wheat per annum. Can I, or should I, for the sake of 3,500,000 bushels of wheat per annum—I do not think that we can expand our wheat industry to any very material extent for years to come—rob the dairy farmers of the benefits they get, endanger the sugar position and promote hostility in the Southern States? We could not do anything more calculated to promote hostility in the Southern States than refuse to be a party to the economic rehabilitation of the wheat industry of Australia. This is an occasion where we cannot think in terms of the Wheat Board; we cannot think in terms of any specific industry. We can only think in terms of the whole of the industries in our chief objective of organised marketing—a means whereby we can accomplish and insist on loyalty to a principle that I heartily endorse. I unhesitatingly support the principle of organised marketing and the principle of giving the farmers control over their commodities.

Suppose that we did not come to an agreement, that we were prepared to stand apart, to remain a kind of foreign State. What would happen? The export surplus of 75 per cent. could come to Queensland just as it could be consigned to other

[Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

destinations—if we did not come in the people who would naturally be hostile on that account would invade and break down the market available in Queensland for our own wheat—Queensland would become the dumping ground for surplus flour, wheat, bran, and pollard from the Southern States. Could you blame the Southern States if they said, “Since Queensland will not come in, since Queensland wants to be regarded as a foreign country, and cannot think nationally in terms of the benefits to the Commonwealth, she must take what is coming to her.” If the Wheat Board finds it can get levels a little higher than those promoted by this Bill, it should at the same time consider the effect nationally. To those people who say that the wheatgrowers are making the sacrifice I would say, “They are—a small sacrifice.” This sacrifice, however, is compensated for to the extent that 85 per cent. of them benefit under the stabilisation of dairy products. I say in addition that if the wheatgrowers in Queensland did not take Darling Harbour parity in Queensland, wheat based on Darling Harbour parity would be dumped on the Queensland market and Queensland would have no power of retaliation. That would lead to a material reduction in the earning capacity of our wheatgrowers.

I make no apology for introducing this Bill. It embodies a principle for which I stand. It has been said that the difference between the home consumption price of all the Queensland wheat and the figure that Queensland will lose by giving away 75 per cent. of that wheat at overseas parity or export price will make a material contribution to the price of wheat in other States. Let us examine that contention. The flour tax means 1s. 1d. a bushel of milled wheat. That has resulted in Queensland's obtaining £65,000 back from her contribution of £150,000. The position, therefore, is that under this scheme Queensland will not contribute any more than the Southern States are contributing at the present time by the operations of the flour tax. If other States are prepared to make a contribution towards the solvency of one of our major industries then it is an insane suggestion for anyone to make that we will stand aloof—that Queensland, with its bagatelle of a wheat industry can achieve the things which it is said can be obtained by standing aloof.

I see lots of good in the States coming together. Let us review this question as we would review the question of dairy products. Let us regard it as an Australian question instead of a Queensland question, and let the economics of the whole subject be viewed from an Australian and not a State viewpoint. We should not consider the matter selfishly, from the viewpoint of one or two States. Some States of the Commonwealth have not definitely disclosed their reactions to this legislation.

This Bill will come into operation on a date to be proclaimed. It is fairly obvious that it cannot come into operation until all the States have passed enabling legislation. I understand it will not come into operation during the currency of the present year. If Western Australia out of the three major exporting wheat States stood aloof and refused to pass similar enabling legislation then under the implication of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution it would

be able to dump her surplus wheat on the market of Victoria or New South Wales. The whole scheme would then break down. The stabilisation of wheat is somewhat different from the stabilisation of butter, where we had the three major exporting States—New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland—as the subscribing States to the agreement, although the other States did come in. When the Commonwealth proclaims its Act Queensland will proclaim its Act, and Queensland, anticipating and expecting the loyalty of Southerners in respect of the stabilisation of sugar and butter, will give in return an equal measure of loyalty to Southerners in respect of the stabilisation of wheat.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [2.25 p.m.] : Although the Minister has given the Committee a full explanation of the purposes of this Bill, we do not know its full text. It seems to be a Bill on which there will be much difference of opinion in Queensland, if not in other parts of Australia.

I agree with the Minister in some of his conclusions, but not in others. According to the information he supplied the measure appears to be one that will be regarded by the farmers with favour or disfavour according to the season of the year. If the measure is passed, the farmer will disapprove of it when Australia has a good crop and approve of it when the harvest is a poor one.

Most of the wheat farmers in Queensland are also dairymen. Dairying is the major industry on the Darling Downs, and wheat-growing is not carried on to any extent outside that area. If similar legislation is carried in the other States it appears impossible for Queensland to say, “We stand out.” I do not agree with the Minister, however, in his conclusion that Queensland could be used as a dumping ground if we did accept the measure. After all, at the present time our wheat is sold on the basis of the export price at Darling Harbour, and we can never be treated worse than that. I do not consider the argument of the Minister in that respect a weighty one.

I am considering the wheat industry as a whole and giving due weight to the question whether Queensland can afford to stand out in view of the other primary products that are affected, and I am also bearing in mind the fact that dairying and wheatgrowing are in a great number of cases carried on by the same farmers. This scheme to embrace all the States may not go any further. If—as the reports in the Press indicate—other large States are not sure whether they will come in or not, it may be that the thought applied to this measure will have been wasted. The main thing to be considered by Queensland is whether we can afford to stand out, considering the other interests in the State that are affected.

There is one aspect of this matter that the Minister did not touch on. We have striven for years to give a certain standard of living to a section of the people, and when that was accomplished other sections insisted on the same standard and we have now reached the position where everybody is as he was before. Each one has contributed a portion of the other fellow's rise in wage or salary or price for product and we have reached the position that we are on

Mr. Deacon.]

the same basis as though nothing had been done in that way at all.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is what you always wanted, so you will be happy now.

Mr. DEACON: No, we have not brought all up, but I am glad that we at least have brought up one section to the level of the other. Their burden was passed on to us, and now we pass our burden on to them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A case of taking in each other's washing?

Mr. DEACON: As the hon. gentleman says, it amounts to taking in each other's washing. Everybody's claim has a right to be considered when legislation of this nature is being discussed. The wheatgrowers and the dairy-men have the same claim as everybody else.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why should they not?

Mr. DEACON: As I have said, the result eventually will be that we shall be as we were and in the long run nobody will benefit. At present we cannot afford to stand out of the scheme even if it is no advantage to go in. I agree with the Minister on that point—that we cannot stand out. Queensland has got to take the scheme, as husbands have to take wives—for better or worse.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*), [2.32 p.m.]: I agree with the Minister on the necessity for Queensland's going into the scheme, because I do not think she can afford to stand out, and moreover, even if that were not so it would not be fair for her to stay out. The primary producers of Queensland are obtaining advantages in other directions, such as in respect of sugar and dairy products. So far as the latter is concerned, Queensland obtains a greater advantage than do any of the other States and to stay out because the wheat industry may not receive the same advantage as at the present time would be quite wrong. It would endanger the whole system of orderly marketing in Australia. If we are to have this system of orderly marketing, then it is necessary that we in Queensland should take the rough with the smooth.

Nevertheless, I do not think it is necessary for the Minister to paint a horrible picture of what would happen if we did not go in. I do not think there would be any dumping of wheat in Queensland. At the present time Southern growers have the opportunity of doing so if they so desire—they have had it for some time—but owing to the geographical position of the State and the cost of freight I do not think there will be very much danger from that point of view. The Queensland primary producers have obligations to other primary producers throughout Australia, and if we obtain advantages in some directions we should be perfectly willing to suffer some disadvantages in others.

I am not at one with the Minister in his statement that none of the States gave their growers a chance to say whether they would have compulsory pools.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I was referring to South Australia.

Mr. MOORE: In Victoria there were two ballots and in each instance the pool was turned down by a very large majority. They took a ballot in Western Australia and the scheme was turned down. But that is not

the point at issue to-day. The point is that the Commonwealth Government are prepared to join in with the various State Governments in an orderly marketing scheme to establish a home consumption price. A great deal depends on the exportable surplus. As was stated in the Chamber recently we shall reach the same position as obtains in the sugar industry at the present time. In the future there will be a larger exportable surplus of wheat and then there will be suggestions that wheat land be assigned like sugar-cane land. When that condition of affairs is brought about, of course we are reaching the end. The whole matter now depends on the price to be received and whether it will be of benefit to Queensland, with, of course, the question of the amount of the exportable surplus. If there is a bad season and a small exportable surplus Queensland will probably benefit.

I do not agree with the Minister that the mere fact that if Queensland enters into a wheat stabilisation scheme it will assist our dairy stabilisation scheme. It will make no difference—if once the dairy producers of the other States realise that their confreres in Queensland are obtaining greater benefits than they should, there will be an immediate outcry.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why raise that question?

Mr. MOORE: It will be so. The mere fact that the Minister puts forward as an inducement to come into the wheat stabilisation scheme the argument that Queensland dairy producers will secure an advantage in their dairying scheme does not make it an advantage. The matter of most importance is that we should look at the question from an Australian viewpoint. The primary producers of the various States should recognise that they are in an Australian primary-producing industry and if there is to be any system of stabilisation and orderly marketing they should all be in the organisation. Queensland cannot stand out when it suits her to stand out but suits the rest to go in; and go in when it is to her advantage to go in and to the advantage of the rest to stand out. The whole organisation has to be on an Australian-wide basis. It is no use saying that we have to go into this proposal because it will secure stabilisation of sugar or dairy products. It does not mean that. The only result will be to create a better feeling.

From that point of view, I think we are justified in going on with this proposal. I do not know whether the other States will pass Bills enabling this scheme to be put into operation, but we can do our share. I cannot see any justification for not joining in with this proposal. If this Bill and the Farmers' Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Bill will prevent the growing of wheat in those portions of Australia that are unsuitable, Queensland will be in practically the same position as the other States of the Commonwealth, depending on the size of the crop and the amount of surplus to be exported, together with the ruling export price.

I do not know whether better results could be obtained by having compulsory pools throughout Australia. I doubt very much whether they would have that effect. There would certainly be a great deal of difficulty as regards finance. That difficulty is not great

{*Mr. Deacon.*}

in Queensland, but the fact that a compulsory pool has been successful in Queensland does not mean that it will be successful in either New South Wales or Victoria, because conditions are different. We do not grow enough wheat for our own consumption, and the Wheat Board has a very simple duty to perform. It stores the wheat and regulates the distribution to meet the requirements of the millers. The operations of a pool assume an entirely different character when there is an exportable surplus of 75 per cent., so we cannot judge whether the other States are wrong in not having compulsory pools. The position is entirely different in Queensland; we have not to deal with the selling of large quantities overseas. The question whether a compulsory pool would be an advantage in the South is a matter for the other States and the southern growers.

This Bill is a step in the right direction, and it is delightful to see this change of thought on the part of the Government. It is much better than the attitude adopted by a previous Labour Government, who fixed the price for Argentine wheat at 8s. 6d. and of Queensland wheat at 3s. 6d. The effect of that policy was to cause the Queensland farmers to cease growing wheat. If the primary producer is restricted in his operations, the financial structure of the whole community is endangered and the standard of living lowered. If standards in secondary industries are fixed without regard to their capacity to produce, then it naturally follows that the same principle should be observed in fixing prices for locally consumed primary products. If that is all that is in the Bill, I can see no objection to it.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*) [2.40 p.m.]: I fully recognise the importance of this Bill, and I am a firm believer in the principle it embodies. We all recognise that stabilisation has always been of great benefit to our farmers. The Paterson scheme, for example, was worth millions of pounds a year to the butter producers from its commencement. We fully realise that Darling Harbour rates for wheat will mean a loss to the wheat growers, but there are other factors to be taken into consideration. One is that our production is very small and we have wonderful opportunities for expansion. I strongly advise hon. members who are interested in wheatgrowing to study a graph drawn out by Mr. Kemp of the Main Roads Commission, which will show that wheatgrowing in Queensland is only in its infancy. I venture to prophesy that the younger members of this Committee will see the day when Queensland is producing more wheat than any other State in the Commonwealth.

We realise that when home consumption of a commodity is small, a stabilisation scheme of this kind will not have as great a benefit as it would with a larger consumption. New Zealand, with a heavy production of butter and a small population, would find a stabilisation scheme unworkable. I agree with the contention of the Minister that in butter and sugar and other things we have an advantage over the southern States—although they grow they have supported stabilisation and we have benefited. It appears now that we are going to lose 2½d. a bushel, but I am of the opinion that the Committee appointed by the Commonwealth, representing all the States, will have sufficient common sense to set the stabilised

price high enough to ensure that the loss is not too great in Queensland under normal conditions. Our price must always be lower than theirs, but in normal times I think our position is quite sound.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is a point beyond which a stabilised price cannot go.

Mr. WALKER: We could in many ways improve matters connected with wheat production. Like the butter industry, the wheat industry could study economy. For example, in the last season the dumps lost something like 133,000 bushels of wheat, which proves conclusively that there is some laxity. If we economised we should show those in the South that our wheat-growers were trying to do something for the industry and endeavouring to produce a sufficient quantity of good quality wheat at lowest possible costs. In fact, it is necessary for our wheatgrowers, in order to look after their own domestic affairs, to create that impression. Our export quota in Queensland is really nil.

Mr. Scullin, at a conference with State Ministers, expressed the opinion that a bounty should be given for export wheat. It would never have done for us to support that proposal, because in the first place Queensland is not an exporting State and could not participate in the bounty. In the second place, in the other States the bounty would pass through so many hands that the grower would in all probability get none of it. It would be in the hands of the firms purchasing or milling wheat, as the case might be.

The only way to overcome the present economic difficulties is by a sound stabilisation scheme. A grievous error was committed in South Australia and Western Australia in that certain wheatgrowers were permitted to try to grow wheat in areas where it was almost impossible to do so. They have only one good season out of ten, and the growers in those districts have been on the breadline for years. We cannot hope to benefit those growers to any material extent by any stabilisation scheme, because they are endeavouring to produce a primary product in an area quite unsuited to the purpose. Queensland is placed at a big advantage with its suitable soil. I have to admit that the rainfall for wheatgrowing purposes is not always propitious, but for the last eight or ten years the seasons have been particularly good. The cultivation of the soil is easy and large quantities of fertiliser are not required to rejuvenate it, as is necessary in the Southern States. I am confident that the wheat industry has a very bright future in this State, and that the stabilisation scheme is a step in the right direction, provided it is administered along sound lines.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [2.47 p.m.]: I was very interested in the speech delivered by the Minister. It must be admitted that organised marketing is inevitable and that it has come to stay.

I was rather astounded at one statement made by the Minister. He made it very clear—as he always does—that the farmers should be allowed to control their own affairs. I agree with his sentiment, but he also said that on this occasion, at least, he was not going to take very much notice of the

Mr. Edwards.]

Wheat Board. His statement requires some amplification.

Mr. LLEWELYN: He said that he could not allow the Wheat Board to dictate the policy of the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is all very fine, but the hon. member cannot get out of it in that way. Rightly or wrongly, the members of the Wheat Board represent the wheat-growers on the Darling Downs for the time being, and if the Minister can ignore their opinions can he not also do the same thing with the representatives of the dairying industry if their opinions—being the considered opinions of the dairymen—clash with Government policy? This is a very dangerous attitude, and the Minister should give the matter very careful consideration before he defies the representatives of the wheat-growers on the Darling Downs.

Mr. WALSH: The Wheat Board was established in accordance with legislation passed by this Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is all very fine to say that. Are representatives of primary producers to be appointed to control commodities and their opinions over-ridden at any time that the Minister desires to do so? If that is the attitude of the Minister then these men are not the representatives of the farmers at all.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They are not legislators, they are administrators.

Mr. EDWARDS: This is a very important matter for the wheatgrowers, and it is highly desirable that the Minister should get the Wheat Board together.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have already had them in conference.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Minister should try to get the Wheat Board to work in with him on this legislation. The Minister must admit that a conference with representatives of the wheatgrowers, who have full powers in respect of the marketing of wheat, would be of material assistance in this matter.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You are not suggesting that the Minister ignored the Wheat Board?

Mr. EDWARDS: There is no question about it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Hanson, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Nanango says that I ignored the Wheat Board. I stated that I had invited representatives of the Wheat Board to the Canberra Conference and had subsequently conferred with the board and its officials.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Nanango to accept the explanation of the Secretary for Agriculture.

Mr. EDWARDS: I accept his explanation, nevertheless, the Minister must admit that he is now ignoring the opinions of the Wheat Board. If the Government adopted a similar attitude in relation to organisations connected with other primary industries the whole system of organised marketing and collective bargaining would soon be destroyed.

There is another matter I am very interested in. The hon. member for Cooroora suggested that in a few years Queensland might become the biggest wheatgrowing State in the Commonwealth. Anyone who

holds that view should visit the Southern wheatgrowing centres, make comparisons and inquiries regarding the conditions under which wheat is grown there and then compare them with the conditions under which wheat is grown in this State. He should further examine the methods of cultivation in the Southern States and compare them with those adopted in Queensland. If he did so he would not hold that opinion for twenty-four hours.

We should consider very carefully whether we are taking a step that is necessary. I am a great believer in a sound policy of an Australian-wide organisation of marketing, but in this case we should not lose sight of the position of the industry in this State. The industry in Queensland stands by itself because the whole crop is consumed locally; in fact, millers in Queensland are at times compelled to import wheat. What desire is there for Queensland to be a party to this enabling legislation?

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: The desire is just the same as it was with our sugar and butter.

Mr. EDWARDS: We do not export wheat to the Southern States as we do sugar and butter. The question is whether this legislation is for the benefit of this State. Are we merely enacting it because the Southern States desire us to do so? If that is so, it is a bad thing for our wheatgrowers. They will lose from 2d. to 3d. a bushel as a result.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: Is this Bill of benefit to the wheatgrowers or is it not?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not see why Southern exporters should say we should come in, seeing that we are not exporters. If we were exporters of wheat they would have a sound argument. I do not see why they should bother about us.

Mr. LLEWELYN: You must be against it.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member can think what he likes, and I can think what I like, nevertheless that is the position. The Minister has not given any proof that this Bill will improve the conditions of wheat marketing even in the Southern States. If Queensland refuses to be a party to this enabling legislation what harm will accrue to the Southern States? I cannot for the life of me see what harm can follow our refusal. If we exported even one bushel of wheat, or any of its by-products, then by all means let us join the other States in this legislation.

Organised marketing is a very fine principle to adopt; but if a marketing organisation is not conducted on sound commercial lines it may be disastrous for the primary producers. There have been many failures in organised marketing.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: The Wheat Board and the Butter Board have been successful.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is true up to a point. According to a rumour that is prevalent—I am not in a position to say whether it is true or not—enormous losses have occurred in connection with the wheat dumps.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: There were losses before the pools operated.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is true, but these organisations were created for the purpose of improving conditions. It is of the utmost importance—and I am sure the Minister agrees with me in this regard—that these

[Mr. Edwards.]

organisations should be as highly efficient as it is possible to make them.

Mr. JESSON: Have not those organisations improved the conditions obtaining in various industries?

Mr. EDWARDS: In some cases they have and in others they have not. I know people who invested money in co-operative concerns and lost it all. State enterprises provided an illustration. The principle of organised marketing is a splendid one; but organisations must be conducted on sound commercial lines, and we should not be satisfied unless an improvement is continually effected.

It must be recognised that the dairyman and the wheatgrower are experiencing a very difficult time, and every effort should be made to improve their conditions. Despite the improvement that has taken place, there are many dairymen who are practically on the bread line.

Mr. POWER: The same old story.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member knows nothing about this matter. I dare say many of the wheatgrowers are in the same position as the dairymen. I know that the cost of cultivating wheat lands on the black soil areas on the Downs is exceedingly heavy. The area is not as adaptable to wheatgrowing as certain areas in Southern States, where one may see hundreds of miles of wheat ripening and scarcely a green blade of vegetation. On the Downs one may see a patch of corn growing in the same paddock as a ripe crop of wheat.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS (*Cook*) [3 p.m.]: I support the measure under consideration because the principle of organised marketing is one that every farmer in Queensland who has the wellbeing of the industry at heart must wholeheartedly support. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Nanango adopting such a lukewarm attitude towards that principle. It is the attitude taken by the hon. member that is very largely responsible for the bad position of wheat farmers, not merely in Queensland, but throughout Australia. They have shown from time to time a lack of determination in tackling the problem with a view to putting the industry on the same sound footing as those on which other primary industries rest that have organised marketing.

In common with several hon. members on the other side of the Chamber I have had considerable experience in organised marketing, and one of the principal objections put forward by farmers, not only in the north, but also in the south of Queensland, has been expressed in this fashion: "We think pools are all right provided they are established on a Commonwealth and not a State basis. If one could say there would be a Commonwealth pool for maize, butter, or other product it would be a fine thing, but we do not think that State pooling goes far enough." The proposed Bill, although it does not create a Commonwealth pool, gives effect more or less to the same principles.

The principle of the Bill is whether there shall be an Australian price for the wheat that is to be consumed in this country. Definitely that is a step in the right direction. How can we in Queensland argue that

it is sound to have a Commonwealth-wide organisation for sugar and butter but unsound to have a similar organisation for wheat? It is unfortunate that the operation of the measure will reduce in a slight measure the returns that the wheatgrowers of Queensland are receiving at the present time, but I submit we must not look on the present output of wheat from Queensland as the maximum of its possibilities in wheat production. Experts have investigated the question whether we can produce wheat successfully in much larger quantity than at the present time. There is some difference of opinion among them. Some state definitely that we shall eventually be the granary of Australia, others have doubt as to the possibilities of our production. At one time it was thought it would be quite impossible to grow wheat in many parts of Australia that to-day are very successful wheat-producing areas. At one time it was not thought Australia would be a big factor in the world's wheat markets. But with the application of scientific wheat breeding to the problem of obtaining suitable varieties for suitable areas, Australia is becoming one of the very large grain exporting countries of the world. Following that principle it will be possible to evolve a wheat suitable to a great belt of country that to-day is not producing wheat but in the future will produce many millions of bushels. And it is to the future to which we must more or less look. If Queensland exported a large quantity of wheat it would go without saying that this measure would be regarded as a fine Bill, and we should look to the future when Queensland must become a large wheat-exporting State.

In the meantime Queensland is obtaining considerable assistance from a number of Commonwealth-wide marketing organisations for the great sugar and dairying industries of the State. As the Minister has quite correctly said, "We cannot play with a double-headed penny and get away with it." That has often been tried, but very seldom with success. Therefore, Queensland must support the principles contained in this Bill.

I believe that the Commonwealth Government were ill-advised in not accepting the recommendation of the Wheat Commission to introduce a Commonwealth-wide pool. I believe that the main objection to that pool was the fact that it would upset certain gentlemen who are trading in wheat. As a farmer, and a representative of a farming community, I contend that we should not concern ourselves with the question whether we upset some middleman. Many of Australia's problems would have been solved if we had been able to place the farmer on a much better business footing. By establishing a Commonwealth-wide wheat pool and endeavouring to eliminate the great body of middlemen and grain speculators who are now exploiting the industry, we should be doing something that is needed to safeguard the farmers without doing an injustice to any large section of the community. It is common knowledge that wheat cargoes change hands as many as five and six times in transit between Australia and its overseas destination. As the result of a sale of wheat ships are very often diverted to an entirely different port. If there is money to be made by speculation in wheat it is the farmers' job to control the product that they go to much trouble and expense

Mr. H. H. Collins.]

to produce, so that they may sell it direct to the manufacturer.

Surely no one can argue that it is not more businesslike and to the advantage of the Commonwealth to sell the whole of Australia's wheat as the product of one man instead of 20,000 individual growers, as is being done at the present time! Without a pool, the farmer has very little opportunity of knowing the value of his product. The middleman, sitting at his desk in the city with the world's cables at his command, knows the value of wheat and sells when the price is right. Why do not the farmers combine and establish an organisation in the city so that they will know the wheat prices of the world and be able to sell to the best possible advantage? Until the farmers realise the benefit of control by a pooling system they will never achieve that measure of success to which they are justly entitled.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I believe that it is sound in principle and embodies a system that has worked successfully with every other commodity that has been controlled by a pool.

The hon. member for Nanango mentioned the many bungs that had been made by pool boards, but bungs have also been made by private individuals. The fact that some mistakes are made is not a reason for condemning the whole system. The system is right.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member for Nanango did not oppose the Bill.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: He certainly did not praise it. He would not say whether he was for or against it. Not one of the pools formed in Queensland has gone out of operation, and that should be sufficient evidence as to whether pooling is a success or not.

Mr. EDWARDS: You know I did not say that at all.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: I asked the hon. member if he supported the Bill and he said I could take what I liked from what he said. If the hon. gentleman was in favour of the Bill it was certainly a very half-hearted way of expressing his opinion. Despite the fact that some people contend that pools in Queensland have made mistakes, each of those pools is still operating although farmers have from time to time the opportunity of voting on the question whether they shall be continued or not. That answers the question. I believe that the wheat growers of Queensland, in supporting this Bill, will eventually lose nothing, but that when we come into our own as a big wheat exporting State—as I believe must be the case—this pool will be as great a boon to us as it is now to the other States.

Mr. MULLER (*Fassifern*) [3.12 p.m.]: I desire to compliment the Minister on introducing this Bill. I feel the time has arrived when we should discuss the question of organised marketing from an Australian point of view. Wheat is our only large industry that remains disorganised, and if any State in the Commonwealth has anything to gain by the organisation of its primary industries, that State is Queensland. We have a very clear recollection of what happened when we sent our dairy produce men to organise and equalise on a Commonwealth basis the prices of dairy produce.

[Mr. H. H. Collins.]

Should Queensland offer any objection to this Bill, we should be placing ourselves in the same position as South Australia and Western Australia adopted in respect of the dairy products equalisation scheme which, because they were not producing large quantities of dairy produce and felt that they would lose something by joining a Commonwealth organisation, would not agree to link up with the scheme.

It has been suggested this afternoon that Queensland wheatgrowers may lose 2d. a bushel. I feel, however, that there is not the least danger of that. Though I have not seen the Bill, I understand that the proposal is to set up an Australian price, based on something like 4s. 9d. a bushel. Without some form of organisation it would be impossible for Queensland to maintain a price anywhere near that figure. Our Queensland prices would be based on overseas values, and there is every possibility that world prices will recede to 3s. or 3s. 6d. a bushel. Queensland would have to accept that price, and if the Australian price is set at 4s. 9d. Queensland's only hope of obtaining it is by joining the Australian organisation. Should the wheatgrowers of Queensland stand out of this pool, they have everything to lose. I know that there is a danger of the Wheat Board's offering some opposition to this Bill. I can only say that in that case they would be taking a very narrow view, or show ignorance of the manner in which this scheme will work out in practice. If we are to continue to listen to a body of men who are not alive to their own interests or the interests of the people they represent, we are not going to get anywhere.

We cannot have one-way traffic in the sale of any community. If a stabilisation scheme is justified for dairy produce and sugar, it is equally justified for wheat. The Queensland wheatgrowers are not going to lose anything by this measure. It is estimated that 95 per cent. of the wheatgrowers participate in the benefits of the dairy stabilisation scheme, and in view of that fact the wheatgrowers as a whole should be prepared to adopt a stabilisation scheme for wheat production and marketing.

The dairying industry, the sugar industry, the peanut industry, and other industries have been organised, but there are still primary producers crying aloud for organisation of some description, and the time is not far distant when we shall have to take a step further in that direction. If we are going to control the sale of our products overseas, then we shall first of all have to control their sale on the domestic market. If we expect to exercise some control over the prices for beef, mutton and other primary products, we shall have to exercise efficient control over the products in this country and over shipments overseas.

I offer no opposition whatever to the Bill. I have not seen it, but I am quite satisfied that it will be in the best interests of the wheatgrowers of the State.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [3.17 p.m.]: Quite a lot has been said in connection with this Bill, but we are apt to overlook very big principles involved in the adoption of an organised marketing scheme, not only for Queensland, but also for the whole of Australia. Anyone who has been associated with organised marketing schemes is

convinced that very little can be achieved to-day by a State scheme alone, and that it is necessary that a Commonwealth-wide scheme should be adopted, particularly in respect of those industries that have exportable surpluses. I cannot see why the wheat growers in Queensland should have any objection to the measure. If a stabilisation scheme is to be successful it must be Australian-wide in its operation. Although it may appear that the Queensland wheatgrowers will lose 1d. or 2d. a bushel, the ultimate advantage of an Australian-wide scheme is adequate compensation. They cannot possibly expect to achieve the same beneficial results by a State stabilisation scheme. The time arrived long ago when State organisation schemes should be merged into Australian-wide organisations in all industries with an exportable surplus. Wonderful benefits have been achieved in the dairying industry by a State scheme, but they cannot compare with the enhanced benefits derived by the dairymen from the schemes established on an Australian-wide basis. There is only one way in which industries with exportable surpluses can be successfully organised, and that is by the adoption of a scheme to be applied to Australia as a whole. Although some of the wheatgrowers in Queensland may think that this measure will place them at a disadvantage, they will eventually be convinced that the Governments have adopted the wise course in approving of an Australian-wide organisation. I cannot think that any wheat-grower would offer any objection to the scheme. There is no alternative for them than to fall into line with the other wheat-growing States of the Commonwealth. If the industry is to be placed on a profitable basis, not for one year, but for many years, then the broader scheme will have to be adopted. I welcome the Bill.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) [3.19 p.m.]: Hon. members on this side have recognised during the past decade that little can be achieved by primary producers' organisations if they are not made Australian-wide. The fact that the Commonwealth and State Governments have agreed to set up a Commonwealth-wide primary producers' organisation in connection with wheat and other products indicates clearly that primary production organisation has evolved to such a stage that Commonwealth-wide schemes are essential.

The Minister stated that under this scheme of stabilisation wheatgrowers of this State would lose 2d. to 3d. a bushel on the price they are obtaining to-day, and that the growers were protesting against it. I recognise that no board can dictate to Parliament as to what their policy should be, but the Wheat Board, in doing so, is only fulfilling its obligations to its growers in protesting against this probable loss. It would not be doing its duty unless they endeavoured to maintain present price levels. The board by doing so is performing a service to all the wheatgrowers in Australia.

The hon. member for Cook took it upon himself to castigate the hon. member for Nanango for not dealing with the principles of the Bill, and he asked him if he was not in favour of the Bill. It is just as well at this stage to inform new members who possibly have seen a copy of the Bill in caucus, that Opposition members have not yet seen the Bill.

Mr. WALSH: Do you not accept the Minister's explanation of its principles?

Mr. BRAND: The only information about the Bill we possess is what the Minister has been prepared to give the Committee at the present stage.

Mr. WALSH: He outlined the main principles.

Mr. BRAND: We have no knowledge that he did so in full or not. The Minister only indicated the main principles of the Bill. The hon. member for Nanango dealt with several phases of the issue as it appeared to him, and it will not benefit new members, who may possess greater knowledge of the contents of a Bill through having seen it in caucus, to castigate him when, as we all know, the principles will be dealt with on the second reading stage.

Organised marketing and co-operative efforts by primary producers have been discussed by the Minister. Of those principles we approve. We recognise that in recent years considerable advance has taken place in the methods of marketing our primary products. This specially applies to the dairying and sugar industries, which have obtained an Australian price for their products. It naturally follows that other primary industries are anxious to organise on the same lines. I hope it will not be long before the beef cattle industry, not merely in Queensland, but throughout Australia, will be able to follow similar lines and secure a price that will enable it to produce at a profit.

The idea of fixing a price level in Australia for wheat is a commendable one. We hope that when the Bill is brought down that its principles will be in keeping with similar Bills now before other State Parliaments, and that it will take into consideration factors making for the prosperity of other industries dependent on wheat for their development. The wheatgrowing industry must recognise that there are other industries dependant upon it, and that their interests must be safeguarded. I trust that the Bill contains these safeguards, and that these industries will not be unnecessarily harassed. The Bill, as outlined by the Minister, is one that hon. members can support, and I only hope that when it is circulated it will be found to meet all our desires.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [3.25 p.m.]: I do not agree with the suggestion that the wheatgrowers should be brought under a marketing scheme whether they like it or not. They should have the final voice in the matter. It is all very well for hon. members who do not represent wheatgrowing districts to suggest that a scheme should be introduced irrespective of the wishes of the farmer concerned. If hon. members representing parts of the State where sugar is not grown endeavoured to dictate what the sugar farmers should do, we should be told to mind our own business. I confess I do not know a great deal about the sugar industry, because I have not studied it to the same extent as I would if I represented an area in which that crop was produced. Naturally, the people who are engaged in growing wheat have no desire to be dictated to by other people.

When the Wheat Pool was first established it was favourably commented on by

Mr. Morgan.]

many people. I was in favour of it because I recognised that the wheatgrowers, if not organised, would be at the mercy of speculators who desired to fleece them by not giving them a fair price for their product. I am satisfied the pool has been a success. I do not contend that blunders have not been made, but taking it by and large the pool has proved successful from the wheatgrowers' point of view. The wheatgrowers now elect their own board. The nature of their work was at first experimental, they had to crawl before they could walk, and although they have made mistakes, they have accomplished much. The wheatgrowers are as intelligent as any other section of primary producers, and they know what they want, just as the sugargrowers know what they want. Their opinion should be considered before any scheme affecting their interests is put into operation.

If the scheme to establish an Australian price level for wheat materialises, it appears that the Queensland wheatgrower will be at a slight disadvantage, but that condition may not continue for any length of time. If we succeed in growing wheat in large quantities—we have been endeavouring to do that for the past sixty years, and up to the present we have not succeeded in growing enough for our own requirements—it will be of considerable advantage to the growers in this State. Although Governments have endeavoured to encourage an increase in wheat production it appears that our climatic conditions are inimical to large scale wheat production. The type of wheat produced in Queensland is perhaps the finest that is grown in Australia, and from the milling point of view has no equal.

At 3.28 p.m.,

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: During the period in Queensland when the millers refused to buy wheat at a certain price from the Wheat Board, they obtained supplies from the Southern States, and the bread manufactured from that flour was very inferior. In order to make good bread the bakers mixed a certain amount of flour manufactured from the Queensland wheat with the Southern flour. Millers also found it necessary to mix Queensland wheat with Southern wheat in order to produce a high quality flour.

Our endeavours to grow larger quantities of wheat have not met with the success that we desire. This year the harvest will be somewhere about 3,000,000 bushels. That will not be sufficient for our own requirements and we shall have to import from the other States. Victoria is one of the principal wheatgrowing States of the Commonwealth, and the growers there are not enamoured of the proposal. The Victorian Government have not passed legislation similar to this up to the present. I would ask the Minister if that is not so.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It has not been passed.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Victorian wheatgrowers consider that the proposal will not be beneficial to them, and I doubt if the Victorian Government will force the legislation through against the desires of the growers of that State. The Vic-

torian Government will be guided by the opinions of the wheatgrowers, and if the growers by declining to come under this scheme do something detrimental to themselves they will have only themselves to blame. They will not be able to throw the blame on to the Government for not bringing them into this pool.

I am not aware of the points of view of the majority of the Queensland wheatgrowers. I do not know of meetings being convened to discuss the matter or whether the growers are very much concerned one way or the other. It may be that they are looking to the Wheat Board to protect their interests. The personnel of the board includes men with a large experience in wheatgrowing. The members of the board were only recently elected for a period of three years, and no doubt the growers will be guided to some extent by their views. It is a representative body.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Queensland Wheat Board will be the wheat stabilisation board for the purposes of this Bill.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I am very pleased that this will be so, and it is only right that it should be so. The board is a recognised body, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister and the board do not see eye to eye on every occasion. The board consists of very capable men and does good work. I do not intend to oppose the main principles of the Bill, provided I do not receive definite information from the growers in my electorate that they are not satisfied with the measure and desire that it should not be passed. Of course they are not yet conversant with its provisions, and therefore I would ask the Minister not to force such an important measure through all its stages in one day.

Mr. KING: So that you can get to see your people.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: In reply to the hon. member who interjected I would inform the hon. member that it is my duty to obtain the views of the growers in my electorate. If I did not do so I should not be their representative in this Chamber. I do not intend to coerce them one way or the other. A number of my electors are interested in wheatgrowing. The Dalby district is one of the large wheatgrowing areas of the State, and views have been expressed that it will eventually be the granary of Queensland, if not of Australia. There is a wonderful crop in that locality this season. Queensland will then produce more wheat for home consumption and export greater quantities overseas. The export of huge quantities of wheat from this State will attract more shipping to Queensland ports, provide greater revenue for the railways, and be the means of creating much more employment in the State. If my constituents do not object to the Bill I shall more than likely give it my whole-hearted support.

Question—"That the resolution (*Mr. Bulcock's motion*) be agreed to"—put and passed.

The House resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) presented the Bill, and moved—

“That the Bill be now read a first time.”

Question put and passed.

Second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Gladson, Ipswich, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.*)

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.39 p.m.]: I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend ‘The Dairy Produce Acts, 1920 to 1934’ in certain particulars, and for other purposes.”

It has been my experience during the time that I have been Secretary for Agriculture that any amendment of the Dairy Produce Acts always provokes a great deal of discussion in Parliament, and I anticipate that the Bill I am now presenting for consideration will meet with precisely the same treatment. I think I can anticipate many of the arguments that will be used by hon. members opposite. In the vanguard of those arguments will be found the banner that hon. members opposite so persistently display!—“No Government interference!”

I am afraid that this Bill may be considered by the lesser lights of the Opposition as an indication of further restrictive action on the part of the Government. For that reason I propose to trace briefly the history of this Bill, so that hon. members will debate it in the clearer perspective that comes of knowledge. I am aware that the things I am going to relate are known to hon. members on the opposite side of the Chamber who have had an intimate personal association with the many different phases of the dairying industry.

It must be remembered, in approaching a question such as is involved in this Bill, that the days of production, and production alone, are definitely past. The farmer to-day needs an economic organisation to make marketing profitable. The provision of that marketing organisation and his cultural care are both matters that require the practical sympathy and whole-hearted support of the Government, whatever Government happens to be in power. A good deal of attention has been focussed during the last twelve months on the question of quality in Queensland produce. I am prepared to say that exaggerated and distorted reports were furnished to the public, particularly in the Southern States, because many people believed that they had an axe to grind, and that Queensland should be the grindstone. It is deplorable that a Commonwealth officer—who fortunately has been transferred from Queensland, principally I believe in consequence of his entry into a public argument—should have seen fit to make certain statements derogatory to the Queensland dairying industry. Those statements were eagerly seized upon by certain people who are not very sympathetic

towards our progress in this State, and were used for the purpose of causing a wrong impression to spring up in so far as our dairying activities in Queensland, cultural and economic, are concerned. I was naturally very perturbed about these things, more particularly to find that the reverberations of those discussions and of newspaper statements had found their way into the highest deliberative agricultural body in Australia, the Australian Dairy Council.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Were they true?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The point at issue at this juncture is not entirely whether they were true or not. The point at issue is: can we improve the quality of our dairy produce, and if so are we justified in taking such action as is necessary to accomplish that result? The Australian Dairy Council discussed the question of the quality of dairy produce. New South Wales claimed that it was making an unfair contribution to the stabilisation scheme of Queensland, and a proposal was put forward that the Commonwealth Government should place an excise duty of $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a lb. on all but the choicest of butters, and that the resultant fund should be used for the purpose of subsidising people who were producing the choicest butters in Australia. Obviously that would have had a very grave effect so far as the Queensland dairying industry is concerned, and, of course, it had to be opposed.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Is not that an admission that our butter is inferior?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No. It rather shows a desire on the part of certain interests in New South Wales to gain some material benefit for their own industry because of certain favourable conditions that apply to it. They have different climatic conditions, better agricultural development, and climates and rainfalls that adapt themselves to pasture improvements. They have better road and rail transport facilities because of the fact that theirs is a smaller State, and their factories are closer together. It is obvious in view of all these factors that New South Wales can produce a better range of Kangaroo brand butters than Queensland. Our average must obviously be depressed by the fact that we are opening up new territory each year, where the facilities for the production of choice grade butters and cheeses, particularly the former, are not as good as farmers are privileged to have in the more closely settled areas of the State.

In common with other Secretaries for Agriculture in Australia I gave the Australian Agricultural Council an assurance on behalf of the Government that every possible action would be taken to improve the quality of our dairy produce. Following on that promise I called the dairy factory operatives and representatives of the industry into conference on my return to Brisbane. I took them fully into my confidence and told them that there were certain facts that they should know, that there was a likelihood—perhaps there is still a likelihood—of England's deciding to place a quota on imported butter other than the choicest grades. I asked the representatives what would happen to our own producers who were producing, in the main, cream that churned into second quality butter or even worse, if that were to take place. We

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

discussed the problem from all angles and spent a very exhausting day on the subject. We considered what could best be done. The representatives at that conference were persons capable of counselling me and showing me their respective viewpoints. I told them that I had no particular viewpoint, but that I had the fixed idea that all the things that could be done for the preservation of the industry and the advancement of the quality would be done. The representatives discussed the matter all day and came to certain conclusions, some of which could be carried into effect by regulation, some by Order in Council, and some by legislative action. I assured the representatives at the outset that the conference was a serious one and that we meant business. I told them that they, in common with myself, would have to stand up to anything that they agreed on, because the Government were prepared to give expression to their conclusions.

Some of the things that they decided should be done have been done. The scheme relating to differential payments in respect of cream came into operation in September last, and already there has been a material improvement in the quality of cream. Some of the things that they suggested should be done were done by Order in Council, but the remainder required legislative sanction. Therefore, the Bill has been introduced. It will afford an opportunity for a full and frank discussion concerning the problem of the quality of butter and cheese.

Obviously we could not deal with only one section of the dairying industry—butter production. At a later date I arranged a conference in Toowoomba of representatives of the cheese industry, and I believe that representatives of all the cheese factories and persons supplying milk to them were present. Again we spent another very exhausting day, and we very exhaustively considered the agenda paper that had been drawn up for our consideration. I say quite frankly that they did not agree with some of the matters on the agenda paper, but they readily embraced many proposals and suggested that they should be accomplished as speedily as possible. I had succeeded in getting both arms of dairy production—the butter people on the one hand and the cheese people on the other—into line. They agreed with the general principle enunciated by the Council of Agriculture that quality elevation was not merely desirable but essential for the preservation of the industries.

It is no exaggeration to say that the campaign that I am embarking on is necessary in order to preserve stabilisation, and more essential in order that we should give the British people the very choicest butters. There are some people who habitually do not produce cream that will churn into first-class butter, or send milk to a factory that will ever make first-class milk standards. My experience is that the average farmer, who is not in any other business, is quite prepared to do all those things that are necessary to achieve standards. We have abandoned the practice that obtained in the past whereby our dairy inspectors made regular visits through regular territory and inspected in a regular manner the various dairies of producers with whom they came in contact. In reversal of that policy—for I believe a true test of a

dairyman's practice lies in the can that he delivers—our dairy inspectors have now in the main been attached to dairy factories. We have prepared a schedule and the factory managements supply us each week with the names of suppliers who forward inferior cream. We do not bother the man who is supplying first-class cream.

Mr. WALKER: That has been the practice for twenty years.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did the hon. member not observe that practice when he was Minister?

Mr. WALKER: I did.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The dairy inspectors never came in contact with the dairy factories. The three instructors did so. The dairy inspectors made regular routine inspections. To-day they are making inspections that are suggested by the factories.

Mr. WALKER: That has been an understood thing for twenty years. The management gave the inspectors confidential information.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If that has been an understood thing then I am afraid there has been a very distinct misunderstanding. I find that the inspectors of the department during the hon. member's regime—I admire his administration—were making routine inspections and were not instructed by the dairy factories in any way. It is difficult to understand how he was not aware of that fact.

Mr. WALKER: You cannot put that joke over me.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This Bill proposes one or two major departures and consolidates the machinery that we have for the enforcement of the Acts we administer. I do not know whether hon. members at this juncture desire that I should give them a detailed description of the contents of the Bill. They are mainly machinery provisions, but include two outstanding principles that are entirely new.

The first new principle requires an individual to give twenty-eight days' notice before diverting his milk or cream supplies from one factory to another. Hon. members opposite may argue that that is arbitrary, but before doing so they must assess the value and necessity for it. New Zealand has much more rigid conditions in this respect than I propose to impose. New Zealand butter always sells at a higher price than Australian butter. I know there are other factors.

Mr. MOORE: Not for that reason only.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I said I know there are other factors, but all the factors conspire to produce the result I mention. One reason why New Zealand butter sells at a higher price than Australian is because there is less variation in its quality. That is obtained by regimenting supplies, practically zoning factory districts and forbidding suppliers to change over from one factory to another. That is practically prohibiting "wandering suppliers." By these means they have made it possible to market two brands of butter only. Australia, with her complex system, is marketing about 300 brands. However, that

[Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

again is by the way. New Zealand did these things and thereby protected dairy quality. While we are apt sometimes to growl about New Zealand getting a material advantage on the British market, we do not always realise that it is our duty to ascertain in what way can we gain by comparison with New Zealand.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: What is your reason for introducing this amendment?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. gentleman were not so impatient I should be very happy to give him my reasons. The hon. member knows that when I introduce a Bill I invariably give the fullest possible information, so that hon. members will be in a position to discuss it. I have seen Bills introduced with only a very sketchy summary of what they stood for, and members in Opposition have, in consequence, frequently wasted a tremendous amount of time in discussing principles not embodied in a Bill. I consider that by giving the fullest possible details at this stage much time is saved.

The hon. member asked me to state the reasons why I provided for a period of twenty-eight days. My reasons are not far to seek; I have hinted at them pretty plainly. At one time there was no regulation so far as cream suppliers were concerned; they could send their product from one end of Queensland to the other, if it were feasible. For example, cream may be sent from Gympie to be churned at Kingston, and cream may be sent from Kingston territory to be churned, say, at Gympie. I am using those factories as an illustration to prove my statement. I have had a careful analysis made of supplies, and I find the "wandering supplier" is a danger. The figures relating to a factory situated closer to this House than any other illustrates the whole position. Out of 121 suppliers of second quality cream, forty-eight are outside what may be termed the immediate manufacturing zone. There is a very grave lesson to be learned from these figures. I believe, with my friend, the hon. member for Fassifern, that the real solution of the question of the "wandering supplier" is zoning; but I believe we shall have to approach zoning through a series of graduated steps, and that will eventually be accomplished.

At 3.58 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN took the chair.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The provision prohibiting supplies being removed for twenty-eight days is a very definite attempt to bring about what I believe to be necessary, and what the industry believes to be necessary—an improvement in quality. I indicated a while ago, much to the discomfort of my friend the hon. member for Cooroora, that we were attaching our dairy inspectors to the factories. When a dairy inspector goes along to the factory and finds that a man who is supplying three times a week has had three condemnations, he will immediately get in touch with that individual; and the individual concerned will know that the dairy inspector is on his track. Is there not a temptation for the producer to transfer his supply of cream to some other factory? We could follow that cream, no doubt, but it would mean that the man attached to the factory in the district to

which the cream was sent would have to get in touch with the individual in the district where the cream belonged, and that would lead to all sorts of difficulties, much correspondence would result, and valuable time would be lost. My aim is that when a man sends in bad cream we shall have twenty-eight days in which to discover the reason. At the end of that time he can go to Timbuctoo, or as his fancy dictates; but during that period of twenty-eight days, in the interests of the industry and the individual himself, we claim we can do material work to improve substantially the quality of his cream. If he can pull out as soon as we get on to his track then the whole system tends to defeat itself, and the valuable work of valuable officers may be nullified. The hon. member appears to suggest that there is some other reason. I give him my word of honour that there is no other reason than that I want to keep in touch—

Mr. BRAND: A cumbersome method of doing it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is no other way unless the hon. member and his colleagues will agree to a definite system of zoning, which will overcome all these difficulties.

Mr. MOORE: Have you asked your own people?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: As a matter of fact I have not asked my own people, but I do not think I should have much difficulty in obtaining their agreement.

Mr. EDWARDS: Zoning is the most honest way of doing it, anyway.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The industry will go step by step. It will not be driven.

Mr. BRAND: Nor will it be forced. Now you are getting to the real reason.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member for Nanango states that zoning would be the most honourable way to do it, and by inference suggests that I am doing something that is dishonourable.

Mr. EDWARDS: You are camouflaging.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member is camouflaging his own remarks. If I were camouflaging I should be doing so in very excellent company indeed, because more than one hon. member sitting on the opposite side of the Chamber must accept his share of the responsibility for the passage of these resolutions. However, I have given the real reason why it is being done.

Associated with this question of quality of dairy produce is the transport of cream. There are people living here, there and everywhere, and various delivery vans bring out the cream at varying intervals. Some vans make two deliveries of cream a week and others one every day. It is desirable that there should be some control over the road transport of cream, and this Bill provides that road transport licenses shall be issued to carriers under the jurisdiction of the factory. That certainly will have a tendency towards achieving the objective of zoning—it is certainly another step in that direction. The hon. member for Isis and

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

others representing sugar areas could not contemplate letting sugar pass one mill to be processed at another.

Mr. BRAND: But it does.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not to any degree. Areas are assigned to each mill, as the hon. member knows, and cane is not a highly perishable product such as cream. Cream is sometimes transported under very undesirable conditions. I admit that from an administrative point of view much has yet to be done. Quite recently the Minister for Transport and I agreed that a standing committee consisting of representatives of the Railway Department's transport section and two representatives of the Dairy Branch of the Department of Agriculture should be appointed to investigate the transport of cream by rail. I recognise that even though we can very substantially strengthen the organisation so far as road transport is concerned it is still necessary to pay some attention to rail transport in order to effect the general improvement that is necessary.

The two major principles contained in the Bill are as I have outlined, and I shall now proceed to explain some of the minor principles. Processed cheese was not known when the original Act was passed. It is now proposed to bring this commodity within the ambit of the Bill. The registration of a dairy issued in accordance with the original Act remained in force for ever. Under the new regulations a dairy registration remains in force only until such time as it is cancelled. Power is taken to control the activities of marauding pigs in the vicinity of factories. The factories will assume responsibility for the control of the licensed carriers, and of course adequate safeguards for factory trade will be provided by regulation. The grading of milk into first and second grade is contemplated in the Bill.

The only other important feature is a clause introducing reciprocity as between Queensland and other States of the Commonwealth with regard to dairy certificates. A person engaged in the manufacture of butter or cheese in Queensland is required to have a certificate of competency, but the existing Act contains a back door whereby the Minister may grant that certificate if he is satisfied that the individual has had sufficient practical experience. Many years have elapsed since that section was passed, and I believe that it was designed merely for the purpose of granting certificates to those people who had had previous training, but had not held a certificate previously. This new clause cancels the Minister's power to issue certificates of competency, and permits the holders of certificates from recognised institutions in the South to follow their trade or calling in Queensland without suffering any disability.

Mr. WALKER: I take it that those persons who are at present engaged in the industry will be required to obtain certificates.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Those who are working in the industry at the present time have certificates. I believe the industry is of sufficient importance to warrant our being quite satisfied that an applicant for a certificate is competent. I do not like the continued responsibility of either granting or rejecting applications, yet I have to assume it at present, because the final decision rests with me. When I

grant an application I do so only after most exhaustive inquiry has been made. We should get down to a satisfactory basis, and say that in future all persons must hold the required certificate of competency if they are to continue in that occupation.

Those are the principles of the Bill, and I have pleasure in submitting the resolution.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [4.8 p.m.]: We all agree with the objective of the Bill—improved products—but although an elephant can pick up a pin with its trunk, nobody would keep an elephant for the purpose of picking up pins when that could be done in a much simpler manner. In the same way, a 10-ton steam hammer can crack a nut, but no one would be foolish enough to keep a 10-ton steam hammer for the purpose of cracking nuts. Under this Bill the Minister is assuming most drastic Ministerial powers in order to secure a result that ought to be obtainable by much simpler means. I know from personal experience that some of the suggestions concerning cheese are absolutely impracticable. The Minister suggests that within twenty-one days after a cheese is made the factory must send in a return showing the grade of the cheese. Very often, I have a cheese that is not graded for three months after it is made, and in those cases it would be impossible to furnish a return within twenty-one days after the cheese was made.

Many other of the suggestions laid down in this Bill are impracticable because of the various factors that must be taken into consideration. I do not believe in the delay of twenty-eight days before a supplier can transfer from one factory to another. It is perfectly easy for the Minister to trace the supplier if he gets advice that second or third grade cream is being sent in. It does not follow that because a farmer goes to another factory the Minister is improving the quality of the cream at all.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That factory might give him first grade.

Mr. MOORE: There is the whole trouble. The Minister has put his finger on the significant fact. It really means that the grader in the factory is not going to be honest in giving his correct grade of cream for fear that he will injure his factory or lose a supplier.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That has some bearing on the question.

Mr. MOORE: The real point is: If the grader in the first factory gives the right grade, irrespective of whether the supplier will be retained or not, will the grader do so at the factory to which the farmer changes? All you have to do is to see that the man who supplies the inferior quality shall be given the grade and payment he is entitled to.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If he shifts his cream from one factory to another and gets a first instead of a second, you would lose all confidence.

Mr. MOORE: That is the position. The whole thing lies with the grader, and a grader who thought he could get a new supplier for the factory by that means might give an incorrect grade. If it is second grade when it leaves the first factory it is the same when it reaches the second factory.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Are you in favour of our controlling the graders?

[*Hon. F. W. Bulcock.*]

Mr. MOORE: No; the factories should. If there is to be a basis of grading, all the Minister does in this Bill is to suggest that the graders in the different factories are not grading according to quality.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It would be unfair to many graders to say that, but some of them do.

Mr. MOORE: Personally, I should object to being kept at any factory, because when a supplier gives notice he is an unwilling supplier. The factory, knowing he was going away, would probably "sock" him or else be dishonest and try to please him. If the supplier is unsatisfactory, the best thing to do is to get rid of him right away.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is like turning a man out of gaol. He is a menace to the community.

Mr. MOORE: Not at all. If milk or cream at the factory is given a second grade, the inspector should not go out with a superiority complex and threaten the farmer, but should be sympathetic and endeavour to help him. When a supplier goes to another factory the inspector can easily trace where the fault comes in. Some people are incapable of understanding what is clean cream or clean milk.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you think that is so?

Mr. MOORE: It is so—they do not know. Sometimes the machine is blamed when the individual does not know or care that it is dirty. A farmer would not alter in that regard simply because he changed to another factory.

The Minister has taken great powers in the licensing of vehicles. He could stipulate that vehicles could be licensed only for collecting cream and transporting it to only one factory.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That would not be fair.

Mr. MOORE: The power is there.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I would not do it, at any rate.

Mr. MOORE: I do not know what the Minister is going to do. All I say is that the powers given by this Bill are such that the Minister could bring in that restriction.

I do not think that all the powers in the Bill are necessary, but I do agree that it is important to consider the question of quality. We cannot make a comparison between this country and New Zealand, which has a better carrying capacity, a more favourable climate and different pastures with a large number of suppliers confined to a small area of country. There is, perhaps, one similar case in Queensland, although to a lesser degree, at Maleny. That factory is situated in a remarkably rich area from which the cream can be quickly delivered to the factory. It is only four or five miles from the furthest supplier, and the cream is delivered in a remarkably good condition, but the majority of factories are not so ideally situated, and their supplies have to be drawn long distances, which makes it extremely difficult to obtain a good quality cream, especially during wet weather.

The Bill provides that if a supplier fails to give twenty-eight days' notice of his intention to discontinue to supply to a certain

factory or if another factory accepts his cream before the expiration of that period, both may be liable to a penalty. Consider the case of a man supplying milk to a factory, whose vehicles are held up in wet weather! He has no alternative than to decide not to attempt to drag his product long distances over heavy black-soil roads. He leaves it at home and separates it, but under this Bill he will not be allowed to do that. A new factory would be liable to a penalty if it accepted his product, and he would be liable to a penalty if he discontinued supplying the old factory before the expiration of the twenty-eight days' notice. I have seen cases where suppliers have been unable to supply their factories with milk for two or three weeks on end, because the roads were bad on account of wet weather.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a position that should be met.

Mr. MOORE: The Bill contains many drastic provisions, and no exceptions are allowed. The conditions in this country are very different from those in New Zealand. In the Northern Rivers district of New South Wales practically the whole of the suppliers are comparatively close to the factories, and anyone from that district who visits Queensland wonders how Queensland producers can possibly continue at a profit in view of the distance that they have to cart their product to the factory. If the producers are in close proximity to a factory they have a better opportunity of supplying a first-class article, but in districts outside of the Darling Downs long distances have to be travelled, and in some cases twenty-four hours and even two days elapse before the vans, lorries, or cars arrive at the factories. The journey will take even longer during wet weather, especially when long stretches of black soil have to be traversed. It is extremely difficult to convey cream sixty to seventy miles over black-soil plains, especially during the wet months of December, January, and February.

We must not forget either that during certain seasons weeds spring up that give the milk an unfavourable flavour, and nothing that one can do will prevent it.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: That obtains in other countries, too.

Mr. MOORE: Not to any great extent. In New Zealand the pastures are cultivated, fertilised, and sown with artificial grasses, and the liability to rank weeds and other unfavourable vegetation is not so great. Moreover, a number of people carry on dairying as a side line, allowing the calves to run with the cows till the afternoon and milking once a day. As I said before, many of the powers contained in the Bill are unnecessary. Much more could be achieved if a sympathetic inspector was sent to certain suppliers to show them where their methods of production might be improved. He should not go out bouncing and threatening. Very little will be achieved by compelling the man to sell his product to a certain factory. He has every right to sell it where he likes.

Mr. H. H. COLLINS: And spoil the result for the rest.

Mr. MOORE: It will spoil it wherever it goes. The fact of compelling him to continue supplying milk to that factory twenty-eight days after he has given notice will

Mr. Moore.]

not improve the position. Many suppliers have changed from one factory to another, but it is now a rare occurrence.

The powers taken under this Bill are altogether too drastic, and the Ministerial powers are too great. Of course, we are always told by Ministers that they do not intend to use such powers, but my experience is that the powers provided for in this type of legislation are used, and used very drastically in many cases. The idea is excellent. We all agree with it, but it is the manner of accomplishing it that produces opposition.

We know the conditions under which cream is produced in many districts in Queensland, and the long distances it is conveyed to the factory. We have the difficulties of our cheese factories. There are not sufficient suppliers to draw upon in small areas. In the full flush of the summer time the cheese factories work two or three vats, but in winter time they have not sufficient supplies to work one vat efficiently. What is the use of having one vat for first-class milk and another for second-class milk when the total supply is not sufficient for one vat? These conditions were framed to apply to perfect dairying districts where supplies can be obtained close to a factory. In Victoria, portions of New South Wales, and parts of Queensland such conditions may obtain, but this Bill is framed with the idea of dealing not with one district in the State but the whole State, in some parts of which cream has to be hauled long distances before reaching the factory. It is almost impossible to apply these conditions uniformly State-wide.

Then in many cases no cream sheds are provided at railway sidings, and cream stands for hours in the sun before it is loaded on to the train. That has a detrimental effect on it. The quality of that cream will not be affected by compelling a supplier to give twenty-eight days' notice before changing from one factory to another, or by licensing conveyances and routes. We have to consider also that in many instances farmers take it in turns to cart cream to the factory. Under this Bill they will have to be licensed, and probably will not be licensed.

This Bill is framed on the lines of the New Zealand Act, where the conditions are totally different. In some cases the conditions are applicable, but in others they are not. It does not seem to me that the Minister will achieve the result he desires by this Bill. One thing he desires is uniform quality in the product. This legislation will not obtain that quality. It will not compel a man supplying dirty cream to supply a first-class article. The Minister must get to that supplier's place and show him his difficulties.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You have to discover that first.

Mr. MOORE: That has to be discovered in the first instance.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You will then let him drift away from you.

Mr. MOORE: That supplier does not go out of the State when he transfers to another factory.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He may obtain first-class results there, and we lose sight of him.

Mr. MOORE: The position is not affected through that man's transferring to another

factory. The department can still check up on him.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We could not check him up.

Mr. MOORE: The department would not wait until that man obtained first-class cream results; it interviews him when he gets second-class cream results.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is the proper time, but if he obtained first-class results in another factory he would not be reported.

Mr. MOORE: He need not then be reported.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Suppose the high grade of cream supplied by others forces his grade up?

Mr. MOORE: That supplier does not leave the State when he goes from one factory to another, yet this Bill says he must stop at one factory for twenty-eight days, although neither he nor the factory desires it. That is not going to ensure quality.

Mr. KANE: At the present time they can send cream from the Downs up to Caboolture, or any other place.

Mr. MOORE: I know people are sending it all the way down to Kingston.

Mr. KANE: Is not that wrong?

Mr. MOORE: Why is it wrong if he is getting more for his cream? If it is proved to be detrimental to the cream to have it sent to a certain factory by all means point that out to the supplier, but it is not right to compel the supplier to send it to a factory irrespective of his desires. It is desirable to get at the source of the trouble. The supplier is not going to leave the district because he sends it to another factory. The Minister assumes drastic powers. He can cancel anything irrespective of any recommendation made to him, and appoint a committee to go into the whole question and then disregard the findings of that committee altogether. I cannot see any advantage in granting such powers to the Minister. The objective of getting a better quality could be achieved without granting such tremendous power to the Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Tell me what I could do? This is the method selected by the industry itself.

Mr. MOORE: I do not know whether the industry is conversant with the provisions in this measure. Does the industry suggest that the Minister should be able to cancel any license of his own freewill? The Minister may appoint a committee to investigate the matter, and he may disregard the opinion expressed by that committee and carry out his own ideas.

I am as anxious to increase the quality of the product as the Minister; but I consider the proper method to achieve that object is first of all to see that the graders are giving a proper grade and that they are not dictated to by the directors, and that if the cream is sent to another factory the grader of that factory gives the correct grading.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: In New South Wales they have to report the producer of the cream.

[Mr. Moore.]

Mr. MOORE: Let them report it. The Minister is not satisfied with reporting. He says the supplier has to continue to send his supplies there, irrespective of whether the factory wants him to or not. I do not think that method will gain the objective that is desired by the Minister. It can be achieved in a much simpler fashion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The industry could not tell me and I wish the hon. gentleman would.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Resumption of Committee made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 4.30 p.m.