

17. Do you think that any improvement can be effected in the sale of the dairy-produce under the control of a Board in one pool?—I do not know about the pooling, because the Control Board might handle stuff without a pool being applied.

18. But the main purpose is the marketing and control, is it not?—One purpose is the pooling, but it may not be used.

19. Are you satisfied with your present means of marketing?—The opinion has been expressed by resolution time after time during the last ten years, and at conference after conference of dairy representatives, that the existing conditions respecting marketing were very unsatisfactory; and the National Dairy Association has been requested from time to time to endeavour to evolve a scheme for the better marketing of the produce.

20. Is there a very strong feeling that way?—There has always been a feeling.

21. That the present system is not satisfactory to the industry?—Perhaps not the present methods. I do not suggest for one moment that the marketing conditions cannot be made more satisfactory. I do not suggest that Tooley Street should be left out, but that we should endeavour to arrange with Tooley Street and bring about more satisfactory methods.

22. And more money?—More satisfactory methods mean better prices and more money.

23. In connection with control, you say that no control you can have excepting absolute control would be any good. If you had absolute control through your association would it be generally very much better?—We would then be in a position to stand up against the shipping companies. In dealing with them we would be in a much stronger position than we are to-day, because they know we have not control of the stuff, and in the event of arrangements between the association and the shipping companies breaking down it would allow the individual factories to make contracts for shipping.

24. Under the Meat Control Pool the Board has to approve the contracts entered into in connection with shipping. Your association, or individual factories, could not act entirely independently in such a matter if you had a Control Board?—I take it that the two Control Boards would endeavour to work together as far as possible. That has always been the aim of the dairy producers, and they have expressed their opinion more than once that in regard to shipping matters that the whole of the primary producers should endeavour to work together in respect to shipping contracts, not only the meat-producers but all our primary producers.

25. The object aimed at in connection with shipping would be to have a representative from the Dairy Association arranging the matter with the Meat Control Board, which now controls a big bulk of the freight: is that your opinion?—It would be if the Meat Control Board had control also over the dairy-produce.

26. I mean for shipping purposes alone?—It might be a good arrangement, but I do not think it would give satisfaction to the dairy producers if the Meat Control Board had the making of shipping contracts for the dairy-produce. We desire to have our own representatives to make those contracts.

27. *Hon. Mr. Nosworthy.*] You understand that clause 13 of this Bill refers to the work of the Meat Board, and of the proposed Dairy-produce Control Board, regarding shipping freights. Is it your opinion that by placing on the two Boards the control of the whole export of mutton, lamb, and dairy-produce there would be a greater chance of getting a reduction in freights for dairy-produce and meat than there would be if the two lines of produce were separated and the matter dealt with under separate conditions?—There would be a better chance of getting reduced freights if the whole thing were worked as one. I am quite satisfied on that point.

28. Is it not the fact that by having everything in one hand it becomes a question of whether it is not worth while that outside shipping companies should be asked to compete for the carriage of our meat and dairy-produce combined under the one Board?—That is so. That is the view of the dairy industry in regard to the shipping contracts. But so long as we have not the control of the stuff absolutely we are bound to make contracts with the existing shipping lines trading here. We cannot offer inducements to any other line to come here, because we have not got the stuff in our own hands.

29. You consider it is a necessity that the producers should have full power to speak as one voice to any shipping combine on the question of freights independently of any intermediary body?—I do.

30. *Mr. Masters.*] You express the opinion that if you are going to get a favourable rate of freight the producers as a whole must speak as one body?—Yes, it would be to their advantage to do so.

31. And in the producers you include the meat men?—Yes.

32. You appear to be there at variance with the promoters of the Bill?—No, I do not think so. When it was suggested just now that there should be one Board representing all the producers I did not clearly understand the question. I said the dairy producers wanted their own Board to make their own arrangements, but that the Board should co-operate with the other Board, or other Boards, in the making of the shipping contracts.

33. Do you think the Meat Control Board should have the last say in reference to shipping contracts?—No Board should have the last say, but each industry should have equal consideration. When we got to work with the Meat Control Board in connection with the last contract it was three months before the contract was entered into. We shall have to work with them again before the next contract is considered; it will be due very soon.

34. Clause 12 of the Bill provides that the two Boards shall work together, and the promoters of the Bill have sent out a confidential circular in which they propose that that clause shall be deleted from the Bill. Do you agree with them?—I had nothing to do with sending out that circular, and I am not familiar even with its contents. I think that clause 13 should be in the Bill.

35. The promoters suggest that the clause should be cut right out. Do you agree that it should go?—I think the reason of that suggestion was that there seemed to be an impression that by