

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 31 OCTOBER 1935

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 31 OCTOBER, 1935.

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

WHEAT AND WHEAT PRODUCTS BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE
(Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to Wheat and Wheat Products.”

Question put and passed.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACTS AMENDMENT
BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE
(Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend ‘The Dairy Produce Acts, 1920 to 1934,’ in certain particulars, and for other purposes.”

Question put and passed.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—
ELEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY.

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

ESTIMATES IN CHIEF, 1935-36.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STOCK.

CHIEF OFFICE.

Question stated—

“That £70,571 be granted for ‘Department of Agriculture and Stock—Chief Office.’”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE
(Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [10.35 a.m.]:
I shall endeavour to satisfy the insatiable desire of the hon. member for Cooroora for certain information. The hon. member

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

referred to herd testing, a work that I believe to be of very great importance to the welfare of the dairying industry, and to which my department has given a great deal of attention. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member suggest that nothing was being done in that direction. After he made his statement I had some figures taken out in my department indicating the value of herd testing. The figures disclosed that during the past three years herd testing was carried on to a greater extent than ever before in the history of Queensland. In the last year that the department was under the control of my esteemed friend the hon. member for Cooroora, the figures reached a record low level—falling to 272 herds under test—the lowest for a period of five years. When one remembers that good seasons prevailed at that time it is obvious that a sincere effort was not made to apply herd testing principles. The position of Queensland is unique in this regard. Every other State makes a specific charge for herd testing services, but Queensland finances this and many other services from consolidated revenue and the Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund. The following table will give hon. members some idea of the progress of the work—

	Total Number of Herds under Test.	
1927-28	...	300
1928-29	...	393
1929-30	...	415
1930-31	...	397
1931-32	...	272
1932-33	...	400
1933-34	...	982
1934-35	...	810

In 1933-34 we instituted a drive to get more herds under test. In that year there was an average of 29,521 cows in each herd. With rather more favourable seasonal conditions prevailing at present there is every reason to believe that this work will be considerably extended. There is not quite the appreciation of the value of herd testing that there might be. It is true that herd testing can be a success only if the dairy farmers recognise its value. I have had a representative herd under test for the last ten years. That was over a 273 day lactation period. I shall take the value of butter fat at 1s. a lb. As the result of testing, culling, breeding and feeding over ten years, one cow yielded 491 lb. in last year's test, representing a value of £24 11s. In another case the milk yield was 6,646 lb., the butter fat content being 252 lb., representing a value of £12 12s. The average yield per cow, according to the hon. member for Cunningham and the hon. member for Cooroora, has not increased as a result of the work done. Official figures do not prove that contention to be correct. In 1929-30 the average return was £10 16s. To-day the average value, based on a price of 1s. a lb. for butter fat is £14 14s., which shows that a very material increase has been brought about, almost entirely by the application of herd testing methods. This is the only State in the Commonwealth that does not make any specific charge for herd testing. The staff of the department is available at all times. One of our herd testers is at present in the Rockhampton district. We have built up an organisation

[Hon. F. W. Bulcock.

of which we may be justly proud. Fortunately, there is a growing public consciousness that herd testing offers a solution of some of the very grave problems that confront the dairy farmers.

Some remarks have been made about the Animal Health Station at Yeerongpilly, and quite a lot of argument has taken place about the inoculation work done there. Our percentage losses are not as great as the percentage losses of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research station at Townsville, which indicates that our work compares more than favourably with the work being done at Townsville under Commonwealth supervision. From the 18th June, 1934, to 29th July, 1935, seventy-three animals were inoculated at Yeerongpilly, in addition to thirty-five bleeders, making a total of one-hundred and eight. The deaths during that period were, one bull, owned by Mr. Bell, which died on 30th August, 1934; one heifer, owned by Mr. Cotton, died on 22nd September, 1934, and one bull, died on 26th June, 1935. The heifer dropped twin calves, and her death was not due to inoculation. The beast that died on 26th June, 1935, was owned by Bermuda Station. Those figures represent the total mortality at the station. There is the difficulty—the hon. member for Cooroora perhaps had it in his mind—that it occasionally happens an individual desires to take his beast away before it is thoroughly treated. We cannot yet achieve absolute immunisation. We have the very important factor to-day—it was not known several years ago—that there are more organisms responsible for redwater, whereas it was considered that only one was known a few years ago. To-day the major organisms are to be found over a wider range owing, perhaps, to more efficient transport than ten years ago. An individual with a knowledge of the efficacy of inoculation over a period, but unaware of the new organisms—they are of comparative recent introduction into southern areas—frequently come along and say, "We want to take the bull away." We say, "It will not be wise to take it away." One case occurred in the electorate of the hon. member for Cooroora. An individual had a bull at the animal health station for some considerable time. It was a most difficult animal. It would not react, but this individual insisted on taking it away. He rang me up, he came to see me, and he went out to the station, because he did not desire to miss a breeding season. Finally he took the bull away on his own responsibility, having been warned by the departmental officers at the station that we would not accept any responsibility in regard to its future wellbeing. He was given the assurance that if anything went wrong with the bull we would send a man to his property. We had to send a man up on a couple of occasions. His action was not quite fair to the department. If a man loses a bull as a result of his taking it away from the station before the staff is prepared to say that it has benefited by inoculation and can be reasonably regarded as being a resister the responsibility of the loss obviously rests with him, and not with the department.

During the year we supplied 6,253 doses of blood, and the director assures me that there has been no complaints. During the year action was taken to very materially fortify our position. Unfortunately, it is true that very little is known about the

incidence of redwater. When the Commonwealth Government borrowed the services of Dr. Legg they sent him to South Africa, where he remained for two years. As a result of his investigations he introduced a new control organism known as Centrali on his return. The Commonwealth Government experimented with that organism for several years. It has become known in recent years that the organism exercises a very beneficial result when incorporated in certain ways, as now demonstrated at the animal health station at Townsville. During the last year the bacteriologist at the animal health station at Yeerongpilly spent a considerable time studying the methods at the Townsville station. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research made Dr. Legg's services available to my department, and he has been at the animal health station for some considerable time, and as a result the work at Townsville and Yeerongpilly has been co-ordinated. The work and the new insectaries at Yeerongpilly are under the control of Mr. St. G. Thorn, a bacteriologist, and Mr. Mulherin, one of our veterinary surgeons. I have an agreement with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research to allow its officers to assist, if necessary, by tendering advice on the work that is being carried out.

The fact remains that our losses from redwater inoculation compare favourably with the returns from similar stations in other parts of the world. To-day we have a more complete if still imperfect understanding of the nature of these problems than was the case before.

I agree that anyone who imports a stud bull is very unfortunate if he loses it after incurring all the expense. It is true it is a loss to the individual and to the State, but every effort is made and will continue to be made to protect these people to the greatest degree. One of the greatest veterinarians in the world, a gentleman from South Africa, who visited Australia stated that if the mortality were not greater than 5 per cent. it was exceedingly good work. On that basis the Animal Health Station has done remarkably good work, because never, during my period as Minister in charge of the department, has the mortality reached 5 per cent.

The hon. member for Cooroora made some reference to contagious abortion. That is one of the worst stock diseases in our State. Only this morning I received a return relating to one good dairy herd which indicates that there is a very grave range of contagious abortion. It is not confined to any one herd, and unfortunately its incidence is serious over the whole of the dairying areas. I sometimes wonder what is going to happen when it gets beyond the confines of the dairy herds and spreads to beef cattle. We may then repeat the experience of the Argentina where, for three of four years, increases in stock were gravely restricted owing to the prevalence of contagious abortion.

The disease is also serious from the point of view of human beings, because there is every reason to believe that undulant fevers are developed by the consumption of milk from a cow suffering from this disease. Unless we take a very resolute stand it is obvious that the disease will become a greater menace until finally a certain degree of immunisation will be required, but that will not compensate the dairy farmer and

the industry for the losses that may occur before immunity is established.

The hon. member for Cunningham said that the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act business was not functioning in the right way. I have never said that the trust fund was to be used to purchase bulls. It has been used to provide subsidies to assist in the transport of bulls, but the control of diseases offers such a big protection against economic losses that it is worth while. I have always held, and I still hold that an industry protected should make some contribution towards the cost of its own protection. The hon. member for Cooroora said that the Banana Board was constituted by contributions from the industry and consolidated revenue. That is true. If a small industry like the banana industry is prepared to recognise that its existence depends upon making financial contributions—even with its very limited resources—and is prepared to give a substantial contribution to guard against economic losses, and if the pineapple growers are prepared to do the same, how can the dairy people refuse to contribute to the cost of their protection?

Mr. WALKER: Were we not doing it prior to the introduction of the Act?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I will answer that question in the way that I think it should be answered. Let me show what was done before the introduction of the measure. We had a serum station at Yeerongpilly that did very little beyond preparing a few serums. The veterinary staff was limited, and was situated at the head office. These men sat down and waited for cases to come in. They included a Chief Inspector of Stock who was essentially a clerical man. He rarely went out into the field except under the most extraordinary circumstances. The hon. member loaned one of our most efficient officers, Dr. Legg, to the Commonwealth Government. He reduced the veterinary staff to two individuals.

Mr. WALKER: You would not have liked me to put in a "dud."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did the hon. member not fill the position when he made the services of Dr. Legg available to the Commonwealth Government? Why was the hon. member and his Government content to have two veterinary surgeons to safeguard the whole of the stock in Queensland? There was no co-ordination. If a man was required in Cooktown or Townsville he had to be sent from head office. No veterinary service was possible under these circumstances. In those days the Government were not even prepared to conduct an agglutin test to ascertain the presence or otherwise of contagious abortion. We are to-day conducting agglutin tests at Yeerongpilly free of any charge. We have trained our officers to be competent to give advice relating to diseases in the field. All our senior officers have been brought in to undertake a pathological course at the animal health station. The Dairy Cattle Improvement Act is responsible for veterinarians being stationed at strategic points throughout Queensland. There is an excellent veterinarian in Mr. Ohman, who is stationed at Toowoomba. We have a staff at the animal health station at Yeerongpilly and a veterinarian in Brisbane—Mr. Maunder. In the near

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

future an appointment will be made at Gympie. There is a resident veterinarian in Rockhampton. In addition, there is a resident veterinarian on the Atherton Tableland. All these men are the product of a modern university course. We subsidise the staff work of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Laboratory in Townsville to the extent of £3,500 a year. Hon. members should compare the position that obtained in the past with the position that obtains to-day and ask themselves whether we are or are not more efficiently controlling the factors that lead to economic loss. Is it not better to administer an efficient system than rely on one that has been proved to be obsolete? It has been suggested that the sum of £5,000 a year contributed by the dairying industry is the total amount expended in this work. Hon. members know better than that. They are aware that a considerable amount of the money required for the work is obtained from other sources. There was some resistance against the Act when it was first put into operation. For a year or so resolutions of protest were received. At the last annual meeting of the Council of Agriculture, which is the clearing house of agricultural thought throughout the State, not one motion of protest appeared on the agenda paper, and the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act was not criticised in any way.

Mr. EDWARDS: Of course you had them quite beaten.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There was never any antagonism towards the purposes of the Act, but certain people sponsored an agitation against the payment of a few shillings that each man was required to pay. To-day the Act has the wholehearted approval of the people interested. In fact, a request was received that I should station a veterinarian at Gympie to serve a district that is represented by the hon. member for Nanango. I consider that one of the main functions of the department is to make useful information available to all primary producers. Substantial contribution has been made from the Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund to achieve this desirable end. I meet dairy scholars on Monday, the first day of their sojourn with us, and I ask them frankly to express their views on the work the department is doing, and on the following Saturday—after they have had an opportunity of observing the activities of the department in relation to animal health and dairy work—they meet in conference. Without exception they eulogise the work the department is doing. They have expressed astonishment at the work that is being done. They had not even dreamt that these educational factors for the wellbeing of the dairying industry had been considered. The result is that to-day there is better co-ordination, closer co-operation, and infinitely better feeling between the dairying industry and the department than ever before.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is absolutely essential.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is absolutely essential. I have endeavoured to mould a policy that will enable the farmers to realise that the department exists for their benefit, that the officers of the department, from the Minister down,

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

are the servants of the primary interests of the State, that we are prepared to give every service they desire, and to consider their problems. As a result we are being asked to perform such a volume of work that my vote is not sufficient. If the Government appropriated a greater sum to deal with this important work they would receive a better return than they would obtain from money expended in certain other directions. The department invites the co-operation of the primary producers in the work that is being done. We have done much by the practical application of that doctrine, and to-day co-operation is freely offered by certain sections who were not prepared to assist the Department a few years ago. We have established a dual mind as between the farmer and the department, and it is yielding excellent results to both the State and the individual.

One hon. member asked what we were doing about the tobacco industry. The department has done a good deal of scientific work. Mr. Tarrant was sent to South Africa to study tobacco production under conditions closely approximating those existing in Queensland. He has had valuable experience in the resuscitation of the industry in this State. Another officer, Mr. Mandelson, was sent to the United States to ascertain the scientific results obtained there. He has made extremely valuable scientific contacts, and possibly the most important work he will do in the United States will be in connection with prevention and eradication of blue mould. I understand that the United States imported certain varieties of wild tobacco from South America, principally Brazil, for the purpose of evolving a type that would not succumb to the ravages of blue mould; but whether they have been successful or not I am unable to say. It is claimed that there are certain commercial varieties of tobacco in the United States that do not succumb to this disease. Our major problem in tobacco growing is blue mould. We are able to combat practically every other disease peculiar to tobacco cultivation, but blue mould has proved a very formidable obstacle to the successful establishment of the industry in Queensland.

The department's function in this regard is entirely that of culture. We can do the things that are calculated to give the tobacco grower the best possible opportunity of producing a commercial crop, but the fate of the Australian tobacco industry is really in the hands of the Federal Government, because they control excise duty and the tariff. It is unfortunate that the Federal Government have not done the things that I consider they might have done to assist the Australian tobacco growers. I believe that one of the first things to which the Commonwealth Government should give attention is a revision of tariffs and excise duties. The recent revision of the excise duty is of very little value because it applies only to tobacco manufactured entirely from Australian leaf. Unfortunately, the Australian smoker has not yet been able to discover any particular merit in tobacco manufactured exclusively from Australian leaf. I do not know why it is, but I venture to suggest that amongst the smokers in this Committee there is not one who smokes tobacco manufactured exclusively from Australian grown leaf. I confess that I do not.

Most people to-day smoke a tobacco comprising a considerable proportion of Australian leaf blended with Virginian leaf.

Mr. WALKER: You are not setting a good example.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not going to ruin my throat by smoking an exclusively Australian tobacco at this juncture. Many of the brands in common use contain 40 to 60 per cent. of Australian leaf, and there is a very definite market for it. It is true that with our wide range of climate and satisfactory research work we can produce varieties of tobacco that could be blended to produce a tobacco that will prove palatable to the majority of smokers in Australia. A few years ago only about 30 per cent. of Australian tobacco was incorporated for the Australian market. The tobacco companies have steadfastly increased the proportion of Australian tobacco, with the result that while an unsuspecting public occasionally does complain that the tobacco is not what it used to be, it takes very kindly to a higher percentage of Australian leaf in the ordinary brands. We have made repeated representations to the Commonwealth Government on the matter of tariff and excise duty, and I say very advisedly and with a keen knowledge of the possibilities, that until the Federal Government restore the tariffs applied by a previous Federal Labour Government the tobacco industry cannot be successful. When the Commonwealth Government annulled the Scullin-Forde tariff and instituted the present tariff and excise duty, they admitted quite frankly that it was a revenue measure. If a new industry is compelled to contribute to the revenue of a Government it becomes very heavily handicapped. I think it would be a wise plan if all Governments—Labour or Nationalist—gave more attention to new phases of agriculture by implementing the protection that can be given by favourable tariffs and excise duties. The tobacco industry of Queensland offers the best example of the influence of such measures. Although the industry boomed for a time, it commenced to decay immediately the new tariffs were imposed. I do not desire to drag the tobacco industry into the realm of politics, for I do not think agriculture and politics can be satisfactorily blended; but I should be very pleased if the Commonwealth Government would reconsider the application of the present duties, with a view to affording the relief that is required to make tobacco growing one of our big primary industries. We have the climate, the rainfall, and the potentialities, and with the aid of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research we are hopeful of overcoming blue mould. The remaining obstacle is the fiscal policy of the Commonwealth Government, and I hope they will sooner or later see that it is more desirable to establish the industry in Queensland than replenish the Treasury by killing it.

Mr. WALKER: Do you consider 4s. per lb. is a good return for a first-class leaf?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If a man can get 4s. per lb., and the big percentage of his crop is first class, it would be a very good return; but the hon. member must realise that although 4s. per lb. is realised for part of the crop, that is not the value of the whole of the crop. Only a small percentage of high-grade leaf is produced by each individual. The top prices

may be 4s. per lb., and the lowest may be 2d. or 3d., and an average must be taken to ascertain the return to the grower.

Mr. WALKER: The onus is on the department to work up from the bottom.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We have a man studying these conditions in the best tobacco country in the world, and quite recently we made arrangements with the British Australian Tobacco Company to admit one of our most promising men to the grading floor for a while, so that we could become aware of all the complaints and thus co-operate with the manufacturers in endeavouring to overcome the grading disabilities in connection with Australian tobacco.

Mr. RUSSELL: Quite a lot of the land opened up is unsuitable for the growing of tobacco.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member is opening up a question that will require a good deal of consideration. It is true that much of the land opened for the cultivation of tobacco, especially four or five years ago, is not the most suitable tobacco soil. I made a trip through the Northern areas where tobacco is being grown. I do not know the types of soils used for the production of tobacco overseas, but I believe that the soils at Dimbulah are fairly satisfactory. If we can overcome certain biological problems, Dimbulah will probably become a big tobacco-growing centre.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is the soil a sandy loam?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is decomposed granite. While some very excellent tobacco has been produced at Mareeba, the soil there is entirely different from that at Dimbulah. It is very light—a washy soil. The question that I frequently ask myself in relation to the Mareeba soils is whether the soil fertility, which is at a very low ebb even when the first planting takes place, will not be absolutely dissipated after two or three crops have been secured. It is true that the first year's crop gives a very much bigger range of first quality leaf than the second-year crop, which also gives a much bigger range of first quality leaf than the third-year crop. We are carrying on experimental work with catch crops.

Mr. EDWARDS: Was that not your experience at Beerburrum?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. The exhaustion of soil takes place very quickly. I have frequently wondered whether it would pay to clear an area of land to get only three crops of tobacco, because the cost of fertilizer in these areas is considerable. It may mean that we shall have to move off the light soils which are very low in fertility to the deeper-bodied soils. Perhaps the texture of the tobacco leaf may vary, but the return may give a better average price to the grower. Tobacco growing is a real problem—one of the most difficult for the department.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Don't you think climate has a good deal to do with tobacco growing?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Both climate and soil have a good deal to do with its success. No other vegetable growth is influenced by its surroundings more than tobacco. There is very strong

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

support for the belief that tobacco flavours are largely controlled by fertilizers.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: They are largely controlled by the manufacturer, too.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Each leaf has its own characteristics, both as regards texture and flavour. The supplementary flavourings that take place do not come within the ambit of my department. We have a great number of experimental plots, and we are honestly endeavouring to discover the best types of soil and the best varieties of tobacco. We have a more comprehensive scheme of experimentation to-day than ever before, and we confidently anticipate that valuable data will be obtained. Our experimental plots extend from the Barcoo River, where the seed-beds are in a dry area, which render the seedlings less susceptible to blue mould, to Texas in the South, and Dimbulah and Mareeba, in the North. Fertilizer experiments in the Dimbulah and Mareeba districts are controlled by Mr. W. J. Cartmill, who has done admirable work.

The hon. member for Cooroora also raised the question of the production of pork for export. Two or three years ago I decided, on very definite representations from overseas, to subsidise the white pig. Our pork exports had diminished; in fact, they had been diminishing for two or three years owing to a variety of reasons. Every person who was competent to express an opinion said that the white pig was infinitely more desirable on the English market, and would command a better price than the Berkshire, Tamworth, or other breeds which were rapidly going out of favour.

Mr. DEACON: Why don't they give more for a white pig?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They do.

Mr. DEACON: They do not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Both the Tamworth and Berkshire pig command high prices on the Queensland market.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The point to remember is this: in every competition in Australia and overseas the white pig has been awarded the prizes of merit.

In the competition at the abattoirs last year every class was won by white pigs. The recent investigations disclosed that there may be a better market for the singed pig than the scalded pig. New Zealand obtains a penny a pound more for singed pigs than we obtain for scalded pigs. A singeing apparatus can be installed at a cost of £300, and the abattoir board has agreed to instal one to try it out. If New Zealand can get one penny per pound more, and if the British market demands singed pigs, it is the duty of the abattoir to meet the demand.

Mr. RUSSELL: Our pork is considered to be better than the New Zealand product.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yet the New Zealand singed pig is to-day bringing one penny per pound more than the Queensland scalded pig. I rely for my information on a report from a Commonwealth officer stationed in London, and it is confirmed by Mr. Sunners who recently returned from London. At my request he devoted a considerable amount of time to the investigation of pork products overseas.

[Hon. F. W. Bulcock.

Mr. LLEWELYN: What is the effect of the different processes—singeing and scalding.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Scalding results in a hardening of the tissues, whereas singeing does not.

The hon. member for Murrumba made a very interesting contribution to the debate. He raised a question that has given much concern to the officers of the department—the menace of mat grass—and urged that it should be checked. It was originally imported from America, where it is regarded at the present time as having a definite commercial value. It was introduced into Queensland on the assumption that it would reproduce the same characteristics as it had displayed in America. It was distributed fairly widely over Queensland, and became acclimatised, but it developed inherent characteristics that alarmed quite a number of people. The department is fully aware of the menace of this grass, and spraying tests are at present in hand at Kin Kin. Experiments are being made with fertilizers to stimulate the established grasses, and to establish exotic grasses to ascertain if they are powerful enough to subdue the mat grass.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Nanango approve of the idea of sending officers abroad. It is a policy that I have followed during the time I have been in charge of the department. I recognise that we cannot keep abreast of modern development by means of correspondence. Correspondence is useful to a certain extent, but unless one has intimate contact with the people engaged in research work one is apt to be left behind. Research work is one phase in the race for efficiency. A department that is prepared to slip into a backwash is going to give very poor service in the final analysis. The only way to keep abreast of one's competitors, or even equal to them, is to know all the research work that they are doing. Fortunately there is an international outlook amongst research workers in the agricultural field, permitting a free exchange of ideas, data and the results of experiments.

As mentioned by the hon. member for Nanango, Mr. Somerville will be leaving for the United States and England in the near future, particularly to visit the tropical research bureau at Trinidad. Some of the most famous men of the world have attended that school. Men who travel overseas make contacts that are of very great importance to the department; but one reservation should be made. One has to be sure that the officers selected has the necessary qualifications and enthusiasm and is likely to remain with the department on his return. Of course they are under bond to remain for a certain period. On their return they are generally so fascinated by and interested in their work and have established so many admirable contacts that they do not desire to leave the department. On the question of sending officers overseas hinges the one raised by the hon. member for Murrumba in regard to the Avocado pear or Palta. Mr. Freeman, the Senior Inspector in Fruit Culture was recently in California. His purpose was to study Californian methods and to ascertain as to what degree they could be applied to our own agricultural life. I asked him specifically to look into the question of the Avocado pear and he has furnished me with some very valuable data which prompt me to

introduce some varieties that are unknown to Queensland so that an industry may be established. It may never be a large industry, but it will have a place in the agriculture of the State. One of our difficulties with the imported species is that they are apparently not the best commercial varieties. In America there are varieties that are unknown in Queensland, varieties infinitely more adaptable both in respect of production and disease resistance than any of the varieties in Queensland at the present time. I know of no greater tragedy than to start a man off with the wrong variety and then ask him to make a living. The hon. member for Murrumba also made reference to experiments in bean culture and to soil erosions. One would almost imagine that the hon. member had attended the meetings of the experiment committee over the last twelve months, or it may be the case of "Great minds think alike." The experiments committee has had these matters under consideration for the last twelve months. At the present time a search is being made throughout Australia for a bean with certain characteristics in order that we might select and adapt their progeny to Queensland's conditions.

The hon. member for Cook raised the question of the establishment of a Bureau of Tropical Research at South Johnstone. This project is rendered necessary by the economic position of North Queensland. Our legislation inferentially admits that we have reached the zenith of sugar production in the northern areas of our State, and within the next two or three days the Commonwealth Government will be passing legislation that will practically endorse that view. Therefore, it is obvious that we should endeavour to institute other forms of agriculture, but it is desirable that we should have the best possible staff to do so. The project does not mean the recruiting of a new staff. I am going to transfer the cream of my officers to the Northern institution so that all phases of tropical agriculture may be thoroughly investigated. Many years ago Trinidad found herself in exactly the same difficulty as our northern area is in to-day. Trinidad established a Bureau of Tropical Agriculture Research. It was one of the romances of modern agriculture. As a result of the establishment of that bureau which has grown to be the most replete bureau of tropical agriculture research in the world very material contributions have been made. We were very interested to obtain the services of a man from Trinidad who was trained in all phases of tropical agriculture, but up to the present we have not succeeded. On the matter of the closure of certain State farms the Kairi and Roma farms were closed only after most careful and serious consideration. I visited Kairi and obtained voluminous reports on the work performed at that station. It was approximately 1,000 miles from the centre of administration and made substantial inroads on the moneys available for agricultural research work. One would be lacking in one's duty if one did not ask what material contributions have Kairi made towards the improvement of agriculture in the surrounding districts after a huge expenditure extending over twenty years?

Research stations controlled by the Government justify themselves up to a point, but one must be careful to determine when that point is reached. When the level of agricul-

ture in the surrounding districts is equal to that of the State farms, the State farm has served its purpose. We must then pass to the second phase of agricultural development—the research side—where better types of agriculturists in the areas are associated with the work of the department. As has been very aptly stated by one great American thinker, the Director of Agricultural research work in the Washington Bureau of Agriculture, when he was here with the sugar technologists, the value of a State farm lies within its own fences. With variations of soil, climatic conditions, and other considerations, that value is rapidly dissipated as one proceeds outwards from the farm fences. I was interested to hear a variation of that argument, when I had a discussion with Mr. Theiler, who said, "We desire to establish a farm incorporating outside conditions and practices within its fences, and we need State co-operation in its establishment." The same thing may be said of Roma. There is only a limited amount of money available for the purpose and it must be spent to the best possible advantage. Mr. Soutter, who was in charge of Roma experiment farm for many years, made very substantial contributions to the wellbeing of the Queensland wheat industry. Mr. Soutter has only one disability—one that hurts him more than it hurts anybody else—and that is his extreme modesty, coupled with the fact that he is never prone to take credit for his magnificent achievements. He is to Queensland what Mr. Farrer was to New South Wales. He is an admirable individual, a born plant breeder—not one drawn from a University. Born plant breeders very often do more for the well being of agriculture than university trained men.

Mr. WALKER: You have been telling us that for the past four years.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is why I designated Mr. Soutter a plant breeder, and placed him in a new position where his work will be of greater benefit.

Mr. WALKER: Where is he located?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: At present in Brisbane. He is working on the Darling Downs, laying down plots for breeding and testing. He has asked to be allowed to take part in the work of maize breeding. The work that he will now be able to accomplish will be infinitely more beneficial than the work he was able to perform under the old limited system. I do not know whether the hon. member for Cunningham and I are thinking along the same lines, but I remember the hon. member suggesting last year that more valuable work could be achieved for the benefit of the wheat industry if we diffused the work and closed down the Roma farm. The suggestion is an accomplished fact to-day.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: What have you done with the Roma farm?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Leased it. It was not sold, because it is possible that some succeeding Secretary for Agriculture may not hold the same views as myself.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: It would have been a good training ground for boys.

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We have found it exceedingly difficult to get boys interested in the land, even in the vicinity of Brisbane. That applies generally. The subject is a difficult one. I know you will not permit me to discuss this urgent matter on this vote, Mr. Hanson. We seriously considered what might best be done with Kairi and Roma farms, and I believe that what has been done will eventually prove to be for the best, especially as the South Johnstone station has been opened, and Dr. Myles, who was trained overseas, is stationed there. He is a highly trained plant breeder, but plant breeders cannot prove themselves excepting over a number of years. It is a fact, however, that with his high training and eminent qualifications, Dr. Myles will be of great value to farmers in the North in solving their agricultural problems. I admit that his training was made possible by the foresight of my predecessor, the hon. member for Cooroola. Dr. Myles has the fundamental knowledge, and we propose to ask him to apply his knowledge in assisting us to develop the production of crops on the Atherton Tableland and in the Northern coastal country. He will work under the jurisdiction of the recently appointed Director of Tropical Agriculture. If we pursue a vigorous policy of agricultural development we can greatly increase the value of production in the northern areas. The hon. member for Cook said that the real wealth of Queensland lay in the soil, and I agree with him. His remark reminds me of the French fable. It is obviously the duty of the department and the State—

Mr. EDWARDS: And the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: And the Government, to do everything to liberate that wealth. I have come in contact with officials from the other States as a member of the Australian Agricultural Council, and I am constrained to say that the Queensland officers compare very favourably with similar officers in the Southern States. Moreover, the department is doing work that is not undertaken by similar departments elsewhere. My department is the most comprehensive of them all, and I make no apology for the increase in this vote. I say quite frankly—as the hon. member for Cook also said—that if I could induce the Treasurer to appropriate twice as much money for my department I should be twice as happy, but unfortunately I cannot induce him to do that, although I believe everything in this State depends on agriculture. No avenue of production is safe until agriculture is safe. Economic reconstruction of agriculture, associated with scientific research and development, the education of the producer and allied matters are fundamental to the wellbeing of the State.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Yanango*) [11.41 a.m.]: I listened with the keenest interest to the Minister, who covered a wide range of subjects, and when he spoke of Mr. Soutter and his modesty, I thought that if the Minister could exchange some of his self-assurance for some of Mr. Soutter's modesty it would be of great advantage to the department. I realise that the Minister and his officers carry a great responsibility in a variety of ways. I agree with the hon. gentleman's concluding remarks, that his department is concerned, firstly, with the

feeding of the nation. That is exactly what it means. The wealth from the soil keeps the whole of our industries going.

I was pleased to hear the Minister say that herd testing is being extended. Every dairyman should agree to the testing of his herd from time to time. The work must be carried out over a number of years if it is to be of any benefit at all. The Minister did not give us any idea as to the nature of the season when the tests were made. One of the greatest difficulties confronting herd testing is the nature of the season. That is why we should endeavour to secure a continuation of tests. If the season is a good one the herd test in the summer months will show a remarkable yield of milk and butter fat, but immediately a dry spell sets in—which is experienced not only in the winter but also in the late spring—then the tests are not fair criteria. A test in a dry season does not permit a dairyman to form an opinion as to whether he should or should not dispense with certain cows. If the season is unfavourable the test is very unsatisfactory and inconclusive. That is a phase of the subject that needs most careful consideration.

The Minister gave the impression that the Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund was used largely to bear the cost of herd testing and similar matters. Last year the expenditure from the fund was £4,607, and the receipts over £5,000. His statement is not borne out by facts. I have always contended that the agricultural industry is the only one that is compelled to contribute towards the cost of experiments for its benefit. The principle is entirely wrong, especially when the wealth derived from primary production is essential for the well being of the whole State, and not the industry only. The development of agriculture means the development of the wealth of the people as a whole. Why on earth should a special tax be imposed on this section of the community to increase wealth production in the interests of the whole State?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't you think an industry that enjoys stabilisation should make a contribution towards its economic efficiency.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Minister will not argue that its efficiency has not a very beneficial effect on all sections of the community. He must recognise that every impost—no matter how small—curtails production.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is a very small amount per head.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is only one tax.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The banana industry, which is the poorest in the State, made a voluntary contribution.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. gentleman were a farmer he would realise that taxes have a hampering effect on people who are endeavoured to develop the agricultural industry along scientific lines. It is of paramount importance that we should realise that the people engaged on the land produce the wealth of the country and assist the welfare of the State in every way. The people living in country districts are not able to enjoy many of the amenities enjoyed by people living in towns and cities.

The Minister must realise that it is impossible for the farmer at the present time to obtain the labour that he requires, with the result that mothers of families help with the milking and the children assist before

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

they go to school. Each week-end that I visit my electorate I am asked by different farmers if I can obtain the services of a boy for them. The scarcity of suitable labour is detrimental to the welfare of the industry.

With all due respect to the Minister, who, I realise, is endeavouring to do what he considers to be in the best interests of the State, I say not much credit is due to the department for the accomplishments of many of the men on the land. I quote the case of the dairymen who have bred the best class of cattle obtainable in the State. Has the department given those people any assistance in their efforts to build up an excellent class of stock—particularly dairy stock—that compare favourably with stock produced in any other part of the world?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The bull subsidisation scheme was the commencement of the elevation of our herd standards.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman does not think that for a moment. There are men in my own district who have sent stud cattle all over the world, and all credit is due to them. These men have conducted their businesses in a practical manner.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: When the Premier was Secretary for Agriculture in a previous Labour Government he made it possible for people to buy stock.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the people I refer to were established many years before that time. Some of the herds were being established thirty years ago, and all credit is due to the people responsible because I firmly believe they have done more than the department to improve the standard of dairy stock.

One of the reasons why boys will not go on farms is because they do not understand the conditions that obtain there. Would it not be more beneficial to the farmers or the youths who are interested in dairy farming if they were given the opportunity of interviewing practical dairymen than officers of the department before commencing in the industry? I do not say this with any disrespect to the officers, but with a desire to point out that a beginner in the industry should have some practical knowledge of it. It can be obtained only from the practical man. I have always received the greatest courtesy from the officers of the department. Unless the experts are able to give advice on the practical side of the industry they will not be of great value to the dairying community nor to the stock owners. I have in mind a certain incident. A veterinary surgeon appointed to the department during recent years advised me that it was impossible to dissect a horse while it was on its feet. That is the sort of thing we get. Men with a practical training have performed the operation for years.

Mr. JESSON: What do you mean by "dissecting"?

Mr. EDWARDS: Castrating. That incident occurred. After all his years of theoretical training this officer gave that advice which is at variance with the opinions of practical men. The Minister must see that his veterinary surgeons obtain practical knowledge, and this can only be secured by associating with practical men.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We are doing that.

Mr. EDWARDS: Up to a point. The veterinarians must win the respect of the practical men who require their services from time to time. The farmers who have built up their herds have always carried out their own veterinary work. They have a practical knowledge. I refer to such men as the hon. member for Cunningham. He has carried out that class of work for a number of years. It was very pleasing to hear the Minister state that he could wish for no greater co-ordination between the dairymen and the department in the matter of herd testing. I am advocating a continuance of a policy of co-ordination, but I am afraid that it does not extend to the stock inspectors. For twenty-five to thirty years the inspectors have watched the tick line in my own and other districts, but so far as I and others can judge there has been no alteration. Stock inspectors and their work are looked upon to-day in just the same light as twenty-five years ago. It is considered that the irritating conditions that are imposed create no end of difficulty for the stock owners. I trust that the Minister will investigate the question of the tick menace and ascertain whether it is not possible to have some scientific method of dealing with it as was done with the prickly-pear. If it cannot be done there should be a complete reorganisation by the department to achieve some success. A large sum of money has been expended over the past twenty-five or thirty years in supervising the tick border line, but to-day it is in practically the same situation, and so far as I can judge the same difficulties still exist. The people in the tick-infested country do not desire anything to be done while those in the clean area trust that the tick will be held back. Those in the buffer area are in a most difficult position, and have been so for many years.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There must always be a buffer area.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Minister cannot find it. It may be drawn on a map, but there is actually no buffer area. Ticks have been found from time to time over the buffer areas for the last twenty-five to thirty years, and it seems to me that it is done simply for the purpose of creating a scare in an endeavour to show the necessity for continuing the work.

It is a great pity that the Minister saw fit to close down the experiment station at Roma. It must be admitted that the Maranoa district is on the border of what might be termed a dry belt.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Would you continue an organisation that could only give you one year's results in every three?

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman mean because of drought?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Drought and climatic conditions.

Mr. EDWARDS: That suggests, perhaps, that the Minister has given too much attention to the production of wheat and not enough to the cultivation of the land. The difficulty to which he referred existed in the Mallee district in Victoria with a considerably lower rainfall than Roma. In that district, by the careful handling of the soil, it was possible to grow a crop in most years. If the soil in the Maranoa district were

Mr. Edwards.]

cultivated so that it could produce a crop every year, some benefit would be enjoyed. I appreciate the great work performed by Mr. Soutter, but of what value is wheat-growing to the State? This year it is anticipated the yield will be 3,000,000 bushels, but that quantity was grown in Queensland twenty-five years ago. Where is their any expansion, and what has been the value of the work done?

Mr. LLEWELYN: Do you suggest that we should cease growing wheat?

Mr. EDWARDS: No, but I suggest that we should inquire into the reason why the expansion of this industry has not been as great as one might expect.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The breeds of wheat have been improved.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have done a good bit of wheat farming on the Darling Downs and I know that wheat of a quality equal to that grown in Victoria was grown there twenty-seven years ago.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: But to-day Queensland is growing better wheat than any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. EDWARDS: The wheatgrower in Queensland has had and is getting better treatment than the wheatgrowers in any other State of the Commonwealth, because we consume all the wheat we grow. But why has the industry not expanded to the same extent as it has in other States? I do not suggest that wheatgrowing in Queensland will ever reach the same dimensions as in South Australia and Victoria, but we have not shown any increase in our yield for twenty years. What experiments have been carried out in the way of feeding sheep and raising lambs on wheat for market before it is allowed to go to grain? That is a subject into which the Minister might make thorough investigation. It is of importance to the State. Experiments have been carried out along those lines with great success in Victoria.

It has been suggested by hon. members on this side that machinery has thrown many men out of work in the State. Those arguments cannot apply when one realises that every man displaced by machinery in Queensland is able to follow a new occupation either by growing primary products or manufacturing them into other foods. I feel that that is absolutely certain.

Mr. FOLEY: What about cotton?

Mr. EDWARDS: A great number of men are employed in cotton production—preparing the land, picking, and also at the ginnery. Great credit is due to Mr. Webster. Incidentally, he was a political opponent of mine on a couple of occasions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY (*Bulimba*) [12.7 p.m.]: I desire to congratulate the Secretary for Agriculture on the administration of his department. There are few ministerial positions so important as his. He has proved himself to be one of the most vigorous and enthusiastic Ministers who have ever been in charge of the department. I should like to discuss the staff. I congratulate the Government on their decision to reclassify some positions, and thus give a measure of relief to officers who have been entitled to a

new classification for many years. Officers of the Department of Agriculture, and other spending departments, are frequently penalised in comparison with officers in revenue-producing departments, like the Income Tax Department, State Government Insurance Office, Public Curator's Office, Stamp Duties Office, and others. The tendency has always been for the salaries of officers in spending departments to be lower than in revenue-producing departments, and the attitude of successive Governments in that respect is, to some extent, understandable. I believe that we have some of the best experts in the world in the Department of Agriculture, and they are entitled to a fair remuneration, but they should not be penalised because they belong to a spending department. I trust the Minister will consider the question of giving junior officers an opportunity to become acquainted with the work of the department. The Public Service Act lays it down that junior officers shall have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the work of all sections in the department to which they are appointed, but that regulation is not being carried out. I trust that the Public Service Commissioner will see that nothing similar to this happens in other departments. There is in the Department of Agriculture a young woman who was appointed to the public service about nine years ago at the minimum salary of approximately £70 a year. She was appointed to a job which involved nothing else than dealing with the despatch of mail. In other words, one of her most important duties was to stamp the letters and enter the cost daily in a cash book. After nine years we find that young lady is to-day still occupying the same position, being paid a salary of £200 a year, and in the meantime she has become a Bachelor of Arts by studying at night. I know that if I had brought the matter under the Minister's notice before he would have given it his consideration, and I know that he will do so now. It is not fair to the staff, and when it happens with a man it is likely to be a serious disqualification in connection with later appointments.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to a man who this year will retire under the public service regulations. He will be a great loss to the public service. I refer to the accountant of the department, Mr. Hooper. Mr. Hooper, who was transferred from the Commonwealth service, was first appointed to the department forty-three or forty-four years ago. For more than forty years he has each year attended the sittings of Parliament and assisted the Minister to pilot his Estimates through Committee. This is a record that is not surpassed by any other accountant in the State, and is one that will bear comparison with a similar officer in any other State. Both the present Minister and an ex-Minister, the hon. member for Coorocora, told me they regarded Mr. Hooper—the Premier and the Public Service Commissioner also support their opinions—as a most valuable officer. I desire to pay a tribute to him for his services to the State. The account section began with Mr. Hooper himself, but the staff has increased to twelve to fifteen officers under Mr. Hooper's control. He has trained some very valuable officers for the public service, and some of his former subordinates now occupy important positions in our civic life. The Minister informs me—and I believe this is also a record—that for about ten years—with one

[*Mr. Edwards.*]

exception—it has never been necessary for the department to incur unforeseen expenditure. That is a compliment to the officer who framed the Estimates of the department. I also understand from the Minister that Mr. Hooper has never failed him in his public duties.

Mr. WALKER: I offered him promotion and he refused it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: So did I.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: Mr. Hooper will leave the public service this year with the full knowledge that he enjoys the confidence of all those with whom he has come in contact. He enjoys the confidence of the Minister and his fellow-officers. He has a very fine record, and he leaves an excellent organisation for his successor.

I also wish to make reference to the beef cattle industry, which is a very vital and important one to the State. We are destined to build up a great beef export industry, and I trust that everything will be done by the department to help the producers and see that those engaged in the industry obtain a fair return for their labour. Queensland is in a fortunate position, inasmuch as she furnishes 80 per cent. of the beef exported from Australia. We possess all the potentialities to develop the trade, but there is much to learn from Argentina. Recently I had an opportunity of discussing conditions in Argentina with a prominent man in the industry, and it was interesting to learn from him how efficiently the South American people had organised the meat trade. Recently the Premier of South Australia, Mr. Butler, visited the Argentina, and I understand from a member of his party that his investigations were illuminating. I suggest that the Minister—he is a hard-working and efficient man—should, in the interests of the producers and in the interests of all those engaged in the industry, pay a visit to the Argentina in the recess. The knowledge he would obtain would be of great assistance to this State.

I desire to congratulate the Editor of the "Agricultural Journal," Mr. Reid, on the splendid publication that he has produced, which, I believe, has reached a higher standard than ever. It is regrettable that more farmers do not read the journal, and I hope that efforts will be made to induce them to take it, because it contains much information that would be of great assistance to them in their work.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [12.20 p.m.]: According to a recent press report, Dr. Spahlinger is alleged to have discovered a serum that will prevent or cure tuberculosis. As tuberculosis is prevalent amongst the dairy herds—there have been isolated cases amongst beef cattle—it is of the utmost importance that we should obtain full information regarding the new virus; and I urge the Minister to do so. If a serum can be discovered that will effectively combat or eliminate the ravages of tuberculosis it will be of great advantage to the dairying and beef cattle industries, and the health of the people will also be protected.

I consider that the Roma State Farm did not serve the most useful purpose, although I recognise the excellent work carried out by Mr. Soutter. I had an opportunity of visiting South Australia with him as a delegate from Queensland to one of the most important conferences held in Australia to

consider the propagation of wheat. The services of Mr. Soutter were, to a certain extent, wasted at the Roma State Farm. He should be allowed to carry out his work relating to wheat, but he should not have to concern himself with any other experiments. The farm should not be leased, it should be conducted as a demonstration farm, which is vastly different from an experimental farm. The latter is conducted purely for experimental purposes, whereas the former is established for the purpose of demonstrating how a farm can be successfully conducted. I am well acquainted with the Roma State Farm, having visited it on several occasions. Had it been retained as a demonstration farm and had a practical man—preferably one from the Southern States who was conversant with the fallow system, the manuring of lands, and the breeding of fat lambs for market—been appointed as manager, and had he adopted the fallow system and used artificial manures as they do in the South, I consider that it could have produced fat lambs for market. After a period of five years it should be able to demonstrate whether the soil and climatic conditions are favourable. The farm should be run at a profit. It should not be an expense on the Government, but should be able to meet working expenses. The farm would also be of benefit to the Government in educating boys in farm work. The lads could be sent along to this farm to gain experience, and afterwards be employed by farmers and others at a remunerative wage. It would also be a splendid idea to demonstrate how wheat is grown in dry areas of the other States. I am sorry that the Minister has decided to lease the farm. I have always claimed that it should have been a demonstration and not an experimental farm.

The hon. member for Bulimba mentioned that the beef cattle industry was a very important industry to Queensland. Eighty per cent. or more of the beef exported overseas comes from Queensland. The other Eastern States are smaller and being perhaps more highly developed the settlers engage in sheep-raising and other forms of primary production that cannot be so extensively carried on in Queensland, especially in the dry areas of the North-West and Central-West. Queensland will continue to be the largest grower of beef cattle. We are all extremely pleased that the investigations into the chilling of beef have resulted in Queensland being able to export chilled beef. This is due to the experimental work carried out principally at the Brisbane Abattoir. It has proved beneficial not only to Queensland but also to Australia. These experiments have enabled us to compete with Argentina in Great Britain and other parts of the world to a greater degree than formerly.

At 12.28 p.m.,

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

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: If we are to compete successfully with Argentina for the chilled beef trade we must establish a number of farms to conduct experiments with exotic and other grasses and other fodders suitable for topping off young cattle bred in the western areas. It is only an occasional grazier who is able to fatten his bullocks on his own holding. I have a suitable holding equal to any in

Mr. Morgan.]

Queensland. I have been successful in fattening stock, but I know that Queensland cannot fatten a sufficient number of beasts on natural grasses only to supply the chilled beef trade. If a four years' old bullock is to be prime it must weigh from 750 to 900 lb. The trouble is that graziers cannot fatten beasts in two or three years on natural grasses. Provision will have to be made for larger areas to be put under lucerne and artificial grasses that cannot be successfully grown in the West. The cattle from the western districts could then be transferred to those areas to be fattened. That is done in Argentina, and if we are to compete we shall have to adopt the same practice. In Argentina the cattle are bred on large holdings on the prairies and topped off on alfalfa country. They are topped off for export on feed grown specially for the purpose. When the cattlemen do get their cattle into a fat condition it is generally found that they are overweight. The demand to-day is for a young bullock that will fatten quickly without being overweight.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Sooner or later the Commonwealth Government will have to adopt new weight standards for chillers.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Even then the best bullocks will be condemned. My cattle generally top the market in Sydney and Brisbane, but when they are really fat and ready for market they weigh from 750 lb. to 900 lb. and are about four years old. They are too heavy. If I could fatten them sooner it would be much better as far as weight standards are concerned, but it is impossible to do that on natural grasses. The best bullocks coming to Brisbane for chilling at the present time weigh from 750 to 850 lb. The Minister would be well advised to bring down an amendment of the Abattoir's Agreement Ratification and Meat Industry Act to provide for the improvements I suggest. Almost all commodities are sold by weight, and a weigh-bridge should be installed at the abattoirs. We have endeavoured to have his done in the past, but without success. The cattle producers would be willing to pay a small charge for having their cattle weighed when alive, and the weigh-bridge would become self-supporting. Cattle are weighed alive in Chicago, Argentina, and other parts of the world. Here the weight is guess work. We read where cattle fetch certain prices at the Cannon Hill sale, but those prices are exaggerated, with a view to hood-winking the Price Fixing Commissioner so that he will allow higher prices than are justified to be charged for the meat. They are also exaggerated for the purpose of inducing the cattle owner to send his stock to the yards thinking that he will get a good price. The installation of a weigh-bridge at the abattoir or at the sale yards would not be expensive. The cattle are weighed alive at the Royal National Show on the Sunday morning prior to the show, and when they are sold later in the week the actual weight of every beast is announced. When estimating the weight of a bullock after it has been killed, it is the usual practice to deduct one-third of the live weight. If a beast weighs 9 cwt. at the sale, it is generally found that it will weigh 6 cwt. when killed and dressed. That has been proved time after time. We should get some idea as to what is happening in that connection. At present we are entirely

[Mr. Morgan.

at the mercy of the people who buy our stock, and the Minister should take action. The United Graziers' Association has asked for a weigh-bridge time after time, and it has passed resolutions calling upon authorities to provide it. I notice in the Press that the Federal Government intend to allow a rebate of 15s. a ton on artificial manures not used for wheat growing purposes. Can the Minister tell me whether that will apply to the sugar and fruit growing and other industries that use artificial manures? It would be an assistance if the agriculturists could benefit by that concession which is allowed in the southern States.

Mr. JESSON (*Kennedy*) [12.37 p.m.]: I congratulate the Minister and his department for the way they have managed the affairs of the primary producers during the last few years, particularly in connection with research work. I wish to deal briefly with the question of marketing fruit, which deserves greater commendation. The scheme in vogue is an admirable one, and helps the fruitgrowers in the Stanthorpe and other districts to dispose of much of their surplus. The Railway Department and the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing have done excellent work, but much more remains to be done. That would not only benefit the farmers but also the people in North Queensland, who have to pay unduly high prices for fruit. In some cases the Stanthorpe growers are at the mercy of unscrupulous tradespeople, who pay them what they think fit for their produce. I have often seen cases of that. A consignment of forty cases of tomatoes was sent from Stanthorpe to a Greek, who wired back to the grower that they had arrived in a rotten condition. The grower got the local authority health inspector to inspect the fruit. On picking them over the inspector found that only three cases were bad. If the Greek had been able to injure the grower in this way the grower would probably have lost the whole of his consignment and on the next consignment he would have suffered a deduction from freight. The department could help the grower to market his surplus without glutting the Brisbane market. We are told that boys will not go on the farms. In North Queensland—Atherton and other places—there are not sufficient facilities for boys who want to go on to farms. There are a number of boys in the district waiting to get on the Abergowrie training farm, which proves that in the North some of the lads are land-minded, and that they want to go to this college. I cannot speak for the metropolitan lads. The Abergowrie College is doing admirable work, and occasionally the department sends inspectors there to assist it in its work.

The hon. member for Nanango deplored the closing of the Roma State Farm, where wheat experimentation has been carried on for some time. Considering that there is an over-production in the world's wheat supply of 650,000,000 bushels, there is no encouragement to farmers to enlarge their areas. During 1924 there was an area of 189,145 acres under wheat in the Darling Downs. The area under wheat in 1934 was 232,053 acres. Those figures do not exhibit a very great improvement. Statistics also reveal that in 1924 the average yield per acre was 14.7 bushels, while in 1934 it was 18.8, proving conclusively that the research work carried on at the Roma State Farm is beneficial to the

industry. (Opposition laughter.) The proof of the pudding is in the eating, notwithstanding the chuckles of the Leader of the Opposition. When any contentious matter affecting the primary producers is under consideration all we get from the Opposition is chuckles. I wish further to enlarge on the results of the research work carried out by the department, particularly in the last few years. The figures I intend to quote will support my assertion. They will show that the greatest yield of wheat per acre is obtained in this State, excepting Tasmania, where a soft class of wheat is grown. This class of wheat commands a greater price than hard wheat, because it is extensively used by biscuit manufacturers. Tasmania has a monopoly of this wheat. The average yield of wheat per acre in the various States of the Commonwealth is—

	bushels.
Queensland	14.62
New South Wales	12.85
Victoria	12.57
South Australia	9.88
Western Australia	11.80
Tasmania	20.73

Mr. EDWARDS: Now give the quantities grown in each State.

Mr. JESSON: I have given the yield per acre, and the hon. member can work that out for himself. My figures are obtained from statistics compiled by the Registrar-General. I do not want to combat the statements of the hon. member for Nanango, but some of them were so ridiculous that I cannot allow them to pass. He calls himself a practical farmer, but if his farm is as efficient as his statements are sincere, then I can understand him having a "grouch" about the conditions of the man on the land. He objects to the dairy farmers contributing to the cost of research work and herd testing in order to improve their production. I would point out that producers in the sugar industry levy themselves—contributions are also made by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and the Government—of 1d. per ton to meet the cost of the sugar experiment stations. Just imagine that! The banana industry and the fruitgrowers at Stanthorpe contribute to a fund for the preservation and improvement of their industries, yet the hon. member, who is alleged to be a farmer, contends that dairymen should not contribute one penny towards research work for the improvement of their herds! How is research work to be carried out without finance? Why should other primary industries contribute voluntarily to research work for the improvement of their industries and not the dairymen? It is these ridiculous statements that influence the boys to refuse work on farms.

I desire to congratulate the department through the Minister on the research work it is carrying on in connection with the utilisation of by-products of sugar cane. I understand that serious consideration is being given to the question of extracting a yeast from molasses. I understand from my limited knowledge of the subject that it will be a constituent of a concentrated stock food that can be supplied to stock in drought time and as a lick for stock suitable for chilled meat trade. These are matters that are not common knowledge. I hope that their investigations will be successful. Too much praise cannot be bestowed on the Minister and his staff. The Minister is invited to all

important conferences dealing with agricultural problems, and his advice is sought by agriculturists. The welfare of the man on the land is his main consideration, and his studies are pursued with that objective.

Mr. MULLER (*Fassifern*) [12.49 p.m.]: I compliment the Minister upon his very comprehensive statement, and I endorse his remarks regarding the inadequacy of the vote. We all recognise the importance of our primary industries, and as the Minister has stated, possibly the whole of our future welfare is dependent on the development of our primary industries. I notice that the vote shows an increase of approximately £16,000, but I feel sure that no hon. member will object to this expenditure, which is so necessary for the development of our great primary industries.

I notice that £1,895 has been set down for the purpose of establishing a dairy research institute in Queensland. While I compliment the Minister on his initiative in that direction, at the same time I am disappointed to learn that he desires to obtain more money from the producers. This is a question that is agitating the minds of those engaged in production and manufacture for some considerable time. It is a matter for regret that no definite attempt was made to improve the quality of our dairy products in the past. In my district we have not had the services of a dairy inspector for the last five years. There may be sound reasons for that apparent neglect, but it is a great pity because it is one of the most important dairying districts in Queensland. If we hope to improve the quality of our butter we must commence on the farm where the cows are milked. It is obvious that if the factory receives second quality cream it will not be able to manufacture first quality butter. I hope the Minister will pay greater attention to the supervision on the farms. About 80 per cent. of the dairy products in this State have to be exported, and an improvement in quality would be our best advertisement.

Cream is subject to many defects, but that is a problem for experts. It was recently discovered that some pats of butter taken from a case which had been classed as choice quality were later graded as second quality at the cold stores, although it had all come out of the one churn. There are many problems associated with butter manufacture that will have to be overcome. The industry, in conjunction with the Minister, decided to launch out on some form of scientific research. The Minister set aside a certain sum of money, and the industry also made a very substantial contribution.

I should like the Minister to give attention to the burning question of the delivery of cream to the factories. It may require unpalatable legislation, but it will have to be done, and I hope the Minister will do something in that direction. To some it may appear that the Government or the Minister is endeavouring to take power to which they are not entitled. Australia must face world-wide competition in dairy products, but if we fail to improve the quality our prices must decline. The time has arrived when the factories must lend some assistance in this direction. At the present time if a factory grades cream immediately on arrival—as it should be graded—and a supplier is dissatisfied with

Mr. Muller.]

his grade, he decides to forward his cream to another factory. Competition among the factories for supplies has brought about a serious problem, that will have to be settled. It will be necessary to set up supply zones, and I advocate that system. If the present factories are going to continue, the practice of offering inducements to suppliers to send their cream past the nearest factory, it will be utterly impossible to grade the cream properly.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Will you support a zoning Bill if I bring one down?

Mr. MULLER: I am prepared to support any system of zoning that will improve the quality.

The question of regulating shipments from Queensland is of the utmost importance. Some hon. members may be of the opinion that the mere existence of a Director of Marketing meets the situation, but more will have to be done than has been done in the past. The problem is of great importance to Queensland and Australia. Queensland manufactured approximately 56,000 tons of butter last year, and a very large quantity of cheese. Eighty per cent. of the butter has to be exported. The industry is worth £5,000,000 to the State, but if we are to compete successfully with other Dominions and foreign countries, it will be necessary to regulate shipments to the various markets and maintain continuity of supplies. I desire to refer briefly to a report received last week from the London manager of the Dairy Produce Export Board, Mr. May. He writes as follows:—

“London Butter Market. This week has witnessed a period of considerable activity. There has been a good enquiry, and with sellers looking for higher prices and therefore selling sparingly, most descriptions have recorded sharp advances in prices.

“Unfortunately, Australian butter is now in very small supply. With the unsold consignment stock at 25,000 boxes, and only 70,000 boxes due this month, we have little interest in the market.”

I want the Minister to note the word “interest.” He further states:—

“We have complaints from the North of England that Australian butter is unobtainable—which must be inevitable with our very small supplies—and therefore a large proportion of our former supporters are now being forced on to other descriptions. Should a considerable margin between New Zealand and Australia creep in later in the year we fully expect some Australian interests will advance theories concerning disorderly marketing by United Kingdom agents when really shippers have only got themselves to blame.”

At 2 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. MULLER: It is obvious that as production increases exports will increase, and it will be necessary for the Government to regulate shipments. I cannot see the wisdom of spending large sums of money—as we have done in the past—on advertising our products and building up a clientele on the other side of the world if we are unable to fulfil our orders. I hope that the Minister will consider the possibility of regulating shipments in the future. Queensland is in

[Mr. Muller.

a much more unfavourable position than either Victoria or New South Wales. In Victoria, 60,000 tons of butter were produced last year, 50 per cent. of which was exported, whereas New South Wales produced about 66,000 tons and exported only 30 per cent., as the local market consumed 70 per cent.

Another example of the need for control is shown in our chilled meat trade, which is a new industry in Queensland. I read the other day that the State would fall short of its quota for the last quarter of this year by something like 300 tons. After incurring a great deal of expense in building up a market on the other side of the world for chilled meat, we find ourselves unable to meet the demand. This is most regrettable, especially when it is realised that Queensland depends largely on its export trade. Unless Governments and other responsible bodies are prepared to make an effort to overcome this difficulty, we shall never be able to hold this export trade.

The Minister expressed the opinion that the commodity boards were operating satisfactorily. I hold executive positions on two of these boards, and I know the difficulties with which they have to contend; but I hope that the Minister will endeavour to give them a greater measure of protection in the future. The factories that are loyal to the boards are labouring under difficulties created by unfair competition from people who flout the law and take advantage of a local market built up by these boards. I am delighted to see that the Minister is endeavouring to protect the interests of the primary producers of this State by contributing towards the defence in the James case, which is to be heard by the Privy Council early next year. If the appeal is successful, the whole of the commodity boards will have to be reorganised. I feel that able counsel should be briefed to try to maintain the present organisation; but I am somewhat alarmed at the attitude of the wheatgrowers in Queensland. As primary producers, we should be prepared to take a Commonwealth-wide view of such an important matter. There is the possibility that the wheatgrowers in Queensland will try to continue as a separate entity. I feel that that would be dangerous.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It would be equally as dangerous to them as to the State.

Mr. MULLER: That is what I say. I feel that it would be dangerous to Queensland and to the whole of the wheatgrowing interests in the Commonwealth. It will not be possible to maintain an average price throughout the Commonwealth unless all the States are prepared to honour their obligations. Queensland cannot hope to maintain her organisation except as part of a Commonwealth scheme.

Another matter in which I am interested is the organisation of the sale of milk. In my electorate there are a number of people who are seriously affected by the haphazard way in which milk is sold in the city of Brisbane. Perhaps we can take an object lesson from what has been done in England during the last few years. Some farmers have a serious objection to any form of control. We all feel that it would be much better to allow the individual to market his product as he thinks fit if it did not affect the welfare of the industry. Even old conservative England has learned a lesson in the last few

years, and I am greatly interested in the work of Major Elliott, Minister for Agriculture in Great Britain. In his endeavour to control milk supplies in England he has made it possible for people who in the past were unable to secure milk now to get adequate supplies. His scheme provides for a pool to control both manufactured and liquid milk, and vendors of liquid milk who sell at higher prices have to pool their profits with the manufacturers of butter and cheese. The scheme has provided a more even supply amongst the consumers, resulting in an increased consumption of milk in Great Britain by something like 20,000,000 gallons per annum.

I should like to refer to the question of horse breeding. As the President of the Clydesdale Horse Society in Queensland, I am naturally interested in horse breeding, which, like other businesses, has its ups and downs. There was never a time when the Government should exercise greater control over the breeding of better stock than at present. During the last Parliament the Government passed the Stallions Registration Amendment Act, largely on the recommendation of the society that I represent. The Act is practically useless as it is administered to-day. Owners who are prepared to submit their stallions for examination have to pay licensing fees to permit them to carry on, whereas owners of condemned horses are not liable to pay any fees, but are still carrying on also.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We are tightening up the Act this year, and I do not think there will be any further complaints in that direction.

Mr. MULLER: I hope that is so, because it is a very serious matter to stock breeders. If the Act is not tightened up we might as well drop the idea altogether. It is discouraging when one can see practically every second person in the country leading a nondescript stallion. If the Act were amended as I suggest it would have the effect of improving the standard of our horses. I suggest for the Minister's serious consideration that instead of appointing various boards through the State he should have a body of capable men appointed to do the whole inspections.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That was tried on a former occasion and failed entirely.

Mr. MULLER: I feel sure that if the right men were appointed there would not be any serious difficulty. I have no one in mind, but I think that competent men could be selected. I have no brief for any individual in this matter. The position as I see it is that one set of men do one district according to a certain standard, and another set do another district according to another standard. I have seen scores of horses registered that should never have been given a second thought. If we are to have uniformity we shall have to have one responsible body of men. Three or four would be sufficient to do the job. The present system of control is objectionable to a number of men. The society that I represent has considered the matter very carefully for a number of years, and it is of the opinion that something should be done. There are a number of people who are not competent to judge for themselves, and are prepared to rely on the opinion of some

other person. Unless the department takes a greater interest in this matter there is the danger that the standard of the horse will depreciate very considerably.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. T. L. WILLIAMS (*Part Curtis*) [2.13 p.m.]: I speak on this vote with a great amount of pleasure, because I recognise as most hon. members do, that the progress and history of Queensland is wrapped up in the great improvement that has taken place in our primary industries. The vote shows a slight increase, which is quite justified in view of the increased work that is to be done by the department. No doubt the Minister would like the vote increased by £100,000, so that he could put the additional money to further good purposes.

I congratulate the Minister on his zeal, energy and enthusiasm. That is undoubted and undisputed. Many of his officers, who are known personally to me, make a wonderful band of workers. They have the interests of the department and the people at heart at all times. I do not wish to individualise, but I have in mind Mr. Graham, the Under Secretary and Director of Marketing; Mr. Wilson, the Assistant Under Secretary; Mr. Gibson, the Director of Agriculture; Mr. Hees, the Director of Dairying; Mr. Wells, the Director of Cotton Culture; Mr. Coleman, Mr. Short, and others. A meed of praise is also due to the field officers, comprising the dairy inspectors, the stock inspectors, the fruit inspectors, and the men interested in the cotton, wheat, tobacco, and other industries. They are all deserving of praise not only from myself, but also from hon. members generally. They are all doing faithful work in their respective spheres. I and other hon. members representing primary producing areas frequently come in contact with them, and we have an opportunity to observe their work. We are very proud of the good work they are doing right away from the direct supervision of the Minister and the departmental heads. They stand up to their job, and they are a credit to the department in every respect.

One matter that did concern me—I brought it under the notice of the Minister recently—was the limited mileage that the dairy inspectors were allowed to charge. If the inspectors are to do their work thoroughly it is necessary that they should travel long distances, and if they are to be subject to a maximum and minimum mileage, they cannot do their work thoroughly. The inspector in my electorate travelled 500 miles in one month, which is considerably greater than the mileage allowed him under the regulations. As a result of a conversation that I had with the Minister, the maximum mileage in that electorate was considerably increased, and the dairymen—and incidentally the inspector—are grateful for the concession. They cannot carry out their duties in a proper manner if they are restricted to a limited mileage a month. Another innovation is the instruction to inspectors to visit the factories at certain periods to ascertain the names of farmers who are sending in supplies that are not first grade.

I wish to make reference to the prevalence of tuberculosis in cattle. It is a matter of such importance that hon. members should

Mr. T. L. Williams.

devote some time to it when discussing this vote. I read an article some time ago, in which it was stated that it was generally recognised that as long as there was tuberculosis in our cattle, or if there were one tubercular animal in a herd, there was the danger of the disease spreading to the rest of the herd. The Minister recognises that danger, and if a system were in operation to apply a tuberculin test to animals up to six months old, with immediate steps taken to dispose of affected beasts, it is possible that these methods would result in a modification of the disease or its complete eradication. I am glad the department is doing its utmost to grapple with the problem. Perhaps it may be possible to institute a compensation fund, as has been done in other parts of the world, to compensate owners whose animals are destroyed by direction of the department. In New South Wales a fund was established under the Swine Compensation Act, and it now has a credit balance of £13,287. A sum of £131,000 has been paid by way of compensation to owners whose animals were found to be infected with swine fever. There is another aspect of the matter that I do not wish to deal with now, owing to the limited time at my disposal. Probably a State-wide campaign for carrying out extensive tests would be successful in reducing the disease to a minimum. Dairymen generally would welcome a compensation fund on an improved subsidised basis, because many of them pay big prices for their stud stock and receive big prices for their progeny, and it is very distressing to have them slaughtered without compensation. A concerted effort will have to be made to deal with the matter sooner or later. Victoria has a similar compensation fund in operation. The following newspaper report of a statement made by the Secretary for Agriculture indicates the amount of research work that is going on:—

"The Minister for Agriculture expressed his gratification at the reported intention of the Commonwealth Government to increase the vote to the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research from £30,000 to £130,000. This, said Mr. Bulcock, would remove many of the disabilities under which the council was labouring. In the past it had been compelled to refuse to engage in certain research avenues, owing to the scarcity of funds, although many problems, such as soil drift, were crying out for investigation.

"Presumably, private enterprise would continue to make contributions to the council, as did the State Government. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research now had an opportunity of becoming one of the world's largest scientific organisations."

The increased research work will tend to bring about an improvement in primary production, particularly in the dairying industry, where the output of butter and cheese will not only be improved in quality but also in quantity. As the hon. member for Fassfern pointed out, the dairying industry has become more efficient during recent years.

In order to indicate to hon. members the nature of the increase in the dairying industry, it is only necessary to refer to a statement issued by the Port Curtis Dairy Association, showing the progress of that associa-

tion from 1906 to 1935. The figures are as follows:—

Year.	Average Number of Suppliers.	Cream Received.		Butter Manufactured.
		Lb.	Lb.	Lb.
1906	82	16,834	8,938	
1918	323	1,432,764	720,308	
1928	1,401	7,518,025	3,669,547	
1935	2,957	25,249,949	12,477,791	

The greater the amount of research the greater the increase in first grade cream and butter. The Minister has been most sympathetic whenever I have brought these matters under notice, but I impress upon him the need for the Railway Department to provide special trucks for the conveyance of cream alone. Frequently one observes an empty or full pig or fowl crate in a cream truck, and at other times a bag of onions or potatoes in an overripe condition being returned by a storekeeper. That is wrong. The cream cannot be received in good condition at the factory when transported in such trucks. I have already brought the matter under the notice of the Minister, and I have had the comforting assurance that the practice would be stopped on every possible occasion.

At their annual conference, held at Dalby in June of the current year, the Western Downs Local Producers' Association passed the following resolution:—

"That the Department of Agriculture and Stock, which is deeply concerned with the question of aiming at the highest quality of cream supplied by dairymen, confer with the Railway Department on the matter of preserving the quality of cream carried by it to the factories, it being a well-known fact that cream left at the railway siding in perfect condition has, through a faulty system of conveyance, greatly deteriorated in quality before reaching the factory."

I know the Minister received that resolution, and has already given it due consideration. He is anxious to do his best in that connection because he recognises that it is necessary that the product must reach the factory in good condition if a first-grade product is to be placed on the market. It is pleasing to note that regulations have recently been issued providing for three grades for cream. This report appeared in the "Queensland Producer," of 24th July, 1935:—

"Regulations under the Dairy Produce Acts have been amended to provide that there shall be three grades of cream, designated 'Choice Grade,' 'First Grade,' and 'Second Grade,' respectively.

"Cream which is affected by putrefactive decomposition or is considered by the owner of a factory to be unfit for the food of man, shall not be designated by grade but shall be rejected."

We welcome the regulation, and I am quite sure that the factories have been looking for a lead in that direction. During the last session, and the session before, I referred at some length to the manufacture of margarine and its serious effect on the dairying industry. I desire to quote the remarks of Mr.

[Mr. T. L. Williams.]

Cheers, Manager of the Kingaroy branch of the Maryborough Co-operative Dairy Association. He is also President of the Queensland Butter and Cheese Factory Managers and Secretaries' Association. At a recent conference in Brisbane he said:—

"It had been stated that more than 19,000,000 pound of margarine was sold in Australia every year. That meant that the butter industry suffered a financial loss of considerably more than £1,000,000 annually. Margarine competition with butter should be the subject of investigation. The industry could not function successfully and continue to play its important part in the development of this country if competition, chiefly from black labour in the South Sea Island plantations, were allowed to creep in and take what those engaged in the dairying industry were justly entitled to."

There are other considerations to be taken into account. The cattle industry has to be considered, and perhaps the margarine competition is not so serious as we imagine. I believe Mr. Cheers was referring to the matter generally.

In the "Queensland Producer" of the 24th July, 1935, we read that steps are gradually being taken overseas to combat the margarine menace. It says—

"The oft-repeated claim for relief voiced by Danish farmers during the last few years has now resulted in proposals, submitted by the Danish Government, of which the principal one is an alleviation of the ground rent (through direct State subsidy), whilst it is also proposed in future to use butter instead of margarine in the various State institutions, which is calculated to result in an augmented home consumption of 300 to 400 tons per week."

The article states further on that the sales of margarine in the United States have dropped considerably, and that the Act was recently tightened up in Victoria.

As many people in my electorate depend on the success of the cotton industry, I am pleased to know that the Minister has seen fit to appoint an additional cotton inspector in Mr. Clarkson, a Bachelor of Science, a Queenslander, a University graduate, and a student of the Agricultural College and High School at Gatton. I have felt for some time that an additional man would be very helpful to this industry. Another pleasing feature is that the Minister, his departmental officers, and the cotton growers met in conference some time ago to review the Cotton Board boundaries, with the result that it is likely that the boundaries will be more acceptable to all concerned in the future.

The Government's continued assistance to cotton growers in the Upper Burnett, Callide, Dawson, and other cotton growing areas of the State is very pleasing to hon. members representing the districts concerned, as there will be a considerable increase in the amount of cotton grown this year, as a result of that assistance. I have been informed by Mr. Wells, that up to 25th October last, sufficient seed has been forwarded to growers—working it out on a basis of 15 to 20 lb. of cotton seed per acre—to plant something like 60,000 acres—an increase of about 12,000 acres on last

year's figures. Advances made by the Department of Labour and Industry to necessitous farmers in the Upper Burnett and Callide Valley areas for planting cotton have been of the greatest assistance to the industry. It is interesting to note that the advances were:—

	£
1932-33	28,855
1933-34	16,505
1934-35	15,000

These increases in the Queensland cotton returns over a number of years make interesting comparisons—

	lb.	£
1922	3,878,673	88,466
1925	18,296,507	338,187
1934	26,861,635	481,699

The cotton industry may yet become one of the great primary industries of the State. We learn from Mr. Webster that the new varieties are very satisfactory. I wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Webster for the interest he has shown in the industry, and to compliment him on his management of the Cotton Board.

A week or two ago the hon. member for Murrumbidgee referred to the spread of the fruit fly and other orchard pests. He pointed out the danger to the fruit industry of allowing the city man to grow fruit trees in his back-yard. These back-yard orchards are the breeding grounds for many orchard pests, and I am sure that any regulations brought to bear on the people concerned will not be regarded as an interference with citizens' rights and privileges.

I congratulate the Minister upon selecting Mr. Somerville, the entomologist in charge of the Nambour branch, to go overseas for the purpose of enriching his knowledge of a better plant disease control. Mr. Somerville has been on an orchard in the Gayndah district in which I am interested. He is a most capable officer, and I think that the right choice was made.

In conclusion, I wish briefly to refer to the Fertilisers Bill which was recently passed through this Parliament. It is an excellent measure, and I think hon. members generally agree that it was long overdue. I was not here during the debate, but I read "Hansard," and I found that the hon. member for Dalby suggested that something might be done to establish a factory in our own State for the manufacture of artificial manures. The hon. member for Murrumbidgee said that a reduction in the cost of production was one of the main problems of to-day, and that the use of fertiliser would assist to bring a greater return. That is a very wise statement from a man personally interested in land matters, and it is worthy of some note. I notice also that the hon. member for Isis said—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in dealing with that matter on this vote.

Mr. T. L. WILLIAMS: I was just referring to a measure that will be a benefit to the man on the land. The hon. member for Isis suggested that some arrangement should be made for fertilisers to be carried cheaper by rail so that fruitgrowers, cane-growers, dairy farmers, and farmers

Mr. T. L. Williams.]

generally could reap some benefit. I congratulate the Minister again on his energy and his work during the past year, and I congratulate his officers and everyone connected with the development of the great primary producing industries of our State upon their fine work.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) [2.38 p.m.] : Being a primary producer and representing a large country constituency, I should like to discuss this vote. The Minister is administering the Acts passed by this and previous Governments in a very able manner, and showing a great amount of energy. It is clear, also, that he desires his officers to be energetic. They are doing excellent work in the interests of the primary producers. Queensland is a primary producing State, and it is no wonder that the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture are taken very seriously, especially by hon. members interested in primary production. Science has played a great part in primary production in recent years. Although we are applying science to these industries, it is the work of the farmer and his family to a large extent that has brought about the success we now enjoy. We have to depend on climatic conditions, but I think the hard work of the farmer and his family is responsible for any success in primary production.

The hon. member for Port Curtis dealt with diseases in stock, especially with that dreaded disease, tuberculosis. I do not think that the people in Queensland or in Australia realise the seriousness of the disease, which, unfortunately, is extending in the dairying districts. The Minister is doing good work in appointing veterinary surgeons to investigate thoroughly the health of the cattle providing milk and butter for human consumption. Anybody who has had an opportunity of inspecting a beast suffering from tuberculosis will agree that it is time something was done to stamp out the disease, especially if he believes that possibly his children have been reared on milk obtained from such cows. Many dairy herds are affected, and the percentage of losses has been rather high, but the question of compensation is a matter for the Minister to consider. I am inclined to the opinion that when the producer considers the matter he will be satisfied to have diseased beasts culled from his herd. Every animal that reacts to the test must be isolated and destroyed. I would welcome the destruction of any beast in my herd which reacted to the tuberculin test. I would destroy that animal without compensation, but the burden will be a heavy one on some dairymen. At the present time a great number of tubercular pigs are destroyed. As the pig probably consumes milk from a diseased cow, it is more susceptible to the disease than the human being. The disease can be readily detected in the pig at the bacon factories. The hon. member for Cooroora told me of certain tests made with a number of pigs fed on milk from tubercular cows and others fed with milk from healthy cows. He informed me that even after the bacon had been cured one could readily select the animals that had been fed on the milk of the diseased cows, and that the germs could be seen under the microscope.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Were those pigs killed with the full knowledge that the bacon would go into human consumption?

[*Mr. T. L. Williams.*]

Mr. CLAYTON: The pigs were killed and cured for experimental purposes only. Dairy farmers who supply pigs in large numbers to the bacon factories are reaping a benefit from the existing legislation. I trust that the people generally will take a keener interest in this dreaded disease than they have in the past. It is appalling to think that some of our public institutions may purchase milk from herds in which this disease is manifest.

The Minister recently dealt with the question of stock foods. Unfortunately, I was absent when the Bill was discussed. It is only right that the dairyman should be protected in this respect and that he should have an opportunity to ascertain the constituents of the various stock foods now on the markets. I understand that the ingredients are clearly printed on the labels of the various stock foods, thereby enabling farmers to select stock foods suitable for use in the districts in which the cattle are depastured. In some cases stock licks are not required, but when cattle are depasturing in districts where the soil is deficient a lick containing lime is very beneficial. It assists to build up more robust herds by developing bone. I am pleased to know the matter is being given consideration.

The matter of carrying out experiments in pastoral improvement was encouraged, not only by the ex-Secretary for Agriculture, the hon. member for Cooroora, but also by the present Minister, and excellent results were obtained. If the dairymen are educated in pasture improvement, the production per cow will increase. I urge the Minister to give consideration to that aspect of the matter. A great deal could be done to improve the carrying capacity of the various holdings. During the wet season the cattle tramp the surface of the soil on the river flats, and it becomes very hard, resulting in a reduced carrying capacity, whereas if the surface is worked the carrying capacity is increased. If land that has been ploughed is allowed to fallow, great work can be done by the use of renovator harrows in breaking up the surface, thereby conserving moisture and allowing the grass roots to penetrate, thus increasing the carrying capacity. Farmers should subdivide their properties. If this practice were followed and the paddocks were used in rotation, the production per cow would increase.

The matter of over-stocking is one that should receive serious consideration. If many of the farmers in the coastal districts were content to run, say, thirty cows, instead of forty, they would receive a better return, and when a dry spell eventuated they would not lose so many cattle owing to lack of feed.

I should like the department to take a more active interest in the matter of fodder conservation. Unfortunately, the dairymen are not sufficiently seized with the necessity of conserving fodder. This could be done by making ensilage or by making hay. If the department encouraged the farmers to carry out this work, it would be to the interests of the industry and State as a whole.

Some time ago, when the Forestry Sub-Department was laying down experiment plots adjacent to the railway line between Maryborough and Howard, the Minister, at my suggestion, allowed his officials to lay down some grasses to ascertain those that

would grow best in the poorer soils. Will the Minister inform the Committee what has been accomplished in that connection, and whether any beneficial results have accrued?

The hon. member for Murrumbidgee stated—there is much in his contention—that mat grass or carpet grass is becoming a menace to the dairying industry. In my own holding and in other parts on the Mary River mat grass is extending very rapidly, although I personally have not found it to be the menace that the hon. member for Murrumbidgee said it was in his district. The matter will have to be very carefully watched.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is always that danger with imported grass.

Mr. CLAYTON: There is always that danger and probably scientific methods will have to be adopted to eradicate the grass. It cannot be considered quite as serious as the khaki weed, because on the Darling Downs and in the Wide Bay districts I understand that there is very little of this weed which grew so luxuriantly a few years ago.

The Minister dealt with the question of tobacco, and I quite agree with him that the type of soil has a great deal to do with the texture of the leaf. I am very doubtful that we shall have success in growing tobacco in our coastal districts. The hon. gentleman is aware that extensive experiments were carried out at Beerburrum. Private individuals in other parts of the coastal districts have also experimented without success. I understand that it is now the intention of the department to proceed with experiments further inland, and there is the possibility that experimental crops will be grown in the Burnett district. I trust that the efforts will meet with success.

We all agree that smokers have to acquire a taste for Queensland-grown tobacco. I would prefer to purchase tobacco grown in this State, but I have not yet developed a taste for it. I am not going to cease smoking while I can procure an imported tobacco acceptable to my palate, even if it has to come from America. The Minister also told us that much Queensland leaf was being mixed with imported American leaf, and no doubt this is done, because the Queensland leaf is cheaper, but one would naturally expect the price of the blended tobacco to be reduced in price. There should be an intermediate price; the prices for tobacco at the present are too high.

Will the Minister favour the Committee with some information regarding the training farm for boys at St. Lucia? We have not got the departmental report, and hon. members are not in a position to know the exact state of affairs at St. Lucia. The Auditor-General's report states that the gross expenditure on the farm for 1934-35 was £2,134 7s. 9d. Will the Minister inform the Committee whether he considers the venture has been a success? I trust that good results have accrued, because it is essential that we should endeavour to induce our boys to work on the land. I stated in this Chamber recently that it is almost impossible to induce the city youth to leave the city and take work on farms in the various parts of the State. In many instances the farmers are compelled to work their wives and children from daylight to dark because they cannot obtain labour.

I trust that something will be done to give them relief. If the Minister encouraged boys to attend St. Lucia to be trained in agricultural pursuits, he would be doing a service to the State. I am sure that those boys, after having been on the land for a short space of time, would desire to remain there instead of returning to the city.

I also wish to refer to the matter of herd testing. Herd testing is being carried out very extensively in the Southern States by the Illawarra Herd Society and the Jersey Herd Society with considerable benefit to the farmers. I trust that the Minister will increase his herd testing activities in the very near future. If the primary producer is given the services of Government herd testers he will be able to cull his own herd and retain the cows that are giving the best return.

The hon. member for Cook referred to the production of maize. I anticipate that the crop this season will be enormous, and I hope that the Minister or some co-operative company will be able to engage in the manufacture of by-products in Queensland maize instead of allowing the work of manufacture to go to the Southern States.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the standing orders.

Mr. FOLEY (*Normanby*) [3.4 p.m.]: I cannot allow this vote to go through without joining with other hon. members in recording a word of praise for the wonderful work performed by the field officers, in particular. Although the field officer is sometimes looked upon by the heads of the department as the message boy, he really does the spade work of the Department. He should receive every encouragement and assistance from the departmental heads who have not to endure the hardships and difficulties of the country. The field officers have to listen to complaints from individual farmers, and try to impart practical knowledge to them so that they may keep in touch with what the department is doing for them. I am not in any way depreciating the value of the work performed by departmental heads. There is no doubt that the experts do wonderful work of a scientific and practical nature on the various experimental farms and plots, but notwithstanding the hundreds of thousands of pounds that have been spent by this and previous Governments upon investigation work with a view to improving production, it seems to be extremely difficult to impart knowledge to the average farmer.

I have discussed these matters with the experts of the department. They have endeavoured to organise demonstrations in farming districts to show the farmers what can be done with cheap ensilage pits. They have gone to much expense in providing timber and labour, and in many cases only three or four farmers in a big district have come to the demonstration. The officers are discouraged by the lack of interest on the part of the farmers. Old prejudices still prevail, but I think that the good work of the officers is not brought before the farmer as it might be. If advanced methods were adopted by the farmers it would be to their advantage. Although the department is concentrating on scientific improvements and work of an experimental nature, there is something lacking in the organisation required to bring the results under the notice of the farmers.

Mr. Foley.]

They are not induced to adopt methods that are proved to be practicable. There seems to be some lag in that respect, and I suggest to the Minister that special consideration be given to the matter. Take, for instance, the good work of the wool section; it is hardly ever mentioned. There are some very capable officers in that section. The farmers can have their wool scientifically graded at a very low cost and placed on the first floor in the wool-sale room, and thus obtain a better price than otherwise. Comparatively few farmers send their wool to the department. They prefer the old method of sending it through an agent, who just dumps it on the lower floor of the sale store which the buyers very seldom visit, with the result that it brings the lowest price. There is quite a good deal to be done in publicity work. I think that if the advantages of modern methods were demonstrated to the farmer, he would soon break away from the agent who has done his work for years. The same applies to the work on the experiment farms. Although I have visited the Biloela district, which is portion of the Normanby electorate, quite a number of times, I have only once been able to visit the experiment farm; but the explanations of the man in charge convinced me that considerable work was being done in cotton culture and with grass experimentations, which the average farmer never sees at all, although he may live next door to the farm. Apparently there is something lacking when this good work cannot be brought under the notice of the farmers. I have a suggestion to make to the Minister. I have had the pleasure of seeing one or two very fine pictures demonstrating the work of the Department of Agriculture and other departments. The methods adopted are forcibly brought home to every person who studies those pictures. I suggest that if the Minister devoted some attention to adopting the film as a publicity agent, the cost—even though it may be several hundred pounds—will be amply justified by the knowledge that will be disseminated. The hon. gentleman can arrange for the display of films in farming districts describing the experiments carried on in farming. The farmers and their families who congregate in the larger centres at the week-end for recreation purposes would receive a splendid education. The radio has also been used for this purpose. I have heard various departmental officers, including the editor of the "Agricultural Journal," discoursing over the air, but I doubt whether these means are as effective as some think. The film method conveying ideas by pictures to those directly interested will bring home to the farmer the advantages of adopting up-to-date and scientific methods in place of the old ideas. Much can be done in that connection.

There is also room for investigation into the methods of farming that are practised. As I mentioned on another vote the individualistic system of farming operates in Queensland. We are passing through a period of low prices which has served to emphasise that many farms are over-capitalised and are unable to produce primary commodities at a profit with the existing price levels. They are unable to meet their obligations to the Agricultural Bank, the Department of Public Lands, and other creditors. We must study what is going on in other parts of the world under a different system of farming altogether. I have read

[*Mr. Foley.*

quite a lot of what is being accomplished in Russia. Many splendid articles on this subject appear in the various magazines. (Opposition interjections.) There is no reason why hon. members opposite should sneer when Russia is mentioned. We might learn something from Russia.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The biggest experiments in farming in the world are being carried out there. (Opposition interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FOLEY: More scientific farming experiments are being practised in Russia than in any capitalistic country. I do not say we should adopt the Russian system, but if it is true that production has trebled in Russia as a result of collective farming, we must acknowledge the achievement. I doubt if we can say that of the individualistic farming system in this country. The greater use of machinery is also a factor to be considered. It is an impossibility to expect machinery to be applied to a great extent in Australia because of the individualistic method of farming. Immediately the farmer purchases a tractor or other agricultural machinery he over-capitalises his business because his area is too small. It would be advisable for the officers of the department to study more modern and scientific methods. If necessary send them to Russia to ascertain whether any information and advantages to Australia can be gained. No matter what the country is, or what the social system may be, if we can learn anything from their methods or gain anything by applying them in this country we should do so. The hon. member for Port Curtis very aptly explained what is being done in the field of cotton culture. Credit is due to the officers in charge of that section, as well as the Cotton Board, for the efficiency of the organisation.

One bugbear that worries the farmers in the Biloela and Burnett districts is the question of the reduction in the cotton bounties that were brought about by the Financial Emergency Act. At the present time the price obtained for cotton is very low. Last season it realised an average of 3.2 pence per lb., which is a very poor return. One has only to consider the arrears of rent to the Lands department, the arrears of interest and redemption to the Agriculture Department owing by the cotton farmers to realise that although they are producing cotton and increasing their acreage, it is not profitable for them. The Minister should press on every possible occasion for a restoration of the reduction that was brought about by the Financial Emergency Act. Restorations have been made to other sections of the community—to the salaried officers and others—by the Commonwealth Government, but the cotton growers merit some assistance from that Government too, particularly in view of the fact they are producing a product that is not a payable one.

I commend my suggestions to the Minister and sincerely hope that some good will result.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) [3.22 p.m.]: The industries associated with this department are the foundation of our economic structure; consequently the department plays an important part in the lives of the people, and the Minister and his officers have very

important duties to discharge. I recognise that there are many difficulties associated with rural industries, but the department is devoting much time and attention to the development of scientific methods in farming and grazing pursuits.

An examination of the Estimates for the various departments discloses the fact that the senior officers of the department have not been considered to the same extent as officers occupying high positions in other departments. The Assistant Under-Secretary is a very able officer, and I see no reason why he should not be granted a rise of £40 in common with other Assistant Under-Secretaries.

Mr. GAIR: If that provision were made you would oppose it.

Mr. BRAND: I would not. I stand for the rights of public servants. I have a public right to champion the cause of officers in any department.

Mr. GAIR: You are a critic of the public service.

Mr. BRAND: I have never criticised salaries to the detriment of the public servants. Does the hon. member stand for the granting of an increase to an officer in one department and not to an officer occupying a similar position in another department? I hope the Minister will see that responsible officers in his department participate in increases to the same extent as officers in other departments.

It would be idle to say that the people who are engaged in agriculture and stock pursuits in the State are in a sound position. It would be equally idle to say that the department and its officers have solved the many problems associated with those industries. Their solution is a work that lies ahead of the department and the producers. The difficulties of production are still with them. I wish to pay a tribute to the men in the rural industries of Queensland who have done so much for the State. The people should be grateful to them for their assistance in increasing the production of the State. Farmers and graziers are fighting a valiant battle to maintain their economic status. They are making use of every means that science can provide. Our rural industries are of great importance. The principal agricultural industry is the sugar industry, which extends throughout the coastal areas of the State. Its biggest problem is over-production, which the industry is much concerned about. We cannot pay too great a tribute to the men in the National Parliament of Australia, who have recognised the difficulties of the industry, and have endeavoured to overcome them by an agreement providing for a stabilised price, thereby enabling it to carry on. The Commonwealth Government made a splendid gesture when they gave an assurance eighteen months prior to the expiration of the sugar agreement that the agreement would be renewed for a further period of five years, thus ensuring a stabilised price until 1941. I was surprised to read in the Press the other day that the sugar growers were anxious that the Premier should proceed to London to represent the industry at the International Sugar Conference that is to take place next year. It was known throughout the sugar producing countries of the world, especially those interested in the Chadburne plan which had for its object

the restriction of production that a request was made to the British Government to convene a conference representative of all sugar countries to discuss the position that would arise on the expiration of the Chadburne plan. That meant that Australia would need to have a representative at the conference. The object of the conference is to endeavour to stabilise sugar prices, but it is a matter of much concern to the people of this State. So far as I have been able to discover, nobody has up to the present invited anybody in Australia to send a delegate to attend the conference. A public announcement at the present time would be premature. It would indicate that the sugar producers of Queensland are precipitate in their actions. We know that they are not. I know that up to the present the sugar industry in Queensland has made no suggestion that a delegate should be sent to the international conference in London. It is manners to wait until one is asked. The people in the industry will do the correct thing. They will wait until they are consulted regarding a delegate to represent them in London. Notwithstanding the notice in the Press that a section of the sugar growers have requested the Premier to represent them in London, I know they have not yet been consulted about a delegate nor have they asked for certain things. I am not endeavouring to infer that the Premier is not competent to represent them.

The sugar growers are not unmindful of the fact that the Federal Government are working very hard in the interests of the industry. They have no desire to tell the Prime Minister and his Government who shall represent the Commonwealth Government at the London conference. The Mackay cane growers have taken certain action, but that does not bind the whole of the cane growers of Queensland. I can only say that I believe that the whole of the sugar growers will pay a tribute to the Minister for Trade and Customs, the hon. Mr. White, for continually championing their cause against the people in the South who are protesting against the continuation of the sugar agreement and its ratification by the Federal Government.

Mr. JESSON: Do you not give some credit to the Premier of Queensland?

Mr. BRAND: I do, as far as he is concerned with the administration of the industry in this State, but I believe that the Federal Government will appoint a man to represent the industry in London who will see that the sugar producers of Queensland receive a fair deal. Press reports have already indicated that it is not likely that the Premier will represent the Commonwealth Government, and that Mr. A. R. Townsend is more likely to be chosen. However, I wish to protest against the premature announcement, particularly when the Commonwealth Government are protecting the sugar industry in every way.

It is quite possible that after the international conference of sugar interests in London, a conference will take place of representatives of the sugar interests of the British Empire, and that many matters of vital concern to the sugar industry in this country will be discussed. It must be remembered that the Ottawa Agreement, which gave protection to the sugar industry throughout the British Empire, gave a preference of £3 15s. per ton on sugar exported to Britain, and that preference is to continue

Mr. Brand.]

until 1937. In other words it will apply to the 1936 harvest of this country. The British Government also gave an assurance to the Dominions that no alteration would be made without first giving eighteen months' notice to the Dominions. So far as I can ascertain, that notice has not yet been given. I believe that the representatives of Australia at the London conference will watch our interests, and will secure treatment equal to that extended by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain at Ottawa, because Mr. Baldwin has indicated in his policy speech that trade between the Dominions and the mother land should be maintained and developed.

Mention has been made of the administration of the department by the hon. member for Cooroora, as Secretary for Agriculture in the Moore Government. It has been stated that the peak-year plan should have been instituted for the year 1928, instead of the year 1929. The hon. member for Mirani made reference to the matter, but he knows that the then Minister, the hon. member for Cooroora, gave the sugar industry all that it asked on that occasion. In adopting the year 1929 as the peak year he was carrying out the wishes of the industry. That was decided on by the sugar representatives in conference.

Mr. WALSH: They did not.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member should know that at the last Queensland Cane-growers' Conference he raised the matter, and only three delegates supported him, whereas thirty delegates contended that 1929 should be the peak year. The chairman of the conference intimated that he had no doubt that at that particular time it was decided to recommend the year 1929 to the then Secretary for Agriculture.

Mr. WALSH: By the sugar interests; not by the sugar growers.

Mr. BRAND: I can only repeat what was stated. The hon. member for Mirani heard the arguments—he knows the result, and he knows what the chairman of the conference told him. I was pleased to hear from the Minister of the formation of an advisory committee in connection with sugar experiment stations. He may be able to tell me the recommendations of the advisory committee to him regarding the salaries of two of the senior officers connected with that department. They are advising the Minister in many matters affecting the sugar industry.

Mr. JESON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Isis in order in discussing the sugar industry at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN: So far the hon. member has been perfectly in order. If he gets out of order I shall advise him of it.

Mr. BRAND: I was particularly careful not to incur your displeasure, Mr. Hanson. I knew that if I got on to a certain phase of the matter that you would soon pull me up. However, I should like the Minister to reply to my question. I take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of a number of growers of the action of the Minister in creating a district executive in the Isis area. I have been elected the first chairman of that executive, which is doing some excellent work. The members appreciate the good work of the Minister in their interests, and they wish me to express

[Mr. Brand.

their appreciation on the floor of this Chamber.

Speaking in regard to the wheat industry, it seems a great pity that the whole of the western areas should be without an experiment station. Whatever may be said as to their value, we must realise that experiment stations are essential in certain areas. We must have one to deal with the products grown in the tropics. Good work has been done at Roma in connection with wheat-growing, and I should like to know from the Minister whether his officers recommended that the station be closed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The man who was principally concerned was Mr. Soutter. Recognising that he was only getting about one effective year in three he made the suggestion to me that the station be closed, and that we retain twenty acres for experimental work. That was done.

Mr. BRAND: When I was on the Roma experiment farm I thought it was doing a great work. I think it is necessary to have that station in the west where so much land could come under closer settlement for agricultural purposes. When the Labour Government purchased Mt. Abundance station a few years ago at a heavy price, and cut it up for closer settlement, they inserted a clause in the lease to the effect that the grower should grow wheat on one quarter of the area. To-day we find it is necessary to close down a station almost adjoining it! I understand that the restriction on those growers has been removed, and they can produce whatever they desire. It should have been done long ago. I regret that it is necessary to close any experiment station, particularly in these days when they should assist in developing our primary industries.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you remember voting for the closure of the Home Hill sugar experiment station, the only irrigation experiment station in North Queensland?

Mr. BRAND: I do remember voting for the closure of that station for the simple reason that other sugar experiment stations existed in close proximity, and it was recognised that those stations were doing greater work than that accomplished at Home Hill. The Minister has not endeavoured to re-establish it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Your Government sold it.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. gentleman has taken no steps to re-establish it. It is an easy matter to purchase another one if he desires. We have experiment stations right along the seaboard, but not one in our western areas. An experiment station in the West could demonstrate the possibilities of embarking on industries in that climate.

The Minister referred to the cotton industry, which is a very important one. It is an industry for which there is an assured market, although the price for the commodity is not what we should like. Nevertheless there is a big market for cotton both in Great Britain and Japan. The Minister should give careful consideration to the development of this industry along national lines, and endeavour to obtain greater assistance from the Federal Government than is obtained to-day. The Moore Government rendered the best service to the industry by

guaranteeing a price for cotton. It is to be regretted that the policy was not continued. The Moore Government assisted the industry to develop by incurring an expenditure of £30,000 to pay part of the guaranteed price. The industry has not received the same treatment from the Federal Government. It is capable of settling thousands of people on the land and giving employment to many thousands of workers. It is one that offers the department great opportunities, and is one worthy of the best efforts of the Government and Parliament. The Commonwealth and State Governments should adopt a common policy for its advancement and protection, particularly by granting a bonus. This policy would result in a much greater production of cotton. The price for cotton is not sufficiently attractive to enable the industry to be developed on a large scale. The area under cotton this year has increased by 20 per cent. That is evidence of what can be done in this great industry if both the Federal and State Governments will assist to develop it in a proper way.

Mr. CONROY (*Maranoa*) [3.46 p.m.]: I take this opportunity of complimenting the Minister and his staff on the very able manner in which they have carried on the work of this important department. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the Minister concerning Mr. Soutter, Living at Roma, as I do, I have been in close contact with that gentleman ever since he was appointed manager of the farm. I have had many opportunities of meeting him not only as an officer of the department but also as a private citizen. My remarks and the remarks of the Minister would be endorsed by every resident of the Maranoa district who have had the pleasure of meeting him. Several hon. members have alluded to the closure of the Roma State Farm. It was in existence for about twenty-one years, and during the whole time Mr. Soutter was its manager. He has carried out many important duties, and has evolved many different breeds of wheat.

The Minister stated that 20 acres of the area are still available for experimental purposes. When it was learned that the farm was to be closed the chamber of commerce at Roma called a meeting, and a deputation consisting of the Hon. J. M. Hunter, one time member for Maranoa in this Parliament, Mr. Bottomley, President of the Royal National Association, Brisbane, and Mr. E. A. Thomas, Chairman of the State Wheat Board, was appointed to wait on the Minister. I introduced the deputation, and the Minister suggested that the best procedure first of all would be to give an explanation as to the reasons that actuated him in closing the farm. The fact that no member of the deputation raised any further objection to the closing of the farm at Roma and that no report was made by the deputation to the body that appointed it indicates that the explanation by the Minister was entirely satisfactory. As the Minister has stated, the decision to close the farm met with the approval of Mr. Soutter. I have been more closely associated with the State Experiment Farm at Roma than hon. members opposite, and I am therefore more qualified to speak on the matter. I was concerned about Mr. Soutter's position, but I am very pleased to say that he has been appointed as a wheat breeder and that his services will

be retained by the department. In his new position he will be able to do more effective work in the interests of wheat growing than it was possible for him to do in his former position as manager of the farm. The hon. member for Dalby said it would be advisable to convert it into a demonstration farm. I consider the area would be too small for that purpose, and I do not agree with the suggestion. Although the instructor of agriculture at Roma will not carry out all the duties performed by Mr. Soutter, nevertheless he will be of great assistance to the people connected with agriculture and stock matters in the Maranoa district.

Although the State farm has been abolished the loss will not be as great as hon. members have endeavoured to make out. Once an old established institution, such as a State farm, is abolished, naturally there is a feeling in the locality that its abolition will be a great loss to the community. I am quite sure that the action of the Government in transferring Mr. Soutter to another sphere will be appreciated in the future, and that the great services he rendered to the State in the past will be continued.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [3.56 p.m.]: I was pleased to hear the Minister admit that all wealth comes from the soil. I heartily agree with him. Every argument put forward on behalf of the producer confirms the fact, particularly in Queensland, and the logical conclusion is that the Department of Agriculture is the most important. There are a large number of people engaged in agriculture who must look to the department for assistance from time to time. I know the departmental officers, and I have a great regard for them. Every hon. member who has spoken on this vote congratulated the Minister and his officers, but I do not think there was any occasion to repeat the eulogies. I do not think they care very much whether they are congratulated or not. I have a great admiration for the energy and enthusiasm of the Minister, because it is only by the possession of those attributes that he can hope to cope with the many problems of agriculture, and thus bring about a better understanding that will make for increased production. The hon. member for Wide Bay spoke about tuberculosis in cattle. Listening to the speech of the hon. member one would gain the impression that the herds were so affected that they were a grave danger to the human race. As a matter of fact, the incidence of tuberculosis in the cattle of Queensland is no worse to-day than it was in years gone by, and it is no worse in Queensland than in the other States.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: How do you know that?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I know it from the inspectors of stock. It is quite easy to give the public the impression that they may get the disease by eating part of a diseased animal. Science has determined that one in every ten pigs will show signs of tuberculosis after being fed with the milk obtained from a tubercular cow, whereas only one in every 4,400 persons have been known to get tuberculosis from the milk of a diseased cow. If tuberculosis was spread by the milk of a cow suffering from tuberculosis to the degree that some people imagine I am sure many of us would not be alive to-day. I agree that every effort should be made to stamp out this disease, or

Mr. Plunkett.]

mitigate it as far as possible, and it is interesting to note that it is claimed that a discovery has been made, and that in a few years we shall have a cure for tuberculosis in cattle. We are very interested in the discovery.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I will give some information about that presently.

At 3.59 p.m.,

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

Mr. PLUNKETT: It must be apparent to everyone that the present high charges make it impossible for the small grower to import stud cattle. I understand that the shipping companies and the Commonwealth and State Governments are now considering the question of reducing freight on stud cattle. Just how far they have gone, I do not know, but I know that it costs £197 to land a horse at the nearest port in Australia after purchasing it in England. The cost of importing a bull is £104, and for two sheep £60. Those charges are too high for the ordinary man to pay, and the Government would be well advised to co-operate with the shipping people and the Commonwealth Government with a view to make importations from overseas possible. Anyone who has been to the Smithfield market must admit that Argentine beef stands above that exported from other countries. Even Scotch beef has to take second place. When we consider the question as to how Argentina has proved so efficient in meat production compared with other countries in the world, we realise that it is because they purchased stud stock from England over many years, coupled with the fact that alfalfa grass grows wild in the Argentina, thus making it possible to depasture stock very cheaply. We cannot possibly compete with Argentina—our costs of production are too high—but we can improve the breed of cattle. It will be necessary to import cattle before we can do that, and we must keep on importing them if we are to compete with other countries on the world's market.

I was interested in the Minister's remarks as to whether pork should be scalded or singed. I had an opportunity of seeing the process adopted in Denmark, where the pigs were not only scalded but were also put through a dehairing machine and a singeing retort. I think that method is now adopted all over the world. After singeing, the skin on the bacon—after it had been cured—does not get as hard as it otherwise would. When discussing this question with a large distributor of Australian, New Zealand, and Danish pork, he expressed the opinion that Australia would never do as well as the other countries until she adopts the singeing process.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The abattoirs are installing a singeing plant.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am sure that it will now that Mr. Sunners has been overseas. There is no doubt that we are subject to a lot of competition from other countries who specialise in these matters, and I urge the Minister to send important officers of his department overseas to see what can be done. It is only by having first-hand information of what is happening in other countries that we can hope to become efficient. The Minister is to be commended upon sending his officers overseas to acquire infor-

mation that will be of value to Queensland and Australia. The policy is a very wise one.

The Danish people have developed a pig that is really outstanding, and the prices they secure for bacon in the world's markets are always higher than those secured by other countries. The bacon is of even thickness, the hams are better than English or Polish hams, and the sides are longer. Anyone comparing the bacon sides with ours would immediately conclude that the Danish bacon was the best in the world, as is recognised by the prices it brings. The Minister mentioned how the large white pig had developed in Australia. That is true, and it will develop more. At the same time, it is not up to the standard of the Danish pig. The Danish pig has a greater length, greater depth, and greater breadth of back, and it has the ham of a Berkshire. It is impossible to get a pig from Denmark. The Government will not allow them to be shipped out of the country as they claim they are something out of the ordinary. They have developed their own dairy cow, and though not impossible, it is very difficult to get a dairy beast away from there. We cannot compare our dairying conditions here with conditions in other parts of the world. I have come to the conclusion that our dairy cattle in Queensland are not as bad as many people make them out to be. They are not so well fed. We should first endeavour to improve the quantity and quality of our butter by attention to our pastures. If our cows were fed like the cows in countries overseas, our production per cow would be doubled. Our cattle very often have to scratch for themselves, and during winter months or droughts it is impossible to obtain milk from them. It is surprising that we get as much from them as we do. New Zealand enjoys a very high return, because the cows get more to eat. New Zealand has developed its pastures more than any place I know. We talk about fodder conservation, but in New Zealand growers have made grazing pastures available the whole year round.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They have the rainfall to make it possible.

Mr. PLUNKETT: That is the point. In Denmark and in northern hemisphere countries the rainfall is more regular, and they know before they plant just how much they will need to grow to tide them over with their cattle. Here we have to deal with climatic conditions that no one can forecast with accuracy, and it is impossible for us to make the same provision for cattle in a drought period as they do in other parts of the world. Moreover, in a large State like this there are all kinds of pastures and different methods of handling stock. We are told, "Test your herds and everything will be all right," but that is only part of the trouble. It is a very important factor, but before herd testing can be worth while the cattle must be properly fed. Testing a herd that is not looked after in that way is not of much value. We realise, with the Minister, that this improvement cannot be brought about in one, two, or three years.

It is unfortunate that a lot of people endeavour to blame the department and everyone connected with it for not obtaining a greater percentage of butter fat per cow, without first giving consideration to the conditions under which it is produced. The hon.

[*Mr. Plunkett.*]

member for Normanby said. "You must tell the farmers." That is quite all right. We can tell them, but telling them is one thing and making them do it is another. We must recognise it is impossible for the producers to accept the advice of every person that comes along, whether he be a departmental officer or otherwise. Our farmers have from time to time been advised in so many different ways that they demand an ocular demonstration of the efficiency of the new method. It is an easy matter to say how a task should be done, but it is another to show how it can be done. We should not be disappointed if the producers do not follow all the advice that is tendered.

The top dressing of pastures is most important, and the department might make a special effort in that direction. I know what has been done up to the present, but if the clovers that are growing so luxuriantly this season in many districts could be grown over the dairying areas, we would just about double our production. At this period of the year it is absolutely essential that we should have clovers, but we must have top dressing and manure to grow it.

One hon. member said we lagged behind New Zealand in lamb production. The lamb export trade has not developed to the same extent in Australia. Australia is a wonderful wool growing country, and the people confine their attention to the breeding of a sheep that will give the best wool return, and have not specialised in the production of fat lambs as the producers in New Zealand have done. We could compete successfully in the fat lamb export trade if we specialised in the growing of lambs. We can look to Argentina for advice in the production of beef, and to New Zealand for advice in the production of lambs. To attain the prominence that those countries have attained in this connection we must specialise as they have done. The same remarks apply to the pork export trade.

I am concerned with the way in which carpet grass is spreading in the south-eastern portion of this State. I do not know how the Minister can deal with it. Carpet grass is eliminating paspalum grass in the South Coast district. Anybody who knows how paspalum spreads over scrub lands will be astounded to hear that in the course of a few years carpet grass can subdue it. It is an immense danger to our pastures, and it will be necessary to call science to our aid to eradicate it.

The department is doing its job very well. I am not disappointed with its progress, and I will not be disappointed if it does not accomplish all we desire in one or two years. It must be on the qui vive all the time to keep abreast with the new scientific methods. There is one important matter I wish to mention. The Minister holds firm to the belief that science will solve all our problems. I differ from him.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You never heard me say that.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I have.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No you haven't.

Mr. PLUNKETT: That is just where I differ from the Minister. The Minister is of the opinion that veterinary surgeons and other scientific men will solve all our problems. I have no objection to him engaging veterinary surgeons, but there is one way he

can help the dairying industry, and that is by the appointment of some officer who will assist to standardise our butter. Immediately a butter factory is in difficulty an officer should be made available. The Minister is now getting some revenue from the dairy farmers through the butter factories, and some of the money should be used to enable the producers to get some return through their factories.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am making provision for a special vote in that connection this year.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am glad to hear the Minister say so. We are increasing our exports of butter and other primary production. While we produce choice butter that is appreciated on the world's markets, there is too much lower grade butter, with the result that the sale of one article interferes with the sale of the other. We have not exported this year more than 49 per cent. of choice butter, notwithstanding the fact that new factories have opened, and the managers are doing their best. We want some outside expert to show them why they are unable to produce a larger quantity of first grade butter. It is no use blaming the farmer for the poor quality of some of the butter and cheese. When I was in London I had an opportunity of seeing this produce, and I saw quite a lot of the butter that had been exported. The manufacturing part of the business is not as efficient as it should be. Any action taken by the Minister that would result in an improvement in the quality of butter would be worth while, and it should be possible to increase the quantity from 49 per cent. to at least 86 per cent.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [4.20 p.m.]: There are one or two points I desire to refer to on this vote. I regret that members have not had the advantage of having the report of the department before these Estimates came up for discussion. The Minister did explain that the literary man of his department was engaged with the sugar technologists, and that, therefore, the report was delayed. Other departments do not have literary men compiling their reports. Members are not concerned with the literary quality of the report; all we want are the facts to be stated as concisely as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The report has been in the hands of the Government Printer for nearly a fortnight.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister seemed to think it was necessary that we should have a report of a high literary quality. All we desire is to know what is happening in the department. The facts may be set down crudely but concisely. The less there is to read and the more facts the better. We have no desire for a great deal of padding to be put into the report. It is an advantage to have a report in which the activities of the department are set out as concisely as possible, in order that they may be readily assimilated. The department is carrying out a great amount of work, and the more concisely its activities are stated in the report the more likely it is to be read and the more value it will be.

It was highly amusing to hear the Minister talking about the generosity of the Government and saying, "We do not charge them for it." As a matter of fact, the farmers are paying for it all. First of all, by the

Mr. Moore.]

payment of the bull tax, out of which the herd-testing expenses are paid. During the last three years the Minister collected £10,217 5s. 7d., and expended £8,510 13s. 11d., and there is a credit balance in the trust fund of £1,706 9s. 8d.

Another item I have been looking for in the Auditor-General's report that I cannot find, nor can I find it anywhere else, is what money the Minister collects in the way of ordinary revenue from butter and cheese factories that pay so much for every 100 lb. of butter and 100 lb. of cheese every half-year. In the revenue column an amount of £34,000 odd appears as receipts from the department, whereas the other departments give the details of what the receipts are for.

A fairly substantial sum must be derived from the levies on butter and cheese factories. I presume that it is utilised to meet the expenditure incurred in connection with the inspection of cheese and butter factories.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It does not cover it.

Mr. MOORE: The salaries and travelling expenses of herd testers are put down in the report, and they are more than covered so far. The Minister made a statement to demonstrate how efficient herd testing had been, and said that production had increased from £10 16s. to £14 14s. per head. That is all nonsense.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I was quoting a specific case.

Mr. MOORE: A specific case; but it does not apply as a general thing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Reverting to what you were saying a moment ago, the excess of expenditure over receipts, under the Dairy Produce Act in these particular activities, was £10,028.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman has got down herd tester, second herd tester, and assistant, and then travelling expenses, etc.

I do not know what else. There may be correlating reports in the office. That is put down in the Auditor-General's report and in his own report. There are other amounts of money collected from the butter and cheese factories. An amount of £5,500 must have been collected by way of levies from the butter factories. How much has been collected from the cheese factories I do not know. That money comes out of the dairying industry. It is money taken from the industry, and no doubt partly returned by way of salaries to the inspectors. Although I do agree to a point with what is being done I believe that it is not altogether the factories that we have to contend with. I am not a great believer in pasteurisation or neutralisation to cure defects that can be avoided. The first point is to obtain the primary product as clean and as pure as possible at its source. A great deal of the trouble arises from the fact that all supplies are not clean at their source. The distance between the source of supply and the factory is so great in some parts that it is almost impossible to deliver the cream in its purest state. This can be well understood in a State the size of Queensland. Sometimes two or three days must elapse between the separation of the cream and its delivery to the factory. There are all kinds of matters that enter into the question of the quality of the cream delivered. For instance,

[Mr. Moore.

quite by accident it was discovered that cows that had been fed on Johnson grass produced milk from which it was almost impossible to make cheese—the curd was soft and greasy. The inspectors from the department could not say what was wrong. The only thing that was discovered was that immediately the cows were fed on Johnson grass the trouble commenced at the cheese factory.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is another indication of the danger of importing grasses.

Mr. MOORE: It may be that Johnson grass does not have the same effect in North Queensland. I do not know whether that is so or not, but certainly it had that effect at some places on the Darling Downs. Johnson grass makes excellent feed for keeping cows in good condition, but it has some action on the milk that affects the making of cheese. No analysis of the milk has disclosed the trouble. If this happens with one particular feed it probably happens with some other classes as well. I was very pleased to read in the report the following with regard to the Meat Industry Board—

“In continuation of its policy of assisting in the rehabilitation of the livestock industry, the Board feels that following its expenditure on research in connection with the preservation of beef for long periods, its next step should be directed towards assisting the production of the type of animal which will give the desired finished carcass.

“To that end the Board has gladly associated itself with the Department of Agriculture and Stock in a plan of inaugurating special technical and instructional work for the benefit of cattle and lamb production. Included within the scope of the work that the department proposes to undertake, in association with the Committee specially appointed to co-operate with it, are the questions of diseases in animals, pasture improvement, correct use of animal foods, distribution of seeds, grasses and edible shrubs, the eradication of poisonous plants, and also such other matters as will be decided upon from time to time by the advisory committee. Obviously, any work in such directions will not secure results unless carried on without interruption for several years. The Board has, therefore, undertaken to support the department's plan for a period of five years, and believes that in so doing it will be assisting in a service which will be of inestimable value to the State as a whole.”

I quite agree with that. That was one of the objects for which the board was formed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I forgive you for establishing the abattoir.

Mr. MOORE: There is no question of forgiveness. The abattoir has been a financial success, and it is also a great advantage to the State. The Meat Industry Board is not solely occupied with the slaughtering of animals. It is also occupied with investigations regarding chilling of beef and the production of the right type of beef or lamb suitable for the export market. It is pleasing to note that it is undertaking the work that it is taking its duty seriously and co-operating with the department. If

we are to have a continuous supply of chilled beef it is absolutely essential that we greatly improve the breed of stock and method of fattening.

One disappointing feature of the agricultural position of the State is shown in the report by the Auditor-General on the Wheat Board. It is appalling that out of the total deliveries of wheat to the 1933-34 Wheat Pool of 3,950,129 bushels, the weight loss was 132,993 bushels, and that while the wheat was sold to the milling companies for 3s. 2d. a bushel, milling wheat at 2s. 3d., seed wheat at 4s. 4d., feed wheat and wheat-meal at 2s. 5d., it was sold overseas at only 1s. 7d. a bushel. The report says that the weight loss on intake is the largest recorded, and that the highest previous loss was 129,074 bushels in the 1927-28 pool. The weight loss in the 1927-28 pool was brought about by faulty construction of dumps allowing the water to get in.

We find that the Wheat Board took exception to an endeavour by the department to wake it up to what was happening. In the "Courier-Mail" of 12th May, 1934, the following article was published:—

"PINPRICKS BY MINISTER.

"Wheat Board Attack on Mr. Bulcock.

"Chairman Annoyed.

"Toowoomba, 11th May.

"Complaining of 'perpetual pin-pricks by the Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Bulcock,' Mr. J. J. Booth declared at a meeting of the Wheat Board to-day that growers would rejoice in defeat of the Minister.

"The chairman (Mr. E. T. Thomas) said that with Mr. Booth and the secretary (Mr. J. A. Watson) he attended the conference with the High Commissioner (Mr. Bruce), who had put quite a different complexion on the matter of restrictions, and had impressed everyone present with his arguments. The board would continue to endeavour to manage the growers' business as it thought it should be managed.

"Ever since this board has been elected we have been subjected to perpetual pin-pricks by the Minister for Agriculture," said Mr. Booth. "He has repeatedly interfered with our business, and on one memorable occasion he actually swung the axe over our heads, and said that if we did not meet the millers he would put into effect the recommendations of the commissioner. Mr. Bulcock has retired from the scene now, and I expect that a more peaceful atmosphere will prevail. The growers will rejoice—in fact, all the people of Queensland will rejoice with us—that we nipped in the bud the first attempt to introduce slavery into Queensland since the days of the kanakas."

It is a terrible state of affairs that wheat should be going overseas at 1s. 7d. per bushel and, at the same time, we are importing wheat from New South Wales and paying 2s. 10d. and 3s. 2d. It is also appalling to think that the weight loss on one crop is 132,000 bushels.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You will probably see further pin-pricks by the Secretary for Agriculture in the near future, because I cannot allow that article to go without taking some action.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister has now altered the system of election, and the board, instead of being elected on the basis of districts, is elected by a vote practically over the whole of Queensland. When the election was conducted in districts unsatisfactory conditions could be dealt with more easily. No one can suggest that a weight loss such as 132,993 bushels is satisfactory, and that it is proper to be exporting and importing at the same time, when we do not grow enough for ourselves! These figures, as shown by the Auditor-General's report, are interesting to me because during the 1932 election on the Darling Downs the great wheat ramp was the main subject of propaganda. The appalling conditions of the farmers under the agreement that was then in operation, whereby they received a higher price for wheat than any other farmer in the world was quoted by the Labour Party against us. The farmers were receiving 3s. 10d. per bushel—an extraordinary price during the period of depression. Yet the Government tried to make them believe—for political purposes—that they had been robbed. Some of the farmers were foolish enough to believe that, but most of them admit now they never had as good a deal as they had then.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It was all right as long as the sugar embargo lasted.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister knows that was not the only factor. A great deal of it was carried out by agreement. The millers in the South were prepared to agree not to invade this State until we have got rid of our crop. It was done by conciliation, and that is one of the principles of the party opposite.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You must have been a better conciliator than I was. I could not get them to do it.

Mr. MOORE: I think they were a bit annoyed with the propaganda that the Minister used to secure the return of his Government. The Southern interests said, "If that is the way we are going to be treated after giving concessions, we will see that it does not happen again."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They told me you only asked for it for a year—the sugar embargo itself.

Mr. MOORE: It went on for three years. I admit that the Minister is making every effort, but people cannot be blamed if they get annoyed at the imposition of these small taxes while increased difficulties are put in their way. Reporting the meeting held at Wondai on 11th May, the "Courier-Mail" said—

"MINISTER SHOULD RESIGN.

"Wondai, 11th May.

"The Minister for Agriculture should be called upon to resign, said the secretary (Mr. J. Stevenson), at the annual meeting of the Greenview Local Producers' Association.

"By precepting the Butter Board for the collection of the odious bull tax, he continued, the Minister had forfeited the confidence of agriculturists.

"This view was endorsed by a well-attended meeting. A resolution commending the Maryborough Dairy Association's refusal to pay the precept was carried unanimously."

Mr. POWER: That is why he was returned unopposed.

Mr. Moore.]

Mr. MOORE: He was standing in a district where the bull tax did not operate. The Minister may say how generous it is, but all these little taxes are a great annoyance. I suppose I am the same as any other farmer—I would sooner pay £4 or £5 in one amount than have to pay 10s. here and 10s. there and a few shillings for something else, involving a lot of returns that are annoying and difficult to attend to.

Mr. JESSON: Do you not think it is right if you are getting some benefit from it?

Mr. MOORE: Are people in the city being taxed because industrial inspectors go round?

Mr. JESSON: Of course, they are.

Mr. MOORE: As soon as a man goes out to inspect a cheese or butter factory we have to pay for it, but when an inspector goes to a city warehouse to see if the working conditions are in accordance with regulations, are the workers taxed to pay his salary? If you send the weights and measures inspector to the country districts to test a man's scales, he has to pay for it. We do not have to pay in Brisbane because an inspector goes around and takes milk from a milkman's cart to see if it is pure. We do not have to pay a policeman to summons a man for selling meat before 6 o'clock.

Mr. JESSON: Your comparisons are ridiculous.

The HOME SECRETARY: You forget that the man in the city pays the home consumption price for everything he buys.

Mr. MOORE: The man in the country pays the home consumption price for everything he buys and for everything he transports, and he pays for the 44-hour week in the Railway Department as well.

Mr. GAIR: You believe in a 30-hour week.

Mr. MOORE: Is it right that the farmer should pay a home consumption price for everything he uses in producing his goods?

Mr. POWER: These taxes are like medicine—they are good for the patient.

Mr. MOORE: It is not a question of taxes. I am talking about the home consumption price, and I am asking the Home Secretary not to forget that the farmer pays the home consumption price for everything he buys. If he is going to continue his business, it is necessary that he should get a home consumption price for his produce.

The HOME SECRETARY: He should get a home consumption price, but the city consumer pays his share for all those things.

Mr. MOORE: The farmer in the country is only getting what is right, the same as any other citizen. When it comes to services, such as herd testing or inspections, however, a tax is put on him in order to pay for them. In the case of other sections of the community a tax is placed on the people of the State as a whole to pay for such services rendered.

Mr. JESSON: The basic wage worker is more heavily taxed than any other worker.

Mr. MOORE: It may be that he is more heavily taxed by his organisation. That has nothing to do with this matter. At one time the producers had a voluntary organisation—before the compulsory pool system was adopted. They had a cheese marketing organisation and a butter marketing organisation. They were forced to combine in order to protect themselves.

[Mr. Moore.

I did desire to get the annual report of the department to find out the extent and nature of the experiments concerning pasture improvements. There are a number of private individuals in this State who, without Government assistance or Government supervision, are engaging in pasture improvement work.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Fortunately.

Mr. MOORE: That is so. That is all right for people who live quite close to them. They see the results and find out for themselves the class of fertilizer being used. If the department secured information from those people as to the class and quantity of fertilizer used it would assist its investigations tremendously, and it would obviate experiments in pasture improvements and the sending out of officers to supervise them. It may be that the information thus obtained will be required. It will be an easy matter in these cases to find out the nature of the country and the class of fertilizer being used.

At 4.45 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. MOORE: One fertilizer that is producing successful results in one district may be of little use in another. I know of an instance where fertilizer was used on a scrub area on the Darling Downs, and it had practically no effect whatever, yet within a distance of 20 miles the same fertilizer used on a black soil flat which apparently contained no seed caused white clover to spring up all over it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [4.46 p.m.]: I desire to thank hon. members on both sides of the Committee for the very generous tributes they have paid concerning the efficiency of the officers of my department. I am entirely in accord with them. I have the finest staff in Australia. These officers are making a very material contribution to the wellbeing of the body agricultural in this State. I feel that the thanks of this Parliament should be extended to them for the work they are doing, as it would encourage them to carry on, sometimes in the face of very adverse conditions.

Some reference has been made to the field officers. They are one of the most essential units in the department. The majority are giving excellent services indeed.

The hon. member for Nanango made some reference to tick control in the cleansing area. I would be entirely out of order in discussing that question on this vote, but I would point out to him that what is being done at the present time is as a result of an agreement between the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments entered into by an earlier Government. Our activities in Queensland are governed by the terms of that agreement. I do not believe that there is anything in the hon. member's suggestion for the control of ticks.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. members for Albert and Dalby raise the question of the Spahlinger method of controlling tuberculosis. That, perhaps is the most important question raised during the

debate. I have in my hand certain information that has reached me within the last day or so through our Acting Agent General in London, Mr. L. Pike. So important did Mr. Pike regard the document that he sent it out to me by air mail. It contains a wealth of information which hon. members should be acquainted with. As hon. members know, many years ago a resident of Switzerland named Spahlinger made a claim that he had discovered a serum that would immunise against tuberculosis. The scientific world laughed at him, and jeered at the claim, and said it was not practicable or possible. There were some people who believed that the last word had not been spoken in regard to this matter. Mr. Spahlinger mortgaged all his resources, and finally offered his tubercular formula to a financing house as security for the loans and overdrafts he had. This formula remained as a security in the hands of the financial house for ten years. The question was resurrected, and the Aga Khan, the chief of the Mahommedans, and certain other individuals, found the required amount of money and paid the Spahlinger overdraft, which resulted in the liberation of his formula. The evolution of the serum then began to take shape. In 1931 a Government that one would hardly suspect of being interested in this question to a great degree—I refer to the Government of Northern Ireland—invited Mr. Spahlinger to do certain work. This was long range work. It became necessary to determine whether the claims made by this gentleman were true or bogus. Prior to that there had been some favourable comment made by two pathological veterinarians who had investigated the case in Switzerland, but unfortunately a period of eleven years elapsed from the date of their investigations until Northern Ireland—of all countries in the world—became interested in the matter. The result of four years' experiment is disclosed in the report I hold in my hand. It is true that most remarkable results have been obtained. The British Government has invited Mr. Spahlinger to make his formula available to them, and he has done so; but the making available of this formula has not solved the problem because it has not been possible to apply the formula, because the veterinarians could not evolve the serum. The British Government have asked Mr. Spahlinger to admit one of their research workers to his laboratory in order that he may see the technique in the preparation of the serum. Mr. Spahlinger is prepared to make his formula available to Britain, and possibly he is prepared to make it available to Queensland. Although I have only had the report in my hands a couple of days, I have determined to take up with Mr. Spahlinger through our Acting Agent-General or the British Government, in order to ascertain if there is a possibility of Queensland participating in this work. The conclusion arrived at as a result of these experiments is a remarkable one. During the course of the experiments conducted over a period of four years in Northern Ireland, 100,000,000 bacilli per cubic centimetre per head were injected, absolutely a lethal dose in control animals.

Those not injected with Spahlinger serum died from within seventeen to nineteen days, and those that were inoculated with the Spahlinger serum regained their normal health, showed a slight temperature, and in some instances showed an abscess at the

point of injection, and they were kept for periods ranging from 600 to 800 days after inoculation. After they had been inoculated four months they were reinfested with virulent tubercle germs, and they showed no tubercular reaction. In view of these facts it may be that our present technique in regard to tubercular control will disappear. The men associated with this report are men whose words are law in the veterinary world. It is true that the conclusions they arrived at are such as to justify the very highest hopes that the Spahlinger treatment is not the bogus treatment many people were led to believe, but that it has definitely achieved the results it set out to achieve. I invite hon. members to listen to the conclusions arrived at by a group of these veterinarians who conducted the Northern Ireland experiments. The conclusions are—

“We consider that the injection of the ‘New’ Simplified dead Vaccine prepared by Mr. H. Spahlinger conferred a high degree of resistance against a massive intravenous injection of tubercle bacilli. The intramuscular method of vaccination in this experiment has given the most satisfactory results.”

The London “Times” and the London “Daily Telegraph” and various other papers in Britain have taken up the matter, and I have here cuttings from the various British papers. The first is from the “Daily Telegraph” of the 1st October. The editorial is entitled, “A Promised Boon to Public Health.” It proceeds to show what has been done in regard to the Spahlinger method. It would seem to indicate that very material progress has been made which eminently justifies the hope that tuberculosis—not only bovine tuberculosis—can be controlled in this particular way. The Queensland Government, in common with other Governments of the Commonwealth must necessarily take up this matter. The British Government is being urged to act, and the report from the “Daily Telegraph” of the 2nd October, states—

“SAVING CATTLE FROM TUBERCULOSIS.

“SUPPORT FOR NEW VACCINE.

“*Ministry Urged to Act.*”

“Spahlinger Report a Very Big Thing.”

It then proceeds—

“Mr. Henry Spahlinger, the Swiss scientist, yesterday discussed with me his discovery. The report on the test by the Northern Ireland Government has for him a special significance, for it is the first governmental recognition of his vaccine.”

Incidentally it might be mentioned that the Northern Ireland Government is so satisfied with the result of this particular work that they are now contemplating making inoculation with Spahlinger serum compulsory amongst all stock in Northern Ireland. The report proceeds—

“The report finally confirms the series of tests made in Switzerland and England, which proved that my bovine vaccine confers immunity on cattle against tuberculosis, said Mr. Spahlinger. Thus the experimental stage, on which I have been engaged for nearly twenty years is past.

[Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

"I am so happy to think that before long the vaccine will begin to do its good work and, by rendering the milk supply free from tubercle bacilli, save many human lives.

"There is no difficulty on grounds of cost to the general use of the vaccine throughout Britain. It can be produced in limitless quantities, and at a price which the poorest farmer could afford to pay.

"The Northern Ireland Government intend, I believe, to make its use compulsory after they have completed some little further work on the matter.

"This work, Mr. Spahlinger explained, is to determine the minimum dose of vaccine necessary."

I bring this under the notice of the Committee in consequence of mention made of the matter by the hon. member for Dalby. I take this opportunity of assuring hon. members that the Queensland Department of Agriculture—and I have no doubt other Departments of Agriculture in Australia—will now test this out to the fullest possible limit. If it only does half the things that the Northern Ireland report claims it has done it will have been the most valuable contribution to animal hygiene known over the past fifty years.

The hon. member for Fassifern when speaking on the question of the economics of the industry made some reference to the Director of Marketing. The Director of Marketing, Mr. Graham, has a very responsible job, and the time is not far distant when the office of Director of Marketing will become one of the most important in the State. A virile system of marketing organisation should be built up within the department, and because of that belief we have recruited some of our young and more promising men to that department during the past twelve months. One is taking a course of economics at the University. A very material result will accrue to the staff of the Director of Marketing. Some suggestion was made that we should offer greater protection to the marketing boards. The whole difficulty lies in the present interpretation of section 92 of the Constitution, and the position cannot be clarified until the pending action—the James case in particular—comes before the Privy Council. I dealt fully with this matter yesterday. We are all optimistic that from the results of the deliberations of the Privy Council we shall be able to establish a Commonwealth wide organisation and conduct those things that we are conducting to-day on a basis of much greater security than at the present time.

I was glad to hear the hon. member for Fassifern mention the work being done by the Stallions Board. It is true that there may be some stallions in Queensland that are still being offered for service although they have not been paraded before the Veterinary Board or have been condemned by that body. We circularised the police in the different districts at the conclusion of the last stallion parade, asking them to obtain information concerning any stallion that had not been registered or that was at service after having been disapproved.

It must be remembered that if we were too drastic in the early application of this

[Hon. F. W. Bulcock.

Act, we would inflict very grave hardships. When I first introduced this Act I told the Committee that we would be guided in our administration by the exigencies of each case, and every year we have progressively increased the standard. We have endeavoured to do that over a number of years, so that there will be no violent reaction to this policy. It is refreshing to me to find an hon. member associated with horse-breeding organisations in this State presenting a point of view in this Chamber with which I entirely agree, but which is very different from the views expressed by many hon. members opposite.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Many people in the country do not agree with you.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: But we must remember that the man who requires service to-day insists that the certificate be produced. That is one of the most hopeful signs I have seen in the rural situation.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: That only applies in a very small portion of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It applies over a very large portion of Queensland.

I should not like to resume my seat without paying a personal tribute to the accountant of my Department, Mr. Hooper. He has prepared the departmental Estimates for forty-one years, and, unfortunately these Estimates will be his last. Mr. Hooper commenced work as a clerical assistant in the public service in 1886, and became accountant of the Department of Agriculture in 1894. He has framed Estimates for the last forty-one years, and his method has been used as a pattern by the various other Government departments. He has been more than an officer to the fifteen Ministers under whom he has worked. Mr. Hooper is that rare type of individual, who is not only the Minister's accountant, but also his guide and friend. He has very largely contributed, by his skilful financial administration, to the success of the department. He is respected by everybody with whom he comes in contact, and during the war period he acted as chief clerk in the absence of the present Under Secretary, who was then chief clerk. Every officer in the department is grieved by the thought that Mr. Hooper is leaving. I am particularly sorry, because there is not a more honest, zealous, or conscientious friend in the department than Mr. Hooper has been to me and my predecessors. I hope that he enjoys a period of good health after he leaves the department, but there are personal circumstances that cause him to desire to be relieved of the work he is doing. I desire to pay a tribute on the floor of this Chamber to an officer who has done yeoman service for his State, and I feel that when he leaves the department will be the poorer for his absence.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [5.5 p.m.]: During a previous debate on this matter, I made certain remarks concerning interference by the Department of Agriculture with the workings of the Wheat Board. After those remarks had been published in the Press, the hon. member for Toowoomba asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"Have you received any communication from the Wheat Board approving or otherwise of the hon. member for

Dalby's statements in the House on the 3rd September regarding your alleged interference with the Wheat Board activities?"

The Minister replied—

"Yesterday Mr. Watson, the secretary of the Queensland Wheat Board, phoned to inform me that the wheat statements made in the House on Tuesday last by Mr. Godfrey Morgan were all made on Mr. Morgan's own responsibility. The chairman of the Wheat Board, Mr. Thomas, disclaimed any responsibility, and said that the statements made by Mr. Morgan were made without the knowledge or consent of the chairman of the Wheat Board or the Wheat Board."

This was my reply to that:—

"It is perfectly true that I did not consult any member of the Wheat Board in respect to my remark on interference by the Minister for Agriculture in regard to the sale of wheat. On the first opportunity I have I intend to prove conclusively that my statement was true in every particular."

Both Mr. Watson and Mr. Thompson refrained from expressing an opinion on the statement made by me as to its correctness or otherwise. You will notice that the 'phone message which the Minister was alleged to have received from Mr. Watson did not suggest that my statement was not correct. Certainly I did not consult them. It is not my business to consult any body of people on remarks I make in this House. I made the statement because I knew it was correct. It was borne out by a report that appeared in the "Courier-Mail" of 12th May, 1935.

Mr. JESSON: Before you made your statement or after?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: That was in 1934, and my statement was in 1935. The "Courier-Mail" of 12th May reported the incident as follows:—

"Ever since this board has been elected we have been subjected to perpetual pin-pricks by the Minister for Agriculture," said Mr. Booth. "He has repeatedly interfered with our business, and on one memorable occasion he actually swung the axe over our heads and said if we did not meet the millers he would put into effect the recommendations of the commissioner. Mr. Bulcock has retired from the scene now."

That goes to show that the Wheat Board believed my statement to be quite correct. They recognised that the Minister endeavoured to force the Wheat Board to sell to the millers at a price at which it was not prepared to sell.

Mr. JESSON: That is not right.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: How do you know?

Mr. JESSON: I do; I have studied it.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Minister endeavoured to force the board, by threats and otherwise, to sell to the millers at a price it considered was not fair. The board did not sell; it was prepared to allow the Minister to carry out all the threats he had made and to use all the power he had. I congratulate the board on the stand it took.

The result was that it got considerably more afterwards for the wheat it held.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It did not.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The hon. gentleman knows it made a much better deal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [5.10 p.m.]: I cannot allow the hon. member to make the statement he has made without challenging him. He said, in effect, that I interfered with the conduct of the Wheat Board during a period when certain things happened. We might take all the facts and put them in their proper chronological order to see what did actually happen. We had the flour embargo, which was an offshoot of the Sugar Acquisition Act. That was for the purpose of stabilising wheat and compelling the millers to grist the wheat grown in Queensland.

Mr. MOORE: They did not need to be compelled. They were only too anxious to do it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It did compel them. The instrument was, of course, entirely illegal, and the hon. member knows that the instrument was illegal. We carried that—

Mr. CLAYTON: Why use an illegal instrument?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member was a party to the use of it. He stood behind its use, and he must accept his share of the responsibility equally with myself. Then it became necessary, owing to certain facts, to withdraw that proclamation. If that proclamation had not been withdrawn we should have been in serious difficulties as a State. The accumulated sourness of the Southern millers, who had not been able to get any of their flour into Queensland, resulted in their adopting a dumping policy, more especially in regard to the northern areas of our State. The wheat crop was garnered, and there was no protecting instrument now. The only claim that the Wheat Board had was for geographical protection—the difference between Darling Harbour price and the cost of getting wheat from Darling Harbour to here, which was about 4½d. a bushel. It decided that it would not sell to the millers. They bought wheat in New South Wales to the extent of over 1,000,000 bushels. As the Leader of the Opposition points out, here was the Wheat Board refusing the Darling Harbour parity plus the cost of bringing the wheat to Queensland—the highest price obtainable in Australia—and at the same time shipping wheat overseas, while the Southern millers were bringing 1,000,000 bushels of wheat into Queensland. All this time our own wheat crop was being destroyed by rodents. Could anyone stand for that? The result was—as disclosed by the report of the Auditor-General—four shipments of wheat overseas realised 1s. 7d. per bushel. If my memory serves me right I offered the Wheat Board 3s. 6½d. per bushel for that season's wheat. Its obstinacy and its want of policy landed it in a very dangerous position. I frankly say that I did tell the Wheat Board

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

after a royal commission had been appointed and inquired into its affairs, that if it did not meet the millers we would give serious consideration to putting into effect the recommendations of the commission.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: You denied it when I said so.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I would not bother denying it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I say quite frankly that I did tell the board that it had to meet the millers as an alternative to an application of the recommendations of the commission. I have never denied that. The hon. member cannot produce any proof of my having denied that. The two parties finally came together. We used the recommendation of the royal commission as an instrument to bring the two parties together. No one could sit placidly and see the wheat crop threatened by a growing volume of mice plague, weevil infestation, the exportation of portion of it overseas on one of the world's lowest markets, and the bringing in of wheat from New South Wales for milling purposes to feed our people. Anyone who sat still while those things were going on would be recreant to the trust imposed in him, and would not be safeguarding the interests of the wheat producer. After the board had made four shipments on the overseas wheat market, which cost the growers a considerable sum of money, it decided to meet the millers. The two parties ultimately accepted a price a shade worse—in spite of all the insinuations—than I offered it—that is, Darling Harbour parity, plus the cost of transportation to Queensland.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The board denies that.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member has the patience to read the report of the royal commission, and carefully examine the whole position, he will see just what offer the Government did make.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The wheatgrowers endorsed the actions of the board by a unanimous vote.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Let me inform the hon. member that a member of his own party—I shall not name him—introduced a deputation to me. It asked that I should do certain things which would have resulted in making the board absolutely impotent.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: That has nothing to do with the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: After 1,000,000 bushels of wheat had been imported into this State, and after four small shipments of wheat overseas, which yielded 1s. 7d. per bushel, the board and the millers came together, and the net result of their deliberations was that the board accepted a price a little worse than I had offered them. Had it not been for the fact that I insisted on them coming together, I venture to say that the whole of the wheat crop of this State would have been jeopardised. I offer no apology for my conduct in the matter.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Why did you deny it?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member for Dalby persists in say-

[*Hon. F. W. Bulcock.*

ing I denied that I interfered with the Wheat Board.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I do say it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I did not interfere with it; I simply did these things which my office forced me to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: You admit you did interfere with it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I admit I did these things that were vested in me in my prerogative as Minister. I suggest that had the hon. member occupied my position and been confronted with the position he would have taken precisely the same stand as I did. It was obvious that the position required urgent attention. I could not see our wheat crop being dissipated because the millers and the board could not agree. I took the action I have described, and as a result a big portion of the wheat crop was gristed in Queensland. I will add this for the information of the hon. member: that while the board and the millers were at loggerheads, I got the millers together and asked them to import only their immediate requirements of wheat, so that there would not be big stocks of wheat on their hands. I did so in order that the Queensland crop would not be entirely displaced from milling and consumption in this State. That is the story of the whole matter. The hon. member knows it as well as I do. If we are going to bring pool boards into the stadium of politics, then pool boards are going to fall. Pool boards have a very great obligation to their suppliers. That obligation is to handle the crop in the most efficient manner possible and obtain the best market price.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Without interference by the Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. gentleman says, "Without interference from the Minister." If the position had been allowed to drift in the way it was drifting it would have been a calamity for the growers on the Darling Downs. As the result of the attitude taken up by me, and the negotiations that took place, no difficulty has since occurred in the sale of the wheat crop. The real basis of the difficulty was that the board got 3s. 10d. a bushel under the Sugar Acquisition Act, and it had to come down to the highest economic level it could get for its wheat, which was 3s. 6d. The board did not like to be a party to the sale of that wheat at a price of 4d. per bushel less than it obtained the previous year. I can appreciate their difficulties. It did become necessary to bring the parties together, the millers on the one hand, and the growers on the other, and my policy contributed in no small degree in achieving that object.

I have no apology to make, and I refute the suggestion of the hon. member that I interfered in any way with the functions of the Wheat Board.

Item (Chief Office) agreed to.

CHEMICAL LABORATORY.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*): I move—

"That £5,903 be granted for 'Chemical Laboratory.'"

Item agreed to.

COTTON INDUSTRY.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE:
(Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*): I move—

“That £9,110 be granted for ‘Cotton Industry.’”

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*) [5.22 p.m.]: Although the cotton industry has been beset by many difficulties it is surprising how it has developed in this State, particularly in the Central district. When I was in charge of the department the question was raised as to the advisability of using the Durango type. This particular variety showed remarkable growth at the cotton experiment farm, and the experts were keen on it, believing it was the best for Queensland. Other interests at that time were of the opinion that a short staple was required for Australian use. The Minister gave authority for the importation of different types of cotton, and I should like to know what has resulted from the experiments with them, or if any diseases have been introduced by them, and what the opinion of the officers of the department is as to the short varieties. Sooner or later the Federal authorities will alter the tariff relating to cotton. There are large numbers of people coming from the old country who are interested in the manufacture of cotton goods, and when they arrive in this State the Minister should see that they are shown what the white people have accomplished in the growing of cotton.

At 5.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Under the provisions of Sessional Orders agreed to by the House on 28th August and 16th October, I shall now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

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 5.26 p.m.