powers of this proposed Board would be simply advisory, and whether it be appointed by Act of Parliament or by the Minister what is the difference? The Hon. R. C. Melrose—It would lead to the creation of another department. The Hon. T. McCollum—To the creation of a magnified department.

The MINISTER of AGRICULTURE—I cannot see in what way. It is easy enough to state fears, but in what way is there that danger? Mr. McCollum has referred to the autocratic powers of the proposed Board. Everywhere in the Bill where it is stated that the Board shall do certain things it is subject to the control and direction of the Minister, and members’ fears about the responsibility of the Minister being taken away are ill-founded. Where it is stated that the Governor may do certain things those matters have to go through Cabinet first, so there is no fear there. The power of the engineer at present is much more autocratic than it would be under the power of a Board consisting of these members.

The Hon. H. Tassie—Besides the engineer will the other two members be the inspectors?

The MINISTER of AGRICULTURE—that is so.

The Hon. H. Tassie—If the Board is to consist of the engineer and two inspectors why should it not be so stated in the Bill? As it is now worded it would be competent for the Board to be appointed of any persons in the Public Service whether they are in the Service Department or not. All that the Bill contains features which I object to—powers which seem to be more in the way of securing a council rather than co-operating with it—

I shall support the retention of this clause in the hope that the matter which I think go too far may be eliminated. If they are not eliminated I shall have the right to vote against the third reading.

Clause 6 declared passed.

The Committee divided:


The CHAIRMAN—There are 7 Ayes and 7 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Ayes, in order to allow of further consideration.

Clause 6 thus passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again, November 9.

DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT BILL.

The Minister of Agriculture, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill to promote and encourage the improvement of dairy cattle. Read a first time.

Second reading.

The MINISTER of AGRICULTURE (Hon. T. Pascoe)—Some time ago Mr. Peter Wallace made a gift to the State of certain lands for educational purposes. The Government appointed a fairly large and representative Committee to inquire into the question of the utilization of this gift. Certain matters came before the Committee, dealing with the agricultural industry as a whole, and some of them were referred to subcommittees for consideration and report to the main Committee, in order to economize time and so on. The adoption of the findings of the main Committee has been delayed, probably due to the reason being the financial condition of the State. The utilization of that fine gift of Mr. Peter Wallace was for educational purposes and to carry out the recommendations of the Committee, mean the expenditure of more money than we can afford at present. We had distinct recommendations from a subcommittee with respect to the improvement of dairy stock. I shall read the report of the subcommittee to the main Committee, which adopted it, and sent it to Cabinet. In turn Cabinet approved the recommendations, and this Bill is the result.

The report is:

Your subcommittee has held three meetings, at the last of which representatives of the following livestock associations attended:—The Dairy Cattle Club of South Australia, South Australian Wholesale Milk Producers’ Association, Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia. (1) That the committee request that improvement must come through the use of pure-bred bulls of approved milking strains, and that every effort should be made to discourage the use of mongrel bulls and to check bulls of this description being allowed to run at large, as is the case in many districts of the State. A knowledge of the milk-producing records of their cows will induce the majority of dairymen to make every effort to breed only from the best and to improve their stock by the use of bulls from tested milking strains. For this reason the subcommittee recommend that every effort should be made to encourage hard testing under official supervision. (2) That the Government, with the support of the Premier, should continue to encourage the stock-ascertainment services of the Dairy Tomlinson’s, referred to in the Bill and previously referred to, recommend that the Government be asked to introduce legislation to provide for—(a) The registration of all bulls of age of over 8 years of age inside the State. An annual fee of 10 shillings is suggested. This will not discourage the keeping of mongrel bulls, but will enable funds to be raised to enable the Government to carry out the recommendations. (b) That an annual sale or sales of pure-bred dairy bulls be held under the auspices of the Minister of Agriculture. (c) That with a view to encouraging hard testing and the use of bulls of tested strains, the Government should grant a subsidy on the cost of such bulls purchased by breeders who are prepared to place the bulls at the services of the owners of other dairy cows. Your subcommittee submits the following suggestions as the basis of the scheme, full details of which would require to be settled by a departmental committee. 1. Registration of bulls. (1) All bulls over nine months of age inside the State must be registered at an annual fee of 10 shillings. (2) All bulls over nine months of age inside the State must be registered at an annual fee of 10 shillings. (3) All bulls over nine months of age inside the State must be registered at an annual fee of 10 shillings. (4) Sales of bulls being held under the auspices of the State. There shall be an annual sale of pure-bred dairy bulls at such an advanced as the demand justifies; the bulls to be advertised in the Press and comply with the following conditions:—(a) The bull must be pure-bred or eligible as foundation stock for Australian Herd Book entry. (b) No bull shall be sold which is not a registered animal of officially tested stock with satisfactory performance records according to standards to be fixed. (c) The minimum weight must be 600 pounds. (d) The buyer must have passed the official tuberculosis test. (e) Subsidy to Purchasers of Approved Dairy Bulls. (1) Subject to the following conditions the Government shall offer to approved purchasers of such bulls, provided for in 1., a bonus of 20 per cent. of the purchase price. (2) The bonus shall be paid to owners whose cows have been purchased for a term of 3 years, and must have served up to 70 cows. The application for bonus to be made on forms supplied by the State and in accordance with the instructions of the Government, representative of the Australian Dairy Tomlinson’s. (3) That the Government allow the bull to be available for other owners of cows for service at a fee not exceeding 30s. per cow. (d) That the bonus shall be paid to owners whose cows have served up to 30 cows for the same year, and that the bonus need not exceed 50 per cent. of the purchase price. (e) That the bonus shall be paid to owners whose cows have served up to 20 cows for the first and subsequent years. (f) The owner to supply to Department of Agriculture, a list of names of owners of cows and dates of services rendered, and such list shall be kept under conditions satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture. (g) The owner of the bull shall have the right to refuse to allow cows, which he may have reason to believe to be suffering from contagious disease, to be served by the bull; this may be subject to appeal to the Dairy Tomlinson’s. The purchaser shall take precautions against the spread of contagious abortion by regularly disinfecting the bull.

Generally speaking, South Australia possesses a poor lot of dairy cattle. The reason may be that they are taken as a whole, we have not been a dairying people.

The Hon. J. Grow—Because it was not profitable.

The MINISTER of AGRICULTURE—that may have something to do with it. One of the chief reasons why it was not profitable was because the cows did not produce sufficient butter to make it. It is no good burking the question. The settlers of this State have not been able to the necessity of keeping well-bred stock. They have trusted too much to luck in the production of their animals, instead of breeding on a scientific basis. Many of our settlers do not realize that even if dairying is not their chief means of livelihood, it is more profitable to keep a good than a bad strain of dairy cow. Further, no trouble is taken with respect to milking. The farmers will not even take the trouble to culminate their bull calves, and animals of this class of all ages find their way to the abattoirs. No encouragement has been given to the settler with a small herd to buy a good bull and to care for it properly. Whilst mongrels are roaming about the owners of dairy cattle will not pay a few shillings for the services of a good bull. The result is that people who, for their own benefit, have tried to purchase good bulls for their herds have received no encouragement from their neighbors. So the industry has gone from bad to worse. Years ago the Agricultural Department tried to improve the dairy stock by the purchase of what were known as Bureau bulls. The farmers took them and hired them out to the settlers. The result, however, was disappointing. Very few of the settlers were willing to avail themselves of the Bureau bulls, and the men who hired them were generally left to bear the whole expense. The result is that in the inside country, where at least there should be a fairly decent type of beast, the general thing is to find that the animals are no good for dairying, for beef, or for anything else. No wonder that visitors such as Mr. Exleyeney the Governor, who have taken a keen interest in cattle production in other parts, should feel...
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disgruntled when they see the type of dairy cattle in South Australia. Everything the Government has tried with the idea of improving our dairy cattle, while it may have increased the value of the stock, it has not increased the value of the herd, but also of any particular cow. One cannot bring into competition with his neighbors and can see the benefit of their better treatment or vice versa. The knowledge thus gained creates greater interest and impels the dairyman to utilize the scientific methods both as regards management and breeding. The general tendency will, therefore, be towards a better type of cow and greater wealth to the community. There are three essentials necessary to successful dairying. First comes good feeding and treatment. No animal responds more to kindness than does the dairy cow. Treatment is another thing by which one can increase the type of dairy herd, and that is within the reach of every man whether rich or poor as it means keeping only the calves from the best producers. The third essential is that of buying, for so far as one's financial position will allow, a well-bred bull that comes from a tested line of good milking. It may not be generally known how great an influence a bull has upon the quality of the dairy herd. This has been shown by breeders that cows transit milking qualities more strongly through their sons than through their daughters. You can generally get a better result from mating a good bull with an inferior cow than you can from mating an inferior bull with a good cow. The bull, therefore, is one of the most important factors in dairying. I have obtained a report on this question from the Dairy Expert, Mr. Storer, and the information he supplies is very interesting. His report is as follows:

The necessity for some action being taken towards the improvement of our dairy stock is clearly indicated by the fact that the average yield per cow or dairy test indicates that the best breeds are not bred upon lines to successfully fulfill the purpose for which they are kept. The proposal under consideration will ensure the stock of better type and of greater milk and butter producing capacity. Similar action has been taken by other countries. The Swiss Government, starting in 1893, voted the sum of $100,000 annually, and in 1902 he-satisfied were they that the improvement had been effected during the previous five years, and increased the annual amount to $200,000. Holland has also taken the matter up. In that country co-operative breeders, under the charge of a good bull is purchased, a limited number of cows are allowed, and every assistance is given, even to one or two breeders. The result is that many of those small dairymen have some of the finest type of milkers in the Netherlands. Good bulls, the property of these societies, are not allowed to be exported, but are retained for the country's own use. The pure of purebred sires, with substantial dairy milk and butter records, has been pursued consistently and has had uniform improvement in the class of stock and milking capacity. Numerous experiments could be cited. At the Ohio Experimental Station the records of many sires have been kept for many years, and it has been found that the very best sires produced two groups, one with the highest records of milk and fat, and the other with the lowest. This shows that the former bull's progeny (daughters) were as good. They yielded over all lactation periods 25.25 and 55.5 lbs. milk, 35.5 and 65.0 lbs. butter milk, less than their offspring of different types. On the other hand, the use of the pure-bred bull, with milk records on both dam's and sire's side, resulted in an increase in the number of cases from his daughters, and the progeny of 117.95 and 423.56. of milk and 341 lbs. of butter fat per cow in one period. There is not an average increase for the entire period of their lactations of 117.95 and 423.56 of milk and 341 lbs. of butter fat. Records show that the average yield for this bull was twice that paid for the first bull, who failed to transmit any increase in milk and butter capacity to the progeny. Taking an average of the best milk and fat per cow, 3000 lbs., 65.5 lbs., more than the average yield of the whole number tested. The figures for the worst herd are—Number of cows 19; mean yield of milk per cow, 286 gallons; 405 entire below the average of the best herd; and yield of butter fat per cow, 184 lbs., below the average of the best herd.

The Minister of Agriculture—In supplying those figures the Dairy Expert expressed some dissatisfaction with the type of the stock, the meat yield, the proportions, and the general condition of the cattle. It was his opinion that the stock was not what it should be and that some action should be taken to improve it. He suggested the establishment of a dairy cow farm, with the object of introducing and testing the best breeds of dairy cattle. He also recommended the appointment of a dairy expert, to be responsible for the improvement of the dairy cattle in the colony. He stated that the dairy industry was of great importance to the economy of the country, and that it was necessary to take steps to ensure its development and prosperity.
is proof that he is the chief factor in dairy cattle improvement. In countries where the systematic testing and keeping of milk records has been carried out the movement has been successful in every case, and has resulted in an appreciable increase in the milk yield of the various herds. In Canada the milk yield per cow has increased by 246 gallons and in Sweden by 200 gallons, while in Holland an average yield of 840 gallons has been obtained from 185,000 cows.

The Hon. W. H. Harvey—What is the period represented by the increase in connection with the three pure bulls mentioned in that report?

The MINISTER of AGRICULTURE—I suppose it is for the heritability period. Notwithstanding what has been done in South Australia in regard to herd testing and the importation of good milking strains, by the Government and by private people, very little positive good has resulted. Notwithstanding the propaganda work of the officers and the offer of a liberal subsidy by the Government only one herd testing society has been formed, and we have come to a position when it is time that something else was tried. We have tried importing and leasing bulls and we have tried to encourage herd testing, but we cannot get them that way. Now we must attempt something else to improve our herds, because it is a national question. By the registration or taxation of bulls the probabilities are that we shall get rid of the mongrels, because if a man has to pay 10s. per annum to keep a bull he will realize that if he does not need the animal he will not keep it, and that if he does need it it will be just as cheap, in the matter of registration, to have a good animal as to have a bad one. The registration fee will be 10s. in July for all bulls over nine months old, and for any who have come to that age in January a fee of 5s. will have to be paid to carry them on until the next July. Then there is the question of subsidising and helping dairymen to purchase good bulls. A financial scheme will be drawn up for that, and it will require officers. The tax will be one which will not go into the ordinary revenue. It will be set aside for the specific purpose of encouraging dairying generally, and it is hoped that the tax will make the scheme self-supporting.

The Hon. J. Carr—How will you tell the age of bulls?

The MINISTER of AGRICULTURE—As my friend, Mr. Melrose. Assuming that the average cost of subsidised bulls will amount to £20 and that 3,000 bulls will be registered, the following is an estimate of the amounts if the subsidy is withdrawn at the end of the fourth year:

- Expenditure—1st year, 25 bulls subsidised at £12 10s., £375; 25 old bulls £6 5s., £155 5s.; administration, £300. This year, 100 new bulls subsidised at £12 10s., £1,200; 75 old bulls £6 5s., £450 10s.; administration, £300. Fourth year, 100 new bulls subsidised at £12 10s., £1,200; 100 old bulls subsidised at £6 5s., £600; administration, £300. Fifth year, 200 old bulls subsidised at £6 5s., £1,200; administration, £300. Sixth year, 100 old bulls subsidised at £6 5s., £600; administration, £300. For the six years the total expenditure is estimated to be £2,375 is subsidy and administration, and the registration fees for those six years are estimated total £2,375, leaving a small balance in hand to come and go on. The exact scheme is not set out in the Bill, because the conditions will vary from year to year, and the Bill will have to be carried out very largely by regulation. A dairy fund is to be established out of which the subsidies will be paid, and into which all fines and registration fees will be paid. The details of the measure can be dealt with in Committee. We have every reason to be proud of South Australia in regard to the condition of most of our primary industries, but in the matter of the dairying industry we can only look upon ourselves as a rank failure and, as a community, view the position with shame. Once we get those concerned, however, to realize the need for a better breed of dairy cattle we see no reason why we should not raise the value of that particular industry at least threefold. Such is the state into which it has got that I believe we are getting only about one-third that we ought to get from the average of our dairy cows in this State. I move the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. W. G. DUNCAN seconded the adjournment of the debate until November 9.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 9, at 2 p.m.