

and improve its output by the means which nature can provide. That is a direction in which the Government might with the machinery at present at its disposal, give valuable aid if it were so inclined, charging the cost to the industry, of course, not to the community. Action on these lines would be less fraught with possibilities of friction than to pursue the attempt which is now being sedulously made to bring the industry under cast-iron military discipline in respect to marketing. And, as Mr. Hansen has suggested, the results to be looked for are infinitely more beneficial than any which may be expected to flow from the setting-up of a Board of political nominees to gamble with the farmers' produce.

IMPROVING THE DAIRY INDUSTRY.

Mr. L. Hansen, manager of the Kiwi Dairy Company (Limited), Christchurch, writes as follows: I have read with some interest an article from one of the local factory-managers regarding the proposed dairy-pool finance, and the estimated percentage of advances to dairy-farmers, should the Dairy Control Bill become law. Now, with regard to this particular article, the whole thing is simply a waste of words, inasmuch as it does not deal with fundamentals. Even supposing the Dairy Control Bill would possibly bring us in $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per pound more for our produce, it would cost that amount for its management, and the returns to the producers would be nil. Let us therefore get down to the root of the matter—the dairy-farmers. It is absolutely essential for the progress of the industry—especially as far as Canterbury is concerned—that we procure better-class dairy herds. This can only be done by introducing a high milking-strain of bulls. If we can produce 270 lb. of butterfat per cow instead of 150 lb., as the cows in Canterbury to-day are producing, it would mean an asset to the industry of over £10,000,000, spread over the whole of New Zealand. Canterbury is the Mecca of New Zealand. We produce the finest wool, mutton, and beef, and we also have a poultry industry ahead of any other district in the Dominion. We produce, too, cereals and potatoes for the whole of New Zealand; but the dairy cows, I regret to state, owing to the poor milking-strain used by the farmers, show the lowest records for the Dominion. As far as Canterbury is concerned, the dairying industry is the one which is most neglected. We, as a company, are prepared to go out to assist the farmers in procuring sires of a high-milk-producing strain, which would, in three years' time, increase the production according to the number of good sires introduced. It is only a matter of time when there will be, on the British market, a very fierce competition in the butter industry, and by going to the assistance of the dairy-farmers financially and educationally—as to the desirability of using the best sires, the care of cows and calves, and the selection of feed giving the highest nutriment—we shall be doing something of lasting benefit to the industry.

The pork industry can be made a very important industry for Canterbury. We have the facilities, and without a doubt can breed and produce the finest pork and bacon for export to Great Britain. Every year thousands of bushels of cereals are rejected which could be utilized for fattening-off the pigs. We understand that at the present time the Canterbury Frozen Meat Company are buying pigs from the farmers for export, and they are to be congratulated on the steps taken. Nevertheless, it is a very dangerous matter to commence exporting pork to the British market unless it be properly fattened and of a type acceptable to the British consumers. Most of the pork in Canterbury and elsewhere is fattened off with slop feed, and hence it is wanting in firmness, colour, and flavour. Slop-fed pork twists and turns when being fried, is tough in texture, and if kept for any length of time turns sour and becomes green in colour. For British consumption properly fattened pork of a desired breed is required. The Danes at the present time are exporting 55,000 hogs per week, and the pork industry in that country has superseded the butter industry in £.s.d. May I suggest, sir, that it only requires the assistance of your pen in conjunction with the industry to bring prosperity to our Canterbury farmers. The Farmers' Union have formed a dairying committee, and we sincerely hope that the Press will work in conjunction with the dairy factories and all who are taking a live interest in this vital business in promoting a competitive interest amongst the dairy-farmers and in fostering the formation of testing associations, the grading of cream, and the appointment of dairy-farm instructors.

I wish to make a correction with respect to the evidence I have given, sir. I made the statement that Mr. Grounds was not present at the Council meeting. I was misinformed, as Mr. Grounds was present at that meeting.

16. *Mr. Field.*] Assuming the large factory exercises one vote only, what would be the result if the thirty-eight factories that did not vote had voted?—I could not say, because I do not know how many of the small-factory directors had only one vote, or whether they would be for the pool.

17. *Mr. Hawken (Acting-Chairman).*] You say that you do export butter?—Yes; three thousand boxes or more.

GEORGE GIBSON examined. (No. 14.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Hawken).*] Do you wish to make a statement?—Yes. I am a director of the Rahotu Dairy Factory, and appear on its behalf. It is my privilege as well as my duty to appear before you in direct opposition to the proposed Dairy Control Bill as a representative of the Rahotu Dairy Company, and also on behalf of other individual suppliers of the factory. A meeting has been held, the matter has been placed before them, and without exception they are all against the passing of this Bill. I think the Committee will readily agree that this is a position one has some reason to be proud of, as the evidence that has been submitted to the Committee indicates that there are not many cases where the suppliers to a factory are unanimous on the subject. I have been some thirteen years only in this country, and part of that time—twelve years—I have been the director of a factory. Previously I was a farmer in the Old Country; so that I can look at the question from a dual standpoint. I wish to give you not only my own personal opinion, but, as far as I can, the opinions of my fellow-directors and suppliers. In fact, if it had not been for my duty at the company and the suppliers—working-farmers—I would still have been on the farm trying to forward the production of the Dominion. My suppliers—I am here to speak directly for them—wish to call attention to the methods which have been adopted in rushing this Bill along. I am not so much concerned with the non-carrying of the Dairy-produce Pool Bill last year, but I do wish to stress the point which has been raised as to the hasty and rush methods followed by the promoters in presenting the scheme to the public. My suppliers heard that after the Committee had considered the Bill last year the promoters considered it dead, and if the Committee on that occasion did not foster that idea they certainly never contradicted it, and naturally the great bulk of the suppliers thought that was the end of the matter. It was therefore somewhat of a surprise when it was found that the Bill had come to life again. In the circular issued to all dairy companies, signed by Mr. Grounds and Mr. Brash, marked "Confidential and not for publication," it was stated that it had been decided by the Dairy Council to press forward and secure the passage of the Bill, that the question had been before the dairy companies for some considerable time, and that no doubt it had