SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

THE AUSTRALIAN COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL PRODUCTION

THE *Australian Journal of Science* in an account of the Constitution and Work of the Australian Committee on Animal Production states that at the invitation of the Commonwealth Government, Dr. J. Hammond, of the Animal Nutrition Research Institute of the University of Cambridge, visited Australia in the autumn of 1938. He has submitted a report on the conditions of Animal Production in Australia, making the following recommendations:

> The major problems of the Australian Meat Board, the Australian Dairy Produce Export Board and the Australian Wool Board, are of general Commonwealth concern, and it would appear that the progress of the animal industry in Australia could best be served if an Advisory Committee of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research comprising representatives from these Boards, the Council, the Department of Commerce and Standing Committee on Agriculture, could be set up to make suggestions concerning work to be done in animal production, to accept responsibility for conducting the scientific work fundamental to the industry, and to coordinate the technical work going on in the different states through the research officers suggested above or by other means agreeable to the states.

This recommendation, according to the journal, sounded a rallying note welcomed by most of the bodies in question, so that at a meeting held in Melbourne and convened by the Australian Meat Board, representatives of all the State Agricultural Departments, the Australian Meat Board, the Australian Dairy Produce Board and the Council for Scienitfic and Industrial Research agreed that the establishment of such a committee would be advantageous.

The proposed body has become the Australian Committee on Animal Production. Its chairman is the Hon. H. S. Henley, a member of the Australian Meat Board. Its members are Dr. A. E. V. Richardson and Dr. L. B. Bull, of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research; W. J. Spafford, director of agriculture, South Australia; A. H. E. McDonald, of the Department of Agriculture, New South Wales; G. K. Baron-Hay, of the Department of Agriculture, Western Australia; F. W. Hicks, of the Department of Agriculture, Tasmania; H. A. Mullett, director of agriculture, Victoria; Professor Seddon, representing the Queensland Department of Agriculture; Ross Grant, of the Department of Commerce, and J. Proud, of the Australian Dairy Produce Board. A. J. Vasey, of the Division of Animal Health and Nutrition, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, is secretary.

The Animal Production Committee early appointed technical subcommittees to which were referred for consideration the report of Dr. Hammond and that of J. M. Coleman upon Fat Lamb Production in Australia.

There were five of these technical subcommittees, each of which dealt with a branch of animal production. These subcommittees dissolve automatically after their reports have been submitted.

THE DUTCH ELM DISEASE IN CONNECTICUT

DESPITE federal, state and local efforts to check the Dutch elm disease in Connecticut, the Agricultural Experiment Station at New Haven reports slow but steady increase and spread in 1940. Fourteen new towns were brought into the zone of infection as a result of summer scouting. One diseased tree was found at Preston, thirty miles from the nearest point of infection. Nevertheless efforts to save the elms continue —the federal work through the Dutch elm disease office of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and state work through the Experiment Station, represented by Dr. Roger B. Friend, state entomologist.

Altogether, Connecticut has found 1,686 cases of Dutch elm disease since the infection first appeared there in 1933. Many of the 378 diseased elms found last summer occurred outside the areas of infection. In general the spread was from adjacent towns where the disease had been found previously. The point of infection nearest to Preston, however, is Old Lyme, 30 miles away, where the last case appeared in 1937. Old Lyme lost seven trees in three years. At that time stringent measures were taken to destroy all dead and dying elms or parts of elms that might attract elm bark beetles, carriers of Dutch elm disease. Apparently the job was thorough since no more cases have been found in the vicinity.

During 1940 the U. S. Department of Agriculture has been responsible for scouting, elm sanitation and clean-up work in the state. Through its legal authority to carry on projects on private property when necessary, the Experiment Station cooperates with the federal agents by obtaining this permission for them. The station also is engaged in research, seeking a possible cure or control for the disease. This has involved an intensive study of the elm bark beetles and the materials that might repel or kill them, and the use of chemicals in disease control. So far no spray has been found that will prevent beetle feeding in the crotches of elms. However, creosote treatment of felled timber keeps them from breeding under the bark.

When trees showed outward symptoms of the disease, wilting and yellowing of foliage on terminal