

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, August 25, 1954.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STEEL WORKS AT WHYALLA.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I ask leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Yesterday the annual report of the Director of Mines and Government Geologist was tabled. It is dated August 17, 1954, and attached to it as an appendix is a memorandum on the establishment of an integrated steel industry in South Australia, and I desire to quote from the conclusions which the director came to as follows:—

(4) In my considered judgment the Government would be fully justified in taking over the leases of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and the company's iron ore production plant and equipment if the company is unable to give any guarantees on the establishment of a steel plant at Whyalla.

Firstly, does the Government consider it right that a public servant should advise the Government, in effect, to repudiate an expressed contract made by Parliament? Secondly, will the Minister give an assurance that the Government intends to uphold the sanctity of contracts entered into by Parliament?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The reply is simple. Firstly, the report which the honourable member quoted is a report made by the Director of Mines to Parliament under Statute. It is not edited by the Government in any way and I am glad that the honourable member did not suggest that that should be done. The second part of the question was whether it is the Government's policy to repudiate contracts. To that I would say that nobody should be better informed to answer the question than the honourable member. This is not a repudiatory Government and there has never been any suggestion of repudiation.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Was not a similar question asked in another place last year and the reply given that the Government was negotiating with the company on the lines referred to today?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I am unable to say definitely what occurred in another place,

but negotiations have been taking place between the Government and the company on the matter.

COST OF ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Has the attention of the Minister of Roads been drawn to an article in the South Australia Transport Magazine of this year which states that road construction costs in U.S.A. have been reduced by 4½ per cent in the last year? If so, will he institute inquiries to see how that desirable state of affairs has been accomplished?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I have seen the statement and have inquired as to how it was accomplished and find that in the main it is due to reduced costs of materials.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Will the Minister continue his inquiries to see whether comparable reduction of costs can be achieved here?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—As members are aware, we face one basic difficulty, namely, the all-round increase in costs, but they can rest assured that we are taking all possible steps to reduce our costs.

SUBSIDIES ON PRIVATE SCHOOL BUILDING COSTS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a brief statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—This year the Government has subsidized on a pound for pound basis the various religious organizations that are constructing or furnishing homes for the aged or infirm. Will the Government extend that policy to religious organizations that are providing schools under very heavy capital expenditure?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The grants to which the honourable member refers are made to institutions providing for the care of the aged and have no relationship whatsoever to schools. If the honourable member desires his question to be submitted to my colleague, the Minister of Education, I will do so.

WHEAT STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT BILL.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Minister of Agriculture has stated that the preparation of the roll to enable the ballot under the wheat stabilization scheme to be held is well in hand. Can the Chief Secretary inform the Council what will be printed on the ballot-paper?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I have not seen the ballot-paper, but I presume it will ask

the voters if they confirm or do not confirm what is placed before them as a result of the conference of Ministers.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Another shot in the dark.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—If the honourable member needs any information to guide him in recording an intelligent vote I will go into the matter further for his benefit.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—When the agreement between the States and the Commonwealth on the wheat stabilization plan has been signed by all parties will it be submitted to this Parliament for consideration?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I would not think so. The agreement has been entered into subject to the poll and if it is accepted by the growers I think that the consideration which Parliament has given to approving of the ballot will be an indication of its acceptance.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

WHEAT PRICE STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 439.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—I support the second reading for two reasons. Firstly I consider that the people most intimately concerned in such a proposal should have the opportunity to express their opinion. Secondly I think it advisable that the ballot should be taken despite the opinion expressed in this Chamber that its result is a foregone conclusion. From my observation and inquiry I should say that there is still much opposition among wheatgrowers to anything in the nature of a scheme such as the ballot will decide. It will be recalled that last year an Act was passed which, to all intents and purposes, provided for a ballot in connection with a probable wheat scheme. Some minor alterations to that measure are necessary because in the intervening period other wheatgrowers have come into the business who would not

have been provided for under the 1953 legislation. All this Bill does is to make these minor alterations.

In the debate yesterday, compulsory voting was mentioned. Members might recall that in 1948, when similar legislation was enacted and a poll was taken, provision was not made for a compulsory vote, but such provision was made in last year's Bill by way of regulation. I understand that there is much difficulty in policing anything in the nature of compulsory voting in such a project. I do not raise any objection to that aspect, and I was rather encouraged in this view when I had a look at the poll taken in 1948. On that occasion 16,950 ballot-papers were issued to wheatgrowers, and of that number 5,729 voted in favour and 4,190 against, there being 21 informal votes. The total vote was 9,940, roughly 50 per cent of those who were entitled to vote. In such an important matter there is an obligation upon growers to exercise their vote. The measure will have wide ramifications, because if the ballot is favourable it will implement a scheme which will have a life of five years, and in view of the present situation of wheat markets it is imperative that we should have a scheme of this nature.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Can you say what the stabilization scheme will be?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—The honourable member probably has had the same opportunity as I and others have had to see what has been published in the press. More detail than that can be obtained from the legislation passed last year. Anyone sufficiently interested has a fair idea of the proposition. In addition, I am reliably informed that something in the nature of an outline of the salient points of the scheme will accompany the ballot papers, so farmers will not be, as someone has suggested, buying a pig in a poke. The information will be sufficiently complete to enable them to form an intelligent opinion. If the vote is favourable, the scheme will come into operation, and if not it will collapse. Then, those who do not seem very keen on the scheme can submit something else in its place. Before many years I fear that we shall want such a scheme. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—The only point I wish to raise is in reference to those who will not be entitled to vote. Subsection (3) of section (2) of the present Act provides:—

Every wheatgrower who delivered wheat to the Australian Wheat Board in the season

1951-52 or 1952-53, and whose name is on the list prepared by the Minister under the next following subsection shall be entitled to one vote at the ballot.

Subsection (4) of the same section provides:—

The Minister of Agriculture shall prepare and supply to the Returning Officer for the State a list containing the names of all persons who to the best of his knowledge and information delivered wheat to the Australian Wheat Board as mentioned in subsection (3) of this section.

Quite a number of growers are in partnership. Their wheat is delivered to the board in the partnership name, and the board has no record of the names of its members. A point has been raised as to whether the partnership or each member of it will have a vote. I have spoken to various wheatgrowers who have shown me a circular sent to them by the Minister of Agriculture asking for the names of members of their partnerships, so I presume that every member will be entitled to vote. If the Minister can give some information on this matter it will clear up an important doubt that exists in the minds of many growers. Another question is whether the procedure relating to members of partnerships having the right to vote will be the same in this State as in others. There is confusion at the moment and if the matter can be cleared up it will be appreciated.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—The point raised by Mr. Rowe is important and should be cleared up. Farmers have worked under a stabilization scheme for a number of years and although I have not at any time been impressed favourably by it the farmers have provided over a long period a cheap loaf for the working people of Australia, and have built up a stabilization fund which has now been returned to them. The attitude of the Commonwealth Government in going on with the scheme as though the fund still existed is one of great generosity. It is perhaps the most generous gesture the wheatgrower in this State has ever experienced.

The PRESIDENT—Order! I am afraid I cannot allow the honourable member to continue on those lines. Since yesterday, when this question arose, I have looked more fully into it and have found in Blackmore's *Manual of the Practice, Procedure and Usage of the House of Assembly* the following paragraph:—

The second reading of the Bill is regarded as its most important stage. This is the proper time to discuss the merits and principles of the Bill. If the Bill deals with a particular object it is not in order to discuss a general issue.

This Bill deals with a particular object and I must ask honourable members to keep to the clauses of the Bill.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—In view of that ruling all I can say is that the stabilization scheme is in the hands of the wheatgrowers who have been favourably impressed by the attitude taken on the stabilization of prices and the home consumption price, and it is for them to decide whether they favour the scheme. In my opinion the main trouble with the wheat industry is too much politics.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Incorporation."

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In the House of Assembly the Minister of Agriculture explained the Bill at considerable length and invited discussion on its merits. This afternoon I have come to realize that there will not be another Bill and this is the only opportunity that I will have of not discussing anything outside this Bill. I do not dispute your ruling, Mr. President, but when the Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly the Minister dealt with all parts of the world. He referred to the part played by Sir George Jenkins in bringing the other States into the home consumption price.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member cannot discuss what takes place in the House of Assembly.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is frequently done here every session.

The CHAIRMAN—It may be, but Standing Order 191 lays down that no member shall quote from any debate of the current session in the other House.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not quoting from *Hansard*, but from my own notes.

The CHAIRMAN—But the honourable member is quoting from the debates.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I might be quoting from the press.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member said he was quoting what the Minister said in another place.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I know that 59 items were discussed.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The Bill is in form now, and only awaits voting.

The CHAIRMAN—What happens in another House cannot be quoted.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I bow to your ruling if I am out of order.

The CHAIRMAN—I am afraid the honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Would I be in order if I discussed this matter at a later stage?

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member will not be in order in discussing anything but the provisions of this Bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—“Holding of ballot.”

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—In order that I may get facts regarding the ballot I ask leave to report progress.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 24. Page 440.)

Clause 3 “Interpretation.”

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Clauses 3 to 6 are really interlocked. Clause 3 is a definition of “controlled therapeutic substance” as being one that is, pursuant to proclamation, for the time being called a therapeutic substance. This is done by clause 4 which empowers the Governor by proclamation to declare any drug to be a controlled therapeutic substance. As I see the scheme of this Bill it is, first, to enlarge the definition of “drug” to take in cosmetics and laundry and toilet soap and other things of that sort and then drugs themselves are divided. The objective as I see it is that a controlled therapeutic substance will then be dealt with as to manufacture, sale, etc., by regulation under clause 6. What I do not quite understand is if items like cosmetics and laundry and toilet soap are not to be controlled why they are brought in as drugs. It seems to me that Parliament should say that certain things are drugs and therefore should be controlled, and leave it at that.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity this morning to go into this matter in detail. The whole purpose of the Bill is to control the manufacture of certain things in the public interest; for instance, poisons or substances injurious to public health and therefore they are named by proclamation.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Is it aimed at patent medicines?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—It is aimed at anything relating to poisons. There may be something even in a soap which is injurious to certain skins and could cause dermatitis.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Exactly, then, why not control the lot?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Is the honourable member suggesting that they should not be proclaimed? Does he want a list of the whole lot included in the Bill, or is he opposing the idea of proclamations?

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—If they are drugs control them.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—If necessary they will be controlled.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—But it does not need a proclamation.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Of course it does, and it always has.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendements; Committee's report adopted.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 440.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The Commonwealth Bank has rendered valuable services to the community, particularly to the man on the land. The hostility formerly shown to it by private banks has been somewhat reduced of recent years and despite political interference by a Conservative Government the bank has progressed and is now on a sounder footing. The principal Act (Section 7) empowers the Treasurer to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth Bank of Australia or any other bank in London to provide for all or any of the following matters in respect of public securities issued outside of Australia, namely, the issue of stock, and effecting of conversions, paying interest on public securities, issuing stock certificates, receiving money raised by means of public securities, issuing scrip for deposits or loans raised by sale of stock and paying off capital of stock or loans, and generally for conducting all business connected with stock and loans in accordance with the provisions of the financial agreement. As the Bill effects an improvement in the current law I have no hesitation in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—This Bill is a very short one and it is said to be non-controversial. That may be so, but I think most members will agree that the issues surrounding it have been highly contentious. The Bill seeks to amend

the Public Finance Act of 1936, and the amendments are consequential on certain legislation passed by the Commonwealth Parliament respecting the Commonwealth Bank. Last year a new institution called the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia was formed for the purpose of taking over the general banking functions of the Commonwealth Bank, and it is in law a corporation distinct from the Commonwealth Bank. The Public Finance Act has two provisions in which the Commonwealth Bank is mentioned. Section 7 empowers the Treasurer to make agreements with the Commonwealth Bank or any other bank in London respecting the issue and conversion of stock and allied matters. The other reference is in section 34 which provides for the payment through the Commonwealth Bank in Adelaide of orders drawn on trust funds held by the Treasurer. As a result of Commonwealth legislation it now seems to be doubtful whether these provisions apply to the Commonwealth Bank or to the Commonwealth Trading Bank, and as a doubt has arisen it is necessary to clarify the position without delay. It is proposed by this Bill to amend sections 7 and 34 of the principal Act so that they will apply to both the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Trading Bank. As members are doubtless aware, the Commonwealth Bank has been divided into two sections in accordance with Federal legislation. Particularly in financial matters the most scrupulous care and accuracy must always be taken, and while one may personally be of opinion that this difficulty should never have arisen the application of the proverb, "Better late than never," should be quite suitable to this occasion. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 441.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—In explaining the Bill the Minister of Health indicated that it would cover all medical practitioners employed by the Commonwealth Government and who are registered in only one State, also doctors engaged in the Flying Doctor Service. These men will be able to register in South Australia without fee. It is interesting to go back to the time when the South Australian Medical Practitioners Board was established in 1844 under an ordinance issued by His Excellency the Governor, Sir George Grey. That ordinance was amended in 1880 and then

various regulations were consolidated in a Bill passed in November, 1919. That is the measure we are now amending. It is interesting to note that those who were qualified to register as medical practitioners in 1844 were members of the College of Apothecaries of Great Britain and Ireland.

We have in this State a course of pharmacy of a standard which is recognized as one of the highest in Australia, and every year about 30 pharmacists graduate at the University. At present more than 1,200 active medical practitioners and more than 500 pharmacists are registered in South Australia. The numbers qualifying in medicine are increasing each year, and often those who go to country districts to practise their art of healing must compound their own medicines because no pharmacist is in the town. I know of one instance where a pharmacist desired to open a practice and the local doctor desired a fee of £1,000 for stock and delegating his pharmacy work to him as by way of business goodwill. In another case a young graduate in pharmacy who desired to operate in a country town not far from Adelaide was compelled to pay the local doctor £400. Some of these doctors have a virtual monopoly in such instances. There should be an amendment of the Act so that these young graduates cannot be held to ransom where they desire to open a business and provide a service on a basis equal to that being provided by the doctor. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—The Bill deals with two specific matters. One is to grant registration without fee to medical officers engaged upon Commonwealth business in this State, and the other to grant similar facilities to medical men employed in the Flying Doctor Service. From information I have gathered the proposal concerning Commonwealth doctors is of a reciprocal nature which appertains between the Commonwealth and other States and it is a question of this State falling into line. We must appreciate that a Commonwealth officer may be called upon to exercise his duties in connection with quarantine matters in a State in which he is not registered. Under the existing legislation it would be necessary for him not only to be registered in the State in which he practices, but also pay the fees required in this State. The Bill removes that obligation, and in that respect it is a good measure.

I heartily support the proposal that doctors employed in the Flying Doctor Service should

be treated in the same way. I have a keen appreciation of the wonderful services this organization is giving to people outback, and anything we can do to lighten their burdens is fully justified. In the Flying Doctor Service are others engaged who are not on the medical side, but to an extent their services are wrapped up with and dependent upon the adequate services available from medical officers. Those of us who have seen this service in operation, know that often a nurse may be left alone to handle an unexpected case until a doctor is available. Nurses are a very important adjunct to the service. I do not think there is any question of the wisdom of making the concessions available as proposed, because they are richly deserved. I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I support Mr. Edmonds' remarks and express my wholehearted support of the proposed assistance to the Flying Doctor Service. That service at Broken Hill could easily be called upon to operate in South Australia, Queensland or New South Wales, and unless the doctor were registered in each of those States I presume he would be committing a technical breach. Under the Bill a man who is registered in another State will be relieved of paying additional registration and renewal fees in South Australia and prevented from being subject to red tape. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 443.)

The Hon. J. L. COWAN (Southern)—The object of this Bill is to control the quality of gas supplied at Mount Gambier. The Gas Act of 1881 and the amendments of 1924 and 1950 provide for different systems of testing meters and the quality of gas in the metropolitan area compared with that supplied at Mount Gambier. This, of course, is unsatisfactory to consumers and the Bill will bring about uniformity. The Act requires councils to test and stamp meters and to test gas for its illuminating power and purity. This responsibility has been carried out by the Mount Gambier council ever since the gas supply was established in that area. For some years the council has not been happy about continuing its responsibilities because it has not had the necessary machinery to follow up complaints from consumers and so on, and it has asked to be

relieved of that duty and this is really the reason for the Bill being before us. In the metropolitan area the South Australian Gas Company supplies about 100,000 consumers, and gas has always been maintained at a good quality.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is a very efficient company.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—That is so. Many complaints have been received from consumers in Mount Gambier where a different means of testing is prescribed. Some of these may be due to poor quality coal, but I believe that is not the only reason for complaint. This Bill repeals the Gas Act of 1881 which has now become outmoded. The testing of gas in the metropolitan area is carried out by a Government department under the direction of the Director of Chemistry and this system can be put into operation in Mount Gambier at very little cost and without employing extra manpower or equipment. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 440.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—I support the Bill. I have received many favourable reports about aerial baiting of wild dogs in our pastoral areas. In 1949 landowners at their own expense set about laying poison baits from an aeroplane. As can be imagined, a great deal of trial and error attached to their attempts, but the lessons learned proved quite valuable in arriving at a technique that eventually has become quite successful. The baiting carried out in 1949 was in the Lake Frome district and, although it achieved only a small measure of success, in later years people associated with the pastoral industry in the north-west financed a scheme and made use of the experience gained in the original trial. Their efforts were so successful that the Port Augusta branch of the district committee of the Stockowners' Association made representations to the Government which resulted in legislation three years ago in which it was provided that out of a fund to be set up £2,000 was to be spent on aerial baiting. The period having expired, it is necessary to review the legislation, and in consequence this Bill has been presented to us.

I have watched this form of dingo destruction with a great deal of interest and have taken every opportunity of obtaining opinions from people in a position to express them. Needless to say some diverse views have been expressed, but I think it can be said quite safely that the success that has attended the efforts far outweigh any of the objections raised. An article published in the October issue of the *Pastoral Review* gives an excellent resume of what has been accomplished. This article was written by a man whose opinion can be taken as authoritative, he having been associated with the project from its inception. He points out that the area in which baiting has proved most effective is outside our vermin-proof fencing, particularly the buffer fence adjacent to the Australian Bight running along outside our wheat country and connecting up with vermin-proof districts in N.S.W. The extent of this area makes it necessary for all means to be employed to make it possible to get into places where the greatest numbers of wild dogs congregate. At certain seasons they are in certain places—if conditions are dry obviously they will be found around waterholes and permanent watercourses. By using a plane as a scout it is possible to pinpoint congregations of wild dogs thus enabling the baits to be dropped where they will be most effective. Mr. C. E. Taylour of Wilgena Station, treasurer of the Stockowners' Association of S.A. and chairman of the Vermin Districts Association, has been associated actively with aerial baiting campaigns in the north of this State, so his opinion is worthy of consideration. In an article in the *Pastoral Review* he states:—

The first essential in aerial baiting is to use a good attractive bait and to lay it properly in places most likely to be visited by dogs. For our baiting we now use juicy brisket fat baits cut into one inch cubes and loaded with half a grain of strychnine and paper wrapped. These are obtained from Rockhampton (Qld.) and are by far the best baits we have used to date. For the distribution of the baits we used an Auster Autocar Aircraft with a six-hour flying range in charge of Capt. N. S. Buckley, chief pilot of Guinea Airways, who has been on all our previous baitings and has a very good knowledge of the outback areas of S.A. He was accompanied by a bait-dropper who also knew the country. Depots for the aircraft to operate from were established at Wilgena, Ingomar, Mabel Creek, Mt. Eba, Billa Kalina, Marree, Muloorina, and Woollana Stations, from which places 120,000 baits were dropped, about 12,000 being taken up per trip.

A further extract states:—

Baiting was done right out around the buffer fence from south of Tarcoola to the New South Wales border, whilst many trips were made

away from the fence where dogs had been reported especially in the vicinity of flowing bores and waterholes in the nearby cattle country. Numerous dogs were seen at and near these places and it is obvious that most of the dogs come from that class of country. Baiting was carried out just ahead of the pupping season and I am hopeful of very good results from it.

This indicates that one of the values of the project is to get right on to the spot where most of the wild dogs are to be found and in consequence get the most effective results.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Are any statistics available to show how many dogs have been killed?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—Yes. A further extract from Mr. Taylour's article says:—

There has been some adverse criticism of aerial baiting, critics talking of the futility of attempting to accurately place baits from an aircraft flying at 200 miles per hour and at 2,000 to 5,000 feet up. I agree with them on that point, but do they know that with our use of a small aircraft flying at tree-top height and only doing about 50 miles per hour it is an entirely different job and we can place baits accurately in creek beds, cattle pads, etc., and put them in places where it is impossible to do so by other means.

I did not take out the figures, but if the honourable member cares to look up the speech of the Minister who introduced the Bill in another place I think he will find the number of dogs poisoned, but Mr. Taylour has submitted some figures, which are rather interesting showing the cost of a year's operations. These figures are for the year ended June, 1952, I presume, and are as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Cost of 100,000 baits at Rockhampton	537	10	0
Transport Rockhampton to Adelaide	288	11	10
Transport Adelaide to Dist. Centres	115	17	5
Hire of aircraft	265	12	6
Sundries	1	18	4
	£1,209	10	1

Cost per bait, 2.9d.

When we realize the damage that can be done by one dingo in one night and put it against that cost I am sure members must agree that the effect is well worthwhile. In extending operations beyond the sheep country a service is rendered to the cattle owners, because it is well-known that when wild dogs find smaller game scarce they do not hesitate to tackle quite well-grown calves, or even cows that may be down through some difficulties in calving. From all the information I have been able to get, and from what I have learnt from publications such as I have quoted, the project is

a worthy one. When the legislation was enacted three years ago its operation was restricted to three years, but this Bill removes that limitation so that those who are doing such a good job will be able to plan well ahead. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—During the last week-end I visited the far north and obtained quite a lot of information from those who suffered from the ravages of wild dogs. Aerial baiting is highly praised by them and they consider that since its introduction the destruction by wild dogs has been greatly reduced. The poison now being used, chiefly strychnine, has quite a good effect, but they claim that there is a far more deadly poison available known as 1080, and they would like to see it used. After taking a strychnine bait dogs will wander off for some distance before dying, but 1080 drops them on the spot so that the effects of the baiting are more readily ascertainable. I hope the Min-

ister will see fit to give this poison a trial. I inquired about the possibilities of the destruction of bird life, but they claim that there is such little bird life in those parts where baits are laid that it is of no real concern.

I pay a high tribute to Captain Buckley and other pilots for their very important work. It is carried out at about tree-top height, and therefore at considerable risk. In Queensland last year it is estimated that losses through wild dogs amounted to £300,000 and included not only sheep but, as explained by Mr. Edmonds, there were great losses in calves and cows. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 26, at 2 p.m.