

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, September 26, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

FUNCTIONS

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In reply to a question on August 14 from the Hon. R. A. Geddes about portfolio changes, the Chief Secretary, in part, said:

I point out to the honourable member that, as he well knows, we in this Council have no contact whatever with the Party in another place.

Since all honourable members have received invitations to attend two separate functions to be held at the same time on October 18, can the Chief Secretary say whether the situation he described on August 14 has been extended to cover his Ministerial colleagues in this Council in such a way that they have no contact with each other? If it has, will the Chief Secretary use his good offices to get the Ministers together so that honourable members who desire to do so may attend both functions?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I doubt whether my reply of August 14 had anything to do with the matter raised by the honourable member. I realize that two functions are planned for the same day. Since both the Ministers concerned are in this Council, I suggest that the honourable member address his question to them. I do not know what the Ministers have done to overcome the difficulty referred to by the honourable member. As the Minister of Agriculture has just commented to me, to attend both functions one would need a helicopter. I will refer the matter to my colleagues to see whether steps can be taken to avoid a recurrence of this situation.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I appeal to the Ministers concerned to do something about this matter. Many members would like to

attend both functions. I realize that a specific day may have had to be chosen for the function at the Roseworthy Agricultural College and that it cannot be altered. I cannot, however, see why the date of the function at Islington cannot be altered. Will either of the Ministers concerned say whether something cannot be done to enable members of Parliament to attend both functions?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This situation was pointed out to me about 15 minutes ago, and I have already contacted my office. I can now inform the Council that arrangements are being made to alter the date of the function at Islington.

KINGSTON ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, a question about the electricity supply for the Kingston area. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister of Works, who has been in touch with the General Manager of the Electricity Trust, states:

The General Manager of the Electricity Trust reports that there is much work to be done on electrification of rural areas in the South-East of the State. The trust is carrying out this programme as fast as possible and is working to the policy of progressively extending supply from existing main transmission centres.

Under this policy, most of the electrification of the southern part of the Millicent Electoral District has been completed. This area has been supplied from the transmission system radiating from Mount Gambier. However, the town of Kingston and the surrounding area must be supplied by means of a new transmission line from Naracoorte *via* Lucindale.

At the present time the trust is fully engaged building extensions in the areas around Naracoorte, and it will be some time before this work can be completed. Unfortunately, Kingston is so situated that it will be on the end of the line from Naracoorte with a considerable amount of work to do in the intervening country around Lucindale after the Naracoorte work is completed. It is not possible to set a firm date for carrying out work in the Kingston area, but present indications are that it will be about 1974.

STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to addressing a question to you, Mr. President. Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I address this question with the utmost respect. Yesterday, during the debate on the Public Purposes Loan Bill, I referred to something that

two persons were doing in what I referred to as "another place". You, Sir, pulled me up and said that I was not to refer to "another place". I ask you for a ruling on this, Sir, because I think it is a most important matter. In my view the words "another place" are used so that we are not necessarily referring to the other House of Parliament, as it is referred to in the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders refer to "injurious reflections on members of the other House of Parliament", although I think the words "House of Assembly" are occasionally referred to.

I was actually addressing myself to a newspaper report. Although I did say "in another place" I could just as easily have used the words "somewhere else", but apparently traditionally it seems the words "another place" have come to have a specific reference to the other House of Parliament, which I think is not intended. I ask for your guidance, Sir, in my future conduct on whether, if I refer to "another place", it will be necessarily accepted that I mean "House of Assembly" and, if I refer to "somewhere else", I would be committing the same apparent breach.

The PRESIDENT: I have not had an opportunity to see the *Hansard* report, but as I heard the remark of the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill the suggestion conveyed to me was that the honourable member was referring to something that had been said in another place. The Clerk has been good enough to hand me a copy of May's *Parliamentary Practice*, the relevant part of which, under the heading, "Allusions to debates in the other House of the current session", states:

The rule that allusions to debates in the other House of the current session are out of order prevents fruitless arguments between members of two distinct bodies who are unable to reply to each other, and guards against recrimination and offensive language in the absence of the party assailed: but it is mainly founded upon the understanding that the debates of the other House are not known, and that the House can take no notice of them. The daily publication of debates in Parliament offers a strong temptation to disregard this rule. The same questions are discussed by persons belonging to the same parties in both Houses, and speeches are constantly referred to by members, which this rule would exclude from their notice.

That is the first opportunity I have had of seeing that. I mentioned it yesterday because I thought that the honourable member was referring to something that had been said in another place.

The Hon. SIR ARTHUR RYMILL: I am not disputing your ruling or what you are saying, Mr. President, but I am asking for my future guidance, because I have always understood, in using the expression "in another place", that I am not necessarily referring to the other House of Parliament any more than I am referring to it if I use the words "somewhere else" or "in some other place". It seems that over the years the words "another place", which are continually used, often in that reference, have come to bear a meaning they should not bear. Therefore, Mr. President, would you consider this question and let me have a ruling on it?

The PRESIDENT: I shall be happy to do that. My inclination at the moment is that "another place" would be taken in its context with the words used. However, I will give the honourable member the ruling he desires.

WILLIAMSTOWN SCHOOL CROSSING

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my recent question regarding the school crossing at Williamstown?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The provision of a school crossing in the Williamstown main street is the responsibility of the District Council of Barossa. Such installations are subject to the approval of the Road Traffic Board. The council sought and obtained board approval for school signs at this location in 1963, and sought departmental consideration of a pedestrian under-pass early in 1967. No other approach has been made.

No reasonable warrant exists for an under-pass and the Highways Department would not be prepared to contribute to such an installation. If the council is dissatisfied with present conditions at the school crossing, it is suggested that it approach the Road Traffic Board with a view to the installation of lights.

KADINA HOSPITAL

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of September 17, regarding subsidy payments to the Kadina Hospital?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Kadina Hospital is a community hospital (one not receiving an annual Government maintenance subsidy). On occasions in the past, applications for special subsidies have been made by the hospital direct to the honourable member

for Wallaroo, who then submits the applications to the Chief Secretary's Department. Therefore, any reply, whether it be non-approval or a cheque for payment of subsidy, has been forwarded to the honourable member for transmission to the hospital. However, I do not favour that procedure, and in future cheques for subsidies for any hospital will be forwarded direct to the hospital concerned and, if necessary, the member will be informed.

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: When it was announced that fluoridation was to be introduced into our water supply by administrative action, the Premier announced that members would have as many opportunities as they desired to discuss the matter in Parliament. However, we know that there is a rift between Ministers in the two Houses. Indeed, as the Hon. Mr. Kneebone has pointed out today, it is reported in *Hansard* that they never get together. However, today it was reported in the *News* that the Premier had hit out at the action of the Legislative Council as the result of a motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Geddes yesterday suggesting that the matter of fluoridation be discussed in this Council. In the light of the Premier's hitting out at this place, will the Minister tell the Premier that we should be entitled to discuss our affairs as we think fit without any undue influence from the Premier?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I consider that any person has the right to his own views in this matter. Whether it should be discussed in this or any other Chamber is in the hands of members. Any member in this Council or in any other Chamber is completely free to move a motion favouring or opposing fluoridation. There is no rift between the two Chambers on this matter. Any honourable member who wishes to raise this matter can do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Not according to the Premier.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Can the Chief Secretary now indicate the date of the proposed recess at the end of October?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Government intends that Parliament should not sit during the last week in October. This will mean that this Council will rise on October 24 and resume on November 5.

METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: All honourable members are aware that there are large numbers of staff at the metropolitan abattoirs and that their car park is on the opposite side of the road from the main building, so that many people have to cross the road to and from the car park and the abattoirs. It appears that a safe pedestrian crossing is needed. Will the Minister look into this matter and see whether or not an under-pass, an over-pass or traffic lights can be provided to make this crossing safe for the employees of the abattoirs?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will look into that matter.

MATRICULATION CLASSES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Can the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, say whether the Education Department envisages extending Matriculation classes to additional country high schools in 1969 and, if it does, to which high schools?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain a report from my colleague on this matter.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) moved:

That I have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to prohibit the teaching, practice or application of the system of study known as scientology and for other purposes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. A writ is before the court concerning scientology. Therefore, the matter is possibly *sub judice* at this stage, and the liberties of certain people could be prejudiced if a debate on the matter were to proceed in this place. Is it in order for this Bill to be introduced while the matter is before the court?

The PRESIDENT: Erskine May states:

A matter, awaiting or under adjudication by a court of law, should not be brought before the House by a motion or otherwise. This rule does not apply to Bills.

Therefore, as the notice of motion applies to a Bill and not to a motion, it appears to be in order.

Motion carried.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 25. Page 1376.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): In rising to speak to this Bill, the first thing that struck me as I read through it and the Treasurer's statement was that, in respect of the Loan Fund Account, South Australia has been favourably dealt with compared with other States. For instance, the funds recommended for housing are greater than those recommended for other States, proportionately: more than \$17 a head for housing compared with less than \$10 a head for other States. It must and does affect rental and purchasing prices and is an asset and an attraction to aid development.

I mention, too, the provision for national parks and reserves. It is a very poor community that cannot or does not preserve its natural heritage of land flora and fauna for its own edification and enjoyment and for the benefit of those to come. As a member for Southern District, I am happy to see the South-East drainage scheme is continuing to attract support. Equally, I recognize the value of waterworks and sewerage facilities in the towns. In particular, I refer to the Taillem Bend to Keith main. I trust that reticulation to the areas through which that main passes will be encouraged to enable those areas to be opened up.

I should like to turn honourable members' thoughts to the provision for hospitals. The sum of \$11,600,000 has been provided for hospitals, including \$150,000 for the Modbury Hospital, much talked about, long promised and now taking some shape. Last year, instead of \$11,600,000, only \$9,060,000 was provided for hospitals, so there has been an increase this year in this provision of more than \$2,000,000. I am sorry, for two reasons, that the south-western district hospital was not allocated a considerable priority: first, it is in the vicinity of the Flinders University,

where our second medical school must be based; and, secondly, it is in an area that is in great need of medical services.

It has been suggested that we will not receive Commonwealth funds to enable a second medical school at Flinders University to get off the ground. Personally, I can conceive of no more vital social or community need than that of training more doctors, of whom this State needs many more. At the risk of boring honourable members, I shall refer to some figures not unknown to them. It is estimated that by the end of 1975 this State must be turning out 45 more doctors a year from its own medical schools than it is turning out at present. In 1957, when the population was less than 900,000, there were 863 doctors. In 1965, when the population was 1,064,000, there were 1,254 doctors. In 1957, 57.4 per cent of the 863 doctors were in general practice, but in 1965 only 45.07 per cent of the 1,254 doctors were in general practice. And the percentage has fallen still further since 1965.

In other words, the proportion of family doctors in this State is steadily shrinking, yet in some form or other the family doctor is a vital component in the medical force. I again refer to the good work being done by the Australian College of General Practitioners in fostering post-graduate education amongst its members, and in helping them to keep up to date with all that is new. The family doctor's function is that of a family friend, a confidant and a confessor as well as that of a therapist, for most of his patients.

Is it romantic to think of this second medical school, which will and must come in due course, as a golden opportunity to set a new pattern for medical schools? In other words, should we not establish a school whose orientation is not primarily directed to training embryo specialists but whose orientation is toward providing a complete course for preparing undergraduates for the work of family medicine? In this medical school a basic training school can be established at undergraduate level. The whole foundation of this school should rest on the needs of the family doctor.

I admit that, when one realizes that we do not yet have a second medical school, it is romanticizing, but the day must come when a second school will exist, and should not our thinking be directed along these lines? Is it further romanticism, or is it fundamental thinking, when I ask why we should be

spending increasingly large amounts on buildings and running expenses for large hospitals, when less money—well used—could be the means of more people staying at home and receiving treatment in a familiar environment? We all realize that some patients must be hospitalized, but many people at present in our hospitals could be cared for at home. Indeed, not only could they be cared for at home but they should be so cared for.

As communities develop they become institutionally minded, but greater assistance in respect of domiciliary care could help us to reduce the size and complexity of some of our institutions. Ought we not to be thinking in terms of keeping people out of hospitals by providing more support for extending domiciliary services of all kinds, instead of filling larger and more lavish emporia of healing? Where is the present-day family practitioner trained? He is trained largely in the highly complex, technically equipped and scientifically pressurized centres, where the patient is cut off from his home environment. Where does the present-day practitioner practise his craft at large? It is within the community environment, in and amongst the homes of patients, everyday folk to whom illness is not just a disease but a period of separation from the families whose help they need and which, with a certain amount of outside help, could keep him at home and look after him.

Since the doctor works in this home environment, should his training not be carried out in relation to that home environment? Attached to the Adelaide University has been a preceptorship scheme, whereby senior students spend a period in the practice of and under the care of selected general practitioners. This scheme has been voluntary and extremely successful, and it has given students an insight into family care. However, is it enough training for a man who will spend most of his life in the home and in the community to have had only two or perhaps three weeks of experience in that field?

At home the patient remains an identity, a part of his own people and his own community. Therefore, is there not a case for increased subsidies for those agencies whose work is recognized as valuable in providing domiciliary care, nursing and all the things that go with it? Is it not sound common sense, therefore, that a second medical school and a south-western district hospital should lay special emphasis on family care? Developments along these lines are important if we are

to use our resources ideally and to the best advantage. It is of great value to increase domiciliary services, especially when we remember that one hospital bed initially costs \$25,000, plus a considerable number of dollars each year to maintain it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If you keep on increasing the fees people won't be able to go there.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: It would not be necessary if we used available domiciliary services, with all the facilities of a south-western hospital as a big family-care unit so that the whole made up a community training centre. I let this be my philosophy, really: personalized consideration and less institutionalism.

May I ask this question in closing: is the day too far distant not only when we shall be using more domiciliary care but when the larger private hospitals will take their personal part in providing some of the medical and paramedical training? They train nurses now, but much clinical material for teaching purposes is lost as things exist at present with the private hospital not being used for teaching. Is it too visionary to see the day when the total resources available to the sick shall concentrate on home care first so that only comparatively few need to be admitted to hospital? I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 25. Page 1379.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): At first I had grave doubts about the wisdom of this Bill, but after examining the details of the preceding Acts I must give it my wholehearted support. These Acts are the working tools of the stock inspection and animal disease functions of the Animal Husbandry Division of the Agriculture Department. The prime purpose is to revise them, bring them up to date and strengthen them from the experience gained from the terrible outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Great Britain last year.

It is urgent that this be done, and I am sure that no-one will want to impede the passage of this Bill. However, I think we ought to pay tribute to this branch for the work it has done in animal disease control in recent years. I am sure that this work has not been

sufficiently recognized. It is worth millions of dollars to the State annually, and long before now it should have brought public recognition and honour to the men responsible.

First, that insidious and dangerous disease of cattle, pleuro-pneumonia, was pushed back north and then eradicated from the State. Then, working with the livestock branch of the Northern Territory, it has been pushed back to the wild buffalo country. A quarantine line has been established there, and from there forward we have been able to say we are safe from this disease in South Australia and that we can go north and buy replacement fattening and market cattle with safety and confidence.

Then we had the eradication of sheep foot-rot from the State, a matter that must not be overlooked. When this eradication idea was first put forward it was looked upon by many people in the pastoral industry as a pipe dream, but by patient and persistent work it was accomplished, even in the face of organized opposition from those who now most benefit. Money values cannot be put on work of this magnitude, scope and success. It is certainly to be reckoned in millions of dollars annually when the costs of these diseases, the wastage they caused and the work involved is considered. I emphasize the word "annually".

I most strongly recommend to the Government the merit of these men of the Animal Husbandry Division. They should be given reward and recognition for the valuable work they have done. That we have such men looking to the future and the risks that are presently in front of the animal population of the State is, I think, not sufficiently appreciated by the individual farmer.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone, I think, has mentioned that foot and mouth disease and rabies are immediately north of Australia in countries visited each year by migratory bird species, which necessarily cross all quarantine barriers that can be erected. I have discussed this matter with veterinarians, for it has always been a matter of wonder to me that, in view of this annual bird migration, we have so far escaped these diseases. It is a risk that must always be accepted by Australia, for it is present.

I think there is now some evidence that foot and mouth disease has been here in past years, possibly ages ago. The reason I say this is that I believe the curious fact emerged that none of our wild animal species can be

infected. This was tested in Britain during the recent foot and mouth outbreak there in the course of the work our Australian representatives, who went to observe and help and investigate, carried out.

This might be natural immunity, and it could equally be evolved immunity from past exposure, after which the disease died out. It is surprising that none of our animals who have so long been isolated become infected. Such a situation usually leaves isolated peoples and animal populations very susceptible to exotic disease.

I must make some comments on the Bill itself. In clause 2 (c) (a), which defines stock, it is curious that donkeys and mules are not included in the list, and I think they should be. I suggest that the words "donkeys and hybrid species" should be included. Although I believe the donkey and the mule are not particularly susceptible or may even be immune to some of these diseases, they certainly are subject to other diseases.

I think some thought is needed with regard to clause 2 (d) (2). This clause deals with contacts of infection, and I think it might strengthen the clause if it is specifically stated at the end of paragraph (b) "so that the transmission of disease is prevented".

I think there is a weakness in the following provisions with regard to the disposal of carcasses. It seems that partial cremation could be taken to be adequate. I do not like the term "ashes" in relation to destruction, and I should like it to be specified very clearly that the burning has to be completed. I suggest that the words "inorganic ashes" or "that no trace of flesh remains" be used. Burial also is considered, I think, with foot and mouth disease in mind, but I query whether burial is sufficient where anthrax is concerned. This is another disease we do not want here.

I do not regard clause 4 with the suspicion that the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan has brought to bear. In searching into its meaning, I think it is warranted and justified. Regarding clause 5, I draw attention to a risk we face in South Australia if a type of foot and mouth disease occurred which did not occur in Britain. One of the features of the British outbreak was the speed and distance the virus travelled down wind. I have not yet seen any cause attributed to this but, because we have seen such a spread of insect pests with which I have

been concerned, I am sure the agent that carried the virus was the fly that breeds and lives in animals' excreta.

This was confirmed when the outbreak could not be confined until the cold weather stopped the breeding of flies. In South Australia we have flies at all times of the year. We also have dust storms and together these bring the terrible risk that it will not be possible to get even a result as satisfactory as that obtained at such heavy costs in Britain, unless extreme measures are taken under clause 5. These points should be considered further.

Clause 6 deals with rabies, and I see that vaccinations are provided for under new section 8b (1) (d). I question the wisdom of this. Slaughter-out can eradicate a disease if there is no immunity to hide its presence. Vaccination is a measure that need be taken only when eradication fails. This is how the livestock industries carry on in the many countries where foot and mouth disease is now established.

These countries accept its presence, and every animal is vaccinated soon after it is born. As domestic animals and pets are chiefly involved with rabies, there must be no sentiment. We must take equally as ruthless measures, in an attempt to eradicate this terrible disease, as those proposed for the eradication of foot and mouth disease, if we ever have the misfortune to deal with them.

I think it would be wise to leave out sub-clause (2), which deals with the powers of an inspector to destroy dogs and cats without any compensation being paid. All these powers are given elsewhere in the Bill, and there could be vocal resentment if only the cat and dog were specially mentioned for destruction without compensation being paid.

It would be wise to widen the powers of recruitment. I would not object to seeing it being widened even further than is at present intended. We are notoriously short of qualified veterinarians, and in the emergency of foot and mouth disease these men will be spread very thinly. However, I am content to leave the matter of whether the provisions are sufficient to the judgment of those responsible.

Clause 11 amends section 16 of the principal Act, and I think that such an amendment is necessary. However, it would be wise to tie it more specifically to certain diseases, because we all know the costly danger of lice, foot rot and other diseases from strays. I consider that clause 4 implies negligence by

the owner of such stock. If this is so, it would be advisable to have another look at the wording of this clause, particularly if it is thought that disciplinary action is required in regard to allowing diseased stock to wander. If that thought is behind the clause, a clearer statement is needed.

When I first read section 13 of the principal Act I thought it contained too many powers that did not contain sufficient safeguards. However, having perused the amendments and this Bill, I am sure that the necessary safeguards are already included. We must give these men every power they need in order that they can properly perform their work in preventing the entry of these diseases to South Australia.

I must again refer to the work of the Animal Husbandry Division. Bovine tuberculosis is nearly non-existent in South Australia, and its complete eradication is in sight. It has already gone from the dairy herds, and I am told that a check of the much less susceptible beef herds is well under way. Next on the list is contagious abortion, which could well have meant trouble.

A curious fact came to my knowledge recently: contagious abortion does not occur in cattle when they are running with goats. This points to heavy brucellosis infection in the goat population, and the wild goat in northern areas will be a difficult problem. Even years of persecution have not eradicated the wild goats from Kangaroo Island, and it is astonishing how frequently in scrub land in the Adelaide Hills one can feel hostile eyes looking at oneself and, on looking up, one sees a wild goat watching oneself. However, I wish all concerned well in their work and support the Bill, which can only strengthen the hands of the livestock branch officers to whom we owe so much.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I, too, support the Bill. In these modern times of accelerated travel facilities, we are aware that our livelihood depends on the amount of protection that can be afforded by our various authorities, such as quarantine and stock inspectors, in maintaining a vigilance and keeping our country free of foot and mouth disease, rabies and other such dreaded diseases. As 70 per cent of our exports still depend on primary produce, it is well to remember that each and every one of us, as Australians, should, for our own welfare, be vigilant.

Clause 2 refers to the creatures defined as stock for the purposes of the Act, and indeed widens the scope of the clause to include

many other animals. As the Hon. Mr. Kemp pointed out, though, still more could be included. I agree entirely that the powers of these inspectors should be widened. We do not have enough of them, and it is necessary that they have all the powers they need to perform their duties and act as promptly as they see fit.

I do not intend to speak at length on this matter, but I am concerned that the legislation contains no provisions for compensation. Breeders of cattle and swine have seen fit to pay duties on the slaughter of their animals to provide a compensation fund, which provides compensation for certain specific diseases. Largely because of the forethought of these people in creating such a fund and because of the diligence of our Agriculture Department and its officers, many of these diseases have been either eradicated or brought under control. Also, a special fund has been constituted by the Commonwealth Government to deal with compensation in the event of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. I ask the Minister whether it could not be more clearly spelt out in this Bill that some compensation would be available for the necessary destruction of stock in the event of an epidemic of any sort that demanded the slaughter of these animals. Section 26 provides:

No compensation whatever shall be payable to, or recoverable by, any person for or in respect of the forfeiture, killing or destruction of any stock, fodder, or fittings . . .

I ask the Minister to discuss this with his department and tell me more about it during the Committee stage.

Mention has been made, too, of the necessity to ban completely certain chemicals (dieldrin, I believe, is one) still obtainable for the eradication of ants, termites, and so on. It was found in 1962 that a consignment of New Zealand meat was showing the effects of chlorinated hydro-carbonate, which were the result of sheep being dipped in dieldrin. At that time the Commonwealth Council decided that action should be taken, and it prohibited the dipping of any stock in this concentrate. Since the United States of America has been so very choosy about meat and the American meat producers have on every occasion looked for excuses to ban Australian meat entering America, it is most wise that all precautions be taken to ensure that none of our meat is contaminated. Since perhaps some people would continue to purchase dieldrin under the pretext that they intended to exterminate termites, it is right that that should be prohibited. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.14 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 1, at 2.15 p.m.