**FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1950**

**Legislative Assembly, 19 October 1950, pages 1111-2**

Second reading

**The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (New­castle—Minister of Agriculture)—**The Bill is a short one and extends the provisions of the Act for another year. Section 4 of the Act gives rights to compensation to persons who have suffered loss by reason of any act done pursuant to the fruit fly regulations as defined by the Act. The section also provides that any person who was prohibited from growing or planting any plant or from removing any fruit or vegetables from any land by the operation of any proclamation made under the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act during 1947, 1948, or 1949, is to be entitled to compensation for any actual or prospective loss incurred thereby. The purpose of the Bill is to provide that compensation will also be payable in respect of operations during 1950 and for this purpose it is provided that section 4 shall apply with respect to any proclamations made during 1950. The term “fruit fly regulations” is defined by the Act to mean a list of proclamations under the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act set out in a schedule to the Fruit Fly Act. These proclamations make provision of various kinds for the eradication of fruit fly. The Bill includes in this schedule the various proclamations made for this purpose since the passing of the Fruit Fly Act Amendment Act, 1949.

Particulars I have had prepared covering various operations of fruit fly control during the past four years will doubtless interest members. In the 1950 campaign fruit fly eradication measures have been necessary in respect of five infestations reported during last summer, namely, at Medindie, reported on January 4, 1950, at Kurralta Park on January 8, at Bowden on February 16, at Norwood on February 24, and at Dudley Park on April 3. The infestations at Medindie, Kurralta Park, Bowden, and Dudley Park were due to Mediterranean fruit fly, and that at Norwood to Queensland fruit fly. The Norwood infestation was very small, fruit fly being found on one or two fruit trees in one garden only. In the previous campaign practically all the fruit fly in the area were eradicated. Areas treated in the 1949 campaign have been checked by means of trapping measures and careful inspections of ripening fruit and, with the exception mentioned, have shown no evidence of fruit fly during the past season. The exception was a recurrence of Queensland fly on February 24 at the extreme edge of the area surrounding the 1949 Norwood outbreak. The recurrence was very restricted in area. Areas treated in 1947 and 1948 have continued clean throughout the 1950 fruit season.

The proclamation prohibiting removal of fruit from properties situated in the 1949 eradication areas was kept in force throughout last summer, but in view of areas remaining clean was revoked on July 6 last. Such revoke ment did not apply, however, to areas surrounding 1950 outbreaks, in which stripping measures were carried out until September 30 and where spraying will continue until October 31. Movement of fruit from individual properties situated in areas where bait spraying and other measures were conducted in 1950 will continue to be prohibited throughout the remainder of this year and the summer of 1951. All areas will be constantly inspected throughout the spring and summer of 1950-51 to determine fruit fly status, and such inspections will include servicing and maintenance of approximately 500 traps. The whole of the area south of Adelaide, where we had the first outbreak, extends to Glenelg where there was a large outbreak. The area can now be considered to be clean, there having been no recurrence of fruit fly. That is a great tribute to the Horticultural Adviser, Mr. Strickland, and his officers, who carried out their work most efficiently. If members have any doubt as to the wisdom of the campaign conducted in this State they should inquire into the position in New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia. If they do they will be told that South Australia is the only State that has tackled the matter effectively and that they wish they had undertaken similar work when the fruit fly first became apparent there. Ministers and horticulturists in other States have shown tremendous interest in South Australia’s efforts to eradicate this serious menace to the fruitgrowing industry. Members may be interested to know what the fruit fly campaigns have cost South Australia.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Where are those 500 traps you mentioned?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—In the localities where fruit fly is apparent at present. The 1947 campaign cost £91,698 for eradication and £18,288 for compensation, for both commercial and household claims. The 1948 campaign cost £65,850, and the cost of compensation was £17,593. That covered claims from householders only; there were no claims from commercial growers. The 1949 campaign cost £76,047 for eradication and £50,133 for compensation. For the 1950 campaign the cost for eradication up to September 30 was £107,843; compensation claims have not yet been assessed because we cannot pay compensation until this Bill has been passed.

Mr. Macgillivray—What is the reason for the big increase in cost in the last year? Has a larger area been affected?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Yes, and that has increased costs to some extent. During the earlier years of the campaign many people did not make claims for compensation. Members would be surprised to know of some people who made claims and equally surprised at those who did not. Apparently human nature is the same in Australia as in other parts of the world. When people had their gardens stripped- two or three years in succession and found that their neighbours were claiming and being paid compensation they thought they should claim too. Last year considerable areas at Medindie and Kurralta Park were proclaimed, but claims from those areas have not yet been assessed. We are expecting fairly substantial claims, particularly from Kurralta Park where there are many commercial growers. The amount spent on the campaign up to September 30, 1950, is £341,438 for eradication and £86,015 for compensation, a total of £427,453. That, of course, does not include compensation in respect of stripping in 1950. I hope that the campaign which has been successful to a degree in that it has cleared up the areas where fruit fly has been found, will be completely successful in the near future, and that it will not be necessary for me to introduce a Bill of this kind again. I move the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate