**FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1952**

Land Settlement Bill.

Fruit Fly BiU.

**Legislative Assembly, 21 August 1952, pages 511-2**

Second reading

**The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Minister of Agriculture)—**I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. This Bill is for the same purpose as the previous Bills dealing with the campaign, for the destruction of fruit fly. In January of this year, after investigating reports received by the Department of Agriculture, the Government deemed it advisable to make a regulation preventing the removal of fruit from certain areas in Adelaide and the southern and eastern suburbs. In April a further regulation was made prohibiting the growing of certain plants in the same area. In accordance with the policy previously approved by Parliament it is proposed that persons who suffer loss as a result of these regulations or action taken under them will be entitled to compensation. The Bill provides for this and will also apply to any further regulations prohibiting the growing of plants which may be made during the current calendar year. As this measure involves considerable expenditure I have obtained the following report from the Chief Horticulturist, Mr. Strickland, whom I commend for his work in the eradication of this

From the late summer of 1950 no evidence of fruit fly was found in Adelaide suburbs or elsewhere in the State until January 27, 1952, when a restricted establishment of the pest was discovered in Hutt Street, City. The measures employed in previous outbreaks, i.e., fruit removal, bait spraying, and DDT spraying were implemented immediately. Simultaneously a close check was radiated from the garden in which the pest was found. This check showed no sign of fruit fly infestation other than in several adjoining gardens in the vicinity of the Hutt Street report, and indicated that the occurrence was very much more restricted than those of 1950 and earlier

The outbreak stimulated public interest and co-operation to the extent that, subsequently, 531 householder reports of suspected fruit fly were received from throughout the city and all suburban areas. A reference map shows how completely the metropolitan area was covered by these volunteer reports. Every report was investigated, and all proved negative.

For the information of members I have brought down a map of the metropolitan area which shows clearly where each report came from. The allotments are shown on the map by red dots. There were 531 reports from the metropolitan area and the hills district around Blackwood. This indicates the tremendous amount of work done by the Horticultural Branch of the department in keeping down this pest. In not one case did an investigation show that fruit fly was present. The department’s officers and I are very pleased that people are alive to the necessity of reporting their suspicions of outbreaks, arid that is why I have brought down this report, to show that householders are conscious of the need for giving the fullest information to the department. The report continues:—

In addition to the implementation of eradication measures in respect of the Hutt Street outbreak, and the checking of volunteer fruit fly reports, inspections and trapping measures have been continued in all areas where the pest occurred in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. These latter measures have indicated continued freedom of the previously infested areas. This is evidence of the effectiveness of the actions taken in preventing fruit fly gaining the suburban establishment which would be followed inevitably by infestation of our main fruit-growing districts. The costs of the campaign in each year since 1947 and the total cost to date are tabulated as follows:—

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year of Outbreak. | Eradication Costs(ExcludingPayroll Tax)£ | Compensation Costs£ |
| 1947 | 91,698 | 18,288 |
| 1948 | 65,850 | 17,621 |
| 1949 | 76,047 | 50,167 |
| 1950 | 125,322 | 50,520 |
| 1952 | 47,879 | - |
|  | £406,796 | £136,596 |

Compensation costs have not yet been computed for this year; this Bill is for the pur­pose of enabling the Government to pay it. The total over-all cost since 1947 is £543,392. Those figures indicate the tremendous amount of work that has been done by the department in eradicating this pest, and it is pleasing to know that its efforts have been successful. When I visit other States and see what has happened from fruit fly infestation, particularly in Western Australia, Queensland, and New South Wales, I think the fruitgrowers of this State should realize what the Government has saved them from. This is the only State that can embark upon methods for complete eradication. Our officers have been asked by departments in other States for information to help them deal with the pest. I am sure the House will view the measure sympathetically.

Mr. O’HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.