**WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1951**

**House of Assembly, 27 November 1951, pages 1475-6**

Second reading

**The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Yorke Peninsula— Minister of Lands)—**The purpose of this Bill is to provide statutory authority to use funds raised by rates levied under the Wild Dogs Act for carrying out aerial baiting for wild dogs. The question of aerial baiting for wild dogs was raised late in 1950 by a deputation from the Vermin Districts Association. Subsequently, a letter was received from the Stockowners , Association supporting the suggestion of the Vermin Districts Association, and later a letter was received from the Superintendent of Stock Routes, Queensland, suggesting that this State should co-operate with Queensland in an aerial campaign which it was proposed to conduct in the north-eastern portion of South Australia. The States of Queensland and Western Australia first commenced aerial baiting campaigns in 1948. The Pastoral Board has been in touch with the authorities in those States and the information received indicates that aerial baiting in these States has met with some measure of success. In addition, aerial baiting has been carried out by some South Australian pastoralists and, whilst no spectacular results have been reported, the general consensus of opinion obtained from those interested is that this mode of attack on dingoes is well worth persevering with.

The Pastoral Board has recommended to the Government that the time has now come when this State should participate in an aerial baiting campaign and that this should be carried out over an experimental period of three years. Before making this recommendation the Pastoral Board discussed the matter with the Dog Pence Board which concurs with the recommendation. The Bill accordingly provides that during the calendar years 1952, 1953, and 1954, the Minister may expend up to £2,000 per year in the carrying out of aerial baiting operations for the destruction of wild dogs. The funds for this purpose will be derived from wild dog rates imposed on pastoral lands under the Wild Dogs Act. The last rate declared under the Act was 6d. per square mile. The maximum rate authorized by the Act is Is. per square mile. It is estimated that a rate of 3d. per square mile will yield approximately £2,000 so that, if the present rate revenue is insufficient to meet the present costs of the Act and the costs of aerial baiting, the rate will need to be increased by up to another 3d. per square mile. It may be mentioned that such an increase in rates has been contemplated by the Vermin Districts. Association. The Bill, of course, makes no provision for an increase in rates as, if an increase in the present rate is necessary, this can be done under the existing provisions of the Act. However, as the Act limits the expenditure on aerial baiting to £2,000 per year, it follows that, in practice, any increase in rates which may ,be necessary will not exceed 3d. per square mile. It is provided by the Bill that, in carrying out aerial baiting operations, the Minister may seek the advice of the Dog Fence Board. On this board are representatives of the Vermin Districts Association and the Stockowners\* Association so that the board is so constituted that representatives of the persons moat concerned will be available to advise the Minister as to the manner in which the aerial baiting operations should be carried out move the second reading.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—This Bill comes to Parliament with the full knowledge and endorsement of the Vermin Districts Association and the Stockowners’ Association, who are the people most vitally concerned and who will be responsible for the raising of funds. Although I am not very keen on it, the legislation appears to have received the endorsement of the Western Australian and Queensland Governments, and pastoralists in my own district endorse it. The Bill gives the Minister authority on the advice of the Vermin Boards, to make funds available for certain purposes, and I see no reason why it should be opposed. Members on this side do not oppose it, although it is considered that it could have been brought before the House earlier so that a little more study could have been made of its provisions. Often mistakes have been made in legislation pushed through in one day, because members are not given an opportunity to check the statements made by its sponsors. I have no reason to doubt the Minister’s statement that the people interested have been consulted and have indicated their support.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.