

Supplementary Order Paper

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, the 15th Day of October 1963

HYDATIDS AMENDMENT BILL

Proposed Amendments

Hon. Mr TALBOYS, in Committee, to move the following amendments:

Clause 6: To omit the proposed paragraph (bb), and substitute the following paragraph:

“(bb) With the prior authority, by resolution, of the local authority or approved organisation in whose district or area the dog is kept, to give notice requiring any owner to place a dog in a specified boarding kennel and, at the expense of the owner, there keep the dog for a specified period, not exceeding three months, for the purpose of enabling the dog to be treated for hydatids; but nothing in this paragraph shall apply unless—

“(i) The dog has been treated for hydatids and the purged material obtained from the dog has been found on examination to contain hydatids; and

“(ii) The dog has subsequently been treated for hydatids and the purged material obtained from the dog has been found on examination to contain no hydatids; and

“(iii) On a subsequent treatment of the dog for hydatids at any time within six months after the first-mentioned treatment the purged material obtained from the dog is found on examination to contain hydatids:”.

Clause 9, subclause (2): To add to the proposed new subsection (1A) the following paragraph:

“(d) In any case where the area under the control of an approved organisation comprises the districts of two or more local authorities, fix different fees in respect of dogs kept in different districts, having regard to the incidence of hydatids in dogs kept in the several districts.”

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Clause 6: This amendment proposes to substitute the proposed new paragraph (bb) relating to the keeping of dogs in boarding kennels. The proviso to that paragraph restricts that power to cases where a dog has been found to be infected with hydatids, later found to be free of hydatids, and then later found to have become reinfected.

Doubts have now arisen as to whether the proviso is technically correct where it refers to a dog having been found free of hydatids, as the fact that the purged material obtained from a dog does not contain any hydatids does not necessarily prove that the dog is free from hydatids. The new provisions in the paragraph now refer to the purged material from the dog being free from hydatids, and not to the dog itself being free.

Clause 9: The amendment to this clause will enable an approved organisation to fix different hydatid-control fees in respect of dogs kept in different parts of the area under its control, having regard to the incidence of hydatids in dogs kept in the several parts.
