also, very rarely, appear spontaneously. About one in a million cattle could develop BSE without any exposure to infectious material. The regulations which prohibit the feeding of material derived from ruminants to other ruminants are designed to ensure that should one of these sporadic cases of BSE occur, there is no possibility of spread to other animals.

It is common practice for abattoir waste material to be rendered, that is cooked at very high temperatures, and made into meat, blood or bone meal which can then be incorporated into manufactured feeds for livestock. All states in Australia have implemented a ban such that material from ruminants cannot be included in feeds for other ruminants. All states have also agreed to extend this ban to prevent the feeding of material from mammals to ruminants and the NT regulations are being changed to this effect now. In order to ensure that people within the feed manufacturing industry, and elsewhere in the livestock industry, comply with this requirement, departmental inspectors need to be able to check feed manufacturing operations, and also other points in the chain of supply of livestock feeds, to see that banned ingredients aren't included in feeds made for ruminants and that labelling requirements are followed.

Late last year, we identified a deficiency in our own legislation in that our legislation did not give inspectors the power to take samples away from the feed manufacturing plant for testing. This bill currently before the House rectifies that deficiency. It also makes it clear that inspectors may inspect livestock, fodder and other things to confirm that operators are complying with the legislation, without the need for any suspicion of a breach of the act or of the presence of disease. More and more, the animal health services in Australia are operating in this manner. Rather than putting in place laws, and then attempting to either detect breaches of the legislation or to detect disease, the new international trading environment requires that we demonstrate compliance with the legislation and the absence of disease. Naturally, in establishing compliance with the legislation and the absence of disease, we also find that we will detect any breaches of the legislation and we will detect the disease where it occurs.

Apart from rectifying the deficiency in our legislation, this bill recognises the new environment in which our animal industry regulators work. It will help to underpin Australia's BSE-free status, and it will help to maintain Australia's reputation as the most disease-free source of livestock and livestock products. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (KATHERINE RATES) BILL (Serial 149)

Continued from 21 April 1999.

Mr RIOLI (Arafura): Mr Speaker, the government is seeking urgency for this bill to correct a clerical error, originating within the Katherine Council. This side of the House is in agreement to see the bill go through all stages at these sittings. We heard from the Minister for Local Government in a second reading speech to this bill as to why this bill is necessary.

This bill will amend the declared Katherine Council 18 differential rates for 1997-98, and 1998-99 to the intended 18 differential rates.

I do not believe that the Katherine ratepayers are being disadvantaged because of this bill. I understand the rate notice quoted the correct amount payable by the ratepayers. This bill will be retrospective, which is only putting into place the intention of the Katherine Council. And the Katherine Council, in due course, did issue a press release last Friday, outlining and advising these changes to its constituents.

I thank the minister for providing a briefing on this matter 2 weeks ago.

Mrs BRAHAM (Local Government): Mr Speaker, I thank the member for Arafura for his comments and his agreement to pass this through with urgency. There's no doubt what the intention of the Katherine Council was, as the declarations clearly show, the amount they expected to raise from rates, and these totals obviously couldn't be achieved using the differential rates as shown in the declarations. It seems appropriate at this stage.

I say to the member for Arafura that it seems a little silly that we have to have a new bill to correct an error like this and perhaps when we review the *Local Government Act* we could put some clause into it so that if it does occur again, we can do it without having to go through this whole process.

I move that the bill be read a second time.

Motion agreed to; bill read a second time.

Mrs BRAHAM (Local Government)(by leave): Mr Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to; bill read a third time.