

of the Victorian Department of Agriculture. He joined C.S.I.R.O. in 1937 and held the position of secretary of the Division of Animal Health and Production until 1960 when the Division was split into three separate Divisions, and he became secretary of the Division of Animal Health. His duties as divisional secretary included the development and management of the Division's eight research stations. His extra-mural activities have included holding the positions of honorary secretary of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science (1935-45), secretary of the Australian Committee on Animal Production (1939-63) and technical adviser to the Australian Cattle and Beef Research Committee (1960-63). His recent interests have included the publication of the new *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture and Animal Husbandry* and, as a member of the Council, the foundation of the Marcus Oldham Agricultural College, Geelong, Victoria.

#### Remuneration of Academic Staff in Britain

In a statement in the House of Commons on March 26, the Minister for Science, Mr. Q. Hogg, said that the Government accepted in principle the findings of the National Incomes Commission in its report on the remuneration of Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges of Advanced Technology, and in particular, after consultation with the University Grants Committee, it accepted the recommendations in respect of salary rates and allowances. The Government agreed with the Commission that this was a genuine case for special treatment in terms of income policy: over the years there had been a decline in the relative position of university salaries and this decline was having undesirable consequences and should be corrected. For the universities, implementation of the recommendation was a matter for the institutions in consultation with the University Grants Committee. For colleges of advanced technology, assimilation to the university grading structure and salary rates would be the subject of early discussions among the Ministry of Education, the University Grants Committee, the colleges and their staffs. Parliament would be asked to provide additions to the recurrent grants for universities for the rest of the quinquennium and to the grants for colleges of advanced technology to enable the new rates to operate from April 1, 1964; for the coming financial year the supplementary provision required was estimated at £7 million.

#### International Institute of Medical Research

In reply to a question in the House of Commons on March 19, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd said that the Government had voted for the resolution adopted in the World Health Assembly on March 17 requesting the Director-General to continue investigations of the project for an International Institute of Medical Research and report to the Executive Board and the World Health Assembly. The proposal fell into three main parts: first, epidemiological studies; secondly, a centre for assembling and processing information; and thirdly, establishing a large international laboratory for biological research. On the first two, there was little difference of opinion, but the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy had advised strongly against the third. The Director-General was making a further study, and decision would be taken by the countries concerned in the light of that study. The precedent of the European Centre for Research in Nuclear Science would be fully taken into account, as would the suggestion that the Centre should be located in the United Kingdom.

#### Poisonous Substances used in Agriculture and Food Storage

In the House of Commons on March 24, the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Mr. C. Soames, announced that he had received the report of the Committee on Poisonous Substances used in Agriculture and

Food Storage on the persistent organo-chlorine pesticides. He said that although the manufacturers of aldrin and dieldrin had informed him that they disagreed strongly with the Committee's scientific conclusions and the National Farmers' Union had directed attention to the considerable significance that restrictions of their use could have for agriculture, the Government had decided to give effect to the Committee's recommendations. He had had assurances of co-operation from all interests concerned in curtailing the use of these chemicals on the lines recommended by the Committee, and this would be done through the voluntary schemes operated jointly by the manufacturers and the Government. Fertilizers containing aldrin, products for garden use containing aldrin or dieldrin, and dips and sprays for sheep containing these chemicals would cease to be available, generally, at the end of the 1964 season, although more time might be needed for sheep dips. Further consideration would be given to sanctioning certain relatively minor uses. The Committee's recommendations are based purely on the situation as seen in Great Britain, and the Government is asking it to examine the present voluntary safety arrangements and will consider whether legislation would be desirable. The Government has also decided to extend the Committee's terms of reference to include use of these products for industrial and domestic purposes, such as wood preservation and moth-proofing, and also to enable it to report on other toxic chemicals referred to it from time to time. Accordingly the Committee would in future be primarily responsible to the Minister for Science.

The statement was welcomed in the House, but the Minister was pressed about delay in acting earlier on these products. In reply, he pointed to some division of scientific opinion, and, while he stated that it was not intended to withdraw the booklet, *Chemicals for the Gardener*, he said that the new booklet to be printed would not include the chemicals no longer within the advisory scheme. The same points were also firmly pressed when Lord St. Oswald made a corresponding statement in the House of Lords also on March 24, but weak replies shook confidence in the Government's action and suggest that the vital point of cumulation of residues is being ignored. Mrs. J. S. Butler, supported by Mr. W. Yates and Mr. F. Peart, pressed the point further in an able and well-informed speech on March 26, criticizing strongly the booklet *Chemicals for the Gardener*, which she described as disastrous, and asking for a total ban on the use of aldrin, dieldrin and DDT. In a more satisfactory reply, the Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Mr. J. S. R. Scott-Hopkins, admitted the possibility of long-term contamination of the environment. Urging the need for a sense of proportion, he said that the Minister was also considering what kind of expert body might be best fitted to advise him on methods of husbandry now used in intensive rearing of animals and birds.

#### Agricultural Chemicals Approval Scheme

THE need for control in selecting chemicals used in agriculture is now widely accepted. The purpose of the Agricultural Chemicals Approval Scheme is to enable users of insecticides, fungicides and herbicides to select appropriate crop-protection chemicals. Claims made on labels are also kept under review. Full support is given to the scheme by bodies representing the various interested parties. Approval cannot be given to a product containing a new chemical until it has been cleared under another voluntary scheme, namely, the Pesticides Safety Precautions Scheme. Under this scheme a manufacturer proposing to market a new chemical for agriculture or food storage has to notify the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food of his intention. Each notification has to be supported by extensive data including composition, toxicity, persistence and possible hazards to animals, birds, etc., and later recommendations are made