Marine Loading Facility (5.4): The design of this facility has not yet been finalized but an underwater study along the probable site has been made. The design of the facility will be made taking account of the results of that study and the wellknown necessity to ensure that water movements are unimpeded.

Pipeline Routes (5.5): Detailed studies not yet commenced although preliminary surveys on possible routes have been undertaken and discussions held.
Surrounding Urban Areas and Facilities (5.6)

(*a*) A large amount of work is being carried out in this general area of interest, including input from the Environment and Conservation Department, Community Welfare Department, Education Department, South Australian Housing Trust, Aboriginal Affairs Department, and Public Health Department, among others.

(*b*) 1973.

(*c*) See (*a*).

(*d*) As available.

(*e*) Yes.

2. This question assumes that there will be seepage of effluent water from a proposed ponding area to gulf waters. This need not occur from any ponding system, and care will be taken to ensure that it does not occur at Redcliff. As described in paragraph 3.2.2 (*b*) of the plan for environmental study, the effluent to be subjected to biological oxidation treatment will first receive primary treatment to remove oil and suspended solids. The biological oxidation treatment involves the use of holding lagoons or basins which can and will be sealed, most probably with concrete, although other materials could be used, so obviating seepage.

3. This all-embracing and non-specific question cannot be answered completely. A vast amount of study has been carried out and numerous books and reports have been published on the effect of atmospheric emissions on all forms of life. The Report of the Committee on Environment in South Australia, a copy of which is in the Parliamentary Library, gives some details of the kinds of problem which can arise from emissions to the atmosphere (pages 13-20), of the meteorological associations with such problems (pages 20-28), and of the effects of a damaged air environment (pages 28-30). The Government's role in such areas of research is likely to be restricted to examining areas of the State in which atmospheric emissions are known, or can reasonably be expected, to occur. Studies of a more general nature are likely to continue to be carried out in universities, colleges and other research institutes throughout the world. On the basis of such studies, emission limits are laid down and enforced. In conjunction with such a programme, a monitoring system is usually set up, as in Adelaide, to give information on the levels of ambient air pollutants and the rates at which they dissipate.

4. The degree of toxicity of an extremely wide range of substances is already known in relation to an extremely wide range of animals and plants. Studies of this nature have been, and continue to be, carried out in many countries of the world. It is on the basis of such data that discharge levels are established and controlled. But a monitoring system is also required to ensure that the discharge levels continue to satisfactorily protect the environment.

5. Yes—to ensure that the environmental protection requirements and standards are being met. Specifically, the quantities and types of effluent to be permitted and their toxicity at the required level of dilution on discharge to sea, air and land will be published.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (on notice):

1. What is the total proposed production of ethylene-dichloride at the Redcliff petro-chemical project?

2. In what form is this material to be exported?

3. What quantity of ethylene-dichloride reaching the gulf waters would be considered dangerous to the ecology?

4. If quantities of ethylene-dichloride reach gulf waters, what methods can be used to remove this substance?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. The total proposed production of ethylene-dichloride (EDC) at Redcliff is 600 000 tonnes a year.

2. EDC is a liquid and will be exported by sea in tankers.

3. Studies are being undertaken to determine toxicity levels for EDC.

4. A large spillage of EDC to the gulf would constitute a major catastrophe although trace quantities will naturally oxidize. Every measure will therefore be taken to prevent the occurrence of any spillage but as a security precaution the consortium is preparing contingency measures for the long odds of such an event occuring.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1928-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the first of three measures intended to enable a new dairy product "dairy blend" to be lawfully marketed in this State. This new foodstuff, in broad terms, consists of an admixture of milk fat in the form of cream and vegetable oils. The product has the flavour and nutritious value of butter but, because it is easier to spread, it appears likely to have a wide public acceptance.

Honourable members will be aware that for a number of years the legislation of this State and indeed of all the States of Australia has had the effect of prohibiting the addition of vegetable oils to butter. It is in the context of this legislative framework that appropriate amendments must be made to permit the marketing of this product which, incidentally, was developed in the Agriculture Department's Northfield laboratories. This Bill amends the principal Act (the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended), and the contents of this measure can be best considered by an examination of its clauses.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This clause is most important, as all the amending Bills giving effect to the scheme must necessarily come into operation on the same day. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "dairy blend", and I commend this definition to members' closest attention. So far as possible, the definition of "dairy blend" is to be uniform throughout the States of Australia. The manifest advantages of this approach are, I suggest, obvious. In addition, by an amendment to this section, dairy blend is included in the definition of "dairy produce" and, by and large, the provisions of the Act applicable to butter are extended to touch on dairy blend.

In addition, two minor metric amendments are made to this section. Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act by extending the grading provisions relating to butter to include dairy blend. Clause 5 amends section 22 of the principal Act and makes a metric amendment which is self-explanatory. Clause 6 amends section 28 of the principal Act by extending the power to make regulations to cover the dairy blend. Finally, I would indicate that once this product comes on the market it may not necessarily be marketed in the name "dairy blend": it is likely that the trade name "dairy spread" will be used.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Margarine Act, 1939-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the last of the three measures that will facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The effect of this short Bill is to take "dairy blend" as defined for the purposes of the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended, out of the definition of "margarine". As a result, the Margarine Act will have no application in relation to dairy blend. In addition, opportunity has been taken to amend section 16 of the Margarine Act, which deals with the distance by which butter and margarine factories must be separated, to make this section consistent with section 22 of the Dairy Industry Act, as that section is proposed to be amended.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act Amendment Bill, 1973, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1974.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Several important developments have occurred since this measure was introduced into the Council in the last session of Parliament. The legislation was in fact introduced with a view to facilitating these developments, but it was not possible to obtain its passage at the close of the last session. These developments have now come about and, although the present state of the Act has not proven an insuperable obstacle, the amendments will greatly assist in tying up what loose ends remain. The honourable Mr. DeGaris, in speaking to this Bill on March 27, 1974, stressed the fact that the producers would, if the measure passed into law, be denied representation on the authority, even though they would continue to carry the financial burden for the development. Mr. DeGaris stated:

> In my opinion the producers have a right to representation, if for no other reason than to have some say in the exercise of proper control over expenditures. The expenditures on the pipeline are wholly the responsibility of the producers.

As a result of the developments which have taken place since that time, that is no longer the case and, as a result, the whole argument falls to the ground. Under a new agreement that has been entered into by the producers and the Government, the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority has become the monopoly purchaser of all methane produced on the South Australian field. A field gate price of 24c a million British thermal units has been established to operate from May 1, this year. The authority in turn is selling the gas to the primary consumers (the South Australian Gas Company and the Electricity Trust of South Australia) and certain industrial establishments, and is responsible for all future developmental expenditure.

As part of a *quid pro quo*, the producers have agreed to review their exploration commitments and to enter into an agreement whereby they will spend $15 000 000 on exploration for new gas in the Cooper Basin over a five-year period, with a minimum of $2 000 000 spent in any one 12-month period. Agreement has been reached by the Mines Department as to the specifics of the first year's programme. In the light of all these developments I submit that the arguments raised in the Council when the matter was first introduced are no longer relevant. Concerning membership of the board, it is possible that somebody intimately associated with the producing interests will serve on the reconstituted authority, but this will arise not as a matter of right but as a matter of convenience.

The PRESIDENT: I point out to the honourable Minister that the second reading of this Bill has been moved previously and that, with the leave of the Council, his remarks will merely form part of the second reading debate.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Very well, Mr. President.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills. The three persons representing the House of Assembly on such a committee would be the Hons. D. A. Dunstan and L. J. King, and Mr. Chapman.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the House of Assembly's request be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative Council to be members of the Joint Committee be the Chief Secretary, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

Motion carried.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides in the usual manner for the payment of compensation to any person who suffered loss by reason of the actions of eradication officers in relation to those areas of the State affected by the various outbreaks of fruit fly during the early months of this year. The districts involved were Kent Town, North Adelaide, Parkside, Rosslyn Park, St. Peters, Hindmarsh, Hillcrest, Highbury, and Vale Park. All in all, eleven proclamations were made, and it is expected that the total cost of compensation could be about $50 000.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 directs that this new Act be read in conjunction with the Fruit Fly Act. Clause 3 sets out the basis for entitlement to compensation.

three, because they are related. I have asked the Minister once or twice about the Government policy regarding margarine, and I think I am right in saying that, if it had its way, the Government would completely abandon quotas on margarine, not just on table margarine but also on the manufacture of margarine throughout the whole of the industry.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Quotas apply only to table margarine.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is the point I want to make. The dairying industry has changed its views considerably in the past few years in one respect: it now believes that, as a result of medical reports, people who wish and who have been recommended to use poly-unsaturated margarine should be allowed to do so. I do not think those in the dairying industry, or the people of South Australia generally, believe there should be an open go for the use of imported palm oil to produce a cake-like spread which is anything but poly-unsaturated; in fact, it is a solid fat and I think that would be resisted very strongly.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It cannot be used in poly-unsaturated margarine anyway, because it is not a poly-unsaturated oil.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The point I make to the Minister is that I understand Government policy is that quotas on table margarine should be removed completely, and no action would be taken to amend the Margarine Act to see that the Victorian or the Queensland Act would be adopted in this State; that is, all margarine that is produced (except that which is entitled to be called poly-unsaturated or table margarine) must not be coloured and must bear on the carton or package a notation to the effect that it is cooking margarine.. No provision seems to have been made for that by the Government in amending the Act, but the Minister says he will move strongly for the removal of quotas at the next Agricultural Council meeting.

The Government should amend the Margarine Act so that, in the event of it happening (as it looks like happening) that the quota for table margarine is abandoned, something can be done to protect the public against an article that one can buy for 35c at present in the form of copha. If it has a colour in it, it is sold as margarine spread—something we have been arguing about for years. Copha is a highly fat-saturated product. This legislation should have something else written into it. To make this product we are going to use, we should stipulate the other ingredients, 16 per cent to 20 per cent of added vegetable oils, and it should be that they are Australian-produced oils, because that would ensure that we had control over the type of ingredients used. The ingredients we can use, which are poly-unsaturated and which grow readily in this country—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Such as?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Does the Minister want to know the full list of them?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Yes, if the honourable member has them.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have soya beans, which we can use in any quantity we like.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do we grow them in Australia?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We can grow them if we set out to; and we can grow safflower.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: In what quantities?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In any quantities we like to grow. A few people in the earlier days of this country tried hard to grow safflower. If we did not have such a restrictive policy in regard to cash crops, with water from the Murray River in times of plenty we could grow many of these things along the river. We can use sunflower, we can use soya beans, and we can use cotton.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Can we?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; it is poly-unsaturated. It is a rich source of poly-unsaturated oil. I return to this matter of getting the margarine legislation into proper order. The dairying industry has given the all-clear to this State, with no great hostility, to allow the use of poly-unsaturated margarine. It has put forward a composite pack of butter oil and vegetable oil, with which we are dealing under this legislation. But the industry should not be taken to the cleaners by people being allowed to manufacture as much as they want of a product which they can dolly up to look like butter and which is much more heavily impregnated with fat than is anything sold on the market today. Our present cooking margarine is 90 per cent beef or mutton fat. In making poly-unsaturated margarine we have to use non-fat oil from vegetables.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You mean from animals?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, from vegetables, for poly-unsaturated margarine. My plea is that the Minister look at this situation carefully and insist that the definition in the Act be amended to ensure that Australian-produced vegetable oil is used. Otherwise, if we give a free go, we shall be flooded again with cheap palm oils from either New Guinea or some other country. That may happen, as it once did. The only reason why the Margarine Act ever came into operation was as a result of a Labor Government which, under the national security regulations, introduced a law prohibiting the use of imported fats in the form of coconut oil, which was being sold to the public cheaply and was ruining the dairying industry at that time. We do not want a repetition of that; we have come a long way since then.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do you think this spread will ruin the dairying industry?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I did not say that at all. The Minister has a great capacity for trying to get people into a corner but he has picked the wrong buddy this time. I did not say that at all. I am saying that I want to ensure that we do not go back to the bad days of importing all sorts of oil without the public knowing what they were getting. After all, we put on cigarette packets that "smoking is a health hazard." There is no greater health hazard than the use of impregnated fats that are sold freely on the market unless some control is exercised. I look to the Government to see that the legislation is amended so that this does not occur. I hope I have made the position clear.

First, I should like a change in the definition clause to get the formula right; and, secondly, I want to see a prohibition written into the Act on the manufacture of margarine in a place other than a butter factory. The Minister will receive many complaints from people in the dairying industry if he departs from using the proper ingredients not only in this spread but also in the manufacture of margarine.

The whole concept of dairy blend is good, and I am pleased that the industry appears to have accepted it. However, I hope for the sake of those in the dairying industry that the project is successful, because no-one can tell me that the industry is on top of the world at present. It is a difficult industry from which to gain a living, and it is not one into which many venture. However, it is an industry that keeps many people employed. Leaders in the industry have been brave in accepting this step forward, but I want to see that what is left for them is protected, and that is why I ask the Minister to look carefully at the points I have raised.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Further consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's message intimating that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from August 13. Page 392.)

Amendments Nos. 1 to 4:

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendments Nos. 1 to 4.

Amendment No. 1 should not be insisted on because it gives the Government far too narrow powers to make regulations in situations of emergency. There are many situations which, to be properly dealt with, will require wider powers than this. Amendments Nos. 2 and 3 are merely consequential on amendment No. 1. Amendment No. 4 should not be insisted on because a power of the nature proposed to be removed has no place in the controlling of situations of emergency that arise from industrial action; in fact, if exercised, it only exacerbates the situation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I believe that the Council should insist on its amendments. I do not agree that the four amendments narrow the Government's power; in many ways they widen its power to handle emergency situations. In all the matters we have spoken about in relation to this Bill the Government has sought powers to provide the essentials of life to people. Through amendments Nos. 1 to 4, the Government has been given power to provide the essentials of life. The restrictions that the Government had in the Bill have now been removed and the Government's powers have an equal effect on every person in the community: there are no privileged sections. If the amendments were removed, could the Government declare a state of emergency and decide to dispense with the services of a judge of the Supreme Court (who otherwise is protected under the Constitution Act)? In other words, would this Bill give the Government power to take action which at present is prevented under the provisions of the Constitution Act?

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: By regulation!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I could not answer the question properly until I looked closely at the situation. As I have said, amendment No. 1 should not be insisted on, because it gives the Government power that is too narrow to make regulations in cases of emergency. However, it is difficult to ascertain what the emergency might be.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It might be a flood!

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It might be a fire.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Does the Minister appreciate that the sittings of the Supreme Court, as provided by the Supreme Court Act and the regulations thereto, may be affected? I do not believe that the regulations could repeal the Act, but the sittings of the court could be suspended. If the Government decided that court orders were disturbing the peace, order and good government of the State it could legislate by regulation, thereby interfering with the sittings or determinations of the court, although I doubt whether the sittings of the court could be suspended.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am sure that the Leader realizes that if the Government brought down a regulation it would be for a limited time, say, seven days.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It would be for 14 days.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It would be for seven days and then the Government would have to go before Parliament.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It can't be for seven days.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I said, it could happen—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is 14 days.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think it is.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yet it is. Do your homework!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is the information I have been given and I understand that is the case. It must come back to Parliament, which will decide.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Would Parliament's decision be forever?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, I suppose, until it decided to alter it in the future.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not think that that is necessarily correct. If the Government decided, after Parliament had stopped sitting, to act in the same emergency, another 14 days would be involved. The same regulations would be introduced with monotonous regularity.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Does the Minister believe that the Government should have this wide power? He is asking honourable members not to insist on the amendments. It appears that the powers that the Government is seeking are limited somewhat by the amendments, and justly so. However, they are also enlarged so that the powers that the Government has are equally spread. Does the Minister realize just how wide the powers in this Bill, if left alone, could go? I have referred to the question of interference with the Constitution Act; there is some doubt in this connection. I do not think there is any doubt that the Government could interfere with the Supreme Court Act and with the sittings of the Supreme Court. Let us suppose that the Industrial Court did not grant a union claim, and the Supreme Court applied the tort and contract clause against the union. In that case the Government could, in a state of emergency, interfere with the determination of the Supreme Court.

I am pointing out these things for the information of the Minister, who has claimed that honourable members do not do their homework. Before he makes such claims he should do his own homework. The Minister has said that we are restricting the power of the Government. Of course we are, but I am saying that it is a just restriction. In other ways the amendments widen the powers so that they rest equally on every citizen in the community. In this regard I support the Hon. Mr. Creedon, who has bleated about equality for a long time, but I have not heard him on this one. He talks a lot about equality but, when he can show his interest in equality, he sits dumb in his seat and says nothing. I believe that the four amendments are essential.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I support the attitude taken by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I cannot understand why the Government has disagreed to these amendments, because they are reasonable and fair. Either the Government is putting forward a Bill so totally unacceptable that it will be lost or the Bill has a far more sinister import than has been mentioned. With these amendments, the Bill still leaves wide powers to the Government to handle a state of emergency. We have heard statements about closing roads and about floods, etc., but

or cheese factories. So, the industry saw that an equalization scheme was necessary; in due course, the Commonwealth Government, too, saw that it was necessary. While in the first instance this legislation dealt with intrastate production, subsequently it embraced a wider field. When the whole of the Commonwealth production was examined, some had to be exported and some had to be consumed, in various forms, on the Australian market. A proprietary company was set up at some stage (I cannot remember the exact date), and it is still operating. It works with the Agriculture Department as part of the dairying industry's structure.

The board has done a good job in maintaining a general equalization in the industry. It decides on the amount of production and the price for which the milk will be sold. It also decides on the amount of cheese and butter that will be produced within the State and, as well, it sets the quota for export to other States. As a consequence, a fairly equitable situation arises from the board's operations. It is important that this new product, which is to be put on the market soon, will also come within the ambit of the board's operations. If the Act is not amended, this product could not come within its ambit, because it is not a product that is made from milk only: it is a composite product of which more than 60 per cent will be butter.

It is necessary that the board take into account the amount of butterfat that is to be used in the composite product, dairy blend, when it is assessing the number of products that will be needed for use within the State. The previous situation, in which only butter and cheese were dealt with, is changed. The board will have the additional responsibility of supervising the distribution of butterfats that are used in dairy spread. As the interpretation section of the Act has been amended to include "dairy spread", it is logical for the matter to come under the board's operations.

Most of the amendments contained in the Bill are consequential on the Bill to amend the Dairy Industry Act. The Bill brings the new spread into line with many other dairy products. It is necessary that the amendments be put into operation and that we continue to hold a tight rein on orderly marketing within the dairying industry. For these reasons, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 391.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): The amendments in this Bill fit into the pattern of two other Bills (the Dairy Produce Act Amendment Bill and the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill) with which the Council is currently dealing. As I said yesterday, the Margarine Act is not being amended in a major way (it is still certainly not being amended in as major a way as I would like to see it amended). I sincerely hope that, when the marketing of this new product gets under way, the Minister will again bring an amending Bill before the Council so that honourable members can try to put the legislation in order in the same way as the other two Bills with which the Council has already dealt put those other Acts in order.

The main part of this Bill is the amendment to section 3, which is the interpretation provision. The amendment excludes dairy blend from the provisions of the Act. This product is of the same nature as margarine, as it is not completely derived from a lacteal product. The definition of it is more akin to that of margarine than to that of butter, although butter will be the main ingredient in the new spread. The Bill also makes metric conversion amendments. As I said yesterday, one conversion is not accurate. I am sure the Minister will tell the Council why the reference to "one hundred yards" is being converted to "ninety metres". I am sure there must be a good reason for it, or the Minister would not have put it in the Bill.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What do you suggest it should have been?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think it should have been about 91 m. If Sir Arthur Rymill has his calculator working under his desk, as I am sure he usually has, he will be able to tell honourable members the exact conversion.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That would make us slaves to the Imperial system.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I like being a slave to the Imperial system. I am proud to be a slave to the Imperial system, whatever form it takes. I believe in the Imperial system. Some people seem confused about the present situation, and I draw attention to a report from the Heart Foundation of Australia and a physician's statement which was the basis of a seminar attended by many eminent people. Some points arising from this report are relevant to the subject.

First, the quota for table margarine at present encompasses 23 174 tonnes a year, but the quantity of other margarine on the market in the form of spreads or cooking margarine is much greater. We have heard about the possibility of removing quotas applying to table margarine, but the points I have in mind deserve consideration. The first relates to labelling. I do not think there is any problem about public acceptance of poly-unsaturated margarine: I think the public accepts it very well. However, more care must be taken to see that the public is properly informed on just what is being sold as margarine or as spreads.

Many people believe that, because they have read that margarine is better for them than butter, they should buy margarine when they see it readily displayed in the shop. Unless there is some indication on the package to inform people that the contents are not poly-unsaturated margarine but, in fact, 90 per cent animal fat with colouring and other things added to give proper spreadability, I think the public is being taken for a ride. I am not so much in favour of the Victorian legislation, which provides that no colouring at all can be put in cooking margarine, that it must be sold in the clear colour (which is much the same as the colour of lard), and that it must be put in a packet clearly marked to the effect that the contents are cooking margarine for cooking purposes only. I think that stipulating "for cooking purposes only" is probably going too far, but the public should be warned against buying straight-out fat, which is what it is being sold as at present.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I think it would be better to say beef and mutton fat rather than animal fat.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If the Minister wishes, I shall do that, because he is perfectly correct. If people were asked to use mutton and beef dripping at all times for spreads, for making sandwiches, and so on, most would refuse. However, because the product is dressed up with a bit of colouring, people are willing to use it; smart advertising techniques have convinced them it is a substitute for butter. Some of the earlier advertising showed a butter knife, to engender the idea that the spread was actually butter, and this has remained in the minds of many people.

The high fat content is most harmful to people who have high cholesterol blood counts. It may not affect some people, but the health of those with a cholesterol problem is being put at further risk unless some warning is given by legislators. If the warning that smoking is a health hazard is to be displayed on cigarette packets, I think equally people should be told that the use of these fats is a health hazard. Over the years, Governments have been reluctant to take a stand against the dairying industry in these matters. That dates from the early days of margarine when the ingredients were all imported, mainly in the form of coconut oil and similar oils that came from countries where little hygiene was observed in the gathering of the products, or when little hygiene was observed in the manufacture of the margarine at the time. People became very cautious about it.

The original laws were strict and recently, with overproduction in the dairying industry, it has been difficult to do anything about the acceptance of margarine. From the time poly-unsaturated margarine came on the market the position should have changed, but the resistance has always been great. As one who has been to meetings of the Agricultural Council, I know the difficulties the Minister and his colleagues must have encountered. The States of New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria are fairly dependent on the dairying industry, and in New South Wales and Queensland the industry is not thrifty, having much bulk milk but little milk of high quality. This position has largely held up the acceptance of poly-unsaturated margarine throughout Australia. That is a great pity, because much of the country used over the years for grazing cows could equally have been used for producing the various crops for vegetable oils used in the production of margarine. It would not have been a threat to primary industry if the Australian content of poly-unsaturated margarine had been 100 per cent, but the fear that, if there is an open go, we will revert to importing various cheap raw materials has remained in the minds of the people, especially those in the dairying industry. They fear that there will be insufficient Government protection.

I do not think we should over-protect the dairying industry, because it wants and needs competition, but that competition must involve an Australian component in the product that is a substitute for butter. That can be provided, as I said yesterday, in several forms and from a number of parts of the Commonwealth of Australia, including South Australia. Therefore, I think there will be little objection to the Government's policy of endeavouring to have the other States agree to removing the quotas on table poly-unsaturated margarine; but I think and hope there will still be resistance to making it any easier for people to produce any old thing in the name of margarine.

The Government should now overhaul the legislation if it is advocating wholeheartedly an open go in producing poly-unsaturates. It must ensure that the dairying industry is protected against the cheaper and easier to manufacture type of margarine. I ask the Minister to look at this closely, bearing in mind that the dairying industry will co-operate well but needs protection. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Further consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's message intimating that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from August 14. Page 453.)

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee adjourned yesterday, it was about to take a vote on the question that the motion as amended be agreed to.

Motion as amended carried.

Amendment No. 6:

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment No. 6.

If this amendment was carried (and, unfortunately, the Government cannot accept it) it would mean that the Act presaged by this Bill would have a life of less than five months. In the opinion of the Government, that would be far too short a period. For that reason, I cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This amendment finally became my amendment because I moved the Act should have a shorter life than provided for in the Bill, and apparently honourable members eventually agreed to this. I made my position clear in the previous debate that, if the Act worked properly, then I for one, and I am sure other honourable members, would not object to its being extended for another 12 months. I have made the point that this is experimental legislation and we must see how it works before we give it such a long period of operation as nearly 18 months, as the Government proposes.

Since I made that speech, I have given this measure, as no doubt other honourable members have, considerable thought, and it is my considered opinion now that the Bill is a really appalling one, fraught with all sorts of absolute dangers to our democracy. Personally, I would prefer to see it abandoned altogether, and perhaps the Government could come along with more specific legislation from time to time to deal with situations as they arose. However, I know we find it almost impossible, on this side of Parliament, to get our message across. We do not have the press secretaries that the Government has to deal with these matters. As we have none of these secretaries, the newspapers are festooned with a variety of statements, already made up for the Government by its press secretaries, and the Government has the advantage there, whereas the message of honourable members on this side does not seem to get across to the public at all.

If we vote against the Bill altogether, the Government will get its press secretaries to work to say that we are decadent, ancient and reactionary, etc., without their presenting the case that we believe in, thus throwing further mud at this Council. I would prefer to see the Act operate for a short period in consequence (and only in consequence) of the Bill so that we can review its operation after a comparatively short time; but, if the Act is to operate for 18 months without review, and if it proves to have the implications I fear it will have, chaos can be caused in that time.

So I am adamant about providing a very short period. I have no doubt the Bill will go to a conference. If the conference in its wisdom votes for the longer period, I will exercise my prerogative in this Council of voting against the recommendations of the managers, as we are entitled to do. This is a vital clause of the Bill, and I ask honourable members to insist on the amendment.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I, too, believe this to be an extremely important provision. Whilst the Government has stated that it will not accept the amendment, I make

countries. This proposal was endorsed by the Law Reform Committee in its twenty-first report and has the support of the Law Society. There are, of course, at the present moment various provisions that are to some extent analogous to the present Bill. For example, order 37 of the Supreme Court Rules deals with the subject.

These provisions appear to cover civil and criminal proceedings. In the Local and District Criminal Courts Act provision is made in sections 284 to 292 for the taking of evidence away from the court. These provisions, however, relate only to civil matters and do not extend to district criminal courts. There does not appear to be any general power in the Justices Act for this purpose but certain legislation, for example, the Community Welfare Act, deals with the subject in so far as the proceedings authorized by the legislation are concerned. The amendments contained in this Bill will provide a procedure which it is hoped will become uniform throughout Australia and under which many of the present complexities and inconsistencies will be avoided.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 enacts new Part VIB of the principal Act. Under new section 59d the Attorney-General may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, declare that a South Australian court corresponds to a foreign court for the purposes of the new provision. Section 59d (2) provides that the new Part will extend to both civil and criminal proceedings. Section 59e provides that a South Australian court may request a corresponding court to take evidence of a witness or to order the production of documents. Section 59f is a reciprocal provision to the effect that, where a corresponding court requests a South Australian court to take evidence, the South Australian court is invested with all the necessary powers for that purpose. Section 59g provides for verification of depositions. Section 59h deals with a case where a witness from whom a South Australian court is requested to take evidence is proceeding to some other country or State. In that case a request received from a corresponding court may be transmitted to another court to whose jurisdiction the witness is proceeding. Section 59i provides that the new provisions do not limit the power of a court to require a witness to attend in person. It further provides that the provisions of the new Part are supplementary to, and do not derogate from, the provisions of any other Act or law.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Members will recall that the principal Act, the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, was passed by this House last year. Pursuant to section 49 of that Act a poll was held, and 65 per cent of those voting expressed themselves as being in favour of the measure. Following this vote the Act was substantially brought into operation. However, when the licensing committee set about its task of determining base quotas for poultry farmers, it formed the opinion that the application of the Act, in its present form, could give rise to some inequities that could be avoided by its amendment. Since these inequities cover somewhat disparate aspects it would seem convenient if they could be dealt with in the consideration of the clauses of the measure. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes an amendment to section 4 of the principal Act, this being the interpretation section and, since this amendment is entirely consequential on the amendment intended by clause 6, it can be better dealt with in the explanation of that clause. Its relationship with that clause is, it is suggested, self-evident.

Clause 3 proposes that the time for making an election under section 13 of the principal Act will be extended until one month after a day that will be fixed by proclamation, if and when this Bill is passed. It seems that the time originally provided in the principal Act for the making of an election by farmers was, in all the circumstances, too short. Clause 4, by an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act, proposes to remedy one apparent inequity. Members who are familiar with the scheme of production control encompassed by the principal Act will be aware that it is based on the number of leviable hens kept by poultry farmers over various periods antecedent to the enactment of that Act. A leviable hen is a hen in respect of which a hen levy is payable under the relevant legislation of the Commonwealth.

However, in any flock comprising leviable hens, the levy is not paid on the first 20 hens. Accordingly, in the calculation of base quotas under the principal Act no regard could be paid to the first 20 hens in any such flock. While in a flock of, say, 2 000 birds this factor would be relatively insignificant, in a flock of, say, 50 to 100 birds this factor would result, in the licensing committee's view, in an unfair reduction of a base quota. Accordingly, by this clause it is intended that every poultry farmer will be entitled to keep, in any licensing season, his hen quota plus 20 birds. This will place each farmer in a marginally better position than he would have been had the 20 birds been included in the figure from which his base quota is derived.

The licensing committee is satisfied that in practical terms this apparent increase of about 34 000 birds that will result from this amendment can be kept in this State within the limits of the State hen quota. Clause 5 proposes, in relation to section 20 of the principal Act, an amendment similar in both form and effect to that proposed by clause 3. Clause 6, on the face of it, by inserting a new section 20a in the principal Act, seems to confer an extraordinarily wide power on the licensing committee. However, it is proposed only after careful consideration by the committee. The committee discovered that the strict application of the Act will bear heavily on eight or nine cases out of a total of 1 678 cases.

While it would be easy to ignore these cases which for one reason or another do not fit exactly the terms of the Act, the committee considers that this would be fundamentally unjust. In ordinary circumstances specific provision would be made to cover them by an amendment to the legislation, but such an amendment was found, in practice, to distort the legislation unduly or to open the door to other applicants who were, in the philosophy of the Act, without merit. Accordingly, after deep consideration it is thought better to invest the licensing committee with this discretion in the confident expectation that it will be wisely used. Clause 7 amends section 28 of the principal Act by making the application of that section quite clear.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. Dean Brown: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Once again, we have made arrangements that have been broken. This Bill is the first of three measures intended to enable a new dairy product "dairy blend" to be lawfully marketed in this State. This new foodstuff, in broad terms, consists of an admixture of milk fat in the form of cream and vegetable oils. The product has the flavour and nutritious value of butter but because it is easier to spread it appears likely to have a wide public acceptance.

Members will be aware that for a number of years the legislation of this State and indeed of all the States of Australia has had the effect of prohibiting the addition of vegetable oils to butter. It is in the context of this legislative framework that appropriate amendments must be made to permit the marketing of this product which, incidentally, was developed in the Agriculture Department's Northfield laboratories. This Bill amends the principal Act, the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended, and the contents of this measure can be best considered by an examination of its clauses.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This clause is most important, as all the amending Bills giving effect to the scheme must necessarily come into operation on the same day. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by providing for a definition of "dairy blend", and I would commend this definition to members' closest attention. So far as possible, the definition of "dairy blend" is to be uniform throughout the States of Australia. The manifest advantages of this approach are, I suggest, obvious. In addition, by an amendment to this section, dairy blend is included in the definition of "dairy produce", and by and large the provisions of the Act applicable to butter are extended to touch on dairy blend. In addition, two minor metric amendments are made to this section.

Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act by extending the grading provisions relating to butter to include dairy blend. Clause 5 amends section 22 of the principal Act, by providing that the manufacture of dairy blend will be subject to the same limitations on its manufacture as are provided in relation to butter, and also makes a metric amendment which is self-explanatory. Clause 6 amends section 28 of the principal Act by extending the power to make regulations to cover dairy blend. Finally, I would indicate that once this product comes on the market it may not necessarily be marketed in the name "dairy blend". It is likely that the trade name "dairy spread" will be used.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is the second of three measures intended to facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The principal Act, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this board is to recommend and promulgate quotas for intrastate sales of butter and cheese within the framework of the Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalisation Scheme. I am sure that all members who have an interest in this field will be aware of the application of this Act to butter and cheese. The effect of the amendments proposed by this Bill is to extend the application of the Dairy Produce Act to dairy blend.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "dairy blend" in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended. This clause also extends the definition of "dairy produce" to encompass the product dairy blend. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that in the constitution of the Dairy Produce Board manufacturers of dairy blend will be recognized.

Clause 5 amends section 15a of the principal Act by extending the powers of the board to reporting on the wholesale price of dairy blend in the same way as it reports on the wholesale price of butter, and the powers of the Governor under this clause are consequently amended. Clause 6 amends section 16 of the principal Act and gives the board power to determine quotas for dairy blend in the same manner as it determines quotas for butter and cheese. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act and is an amendment to the penalty sections consequential on the increased powers of the board. In addition, paragraphs (*b*), (*c*) and (*e*) of this clause effect metric amendments. Clause 8 is a consequential amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is the last of the three measures that will facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The effect of this short Bill is to take "dairy blend" as defined for the purposes of the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended, out of the definition of "margarine". As a result, the Margarine Act will have no application in relation to dairy blend. In addition, opportunity has been taken to amend section 16 of the Margarine Act, which deals with the distance by which butter and margarine factories must be separated, to make this section consistent with section 22 of the Dairy Industry Act as that section is proposed to be amended.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.