maximum market value of a pig is fixed at £5.
To make the requisite alteration of the law it
is necessary to amend several sections of the
Swine Compensation Act. This is done by
the clauses of the Bill and the only amendments
made by the Bill are for this purpose. I move
the second reading.

The Hon. J. M. BEERWORTH secured the
adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. J. HULDALE (Midland—
Attorney-General)—This Bill alters the consti-
tution of the Dairy Produce Board and extends
the operation of the principal Act. As mem-
bers know, the Dairy Produce Act provides the
legal basis of the arrangements for securing
an equalized price for butter and cheese. It
establishes a Dairy Produce Board, and this
board determines how much of the butter and
cheese produced in the State can be sold locally.
The actual arrangements for equalizing the
returns received by those in the industry from
local and overseas sales are managed by a com-
pany known as the Commonwealth Dairy
Produce Equalization Committee Limited. This
company represents the Dairy Produce Boards
of all the Australian States. Shareholders of the
company must be members of State Dairy
Produce Boards and the directors of the com-
paoy have to be nominated by the shareholders.
These directors constitute the Equalization
Committee. South Australia is entitled to have
four shareholders in the company and these
shareholders have the right to nominate two
directors. The cheese manufacturers of this
State have been in the Commonwealth Equaliza-
tion Scheme since its inception, and although
they have not been actually represented by a
director of the Equalization Committee they
have had a representative who attended meet-
ings of the board without having the power to
vote. The butter manufacturers until April 1 of this
year were not members of the Commonwealth
Equalization Scheme but had a separate local
scheme. On April 1, they joined the Common-
wealth scheme. It will be seen, therefore, that
since April 1 both the butter and cheese manu-
facturers of South Australia have had the right
through the medium of the Dairy Produce
Board to participate in electing the directors
and controlling the policy of the Commonwealth
Equalization Committee. The board has, how-
ever, urged upon the Government that its
present constitution under which it consists of
a chairman, one consumer's representative and
one producer's representative, does not permit
an adequate representation to be given to all
sectors of the dairy produce industry. The Gov-
ernment has carefully investigated this matter
and has come to the conclusion that the inclusion
of those in the industry for a more widely rep-
resentative board are justified, mainly on the
ground that in the future the board will be
the principal medium through which those
engaged in the dairy produce industry in the
State will be able to influence the policy of the
Equalization Committee.

It is proposed, therefore, in the Bill to
substitute for the present board a board of
seven members. There will be one consumer's
representative, two representatives of dairy
milk, two representatives of butter manufactur-
ers and two representatives of cheese manufac-
turers. By way of recognizing the importance
of the cheese industry in the South-East it is
provided that one of the cheese representa-
tives will represent the factories in the South
East, and the other will represent the cheese
factories in other parts of the State. The con-
sumers' representative will be appointed chair-
man of the board. The present arrangements
under which the Minister chooses the person
to act on the committee as representatives of
the various branches of the dairy industry will
be retained. This arrangement has worked
satisfactorily, and there is no demand for a
change in it. These alterations which I have
explained are made by clause 3 of the Bill.

Clause 4 increases the quorum of the board
from two to four. This is purely concessional.
Clause 5 provides that the board may
become a member of, or nominate or appoint
members to, or otherwise co-operate with, an
organization formed inside or outside the State
for the protection of the interests of persons in
the dairy produce industry. This clause is nec-
sessary because as a matter of strict law the board
would have no power to take up shares in the
Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalization
Committee Limited or otherwise work with the
committee unless so authorized by Statute.

Clause 6 repeals section 26 of the principal
Act. This is the section which imposes a time
limit on the duration of the Act. It has been
the policy of Parliament for some years to
extend the Dairy Produce Act from time to
time for periods of two years. This practice
was justifiable while the equalization scheme
was in its early and experimental stages. It may
now be said that the equalization scheme has
DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 775.)

The Hon. E. A. OATES (Central No. 1)—As we have heard practically no criticism against the Commonwealth equalization scheme it is evident that most members are satisfied with it. It appears that it has done a really good job for Australia and the States generally and I am at a loss to understand why this measure is being introduced, as I am sure it will not operate to the benefit of producers, manufacturers, and last but not least, consumers. I realize that the producers did not become part of the scheme, but that was not the fault of this Parliament. Cheese manufacturers did, to a degree, as a matter of fact, one person acquainted with the industry was elected as a representative of the cheese manufacturers of South Australia and apparently he, with the assistance of the equalization committee, did a remarkably good job. I feel that this Bill will upset the equilibrium of the scheme. The 1934 Act provided for a board of three, one member being nominated by the Government and acting as chairman, one representing the consumers, and one the producers. This Bill will increase the board to seven.

Although consumers had equal representation under the 1934 Act, under this Bill they will be outnumbered, as there will be two representatives each of dairymen, butter manufacturers, and cheese manufacturers. Such a board will increase expenditure and provide plums for someone. The proposed chairman who will be known as the consumers’ representative, will not represent the Housewives’ Association, the Trades Hall or the Trades and Labor Council. He may know the taste of butter or cheese, but he will not know how to manage a home in which butter is one of the main commodities. Sooner or later we must prevent the creation of such large boards. I have been reliably informed that four members of the board will be members of the equalization committee.

What is to prevent us from reducing the number of members from seven to four and having one representative each of butter manufacturers, dairymen, and cheese manufacturers? The industry has been functioning quite satisfactorily under the equalization scheme. I have heard no complaints about its fairness and I believe that the Governor should state the reasons why this amendment is needed. It is not reasonable to suggest additional representatives of the various sections of the industry, one representative of each section is sufficient.

The Hon. N. N. Jude—Do you think it would be well balanced to have two members, one producer and one consumer?

The Hon. E. A. OATES—Yes. The last we could work together. If the Bill is passed without alteration there will be four members nominated to represent two representatives of producers and one of consumers. Such a board will not be so well balanced. I favour four members, unless the Minister can satisfy me seven are necessary.

The Hon. R. J. Badall—The boards in Tasmania, Western Australia and New South Wales have seven members. I think seven is the limit.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—It is not necessary to follow the other States. Until April next year each of the interests on the board had one representative. I support the second reading, but hope the Minister will be able to supply me with the information I desire.

The Hon. N. BROOMKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

VII.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 777.)

The Hon. J. M. BEERWORTH (Northern)—I am sorry that the Minister did not give the reason for adopting the original compensation scheme. I fully support the Bill as far as the more favoured areas of the State are concerned, but I am doubtful of its practical application in outback areas. Under the Bill it will be necessary, in order to qualify for compensation, to obtain a certificate from a qualified inspector that the animal died from one of the specified diseases. In Queensland there is an inspector of stock but I do not know whether there will be machinery to see that those areas obtain the full benefit of this legislation. At Port Augusta there is one of the biggest pig factories in the State outside the metropolitan area, and people there will be under a disadvantage. I should like more information from the Minister as to the extent of the fund.

The Hon. E. J. Badall—I think it is about £50,000.

The Hon. J. M. BEERWORTH—The Minister. The Bill is a step in the right direction.

The Hon. E. W. CASTINE (Midland)—I support the Bill, which is long overdue. The amount in the fund seems to be a tremendous sum for the purpose. Those who have been selling pigs have been paying into it for years but so far as I am aware the only persons who have obtained compensation are the buyers in pig markets. The pigs of a man in the country may die from one of the diseases mentioned and it may be impossible to get a stock inspector on the spot to examine them. There are other people than stock inspectors capable of styling what is a pig from a test and if they were not assured under the Bill to do so owners of pigs dying from the diseases specified would not miss compensation.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee’s report adopted.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 778.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Central No. 1—Leader of the Opposition)—It was asked in another place that as much as £250,000 has been received in South Australia from the sale of whaling stock to Melbourne, which proves how important the fishing industry is to this State. Under existing legislation individual fishermen must take out a licence, but corporations have no such privilege. Under the Bill they may, and I hope the Minister will do so, that strengthens the Act. Section 14 of the Act provides for the registration of fishing boats, which is desirable.
TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Having obtained leave, the Hon. R. J. Redall introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Trustee Act, 1936-42. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. J. REDALL (Midland—Attorney-General)—This Bill deals with the power of trustees to invest trust money in debentures of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Under the Trustee Act, 1936-1942, trusts are empowered to invest trust funds in securities guaranteed by the Government or the Parliament of the State. By section 7 of that Act, however, these securities, if redeemable at any time, cannot be purchased at a premium of more than 15 per cent.

The Trust’s debentures are securities guaranteed by the Government of the State within the meaning of the Trustee Act, and therefore the above provisions apply to them. They do not, however, apply to Commonwealth Government stocks, nor to stocks guaranteed by the Commonwealth, nor to the Adelaide Electric Supply Company’s debentures, nor to the Gas Company’s debentures. Thus the Trust’s debentures are treated less favourably than a trustee investment than the other securities mentioned. There is no reason for permitting this state of the law to continue. Requests have been received by the Government from stockholders and the chairman of the Trust for an amendment of the law so as to provide that the Trust’s debentures may be purchased as a trustee investment even if they are at a premium. The Government considers the request reasonable and has brought down this Bill to give effect to it.

The Bill simply states that the restrictions which prohibit trustees from purchasing securities at a premium, as set out in section 7 of the Trustee Act, will not apply to debentures issued by the Trust, or on which the Trust is liable. The Bill will not, of course, affect the general duty of trustees to exercise prudence in investing trust funds and to act justly between beneficiaries entitled to capital and interest respectively. This is a simple Bill which brings the securities guaranteed by the Government in connection with the Electricity Trust under the same provisions as already apply to the other stocks and debentures I have set out. There appears to be no reason why this should not be done, I note, in the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON moved the adjournment of the debate.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

DAIRY PRODUCER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 79.)

The Hon. N. BROOKMAN (Southern)—In his second reading speech the Minister made it clear why the Act should be amended, in order to enhance the board to seven members, and provide that legislation shall continue in force over the years. In the past there has been the practice to extend the life of the existing Act for short periods. The board manages the dairy produce industry and do so in the Commonwealth stabilization scheme. Oates seemed to have some apprehension about increasing the size of the board, and he suggested one of four members because he thought seven were too many. But I think the interests of the consumers would not be properly protected. I believe that he is unnecessarily alarmed because a board of seven is not so effective as one of three or four. When a board is enlarged new interests are introduced and the views expressed by the additional members are valuable. The main point is increasing the board. As proposed is that a representative of the South-Eastern cheese industry will be appointed. The dairy industry in that part of the State is growing rapidly and the production will increase greatly when more settlement takes place. Because of its geographical position the South-East is set apart, and the tendency of the products of the dairy industry to go to Victoria, whereas an applicant for the Paterson scheme, the butter and cheese were sold in South Australia. Sixty-two per cent of the butterfat produced in this State is converted into butter and 32 per cent into cheese. The board fixed the quantities to be sold inside and outside the State as well as overseas. Under the equalization scheme, as short ages of butter and cheese in other States can be made up with supplies from South Australia. Such a scheme is essential and I believe it started with the Paterson scheme. It is not generally understood that the $7,500,000 provided by the Commonwealth as a bonus to the industry does not go to the dairymen. It is really wrapped up in the equalization of the butter and cheese prices. The overseas price of butter per hundredweight is 175s. 6d. sterling, which is 216s. 1d., in Australian money. The price of first grade cheese overseas is 10s. 6d. sterling, which is 15s. 6d., in Australian money. The local price of butter is 16s. 6d., per hundredweight in bulk. The cheese price is 11s. There is a discrepancy between the prices obtained overseas and the prices at which the product is sold in Australia. At present if the industry were not stabilized dairymen would be getting money for their product. The present export prices. Under the scheme the Commonwealth Government, with the money available, makes up the difference between the Australian rate for butter and 20s., a hundredweight so as to enable people in Australia to get it at a cheaper rate. They pay the difference to keep the price down. But it does it not go directly to the dairyman. Another good reason why there should be a board of seven members is that four members are chosen to represent South Australia and become shareholders in the Dairy Produce Equalization Committee Limited. Two of the four are appointed as directors to represent South Australia. If we do not pass the Bill there will be great difficulty in administration.

The Hon. R. J. Redall—The Commonwealth Government will appoint representatives of its own.

The Hon. N. BROOKMAN—I think so. The number of members of boards in other States are: Victoria, five; New South Wales and Western Australia, seven; Queensland, 11. In Queensland it is a Butter Board, different from the others. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. P. BLESING (Northern)—The legislation we are amending was brought into being when I was Minister for Agriculture, after much discussion and many conferences, following a vote carried in the Paterson scheme, which served a good purpose until loopholes were discovered in it. No dairyman in South Australia, I think, will ever regret the legislation put through at that time. The equalization system, inaugurated because of the high cost of production in this country, has saved the dairy industry. This Bill increases the number of members of the board and dairymen will now have two representatives on it out of seven. I am confident that the type of men who will be appointed in addition to the dairymen will in no way impair the efficacy of the legislation. Most members have had experience of the working of the scheme.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—Has it worked successfully?

The Hon. A. P. BLESING—Yes, so far as the industry is concerned. We could not have such an important industry, producing one of the staple foods of life, and the money of low export prices, knowing that costs of production are continually increasing. Before the introduction of the legislation the dairyman’s work was drudgery and he depended for labour largely on the work of his wife and children because he could not afford to pay for outside help. It was difficult to get dairymen to agree to be tied up under the legislation, and many farmers kept their market and were able to sell fresh dairy butter at a price much in excess of the export price, but that was not in the interests of the industry as a whole, so they had to be levied under the equalization scheme. I am pleased that one clause of the Bill provides for co-operation with other States. When the first Bill embodying an equalization scheme was being considered there was great difference of opinion as to whether dairymen in this State should be better off working under a State Act and a State board or under a Commonwealth scheme. I believed it was necessary in the interests of the dairymen to co-operate with the other States.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—You didn’t view it very favourably.

The Hon. A. P. BLESING—I advocated it. Particularly at certain times of the year when we had to import butter. I could see that South Australian dairymen would reap a benefit from the bigger scheme. A section of the trade and some producers were inclined to continue it to the State, but I had a departmental committee established to investigate the whole question and it reported in favour of the Commonwealth scheme. Though the Bill was so framed that South Australia could come under the Commonwealth scheme I do not know that it would go into it entirely, except that the people who did, and it placed the South-East on the map of Australia as a cheese manufacturing district. Clearly connected with that question was the bringing up to date of South-Eastern factories. The South-East was the home of cheese-making at the time, and it fell to my lot to approve of the enforcement of a drastic regulation as to grade there. The South-East had been exempt from its operations, but it
was discovered that the grade of cheese produced by certain South-Eastern factories was down to 77 points instead of the 91 points required for export cheese. It was desirable, therefore, in their own interests, that they should conform to the regulation, as other parts of the State did. I was struck by the difficulty of enforcing the regulation in the South-East, but I replied that I would go there and explain why it was done, and offer departmental assistance in putting in the necessary plant to conform to the regulation. The result was that the quality of some factories went up to 100 points. It was a matter of hygiene. But for that those factories would have continued to produce low grade cheeses; now they produce the best quality in Australia. The Hon. A. P. Blesing—What assistance did they get from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. A. P. Blesing—The Commonwealth Government was just standing by. They got legal assistance, but the State worked out its own destiny in that regard. South-Eastern dairymen would admit now that what was done was necessary and beneficial. We have not yet reached the limit in regard to output, and I believe that if we can maintain the present high quality, we shall be better able to compete in the world market and maintain our position.

The Hon. J. E. Steinbeck—What did the Commonwealth do for the State in the dairy industry?

The Hon. A. P. Blesing—The Commonwealth Government was just standing by. They got legal assistance, but the State worked out its own destiny in that regard. South-Eastern dairymen would admit now that what was done was necessary and beneficial. We have not yet reached the limit in regard to output, and I believe that if we can maintain the present high quality, we shall be better able to compete in the world market and maintain our position.

The Hon. J. E. Steinbeck—What did the Commonwealth do for the State in the dairy industry?

The Hon. A. P. Blesing—The Commonwealth Government was just standing by. They got legal assistance, but the State worked out its own destiny in that regard. South-Eastern dairymen would admit now that what was done was necessary and beneficial. We have not yet reached the limit in regard to output, and I believe that if we can maintain the present high quality, we shall be better able to compete in the world market and maintain our position.

The Hon. J. E. Steinbeck—What did the Commonwealth do for the State in the dairy industry?

The Hon. A. P. Blesing—The Commonwealth Government was just standing by. They got legal assistance, but the State worked out its own destiny in that regard. South-Eastern dairymen would admit now that what was done was necessary and beneficial. We have not yet reached the limit in regard to output, and I believe that if we can maintain the present high quality, we shall be better able to compete in the world market and maintain our position.

The Hon. J. E. Steinbeck—What did the Commonwealth do for the State in the dairy industry?

The Hon. A. P. Blesing—The Commonwealth Government was just standing by. They got legal assistance, but the State worked out its own destiny in that regard. South-Eastern dairymen would admit now that what was done was necessary and beneficial. We have not yet reached the limit in regard to output, and I believe that if we can maintain the present high quality, we shall be better able to compete in the world market and maintain our position.
TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjoined debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 6. Page 282.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Central No. 1—Leader of the Opposition)—The Bill deals with the power of trustees to invest money in debentures of the Electricity Trust of South Australia and I see no objection to it. Section 7 of the principal Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (2) thereof, "such debentures as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine.

Section 9 of the principal Act states that trustees may invest in the securities mentioned in section 5 notwithstanding that they are redeemable—so the debentures of the Electricity Trust will be. Requests have been received from stockbrokers and the chairman of the trust for this amendment to the Act. The Bill does not affect the general duties of trustees. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. OUDORE (Central No. 2)—This is a small amendment of the law arising out of the taking over of the Adelphi Electric Supply Company by a Government trust, and permits debentures which will be issued by the trust to existing shareholders to be bought at above par in certain circumstances. I agree with what the Minister said in moving the second reading, but I think Mr. Condon came nearer to the real explanation when he referred to section 5 of the Trustee Act. The Bill, though I do not oppose the Bill I suggest that the alteration of the law is not being carried out in the right way. It appears to me that the alteration of the law is not being carried out in the right way. It appears to me that the amendment is not in accordance with the wishes of the Minister. 

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Midland—Attorney-General)—I am obliged to Mr. Oudmore for his remarks. In paragraph (c) of section 5 of the Trustee Act it is already provided that trustees may invest in securities or guaranteed by the Government or the Parliament of the State, so there is no need to amend section 5 for the present purpose because debentures of the trust are guaranteed by the Government and come under section 5 already. The Bill amends section 7 because the exceptions set out in subsection (2) of the section include paragraph (c) of section 5. Bill read a second time and taken through the Committee of amendment. Committee's report adopted.

BANKING COMPANIES ACT REPEAL BILL.

Adjoined debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 6. Page 282.)

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—This is an unusual measure, being a repeal Bill. There has been a clause in the Act that the debentures are included in the securities mentioned in section 5 notwithstanding that they are redeemable—so the debentures will be. Requests have been received from stockbrokers and the chairman of the trust for this amendment to the Act. The Bill does not affect the general duties of trustees. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—The Bill deals with the dairy industry which has been of tremendous value to the State, and the amendment is in the right direction. I think it is a good job of it then that there has been left to repeal. As that date was before the time when a number of us entered Parliament, we have had little experience of repeal legislation. As the Chief Secretary explained, the necessity for this Bill has arisen out of sections brought about by the Commonwealth Banking Act. He said the reason for it is the Commonwealth Bank Act passed last year deals with the same matters as the Act of 1935. Section 109 of the Constitution states that if a law of the Commonwealth is inconsistent with the law of the Commonwealth then shall prevail and the former shall, to the extent of that inconsistency, be invalid.

The Act is either inconsistent with the Commonwealth Act and therefore invalid, or duplicates its provisions and thereby imposes an unnecessary burden on banks. This is the second piece of legislation with which we have had to deal because of the Commonwealth Banking Act. Twelve months ago we amended our Savings Bank Act. When the Banking Act was passed the Commonwealth Government thought that our Act had a Government that when shown that the Act was not so it refused to alter its legislation. In order to overcome a difficulty which should not have arisen, South Australia had to make its Savings Bank a Government instrumentality. Previous speakers on this Bill made scathing statements and it is unlikely that there will be any opposition to it. At present, banks are required by law to prepare at set periods statements giving certain particulars. As the Banking Act covers this matter there is no need for State legislation. In these days of scarcity of manpower it is necessary to do away with local schemes, in accordance with the provisions of State legislation. In April they came into the Commonwealth scheme. As I pointed out in my second reading speech, a representative of the dairy manufacturers was present at the meetings of the board of directors of the Commonwealth Equalization Company, but he was there merely as an observer and had no voting power. He was not a director of the company.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—Don't you think that he did an excellent job?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—No. The position was, therefore that up to this year there was no representative from South Australia acting as a Director of the Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalization Company. Under the articles of association of this company into which South Australia has only recently come, South Australia is entitled to four shareholders, all of whom must be members of the State Dairy Produce Board and two of whom may be elected as directors of the company by the four shareholders. It must therefore be obvious that the representation had to be increased and the only question to be considered was the number of representatives that should be provided under the new circumstances. Although four would have been provided with us the number of shareholders to which we were entitled, the representation from the industries concerned made it quite clear to me that four would not have been a satisfactory representation.

In the first place, with regard to the cheese manufacturers, it must be well known to all those connected with this particular trade that a considerable quantity is now manufactured in the South East which is separated by a considerable distance from the hills districts where the cheese and the butter are manufactured. In these circumstances the dairy manufacturers should have its own representatives on this board. When once the claim of the cheese manufacturers is admitted then it becomes apparent that the manufacturers of butter are also entitled to two representatives because it must be remembered that butter is manufactured over a considerable portion of the State, and two representatives from this important and widely scattered industry cannot be said to be an over-representation.

With regard to the dairymen, they are of course the producers of the raw product upon which the cheese manufacturers are based, and under
the equalization scheme are very much concerned with the equalization that is carried out by the committee, and are most certainly entitled to as much representation as the industries previously mentioned. The consumers will be represented by a person to be appointed by the Governor, who will also be the chairman of the board.

I shall now compare the position of this board with the various State dairy produce boards. In Queensland there are six persons, each of whom is a member of the Queensland Butter Board as a representative of the grower; three persons each of whom is a member of the Queensland Cheese Board as a representative of the grower, and the Director of Marketing or a deputy appointed by the Minister of Agriculture and Stock. In New South Wales one is nominated by the Minister of Agriculture; two are nominated by the boards of directors of companies which are manufacturers as the representatives of such companies; two are nominated by the boards of directors of societies registered under the New South Wales Co-operation Act and which are manufacturers as the representatives of such societies; one is nominated by the Minister of Agriculture; one by the Victorian Proprietary Butter and Cheese Factories Association; one by the Victorian Dairy Farmers Association and one by the Minister of Agriculture as representing consumers of dairy products. If these measures are adopted, the committee will consist of two representatives of the board of directors; one representing the board of directors of companies which are manufacturers as the representatives of such companies; one by the Minister of Agriculture; one by the Victorian Proprietary Butter and Cheese Factories Association; one by the Victorian Dairy Farmers Association and one by the Minister of Agriculture as representing consumers of dairy products. If these measures are adopted, the committee will consist of two representatives of the board of directors; one representing the board of directors of companies which are manufacturers as the representatives of such companies; one by the Minister of Agriculture; one by the Victorian Proprietary Butter and Cheese Factories Association; one by the Victorian Dairy Farmers Association and one by the Minister of Agriculture as representing consumers of dairy products.

I point out to Mr. Oates that in some of the States the numbers are greater than is provided for in this particular legislation, but in some of the States there is no direct consumer’s representative at all, and that in no State is there more than one member representing one class. I think this information should be enough to enable Mr. Oates and any other member of the Council that the board is a well-balanced one, and that the particular circumstances of South Australia entirely justify the action taken by the Government in this matter.

To sum up, I might say shortly that this Bill will give what is desired—the right of South Australia to take its full share in the work and management of the equalization company which it has not hitherto been able to do, and the board as suggested in the Bill will suit the requirements of this State.

The Hon. H. H. Donnelly—Consumers will not be as well represented here as they are in the other States.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—The board is a well-balanced one suitable for the conditions which prevail in this State, but which certainly are not in the conditions which prevail in a compact State such as Victoria. It is obvious that representation must be increased. I think that the facts which I have given will satisfy members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—Constitution of board.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—The Minister for the information which he has just given me, but regret that it was not supplied in his second reading speech. However, I still think that the board is lop-sided. When I was speaking of the Bill Mr. Oates reminded me that the middle man was gaining representation at the expense of the two most important bodies—producers and consumers. Although I do not object to the interests of the South-East being looked after, I remind the Minister that he may find the northern or eastern parts of the State asking for direct representation.

The Hon. C. B. Cudmore—You want to bring a goat’s milk into it.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—No. I was informed this week that a body of men in another part of the State was seriously considering going in for cheese manufacturing, although not to the extent operating in the South-East. If members do not object to a board of seven, what objection have they to increasing the number to eight and giving consumers the same representation as the other sections?

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed. Bill reported without amendment and Committee’s report adopted.