EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

The Hon. R. D. GARRETT (Leader of the Opposition): I am impressed in putting so clearly the case why the Council should not insist on its amendments. I wonder whether the Minister would report progress at this stage to enable us to consider the Government amendments alternative to those made by the Council to the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): On the government side, we are saying that we do not intend to change the Bill on this amendment. The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): On the government side, we are saying that we do not intend to change the Bill on this amendment.

The Hon. R. C. STORY (Member for the Abattoirs): I shall leave you with this amendment. I cannot really argue with the point, but I am not sure that it is the right point. It has been a very interesting point, and I think that it is a point that needs to be addressed by the government in the future.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I will consider the point and come back to it in the future.

The Hon. R. C. STORY (Member for the Abattoirs): I accept that, but I think that it is a point that needs to be addressed.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I will consider the point and come back to it in the future.

The Hon. R. C. STORY (Member for the Abattoirs): I accept that, but I think that it is a point that needs to be addressed.
The Hon. R. A. GODDESS: What has that to do with cattle?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am referring to the operation being carried out according to the instructions (I am not saying it was not in this case). I have asked for a report from the department on this; I cannot make a true evaluation without receiving information from the department. I do not intend suddenly to ban the use of acridates as I am not in a responsible position. So, in the circumstances, I think it prudent to wait until the information is available before taking the drastic step that the honourable member has indicated. I await the report with interest and will discuss it with my colleagues and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek the leave of the House to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as the Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD, I will refer the honourable member’s question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

WATER STORES

The Hon. M. RUSSELL: Will the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, ascertain the state of various water storages in relation to their total capacity, including what might be described as the semi-metropolitan storages at the southern end of the Burdekin?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member’s question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have leave to incorporate in Hansard the five questions I asked on March 13 about the operation of the Land and Business Agents Act, together with the Minister’s answers to five questions, which were delivered to me in writing by the Minister after proposing the leave.

LAND AGENTS

(1) A person holding both a land agent’s and a landlord’s licence is also a licensed land broker, will he be permitted to act as a landlord’s licence holder in carrying on business only in one capacity?

(2) Will a person currently holding both a land agent’s licence and a broker’s licence relinquish one of them, will he be permitted to carry on his business in the capacity of a licensed land broker, and what restrictions, if any, will be imposed on him?

(3) Will a person currently holding both a land agent’s licence and a broker’s licence relinquish one of them, in order to continue his business in the capacity of a licensed land broker, and what is the period of time for which he will be permitted to continue his business?

(4) Will a person currently holding both a land agent’s licence and a broker’s licence relinquish one of them, to act as a landlord’s licence holder, and what restrictions, if any, will be imposed on him?

(5) Will a person currently holding both a land agent’s licence and a broker’s licence relinquish one of them, in order to continue his business as a landlord’s licence holder, and what restrictions, if any, will be imposed on him?

EFFLUENT DISPOSAL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture replied to the report of the recent survey with regard to the effluent disposal at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The issues in the honourable member’s specific inquiry are “No”, although the Minister of Works states that a duplication of the pipeline from Mount Gambier to the sea is required to increase its hydraulic capacity, but the department is investigating the feasibility of establishing an effluent treatment plant inland.

LAND RENTAL

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health regarding the Minister of Transport.

Leaves granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am under the impression that land between North West Department from Mr. and Mrs. Eksion, situated in Burtbridge Road, near the M山 Park, was sold by the department. It was that department which made the acquisition. It is now leased to certain other people, will the Minister of Health be told whether that land is sold or what valuation and other circumstances the matter is based?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member’s question to my colleagues and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

ROAD MARKINGS

The Hon. G. J. GILLILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. J. GILLILLAN: I believe that one of the improved safety features in one road system is the provision of clearly marked lines. The squaring whips which are marked on roadsides are particularly important in times of bad weather, such as fog, and rain at night. I am sure many drivers have been in the situation where they have found the white line of value in keeping them to the proper side of the road in heavy fog. I have noticed that, probably because of the extremely wet winter we have been experiencing, many road markings are no longer visible or, at best, are only partly visible. I point out that, for instance, a confusing situation exists on the road to Pori Wajekeld, in places where there are stretches of dual highway that merge into a single highway for some distance, until they become a dual highway again. The lack of markings on the road is bad enough, but the lack of proper road lighting and, in addition, can lead to some confusion. Would the Minister ask his colleague to consider the highways Department and other responsible parties and, in the near future, at least for marking roads at all times be given high priority?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading resumed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Middleton): This is the third of three Bills that the Government has introduced dealing with the same general topic. Yesterday day we dealt with the Dairy Industry Amendment Bill, the purpose of which was to amend the Dairy Produce Amendment Bill of the Government of this State before the Council, except that the amendments to the Dairy Produce Act not only have repercussions in this State but also have repercussions in this State. This Bill deals with the operation of the Dairy Produce Act. The Dairy Produce Act was put up in 1932 after a commission of inquiry, of the late W. J. Dunske, was Chairman. Following a lengthy inquiry the Government decided to make a number of amendments to the scheme for the dairying industry, and this proved to be a practical measure.

Most dairy produce is consumed in a form other than milk. The price of whole milk has always been much higher than that which could be obtained for milk used for other purposes. This is due to the fact that milk is so valuable that it is in constant demand, and the dairy farmers who lived close to a metropolitan or a large town would find that every day during busy times in outlying areas they would have to separate the milk from the cream and forward it to butter butteries.
or cheese factories. So, the industry saw that an equalisation scheme was necessary; in due course, the Commonwealth Government proposed one, too, and that was necessary. While in the first instance this legislation was aimed at intra-state production, subsequently it embraced a wider field. With dairy factories being no longer confined to one state, production was examined, some had to be exported and some had to be consumed, in various forms, on the Australian market. As the legislation was set at some stage (I cannot remember the exact date), and it is still operating. It works with the Agriculture Department as part of the dairy industry's future.

The board has done a good job in maintaining a general equalisation in the industry. It declines on the amount of production, and the price paid up for which the milk will be sold. It also decides on the amount of cheese and butter that the board will purchase from one dairy, as well as set the quota for export to other States. As a consequence, a fair 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, however, cannot be included in it, 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 the milk in the period in which the board has to work, and not how much butter and cheese are dealt with, in change. The board will have the additional responsibility of supervising the distribution of butterfat and cheese for the benefit of the farmers and the consumer. This is a point that is treated in the legislation of the Commonwealth. The board has been amended to include dairy blend, and it is necessary that the amendment be made in the Dairy Industry Act.

The Bill brings the new spread into line with many other dairy products. It is necessary that the amendments to which the committee has been referred, that it deal with, are orderly marketing within the dairy industry. Furthermore, I support the second reading. Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Chairman: The Hon. R. J. PUKA reported: Committee to sit again.

MARGARET ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjointure due for second reading. [Concluded from August 15, Page 291.]

The Hon. T. C. H. STERRY (Member for Illawarra): The amendments in this Bill fit into the pattern of other two Bills (the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill and the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill) with which the Council is currently dealing. As I said yesterday, the Margarine Act has been in force for many years, and I do not think it can be described as being in a major way, as I would like to see it amended. I sincerely hope that, when the Federal Treasury is in the course of debate, the Minister will again bring an amending Bill before the Council so that the amendment can be passed. This Bill again does not put the legislation in order in the same way as the other Bills with which the Council has already dealt put these Acts in order.

The main point of this Bill is the amendment to section 3, which is the interpretation provision. The amendment excludes dietary items from the provisions of the Act. This product is of the same nature as margarine, as it is not completely derived from a liquid product. The definition of it is the same; it is to that of butter, although butter will be the main ingredient. The definition in the Commonwealth Acts has been revised, or it is being revised, so that it is being converted into "ninety metres". I am sure there will be a good reason for it, or the Minister would not have put it in.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: What do you suggest it should be?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is merely a compromise.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This is a compromise I think has been a great success with the Commonwealth government, but I cannot see the success of it being put at far greater risk unless some warning is given by the Minister. I do not think that smoking in a health hazard is to be displayed on cigarette packets. I think equally people should be told that the one of these fats is a health hazard. Over the years, Governments have been reluctant to take a stand against the dairy industry in these matters. The earlier the days of margarine when the ingredients were all simple, in the form of coconut oil and similar oils that came from countries where the margarine was used for 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 dairy industry, it has been difficult to do anything about the acceptance of margarines. From the time poly-unaturated margarines came on the market the position has changed, but the resistance has always been great. As one who has been associated with the Agricultural Council, I know that the difficulties that the Minister and his colleagues have encountered. The States of New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria are fairly independent on the dairy industry, and in New South Wales the industry is not thrifty, having much more milk, but little milk of high quality. This position has largely held up the acceptance of poly-unaturated margarines, and has prevented any improvement in the product. It is a great pity, because much of the country used over the years of high quality oils, and have only been used by producing for the various crops for vegetable oils used in the production of margarines. It would not have been if there was no diffusion of the Australian market on poly-unaturated margarines had been 100 per cent, but the fact that, if there is an open go, we will revert to impotent, as it is an Australian industry. This loss resulted in the minds of the people, especially those in the dairy industry, for fear that there will be insufficient Government protection.

I do not think, we should over-protect the dairy industry, primarily because it is a competition that must be involved in an Australian component in the product that is a substitute for butter. That can be provided by the press of various 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 going to the other States agreeing to remove the questions on table 1 to table 2, so that we can make margarine. I think and I hope there will be some resistance to it, but it will be easy for people to produce any old thing in the name of margarine. The Government must deal with the legislation if it is advocating wholeheartedly as an open go in producing the product. I must ensure that the dairy industry is protected against the price and quality to manufacture type of margarine. I ask the Minister to look at this whole question of how we can produce a healthy dairy industry, co-operate well but needs protection. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPENCER: accorded the adjournment of the debate.

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Further consideration of the report of the House of Assembly's message intimating that it is referred to the Legislative Council's amendment.

[Continued from August 15, Page 293.]

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee adjourned yesterday, it was about to take a vote on the question that the amendment to the Emergency Powers Bill moved by Mr. Moloney as amended carried.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move that the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment No. 6.

Since I was carried (suff., unfortunately), the Government cannot accept it. It would mean that the Bill as passed by this House would have a life of less than five months, whereas it would be for far too short a period. For that reason, I cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. ARTHUR RYMILL: This amendment finally by my amendment because I moved the Act should have a much wider life than provided for in the Bill, and the amendment was carried. I would not object to its being extended for another 12 months. I have made the point that this is experimental legislation and we all see how it works before it give it such a long period of operation in the future, as the Government proposes.

Since I made that speech, the Government has no doubt other honourable members have, considerable consideration of the other. We see that the Bill is a pretty appalling one, with all the reasons and absolute danger to our democracy. Personally, I would prefer to see it abolished, perhaps even the Government could come along with more specific legislation from time to time to deal with situations as they arise.

However, I know we cannot possibly impose on this side of Parliament, to get our message across. We do not propose to put the Bill to a vote. In fact, I may never have seen a situation where we have to deal with these matters. As we have noted of these secretaries, the newspapers are traversed with a variety of statements, deliberately so, by its press enemies, and the Government has the advantage there, whereas the message of honourable members on this side does not seem to be known, because all.

If we vote for the Bill altogether, the Government will yet get its point across in a way that we are, adolescent, ancient and reactionary, etc., without their preceding the case that we believe in, throwing further into 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. I would like to see it operate for 18 months without review, and if it proves to be useless I fear it will have, chaos can be caused in that time.

So I am adjourned about providing a very short period. I doubt that the debate on the amendment that the Government has to deal with these matters. As we have noted of these secretaries, the newspapers are traversed with a variety of statements, deliberately so, by its press enemies, and the Government has the advantage there, whereas the message of honourable members on this side does not seem to be known, because all.

If we vote for the Bill altogether, the Government will yet get its point across in a way that we are, adolescent, ancient and reactionary, etc., without their preceding the case that we believe in, throwing further into 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. I would like to see it operate for 18 months without review, and if it proves to be useless I fear it will have, chaos can be caused in that time.

So I am adjourned about providing a very short period. I doubt that the debate on the amendment that the Government has.
The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move—
After amended to insert—
(a) representative or ‘dairy blend’; and
(b) This is my main amendment. It amends section 22 of the principal Act, which provides—
(2) No person shall manufacture butter in premises in which margarine is manufactured, nor in premises any part of which is used for the manufacture of margarine.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They are not notorious, they have just a little reputation. The word "diary blend" will be important where the firms are in the dairy business, and in reading a deal with
We are dealing with this clause, the penalty should be altered from $100 to $200. Can the Minister explain why the penalty should be altered to $200 from the $100 which is the exact equivalent of 100 yards? The effect of my amendment will be that this new product, known as "diary blend", will be a sub-class of butter, but probably as "dairy spread" under a patent taken out, will not be able to be produced in any factory other than a dairy factory used for producing butter. That is fair enough, in the butter industry has invested large sums of money in providing good, hygienic equipment in this State. Much complicated machinery was used to establish those factories in the early days, and the decals and mortars were erected by the wheat of the pioneers of this industry. Therefore, the firms now operating as butter manufacturers should be able to continue as butter factories, whereas the margarine manufacturers cannot. My amendment is similar to a national combination, or at least a national combination in a fairly big way. There it not nearly the same affiliation between those people who provide the raw material, the dairymen, as there is in the margarine industry. Therefore, the dairy industry in the particular factories and the manufacture of new product which, after all, must have more than 60 per cent butter content and can have up to 80 per cent butter content. Where there is a long time when the dairy industry will not have to manufacture margarine in dairy factories, and vice versa, is something that should be considered later. For the purposes of this Bill, in the period, that exclusive right should be given to the dairy factories of the State.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not go along with the honorable member for Dalrymple in the belief that the amendment which would be given the exclusive right to manufacture this new product, will give a different trading identification. It is true that the dairy industry contributed about $500,000 towards implementing and financing the product, but the clause in conjunction with the South Australian Agriculture Department. The money was forthcoming from outside any outside body, it was exclusively dairying industry money and, because that money was forthcoming and because the efforts of the Agriculture Department and the Government of South Australia pro-

The Hon. G. J. GILFELDEN (Northern): In speaking to this Bill, I do so with much concern because the more I look at the Bill the more concerned I became. This Bill should be examined closely by the legal experts in this Chamber. My interpretation of the result of the passing of the Bill was that the provisions in respect of the storage and carriage of petroleum within the existing Act—
First, this Bill seeks to change the personnel of the authority defined in the Act. In the original legislation referred to the composition of members of the authority, such as consumers, producers, and others. Yet the bill is now is to agree to it as an unknown quantity at the hands of the Governor, because people could be drawn from anywhereness. The producers, who are probably the most important people of those two classes, the existing legislation, might not even be represented. This oversight should be corrected.

The Hon. T. C. M. STIRLING (Mawson): Subject to this Act, but without limiting the generally expressed opinion of subsection (a) of section 4 of this Act, the authority may—
(a) construct, reconstruct or instal or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed pipelines for conveying petroleum or any derivative thereof through the pipeline system for the carriage of petroleum and any derivative thereof—
(b) acquire, take into ownership or otherwise acquire any existing pipeline and salt or other similar property for any purpose relating to the authority—
(c) license, develop and operate any pipeline owned or to be constructed by the authority, and any pipeline pipeline petroleum and any derivative thereof—
(d) sell or otherwise dispose of petroleum or any derivative thereof or purchased or acquired—
(e) purify and process petroleum or any derivative thereof or purchased or acquired—
(f) dispose of any derivatives thereof for the removal of substances forming part of the finished product, but not otherwise sold in Australia at its own discretion subject to the approval of the Minister for Customs and Excise.

As I read this combination of words, the Minister may, if he believes it is in the public interest, authorize the authority to do such things as the Government may, in order to protect the interests of the authority or to promote or assist in the operation of any pipeline owned or to be constructed by the authority.

As I read this provision deals with contracts. Section 19 (3) (b) provides that the authority shall not—
As I read this combination of words, the Minister may, if he believes it is in the public interest, authorize the authority to do such things as the Government may, in order to protect the interests of the authority or to promote or assist in the operation of any pipeline owned or to be constructed by the authority.

As I read this provision deals with contracts. Section 19 (3) (b) provides that the authority shall not—
(c) construct, reconstruct or instal or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed pipelines for conveying petroleum or any derivative thereof through the pipeline system for the carriage of petroleum and any derivative thereof—
(d) acquire, take into ownership or otherwise acquire any existing pipeline and salt or other similar property for any purpose relating to the authority—
(e) license, develop and operate any pipeline owned or to be constructed by the authority, and any pipeline pipeline petroleum and any derivative thereof—
(f) sell or otherwise dispose of petroleum or any derivative thereof or purchased or acquired—
(g) purify and process petroleum or any derivative thereof or purchased or acquired—
(h) dispose of any derivatives thereof for the removal of substances forming part of the finished product, but not otherwise sold in Australia at its own discretion subject to the approval of the Minister for Customs and Excise.
Egg Industry Stabilization Act Amendment Bill

Second reading.

I, 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.

Members will recall that under the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, was passed by this House last year. Section 49 of that Act a poll was held, and 65 per cent of the egg producers voted in favour of the measure. This vote of the Act was widely acclaimed as being in the interest of the farmers. However, when the licensing committee set about its task of determining base quota for poultry farmers, it found the provisions of the Act, as it is presently in force, could give rise to some inequalities that could be avoided by its amendment. Some farmers have expressed opinions that, as it is presently in force, the Act could be misleading in the calculation of the charge of the measure. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends an amendment to section 20 of the principal Act, this being the interpretation section and, since this amendment is preliminary to any amendment intended by clause 5, it can be better dealt with under the interpretation of that clause. Its relationship with that clause is, it is suggested, the best way.

Clause 3 proposes that the time for making an election under section 13 of the principal Act will be extended until one month after the charges are fixed by proclamation. It is not yet known whether this is a short time to make the necessary preparations to elect the producer’s representative. 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 enjoined by the principal Act will be aware that it is based on the number of licensed eggs kept by poultry farmers over various periods measured from the commencement of that Act. A license has been in respect of which a hen levy is payable under the relevant legislation of the Commonwealth.

However, in any flock comprising live hens, the levy in no uncertain terms.

Clause 5 provides for the Act to come into force on the 1st January, 1974. Accordingly, in the calculation of base quota under the Act, a new farmer’s representative will be relatively insignificant.

Clause 6, by an amendment to section 20 of the principal Act, is designed to make the provisions of the Act applicable to butter and cheese.

The licensing committee is satisfied that in practical terms this apparatus in that a farmer’s representative will be relatively insignificant, in a flock of, say, 50 to 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant. In a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant. In a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant. In a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant.

Accordingly, by this clause it is intended that every poultry farmer will be entitled to vote. If the licensing committee is satisfied that in practical terms this apparatus in that a farmer’s representative will be relatively insignificant, in a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant. In a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant. In a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant. In a flock of, say, 100 birds, this factor would be relatively insignificant.

In addition to the minor metric amendments made to this section.

Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act by extending the provisions relating to the inclusion of any dairy product.

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 have to be made for 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 invent the licensing committee with the farmer’s to override that expectation that it will be used. Clause 6, by its proposed amendment to section 28 of the principal Act by making the application of that section quite clear.

Mr. QUINN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. QuINN 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 produce. The scheme of the Dairy Produce Act, which is to provide for the establishment of the Australian Dairy Produce Board, is under way. The Dairy Produce Act, as the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is set up, the Prime Minister, under the Dairy Produce Act, as the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is set up. The scheme, under the Dairy Produce Act, as the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is set up. The scheme, under the Dairy Produce Act, as the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is set up. The scheme, under the Dairy Produce Act, as the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is set up. The scheme, under the Dairy Produce Act, as the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is set up.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formula. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of “dairy produce” 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 of dairy produce. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that in the constitution of the Dairy Produce Board manufacturers of dairy produce will be represented.

Clause 5 amends section 15 of the principal Act by extending the powers of the board to secure the entire wholesale price of dairy produce in the same way as it regulates the wholesale price of butter and cheese. Clause 6 amends section 16 of the principal Act by providing for the payment of “dairy produce” 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 of dairy produce. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act by providing for the payment of “dairy produce” in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended.

Mr. BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARGARET 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 produce. The effect of this bill is to take “dairy produce” as defined in the Dairy Produce Act, 1928, as amended, out of the definition of “margaret”. As a result, the Margarets will have no application in relation to dairy produce. In addition, opportunity has been taken to amend section 16 of the Dairy Produce Act, 1928, as amended, as to 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. McEANAY secured the adjournment of the debate.