Clause 4 provides that any claim for compensation must be lodged with the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee no later than August 31, 1974.

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

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): After that impassioned plea in putting so very 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 me to consider moving an amendment alternative to those made by the Council to the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The only reason why I merely moved formally that the Council do not insist on its amendments was that I had not been informed by the Leader that he wanted to move a further amendment, although I had heard on the grapevine that he did. If he is not satisfied with the way I handle the business in this Council he should say so, and not make snide remarks. I mean that quite genuinely. I am quite willing to report progress so that the Leader can draft a further amendment.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He might do a Dean Brown on you.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: He can if he likes. I do not like snide remarks at any time from anyone. Nevertheless, I am willing to co-operate in the best way I can, and I ask the Leader to do likewise. If we are to get somewhere during this session we must have the co-operation of every honourable member at all times. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BOATING BILL

Order of the Day, Government Business, No. 1: Report of Select Committee to be brought up.

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Tuesday, September 24, 1974.

Motion carried.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Produce Act, 1934-1946. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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 Equalization Scheme. I am sure that all honourable members who have an interest in this field will be aware of the application of this Act to butter and cheese. Shortly, 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 of the Bill 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.

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

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 8. Page 359.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill. At the outset I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and the Egg Board, and particularly the committee that worked so hard to bring these amendments before the Council and to sell the concept of orderly marketing to the industry. This legislation is one of the successes of the Minister's administration. It is a measure the industry required. Before the Act came into operation there was much friction in the industry. The appointment of Mr. Ray Fuge as Chairman of the Egg Board and the subsequent changes made in the board's structure, as well as the talents of these people, ensured that the Minister was properly advised about this matter.

The opportunity was taken to keep growers fully informed about what was happening in the industry, the result being that a happy arrangement was reached from those negotiations. The board has been operating for some months now and seems to have settled down well, with the exception of the three matters dealt with by the Bill. The amendment regarding the number of hens that should be exempted is a logical alteration. As has been pointed out, the previous provision was an oversight that militated against a person who had, say, up to 40 hens. It did not affect the large operator.

The second amendment of consequence relates to sections 13 (3) and 20 (3), which deal with group I and group II licences provided for in the Act. It was not expected that everyone would be able to take advantage of the provisions of the Act, and the 28 days allowed has proved to be insufficient time. The Minister accepted the recommendation, and this provision will operate from a date to be fixed by the Minister, thus giving everyone an equal opportunity.

Only about nine people are involved in this matter; they are all known, and they will be dealt with by the committee set up under the Act for licensing and relicensing.

As soon as these people fulfil the necessary requirements to qualify for the other type of licence, this amendment will not be necessary. However, it seems to me that it is good to leave the matter at the discretion of the committee, because it will save time and trouble in having to come back to Parliament. The measure cannot be used improperly, because the people are known, and I imagine their names will be available to any honourable member who wishes to approach the Minister. The main amendment is contained in new section 20 (*a*), which deals with groupings. I am happy about the amendments of the Bill and pleased that the egg industry seems at last to be settling down and getting somewhere.

The industry was in a shocking condition in the late 1960's. In fact, it was in absolute chaos. I am glad we did not take the advice of the experts who would have cost the industry well in excess of $1 000 000 in setting up a pulping plant in South Australia. Had that been done, the plant would have been lying idle and would have been a debt left with the growers. Eventually the Government would have had to come to its aid and either put the obligation squarely on the producers left in the industry or written it off. It is indeed heartening to see the industry going ahead as it is at present.

This Council is obligated to the Hon. Mr. Burdett for the tremendous amount of time he has spent in researching this matter. He presented a clear dissertation on the matter. I congratulate him also for the work he did during the meetings held throughout the State in order properly to apprise the producers of the situation. I appreciate the work done by the United Farmers and Graziers poultry section and the Hon. Mr. Burdett, who have done much to bring this legislation to fruition.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank both the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. Story for their contributions to the debate. I, too, express my approval of the work done by the Hon. Mr. Burdett not only in this measure but also in the measures that came before the Council last year. Without his help, producers might have been pushing uphill in getting the legislation through this year. As I said last year, the honourable member has done a great service to the egg industry in South Australia, and I am sure it is much appreciated. Although the amendments are minor, they are of infinite value to the industry if it is to continue to have orderly marketing of eggs in South Australia. I am sure that the amendments contained in this Bill were not foreshadowed last year when this legislation was introduced, but I gave an undertaking then to the egg industry that if amendments needed to be made they would be brought before Parliament as soon as possible so that the Act could be brought up to date and put into true perspective. Once again, I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Licensing Committee may allot base quotas in special cases."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In his introductory remarks, the Minister said that this clause was introduced to assist eight or nine cases out of a total of 1 678 farmers who sought a base quota under the group 2 classification, and that the insertion of new section 20a would assist this small number of people who otherwise, under the original measure, would not be eligible. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has looked at this closely and checked that about nine people are involved.

When I reviewed the Bill, I wondered whether new section 20a needed to be made subject to Ministerial approval or, alternatively, whether the Review Tribunal might need to have some say, because the person, being one of these nine people, who expected to obtain a base quota after the Bill became law might not receive it. In those circumstances such a person should have a right to appeal to someone to have justice done. I understand that the persons concerned already know their case will be considered favourably if this Bill passes. The best way in which I can be satisfied on this matter is to ask the Minister whether he can give an undertaking that, if this Bill passes, this small group will obtain quotas.

If the Bill does pass, they can be considered favourably by the Licensing Committee under new section 20a. Would the Minister comment on that matter? I should not like it to happen that one of these people would go to his local member or perhaps directly to the Minister in a month or so and say, "I was expecting to receive a base quota from the Licensing Committee; I am eligible but, although I was expecting to obtain that quota, I have now not been given a quota." He would be most upset in those circumstances.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I am sure the fears expressed by the honourable member are not justified, because we have been to much trouble to amend the Act bearing in mind the position of these few people. We would not have so amended the Act unless we had been willing to show them every consideration. I cannot guarantee unconditionally that those people will get that quota, because I am not on the Licensing Committee. The amendments were introduced to deal with what we believed to be an anomaly. If those people are still not satisfied, they can go to the Review Tribunal and put their case. Section 29 (2) provides:

The Review Tribunal may do all acts necessary for or incidental to the exercise or discharge of the powers, authorities, duties or functions conferred or imposed upon it by or under this Act.

So, if these people are not satisfied with these amendments, the tribunal can act; but I do not believe it will reach that stage, because the Licensing Committee is fully aware of these people's problems and will do its best to solve them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am only partly satisfied with the Minister's reply because, in my view, these people cannot go to the tribunal. Will he tell me exactly where in the Act or in the Bill it is provided that the Review Tribunal can hear the case of one of these eight or nine people? Certainly, it is provided that the Review Tribunal may do all acts necessary for the exercise or discharge of the powers, authorities, duties or functions conferred or imposed upon it under this Act, but it is not concerned with section 33, which provides:

The Review Tribunal shall hear and determine appeals submitted pursuant to this Act.

I cannot see where it is provided that these persons can appeal to the tribunal. Certainly, it does not apply under section 20 of the principal Act, because that is more of a statistical approach to egg quotas; so an appeal does not come into it. However, by writing this new section into the Act, we are introducing a discretionary power to the Licensing Committee, which, although it comprises three people, has a quorum of only two persons, so two persons will have this discretionary power. As I read the

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 15, 1974

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

COMMONWEALTH AID ROADS GRANTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the House of Representatives on July 11 a question was directed to Mr. Charles Jones, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport. In reply to that question, which related to Commonwealth aid roads grants, the Minister said:

The accusations made by Sir Charles Cutler in New South Wales are typical of the squealing which is coming from a number of State Ministers responsible for roads who are not prepared to examine the facts.

Shortly afterwards, in reply to the interjection "What about Mr. Virgo?", the Minister replied:

Mr. Virgo is quite happy with it, because he knows what is under way.

Will the Minister of Health ask his colleague whether it is true that he is perfectly happy with the present financial arrangements regarding roads in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague.

CATTLE DEATHS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: On last night's television and in this morning's country edition of the *Advertiser* it was reported that 37 cattle had died on the property of Mr. Krause at Padthaway. These cattle are alleged to have died as a result of a chemical used for the control of tick. The report states that this was an isolated case, as this chemical had been used extensively in this State and in other parts of Australia. I noticed from the report that Dr. Fearn, an Agriculture Department veterinarian, stated that a report was being prepared for himself and, I presume, for the Minister. As these are peculiar circumstances, and this isolated case (in which $5 000 worth of stock has been lost) may have been caused by the time of the year or something of that nature, will the Minister say whether he has any further information on this subject that he could give the Council?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No, I have no further information. However, a report will no doubt come to me in due course, and I will inform the honourable member what the circumstances were at the time and what are the likely remedies.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Does the Minister think that perhaps it would be prudent to suspend the sale and the use of the chemical preparation known as Warbex, which at the moment is suspected of having caused the death of these cattle, until his officers have had time to investigate the situation and report on it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that if many chemical compounds that have been on the market for many years (for example, sheep dip) are not used according to the instructions and not at the right time—for example, we do not normally dip sheep when it is raining—

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: 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 this chemical; it may not be necessary. 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 suggested.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as the acting Leader of the Government in the Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I raise a matter to which I referred during the Address in Reply debate, a reply to which I have not yet received. It concerns the Government's announcement in His Excellency's Speech of its intention to bring down legislation involving planning and development activity. I mentioned at the time that there had been press publicity stating that some people were dissatisfied with the present legislation. Major press articles appeared on the matter on August 13 last year, and on May 21, May 25, and June 19 this year. People have mentioned to me that they consider that members of the public should be given every opportunity to give evidence and to involve themselves in proposals that can lead to the best possible legislation of this kind that South Australians ought to be governed by. At the time, I mentioned my own view that a public inquiry should be held so that interested people could give evidence. Does the Government accept the principle that maximum public involvement is necessary to help formulate the best possible draft planning and development legislation? If it does, will the Government set up a Royal Commission or similar public inquiry to ascertain the best possible way to improve planning and development legislation in South Australia; if so, will the Government give all institutes, associations, and individuals interested in or affected by planning and development legislation an equal opportunity to give evidence before such Royal Commission or inquiry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall obtain a report as soon as possible in reply to the honourable member's questions.

EFFLUENT DISPOSAL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding effluent disposal at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer to the honourable member's specific inquiry is "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. However, the department is investigating the feasibility of establishing an effluent treatment plant inland.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 24 about sewage disposal from Mount Gambier?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This matter comes within the functions of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and my colleague states that that department has undertaken a study and is currently investigating various alternative methods of treatment and disposal of sewage from Mount Gambier.

LAND RENTAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am under the impression that land acquired by the Highways Department from Mr. and Mrs. Elston, situated in Burbridge Road, still belongs to the Highways Department. It was that department which made the acquisition. As I understand the land is now leased to certain other people, will the Minister ascertain what rental is paid, and on what valuation and other circumstances the rental is based?

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

WATER STORAGES

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

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. F. J. POTTER: I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* the five questions I asked on March 13 about the operation of the Land and Business Agents Act, together with the replies to those five questions, which were delivered to me in writing by the Minister after prorogation.

Leave granted.

LAND AGENTS

(1) Where a person currently holds both a land agent's licence and is also a licensed land broker, will he be permitted to retain both licences and elect to carry on business only in one capacity?

(2) If a person currently holding both a land agent's licence and a broker's licence relinquishes one of them, will he be permitted in the future to obtain again a licence for the relinquished category without restrictions or difficulties—for example, again having to submit himself to a qualifying examination?

(3) Where a land broker was previously employed by a land agent and continues in that capacity, pursuant to the terms of the new Act, will that broker be permitted, with his employer's consent, to undertake work in his private capacity as a broker, either within or outside his normal employment hours?

(4) Where a land agent lawfully continues to employ a land broker on his staff, will he be permitted to refer persons, who may call at his office seeking the services of a broker, to his own employee?

(5) Will a person who carries on business solely as a licensed land broker be permitted as such to collect for and on behalf of his clients (*a*) principal and interest repayments on mortgages which he has prepared for clients; and (*b*) house rents where he has prepared the lease?

The answers to the questions are as follows:

(1) Yes, provided that he in no way acts in the dormant capacity.

(2) (*a*) A person previously licensed as an agent will not have to pass a qualifying examination if he applies for a licence within 10 years of relinquishing his licence.

(*b*) A person licensed as a land broker on June 23, 1974, will not have to pass a qualifying examination if he later seeks a new licence after relinquishing his licence.

(3) Yes, provided that—

(*a*) the licensed land broker was so employed from May 1, 1973, or earlier;

(*b*) he is not a director of or in a position to control the affairs of an agent which is a corporation; and

(*c*) the broker does not pay or give the agent any commission and the agent does not procure, or attempt to procure, the execution of a document by which any person requests or authorizes the broker to transact any dealing affecting land.

(4) The answer to this question depends on what is meant by "refer". In any event, the agent must not receive any fee from the broker and must not procure, or attempt to procure, the execution of any document by which a person requests or authorizes the broker to transact any dealing affecting land.

(5) Yes.

ROAD MARKINGS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I believe that one of the important safety features in our road system is the provision of clearly painted guidelines on roadways. These 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 Port Wakefield, in places where there are stretches of dual highway that merge into a single highway for some distance and then become a dual highway again. The lack of marking on the roads, and particularly on those due for reconstruction, can lead to some confusion. Would the Minister ask his colleague to suggest to the Highways Department and other responsible authorities that the clear marking of 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.

(Continued from August 13. Page 392.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): This is the second of three Bills that the Minister of Agriculture has introduced dealing with the same general topic. Yesterday I dealt at length with the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill, the provisions of which are very much the same as those of the Bill now before the Council, except that the amendments to the Dairy Produce Act not only have repercussions in this State but they also have Commonwealth repercussions. This Bill deals with the operation of the Dairy Industry Board, which was set up in 1932 after a commission of inquiry, of which the late W. J. Dawkins was Chairman. Following a lengthy inquiry the Government decided to bring into operation an equalization scheme for the dairying industry, and this proved to be a prudent move.

Most dairy produce is consumed in a form other than milk. The price of whole milk has always been rather higher than that which could be obtained for milk used for other purposes. Consequently, those people fortunate enough to be able to sell their milk as whole milk were at a distinct advantage, as were those dairy farmers who lived close to a metropolis or a large town. On the other hand, dairy farmers in outer country areas had to separate the milk from the cream and forward it to butter factories

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

their ability to be different from people in the other States when they wish. The Queensland product must contain a minimum of 75 per cent butter fat, as compared to our minimum of 80 per cent, so Queensland manufacturers are permitted to use 25 per cent vegetable oil as compared to 20 per cent in South Australia. From the information I have received, I think Queensland manufacturers will be making this product before the end of the year, so I hope South Australian manufacturers will do the right thing. After all, South Australia pioneered "dairy blend" and I am sure it will be a success if the manufacturers promote it in the right way.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move:

In subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (*a*) to strike out "Kruisher" and insert "Kruisheer and".

This establishes quite clearly that two people were involved in the process. I mentioned this matter during the second reading debate, and the amendment makes the position clear.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the honourable member for picking up that mistake. Dealing with foreign names can be rather complicated. At one stage I thought the two names were one, probably as a result of their being incorrectly published in a magazine. However, the amendment corrects the error. I should like to mention one other matter in this clause. In this clause, which amends section 4 of the principal Act, we see in paragraph (*a*) the following:

(*a*) contains not less than 12 per centum and not more than 20 per centum, by weight, of vegetable oil or oils, in its total weight . . .

(*c*) contains (i) vitamin A in an amount equivalent to not less than 240 microgrammes of retinol activity per 28 grammes of the product.

For the benefit of the Committee, I should explain that one microgramme is one-millionth of a gramme; and "retinol activity" is a technical term used to express vitamin A. Why that term is used I do not know. Subparagraph (*c*) (ii) of paragraph (*a*) states:

vitamin D in an amount equivalent to not less than 1·5 microgrammes of cholecalciferol per 28 grammes of the product.

"Cholecalciferol" is a technical term to express the amount of vitamin D. Subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (*a*) states:

has a spreadability of not more than 75 Newtons and not less than 45 Newtons at 5°C based on the method of determining spreadability of Kruisher den Herder.

A Newton is a metric unit of force replacing pounds to the square inch; and Kruisher den Herder (which name the Hon. Mr. Story is moving to amend) was the inventor of pressure resistant units, which means spreadability. Subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (*a*) continues:

notwithstanding that the product also contains skim milk, antioxidants, mono-glycerides or diglycerides of fat forming fatty acids, flavouring or harmless vegetable colouring.

The word "monoglycerides" is used to denote the ratio of glycerine to fatty acid. All fats are triglycerides—that is, they have three molecules of glycerine. Monoglycerides contain one molecule of glycerine and two molecules of fatty acid.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Restrictions on manufacture of butter in or near margarine factory."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move:

After "amended" to insert:

(*a*) by inserting in subsection (1) after the word "butter" the passage "or dairy blend"; and

(*b*)

This is my main amendment. It amends section 22 of the principal Act, which provides:

(1) No person shall manufacture butter in premises in which margarine is manufactured, nor in premises any part of which is within one hundred yards from premises in which margarine is manufactured.

(2) Any person contravening this section in any respect shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds.

While we are dealing with this clause, the penalty should be altered from £100 to $200. Can the Minister explain why the Bill alters 100 yards to 90 metres and not 91·2 metres, which is the exact equivalent of 100 yards? The effect of my amendment will be that this new product, known as "dairy blend" for the purpose of this Bill but probably as "dairy spread" under a patent taken out, will not be able to be produced in any factory other than a factory used for producing butter. That is fair enough, as the butter industry has invested large sums of money in providing good, hygienic factories in this State. Much complicated machinery was needed to establish those factories in the early days, and the bricks and mortar were erected by the sweat 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 is mostly manufactured by a multi-national combine, or at least a national combine in a fairly big way.

There is 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 should have the edge on the exclusive manufacture of this product which, after all, must have more than 60 per cent butter content and can have up to 80 per cent butter content. What will happen in 15 years time when perhaps the dairying industry will not want to manufacture margarine in dairy factories, and vice versa, is something to be considered later. For the present, during this phasing-in 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 honourable member's reasoning why dairy factories should be given the exclusive right to manufacture this new product, but I will give a different reason. It is that the dairying industry contributed about $30 000 towards implementing and financing this product; it did this in conjunction with the South Australian Agriculture Department. No money was forthcoming from any outside body: it was exclusively dairying industry money and, because that money was forthcoming and because the officers of the Agriculture Department and the Government of South Australia provided assistance, a patent was taken out in the name of the Minister of Agriculture in South Australia, and not in the name of the Minister for Agriculture in Canberra. I do not agree with the reasons given by the honourable member why the dairying industry should be given the right, because we want competition and free enterprise in order to get the product off the ground. The more people we can get to compete for a certain product the more likely we are to get a quality product. Unfortunately, when only one section of the manufacturers makes a product, this price structure is not built into the commodity. That is why it is important for people in the future to be given an open slather as to what they can or cannot produce. If the Act remained as it was, without this amendment, it would mean that the margarine manufacturers could manufacture "dairy spread", but where would they get the cream from? Would they get it from the butter factories? Would the butter factories sell them the cream?

The Hon. C. R. Story: They could get some outside equalization scheme.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think they would be interested. In the dairying industry in Victoria there are still notorious characters running some of the shows.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They are not notorious, they are businessmen, Victorian businessmen.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They are Victorian businessmen, and they would not be hesitant in making a deal with margarine manufacturers. Of course, margarine companies can still produce margarine. They can purchase a dairy factory, if they so desire, and they can manufacture margarine there, themselves. For the reasons I have given I am willing to accept the honourable member's amendment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am delighted that the Minister's early training in political philosophy, latent as it is, has at last come forward. I am delighted to hear him refer to competition and private enterprise. It has done much to hearten me.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 15. Page 488.)

Clauses 2 to 8 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 494.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): In speaking to this Bill, I do so with much concern because the more I look at the Bill the more concerned I become. This Bill should be examined closely by the legal experts in this Chamber. My interpretation of the result of the passing of this Bill is that there will be far-reaching consequences to the original Act. Would it not be wiser to withdraw the measure and draw up a completely new Bill repealing the existing Act rather than to impose 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 reference is made to the composition of members of the authority, such as consumers, producers, and others. Yet the board we are now asked to agree to is an unknown quantity comprised of persons simply appointed by the Governor. These people could be drawn from anywhere. The producers, who are probably the most important people of those named in the existing legislation, might not even be represented. This oversight should be corrected.

Secondly, I am concerned about the powers of the authority itself. This Bill seeks to amend section 10 of the existing legislation. I now refer to section 10 as it would be with the word "petroleum" substituted for the words "natural gas", as follows:

10. (1) Subject to this Act, but without limiting the generality of paragraph (*b*) of subsection (2) of section 4 of this Act, the authority may—

(*a*) construct, reconstruct or install or cause to be constructed, reconstructed or installed pipelines for conveying petroleum or any derivative thereof within this State and petroleum storage facilities connected therewith;

(*b*) purchase, take on lease or otherwise by agreement acquire any existing pipeline and sell or otherwise dispose of any pipeline owned by the authority;

(*c*) hold, maintain, develop and operate any pipeline owned by or under the control of the authority and convey and deliver through such pipeline petroleum and any derivative thereof;

(*d*) make such charges and impose such fees for the conveyance or delivery of petroleum or any derivative thereof through any such pipeline as it may, with the approval of the Minister, determine;

(*e*) purchase, take on lease, or otherwise by agreement, acquire, hold, maintain, develop and operate any petroleum storages and the necessary facilities apparatus and equipment for their operation;

(*f*) for purposes of selling or otherwise disposing of the same, purchase or otherwise acquire and store petroleum or any derivative thereof;

(*g*) sell or otherwise dispose of petroleum or any derivative thereof so purchased or acquired;

(*h*) purify and process petroleum or any derivative thereof and treat petroleum or any derivative thereof for the removal of substances forming part thereof or with which it is mixed;

(*i*) for its own use and consumption, purchase or otherwise acquire and store petroleum or any derivative thereof or any other kind of fuel;

The remainder of the provision deals with contracts. Section 10 (2) (*b*) provides that the authority shall not:

do, or enter into any contracts to do, any of the things referred to in paragraph (*e*), (*f*), (*g*) or (*h*) of subsection (1) of this section without the approval of the Minister given, generally or in any special case, on his being satisfied that it is necessary or desirable to do such thing—

and this is where the section is to be amended, by inserting the passage "in the public interest or"—

in order to protect the interests of the authority or to promote or assist in the operation of any pipeline owned by or under the contorl of the authority.

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 wants it to do under the sweeping powers conferred in paragraphs (*e*), (*f*), (*g*) and (*h*). That is a tremendously wide power, which could endanger the whole installations of the petrol companies in this State, because the scope of the authority is within the State's boundaries. The Bill could put at risk the pipelines, installations and the contents thereof, thereby jeopardizing the whole State's fuel supplies.

Already, one main (the 26-mile main) is privately owned by the refineries, although it appears that is it being managed by the unions at present. I fear of the way in which we have been going in recent months and years. Indeed, we in Australia could be seeing the end of democratic government as we have known it and come to understand it, with more and more powers being given to the Executive and unnamed authorities. This Parliament is being asked to give far-reaching powers to an authority the personnel of which is unknown and which is under the direct control of the Minister and the Government. I read with interest the second reading speeches, especially the second reading explanation given by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone and the recent speech made by the Acting Minister of Lands. It was stated that things that have needed to be done have been done and that the amendments in the Bill were intended to simplify the position.

The petro-chemical works at Red Cliff Point has been referred to as one of the reasons why it was desirable to amend the Act. However, honourable members have no

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.