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

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

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

(*b*) 1973.

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

(*d*) As available.

(*e*) Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

Motion carried.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

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

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

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

Motion carried.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

The Bill then lists the various proclamations concerning areas where outbreaks occurred and gives the relevant pages and dates in the *Government Gazette*. Clause 3 (1) (*b*) and subclauses (2) and (3) further provide:

. . . shall be entitled to compensation for that loss as provided by the Fruit Fly Act, 1947-1955.

(2) This section shall apply to—

(*a*) any act done pursuant to the excercise or intended excercise of powers conferred by the Fruit fly regulations, if such act is done on land while the removal of fruit therefrom is prohibited by any of the proclamations referred to in subsection (1) of this section;

or

(*b*) any act done in the course of, or incidentally to, the doing of any act of the kind mentioned in paragraph (*a*) of this section.

(3) This section shall apply to acts done and loss suffered before or after the commencement of this Act.

Subclause (3) is the normal provision. However, it appears to me that two separate types of compensation are foreseen: first for the loss of fruit which people with commercial stands have been told they are not to remove from their land (those people thus incurring a loss because the fruit is unsaleable); and, second where an inspector may damage trees through spraying, neglect, or anything of that nature. I believe that is what is meant, but I am sure the Minister will correct me if I am wrong. Clause 4 provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1*a*) of section 5 of the Fruit Fly Act, 1947-1955, a notice of claim under that section for compensation under section 3 of this Act shall be delivered to the Committee on or before the thirty-first day of August, 1974.

The Act was amended in 1949 to alter slightly the original concept by introducing subsection (1*a*) as mentioned in the Bill. The 1949 amending Act set out a schedule whereby the Fruit Fly Compensation Comittee could receive from the public applications for compensation. In addition, it fixed October and December as the months on which to base calculations of the period in which a claimant must notify the committee. I presume that the Government is now requiring the public to lodge applications before August 31, and that is not far away at all: it is certainly not three months after the last proclamation. The last proclamation was very late, because it was made in respect of fruit fly found virtually in the last peach of the year. The other system under which the department worked involved December and October, but we are now getting back to August, and I see no reason for it. Perhaps the Government has found that it did not adequately provide for this matter in last year's Estimates.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Will the legislation be proclaimed by August 31?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure that the Minister would not want to put through hasty legislation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You wouldn't delay compensation for the poor people concerned, would you?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. I have been interested in the biological control of fruit fly for many years. Officers can get bugs to do the work for them, and the bugs enjoy doing it. This method is cheaper than spending much money on chemicals, which pollute the air. When I was Minister of Agriculture money was spent on setting up an insectory at Loxton to breed various predators for the biological control not only of fruit fly but also of oriental fruit moth. A recent report states that Dr. Loren Steiner, who has done much successful work in Hawaii, worked closely with Mr. Noel Richardson, a brilliant entomologist with the Agriculture Department. Unfortunately, the sterile males that were bred in captivity under sheltered conditions could not survive when turned out into the wild and they could not excite their wild sisters sufficiently to be of any use. So, we will have to continue the techniques that we have been using in South Australia. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the honourable member for his contribution to the debate. This type of Bill has been in the same form every year for the past few years; of course, there have been more outbreaks this year, and that affects the exact wording of the Bill. The last day for making claims under the legislation is August 31, which is more than three months after the date of the last outbreak. We would like to get the matter cleared up before the next season in which an outbreak of fruit fly may occur. We do not want further outbreaks while we still have to pay compensation for the previous season's outbreaks. The department wants to avoid administrative problems. The committee has to deal with many applications, and it is therefore reasonable that the applications should be submitted as early as possible. I announced several weeks ago that August 31 would be the last day for lodging applications, and I assure the honourable member that those people who qualify have already lodged claims. Claim forms will be available from district council offices, post offices and also the Agriculture Department.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Anticipating the co-operation of this Council.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is done with a measure of this nature. This type of Bill is always introduced after an outbreak of fruit fly, because it is important that compensation be paid. The Hon. Mr. Story also asked a question regarding clause 2, which provides:

This Act is incorporated with the Fruit Fly Act, 1947-1955, and that Act and this Act shall be read as one Act.

That is the way it must be: the Acts must be read as one Act. This has always been the case.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 391.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): This Bill has been worked on for many years. It is necessary to amend the Act because the dairying industry is doing something, with the assistance of the Agriculture Department, to promote and sell its product, butter. It has produced a new concept of butter, which is known, at least in the Bill, as "dairy blend" but which will probably be known, when it is marketed and if patent rights are granted to it, as "dairy spread". This is similar to a Swedish product called "Bregott", which has found its way on to the market and which contains practically the same formula as that for which we are now legislating.

Unfortunately, we cannot claim that this is a poly-unsaturated product, although it would have been nice to be able to do so, because this is the "in" thing at present. Doctors and, indeed, the Heart Foundation warn us of the need in many cases to use poly-unsaturated fats in our normal diet. I shall now deal with a few aspects of the Bill that it may be necessary to amend. Clause 3, the interpretation clause, defines "dairy blend" as follows:

"dairy blend" means a product obtained by mixing milk fat in the form of cream, edible vegetable oil or oils, salt and water where the resultant mixture is a solid or semi-solid emulsion and where the product—

(*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;

(*b*) contains not more than 16 per centum of water by weight and not more than 4 per centum of salt by weight in its total weight;

(*c*) contains—

(i) vitimin A in an amount equivalent to not less than 240 microgrammes of retinol activity per 28 grammes of the product; and

(ii) vitamin D in an amount equivalent to not less than 1·5 microgrammes of cholecalciferol per 28 grammes of the product; and

(*d*) 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,

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

That is a fairly technical dissertation. The first matter that needs attention (the Minister's second reading explanation refers to it, and the Bill certainly contains it) is the method of determining spreadability under clause 3 (*a*) (*d*). I have here a copy of the *Australian Journal of Dairy Technology*, on page 15 of which is an original report on the spreadability of butter, and a determination, description and comparison of five methods of testing. Among these five methods is that which is referred to in the Bill. According to this booklet, the method is the "Krisheer" (and that is followed by a stroke, which means that two people are involved) and "den Herder" method, and in various places throughout the report it is referred to as the "Krisheer and den Herder" method. The Act should therefore read in accordance with what seems to be the accepted spelling, even if my pronunciation has not been correct. This is a recognized means of testing the firmness of butter and similar products. It is one of the five recognized methods, and it operated for some time in Holland. It would seem, therefore, that that is what the Minister is seeking in the Bill. I refer to this matter, as it is better to have it correct right from the beginning.

The Bill contains some consequential amendments. In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to metric conversions. The reference to "fifty gallons" in the definition of "milk depot" is to be amended to read "228 litres"; the word "ton" in the definition of "store" is to be replaced by "tonne"; and the passage "one hundred yards" in section 22 is to be amended to read "90 metres". That is not an accurate conversion, because 100yds. would not be equivalent to 90 m. Obviously, however, there must be a reason for this.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: For the honourable member's benefit, 100yds. is equivalent to 91·44 m.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is correct. There must therefore be a subtle reason why the Minister has done this. Perhaps I have found the reason. I do not know whether the Minister intends it to be so, but I want to develop the point. Section 22 of the principal Act, which is to be amended by clause 5, 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.

That is now to be changed to 90 metres.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Do you know why they have to be separated?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; so that there will be no shenanigans. That is the quick answer. If the Minister consults the principal Act he will find that, by not adding the words "or dairy blend" immediately after the word "butter", we will depart from a position that has obtained since the first impost was made on the manufacture of margarine; that is, that butter was to be made in a butter factory while margarine was to be made in a works especially prescribed and looked after under the Margarine Act, with inspectors appointed by the Agriculture Department and by the Health Department. If we do not amend this, it is possible that dairy blend, which has a predominance of butter and which really belongs to the butter industry, can be manufactured in a margarine works. I do not know whether that is the Government's policy, but I think it would be strongly resisted. I have not taken this up with the co-operative butter factories or with the private butter factories, but I do not think they would like a product with a predominance of butter, and one which they agreed should be marketed as a form of butter, to be manufactured in a margarine works. The Act as amended will provide for the new product to be treated in the same way as butter, under the definition of "dairy products". That will be the position unless the Bill is amended; it will be possible for dairy blend to be manufactured in a margarine works.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I don't think so.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think that is so. Section 22 of the principal Act refers to restrictions on manufacturing butter in or near a margarine factory, and section 21(2), as amended, will provide:

Every owner of a factory shall grade, or cause to be graded, all butter—

and there we insert the words "or dairy blend"—

manufactured at the factory, according to quality, and in accordance with the regulations, and shall cause every package into which such butter is packed at the factory to be marked with some words, or words and figures, correctly signifying to which of the prescribed grades the butter belongs.

Then we say that no person shall manufacture butter in premises in which margarine is manufactured. We have come a long way in virtually legalizing margarine in the eyes of the dairying industry. Under the previous interpretation, this product is really nothing more than a margarine. The definition of "butter" provides that it is produced wholly from milk or a lacteal substance. Here, we are using butter oil in the form of cream and allowing it to be mixed with certain vegetable oils; in fact, we are making a margarine except that, because it has a predominance of butterfat, we are setting up a theoretical barrier, if not a factual barrier, and we are therefore putting out a product which is not butter but which is nearer to margarine.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is nearer to butter.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is nearer to butter in the butterfat content, but it is nearer to margarine under the original interpretation of poly-unsaturated margarine.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But we are not talking about poly-unsaturated margarine.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, but what I say is quite true. I believe the butter industry is entitled to manufacture this product because it is a good spread, but I also believe it should be manufactured exclusively in factories in which butter is made, not where margarine is made. Unless the Bill is amended, the manufacturers of margarine will have an open go to make this product.

Three Bills on this subject are on the Notice Paper, one of which I am dealing with at the moment and which amends the Dairy Industry Act. Another will amend the Dairy Produce Act and a third will amend the Margarine Act. Most of my comments will apply to all

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

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

(Continued from August 13. Page 392.)

Amendments Nos. 1 to 4:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

may have seen in yesterday's press a report of an interview with Professor Blackett of the Department of Medicine at the University of New South Wales, part of which is as follows:

There is a good case for the unrestricted availability of poly-unsaturated margarines and an equally strong case for changing the composition of cooking margarine. All margarine laws are out of date and antipathetic to the health of the nation . . . A food supply which is largely unsuitable for a third to half of the population needs looking at. Those who are unable to tolerate high fat, high sugar, high calorie foods have to use their ingenuity and swim against the tide of the present food supply. Without informative, quantitative labelling of all manufactured foods—margarine, butter, and all dairy products, biscuits, confectionery, breakfast foods, meat products, etc.—it is impossible for the consumer to know what he is eating.

This Bill and those amending the Dairy Industry Act and the Dairy Produce Act go together and I think they are perfect bedmates, but I think they are all rather unfortunate for the sake of the ordinary housewife.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the Hon. Mr. Springett for his comments on the Bill. I agreed entirely with his comments when he asked why the public should not get a product that it wanted rather than have a quota on something that it wanted but could not get. I have been trying diligently for the past three years to get some semblance of sanity into Ministers from other States in this respect, but unfortunately they are not of my political persuasion: they belong to the same Party as do members opposite.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Which in particular?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am referring to New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are those Liberal Party Governments?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Queensland has a Country Party Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about New South Wales?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That State has a Liberal Party Government, as does Victoria. Of course, a Liberal Party Government in Tasmania initially introduced these restrictions on cooking margarine, and it was followed later by Victoria.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And those restrictions were maintained by Labor in Tasmania.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Well, that Government did not do anything to rectify the situation. However, I suppose it has not been in office for very long, and I do not know what its philosophy on this matter was when it went to the people. The fact remains that cooking margarine, which is more presentable to the public, has been under quota. For this reason, it is difficult for the margarine manufacturers to fulfil their obligations to different markets throughout the Commonwealth. It is ludicrous that margarine manufacturers are obliged to stamp on four sides of containers exactly what is cooking margarine. However, the manufacturers of poly-unsaturated margarine are merely obliged to stamp this information on the top of containers. There has definitely been a war against the manufacturers of cooking margarine, despite this product's having been accepted throughout the world.

Only Australia has these ridiculous labelling requirements that have been imposed by the other States, particularly the Eastern States, where manufacturing is done in bulk. Manufacturers must comply with these labelling requirements, as most of the margarine that is manufactured in the Eastern States finds its way into the other States. I have been trying for three years to bring about some sanity in relation to the labelling of these products. Most people who buy a product look only at the top of a container anyway and, as long as the required information is printed in sufficiently large lettering on the top of the container, that should be sufficient to satisfy the average consumer. I will again be pressing for this at the next Agricultural Council meeting later this month, but whether I get anywhere remains to be seen.

There has been a war between margarine manufacturers and the dairying industry. It is indeed enlightening to see that Mr. Page Beatty, the Chairman of the Australian Dairy Produce Board, has admitted that the battle against the margarine manufacturers has been lost. If one examines the graph of consumption of margarine compared to that of butter, one will see that the consumption of butter is decreasing quickly. According to the latest figures, it appears that if the present downward trend continues little butter will be consumed in Australia in 15 years time. Whether that graph continues in its downward movement we shall have to wait 15 years to see. However, that is today's trend. The dairying industry has therefore been given sufficient warning.

The Bill has been introduced to legalize "dairy spread" in this State so that the dairy industry can be given an opportunity to pick up some tabs that it would not otherwise have been able to pick up. One of the problems about butter is that it has been difficult to spread, and this is where the margarine manufacturers have absolutely taken over the market. Sales of similar products, as a substitute to butter, have increased because of their spreadability. The Hon. Mr. Springett was straightforward and conscientious in his remarks, and I agree wholeheartedly with him.

I believe that there was no justification for quotas on poly-unsaturates in the first place. As much as two years ago I suggested to the Agricultural Council that it adopt the definition of "poly-unsaturated margarine" laid down by the National Health and Medical Research Council. I said, "Let us adopt this definition so that we can produce poly-unsaturated margarine. Remove the quotas so that the people who want this product in the interests of their own health can buy it." However, once again the dairying industry exerted pressure, and the political lobbying that has taken place has been detrimental to the dairying industry.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think it has been a general demarcation dispute?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It has gone further than that. The whole trouble with the industry today is that big business, which has large sums of money to spend on advertising, has come on to the scene. Oversea companies, particularly in the margarine field, seem to have unlimited resources to pour into advertising. If one advertises effectively for long enough, one will sell one's product. That, unfortunately, is what has happened, and that is why the dairying industry has lost the battle with the margarine industry. So, the dairying industry must try to pick up any threads that may be left. I hope that "dairy spread", which is dealt with in this Bill and the associated Bills, will in some way promote the sale of a product that is basically butter; the legislation provides that it will be 80 per cent butter.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am grateful for what the Minister said when he closed the second reading debate, and I agree with many of the points that he and the Hon. Mr. Springett made. Next week the Minister will attend a meeting of the Agricultural Council, at which margarine quotas will be discussed. This Government's policy is that quotas for table margarine should be completely abandoned. If that policy is not agreed to at the Agricultural Council meeting, the South Australian Government can still go it alone in this State; as far as I can remember, it is only a gentlemen's agreement. There are two separate matters here, one being a health matter and the other being plain chicanery. Poly-unsaturated margarine is obviously most desirable and necessary in preventing some forms of heart disease and for other health purposes. It would be wrong to allow the production of any sort of margarine without any quotas or restrictions. This would happen if this State and the other States did not take preventive legislative measures to ensure, first, that poly-unsaturated margarine was put in a category of its own and, secondly, that it could not be undercut by cheap products made from cheap vegetable oils such as coconut oil, particularly imported coconut oil, which cheap products can be sold for about 30c for 454 grams. That, of course, would cause grievous losses to people trying to produce poly-unsaturated margarine with the best Australian vegetable oils, which have to be very pure and carefully made. The same applies to butter, which has to reach a high standard in butter factories to pass health laws.

At present little notice is taken in some other States of health laws in regard to the raw materials that go into cooking margarine; practically anything that comes from a sheep or from beef can be rendered. Further, anything that can be sent to a knackery can be ground up and made into the necessary nice-looking basic ingredient and sold as cooking margarine. That was happening until fairly recently. I do not know what the present position is. Our South Australian health laws are no tighter than are health laws in the Eastern States. However, we have been fortunate in having good types of manufacturer who use a good type of ingredient, but I remind honourable members that most of the cooking margarine sold in this State is manufactured in other States. If the Minister advocates the policy to which he has referred, I am sure that much more attention must be given to proper packaging and proper legislation in connection with cooking margarine.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I think the honourable member is treading on rather dangerous ground here. This was one of the chief weapons used against the cooking margarine people a few years ago. In attempts made to belittle the cooking margarine manufacturers, all sorts of adverse comments were made; for example, it was alleged that people went to a margarine factory and found a sugar bag full of horse shoes, the implication being that horses were being rendered down and the fat was being used in the manufacture of cooking margarine. I do not believe that such allegations have been justified. I have inspected margarine factories in other States, from which most cooking margarine comes. There is a Health Department inspector at all times in such factories. Surely he would notice any anomalous practices in those factories. I agree that the product must be wholesome and edible, but I do not think anyone should criticize margarine factories in other States if it is not known how they operate. I do not believe for one moment (and I have been given undertakings to this effect) that the factories use anything other than edible products. The margarine manufacturers can go to butcher shops in Melbourne and Sydney and collect all the fat, meat and bones that the butchers cast off and, instead of those materials going into a rendering plant somewhere, the manufacturers can purchase them; the products have to be edible to get into a butcher shop in the first place.

There has been a war within the margarine industry itself, to say nothing of the war between sections of the margarine industry and the dairying industry. I hope that common sense will soon prevail and that some semblance of sanity will return. After all, as legislators we are trying to give the people exactly what they want, ensuring that the product should be of a wholesome nature in the interests of the general health of the community.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 451.)

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): This is the main Bill dealing with the manufacture of "dairy blend", and I compliment the Hon. Mr. Story on his contribution to the debate. He certainly did his homework, and I commend him for that. In this legislation, the Government is trying to give everyone an opportunity to produce "dairy blend". That, I believe, is the sole right of any manufacturer. I think the Hon. Mr. Story mentioned this when he said that any industry must have competition in order to produce maximum benefits. However, I do not think we have such competition in this industry. If we accepted the statement of Mr. Page Beatty, we would have competition in an industry where either the margarine manufacturers or the butter factories could manufacture either product. Perhaps one day we will reach that stage, but at present such a course would not be politically acceptable in New South Wales or Victoria, especially in Victoria, which has the biggest dairying industry of any State, so naturally, for political reasons, it wants to protect dairy farmers. Nevertheless, while not wide, the amendments contained in this Bill allow the manufacture of "dairy blend" in South Australia. The compound has been manufactured here, first, in laboratories at Northfield, and secondly (and on rather a bigger scale), at Roseworthy Agricultural College. Thirdly, on an experimental basis, it was manufactured on a large scale at Werribee, at the research centre of the Agriculture Department in Victoria.

I am sure everyone who has tasted this product has liked it and has commented favourably on it. It is to be hoped that the manufacturers in South Australia will do something about it without delay. I hope this will not be too long in taking place, because the industry has had the necessary information for the past two years. I am anxious to see manufacture commence as soon as possible. Such a course would be in the interests of the dairying industry, and I hope the people who will be given the franchise will not simply sit back and commence manufacture when they feel inclined. They have been given the necessary information, they have been shown how to make the product, and they have been given every possible assistance. The man responsible for the manufacture of the product was Dr. John Feagan, an officer of the department, and I would be happy to make his services available at any time to advise manufacturers in any way.

Legislation has been passed in Queensland giving manufacturers the right to produce "dairy blend." The Queensland product differs slightly from the South Australian product; Queenslanders, of course, are noted for

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 control 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.