LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 20, 1974

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

SMOKE NUISANCE

The PRESIDENT: In view of the atmospheric conditions in the Chamber due to misadventure by those working on upgrading the building, I suggest that, until the smoke nuisance has abated, the honourable Acting Minister of Lands move that the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): As I wholeheartedly concur in what you have just said, Mr. President, I move:

That the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Motion carried.

[*Sitting suspended from* 2.16 *to* 3.15 *p.m.*]

PETITION: SODOMY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition from 119 electors and residents of South Australia objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalize sodomy between consenting adults until such time as the Parliament had a clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to do so.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS presented a petition signed by 156 ratepayers and residents of the District Council of Minlaton expressing dissatisfaction with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and praying that the Legislative Council would allow the District Council of Minlaton to remain as a local government authority and be enlarged to include surrounding areas of the district which use Minlaton as a centre.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In his Speech at the opening of the session the Governor said that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act would be amended this session to remove the right of tort actions. In view of the prevailing conditions, can the Acting Minister of Lands, as Leader of the Government in this Council, say whether the Government intends to proceed with the amending legislation and, if it does not, when did Cabinet decide not to proceed with it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: To the best of my knowledge, the reply to the Leader's question is "No". From memory (and I stand to be corrected) I think the decision was made at a Cabinet meeting earlier in the week.

VINE PLANTINGS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: During the Address in Reply debate the Hon. Mr. Chatterton said that he had been appointed Chairman of a committee to inquire into the desirability of rehabilitating viticultural plantings under irrigation. I believe that the committee is now collecting evidence. In view of the fact that the Chief Research Officer of the Nuriootpa viticultural centre, Mr. Max Loeder, has said recently that, of the 7 700 hectares of plantings in the Barossa Valley, two-thirds of the area needs replanting, no doubt the same position prevails at Clare and in the southern districts. Can the Minister say whether the inquiry being conducted is broad enough to encompass the areas I have referred to, or whether the committee is looking at only those plantings under irrigation at present? If the committee is looking at only the rehabilitation of irrigated areas, will the Minister take up with the Premier, who appointed the committee, the matter of the general rehabilitation of the viticultural industry in this State with Government assistance? In Germany, Italy and California, where this has been done with Government assistance, the producer has been able to gain a very good livelihood from a much smaller area than that which he would need under Australian conditions at present. In fact, it is alleged that 6 ha of rehabilitated vines can be a living area in some places overseas, whereas in the Barossa Valley at present about 20 ha of vines is required for the same return.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will take up the honourable member's question with the Premier and see exactly what the committee's terms of reference were. I am sure the honourable member would agree that an inquiry was desirable in the present circumstances. Only recently the grapegrowers advisory council issued a statement (under my name, incidentally) which indicated what types of grape were suitable for growing in the future not only in irrigated areas but also in non-irrigated areas. This is the type of information that the viticultural industry requires from time to time, to give it an idea of exactly where it is going. I only hope that we can encompass the whole industry, because it is no good doing it in piecemeal fashion. If the viticultural industry can be rehabilitated in this way, it will do South Australia the world of good.

PARKING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My question concerns the motor vehicle parking arrangements in car parks at supermarkets and shopping centres. The extent of damage caused to vehicles when drivers endeavour to park between two stationary cars, or when doors are opened to load groceries and other goods, is considerable. By this I mean that, although each vehicle's damage is not serious, the cost of repairs of the minor dents and scratches is a financial burden to many vehicle owners, thus having the effect of making trips to these centres expensive shopping excursions. Many victims of the problem claim that the markings or guidelines painted on the bitumen surfaces of these car parks do not provide sufficient space for each vehicle to be parked safely; the smaller the space, the more cars that can be parked. This may well be advantageous to the shop proprietors but it does not help the customers. Can the Minister say whether there is any local government or other control to ensure the provision of adequate space between these markings so that customers have reasonable certainty that their cars, once parked, will not be damaged as I have described; if there is not, will the Minister investigate this problem with a view to ensuring such consideration being given to customers?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

MONARTO

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On August 8, I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture regarding the numbers of staff of the Agriculture Department at the head office in the city and at Northfield, and also what proportion would be required to transfer to Monarto. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The numbers of employees at present located at the headquarters of the Agriculture Department at Gawler Place and at Northfield Research Centre are 234 and 165 respectively. As it is not known how many of the personnel presently based in Adelaide will still be employed by the department when it is relocated, I am not in a position to say what proportion of the present staff will be required to work at Monarto. Submissions have been made by the Director of Agriculture to the Monarto Public Service Relocation Committee concerning those components of the department which it is considered must necessarily remain in the Adelaide area, and the committee will make its recommendations to the Government in due course. The Government has no intention of directing employees where they shall reside.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on August 6 about Commonwealth Government funds for the development of Monarto?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: A total of $4 413 000 was received from the Australian Government before June 30, 1974, to cover land acquisition, planning studies, tree planting costs and office establishment costs. In addition, the Australian Government is processing a further claim for $1 078 500 to cover additional expenditures on these categories to June 30, 1974. With this amount, the total received from the Australian Government for Monarto for the year ended June 30, 1974, will be $5 491 500.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On August 14, I asked a question regarding local government boundaries. Has the Minister of Health a reply from the Minister of Local Government to that question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have a reply to the honourable member's question and also to a similar question asked by the Hon. R. C. DeGaris. My colleague has furnished the following information:

The first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas was posted to all councils late on Friday, July 19, 1974, so that it would be received by the councils on Monday, July 22, 1974. Therefore, this means that councils will have had the report for a period of six weeks by the time the closing date, namely, August 30, expires for the lodging of further submissions to the Royal Commission. This is regarded as a sufficient period of time to enable a council to have studied the report and to have determined its attitude on the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and to make further representations to the Royal Commission if so desired. Therefore, it is not proposed to extend the closing date beyond August 30, 1974.

ABATTOIR

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on August 7 whether some means could be found to overcome problems existing at the Gepps Cross abattoir?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have received the following report from the General Manager of the South Australian Meat Corporation:

When all other works went on strike in South Australia in early July, Gepps Cross had an immediate livestock build-up. This was corrected as operators adjusted their livestock purchases in line with our capacity to kill. We provide forward information to operators to enable them to have only sufficient stock on hand to avoid stock standing around at the works. Angliss, Borthwicks and Metro were banned at Gepps Cross but, following the Industrial Commissioner's ruling on this matter, Gepps Cross employees returned to work on Tuesday, August 13, 1974, and work has proceeded without interruption since that date.

GAS RESERVES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from his colleague to my question regarding gas fields and known reserves of natural gas in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Development and Mines, states:

His Excellency the Governor was referring to the Cooper Basin when he said that a vigorous programme of exploration was contemplated. Moomba and Gidgealpa are two of the 22 gas fields already known in the Cooper Basin. Hopefully, the vigorous exploration programme will discover new such gas fields. The South Australian Government does not have drilling rigs operating in the Cooper Basin and does not contemplate doing so. Government geologists are constantly studying, reassessing, and reinterpreting the geology and petroleum potential of the Cooper Basin, as are the producers' geologists. This study is done on the subsurface information obtained from geophysical surveys and drilling already carried out by the producers. It is on the basis of these studies that Government geologists are able to make assessments of the Cooper Basin potential. His Excellency the Governor did not mean to imply that the South Australian Government would have drilling rigs operating in the Cooper Basin. The producers expect to commence drilling development wells in the Moomba field within the next two months. They also expect to commence exploration drilling in search of new fields early in 1975.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On August 8, I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture regarding reserves of natural gas to provide supplies for the Redcliff petrochemical complex. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am informed by my colleague, the Minister of Development and Mines, that the presently known reserves of deliverable gas available in the Cooper Basin for supplying Sydney and Adelaide amount to 3·4 trillion cubic feet. Under earlier "dedication" arrangements involving allocation of specific fields to these markets, it would not have been possible to supply Sydney and at the same time satisfy Adelaide's expanding needs and the Redcliff complex. However, under rationalization arrangements now being worked out, it will be possible to cater for all needs for Sydney and Adelaide, including Redcliff, until the end of 1987. Based on presently known reserves, supplies will commence to decline after that time, but would still be sufficient to cater for presently contracted supplies to Sydney. The necessary development drilling to enable production from known reserves to be increased to meet these demands is scheduled to commence in September, and exploration drilling for the further reserves required beyond 1987 for both Adelaide and Sydney is scheduled to commence early in 1975. This development and exploration drilling will continue on an integrated programme for several years.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Will the Minister convert those cubic feet to cubic metres so that I can understand the reply?

PRICE CONTROL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on August 6 about price control?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague, the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, has furnished me with the following reply:

The principle of the confidentiality of information furnished to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has formed part of the system of price control

in this State since its inception. It was established by the regulations made under the National Security Act in 1940 and was continued when price control was given its basis in the law of this State by the Prices Act, 1948. This confidentiality and the corresponding obligation of secrecy on the part of the Commissioner and his officers were preserved throughout the administration of the Playford Government and the Hall Government, of which the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was a member. Throughout those years it was accepted that it would be unreasonable to require business organizations to disclose information to the Commissioner, for without this confidentiality it would then be published to the world, including the organization's competitors. The existence and operation of the Prices Justification Tribunal have introduced new factors into the situation. The whole question of the operation of price control in South Australia and its relationship with the Commonwealth prices justification system is currently under consideration. I am not at present able to say what, if any, changes in the legislation will result.

TAXI-CABS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply to a recent question of mine about the reason why some taxi roofs have not been fitted with the latest taxi sign?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A delay occurred with the production of taxi-cab roof lights owing to non-availability of plastic. However, through the efforts of the Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department, sufficient plastic has been obtained from New South Wales to complete this project. At present the light is in full production and about 40 are being fitted to taxi-cabs each week. All cabs should be so fitted within three to four months.

PORT AUGUSTA BUS SERVICE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the Port Augusta bus service?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not the intention of the Government to subsidize the privately owned bus service in Port Augusta. However, the provision of adequate bus transport within that region is presently being studied by the Transport Department in conjunction with the proposed Redcliff development.

"MUSIC ON WHEELS" CARAVAN

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before addressing a question to you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have been asked by several people what is the position in relation to the caravan and another vehicle that are parked partly on the front steps of Parliament House. I know the police have interviewed the occupant of the vehicle. I, and I am sure the public, should like to know whether you have any information to give honourable members about whether an offence is being committed whilst the vehicles are drawn up in that position in front of this building, and what action can be taken to remedy the situation.

The PRESIDENT: When the vehicle was parked on the pavement in front of Parliament House last week, the matter was referred to me. The answer is, of course, that the vehicle is not on any part of Parliament House or on any area under the control of the Presiding Officers. I consider the footpath is the responsibility of the Adelaide City Council rather than being anything to do with Parliament. As far as I was concerned, I left the matter to the discretion of the police to take what action, if any, they saw fit to take.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as Acting Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Can the Minister say whether he has any information that could throw light on the reason why the footpath in front of Parliament House has been obstructed for several days, with washing hanging out on a line? Has Cabinet discussed this matter and have the police been instructed or not instructed to take action?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: To my knowledge, the Government has taken no action in this matter and it has not been discussed in Cabinet. All I have heard about it is that the lady in question says she will stay there until she sees the Premier. That is what the newspapers report, and that is all that I know.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Health. Further to a radio report last week that His Excellency the Governor had requested the opportunity to visit Glenside Hospital, has the Minister agreed to arrange such a visit?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not hear the broadcast referred to but I understand that representations have been made by His Excellency to visit Glenside. I also understand that His Excellency is awaiting a reply, and I think I should give it to him first before I give it to honourable members.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Minister of Health has a reply to my recent question about the Christie Downs railway.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In April, 1974, when this project, including the interchange terminal at Christie Downs, was submitted to the Australian Government for inclusion in its programme of financial aid for urban public transport, it was estimated to cost $8 944 000. The Australian Government is to meet two-thirds of this cost but the necessary legislation has not yet been passed. It follows that no money has yet been received from the Australian Government. Local government was contacted regarding the proposal before the Bill was introduced.

LAND TENURE

The Hon. C. M. HILL (on notice):

1. What form of land tenure is to be adopted for residential titles within Monarto?

2. What form of land tenure is to be adopted for titles within zoned commercial areas at Monarto?

3. What form of land tenure is to be used for land released as building allotments within metropolitan Adelaide by the Land Commission?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to adopt a policy in which covenants shall be placed on land titles issued in Monarto or by the Land Commission?

5. If so, will such covenants include retention of development rights, or development value, by the Crown, or the relevant lessor?

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

1. The Monarto Development Commission has not yet submitted a recommendation to the Government on a land tenure policy for Monarto, although the matter is being investigated. It is probable that a policy proposal will be submitted to the Minister for consideration sometime next year.

2. See 1 above.
3. The South Australian Land Commission will determine the tenure of land to be disposed of by it, having regard to Government policy decisions on the matter of land tenure. It is understood that such decisions are now being considered, following the recent Australian Cabinet decisions on the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures.
4. If the Government should adopt, as a matter of policy, the land tenure recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures, the Land Commission, in implementing that policy under existing South Australian Statutes, would place covenants on interests in land conveyed by its imposing improvement conditions and the reservation of development rights.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 489.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): This Bill is one of a trilogy, the other two Bills being the Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill and the Dairy Produce Act Amendment Bill. Margarine has traditionally been regarded by many people as a substitute for butter, and that approach I do not regard as being really correct. Some people have regarded rice as a substitute for potato, or vice versa, yet each of these substances is a distinct product in its own right. Similarly, butter is one product and margarine is another.

His Excellency referred in his Speech to the development of a new "dairy blend" product, being a mixture of both butter and margarine. I refer to a report concerning the dairying industry and statements by the Chairman of the Australian Dairy Produce Board (Mr. A. P. Beatty). The report of Mr. Beatty's statements is as follows:

It might not be too far in the future before butter manufacturers started making not only butter-margarine blends but also straight margarine. He said the dairy industry should be interested in supplying the whole food industry. Dairy factories could produce pure dairy products, blended products and those which competed with dairy products. I think the venture of dairy products into margarine manufacture is a reasonable business proposition. We should be in the food trade, it's as simple as that. Why should we then not be manufacturing margarine or any other food if we so desire?

The report continues:

I have reason to believe that margarine manufacturers are interested in a butter and vegetable oil blend.

The report further states:

Mr. Beatty said that, in a tight supply situation, dairy manufacturers might be making butter-margarine blends of as low as 25 per cent butter. Once you get to that stage, isn't it reasonable to assume that butter factories will be virtually manufacturing margarine and why shouldn't they make straight margarine? I am a realist and I think people should be able to buy whatever they like, he said. I don't think margarine quotas have been helping the dairy industry at all.

The report concludes:

It is a sophisticated world and people like to try things which are new. We have got to meet them. The consumer is entitled to be given a choice of product.

As all the ingredients of butter and margarine are of Australian origin, I believe there is no need for tariff protection considerations to limit the production of either product. However, it appears that this Bill, which comprises one of a trilogy, seeks to curb one industry at the expense of another. Further, since the production quota and supply of margarine are now in balance, what is the reason for the continued maintenance of the production quota currently applying?

I represent many dairy farmers, and I eat butter and enjoy it. Nevertheless, I am puzzled about the situation applying when the supply and the production of margarine under quota are in balance. Why does the quota still apply? We are told that more and more butter is required. Australia's population is growing, through both migration and natural increase. Why should Australians be denied the opportunity of purchasing and using margarine?

Migrants from many oversea countries have been accustomed to using margarine, and they should have the right to choose this product in Australia. This right should apply not only to the quality of products available but also to their quantity. Cooking margarine is margarine containing 90 per cent beef fat. Naturally, this is Australian fat. Cooking margarine is flavoured by diacetyl, the same substance used in the flavouring of butter and to be used for flavouring in the new "dairy blend". Yet the same substance, diacetyl, is banned from use in several other States. Can the Minister say why this should be the case and what is the position relating to the use of this substance in South Australia?

The colouring agent in cooking margarine is beta-carotene. This same agent is used in the production of butter and table margarine, as well as many other products such as cheese, invalid foods, and similar preparations. I have referred to the International Labour Organization's reference encyclopaedia and the handbook of toxic products in respect of the two additives to which I have just referred, yet there is no reference to either product in either of these reference books. If diacetyl and beta-carotene are accepted as suitable additives in some States for use in some dairy products, why are they not considered acceptable for use in all States in the production of margarine?

I have been told that the Australian quota for table margarine is 1·814 kg a head, and most of the margarine produced within this quota is poly-unsaturated. Poly-unsaturated margarine is often recommended by clinicians and research workers for patients having hyper-lipidaemic conditions. It is ironic that some dairymen are advised to use poly-unsaturated margarine as an aid to their good health yet, because of the application of the quota, they may be unable to obtain sufficient quantities of this product. Naturally, dairy farmers are anxious to sell their butter, and they have a certain antipathy toward the use of margarine; nevertheless, it is ironic that these same men may need to use poly-unsaturated margarine and, because of the production quota applying to this product, they may be unable to get sufficient quantities for their own use.

Why should there be a quota applying to the production of table margarine, but no quota applying to the production of cooking margarine or butter? Indeed, why should there be a quota at all? Why should the new "dairy blend" be excluded from the definition of margarine? If the Minister suggests that it is not margarine, then I point out that neither is it butter. This new product is a hybrid. It seems that there has been an attempt to please everyone. Do housewives realize there is no justification for cooking margarine to be labelled as it is labelled and to be told that it is to be used for cooking purposes only? It is absurd that a product comprising 90 per cent of cooking fat and 10 per cent of vegetable fat should be so described. What is that product? It is cooking margarine. Cooking margarine becomes table margarine when the beef fats drop to 89 per cent and the vegetable fats are 11 per cent or more. This relates purely to the Australian market; nowhere else in the world does this apply. I admit that margarines need to come from vegetable oils whence come poly-unsaturated fats, but we cannot really make flesh of one and fish of another. Honourable members

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 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

information before them to show whether the Redcliff project will ever proceed. If an area exists where a special authority is needed, it should be defined in the Act, without a sweeping authority being given to cover the whole State.

I am still considering whether I will support the Bill. I should like an opportunity further to examine some parts of it and to seek opinions on some of the matters I have raised. I do not believe this matter is urgent. Indeed, it has been admitted that the authority can continue its work under its present powers. I therefore believe the Council should examine closely what the far-reaching effects of the Bill could be.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 21, at 2.15 p.m.