

only the problem of providing work for those who are displaced, I can see very little hope, except the one ray that Western Australia will still have a market provided by its own people, if they are patriotic enough to purchase our local products. Outside of that I can see no hope. I feel indebted to the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) for the thought that he certainly has put into this subject. I am sure we are all pleased that he should be interested in it. The question now is one which is removed from any party bias and I agree that this House, as a House, should devote itself to the solution of the problem, because the solution means so much to the State. I am pleased to be able to report that the Government has progressively overcome the difficulty. We are now in a position to offer a job to any man able and willing to work. Men need no longer depend upon sustenance. Any man out of work who approaches a member should be sent by the member to the Employment Department for the purpose of having his case examined. We guarantee now that the men will get something better than sustenance. Our conditions are better than those of any other State of Australia. I am extremely pleased to be able to make that report.

On motion by Mr. North, debate adjourned.

BILL—TRAMWAYS PURCHASE ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 21st November, 1940.

Bills:		PAGE:
Fisheries Act Amendment, report	2135-
Reserves, Com.	2135-
Legitimation Act Amendment, Com.	2135
Builders Registration Act Amendment, 1B.	2137
Margarine, 2B., Com.	2137

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—RESERVES.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—York lot 450:

The HONORARY MINISTER: The name "Pyke" is twice mis-spelt in the clause. I move an amendment—

That the word "Pryke" where first appearing in line 2 be struck out, and "Pyke" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The word "Pryke" where appearing for the second time in line 2 will be consequentially amended to "Pyke."

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 7, Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—LEGITIMATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 6 (partly considered):

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment standing in my name on the

notice paper represents what we tried to arrive at yesterday. The object of Mr. Nicholson's amendment, which was withdrawn, was to include persons incapable of attending to their affairs. I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 of paragraph (b) the words "dies thereafter or becomes insane without having previously" be struck out, and the words "and before he shall have" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That after the word "hereof" in line 6 of paragraph (b) the following words be inserted:—"dies or becomes insane or of such a condition of mental disability as to render him in the opinion of the judge hearing an application hereinafter provided for, incapable of making such a declaration."

Amendment put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That after the word "insane" in line 12 of paragraph (b) the words "or mentally disabled as aforesaid" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as Subsection 1A:—

1A. A copy of any application under paragraph (b) of Subsection (1) hereof, and of the evidence by affidavit to be used in support thereof, shall be served upon the man alleged to be insane or mentally disabled as aforesaid, or upon the committee (if any) of such man, within the same periods prior to the hearing of the application as are provided by the rules of the Supreme Court, 1909, to be limited in a writ of summons for the appearance of any defendant.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It seems to me that the effect of the proposed subsection will be to delay proceedings. The rules of the Supreme Court prescribe the procedure to be followed. Notwithstanding that a man may have been conclusively proved to be insane, it will, under this provision, be necessary to effect service.

Hon. J. Nicholson: On his committee.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: He may not have a committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He might.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Few inmates of the Hospital for the Insane have a committee appointed.

The Honorary Minister: The insane person may not be in that hospital.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I am assuming he is there. In the great majority of instances, insane persons become inmates of that institution. If the amendment is passed, it will be necessary to go through the farce of serving a copy of the application on the committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The hon. member will notice that the words "if any" appear after the word "committee."

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Even if a committee be appointed, he deals only with the insane person's goods and chattels. The subsection would, as I have said, have the effect of delaying proceedings. I consider the provision unnecessary.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I appreciate the view expressed by Mr. Parker. Every person who unfortunately becomes mentally unfit is not resident within our jurisdiction. This point was discussed and considered, and the procedure proposed was deemed to be correct. A person mentally unfit may be confined in an institution in the Eastern States or he might even be overseas. Unfortunate cases are likely to arise in the serious conditions prevailing throughout the world. Parties entitled to have a matter such as this brought to their knowledge should be served with a record of the proceedings.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But a judge would not act unless that was done.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the proposed subsection is struck out, he certainly would. Its deletion would certainly weaken the measure. It is of vital importance that the subsection should remain, and I hope the Committee will agree to its inclusion.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER. Suppose the man was in a part overseas, probably 90 days would elapse before the application could be heard.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That would not matter.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The amendment deals with a person who is insane or is unable to make a declaration. What is the use of serving a lot of legal documents on a man who is too insane to understand them? Ample protection is contained in the provision that proof to the satisfaction of

the judge must be adduced that the man is the father of the child.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Parker need have no hesitancy in supporting the amendment. He has limited his remarks to the case of an insane man, and has obviously overlooked that the amendment also refers to a man in such a mental condition as to render him, in the opinion of the judge, incapable of making the declaration. The Lunacy Act provides for a man incapable of managing his affairs.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: And of unsound mind.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, the term is a man incapable of managing his affairs. That incapacity might be of a temporary character. Possibly a man might receive the document during a lucid interval when he would be quite capable of comprehending its meaning.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: But he might not receive it then.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The provision is necessary. It will clearly be of assistance to the judge, who will satisfy himself that the steps being taken are essential in the cause of justice. Possibly the rights of other children would be affected, and so the fullest care should be exercised in taking each step. If there is any chance of such a man regaining his reason for a time, he should be given an opportunity to know of proceedings in which he is vitally concerned.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I thank Mr. Nicholson for his clear exposition. The Solicitor-General has re-drafted the provision and considers it satisfactory.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Did the Solicitor-General say it was necessary? If it is necessary, it is curious that he did not include the provision in the original Bill.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He overlooked it.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—BUILDERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. L. B. Bolton, read a first time.

BILL—MARGARINE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.0]: We were informed by the Chief Secretary that this Bill is complementary to legislation of a similar nature that has either been introduced or passed in the other States, its object being to exercise some control over the inroads being made by margarine on the dairying industry. This is the outcome of a unanimous recommendation on the part of the Australian Agricultural Council, which body wants the controlling measure enacted. I intend to be singular in respect to the Bill, because I have sensed that the views of members are in the direction of accepting it. The Bill gives me some concern, and by reason of the years in which I have been associated with the dairying industry I am compelled to say that I cannot conscientiously support the second reading. Just to let members understand, as far back as 1911 Parliament amended the Health Act and brought into existence an advisory board to standardise all foods and so help to provide that uniformity which was necessary. When this was done in Western Australia, uniformity throughout Australia had to be sought. At that time there was no Federal law in force to assist in bringing about the standardisation. Conferences were held at different times and they were attended by the Commissioners of Health and the Government Analysts from all the States. I attended as a representative of Western Australia's commercial interests. The result was that uniformity was brought about, and of course margarine was one of the commodities that had to be standardised. At that time it was made almost exclusively from animal fats, or oleo margarine. The analysts who were dealing with the matter proved that it was possible to make margarine from vegetable fats as well as from animal fats or oleo margarine. Some time later the financial magnates who had become associated with the manufacture of this commodity saw an easy way of making money and they developed an unusual activity by extending their operations. It was possible for them to do that because at that time there was no control exercised over the manufacture of margarine. The dairying industry

was in a very bad way; it had been working under difficulties brought about to some extent by the tariff and labour awards. It had to compete against margarine and it received no help from outside sources, or from the State Governments and so it was practically impossible for it to expand. From time to time efforts were made to organise the trade and to discover means by which assistance could be rendered to those who were connected with dairying. Repeated attempts were made to induce State Governments to render assistance. Referenda were conducted amongst the dairy people, but it was never possible to arrive at any satisfactory solution of the troubles. There was always a majority to oppose a progressive move such as, for instance, paying for something which that majority thought could be done without. So the industry remained in a bad way; the price of butter was low and margarine was able to make some headway. Eventually the Paterson plan was evolved, a plan that gave the producer a better return, and the consumer of course had to pay a higher price. Again that higher price proved of assistance to margarine and as time went on it was felt that something drastic had to be done to check the continued inroads of margarine in the butter industry. The opinion was expressed that legislation should be passed to prohibit the sale of margarine. As a matter of fact one State did pass such legislation, but as time went on the legislation passed by that single State proved of no avail, and the people who were behind the manufacturers of margarine were able to use such arts and methods as enabled them to increase the sale of their product from year to year.

The dairying industry has spent thousands of pounds in the effort to protect itself from the competition of the cheaper margarine. The task was a difficult one because margarine had behind it all the skill and ability of people who were able to protect themselves for the purpose of increasing the sales of the product. The result is that to-day Australia as a whole finds itself menaced by a foreign substance which is sold at a very low figure, and which is slowly eating into the vitals of the dairying industry. It has made remarkable progress and will continue to do so unless it is checked. We require something more drastic than is contained in the Bill.

Hon. A. Thomson: What do you propose?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Can you get the other States to agree?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I do not think the House would support my point of view in respect to this suggested legislation, because I am not at all in sympathy with what the Bill proposes. My belief is that with the display of a little courage we could act more effectively than by limiting the output of margarine as the Bill proposes to do. Last year, it will be remembered, we called upon the dairying people of this State to raise money to assist to develop the industry. Everything that has been done to assist the industry has been carried out with funds provided by it. The industry works on a small margin compared with the margin on which those associated with the margarine industry operate. They would not be taking up their present attitude if they were not receiving good money from the manufacturers of margarine. It is not their care whether dairying progresses or not. Their viewpoint is to earn all they possibly can. Profit is what they have in mind and, by passing this legislation, we are going to help them to create that profit. Those who are associated with the dairying industry will have to rack their brains to find out how they are going to counter the advance that margarine is making. The margin on which the dairying industry works is narrow enough as it is without making it worse by passing legislation such as that we are asked to pass. I have before me a dairying journal published in Victoria and in its issue of the 16th of the present month a writer makes it plain that in spite of the legislation being introduced in all the States, margarine is making inroads on the dairying industry to the extent that dairying will have to take drastic steps to safeguard the position. Mr. Plunkett, M.L.A. of Queensland, who is the chairman of the Australian Dairy Produce Board states that the people of Australia and New Zealand are now collecting from the producer funds to use in the publicity campaign for butter on the United Kingdom Market and to meet the margarine competition after the war. While we are expressing concern about this menace and the industry is being called upon to provide funds for the purpose of fighting it and checking its growth, I wonder what will be said, when the war is over, about the Agricultural Council submitting the request to the various States to pass

this type of legislation, for the purpose of enabling the margarine people to get what are called their rights. It is proposed to keep the output throughout Australia down to 73 tons per week, and quotas have been allotted the various States. The quotas, however, are not anything new because they have been operating here for five years. The production here has been 5 tons, or 200 cases weekly, over a period of four or five years, and that has given the producers the opportunity to build up this article and popularise it to the extent that now the quota in Western Australia is going to be raised to 7 tons weekly. That is what we have to face in a State where every effort is being made to advance the dairying industry. There is no question that dairying in Western Australia has made progress and now, when it was thought that it was going smoothly along the road, it meets trouble of this description.

I am unable to feel satisfied that even at the present stage to accept the Bill as an expedient, would be right. All must recognise the value of the dairying industry to Australia as a whole and Western Australia in particular, and desire it to be developed still further so that it may be of greater value to the nation. On the other hand, if we accord consideration to an industry that procures its raw materials from countries outside the Commonwealth, we shall not assist the dairying industry to attain its goal. I am definitely opposed to the fostering of margarine production. Butter can be produced under beneficial conditions and of such cheapness that even the poorest can procure supplies at reasonable rates. One difficulty is that if margarine production has been permitted to jump from 4 to 7 tons in Western Australia—seven tons is to be the quota—will those concerned be satisfied with the existing position? Ever since I have been associated with the dairying industry, I have been aware of the arts and devices resorted to by the margarine interests in their endeavour to grab the trade of this State. The extent of their success to date affords me much concern. I cannot accept the proposed expedient and shall vote against the second reading of the Bill.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.17]: I do not think any member of this Chamber, apart from Mr. Macfarlane, will vote

against the second reading of the Bill. I would not have risen to speak but for the fact that I represent a province in which the dairying industry is carried on extensively. From time to time, we hear of the cost of "Hansard" and the great length of time spent on debates. Perhaps I may not be quite in order in mentioning the point, but I understand that in some Parliaments the rules of debate provide that after so many consecutive speeches have been made for and against a measure, the question is put automatically. Already we have listened to seven or eight speeches all of which have been in support of the Bill, and it seems to me to be an unnecessary waste of time to prolong the debate bearing in mind that expedition in putting the measure through is so essential. I understand that the passage of the Bill is awaited in the Eastern States, and it is important that we should pass it without delay. The question has been fully debated and details may be left for consideration during the Committee stage. The Bill has been described as most unusual, and its form is explained by necessity and special circumstances. I congratulate the Government on its attempt to save the dairying industry. We should not regard the Bill as accomplishing all that is necessary. To continue effecting improvements in the dairying industry is essential. There is room for an improvement in quality and the cost of production can be reduced. Those are important facts to remember. Western Australia possesses wonderful dairying country and what has been said in praise of the irrigation districts was certainly correct. The areas under pasture at present constitute a mere bagatelle compared with the thousands of acres of suitable country awaiting development. If we can succeed against outside competitors, a wonderful future awaits the South-West of this State and other parts of the Commonwealth. Dairying is a most important industry and I was sorry to hear Mr. Macfarlane say he would not support the Bill. I regard the measure as a step in the right direction.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The first step was taken long ago and now this deals with the second step.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I have had much to do with the fight against the margarine menace in the past, and it seemed to me from

time to time that the position had become worse. The Bill represents the best the Government has been able to do in the circumstances, and it should result in assisting the dairying industry to be placed on a sounder footing.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I hope that you are right and that I am wrong.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I hope so, too. If the Bill is passed, we must certainly carry on and improve the position of the dairying industry. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.21]: If I thought a vote against the Bill would, as Mr. Macfarlane suggested, serve to assist the dairying industry, I would have no hesitation in adopting that course.

Hon. L. Craig: So would we all.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The dairying industry has cost the State a vast sum of money and is just getting on its feet. In order to promote the interests of the industry, Western Australia is falling into line with the other States that have passed legislation. The measure will afford some protection to the public in that it definitely lays down that margarine must not be sold unless labelled as such. I am told that in the past it has been possible to pass margarine off as butter.

Hon. L. Craig: It is done now.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Possibly.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And will continue to be done.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I understand that in Victoria 29¼ tons of margarine are manufactured per week, and those concerned have agreed to a reduction in output to 23 tons. Although a small increase has been granted in Western Australia, it is at any rate gratifying that the Government intends to police the industry and, as far as possible, protect the dairying industry. If it were possible to prohibit the manufacture of margarine, I would support a move in that direction. Unfortunately, the Commonwealth controls the position and the State cannot act. I do not think we have the power to deny the sale of margarine in Western Australia.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: We were fairly successful in checking the business until the State granted a quota.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I commend the Government on the introduction of the Bill, although its provisions do not go as far as I would like. It represents an honest endeavour to protect the dairying industry. I have received a circular requesting me to support the Bill, and I do so not because of the request but because I believe the measure is in the interests of the dairying industry.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [5.25]: I support the Bill. During the course of the debate statements have been made that are not altogether correct. Margarine has its proper place in industry. I refer to cooking margarine. Biscuit and cake manufacturers could hardly continue operations during the summer months without the use of margarine.

Hon. W. J. Mann: How did they get on in the past?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Many years ago margarine was dearer than the best butter.

Hon. A. Thomson: I wish that applied to-day, for we would then have no need to worry.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Supplies of margarine are almost essential for those engaged in the manufacture of cakes and biscuits, and it certainly would not do for this State to prohibit the sale of that commodity. Supplies made from cotton seeds produce first-class cakes. If those manufacturers were compelled to use butter, the cost would rise and they would not be able to compete against Eastern States manufacturers. I agree with those who say the time has arrived when we should take a definite stand against the use of margarine for domestic purposes, and I certainly support the contention that men and women who have been fed on butter from childhood are physically better than those who were accustomed to margarine. I am glad that the Bill has been introduced.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [5.28]: I have no doubt, after listening to the speeches of members, that the Bill will meet with the approval of the House. At the same time, I think I should have something to say in reply, particularly in view of the remarks

of Mr. Macfarlane, who is the one member to indicate his intention to oppose the measure. In the first place, I wish to emphasise that it is the attitude indicated by Mr. Macfarlane in his remarks, that has prevented unanimity being reached throughout the Commonwealth upon this question, and this has been the position for some considerable time. People very prominent in the dairying industry in at least one State have expressed sentiments identical with those of the hon. member. Even those people have been forced to alter their point of view, with the result, as I shall show conclusively, that the dairying industry in Victoria is now satisfied that, owing to difficulties under the Federal Constitution, the only method that can be adopted for the protection of the industry is by means of legislation of this description. That has been substantiated by the Australian Dairy Council, and, while I am not associated with the dairying industry, I can appreciate the reasons actuating leaders of that industry throughout the Commonwealth in their effort to preserve the position of the butter industry not only at the present time but more particularly when the war is over. Sir Hal Colebatch gave the Bill his blessing, but stated he was of the opinion that it would not be as successful in operation as its advocates claimed.

Hon. J. Cornell: He is pretty sound on that point.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He may be; but he agreed that Australian consumers are quite ready and have been prepared for years past to pay a higher price for butter in order to assist the sale overseas of surplus butter manufactured in the Commonwealth. That is the very reason the Bill has been introduced—to preserve to the butter producers of the Commonwealth as high an average price for their product as can be obtained. I venture the assertion that if butter were to be sold in the Commonwealth at the same price as is charged in the Old Country, dairy farmers in Western Australia would be in a pretty bad way.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is an artificial means of preserving the industry.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No one will contradict that statement, but this is not the only industry that has had to employ artificial means to preserve its identity and provide some sort of prosperity for those engaged in it. I am afraid that if the war

continues for any length of time, quite a number of people will find it necessary to alter their point of view in regard to matters of this kind. Nobody can prophesy what changes will take place, and we cannot blame those in the dairying industry for endeavouring to safeguard their industry by this means when they have the example of other industries which to-day are prosperous mainly as the result of using this method.

Other speakers have raised different points. Mr. Baxter said he thought it would be better if the control of the manufacture of margarine and the issue of licenses were under the Dairy Products Marketing Board. That board has no power except in connection with the sale of dairy products, and more particularly in connection with the stabilisation of the price for export butter.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I meant that the board should be given power under this Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There are objections to that. As a matter of fact, margarine factories are licensed under the Dairy Industry Act. Inspectors under that Act require to have certain qualifications. I am advised that the provisions of the Dairy Products Marketing Act do not provide for inspectors having those particular qualifications. I am also advised that the board as at present constituted would not be competent to carry out the duties performed by the inspectors operating at present. Only last year Parliament amended the Dairy Industry Act to give the Minister power to refuse the registration of or a license for any dairy factory. Under this Bill the Minister is given greater authority than he at present possesses.

Reference was made by Mr. Craig to the fact that a number of inspectors are employed in connection with the dairying industry and that the industry itself is finding the wherewithal to pay for their activities. This was referred to also by Mr. Macfarlane who said that the dairying industry was having to bear the expense of those inspectors, and that he saw no reason why the margarine industry should not be called upon to bear its portion of the expense. As a matter of fact there are ten inspectors employed under that Act and eight of them are

paid by the Government and not by the industry. The industry is paying for only two.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is a start, following last year's amendment.

Hon. L. Craig: More will be appointed and paid by the industry.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That may be so, but the hon. member gave the impression that the industry was providing the money for the payment of inspectors at present operating under the Act.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Under last year's amendment, the industry was asked to do so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That may be so, but at present the Government is meeting the expense of eight of those inspectors, and the industry is paying for two. If the position is as serious as I believe it to be and as I am sure this House believes it to be, is it not highly desirable that, if necessary, the industry should pay the cost of these inspectors in order that this measure may be policed, thus ensuring that the manufacture of margarine is limited to the specified amount? The expense would be very small compared with the good the inspectors would do.

There is only one other point I desire to mention and that has reference to the export of margarine. More than one member suggested that by agreeing to the export of margarine we would probably affect our market for butter. In the first place, a license for the manufacture of margarine is necessary and we know there is a market overseas for that commodity. I am advised by the department that the market exists not because margarine is better than butter but partly owing to the fact that there is a religious objection in some countries to the use of butter.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: You are referring to Ghee, in India.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If there is a market for margarine, it will not affect the market for our export butter. There is no reason why we should not exploit that market to the best of our ability. The question of cost, particularly in the East Indies, is no doubt a very vital consideration in some countries, and I would not be surprised to find that in some places it would be impossible for people to consider the purchase of butter, on account of its price. On the other hand, they would be able to buy margarine because of its lower cost.

In introducing the Bill I endeavoured to give what I thought were solid reasons for the passing of the measure, and I am very pleased to note that most speakers endorsed the remarks I made. I do not claim that the Bill is perfect. Perhaps some members will desire to alter parts of it, but this is the only constitutional way in which we can give that protection to the butter industry to which I consider it is entitled.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Interpretation:

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of the definition of "cooking margarine," the words "and does not resemble butter in colour" be struck out.

I am informed that the words "and does not resemble butter in colour" do not appear in the Acts of the other States. Furthermore, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to comply with this definition, because cooking margarine has a colour that resembles that of butter.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the hon. member will not press his amendment. I am informed that most cooking margarine is manufactured almost wholly from imported oils, principally of vegetable origin, although whale oil may be used when a supply is available.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: For cooking?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. Margarine manufactured from those constituents is similar to butter both in colour and texture.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It is a dead pale colour.

Hon. L. Craig: That is a blend. The Minister is correct.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I believe a sample was available to members yesterday, both to see and taste, and I am told it was impossible for them to distinguish it from butter.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: This refers to margarine made up of 90 per cent. of animal fats.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I am advised that the definition conforms to the definition in the Victorian and New South Wales Acts. Those are the largest margarine manufacturing States of the Commonwealth. The definition must be in this form. I believe that where cooking margarine is manufactured purely from animal fats there would, generally speaking, be a difference in colour. The words are necessary because some of the grades of margarine are similar in colour and character to butter.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I am instructed that the words in question do not appear in any of the Australian legislation.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The clause should be left as it is. The words have been inserted to prevent cooking margarine from being used as the table variety. It is desired to ensure that cooking margarine shall be used only for cooking.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am opposed to the amendment. Certain persons in this State have been using margarine instead of butter, and members of the public have been taken in. If these words are deleted it will be possible for cooking margarine to be used instead of butter.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Margarine which consists of 90 per cent. of beef or mutton fat has a yellow tinge very much resembling that of butter. I am advised that the clause could not be implemented if the words in question are not deleted.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: The definition is framed to provide for the protection of table margarine, and the Bill is designed to control its manufacture. During the last few years such improvement has taken place in the preparation of margarine that it has become almost impossible to differentiate, from appearance, between different kinds of margarine and some kinds of butter.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And from the point of view of taste as well.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: This applies more particularly to table margarine, which is almost the counterpart of butter, except as to the analysis. Probably the improvement that has taken place in the product has induced people in other parts of Australia to approve of legislation of this kind.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: If these words are left in the clause will not be workable.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If cooking margarine possesses the same colour as butter it will not comply with the provisions

of the measure. Cooking margarine that is not of the same colour as butter would not be affected, so that the words to which exception has been taken would do no harm.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I oppose the amendment. Without these words it would be possible under the definition to turn out margarine of exactly the same colour as butter. Manufacturers of cooking margarine could readily produce it so that it would not resemble butter in colour. The amendment strikes at the very essence of the definition.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I am disposed to support the Minister. Genuine margarine should be given all the liberty possible lest the second grade should compete against it. I would prefer cooking margarine myself, because it contains vitamins that are not found in table margarine. In ox fats, which are largely used in cooking margarine, there is always a noticeable yellow tinge. Strange to say butter manufacturers are always trying to get the colour out of their product, while manufacturers of margarine are always trying to keep the colour in.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: The object of the words is to protect customers, but a housewife would not purchase 10 lbs. of the article in one lump. That would be too much for her purposes. The important point butter manufacturers should heed is that they must by scientific methods preserve the flavour of the butter.

Hon. L. Craig: The farmer's wife does not put the flavour into the butter. The cow does that.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: If butter manufacturers would take the same trouble and use the same skill as margarine manufacturers have done during the past three or four years, there would be no chance for margarine to compete successfully against butter.

Hon. A. Thomson: Are you supporting Mr. Parker?

THE HONORARY MINISTER: No; the Bill. The dairy farmer is greatly concerned at the menace of the margarine industry. During the last 12 months butter produced here has greatly improved.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—Control of amount of table margarine to be manufactured:

Hon. W. J. MANN: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to paragraph (a) of Subclause (1): Provided that such maximum quantity of table margarine to be manufactured in any period of 12 months ending thirty-first day of December otherwise than for export beyond the Commonwealth of Australia shall not exceed three hundred and sixty-four tons."

The quantity represents seven tons multiplied by 52. Such is the corresponding provision of the Victorian Act. I discussed the matter with the Minister for Agriculture prior to his departure for the East, and Mr. Wise said he had no objection to the amendment, which, on the contrary, he thought was probably desirable.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I understand the Minister for Agriculture did discuss this amendment with the hon. member and he was not prepared to raise any strong objection to it at the time. However, there is a reason for not mentioning the quantity. I think it would be safer to leave the clause as it stands. The carrying of the amendment would mean that possibly a manufacturer who had completed his quota some considerable time before the end of the year and would have to close down unless he had export business, necessitating loss to his employees, could bring pressure to bear in some quarter to be granted permission to go on manufacturing in order to keep his men employed.

Hon. W. J. Mann: He could not do that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We know those things are sometimes done. Personally I have no objection to the amendment, but I am looking at it from the aspect of pressure which might be brought to bear.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Stick to your Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Minister for Agriculture favours the Bill in its entirety. The quota is to be proclaimed through the "Government Gazette," and the Minister might proclaim less than the quota stated.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The object of the Bill is to restrict manufacture and sale of margarine. The Chief Secretary's argument is not in keeping with the Bill, since the hon. gentleman said that there might be circumstances under which it would be

necessary to extend beyond the maximum of seven tons per week. The matter should be settled straight away, in order that manufacturers of margarine may not put up fictitious cases.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following results:—

Ayes	8
Noes	10
Majority against	2

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. L. Roche
	(Teller.)

NOES

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. L. B. Bolton
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 to 30—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.19 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 21st November, 1940.

	PAGE
Questions: Produce Markets, broadcasting	2144
Colliery coal mines, as to Royal Commission's report	2145
"Hansard": Incorrect division list	2145
Select Committee: Commonwealth Oil Refineries, Limited (Private), Bill, report presented	2145
Leave of absence	2145
Bills: Builders Registration Act Amendment, 3R.	2145
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	2145
Medical Act Amendment, 2R.	2147
Employment Brokers Act Amendment, Com.	2171

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION—PRODUCE MARKETS, BROADCASTING.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is he aware that details regarding a portion of the auction sales in