section that will be separate from a proposed ponding area to golf waters. This need also occur from any ponding system, and will be taken to ensure that it does not occur at Redcliff. As described in paragraph 3.2.2 (E) of the plan, the effluent that is to be subjected to biological oxidation treatment will first receive primary treatment to remove oil and suspended solids. The biological oxidation treatment involves the use of bacteria, such as can and will be sealed, mostly with concrete, although other materials could be used.

This all-embracing and non-specific question cannot be answered correctly. A vast amount of study has been carried out and numerous books and reports have been published on the impact of atmospheric emissions on all forms of life. The Report of the Committee on Environmental Policy for South Australia, a copy of which is in the Parliamentary Library, gives some details of the kinds of problems which can arise from emissions to the environment, but R. C. DeGroot's paper, does not discuss such items. The report states that atmospheric emissions are known, or can reasonably be expected, to occur. Studies of a general nature are likely to continue to be carried out in universities, colleges and other research institutions throughout the world. On the basis of such studies, emissions limits are fixed and enforced. In conjunction with such a programme, an monitoring system is vitally set up, as in Adelaide, to give information on the levels of ambient air pollutants in the city.

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

5. Yes—to ensure that the environmental protection requirements and standards are being met. Specifically, the questioning and types of effluents relating to their toxicity as the required level of discharge is at present being performed by the Town and Regional Councils. These are not only in the first stage, but also in the subsequent stages.

6. The Hon. J. G. J. GILLIFLAN (on notice): What is the proposed policy of effluent disposal at the Redcliff petro-chemical plant?

7. What is the form that this material is to be expected? What quantity of effluent is to be re-treatment of the following:

8. If effluents of effluent-disposal rate, such that the facility will be separate from the proposed fishing area to golf waters. This need also occur from any ponding system, and will be taken to ensure that it does not occur at Redcliff. As described in paragraph 3.2.2 (E) of the plan, the effluent that is to be subjected to biological oxidation treatment will first receive primary treatment to remove oil and suspended solids. The biological oxidation treatment involves the use of bacteria, such as can and will be sealed, mostly with concrete, although other materials could be used.

This all-embracing and non-specific question cannot be answered correctly. A vast amount of study has been carried out and numerous books and reports have been published on the impact of atmospheric emissions on all forms of life. The Report of the Committee on Environmental Policy for South Australia, a copy of which is in the Parliamentary Library, gives some details of the kinds of problems which can arise from emissions to the environment, but R. C. DeGroot's paper, does not discuss such items. The report states that atmospheric emissions are known, or can reasonably be expected, to occur. Studies of a general nature are likely to continue to be carried out in universities, colleges and other research institutions throughout the world. On the basis of such studies, emissions limits are fixed and enforced. In conjunction with such a programme, an monitoring system is vitally set up, as in Adelaide, to give information on the levels of ambient air pollutants in the city.

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

5. Yes—to ensure that the environmental protection requirements and standards are being met. Specifically, the questioning and types of effluents relating to their toxicity as the required level of discharge is at present being performed by the Town and Regional Councils. These are not only in the first stage, but also in the subsequent stages.
The Bill then lists the various provisions concerning dairy products, including clauses for dates and the referendum. Clause 3 provides for the establishment of the Australian Dairy Board. The Bill is intended to be read in conjunction with the Dairy Produce (Milk) Act, 1947, and the Dairy Produce (Milk) Regulations, which are in force in all states. The Bill is based on recommendations made in the Interdepartmental Committee report on dairy produce.

Clause 4 provides for the establishment of the Australian Dairy Board. The Board is to be composed of nine members, including representatives from the dairy industry, the Government, and other interested parties. The Board is to be appointed by the Governor-General in Council and is to be responsible for the administration of the Act.

Section 22 of the principal Act refers to restrictions on manufacturing butter in or near a margarine factory. Under the provisions of section 22, any person shall not manufacture butter in or near a margarine factory. The fines for violation of section 22 are specified in the Act, with penalties ranging from $10 to $50 for each offense.

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

Every owner of a factory shall give, or cause to be given, notice in writing to the Minister of the words "dairy butter"—manufactured at the factory, according to quality, and in accordance with this Act, and must be of such description as to be readily distinguishable from other butter, and must be of the quality of which the manufacturing process and the sale of butter is to be marked with the words "dairy butter," under the definition of "dairy products." It will be possible for dairy blend to be manufactured in a margarine factory.
As an industry that keeps many people employed, Leaders in the industry have been among those who are accepting this step. They may be surprised to find out that we can use soya beans, and we can use cotton. The Hon. T. M. Casey: Can we?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, it is poly-unesterized. It is the basis of the industry. I return to this matter of getting the margarine legislation into proper order. The dairy industry has given the all-clear to the State, with no great hostility, to allow the use of poly-

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

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, from vegetables, for poly-unesterized margarine. My plea is that the Minister look at this situation carefully and bear in mind that the description in the Act be amended to ensure that Australian-produced vegetables be used. Otherwise, if we give a free go, we shall be flooded again with cheap palm oils from either New Guinea or some other country. That may happen, as it once did. The only margarine which came into operation was as a result of a Labor Government which, under the national security regulations, introduced a law prohibiting all the mandarins narrow down the Government's powers in many ways, which it desires to operate in many other ways. In other words, we must ask what the Coopers say about the Government's powers to provide the prescribed power to the Government, and is the power of the Constitution Act?

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: By resolution.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I could not answer the question whether it was passed in conformity to the Constitution Act.


The Hon. T. M. Casey: I should like to ask a question in this connection. The Constitution which is in operation is the Constitution which is in operation. The Act is passed under the Power of the Constitution Act.

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

The Hon. R. C. Degrade: The Minister appreciates that the sillings of the Constitution which is in operation has been passed by the lower house, and that it is impossible to say that it is a bill.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I am quite sure that the Leader of the Government has brought down a regulation it would be for a limited time and that is why I did not ask the Minister to look carefully at the points I have raised.

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

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Further consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's intimation that it had disagreed with the Commonwealth Government's proposal to allow the Government to be responsible for any disaster which might happen in the Commonwealth. The Hon. R. C. DeGrade: It can be for seven days, and the Government is not responsible for seven days. The Hon. T. M. Casey: As I said, it could happen—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It can be for seven days, and the Government is not responsible for seven days. The Hon. R. C. DeGrade: It can be for four days. The Hon. T. M. Casey: Yet in. Do your homework?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is the information I have been given, and I am ready to proceed to the bill. It must come back to Parliament, where it will be considered.

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

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

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

The Hon. R. C. DeGrade: Does the Minister believe that the Government could have this wide power? He is asking honourable members not to insist on the amendment. The Minister clearly states that the powers that the Government is seeking is limited some extent. Will the Government give it to the Commonwealth?

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Just on this occasion, could I point to the amendment in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. R. C. DeGrade: In other words, have we not seen a provision in the Constitution Act which would give the Government power to take action which is not present in the Act?
may have seen in yesterday's press a report of an interview with Professor Blackett of the Department of Medical Physics at University of New South Wales, part of which is as follows:

There is a good case for the unrestricted availability of polyunsaturated margarines and that action should be strongly urged for the composition of cooking margarines. All the fats and oils are needed for the health of the nation.

A food supply which is largely unsaturated will be more to the liking of the New Zealand needs looking at. Those who are unable to tolerate high fat, high sugar, highly improved fats may lose their memory and again swim the tide of the present food supply. Without any study of the margarine labeling of all manufactured foods—margarine, butter, and all dairy products, biscuits, vegetables, and other food products, it is impossible to know for what he is eating.

The Bill that is on the Industry Act and the Dairy Produce Act go together and I think they are perfect husbands, but I think they are all rather unfortu- nate for the New Zealand industry.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the Hon. Mr. Sprigg 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 unity 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. DeGeurin: Which in particular?

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

The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: Are the Liberal Party Governments?


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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That State has a Liberal Party Government but they are not as keen to consult the Council, a Liberal Party Government in Tasmania initially introduced these restrictions on cooking margarines, and it was followed later by Victoria.

The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: And those restrictions were maintained Washington Labor in Tasmania.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Well, that Government did not do anything to rectify the situation. However, I suppose that they are not so keen to know what their principles on this matter was when it went to the people. The fact remains that cooking margarines are 100 per cent more expensive to the public, but these have been under quota. For this reason, it is difficult for the manufacturers to fulfil their obligations to different and in the Commonwealth. It is necessary that margarine manufacturers are obliged to ship on four sides of containers exactly what is cooking margarine so that the manufacturers of polyunsaturated margarine are merely obliged to stamp this information on the containers. This has been the biggest war against the manufacturers of cooking margarines, despite this product having been accepted throughout the world.

Only Australia and New South Wales had labeling requirements that have been imposed by the other States, particularly the Queensland States, where manufacturing is done in bulk. Manufacturers must comply with these labeling require- ments, as most of the margarine that is manufactured is it is finding its way into the public. 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 a legible font on the container, that should be sufficient to satisfy the average consumer. I will again be pressing for this at the next Agricultural Council, at which time the need for the margarine quotas will be discussed. This Government’s policy on the quota system must be abolished. The margarine industry should be com- pletely abandoned. If that policy is not agreed to at the Agricultural Council meeting, the South Australian Government will not agree to it either. 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 a financial matter. However, the price of margarine is obviously most desirable and necessary in preventing some forms of heart disease and the like. Those who want to try the new product will want to know that the State and the other States did not take preventive legislative measures to ensure, first, that polyunsaturated margarine was put in a particular category; secondly, that it could not be used for the production of top-grade and second-best products or from cheap vegetable oils such as coconut oil, particularly imported coconut oil, which cheap products can be sold for about $30 for 454 grams. That, of course, would cause grave leavings to people trying to produce polyunsaturated 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 States of the new cooking margarine, particularly anything that comes from a sheep or beef can be repaired. Further, anything that has been processed can be used up and made into the necessary cooking ingredients and sold as cooking margarine. That was happening until fairly recently. I believe the present position is, Our South Australian health laws are no tighter then are health laws in other States. However, once the product has been made in good conditions by manufacturers who use a good type of ingredient, and I remind the honorable members that the product is no different from the product sold in this State to manufacturers in many industries. 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 margarines.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: (Minister of Agriculture): I think the Minister has brought up an interesting point. The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: I think you have brought up a good demonstration of that. The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: 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, is trying to hoodwink the public. The manufacturers of polyunsaturated margarine are merely obliged to stamp this information on the containers. This has been the biggest war against the manufacturers of cooking margarines, despite this product having been accepted throughout the world.

The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: 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 a legible font on the container, that should be sufficient to satisfy the average consumer. I will again be pressing for this at the next Agricultural Council, at which time the need for the margarine quotas will be discussed. This Government’s policy on the quota system must be abolished. The margarine industry should be com- pletely abandoned. If that policy is not agreed to at the Agricultural Council meeting, the South Australian Government will not agree to it either. 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 a financial matter. However, the price of margarine is obviously most desirable and necessary in preventing some forms of heart disease and the like. Those who want to try the new product will want to know that the State and the other States did not take preventive legislative measures to ensure, first, that polyunsaturated margarine was put in a particular category; secondly, that it could not be used for the production of top-grade and second-best products or from cheap vegetable oils such as coconut oil, particularly imported coconut oil, which cheap products can be sold for about $30 for 454 grams. That, of course, would cause grave leavings to people trying to produce polyunsaturated 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 States of the new cooking margarine, particularly anything that comes from a sheep or beef can be repaired. Further, anything that has been processed can be used up and made into the necessary cooking ingredients and sold as cooking margarine. That was happening until fairly recently. I believe the present position is, Our South Australian health laws are no tighter then are health laws in other States. However, once the product has been made in good conditions by manufacturers who use a good type of ingredient, and I remind the honorable members that the product is no different from the product sold in this State to manufacturers in many industries. 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 margarines.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: (Minister of Agriculture): I think the Minister has brought up an interesting point. The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: I think you have brought up a good demonstration of that. The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: 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, is trying to hoodwink the public. The manufacturers of polyunsaturated margarine are merely obliged to stamp this information on the containers. This has been the biggest war against the manufacturers of cooking margarines, despite this product having been accepted throughout the world.

The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: 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 a legible font on the container, that should be sufficient to satisfy the average consumer. I will again be pressing for this at the next Agricultural Council, at which time the need for the margarine quotas will be discussed. This Government’s policy on the quota system must be abolished. The margarine industry should be com- pletely abandoned. If that policy is not agreed to at the Agricultural Council meeting, the South Australian Government will not agree to it either. 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 a financial matter. However, the price of margarine is obviously most desirable and necessary in preventing some forms of heart disease and the like. Those who want to try the new product will want to know that the State and the other States did not take preventive legislative measures to ensure, first, that polyunsaturated margarine was put in a particular category; secondly, that it could not be used for the production of top-grade and second-best products or from cheap vegetable oils such as coconut oil, particularly imported coconut oil, which cheap products can be sold for about $30 for 454 grams. That, of course, would cause grave leavings to people trying to produce polyunsaturated 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 States of the new cooking margarine, particularly anything that comes from a sheep or beef can be repaired. Further, anything that has been processed can be used up and made into the necessary cooking ingredients and sold as cooking margarine. That was happening until fairly recently. I believe the present position is, Our South Australian health laws are no tighter then are health laws in other States. However, once the product has been made in good conditions by manufacturers who use a good type of ingredient, and I remind the honorable members that the product is no different from the product sold in this State to manufacturers in many industries. 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 margarines.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: (Minister of Agriculture): I think the Minister has brought up an interesting point. The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: I think you have brought up a good demonstration of that. The Hon. R. C. DeGeurin: 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, is trying to hoodwink the public. The manufacturers of polyunsaturated margarine are merely obliged to stamp this information on the containers. This has been the biggest war against the manufacturers of cooking margarines, despite this product having been accepted throughout the world.
their ability to be different from people in the other States when they wish. The Queensland product must contain at least 25 per cent butter fat, and is composed to 12 per cent of minimum per cent of buttermilk contained, to be 25 per cent in South Australia. From the information I have received, I think Queensland manufacturers will be making this product before the end of next year. I hope South Australian manufacturers will do the right thing. After all, South Australia pioneered "dairy blend" and I am sure you will assist if the manufacturers promote it in the right way.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

 Clause 3—"Interpretation."

 Hon. B. R. STERRY: I move:

In subparagraph (d) of paragraph (a) of the Bill to substitute "Kriekler" and "Kriekler 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 in result of their being incorrectly published in a magazine. However, the amendment corrects the error. I should like to mention another matter in this clause. In this clause, subsection 4 of the principal Act, we see paragraph (a) the following:

(a) contains not less than 12 per centum and not more than 18 per centum, of vegetable oil or oils, in its total weight,

which is the equivalent of 240 microgrammes of retinol activity per gramme of the product. For the benefit of the Committee, I should explain that this microgramme is one-thousandth of a microgramme, and "retinol activity" is a technical term used to express vitamin A. Why that term is used I do not know. Subparagraph (c) (i) of paragraph (d) of subparagraph (a) states:

contains 25 per cent or more of vitamin D in an equivalent amount to not less than 15 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:

contains 25 per cent or more of vitamin D, and not less than 45 micrograms at 5°C based on the method of determination of vitamin D in milk by the method of Kriekler and Herder.

A Newton is a metric unit of force replacing pounds in the square inch; and Kriekler and Herder (which name the Hon. Mr. Sterry is using to amend) was the inventor of pressure resilient units, which means speedily. Subparagraph (a) of paragraph (d) of subparagraph (a) continues:

contains not less than 15 micrograms at 5°C based on the method of determination of vitamin D in milk by the method of Kriekler and Herder.

A Newton is a metric unit of force replacing pounds in the square inch; and Kriekler and Herder (which name the Hon. Mr. Sterry is using to amend) was the inventor of pressure resilient units, which means speedily. Subparagraph (a) of paragraph (d) of subparagraph (a) continues:

contains not less than 15 micrograms at 5°C based on the method of determination of vitamin D in milk by the method of Kriekler and Herder.

A Newton is a metric unit of force replacing pounds in the square inch; and Kriekler and Herder (which name the Hon. Mr. Sterry is using to amend) was the inventor of pressure resilient units, which means speedily.

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

After "amended to insert—" insert paragraph (d) (ii) after the word "butter" the passage or "dairy blend" and:

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 used or which is used for the manufacture of which margarine is manufactured.

(2) Any manufacturer in any section in any respect shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $200, and for every day during which the offence is continued or in making a deal with

While we are dealing with this clause, the penalty should be altered from $100 to $200. Can the Minister explain why the penalty is altered to $200 in this Bill, whereas the offence in the "dairy blend" Bill, proposed to be $100? The effect of my amendment will be that this new product, known as "dairy blend", will be produced under the same conditions as the present product. This product will be produced under the same conditions as the present product. This product will be produced under the same conditions as the present product.

There is nearly the same attainment between those people who produce the raw materials, the dairyman, as there is in the margarine industry. Therefore, the dairyman should be entitled to have the same machinery to manufacture this product and, after all, must have more than 60 per cent butter content and can have up to 80 per cent butter content. Under these terms which the dairy industry will not want to manufacture margarine in dairy factories, and vice versa, is something that must be considered later. For the present, in this Bill, in that period, exclusive right should be given to the dairy factories of the State.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not go along with the honorable member for Kangaroo Point concerning why dairy farmers should be given the exclusive right to manufacture this new product, and I will give a different trading industry contributed about $50,000 towards implementing and financing this product. It did this in conjunction with the South Australian Agriculture Department. The money was forthcoming from any outside body: it was exclusively dairy 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 honorable member for Kangaroo Point concerning why the dairy industry should be given the right, because we want competition and first-rate service in order to get to the product off the shelf. If the Government has got to compete for a certain product the more likely we are to get a quality product. When we get to the end of one section of the manufacturers make a product, this price structure is not built into the commodity. That is why it is important for fairness to be given an open slasher 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 the butter manufacturers sell them the cream?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They could get some outside equilibration scheme.

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

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They are not notorious, they are just as much as everywhere else.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They are Victorian businessmen and they want to make a sale in Victoria where they are margarine manufacturers. Of course, margarine manufacturers can still produce margarine. They can purchase a dairy factory or they can manufacture margarine in the factory, then 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 philology, hence it is, has at last come forward. I am delighted to hear him refer to competition and private enterprise. It has done much to enhance 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:

From August 15. Page 488.

Clauses 2 to 8 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT

Adjointed debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 494)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILAN (North): 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 it is enough for the withdrawing consequences to the original Act. Would it be not wise to withdraw the measure and draw up a completely new Bill reserving the existing Act and stipulating that 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 bill we are now asked to agree to is an unknown quantity, comprised of persons simply appointed by the Governor. Those people could be drawn from anywhere. The producers, who are probably the most important people of those involved, would not be involved, and the authority the proposed Bill seeks to create would not be involved, and the authority the proposed Bill seeks to create would not be capable of properly managing the authorities, and thereby jeopardizing the whole State's fuel supplies.

As I do not know how the title is currently owned by the refiners, although it appears that it is being managed by the unions at present. I fear of the way in which they go about the business. Indeed, we in Australia are seeing the end of democratic government as we have known it if we are to understand it, with more and more power being taken to the Executive and remote authorities. This Parliament is being asked to give the federal government any authority the personnel of which is unknown and which is under the direct control of the Minister and the Government. Wind of dealing with the existing Bill, especially the second reading explanation given by the Hon. Mr. Keneally and the recent speech made by the Acting Minister on the Queensland Bill, the refiners has been involved in the coal and coal by-products, and there has been no legislation to deal with the coal and coal by-products, which has been the object of the Bill in the last number of years.

The petro-chemical works at Red Cliffs are referred to as one of the reasons why it was desirable to amend the Act. However, honourable members have no
Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran (Minister of Works): I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanatory Bill

It is the second of three measures intended to facilitate the production of dairy products. This measure, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this Board is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth. The Bill is the explanatory measure for the Dairy Produce Act, and its object is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth.

Clause 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "dairy bill" in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as annotated. This clause also extends the definition of "dairy produce" to encompass the product of dairy bulls. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that both the Dairy Produce Board and the Dairy Produce Board manufacturers of dairy bill shall be eligible to receive the benefits of the principal Act.

Clause 5 amends section 13A of the principal Act by providing that the powers of the Board to regulate the wholesale price of dairy bill in the same way as it regulates dairy produce shall extend to the establishment of minimum and maximum prices for dairy bill in the same manner as it determines quotes for butter and cheese. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act by providing that the Board may make regulations regarding the conditions of sale of dairy bill, and that the Board may make regulations for the protection of the public.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Margarine Act Amendment Bill

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran (Minister of Works): I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanatory Bill

It is the last of the three measures that will facilitate the production of dairy bill. This measure, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this Board is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth. The Bill is the explanatory measure for the Dairy Produce Act, and its object is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth.

Mr. MCAWLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran (Minister of Works): I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanatory Bill

Members will recall that the principal Act, the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, was passed by this House last year. These eggs, which represented 49 of that Act was held, and an additional 25 per cent of the total number of eggs, were expected to be in favour of the measure. Following this vote the Act was amended by the House. However, when the licensing committee set about its task of determining base quotes for poultry farmers, it found the market conditions very difficult. In its present form, the Act, in its present form, could give rise to some inequities that could be avoided by its amendment. Since these inequities were somewhat difficult to control, they might be dealt with in the consideration of the changes in the measure. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 amends the principal Act to extend the period of the Act by two years, and to amend section 20 of the principal Act, to provide for the payment of "dairy bill" in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as annotated. This clause also extends the definition of "dairy produce" to encompass the product of dairy bulls. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that both the Dairy Produce Board and the Dairy Produce Board manufacturers of dairy bill shall be eligible to receive the benefits of the principal Act.

Clause 5 amends section 13A of the principal Act by providing that the powers of the Board to regulate the wholesale price of dairy bill in the same way as it regulates dairy produce shall extend to the establishment of minimum and maximum prices for dairy bill in the same manner as it determines quotes for butter and cheese. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act by providing that the Board may make regulations regarding the conditions of sale of dairy bill, and that the Board may make regulations for the protection of the public.

Mr. QUINN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Dairy Industry Act Amendment Bill

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran (Minister of Works): I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanatory Bill

It is the second of three measures intended to facilitate the production of dairy bill. This measure, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this Board is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth. The Bill is the explanatory measure for the Dairy Produce Act, and its object is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth.

Clause 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "dairy bill" in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as annotated. This clause also extends the definition of "dairy produce" to encompass the product of dairy bulls. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that both the Dairy Produce Board and the Dairy Produce Board manufacturers of dairy bill shall be eligible to receive the benefits of the principal Act.

Clause 5 amends section 13A of the principal Act by providing that the powers of the Board to regulate the wholesale price of dairy bill in the same way as it regulates dairy produce shall extend to the establishment of minimum and maximum prices for dairy bill in the same manner as it determines quotes for butter and cheese. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act by providing that the Board may make regulations regarding the conditions of sale of dairy bill, and that the Board may make regulations for the protection of the public.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Margarine Act Amendment Bill

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran (Minister of Works): I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanatory Bill

It is the last of the three measures that will facilitate the production of dairy bill. This measure, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this Board is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth. The Bill is the explanatory measure for the Dairy Produce Act, and its object is to set the minimum and maximum prices for dairy produce, and to regulate the distribution of dairy produce in the Commonwealth.

Mr. MCAWLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.