

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 23, 1952.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Dunks) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

RADIUM HILL ELECTRICITY ROUTE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—For some time speculation has been rife in the north as to the route of the electric power line to supply Radium Hill. At first it was suggested it might be from Waterloo Corner northward, but more recently it has been suggested it may be taken across country from Morgan. People in country towns along the possible route are interested because they feel they may be able to get power from the line. Has any decision been reached on the question?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Electricity Trust has been investigating the question of the route of the transmission line. The first route examined was from Waterloo Corner, and a more recent suggestion has been a route from Morgan. The position is governed by the factor that there must be a supply of electricity of high voltage at the starting point: it is not possible to extend from a low voltage terminal to Radium Hill. At both Waterloo Corner and Morgan there is, or it is proposed to have soon, a 132,000 voltage line. As soon as further information is obtained from the trust concerning the exact route I will see that the honourable member is supplied with it.

UNSEEMLY BEHAVIOUR AT SEACLIFF.

Mr. PATINSON—Today's *Advertiser* reports a series of justifiable protests, extending over a lengthy period, from members of the Brighton Council concerning a public nuisance inflicted on law-abiding householders of Seacliff once a week. Every Friday a dance is held at the Argosy Palais situated on the Esplanade, and a large number of the patrons comprise riff-raff of both sexes, who journey from Adelaide in three buses especially provided by the dance promoter. They indulge in raucous noises, excessive drinking and other questionable practices on the Esplanade and on the lawns and in private gardens, until the small hours of the morning. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Chief Secretary and ask him to give instructions to remedy this nuisance by appropriate action under the Police Act, the Places of Public Entertainment Act, or both?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

REPORTING STOLEN PROPERTY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—As regards stolen push bicycles and other property, the police in the past have been able to render a service to the public on Saturday mornings, but I understand that under a new practice the office concerned is now closed on Saturday mornings in accordance with the conditions laid down in awards. Can the old practice be reverted to whereby people could make reports and inquiries on Saturday mornings?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have inquiries made and let the honourable member know what action can be taken.

BROADENING NORTH-SOUTH RAILWAY.

Mr. MICHAEL—My question is prompted by a report in this morning's *Advertiser* of a discussion between the South Australian and Federal Governments regarding the extension of the broad gauge to Marree on the north-south railway line to assist the transport of beef cattle to the Adelaide market. A report was recently made by Mr. Beattie in which he outlined the advantage of making Adelaide the chief Australian beef centre. All competent authorities say that the only way the cattle industry in Central Australia can be developed to full capacity is by means of rail transport. No other method can adequately serve transport needs. Has the Government taken any action, and if not will it advocate the extension of the line beyond Marree up the Birdsville track, some 250 miles, which would take the railway over the hard country into soft channel country where the cattle are fattened so readily?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the Northern Territory Acceptance Act the Commonwealth, in exchange for securing the property rights over the Northern Territory, agreed to the construction of a railway from Oodnadatta to Darwin. The South Australian Government has continued to press for that obligation to be carried out. It is now provided in the Standardization Agreement that that work shall be proceeded with. The mention of Marree is actually in furtherance of that agreement. The Commonwealth has already agreed to take the line to Leigh Creek, and the State Government has suggested that, as it has started on the job, it is an appropriate time to continue it, and from time to time my Government will request the extension of the line as the work progresses. The Commonwealth Government has not only a moral, but a legal,

obligation, ratified by both Parliaments, to build the north-south line to Darwin. At the time this legislation was passed the Prime Minister of the day, in explaining the Bill to the Commonwealth Parliament, said the Commonwealth had made a remarkably good deal: it had bought the Northern Territory at approximately 5d. an acre. That 5d. an acre has not been paid. The Government will continue to fight for the rights of South Australia in this respect. I agree entirely with the honourable member that the Northern Territory will never be opened up satisfactorily until there are adequate road and rail transport facilities between the Territory and South Australia. Quite apart from any other consideration, the mineral resources of the Northern Territory make it imperative that adequate means of defence for the Territory should be provided in the future, and I believe that to a large extent, as in the last war, that will depend on satisfactory communications between South Australia and the Territory.

PORT PIRIE RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS—Some time ago the Minister of Railways advised me that because of the men being trained in the railways he was hopeful of having a full train service between Adelaide and Port Pirie. Has he any further information to give the House?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As promised, I took up the matter with the Railways Commissioner, and I have now his proposed time table. The evening train on Saturdays will be restored and will depart from Adelaide at 7.15 p.m., arriving at Port Pirie at 11.42 p.m. On Mondays the train will depart from Port Pirie at 12.30 p.m. and arrive at Adelaide at 3.35 p.m. The report from the Railways Commissioner states:—

Commencing on Saturday October 4, a night train will run from Adelaide to Port Pirie. On October 6 the new East-West service will commence, which will necessitate a train running to Port Pirie to pick up the East-West on Monday, so that advantage is being taken of this fact to re-introduce the Saturday night train.

SHOOTING ON HENLEY BEACH ROAD.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Premier say whether the Government, or the Chief Secretary, intends to call for a report on the unfortunate incident which occurred on Henley Beach Road yesterday? Will that report be tabled in Parliament and will it explain why two able-bodied policemen, trained in the art of self-defence and combating truculent persons, were unable

to overcome the man concerned? Will the report go into the matter of whether South Australia should adopt the London practice of police officers not being supplied with revolvers, except under special permit?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The coroner will inquire into these matters in due course and issue a report, which will be made public.

LAND USED AS DUMP.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Local Government anything further to report regarding the question I asked on June 25 about the portion of the old Holdfast Bay railway line between South Road and West Beach Road being used as a dump by the Electricity Trust?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I find that the material on the site does not in the main belong to the Electricity Trust but to the Highways Department. I have asked the Highways Commissioner to give me a report thereon, as the citizens are objecting to the unsightly condition. I have not received a report from him yet. The honourable member can be assured that I, as Minister, and the department, do not want to continue a nuisance or inconvenience to the people, and every attempt will be made to make the site unobjectionable to residents.

AMENDMENTS TO MILK ACT.

Mr. MOIR—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether he intends to bring down amendments to the Milk Act this session, in view of the fact that the Pittman *versus* Milk Board case, and the Rayner *versus* Co-operative Factories case, have been completed?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have had no request from the Milk Board or persons interested to bring down this session any amendment to the Act. Until I receive some request, and know something of the nature of proposed amendments, I am not likely to ask Cabinet to agree. At present there is no suggestion of any amendment to the Act.

HOUSING AT RADIUM HILL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Following on the report in the *Advertiser* of Saturday that Cabinet had approved of further accommodation being provided for employees at Radium Hill, can the Premier indicate the type of accommodation which will be provided, and particularly if it will be accommodation for married men in the categories I mentioned in my question last week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The accommodation referred to in Saturday's press was in connection with single men and community facilities. The present housing programme has not been completed; the contractors are still working on it. It was not a question of extending that programme at the moment. That will come up for consideration when the contract is further advanced.

RENTALS FOR HOUSING TRUST FLATS.

Mr. SHANNON—Following on the question I asked last week relating to rents of flats now being constructed by the Housing Trust for occupancy by elderly people without families, and I understand some newly married people, can the Premier say what rents will be charged?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The buildings concerned have not yet been completed and the trust has not fixed any rents, so any figures quoted concerning rents of flats are purely conjectural. I point out that under its Act the Housing Trust is required to fix economic rentals. In other words, it is required to meet administration and building costs from the rentals of houses and flats. I am sure that, consistently with Housing Trust policy, the rentals of these flats will be fixed as low as possible.

PETROL PRICES.

Mr. FLETCHER—My question relates to the disposal of Commonwealth C.O.R. shares, which is a very prominent question today throughout the Commonwealth. As Prices Minister, does the Premier consider, from the evidence from the C.O.R., that the C.O.R. costs helped to keep down the price of petrol in the past?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no knowledge of the position prior to the State's taking over price control, but since then there has been substantial agreement between all oil interests over the prices of petroleum products. The industry has requested industry prices rather than prices for any one individual firm, and I have no evidence that the C.O.R. has had any influence in putting the price either up or down. During the latter part of the period of which I am speaking the C.O.R., which had previously received its oil supplies from Abadan, has been deprived of its natural source of supply and, I believe, has had to make all sorts of unfavourable arrangements to maintain its business in Australia, so that the period under review is probably not one that would give an indication of the policy of the company over the whole period.

AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION.

Mr. BROOKMAN—During the Address in Reply debate I suggested to the Minister of Agriculture means by which the dissemination of agricultural information could be speeded up from the laboratory to the farmer, and also suggested that such information be put into a simple form which could be more easily assimilated by every one than when in scientific language. Has the Minister considered my suggestions and, if so, has he any statement to make?

The Hon. SIR GEORGE JENKINS—During the course of his speech the honourable member made several suggestions which covered fairly wide ground and the relationship between the Waite Research Institute and the Department of Agriculture. I have asked the Director of Agriculture to investigate the questions raised and furnish a report which I shall be pleased to supply to the honourable member as soon as it comes to hand.

PORT ROAD WIDENING.

Mr. HUTCHENS—As recently as six months ago the lighting of the Port Road was completed and since that time I have heard many highly complimentary reports on it; in fact, a person who has travelled the world claims there is no better lit road anywhere. Now the Highways Department is widening the Hindmarsh Bridge at great cost and in my opinion it is doing a good job which will assist the traffic in that area, but to complete the job it is necessary that the widening of the road be completed. As many of my constituents and people travelling through and to Hindmarsh are anxious to know if and when the department intends to continue the widening, can the Minister of Works make a statement on that matter?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question and I appreciate that because it enables a Minister to ascertain information on technical and engineering sides of the matter. I also appreciate his remarks on what has been done on the Port Road and feel sure that the good job done there will be generally recognized. With regard to the widening of the track the Commissioner of Highways has told me that at present attention is being given to the more urgent work on Victoria Road, which was not previously trafficable, whereas the major portion of the Port Road now has three traffic lanes in each direction. It is not at present possible to indicate a date for the

resumption of widening on the up track, but it is a work which is kept constantly under review for attention as opportunity offers. I assure the honourable member that that work will be proceeded with in due order.

EMPLOYMENT OF BRITISH MIGRANTS.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Premier notice a press report that a body of British migrants who recently arrived in Sydney have been informed that there was no work available for them? I understand that a batch of such migrants will probably come to South Australia. Will the Premier renew his efforts in the Loan Council to indicate that if this State had more money available for Loan works it would be able to place in employment British migrants coming to South Australia? If money is not available to give work to British migrants arriving in Australia, will he ask the Commonwealth to tone down its British migration programme until more work is available?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Requests have been made by this State, supported I believe, by Victoria and Tasmania, for a meeting of the Loan Council. Under the Constitution, if three States request a meeting of the Loan Council it must be convened, and I have no doubt the Federal Treasurer will desire to convene it as soon as practicable. With regard to the second part of the question, all undertakings made by this Government for employment of immigrants have, as far as I know, been fully honoured. I do not know of one case where people have been engaged overseas to come to South Australia to work in Government departments and on arrival have been told, because of changed circumstances, no work is available for them. However, I will inquire, and, if there is such a case, will advise the honourable member.

DEVELOPMENT OF METROPOLITAN AREA.

Mr. PATTINSON—On August 11, 1950, I introduced to the Premier a deputation consisting of Sir Lloyd Dumas and representatives of the Town Planning Institute, Municipal Association, the Institute of Architects, the Institute of Engineers, the Institute of Surveyors, and the National Fitness Council, and other bodies. That deputation requested that the Government appoint a committee to inquire what steps should be taken to prepare a co-ordinated plan for the development of the metropolitan area. The Government acceded to that request and, towards the end of 1950,

appointed a committee. I have now been informed that that committee completed and submitted its report to the Government some months ago, and I have been requested to inquire of the Premier whether the Government intends to act upon that report and the committee's recommendations, and, if so, when?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member is correct in his facts. The committee's report has been received by the Government, examined by the Minister of Local Government, who is chiefly concerned, and submitted to Cabinet. In it are a number of matters involving policy and Cabinet has referred their consideration to the Treasury Department. Generally speaking, the report did not produce a plan for the metropolitan area, as the Government had hoped, but suggested that legislation be passed appointing an advisory committee to go further into the question of preparing a plan. Frankly, I have not had a chance to analyse the report sufficiently to see the motives behind this, but normally it is not necessary to pass legislation to appoint an advisory committee; indeed, the Government has permanent powers appropriated to it by Parliament to appoint a Royal Commission if it wants advice upon any matter, or any matter analysed. Therefore, the suggestion for a committee to be appointed by Act of Parliament is rather a new one, and is being examined. I assure the honourable member that the matter has not been lost sight of and in due course the Government will make an announcement. The problem confronting us is not one of desirability. Every South Australian favours adequate parks, gardens and green belts surrounding our metropolitan area, and no authority would dispute the necessity of appropriate means for transportation, public utilities and other matters for the future. It all comes down to the question of the financing of large areas of land which may be required. They are all at present held under freehold and the Government has not the power of compulsory acquisition. Even if it had, compulsory acquisition could only be exercised at great cost to the taxpayer and the community, and that at a time when every effort is being made to maintain employment and carry out essential and urgent works. I assure the honourable member the Government realizes the importance of this matter, that the report is receiving consideration and that appropriate steps will be taken, if necessary, this session.

WEST BEACH AIRPORT.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Premier anything further to report on a question I asked some weeks ago about the West Beach airport?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Pursuant to my promise, I wrote to the Federal Minister for Civil Aviation, and a few days ago received the following reply:—

I desire to refer to your letter of the 14th August concerning the completion of Adelaide airport at West Beach as raised by Mr. Fred Walsh, M.P. Early this year it became apparent that construction of the first runway at the airport would be sufficiently advanced by the winter to permit aircraft landings, although the second runway and the buildings would not be available. During May a conference was arranged between representatives of T.A.A., A.N.A., and the Department of Civil Aviation. T.A.A. stated that before it could use the Adelaide airport it would require certain temporary passenger, catering, engineering and other facilities which could not be erected in time to meet the period when an alternate to Parafield would probably be required. A.N.A. stated that the use of Gawler as an alternate to Parafield was preferable to using the new Adelaide airport as an alternate, and that A.N.A. did not wish to use Adelaide until the move to that airport was permanent. The departmental view was that the availability of a runway did not constitute all the requirements for safe operation. There were installations necessary for traffic control, radio communication, and other facilities which must be properly housed. It was therefore decided that, owing to the amount of work to be carried out to ensure safety and the small number of diversions from Parafield to the alternate, it was advisable to construct the permanent buildings and move to the Adelaide airport when this could be arranged on a permanent basis.

During the period of the conference the operations section of A.N.A. wrote to the department requesting the replacement of Gawler by Adelaide but stating that temporary lounge and tower radio control would be necessary. The A.N.A. representative at the conference is now the operations manager of the company, so it is assumed that the company's views as expressed at the conference correctly describe their official attitude. The Minister for Civil Aviation, the Hon. H. L. Anthony, who is at present overseas on official business, inspected the airport with the Director-General of Civil Aviation in June last and is of the opinion that the department should not provide a set of temporary and costly buildings which would be used for a few days in the year, but should concentrate upon obtaining the permanent buildings which would be ultimately cheaper and form an attractive asset to the city. It is, however, hoped that the present conditions in the building trade will permit of an earlier completion date than was previously estimated and

I will write to the Minister of Works, the constructing authority, in an endeavour to achieve this end.

That letter was signed by the Acting Minister for Civil Aviation, Senator McLeay.

BULK DRYING OF FRUIT.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Probably over a year ago the manager of the Berri Co-operative Packing Company placed a scheme before the Minister of Irrigation for the bulk drying of fruit, mainly grapes. I understand that if the scheme were practicable it would mean that settlers, especially new settlers, would be saved the expenses of individual racks and the individual housing of employees during the harvest period. Has the Minister examined the scheme and, if so, what conclusion has he arrived at?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I remember that that matter was raised during the course of a discussion, and I noticed from the press today that a deputation was being arranged to wait upon me to discuss it. I will get a report for the honourable member and see if anything has been done.

ALLEGED RACING CONSPIRACY.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Premier anything further to report concerning the question I raised on August 19 regarding incidents associated with horse racing and the allegation that conspiracy had occurred?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The investigations I promised have been made by police officers and I understand a prosecution is pending.

FIREWOOD FOR PUMPING STATIONS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Last week I drew the attention of the Minister of Irrigation to the disastrous effect that the sudden closing down of the purchase of firewood for pumping stations on the Murray had had on a number of wood cutters, mainly in the Renmark area. Has the Minister the report he promised?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—There has perhaps been a misunderstanding regarding supplies delivered to pumping station and contracts that were to be completed. A total of 12,300 tons had actually been delivered and there were still current contracts for 12,000 tons, which will be accepted. The honourable member mentioned 800 tons lying at grass. Arrangements have been made to purchase this quantity from the contractors.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I have in mind those men who simply supplied the department as

firewood became available, and had no contracts. During recent months suppliers had been asked to provide as much wood as possible, and as labour became available men were engaged on this work, mainly for pumps in the Berri area. They were encouraged to do this. Such casual suppliers have, at a moment's notice, been thrown on the streets, unemployed. The Minister said he would go into the particular aspect of gradually terminating these supplies by giving a week's or a fortnight's notice, so that the men would have an opportunity to get other employment. Can he reply on that aspect?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The position was that so many men from other industries became unemployed that they suddenly threw themselves on the Department of Irrigation offering to cut wood, which I admit was required; but there is a limit to the quantity the department can accept. It was not known, and there was no means of knowing, how many men would suddenly become available to cut wood. The department is accepting a considerable quantity of firewood above what it was anticipated it would receive. I remind the honourable member that when the department was in trouble as to firewood supplies it could get practically no assistance, and but for the fact that Leigh Creek coal was available the department would have been in trouble. As so many men have suddenly become available for firewood cutting, I am afraid the Government cannot help them to the extent that the honourable member might perhaps suggest.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Does the Minister think that the sacking of workers without notice is the best way to build up a good working staff to keep the plants going? Is there not ample room in the Berri yard to stack some thousands of tons of firewood, and is not that firewood a safeguard against a period of shortage, which the Minister has spoken about? Would it not be wiser to take firewood so long as it is available, and avoid having to bring in Leigh Creek coal?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Government has no desire to dispense with the services of any employees. Wood already contracted for and wood already delivered will supply the Berri pumping station for about three years. It is not a good proposition to keep wood for any lengthy period. The honourable member knows that the Government is endeavouring with all possible speed to electrify the Berri pumping station.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—As the Minister knew there would be enough wood at the Berri pumping station for about three years why was not more consideration shown to casual workers, who helped the Minister and the department when there was a shortage, by giving notice that firewood would not be accepted from them after the expiration of a fortnight?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I ask the honourable member to put that question on the Notice Paper.

WALLAROO RAILWAY ROUNDHOUSE.

Mr. McALEES—Has the Minister a reply to the suggestion I made during the Address in Reply debate regarding the housing of locomotives at Wallaroo?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—During the debate the honourable member stated that a bay of the roundhouse should be retained for that purpose, and on the face of it it did not appear that the undertaking was fully complied with. I addressed a memorandum to the Railways Commissioner and he has replied as follows:—

The position is that one bay of the original five-bay roundhouse has been retained at Wallaroo as undertaken in my minute of 1/11/50 herein. To complete the work it was necessary to lay a short length of track from the turntable, provide a shed for lighting-up materials and finish the roofing and walls of the bay which was left. This work was authorized in January, 1951, and is completed except for the roof and wall covering which has been delayed because all available tradesmen have been engaged on house construction. However, this work will be completed very shortly.

The honourable member will see that it is desirable to do more urgent work first.

SUBURBAN RAILWAY ELECTRIFICATION.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Railways say whether the Railways Department has prepared plans for widening the Adelaide Railway Station yard in view of the possible electrification of the suburban railway system, and whether such plans envisage the provision of a wider Morphett Street bridge to provide for road traffic, and has the Minister considered the proposal of the Adelaide City Council to extend Kintore Avenue?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Apart from the technical side, the question involves a matter of policy, and I will therefore take it as a question on notice and bring down a reply on the points raised as early as possible.

STATE BANK HOUSING LOANS.

Mr. STEPHENS—I have been informed that applicants to the State Bank for loans for house building have been advised that it will not grant any loans at present as it is waiting for interest rates to increase from 4 to 4½ per cent. A case I have in mind concerns a man who has partly built a house and who went to the State Bank for information. He was advised to apply for a loan now, before the interest rate is increased. He applied on September 16 and today was told that the application would not be granted until after the date of the interest increase. Can the Premier say whether this is the general policy of the State Bank? Does it withhold the granting of applications for loans until after the interest rate has been raised? If the Premier desires I can give him the name and address of the applicant, and also information about other persons interested in this matter.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the Advances for Homes Act, and in connection with some of its other financial activities, the bank gets money from the Government, which money is included in the State's official Loan programme, which must be approved by both Houses of Parliament. The Loan Estimates passed this House some time ago, and recently the Legislative Council. This morning I declared the interest rate for the year. Now that the legislation has passed the Legislative Council there should be no further holdup in the matter. I have previously pointed out that the Government must have lawful appropriation of money before it can make money available, and everything depends on the vote of Parliament.

Mr. Stephens—Does the interest rate apply to Commonwealth loans?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. I declared a rate of 5½ per cent, less ½ per cent for prompt payment, making an effective rate of 4½ per cent. I do not know the Commonwealth rate of interest. Some semi-governmental authorities are offering loans at a rate of £4 12s. 6d. That has happened in every State except South Australia. Under these circumstances I think the next official loan, if we are to get the money needed, will have to be at an increased rate of interest, but that is not yet known. Semi-governmental loans are now dominating the market at a rate of £4 12s. 6d. per cent.

FACTORY WORKERS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—How many persons were employed in factories as at June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1952—(a) in the

metropolitan area; (b) at Port Pirie; (c) at Whyalla; and (d) elsewhere?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government Statist reports:—

	1939.	1951.
(a) Metropolitan area approx.	36,000	72,051
(b) Port Pirie		2,340
(c) Whyalla		1,409
(d) Rest of State		7,369
Total . . . (actual)	43,371	83,169

The figures are allied in the Statist's returns to industries and not districts. The returns for 1939 have been destroyed, and that is why the Statist can give only approximate figures for that year.

HOUSING TRUST HOMES.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—How many applicants to purchase Housing Trust houses to whom houses have been offered have declined such offers or have not replied to such offers since July 1, 1952?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—One hundred and eighty six.

RELEASE OF PRISONER.

Mr. MOIR (on notice)—

1. Could the Treasurer state the reason for the refusal to release on probation prisoner Ronald Sharpe, who has served 14 years of his term?

2. Has the Government received several such requests from interested organizations, or persons during the past two years?

3. Were accommodation and work promised for this person if released?

4. During the last five years has any prisoner serving a long term in similar circumstances been released on probation after serving 10 years of his sentence?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Release on probation is not possible in the case of the person named.

2. The Government has the correspondence. Requests have been made.

3. Yes, on some occasions.

4. No.

SALT CREEK CROSSING.

Mr. Heaslip for Mr. CHRISTIAN (on notice)—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to provide financial assistance to the District Council of Franklin Harbour for the acquisition of land and the construction of a new ford over Salt Creek, at Mangalo, as recommended by the engineer of the Highways and Local Government Department?

2. If so, what proportion of the cost will be borne by the department?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—A conference was held at the site of the proposed crossing with the chairman of the District Council of Franklin Harbour, the councillor for the ward, and seven local residents vitally concerned in this matter. They expressed a wish that, rather than have a ford as a temporary measure with the possibility of its becoming a permanency, it would be preferable to wait two or three years for a bridge. In view of the wish expressed by the local residents, it is proposed to survey the site with a view to constructing a bridge as soon as possible. Whatever structure is finally built, the cost will be met out of highway funds.

NORTHERN RAILWAY ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. John Clark for Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. What proportion of the cost of the Royal Commission on the Brachina-Stirling North railway route was borne by—(a) the South Australian Government; and (b) the Commonwealth Government; and what were the respective amounts?

2. What was the cost of legal representation to—(a) South Australia; (b) the Commonwealth?

3. Who made the decision to engage counsel?

4. Is the report of the Royal Commission to be printed?

5. If so, when will copies be available?

6. Did the Commission make any recommendation regarding payment of compensation to residents who will be affected?

7. If so, what was the recommendation?

8. Is the Commonwealth Government meeting any of the cost of compensation?

9. What action, if any, is the Government taking to—(a) retain the existing line and present coal traffic to Adelaide *via* Quorn; (b) attract any new industry to Quorn?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. (a) The cost of the Royal Commission was not borne by South Australia. (b) Unknown.

2. (a) South Australia was represented by the Crown Solicitor, and the only legal cost involved was for a junior, to whom an amount of £1,011 was paid. (b) Unknown.

3. The Commonwealth.

4. Yes, by the Commonwealth Government.

5. Probably four or five months.

6 and 7. Not directly.

8. A request has recently been made to the Commonwealth Government, but no reply has yet been received.

9. (a) and (b) Any representations on matters within the power of the State Government will be considered.

ISLINGTON WORKSHOPS CANTEEN.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Is the canteen at Islington Workshops part of the railways refreshment services?

2. If so, are profits from the canteen credited to that branch?

3. Are any of the profits of the canteen devoted to the provision of amenities for employees at the Islington Workshops?

4. If so, what is the nature of the amenities provided?

5. Is the canteen conducted by a committee?

6. If so, what representation have the employees on that committee?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. The Islington canteen is administered locally, but food supplies generally are procured from the Railway Refreshment Services, Adelaide.

2. The gross sales are credited to railway revenue and the expenses are debited to Railway Refreshment Services.

3. Yes.

4. £5,000 has been earmarked, and of this, £2,158 has been expended on the lining of two locker rooms and the purchase of three water cooler units for dining rooms.

5. The canteen is conducted by a canteen manager, with the assistance of a canteen advisory committee.

6. The committee consists of the chief clerk and 10 members of the Islington Workshops staff, who are elected by ballot by the staff of the workshops.

SECONDARY EDUCATION, LEIGH CREEK.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—

1. Is the Minister of Works aware that there are a considerable number of children in the upper grades of the Leigh Creek school?

2. If so, has any provision been made for post-primary education in that area?

3. If not, will such provision be made in the future?

4. Is the Minister aware of the long distance from any high school or other suitable school?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. There are only 11 children in Grade VII., and nine in Grade VI.

2. Vide No. 1.
3. Yes, when the numbers warrant it.
4. Yes.

TRANSPORT LICENCES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Road and Railway Transport Act along the lines suggested on page 37 of Judge Paine's report on State transport so that all applications, transfers, or renewals of transport licences will be considered in public?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Judge Paine's report recommends a very comprehensive system of control over all types of transport, and if such control was introduced, public hearings would be more or less a natural corollary. On the other hand, the simpler procedure adopted in South Australia has been very effective and inexpensive for the limited controls operating here. The chairman of the Transport Board reports:—

The past and existing policy of the board is to advertise in the press any licence that may become available, and to receive applications therefor. Any person may request an interview with the board in connection with the advertised licence. Where a new licence is contemplated the board conducts an investigation and frequently visits the district concerned and holds a public meeting at that centre and obtains views for and against the granting of the licence. The above procedure has operated effectively since 1930, and the board has received much favourable comment on the smooth working and simplicity of South Australian road transport control legislation. Experience of public hearings in Victoria has revealed that such hearings become most involved and extremely costly to the participants. It has become the practice for each party to arrange for his case to be submitted by his legal adviser, and in fact, legal representation is now considered almost a necessity. Many lengthy legal battles ensue, with resultant heavy costs. My board considers it can obtain the necessary essential evidence without involving applicants or objectors in the high legal costs which will inevitably be incurred if public hearings are compulsory, and it is quite conceivable that such expense may deter applicants with limited financial resources who would not risk their savings to pit themselves against firms or persons with unlimited finance. If such persons of limited means were thereby excluded it would run counter to the board's past efforts to assist wherever possible the man, particularly the returned soldier, who has perhaps only one vehicle, and that probably financed. Such a man would be unlikely to jeopardize his small savings to combat other wealthy applicants. My board does not consider that the time and expense which would be involved in the hearing in public of all applications, renewals and transfers of licences would be justified.

POLICE OFFICERS' WORKING HOURS.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. Are male constables on duty for a fixed number of hours per week?
2. If so, what is such number?
3. If male constables are on duty for a greater number of hours than those fixed by the award, do they receive extra payment for overtime?
4. Are women police liable to be called on duty at any hour?
5. If so, do they receive extra payment if they are on duty for more than 40 hours a week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Commissioner of Police reports:—

1. The hours of duty of male adult constables are fixed in accordance with the police officers award.
2. The normal duty hours are eighty-eight per fortnight, worked in eleven shifts of eight hours, and include meal breaks, ranging from one-half to one hour per shift.
3. There is no provision for payment of overtime in the award. If a constable is required to work in excess of normal shift hours, an adjustment is made by allowing time off in lieu thereof.
4. and 5. Women police are liable for duty after normal hours if special circumstances so direct, and are thereby entitled to claim time off in lieu thereof. No payment is made for overtime worked.

PORT AUGUSTA SUB-BRANCH R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. (PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

URANIUM MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 591.)

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—I am sure every member appreciates the importance of this Bill, not only because of its purpose—to preserve the secrecy of operations for the development of our uranium resources—but also because of the value of that mineral to South Australia and the Commonwealth. In his second reading speech the Premier succinctly summarized those two points by saying:—

This undertaking will, I believe, be of the greatest importance to the future of South Australia and the development of Australia

as a whole. I go further and say it will be of the greatest importance to the safety of the free world.

In common with all other members I deplore the necessity for a Bill of this nature, for it exemplifies only too clearly the continued friction between the people on each side of a curtain. For peace-time purposes uranium is the greatest discovery in the history of this State, but unfortunately its development is to be hedged about with all sorts of difficulties because somebody somewhere is not satisfied to live at peace with his neighbour. The Bill deals with a number of aspects of security. Clause 4a prescribes and describes the oath that will be required to be taken by personnel associated with this undertaking. The Leader of the Opposition said:—

I believe the person who is a spy or a traitor will not hesitate to take any oath if it will help him to secure the information he wants for those engaged in his nefarious trade.

As an ex-serviceman I disagree with that remark. I believe that every ex-serviceman will agree with me that one of the most powerful impressions of service life was the swearing in for military service. The impression of that act engendered by the atmosphere and the context of the oath must always leave a very serious and lasting impression on the serviceman, and I believe that in this case subscribing to an oath will serve the valuable purpose of impressing on the person subscribing the importance of the work in which he is engaged and of constantly reminding him of the secret nature of the information with which he is entrusted.

Mr. John Clark—Even if he is a traitor?

Mr. PEARSON—No. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that a traitor will go to any lengths, but the honourable member for Gawler cannot deny the value of the oath to an ordinary citizen who might otherwise inadvertently hand over secret information to a person not entitled to it. The provisions for security appear to be fairly complete. I do not know, however, what steps are to be taken to police them on some aspects. For instance, during war time every person in the forces had his mail censored if he was in remote parts; indeed, check censorships were taken of all mails that passed through our post offices. People engaged in the mining and treatment of uranium will be situated in a remote, or at least an isolated, field. They will gain information which would be better not passed on to the public, but I am not suggesting for a moment that we impose a

wartime censorship on their correspondence. It may even be outside the power of a State Act to authorize that, but this is one of the problems we are up against in preserving security.

Some members have referred to the desirability of secret trials of any people apprehended under this legislation. It has been suggested that under certain conditions the court should be cleared of the public and that portion of the evidence should be heard in camera. The Leader of the Opposition said it was his intention to move that no person presiding over a court, other than a special magistrate or a judge, would have power to order that the court be cleared and suggested therefore that courts presided over by justices of the peace should not have that power. He also said he intended to move that no person should be apprehended or searched without immediate action being taken to ascertain whether or not he was guilty of an offence. I do not know how he can reconcile those two intentions. On the one hand he asks for immediate action to be taken and on the other proposes that a court shall not be competent to hear secret material if tendered as evidence unless presided over by a special magistrate. Does that mean that whenever a person is apprehended, whether at Radium Hill or at some other remote place, a special magistrate will have to be immediately dispatched to hear the case if the evidence is likely to be of a secret nature? I am also wondering what is the intention regarding the administration of oaths of secrecy to people who have been engaged in hearing evidence of a secret nature. Will all counsel and officers of the court be obliged to take an oath similar to that taken by people engaged in the mining and treatment of uranium? There is no parallel in civil litigation to the military court where charges of conspiracy were heard and persons were sentenced, because in those cases all parties attending the court were sworn personnel, and it seems hardly fair that a person employed by the Mines Department and engaged in secret work should be obliged to take an oath when other people with access through a court action to similar information are not similarly sworn.

I will make some comments on this question which may be helpful not only to the parties charged with carrying out matters of secrecy, but also to the officers obliged in the course of their duties to be in possession of important secret information. During the war, as an officer of the R.A.A.F., and working in the Intelligence Section, it was my duty to take

charge of security in several operational squadrons and later to be in charge of the same department of a wing, which controlled several squadrons. I learned something of the psychology of security, firstly as a junior officer in intelligence and being entrusted with secret information, and secondly as an executive charged with the duty of policing and maintaining security within operational commands with which I worked. In each of these fields one or two principles held good. Firstly, there must be a proper appreciation of what constitutes security, and secondly the individual concerned must develop an attitude of mind that will enable him to be a safe person to entrust with secret information. The authority, in this case the Director of Mines, must clearly define to his officers and staff those things and projects which are really secret, and those which are not, so that those people may know exactly where they stand, not only in relation to the day to day performance of their duties, but also in their social contacts, domestic discussions, and conversations in private life. Domestic and private conversations afford some of the main opportunities for the inadvertent passing on of secret information. This legislation will impose great responsibilities on the people concerned and prescribes severe penalties for infringements. Parliament has a duty to see that they are given every possible help in obtaining an intelligent understanding of their position. We must make every effort to secure their confidence and co-operation.

Soon after the Bill was introduced I travelled to Broken Hill on the express and, after meeting friends, journeyed in their compartment. There was also in that compartment an employee of the Department of Mines, and on discovering that I was a member of Parliament he raised this very question. He was preparing plans and specifications for some of the work which was being done by private contract. In order to carry out his duties he had to have precise information about certain details associated with the job. He was advised that some of this information was of a secret nature. How could he prepare plans and specifications, which a tendering contractor would require, without putting in writing the very thing he was informed was a secret? He was in a dilemma. He probably realizes now, as I do, that he had been wrongly informed by someone and that the matter he was told was secret was not secret at all. That is an illustration of the necessity for clear instructions because on the one hand

there is a possibility of a breach of security unwittingly committed by a servant of a department and on the other, there could be unnecessary and hampering restrictions because of insufficient or incomplete briefing by the authorities on what are the real secrets of the undertaking. The prerequisite for intelligent security is a clear understanding of the matters that are secret. Secondly, there are some points that should be made with regard to the individual's attitude, or ability to be entrusted with a matter of a secret nature. We are all inexperienced at some time in some things, and tend to get a great kick out of being called into secret conclave and told important secrets. We have probably all seen a demonstration of the truth that if you want to get a rumour spread quickly you should first tell it to your wife with the strict instruction that she must not tell a soul. It is fortunate that this does not hold true of every wife and, indeed, perhaps that is one of those slanders of the fair sex that have little foundation, but if any person is to be the safe repository of a secret it is essential for him to develop a certain habit of mind and, if necessary, to departmentalize his life. It is essential to associate certain thoughts and ideas only with certain circumstances, and to think those thoughts and converse in those terms only within the precincts or within the circumstances applicable to them. I believe that lawyers, doctors and bankers will agree that such is the case in their professions, and that when they close their office doors they lock up their secrets too, and would not, under any circumstances, repeat them outside. So it should be as regards the security of things of an international nature, where the consequence of a breach can have such far-reaching and calamitous results, of a magnitude that has already been demonstrated in the case of the subject matter of this Bill. I therefore offer this advice to those whose duties put them in possession of vital secrets—'When you leave the room of secrets, forget you ever heard them until you re-enter it.'

The enemy relies for information not merely on the spy or the informer. Far more valuable to him are the bits and pieces of information he gets from here and there, and herein lies the greatest potential danger. I venture the opinion that from a series of bits and pieces, no single one of which would be sufficient evidence to convict a person before a court, an enemy could build a picture so complete as to enable him to act upon it with certainty. The job of those engaged in espionage is to collect and

collate apparently innocent words or actions from here and there into a coherent and complete story. Herein lies the greatest difficulty in preserving security, in policing this legislation, and in making judgments and inflicting the penalties thereunder. This fact serves to highlight the following points:—(1) Some people are psychologically unsuited for secret work; (2) there must be the fullest briefing by responsible authorities of what is basic security and the secret nature of the work; (3) for a person engaged in this work it is essential to develop a habit of mind; and (4) whatever penalties are inflicted under the Act, in the final analysis we cannot compel security. As the Leader of the Opposition rightly said, the person who intends to betray his country for some motive we cannot understand or appreciate will do so in spite of any legislation. Real security can be obtained only by care in the selection of personnel and from the loyalty of those engaged. This means that academic qualifications and technical skill are not the only requirements. The worst leakages of information concerning atomic secrets have been from people brilliant as scientists, but lacking in an appreciation of their loyalty to their country.

Mr. O'Halloran—In other words, from people well on the "inside."

Mr. PEARSON—On that score the Government should be warned by things which have already occurred and should see to it that the men selected should be chosen not because they are brilliant mathematicians, physicists, chemists, and so on, but firstly for their loyalty, and perhaps secondly for their academic qualifications. It is not only the little men who betray the nation. Both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that the great traitors concerning knowledge of uranium have been certain people at the top—people who undoubtedly were qualified academically, but were possessed of some warped idea and perhaps of some motive to make available vital secrets to a potential enemy. I believe that we are all involved in this matter of security and all politicians, public men, and the press must be aware of the position. I remember the classic example of a high political figure in Australia, who in a broadcast during World War II. referred to a place in a certain remote corner of Australia—a place which was highly secret; and as a result there was an air attack by the Japanese an evening or two later. Fortunately, they missed the target. Had they succeeded it would have set back the clock of the Pacific war by months and seriously

jeopardized the position of the thin line of Australian troops who were holding down the enemy in New Guinea. The facts of this matter may not be generally known, but as one who was on the "inside" during that period, it was well-known to me. The Bill affects us all vitally, and it is to be regretted that it is necessary to be so secretive about these things. We all believe it would be far better if we could proceed with the development of this valuable mineral for peace-time purposes. The free exchange of information on this matter by scientists would undoubtedly produce results for the benefit of industry in much shorter time than is now possible, but because of the exigencies of the cold war, we have no alternative but to provide against leakage of information. I believe, however, that when this emergency period passes, as I believe it will, the progress which has been made in the interim will result in a new era of industrial production which will be of material benefit to all. I support the second reading.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I very much question the need for such drastic provisions. When one sees in the press every day reports of what one would consider top secret matters it is very difficult to understand the need for the strict secrecy provided under this Bill. If uranium processing were being developed for atomic power for peace-time industrial purposes only, there could be no justification for such repressive legislation. So one can only assume that we are concerned at the moment with processing uranium for war purposes, particularly as it relates to the atomic bomb. Mr. Pearson spoke in terms of a war-time complex. He has reminded us before that he served in the forces, but he is not the only one. A number of members in the House served with the forces in World War I. or in World War II., and were in positions just as responsible as Mr. Pearson. Nearly 1,000,000 Australians participated in World War II. indirectly by the making of munitions, and consequently were unable to get into the services. Generally, Mr. Pearson's remarks were along the lines one would expect during a period of war; but we are not living in a period of war, but in an allegedly peace-time era. It is true that there is a cold war, but I have never heard that term described so that it could be understood by the people generally. It is generally recognized that England and the United States of America, through the Anglo-American Atomic Energy Committee, are most keen to get absolute

control of world uranium production. Apart from England, America, Russia, and perhaps some of her satellites, even Eastern Germany, other countries have not the equipment, plant nor necessary scientific knowledge for the development of atomic bombs. It is impossible for a country like Australia to obtain the necessary knowledge because it is held by people who have been studying the subject for a number of years. This knowledge is confined to the top secret places in the United Kingdom and America. I should like to see a total ban placed upon the export of uranium. I appreciate it is impossible for us to purchase the necessary scientific plant and equipment for the development of atomic energy because we have not the money, particularly dollars. Apparently, the only way for us at the moment to obtain these dollars is by the sale of uranium. That is why the Labor movement appreciates the need for the sale of this commodity—if we cannot sell it we cannot get the dollars, and without dollars we cannot purchase the machinery, plant, and scientific knowledge required. Negotiations have taken place between authorities in Washington and the South Australian Premier to develop Radium Hill. Not long ago he visited Washington for the purpose of discussing the question, and also the possibility of obtaining the necessary finance. He took with him some of this State's mining experts. Then the Prime Minister negotiated with the same Washington authorities about the development of the Rum Jungle deposits. Not only our people, but members of Parliament have not been told of the provisions of any agreements arising from negotiations. Numerous reports have been circularized about agreements. I was told some time ago that one between our Government and the Anglo-American Atomic Energy Commission provided for the giving of finance and essential plants for use at Radium Hill. I was also told that it provided for the repayment of the money advanced by the sale of our uranium, to be spread over seven years. This Parliament has not been told about it. Undoubtedly the Premier agreed to something while he was away. I also have some figures, but for obvious reasons I shall not refer to them. As members of Parliament we should be told of provisions in any agreements committing this State. It would not be a means of giving information to a potential enemy, because the information could be obtained in many other ways. All members of Parliament have taken seriously the Oath of Allegiance and it is not likely that

they would intentionally infringe it. For that reason members have the right to be told of provisions in all agreements affecting South Australia. I appreciate the need for defence preparations, especially in the present unsettled state of the world, but I will not be stampeded into saying that anyone talking about the need for peace is an enemy of our country. Many people have a keen desire for peace. Some may be a little fanatical in their talk and in some of their associations; some of the conferences they attend may be open to question. Some people attend these conferences and talks because of their keen desire to bring peace to the world, but unfortunately they are used by certain sections, and can be called stooges.

A few days ago the president of the Metal Industries Association, and vice-president of the South Australian Chamber of Manufacturers, Mr. Geoff Gerard, spoke of our obligations and the need to take migrants from crowded Great Britain and Europe as we need far more people to defend our shores. He referred to the Communist ridden Asiatic countries who were looking towards Australia with more enthusiasm now that they had learned of our valuable uranium deposits, but they would not be of much value to them, because they would not have the necessary plant, nor know how to use them. Mr. Gerard also said that 8,000,000 people could be swamped by 800,000,000 fanatically led Asiatics who were not far away to the north. I do not believe that it is possible for us to defend Australia as we would like it to be defended, even with the population that will be built up in the next 25 to 30 years. Mr. Gerard tried to create a certain psychology in the minds of the people who would read his statement. It is not amiss to talk about a better relationship between ourselves and the Asiatic peoples he mentioned, but he could have referred to them in a more friendly way. America and Russia are using the battlefield in Korea as a sort of experimental ground for new weapons. If they are not doing so, what is the value of carrying on the war? What is their objective? We were told earlier that it was to drive the North Koreans back to the 38th parallel, but when they got there we were told that they had to be driven back further.

For about 18 months there have been talks of peace. If the leaders of the great powers I have mentioned were to take those talks more seriously we might get somewhere. The talks have gone on in a phoney way for the

past 18 months. We should see that there are more serious peace talks. If something is not done soon it will need only one or the other of the forces engaged to commit some act to start a third world war. If for no other reason it is time the position in Korea was seriously reviewed, and then we would not get the press reports that the peace delegates met for five minutes or 30 minutes before adjourning for another week. This is how things are going on, and it is becoming a joke. The peace talks take place within the sound of guns. If peace were agreed to tomorrow it would mean the withdrawal of the Chinese Communist forces, which could not remain in the field for 24 hours but for support from Russia. A person knowing anything about China, and remembering that for many years she was occupied by Japanese forces, must know that she could not possibly build up a war potential, and that she could not remain in the Korean war without assistance from Russia. If peace did come tomorrow and the forces of both sides were withdrawn, how long would it be before we would find Russia still being the dominating factor in all Korea? If it were not done by means of infiltration, or crooked elections, it would be done in some other way. We should realize the position and not allow the present fiasco to continue in Korea, with the lives of our young soldiers in danger.

I regret that the United Nations organization is unduly influenced by America. Is Australia to be influenced by the same nation? As a nation, and as a co-participant in Korea, we have not been consulted in any way about the conduct of the war. We should claim it as a right. If there is any truth in the many rumours current it appears that we are coming under American influence in the development of our uranium deposits, and, in fact, in the development of our national economy. The Melbourne *Herald* of June 19 last, contained an article under the heading "World Bank divided on our Loan Terms." It was not written by an ordinary journalist, but by a special reporter who travelled with the Prime Minister to Washington. He has been previously associated with tours by the Prime Minister, and has been long connected with Canberra. The press reports states:—

The present position is that the bank tacitly agrees that Australia should have the loan—which is expected to be 50 million dollars (£22 million) a year for the next three years. I understand one section of the bank's directors thinks that the loan should be on the same general terms as other

International Bank loans—it should be available only for projects specified by the bank. But another group is disposed to meet Mr. Menzies' request for a more flexible arrangement which would not tie the advances too tightly to named projects. The bank is reported to be dissatisfied with Australia's assessment of the priorities of major public works. Mr. Menzies' next important task will be to advance proposals for exploitation of the Rum Jungle uranium fields. I understand he is discussing a proposal that the American Import and Export Bank should finance uranium development.

I could produce many other reports which give the impression that Australia is gradually coming under the influence, if not the complete domination, of the United States. Although I am not unmindful of the part played by that nation in helping to save Australia during World War II, I remind members that it was not until she was attacked at Pearl Harbour that she came into the war. The U.S.A. did not appear to be greatly concerned about the salvation of Australia before that time, but was prepared to let Britain and the Dominions carry on the struggle, the only assistance she gave being by way of materials for which she was paid. In World War I the U.S.A. did not declare war until one of her ships was sunk in the Irish Sea, and, although entering the war at a late stage, she was able to derive any benefit which may have accrued from victory. If there be any benefit from victory in a world war the United States has again derived it as a result of World War II, for Britain's economic position is immeasurably weaker because of its effects. This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report that Britain's request for representation at the Anzus Conference has been rejected, and that is typical of the audacious attitude of the United States in view of the supposedly close alliance between Britain and that country in world affairs. These things should not be lost sight of in discussing this Bill, for it has been suggested by people who are in a position to know something of these matters that we have to a great extent been again influenced by the United States to legislate for provisions which she has not been able to provide by legislation in that country. The United States brought pressure to bear on Britain to tighten her security measures and also refused to give her information on the atomic bomb, but despite that Britain is on the verge of exploding her own bomb close to our shores. That development has been achieved through the efforts of her own scientists and not with the help of Americans.

Reference has been made to the penalties involved by breaches of other Acts, both State and Commonwealth, particularly the Crimes Act, but it does not necessarily follow that, because the Crimes Act is on the Commonwealth Statute Book, members on this side subscribe to it in its entirety; in fact that is not so. Sections 30j and 30k are particularly repugnant to the industrial wing of the Labor movement and, although it may be said that those sections were invoked by a Labor Government that does not necessarily mean that trade unions have not always opposed those sections. Section 10 of the Crimes Act, which deals with search warrants, states:—

If a justice of the Peace is satisfied by information on oath that there is reasonable ground for suspecting that there is in any house, vessel, or place—

- (a) anything with respect to which any offence against any law of the Commonwealth has been, or is suspected on reasonable grounds to have been, committed;
- (b) anything as to which there are reasonable grounds for believing that it will afford evidence as to the commission of any such offence; or
- (c) anything as to which there is reasonable ground for believing that it is intended to be used for the purpose of committing any such offence;

he may grant a search warrant authorizing any constable named therein, with such assistance as he thinks necessary, to enter at any time any house, vessel, or place named or described in the warrant, if necessary by force, and to seize any such thing which he may find in the house, vessel, or place.

The Bill before members provides that suspected persons may be searched without the issue of a warrant, and the amendment foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition to provide for the immediate search of a suspect is supported by all members on this side. Section 70 of the Crimes Act states:—

Any person who, being a Commonwealth officer, publishes or communicates any fact which comes to his knowledge by virtue of his office, and which it is his duty to keep secret, or any document which comes to his possession by virtue of his office, and which it is his duty to keep secret, except to some person to whom he is authorized to publish or communicate it, shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: imprisonment for two years.

Therefore a two-year penalty is provided with regard to breaches of an Act which applies throughout Australia. The Leader of the Opposition read a letter he had sent to the Premier and the reply he had received, and although I do not desire to reflect on the Premier's assurance, I am concerned with the

possible position in the event of a change in the personnel of the Government; for while I do not doubt that the Premier is sincere in his assurances, will future legislators feel themselves morally or otherwise bound by his assurances? I am inclined to doubt that they will.

It is proposed that vital areas will be fenced and protected by a 24-hour guard, but, although the vast area at Radium Hill could be neither fenced nor adequately guarded, it would come within the provisions of this Bill and any person found within those limits could be dealt with under it.

Mr. RICHES—From the mention of aeroplanes in the proposed new section 4d it appears that the Government had a fairly large area in mind.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, and if all workers on these establishments or on the field are to be covered the Bill is going too far. It should be easy to state precisely in the Bill just what is deemed to be a proclaimed area. If it is deemed to be a place where scientific data is kept then I believe every member will support all possible measures to ensure security. The honourable member for Flinders said that many competent people who are appointed to scientific projects are psychologically unsuited to the job. That is true. Some people have let their countries down, either intentionally or otherwise, because they were not suited to their jobs. They were easily enticed to divulge information that they would not have otherwise given. A proper check or screening of these people could not have been carried out. I recognize that any person suspected of an infringement of this legislation should be apprehended. Every member on this side of the House subscribes to that view and has no objection to provisions for this purpose. The policing of the legislation will be simple if the principal establishment is the only area proclaimed, but what will happen if the law is to apply outside that area? I take it that people similar to those who acted as security officers during the war will police the Act. During the last war there was no bigger nuisance than the air raid warden who became intoxicated with his authority. He would tell you to pull your blind down and, when you had complied with his instructions, he would come back and say there was a glimmer of light showing between the window frame and the blind. Later, he would tell you your parking lights had been left on. He wanted to make himself a nuisance because he was clothed with some little brief authority. Some people in

Government departments adopted a bureaucratic attitude during the war. In order to see a head of a department one sometimes had to tell the boy in the front office the whole of one's business. I hope the people appointed as security officers under this Bill will not be of this type, but men able to carry authority and not abuse it. Otherwise, they may take away the freedom of the people, which is a fundamental right.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that any court of summary jurisdiction dealing with an infringement of the legislation should be presided over by a magistrate. I am not reflecting on any justice of the peace now but, generally speaking, they are not competent to analyse evidence submitted in such cases. Further, they may inflict unfair penalties. A person I recommended for appointment as a justice heard a case recently. He ordered a middle-aged couple imprisonment for six weeks, which was the maximum penalty, but this was too severe. He said that if he had had the power he would have ordered a longer term. If a person came before him under this legislation he would probably pass sentence of death. We should see that only the right type of person presides over a court in any case heard under this legislation.

Almost every day we read in the press that uranium has been found in some other part of the world. It seems that in South Africa gold tailings dumps at The Rand will be retreated, and it was also suggested recently that the skimp dumps at Kalgoorlie would be examined. It seems, therefore, that uranium is a plentiful commodity, but that it is not of much value until processed. My colleagues and I do not oppose any reasonable legislation to protect the interests of the State, and do not oppose the passing of legislation for this purpose if it is in accordance with justice. I therefore ask that the amendments to be moved in Committee by the Leader of the Opposition will have sincere consideration.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Oath of Service and Secrecy."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move—

To insert "forthwith" before "search" second occurring in proposed new section 4i (1).

I realize that the provisions of clause 3 apply only to prohibited areas which would naturally be enclosed, and any person detained for search

would probably be there without a permit. A search would be warranted in such a case, but I do not agree with the clause as drafted because a person could be detained for some time, and this would amount to a form of imprisonment. This difficulty would be overcome by carrying my amendment.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have examined the amendment, and as it does not impair the Bill and as I feel it provides for the right procedure, I have no objection to it.

Amendment carried.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I now move to insert the following words after "be" in line three of proposed new section 4k (2):—

a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds or imprisonment for not more than six months: Provided that if it is proved that the act or omission constituting the offence was done or made for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or interests of the State or the Commonwealth the punishment shall be

As I indicated in my second reading speech, my Party has no objection to severe penalties on traitors or spies, but there is an inherent danger that innocent persons who have no subversive motives may be found guilty of some disclosure which would bring them within the ambit of the Bill and render them subject to the penalties provided. I consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman and he suggested that we might adopt an amendment on the lines of a provision contained in the British Official Secrets Act whereby a different scale of penalties is provided for the more innocent offences, as compared with those committed knowingly and with a desire to injure the State. I am aware that the clause provides maximum penalties, and the court can impose lower fines if it is satisfied that the offence is not a glaring one, but I suggest that my amendment is necessary to give a lead to the court.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the amendment, if the breach has been committed through carelessness or lack of thought, the court is to take that into account and treat the offender entirely differently from one who maliciously betrays his country. The fact that a similar provision has been included in the British Act shows it is a principle we can well accept. I therefore support the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. O'HALLORAN moved after "be" in line three of subsection (3) of the same section to add:—

a fine not exceeding two hundred pounds or imprisonment for not more than two years:

Provided that if it is proved that the act or omission constituting the offence was done or made for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or interests of the State or the Commonwealth the punishment shall be

Amendment carried.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move to insert the following subsection after subsection (3):—

(4) A court of summary jurisdiction hearing a complaint for an offence against this Act shall be constituted by a special magistrate.

In a previous clause we accepted the principle that on an affidavit of the Attorney-General the court must decide that certain witnesses should be heard in camera and that certain evidence should not be published. As I said in my speech on the second reading, I have no desire to reflect on justices of the peace,

who give excellent service in administering the law, particularly on minor offences and in the more sparsely populated districts. My amendment provides that a court of summary jurisdiction under this legislation shall be presided over by a magistrate, because I believe a magistrate would have a better appreciation of the information contained in an affidavit of the Attorney-General than would a bench comprising justices of the peace.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clause (4) and title passed. Bill reported with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 24, at 2 p.m.