LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, October 1, 1952.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION.

HOME WORK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—It has come to my knowledge, credibly or otherwise, through some of my medical friends, that some of the younger children in our State schools have had to be treated for neurotic disorders as the result of home work. Has the Minister of Education any information to give members?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—Under a departmental regulation no homework is prescribed for children below Grade IV.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—What is the average age of children in Grade IV.?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—I think it is between eight and nine years. Homework cannot affect the position as mentioned by the honourable member. Anybody who has seen the work done in the infant schools would realize that no strain is placed on the children. Any member who wants to see a happy congregation of children will find it in our infant classes. I have heard nothing whatsoever to the effect suggested by Mr. Anthoney, but I will make inquiries. I would be extremely surprised if there were any grounds for the suggestion mentioned by him.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Continued from September 30. Page 662.)

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

Committee's report adopted.

BUILDING OPERATIONS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 673.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—I shall not speak at any great length on the Bill, but will generally indicate my attitude towards it. I am pleased that the Government has been able to relax the position to some extent and am sure everybody appreciates that. I do not, however, subscribe to some of the opinions expressed that the time has arrived when we can abolish building control. It would impose great hardship in certain directions if we allowed a person to build any kind of structure at present. I have carefully considered the clauses which increase the size of houses which can be built, without permit, to 18 squares. I point out that 18 squares includes outbuildings normally erected with a house, such as a garage, laundry or toolshed. In fixing the area the previous Act did not include outbuildings so that actually the increase from 12½ squares to 18 is not as large as would appear on the surface, as outbuildings are now included. From inquiries I have made it is possible at present for practically anyone to get a permit to build a house of 14 squares and by increasing it to 18 squares—if we allow 250 square feet for outbuildings, which would not be excessive for a garage and laundry—we are only permitting an effective increase of 150 square feet.

During the last few days I have taken the opportunity to inspect half a dozen houses—some of them in respect of which prosecutions have been issued—which have been measured by the building inspectors so that I could judge for myself what is involved in an 18 square house, and without exception I found that most of them were slightly over 20 squares calculated in the manner prescribed under this Act. The time has arrived when we could allow people to build up to 20 squares inclusive of outbuildings, and in Committee I propose to submit an amendment to this effect. It should not cause any hardship, but would enable quite a number of people to build houses with which they were satisfied. During the last few years practically all the houses we have built have had to go without adequate verandah protection. In country areas particularly a verandah is most desirable, at least on the northern and western aspects which are subject to most of the sun and weather. In addition, the majority of our houses are built with the front door opening direct into a room to save the area involved in a hall, and this is most unsatisfactory from the point of view of living conditions.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Would you agree to the verandah area being exclusive of the living area?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am suggesting increasing the area to 20 squares, leaving to the owner's discretion the manner in which he uses it; one man may prefer a larger house with no outbuildings and another a smaller house with larger outbuildings. At present the verandah is calculated as half its area in square feet for the purposes of the Act and that would still be the same basis. Under the Bill controls in respect of burnt bricks, galvanized iron, and two other commodities still in short supply, will remain. This will ensure that people who have claims for priority will get it, but it will not affect the person who has limited means and desires only to build a smaller house. Other States have seen fit to go further and have for practical purposes abolished all building controls. I do not wish to go that far, but I feel that my amendment has not been drafted without fairly accurate and detailed consideration after the inspection of actual houses which have been built, and I hope that members will support me in this move.

My experience is that tradesmen are much more freely obtainable in country areas and that materials are certainly in much better supply than they were 12 months ago, so that in agreeing to this increase of two squares all that is required is a little more walling, flooring, ceiling, and roofing, and it does not involve duplication of bathroom or laundry fittings or additional plumbing, although it may slightly increase electrical installations. It will simply give people who desire them the opportunity to build slightly larger rooms. I have another amendment on the files to which I think there can be no objection, namely, that a person may carry out an addition to any dwellinghouse where the total area when it is completed, including all outbuildings, will not exceed 18 squares. The necessity for this is to get over the position of people who may have built houses of 12½ squares without a permit. This will enable them as well as those who had permits to go up to 18 squares, which I think is only fair. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 674.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This Bill deals principally with the payment of compensation to those who are prohibited from growing or planting, or removing fruit or vegetables from any land, by proclamation under the Act. I rang the Horticultural Department to ascertain what was meant exactly by this provision, which is contained in clause 3, and was informed that it is to enable compensation to be paid in the event of a further outbreak. I pay a tribute to the Minister of Agriculture, and Mr. Strickland and his officers, on the splendid job which has been done in preventing the spread of the dreaded fruit fly. The first outbreak occurred in 1947 and its eradication to date has cost £406,796 plus compensation £136,596, a total of £543,392, to which must be added any compensation which may be paid after the passing of this Bill. Since living in the metropolitan area I have taken particular notice of the work of those engaged by the department for spraying, picking and so forth, which has been so much criticized, but it must be remembered that in 1947 labour was very scarce and only casual workers were available. It is always noticeable that casual labour does not give the same efficiency as permanent labour, but by and large they did a splendid job. The public has co-operated splendidly and last year made 548 reports. Every report was investigated and the areas involved extended beyond Blackwood but there was no outbreak in those areas. I hope the legislation will remain so long as it is necessary. When one visits other States and sees the damage that has been caused by an infestation of fruit fly a greater appreciation is gained of the action which has been undertaken here to eradicate it. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—This Bill is becoming a hardy annual. Most members were hoping we had seen the last of it because it is two years since there was an infestation of fruit fly. This matter cannot be treated too lightly because it is costing taxpayers a great deal. So far about £500,000 has been expended and this Bill will add another £100,000. Most of the expenditure has been for labour and only a small fraction has been paid as compensation to growers.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It entails much labour to eradicate the fruit fly.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—Yes, and a number of people were engaged in removing good, bad and indifferent fruit and vegetables and no doubt much good produce was destroyed. Few flies have been discovered and

if one was to measure the cost to the taxpayer it would amount to a considerable sum for each fly. We must protect the public from an infestation of the fly because those who have seen its effect in other parts of the Commonwealth realize the destruction that can be wrought. I also pay a tribute to the cooperative work of the public in informing the department of the presence of any suspicious fly or larvae. It is pleasing that of all the reports made by the public only a few have proved positive. In order to provide compensation for the people who have suffered loss we must pass this Bill and I support the measure hoping that it will not have to be introduced again.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

Committee's report adopted.

CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 676.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—I listened with considerable interest to Mr. Cudmore's most interesting speech last week. While I have not had the privilege of reading the report of that distinguished jurist, Lord Wright, I have read extracts, but it would seem that in spite of the excellent qualities of the recommendations not one has been put into operation in England, and one wonders why.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—The war prevented it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—That is probably so. One must remember that England is a conservative country and no doubt her legal profession is more conservative than ours and would not enter upon any drastic alteration of the legal system without considerable thought. It is to the credit of the Government and the City Coroner that they should recommend these important alterations. The main alteration concerns the abolition of the criminal jurisdiction of a coroner and takes away his right to commit a person for trial. One wonders how many innocent people may have been committed in the past under the old system but whatever has been done will not be perpetuated in future because the Bill will completely overcome that. The Bill will assist other people in regard to the presentation of evidence in as much as it may now be made by affidavit and can be sent by letter. Short cuts are being made in order to facilitate the coroner's work. There is nothing to condemn the Bill, but everything to commend it, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—I express to members who have spoken on the Bill my very sincere thanks, realizing the tremendous amount of work which they have put into their speeches, particularly Mr. Cudmore and Mr. Rowe. They were not made without an immense amount of research. This matter concerns the legal profession perhaps more than anybody. I do not think an examination of the Act will leave members without any doubt that the suggestions contained in the Bill are worthy of being put into practice. Some of the provisions are an innovation, but they are based on very good foundations set out in the report of Lord Wright's committee. I think that the reasoning behind it appeals to everybody who cares to study the position. I propose, when the Bill goes into Committee, to report progress so that over the week-end I will have an opportunity of examining in detail the suggestions made by various speakers.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 669.)

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—Almost every session we have a Bill dealing with the Renmark Irrigation Trust and invariably Parliament has willingly acceded to the trust's requests. The trust is a body elected by the people directly concerned and therefore it can be taken that the management represents as well as any body possibly could the wishes of those it governs. The trust comprises seven members. Basically, eligibility for a seat on it is that an elector must be 21 years of age and owner, in his own right, of 10 acres. The words "in his own right" was a wise amendment to the Act a few years ago and supports what I have just said—that those responsible for the election of the seven members on the board of management are primarily concerned in the trust's affairs. That verifies my opinion that these people know what they want and also their own business. Parliament will find great difficulty in declining their requests.

The Bill deals with the rate that the board can levy on land under its control. At present the maximum amount which can be

levied must not exceed £2 an acre; it is now proposed to increase it to £4. It is not for us to say whether this is just or sufficient and it strongly fortifies me in my view that these people, by their franchise, are peculiarly fitted to manage their own affairs. When speaking on a measure in 1950, I referred to the river settlers as being a particularly brilliant and valuable jewel in the Crown of the State. I see no reason to qualify that opinion. Visitors to the irrigation areas note the tremendous pride of settlers in their settlements. They see there not only a brilliant green in the settlements and an air of prosperity but evidence of extreme civic pride. It is a sad thing that these wonderful areas are separated from the closely populated parts of the State by a sort of "No man's land." This area raises the difficult question of transport and I hope for the settlers' sake that this problem will be solved in the near future. It is accentuated by the divergent wishes of people who live on the north of the river and those on the south.

The PRESIDENT—I cannot allow the honourable member to discuss the question of transport.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—The Bill has my blessing and I am sure my colleagues endorse what I have said.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 670.)

The Hon. F. T. PERRY (Central No. 2)—This is a short Bill seeking to amend the Act governing the Gas Company, which was founded in 1861 and has continued to supply gas, coke and other services for lighting and heating and industrial power to South Australia ever since. As far as I know, except in minor cases where the fault has not been attributable to the company, but rather to its supplies, it has fulfilled its functions under the Act. Through the years changes in financial conditions have somewhat altered its position as regards finance. In 1924 Parliament limited the interest rate on the company's shares to 8 per cent. In 1950 Parliament again considered the matter and lowered the rate to 5 per cent, giving the right to the company, with the Treasurer's approval, to raise it to a maximum of 6 per cent.

No matter from what angle we look at the Gas Company it appears that Parliament has provided all the safeguards that are necessary and desirable for supplying a community service, controlled by private interests, which savours somewhat of a monopolistic character.

I am somewhat afraid that Parliament, in its wisdom, has perhaps unduly limited the rate of interest which can be paid to ordinary shareholders of the Gas Company. As the value of money declines it necessarily follows that if a share is to maintain its value it must earn a rate of interest comparable with rates paid on shares of other companies of like character. The company in its wisdom desires to issue more bonds. From an examination of its balance-sheets it appears that in the past bonds were obtainable bearing an interest rate of 4 per cent. I presume that when the original Act was passed this restriction was placed on the company so that it could not issue a greater number of £1 bonds than was equal to £1 shares which the company had issued. That stage has now been reached. The company has a capital value in £ shares of £1,950,000 and it has issued bonds to an almost like amount—on its last balance-sheet £1,863,679—and further bonds cannot be issued without an alteration of the Act. The Government has approved of the company's policy and this Bill is the outcome and I see no reason why it should not be supported. Generally, the control of companies and their profits by Parliament is not desirable except in the case of a monopoly—

The Hon. E. Anthoney—This is not entirely a monopoly, is it?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—It is as far as gas is concerned, and in 1861 it was a complete monopoly, for electricity was not in existence in South Australia then. I do not know whether it was the desire of the framers of the original Act that the bondholders should not take any risk, but it is a common practice for companies to have a provision of a like nature. Therefore, I think we might easily relieve the Gas Coy of the restriction in the Act on its capital issue. I cannot see that the Bill will inflict hardship on anyone and I think that the character of the company's executive is so wellknown and so well thought of that no harm can be done. The bondholders will be able to look after themselves more easily than the shareholders and the security of the bonds will be reflected in the manner in which any further issue is received by the public.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—They will be offered to the public?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I understand that that is required by the Act. I support the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 671.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—I support the second reading and do not propose to occupy much time in dealing with the major question, namely, the appointment of another permanent judge. The figures quoted by the Attorney-General are unanswerable and I know from my own knowledge that the work of the Supreme Court is being held up to such an extent as to be rather dangerous to the proper administration of justice.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—An extra judge would not be sufficient, really.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—At least it is a proper step. I remind members that things got difficult over a period of years by reason of the fact that whenever any other State wanted a judge to conduct an inquiry or a Royal Commission they seemed to look to South Australia to provide one and consequently we have had an acting judge for years. It is therefore time we had another judge. The second part of the Bill provides that when a judge is unable to preside at assizes in the country his place may be taken by any practitioner who has had seven years practice. I would like the Government to consider whether, instead of a practitioner of seven years experience who may never have had to sit in a judicial capacity, it should be restricted to a special or honorary magistrate.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Honorary special magistrates of course would be eligible.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Why not confine it to magistrates or special magistrates, because they are experienced people who do take cases when necessary? It seems that in this Bill we are ignoring magistrates, who are the next step down after the judges in the administration of our legal system.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—They have their own duties to perform.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Quite so, but it seems to me that the first substitute for a judge of the Supreme Court should be a magistrate and, if he is not available, then one of the honorary magistrates, and I hope this will be seriously considered by the Government. My next point is, I think, really important. A Bill now before us deals with the salaries of the Public Service Commissioner, the Auditor-General and the Commissioner of Police. It was pointed out by the Chief Secretary that a report had been received from Mr. President Morgan on the question of these salaries which are fixed by Act of Parliament and are not automatically increased like other salaries. Increases in the last five years have been phenomenal and it is those years which have been so serious for the unfortunate people whose salaries are fixed by Act of Parliament and are therefore permanent. If it is right that Parliament should consider only the salaries of these higher public servants surely it is right that we should consider our top civil servants—the judges of the Supreme Court.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Are not judges in a totally different category from the public servants you mentioned?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—The judges' salaries were fixed last in 1947. In 1944 Parliament decided that judges, subject to a contribution, should receive on their retirement, pensions equalling half their salaries. In 1947 we increased their salaries but pegged their pensions and did not allow them to get half of the increased salary as pension. Every fair-minded person will realize the extraordinary difference in the cost of living allowances which everybody else in the community has received in the last five years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Members of Parliament are in the same category.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Members increased their own salaries less than five years ago. We have done it for other people and for ourselves and we will be doing much less than justice for the judges of the Supreme Court, for whom I have tremendous admiration, if we do not do something for them, and accordingly I ask the Government to consider this matter before the Bill is passed.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY (Central No. 2)—I have always regarded the Supreme Court judges as a body unto themselves and I support Mr. Cudmore's suggestion that only a magistrate or honorary magistrate should be eligible to act as a substitute for a judge, for I do not like the idea of anyone of an inferior rank being allowed to deputize. Litigants before the court would be very upset if their case were tried by a solicitor of only seven years standing.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—They might be highly delighted.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—That may be so. I gather from what Mr. Cudmore has said that this is something which has not been the custom previously. If that is so the matter should be examined and in the interest of litigants—

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—It applies only to the criminal jurisdiction.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Then I withdraw some of my remarks because a criminal is probably not as particular about his case as a litigant in a civil case who would prefer it to be dealt with by a judge. Apart from that I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—As has already been said, this Bill really requires no special or particular argument. One does not often get an opportunity of speaking on such a subject but I was particularly struck by the remarks of the Attorney-General reminding us that our democratic system can function only under the rule of the reign of law, and so far as the legal system is interwoven with the laws of our being so it is of paramount importance to us as law-makers. The figures quoted by the Attorney-General showed that in a few years litigation has expanded greatly and in consequence, although strenuous efforts have been made to keep the work up-to-date there is a consciousness of the great pressure which is making it extremely difficult, it has been recommended that another judge should be appointed. That alone should be sufficient argument to ensure the speedy passing of the Bill. An examination of our population figures reveals that there must be a pressure on the Supreme Court and consequently I support the proposal to appoint another judge. The point raised by Mr. Cudmore is one which probably makes a greater appeal to the legal mind than to the non-legal mind. The status of the whole machine might be impaired if the greatest care was not exercized, but I am sure it would invariably be most carefully considered and the system adequately protected. I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I endorse the major portion of Mr. Cudmore's remarks. I have always said that there are three ingredients which make up our democracy—citizenship, Parliament and the judiciary. It all reverts to our citizens who elect Parliament and the Government of the day which elects the judges to administer the laws passed by Parliament. I thoroughly agree with Mr. Cudmore that our judges have always been held in high esteem because it is true that not only the Commonwealth Government but other State Governments have requested their services in carrying out important investigations and Royal Commissions. That indicates the respect in which they are held and their characteristic high standard and integrity. The judges are overworked and it is futile to expect the work of our courts to be expeditiously carried out unless there is an increased personnel. Mr. Cudmore's question as to who should succeed to the judiciary, whether a stipendary or honorary magistrate, is a matter for the Government. The Bill does not provide for it, but seeks the creation of a new judgeship for the purpose of relieving the pressure of work which is cluttering up the courts. It is only fitting and proper that Parliament should increase the number of judges and I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC OFFICERS' SALARIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 672.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—This Bill is for the purpose of providing for increases in the salaries of certain public officers and other purposes, the other purposes being to make good to those officers the automatic living wage increases which they have foregone for the last 12 months. The Bill refers to the Auditor-General, the Commissioner of Police and the Public Service Commissioner. The Auditor-General was originally dealt with under a Statute but since then he has become a public servant and the Public Service has dealt with any increase to his salary. It was a good practice and I think it was a mistake that his and the salaries of the other two officers should be dealt with by Parliament. It was done on the suggestion of Mr. President Morgan, no doubt because they were officers appointed by Parliament and therefore Parliament should deal with their salaries. On speaking to a similar Bill I voiced the opinion that it would have been better when fixing these salaries to make the automatic increases apply as it would save a lot of time. We will have to deal with this matter again next year because of the probable cost of living increase next quarter. The officers have suffered a loss, together with other people not mentioned in the Bill, which can be defined at £150 plus the automatic increases and the Bill will remedy the position. I support the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

URANIUM MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 678.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—This is the most far-reaching measure which has been introduced to Parliament for some time. I cannot remember any legislation in South Australia having greater ramifications. Its wide provisions cut right across the fundamental principles of freedom and democracy which the trade union movements of Australia have considered vital to maintain. The first knowledge members had of this Bill was when the press published certain provisions which at that time were unknown to members and before they had any opportunity of seeing the Bill. Apparently the press knew its contents and openly criticized it hoping some members would follow their lead. The press set themselves up as the champions of freedom and democracy although no doubt they desired that an agitation be commenced for Radium Hill and the processing of uranium to be controlled by private enterprise. Members should have an opportunity of examining any Bill, particularly of this nature, before it is made public. It is not the fault of members of this House, but of somebody who disclosed the contents of the Bill. Its provisions were set out in the press word perfect. Whoever was responsible for this action is to be condemned as Parliament is in a far better position to deal with these things than the press. We must bear in mind the importance of uranium in world development today. It has a huge peace-time potential and a greater war-time value. This Parliament has authorized the spending of millions of pounds for the development of uranium mining which, with recent scientific advances, should be retained as a State instrumentality. South Australia does not possess the scientific knowledge to fully process uranium and was forced to bargain for the necessary information, apparently from America.

Some time ago the Premier visited the United States, following which certain information was made available and statements made by people in authority to the effect that America would make capital available for uranium mining in South Australia. It appears that American dollars are to be used for the purpose. The Bill has been introduced at the dictation of a country which would hesitate to introduce a similar measure into its own Parliament. I am forced to ask how it is possible for private enterprise to even remotely safeguard the secrets which we are told are so essential; in fact, it would be impossible for it to do so. Can the South Australian Government adequately safeguard the secrets connected with uranium mining development? The suggestion that has been made from time to time about private enterprise being in a position to control the mining and processing of uranium falls to the ground. An easy way out would have been to hand over Radium Hill to the Commonwealth Government in which case Commonwealth legislation, which is more severe in many respects than that contained in this Bill, would prevail.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Wouldn't the Federal Government encourage private enterprise to develop Radium Hill in the same way as Rum Jungle?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The present Federal Government is encouraging private enterprise all along the line. Although it is doing so under what is termed "management" it has full security powers and control. We have yet to learn what will flow from this so-called "management". The Government decided to place this legislation on the Statute Book in order that control will be retained by the State. The Bill has not a general application as it applies only to the mining and treatment of uranium ore. The essential new sections appear to be numbers 4a, 4d, 4e, 4f and 4i. I am not greatly concerned with the provisions of section 4a which set out that any person who refuses to take an oath may have his services terminated. It does not say that every employee must take the oath and I fail to see what is to be gained by all employees on the field having to take an oath or affirmation of "faithful service and secrecy." It would be easy for any person with ulterior motives to take such an oath if, by so doing, he could gain secret information and pass it on to a foreign power. Some persons would have no compunction in taking the oath set out in the Bill. They would not be pricked by their conscience by taking such an oath.

New section 4d provides that no person shall enter, be in, or fly over a prohibited area unless he is the holder of a permit. What are the intentions of the Bill if the whole of the Radium Hill area is proclaimed a prohibited area? It is a large tract of land and it is possible that an innocent person, unaware that he was within the boundaries of the area, could be apprehended and subjected to prosecution, embarrassment and inconvenience. Is it the intention that every area is to be proclaimed, fenced and guarded for 24 hours a day? If so, the Bill should say so.

New section 4e states that no person shall, except with the Minister's permission, make or have in his possession a record of anything in a prohibited area or of any operations carried out there. It is a far-reaching provision, as it includes photographs. During the recent Parliamentary visit to Radium Hill I had a camera in my possession and took photographs of the Radium Hill undertaking. I hold in my hand a photograph of a small treatment plant and dams in course of construction, also of diamond drills in operation, men's quarters and practically everything used in conjunction with Radium Hill operations. These photographs are a most interesting record of the progress being made at one of our main radium discoveries. When the Bill becomes law it will be illegal for me to have the photographs in my possession. I am sure members will agree that there was no ulterior motive, so far as I am concerned, in taking them and having them in my possesion. I may not be the only person who has photographs of the undertaking.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Were you allowed to take them because you were a member of a Parliamentary party?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Nobody objected and I took them quite openly. If the Bill becomes law my action will be illegal.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Is this retrospective legislation?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Bill provides for "records." Any person, not having a permit, with these "records" in his possession commits an offence and can be prosecuted.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—You could get the Minister's permission.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Bill should state definitely what is meant. It is proposed to construct a treatment plant for the ore at Port Pirie. It will be necessary to bring the ore from the mine to Port Pirie by what is termed an "ore-carrying train." What will be the position of any person who takes a photograph of a train carrying this ore? If he has the photographs in his possession after this Bill is passed he will be contravening the Act and this point should have been better clarified before the Bill came before Parliament. This clause also could have a far-reaching effect upon workmen who may quite innocently pass a remark to a friend about the mine in the hearing of an authorized officer. For example, it would be quite easy for him, perhaps outside a proclamed area, say in conversation with a friend in a hotel bar to say, "We had a good day today and mined so many tons of very rich ore," and he would find himself in hot water.

Section 4f provides that a person shall not carry or have in his possession or use a camera without permission whilst in a prohibited area. I see nothing wrong with this provided the prohibited areas are made clearly known. Section 4g provides against damage or interference with property, machinery or plant and is necessary because anyone who does so should suffer the consequences. Therefore I do not object to it. Sections 4i, 4j and 4k are far-reaching. The trades union movement has always opposed sections 30j and 30k of the Crimes Act, and the provisions I have referred to are just as revolting to unionists; and if it is intended to cover all workers on uranium projects the Bill goes too far. On the other hand, if that is not the case the Bill should clearly define what is meant. The Trades and Labor Council has already discussed and rejected these provisions. Their publication in the press before Parliament had the opportunity to discuss them created a fear in the trades union movement. It was felt that there was absolutely no necessity at present for any legislation of such a far-reaching nature. However, when we had an opportunity to examine the Bill we were able to answer many of the queries raised in the Labor movement. Amendments were moved by the Opposition in the other place which were accepted by the Government and are now incorporated in the Bill, and although they do not wholly remove our objections they do to some extent rectify anomalies.

I have no brief for traitors or spies, who deserve the severest penalties when they are caught; only one penalty should be meted out to them. We read from time to time reports of what has transpired in other countries and it would be safe to say that all countries have their own traitors and it is recognized that a person caught in the act of spying must suffer the consequences. One of our own people may be tempted by the agents of another country to spy on its behalf, but that is no excuse and he deserves the severest penalty; I would say that the penalty in the Bill is not severe enough in such circumstances, but are we not creating a danger to innocent people by the phraseology of this measure? However, in view of the amendments made in another place I have no alternative but to support the second reading.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 7, at 2 p.m.