

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 7, 1952.

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

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated by message his assent to the Land Settlement Act Amendment, Minister of Agriculture Incorporation and Stamp Duties Act Amendments Acts.

QUESTIONS.**PRICE OF CORNSACKS.**

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Recently it was announced in the press that the price of cornsacks for the coming season would be 70s. 6d. a dozen, and this has been confirmed by sales accounts. As freight has been increased also it will mean that cornsacks will be dearer this season than last. All reports coming to hand indicate a falling market in jute. I have a list of prices obtained from Hoare, Miller & Coy. Ltd., traders in jute, showing prices since December, 1951. At that date they were quoted at 55s. 11½d. a dozen English currency, which is 70s. a dozen c.i.f. Australia, and prices have since progressively fallen to 34s. 8d. as at August 27, 1952, showing an average through the year of approximately 46s. a dozen, compared with 70s. 6d. quoted to the farmer today. I do not suggest that the Wheat Board is charging more for cornsacks than the average price it pays, but I do suggest that it shows at least a very bad purchase.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Bad judgment.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Yes. The truth is that the Wheat Board goes into the Indian market for cornsacks and the sellers put up their prices until Australian requirements are supplied and then, as the figures indicate, the price progressively came down to the very low figure of 34s. 8d. a dozen. As this has a bearing not only on the cost to the farmer, but to the consumer in the price of bread, I give notice that I will ask the Chief Secretary on Tuesday next if he is aware—

(1) That the price charged for cornsacks has progressively dropped from 70s. to 34s. 8d. per dozen c.i.f., or cost landed in Australia over the past year?

(2) Is it the intention of the Government to approach the Australian Wheat Board regarding the price being charged for cornsacks for the coming harvest, namely, 70s. 6d. a dozen?

STATE LOAN ALLOCATIONS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice)—

1. What action does the Government propose taking at the next Loan Council meeting for the purpose of securing loan money to carry out public works?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to support action of other States to secure better treatment under the Financial Agreement?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The replies are:—

1. The Treasurer will press at any future meetings of the Loan Council, for adequate loan money for this State. He points out, however, that the amount of loan money available for the purposes of the Loan Council is in the hands of the public, as the moneys available for allocation among the States by the Loan Council are moneys which the agreement provides shall be borrowed by the Commonwealth by means of public loans. Last year the Commonwealth Government guaranteed from its revenues the amount of money made available to the States for their loan programmes. This year the Commonwealth, from its resources, has undertaken to invest not less than £125,000,000 in the public loans raised during the year, and is advancing to the States monthly amounts on the basis of public loans being raised to the extent of £180,000,000.

2. As the Loan Council comprises six Premiers and a representative from the Federal Government, it should be obvious that the States obtain the highest allocation possible through the Loan Council. The support given to the State programmes in the last two years by the Commonwealth Government has been voluntary as there is no legal obligation on the part of the Commonwealth to give this support. The State programmes under the agreement are dependent upon the moneys that can be raised from the loan market.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

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

Returned from the House of Assembly with an amendment (new clause 4).

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General) moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

BUILDING OPERATIONS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 700.)

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—This Bill is the latest attempt to deal with the method of control of the building industry and seems to be an endeavour to adjust the systems of control which have been in operation for some time. Circumstances have changed and so, perhaps, has the public's attitude on this question. We have heard various views expressed, some approving continued control, some disapproving of it and others, whilst regretting it, acknowledging the necessity for it. I do not deny that during the war and in the immediate post-war period there was a necessity for control and we would not have been justified in having no control over essential materials, but one does not want to visualize another example of the classic instance of the packing case and pencil developing steadily but surely into a permanent department. The sooner we can shake off control the better. I hope no one in the Building Materials Office will believe I am referring to it literally as a packing case and pencil. It was said during the war that one could start a department in the twinkling of an eye and before one realized what was happening it grew to be a vast incubus. One knows how much easier it is to start things than to stop them, particularly when it comes to departments employing a number of people. I would take the earliest opportunity, when circumstances were suitable and appropriate, of getting rid of one of these departments. Now that the days of shortages have passed and violent inflation has been checked it is probably an appropriate time to do so. At present there is little shortage of building materials, in fact, there is almost a glut of first class imported materials, although perhaps locally produced articles and imported and local cement are in short supply. I remind members that all the great houses of

South Australia were built without cement. The old pastoral homesteads and the big homes on the outer fringes of Adelaide have little cement in them. In my lifetime I can remember building operations where it was considered luxury to use cement other than as a bathroom floor. Those homes were built with stone, lime and sand and I think that if controls were lifted and people were thrown back upon their own responsibility in securing materials and building their homes as best as they could manage, we would see a healthy return to the use of those local materials. South Australia is fortunate in having building stone from literally one end of it to the other, as there is hardly any part where building stone of fair quality is not available. We have a great advantage over other States which seem to have to be content with building houses of wood. If all controls were relaxed and people were allowed to buy imported materials freely houses would be more costly but surely that is a matter for the people themselves. If they are forced to pay a little more than normal for imported materials it is up to them to economize by using local materials. I hate to see controls being carried on one day more than necessary and I believe today is an appropriate time for their elimination.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Would you free all commercial building?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I would free the whole thing. A year or two ago everybody was bursting with wealth, but the taxation by the various Governments reduced their enthusiasm for spending regardless, therefore that position has been flattened out a good deal. I am confident that if the market were thrown wide open and building restrictions completely lifted we would soon find a proper adjustment in demand and supply. The fact that people have to consider their pockets seriously makes the position vastly different from what it was a year or two ago when the sky was the limit. I hope that the control of building materials will be completely removed at the earliest date and I doubt if I could really support the Bill except with a sort of lip service. I prefer to see controls lifted altogether.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Southern)—I join wholeheartedly with Mr. Cudmore in his firm objection to this measure. The idea of re-enacting it is totally wrong and, moreover, its retraction *in toto* is long overdue. Materials today are so readily available that I blush to listen to any alternative suggestion.

Sponsors of the Bill may say it will mean black market prices, but do members realize that many firms in this State are offering imported materials, which they bought at a considerable price, at a competitive level with local materials? If the legislation is to be re-enacted members should look at the problems it must produce. I believe that a Bill is to be introduced into the House of Assembly to amend the Licensing Act. Members must realize that this is wrapped up with building and the controls over building which, I believe, were soundly conceived at one time as regards licensed premises. That Bill will mean that certain restrictions will have to be removed, as regards licensed premises, if it is to be worth anything at all in the legislation of this State.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Isn't this Bill to assist you in what you are talking about?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I fail to read that into the Chief Secretary's suggestion. I think I will be able to convince members that he is not so substantially sound in his argument as to warrant a continuance of the Act. We have already seen it re-enacted for a considerable number of years after the time when an emergency might be said to have existed. As Liberal Party members, apart altogether from being members of this Chamber, we should congratulate the Federal Government upon its attitude, publicized in the last day or two, that controls must go as soon as practicable. I want to see the South Australian Government remove controls as fast as it can, regardless of any other consideration. We are also asked to support a clause to control cement for two months; that is a most unusual provision.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Don't you want to get rid of controls as soon as possible?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I do. Fancy a suggestion that cement needs controlling for only January and February, 1953, when any quantity of cement of all types can be bought in my district. It is ridiculous to suggest that we need a Bill to control cement for two months.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Isn't it coming from Victoria?

The N. L. JUDE—It might be, but my answer is that it is available. Does the honourable member want cheaper cement for the people or does he want control?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I want equal distribution of a necessary material.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Then come into my district, and the honourable member can buy all the cement he wants.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—From Victoria?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I do not care where it comes from, the position is that it is available on the local market.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—This Bill deals with locally manufactured cement.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—It deals with cement manufactured in Australia. Moreover, it goes further, and is rather extraordinary in its attitude as regards the control of building materials, as it makes no reference to the control of prices. Apparently the price for building a house does not matter and the sky is the limit. A person could, by exaggerating, build a £2,000 bathroom, but that does not seem to matter, provided the stipulated area was not exceeded. I can only suggest that the Government has realized that this control is getting out of hand and therefore it has released the control on prices and wants to hang on to the control of materials. The legislation is unwarranted and I shall oppose it.

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

CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 1. Page 701.)

Clauses 3 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Depositions."

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—This is one of the clauses referred to in second reading speeches. The crux of the matter is how far we should agree to allow any coroner to direct that evidence should not be taken down in writing. It is very difficult to say how far evidence before a coroner may not be wanted for further reference, and if we allowed the present provision to stand it would mean that a coroner would have power to direct that evidence be not taken down, but I think that would be a mistake. Consequently, I move—

In new subsection (3) to delete "be not put in writing, or that it" and at the end of the subsection to add "Any evidence so taken down in shorthand shall be retained with the records of the inquest."

The effect of the amendment is that it will be within the power of the coroner to direct that, instead of evidence being taken down,

in writing, it may be taken down in shorthand so that it will always be available to anyone interested in the proceedings.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—All evidence?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—No, only that which he directs.

The Hon. K. E. Bardolph—In transcript or only in shorthand?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—If it is not taken down in transcript, which it usually will be, the coroner may direct that, say, formal evidence shall be taken down in shorthand and retained.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Will that shorthand record be signed by the coroner as an official document?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—Yes. It will be part of the official proceedings.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to move this amendment. It is not quite the suggestion I made in my second reading speech, which was that we should do away with the record of proceedings only when it was directed either by the City Coroner or his deputy. In other words, that there should always be a record in respect of country inquests. This amendment provides that there will always be a record, but it may be only a record in shorthand, which I think meets the position better than my suggestion. I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Criminal Law Consolidation Act."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I understand that another place has before it a Bill to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and I ask the Attorney-General whether he does not think that it would be better to put this amendment in the principal Act, which seems to be the proper place for it.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—The difficulty is that we do not know what will be fate of that Bill. I would, however like to refer to the question more generally because it was raised by both Mr. Cudmore and Mr. Rowe. I have had a report prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman, which I think should be of interest to members, as follows:—

Mr. Rowe does not like the idea of amending the Criminal Law Consolidation Act by a clause in the Coroners Bill. He points out that a solicitor may be asked to advise on a provision of the Criminal Law Consolidation

Act and would never in his wildest dreams think of looking in the Coroners Act to see whether the Criminal Law Consolidation Act had been amended. I quite agree with Mr. Rowe that most solicitors would not think of this. But that is not the end of the matter. No solicitor ought to advise on any section of any Act without finding out whether it has been amended or repealed; and if a solicitor's statutes are not noted up with all the alterations, he can and ought to look at the table which is placed at the end of each annual volume indicating all the amendments made to each section of each Act. There is no laziness or indifference involved in amending the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in this way. When amendments of two Acts are closely linked up with the same scheme of reform and it is desirable that all the amendments should go through Parliament together it is not unusual to include them in one Bill.

The point I want to emphasize is that no solicitor ought to advise on any subject without having his statutes noted up. Admittedly, this is a tremendous task and if it cannot be kept up to date he may refer to the latest annual volume, at the end of which will always be found a list of all statutes that have been amended. It would be dangerous to leave out a consequential amendment here simply in the expectation of the passing of another Bill, which may not eventuate.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment and Committee's report adopted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 703.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the Bill as it affords the Opposition an opportunity to state its viewpoint regarding the South Australian Gas Company. It will be readily agreed that this is one of the few companies that recognizes that the workers are an integral part of industry. The employees in the gas industry have played a most prominent part in its development and there is now a very amicable feeling between the Gas Employees' Union and the company, which has been further extended since the advent of the present secretary of the Gas Employees' Union, Mr. Keane. This is a hybrid Bill and has been recommended by a Select Committee. It extends the present Act to permit the company to go on the market with regard to bonds. The Act prevents the issue of bonds unless on an equal basis with

the paid-up capital of the company. I understand that the paid-up capital has almost been exceeded by the issue of bonds and it is essential that this Bill be passed in order that the company's activities may conform to the Act. The company was established in 1861 and for a number of years had a virtual monopoly, but with the advent of electric power and energy competition came and the company requires additional money for the purpose of expanding its activities. I support the Bill.

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

Committee's report adopted.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 704.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—The time has come when we should appoint another Judge to the Supreme Court Bench. The full facts have been covered in the Minister's second reading speech and subsequent speeches but it is almost 26 years since the fifth Judge was appointed in 1927. During that period our population has increased from 551,000 to 723,000, an increase of 29 per cent, civil cases from 380 to 758 in 1951, divorces from 97 to 637 and criminal cases from 272 to 372, so it is obvious something must be done. This request comes from the Chief Justice, supported by his brother Judges on the Supreme Court Bench. We all realize the necessity of having justice executed as expeditiously as possible and an additional appointment will help towards that end.

On a previous occasion I mentioned the question of accommodation at the Supreme Court. At present there are only five sets of Judges' chambers and the conference room is sometimes used as an additional court room. Recently the Chief Justice had to sit in that conference room. The congestion will obviously be increased by the appointment of a sixth Judge and the Government will have to consider making arrangements for additions to the Supreme Court building. Certain alterations are being made to relieve the position but they will not overcome the major difficulty of not having sufficient room for the necessary officers. At present there is a Master and a Deputy Master, but those familiar with the business of the court know that in fairness to them another deputy should be appointed, but there is no reasonable accommodation for him. The Supreme Court library—which is an excellent library and serves its

purpose well—is housed in a number of different rooms and it is not easy to find one's way around. We are reaching a stage when we might expect something to be done about increasing accommodation in our public buildings and the Supreme Court should have a high priority. As members we feel we need surroundings commensurate with our functions. That applies equally to Judges of the Supreme Court and it is our responsibility to see that they have adequate and appropriate accommodation.

Mr. Cudmore referred to clause 4 which deals with the appointment of a practitioner of seven years or more standing in the case where the person appointed to conduct a circuit session is not able to do so. The Act provides that the Governor may appoint either a Judge of the Supreme Court or a practitioner of seven years or more standing, but clause 4 takes it further and provides that if the person appointed is not able to perform those duties another proclamation may be made and either a Judge or a practitioner appointed in his place. Mr. Cudmore's criticism was that in agreeing to this amendment we might be allowing the appointment of someone who, although having practised for more than seven years, would not be particularly qualified. I feel that as the appointment is to be made by the Governor a proper selection would be made and no practitioner, except one who had high qualifications and was capable of undertaking the duties, would be appointed. As the Act stands there is power for such a practitioner to be appointed and I do not think Mr. Cudmore's objection is one we need seriously press. Circuit sessions are only held at Mount Gambier and Port Augusta and are limited to criminal cases. It may be that in future civil cases may be determined but it will be some time before that happens. This is an emergency measure and as there are safeguards in the Bill I support it.

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

Committee's report adopted.

PUBLIC OFFICERS' SALARIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 704.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—In his second reading speech the Chief Secretary quoted from a report made by Mr. President Morgan who said:—

My recommendation as to the salaries which should be fixed by Parliament is that they

should be fixed by Parliament at definite sums without provision for any automatic adjustment system. If necessary, owing to a substantial change in the cost of living, they must be reviewed by Parliament itself—there seems to be no wise alternative. It might be necessary for this review for some years to be annual.

The officials whose salaries are affected by this Bill are the Auditor-General, the Public Service Commissioner, and the Police Commissioner. During the period they have occupied their positions these gentlemen have carried out their work with ability and integrity equal to that of their predecessors. In reviewing the positions with those in other States it will be seen that the Auditor-General in Queensland receives £2,300 per annum, New South Wales £2,700, Victoria £2,100 and South Australia £2,300. All these salaries are fixed by statute. The recommendation made by former President Morgan and the Government suggests that the cost of living adjustments shall be made retrospective. I do not desire, nor does any member of the Opposition, to prevent any person, whether on a salary or wages fixed under an arbitration award, from receiving his full and just dues, but it is anomalous that the President of the Industrial Court should recommend that the Government should make retrospective payments when it is a well known axiom, in both State and Federal Arbitration Courts, that when employees apply for an award it is not made retrospective. The Chief Secretary went on:—

Of this sum of £198 approximately £50 is attributable to increases which the officers failed to receive last financial year.

I am not objecting to these officers receiving it, but if it is to apply in one direction it should apply equally in other directions where wages and salaries are concerned.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Do you say that wages have not been made retrospective to employees?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. Employees are always one quarter behind, in money values, when the basic wage adjustment is announced.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—They are cost of living adjustments.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, and this is a cost of living adjustment, too. The cost of living and Arbitration Courts awards are co-related as regards the fixation of wages. I compliment the officers mentioned on the work they are doing. It is recognized in official language that civil servants are servants of the Crown and are in a totally different category

from members of Parliament or the judiciary. Civil servants carry out the process of Government. When a change takes place, irrespective of the political colour of the Government, civil servants continue and because of their permanency become Government advisers. They receive no fee or reward other than the emolument fixed by Statute. Civil servants, generally, are a great body of people. I always have held the view that if a Government or an employer is to get the best from his employees, a wage must be paid commensurate with the position.

The £2,300 salary paid to the Auditor-General in South Australia levels up the position with Auditors-General in other States. In Victoria the Auditor-General receives £2,100. The Queensland Public Service Commissioner is paid £2,300, likewise our own Public Service Commissioner. Both salaries are fixed by Statute, but in New South Wales there is a board of three, the chairman receiving £3,500 by Statute. In Victoria there is also a board of three, the chairman receiving £2,500. No provision is made whereby the Auditor-General or the Public Service Commissioner get the benefits of any cost of living increase; that should be done. In Queensland the Police Commissioner receives £1,750, plus cost of living adjustments. He is also appointed by Statute, but the law provides for quarterly wage adjustments or cost of living increases, irrespective of the £1,750, which remains at a static yearly sum. The New South Wales Police Commissioner receives £2,510, which is fixed by Statute, and our Commissioner £2,050, plus a uniform allowance of £30 a year. All these officers do laudable work on behalf of the Government and the people and the Government should seriously consider the question of fixing, by Statute, as is done in Queensland, the cost of living and quarterly basic wage adjustments so that these officers can receive them without our having the matter submitted to us year after year, necessitating amending legislation. If that were done it would obviate the necessity of debate on these issues and would be in conformity with provisions operating for other civil servants. Public servants generally receive a cost of living allowance totalling £259 a year. That being so, the Government should introduce legislation whereby the highly paid officers mentioned can automatically receive the cost of living increases. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

URANIUM MINING ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 706.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—It has been claimed that the provisions of this Bill go further in curtailing the freedom of the individual than any legislation that has been introduced in recent years. That, to some extent, is possibly correct. We must remember, however, that under a democratic form of Government the basic principle is that the people must accept a fair share of responsibility as well as enjoying privileges. There may be some justification for expressing the view I have mentioned in regard to peace-time avocations, but during war-time many restrictions are placed on the people's freedom, all in the national interest.

It is safe to say that, to the ordinary lay mind, interest in uranium mining was aroused when the first atom bomb was exploded at Hiroshima, Japan, during the last war, an event which undoubtedly hastened the termination of that conflict. It is interesting to note that the history of uranium goes back much further than that. In the *Mining Review* of 1908 appears a report by Professor Bragg, who was, I understand, at our university at the time making investigations into some other minerals that had been sent to him for inspection and research. He suggested that uranium ore possessed definite radio-active properties. When the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima its importance was not generally recognized until it became the agent of that fearful element of destruction which came into being in Japan. Hateful to us as that may be, it nevertheless occurred.

Since that day there has been an awakening of the possibilities of this ore for commercial purposes. In this regard we must pay tribute to our Premier, supported by members of his Government, for the most enthusiastic manner in which he has brought the importance of this particular mineral and its possibilities under the notice of the public, and steps that have been taken for its development. Its commercial possibilities, such as its use as motive power, are only a secondary consideration. The whole object of the Bill is to secure secrecy regarding research and investigation into its use for defence purposes. In this regard there has been something in the nature of a liaison between scientists in other countries and our own into investigations on the utilization of uranium ore and other associated minerals.

That being the case we are under an obligation to fulfil the requirements of other people who may be vitally interested in our uranium deposits and it is to secure that secrecy which is so necessary that this Bill has been introduced.

It must be generally recognized, from the experience of other countries, that we cannot be too careful in our screening of all people in any way associated in this research or in anything to do with the mining or development of this ore. We know that in other countries there have been betrayals by people who were the last one would have suspected of acting treasonably, and therefore it is imperative that we should exercise the utmost care in whom we allow to have access to any information derived from our investigations. That is the whole purpose of the Bill. Much as we may talk about the taking away of the rights of the people or cutting across their freedom there comes a time when they have to accept responsibility, and this is one of them. The provisions of the Bill are in some respects admittedly drastic, but they have been fully explained by the Minister and understood by members. I cannot object to them having regard to the important nature of the work and all it may lead to, but I express the hope that some day there will emerge a desire, not to create destructive, but constructive forces by utilizing our wonderful asset towards revolutionizing the motive power of industry.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—I too support the measure. One could spend quite a time in interesting speculation of the work of scientists, not only in discovering this extraordinary mineral but in its wonderful development. When the physicist discovered the atom he thought he had found the secret of the universe. Then he found that, by extraordinarily expensive means, he could smash the atom and so the secret of the universe is still undiscovered. I join with the previous speaker in congratulating our own Premier and his Government on the work they have done in the development of Radium Hill, and I also pay a tribute to the zealous band of young scientists which the Mines Department has built up who are working this mine and bringing it to the notice of the world. We are now in liaison with scientists in many other parts of the world who join with us in our development of this important mineral which, in the wrong hands, might lead to the complete destruction of civilization. On the

other hand, if developed on peaceful lines, it may do much to improve the lot of man on earth.

We know from history just how scientific discoveries have been linked with all kinds of spying and traitorous actions and the trouble that other Governments have got into as the result of the malpractices of certain people. We have been surprised to learn that this spying has not been confined to minor figures but has been perpetrated by key men working as the confidential agents of foreign Governments. Therefore it behoves this Government to be quite sure that the people working in the industry are not only thoroughly screened, but that the penalties are sufficiently high at least to deter them from doing these things. That I think sums up the purposes of the Bill. Spies and traitors are, of course, forever in our midst. Moreover, some scientists believe that science

is universal and that there should be no secrecy about it; that what they discover in any part of the world should be open to the use of all people, but we do not hold that view and therefore we provide for very heavy penalties on those who would make improper use of secret information. I admit that some of the provisions appear to be drastic and that they interfere with what we regard as the freedom of the subject, but desperate cases demand desperate remedies and, therefore, in order to prevent leakage of this very secret information, the Government is doing its best, by means of this Bill, to protect the country. I have much pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 8, at 2 p.m.