LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, September 17, 1964.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

APIARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It follows the usual form of Supply Bills and provides for the issue of a further £10,000,000 to enable the public services to function until the Appropriation Bill has been passed. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £10,000,000, and clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages which may be authorised by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this formal Bill, which provides money to meet the expenses of the State until such time as the Appropriation Bill is passed. I have nothing to say now regarding the matters covered because later I shall have an opportunity to speak on them.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

In Committee.

(Continued from September 16. Page 836.)

Clause 27—"Evidence"—which the Hon. N. L. Jude had moved to amend by striking out paragraph (*a*) and inserting the following paragraph:

(*a*) by inserting after paragraph (*b*) thereof the following paragraph:—

(*b*a) a document produced by the prosecution and purporting to be signed by the Commissioner of Police, or by a Superintendent or an Inspector of Police, and purporting to certify that any electronic traffic speed analyser specified therein had been tested on a day mentioned therein and was shown by the test to be accurate to the extent indicated in the document, shall be *prima facie* evidence of the facts certified and that the electronic traffic speed analyser was accurate to that extent on the day on which it was tested; and

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Roads): The Hon. Mr. Bevan yesterday indicated that he would like to see different verbiage in order to clarify this clause, and I ask whether he has anything to add.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yesterday I intimated that it was not my intention to move an amendment to this clause but I stated my objection to it and merely suggested that the Minister have another look at the clause. The intention of the clause is that a certificate would be issued on a reading taken immediately prior to the alleged offence occurring, but it does not read that way in the clause at present. I suggest that the Minister amend the clause accordingly. The debate has been lengthy and I strongly oppose the clause. There is a danger of a person being wrongly convicted.

I now refer to a case heard in a court some time ago, that of McNamee *v.* Eldred Norman. Two scientists were engaged in that case, a Mr. Crompton for the prosecution and a Mr. Thonemann for the defendant. I have a copy of the comments of the special magistrate who heard the matter, and although I shall not quote the complete judgment I shall quote some reasons given by Mr. Redman, S.M., showing that it is possible for the machines to be accurate one minute and inaccurate the next. Portion of his judgment states:

Both Mr. Crompton and Mr. Thonemann agreed there are three main faults that can occur with the equipment. The first is a slow degeneration of the equipment caused by aging valves or other components. I accept the evidence on this question of Mr. Crompton that a calibration test by means of the built-in switches in the equipment before and after a particular assignment will reveal any such degenerative fault by failing to record the simulated speeds of 40 and 70 miles per hour within plus or minus two miles per hour. The second fault which can develop is complete failure of the equipment during an assignment.

I again accept the evidence of Mr. Crompton that such a fault would be obvious by malfunction or non-function of the meter during its use. The third fault, which is obviously the most difficult of the three to detect, is an intermittent fault which may occur during an assignment but may not be apparent or even present before and after an assignment. Mr. Crompton says of this type of fault at page 27 of the transcript "every designer of electronic equipment knows these are the hardest of all to deal with. But again it is my opinion that any such intermittency would be at once apparent to the operator by malfunction of the indicating meter; in other words by getting a reading on the meter which is obviously haywire. Typically the meter would fail to record at all; it would stop at full scale or flick up and down at random. Question: It would not record apparently accurately but with an error? Answer: From my examinations of the circuits associated with this meter I find it difficult to envisage any circumstances in which this would arise. In the above case the special magistrate gave his decision because of the fact that the speed as indicated by the apparatus itself was verified by a qualified officer appearing for the prosecution who attended in court. This man was recognized as an expert as far as speed was concerned, and because the evidence was corroborated by that person it was accepted by the court. Here is a case where it is proved conclusively that a machine can function properly one moment but not the next. Because of that, in no circumstances should legislation such as this be passed. It is contrary to the recommendations of the manufacturer, who recommends that the machines should be tested immediately prior to use, during use and immediately after use.

As an additional safeguard a police car, previously tested for accuracy, should be intermittently driven through the beam so that the correctness of the machine could be tested. That would be a safeguard, but as it now stands there is no such safeguard. The Government would be setting itself up as a separate authority and disregarding the recommendations of the manufacturer if it proceeded with this clause. Mr. Redman, S.M., in his summing up in the case abovementioned, raised three points. He expressed grave doubts as to the accuracy of that machine.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Regardless of the technical problem that appears to be facing Mr. Bevan and which is stated as his reason for opposing this clause, the Hon. Mr. Shard simply states that he would not have a bar of it anyway. I appreciate that there is a tendency for all honourable members to be concerned about any new method of detecting breaches of the law. That attitude may have been understandable in the old days when people were apprehended at speeds of 20 to 23 miles an hour on Sunday afternoons, but we have to move with the times. As our most recent surveys reveal, many serious accidents are caused by the carelessness of pedestrians and the excessive speeds of vehicles, both in the country and in the city. The modern speed detection machine is probably far less liable to failure than is the vehicle itself. If we suggest that every time one of these highly tested and technical machines is used it will go out of action, we may as well go further along the road to absurdity and say that the police officer concerned may have had a fly in his eye when taking a reading so that he may not have taken a correct reading. It may be suggested that his sight should be tested each day he goes out to use one of these instruments. I maintain that the machine is far less prone to being inaccurate than is the human element involved in the problem.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan is concerned about the verbiage of this provision. If I accept the genuineness of his suggestion in this regard, I want to give an unequivocal answer to this Chamber that I have consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman on this. He is fully satisfied that the clause as drafted covers the testing of the machine at the time on the day in question and a certificate will be given on that day. One honourable member said that virtually the Commissioner's certificate would be that of the officer concerned. Of course, that is accepted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How many officers are there concerned who are capable of giving the information?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Very few.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But how many are there?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Two.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: There are very few officers in the Police Force engaged in this work because of the special knowledge required of them. Those who are engaged in it have an amazing ability to deduce speed without any instruments at all. That fact is worthy of some comment. They become experts at this job when they are doing it all the time. I can only suggest that in the interests of public safety generally we accept the reasonable use of radar that is tested regularly, according to this provision, even while the actual traffic checks are taking place. It takes only a few seconds to check the instruments. The results can be noted on the police

officer's pad. If the offences committed seem to be bad, the machine can then be tested by a police car going through the beam with a tested speedometer. Will the honourable member opposite suggest that the speedometer may be inaccurate?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are not always right.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: If we are to suggest that everything is wrong, we shall have to abandon the idea entirely. In the interests of public safety generally, honourable members should accept the amendment so that control by radar, which has been in operation for years in the United States of America, can be used. It should be remembered that radar is not used with the sort of furtiveness that many people associate with it. In many cases a check by radar is done by public notice, and even then two miles further on from the radar checking point cars are pulled up in a long queue for exceeding the speed limit. They are pulled up by the dozen and the drivers are given a chit. In those cases nobody argues about the accuracy of the machine, which no doubt would have been checked during the earlier part of the day. I ask that this amendment be accepted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In reply to one or two things that have been said, let me say that my lifetime has been spent in progressive movements. We have always maintained that our Party is more progressive than the Party opposite. I have played no small part in furthering some progressive movements. I am not against progress: in fact, I am better built that way than is the Minister. I believe in progress and want it—better housing, better clothing, better schools, better food, better everything. The Minister says that we on this side are not progressive. My record will stand higher than his from a progressive point of view.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You are not progressive in this matter.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not want progress in something that is doubtful. I do not want it to be thought that we are taking the part of motorists who indulge in high speed but I do not want to see a piece of legislation enacted about which there is some doubt. After some two or three years of using these radar machines, New South Wales has stopped using them because of the doubt involved.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: But they were out-of-date ones.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is the point. Let us get something faultless, and I shall agree to it. We want progress but we want it to be perfect.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You will have to wait a long time for that.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There has been a case where the magistrate has said that this machine can go wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But he convicted the man.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, not on the machine. The evidence was corroborated by the police officer, who was an expert.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you not have that with the machine, too? You had the observation of the police officer on the machine.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; there was no expert who checked the motorist doing 75 or 80 miles an hour. That is done by the machine, and the machine only. We have the special magistrate's own words, and the experts agree that the machine can go wrong. While that is the position, we should not enact this piece of legislation.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: The experts can be wrong sometimes, too.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Even the courts make mistakes sometimes.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. Let there be no doubt about that: everything that happens in the courts is not necessarily correct—but we do not want to go into that. Every member of this Committee knows that, upon the evidence of the experts, this machine can go wrong. I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I support the amendment and find it difficult to understand the attitude of my friends opposite.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not unusual!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is difficult to understand the attitude of the honourable member on many occasions. It would appear that members opposite have no confidence at all in the members of our Police Force.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. At no time have I criticized a member of the Police Force. I take exception to the honourable member's remark and ask him to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said "it appears"; he did not use the words that the honourable member says he did.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I take exception to what he said. Never at any time in this Council have I appeared to criticize the police, and I do

not want it recorded in *Hansard* that I have. I ask that those words be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: If the words are objectionable to the honourable member, I ask the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to withdraw them.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am prepared to withdraw those words, but I still cannot see how my honourable friends have any confidence in the Police Force, as the whole of this objection is to my mind based on the fact that this is a mechanical device that is not perfect. We admit that; no device is perfect. The Hon. Mr. Shard said he wanted progress when things were perfect, but there could not be any progress if we had to wait until everything was perfect. This machine is the latest electronic device that has been produced. It is a much later machine than that which was used in New South Wales. I have every confidence that it will be used in a very responsible manner by capable people. I have no doubt that the police officers will use it in the best manner. If there is any doubt about its accuracy, I am sure that the particular prosecution will not be proceeded with. Police officers doing traffic duties become expert in estimating speed, and they would know quickly if the device was far out. I find it difficult to understand the attitude of members opposite, as I believe that this is a progressive and scientific step that will enable an accurate check to be made on speeds in 99 cases out of a hundred.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Honourable members seem to be worried about the fact that this amendment provides that a test made on the day mentioned in the document relating to the test shall be *prima facie* evidence that the machine was right on that day. They seem worried about whether, if the document was given in relation to the day before and the day after an alleged offence, that would cover the intervening period. I have tried to see what amendments could make the clause absolutely clear. I have always taken the attitude that if there is any doubt about the interpretation of a clause it should be covered by putting into the clause words that do not alter it but make it more certain. The only suggestion I have is that after "tested" the words "and no other day" could be added. However, the Minister has quoted what the Parliamentary Draftsman has stated and I have reached a conclusion that the clause is all right as it stands, and I shall support it.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: I do not think this clause is quite clear. I know that an instrument of this nature can and does work accurately. It has been said that its use has been discontinued in New South Wales and that it is not accepted by the courts in South Australia, but we have not heard a word about that from the Minister, so I presume that he is satisfied that the machine is accurate. However, I understand that the machine has to be tested before and after use so that the police can be certain of its accuracy. I cannot see how the Commissioner of Police or anyone else could sign a document of correctness unless they were operating the machine. The Minister has not said in so many words that he is satisfied; he has said only that the Bill is right and that he supports it. I should like to hear him say that he is satisfied that the machine has been used by the police and has given readings satisfactory to the police without there being any risk of a man being convicted wrongly. Unless this is cleared up, I intend to support the Hon. Mr. Bevan.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The honourable member told me of his doubts yesterday, and I thought it desirable to quote from the maker's specifications. Regarding checking, the specifications set out the following:

Calibration signals corresponding to 40 miles an hour and 70 miles an hour are provided within the equipment. Calibration checks can be carried out at any interval, and in particular following the apprehension of each offender, by operating the check switch. The readings obtained must be between 38 and 42 miles an hour for 40 miles an hour and between 68 and 72 miles an hour for 70 miles an hour. As an additional accuracy check, a patrol car, fitted with a speedometer checked for accuracy against a stopwatch over a measured mile, may be driven through the beam at a selected speed before the commencement of operations. This check may also be carried out at the conclusion of operations.

These are the maker's recommendations. The operation of the check switch is a momentary procedure. The police report concludes as follows:

A record is made at the time the tested speedometer is checked against the radar speed and it is proposed to include in every traffic breach report a notation that the radar unit has been tested at the location by the in-built calibrator.

I do not think I need say, after reading that, that I am satisfied that the equipment is good.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: I am satisfied with the Minister's explanation, but it would appear that there is a margin of two miles above and two miles below in the reading of the machine. I presume that that margin would be allowed, in addition to one allowed by the police.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: My colleague and I seem to be at cross purposes

because the Minister's statement has renewed my qualms about this matter. The Bill requires the machine to be tested on the day of the alleged offence, but the test could be made 23 hours and 59 minutes later. Apparently the maker recommends that there be a test immediately after a person has been charged because of what the machine showed. There is nothing in the provision about a test being made immediately afterwards. There could have been a test at the beginning of the day and one at the end of the day, but that is not mentioned.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I join in the condemnation of the amendment. What was read by the Minister appears to indicate some doubt in the mind of the maker as to how long the machine will remain efficient. It said that the machine should be tested here, there and everywhere—all the time, but that does not indicate efficiency. Because of the tolerance of four miles an hour there is an indication that at best the machine is to that extent inefficient. That increases my doubts about it. The police report said that the machine is tested on location, but I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that that could be at any time during the day. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: If the calibration test could be done in two seconds when a vehicle was travelling at 60 miles an hour or more, would the two members opposing the amendment make the check?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I would, and if that is the position why not put it in the clause that the check be made immediately afterwards? If that were done everybody would be happy, and it is what the maker recommends. I withdraw my support for the Minister's amendment. I shall decide my attitude on it between now and when the vote is taken.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: If I were making a check of a line of vehicles travelling at speed I would leave it until the last of them had gone through. Then, the machine could be wrong. That would not mean a test being made immediately afterwards.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If the clause said that the calibration test should be applied immediately a person was charged with an alleged offence, and the machine were tested by another method each day, I would be happy, but the clause does not say that. According to the Minister, one calibration test on the day of the alleged offence is sufficient for *prima facie* evidence. A magistrate has shown some reluctance about accepting the machine, and the purpose of the clause is to make it *prima facie* evidence that the machine is right.

In a case of this sort there has to be proof beyond reasonable doubt. If the amendment becomes law the evidence of the police officer, with the document, would be sufficient *prima facie* evidence that the offence had been committed, and the defendant would then have to prove his innocence. If he could prove that there was a reasonable doubt he would get the benefit. He might say that he looked at the speedometer, which he had tested shortly afterwards, to prove that he was travelling at a lower speed. That might not be accepted, except if he had a passenger to support him. The clause has been inserted to make the machine indication positive evidence of a breach, unless the defendant can disprove it. Members want the machine to be more regularly tested by the calibration test, and also to have each day the more accurate test by the police car. That is what the maker recommends, but it is not what the clause says.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: All the clause does is to suggest that the acceptance of the car test as against the instrument test be adequate. The calibration internal test is a subsidiary test, and is of assistance to the police officers concerned. No-one here would suggest that if the policeman found the machine to be inefficient he would proceed with it. He would call on the police car and have a check made of the speed of the vehicle. If it were wrong he would look for a fault in the electronic machine or send the instrument to the only available place for checking against another electronic machine, and that is the university. To suggest that the Police Force would operate a machine found to be inaccurate is going just a bit too far.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not suggest that the police would do that, but I am indebted to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for his comments. He stressed that this clause places the onus of proof on the defendant, which is another breach of our standards of justice.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: The law places the onus on the defendant in the case of ordinary speeding.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but this clause would say to the magistrate, "This certificate is *prima facie* evidence that an offence has been committed." That is brought about by a judgment in the last Police Court decision, where the magistrate said that he accepted that the machine could be at fault.

He convicted in that case only because the evidence was corroborated by a police expert. Now we are asked to agree that a certificate of correctness of such a machine be accepted as *prima facie* evidence without the necessity of supporting evidence that the machine is accurate. It places an unfair onus of proof on the defendant. Last Saturday 70 or 80 motorists were caught when proceeding to a sporting fixture. Was the machine tested before that day? Was it tested after each motorist was caught? Finally, was it tested afterwards?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: When did the prosecution come up?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know. When 70 or 80 motorists are caught within a short period of approximately an hour it would be difficult to imagine that the machine was tested after each offence, yet with this amendment it would be accepted that it was so tested.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: The same thing is accepted with a speedometer.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but it has to be proved. The difference between them is that, if a motorist is caught speeding by the police, the police give evidence and prove that the motorist charged was speeding according to their speedometer, but this amendment informs the magistrate that *prima facie* the defendant is guilty.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: It is the same thing; that he was travelling at a certain speed.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is a difference.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: A speedometer is a mechanical device.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. In any case this clause is not a good one and I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment at this stage.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am pleased to see that at last the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has seen the light. Ever since last Tuesday I have been trying to draw attention to the recommendations of the makers of this machine. I mentioned them again today, but apparently I must be considered a little off-beam as nobody has accepted what I have been putting forward. However, when the Minister read the recommendations of the manufacturers, it was immediately accepted by honourable members, including Sir Arthur Rymill.

I repeat that although the Government is apparently not accepting the recommendations of the makers of the machine it is accepting its own recommendations. There is a grave doubt about this machine and the motorist must be given some consideration. Unbeknown to the motorist this machine will be operating, and it will have the effect of trapping him when he breaks the law. It has been proved that there is a doubt about the accuracy of this machine, and the benefit of the doubt should be given to the motorist. While there is such a doubt, this clause should not be placed on the Statutes.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Section 175 (3) (*b*) states:

A document produced by the prosecution and purporting to be signed by the Commissioner of Police, or by a Superintendent or an Inspector of Police and purporting to certify that any stop watch or speedometer specified therein had been tested on a day mentioned therein and was shown by the test to be accurate to the extent indicated in the document, shall be *prima facie* evidence that the facts certified and that the stop watch or speedometer was accurate to the said extent on each of the 14 days following the day of the test.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But they are mechanical devices.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I find it difficult to reconcile the attitude of the Labor Party today with their attitude yesterday when dealing with another clause of this Bill. May I read a clause that they supported yesterday? It was clause 14 (7), which states:

A signal given by a device complying with the regulations and indicating that the brakes of a vehicle are being applied before it stops or while it is slowing down shall be deemed to be given for a sufficient time to give reasonable warning to drivers approaching the vehicle from behind.

A statement was made today that they would not have a bar of putting anything on the Statute Books where there was any reasonable doubt that some mistake could occur where the particular action was subject to some human element. On this clause yesterday there was much doubt expressed whether a driver, when applying his brakes, automatically lighted his stop light. Today, however, the Party opposite claims that it will have nothing to do with this electronic device because there may be an element of doubt.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Because there is an element of doubt, not "may be".

The Hon. L. R. HART: If the honourable member likes to read *Hansard* tomorrow he will find that he said just now that, even if the machine is right, the human element can enter into it. So, even if we get the perfect machine, it is still not acceptable because the human element comes into it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will read *Hansard* tomorrow. I think the honourable member misunderstood me.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You would say that a mechanical device was more accurate than the human element?

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Police Force and the Minister will agree that in these cases the prosecution of a driver is based on the fact that he is not merely exceeding the speed limit but is exceeding it substantially. It is doubtful whether any man driving at less than 45 miles an hour has ever been prosecuted, if it has been a first offence, for exceeding the speed limit. When it is said that he was doing 45 miles an hour there is always some speculation whether he may not have been doing 48 anyway. If there is a doubt he is given the benefit of it because he is prosecuted only when he exceeds the speed limit substantially. I support the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This amendment states that any electronic traffic speed analyser must be tested on the day it is used. Is that test the same as a calibration test or does the calibration test differ from the test referred to in this amendment?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The main test is a test between a police car with a tested speedometer and the machine. If the speedometer of the car agrees with the reading on the meter of the machine, the machine is accepted as operating satisfactorily. The calibration test is a test of an internal circuit which checks the machine internally, as in the case of a crystal locked transceiver set which, if it is not locked on the correct wave length, does not work. The police test, done before the checking of the traffic takes place, is carried out by means of a police car passing through the beam.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: How long does it take an operator to do a calibration test?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Approximately one second, as far as I can ascertain. If the honourable member will look at the photograph on the notice board in the Chamber, he will see that it is merely a case of turning on an internal switch to get a reading.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Minister spoke of an in-built test of the machine and an external test with a motor car. I point out that this amendment refers merely to "test"; it does not say "external test". A test is a test if it is in any way testing the accuracy of the machine. I imagine that a calibration test is a test of the accuracy of the machine. I suggest that, if we used the phrase "externally tested", the Minister might get over his difficulties. The amendment would then read:

. . . any electronic traffic speed analyser specified therein had been externally tested on a day mentioned . . .

That is all that is needed.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: I agree with the Minister's statement about checking the machine. Conditions have improved very much over the years. However, it appears to me from what honourable members have said in this Chamber that this clause could be made clearer than it is. After all, we are proposing something entirely different from what has been used in the State previously, something new in its application. In some places an electronic device for speed testing is rarely used. It would, of course, be used by Mr. Donald Campbell's team. While we have every sympathy with the Government in its attempt to enforce the law, we must have some regard for the motorist who may be charged and convicted on evidence of this sort. We are asking the courts to accept this as satisfactory evidence. This provision should be modified. Speedometers are calibrated and I do not think any speedometer would be more than four miles an hour out of balance either way if tested once a fortnight. It may be said that the machine could be four miles an hour out after testing, but, if that is so, without testing it may be even more inaccurate. A motorist who may be penalized for an offence on this evidence needs to be satisfied that everything is done to ensure that his conviction is justified and that he has not been charged with an offence he has not committed.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I am not satisfied with the clause as it stands. I listened carefully to the Minister's explanation. The manufacturer said that the machine should be tested after every apprehension, therefore he did not envisage the mass apprehension that we have heard of today. It has been said that 70 or 80 people were apprehended on one occasion. There is a possibility of injustice being done to the motorist by this clause. I would support the clause if it were modified.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I have listened with some interest to the continual expression of doubt. We do not want to get into a legal controversy but Sir Frank Perry suggests that the verbiage could be simplified and made more explicit. The Parliamentary Draftsman has suggested that we might add the words "by comparison with an accurate speedometer" after the words "purporting to certify that any electronic traffic speed analyser specified therein had been tested". If that will satisfy honourable members, I am prepared to add those words to the amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am prepared to vote for the clause if it contains that amendment.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: That satisfies me.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I ask leave to amend the amendment as follows:

After ''tested'' first occurring to insert ''by comparison with an accurate speedometer''.

Leave granted; amendment as amended carried.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (14).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, N. L. Jude (teller), H. K. Kemp, Sir Lyell McEwin, Sir Frank Perry, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, C. R. Story, and R. R. Wilson.

Noes (3).—The Hons. S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 11 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 28 passed.

Clause 17—''Portion of body protruding from vehicle''—reconsidered.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have previously given illustrations to show that if this clause is passed it can react harshly against motorists, and I have admitted that I have offended against the clause. I also referred to the driver of a commercial vehicle who might have his arm resting on the right-hand door, but it would not be protruding because the body of the vehicle would be wider than the cabin; however, that would be an offence under this clause. There has been much controversy about this matter. It has been said that when a motorist has his elbow protruding it indicates to the driver following that the man in front intends to turn to the right. I think that in South Australia there have been three instances of an arm being severly injured because of its protruding from a vehicle. I suggest that there should be an educational period before any provision dealing with this matter becomes operative. I understand that Mr. Story has an amendment to meet the position I have raised. He proposes that the amendment shall not come into operation until January 1, 1966, so that prior to that date motorists would have the opportunity to overcome the habit of protruding a limb. I understand he has a second amendment, too, to which I raise no objection.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yesterday, when discussing this clause, I voiced some opposition to it. When the Minister challenged me to do something practical about it I thought it would not be proper to have one law for the metropolitan area and one for the country, so I shall not proceed with that matter further. I know that some members want to strike out the clause and they will support such a move, but I think that those who want the clause in a modified form will support my amendments. I move:

Before ''a'' in new section 94a (1) to insert the words ''On and after the first day of January, 1966''.

If accepted, we shall have an educational period, which will enable the police to tell motorists who have this bad habit that they must overcome it before January 1, 1966.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not oppose Mr. Story's amendment at this stage, nor do I wish the clause as it stands struck out. Some members sympathize with the Minister's amendment but regard it as sweeping. The words that I find too sweeping are ''any portion of his body or limbs''. Will the Minister consider removing those words and inserting ''hands'' or ''feet'' or something of that nature? To put your elbow on the car window and to put your hand out are quite different matters, and perhaps there could be a compromise. It could be made an offence to wave a hand or arm outside a car, but not an offence to place an elbow on the door.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I am pleased with the careful consideration given to this clause by the Committee, and that is why its further consideration was held over. I would be happy to ask the Government to accept the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Story as supported by the Hon. Mr. Bevan. This is an innovation in this State, although it applies in Victoria and I understand in one other State. It is also embodied in the National Traffic Code and is becoming more and more important in our daily lives. The clause gives a uniformity not just for the sake of uniformity but for the sake of common sense. It may appear hard that an elbow cannot be placed on the door, but the policing of these things should be left to the authorities concerned. I cannot imagine how an elbow could rest on the door without protruding, and I think a police officer would use his common sense to see whether the elbow was 12in. outside the door or a reasonable distance. Many people place the elbow on the door before giving a hand signal, and that is why I say it should be a matter of common sense. The Act provides that a person giving a signal is exempted, and I consider that is adequate. I suggest that members accept Mr. Story's amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am prepared to vote for that amendment. Anybody who is opposed to this clause should also vote for Mr. Story's amendment, as it delays the operation of the Act. To vote for the amendment would not prevent members from voting against the whole clause later on.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: New section 94a (2) reads:

Subsection (1) of this section shall not apply to a driver—

(*a*) giving a signal as prescribed or authorized by this Act; or

(*b*) who, when reversing his vehicle, protrudes portion of his body from the vehicle for the purpose of obtaining a clear view to the rear of the vehicle.

In other words, when he is reversing his vehicle he may put his head out of the window to see where he is going. I move:

After "reversing" to insert "or turning".

The clause as drawn assumes that rear vision mirrors are 100 per cent efficient and that one can use a rear vision mirror when turning to see that anyone approaching from behind will not cause an accident or get in one's way. However, with three people in the back seat of a vehicle it is not always possible to see everything through the rear vision mirror and it might be necessary to put one's head out as a matter of safety or prudence. The same thing would often apply to a commercial vehicle. This is a matter of ordinary prudence. I have a modern car with a big picture window at the back, so I can more or less rely on my rear vision mirror, although I still like to look around. My wife's car, which I sometimes drive, is also a current model but when in that one I must put my head out of the window so that I can see, and I find this a more efficient method. I claim that it is equally necessary to put your head out of the window when turning as when reversing.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I support the remarks of Sir Arthur Rymill. Sometimes when a motorist is leaving the kerb he is unable to make practical use of the rear vision mirror. Many times drivers have been sworn at when pulling away from a kerb simply because they were unable to see traffic that was overtaking them. I support the amendment moved by Sir Arthur Rymill, as I consider it will cover the position.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I support the amendment for the reasons given by the honourable member who has just spoken.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move to insert the following new subsection:

Paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of subsection (1) of this clause shall not apply to a driver of a motor vehicle if the total width of the driver's cabin of the vehicle between the external limits thereof is not less than 2ft. narrower than the widest portion of that vehicle.

It seems necessary for all these words to be used in order to say that if the tray of a vehicle were one foot wider on each side of the cabin the vehicle would be exempt from this clause. It would enable the driver to get his arm up ready to work the mechanical device used when turning and stopping. Anybody who has had much experience of truck-driving knows that on bumpy roads a little more support is needed for the arm than in a comfortable motor car. I see no danger in allowing a person to rest his arm to that extent. This amendment should suit the members who wish to see the clause defeated. It would be wise to look at the clause carefully before the vote is taken because we need many of the provisions listed.

It has been said that this clause conforms to the Traffic Code. If we do not go all the way with the code at the moment, this is a good compromise. It will also fit in with the period of education that has been suggested. Perhaps in two years' time the Minister will bring this matter back to us to see how we have got on with it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I support this amendment. In the second reading debate I did not entirely agree with the ramifications of the clause but I am particularly pleased that this amendment may be inserted. Anybody who has driven a truck in traffic will know that to give an effective signal with a mechanical device it is almost necessary to rest the arm and elbow on the door to get the necessary leverage to work the device.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I would be prepared to support the amendment except that I feel it does not go quite far enough. It is all right when dealing with conventional types of motor vehicles but the position may well arise where the cabin of a motor vehicle will be wider than the actual tray when it is unladen, but when it is laden the width of the load may protrude 2ft. or more beyond the side of the cabin. I think we could get out of our difficulty if we added a few words at the end of this amendment. Accordingly, I move to amend the amendment:

After "vehicle" last occurring to insert "or if laden the widest portion of that vehicle together with its load".

The Hon. Mr. Hart's amendment carried; the Hon. Mr. Story's amendment as amended carried.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: With some honourable members who have spoken, I oppose this clause. I assume it is designed for the protection of the motorist. If it is not, I can see no reason for its inclusion in the Bill. This clause will not prevent accidents; it will not help the driver. We should observe the comfort as well as the protection of the motorist. The custom of resting the elbow on the driving window is prevalent. Under this clause the motorist would be liable to a penalty of up to £25 if he rested his arm or elbow on the window. Motor accidents must number tens of thousands a year, including all kinds of accidents. However, I have never known anyone to be injured as a result of having an elbow protruding from a car window, although I do not say it has not happened. I do not know who produces the code: presumably they are responsible people, but I do not agree with them in this matter. Although the clause has been improved by the amendments made to it, I propose to vote against it.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments; Committee's report adopted.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 676.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health): I thank honourable members for the consideration they have given to this Bill and for indicating their general acceptance of it. However, one or two points were raised, and I think it would be appreciated if I gave the Council some indication of what this measure sets out to achieve. In introducing the Bill, I explained the various clauses, but one or two points have been raised about whether training under this measure will compete with any other method of training. Since the Bill was introduced, I have obtained the report of an expert committee on auxiliary dental personnel in a publication by the World Health Organization. The report contained the following statements:

The committee considered the general functions of a chairside assistant and strongly recommends that the employment of such personnel should be regarded as an essential in any dental service, public or private. As an analogy, it was stated that the chairside assistant should stand in the same relationship to the dental surgeon as the operating theatre assistant does to a surgeon, and is quite as essential for his full efficiency.

The functions of chairside assistants are then enumerated as follows:

(1) Reception of the patient.

(2) Preparation of the patient for any treatment he or she may need.

(3) Preparation and provision of all necessary facilities (such as mouth-washes, napkins, receivers).

(4) Sterilization, care and preparation of instruments (and in this the assistant should be highly efficient).

(5) The preparation and mixing of restorative materials (this will include filling and impression materials).

(6) The responsibility, on completion of the treatment, for the care of the patient until the latter leaves, when the assistant will clear away the instruments and prepare them for re-use.

(7) The preparation of the surgery for the next patient.

(8) The presentation of documents to the surgeon for his completion, and the filling of these.

(9) Assistance with X-ray work and the processing and mounting of X-rays.

(10) Instruction of the patient, where necessary, in the correct use of the toothbrush.

(11) The after-care of persons who have had general anaesthetics.

Regarding training, the report stated:

The basic principle that the chairside assistant's function is to assist the dentist by providing an extra pair of hands to enable him to work more effectively and speedily must be borne in mind in any course of training for this type of auxiliary. Because of her contact with patients and professional personnel, it is desirable that she be resourceful, have a pleasant personality, and be neat and tidy in appearance. These attributes may be regarded as having an importance equal to that of educational achievement.

The Bill provides for these things to be done. The Hon. Mr. Bevan said that dental assistants now have some form of training, and I have looked into that. For a number of years there has been a part-time course of training available to dental nurses in South Australia. The course is arranged by the South Australian Branch of the Dental Assistants Association of Australia with the help of a group of dentists who are members of the Australian Dental Association. I think that was the course to which the Hon. Mr. Bevan referred. It consists of lectures and demonstrations on various aspects of dental nursing and is available on a voluntary basis and in their own time to dental nurses belonging to the association, whether they are employed by private dentists or by Government institutions. The Bill does not take away the right of privat. dentists to train

their own nurses. As a matter of fact, I have a letter on my file from the association expressing its approval of this legislation.

I think it was suggested by some honourable members that as not enough nurses would come out of the dental hospital it would be necessary for training by private dentists to take place. This training can take place side by side. It will be a matter for the board to obtain appropriate regulations under the Act to permit the enrolment of dental nurses who have satisfactorily completed a part-time or a full-time course of training and have passed the prescribed examination.

It is not too difficult to conceive the possibility of an arrangement whereby many of the lectures and demonstrations could be given at the same time to hospital trainee dental nurses and to dental assistants employed by private practitioners. With increasing numbers of dentists graduating from the Dental School of the University of Adelaide in the next few years there will be a greater demand in the future for dental nurses who have undergone a formal course of training. An increase in the number of dentists in South Australia will lead to an improvement in the dental health of the community, but the dentists need to be supported by properly trained nursing staff. There is no need for me to mention the shortage of trained staff. Anything we can do to improve the standard of the work should be done. The purpose of the Bill is to improve the standard of dental nursing in this State and by this means indirectly to improve the health of the community. The Nurses Registration Act now provides for the registration of nurses, mental nurses and midwives, and the enrolment of mothercraft nurses and nurse aides. It is now proposed to enrol trained dental nurses. Persons in each of these categories make their individual contribution to the health services of the State.

A comparison in every respect of one with the other is meaningless because their qualifications and status under the Act are not interchangeable. The Bill is a mechanism for providing evidence that a dental nurse has acquired the knowledge and ability that is expected of her as a dental nurse. It will result in the raising of the standard of dental nursing in the State, thereby improving the capacity of individual dentists to render a better service to the community. It will give recognition to dental nurses who have undergone a formal course of training and have achieved a proper standard in their work. The provisions of the Bill cannot have any possible disadvantage to existing dental nurses, or future dental nurses. On the contrary, the Bill can lead only to an improvement in the status of properly trained dental nurses. It has been said that there will be no advantage from its passage.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The only advantage will be the increased status. It is no advantage if they are sacrificed industrially for status.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Does the honourable member say that industrially they will be worse off?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They could be.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: That is nonsense. We have nurses who are given leave to attend the College of Nursing in Melbourne in order to take a course and when they return they are given higher status and get more remuneration. Inevitably a higher status means more remuneration. At present there are inadequate facilities for a formal course of training for dental nurses employed in the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. With knowledge of the proposals in the Bill, provision of training facilities for dental nurses has been taken into account when planning alterations and additions to the Dental Hospital building in Frome Road. Adequate space will be available for lectures to dental nurses in the same lecture rooms as will be used for dental students. A separate classroom has been planned for some aspects of the formal training of dental nurses, and there will be office accommodation for the teaching staff. It is proposed that the courses of instruction for dental nurses will be integrated with the courses given in the nursing schools of the general hospital. Practical training will be carried out in the various clinics and sections of the Dental Department and the Dental School under the supervision of hospital staff sisters and senior dental nurses in charge of the nursing staff of the clinics. It is envisaged that the prime object of the full-time training course for dental nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will be to turn out numbers of dental nurses appropriate to the needs of Government institutions and clinics. Those not absorbed by Government institutions will readily find employment with private practitioners because of the high standard of knowledge and ability they will have achieved.

My authority for that is the opinion expressed by dentists. I thought it would be appreciated if I indicated how the legislation would work. Not only will a professional

status be gained by these nurses, but the service given will be to the benefit of the health of the community.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Enactment of Part IIIc of principal Act."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: During the second reading debate I specifically mentioned this clause. I agree with most of what the Minister has just said in his explanation. I do not think any member has passed an adverse comment about the training course. It was first started in New South Wales, then in Victoria and finally in South Australia. It is a voluntary course and is undertaken at the expense of the girls in their own time. It is a theoretical and not a practical course. The point is whether, when the course has been taken, a girl will get a certificate to qualify her for registration by the board. If she does not, it will be unfair to those girls who have gone through a voluntary course of training and hold a certificate of proficiency. It is possible for a girl to be employed for a period of three years without undergoing any training at all, and still be eligible for registration. A girl holding a certificate for that course should be entitled to registration under this Act, but it does not say so. So far I have not received an answer to a pertinent question I asked during the debate, and I consider it would cause hardship if that particular course were not recognized for registration under this Act. Can the Minister give further information on this point?

Another point is the Minister's comment that a girl who is registered has everything to gain and nothing to lose. Once this Bill becomes law we will find that, as far as dental surgeons are concerned, only girls registered under the Act will be employed. When the Minister states that industrially these girls must gain, I would correct that impression, even though he has been advised accordingly. I have had experience in the Industrial Court. These girls are covered by an award of that court. When they are registered they will be given professional status as far as dentistry is concerned, but once they obtain that they will be outside the scope of their award. It is possible that these girls could be financially worse off until adequately protected by an award.

I am pleased to hear from the Minister that adequate provision is being made at the new dental hospital for the training of these girls. There will be lecture rooms available to them and I understand that arrangements have been made for the reconstruction of the dental hospital to provide such rooms. The hospital provides adequate training for these girls, and the rebuilding of that hospital will cost the State Government over £1,000,000. When the inquiry into the scheme was held there was no mention that this rebuilding would provide for lecture rooms or for training dental nurses or that such a sum would be involved. Will the Minister give further information on the training course that these girls have completed and say whether their qualifications will be recognized by the board?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health): I am sorry that I did not deal with that point for the honourable member, as he did indicate that he would ask that question. The position here is the same as when this Parliament first deals with registration for any profession, and there have been a number of instances over the last decade. When such a situation arises those currently engaged in the profession are not put out of business. These girls, be they nurse attendants, chairside assistants or third-year dental assistants, would automatically be registered. In other words, they have all completed many years' practical experience and they would not be asked to do anything further to obtain registration.

The next clause covers those who have completed two years, and they would be in the same position as those who follow. All that they would be required to do would be to pass the prescribed examination, which they would be qualified to do. An attempt has been made to give proper recognition to everybody who merits it. The same thing happened with veterinary officers when the Veterinary Practitioners Bill was discussed and that has been the experience in all of these cases. Those with experience in the profession concerned are recognized if they have given satisfaction.

The other point raised by the honourable member was whether there would be sufficient jobs available for these girls when they were trained. I think it will be a long time before the position is reached where positions will not be available for these girls. Some years ago I brought up the matter of dental nurses being specially trained to carry out dental work on children, as is the case in New Zealand. There was considerable hostility to that suggestion, though there may not be quite so much hostility to such a course today.

At the present time we have a shortage of qualified nurses. I remember the Hon. Mr. Bevan saying the other day that we would not get enough nurses. I think he has the same fear as I have, that we shall not get enough quickly enough—but this Bill is a start. With the development of the dental hospital and as the opportunity for training increases, I hope it will be the wish of the staff of the dental hospital that some of these trained nurses will stay on a little longer and thus increase the efficiency of the hospital, and assist in training others. I think I have covered the main points raised by the honourable member.

The Hon. Mr. Shard today referred to the profession. We must be prepared to admit that this sort of training will give rise to an increase in status. The whole intentions of the Bill are laudable; it can render great service to the community.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It was on August 18 last that I said this at page 445 of *Hansard*:

I have no objection to the objects outlined in the Minister's explanation . . .

We agree they are good. Further on, I said:

I am concerned that, if this Bill is passed, immediately upon their being registered as dental nurses these people will not have any award covering wages and conditions, and I do not think that is a good thing.

On page 446 I said:

Nobody can object to these girls having the status of nurses so that they can wear the nurses' uniform and badge provided that they do not lose the protection of the award, which I think will be the position.

Immediately dental nurses are registered, they are no longer dental assistants under an award. The award of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union provides only for dental assistants. These dental nurses will become enrolled in the Royal Australian Nursing Federation (South Australian Branch), and that body has no award to cover dental nurses. There will be a period when a private dentist will not have to observe any award. Having had some experience in the industrial field, I think this period will not be short.

The Royal Australian Nursing Federation (South Australian Branch) is making an application to enrol these girls and is applying to the State Board of Industry to expand the federation's constitution so that it can apply for an award. I have no objection to that, but it will be opposed by the Miscellaneous Workers' Union and the Australian Government Workers' Association and, if the Industrial Court or the Board of Industry runs true to form, I doubt whether its application will be granted. If the girls are not members of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union or the Australian Government Workers' Association, it is hardly feasible that these bodies will apply to the court for awards to cover dental nurses who are members of another body. So, whatever the case may be, if I am any judge, when this legislation is enacted there must be a period of at least 12 months when those nurses will be award-free, with no guarantee of being paid the award rates. I agree that they are entitled to them but we know only too well what happens to people working for somebody with no award covering their wages and conditions.

Somebody came to me recently on quite a different matter concerning nurses, and his complaint was exactly the same. He said that, when they became a separate body, they would have no award to cover them and were fearful of what would happen. If the girls know that they will get the status to wear a uniform and a badge and if they realize they will not have any award protection, but are still satisfied, that is up to them. It is wrong of the Minister to tell me that I do not know that nurses go from this State to train and then return. The Royal Australian Nursing Federation has not a single determination or award in this State covering dental nurses, and they are liable to be exploited.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: There are many people like that.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Exactly.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Why?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not want to go into that. They get exploited but that will be the position when these dental assistants become registered dental nurses: they will have no protection. If they want it that way, that is their affair. When I was at the Trades Hall and was Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, never a week went by without my getting a complaint, and some of them were pitiful cases of people not covered by an award.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I want only to assure the honourable member that I do not wish to misrepresent him in anything that he says, but I have not looked at this matter from the point of view from which he has been speaking. I understood him to suggest that, if these girls became registered nurses, somebody would exploit them or they would get less pay.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The suggestion is that when they get this qualification and their status is higher and they are registered nurses, somebody will exploit them.

Knowing the standard of the profession here, I do not think it will be suggested, "Now you are not under an award, we shall reduce your pay by £5 a week." I do not share the view that that will happen. I do not think public opinion would stand for it. It is more likely that they will get more pay.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Ultimately, but there will be a period of waiting.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Ultimately, but I do not want the honourable member to think that I was pursuing it in another way when I was referring to this matter.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WORKMEN'S LIENS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 822.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support this Bill. I think we are all acquainted with the circumstances that made it necessary. We did not intend to hold up this Bill; however, we wanted to look at it over-night. Members on this side of the House are happy to accept its provisions. As the session is getting well on and soon it will be too late for private members' business to be dealt with, I shall not delay the Bill.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2): I do not wish to argue this point, but I thought wages in industry were now paid weekly. If that is so, it seems to me that raising the employee's lien to £100 is going too far. This represents about four weeks' wages.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what is intended.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: At one time it may have been the practice to pay employees less frequently than by the week, but now wages are paid weekly. When someone becomes insolvent, many others apart from workmen are involved. I should like to see this matter coupled with the legislation proposed by the Attorney-General.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): This Bill covers four weeks.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: I understand that, but why?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleagues and I know of many cases where people have not been paid weekly because the firm has been likely to become insolvent. This happens in contracting and subcontracting, and it also happens where people who are said to be contractors or subcontractors provide labour-only work. When I was an employee, on occasions I had to wait for more than one week to obtain my wages. This measure does not say the protection has to be four weeks; the £100 is a maximum, and covers four weeks.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. I had a copy of the Bill on my file yesterday, but it seems to have disappeared.

The PRESIDENT: I must point out that the Hon. Mr. Kneebone has closed the debate.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: But I was raising a point of order, Sir. However, I now have a copy of the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 22, at 2.15 p.m.