

that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition resume his seat, and in thus giving him no opportunity to speak, compliance with Standing Order No. 143 was not possible and redress could only be obtained by appealing to Mr. Speaker.

Question put and a division taken.

Remarks During Division

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, you would not want to be saved by the guilty man, would you?

Mr. Hawke: Rafferty rules; Rafferty was a gentleman! Bunch of Al Capones, if ever there was a bunch of them!

Mr. Rowberry: Strong in tooth and sharp of claw!

Mr. Graham: Thick in the skull and in the hide!

Mr. Hawke: Al Capone has taken over! Rafferty rules!

Result of Division

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes—20

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Burt	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hart	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Rhatigan	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Evans	Mr. Runciman
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Dunn

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

House adjourned at 1.27 a.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 20th November, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	2958
BILLS—	
Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill—2r.	2957
Dentists Act Amendment Bill—3r.	2957
Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2956

Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. and 1r.	2957
2r.	2965
Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill—Assent	2956
Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Assent	2956
Traffic Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2958
Com.	2968
Report; 3r.	2966
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Assent	2956

MOTIONS—

Fluoridation of Water—Inquiry by Select Committee	2970
Town Planning—Appointment of Advisory Committee	2966

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

Parliament: Visits by School Children—Transportation Costs	2956
School Teachers' Quarters—Provision of Kleenheat Gas Stoves and Hot Water Systems	2957

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (4): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill.
2. Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill.
3. Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).
4. Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PARLIAMENT: VISITS BY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Transportation Costs

1. The Hon. R. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the growing interest being shown by school authorities and pupils in the functions of Parliament, as indicated by the increasing numbers of visits to Parliament House, would the Minister for Education give consideration to meeting the cost of transporting children of grade 7 and high school standards to Parliament House, as the parents and citizens' associations are finding it increasingly difficult to finance this important part of children's education?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The costs of school transport are already very high and the Government would not feel justified in adding to these costs by providing transport to enable children to

visit Parliament House, especially bearing in mind that country children would be as much entitled to this privilege as metropolitan children.

2. *This question was postponed.*

SCHOOL TEACHERS' QUARTERS

Provision of Kleenheat Gas Stoves and Hot Water Systems

3. The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN asked the Minister for Mines:

What is the policy of the Education Department regarding the installation of—

- (a) Kleenheat gas stoves; and
- (b) hot water systems in school teachers' quarters in country areas?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Where circumstances warrant Kleenheat gas stoves are occasionally installed in new quarters or as replacements for worn-out stoves.
- (2) Hot water systems will be installed in school quarters when extensive repairs and renovations are being carried out.

IRON ORE (MOUNT GOLDS-WORTHY) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and read a first time.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 19th November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Midland) [4.39 p.m.]: This Bill deals really with two objects. The first one is to limit the abattoirs district, which is a very good idea because it will give private enterprise a better opportunity of building up abattoirs in various districts where cattle and

sheep can be slaughtered without having to travel great distances by rail or road. This is a big step forward, because stock will arrive at the abattoirs in much better condition for killing than if they had to travel over great distances.

The measure creates two positions instead of the dual one of manager and controller of abattoirs; in other words, one man for one position. It will mean that the Midland Junction Abattoir will have a manager. His sole job will be to manage that particular business; and a new position of controller of abattoirs will be created.

The controller will be responsible to the Minister, and I think in this regard we could have a better set-up to cover country abattoirs by giving the producers, the pastoralists, and the owners of private abattoirs some say regarding how the industry should be run. In my opinion, the Bill does not go quite as far as it should, because it does not cater for the people I have just mentioned. The controller will have control of the private killing works throughout the country, and it will be his job to try to improve their standard. However, in this connection I think the producers should have some say in the works that are set up for the killing of their stock.

I do not wish to speak for very long on this measure, because I think it is a step in the right direction. I shall support it, but I hope, at a later date, something will be done to improve the Act so that the pastoralists, the producers, and private enterprise will have some representation on the board.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [4.44 p.m.]: I am afraid this Bill coincides with the policy of the Government to hand over to private enterprise, the country abattoirs, which are at present being run by the Government.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Where does the Bill say that?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: The people in charge of the abattoir on the goldfields are a little frightened that that will be the position under this Bill. The matter was brought to my notice within an hour of my leaving Kalgoorlie on Monday and, unfortunately, in the time available I could not get much information about it. People on the goldfields are quite satisfied with the abattoir they now have. It is serving a useful purpose, and is satisfactory to all concerned.

I have relations in Perth who, according to the information given last night, would fall into two of the categories mentioned. One of my relations has a large quantity of meat slaughtered at the Midland Junction Abattoir, while the other one has only a small quantity slaughtered. The one who has a large quantity killed would be one

of the big men in the meat industry. They have both advised me, however, that they would not like to see the present set-up at the Midland Junction Abattoir changed. The present system is working quite smoothly, and has been for many years.

I am afraid, as I said before, that the big meat combines will take over the small abattoirs, at a very small cost; and that will not be in the interests of the public. I would like the Minister to enlighten me on the position and allay my fears that the Government abattoirs will be sold out to the meat combines.

Debate adjourned to Tuesday, the 26th November, on motion by The Hon. J. G. Hislop.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 13th November, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [4.45 p.m.]: This Bill deals with a variety of matters, but the particular aspect to which I wish to address myself is the final clause, which deals with added penalties and their effect upon transport in general. This is the clause which increases the penalty, and also imposes a continuing penalty of 10s. per cwt.

There are big problems in the heavy haulage industry in this State today; and freight charges and general transport costs are of vital importance to a State which occupies one-third of the Commonwealth. Certainly, of necessity, much of that area is not traversed, because there is nobody there; but overall the distances are great, and the costs of transport affect this State very markedly.

However, the general transport situation of the State is not the prime matter to which I wish to draw attention, because it is not my province, in a literal sense, to do so. In the area in which, with Mr. Murray and Mr. Willmott, I am vitally interested—that is the south-west corner of the State—distances are not so great, but we have specific problems in regard to transport which have been causing the people there grave concern. While it is reasonably possible to assess loads of a standard commodity, such as gravel, sand, wheat, etc.—one knows that a certain given quantity weighs a certain amount—it is not as easy to assess a load of timber in the round. This is a problem of very grave concern, because it affects not only the fellows who cart the timber, but also the entire economics of the industry.

There are certain aspects of heavy haulage which have an effect on all products and all people engaged in this activity, and many of those problems are

at present being investigated in many countries of the world. It does, of course, behoove us to stop and think now and again of the rapidity with which road transport, in its present modern concept, has come upon us. I think most of us here can recall the day when a trip of anything up to 100 miles was a virtual excursion of adventure. Cars were loaded up, the running board carriers were put on, and the drivers put in their axes, shovels, chains, and bits of sacking.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: And something to eat.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, and something to eat and drink; and one bravely sallied forth. Even in my young days a trip from Bridgetown to Perth with my parents would take up to 24 hours.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: What, with a donkey team?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, in a modern motorcar of the day—a Dodge or something of that calibre. It was quite a good car. Now, Mr. Willmott does it in something like four hours, regularly, and with no worries at all. That transformation has come about in the lifetime of one individual, and I think it emphasises the explosive nature of the changes in road transport.

I can recall my father speaking of goods being transported to Bridgetown. When he started work as a grocer in that town, goods were transported by bullock teams once every three months from Bunbury to Bridgetown. If he was still alive he would be 72 years of age, and so we can realise that over that short period tremendous changes have taken place in this particular field. Realising that, we can appreciate and understand that research into the various fields of heavy haulage transport has lagged behind.

[*Applause heard from Assembly Gallery.*]

I appear to be receiving more applause than I think I deserve.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The general concept of loads and heavy haulage is that we set an all-up weight for a vehicle which must not be exceeded. This is divided into an axle weight, and a certain tonnage is allowed per axle. This, of course, is affected by the size of the tyres used. A simple analogy which can be drawn, and which we all know, is that of women's shoes. We have all become aware in recent years of the stiletto heels which grace the feet of most women today, and most elegant they look. But when they walk on a parquet floor we know the marks that are left by those shoes. On the other hand women wearing flat-heel shoes leave no marks at all.

In the same way a motor vehicle with narrow tyres which are inflated to a high pressure will have a greater effect on a road than a tyre of a moderate width inflated to a moderate pressure. If one loads a given vehicle with a certain weight, and it is equipped with tandem axle and dual tyres, the effect of that load will be less, and the effect on the pavement will be less.

Let us compare two trucks. First a truck having a gross loaded weight of nine tons. This truck has two axles and four tyres each 1100 x 20. The weight on each of those tyres, and the all-up weight, would be 5,040 lb. Compare this with a truck having five axles and 18 tyres—and this is more or less a standard truck—equipped with 1100 x 20 tyres. The permissive gross weight of the vehicle is 20 tons. The weight on each tyre of this vehicle would be 2,489 lb. This is less than half the previous figure.

Yet it is the larger truck which excites the attention of the authorities, even though the weight per tyre exerted on the pavement is 2,489 lb. The small truck does not excite the attention of the authorities, but the weighted surface of each tyre is 5,040 lb. Those are authoritative figures given in another place in answer to a question, and they illustrate the effect of multiple tyres on the roads.

It would appear therefore that a far better method of assessing the allowable weight of a vehicle would be to do it on a tyre-width basis which then comes down to actual pressure. On this hypothesis, of course, we must take into consideration the number of axles, the size of tyres, and the pressure of tyres; because all those things will have a bearing on the allowable weight. I have learnt today that a fair amount of research has been done on this matter, and it is not quite as simple as it appears. I have learnt that the pressure actually varies from the edge of the tyre to the centre of the tyre; it varies with different makes of tyre and the pressure on the road—some makes concentrate the pressure on the edge of the tyre and not on the centre.

In America, where a considerable amount of research has been done, no firm decisions have yet been arrived at. All this has a direct bearing on the particular clause I mentioned, in that the economics of the heavy haulage industry are of course affected by the penalties imposed in the case of overloading. It is hoped that sometime we may be able to reach the stage where we will get a more scientific assessment of what a vehicle will be allowed to carry. The governing factor of what can be put on a vehicle is, of course, the allowable strength of the pavement surface.

In this country our roads are built to carry 18,000 lb., which is virtually a world-wide standard. Some States in America

have increased their figure to as high as 22,000 lb., but 43 States in America have a standard of 18,000 lb. A fair amount of research has gone into the economics of increasing this by various means. Two States have increased it to 20,000 lb. and two others to 22,000 lb. This 18,000 lb. is the pressure which can be carried per axle load. The research going on in regard to square inch pressure has not as yet reached finality, but even that has been carried out on the basis of per inch width of tyre rather than per square inch of pressure.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I think it is 1,800 lb.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The standard to which our pavements are built takes a pressure of 18,000 lb. There is a permit load of 35,000 lb. per tandem.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Bell Bros. have been fined for less than that.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order! The honourable member should address the Chair.

The Hon. G. C. MACKINNON: They may have been fined for less than that, but various trucks have various permit loads which they can carry. Our road strength has been constructed to stand 18,000 lb. of axle load distributed over the wheels. That is the strength to which the pavement has been constructed. The pavement is affected in various ways. The subsurface of the pavement is affected by gross weight, whereas the top is actually affected by pressure weight. It is easier to pierce the road surface with a narrow tyre with a high pressure, than with a wide tyre. So, irrespective of the economics of the industry and the carrying project, it is not possible to allow weight beyond that as a regular thing; because if we allowed 22,000 lb. load on the road it has double the effect of an 18,000 lb. load. That is a mathematical fact.

The increase is not in direct proportion to the weight increase, which increases at a much more rapid rate than the proportion of the one weight to the other. When we get into very heavy loads the increase rate has the particularly marked effect of trebling for every 2,000 or 3,000 lb. of increase. So it is necessary to balance the economics of the construction of the roads as against the economics of the industry, because roads cost an awful lot of money to build.

In this State we are indeed fortunate with our roads. We have been blessed with a number of excellent engineers and we have experienced a good class of workmanship. None of us desires to see these roads damaged by overloading or by any other means. At the same time we must have cognisance of the economics of the general transport problem. In this connection a considerable amount of research is going

on, and we have to be very careful with regard to the imposition of penalties. I was very pleased to observe that the Minister has agreed to an amendment to the particular clause I am discussing, whereby it will be no longer obligatory upon a magistrate to impose a maximum penalty and the continuing penalty per hundred-weight.

It is unfortunate that when these cases go before the courts they tend to be treated in a somewhat arbitrary fashion. I am afraid that most traffic cases receive the same sort of treatment. There is a wide variety of things that do affect the loading of a vehicle. For example, if one is in heavy country—and most jarrah is won in heavy country—it is a common thing to load butts forward to put the maximum load on to the drive wheels. The weight is put on to the drive wheels in order to get a grip to get out of a difficult situation. It is possible to have the maximum allowable weight of 36 tons with logs in the round, be 8 tons underloaded, and, of necessity, load the drive wheels of the vehicle in such a way that the moment the vehicle is weighed the driver is subject to legal action. However, there would be nothing else he could do to get out of the bush. That is a problem in the timber industry.

We are all aware that the jarrah tree is not as symmetrical as the karri tree, and it is difficult to load it with accuracy so as to have the exact weight per wheel, or even per axle. Indeed, it is possible to be tons underweight and still be overweight on one wheel or on one axle; and very often it is absolutely necessary to overload the drive wheels in order to get a grip to get out—and this automatically makes one's vehicle overweight and subject to legal action.

Unfortunately, when these people go before the court, even though they might be able to explain why they are overweight, they are penalised and pay the penalty, irrespective of any justification they may be able to put forward. The magistrate has to administer the law in view of the desire of the Main Roads Department to maintain the high standard of our roads. This action on the part of the magistrate is justifiable, but it does mean that the costs of hauling timber are made extremely high.

In co-operation with certain other members, I made a considerable amount of study, research, and investigation into this problem. We found that the solutions we thought might work will not work in view of the fact that the roads have a maximum capacity of 18,000 lb. and that they are built to that standard. The theories which I worked out, and others confirmed, sounded excellent, until we had to face the problem that the roads are built to a certain standard. Had the roads

been built to a standard of 30,000 lb. per axle it would have been a completely different matter. But the roads are built to a standard which has been worked out as being the best average standard to which to build these pavements—and that is it.

That, of course, is the major limiting factor; and, in the light of that, it is extremely difficult to see what can be done except adopt very readily the amendments which the Minister has seen fit to place on the notice paper, because they will at least give some possible leniency and safeguard to this particular industry. Other steps are being taken to try to assist in the problem, not only in this State and on an Australia-wide basis, but, indeed, on a world-wide basis. Many types of research are being undertaken with a view to trying to come to grips with this problem.

It boils down to the fact that this is fairly new matter and circumstances are changing constantly. Therefore, we must endeavour to the best of our ability to keep abreast of the problem. We have all had brought to our attention instances of people who have been somewhat arbitrarily dealt with for overloading, and who have had their maximum loads reduced; and all sorts of problems with regard to transport have been drawn to our attention. All of us, particularly those of us who live out of the metropolitan area, are fully aware of the grave difficulties facing road haulage and the tremendous number of problems which have to be solved. Above all, I think it is fair to say in the interests of everyone concerned that we must maintain the high standards of our roads. It must be realised that one can drive to Albany on a bitumen road and go as far as Carnarvon in the north and Kalgoorlie in the east. One can do this driving on beautiful bitumen roads all the way.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: And Esperance.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We take great pride in this; however, because this State is so dependent for its economic welfare upon road haulage, we must do all we can to assist the road haulier, but we must ensure that loads are kept within the bounds of the carrying capacity of our roads. I do not think this was ever highlighted more than it was last winter, when conditions were very adverse. Even with the best will in the world, under the circumstances our roads could not have carried the loads for which vehicles are licensed. I think we all saw evidence of that.

Whilst I regarded this Bill with great disfavour in the early stages after its introduction, I have, albeit somewhat reluctantly, come to the view that the best thing at this stage is to accept the amendments proposed by the Minister in the hope that the research which is progressing will

ultimately lead to an easing of the situation that faces hauliers who have to handle difficult commodities.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.10 p.m.]: I have to admit that yesterday I took home the wrong Bill so I was unable to study the measure we are now discussing. However, after listening to the instructive address given by Mr. MacKinnon, I now wish to speak in order to comment on two clauses. One is clause 6, which seeks to amend section 32 of the Act.

I have not a copy of the Minister's introductory notes, so I will have to make my comments in accordance with how I see the position. During my Address-in-Reply speech at the beginning of this session of Parliament, I spoke of the fining of drunken drivers—and I take it that this measure has to do with the driving of vehicles while the driver is under the influence of drink.

I regard this as the worst crime any driver can commit. I know that speed at the wrong times or in the wrong circumstances is a dangerous thing, but one must realise that the driver who sits behind the wheel of a motorcar of 25 or 30 horsepower—under the new formula it is 100 to 115—is a potential killer of other people, if not of himself, if he is drunk.

I have said this before, and I say it again, that once a driver has been convicted a first time and given a second chance, he should not be given a third. When a driver is caught for drunken driving he has his license suspended for three months and is fined between £40 and £70, according to the whim of some magistrate. For a second offence he loses his license for six months, which is a fairly heavy penalty; and if, while he is under the influence of liquor, he drives a vehicle and is convicted a third time, he loses his license for good. I have to accept that because it is the law.

I regard the offence of drunken driving as a most heinous one; but if a driver, after a third offence, loses his license for life, surely that is sufficient penalty without fining him £100 to £150. As far as the person is concerned, it represents a life sentence; and there is no provision in the Act under which he can obtain another license. Therefore why fine him £100 to £150? Surely £25 or even £10 would be sufficient.

Of course, I am not referring to the case of a drunken driver who causes loss of life. That is something for the courts to decide. I would like the department involved with this Bill to do something about what I call a most vicious sentence: the taking of a man's license from him and then fining him £100 or £150. The late Hon. Harry Hearn chided me on a statement I made once, and I repeat

it, that eight out of 10 people who lose their license are working people on a small salary. If a working man is fined £120 or £140 then his family is going to be hard hit. Surely the State can do better than that.

Another point I wish to speak on was raised by Mr. MacKinnon. When Mr. Styan was Minister for Transport I took a deputation to him on behalf of the Road Transport Union and Bell Bros. At that time Bell Bros. employed about 560 drivers, and the firm did everything possible to make its vehicles suit the requirements of the Main Roads Department's regulations and by-laws. Now, Bell Bros. meant nothing to me at all, but the 560 drivers involved did concern me. I was very pleased, on behalf of Bell Bros., to be able to put to the Minister that cognisance had to be taken of the fact that this firm was prepared to spend £100,000 to bring to Australia aluminium bodies for their vehicles in order to reduce the tare of those vehicles. After all is said and done, Bell Bros. played a very big part in the development of this State in providing the wherewithal for heavy work to be done outside the metropolitan area, in the north of the State, etc.

This firm was doing everything it could to make its vehicles suit the requirements of the Main Roads Department and comply with the formulae set out in the by-laws and regulations. Several weeks ago there were headlines in the Press stating that Bell Bros. was fined something in the vicinity of £1,400 for various breaches, and the magistrate commented that he sympathised with the firm but he had to impose the fines. The offences were not committed only within the last few months but dated back to February, 1962. Bell Bros. got tremendous adverse publicity because they had been fined £1,400 for a number of breaches. Surely the courts in this State can handle the affairs of their office better than to have charges dating back as far as February, 1962.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: The firm might go broke and not be able to pay the money.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The history of the firm of Bell Bros. is a saga. A few years before the last war it started in Midland Junction with a few horses and drays, and some very old wagons. It played its part in the war effort, and I think the saga of Bell Bros. in Western Australia is something that one could write a book about.

From the workers' point of view it is a firm which has always tried to do its best for the staff and has always paid the proper award wages. Of course, it expects good service from its staff. As far as my union is concerned, our relationship with Bell Bros. has always been exemplary. There have been some minor breaches, but Bell Bros. has always accepted its part in the national development of this State.

I say that Bell Bros.—and other big firms with similar types of vehicles—in trying to bring down vehicle tare so as to carry economic loads for themselves, also benefit the transport costs of the State.

Whenever we have Bills before this House dealing with trade unions, or workers' compensation, we are told we have to keep costs down. I agree entirely; and transport, so far as I am concerned, is one of the greatest factors in the cost structure of the commerce of the State. Anything that can be done to assist those big firms that are prepared to provide a type of vehicle with the axle loading which Mr. MacKinnon was speaking about should be done, and further penalties, such as I read into this Bill, should not be placed on them. I believe that with the type of work they do and the type of road they have to travel over, they are not doing anywhere near the damage that is being done by the speeding motorists with lighter types of vehicles. I believe speed kills motors; it kills tyres; and it kills roads.

When we consider heavy haulage and think of the tonnage that is moved interstate, intrastate, north, south, east and west throughout Australia, we must remember that the greater proportion of our goods are handled by road transport. In the future, road transport will be taking an even greater part in the development of this country; and I speak for the whole of Australia, not only for the West Province. I think someone has to get up to speak on behalf of those major firms that are trying to do their best with their vehicles.

I would draw the attention of the Traffic Department to another type of offence. I have read that there is a section of the department which tests heavy haulage vehicles for overloading. What about overwidth vehicles travelling between Northam and the city, and between the city and Albany? These vehicles travel at night with no lights on the 10 ft. blades of the units they are carrying. A few days ago, about 45 miles from Perth, I came across such a vehicle with good lights on the front and on the sides, but it had no lights on the 10 ft. blade of the earth moving machine it was carrying. I understand that that vehicle should only be travelling between sunrise and sunset. I took notice of the name of the firm, but I will not mention the name because I saw recently where it had been fined, and rightly so. I hope the Traffic Department will pay particular attention to this type of offender who travels after sunset, because he is a serious menace on the road. I support the Bill.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.26 p.m.]: I think we are all the wiser for this afternoon's discussion concerning the

weighing and testing of vehicles to ensure the standard of our roads. When we get on to subjects such as overloading and gross vehicle weight, we could possibly discuss them for some considerable time.

I appreciate that Mr. MacKinnon, and other members, have taken the opportunity to investigate this matter. I think that investigation has proved that our departments are right to the fore in making sure that we do not lower the standard of our roads, while, at the same time, trying to be fair to the people who earn their living by heavy haulage.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Hear, hear!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The aim of the department is to get co-operation, and I feel that Mr. MacKinnon has proved that fact. There is no doubt about the amount of money that is used in America for research on this particular problem. As a matter of fact, the amount of money which America spends on research of all types is phenomenal.

A few matters were mentioned during the course of the debate. Mr. Willesee raised two points and one of them dealt with the definition of a driver. He said he did not like the idea of a driver meaning any person driving or in control of a vehicle. I think the reason why "control of a vehicle" is included in the definition of a driver is to cover the driver who is not necessarily driving along a road, but is still in control of the vehicle because he is sitting behind the wheel. Unless we have control in that respect it is possible for a driver to dodge a charge laid against him.

The other point was in regard to drive-in theatres. If Mr. Willesee looks at clause 5 he will find that it states—

Every person who drives a vehicle, on a road or in any place commonly used by the public or to which the public is permitted to have access, negligently, recklessly, or at a speed, or in a manner, that is dangerous to the public, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the nature, condition and use of the road or place and to the amount of travel that is at the time, or might reasonably be expected to be, on the road or in that place, commits an offence.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I think your comments stated that a drive-in theatre was not included.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The reason given to me was that it was not intended to include drive-in theatres in the definition of "road". Apparently some vehicles never leave the drive-ins and do not need to be licensed. Therefore, if the definition of "road" included drive-in theatres, those vehicles would have to be licensed. That,

to me, does not seem to be necessary, as I think most drive-in theatres are on private land and could not be declared a road. I would prefer that to the reason given to me. However, with the two explanations, we have the reason.

Mr. Loton raised the question of interstate hauliers and pointed out that they did not pay a license fee anywhere. I must admit that when I first had a look at this matter I was perturbed, too. I could not see why a man who was domiciled in Western Australia, even though he was operating purely interstate, should not pay a license to a local authority in the State in which he resided; and I felt the same about a man living in Melbourne, Brisbane, Sydney, or Adelaide who was operating interstate. I would have thought we would not be breaching section 92 of the Constitution by charging a license fee. Obviously, however, the High Court thought otherwise; and this is the information given to me—

So as not to offend against section 92 of the Constitution it has been ruled that it would not be reasonable to charge fees on interstate vehicles except such fees that would be no greater than those reasonably required to cover administration costs only.

As there could not be fees that go to a general road building fund it would be extremely difficult to strike a fee that would only cover the case and it is felt it is far more reasonable to fix no fee.

Apparently it is an arrangement between all the States that they do not charge a fee, but charge 7s. 6d. for a plate and charge for third party insurance. I know this is hard to understand, but that is the position.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: I think it is stupid.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I would say the same thing, too; and I cannot understand why the State Ministers cannot, when they meet each year, work out something in conjunction with the Commonwealth to provide for at least a license fee payable in the State in which the transporter resides. I will certainly mention this matter to the Minister concerned with the object of his raising it at the next conference of transport Ministers.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: A case went to the Privy Council.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; I believe so. The same company that Mr. Lavery has in mind—Bell Bros.—was recently taken before the court in this State and the court upheld the company's defence. I think the matter concerned the carting of timber in the Busselton area and the transshipment of it. It looks as though at the moment nothing can be done in this regard.

It was found that some interstate operators were operating intrastate without paying a license fee. That is one reason why they will be obliged to sign a statutory declaration that their trucks will be used only on interstate work. Then if they are picked up doing other work, a case against them can be presented in court.

Mr. Lavery raised the point concerning drunken driving—at least he anticipated that the provision in the Act was dealing with this matter. The clause actually repeals the present section and re-enacts it in a different form to make the position in regard to drunken driving a little tighter. The penalties were laid down after considerable debate by both Houses of Parliament in 1956, I think, when the last amendment was made.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I thought it was 1954.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There was an amendment in 1954, and then there were further amendments to this portion in 1956. There was also an amendment in 1953, and another amendment to a different portion of the Act again in 1956. Those amendments were mostly dealing with this type of offence; and section 32 (3) (a) (iii) provides—

For a third offence a fine not exceeding two hundred pounds or imprisonment for twelve months and the court before whom the person is convicted shall in any case permanently suspend any license to drive held by the person and shall permanently disqualify the person from obtaining a license under this division of this Act.

Actually the court has jurisdiction in this matter; it can fine a person £1 or send him to prison for twelve months, or for any other time. I do not know that we can have much control over the jurisdiction of the court.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You could amend the Act at a later stage.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If my memory serves me aright, when we were dealing with this situation the Bill, as introduced, provided for permanent disqualification after a second offence, but members thought that a little harsh and made it apply to a person who was convicted of a third offence.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Yes; and I agreed with that at the time.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think I have covered most of the points raised during the debate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. A. R. Jones) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4: Section 11 amended—

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I thank the Minister for the explanation he gave. It is farcical to continue to allow a vehicle that is operating from State to State to be unlicensed within the boundaries of the State in which the transporter resides. We know the cost that has been involved in maintaining the Eyre Highway, and we know of the requests that have been made to the Commonwealth Government to provide finance to seal that highway. The people that abuse the highway most are the heavy road hauliers, and they make no contribution towards its upkeep outside of the fuel tax that they pay in the same way as does the ordinary motorist.

The Minister did not go as far in his reply as I would have liked him to go on the points I raised in respect of small vehicles carting goods interstate, such as a 30 cwt. or 2 ton vehicle carting merchantable goods to the Eastern States. Such vehicles could be licensed. A firm operating that type of vehicle could have a branch in Kalgoorlie, and there would be nothing to prevent that firm's vehicles from dropping off a certain portion of its load at Kalgoorlie, then going on to South Australia, and backloading goods to Western Australia and dropping off a certain percentage along the way. The provision states that the vehicle shall be used for interstate transport only, and those vehicles are making no contribution towards the maintenance of the roads. The Minister said he will see that this matter is brought up at the next meeting of the Ministers for Transport. I do not know why it has not been brought up before.

I would like to see this clause deleted, and then we would not be condoning the action of allowing these people to continue. We should leave the position as it is at present; it should not be condoned by the Government.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: This matter has been discussed and rediscussed by Ministers for Transport in conference through the years. I recall a conference called by the late Mr. Eddie Ward, when he was Commonwealth Minister for Transport especially to discuss this matter; and the position has been made more difficult lately by the case recently determined by the Privy Council. In that case the owners of an intrastate vehicle carrying goods to a port for an interstate destination challenged a State in regard to the ability of the State to levy fees, and they won their case because the destination of the goods was interstate.

Because of section 92 of the Constitution, no matter how many conferences are held, nothing can alter the situation; and nothing can be done until the Constitution has been amended. That is the position.

no matter what we may put into State laws or Commonwealth laws, or what the State Ministers may decide in conference. The first part of section 92 of the Constitution is very clear. It states—

On the imposition of uniform duties of customs, trade, commerce, and intercourse among the States, whether by means of internal carriage or ocean navigation, shall be absolutely free.

"Absolutely free" means in every way absolutely free in respect of every impost, burden, levy, tariff or tax where the trade is a matter of intercourse between States.

Although there is a provision in the Bill that endeavours to provide for a permit to offload interstate goods within a State through which an interstate vehicle is passing, as Mr. Loton has said, it should not be in the Bill because interstate hauliers may do that without let or hindrance, no matter what the source of the goods may be, so long as it is an interstate source.

We are deluding ourselves if we think this matter may be resolved at ministerial conferences, unless such conferences resolve that the Commonwealth Government shall test the position by a referendum to the Australian people on the question of amending the Australian Constitution in this particular. The position is as difficult as that; yet it is simple. The present position is very unjust and very unfair because of the amounts from the petrol tax that the States have to spend on main roads. People handling interstate matters get away with something that the intrastate transporter cannot avoid. This is a matter which has to be taken up with a view of amending the Constitution.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I thank Mr. Wise for his explanation; but the fact that a constitutional amendment is necessary to deal with the matter does not say that we should write into this legislation a provision condoning this action.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The reason for putting the provision in the Bill is to make it a little easier to handle the people who have received a free license but then use it intrastate instead of only interstate. It is an attempt to tighten up the position, and I think that is the right attitude. If a man has a free license, interstate, and uses it intrastate, it is time we caught up with him, because it is a privilege he should not abuse.

I appreciate the exposition which Mr. Wise has given. I am aware of the difficulties, and I was trying to work out why, from a State point of view, a man resident in the State should not be charged some license fee; because he has to go from his place of operation to the border, in any case. I do not see why we should not impose a charge, not upon the goods, but upon the vehicle. I realise the difficulties,

and I appreciate that a constitutional amendment is the only way to overcome them.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 43 amended—

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: When Mr. Willesee was speaking the other evening he referred to certain facts in clause 7 dealing with penalties. I have already given notice to the Clerk that I intend to move an amendment as a result of a suggestion from the Minister who handles the traffic portfolio, and I have placed two amendments on the notice paper. I think they will conform to the wishes of the Committee. I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 10—Delete the word "shall" and substitute the word "may".

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move an amendment—

Page 5, lines 11 to 13—Delete the passage, "irreducible in mitigation, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, of" and substitute the words "not exceeding".

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

IRON ORE (MOUNT GOLDSWORTHY) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

When last year's Bill ratifying the agreement between the Government and the several firms who were to undertake the development of the Mt. Goldsworthy iron ore deposit was passed, there was a general intention that the harbour for the export of iron ore would be established at Depuch Island, and the agreement was based accordingly.

Although the agreement envisaged this course, it was well known at the time that such decision could only be based on survey information then available. Under the agreement, the Joint Venturers—which is the term used to identify the

firms concerned—undertook immediate obligations. Amongst these was an obligation to make a general reconnaissance of the various sites of operations; the selection of a railway route to a suitable harbour; engineering investigations of suitable port sites; wharf installations; and the planning of townsites both at Mt. Goldsworthy and at Depuch.

There was a provision that, in all these matters, the Joint Venturers would consult with the Government. The State was obliged to make adequate areas of land available for jetties, marshalling yards, townsites, etc. As mentioned previously, the company was required to select the port site in consultation with the State and the consulting engineers, Messrs. Rendel, Palmer, & Tritton, give due and proper consideration and regard to their reports, and advise on the general development and utilisation of the island as a deep-sea port.

There was the further provision that should the State consider the areas selected by the Joint Venturers would prejudicially affect the proper development, use or capacity of the port as a whole, the Joint Venturers should not be enabled to proceed until a final decision was determined. It will be appreciated that very many important factors are dependent on the right choice of a harbour site. Briefly, these may be enumerated as dredging, wharves, railway, roads, townsites, and the land necessary for their construction.

It is further provided in the agreement that in the choice of any site or route, each party will have regard not only to their respective interests, but also to the general development of the area or areas likely to be affected. Since the ratification of the agreement, both parties have been carrying out their obligations satisfactorily. For instance, nearly £1,000,000 has been spent by the Joint Venturers on preliminary investigation, field engineering, designs, and estimates of construction costs.

As a consequence of investigations, the Joint Venturers are undecided at this point of time on the location of the port site, and it could be that they will select a site other than Depuch Island. There exists no elasticity in the agreement in this respect, so it is desirable and necessary, in the best interests of both parties to the agreement, that provision should be made to vary the arrangements if proved necessary.

In view of the fact that the change of programme could possibly be made in the next few months, at a time when Parliament is in recess, it is very desirable to have a provision enabling the parties to the agreement to vary it in a manner necessary at the time, thus avoiding any delay. The Government, in response to the verbal

representations made earlier, was convinced of the desirability of amending the Act to accommodate a probable variation of the original agreement.

Accordingly, this Bill was drafted. The passing of it would give the parties to the agreement the right to vary it to give effect to the following:—

- (a) to require, or enable, the State to grant to the company a lease of any area (including the outer ocean approaches to any port or place) to be dredged;
- (b) to substitute for Depuch Island, mentioned in the agreement, another port or place and, in the event of such a substitution being made, to make consequential or other amendments, with respect to the railway, town sites, facilities, services, and other matters referred to in the agreement; and
- (c) to bring about the more efficient or satisfactory fulfilment of its objectives.

This measure is considered to be in the best interests of both parties to the original agreement, and is necessary to enable the development of the project to proceed to its ultimate success.

In introducing this Bill, it is not my desire to give any clear indication whatsoever that the Joint Venturers will, in fact, choose Port Hedland, or any other place, instead of Depuch Island; but, bearing in mind the notice dates in the agreement, it could well be that the company desires to negotiate further with the Government on the change of port site when, as I have already said, Parliament is not in session. This would result in considerable delay, and whilst it could be said that the arrangements made could be ratified by Parliament at its next session, we cannot get away from the fact that the Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Act provides specifically for the establishment of a port at Depuch Island.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is the Minister able to tell us if he has had any indication how far they are away from a decision?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As each week passes I am hoping the company is closer to a decision. However, as I am sure the honourable member will appreciate, a decision of this importance is one the company cannot easily make. I repeat that it has spent in the order of nearly £1,000,000 to date on research, and I do not want to give the House, the people in Port Hedland, for instance, and the people in the north, generally, the idea from what I am saying here that it is a foregone conclusion that this company is going to commence its operations at Port Hedland.

I realise, of course, that if it decides to go to Port Hedland it will not be an unpopular decision. In fact, I think I can safely say that it probably would be one of the most popular decisions it could make. However, I can say this to the honourable member in reply to his interjection, that I will be most anxious to press the company to the point of making a decision as soon as possible. I am conscious of the fact that we must do everything we can to help these companies in the sale of this particular mineral. I have something in these notes on that aspect which I will mention as I proceed.

I say this, I repeat, because I do not want, for instance, the townsfolk of Port Hedland or the people in the north generally to be led into the belief that there will be a change when, after further consideration and investigations, it may be that the company will resort to the original plan. On the other hand, the Government is anxious, in the interests of the State, to see contracts for the sale of this mineral negotiated as soon as possible, and I feel that Parliament is justified in authorising the Government to come to any decision necessary in respect of the relocation of the port site.

Of course, in doing this, it may be asked: What will happen to the railway and the railway Bill? In the event of any change, of course, the route of the railway will have to be changed, and I will have to bring a Bill before Parliament to effect that. The first essential is to give the Government the authority, should the occasion arise, to act in the best interests of the State—and I can assure members that it will be in the best interests of the State—and to renegotiate the agreement on that basis. As far as the railway is concerned, it will not be too late to bring forward a Bill to change the route of the railway next session.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

TOWN PLANNING

Appointment of Advisory Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 17th October, on the following motion by The Hon. J. G. Hislop:—

That in the opinion of this House, now that the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme has been tabled, a stage has been reached when what has been achieved and planned should be reviewed and aspects of future planning that were not originally obvious should be studied, and, in order that these objects may be achieved, the Government be requested to give consideration to the appointment of a committee representative of both Houses of Parliament and the

public, with authority to investigate and advise upon all matters relating to town planning.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Town Planning) [6.1 p.m.]: I think all members will agree that an opportunity should be given to this House and to another place to discuss the problems of town planning which affect the City of Perth and its regions. Dr. Hislop moved the motion so that he could expound his views in this regard, and I hope other members will take this opportunity to do likewise. I do not agree with the last part of the motion, but I accept the first part which is the crux of the matter.

In this debate Dr. Hislop mentioned many matters, particularly those relating to the planning of the city. We have to appreciate that from a town planning regional authority point of view, its job is to lay down, in broad principles, the basis of planning for the region. When we deal with the inner workings of the city, that can only be done in collaboration with the City of Perth.

At the moment we do not have the power to direct local authorities as to what they should do in this regard. It is unfortunate that such a large local authority as the City of Perth, with so many responsibilities, has not seen fit to appoint a town planner to its staff. I think it has been very remiss in this respect.

When I first became the Minister for Town Planning, the City of Perth did not even have a zoning plan. I admit it tried in 1957 to have one adopted, but this House defeated the measure; it tried again to do that in 1959, with the same result. A local authority as large as the City of Perth should not have played around with zoning schemes; it should have submitted a town planning scheme.

Recently when I attended one of the meetings of that local authority I said it was about time the City of Perth endeavoured to appoint a town planner to its staff, in order to give some relief to the Town Clerk. Mr. McI. Green, the Town Clerk, is quite a capable town planner, but one cannot expect him to carry out the duties of Town Clerk and town planner. The amount of work which he had to undertake was, to some extent, the cause of his ill-health.

I believe that plans which we make in the next few years will be critical. Whatever basis is laid down in the next few years will become the foundation for many years ahead. The determination of the basis and the ideas on future planning can only come about through the efforts of professional men trained to do the job. This is not a job only for town planners; it is one for professional men, such as architects, departmental officers, and even

landscape artists. The last mentioned must play a very important part in developments of the future.

One of the features I noticed during my American trip was that in the construction of highways and freeways, the surrounding area was landscaped. That was done when the buildings and roads were constructed. Landscaping made all the difference to the appearance of many huge concrete structures in San Francisco. One of these was a concrete system of highways on six different levels; yet wherever possible the surrounding area was landscaped.

In my view no single department is able to evolve what will be the basis of town planning for the City of Perth. Whatever else we might do we should make sure that the foundation is sound; and the next few years are vital because the foundation will be laid during that time.

We have gone to a lot of detail in regard to the construction of Mitchell Freeway. This project is only one of the very many features of the regional town planning scheme, and up to date most of the work has been undertaken by the Main Roads Department in conjunction with the De Lew-Cather Company. This firm was brought to Western Australia by the Government to examine the scheme put up by Professor Stephenson and worked on by the Main Roads Department. This was done to ensure that we were on the right track before any attempt was made to pull down buildings to construct the freeway. This is a well-known construction company, and I had the opportunity to meet some of its executive officers in San Francisco and Chicago. I was able to see some of the tremendous projects it has worked on, and I am perfectly satisfied that the men this company will allocate to Western Australia for the construction of the freeway can be regarded as some of the top men in this field of development.

Sitting suspended from 6.8 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Prior to the tea suspension I was discussing one of the phases of the regional scheme which had received the most attention. I am referring to the switch road, or Mitchell Freeway. Of course, this of itself does not make the scheme.

Perhaps the next most important aspect in regard to the city is its transportation system and the contemporary problems associated with such a system. In my travels I found that this is a problem which affects practically every city in America; and none has found the ideal solution.

Prior to my arriving in San Francisco, a referendum was held as to whether the city should raise one billion dollars—which in our language is about £470,000,000—for a rapid transit system; the loan to be repaid over 33 years. The system would

serve San Francisco and the two cities across the bay; namely, Berkeley and Oakland. The proposal was for a rapid rail type of transit system. The scheme looked very good. Ratepayers were informed that they would be taxed for the next 33 years to repay the loan. The authority would pay only running costs and replacement parts, and nothing would come out of the system to repay interest and sinking fund charges in connection with the loan. It was a grandiose scheme and I was privileged to study it.

The scheme which is nearest to the one proposed for Perth is that which applies in Denver. The population there is what we might expect Perth to have in the next 15 or 20 years. The authorities in Denver have spent many thousands of dollars on every type of research in an effort to solve its transportation problems. It is amazing the amount of money that is available in America from different funds for research of all kinds. But despite all this research, the theme at the town planning congress which I attended at Seattle was one of frustration. Experts were unable to get anywhere because of the lack of parliamentary or legal procedure; they could not get anything down in black and white.

This theme of frustration was evident throughout the conference. Planners were wondering how they could put their thoughts and ideas into practice. A transportation system for Perth would not be an easy problem to solve. I do not think it will be solved by members of Parliament. It will take experts, with knowledge of overseas trends, to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. The Government has arranged for the De Lew-Cather Company to inquire into this problem to give us some thoughts on the matter. But there are many problems associated with the regional scheme.

We have already received preliminary reports on the lowering of the railway line. The matter has been investigated by an officer of the Town Planning Department, but it has still to be considered by Cabinet. As Minister for Town Planning, I would say that the sinking of the railway line is most important in conjunction with the development of the switch road and the standard gauge railway. If it is not done now, then the opportunity will be lost forever. If the railway line is lowered it will be an asset to the city.

I hope we will be able to make use of the scheme that has been presented to us, although it will cost a lot of money. Whenever we plan for the future, or decide to build bridges across the river, we strike trouble because we run across somebody's property. On the plan there is a proposal for a bridge to be built from Point Resolution. It will not be built for some years, but already we are receiving objections to the proposal. Every man has the right to object in these matters, but we

should appreciate that whenever we put something into operation, somewhere along the line somebody will be upset.

One of our biggest headaches will be a road and rail system into the Port of Fremantle. Fremantle is on a small peninsula, and the port will develop very rapidly. The region is likely to have a population of 1,250,000, and we can quite well appreciate the difficulties of having a road and rail transport system into the heart of Fremantle that would serve the volume of traffic which is likely to occur in that area.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There is a big bottleneck near Cottesloe.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There are a lot of bottlenecks. There are 13 points on the plan for the Fremantle area, and it would take engineers three or four months, working solidly, to work out an outline of what could happen in the future regarding a road and rail system. Many difficulties lie ahead for our planners. We do not have sufficient qualified planners to delve into this problem. Each one of them is overworked. The Town Planner (Mr. Lloyd) is unable to concentrate on this one problem, but has to solve all kinds of problems all along the line. I am hoping that in the not very distant future I will be able to arrange for two more planners to join the department. I think that would be of advantage to the city and the State.

Dr. Hislop mentioned a seminar held this year which, unfortunately, I was unable to attend. I opened the one held last year, but on this occasion I had to go into the country and was unable to open it. However, I was able to read the papers which were presented. I agree with Dr. Hislop that much of the meat at these seminars comes out of the discussions which take place. There is no record of the discussions that took place, or of the working parties; and I will make sure that next year a record is kept of these discussions. I agree with the honourable member that it is during these discussions that we really get to the meat of the various problems. I think these discussions are equally as important as the actual papers that are read.

Mention was made of the western switch road and the approaches to Parliament House. This is not an easy matter to solve. Two years ago this House passed a resolution to control the erection of buildings around Parliament House. The Principal Architect, the Commissioner for Main Roads, and the Town Planning Commissioner are co-operating with Professor Stephenson to bring down a report on the methods of handling this matter.

It is not easy to get these people to meet together very often. It is not an easy matter, because we are dealing with properties which are already owned, and we are dealing with uniform building by-laws. There are by-laws which say that in certain areas we cannot erect buildings of more than a

certain height; and certain architectural features apply to other areas. We will have to have some sort of control, whether or not the individual likes it. We have to face up to this problem if we are going to have a wonderful landmark in this city—and in this connection I am referring to Parliament House when it is completed.

I think Dr. Hislop was short in the amount which he suggested was being spent on additions to Parliament House. I think he said the amount was £375,000.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: I said £750,000.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If my information is correct, I think it is over £1,000,000, or it will be by the time the additions are completed. We will have something which is worth while preserving.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is worth £1,000,000 to exert State rights to that extent.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes. I realise the problems connected with this matter. I can assure you, Mr. President, that you, as Chairman of the Joint House Committee, and as the President of the Legislative Council, will be brought into discussions with the committee on this matter. I have had an assurance from the committee that that will be done.

It is not my intention to keep the House any longer on this motion. I think it is a good thing to give members an opportunity to express their opinions on these subjects, but I hope Dr. Hislop will not persist with the latter portion of the motion; because I honestly believe this is a job for experts, and they should advise us. It is difficult for us to advise them, and when we have received their advice, it is up to us to accept it or reject it. I appreciate the opportunity this motion has given us to debate the subject; and I have been able to express some points of view I have in regard to the plan and what we expect to apply within this city of ours.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [7.46 p.m.]: I think it is a treat, and quite interesting, to hear the Minister for Town Planning deal with the subject of town planning when not in a belligerent mood—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I am never in a belligerent mood.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: —when not on the defensive in respect of something that has been trenchantly criticised; and we like him in that role.

Tonight the Minister has given us some information which is not only interesting but extremely provocative of thought. In speaking directly to the motion, it could be described as one of the most pious of a pious type; because, if carried, it could mean nothing and would put nothing into effect. Dr. Hislop knows that full well and appreciates that that is the situation. He also appreciates that the opportunity is

afforded to have the subject debated within the scope of the motion, and I have no doubt that was the sole purpose which prompted its introduction.

I would like to see a motion of this type much more specific in character, referring directly to certain sections of the Act, and for some inquiry by an authority, whether within or without Parliament, to deal particularly with those sections of the Town Planning Act which refer to resumptions, and to the powers and authorities of the Town Planning Board. In the latter matter, naturally, I am referring to section 24 of the Act.

If we read the motion we can imagine there are certain aspects of town planning, and the administration of town planning, which cause the general public considerable concern; and that cannot be denied, however warranted the concern may be, however well-founded the complaints may be, or however unjust the decisions of the board may be regarded.

The Minister gave us an outline of what may be required of the public when various works, projected into the future, involve resumptions of private property—when people have no idea that such a thing can happen to them. People could find that they were involved in plans for an abutment, approaches to a bridge over the river, or a design involving new roads and the redesign of highways, and work to be carried out in the inner circle of the city. When people find out these things they become distressed because their life savings, in some instances, are imperilled, or indeed impaired, and they do not know what to do about it because the law is not on their side.

Therefore, I think it is time that not only an inquiry at departmental level be instituted in this connection, but also that the Minister institute at a very high level an inquiry along the lines envisaged in the early stage of the motion, and including those sections of the Act, from section 7 onwards, which deal with resumptions, and those from sections 20 to 26, which deal with the powers of the board. I think that should be done because at this stage it is imperative that the public be brought more on side with the activities of the Town Planning Board than they can possibly be unless they are taken more into the confidence of the board and of the planning of the Government through the board.

It is in an exchange of thoughts in a contemplation of ideas and ideals, and in a discussion of involved subjects, that the most profitable confidence is engendered among the parties concerned. Doubts one may have about whether one can trust some person, or about one's liking for a person, because of what appears to be his autocratic attitude, or an unfortunate abuse of use of authority and power, will, if properly handled, fall away in those circumstances. What is required at this stage,

I think, is to dispel a lot of the suspicion in order to get away from the criticism which the Minister knows is levelled constantly at the Town Planning Board.

Indeed the Town Planning Board is so much the subject of criticism that public men can almost feel, in the presence of some of the representatives of the board, that they are saying, "You are one of our critics. I am not too sure whether we like you or trust you." That is an unfortunate development, but I am sure there are members present who have had that sort of feeling. I would have liked to see a much more substantive motion moved, one which would have caused an inquiry by parliamentarians to be held into the effects of the sections of the Act to which I have referred.

However, I would suggest to the Minister that he arrange for a very critical look at the sections I mentioned by someone outside the board itself; and there are people competent to have a look at them, in that sphere of activity, in local government spheres, and in university spheres, to say whether certain sections are acting harshly and should be amended in the public interest. I think what is required more than anything at this stage is a restoration of confidence that something done is not being done with any vicious intent, but is generally in the public interest in regard to town planning.

I do not intend to speak at length on this subject. I know Dr. Hislop moved this motion, in this form, deliberately to have the matter discussed, knowing that when carried it is a matter for the Minister to say whether anything can be achieved by it. However, I hope that some inquiry will be pursued to ensure that some of the wrongs as between the public and the board may be righted.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [7.56 p.m.]: I am grateful to those who have spoken to the motion; and, as Mr. Wise said, it was worded purely in order that the whole subject could be discussed. When I have said my few words I will be quite prepared to ask leave of the Chamber to withdraw this motion because I believe we have come to an arrangement with the Minister which will ensure that a great degree of what I have asked for in the motion will be done.

One of the things I really criticise in regard to the planning for Perth conference that was held at the University in September, was that while the actual speeches were recorded none of the valuable discussions were recorded, which means that much of real value was lost to the Town Planning Board and to the public. I believe the Minister will see that that is rectified at the next meeting.

I would like to see this planning conference, which is held annually, grow to such an extent that it has to move into

much bigger surroundings than are available in the lecture theatre at the University. At the last conference about 150 people, most of whom were architects, senior civil servants, and other men occupying responsible positions, were present. But I want to see the man in the street able to air his views and say what he thinks is being accomplished within his city. I think the matter ought to be discussed in a much wider fashion, and ample scope should be given so that various avenues of this problem can be discussed.

It might be possible to set aside a legal section so that the wishes of Mr. Wise could be met by people giving considerable study to the various points raised. I agree, too, that if town planning is to be a success we must have the co-operation of the public, and we must also have their confidence. If we can, by some other means, spread confidence in what we are trying to achieve as a Parliament, and a Town Planning Board, then I think the ultimate end, so far as the city of Perth is concerned, will be something which we can praise.

Therefore, having achieved my object, I ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 29th August, on the following motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon—

- (1) The desirability or otherwise of introducing fluoridation of water into the reticulation systems and supply to the capital city and town supplies in Western Australia;
- (2) the particular advantages to the health of the communities by such introduction;
- (3) whether benefits to dental health may reasonably be expected in Western Australia from the addition of fluoride to public water supplies, having regard to the results of the fluoridation of water supplies in other countries;
- (4) whether any disadvantages may result from the addition of fluoride to waters naturally containing less than one part of fluoride per million;
- (5) whether it is desirable or expedient that local authorities should be permitted to decide

on such addition for the benefit of residents, particularly children, of their districts;

- (6) whether there are any practicable methods of adjusting the daily intake of fluoride other than by addition to the water consumed;
- (7) whether, and to what extent, the Government should take any steps in relation to the powers or actions of local authorities in respect of any of the foregoing matters; and
- (8) generally, to inquire into any other such questions that may come to notice in the course of inquiries into the foregoing matters being investigated.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [7.59 p.m.]: The motion moved by Mr. Stubbs, as I think members will agree, has been on the notice paper for some considerable time without being proceeded with, the principal reason being that Parliament had before it for its consideration a Bill which, had it been passed, would have authorised the fluoridation of the public water supplies of this State under certain conditions. It is true to say that during the course of the debate on the Bill which was before the House, a great deal was said in this Chamber, and in another place, on the merits and demerits of the fluoridation of public water supplies.

Very much more has, of course, been said in many countries of the world. I do not propose at this point of time to add a great deal to the total. Mr. Stubbs in his speech introducing the motion pointed out some of the pros and cons of the fluoridation proposals, and, as a result of the presentation of his case, drew the conclusion that a Select Committee would resolve, as he said, the frustration and the perplexities of the people in their approach to this subject.

I gathered the impression from the remarks made by the honourable member at the time that he was rather more than inclined to favour fluoridation of public water supplies. I may be wrong in that assumption, but I seemed to read into his remarks at the time that he was not one that could be placed among those whom I might refer to as anti-fluoridationists.

In general, the view of the Government is that the fluoridation of public water supplies is a simple public health measure. It is one which performs a minor miracle in reducing dental decay in children's teeth by up to approximately 65 per cent. Fluoridation of water supplies has been proved time and time again to have this most beneficial effect; and the overwhelming

weight of scientific, medical, and dental opinion supports the reform as a practical procedure which is completely safe.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is not true you know. There is as much against it as for it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will get to the point of concluding my remarks on this matter. I would also point out that Western Australia has an efficient public health service controlled by competent officers who have the necessary training and experience to study and evaluate the technical information relating to public health. Public health officers broadly have two functions: to advise the Government as to the need, advisability, safety, and effectiveness of public health measures, and to implement such measures; and to advise the community upon these matters.

This is a system which has produced highly satisfactory results in the control of major health problems in Western Australia. Whilst I am not going to take up the time of the House this evening, I think many of the measures on public health that have been introduced into this State, and perhaps into other parts of the country, come under the category of the explanation I have just given. I think it will be agreed that relatively few people in the community have the technical background and experience to be able to evaluate—even if they have the necessary journals and the conflicting scientific arguments—the complex medical and public health data inherent in such problems.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That cuts both ways.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course it cuts both ways. The community employs qualified people to make recommendations on its behalf, and fluoridation as a subject matter is really no exception; it is merely a segment of public health work.

The alternative to an organised assessment of public health, since so much public health legislation concerns the whole community, would be a rather chaotic situation which could not help but be—indeed it must be—prejudicial to general public health. Extremely important work has been carried out in research in many countries and by many organisations. In particular I refer to the work of the Select Committee of the World Health Organisation, and to the exhaustive and scientifically based research in the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, and, of course, to the excellent job done some few years ago by the New Zealand Royal Commission into fluoridation.

I think it is also appropriate to point out that the British Ministry of Health, during its memorable conduct of studies on fluoridation, closely and scientifically assessed a considerable list of scientific

references and work done by individuals and teams of experts over a number of years.

I have in these notes what may be referred to as long lists of such references; many for, and some against. I do not propose to weary the House by reading these to members, but I repeat that many are for, and some are against, the arguments on fluoridation. It should be noted that many of these references are to a number who oppose fluoridation of water supplies; but the significant fact is that when all these scientific references were assessed by the trained people capable of assessing them, the British Ministry of Health announced that it was completely in favour of the fluoridation of water supplies, and that fluoridation was completely safe.

It has been said on a number of occasions that no public health matter has ever had such a vetting, or been so inquired into, as the matter of fluoridation of water supplies. We in this Chamber have ventilated over a long period of time our personal feelings on the matter; we have given forth to authorities on the matter; we have received information, and some fears have been stated—I will not say created—in respect of the matter; but the Bill that was before Parliament, and which passed the Legislative Assembly and came here, was in fact not passed by this House.

I accept, as always, the will of the Chamber, and the majority of the Chamber, when it votes. I have no quarrel with the fact that the House rejected this piece of legislation; although I must express both personally, and from the Government's point of view, a disappointment that that happened. I do not consider that any of these things can be sorted out and made any better by the appointment in this Chamber of a Select Committee to inquire into this matter. In view of these things it appears to me, to say the very least, extremely doubtful whether any good at all could flow from a Select Committee of members of this Chamber. I am therefore obliged to state that I oppose the motion, and I hope it will not be carried.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (West) [8.10 p.m.]: During the debate on fluoridation I had nothing to say. I felt then, as I feel now, that this question is one which has not been resolved completely in people's minds. There is still considerable doubt as to whether or not the community would be doing the right thing if it introduced fluoridation. While that doubt remains I feel we have an obligation placed upon us to do something to see if we cannot resolve the question in people's minds so that they will either accept or reject the proposition completely.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you think a Select Committee of lay people will do that?

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I will get to that in a moment. I was a bit disappointed at the trend of the debate. I felt there was some bitterness, hostility, and intolerance which we should not find in such a debate.

This is a question which could have far-reaching results in the community. I certainly do hold the opinion that fluoride would have beneficial effects in relation to children and their teeth; but I am afraid I am one of those who have yet to be convinced that those effects, so far as adults are concerned, will be completely harmless.

As I said, I felt there was a certain amount of intolerance about this question. I will not delay the House long, but I propose to put this point of view: I think the Minister in his second reading speech on the question referred to a minority of scientific opposition of varying repute but very voluble. Anybody who happens to belong to a minority has the right, if he feels justified, to become voluble; and I will give ample reasons why.

There was a pamphlet issued, and I take it it was a most authoritative one, by the Health Education Council of Western Australia in association with the Australian Dental Association. When I picked it up to read and study it I felt that this would contain the answer to fluoridation. I will not take the questions in the order in which they appear. The pamphlet is entitled, "Answers to questions most likely to be asked about fluoridation." I thought, if those are the questions most likely to be asked—and remember the answers are provided—they are real Dorothy Dixers. They asked the questions and gave the answers themselves. Seeing they were bodies sponsoring fluoridation, I should have thought they would give answers which would have been satisfactory to the people. One of the questions reads as follows:—

How can communities obtain the benefits of fluoridation?

This is the answer given—

By urging community service organisations to approve the measure for the sake of the children, by demanding action by legislators at Shire Council and State Parliament level and by talks with friends and neighbours so that a popular demand for this public health measure will demonstrate to health authorities that this is the wish of the people.

I took that to mean that in order to obtain the wish of the people we must urge some, and we must demand of others, that they accept one's point of view. I happen to be one of those peculiar people who do not accept urging or demanding, and I felt I had to be a little in opposition to what they were trying to get the community to accept. The people who oppose fluoridation and who happen to be a little voluble, might, I suggest, have

found it necessary to be voluble in order to have their views heard above the clamour and demanding of the Health Education Council.

I believe any group is entitled to be heard. Let me give a couple of suppositional cases so that we can take this matter out of the atmosphere of intolerance and, perhaps, bring a little sanity into it. Suppose there was a proposal to put aspirin into our beer at the source of supply and the reason given was that it might eliminate the possibilities of headaches and hangovers. Surely if the group that is popularly referred to as the Lager Lovers' League wished to raise its voice in opposition, we would be prepared to listen.

Let us take another suppositional case. Suppose there was a proposal to spray all tobacco leaf with a chemical which would remove any danger of lung cancer. Surely when a proposal like that is made in the interests of the health of smokers, they would be prepared to accept it. But if they decided they would object to something like that being done, surely we would listen to their point of view. I believe we are running a grave risk; because every time a proposal of any kind is put forward, those who make the most noise are the people listened to. I feel it is a dangerous state of affairs.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I might remind you about those words a little later.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: All right, Sir. There is an institution in Parliament which always reminds one of what one says; and there are always people who will look back over a period of 10 or 12 years to bring matters up. I am of the opinion that we start to be intolerant when one is not permitted to change one's views. I might have entirely different views on this matter tomorrow morning when I wake up. I might have different views next week. Nevertheless, as an individual, I am entitled to have that privilege. A woman is not the only one who should have the prerogative to change her mind—and I say that with all due apologies to Mrs. Hutchison.

In relation to this Select Committee, I think we could support some investigation which could have regard to all sides of the problem and eventually make a report to the House. I will give one example of where a similar move took place. I do not know, Mr. President, whether I am in order in mentioning another place, but the event I wish to refer to took place in the Federal House when the question of the fluoridation of Canberra's water supplies was raised. A suggestion was made that there be a committee of the House, composed of four members appointed by the Prime Minister and three by the Leader of the Opposition, to consider the aspects of this problem and report back.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: They had one extra on the Government side.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Being the Government, I suppose it was entitled to have that extra member. When a vote was taken in the House the numbers were 55 to 55—and voting was not on party lines.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They must have had a few pairs there.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Of course, the Deputy Speaker gave his vote against the proposal, which is customary in the debates of that House. The man who raised the question of a committee of the House was not a member on the Government side; but they were prepared to have a look at both sides of the question.

I feel we should do the same. I believe the day will come when water supplies will be fluoridated, but other things will happen between now and then to enable me to have a definite opinion. Many things have happened in the medical world during this past century which were accomplished despite the majority of opposition from medical circles. I might just quote a few examples: There was an overwhelming majority of medical practitioners who would have been prepared to certify to the professional incapacity of Lister, Jenner, Pasteur, and Madam Cure. So the argument that a Government has the numbers on its side does not necessarily cut ice; and the views submitted are not necessarily correct.

Some people always like to rubbish the Opposition. It is often thought that the authorities on the Government side are wonderful, and that the authorities on this side of the House are not authoritative at all. An authority could be a Nobel prize winner, but when he talks about fluoridation it is said that he does not know what he is talking about. Members may have read in the paper during the week that Dr. Hugo Theorell, the 1955 Nobel prize winner, said that he was still opposed to the fluoridation of municipal drinking water. Surely we can accept the view of an authority like that.

He is not the only one. There is Sir Arthur Amies. Those authorities go down big with me. In regard to medical matters in this House, I am always prepared to accept the opinion of Dr. Hislop; and if I were feeling sick in the House and he recommended I should take something—I take it he would not recommend that I should take a dose of cyanide—I say frankly that I would respect his advice.

If we feel the day will come—and I feel it will—when water supplies will be fluoridated, then many problems must be answered. There is still a lot more to be learned about this matter, and I appeal to all members to listen in tolerance to

both sides of the question. I am of the opinion that that is what Mr. Stubbs had in mind when he moved for a Select Committee. Seeing there is such a variance of opinion, a Select Committee could take evidence from all sources and present its report to the House. I do not know whether the House would be prepared to accept it or not; I have my doubts about that; and I am a little bit with the Minister in this respect.

Although I support Mr. Stubbs—if members can follow one who is a little Irish—in his desires for a Select Committee, I can also see the point of view of the Minister. I believe we are not yet ready to accept fluoridation, and I do not think a Select Committee would turn the balance one way or the other, irrespective of the information submitted to it. I support Mr. Stubbs in his motion that a Select Committee be appointed because I consider it would be a forward step, even though its report might not be acceptable to the House.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would remind you that the honourable member introduced his motion before the debate on the Bill.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Fair enough; and we were not prepared to accept his good advice when given then. However, I am prepared to accept it now.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [8.23 p.m.]: When this motion was first introduced by Mr. Stubbs, I was inclined to believe it might be a good move to have a Select Committee to inquire into the fluoridation of our water supplies. However, since then we have had the legislation before us and I have spent a lot of time in studying and considering this particular subject. I believe the problem is one of such magnitude—I do not cast aspersions on any member who might want to be appointed to a Select Committee—that it would be almost impossible for a Select Committee to arrive at a conclusive opinion on this subject.

It would be necessary for a Select Committee inquiring into this matter to take evidence within this State, within Australia, and overseas, and that would cost a great amount of money. If members of the Select Committee did not travel overseas it would be necessary to invite evidence from expert medical people from overseas. The New Zealand Government held a Royal Commission into this subject. Some overseas people gave evidence, but even then the conclusion reached was not based on all the facts available throughout the world.

I do not think water supplies have been fluoridated for a long enough period to make the effects of fluoridation fully known, so that it is possible to get down

to the basic evidence. So, with those remarks, I feel I cannot support this motion, because of the impossibility of a Select Committee of this Parliament being able to get the evidence required to arrive at a conclusive opinion.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.27 p.m.]: I would like to clear up one or two misunderstandings that may have resulted from the heated debate that previously took place on the subject.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Speak up!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I have a file of evidence which I have not yet given to this House, but I do not propose to do so tonight.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Good.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am sure, Mr. President, you would not want me to do that. What I would like to clear up is this: Some members suggested that our vote in this House was a political one. Therefore I would like to inform members that I was a delegate at the 1962 State conference of our party, just as the Minister probably was at his party conference.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I thought you were going to say to your party.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We would not let you in.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Because of the wide variation of thought on this subject, we, as a party in our political wing, decided to form a committee to investigate fluoridation and report back to the next conference of our party late in 1964. That gave the committee two years in which to work—and it is working at present. Mr. Stubbs is a member of that committee.

Since Mr. Stubbs placed his motion on the notice paper in the early part of the session, we received a great deal of mail both for and against the subject, and this further confused the issue on the Bill which was later introduced. However, when we voted on the Bill, it was not a party vote. Because our party has not received the report of the committee that was set up, we were in as much doubt about the subject when the vote was taken as we were at our State conference.

When Mr. Stubbs brought this matter forward, he was appointed, with another member of State Caucus, to go on the committee of the State conference of our party. Therefore, I feel we must support Mr. Stubbs in his move for a Select Committee; because the information which is coming in daily to this committee, which was appointed by the party of which I am proud to be a member, is so enormous and so confusing that I do not think even Dr. Hislop could argue against voting for a Select Committee of this House. I support the motion.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [8.31 p.m.]: I do not intend to be long on this reply. I think we have heard as much on fluoridation as we can take this session. I would remind members that I gave notice of this motion on the 1st August, and moved it on the 29th August. In the meantime we have heard quite a lot on this subject; and I think almost every member on our side has spoken, and quite a few members on the Government side.

I would remind members that I gave my reasons for moving the motion. I believed that the people were perplexed and confused about the issue. However, I do not believe that our discussions have helped much. Some of the people to whom I have spoken have been against the proposal, and others have been for it. Some want it for their children, and others are doubtful. I believe it is a bit late to do much about it at this stage, but we never know.

Members may recall that the first item into which I desire a Select Committee to inquire is as follows:—

The desirability or otherwise of introducing fluoridation of water into the reticulation systems and supply to the capital city and town supplies in Western Australia.

From the discussions which have taken place in another place, and here, it is obvious that we all agree there is a certain amount of merit in the proposal. Another item in my motion is as follows:—

Whether it is desirable or expedient that local authorities should be permitted to decide on such addition for the benefit of residents, particularly children, of their districts.

This matter was discussed during the debate on the Bill. We wanted local option; and I still believe that people in localities should have the right to decide whether they want fluoridation. This matter will only arise, of course, if the legislation is introduced at some later date, and passed. I know that in my own area there are about a half a dozen towns which want fluoridation and about three which do not. Therefore at any future date it would be desirable for local authorities to have a say.

The following is item No. (6) in my motion:—

Whether there are any practicable methods of adjusting the daily intake of fluoride other than by addition to the water consumed.

We all know it is possible to obtain fluoride tablets, and I know a lot of people who are giving them to their children, whose teeth are very good. They are obviously

benefiting from the tablets. Human nature is involved in this matter of tablets. Some people will stick meticulously to giving tablets, but other parents could not care less. They will give their children one tablet, and then several days—perhaps weeks—will elapse before they give any more. For some reason tablets seem to be put on a shelf and forgotten for some time.

The next item is No. (7) which reads as follows:—

Whether, and to what extent, the Government should take any steps in relation to the powers or actions of local authorities in respect of any of the foregoing matters.

The reason for this provision is that Tasmania subsidises its shire councils or local water boards to the extent of 60 per cent. for equipment; and they are subsidised pound for pound in the running of the scheme.

We have heard evidence both for and against; and, as I said earlier, we have all had our fill of fluoridation. Only the other day we read of a doctor who had given slimming pills to women who subsequently developed cataracts. We all know of the effect thalidomide had on babies born to women who, during their pregnancy, took this drug. The doctors at the time believed that those pills were quite all right. They were sure of it. However, evidence has proved that they were not all right.

I do not intend to hammer this matter any more. I am sure that members have made up their minds as to which way they will vote, and nothing I could say now would change their minds.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—12

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. D. F. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchinson	Hon. W. F. Whilesse
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise

(Teller)

Noes—15

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. L. Loton	

(Teller)

Pair

Aye	No
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. J. M. Thomson

Majority against—3.

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

House adjourned at 8.39 p.m.