

driving. In the evidence given in court it was stated that the passenger was very seriously knocked about and the passenger gave some evidence—or was supposed to have made a statement to the police—to the effect that he leant against the door and fell out. When I told this to the chief officer of the trust, I was told that that was the end of the appeal—no negligence on the driver's part had been proved and no payment could be made.

We are all accustomed to driving with our families in the car and we all believe that we are sufficiently covered should one of the children fall out of the car; but apparently we are not.

I feel there is ample scope for a thorough inquiry into this type of case. Mr. Heenan is the mover of the motion and he is quite competent to undertake that type of inquiry.

One other aspect of the Minister's reply intrigued me somewhat. The Minister told us that he had introduced a Bill for the purpose of allowing this matter to be studied and anyone who felt he had an objection could bring his objection forward. The Minister said the only approach he received was from the R.A.C.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: And the Law Society.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I was going to say that I would have been surprised if the Minister had not heard from the Law Society. I did not understand the Minister to say this in his reply—I understood him to restrict it to the R.A.C. However, I stand corrected on this point. The Law Society is very concerned about this particular Bill, and one of its main objections is that the Act will be altered to set up a tribunal from which there would be no further appeal. Of course, that may seem all right to some people but I, personally, feel that our rules of justice—the British rules of justice, which we adopt—have always allowed an appeal from one authority to another, and consequently the opinion of one tribunal is not conclusive. One has the opportunity of approaching at least three tribunals under our law, which means that one opinion does not prevail. One has the opportunity to obtain two opinions out of three.

I consider that Mr. Heenan, who is a member of the Law Society, has every right to move for this Select Committee and that he would be a very competent person to conduct an inquiry along proper lines. This motion for a Select Committee is different from the motion I moved recently in the House, because my motion dealt with a Bill. The Minister's objection to my motion was based mainly on the fact that it might hinder the passage of the Bill, because there was not much time left in which to act.

This motion is entirely different—it is a separate motion and would not hold up any legislation which is before the House.

Members should give thorough consideration—and I imagine that most members have had some experience with accident cases in relation to third party insurance at some time or other—to the holding of this inquiry. We should be informed more thoroughly as to exactly what the legislation could be and what it could mean—in fact, the type of legislation we desire.

I was rather amazed at the Minister's statement that a person injured in one State is not covered in another.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I only said that when the question of total liability was brought in there would not be any reciprocity.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister was not referring to the present situation?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I see; the Minister was using a hypothetical case and I will not follow this point any further, because it has nothing to do with the motion. I again repeat that I hope members will give very careful thought to the proposition before them and make up their minds whether they are going to have a Select Committee or whether they are not. I hope members will be prepared to allow a Select Committee to examine the question.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan.

*House adjourned at 4.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 20th October, 1966

CONTENTS		Page
ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1966-67—		
Committee of Supply: General Debate	....	1598
Speaker on Financial Policy— Mr. Hawke	....	1598
BILLS—		
Companies Act Amendment Bill—Returned	....	1595
Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—2r.	....	1583
Optical Dispensers Bill—2r.	....	1595
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill—2r.	....	1596
Public Works Act Amendment Bill—Council's Amendment	....	1801
Supply Bill (No. 2)—Returned	....	1595
LEAVE OF ABSENCE	....	1583
ORDERS OF THE DAY—		
Postponement	....	1801

## CONTENTS—continued

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Albany Regional Planning Scheme: Recreation Reserves .....	1581
Electricity Supplies—Wiring: Comparison of Costs between Overhead and Underground .....	1582
Fire Brigades Act: Contributions by Local Authorities .....	1580
Fishing—Foreign Vessels: Infringement of Rights .....	1581
Housing—Carnarvon: Weight of Materials Used .....	1580
Iron Ore—Reek, E. J.: Application for Reserves .....	1581
Land: Exmouth Business Sites .....	1580
Muja Power Station: Extension, and Use of Colliery Coal .....	1582
Native Welfare—Albany: Appointment of Inspector .....	1580
Shipping: Cargo Bookings to the North .....	1582
Tramways—	
Albany Courts: Offences and Fines .....	1582
Concessional Vehicle Licenses: Availability to Age Pensioners .....	1581
Traffic Department—Inquiry: Request by Albany Shire Council .....	1581
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—</b>	
Ord River Scheme: Deferment .....	1583
Standard Gauge Railway: Inspection of Embankments .....	1588

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS (17): ON NOTICE**

1. to 3. *These questions were postponed.*

**FIRE BRIGADES ACT***Contributions by Local Authorities*

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Have any representations been made by the Shire of Perth or the Local Government Association in recent years to relieve local authorities of the burden of making contributions under the provisions of the Fire Brigades Act?
- (2) If so, will he lay such papers on the Table of the House, or make available a copy of the relevant papers?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) No objections or representations have been made since the decision of the Government was conveyed to the Local Government Association on the 25th August, 1966, indicating that no change in contributions was contemplated.
- (2) No.

**HOUSING***Carnarvon: Weight of Materials Used*

5. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Housing:

In relation to the three-bedroom house which is being built at Carnarvon, what is the approximate weight of all materials used in the construction, including all fittings?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

Twenty-seven tons (approximately).

**LAND***Exmouth Business Sites*

6. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Under what terms and conditions are the business sites at Exmouth being offered?
- (2) Have any been allocated on a freehold basis?
- (3) How many business sites have been allocated at Exmouth and for what purpose?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Bovell) replied:

- (1) The lots in Exmouth townsite recently released for business purposes are subject to the following conditions:
  - (a) Lease term: 21 years.
  - (b) Rental: \$20 per annum.
  - (c) Premium: \$735 or \$1,470 depending on the lot concerned.
  - (d) Rental reappraisal at intervals of seven years.
  - (e) Preliminary plans of development to be submitted with application.
  - (f) No residence to be erected on lots leased for business purposes.
  - (g) Building operations must commence within six months of date of approval of application and must be completed within 12 months.

- (2) Five.

- (3) Fifteen. Service station (1), hotel (1), banks (2), general store (1), bulk fuel depots (3), transport depots (2), storage (2), workshop (1), factory (1), business (unspecified) (1).

**NATIVE WELFARE***Albany: Appointment of Inspector*

7. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Is there a native welfare inspector in Albany working in conjunction with the Native Welfare Committee?
- (2) If "No," would he agree to the appointment of either a part-time or voluntary inspector, in view of the growing native problem at the centre?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. Native welfare officers stationed at Gnowangerup are responsible for Albany and visit there periodically.
- (2) If a suitable person were available, I would be willing to appoint him my honorary representative for prescribed duties.

# ALBANY REGIONAL PLANNING SCHEME

## Recreation Reserves

8. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

Can he advise what areas and acreages have been set aside in the overall regional planning of the Albany area (shire and municipality) for sporting fields and recreational purposes?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

The overall regional plan is not a detailed plan. It shows broad principles only, which will become the subject of detailed planning by the constituent local authorities when they prepare detailed town planning schemes. Within these detailed schemes areas will be provided for recreation.

# CONCESSIONAL VEHICLE LICENSES

## Availability to Age Pensioners

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Police:

When an invalid pensioner is transferred to the age pension (with no increased income) he loses the concessional vehicle license. Will he introduce amendments to the Traffic Act to overcome this anomaly?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

This matter has been closely examined and, in fact, is still receiving consideration, but no change of policy has yet been decided upon.

# TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT

## Inquiry: Request by Albany Shire Council

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Have approaches been made to his department by the Albany Council to have a full inquiry made into allegations against the Traffic Department?
- (2) If "Yes," what will be the terms of reference of the inquiry?
- (3) Will the department undertake to investigate the matter of council finances resulting from traffic fines and court actions?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No decision has been made.
- (3) No undertaking can be given at this stage.

# FISHING

## Foreign Vessels; Infringement of Rights

11. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

Can he advise if a check made by professional fishermen, whale chasers, and others, revealed any infringement of rights by foreign commercial fishing vessels operating off the Western Australian or Australian coast?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

As far as the department is aware, there has been no infringement of territorial waters by foreign fishing vessels off the Western Australian coast.

12. *This question was postponed.*

# IRON ORE

## Reck, E. J.: Application for Reserves

13. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) On what dates did E. J. Reck apply for either reserves or temporary reserves for iron ore?
- (2) What were the numbers distinguishing each reserve?
- (3) In what area were they located?
- (4) Was he successful in being granted either reserves or temporary reserves?
- (5) If not, what reasons were advanced for refusals?
- (6) Were the areas in part, or whole, applied for by E. J. Reck, granted to any other applicant; if so, to whom?
- (7) What was the reason for this action?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) E. J. Reck and D. A. H. Shilling applied for iron ore Temporary Reserve No. 2103H on the 7th June, 1961, and No. 2323H on the 1st September, 1961, while Reck alone applied for No. 2502H on the 11th January, 1962.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) No. 2103H at Muccan in Pilbara goldfields.  
No. 2323H at Muccan in Pilbara goldfields.  
No. 2502H at Mt. Cecilia in Pilbara goldfields.
- (4) Application No. 2323H was granted in part.
- (5) Application No. 2103H was withdrawn and application No. 2502H was refused as it was received after the closing date for applications on the 30th September, 1961.
- (6) The part not included in the approval of application No. 2323H

was part of a successful application by Consolidated Gold Fields (Australia) Pty. Limited, Cyprus Mines Corporation, and Utah Construction & Mining Company.

- (7) After consideration of the relative merits of the two applications, it was decided to grant the area to the consolidated group.

#### MUJA POWER STATION

##### *Extension, and Use of Collie Coal*

14. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Electricity:

Will he supply to the House information of future proposals in regard to the Muja Power Station in connection with—

- (a) the station being progressively extended; and  
(b) the intention to use Collie coal exclusively as fuel?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (a) and (b) The Muja power station is being extended from two 60,000 kilowatt units to four 60,000 kilowatt units. All these units will use Collie coal.

Future extensions at Muja depend on the comparable economics of other proposals.

#### SHIPPING

##### *Cargo Bookings to the North*

15. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Transport:

How many tons of cargo are now booked for shipment to the north and what amount is still awaiting shipment?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

Cargo bookings as at today are—  
2,650 tons to be despatched by the *Wangara*, ex Fremantle on the 28th October, 1966.

4,165 tons to be despatched by the *Dorrigo*, ex Fremantle on the 9th November, 1966, and the *Delamare*, ex Fremantle on the 12th November.

Additional to this, 2,500 tons of pipeline are to be shipped between now and the third week in November.

Other sailings listed for November in addition to those mentioned are—

*Koojarra*, ex Fremantle on the 10th November, 1966.

*Kabbarli*, ex Fremantle on the 22nd November, 1966.

*Kangaroo*, ex Fremantle on the 26th November, 1966.

#### ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

##### *Wiring: Comparison of Costs between Overhead and Underground*

16. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What is the initial cost in a new suburb of—  
(a) erecting overhead wiring; and  
(b) putting the wiring underground?  
(2) What would be the difference in cost of—  
(a) aerial wiring; and  
(b) underground wiring?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) In a new suburb for 1,000 houses—  
(a) \$69,000  
(b) \$375,000  
assumptions made:  
(1) Favourable digging conditions.  
(2) Cables laid before roads, footpaths, and other services which might interfere.  
(3) Street light standards are required.  
(4) Extra-high voltage transmission lines not undergrounded.  
(2) 132,000 volt transmission line—  
(a) \$10,000 per mile.  
(b) \$100,000 per mile approximately if practicable.  
66,000 volt transmission line—  
(a) \$8,000 per mile.  
(b) \$60,000 per mile.  
22,000 volt distribution line—  
(a) \$3,000 per mile.  
(b) \$14,000 per mile.  
low tension street mains—  
(a) \$2,500 per mile.  
(b) \$10,000 per mile (cable only).

#### TRAFFIC

##### *Albany Courts: Offences and Fines*

17. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What percentage of all charges heard in the Albany courts for the years 1964, 1965, and 1966 was for traffic offences?  
(2) What amount was received by way of fines for the respective years for traffic offences heard at Albany?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Albany Police Court—

	Per cent.
1964	72.3
1965	55.8
1966 to 30th September	64.2
Albany Children's Court—	
1964	53.7
1965	27.2
1966 to 30th September	29.5

**(2) Albany Police Court—**

	1964	1965	1966 (to 30th Sept.)
	\$	\$	\$
Local Authority Prosecutions .....	9,246	13,190	9,814
Police Prosecutions .....	2,978	4,394	5,147
	<u>\$12,224</u>	<u>\$17,584</u>	<u>\$14,961</u>

**Albany Children's Court—**

	1964	1965	1966 (to 30th Sept.)
	\$	\$	\$
Local Authority Prosecutions .....	832	534	350
Police Prosecutions .....	224	344	115
	<u>\$1,056</u>	<u>\$878</u>	<u>\$465</u>

ask the Minister to inspect them and assure himself that there is no danger, and that my fears are unfounded.

Mr. COURT replied:

I am afraid the honourable member places more confidence in my engineering capacity than I do myself. However, I can assure him I will take action to confer with the engineers, on the spot. I will seek an explanation and I will advise the honourable member.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

On motion by Mr. May, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. Fletcher (Fremantle) on the ground of urgent public business.

**QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE****ORD RIVER SCHEME***Deferment*

1. Mr. NORTON (for Mr. Rhatigan) asked the Minister for the North-West:

Has the Prime Minister advised the State Government that the decision on the Ord River irrigation scheme has been deferred, and if so, has the Prime Minister given the reasons to the State Government?

Mr. COURT replied:

Whilst the Premier has been advised of the contents of a letter addressed to him, the letter has not yet been received. However, I understand it is on the way. Without going into a lot of detail, and not having seen a copy of the telephoned or posted copy of the information, the Commonwealth Government has deferred the decision on the Ord River scheme. I think the reasons are similar to those given on a previous occasion when more information was sought generally, and also as to details of the results of the next crop. Apart from that information I could not advise the honourable member any further.

**STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY***Inspection of Embankments*

2. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Railways:

During the course of the intended inspection of the standard gauge project, which I understand will take place next Monday, will the Minister give particular attention to two embankments: One is just west of Kellerberrin, and the other is in the vicinity of Woolundra siding—or where the siding used to be? The two embankments are of considerable magnitude, and I

**FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL.***Third Reading*

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [2.31 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.32 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the third reading of the Bill, but I would not have done so if any honest or reasonable attempt had been made to refute the argument which I advanced. I had available to me considerable time in which to state my case, and I would have been content with that had I been given a fair deal; but, instead, I got nothing but misrepresentation, distortion, and denial.

Mr. O'Connor: We got a bit of that, too.

Mr. TONKIN: Did you! If the Minister could give day and date for his statement, and back it up as I propose to do, it would be all right.

Mr. O'Connor: It is in *Hansard*.

Mr. TONKIN: You find the section! These general statements are all very well; they get over for the time being, but when one asks for the evidence it is never forthcoming.

First of all I want to deal with two points only from the speech of the Minister for Works, who represents in this House the Minister for Health; and, as I want to give the basis for the statements which I make, I shall be obliged to quote fairly extensively from my authorities. When during my second reading speech I raised the point that at the Princess Margaret Hospital there was knowledge of persons who were allergic to fluoride, we got immediate denials which referred to statements I never made at all. So that the records shall be kept straight I shall quote from *Hansard* what I said on this question.

I quote firstly from page 1286 of *Hansard* No. 11 of the current session. This is what I said—

I learnt a few hours ago that at the Princess Margaret Hospital here in Perth three children are listed as being allergic to fluoride. One of these children has eczema. The dentist attending the child—and he told me this himself—advised the parents to give her fluoride tablets. The experience is that every time this child takes fluoride, the eczema flares up and the child is in a very bad condition. When the fluoride is stopped, the condition subsides. This occurs every time. Information has come to me that three such children are listed at the Princess Margaret Hospital.

There is no word in that which either says or implies that any of these children were patients in the hospital; but this was the basis upon which we got a denial. I shall now quote from the Minister's speech, which is to be found on page 1384 of the same *Hansard*. The Minister said—

There have been no children admitted with fluoride sensitivity to Princess Margaret Hospital. Three years ago, three parents approached the hospital claiming that their children were sensitive. Two refused to bring their children for testing, one claiming her two boys were "sensitive to everything." The one child who was brought to the hospital was said to be sensitive to fluoridated tooth-paste but proved, after testing, to have no sensitivity to fluoride. In recent weeks the Dental Health Education Officer sent the hospital the name of a woman who claimed that her child was sensitive to fluoride tablets, but this woman has not replied to a letter asking would she like to have sensitivity tests carried out. We should therefore like to repeat that there are no children in Princess Margaret Hospital who are allergic to fluoride, and never have been.

I ask first of all, "Who said there were?" As regards the statement, let us see how much reliance we can place on it. It reads—

There have been no children admitted with fluoride sensitivity to Princess Margaret Hospital.

How would they know? Did the hospital ever carry out any tests on all the thousands of children who have been admitted to the hospital to see if there was anyone who was ever admitted to the hospital who had a sensitivity to fluoride? Or are they saying that no child, anywhere, can be allergic to fluoride? Because, unless they can say that they have tested every child for sensitivity, how can the hospital authorities say categorically that no child has ever been admitted to Princess Margaret Hospital who is allergic

to fluoride? As a matter of fact the statement is repeated—

We should therefore like to repeat that there are no children in Princess Margaret Hospital who are allergic to fluoride and never have been.

How would they know? I ask the Minister: How would they know that there never have been children admitted unless they can say—which they cannot, of course—that no child could possibly be allergic to fluoride? So members can see just how good that denial is in the circumstances, apart altogether from the point that I certainly did not say—and nobody has ever said; at least, not that I know of—there were in the hospital children who were allergic to fluoride.

Mr. Court: You are splitting straws.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not splitting any straws at all, because I was careful to say that there were listed at the hospital children who were allergic to fluoride; and I am about to prove that statement is true.

Mr. Court: There would not have been anyone in the House that night who did not gain the impression from your dramatic statements that there were children suffering from this allergy and who were being affected by fluoride; and I am just an ordinary simple-minded person who was listening at the time.

Mr. TONKIN: What is the Minister saying?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. TONKIN: I now propose to read a letter from a woman who says her child is allergic to fluoride; and she has been in touch with the dental section of the Princess Margaret Hospital, and with Mr. Bonney. The letter is from Inglewood and is addressed to me under date the 13th October, 1966. It reads as follows—

I commenced giving my eight-year-old son fluoride tablets when he was about 18 months. At this stage his teeth were like little white pearls and were being cleaned regularly by myself. Within a week or so his teeth had become discoloured—similar to dirty yellowed teeth, only green in colour (cleaning made no difference). I discontinued the tablets and the teeth whitened. Some time later I resumed the tablets again with the same results—I then discontinued the tablets altogether.

When I mentioned the matter to my family doctor—  
whose name she mentions, but whose name I do not want to mention—

he said he only knew what he read in his magazines but thought a much larger dose would have been needed to get such a reaction. (Had I been clairvoyant I would have sought a signed statement at this stage for

future use—such as everytime the Bill for Fluoridation of the Water Supply came before Parliament.) When the Bill first came before Parliament, I wrote to both my local member (Mr. Oldfield) and *The West Australian* newspaper. Mr. Oldfield replied with a duplicated letter that it was not Labor's policy to support the Bill.

*The West Australian* replied to the effect that sufficient coverage on the subject had already been given. I later contacted a member of Mr. H. Robinson's (M.L.C.) household, and Mr. Robinson later contacted my husband and told him that medical opinion supported fluoridation of the water and that there would be no allergic reactions and that several mothers had already complained of allergic reactions but refused to have their children tested under medical supervision. No such suggestions were made to us!

In a leading article Athol Thomas reported about a defluoridating attachment made by University students. I rang him and he then referred me to Mr. Bonney, who referred me to the Princess Margaret Hospital. I was asked had my son been jaundiced as a baby or had any liver complaint, and to my knowledge he had not. I signified my willingness at this stage to test some fluoridated water. I was then referred back to Mr. Bonney who then referred me in writing to someone in the Perth Dental Clinic. By this time I was getting rather fed up with the run-around. I was beginning to wonder why I was working so hard for others to convince me that something I was by now sure I did not want was harmless (with the weight of equally expert opinion supported by my own experience). By this time the Bill had been defeated so I let the matter drop.

Three years later when the Bill came up I rang my local member, the member for Maylands, Mr. R. Marshall.

The member for Maylands will know whether this lady rang him or not. To continue—

Mr. Marshall listened to my case with the utmost courtesy and took the trouble to have me advised regarding the presentation of the Bill. However, for him of course, it was a matter of voting according to Party-line.

I am in complete sympathy with those mothers who have observed reactions in their children and who will not allow experimentation. Although at one stage I was prepared to accept testing, I now do not feel that the knowledge of medical science as to the cause and treatment of allergies is such as to permit testing with my children.

In relation to allergic reactions with my children, I have always found that my own observation has been vital in diagnosis by my doctor and have never had it doubted—except by Parliamentarians and others who have made up their minds on this issue and do not want to hear anything to the contrary!

I am opposed to the Bill for Fluoridation of the Water Supply. I reserve the right to supplement my children's diet in the way I choose (as indeed I do, with a tablet containing fluorine made from bone meal) though I approve any move to supply free fluoride in liquid or tablet form to those who wish to use it. It is illogical, in my opinion, to say that this method is any less reliable than the inconsistent amounts of water that children consume from day to day and from season to season.

That was one case of allergy.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What nonsense.

Mr. Burt: Did you help her write that letter?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I should cease to be amazed at what you say.

Mr. TONKIN: No, I did not help her write that letter, nor did I suggest that the letter be written. I have this morning spoken to a lady who lives at Marmion, and who told me that when her boy was 2½ years old she took him to a dentist in the Terrace—whose name she has given me—after which she took him to the late Dr. Crisp. I have no doubt that his records will prove or disprove whether this statement is true. Unfortunately the doctor has passed on.

According to the lady in question, the doctor who was well known in this field of allergy, advised her to stop giving the child fluoride tablets, which she did. She told me when she gave him fluoride tablets he had severe enteritis and stomach upset, and that is why she took him to Dr. Crisp. She said that his condition came on in a matter of days and worsened when she was giving him the tablets. But when she stopped them on the doctor's advice there was no further trouble.

I have another case of a woman who told me—and she has given me the name of the person at the dental clinic who told her; but I will not crucify anybody by mentioning names—that the person at the dental clinic had told her there were three children registered at the hospital as being allergic to fluoride.

This youngster was actually in the Princess Margaret Hospital with eczema; a patient in the hospital with eczema. That is why I say: How can a doctor give the Minister the answer he did; namely, that no child was allergic to fluoride, when no test of this child was carried out by the hospital?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Tests would have been carried out.

Mr. TONKIN: They have no scientific basis for saying that children cannot be allergic to fluoride.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I will have the tests carried out.

Mr. Graham: A death bed repentance.

Mr. TONKIN: From the information conveyed to me by these people, and with the names and details given of their own experiences, I say that the Perth Dental Hospital has not got cognisance of the number of children who are allergic to fluoride. The other statement with which the Minister dealt was the one trying to prove that Dr. Theorell had changed his mind. This is an attempt, in my opinion, to prove that black is white. The Minister quoted something to prove that what Sir Robert Menzies had said in the Federal Parliament was correct, and that Dr. Theorell of Sweden was no longer opposed to the fluoridation of water supplies.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, I have here a portion of the *Weekend News* of a date some months subsequent to the statement made by the Prime Minister, and the date of this is Saturday, the 16th November, 1963. The heading is, "This Doctor's Not For Fluoridation"; and the paper purports to have had a cable from Atlanta, Georgia, saying—

Dr. Hugo Theorell, 1955 Nobel Prize Winner, said today he was still opposed to the fluoridation of municipal drinking water.

That does not mean a thing to the Minister; he still proceeds to prove that Dr. Theorell has changed his mind.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I have a letter with his signature.

Mr. TONKIN: That has not sunk in. I propose to quote from a publication called *Ahead*, issued by the Australian Health Division as its advisory digest, vol. 1, No. 3. There is an article by J. B. Polya, Associate Professor of Chemistry, University of Tasmania with reference to the point with which I am dealing. He said this subsequent to the statement by Sir Robert Menzies—

A notable opponent of fluoridation, Professor Theorell of Sweden, has been "quoted"—

and that is in quotation marks—

—by the Prime Minister as having changed his mind on fluoridation. The "evidence"—

again, that is quoted—

—(sent to me by the courtesy of a leading proponent of fluoridation) is the English translation of a Swedish interview between Theorell and a dental journalist. In the unquoted conclusion of the interview Theorell is reported as awaiting results. In recent letters (May, 1964) Theorell writes that he does not recommend general fluoridation of tap water and that (in

Sweden) "results of further scientific investigation should be awaited before any decision is taken." Speaking of a "change of mind" is misrepresentation of one of the makers of modern Biochemistry.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what we have to put up with when we are endeavouring to establish a case.

Mr. Graham: The Minister!

Mr. TONKIN: I produce evidence to show that Dr. Theorell has not changed his mind; then we have a statement from the Minister who is endeavouring to prove that he has, in the face of the fact that Dr. Theorell, himself, declared he has not changed his mind at all.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have not proven that.

Mr. TONKIN: Is the Minister prepared to concede that Theorell has not changed his mind?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course I am not.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is hopeless and I will not spend any more time on it.

Mr. Graham: He is hopeless anyway.

Mr. W. Hegney: Have you just woke up to that?

Mr. TONKIN: I have a little to say about an attempt made by the member for Bunbury to prove that a certain film was, he was careful to point out, shown in my presence and therefore it could be inferred that it had my support and approbation, which it did. He proposed to show it was phoney—that it misrepresented the situation.

Fortunately I have available to me a scientific appraisal of this film and again I want to show the lengths to which the proponents of fluoridation will go to distort and misrepresent. I quote a scientific appraisal which has been made by H. A. Cook, B.Sc. (London), A.R.C.S., F.R.I.C., Hon. Secretary of the Scientific Committee for the Study of Fluoridation Hazards, 14, St. Alban's Street, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1. The chairman of this organisation is Mr. Charles Dillon, D.D.S. (U.S.A.), L.D.S. (Glasgow). This is what Mr. Cook says about this film—

The following Postscript has been prepared in response to a request for a scientific appraisal of the criticisms made about this film.

The film to which this Postscript refers has caused the greatest amount of concern among those people who are trying to get fluoridation forced on to every community without adequate scientific consideration.

This film shows publicly, for the first time, the effect of minute concentrations of fluoride on living cells, and instead of accepting the evidence revealed by this film as scientific data showing that living cells can be affected, and their growth slowed and



stopped, and the cells even killed, by the presence of those minute amounts of fluoride, a number of advocates of fluoridation are endeavouring to discredit the film, its sponsors, its commentators, and its producers.

This film was made at the instigation of a number of New York doctors and dentists opposed to fluoridation in order to confirm or refute the work of Dr. Roger Berry and Mr. Wilfred Trillwood at Oxford, after that work was brought to their notice by Dr. Hugh Sinclair of Magdalen College, Oxford. The film work carried out involved experiments on a standard culture of mouse tissue cells, known as mouse "L" fibroblasts, which are regularly and normally used to test the effects of various drugs on living cells, and also on some human tooth pulp cells, and a strain of human heart cells.

It is scientifically well recognised that establishing cultures of cells outside the living organism causes changes in those cells, so that they are no longer exactly the same as cells within the living organism, but nevertheless they remain living cells, and are recognised to respond to drugs in such a way as to indicate how cells within the living organism may be expected to respond to those drugs. The use of these tissue cultures, and particularly of the mouse "L" cells, is a normal and standard procedure in testing the toxicity of drugs.

The present film is being criticised by those people pushing fluoridation by saying that the mouse cells became malignant while in culture, and then lost their malignancy and therefore were abnormal.

Dr. Roger Berry, who is Head of Radiobiology of The United Oxford Hospitals, was consulted about this criticism, and he says bluntly—"This is a very ripe red herring. The strain 'L' fibroblasts originated indisputably from Normal mouse tissue, and it is semantics" (that is, playing with words) "and not science, to resolve whether they are still 'normal', as they are far from being functionally like any cell in an organised tissue in the living animal." (This is of course due to the fact that they are cultured outside the living organism, but they are nevertheless still living cells.)

The film is being further criticised because of the omission of sequences involving human tooth pulp and heart tissue cells.

Dr. Roger Berry made a close study of the original film which included the human tooth pulp cells, and showed the strong effect on the mouse cells but no observable effect on the human

cells. Dr. Berry stated that "the sequences involving the tooth pulp cells are of little use as the cells show the contact inhibition common to many normal tissue cells in culture". (This means failure to grow caused by contact of the cells with one another).

He adds that "the fluoride was in most cases added to the medium after the culture had reached the stationary phase in overcrowded cultures in which no further cell division would ordinarily be expected. We really do not know whether in a properly-done experiment there would be any effect on human cells at the level of fluoride used or not." He says that this part of the work should be repeated, with paired cultures, during their rapid growth period, and with a much wider variety of cells of various tissues, in order to have real value.

Dr. Sinclair states that Dr. Berry is an authority on the subject of tissue culture, which means that he is one of the very limited number of people who are properly qualified to assess the results obtained in these experiments.

The New York sponsors of the experiments decided to release the part of the film demonstrating the mouse tissue cells, since this showed the directly observable effect with living cells, and this part is the present film.

Dr. John Ott, the Director of the Time-Lapse Research Foundation, where the experiments and film were made, although stating he is not a medical man himself, has criticised the release of only the part of the film demonstrating the mouse tissue, but only after consultations with the American Dental Association, which is strongly pushing fluoridation.

Dr. Ott has, however, himself made the following comments: "the addition of the sodium fluoride seemed to inhibit further mitosis" (i.e., growth) "in the case of the mouse 'L' cells, but both the human tooth pulp cells and heart cells did continue to show mitosis" (i.e. growth) "after the sodium fluoride was added. The addition of sodium fluoride in low concentrations did not seem to have the immediate toxic effect on human cells that it did on the mouse cells, but only time could tell what, if any, cumulative effect there might be over a prolonged period."

Finally, as a comment on the criticism of the present film, we have the remarks of Professor Albert W. Burgstahler, Professor of Chemistry at the University of Kansas, who says, "the film as it stands is perfectly valid.

Sensitive mouse fibroblast cells show the effect in vitro" (i.e., outside the living organism) "at 1/30th and even 1/60th part per million. Human heart cells did, or do, not respond at this dilution. The point is that living cells can be sensitive, and who knows which kind, in the body, of different persons, might not also be sensitive under certain conditions"?

I ask: Who knows?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What is the date of that?

Mr. TONKIN: The 11th October, 1966. We cannot get much closer to the present day.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is the date of the paper. When did the professor say that?

Mr. TONKIN: Obviously he said it after the criticism of the film. I think that is the important thing. I am unable to give the answer to that question, unfortunately, but it must be assumed that it was after the criticism of the film, because he was replying to the criticism.

Time is running out, and I want to be sure to reply to a couple more things which have been said. One good lady writing for the paper—and I read quite a lot of what she writes and find it is very interesting and quite to the point—was quite alarmed because when I mentioned that four Nobel prize winners were opposed to fluoridation—I did not give their names—she, like a lot of proponents of fluoridation, immediately assumed she was not being told the truth.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You mean proponents of anti-fluoridation.

Mr. TONKIN: No, I don't. The proponents of fluoridation believe that those against fluoridation are not telling the truth and do not know what they are talking about. For example when I told the Minister that Professor Theorell had not changed his mind, he would still not agree with me, despite the fact that there are cables and letters to say that he has not.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have not demonstrated that.

Mr. TONKIN: If that is what I am up against, the situation is impossible. But let us have the names of the four Nobel prize winners who are opposed to fluoridation and who have not changed their minds. They are Theorell, Warburg, Euler, and Dr. James Summer, formerly Director of Enzymic Chemistry at the Cornell University. Those are the four Nobel prize winners to whom I referred, but whose names I did not previously mention. I hope the good lady who drew attention to this will be fair enough to print the names in the next issue of the paper.

From time to time we are told that fluoride is a nutrient; that it is a good thing for the body; and that it is nourish-

ing. Those are the statements of laymen who do not know anything about the subject. The standard textbook on biochemistry is a book by Professor Fruton and Assistant Professor Simmonds of Yale University, and they should know what they are talking about because they are giving advice to students. This is what they say about fluoride—

Bromide and fluoride, both of which are found in animal and plant material, are generally considered non-nutritive and toxic for higher animals.

I cannot expect the Minister to believe that either; but nevertheless that is the definition in the standard book on biochemistry.

Now I wish to have a word or two to say about the attitude adopted by the learned member for Wembley. I have never at any stage made any pretensions to having any medical knowledge, and, without hesitation I defer to the member for Wembley in the field of medicine. However, with regard to understanding the English language, I am not prepared to take second place to him. I can read English and write it as well as he can and, I think I can prove, somewhat better. I quoted an article from the *Annals of Internal Medicine*. It was a case report compiled by three doctors and specially reported. They said—

All cases of chronic fluoride intoxication with radiculomyelopathy have been previously reported from India. This paper describes a patient with clinical, necropsy, and toxicologic findings of this disorder, whose problem is of special interest because he lived in an area where cases of advanced fluorosis would not be expected.

We need to know what fluorosis means. According to the *Medical Dictionary* in the Parliamentary Library it is, "Poisoning by absorption of toxic amounts of fluorine." So this is a case report of a man who had poisoning by absorption of toxic amounts of fluorine. It is true that the immediate cause of his death, given in this report, was pneumonia.

This case was not reported because the man had pneumonia—it was reported because he had fluorosis. It says in the report that he was in and out of hospital a number of times. I ask the member for Wembley: Was he in and out of hospital a number of times with pneumonia?

When one reads this, one finds a reference to the fact that there was no significant evidence of active bone resorption, which is one of the symptoms of excessive fluoride ingestion. Another finding at the autopsy was that he showed massive protuberances of bones, which is another result of the ingestion of excessive amounts of fluoride.

A book was written by Professor Walter F. Neuman and Professor Margaret W. Neuman of the Rochester University

called the *Chemical Dynamics of Bone Mineral*. In that book it says—

In the presence of carbonate and citrate the solubility of hydroxy apatite is greatly increased, while fluoride markedly inhibits its dissolution. It is this property of decreasing solubility that provides the basis for the use of fluoride in preventive dentistry. It is also the probable basis for fluoride's chronic toxic effects at low levels of intake. Thus physiological mineral-resorptive processes are inhibited by excessive dietary fluoride giving rise to mottled enamel, skeletal malformation, increased bone density and exostoses (outgrowths of bone).

The very things mentioned in this case report—bone protuberances which are exostoses; physiological resorptive processes are inhibited—are, in fact, the very things which the autopsy showed with regard to this man. I submitted this to a doctor friend of mine and asked him, "Is this a case report about a man who was so ill from pneumonia that he died, or is it a case report about a man who had, throughout 43 years, ingested fluoride in the water from 2.4 parts per million to 3.5 parts per million?" He said, "There is not the slightest doubt that although this man's death was immediately due to pneumonia, that only supervened upon a condition he had reached whereby it was impossible for him to live."

That is the sort of argument we have to spend time here trying to refute. If any honest and reasonable attempt were made to combat the arguments advanced, I would accept the situation, but all we get is distortion, misrepresentation, and a complete refusal to accept the facts—an attitude which was taken by the Minister this afternoon. Any reasonable person would accept as proof the findings of these experts, but the Minister is not prepared to change his mind in order to agree with their findings. Under those circumstances, what hope is there for anyone arguing that fluoridation has not been proved to be completely safe?

If one reads the book of Waldbott, a graduate of the University of Heidelberg, who is a pioneer in the field of allergic diseases and is presently consulting physician in allergy at the Harper Women's Hospitals in Detroit, a member of the American Medical Association, a member of the Michigan State and Wayne County Medical Societies, a fellow of the American Academy of Allergy, a member of the American College of Physicians, and a member of other national and international medical societies, one finds he says straight out that people who have an allergy are likely to be affected quickly by fluoride. There is a study which has been carried out by Feltman R. and Kozel, G., on pre-natal and post-natal ingestion of fluoride, which is the result of 14 years' investigation, during which time prelimi-

nary reports were issued, and then a final report. This is to be found in the *Journal of Dental Medicine* No. 16, at page 190, and the journal is dated October, 1961. These scientists reported that, over that period, in giving fluoride tablets to pregnant women and children, they found 1 per cent. of them who could not tolerate the drug. One per cent of people in a population such as we have in Western Australia means a lot of people.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not proved. It has been taken before authorities in many places.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister has never seen the book; he has never read it, but he is prepared to state immediately I give the title and tell him where he can find it and say what period of investigation it covers, and what the findings were that, "It is not proved." What position is the Minister in to make a comment at all?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I am in the position of being able to comment because this report has been assessed, and it was assessed by experts.

Mr. TONKIN: That is the attitude of the Minister, and I want to impress this upon members—the one he has adopted consistently. Those who support fluoridation do not want to listen; they will not listen, because they have accepted that it is safe, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. Williams: Those who are opposed to it will not listen either.

Mr. Court: Whatever we told you, you would not believe.

Mr. TONKIN: As I have said, this report was prepared by reputable scientists who were operating under research grants. Here is a case where the inquiry was carried on over 14 years. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, these men would risk their reputation by putting up something they could not back up and prove through the results of their research?

I invite the Minister to get hold of this book and read what they said. I repeat, they administered tablets to pregnant women and children and found that 1 per cent. could not tolerate the drug. But the Minister says it is not proved. I would like to know how much more research one has to have. This is not being said by somebody in a back lane or by some quack—this is being said by reputable scientists who published their findings in reputable publications which showed the full results of their research. If we cannot take any notice of what they say, whom can we believe? Can we believe men, such as the Minister, who make statements without reading anything about the matter?

Mr. Hawke: Or the member for Bunbury?

Mr. TONKIN: I complain bitterly about that sort of thing. I say that every member has a right to take seriously the

result of the researches of men, whether they are for fluoridation or against it, and not only accept the statement of the proponents of fluoridation and completely disregard every research which comes forward from the opposite direction.

What one must keep in mind is this: It is easy to swim with the stream. However, the research men who have come to these adverse conclusions have considerable courage and fortitude to publish their findings. I could give an instance of one case whereby, when they had published adverse findings, their research grants were cut out so that they could not continue to find out any more in that direction.

We are told that it is perfectly safe; one cannot get an allergy; one cannot get fluorosis at one part per million; outstanding scientists have declared it is perfectly safe, so do not worry. However, we were told the same thing about thalidomide.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There is no comparison with thalidomide, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. TONKIN: For six years thalidomide was sold on the market and could be bought over the counter.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: There is no comparison.

Mr. TONKIN: For six years it could be bought over the counter and when the first doctor—a German—drew attention to the fact that it was responsible for deformed babies, do members know what the authorities wanted to do to him? They wanted to sue him for libel!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: A woman doctor in the United States was one of the first.

Mr. TONKIN: No, she was not! It was a woman doctor in the United States who, having seen the results of thalidomide, prevailed upon the United States Public Health Service to do something about the sale of the drug.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is right.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course. But she was not the one who, first of all, came out into the open and said, "This drug is dangerous." We did not hear from the World Health Organisation, or the 1,400 doctors in the United States who were dispensing thalidomide; they did not say it was harmful. The drug was on sale in Australia months afterwards it was withdrawn from sale in America. The drug could still be bought in this country months after it had been withdrawn from sale in America, and yet we are told to accept fluoride on the advice that it is absolutely safe.

More research can be expected as the pressure is applied for the extension of fluoridation; more men will have the courage to stand up against this policy which is pushed in certain quarters, and one by one pieces of information will be published similar to the information which has

been published in the book, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, and so we will eventually find somebody saying—as was said in regard to thalidomide—"It is time we had another look at this."

It has been said by Waldbott that fluoride has an adverse effect on people with asthma. This reminds me of a newspaper report that I read in yesterday's Press of a person with asthma who went to the Premier's residence and sucked two fluoride tablets in his presence, and who, after swallowing the second one, was in such a condition that he was gasping for air and had to be assisted by the taxi driver who had taken him to the Premier's house, and by a woman who lived across the road, until he had recovered.

In his book Waldbott says that fluoride can have an immediate affect on asthma patients. I do not know the circumstances of this case to which I have just referred, but the man concerned telephoned me this morning, and he was irate over the Premier's denial of his story. He told me that when he went to Mr. Brand's home, Mrs. Brand came out on to the verandah and he asked her if he could see Mr. Brand and she said he could. Mr. Brand came to the door and this man (Mr. Cain) asked if he could come in, and the Premier allowed him to enter. He then said that in the Premier's presence he sucked two fluoride tablets, and when he handed the envelope to Mr. Brand, pointing out that it had the word "poison" marked upon it, Mr. Brand asked him to leave the premises or he would call the police.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Does that prove anything?

Mr. TONKIN: It does not prove anything; it does not even prove the man was there, but I think the Premier's statement does. All I am saying is that Waldbott, in his book, has stated that people who have an allergy would be quickly affected by fluoride; and here was a man who stated he had asthma and who said that, in the Premier's presence, he had sucked two fluoride tablets with very distressing results to himself.

Mr. Dunn: You do not even know he had asthma; he only stated he had it.

Mr. Hawke: There is nothing much wrong with the member for Darling Range.

Mr. Dunn: No, there is nothing much wrong with him.

Mr. Hawke: Much!

Mr. TONKIN: I now wish to quote from page 24 of the book entitled *A Struggle With Titans—Forces behind Fluoridation* by G. L. Waldbott which I would recommend to anybody with an open mind to read. The quotation is as follows:—

Drug allergy and drug intolerance in allergic patients had interested me for many years. An otherwise harmless dose of a drug can cause serious difficulties in allergic individuals. Some

drugs, even in minute amounts, can induce attacks.

That was said by a man who is an expert in allergies, and to whom suspected allergy cases are referred by physicians. In Detroit he is a recognised authority on this complaint.

I will conclude with another quotation from a statement made by Doctor Alfred Taylor, Ph.D. of the Biochemic Institute of the University of Texas. It reads—

The growing weight of scientific evidence that waterborne fluorides even at one part per million have toxic properties MUST finally be recognised.

That is not from somebody practicing in the shadow of medicine; that is not from some crank in the street; that has been said by a scientist holding a responsible position in a university who was confident that, against all the strength of the promotion, toxic properties of fluoride must finally be recognised.

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [3.27 p.m.]: The honourable member who has just resumed his seat is one who becomes so obsessed with his subject that he tends to retreat into a fantasy land of his own in which he believes anything he reads from any document. I have no doubt he feels the same about me; that seems to be the pattern of the debate on fluoridation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to many points and one concerned allergies. He alleged that children in this State suffered because of fluoride. This matter was dealt with at the second reading stage, and if any member wishes he can read all the debates on this point in *Hansard*.

Suffice for me to say at this juncture that I can guarantee, on behalf of the Minister for Health, that any child who is considered to be suffering from fluoride sensitivity can be freely tested for such sensitivity at the Princess Margaret Hospital. Indeed, the doctors there would be delighted to conduct such tests, which would be quite harmless, but they would be conducted on the blind technique basis. That is a technique by which one is dosed with water which does not contain fluoride, and dosed with something else so that the results of the experiments can be assessed without bias and without partiality. I would be delighted if those experiments could be carried out.

During the debate on the second reading of the Bill, I explained that two of the ladies who said that their children suffered from such sensitivity refused to bring their children in to the hospital. They might have had a number of reasons for not doing so, but the offer still stands; and all those who suffer in this way should submit themselves for experiment. There is very much more I can say on this aspect, but I shall not.

Regarding Professor Hugo Theorell, a Nobel prize winner, I read out to the House during the second reading debate a copy of a letter which he had sent to Professor Noel Martin. In the photostat copy of the letter his signature is evident. This letter has been quoted and is recorded in *Hansard*.

If one reads this letter and the remarks of Professor Theorell in reply to questions by an interviewer on this matter, and believes that Professor Hugo Theorell has not changed his mind, then one just cannot appreciate English literature. I do not say that Professor Hugo Theorell has adopted a complete about-face, but he did have a serious change of mind on the whole question, to the point where he now says that the experiments at Norrköping should continue, that there is no enzyme danger, and that his previous fears had been proved to be groundless.

Mr. Tonkin: Will the Minister accept this challenge? Will he write down that Professor Hugo Theorell has changed his mind, and allow me to send him that assertion for confirmation or otherwise?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I read this letter out during the second reading debate, because that is the significant thing brought out by the interviewer.

Mr. Tonkin: The unquoted portion.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is not.

Mr. Tonkin: Yes, it is.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am not in the habit of hiding or misconstruing anything. That is not in my make-up, and I would rather lean the other way. I do not know from where the Deputy Leader of the Opposition gets his ideas, but if the cable referred to has anything to do with the matter, he probably inferred that from the question and answer. Professor Hugo Theorell was asked—

Have you altered your opinion as to the possible injurious effects of fluoridation?

His reply was—

No, if you read my 1958 report you will see that at that time I simply did not consider the time to be ripe for any general permission for the fluoridation of water supplies, and advised experiments along other lines. But now, since the Norrköping experiments have shown such good results . . . I consider it would be wrong to stop the experiments.

This type of experiment does not last for a week or two weeks, or a year or two years; it goes on for many years.

Mr. Tonkin: How could the experiments go on when they were stopped in 1961?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am talking about experiments generally.

Mr. Tonkin: In Norrköping?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes.

Mr. Tonkin: But they were stopped in 1961.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is referring to the experiments at Norrköping, it was the feeling of Professor Hugo Theorell that they should be resumed.

Mr. J. Hegney: They were only experiments.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have said that the experiments in Norrköping fell into two parts. One half of the town was being supplied with fluoridated water, but the other half was not; and neither half knew which part had been fluoridated. This is a form of blind technique which becomes fairly essential in experiments of this type. Of course, as time went on, the people found out which section had the fluoridated water, but in the initial stages the nondisclosure allayed any fears which might have been held for being exposed to fluoridated water. Initially, the people who had alleged complaint would not know whether or not they were drinking fluoridated water. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned Professor Waldenstrom.

Mr. Tonkin: No.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Was he not the Nobel prize winner mentioned by the honourable member?

Mr. Tonkin: No.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Professor Hugo Theorell said—

I have just drawn up another report, with Professor Jan Waldenstrom and Professor U. S. von Euler, recommending that the Norrköping experiments be continued.

Mr. Tonkin: That was a very sensible thing to do; and so would I make such a recommendation.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition now changes his mind. He has said that Professor Hugo Theorell did not change his mind.

Mr. Tonkin: Because a person wants the experiments to be continued, it does not mean that he is in favour of what is being experimented on.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let me say this before I also get into the fantasyland of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Court: Don't confuse him too much with facts, because his mind is already made up.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said Professor Hugo Theorell opposed these experiments.

Mr. Tonkin: I did not say that at all.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I say that is true, and Professor Hugo Theorell did oppose them in 1958.

Mr. Tonkin: It was supposed to have been said that as an anti-fluoridationist he changed his mind.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is no doubt that Professor Hugo Theorell in 1958 opposed experiments on fluoridated water. He thought other experiments should be conducted, and his fears were based on enzyme poisoning.

Mr. Tonkin: Can the Minister say—

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let me complete what I have to say. The stage was reached some years later when he believed that the experiments at Norrköping should be continued, and he believed that in company with Professor Waldenstrom and Professor von Euler.

Mr. Hawke: And in company with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No. The honourable member is trying to draw a red herring across the trail.

Mr. Tonkin: Will the Minister tell us where this alleged statement that Professor Hugo Theorell was opposed to the experiments can be found?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Professor Hugo Theorell said he did not consider the time to be ripe for any general permission for the fluoridation of water supplies.

Mr. Tonkin: Where did he say he was opposed to the experiments?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: He did not approve of them.

Mr. Tonkin: Where did he say that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The interviewer asked him about this.

Mr. Tonkin: I give up!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should not try to cross-examine me on silly technicalities, and I do not want to be subjected to such absurdities.

Mr. Tonkin: I want some evidence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will address the Chair.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Here is a Nobel prize winning scientist, mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who has had a change of mind. I go as far as to say there was not a complete change-around to the point where he felt the experiments should go forward completely, but he felt the experiments on fluoridated water at Norrköping should continue. Initially he did not believe they should.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned the time lapse film—a matter referred to by the member for Bunbury. He dealt with this in as simple a way as possible, and conveyed his meaning to the House that the experiments which were conducted and the film which was shown left out vital sections. As such, the film was not scientific evidence of anything. Reference was also made to the time lapse film and to the fact that mouse cells and

human cells—that is, cancer cells—were treated with a proportion of fluoride in the water. The honourable member also mentioned Berry and Trillwood. Their experiments were not conducted at all in proper scientific fashion.

Mr. Tonkin: What basis have you for saying that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will bear with me, I will tell him. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and his supporters, have claimed that long lists of scientists were quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; much longer lists than I have quoted. What that proves, I do not know, but I am trying to show how some of the quotations regarding experiments of anti-fluoridationists were not exhaustive. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned Berry and Trillwood, and, for some reason or other he went on to say that Berry was a broken man. He also mentioned Dr. Alfred Taylor. I would like to read something for the edification of the honourable member.

Mr. Tonkin: What about the basis for that statement which you made?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will listen carefully because he has an analytical mind. It is only when he retreats into that fantasyland that we cannot get at him.

Mr. Tonkin: I am in no fantasyland.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let me preface this quotation by saying that, of course, there must be scientists, doctors, dentists, and members of the community, opposed to controversial matters of this kind. One does not find 100 per cent. of the people in favour of any one particular project. That is the nature and build-up of individuals throughout the world.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you remember a certain answer which you gave in this House that no reputable scientist was opposed to fluoridation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No; I did not say that. You are trying to twist something else I said. I spoke about reputable authorities.

Mr. Tonkin: You said no reputable authorities.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No; that most of the reputable authorities of the world are in favour of fluoridation, and that is so.

Mr. Tonkin: That is not what you said at all.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Let me continue. The following is from an editorial published in the *British Dental Journal* on the 21st June, 1966. I will quote from the first column after leaving out a lot of the literature which would not appeal to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Start-

ing at the second paragraph it reads as follows:—

If a paper which suggests a doubt is shown by later work to be unrepeatable or misinterpreted there is again little or no publicity. For example, a report published as a letter in the *British Medical Journal* by Berry and Trillwood claimed to have shown that cells grown in tissue culture medium containing small concentrations of fluoride ions, divided at a rate slower than their controls. The cells employed were mouse fibroblasts and a strain of human cancer cells. The letter by Berry and Trillwood contained insufficient details of the method and composition of the media employed to enable the experiment to be evaluated fully.

I would like to pause here and say that this is the whole history—perhaps not the whole history, let me not be extravagant. This history shows that many experiments conducted by anti-fluoridationists were conducted on a narrow basis without carrying them out on a planned blind technique system. To proceed—

However, the study was repeated and extended by Armstrong *et al.* (1965) using a precisely controlled technique in which fluoride determinations of the culture medium were made. In these experiments no difference in the rate of cell multiplication was found between those grown in the control and those grown in media containing 4.5 p.p.m.F. Further, they showed that protein synthesis was not impaired by 10 p.p.m.F. in the medium and that human oesophageal cell multiplication was reduced only when the fluoride concentration in the medium reached 15 p.p.m.F. The findings of this study are supported by the work of Prophet and Ackerman (1964) who, using radio-carbon labelled proline, showed that D.N.A. and collagen synthesis was reduced only by fluoride in concentrations greater than 10 p.p.m.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.6 p.m.*

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Just before the adjournment I was reading from a document which described the further experiments conducted on a proper and true scientific basis, advancing from the experiments conducted by Berry and Trillwood, Berry being one of the scientists whom the Deputy Leader of the Opposition claims to be a man who conducted exhaustive tests on this matter of the effect of fluoride on cancer cells.

I have quoted two works, one by Armstrong and one by two gentlemen named Prophet and Ackerman who proved scientifically that Berry and Trillwood's claims were not founded on fact, and that it was only with massive doses of fluoride that any effect was likely to occur. The

editorial goes on and talks about a Dr. Alfred Taylor, another gentleman about whom the Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke in glowing terms. The editorial states—

More recently, there has been much publicity given to the letter in the *Saturday Review* 3 by Dr. Alfred Taylor of the Biochemical Institute, Clayton Foundation, University of Texas. In this letter, and in several papers in scientific journals, Dr. Taylor claims to have shown that in the mouse the growth of artificial cancer lesions is increased and that death of the mouse due to cancer is hastened. A number of important experimental details is missing from the reports which make the investigation impossible to repeat precisely. Further, there is no indication that the qualitative assessments of the findings were carried out using a blind technique. Experiments similar to these have been carried out by Dr. W. D. Armstrong and Dr. Leon Singer, both of the Department of Biochemistry at the Medical School of the University of Minnesota, in collaboration with the late Dr. John Bittner, the eminent cancer biologist. These experiments were carried out using a blind technique in which the examiners did not know to which group, control or fluoride, each animal belonged. In this way unconscious bias—

Members should note that it does not say "bias"—but "unconscious bias." To continue—

—was eliminated. The results of this investigation showed that drinking fluoridated water had no effect upon the onset of cancer in mice. It is incidentally interesting to note that Taylor's findings contradict those of Berry and Trillwood who claim an inhibiting effect of fluoride on cancer cells grown in tissue culture.

And so it goes on. It is not easy, with all the matter that was quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, to be able to pick out and quote the names of people whose experiments have been conducted following on and in advance of the experiments to which he referred.

I was fortunate, however, to have the documents to which I have referred, and the information which I have given to the House. The conclusions are paralleled in almost every case, and I would like to say that the claims of Berry and Trillwood, Waldbott, and Rapaport, and the others he mentioned, have been subjected to close scrutiny, and further experiments have been conducted by other scientists. Those experiments have been conducted along lines using blind techniques, and without any bias, in an endeavour to arrive at the truth—

Mr. Tonkin: Does the Minister know—

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —and in almost every case—I could not say "every case," because the honourable member would immediately say, "How do you know?"—

Mr. Tonkin: Yes; that is a relevant question.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the honourable member will allow me to finish. Whenever any of these gentlemen who have felt so strongly about the experiments they have carried out have submitted their findings for examination by other people, and other authorities, they have been disproved.

Mr. Tonkin: Another general statement.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That happened at the New Zealand Royal Commission, which was one of the classic commissions into the fluoridation of water supplies.

Mr. Tonkin: Does the Minister know that Berry replied to that criticism of Armstrong's?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It happened again in the famous Dublin case, over which Mr. Justice Kenny presided, a case on which the anti-fluoridationists, as I said previously, pinned high hopes; and their claims were proven wrong. Waldbott was found by Mr. Justice Kenny to be completely biased in his findings; and he said that so and so, and so and so, whose names I was trying to find during the afternoon tea break—however, they were eminent scientists who also gave evidence—had submitted findings which could be believed. However, he discounted and discredited Waldbott's statements.

Waldbott is another scientist, or doctor—one of the few—who opposes fluoridation, and this is something we must expect with any health reform. In years gone by people were even opposed to doctors washing their hands. That was thought to be a terrible thing, as was the introduction of cowpox to combat smallpox. Waldbott's syndrome was given exhaustive treatment by the New Zealand Royal Commission. This commission, like all commissions, was composed of a judge as chairman and there were a professor of biochemistry and a merchant as the other members. They went through the evidence exhaustively and studied the Spira-Waldbott syndrome.

I have the report of the commission which describes what Waldbott said and what the commission's findings were. These are summarised in chapter 41 of the *Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies* in 1957. These are the conclusions—

At this point we summarise our conclusions on the "Spira-Waldbott Syndrome" as follows:—

- (1) We are of the opinion that the individual's signs and symptoms of the alleged syn-



drome may be due to any number of unrecognised causes; and

- (2) We are satisfied that there is no causal relationship between any of these signs and symptoms and the ingestion of water containing 1 p.p.m. of fluoride and food cooked in this water.

The same sort of conclusions have been arrived at by other commissions and courts of inquiry held in many places in the United States of America and in the famous Dublin case to which I have referred.

This matter has been given a very full debate and to my mind there is no question of a doubt that the introduction of fluoride into our water supply on the basis of one part per million of fluoride to water, is a safe and highly beneficial proposition.

Mr. Kelly: You will have plenty of time to learn about it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### **BILLS (2): RETURNED**

1. Supply Bill (No. 2).
2. Companies Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

### **OPTICAL DISPENSERS BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [4.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In 1940, legislation was passed to provide for the registration of members of the optical profession. This legislation did not cater for several categories of people who operated in associated professions or trades. During the past several years, development in Western Australia and overseas has highlighted the differences between persons practising as optometrists and those who limit their activities to the craft of spectacles making.

The matter was brought to a head last year when, in the process of court proceedings, certain interpretations were clarified. This, however, led to further confusion between professional and trade interests. A Bill was presented to Parliament with the object of making a clear legal definition between the practice of optometry and the making of spectacles. This, of course, did not interfere with the right of optometrists to make spectacles.

At the time the Bill was passed, certain reservations were expressed and the Minister for Health undertook to investigate the overall picture more closely. As a result, this Bill is presented. It represents

the outcome of lengthy consideration following full consultation with all interested parties.

In broad terms the Bill aims at creating a separate form of registration for optical dispensers. As these people are in the nature of skilled craftsmen rather than professional practitioners, the Bill does not create a registration board. It provides that a person who has earned his livelihood in the occupation of optical dispensing for a period of two years out of the five years preceding the coming into operation of the Act, will be licensed by the Commissioner of Public Health.

It is envisaged that a course of training will be established as an extension of the existing apprenticeship system. Future graduates from this course of training will be licensed on the strength of this qualification. The Bill also enables regulations to be made under which qualifications of a suitable standard obtained from training bodies outside Western Australia could be recognised. If the Commissioner of Public Health refuses an application for a license, the applicant may make an appeal to the Minister who may confirm or alter the commissioner's decision.

It has been necessary, in order that justice might prevail, to make provision in this Bill to license persons who are skilled in the manufacture and fitting of haptic lenses. This lens is a large type of contact lens. It is not to be confused with the appliance most commonly referred to as the micro corneal lens. We have been fortunate in Western Australia to have available a craftsman who has had adequate specialised training in the manufacture and fitting of haptic lenses. This training was obtained under the direction of one of our early eye specialists who took a special interest in this work. When the eye specialist ceased to practise, the craftsman became the only person in the State competent in this field. Clause 6 of the Bill enables the granting of a license to cover these operations. It would, of course, be open to the commissioner to grant similar licenses to other persons who satisfied him of their competence.

The Bill does not authorise optical dispensers to deal in corneal lenses. There is a special reason for this. These lenses are only prescribed in special cases where there may be other conditions to be considered in addition to visual defects. It is important that persons fitting these lenses have the necessary professional training in order to safeguard the welfare of the patient. These lenses will be supplied only through medical practitioners or optometrists. The Bill also imposes a license fee of \$5 per license, but as this is taken out only once it will not be a heavy impost.

If a licensed optical dispenser commits an offence against the Act, or is guilty of such improper conduct in carrying on his business as an optical dispenser as would

justify the cancellation of his license, the Commissioner of Public Health may recommend to the Governor that this be done.

The provisions of this Bill render unnecessary the amendments to the Optometrists Act which were passed last year and which dealt with related subjects. A separate Bill is therefore presented—it will follow the introduction of this measure—in association with this legislation which has the effect of repealing the amendments of the 1965 Act and adding an interpretation "optical dispensing" to harmonise with the provisions of this Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Norton.

### OPTOMETRISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [4.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill seeks to repeal the Optometrists Act Amendment Act, 1965, which has not yet been proclaimed and is not now required, as I explained when introducing the previous measure. The Bill now before the House also provides for a definition of "optical dispensing" to harmonise with the provisions of the Optical Dispensers Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Norton.

### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1966-67

#### *In Committee of Supply*

Resumed from the 6th October, the Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Mitchell) in the Chair.

**Vote: Legislative Council, \$54,700—**

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [4.24 p.m.]: The expenditure estimated in the Budget for the current year is \$223,054,000, and the estimated revenue \$222,436,000, leaving an estimated deficit for the financial year of \$618,000. The estimate of total revenue for this year will exceed by \$15,000,000, approximately, the total revenue received into the Treasury last financial year. The increased revenue for the current year comes under the main headings of—

	\$
State taxation .....	2,184,121
Territorial .....	2,947,924
Law Courts .....	101,316
Departmental .....	1,991,497
Receipts from the Commonwealth .....	1,788,073
Receipts from Public Utilities .....	6,697,795

In the survey of the State's economy which the Treasurer gave, he dealt with many subjects. It is my intention this afternoon to deal with only a few of those

subjects, but before I proceed any further I am sure all members were sorry to learn this morning of the indisposition of the Treasurer, and I am certain we all hope his indisposition will be of short duration and his health will improve during the next day or two.

One of the subjects dealt with by the Treasurer had to do with retail sales during the 1965-66 financial year. In his summary of those sales he told us the citizens of Western Australia, during that year, had saved more and had also purchased more. He gave as probably the most significant indicator of income growth and of the confidence of the public in the future, a total value of retail sales which was 8.8 per cent. higher than the total in the previous year.

I am not querying the basis of the comparison made by the Treasurer, because I agree the basis of the retail sales during the last financial year, compared with the one immediately preceding had, in the main, been carried out in the same way and on the same basis. But we do know retail sales in these days are greatly inflated beyond the current buying capacity of the public through the medium of the hire-purchase system.

I would think that if members of the public were suddenly placed in a position where cash, very largely in total, had to be paid for goods and services, we would find such a collapse in retail sales as would bring about an economic situation which would be unmanageable and which all of us would deeply deplore.

I also notice in the Budget the interest payments and the debt repayments by the State during this financial year will take up a very solid percentage of the total estimate of revenue for the year. Those of us who have had anything to do with the hire-purchase system—I admit I have not had anything to do with it directly, as I am one of those fortunate citizens who has more than an average income and who prefers to pay in cash for what has to be bought—would know, either from our own direct experience, or from knowledge of the experience of others who have operated under this system, of the very great burden in a financial sense which is put upon the people through hire-purchase commitments.

We also know of instances where some families, consciously or without really understanding the full liabilities which they are taking on, have become hopelessly overburdened with the hire-purchase commitments into which they have entered. I sometimes wonder how long this system will keep rolling on.

I remember reading an article in *The West Australian* a few weeks ago by John Eddy in which he dealt specifically with the interest problem in relation to hire purchase; in relation to governmental debts; and so on. He clearly sounded a very strong warning. I suppose nobody

in authority will take any notice of the warning which he sounded. Maybe, when the day of reckoning comes in regard to this total subject, someone will be decent enough to uncover this newspaper article and give it some publicity, and will declare the situation which will then exist might not have come into existence had notice been taken by more people and by more authorities at the time it was first published.

Although there is substantial ground for satisfaction in one sense in the growth of retail sales; and, although it is natural with an increasing population those sales should increase, I think underneath it all there might be some ground for caution, if not for restraint, as to where this situation will lead individual citizens and Governments in the years which, perhaps, are not so very far ahead.

In the field of retail sales, motor vehicles naturally play a solid part. The Treasurer told us sales of motor vehicles, petrol, and motor accessories in Western Australia during the last financial year totalled \$172,000,000, an increase of 5 per cent. over the sales for the previous year; registrations of new cars and station wagons were only slightly above the figure for the previous year; and registrations of new commercial vehicles increased by 33 per cent. I would think there is considerable significance in that summary of the sales of motor vehicles in Western Australia in the last financial year, as against the previous financial year.

It would seem as if the capacity of the normal run of citizens to buy motorcars has risen very little, or as if the capacity of the industrial world to purchase vehicles for business purposes has increased quite solidly. Whether these indications are something to become enthusiastic about, I am not sure.

Mr. Craig: Did you notice in the Press the other day a report that the sales of new motor vehicles in Western Australia have increased, whereas in the other States they have declined?

Mr. HAWKE: I shall come to that point shortly. It is certainly significant that the sales of motor vehicles, which more or less are bought by the general public, should increase to a small degree, whereas the sales of commercial vehicles should increase so very greatly. I know one answer is there has been considerable development in our north-west, and no doubt a great number of commercial or industrial vehicles have been purchased for that development.

In the other States of Australia the sales of motor vehicles in total have not increased; in fact, they have decreased. The answer to this is fairly obvious. New South Wales experienced in many of its areas very serious drought conditions, and Queensland to a lesser extent suffered the same experience. Doubtless the slump in

wealth production and the resultant slump in commercial activity have had the effect of reducing the demand for vehicles in those States.

I was in South Australia recently, and it was obvious to me the same situation had developed there to a lesser extent. A considerable amount of activity in connection with the production of motor vehicles in Australia is carried on in South Australia. Motor industry activity in South Australia is part and parcel of the total motor vehicle industry of Australia. Many of the vehicles which are sold in Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland have some of the important parts produced in the factories of South Australia. Consequently, with a less effective demand for motor vehicles in the Eastern States, the motor vehicle building industry in South Australia has suffered a slump.

We also know—and most unfortunately—the policy which the motor vehicle building companies in Australia follow when there is a slackening in the demand by the public for motor vehicles. When I was in South Australia the other day I noticed quite a number of men, employed in the motor manufacturing industry, had been put off almost at an hour's notice. On the surface one cannot appreciate why a big and wealthy company should take action of this kind. The explanation of the company is that manufacturing activities in South Australia have to be integrated with similar activities in Victoria, and to a lesser extent in New South Wales.

Therefore, when there is a breakdown in Victoria, in particular, in the motor manufacturing industries, there has automatically to be a cut-down or a close-down in related factories in South Australia and, maybe to some extent, in New South Wales. As we all know, the purchase and ownership of a motor vehicle has a very high priority with most people these days. So I suppose the number of motor vehicles being sold in any State is now a solid indicator of the purchasing capacity of the people.

Whether the motorcar should be the number one priority in the family budget, is, I think, open to question and open to a very solid difference of opinion. However, this is the way things have developed. I suppose the number one priority in the mind of every teenager is to become the possessor of a driving license at the first opportunity; and, naturally, to follow that up as soon as possible thereafter by coming into possession of a motor vehicle, which the teenager himself or herself gets under hire-purchase conditions, or by consistent and persistent overtures which the teenager puts to the father or the mother having the use of the family car, or one of the family cars, if the family is fortunate to possess two, three, or more.

I only want to say one thing about the building industry, as this was a subject

with which the Treasurer dealt with. He told us there had been a decline in this industry which is, of course, unfortunate. In my young days, the possession of a home was the number one priority in the family thinking and in the family budgeting. These days, of course, many families leave the provision of a home to Governments and consequently it has no place at all in the actual family budgeting, except for the provision of payment of rent; or, if the home is taken from the Housing Commission on a purchase basis, the meeting of the purchase commitments which become due from time to time.

I mention this subject almost entirely because of representations which were made to me a few days ago by some people who are in a practical way concerned in the availability of bricks for the building industry. I was told a very serious shortage of bricks exists at the present time and was further told one of the companies which manufactures bricks is operating a policy which is very detrimental to quite a few of those actually engaged in the building industry. I was advised the situation in relation to this company is so serious as to have caused some of those who are suffering as a result of the company's policy to give serious thought to the question of making an approach to the headquarters of the company, which are located outside of Australia.

Some questions were submitted by me to the Premier yesterday in this matter and he indicated in reply steps which are being taken by at least one company in Western Australia very greatly to increase its production of bricks in the reasonably near future; and also the possibility, or maybe probability, of similar action on the part of another company which is manufacturing cement bricks. I would hope the appropriate Ministers in the Government would give very close attention to this matter. I think close attention is all the more necessary because of the effect of the slump—if we might call it such—which has occurred in the building industry over the last year or so.

It has always been claimed in the past with considerable accuracy that the building industry is one of the best indicators of economic activity. In other words, when the building industry is active, progressive, and prosperous, there is a great deal of useful and well-paid employment in many directions, because the industries which serve the building industry are active in producing all of the building materials required. In addition, of course, building tradesmen of every type are given the opportunity of being employed full-time, or very nearly so, and, in some instances, of working overtime.

The Treasurer, in his speech, went on to tell us the published deficit for 1964-65,

after receiving the first instalment of the special grant from the Commonwealth, was \$4,697,000. He told us the State would receive a further grant during the current financial year on account of the 1964-65 year which would leave the State with a final surplus for that year of \$9,000. He then informed us the State finished with a surplus in 1963-64. The Treasurer then went on to deal with the published deficit for the last financial year, 1965-66, which he said was only \$10,000.

Up to that stage the story was quite good. However, the Treasurer then saddened us somewhat by saying the Grants Commission anticipates the State will be left with a final deficit for last financial year of approximately \$2,000,000. He went on to say that deficit would have to be met from next year's loan funds; and we could all agree with his comment at that stage on the unfortunate situation which arises when a developing State such as Western Australia has to use loan funds for the purpose of meeting deficits in the Consolidated Revenue account.

We were given what were considered to be, in the opinion of the Treasurer, two main causes for the final deficit for the last financial year. One was quarterly adjustments to the basic wage; and the other the drought in New South Wales, coupled with a deterioration in Victoria's financial position and the effect the last-mentioned situation in New South Wales and in Victoria would have upon the assessment to be made by the Grants Commission in relation to the grants which we might expect to receive from the Grants Commission when it made its next recommendation to the Federal Government and, through the Federal Government, to the Federal Parliament.

The Treasurer went on to deal in some detail with quarterly adjustments to the basic wage in Western Australia, and gave figures to show how the quarterly adjustments which had taken place during the last financial year had increased the expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. He then made the statement that it was the intention of the Government to introduce legislation during this current session of Parliament to provide for the abolition of quarterly adjustments to the basic wage. As members know, the legislation in question is now before us. I do not propose to try to discuss that matter in this speech, except incidentally, because ample opportunity will be available to us next week to say what we think about that proposal.

We had quoted to us by the Treasurer, statements made by the Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte). Sir Henry had made statements which were published in Australian newspapers and which indicated it was becoming extraordinarily difficult for State Governments to budget satisfactorily because Commonwealth funds being made

available to the States were not anywhere near adequate to meet the greatly increasing demands upon the services which State Governments in Australia had to make available to their respective populations. Among other things Sir Henry Bolte said—

The States are responsible for major and costly services with education the key example and yet, on the other hand, the States have no effective access to any of the major revenue fields in Australia.

It is significant in this situation to find the Premier and Treasurer of the most prosperous State in Australia making the statement to which I have just referred. I would say without any risk of contradiction, Victoria is by far the easiest State in Australia to govern. It is not the smallest in area, because Tasmania is smaller; but it is small and compact. It has wealth. It is the financial centre, to a large extent, of Australia, and it has very considerable and varied natural resources. Therefore a great deal of notice has to be taken of Sir Henry Bolte.

An extraordinary feature about the financial position of the States today is they are all seriously short of funds. I suggest they would not have been nearly as seriously short of funds as they are at the present time had this calendar year—1966—not been a Federal election year. I think had the Federal election been held last year, the Federal Government would not have hesitated this calendar year—or financial year, if you like to put it that way—to raise a considerable amount of additional revenue from Federal sources and would have quite happily, I imagine, made larger financial grants by one method or another to each of the six State Governments. However, because this calendar year is an election year, there was no possibility at all of the Federal Government imposing additional financial burdens upon the people.

Mr. O'Neil: There is a lot to be said for a five-year Parliament.

Mr. HAWKE: So the Prime Minister of Australia and his colleagues have, as it were, thrown the State Treasurers to the wolves. Maybe on the quiet and in confidential talks they have said to the non-Labor Premiers, "Just battle it out for the rest of this calendar year. Raise a bit more money yourselves. Put a few additional burdens upon your own people, and come back to Canberra in February, 1967, and we will see that you are given substantial increased financial help."

I think that is indicated by the fact that the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales recently put pressure on the Prime Minister to receive them for the purpose of discussing exclusively the financial difficulties which those two States were experiencing, and with the idea in view of trying to persuade the Federal Government to make special emergency financial

help available to those two States. Naturally, the Prime Minister was not green enough to fall for that one. Had he met those Premiers at that time and agreed to give them special emergency financial help, he would have immediately committed himself, without saying so, to give special emergency financial help to every other Premier in Australia, irrespective of whether he be a Labor Premier or a non-Labor Premier.

So the Prime Minister, in quite a wily way, has agreed to meet all the Treasurers and Premiers of Australia in February of next year. He may not have the opportunity of meeting them then, not as Prime Minister, anyway. However, whoever meets them next year—whether it be in February, March, or April—will undoubtedly have to take action to make considerable additional amounts of Federal finance available to the State Governments in Australia.

The Treasurer then went on to tell us about the additional financial burdens which he and his Government propose to put upon the people of this State, and also of some other steps which the Government is taking to ensure the taking into Consolidated Revenue of additional funds. For instance, it is proposed to take approximately \$200,000 in Lottery Commission receipts into the Consolidated Revenue Fund to assist the Government towards meeting the very heavy and always increasing costs of financing hospital services in Western Australia. I am one of those who believe everything possible should be done for hospitals.

Nothing is too good for the sick, and we should do whatever it is possible to do for them. However, I sometimes wonder whether the enlargement of hospitals to the size which we have at Royal Perth, does not tend to create a situation in which management is under some considerable difficulty in keeping costs under reasonable control. I do not know how much of the total amount made available to the Royal Perth Hospital management board actually goes to help patients, and how much goes in other directions.

I suppose indirectly all the money goes to help the sick in some way, but if, perhaps, a dissection of expenditure could clearly be made it might be found that the patients are not getting as much value from the total expenditure as could be. It might also be found that a proportion of the expenditure is in a direction which, perhaps, could be improved on. I am not in a position to speak with authority on that. I do know there is a tendency, when those establishments become really big, for administration expenses to climb up and up. The employment of some additional people in one direction appears to automatically create the necessity to employ another group; and that group has to be serviced by another group. Before we know where we are going the total cost is getting sky high.

Mr. O'Neil: The hospitals would not spend much on advertising for customers.

Mr. HAWKE: I should think not.

Mr. Court: I think the upward escalation of size is one of the great problems. It is a problem to know when it reaches the stage of Parkinson's law and the un-economic factors creep in. I quite agree with you.

Mr. HAWKE: I should think that would be a real worry to those in authority. I am not going to argue about the proposed increases in taxes; I am not going to argue about the increased burdens which have been put upon the people by this Government over the last year or so except to say those burdens have been terrific for a population as small as we have, and for people who, in the financial sense, are as poor as we are—if it can be expressed that way.

Most people in Western Australia are not in a position to successfully bear all the additional burdens which are being piled onto them. Some of them have not a hope in the world of successfully coping with the situation. When these additional taxes, charges, and burdens are put upon them something has to suffer. Most certainly the standard of living of many families has to suffer. Maybe some of the tradesmen have to suffer because accounts which previously were paid in full, are not now paid in full. And maybe the situation just ripples along, and losses are suffered in many directions as a result of the inability of families, from their weekly incomes, to fully finance the total burdens put upon them.

However, we will have ample opportunity to discuss the Government's taxation policies fully when the necessary legislation is brought to Parliament for our consideration. One further comment in that direction is this: The Government proposes to force—or try to force—legislation through this Parliament for the abolition of quarterly adjustments to the State basic wage. At the same time, among other increased taxation, it proposes to impose a receipt duty tax.

I am not sure what name this tax will be given in the legislation which is to come before us. At the present time, and in the past, it has been known as stamp duty. It is not so long ago the Government raised the exemption from stamp duty to £5. All receipts issued since then for amounts under £5 have not had to carry stamp duty. It is true the Government, at the same time, increased the rate of stamp duty on amounts above £5. However, in the new proposal, according to what I have read in the newspapers, the Government proposes to put a tax or stamp duty upon every receipt to be issued. I find it hard to believe that will, in fact, be the proposal when it reaches us. I think it would be crazy in the extreme to have receipts put upon purchases of very small amounts. However, we will wait with controlled patience the Government's legislation in this matter.

Mr. Court: The Premier's proposition was to collect this duty in total to overcome the vexatious situation which exists at the present time under which so many people escape liability.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, I understand the Premier's aim is to collect the duty in total. However, that is a problem one cannot just take on its face value. I think the number of purchases are so tremendous and the variety of them so wide as perhaps to make it difficult for the Premier to apply a flat rate system, as it were.

The point I want to make in connection with the two subjects—the abolition of quarterly cost of living adjustments, and the imposition of this tax—is the imposition of the tax will certainly increase the cost of living. Nothing can be more certain. The cost of living will increase quite substantially as a result of this tax when it becomes law and is imposed.

So the cost of living will increase. The dollar will purchase less than the dollar purchases today. Yet wage and salary earners, whose incomes are subject to basic wage adjustments, will receive no more. Logically and obviously, therefore, the real purchasing power of wages and salaries will be cut down. The abolition of quarterly cost of living adjustments will, in effect, be a wage and salary reduction measure.

In concluding his Budget speech to this Committee, the Treasurer said—

On the one hand the State is experiencing a rate of development exceeded during only one other period in its history.

I think that here he meant from 1953 to 1959, although he did not state the period. He went on to say—

The economy is buoyant and we can face the coming year with continued optimism.

The member for Wellington does not look very optimistic. I do not know whether he has received a letter today which has worried him.

Mr. Court: More letters on the arch?

Mr. HAWKE: I ask: Who are "we"? Who are the "we" who can face the coming year with optimism? I would say the great majority of people in Western Australia, because of their economic situation and particularly because of the increased charges which have already been put upon them during the last 12 months and the substantially increased ones which are to be put upon them before this calendar year is closed, are not now facing this coming year with any optimism. They cannot possibly face it with any optimism in view of the terrific financial burdens which are put upon them.

This applies particularly to the family man whose income is limited. I am sure every member in this House—including the

Ministers—would know from the cost of living which they themselves have to meet how impossible it must be for families on small incomes to meet all commitments. There is no hope in the world of their doing it. Therefore, the only way they battle along is to use the hire-purchase system more fully; or else the wife, because of economic pressures, goes out to work.

I would like to see a check made on the number of children in Western Australia who are not receiving the amount of care and guidance they should be receiving, due to the fact that a number of mothers, because of economic circumstances, are forced to go out to work to add to the family income each week. I am not saying—nor would I ever say—every mother who goes out to work has to go out to work. I know some who go out from choice, because they like to have an income of their own and be independent. However, unfortunately, there is a growing number of mothers in Western Australia who are being forced out to some employment or another in order to provide the home with sufficient income, in addition to the husband's earnings, to enable the family budget to have some prospect of balancing, or getting somewhere near to the balancing point.

#### *Progress*

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### *Postponement*

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning—Deputy Premier) [5.13 p.m.]: I move—

That Orders of the Day Nos. 5 to 11 inclusive be postponed.

Question put and passed.

#### *Point of Order*

**Mr. HAWKE**: May I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker? I understood the Deputy Premier to move a postponement of the prior items for the purpose of considering Order of the Day No. 12. I understood the Deputy Premier to put the motion simply for the postponement of the items which appear on the notice paper before item 12, and not for the consideration of No. 12. Would not the motion, as the Deputy Premier has put it, and if adhered to, have the effect of making it impossible for the House later in this sitting, if need be, to go back to the other items?

The **SPEAKER**: Yes, that is my understanding of what the Deputy Premier moved.

**Mr. HAWKE**: But it is not what he moved.

The **SPEAKER**: I am sorry; I misunderstood the question. If anyone wishes, I will put the question again.

**Mr. Ross Hutchinson**: The Deputy Premier does not wish to deal with any other items today.

### **PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Council's Amendment*

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

#### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The amendment made by the Council is as follows:—

Clause 3, page 4, line 14—Delete the word "practicable" and substitute the words "in the opinion of the Minister practicable and appropriate".

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON**: This is a small amendment, and some members might wonder at the reason for introducing it as, in effect, the amendment as suggested would be carried out in practice. However, it is an amendment which was apparently suggested by several local governing authorities, and I propose to support it. The amendment has relation to a qualifying paragraph in another part of clause 3. I do not think the Opposition will raise any objection to it. Accordingly, I move—

That the amendment made by the Council be agreed to.

**Mr. TONKIN**: I do not like this at all. The question of whether a thing is practicable or not is a question of fact. It should not depend upon the opinion of a Minister as to whether it is practicable or not. The Minister may say it is not practicable when it is practicable. Whether a thing can be done, or cannot be done, is a question of fact—it is not a matter of opinion. This simply means it can be done at the whim of the Minister. I say that is a bad way to legislate, because some Ministers have bad judgment. Why should they, in a matter of law, determine whether a thing is practicable or not?

I have come against this obstacle with regard to other legislation. One interpretation of whether it is practicable or not in the opinion of the Minister is that the person who advises the Minister has to be the judge as to whether a thing is practicable or not; so, if it does not suit him to regard it as practicable, he says it is not practicable. That is the situation; that is what one has to accept. Surely, that is not a fair way to legislate.

This is something which can be determined. On this point, there has been a great deal of litigation on Commonwealth legislation in years past. Power was taken under the regulations framed under the War Precautions Act when Ministers believed they were to be the arbiters, and they simply said, "It is not practicable," but when the matter went to court it was discovered it was a question of fact whether it was practicable and it was not a question of opinion. This is a matter

upon which I would like to hear the member for Perth express an opinion, if he is free to give it.

In framing legislation we should endeavour to make it appear that it will be workable and will not give rise to litigation. If the Minister can prove to me that the question of determining whether something is practicable or not is not a question of fact, I will change my ideas. It ought to be possible to establish, by evidence, whether something is practicable. Surely that should be the criterion, and the question should not be decided on the Minister merely saying it is practicable.

Under the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, it was anticipated that the Totalisator Agency Board would be able to put as much money as was practicable on the totalisator at the course, but that varies from time to time according to the whim of the chairman of the board. He decides whether he wants that done, and he regards that as being a criterion of practicability; that is, whether it suits him. We cannot have a better illustration than that, and I can give the date of the illustration.

For example, it has been published in the Press that the Chairman of the Totalisator Agency Board has said that he withholds money from the totalisator on the course if he thinks, by putting it on, it will unduly depress a dividend. So he determines what the dividend is likely to be, and he interprets the law which instructs him that he shall put as much money on the totalisator on the course as is practicable. The discretion is left with him in regard to putting it on.

That is what will happen with this provision, and I do not think we should accept the Council's amendment, because it should be a question of practicability. It should not be a question of the Minister saying it is practicable. The implication in the amendment is that it will permit the Minister to say at any time, "In my view this is not practicable," regardless of whether it is practicable; and that will be the position. That is bad legislation and we should not agree to the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

### *Report*

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

*House adjourned at 5.26 p.m.*

# Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 25th October, 1966

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—</b>	
Tabling .....	1603
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill—3r. ....	1603
Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1613
Com. ; Report .....	1615
Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r. ....	1603
Local Government Act Amendment Bill—2r. ....	1615
Perth Medical Centre Bill—2r. ....	1603
Public Works Act Amendment Bill—Assembly's Message .....	1603
<b>MOTION—</b>	
Motor Accident Victims : Compensation—Inquiry by Select Committee .....	1630
<b>PETITION—</b>	
Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies .....	1602
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Companies Act—Holding Companies : Statutory Obligation for Group Liabilities .....	1603
Midland Junction Abattoir : Establishment of Meat Hall .....	1603

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

## FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES

### *Petition*

**THE HON. R. THOMPSON** (South Metropolitan) [4.33 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from the residents of Western Australia concerning the compulsory fluoridation of public water supplies. I move—

That the petition be received.

Question put and passed.

**THE HON. R. THOMPSON** (South Metropolitan) [4.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the petition be read and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

The petition contains 7,101 signatures and reads as follows:—

We the undersigned residents of the State hereby humbly petition the honourable members of the Legislative Council of Western Australia to do all within their power to prevent the compulsory fluoridation of public water supplies in Western Australia. The main grounds of our case are that we believe such compulsory fluoridation would be a serious and unnecessary infringement of our personal freedom. And your petitioners will ever pray that their humble and earnest petition may be acceded to.

Question put and passed.

*The petition was tabled.*