

officers of the department who help me in making determinations, try to cover the situation so the board can make an effective start. I cannot at this stage say how many parole officers will be appointed. I think I remarked during my second reading speech that the situation may well be limited according to the availability of suitable people. It is my hope that some career opportunity will be created for people who want to qualify as employees of this board.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: In the annual report of the Victorian Parole Board (Male) for the year 1957-58, under the heading, "Activities of Parole Officers" is the following extract:—

- (b) Each officer combines the role of probation and parole officer.
- (c) The number of cases handled by the male officers during the year was—

Pre-sentence reports	140
Probation cases	1,039
Parole cases	320
	<hr/>
	1,499

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We will also have honorary parole officers.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 29 to 51 put and passed.

Clause 52: Regulations—

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I may have overlooked such a provision, but I did not notice, when going through the Bill, any provision whereby a report shall be issued to Parliament each year.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have passed the clause dealing with that matter.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I probably have, but I just wanted to make sure that the Bill did contain this provision.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFITH: The provision is contained in clause 34 which states that a report must be made before the 1st October each year to the Minister. I presume that the report will be laid on the Table of the House as is the case with reports of all boards.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Thank you.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 53 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 2 amended—

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This clause mentions institutions for the reception of convicted inebriates. Is it contemplated that a new home will be provided or does the clause refer to those already established?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The explanatory note I have on this clause is as follows:—

In clause 3 of the Bill, there is provision for the insertion of a reference part VIB—institutions for the reception of convicted inebriates, subsections 64.0 to 64Q—into section 2 of the Act, which lists the several parts of the Act. This reference was included in the main body of a Bill passed by Parliament last year but its insertion in section 2 was overlooked.

This clause is merely included to rectify the position.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 15 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 9.46 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 24th September, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1256
Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1246
Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—2r.	1270
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill—Com.	1257
Sale of Human Blood Bill—2r.	1247
Com.	1253
Report	1255
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill—2r.	1255

METROPOLITAN REGION PLAN—

Amendment or Disallowance Motions	1239
Restoration of Maps: Statement by Speaker	1239

CONTENTS—continued	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Education—	
High Schools : Enrolments in Metropolitan Area	1242
Visual Education Staff : Reclassification	1241
Fluoridation of Water Supplies—Adoption by Organisations	1242
Grapes—	
Investigations into Industry : Availability of Files	1241
Position of Industry	1241
Housing—"Graham" Flats : Rental Payable by Social Service Pensioners	1239
Mining : Iron Ore Sales—	
Effect on Geraldton	1245
Minister's Press Statement	1245
Price of Tallering Peak Ore	1245
Packaged Goods—Investigation into Standardisation and Marking	1242
Pastoral Industry—Status of Foreign Companies	1242
Potatoes—Overseas Markets	1241
Sports and Entertainments—Charges to Public	1240
Timber—	
Boddington : Milling on Property of Industrial Extracts Ltd.	1239
Dwellingup Mill : Operation	1242
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Grapes—Position of Industry	1246
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE—	
Show Week Adjournment, and Thursday Nights	1246

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

METROPOLITAN REGION PLAN

Restoration of Maps: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I would like to draw the attention of members to the fact that the metropolitan region plan maps have been restored to the Table. The Clerk has received a letter from Mr. Hamer, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, which I propose to read in part—

I forward herewith maps numbered 13, 23, 25, and 27. These are for identification endorsed by me in the bottom right-hand corner.

These have been restored to the form in which they were laid before Parliament on the 13th August, 1963. Will you please therefore substitute these sheets for the sheets of corresponding number in the tabled documents.

Upon this being done, I certify that the Scheme Map is the map forming part of the Scheme approved by the Governor on 7th August, 1963, and so notified in the Gazette on the 9th August, 1963.

Yours faithfully,
M. E. Hamer,
Chairman.

I have had Mr. Hamer personally check this particular document, and he is satisfied that the correct maps have been inserted in the right place. The position now is that the map, as it now lies on the Table of the House, is in all ways identical with the map which was tabled on the 13th August; and I hope that clarifies the position so far as the tabling of this particular plan is concerned.

Amendment or Disallowance Motions

Mr. HAWKE: There is a question which now arises in relation to these papers. That question is whether a motion for the tabling of this latter set of papers, as a new set of papers, is now required. Associated with that matter is the further question as to whether it now requires a period of 21 sitting days during which any member who wishes to do so can move for an amendment or disallowance of the regulations.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): In reply to those questions, the position as I understand it is that the plan, of which the map was a part, was tabled on the 13th August as required by legislation. The legislation does not require that it shall lie upon the Table of the House for a set time. The legislation does provide that any objections may be taken within 21 sitting days of the date of tabling; that is, the 13th August.

The position is that the plan was tabled on the 13th August and it has now been restored to exactly the same position as when it was tabled. The problem that concerns me is the matter of information of members, so that members will be quite clear on what the position is. I understand that the requirements of the legislation have been complied with and it can be assumed that the date of lodging of objections will count as from the 13th August.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE "GRAHAM" FLATS

Rental Payable by Social Service Pensioners

1. **Mr. GRAHAM** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

What is the rental payable by a married couple occupying a *Graham* flat where the tenants' income is the full social service pension only?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The sum is £1 8s. 6d. per week.

TIMBER AT BODDINGTON

Milling on Property of Industrial Extracts Ltd.

2. **Mr. GRAHAM** asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) What are the circumstances of the sawmilling of an area of about

13,000 acres of timber country owned by Industrial Extracts Ltd. in the Boddington area?

- (2) Has a contract been let or a permit been issued?
- (3) What sawmiller will operate on the area?
- (4) What royalty or other consideration is payable, and to whom?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) to (4) It is understood that Industrial Extracts Ltd. sold the timber on an area of 13,000 acres of land owned by it in the Boddington area. The timber was not under the control of the Forests Department.

SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENTS

Charges to Public

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Will he list for the period of the last twelve months for the metropolitan area and the country respectively, the number of sporting, recreational, and entertainment activities held or conducted under the following headings where permission has been granted to make a charge to the public, either to view or to participate in such activities:—

Cinemas (theatres, gardens, drive-ins);
Dances and balls;
Concerts;
Displays and demonstrations;
Stage plays;
Badminton;
Squash;
Table tennis;
Bowling alleys;
Skating;
Entrance to zoos, museums, dams, parks and similar places;
Football;
Soccer;
Rugby;
Cricket;
Tennis;
Golf;
Hockey;
Athletics;
Basketball;
Swimming;
Surf carnivals;
Other?

- (2) What concessions in respect of starting time for cinema shows has he granted since assuming office?
- (3) Does he contemplate allowing promoters of sporting activities such as football the degree of latitude extended to such as proprietors of motion picture theatres?

- (4) Does he consider charging for personal gain for the viewing of imported films (many of which could be of doubtful quality and morality) to contribute less to the "commercialising of the Sabbath" than the charging for watching football without the object of personal profit, but to assist in the conduct of a healthy sport?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

	Metro-politan Area	Country
(1)	23 (Annual)	47 (Annual)
Cinemas	23	47
Dances and Balls	Nil	Nil
Concerts	4	8
Concerts—Band	7	—
Displays and Demonstrations	8	2
Stage plays	Nil	Nil
Badminton	Nil	Nil
Squash	Nil	Nil
Table Tennis	Nil	Nil
Bowling Alleys	Nil	Nil
Skating	Nil	Nil
Entrance to Zoos, museums, dams, parks and similar places	Not required	7 (Annual)
Football	1	Nil
Soccer	Nil	Nil
Rugby	Nil	Nil
Cricket	1	Nil
Tennis	13	1
Golf	1	Nil
Hockey	Nil	Nil
Athletics	1	Nil
Basketball	Nil	Nil
Swimming	2	Nil
Surf Carnivals	2	Nil
Others:		
Rodeos	Nil	2
Harley Scramble	1	Nil
Car Racing	1	Nil
Cycling	2	Nil
Gymkhana	1	Nil

With regard to some of these activities, a permit is not required as a charge for admission is not made.

- (2) One—the 8.45 p.m. starting time has been advanced to 8.15 p.m.
- (3) The right to charge or collect at Sunday cinema shows has been operating for many years and accepted by successive Governments. The policy with regard to

sporting activities, likewise accepted by successive Governments, has been to deal with each application on its merits.

- (4) An Act of Parliament governs this matter and gives the Minister discretionary powers which have been exercised, as far as I am aware, rather liberally by successive Ministers and without undue conflict with varying interests. However, I would point out to the honourable member that apart from the views which I may have personally, I should also have regard for the fact that Parliament itself thought it necessary in 1945 not to liberalise in this matter but to further restrict by adding Good Friday and Christmas Day to the Sunday restrictions.

POTATOES

Overseas Markets

4. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

As Asian countries—Singapore, Hong Kong, Borneo, and Colombo—import thousands of tons of potatoes a year, what endeavours has the Government made to obtain a share of the potential markets?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Although the Western Australian Potato Marketing Board supplied to Asian ports last season over 7,000 tons of potatoes surplus to local requirements, the prices offering in this area are considerably lower than cost of production plus freight and handling charges from Western Australia, as a result of keen competition from other countries where costs are lower.

The Government is investigating other varieties of potatoes for which more economic prices may be obtainable.

GRAPES

Position of Industry

5. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it conceded that the grape industry in this State is in jeopardy?
- (2) If the answer to No. (1) is "Yes," what remedial measures are being taken to rectify the position?

Investigations into Industry: Availability of Files

- (3) Have the report and surveys as compiled by L. W. Slade been considered by the Departments of Industrial Development and Agriculture?

- (4) Was Dr. H. P. Olmo commissioned by the Vine Fruits Research Trust of W.A. to carry out investigations in 1955; if so, will he make the file available for perusal?
- (5) Will he make the file available relative to the report as compiled by L. W. Slade?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) No. The industry is not in jeopardy. There has been a decline in grape production over the past few years because of a variety of reasons that were revealed in a survey and including the uncertainty of some overseas markets.
- (2) See answer to No. (3).
- (3) Yes. A committee, comprising a former Director of Agriculture as its chairman, 3 representatives of grape growers, and officers from the Departments of Industrial Development and Agriculture, has been formed to give more intensive and detailed study of the various aspects raised in Mr. L. W. Slade's report and to submit recommendations.
- (4) Dr. H. P. Olmo was commissioned in 1955 by the Vine Fruits Research Trust to carry out an investigation of the problems and possibilities of the Viticultural Industry. This was financed by the Fulbright Foundation of the U.S.A.

As most of Dr. Olmo's investigations were made from the University of Western Australia, only incomplete records are available from the Department of Agriculture files.

- (5) This file containing the papers is currently in action but the honourable member can examine it if he so desires by arrangement with the department.

VISUAL EDUCATION STAFF

Reclassification

6. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Under what authority and under what conditions is the staff of the Visual Education Department employed?
- (2) Is it not a fact that this staff is employed under Public Service conditions?
- (3) Why was not this particular staff included in the new scale of salaries which were paid last June and made retrospective to the 1st January, 1963?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

- (1) They are employed under the authority of the Education Act. Public Service conditions have been applied to these employees.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).
- (3) Some of the staff members received the increase in salaries. The new scale of salaries was not applied to members of the technical staff, as an attempt is being made to reconcile their margins with those applying to similar positions in outside industry. Any adjustment as the result of this investigation will be retrospective to the 1st January, 1963.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrolments in Metropolitan Area

7. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) At the commencement of the first term in 1964 how many three-year high schools in the metropolitan area is it anticipated will have enrolments in excess of 1,340 students?
- (2) Will he indicate the high schools concerned and the applicable numbers?
- (3) How many five-year high schools in the metropolitan area is it anticipated will have less than 1,345 students at the commencement of the first term, 1964?
- (4) Will he indicate the high schools concerned and the applicable numbers?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Lewis) replied:

- (1) Two.
- (2) Belmont, 1,560; Bentley, 1,345.
- (3) Two.
- (4) Armadale, 1,205; Hollywood, 990.

PASTORAL INDUSTRY

Status of Foreign Companies

8. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Are any—and if so which ones—of the following foreign companies carrying on business in this State, subsidiary companies, and what are the names of the respective holding companies (within the meaning of section 6 of the Companies Act, 1961-62):—

- (a) Nicholson Grazing Co. Pty. Ltd.;
- (b) The Turner Grazing Co. Pty. Ltd.;
- (c) Ord River Ltd.;
- (d) Gordon Downs Ltd.?

Mr. COURT replied:

The records of the Companies Registration Office in Perth do not contain and are not required to contain information as to whether or not any of these companies are subsidiaries and there is no information as to the names of the respective holding companies if there are such.

PACKAGED GOODS

Inquiry into Standardisation and Marking

9. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Police:

Referring to question No. 5 of the 13th November, 1962, regarding an inquiry by Mr. W. J. Cuthill S.M., into standardisation and marking of packaged goods on an Australia-wide basis, can he advise whether the inquiry has been completed; and, if so, whether a copy of the findings is available for the information of members?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

A preliminary report has been submitted and is at present being studied by the respective State Ministers. Until this is completed no findings are available for the information of members.

DWELLINGUP MILL

Operation

10. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government that the Forests Department mill now being rebuilt at Dwellingup will be operated by the Forests Department or be leased to a private company?
- (2) What procedure will be followed to decide which private company should obtain a lease of the mill should the Government's policy be in favour of leasing it?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) The Forests Department mill now being rebuilt at Dwellingup will be operated by the Forests Department.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Adoption by Organisations

11. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Which, if any, of the following organisations have actually recommended the adoption of fluoridation—
 - (a) American Medical Association;

- (b) American Water Works Association;
 - (c) American Cancer Society;
 - (d) World Health Organisation?
- (2) When were the recommendations made and when and where were the facts published?
- (3) Is there any scientific basis for his assertion that the fluoridation of water supplies is a "beneficial health reform which is completely safe"?
- (4) If "Yes," who did the scientific studies upon which he based his assertion, and where are particulars of such studies to be found?
- (5) Is it not a fact that the Councils of the American Medical Association have pointed out that it is still too early to know what the effects of artificial fluoridation will be?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

I preface the answers to this question by saying that the answers are fairly lengthy, but the questions are of such a nature that fairly lengthy answers are necessitated. They are as follows:—

(1) and (2)

(a) American Medical Association:

The House of Delegates of the American Medical Association at its meeting in Los Angeles (December 4 to 7, 1951) adopted the following resolution:

That the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association endorse the principle of fluoridation of community water supplies. (*Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1952, volume 148, p. 1130.)

A subsequent comment by the Secretary and General Manager of the American Medical Association is also relevant:

The unscrupulous opponents of fluoridation have spread the impression that the American Medical Association did not endorse this public health measure. The fact is that they did and that it stands by its endorsement. It is true that the endorsement did not urge any action whatsoever upon responsible officials because that is not the function of the Association. Both the A.M.A. Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry and the A.M.A. Council on Foods and Nutrition expressed themselves definitely to the effect

that fluoridation is safe. (Lull, G.F., 1955, Editorial, *Today's Health*, 33; 13, 63.)

(b) American Water Works Association:

Owing to its composition it is not the function of this body to recommend fluoridation as a public health measure, but its policy is clear from the following statement by the Secretary and Chief Executive Officer of the Association:

In communities where a strong public demand has developed and the procedure has the full approval of the local medical and dental societies, the local and State health authorities and others responsible for the communal health, water departments or companies may properly participate in a programme of fluoridation of public water supplies. (*American Water Works Association Journal*, 1949, volume 41, pages 75-97.)

(c) American Cancer Society:

In view of its nature it would not be appropriate for this society to advocate fluoridation, although it would be quite proper for it to express a view on any allegation related to cancer.

The following statement by the President of the American Cancer Society is, therefore, most relevant:

The American Cancer Society does not consider fluorine or the common fluorine salts to be carcinogenic. Its position, therefore, with respect to water fluoridation for the purpose of dental caries prophylaxis is that such treatment of public water supplies is without danger so far as cancer causation is concerned. (New Zealand Commission of Inquiry on the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies, 1957, page 81, paragraph 282.)

(d) World Health Organisation:

The following were the conclusions of the W.H.O. Expert Committee on water fluoridation:

(1) Drinking water containing about 1 p.p.m. fluoride has a marked caries-preventive action. Maximum benefits are conferred if such water is consumed throughout life.

- (2) There is no evidence that water containing this concentration of fluoride impairs the general health.
- (3) Controlled fluoridation of drinking water is a practicable and effective public health measure. (W.H.O., 1958, Tech. Report Series No. 146, page 21.)
- (3) Yes.
- (4) The particulars of the scientific studies establishing the benefits and the safety of the fluoridation of water supplies are to be found among the 10,000 or more reports published in reputable professional journals.

A list of scientific references given by the British Ministry of Health in its report on the conduct of the British fluoridation studies will demonstrate the wide variety of studies that have been conducted over the years. These references are:—

- Adcock, E.W., Berry, W.T.C. and Forrest, J.R. (1958) *Mth. Bull. Minist. Health Lab. Serv.*, 17, 54.
- Berry, W.T.C. (1958) *Amer. J. Ment. Defic.*, 62, 634.
- Bond, A.M. and Murray, M.M. (1952) *Brit. J.exp. Path.*, 33, 168.
- Durbin, P.W. (1955) *J.dent.Res.*, 33, 789.
- Eley, A.J., Kemp, F.H., Kerley, P.J. and Berry, W.T.C. (1957) *Lancet*, ii, 712.
- Committee appointed to enquire into and report upon the Fluoridation of Municipal Water Supplies, Ontario (1961) Report.
- Ericsson, Y. and Ullberg, S. (1958) *Acts odont.scand.*, 16, 363.
- Forrest, J.R., Parfitt, G.J. and Bransby, E.R. (1951) *Mth. Bull. Minist. Hlth. Lab. Serv.*, 10, 104.
- Frada, G. and Montesana, G. (1953) *Boll. Soc.ital. Biol. sper.* 29, 750.
- Galletti, P., Held, H.R., Korrodi, H. and Wegmann, T. (1955) *Schweiz. Mschr. Zahnheilk.*, 65, 753.
- Griffith, G.W. (1961) *Med. Offr.* 106, 393.
- Griffith, G.W. (1962) in preparation.
- Hagan, T.L., Pasternack, M. and Scholz, G.C. (1954) *Public Health Rep.* 69, 450.
- Heasman, M.A. and Martin, A.E. (1962) (in preparation).
- Jackson, D. and Weidmann, S.M. (1958) *J.Path.Bact.* 76, 451.
- Kemp, F.H., Murray, M.M. and Wilson, D.C. (1942) *Lancet* ii, 93.
- Kemp, F.H. and Wilson, D.C. (1947) *Brit. J. Radiol.* 20, 410.
- Kemp, F.H., Wilson, D.C. and Emrys-Roberts, E. (1948) *Brit. J.Soc.Med.* 2, 66.
- Khan, Y.M. and Wig K.L. (1945) *Indian Med. Gaz.*, 80, 429.
- Leone, N.C., Shimkin, M.B., Arnold, F.A., Stevenson, C.A., Zimmermann, E.R., Geiser, P.B. and Lieberman, J. E. (1954) Medical aspects of excessive fluoride in a water supply: a ten-year study. In: *Fluoridation as a public health measure*, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, p.110.
- Leone, N.C., Arnold, F.A., Zimmermann, E.R., Geiser, P.B. and Lieberman, J.E. (1955) *J.Amer.Dent.Ass.*, 50, 277.
- Linsman, J.F. and McMurray, C.A. (1943) *Radiology*, 40, 474; 41, 497.
- Longwell, J. (1957) *Roy. Soc. Health. J.* 77, 361.
- McCauley, H.B. and McClure, F. J. (1954) *Public Health Rep.*, 69, 671.
- McClure, F.J. (1946). In: *Dental caries and fluorine*, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, p.74.
- Massier, M. and Schour, I. (1952) *J.Amer.Dent.Ass.*, 44, 156.
- Medical Research Council (1949) *Memor. Med. Res. Coun.* (Lond.) 22.
- Murray, M.M., Ryle, J.A., Simpson, B.W. and Wilson, D.C. (1948) *Memor. Med. Res. Coun.* (Lond.) 18.
- Pandit, C.G. and Rao, N.D. (1936) *J.dent.Res.*, 15, 281.
- Penrose, L.S. and Brown, H.L., editors (1961). *Recent advances in human genetics*, London; Churchill.
- Rapaport, I. (1956) *Bull. Acad. Nat. Med.* (Paris), 140, 529.
- Rapaport, I. (1959) *ibid*, 143, 367.

Roholm, K. (1937) Fluorine intoxication. London: H.K. Lewis.

Schlesinger, E.R., Overton, D.E., Chase, H.C. and Cantwell, K.T. (1956) J.Amer.dent. Ass., 52, 296.

Schlesinger, E.R., Overton, D.E. and Chase, H.C. (1956) J. Amer. med. Ass., 160, 21.

Siddiqui, A.H. (1955) Brit. med. J., ii, 1408.

Smith, F.A., Gardner, D.E., and Hodge, H.C. (1955) A.M.A. Arch.Industry.Hyg., 11, 2.

Waldbott, G.L. (1956) Acta med. scand. 156, 157.

Waldbott, G.L. (1958) Int.Arch. Allergy, 12, 347.

Weaver, R. (1950) Brit.dent.J. 88, 231.

Wilson, D.C. (1941) Lancet, i, 211.

World Health Organization (1958) W.H.O. Techn. Rep. Ser., 146.

(5) No.

A statement issued by the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association in December 1957 reads as follows:—

No evidence has been found since the 1951 statement by the Councils (Council on Drugs and Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association) to prove that continuous ingestion of water containing the equivalent of approximately one part per million of fluorine for long periods by large segments of the population is harmful to the general health.

(*Journal of the American Dental Association*, 1962, volume 65, page 603.)

IRON ORE SALES

Minister's Press Statement

12. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Does he remember having told the *Daily News* prior to the 21st of May this year that "The whole question of iron ore sales is progressing smoothly and in accordance with everyone's expectations, except perhaps Tonkin's"?

Effect on Geraldton

(2) Did he not also state that the export of Talling Peak and Koolanooka ore could achieve the permanent upgrading of the port of Geraldton to take bigger ships?

(3) In view of the reported statements of the Premier that it would be almost impossible to deepen Geraldton Harbour enough to allow big

ore carriers to use the port, and as a consequence royalties may have to be reduced, and as negotiations for the sale of Talling Peak ore are no further advanced than they were nine months ago and his colleague, the Minister for Mines, is still waiting for the advice that a contract had been signed which he informed the public in June "he was daily expecting," does he not think it is time that the true position was explained with special reference to the effect of Japanese interests in iron ore deposits at Mt. Newman?

Price of Talling Peak Ore

(4) How much below the price of £5 18s. 3d. per ton is it considered Talling Peak ore must be offered to give the possibility of sale?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes; although I think I should add that I said, "Mr. Tonkin," rather than "Tonkin".

Mr. Tonkin: No you didn't!

Mr. COURT: Yes I did. In fact, I dug up a copy of the Press statement to make sure.

Mr. Tonkin: However, I am not worried about it.

Mr. COURT: The remaining answers are as follows:—

(2) Yes.

(3) It is not correct to say negotiations for the sale of Talling Peak ore are no further advanced than they were nine months ago. A lot of progress has been made in these negotiations and there is still good reason to be confident that an agreement for Talling Peak and Koolanooka ore could be successfully completed in the near future. The true position in respect of all iron ore deposits has been made public.

As far as the Mt. Newman deposit is concerned, the Minister for Mines advises that this area is held as a temporary reserve in the names of Hilditch and Warman who have entered into a formal option agreement to Mt. Newman Iron Ore Co. Ltd. a company incorporated in Western Australia, which is a subsidiary of American Metal Climax Inc.

It is understood that earlier Hilditch and Warman were negotiating with Japanese interests, but now advise that the option referred to is between Mt. Newman Iron Ore Co. Ltd. and themselves as the only parties concerned.

(4) In view of the stage of negotiations reached it is not desirable that any public comment be expressed on price at this stage.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE**GRAPES***Position of Industry*

Mr. HALL: The answer which the Minister for Agriculture gave to question No. 5 on the notice paper, asking whether he agreed that the grape industry was in jeopardy, is in direct contrast to a report published by Mr. Slade, Sales Promotion Officer of the Department of Industrial Development. It is evident from the report that the W.A. grape industry on the whole is on the decline. I shall read the report to the House.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member cannot read the whole of the report.

Mr. HALL: I will read that section of the report which links up with the statement. It is so important I think it should all be read.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! If the honourable member wishes to ask a question he should do so, and not start an argument with me. Would he please get on with the question?

Mr. HALL: As I have said, the Minister's answer is contrary to the statement of the Sales Promotion Officer of the Department of Industrial Development that the W.A. grape industry is in jeopardy.

Mr. NALDER replied:

I think that refers to a statement made by the officer concerned, but if the honourable member requires further information I suggest he place the question on the notice paper.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE*Show Week Adjournment, and Thursday Nights*

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [4.50 p.m.]: Last week the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question concerning the proposed arrangements for sitting during Show Week. In answer at that time I suggested we would not sit on People's Day (Wednesday). However, since then, further consideration has been given to the matter and it is proposed now not to sit during Show Week at all. The House will not be sitting on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, inclusive. We will, however, sit on Thursday, the 10th October, and continue the sitting after tea.

Mr. Graham: And every Thursday thereafter?

Mr. BRAND: And every Thursday thereafter. I would point out, however, that sittings on Thursdays after tea will begin only one week earlier this year than was the case last year.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Third Reading*

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [4.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

I undertook during the third reading stage to explain parts of the Bill to the Leader of the Opposition. In regard to clause 7 on page 6 of the Bill, the member for Warren implied that the local authority would be judge, jury, and prosecutor; and I also undertook to have that matter clarified.

I have a Crown Law opinion which I will read, together with an explanation by the Secretary of the Bush Fires Board which, I think, substantially agree with the interpretation I placed on the clause of the Bill. The following is what the Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman of the Crown Law Department has to say:—

The provision of the proposed subsection (4a) is to enable a local authority to recover expenses incurred by a bush fire brigade in preventing the extension of, or extinguishing a fire which escapes from the land upon which it was started or which in the opinion of the officers is out of control. When expense has been so incurred, the local authority may request the person who started the fire to pay those expenses, and in default of payment may take action against him through a court to recover the amount of the expenses. The amount sought is not a penalty, but is a debt due to the local authority for the expenses incurred by the bush fire brigade in providing a service in relation to controlling or extinguishing the fire. The maximum amount permitted to be so recovered is £50.

Somewhat similar provisions are contained in the Fire Brigades Act, 1942. Under section 65, subsections (1) and (2) of that Act a liability is imposed on owners or occupiers in circumstances set out in the section to pay to the W.A. Fire Brigades Board an amount to be determined by it as set out in the third schedule to the Act, for the attendance at a fire of any fire brigade that is under the board's control. Such section then in subsection (5) provides further that in default of payment, any such fees or charges may be recovered by the

board summarily in any court of petty sessions, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction.

As local authorities incur expense in establishing and maintaining bush fire brigades, it is suggested that a provision is not unreasonable which gives them the right to recover the cost involved in the attendance at fires of their brigades.

I repeat that they are to be recovered by the decision of the court. The opinion of the Secretary of the Bush Fires Board is as follows:—

This provision was intended to enable bush fire brigades to recover expenses incurred, especially in cases where the person who lit the fire does not support the brigade with services or money and is not a member of it. It is a question of payment for a service and has no reference to any offence.

The provision does not authorise a bush fire control officer or an officer of a bush fire brigade to determine any matter other than the fact that the fire had escaped from the land or was out of control on it. If a brigade was called to a property where the officers did not consider the fire was out of control or had escaped then no expenses could be claimed. If the control or brigade officer is of the opinion the fire was out of control then the brigade may decide to request the local authority to charge expenses incurred in extinguishing the fire. The local authority would obviously satisfy itself as to the circumstances before it raised the charge. The local authority would be entitled to refuse to raise any charge.

If the person charged with the expenses did not consider them reasonable or that he was not liable for them he could refuse to pay. The local authority would then have to take him to court, if it wished to pursue the matter, and would have to be prepared to prove that the person had started the fire; that the bush fire control officer or brigade officer was of the opinion the fire was out of control on the land and that the expenses had in fact been incurred by the brigade in putting out the fire. The court would then have to decide if a debt was due.

That is in relation to the first question raised by the Leader of the Opposition; and in vol. 2 of *Hansard*, 1962, page 1072, this matter was raised and I replied then in substantially the same way.

In relation to the onus of proof clause, the Parliamentary Draftsman says this—

The purpose of section 66 is to provide a means of proof of ownership or occupancy of land, and this provision appears in a number of Acts on

the Statute Book. The source of the present provision (including subsection (3)) was the Local Government Act, 1960—section 655. Similar provisions appear also in the Noxious Weeds Act, 1950—section 40 and the Vermin Act, 1919—section 129.

The comment of the Secretary of the Bush Fires Board is—

This clause has been inserted to bring the Bush Fires Act into line with the Local Government Act and other Acts administered by local authorities. It is a question of setting out what a Court may accept as proof. For instance under the Bush Fires Act at present even a Certificate of Title can be challenged on technical grounds and an Assistant Registrar of Titles would have to appear in Court to prove the Certificate. It is not intended that the means of proof should be exhaustive i.e. if one fails that another should be followed. Few people wish to contest ownership but under the provisions of the Bill they may do so if they wish. The purpose of the amendment, however, is to overcome the raising of these questions as technicalities only.

I believe that the comments of the Senior Parliamentary Draftsman on behalf of the Crown Law Department and the comments of the Secretary of the Bush Fires Board substantiate the comments I made that the court in the first instance would be obliged to decide whether there was an offence and, in effect, the first procedure is only establishing a cost for services given.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

SALE OF HUMAN BLOOD BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [5.3 p.m.]: This is a short Bill containing four clauses, but it covers a very important subject. From what the Minister told us the need to bring this Bill before the House was caused by the running out of a patent, which was held by the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories for a number of years. Under this patent the Serum Laboratories had the sole right of treating blood to take out its various component parts for redistribution, as needed, to hospitals and doctors.

Over the years, Australia has probably been in a unique position so far as blood transfusions, and the donation of blood and its distribution are concerned. The

Red Cross, in partnership with the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories, has had the complete control over this operation. The Red Cross in itself has been the taker and distributor of whole or part blood, while the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories have taken the various extracts, plasma, and so on, that are required.

The Red Cross has, over a period of time, built up a very fine organisation and is housed in large buildings. That organisation has encouraged people to go to it to donate their blood. In return the Red Cross has distributed to hospitals and doctors the whole blood, extracts, and the plasmas of blood so that people who are badly in need of it or are unfortunate enough to need transfusions can obtain blood quickly at no cost. So far as the Red Cross is concerned, distance is no bar. If there is a need for blood to be rushed to any part of the State, then the blood reaches its destination.

If legislation similar to this is not passed on a Commonwealth-wide basis many of the pharmaceutical chemists would build up blood banks of their own and this would cause some competition in respect of the selling of blood. Because of the set-up we have here, this would be very undesirable; and if we can maintain the organisation we have today it will be much to our credit. If blood could be bought and sold I feel that blood donors would not come forward as readily as they do at present. Many people would not then be willing to sell their blood, but at the present time they are only too anxious to donate it in order to save the life of somebody else or to assist someone back to health.

I feel that the Bill, as worded—that is, the main clause—does not do exactly what the Minister wants. The idea of the clause is to prohibit anyone from selling blood; but as I read the last portion of the clause, it will even stop the right of any person to take blood from another person. In view of this I have placed two small amendments on the notice paper which I think will clear up the matter, and I trust the Minister will see his way clear to accept them.

The position would then be quite clear: that blood could be taken by the blood banks or doctors when necessary, but in no case could it be sold or given away for some reward. I support the second reading.

DR. HENN (Wembley) [5.8 p.m.]: For some 30 years or more—I think 34—the handling and management of blood transfusion services in this State, and indeed in all of the States of the Commonwealth, have been in the hands of the Red Cross divisions. This was controlled, as has been said by the Minister and the member for Gascoyne, by a Commonwealth patent which expired about 18 months or two

years ago. It was thought by the legal experts of the Commonwealth that it might be as well to renew the patent, but on examination it was found not possible to do so and that the only way to do it was for the Commonwealth and the States to pass uniform legislation to prevent the sale of human blood by parties other than those doing it now if the same process was continued.

One can give a very good account of the stewardship of the Red Cross in regard to this matter over the last 30 years. I do not think any member in this House will have any difficulty in voting for the Bill in view of the stewardship by the Red Cross. The history of the blood transfusion service began about 1930 when the service had a book containing over 50 donors' names. This book was kept at the Royal Perth Hospital. The modern service began in 1935 when Dr. Cyril Fortune approached the Red Cross to see if it would set up a committee to run the service of the blood transfusion organisation. This was formed, with Dr. Fortune as chairman. The service began with a grant of £50 from the Lotteries Commission for incidental expenses. By 1940 there were 700 voluntary donors on the list.

I might say here that without the donors the transfusion service could not exist. In 1941 the donor panel was increased to 2,500; and at this time the second world war was, of course, under way and the service was assisted by a large number of dedicated volunteer workers. In 1942 there were 3,000 donors on the roll; in 1952 the number was 14,850; in 1960-61 it was 21,500; and today it is 26,128. I might say that more than half of these donors are from the country areas.

During this time, when the service was growing, it had no permanent home, and had to move from place to place. It was not possible to obtain a suitable building as it was wartime and things were very difficult. Its first address was the Mercantile National Buildings; then Bellevue Terrace; and then Adelaide Terrace. In 1955, the Hawke Labor Government, fully convinced of the value of this service, agreed on a plan to finance a new building in Wellington Street. This four-storey building cost £185,000, and was opened in May, 1958. At that time the arrangement was for the Government to pay two-thirds of the cost of the building, and the Red Cross one-third; but by the time the building was finished there was an excess cost of £25,000, which was met by a grant from the Lotteries Commission.

At this point it might be interesting to mention just a few of the contents of blood—not only whole blood, but also its derivatives. If whole blood is not used after being kept a fortnight, it is not subsequently used but broken down into various constituents. In each pint of blood there are, among other interesting

things, about half a pint of plasma, about 3,000,000,000,000 red corpuscles, about 5,000,000,000 white corpuscles, and a large number of platelets.

Whole blood—that is, corpuscles and plasma—keeps for only two weeks. After that time the plasma can still be used. Because corpuscles age so quickly in storage, a stockpile of blood cannot be maintained. That is why it is so necessary to keep a constant supply of donors on hand. If whole blood has been in storage for 14 days, it is made into essential blood products, which are:

Plasma: Usually fresh-frozen and used for the treatment of hæmophiliacs (bleeders).

Serum: The “shock troop” of blood transfusion services, used in emergencies before the blood group of the patient is known and for the treatment of burns and shock.

Gamma Globulin: To protect people exposed to infection with polio, hepatitis, and other diseases.

Albumin: To make up protein lost from blood plasma.

Fibrinogen: For use when the blood does not clot well, particularly for mothers in childbirth.

I might say that no blood is ever wasted, because some of the constituents which I have mentioned can be kept for a long time.

It is interesting to note that of the 200,000 people eligible to be blood donors in the metropolitan area—anybody between the ages of 18 and 60 can be a blood donor—there are only roughly 10,000 on the donors' roll. So it seems that with a little bit of publicity and perhaps a little bit further organisation, we would obtain more donors. More donors will be required in the metropolitan area because of the anticipated increase in population. Furthermore, a much greater use will be made of blood in regard to serious operations than is the case today.

The Blood Transfusion Service is assisted in many ways and by various organisations in this State. For instance, the Metropolitan Transport Trust quite recently provided, free of charge, 100 spaces for advertising in its petrol buses. Some Rotary clubs, particularly Armadale and Melville, have been most helpful in organising blood donors into small groups, thus enabling the Red Cross mobile units to go to the areas and take blood from donors. The service has always had the utmost co-operation from the Midland Junction Workshops, the employees of which are always very willing to help.

One might also mention the large industrial and commercial firms which are ever ready to permit the transfusion service to visit their establishments and take up the time of their employees to obtain the

blood. I would in this regard like to mention particularly the West Australian Refrigerated Transport which has always been so good to us over the years in that it has transported a lot of products to the Eastern States by train and other means. From the inception of the service Peters Ice Cream Co. Ltd. has offered its facilities for refrigeration of the various products.

The transfusion service has endeavoured to step up publicity. Quite recently it started a system whereby senior high school students aged between 16 and 17 are invited to visit the service. This has a double purpose in that it interests them in studies of physiology and also introduces them to the work of the service so that when they become 18 they may enrol as donors.

We have also been in touch with many donors who have been on the rolls in the metropolitan and country areas but who are now travelling to the north-west to work. The service has contacted these people and asked them to continue to give their blood. Their blood group and a list containing their names has been forwarded to the various hospitals in the north-west.

The service has inaugurated a presentation scheme whereby those who have given 50 or more pints of blood are presented with a set of six sterling silver spoons. Three of these have already been given; and, of course, as time goes on, many more will be presented because the service will have been in operation for that much longer.

As far as publicity through films is concerned, the Western Australian branch made a film about three years ago called “The Gift of Blood”. This was quite successful and was received very well in the Eastern States and, in fact, all over the Commonwealth, so much so that another film was made by the Melbourne branch, this film being called “The Stream of Life”. I must confess that this film was better inasmuch as the technique was improved. Perhaps they picked up one or two ideas from the one produced in Western Australia. However, the fact remains that the second one was better than the first.

At this moment the Red Cross (W.A. Division) is producing another film, which will be shown in about three months' time. It is being made with the co-operation of the Education Department and the Government Films Production Unit and is based on Rh babies. In these cases a complete exchange transfusion is involved; and I do not think that a film on this subject has ever been made anywhere in the world before, so it should be interesting, informative, and useful.

I have related briefly some of the history of the service. As to its future in Western Australia, steps have been taken towards

expansion. It is proposed to establish regional blood banks in certain areas. There is already one in Albany; and next month one will be established in Bunbury, which will serve the areas around Collie, Busselton, Harvey, and Donnybrook. Within the next six months, I should imagine, one will be opened in Geraldton, and one in Northam, which is a very important centre.

Kalgoorlie has always had a service. It has a special significance of its own because of the mines and the ever-present possibility of an unfortunate accident occurring, when a large quantity of blood would be required. One will also be opened in Manjimup to serve Boyup Brook, Nannup, Pemberton, Bridgetown, and Mayanup, and I hope that that will be opened at least within the next 18 months.

Apart from the fact that the opening of regional blood banks will assist in improving the service, particularly by increasing the number of donors, we will be able to provide a better service because, in a serious case, where a large number of pints of blood are necessary, the donors will be on the rolls in the particular regional area concerned, the whole technical arrangements will be made on the spot, and the necessary facilities will be readily available instead of these having to be provided from Perth.

Apart from that improvement in the actual service, which the regional blood banks will provide, there is the question of civil defence; and this service is very closely allied with that because, as members can imagine, if there are any unfortunate episodes—of either a civilian or military nature—it will be essential that the service be decentralised, as I outlined a few moments ago.

The Blood Transfusion Service will play an important part. We will at least need to stockpile some taking and giving sets in these centres, and also products of fractionation to which I referred when I read out the list of the components of blood. After they have been tried out, so to speak, we will be able to stockpile them in these areas for a number of years and they can be replaced from time to time. It will cost a certain amount of money, but we have to be prepared.

The Red Cross is working very closely in conjunction with civil defence, and it is important that it should do just that. We must always remember the Dwellingup fire. We were extremely lucky during that episode in that there were no serious burns. I know there were some burns to the eyes and so on, but there was nothing really very serious. However, a person does not have to be burned very much before he suffers considerable shock, which condition requires a tremendous amount of blood. We would only have to experience a serious fire, or some other disaster like floods, for blood stocks to be depleted.

There are at the moment regional hospitals at Albany, Bunbury, and Kalgoorlie, and there are also blood banks established with laboratories and pathologists—or, at least, experienced technicians—in charge. In this regard we are very grateful to the Government for supplying them and the facilities.

The Red Cross blood bank is a bank where no-one has an account, but where anyone may withdraw any amount needed at any time. A person does not have to pay it back either; and the bank makes no charge for its service. However, in this connection I would like to say that many people feel they are charged when they have a transfusion. They are charged by the doctor but not by the Red Cross. The doctor who gives the transfusions makes a charge. He not only puts the blood into them and watches it, but he also does cross-matching and cross-typing which takes, in itself, about 2½ hours. Therefore it is not simply a matter of getting a bottle of blood and putting it into a person's veins. Two and a half hours of very intricate and specialised work have to be done before the blood goes into the recipient.

In 1955 the Federal Government promised to supplement payments made by State Governments to the Red Cross, and the present state of financial assistance is that the Western Australian Government pays 60 per cent., the Federal Government 30 per cent., and the Red Cross 10 per cent. In 1960-61, the total cost was nearly £54,000. That figure, of course, refers only to the operation of the transfusion service and not to any other branches of the Red Cross, of which there are many more in Western Australia.

I mentioned previously that the total number of donors on the roll was 26,128, and I would describe these voluntary donors as the shining gems forming the diadem which crowns the work of the transfusion service in Western Australia. One cannot speak too highly of those ladies and gentlemen—members of the public—who donate their blood free of charge. Without them, the service could not operate. For over 34 years the Red Cross has conducted this branch of its service to the satisfaction of the public, and it is fully competent to do so.

I would ask the House to vote in favour of this Bill; but, before resuming my seat, I would like to request members to be good enough—when they have an opportunity in their electorates—to talk about the Red Cross, because the matter of increasing the number of donors in the metropolitan area is very urgent. I support the Bill.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [5.28 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on this Bill. The member for Wembley has dealt with a lot of the technical aspects for the prevention of the sale of human blood and the desirability of all possible

help being given to the service. I would like to deal with some abuses which are in existence throughout the world and which are, no doubt, responsible for the introduction of this legislation.

Legislation to prevent the sale of human blood in this country is desirable on moral and practical grounds. Some of the practical grounds have been mentioned by the member for Wembley. However, I believe that the penalty of £200 is very mild in comparison with what it should be for trading in this precious material. Commercial traffic in human beings is slavery, of course; but the commercial traffic of any part of humans—in this instance, blood—is a retrograde step for any nation.

Apart from this fact, the giving of blood for remuneration can lead to physical debility due to the fact that there is an immediate temptation for the seller to allow himself to be bled too often. I read recently where this abuse is indulged in in America; and I quote America as an example of a place where alcoholics are in the habit of giving a pint of blood for remuneration. They then immediately go to the nearest hotel and spend the proceeds; and then, for the purpose of raising more money, they give another pint of blood and thus debilitate their health to the point where it could be fatal. This Bill will prevent such abuses; and as a consequence, it is a desirable and timely measure, to prevent these malpractices being indulged in here.

The minimum period between blood donations in Western Australia is eight weeks, but the usual period is 12 weeks, or longer if the donor prefers it. The member for Wembley says that a very practical point is that blood is a critical and vital national resource relating directly to the health of the people and the security of the nation. As he pointed out in a time of crisis or emergency—whether it is a war or some other devastating occurrence that could cause a considerable number of casualties, or disease on a large scale—it is unthinkable that this national resource should be in the control of any authority but the Government, through its subsidisation of the Red Cross or the Red Cross programme.

As I have said, in America and other countries commercial blood banks operate competitively with the Red Cross blood donor programme. I will read briefly from a report of Dr. Peter Brain. Dr. Brain visited New Zealand, Canada, and the United States of America. The report is quite a long one, but I will read only briefly from it. What I will read will bear out what I am saying: that quite a considerable amount of money can be obtained for blood; and if blood is sold, that is to the detriment of the nation and the public.

I will quote now from page 4 of Dr. Brain's report. Under the heading, "Seattle, Washington", he had this to say—

On August 20th, I visited the King County Blood Bank. This is not a Red Cross bank, but it is not strictly a commercial bank either. I understand that in America most banks provide blood to hospitals, but the King County bank provides it direct to the patient. This reduces the cost to the patient since all laboratory work (crossmatching and blood grouping) is done by the bank, not the hospital, and included in the cost of the blood, \$9 per unit.

That is quite a considerable amount for people who possibly cannot afford such a fee. Again, on page 5, there is a further reference to the charges that are made. On this occasion Dr. Brain is referring to Portland, Oregon, and he says—

Like all Red Cross Services, this one does not reward donors, but a charge is made for blood. It costs \$6.50 to produce a bottle of blood, and of this \$2.00 comes from Red Cross funds (there is no Government subsidy). The remaining \$4.50 is charged to the hospitals using the blood, who pass it on to the patient plus their own charges for crossmatching (not done by the service) and administration. It costs anything between \$12 and \$17 to have a pint of blood in a hospital.

I do not know the rate of exchange, but \$17 would be somewhere around £8.

Mr. Henn: It is 30s. in Sweden.

Mr. FLETCHER: Dr. Brain, on page 10 of his report, has this to say—

I am convinced also that the Australian system of nation-wide Red Cross control and free blood for everyone regardless of credit is superior to every other.

Dr. Brain is very satisfied with our system; and, incidentally, so am I.

As evidence of the abuses that can be indulged in, I will quote three newspaper references to the trading in human blood that is indulged in in some areas; and I will quote in chronological order. In *The West Australian* of the 15th August, 1962, T. H. Hoffmann, Chapter Manager, American National Red Cross, Detroit, Michigan, is reported as saying—

In the Detroit area we do have four commercial blood banks that both pay donors and sell blood to hospitals.

He then refers to a Mr. Cope who, apparently, was a previous contributor to the newspaper.

Mr. Cope's figure on what is paid for blood, \$40 (£17 13s.) a pint, is certainly way out of line. In actual practice \$4.50 (£2) to \$12 (£5 6s.) is

being paid by commercial blood banks to donors—the amount governed by blood type.

That means that if a donor had the Rh negative type, which is in keen demand, the recipient would have to pay a considerably higher price than otherwise.

The next cutting I wish to refer to is dated the 23rd July, 1962. I assume it is a cutting from *The West Australian*. It is an article from Michael Cope in Toronto and it states—

Canadian-American friendship is being sorely tried in the border city of Windsor, Ontario, across the river from Detroit where American Red Cross officials are wooing Canadian blood donors with big cash payments and free shots of whisky.

I do not want, as a result of these malpractices, to see any strife between Western Australia and the Eastern States. To continue—

A Canadian with a rare blood group can get up to \$40 (£17) for a pint of his blood, plus a lot of whisky before heading back to Canada. In Windsor on the Canadian side of the border, donors get only a "Thank you" and a cup of coffee.

That is all we get here as blood donors; and that is all I am pleased to accept. This extract continues—

Mrs. Herman Savage, director of the Canadian Red Cross blood donor services in Windsor, says that the situation is getting serious with city hospitals running 1,000 pints of blood behind schedule.

Windsor is now staging its own plasma parade with prizes to donors who bring in new volunteers.

Prizes include theatre tickets, hairdos, gramophone records, free tankfuls of petrol, and baseballs autographed by star members of the Detroit Tigers team.

That has not the same value as the next article which I shall read from *The West Australian* of Thursday, the 27th September, 1962. This article appears under the headlines "Blood Sold in U.S. for £20 a Pint." Those are dramatic headlines, and I have no doubt the Minister is aware of the article, which states—

Some Americans paid up to £20 for a pint of blood for a transfusion, W.A. Blood Transfusion Service director, Dr. P. Brain said yesterday.

He has returned to Perth after having studied blood transfusion services in New Zealand, Canada, and the U.S. on his way to attend two international congresses of blood societies in Mexico City.

That is the authority from which I have just quoted. I could read further from that report, but the headlines are sufficient "Blood Is Sold in the U.S. for £20 a Pint."

I suggest that if the Bill does nothing else but prevent that malpractice it is really worth while. The most important part of Dr. Brain's report reads as follows:—

Mexico City.

I visited only one blood bank in Mexico. This was a commercial bank run by a firm called Productos Liofilizados S.A. which in addition to supplying whole blood and lyophilised plasma makes plastic transfusion equipment. Donors, all male, attend weekly for plasmapheresis of one litre or monthly to give 500 ml of whole blood. Whole blood is sent to hospitals on the day of collection and held only 24 hours. At the end of this time it is returned to the factory the plasma separated and the packed cells given to hospitals for the poor.

The bottles of lyophilised plasma each with its accompanying bottle of diluent and giving set are put up in plastic lunch boxes at a cost of about £7. Whole blood is sold to the hospital at about the same price per 500 ml.

The plastic blood taking equipment is cheaper than that made in the U.S. and appears to be of excellent quality. An outer cover for transfusion under pressure appeared to be particularly well designed.

The Minister will be interested in the next small paragraph of the report—

This firm plans to expand into South America and even overseas.

The purpose of quoting that is to pose this question: Is that firm likely to extend its activities to Australia and indulge in the sale of human blood for remuneration?

In another part of the report, Dr. Brain briefly refers to Kuwait where a considerable number of American employees are associated with oil undertakings. Because they cannot accept blood from the indigenous people, owing to the disease that is rampant in the area, they have to acquire it from overseas for company employees, and they are paying high price for it. As a consequence, if this Bill were not introduced, Australian blood could leave our shores for parts overseas; and it could be sold at prices that we could not afford to pay; or, alternatively, blood that we cannot afford to lose could be sent out of the country. As a consequence I find that the Bill is a desirable one.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Health) [5.43 p.m.]: I am indebted to those members who have spoken for the observations they have made in supporting the measure. I found

the remarks of the member for Wembley particularly very interesting and informative, particularly the descriptive comments he made regarding the work of the Red Cross service and the splendid efforts of the donors.

One can feel from the speeches that have been made on the Bill that members favour a continuation of the present system of obtaining blood and the present system of distribution. It is all based on a voluntary system; and any firm—or person—that established itself for the purpose of buying and selling blood would cut across this voluntary system of blood donation and distribution. As the member for Fremantle mentioned, it would be most unwise for this system to be jeopardised, and it is timely for such legislation as this to be introduced.

The member for Gascoyne has on the notice paper some amendments which can well be discussed in the Committee stage. I hope he will not press them very strongly, because I think I will be able to show him that the Bill will be far better if it is left in its present state. However, that is a matter for the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Buying of human blood restricted—

Mr. NORTON: This is the main clause in the Bill and it provides that no person shall trade in any human blood whatsoever. To make the clause more understandable, the word "have" should be inserted after the word "or" in the third line of the clause, and the words "for sale or reward" after the word "person" in the fourth line. As written, the clause would appear to mean that any doctor would have to apply to the blood bank to take blood from any person because any such action is governed by subclause (2) which provides that the Minister may, in writing, authorise a person to buy human blood. As subclause (1) reads, a doctor would not have the right to take blood from any person. My amendment only seeks to tidy up the clause. I move an amendment—

Page 1, line 11—Insert after the word "or" the word "have".

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I appreciate the motive of the member for Gascoyne and that he is not trying to delay the passage of the Bill. However, I think he has misread the clause, which has been phrased in its present fashion deliberately. To insert the word "have" in the clause

would destroy the meaning that is intended. If members will read the subclause slowly, taking the initial part of it separately with the final words of the subclause, they will probably understand it more clearly.

We must leave the wording as printed for it to fulfil its true intention and so that it may cover any of the other contingencies that are listed. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. HAWKE: I think the member for Gascoyne might be correct with his amendment. If we read subclause (1) carefully I think it will be found that the prohibition in the first part of that subclause applies to the buying of blood, whereas the prohibition in the second part applies to the right to take blood from the body of a person. I think there are two separate prohibitions in the subclause, and the first has nothing to do with the second except in point of principle.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They are linked with the words "or the right to".

Mr. HAWKE: I think the first part of the subclause has to do with the prohibition of the buying, agreeing to buy, offering to buy, or holding himself out to agreeing to buy human blood. If all members of the committee agree with me up to that point, we are that far ahead.

In my view, the second part of the subclause covers the second prohibition against the right of anyone to take blood from the body of another person. Therefore, I think the member for Gascoyne could be on the right track because his two amendments, taken together, have the intention of altering the second prohibition in the subclause to one of preventing any person from taking blood from the body of another person for sale or reward.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But we do not want to insert words which will prevent people from having the right to take blood from the body of another person, because there are many occasions in medical service when a little blood must be taken from the body.

Mr. HAWKE: I quite agree; and, that is why the second amendment proposed by the member for Gascoyne intends to insert the words "for sale or reward".

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That cuts the restriction right down. Some person might try to do this in a benevolent sort of way.

Mr. HAWKE: If, in that regard, the Minister's point of view is correct—and it might be—should we not consider the question of inserting the word "buy" instead of the word "have" as suggested in the amendment? I think the second part of this subclause needs a great deal more attention because in its present form it seems to me that no-one will have the

right to take blood from the body of another person; not even a doctor or the people at the blood bank would have the right.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You mean, not under the proposal in the clause?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I cannot see that.

Mr. HAWKE: The second prohibition in the second part of the subclause is contained in the words, "a person shall not . . . have the right to take blood from the body of another person"; that is, with the word "have" inserted.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But did you hear me when I replied to the member for Gascoyne? I suggest that members of the committee should go back to the first part of the subclause to the word "buy" or the words "agree to buy".

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister cannot go back and relate the second prohibition in the second part of the subclause to the word "buy" in the first prohibition of the subclause. That cannot be done logically and I am certain it should not be done legally. I think the Minister would find, if he were to give the second part of the subclause closer attention, that the effect of it legally—should the clause become law in that form—would be to prevent the taking of blood by any person—no matter whether that person was the best medical man in the country—because in the second part of the subclause we would have an absolute prohibition of the taking of blood from any person.

I would appeal to the Minister to delay the further Committee stages of the Bill in order that this part of the subclause might receive very close attention, because I am afraid that if it is passed in its present form great difficulties could arise.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In normal circumstances I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition to have a second look at the subclause and discuss it with the Parliamentary Draftsman. But I have already discussed it with him and he has informed me that its meaning is quite clear, and that one should refer back after the word "or" so that the wording will read, "A person shall not buy . . . the right to take blood from the body of another person."

Mr. Hawke: Why not include the word "buy" between the word "or" and the word "the"?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We are trying to arrive at some satisfactory conclusion, but I want to let the Committee know that when I noticed the member for Gascoyne's amendment on the notice paper I contacted the Parliamentary Draftsman and he said that if the amendment were agreed to it would distort the meaning of

the clause to something that was not intended, and that the form of the wording of the clause as printed was correct and conveyed the proper meaning.

Furthermore, this legislation was drafted virtually at the request of the Attorneys-General of the various States of Australia and so this is a uniform type of legislation. I quite agree that to say this is a uniform type of legislation does not deny the right of members of this Chamber to make amendments to the Bill if so desired, but I am armed with the information from the Parliamentary Draftsman that the clause as printed conveys the meaning that is satisfactory to all concerned. Further, that is the information that has been conveyed to me following the determination by the Attorneys-General.

So I appeal to the Committee not to delay the Bill at this juncture. I am quite prepared to make a further inquiry to check what I have just told the Committee and to ascertain whether it will be necessary, in the light of what the Leader of the Opposition has said, to repeat after the word "or" all those sets of contingencies that are placed before that word.

Mr. NORTON: The verb "buy" and the other verbs following in the various forms of "buy" apply to human blood; however, there does not seem to be any verb which applies to the right to take blood from the body of another person. All I am seeking in my amendment is to bring about clarity in the phraseology. The Minister is being a little dogmatic in not accepting a simple amendment which will clarify the intention of the provision.

Mr. O'NEIL: We have heard the Leader of the Opposition speaking on the wording used in the provisions of other Bills.

Mr. J. Hegney: Will you speak up?

Mr. O'NEIL: I was addressing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

Mr. J. Hegney: I have some rights in this Chamber, and I am entitled to hear what is being said.

Mr. O'NEIL: The first portion of subclause (1) contains the operative words, and they are "buy, agree to buy, offer to buy, or hold himself up as being willing to buy." All those verbs apply to "human blood", as well as to the last part of the subclause, "the right to take blood from the body of another person." If we were to simply take the verb "buy" and apply it to the subclause it would read—

A person shall not buy human blood or the right to take blood from the body of another person.

I agree that the wording of the clause gives the correct intention, and the amendment proposed by the member for Gascoyne

alters the entire meaning. If it is necessary to be more particular, we can insert the word "either" before the passage—

human blood, or the right to take blood from the body of another person.

But I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. HAWKE: I agree that the proposal of the member for East Melville will make the wording clearer, but I am wondering how the right to take human blood can be purchased. I would like some explanation on this point from the Minister.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: A person could sell the right in advance for the taking of blood under certain circumstances. I have already undertaken to have the wording of this subclause examined, and if it is found to be wrong I shall have amendments made.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I agree with the interpretation of the member for East Melville. It is important to take into consideration the punctuation marks. In essence the subclause provides that a person shall not buy human blood or the right to take blood from the body of another person.

I suggest the draftsman had a good reason for including the passage, "the right to take blood from the body of another person", because without those words in the provision the restriction could be got over by taking a form of document from a person to acquire the right to take blood; in that event, it would not amount to buying human blood as such, but buying an interest in the blood.

The amendment proposed by the member for Gascoyne changes the sense of the provision, because I suggest the draftsman had in mind the prohibition of dealing in human blood, or dealing in the right to take human blood. He envisages the taking of the human blood as being the physical act, whereas the right to take blood may be made under an arrangement whereby the blood is taken at some future time. Under such an arrangement there would be no actual taking of blood.

The drafting of the clause could be improved to achieve the objective sought by the inclusion of two paragraphs. If the wording were as follows:—

Subject to this section, a person shall not buy, agree to buy, offer to buy, or hold himself out as being willing to buy,

- (a) human blood, or
- (b) the right to take human blood from the body of another person.

the intention would be set out more clearly.

We should agree to the clause as it is, because the Minister has undertaken to refer it to the Parliamentary Draftsman.

If the draftsman can improve the language used in the provision then the necessary action will be taken in another place to amend the clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. FLETCHER: Subclause (2) provides that where it is desirable, the Minister may authorise a person to buy human blood. I cannot envisage the special circumstances arising where human blood has to be bought; neither can I see any purpose for such purchase. Can the Minister outline the special circumstances when it becomes necessary to purchase human blood?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The provision has been so framed as to cover a possible eventuality when human blood has to be purchased. In the event of voluntary blood donors not coming forward, perhaps an offer to purchase blood would be made. The special circumstances referred to in this provision include the case where insufficient human blood is available, and supplies have to be purchased from another country, or another place. This provision covers an eventuality where special circumstances arise which necessitate the Red Cross Society obtaining human blood from other sources. In such an event the society will approach the Minister for Health for approval.

Mr. FLETCHER: If such a transaction in blood were to take place it would create a dangerous precedent; this applies to the purchase of blood either from people within the State, or from the U.S.A. where I understand the cost is \$20 a pint. If we purchased blood from the U.S.A. it is reasonable to assume that that country would also be prepared to purchase from us on other occasions.

I do not like this clause, but I cannot see any way to amend it. I hope the draftsman will read my remarks, and will be able to find ways to prevent the eventuality to which I referred.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Minister for Police) [7.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow the Totalisator Agency Board to conduct totalisator pools by way of quinella and doubles betting on racing and trotting

events within the State in the same manner as it now does in relation to racing outside of the State.

At the present time on the main race days—Saturdays and public holidays—the T.A.B. conducts: firstly, on Eastern States racing two quinellas and one double pool; secondly, on local racing one all-up for a win on two selected races, the investments on which are sent to the on-course totalisator; and, thirdly, on local trotting an all-up for a win, the same as for local racing.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, your knowledge of racing and betting, like mine, is very limited; and for your edification, a quinella bet means a bet in which the backer nominates a combination of two horses on the chance that those horses will fill the first and second places, irrespective of the order in which they finish; and a double event bet means a bet in which the backer nominates a combination of two horses or nominates the same horse on the chance that those horses or that horse will fill first places in two horse races selected. I presume you, Sir, understand that.

There have been many requests to the board to give consideration to the conduct of a greater number of quinella and double pools, which have become very popular. No quinella or doubles betting is undertaken in local racing and trotting mainly because of the time required and the cost incurred in collating and transmitting the necessary information to the on-course totalisator. Some idea of the task can be gained when it is realised that with 15 runners in a quinella race, there are 105 different combinations which make it virtually impossible to collate the figures for something like 120 agencies in sufficient time to enable the investments to be placed in the on-course totalisator.

Whilst the position in relation to the collating of a double is somewhat easier, as there are no on-course doubles conducted on the local races, as the Act now stands the board cannot conduct such form of betting. On-course quinellas are conducted by the W.A.T.C. and the W.A.T.A. at the local races and trots on every race, whilst the Trotting Association also conducts a double on each two successive races. However, the board would be only interested in one double only on two selected events with at least one intervening race.

The board is not anxious to increase the quinella and doubles betting on Eastern States events; and I agree with it, as it is felt that that would tend to encourage interest in such racing at the expense of interest in local racing and trotting. What the board has in mind, however, is to be able to engage in pure off-course quinella and double pools without being required to transmit the moneys to the on-course totalisator. To enable it to do that, amendments to the Act are necessary; hence

this legislation. The commission to be fixed by regulation will be 15 per cent., which is the standard deduction applicable generally in this State.

Members may be inclined to assume that this will mean an actual increase in the incidence of betting. This should not be so as the all-up for a win on the local races and trots will be dropped in favour of the double; and the moneys invested in the quinellas, one only on the races and one only on the trots, will no doubt be diverted from moneys at present being invested in win and place betting on events conducted both outside and inside the State.

To the backer, the double is more acceptable than an all-up for a win, as there is only one commission deducted for the double as against two for the all-up. It is felt that a very limited amount of quinella betting in local races and trots—and I can assure members it will be very limited—will be very acceptable to the investing public, particularly in country areas, without, it is anticipated, causing any increase in the actual incidence of betting.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Minister for Police) [7.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to once again fix starting-price limits for licensed off-course bookmakers. As most members would know, licensed off-course bookmakers, prior to the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960, being proclaimed on the 31st December, 1960, paid out at starting-price odds with limits.

As from the 31st December, 1960, such bookmakers were required to pay out on the same basis as the Totalisator Agency Board. This basis, since September, 1961, has been the actual totalisator dividends as declared by the respective on-course totalisators, both inside and outside of the State.

When bookmakers only operated prior to January, 1961, the limits fixed were within the State on metropolitan racing: for a win 50 to 1, and for a place 12 to 1; on metropolitan trotting: for a win 33 to 1, and for a place 8 to 1; on country racing: for a win 25 to 1, and for a place 6 to 1; and on country trotting: for a win 16 to 1, and for a place 4 to 1; on Eastern States racing: for a win 50 to 1, and for a place 12 to 1. There were some special limits in regard to feature events, such as the Melbourne Cup. These limits were previously fixed by regulation.

Under this Bill the limits proposed within the State are for metropolitan racing and trotting: for a win 50 to 1, and for a place 12 to 1; country racing and trotting: for a win 33 to 1, and for a place 8 to 1; and for racing and trotting outside of the State: for a win 50 to 1, and for a place 12 to 1.

Thus, relative to the previous limits, it will be seen that the limits now proposed are substantially the same, except that they have been increased in regard to both metropolitan and country trotting within the State. There is no doubt that the removal of the limits has increased the risk of the bookmaker, and particularly the small bookmaker, who could be placed in a position of not being able to pay as the result of a fluke bet. The board, of course, is in a somewhat different position in that a bad result arising from fluke bets in one or two agencies would be cushioned by more favourable results from the bulk of the agencies.

It is believed that since off-course bookmakers have been required to pay out at totalisator odds, they have been inclined to refuse bets on outsiders by reason of the attendant risks. In addition, the Totalisator Agency Board has experienced difficulty in securing licensed bookmakers for those country towns without legalised betting facilities. This legislation, therefore, aims to enable limits to be fixed, not by way of regulation, but in the Act itself. Thus the limits will not be capable of amendment without reference back to Parliament. At the present time there are some 47 licensed off-course bookmakers still operating mainly in small country towns.

It is believed that if this measure is passed it will encourage the smaller bookmaker with a weekly turnover of somewhere between £200 and £500 per week to carry on until such time as his area is proclaimed a totalisator region.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee, etc.

Resumed from the 19th September. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Wild (Minister for Water Supplies) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 6: Section 8 repealed and section substituted—

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on the clause after the member for Belmont had moved the following amendment:—

Page 4, line 28—Delete the word "seven" with a view to substituting another word.

Mr. H. MAY: I am amazed at the attitude of the Minister and of the Government in connection with this clause. I have understood for a long time that the Government was all for democracy; but after the attitude exhibited by the Minister I am satisfied that the Government does not understand what democracy means. If it believes in any kind of democracy at all, it is simply a matter of convenience. The Government has claimed it is trying to improve the differences that exist between capital and labour. We have only to look at the composition of the members of the proposed board to understand how far apart the Liberal Party is from the working class.

Here is a glorious opportunity for the Government to show that it is desirous of the working class receiving representation whenever possible. What difference would it make if a representative from the Opposition party were placed on the proposed board? There are numerous boards the composition of which represent all sections of the community. The Government is saying to the working class of this State, "You should not have representation on this board, and we are not going to give you representation." That is what the attitude of the Government amounts to. Representation would prove that the Government believes in what it says, when it maintains it believes in democracy. However, it believes that the working class should not be represented on any board such as this if at all possible.

How on earth does the Government imagine it is going to bring Capital and Labour closer together? It is showing class distinction when it refuses to have a representative of the working class on the proposed board.

I am amazed and disgusted at the Government's attitude. I hope no-one will suggest to me in future that the Government believes in democracy. I rose to express my disgust at and disapproval of the action of the Government in failing to grasp a glorious opportunity for all classes of the community to be represented on this board. I support the amendment and hope it will be passed.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I wish to enter an emphatic protest against the apathy and indifference, if not hostility, of the Government in connection with the appointment of a workers' representative on the proposed board. The Minister indicated last Thursday that he could not care less. He implied that he was not interested in the amendment; that he was opposed to its terms; that he would not agree to the amendment because he did not believe in it.

The Committee is entitled to know why he does not believe in the amendment. Included in the composition of the board are representatives who, I would say, are

most appropriate. There is reference to the appointment of a chairman. One is to be the general manager for the time being; and one a qualified and competent engineer. I agree with the appointment of the Under-Treasurer, or one of his representatives, because the Government will be financially involved.

Another three persons are to be appointed on the recommendation of the Perth City Council and the Local Government Association. It is proposed that the latter shall nominate two representatives. No qualifications are set out regarding the appointment of local government representatives. No doubt they will represent the ratepayers. Those representatives could be ordinary citizens, having no engineering qualifications or engineering knowledge. They could be citizens having no technical knowledge in any direction. They need have no accounting experience. One might call them "Yes" men.

I am not casting any reflection on those persons who might be appointed, but that situation could arise. We are asking that at least one of the representatives—and we proposed to increase the number of representatives on the board from seven to eight—shall represent the men who do the spade work.

Having checked with the union, I find there are 1,600 financial members of the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Employees' Union. Many of the union's members have been employed in the department for years and have performed loyal, faithful, and efficient service. Among those 1,600 members there are a number who would bring to the deliberations of the proposed board a good deal of practical and human experience, which would be of benefit to the board.

There is nothing ulterior in the proposal that a representative of the union be appointed to the board. It is common practice. The Leader of the Opposition referred to two State instrumentalities in connection with which the workers are represented. There is a representative of the workers on the Arbitration Court; there are representatives of workers in other fields of industry; and there are consumers' representatives on marketing boards, and on other boards which deal with primary products.

We are not suggesting that one of the proposed appointees of the Minister be excluded. We are not asking that one of the local representatives be superseded by a representative of the union. The Government will not lose by adding another member to the board and, in the process, giving direct representation to the industrial workers of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department.

I know a number of those workers personally. Some of them have been employed in the department since the pick and shovel days. They have been paid under the appropriate award, and during the course of their employment they have gained a good deal of practical knowledge. The department's engineers will tell the Minister there are many men belonging to this particular union who would be helpful on a board of this nature.

I mentioned the other day that such an appointment would improve industrial relationships. I have contended at all times that when workers in any particular industry are represented on boards of management, it encourages greater confidence and co-operation than if the workers were excluded from having representation.

There are 1,600 financial members of the union. They are practical men; and if the Government wishes to do the right thing, and show that it wants to improve industrial relationships and create harmony and co-operation between the union and the proposed board, it should agree to the amendment moved by the member for Belmont.

Mr. HALL: Like the previous speaker I think the Government's action in trying to exclude a workers' representative from the board should be condemned. In most cases in successful businesses today the welcome hand is extended to workers' representatives to bring workers into closer touch with the running of the businesses involved. If the Government wishes to have harmony in the working of this board the worker must first of all be given a right to have a say in the administration. Unless something like that is done in the future I can see the board running into all sorts of industrial troubles.

A closer liaison should be built up between the workers and the proposed board. The only way to do that is to appoint a workers' representative. Therefore I think the Minister should have another look at this amendment. If he cares to trace the causes of industrial strikes in the past he will find that they have been brought about by a lack of harmony between the workers and the governing authority. The labour voice is a very important one and it should be heard; and there is no opportunity for it to be heard unless an amendment such as this is agreed to. If a workers' representative is not appointed the board will simply go along blindly and commit sins unwittingly, and these will eventually have repercussions.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest; and, like other members on this side, I am unable to appreciate why the Minister is so dogmatic about refusing the submission

which has been made without advancing any arguments against it, other than to say he does not believe in a workers' representative. I suggest he is completely out of touch with world-wide trends where there is a movement towards employer-employee consultation and management.

Instead of heading in that direction to the extent of one employee representative on a board of eight, we have an arrangement, which apparently will be supported by all those who sit on the other side whereby, on a board of seven, only one person will have any knowledge, and will be required to have any knowledge, of what we know as the Water Supply Department's activities at the present time.

One member is to be the chairman, and he will be appointed by the Governor. That could be anybody at all. One is to be the general manager, for the time being, of the board; and no doubt he would be the under-secretary, or somebody like that, who is already employed and who has an extensive knowledge and experience of water supply matters, ranging from the conservation of water and the reticulation of supplies to the relationship between the department and the consumers. The next one is to be an engineer, but there is no suggestion that he should be an engineer from the department. In other words, so far as water supply matters are concerned, he could be a complete foreigner.

The Under-Treasurer is to be a member, and he would have a knowledge second to none on financial affairs. But in relation to the administration and the general activities of the Water Supply Department, his knowledge would be exactly nil, outside of pounds, shillings, and pence. The representative of the City of Perth could be a clerk, a land agent, a dentist, or a master builder. What knowledge, experience, or qualifications would any of those persons have to enable them to play an important part in the management of a public organisation handling many millions of pounds worth of public assets, and servicing some tens of thousands of consumers?

Two other persons are to be nominated by the Local Government Association, and my earlier remarks have equal application in that case. Somebody who runs a hair-dresser's establishment, or someone who is in charge of a ladies outfitters, or anything of that nature, would have no qualifications whatever. My proposition is that this Bill is something loosely drawn and it ensures that only one person, of necessity, has experience and qualifications concerning matters appertaining to public water supplies. Therefore, is it unreal or illogical for the member for Belmont to suggest that the board should be enlarged to eight so that in addition to the chief administrative officer, the general manager, one member shall have an intimate knowledge of the

workaday affairs of Water Supply Department organisation; and—perhaps more important—be somebody who is there to speak on behalf of employees for the purpose of giving first-hand information to the administration and play a part in making submissions that could avoid industrial trouble?

If this person were not completely acceptable then, of course, he could be out-voted seven to one, particularly if he proposed anything outlandish. Also, as has already been mentioned, there are a number of other public instrumentalities where workers have a representative; and nobody, not even the Minister, would be prepared to suggest that in those capacities such representatives are not making a worthwhile contribution. When he was Minister for Housing, many years ago, was there any thought on his part that the representative of the building trades workers should be denied a position on the board of the State Housing Commission? Of course there was not! If he cares to check with the board of the State Housing Commission today he will have a ready acknowledgment that the representative of the employees in the building industry makes a substantial contribution to the deliberations of that authority.

The Minister has suggested that the board is big enough with seven members, so why extend it to eight? I throw back to him this thought: Why did he support a Government that increased the number of members on the State Housing Commission from five to seven? His colleague, sitting immediately on his left, the other night introduced a Bill to increase a board from 10 members to 13 members; and that had the wholehearted support of the Minister for Works and his colleagues. Therefore, from whatever angle we view this question, we find there is nothing substantial or nothing logical in the attitude the Minister is adopting.

I do not know whether he is reverting to a condition where a Minister, early in the life of this Government, some 4½ years ago, refused to allow an "i" to be undotted or a "t" to be uncrossed, merely because the suggestion emanated from this side, and he thought there might be some loss of face. But the identical amendments were made in the Legislative Council, and, without a word of protest, he accepted them. We have a right to expect something better than that. If there is merit in the case we submit it should be supported. If there is no merit in it, surely it is the responsibility of the Minister to give us reasons where we are wrong in our concept.

With my leader I look forward with great anticipation to votes that will be cast on this amendment, particularly that, for instance, of the member for Bunbury.

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

Ayes—23

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller.)

Noes—24

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

(Teller.)

Pair

Aye	No
Mr. Curran	Mr. Crommelin

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Page 4, line 28—Insert after the word "members" the words "none of whom shall be more than seventy years of age, and"

When the Bill was introduced I would not have envisaged for one moment that a Government could be so irresponsible—as this Government has shown itself—as to appoint, as chairman of this most important body, one who attains the age of 74 years on the 12th October next—about a fortnight from now.

I think it is a most shocking proposition. The Minister tries to overcome some of his embarrassment—and also because of the general abhorrence and rejection of his proposal—by endeavouring to make us believe that the proposed appointee, Sir Alexander Reid, was to hold office for one year only. How silly can one get? Here we have a new organisation being set up which will be in charge of tens of millions of pounds' worth of public assets, and which will have to go through no end of teething troubles in the preliminary stages before it becomes established, and the Minister seriously suggests that the person to be appointed to preside over the new board is to be appointed for one year only.

It is obvious that the Minister is trying to cover up some of the embarrassment he feels at the thought of appointing a man of 74 years of age. It is too preposterous for words that a man of that age should be appointed for seven years, because then we would have him tottering around until

he is 81 years of age and still in charge of this organisation. That has no doubt caused the Minister some embarrassment.

I will allow somebody else to deal with the question of 12 months. The Minister is trying to cover his tracks by talking about the confusion and noise that was going on at the time. The official records will prove whether he is a man of his word or not. In view of the announced intention of the Government I think it is appropriate that Parliament should have some say to ensure that the reasonable thing will be done. I suggest it is fair and reasonable to impose an age limit of 70 years. Anyone who is appointed a judge of the Supreme Court in Western Australia is required to retire at the age of 70 years; and it is admitted that incumbents of these offices are persons with special qualifications very many of which are derived only after many years of practical experience in the type of work upon which they are engaged. So the amendment is fair and reasonable.

In anticipation of the Minister's objection I would say that in the Abattoirs Act, for instance, there is a maximum age of 65 years set down for members of the board, which has received the concurrence and blessing of successive Governments. While there have been exceptions, it is recognised procedure that in respect of part-time boards persons are permitted to continue up to the age of 70 years. But to proceed beyond that age is, to my mind, completely false and unrealistic. I feel very keenly about this proposal of the Government. I am wondering whether it is a square-off, or a put-off, or something of that nature.

I must bring the matter in here, because my amendment is based on the statement of the Minister that it is the intention of the Government to appoint somebody who will be 74 years of age in a few days' time; somebody who has been ingratiating himself with the Government; and I refer to that deplorable blunder he made before Her Majesty at the University when he extolled the virtues of this Government, of its Premier, and of its Ministers, making a party-political rostrum when Her Majesty and her spouse visited the University for an entirely different purpose.

I do not know of another case in a democratic country when the presence of Royalty has been abused to the extent it was by Sir Alexander Reid. In addition to that, of course, the Leader of the Opposition—the leader of the largest political party in Western Australia—was relegated to a place of insignificance among the also-rans in the body of the hall. This man, the Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, who mixes with companies and organisations galore, has been on the throne whilst two

most substantial increases have been imposed upon University students in the last couple of years.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! I must ask the honourable member to come back to the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have already indicated that the purpose of my amendment is to meet a situation on account of the declared intention of the Government to appoint a certain person as chairman. My motion is specifically to meet that situation, and I am surely therefore entitled to give reasons why I have the strongest exception to that course of action, and why my amendment is before the Chair.

Just one other thought and I will turn from it, if I may be permitted. This game of kiss-in-the-ring, and the rest of it, we find is the pay-off for the proposal that there shall be a certain Dr. Brand in this Chamber. We see the traffic has been going in a certain direction, and here is the reward, in my view, coming back in the opposite direction. Sir Alexander Reid, with his finger in many pies, is recognised by this Government and is being offered this job whether it be for one year, two years, three years or more. The intention of the legislation is seven years, but the Government seeks to make it a lesser period because of its embarrassment in this matter. This is the reward for the disgraceful things this man has done.

Mr. Court: A man who has given wonderful service to this State.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course! Sir Winston Churchill gave outstanding service to Great Britain; but that does not mean he has the mental capacity he had 50 years ago.

Mr. Court: Do you suggest that Sir Alex Reid has not the capacity? This man is doing wonderful work.

Mr. GRAHAM: In my opinion he is doing so many abominable things.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

Mr. Court: This is the reward you give him for the wonderful work he has done.

Mr. GRAHAM: That man abused my political party in a party-political manner. It is ludicrous for any Government to propose as chairman, of a pioneer organisation such as this, a man in excess of 70 years. I want to see that the Government will act in accordance with the procedure laid down by Parliament in respect of the original appointee and those who follow him. I want to see that they can extend their services from the normal retiring age of 65 years, and continue to serve till they are 70 years of age, but not beyond.

Here we have a case of a man of 74 years of age being appointed. Next week, or next year, the Government could appoint somebody of 84 years, 94 years, or 104 years of age; it is only a matter of degree. The Government has made itself ridiculous. In the daily Press, and in the public polls, and everywhere else, there is the unanimous opinion that the Government has blundered. That being the case it is our responsibility to bring the Government down to earth.

Mr. Brady: That is why the Premier is not in the Chamber.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is possible he is also suffering some embarrassment, because of the policy of his Ministers.

Mr. WILD: After one has been in this Chamber for some time one gets used to the member for Balcatta taking advantage of parliamentary privilege to attack somebody who has no right of reply.

Mr. Graham: I am going to say it from the public platform.

Mr. WILD: To do what the member for Balcatta has done to a man of the calibre of Sir Alexander Reid, particularly after he has worked so hard for the State for so many years, is disgraceful.

Mr. Nalder: Absolutely!

Mr. WILD: Neither my leader, nor my colleagues, knew anything about my approach to Sir Alex, asking him to accept the position of chairman of this board. When I knew he was going to England in a matter of two months, and I happened to see him in the courtyard of the Public Works Department, I thought I would take advantage of the opportunity to ask him if he would accept this position. If there were a tape recording of the conversation it would probably run along the lines of my saying, "We are going to present a metropolitan water Bill to the House this year; and I wonder, in view of your experience, whether you would give us a year or two to just kick the board off on the right lines?" Sir Alex hesitated and said, "I am pretty busy; but I will do it for you for one year." I said, "Thank you very much. By the time you come back from England I hope this has become law."

Virtually that is all the conversation that took place. I then indicated to my Government that I had approached Sir Alexander Reid with a view to his starting the board off on the right foot.

Mr. Graham: The back yard was the appropriate place.

Mr. WILD: Irrespective of whether he is 74 years of age or not, here we have a man who for eight years has chaired the State Electricity Commission. Can members think of anyone better suited for this position on the metropolitan water board? For that reason I drew the attention of the Parliamentary Draftsman to the fact

that we wanted to appoint somebody for a short time, and he framed for me the words that provide that opportunity. No matter who the appointee might be, I do not propose to support the amendment.

Mr. Graham: What age limit do you want?

Mr. WILD: It is not a matter of age. As a Government we are responsible for appointing somebody to this position—somebody who is best suited for it in the State—and I know of no-one better suited than Sir Alexander Reid. It is only my recommendation. He has not been appointed yet, but it is our responsibility to pick the right man for the right job.

Mr. FLETCHER: I support the amendment. I am reluctant to accept even 70 years. The retiring age in the Public Service is 65, and we will be creating a dangerous precedent in this appointment, a precedent that could be used in the future. Members opposite will not always be there; and they would be the first to condemn us if we, when on that side of the House, indulged in the same practice.

We frequently read in the paper letters from correspondents complaining that they are too old to obtain work, and I come into contact with a lot of such people. These men have large experience which they could pass on to the younger generation. Many of them have dependants; but how many dependants has Sir Alexander? He is very comfortably off and could afford to retire.

I would like to say, in support of the amendment, that if one is too old at 40—as are the tradesmen to whom I referred earlier—one is certainly too old at 70.

Mr. HAWKE: The attempt by the Minister at a dignified rebuke of the member for Balcatta amazed us who know the Minister well. The Minister said that there is a principle involved in this matter. There is a principle involved, and it is a vital one. Members of the Public Service, for instance, are compelled by Government regulation to retire on reaching the age of 65. That practice has been in operation for many years and, so far as I know, it applies in all States of Australia and in the Commonwealth Service. Therefore, if it is considered fair and reasonable for public servants—including highly-placed ones—to be compulsorily retired by the Government at the age of 65, surely the Government is taking a most retrogressive and illogical stand in indicating that the first chairman to control the activities of this board is to be a person who, within a few days, will reach the age of 74!

The Minister asks, "What better man is available for the position?" I suggest there would be many better men available. All members of the Committee would agree that the department in question has been exceptionally well managed through the years; and therefore there must have been

in the department in the past, as there are today, very capable and practical men; and surely capacity based upon practical experience is a very valuable qualification.

I have not the slightest doubt that within the department itself today the Minister could find not one man, but probably several men who could very successfully carry out the duties associated with the chairmanship of the proposed board, and carry them out more successfully than Sir Alexander Reid—not that I want to bring his name or the name of anyone else into this debate. I am sure that the present under-secretary of the department would be a capable and successful chairman, as also would the present senior engineer, or whatever he is called. Another capable chairman would be the Under-Treasurer. It is absurd for the Minister to try to mislead members of the Committee into believing that Sir Alex is the one man in the State who, at the age of 74, is better than anyone else and more capable, more fitted, and more experienced, to be the chairman of this board. I do not know that Sir Alexander has any special knowledge above the knowledge of a dozen other persons in connection with the successful inauguration of this board.

Mr. Bovell: He has a sound knowledge of public finance.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course he has! So has the present Under-Treasurer; and the ex-Under Treasurer, Mr. Byfield; and so have a lot of other men in this State—and not one of them is 74 years of age, or anywhere near it.

If Sir Alexander has some element or some special knowledge or ability which could help this board to some extent, then Sir Alexander would be available to give the knowledge. Why appoint him as chairman of the board? I am satisfied that if he had any special knowledge or experience which might help the board, he would give it freely without being made chairman.

The Minister this evening told us that when he suggested this idea to Sir Alexander Reid he said, "I am a very busy man." For a man of 74 years of age he is shockingly busy—far too busy to be able to give the time, thought, and effort which would be required of a chairman of this board to enable it to be established expeditiously and successfully. In any event, whether he is or is not a suitable man for this position, I say he is beyond the age when he should be considered for an instant for appointment as official chairman of the board.

I believe that if the position were put to Sir Alex he would not hesitate for a moment to say that in all the circumstances, it would be better to appoint someone else as chairman; and he would also say that if at any time the Minister, or the person appointed as chairman, considered he had any special information,

knowledge, or experience which would assist the board in its operations, he would be only too happy to give it—and without payment, and certainly without appointment to the board as chairman or in any other capacity.

Mr. GRAHAM: In case the Minister is under a misapprehension, I want to advise him that he has by no means convinced me that my amendment is an unsuitable or unnecessary one. He told us quite blithely that he wanted to be unimpeded in any way in making his selection; and yet, instead of providing for a board of seven, he has gone out of his way to stipulate from what sources these people shall come. Parliament, in agreeing to that provision, is limiting the Minister in his choice. Therefore, what is improper about Parliament having a voice in what I suggest is a long-established principle? A retiring age is provided in the Public Service for ordinary civil servants, and commissioners, and so forth.

I am pursuing this matter because we have the symptoms of the Minister being on the run. He proudly produced a document which stated that a chairman may be appointed for a period up to seven years, and I suppose that is a fair proposition to allow time for establishment, and for the solving of the teething troubles, and so on. During the course of the debate in this Chamber, because some amazement was expressed by members on this side at the prospect of a doddering old man being appointed as chairman, the seven years was clipped down to two years; and then, because of the protests and outcries that were made, the Minister endeavours to have us believe—he might have fooled the public; he has not fooled us—that it was his intention to appoint Sir Alexander Reid for a period of 12 months only. First a seven-year proposition, then a two-year proposition, and now we are down to one year. If we keep going we may get the result we seek.

Furthermore, the Minister has now told us that this was his personal idea. A casual meeting in the back yard of the Water Supply Department and a few words between Sir Alex and himself. "Hello, Alex". "Goodday Jerry". And, on that basis, it was decided that this all-important job of the chairman, who would be in charge of tens of millions of pounds should go to Sir Alex. Now the Minister is prepared to retreat from that position. He says that this is just an idea of his and that it has not been submitted to the Government yet. I suggest that the Government should be ashamed of the Minister because of the course of action he has decided upon.

I hope and trust there will be a greater sense of responsibility on the part of the Government when it is ultimately making

a decision on this matter. I also hope and trust that if mental deterioration has not set in to the degree that I consider it has, Sir Alexander Reid will have the decency to refuse to accept this position, thus acknowledging the situation which is abundantly clear—that it would be impossible for him to carry out the job satisfactorily. He is a member of the Grants Commission, Chairman of the State Electricity Commission, and wrapped up in the directorship of half a dozen different boards, and in TV and other things. Then, on top of that, to become the pioneering chairman of a tremendous organisation such as this! I think that would be the acid test.

If the Government, because it thinks it is saving face, feels it must continue with its offer to Sir Alexander, then no doubt it will do so. I repeat that there will still be the prospect that Sir Alexander himself will do the right thing. However, that is only dealing with one individual—a man who in my opinion has well and truly dirtied his nose over the past 12 months or so. This amendment, whilst it arises from that individual, makes no mention of him. All it is seeking to do is to ensure that the seven—the Government will not have eight—appointed to the board will be in the age group when their mental faculties will be at their best and when physically they have energy and also when they will have some years still before them.

This important board should not be used as a repository for aged persons, or as a political reward for those who have grown old in the service of the party, or something of that nature. It is a cardinal principle that no-one over the age of 70 should be permitted to serve upon the board. I have already said that I have extended by five years the age limit contained in the abattoirs legislation.

Accordingly, under all the circumstances, I consider the amendment to be fair and reasonable and one which should receive support from fair and reasonable members.

Mr. OLDFIELD: An appointment of this nature should be given to someone who would devote his full time to the job. In the initial stages—during the first 12 months—of setting up the control of the department we would require someone who was not only capable—there is no doubt that Sir Alexander Reid has been, and still is, capable—but who would have the time to do the job. Once the board is under way this might well be one of the jobs that could be fitted in with the chairmanship of the State Electricity Commission, and so on. But the actual launching of this project will tax not only the resources, but the energy of the person responsible for the task.

We ought, at this stage, to record the duties already imposed upon the person who, in the Minister's view, is to be initially appointed. The positions Sir Alexander Reid holds at the moment are as follows:—

Director of: A. T. Brine & Sons (Pty.) Ltd.

McLean Bros. & Rigg Ltd.

Australian Fixed Trusts (W.A.) Pty. Ltd.

Guardian Life Assurance Co. of A/sia Ltd.

Kathleen Investments (Australia) Ltd.

Chancellor of the University of W.A.

Member of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Chairman of the State Electricity Commission of W.A.

Member of the Board of Management of Royal Perth Hospital.

Chairman of directors of Western Television Services Ltd., one of the companies applying for the second commercial TV licence in Perth.

Mr. Hawke: Is he not associated with a coalmining company?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I do not know how many other jobs he has. I understand he holds several other directorships or positions.

Mr. Dunn: He is a man of capacity.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes; but we want a man who has the time and energy to do the job. Does a man of 74 have the energy of a man of 54 to deal with a new project such as this? Is Sir Alexander, in his desire to do such great service for the State, going to resign these other appointments so that he can devote his full time to the setting up of the board? Of course not! He has agreed just to be a figure-head, so to speak, for the first 12 months or two years—or longer if the Government so desires. Sir Alexander will not be able to do the job. He has not the time, although he has, no doubt, the capacity. The amendment moved by the member for Balcatta is a worthy one and it should receive full consideration.

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

Ayes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Kelly	

(Teller.)

Noes—22

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

(Teller.)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Dunn
Mr. Heal	Mr. Runciman

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. WILD: I move an amendment—

Page 4, line 36—Delete the word "Civil".

The title of the institution has been incorrectly stated in the Bill. The proper title is the "Institution of Engineers Australia."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. TONKIN: I move an amendment—

Page 5, lines 7 to 14—Delete paragraph (e).

This provision enables the Minister to make an appointment from a panel of the names of three persons eligible and willing to act as members submitted to him for the purpose by the Council of the City of Perth. As two members of the Local Government Association are elsewhere provided for, in our view a better appointment would be one from the workers engaged by the board. The argument previously submitted in Committee was whether we would add an extra member to the board. My amendment does not add another member; the board will remain at seven, but the worker's appointment will take the place of the one I have just mentioned.

I do not intend to go over the argument again to justify putting on this board a representative of the thousands of workers at present employed by the department; and I am not losing sight of the fact that the board will probably sack most of them and get the work done by contract, so that many hundreds of these workers face dismissal. I think that is inevitable if we have regard for the Government's previous policy in respect of Government employees and in respect of having work done by the Government.

So, while I have in mind that the number of employees working for the department will be considerably less when a board is established, and although I am very fearful of what is going to happen to the men who are somewhat on in years and who will not get the same consideration as Sir Alex Reid—those over 45 will find it difficult to get a job—nevertheless

I believe that for those workers who will remain in the employ of the board, it is desirable that their point of view shall be heard at the table when decisions are being made which will affect the board's employees. So I seek to delete this paragraph and I intend subsequently to move an amendment to give effect to the ideas I have just expressed.

Mr. WILD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has tackled the point made by the member for Belmont, but in a different way. I will not go over the grounds again. This board will decide policy; and as far as the men are concerned, they will not be in any different position after the creation of the board from what they are in today.

Mr. Tonkin: Not much!

Mr. WILD: How could they be? The honourable member ought to know that the work in the Metropolitan Water Supply Department is, in the main, concerned with only small things, such as meter reading, the laying of small pipes, and so on—service jobs. The work is completely different from what is done in respect of big contracts.

Anyway, the Perth City Council pays, I think, over one-sixth or one-seventh of the total rates that are paid into the Metropolitan Water Supply Department funds. So I say that if anyone should have a representative on the board it is the Perth City Council, because its representative would be representing the rate-payers of the square block in the city. I have no intention of agreeing to the deletion of this clause with a view to putting a worker on the board.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not going to accept the distortion which the Minister for Works endeavours to offer.

Mr. Wild: It is no distortion at all.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes it is! If the Minister is so keen on having a representative of the Perth City Council on the board, he can ensure that there will be one by providing that one of the names on the panel submitted by the Local Government Association shall be that of a representative of the Perth City Council. If it is felt that of the representatives of the Local Government Association, the best would be a representative of the Perth City Council, the Minister could easily establish that position by amending his Bill accordingly.

Our argument is that rather than have three members who will probably come from local government—but not necessarily, because this subclause does not make it obligatory to appoint somebody who is a member of the Perth City Council—we should have one who is a workers' representative.

According to the reading of this clause the Perth City Council can appoint anybody as its representative; he need not be remotely connected with the Perth City Council, but the council may still wish to appoint him. We consider it is more desirable to have on the board somebody who would present the workers' point of view; a man who has been working with the men who do the work and who are familiar with the practices. I venture to suggest that it would not only be to the advantage of the employees to have such a direct voice in the management of the board, but it would be an advantage to the board itself.

There is no satisfactory substitute for experience. One can read as much as one likes about what other people have experienced, but in the final analysis the best criterion is to be obtained from one's own experience. The other members of the board, with the best will in the world, would not, in my view, be able to make a contribution to the management of the board on some aspects of its work which would be as valuable as one which could be contributed by a representative of the workers who has been through the mill and who appreciates the difficulties that are experienced from time to time.

There are hundreds of instances on record where suggestions from the men engaged in industry have saved the management thousands and thousands of pounds. In fact, in some private organisations there is a suggestion box and the management invites ideas from the men who are closer to the work that is being done than others in the organisation and who are in a worth-while position to make such suggestions. It would be desirable for the efficient working and management of this board that a direct representative of the workers engaged in the undertaking should be in a position to advise the board and to safeguard the interests of the workers.

After all is said and done, the great bulk of the workers are the consumers of water, and in our view they are entitled to direct representation on the board and not indirect representation such as would come from local government representatives. It is for that reason, and not with any desire that there should not be a representative of the Perth City Council on the board—that does not enter the question at all—that we feel this is the way by which a workers' representative should be placed on the board. That is the reason why we move in the way I am now moving, and I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I propose to support the amendment moved by the member for Melville because it is fair and reasonable. Over the years in this Chamber different interests have always considered that a representative of the consumers and a representative of the producers should be appointed to any board. The composition of this board, according to the Minister

and many of the statements that have been made, is modelled on the State Electricity Commission, and the legislation governing that commission contains a provision for the appointment of a workers' representative. Therefore, why cannot a similar provision be inserted in this legislation?

On any question resolved in this Chamber there is a difference of only one vote; but if an analysis of the voting strength of the metropolitan area were made it would be found that a greater number of consumers of water in the metropolitan area are represented by members on this side of the Chamber than are represented by members on the other side. Yet when it comes to the final decision the Government cannot be influenced in the slightest degree to appoint a workers' representative on a metropolitan water supply board.

We hear and read a great deal of the propaganda put out by the Government in its efforts to obtain closer co-operation of the workers in industry; but when a proposition is put forward to achieve such an objective, the Government's only desire is to look after its friends and to give preference to men such as Sir Russell Dumas, Sir Lance Brisbane, and others; and now the Government is considering the appointment of Sir Alexander Reid as a member of this proposed board. The Government leans well towards such people for advice; but when it comes to considering the workers in this industry by appointing a representative on the board, to safeguard their interests, the Government is not prepared to lean even a little bit towards those people.

We all know that the experience has been that a worker in an industry very often finishes up being the chief executive by virtue of the fact that he knows the full workings of that industry. I understand that on the Government side of the Chamber there are men such as the Minister for Works, who has worked in the mining industry; and the Premier, who was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He was once a worker; and who is to say that if the opportunity were presented to him to act as a representative on any board he would not have the brains to carry out the duties that were required of him?

The Minister for Works is at present presiding over the activities of the Public Works Department, and therefore he should have some ability to carry out such duties—whether it is put to good purpose I would not know—and if at an earlier stage of his career someone in industry had said, "We require a representative on this board and Gerry Wild has been selected for appointment", who is to say he would not have had the brains to fill such a position? The opposition that has been shown to this amendment, therefore, is completely unwarranted.

With the exception of the Minister himself, who said a few words, none of the Government members have expressed their opinions on the clause. We know what the Government has done in the past in dispersing many of the workers engaged in Government organisations which have been built up by the State—which action has been to the State's disadvantage—and we know that the Government always leans towards the various "Sirs" and other men in high positions because they are on the Government's side politically.

There is provision in the clause for the appointment of a representative of the Perth City Council, and another clause provides for the appointment of two representatives of the Local Government Association. The union which looks after the interests of the majority of the Water Supply Department workers is a large one, and any representative from that union appointed to the board would be more of a representative of consumers of water in the metropolitan area than any member of the Perth City Council or the Local Government Association. I support the amendment.

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

Ayes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Kelly	

(Teller.)

Noes—22

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

(Teller.)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Heal	Mr. Hearman

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 15—Delete the words "two shall be persons" and substitute the words "one shall be a person."

The Minister was anxious that the Perth City Council should have direct representation, and the Committee has decided in that direction. Now in paragraph (f) it is sought to have two other representatives of local government. The object of my amendment is to enable the workers

to be represented, and if the amendment is agreed to I shall move for the insertion of a new paragraph.

Under this provision in the Bill the local authorities in the State could be represented by two mayors on the proposed water board, but the day after their appointment to the board they could resign from the position of mayor. It is not provided in paragraph (f) that the two representatives of the Local Government Association shall continue to be a mayor, a president, or a councillor of a local authority. I consider that, in a board of seven, two representatives from local authorities are sufficient; that is, including the representative of the Perth City Council. Provision should be made for the representation of workers on the board.

Mr. WILD: I cannot agree to this amendment. Surely the consumers and the local authorities are entitled to representation; and it is proposed in the Bill to appoint two nominees of the Local Government Association. I do not intend to discuss this aspect as it has already been covered several times.

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

Ayes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Kelly	

(Teller.)

Noes—22

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

(Teller.)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Heat	Mr. Hearman

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Page 5, lines 25 and 26—Delete the words "at the time he is so appointed."

It is a fantastic set-up to have, in a board of seven members, three members representing local authorities. In the case of the Perth City Council the nominee can be any person living in or outside Australia. In the case of the Local Government Association the two nominees are to represent the ratepayers, and also, at the time of appointment to the board, are to

be either a mayor, a president, or a councillor of a local authority within the metropolitan area. Surely it is the intention that the nominees be appointed to the proposed water board because of the positions they hold in local authorities. If the words which I have moved to delete are retained in the provision, then a nominee of the Local Government Association who subsequent to his appointment to the proposed water board loses his seat on the local authority will continue to be a member of the proposed water board, notwithstanding the fact that he has lost the confidence of the ratepayers.

If there is merit in the nominees of the Local Government Association remaining as office bearers in local authorities, then the same principle should be applied to the Perth City Council nominee. It should be remembered that these three nominees are to be appointed to the proposed water board for a period of three years, but the Minister can terminate such appointment on the grounds of inefficiency, misbehaviour, unsoundness of mind, or bankruptcy. If the Minister desires representation on the proposed water board of local governing bodies in the metropolitan area it should be set out specifically in the Bill that the nominees shall be a mayor, a president, or a councillor of a local authority, and not only at the time of appointment to the board.

Mr. WILD: I cannot see the reason for any objection to a member of a local authority being on the proposed water board.

Mr. Tonkin: That is not the point at all.

Mr. Graham: Under this clause it is proposed that an ex-councillor of a local authority can continue to remain on the board.

Mr. WILD: At the time of appointment to the proposed water board obviously the nominee must be a ratepayer to be eligible for election as mayor, president, or councillor. Paragraph (f) states definitely that the two nominees shall represent the ratepayers. Assuming that they lost their positions as mayors, presidents, or councillors, they would still be representing the ratepayers because they were holding those positions when they were initially appointed to the water board.

Mr. Graham: Those nominees might have been booted out of office. You yourself would not be representing water electorate if you were voted out of office.

Mr. WILD: I appreciate that. The nominees of the Local Government Association are still ratepayers, and that is a requirement for election as mayor, president, or councillor. If the nominees were not ratepayers I would agree with the amendment. If these nominees lose their positions on the local authority they should still be entitled to represent the ratepayers on the water board. If they do a good job

on that board I cannot see any reason why they should not be reappointed at the end of their term.

The important point is that at the time of appointment to the water board these two nominees shall be either a mayor, a president, or a councillor; and to hold such offices they must be ratepayers. Therefore, it does not matter if they lose their positions on the local authority subsequently.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let us take this case: A ratepayer is elected to the office of mayor, president, or councillor of a local authority; and then he is one of the two nominees appointed to the water board. Subsequently this person may cease to hold his position on the local authority because he no longer owns or has an interest in any property within that local authority. Therefore, what we have heard from the Minister is of no avail because that person will no longer be a ratepayer.

The Minister has endeavoured to stress that he will continue to be a ratepayer even if he is not a ratepayers' representative. He need be nothing of the sort. Therefore I think there should be some protection or safeguard, otherwise the Minister has included these words just for the sake of inserting words. If a councillor who has been appointed ceases to be a councillor because he no longer has an interest in property in the metropolitan area, he is no longer a ratepayer within the definition of this proposed Act; and therefore he obviously cannot represent the ratepayers. Firstly, he is not one of them; and, secondly, he has no authority from anywhere to speak on the ratepayers' behalf. This is important because, I repeat, three out of the seven members of the board—almost half—are coming in as nominees of local authorities. I think the Minister should admit he has made a mistake in wrongly assessing my amendment.

Mr. WILD: Not at all. I concede the point that this man could subsequently cease to be a councillor and cease to be a ratepayer.

Mr. Graham: Then surely he loses his qualifications?

Mr. WILD: Initially he will be appointed to represent the ratepayers; and in order to be on the board he will have to have certain qualifications—he will obviously have to be a ratepayer. Striking the long bow, it could happen to the representative of the Perth City Council. If he ceases to be a ratepayer I suggest the Government of the day, at the end of three years, would replace him in accordance with the Bill that is before the House.

Mr. Graham: There is no obligation to do that.

Mr. WILD: Surely a responsible Government would do that. If this person were doing a good job on the board and

the chairman and the other members gave him a good report, I cannot see why he should not continue to represent the ratepayers. There has to be a starting point, and he has to be a ratepayer, because he has to be a member of a council.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. BRADY: An important aspect appears to be lost sight of in regard to the composition of this board. I suggest that after the word "Area" the words "or is a qualified medical officer employed by a local government authority" should be added. We know that at the moment the Government is about to introduce the fluoridation of our water supplies. We also know that the Minister recently informed members that four or five different chemicals are now being put into the water. That must raise questions in the minds of members.

Mr. Tonkin: Was not caustic soda one?

Mr. BRADY: Yes, and chlorine, as well as a number of other ingredients.

Mr. J. Hegney: They are already in.

Mr. BRADY: Perhaps that accounts for some of the difficulties that people in the metropolitan area are experiencing. We should have someone who is a medical officer or a qualified pharmaceutical chemist representing the local governing body.

Mr. Graham: And a dentist, too.

Mr. BRADY: We cannot have a layman, without qualifications such as a medical or pharmaceutical degree, doctoring our water supplies. It is my intention to move the amendment I have suggested in order to obtain the opinion of the Committee in regard to this matter. How long are we going to allow Government departments or water boards to be set up without having regard for the health of the people—for the welfare of the people? We are told by the Minister, who is neither a qualified doctor nor a qualified chemist, that he is quite positive that certain fluoridation should take place. I believe fluoridation can do some good, but I do not think I should force it upon everybody.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): I cannot allow the honourable member to continue to discuss fluoridation.

Mr. BRADY: I think every member without exception received a shock the other night when the Minister told us the number of chemicals that were now going into the water.

Mr. Tonkin: Not what he thought was going into it.

Mr. BRADY: Subsequently he said he only thought they were going in. I do not know; but he told us the other night these ingredients were going in. We should know where we are going in regard to these matters. We should have the best brains

possible available when the water supplies in the metropolitan area are tampered with. I move an amendment—

Page 5, line 30—Insert after the word "Area" the words "or is a qualified medical officer employed by a Local Government Authority."

Mr. WILD: This board will have the advice of the Public Health Department. It will be a Government instrumentality and will have the benefit of the best brains in Western Australia. Therefore I can see no reason at all for wanting a member with these qualifications on the board. This measure has nothing to do with the fluoridation of water supplies, and I will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. Graham: I think the chairman probably needs a medical officer with him.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. FLETCHER: I would like the advice of the Minister in regard to the following words in the clause:—

Each member shall be appointed by the Governor, but is not, in respect of his office as such, subject to the provisions of the Public Service Act, 1904. Since members of the board are not subject to the Public Service Act I require from the Minister a cast-iron, watertight, unequivocal guarantee that all members of the Civil Service Association who are at present subject to the Public Service Act will not lose their benefits and conditions, including long service leave, annual leave, public holidays, and other benefits they now enjoy.

Mr. WILD: That would be the prerogative of the board. However, I can assure the honourable member there will be no alteration to the conditions of the members of the Public Service or the men engaged in this particular industry. They will go on in exactly the same way, only the administration will be carried on by a general manager who, at the present time, is the Under-Secretary of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 95 put and passed.

Clause 96: Section 90 amended—

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I refer members to section 90 of the Act. The following two clauses have some relation to the same matter. Section 91 refers to the power of the Minister to levy sewerage rates; and section 92 refers to the Minister having power to levy metropolitan main drainage rates in respect of all ratable land within any metropolitan main drainage district.

The thread which runs through this Bill is to give the Minister power wherever he considers the Government needs it. In the early stages of the Bill provision is made that subject to the Minister the general administration of the Act shall be

under the board. In all these matters the Minister has power over the board, because the board will be subject to his jurisdiction.

However, in the matter of levying water, drainage, and sewerage rates, the Minister and the Government have got out from under. They have passed the buck to the board. They decline in future to accept responsibility for the levying of rates. I can visualise in the not far distant future water rates and sewerage rates being increased; and when there is a hue and cry, such as there was last year, the Government will say, "It is not our responsibility; it is the responsibility of the board. Parliament passed these powers over to an independent board."

But the board is not independent by any means. The Minister set out to indicate to the House that it was desirable for this undertaking to be entirely removed from political control. Anyone who has made more than a superficial study of the Bill realises that the undertaking will not be independent of political control. The Bill states in clear terms that subject to the Minister the general administration of the Act is under the power and the thumb of the Minister. When it comes to the distasteful matter of increasing the rates—and they were steeply increased some little time ago—the Government will have the excuse—it is not a reason—of letting the ratepayers know that the board has fixed the water, drainage, and sewerage rates.

There is no consistency in the Bill. It should be either one thing or the other. The Minister definitely said that an undertaking of this nature should be removed entirely from political control, from political jurisdiction. If we pass the Bill the Government will have jurisdiction over quite a number of matters of general administration, but it will not have jurisdiction over the levying of the rates.

The idea underlying this proposed undertaking is to balance the budget to provide a service to the public. I can foresee the rates being increased; and I would ask the Minister why it is that the Government has elected to give the Minister supreme power over a multiplicity of matters referred to in the Bill, which will be incorporated in the Act, and has side-stepped the responsibility which it had hitherto of levying the rates.

Mr. WILD: I cannot understand the honourable member's thinking in this matter. There will be at least three consumers' representatives on the board; and, if we carry it to its logical conclusion, the Government could be outvoted by five to two because there are only two Government nominees, the Under-Treasurer and the general manager. There are three representatives of the ratepayers and the

engineer is somebody outside the Government, which makes four, and the chairman of the board would make five. Would those people turn around and cut their own throats by recommending to the Minister that the rates be so much, and that figure be an outrageous one? Of course they would not!

We have to rely on these people, and they would do exactly the same as any other board. As happens now with the department, they would take into consideration the question, "Is this going to balance the budget?" Accordingly they would raise or lower the rates.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister is not going to mislead me, and I hope he is not going to mislead the Committee. He said just now there would be a majority of ratepayers' representatives on the board; or, in other words, the Government would have minority representation—

Mr. Wild: It has.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —and the board would recommend—that was the word he used—to the Minister the rates to be levied. As far as I know there would be no recommendation by the board. Section 90 of the present Act says that the Minister shall from time to time make and levy water rates, and all this clause does is delete the word "Minister" and substitute the word "board".

Mr. Wild: But is it not subject to the Minister?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: No; it is not subject to the Minister. The Minister said that in the general administration of the Act the Minister would have jurisdiction; but he indicated earlier that so far as the levying of water rates was concerned it would be removed from political jurisdiction and placed in the hands of an independent board.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is the purpose of it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: This clause will have the effect of altering the Act so that the board shall from time to time make and levy water rates. The same applies to the levying of sewerage rates. The Minister and the Government have been very inconsistent in the matter, and I am not at all satisfied with the Minister's explanation.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 97 to 159 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 12th September, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [10.5 p.m.]: When introducing the Bill at the second reading stage the Minister for Health, at the beginning of his speech, made the following statement:—

This Bill provides for the compulsory fluoridation of water. There is no doubt that it is a controversial measure and that the subject of fluoridation of water supplies has been made controversial particularly by those people who strenuously object to it, and by groups who are opposed to fluoridation of water supplies.

I think everyone would agree that the fluoridating of water supplies is a most controversial subject, and therefore the Bill now before us for consideration is also very controversial because it provides for the compulsory fluoridation of public water supplies in the event of a committee of seven members—which the Bill seeks to constitute—making a favourable recommendation to the Minister.

On receipt of such a favourable recommendation, the Minister is then empowered to go ahead and compel any water supply authority in the State to put fluoride into the water of any supply which any such authority is operating. Presumably, the Minister in his speech put up the best possible speech in favour of fluoridation of our public water supplies. I will give him that much credit, anyway.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Thank you very much.

Mr. HAWKE: The policy of the Australian Labor Party in Western Australia in this matter is clearly one of seeking the approval of a majority of the people concerned, in a referendum, before any authority would be permitted to place fluoride in a public water supply. The Australian Labor Party in this State takes that stand because it agrees with what the Minister said about this being a highly controversial subject. The Minister quoted who we might concede would be expert authorities and who gave views in favour of fluoridation. During my speech I propose to quote the opinions of persons and authorities whom I consider to be expert, and they are clear-cut opinions against fluoridation.

Clearly, when experts disagree strongly upon a matter such as this it is not easy for lay people to know which is the better path to tread. Because the Australian Labor Party in Western Australia believes the people who would be concerned in any particular water supply district should be consulted before fluoride is put in their drinking water, and because the Minister did put up the best case possible in favour of the fluoridation of our water supplies, it is my intention to put up some arguments against fluoridation.

In the situation in which we now find ourselves, it seems to me that is the proper course for me to take as parliamentary leader in this State of a party which favours the submission of this issue to the people by way of referendum. The people have already had the opportunity to read the published reports of the Minister's case in favour of fluoridation and they should, I think, have the opportunity to read the published report of what I might have to say against fluoridation. I do not want it to be thought from this approach that in my judgment, or in the judgment of the Labor Party of Western Australia, there are not arguments in favour of fluoridation. I think it might be conceded without any argument that the putting of fluoride into water could have some beneficial effect on the teeth of children particularly, and therefore there could be arguments—as I have conceded—in favour of the proposal.

However, the Minister covered the ground on that side of the question quite thoroughly, and there is no necessity for me to reinforce the arguments which he submitted. The Minister went on to try to justify the compulsory fluoridation of public drinking water supplies by quoting at least two examples of compulsory application of health measures to people in Western Australia.

The first example he gave has to do with legislation which operates for the application of compulsory X rays to the citizens of the State. The other example which he gave has to do with blood transfusions. On that subject he pointed out in his speech that both Houses of this Parliament had agreed fairly recently to permit two doctors in consultation, or only one in special circumstances, to give compulsory blood transfusions.

After the Minister had given those two illustrations and had spoken at some length on each, he appeared to reach the conclusion that he had, by so speaking, given a complete justification for the compulsory fluoridation of public drinking water supplies; but I think his illustrations did not provide any justification worth talking about for the compulsory fluoridation of drinking water supplies.

Take the first example he gave of compulsory X rays. Does the Minister suggest or does any member who favours fluoridation suggest, that compulsory X rays are applied continuously to citizens in this State? Of course they are not! Compulsory X rays are applied to citizens in this State at very infrequent intervals. So there is no comparison between the compulsory application of X rays to citizens of this State and the compulsory application of fluoride to drinking water supplies which people have to drink every day of the year.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The principle of compulsion is there.

Mr. HAWKE: The principle of compulsion is there in respect of X rays, perhaps three times in a person's lifetime; maybe a bit more.

Dr. Henn: Every two years for a miner.

Mr. HAWKE: The putting of fluoride into water supplies people have to drink means that the compulsory application in that instance is every hour of the day, every day of the year. So the application of compulsion is a million times more frequent in regard to the fluoridation of water supplies as compared with the application of compulsory X rays of citizens.

In the case of blood transfusions the comparison becomes even more ridiculous; even more non-applicable; because how many times does the average citizen—if there is such a person in the community—have compulsory blood transfusions? It would not average once in a lifetime for a citizen; it would even be less. There is no figure that can be drawn upon to compare compulsory blood transfusions with the fluoridation of water. The proposal for the compulsory fluoridation of water supplies means that the compulsory intake of fluoridation by all the citizens in a particular water supply area is consistent and frequent; it is going on all the time.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I did not try to deny that. I was talking about the pure principle of compulsion.

Mr. HAWKE: So obviously the attempt of the Minister to justify the compulsory addition of fluoride to public water supplies on the basis of compulsory X rays, and compulsory blood transfusions, was a comparison which had little or no application to the situation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I do not agree with you.

Mr. HAWKE: The care and protection of teeth—especially the teeth of children—is admittedly tremendously important. There can be no shadow of doubt about that. I think we all know that the teeth of Australian children, and of Australian citizens generally, where they still have their natural teeth, is extremely bad. I ask myself why it is that the teeth of Australian children and of Australian grown-ups who still have their natural teeth are so bad.

If we are honest with ourselves we must admit, I think, that the basic reason is unsuitable foods being eaten in too large quantities. I wonder why the health council, for instance, and the Australian Medical Association, or the Australian Dental Association, have not, long before this time, mounted a campaign on this issue.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They have.

Dr. Henn: They have; you must have been asleep all the time.

Mr. HAWKE: There may have been a campaign.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not controversial.

Mr. HAWKE: It is not controversial, but it is tremendously important. Whatever campaign might have been mounted, or carried out, has had little or no effect. I am inclined to think the campaign which I have in mind has not been carried out, because a number of those who would have to be concerned with the waging of such a campaign would not be too keen to offend the very extensive private enterprise interests involved; for instance those associated with the manufacture, refining, and sale of white sugar. We know the Colonial Sugar Refinery Company is one with a massive capital structure, of great profit-earning capacity, and of great political influence in a number of directions.

Mr. Graham: My word!

Mr. HAWKE: So I imagine it would not be a very sensible thing from its point of view for the Australian Medical Association to mount and wage a continuous, strong, and insistent campaign in regard to the white sugar situation, as it relates to the condition of children's teeth. It would not be a very sensible thing for the Australian Dental Association to do that. Nor would it be wise for the Health Council to do it.

Probably a lot more could have been done in the schools in connection with this matter. I have an idea in my mind—an idea which grows as time goes on—that diet not only plays a tremendous part in the condition of our teeth, but also in the condition of the health of human beings from every angle.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think you are right; but a lot is done in the schools.

Mr. HAWKE: Something is done, but not enough is done; not by any stretch of the imagination. Let us draw a comparison between human beings and a motor vehicle engine. Let us consider all the scientific thought and attention given to the best possible fuels to be put into motor car engines to make them operate efficiently; and let us see by comparison how little scientific thought and attention is put into working out the best foods and diets for human beings to take into their systems to operate their engines—if I may put it that way.

I was very interested to read the remarks of the wife of a dentist. These remarks were published in *The West Australian* newspaper of the 14th September 1963. The name of the woman concerned is Mrs. Winnifred Markley, of Denver, Colorado, in the United States. Her husband is a leading American dental authority. I

think he even advocates fluoridation of water supplies. His wife, apparently, has much more commonsense, and this is what she is reported to have said—

The sugar bowl is always hard to find.

She meant it was hard to find in her home. The article continues—

It has been about 20 years since she has put sugar on the family dining table.

Mrs. Markley said she was an advocate of a wholesome food diet for health, particularly dental health.

Since she stopped eating all sweets, puddings, cakes and pies about five years ago, she had not had any further tooth decay, though previously she had plenty of dental treatment.

She said she had no recurrence of stiff joints.

Her son (22) had no tooth cavities and her daughter (23) only one or two.

That seems to me to be a most commonsense approach to the problem.

It can be said people should be told not to eat white sugar and not to take too much starchy food, and parents tell their children not to drink aerated waters or eat sweets; but nobody takes any notice. If, as a community, this is the way we are heading then obviously from a health point of view we are going down the drain. Instead of the health of the people improving, it will become worse and worse, and that will be an excuse for more drugs of all kinds to be put into our food and drink.

It was said by the Minister—I think he also quoted some authorities on the matter—that there were no possible, undesirable side effects likely to develop in the human system from the drinking of water which contained a minimum quantity of fluoride. I have never seen any guarantee in this regard, and I do not believe the statement. I cannot believe people can go on drinking fluoridated water day after day, for years on end, without developing serious side effects in various parts of their bodies. I would like to see some authority, which has a reputation to uphold, guarantee this.

I am convinced in my own mind that the taking into the human system of sodium fluoride, even in the minute quantities which the Minister talked about, must in the fullness of time have a bad effect on the system. It may not be possible to prove it, but I am convinced as much as I can be convinced about anything that this would occur, because I am satisfied one cannot take into the human system a material which has a metallic base without that material having very serious effects on other parts of the body, such as kidneys, bones, lungs, and so on.

I recall reading some authorities who stated the taking of fluoride into the system could cause cancer, deterioration of the brain, weakening of mental concentration, and so on. I am not in a position to particularise because I have not any expert knowledge of my own to bring to bear upon the situation; but I think, and I feel, there could not be any doubt that very serious side effects would develop after consuming fluoridated water for any length of time.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Why would the British Ministry for Health state there was no danger, and that it was completely safe?

Mr. Tonkin: Has it said that?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Yes.

Mr. Tonkin: Where can that be found?

Mr. HAWKE: I cannot say why the British Ministry for Health made that statement, any more than the Minister can say why the experts—which I will quote later—contend that side effects do develop in countries where public drinking water supplies have been fluoridated. This attempt to fluoridate public water supplies will involve a tremendous amount of waste—not only a waste of fluoride, but also a tremendous waste of effort.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is still the cheapest way.

Mr. HAWKE: I doubt very much if it is the cheapest way. I think it is probably the most expensive way.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is not.

Mr. HAWKE: For instance, the percentage of fluoridated water which will be consumed by human beings will be an extremely small percentage of the total. Most of the fluoridated water will flow down the drains, on lawns and gardens, and so on.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And be drunk by people with false teeth also.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister had better speak for himself. The Minister gave some figures in this House a few days ago in reply to a question by the member for Victoria Park, in which information was sought as to the cost of fluoride tablets. The member for Victoria Park obviously had in mind that the making available by the Government of free fluoride tablets to people in the community who wanted to take such tablets would be a much cheaper proposition than the fluoridating of the public water supplies of this State. I think he was on the right track.

In his reply, the Minister gave figures of costs which amazed me. I could not believe, and I still refuse to believe, fluoride tablets could not be obtained by the Government in large quantities at a much lower cost than that quoted by the Minister. I am not questioning the *bona fides* of the Minister in the matter; no doubt

the information he gave to the House was supplied to him by his department. However, I am positive that fluoride tablets can be obtained much more cheaply than is indicated in the figures given by the Minister in his reply. I suggest in that regard the Minister should have further inquiries made.

As a matter of fact, the member for Victoria Park made further inquiries in Perth and obtained information from a reliable source which indicated fluoride tablets could be obtained much more cheaply than was shown in the figures given by the Minister, and could be obtained ever so much cheaper than that even when they were purchased in large quantities and when discount was made for payment in cash within a certain number of days.

I have before me a newspaper cutting which is headed, "F in salt cost zero." This refers to fluoride in salt cost as being nil. It was a cabled message from Zurich in Switzerland last year, which read as follows:—

Fluoride will be added to table salt in Canton Province, Switzerland. Salt without fluoride will be available for those who prefer it.

The people of Switzerland are not backward; probably most people will agree they are very advanced in almost every field, and certainly in the field of public health. I would say they were very much more advanced than Australians in the field of public health.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Why do you say that?

Mr. HAWKE: Because it has been shown and proven that the people of Switzerland are a very healthy people. I think it will be found their health levels are higher than the health levels of Australians.

Dr. Henn: You don't know that at all.

Mr. HAWKE: No. I said I thought it would be found their health levels were higher than those of Australians.

Dr. Henn: That is misleading.

Mr. HAWKE: It is not misleading. It is an expression of opinion.

Mr. H. May: The member for Wembley does not have to believe it.

Mr. HAWKE: I repeat: From what I have read of Switzerland and its people, they are very healthy. They are a very co-operative people; and I have no doubt that health plays a very important part in the policies of the people and the Government of that country. However, they do not propose to apply compulsion. They do not propose to fluoridate the public water supplies and force fluoride down the throats of every man, woman, and child in the country. They propose to leave the situation on a voluntary basis, but still to tackle it.

Their proposal, apparently, is to add fluoride to table salt in safe quantities; and I find further on in this cable message that the price for salt with fluoride and salt without fluoride is to be the same. So presumably the cost of adding fluoride to salt is not very much.

We read in the newspapers here not so long ago that the Premier of South Australia (Sir Thomas Playford) would not have a bar of a proposal to fluoridate the public water supplies in South Australia. I presume the member for Wembley will not attempt to wipe off the Premier of South Australia.

Dr. Henn: He is getting old, you know.

Mr. HAWKE: Not as old as Sir Alexander Reid, by a long way. Sir Thomas Playford, when some of the protagonists of compulsory fluoridation of public water supplies put the hard word on him to do the job in South Australia, would not have a bar of it. He said he was not prepared to take on such a proposal. He did not think it was right, and proper, and safe at this time to even consider adding fluoride compulsorily to the water supply serving all of the citizens in a particular water district in South Australia.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He was also not prepared to bring about compulsory X ray legislation when we did it here in Western Australia 12 years ago.

Mr. HAWKE: He might not have been, but I am quoting his view in connection with the suggestion that he and his colleagues in Government agree to the compulsory fluoridation of water supplies in that State.

Mr. Dunn: What did Mr. Heffron say?

Mr. HAWKE: I have not seen anything publicly.

Mr. Dunn: He is pretty young too!

Mr. HAWKE: About as young as Sir Alexander Reid.

Mr. Oldfield: He is younger.

Mr. J. Hegney: He is at least two years younger.

Mr. Bovell: I don't know whether he is.

Mr. HAWKE: That is not really appropriate to this matter. I have a cutting here from *The West Australian* of the 28th May this year which indicates that the W.A. National Council of Women, which represents 47 affiliated bodies, will urge the Government in the State of Western Australia to reject any proposal for mass water fluoridation. As far as I know, the National Council of Women is still of the same opinion. I should state, however, I received a telegram from them the other day urging that the debate on this Bill be postponed because of the controversial nature of the Bill. I do not agree with their approach in that matter as I do not think Parliament should postpone, more or less indefinitely, debate on a

subject simply because the subject is controversial. I think the more controversial the subject, the more urgent it is it should be debated in Parliament so that the elected representatives of the people might be given an opportunity to express their views and to make a decision.

I do not think it would be said by any member opposite—because he would probably be scared of saying it publicly—but it might be thought by some members on the Government side, "What would the members of the National Council of Women know about the subject?" I think it is fair to say that sometimes lay people know much more about a subject than they are given credit for knowing. I have a great respect and admiration for medical men generally; but I would point out briefly at this stage that the history of the medical profession during the centuries has had some very black pages because the majority tried by cruel means, in the earlier times, to stifle progress and prevent it. So I do not wipe off the views and opinions of lay people on any subject simply because they are lay people.

They are entitled to their opinions; they are entitled to their views; and elected members of Parliament should, as a matter of plain straight duty, give some consideration to the opinions and views which they express. We are often told women sometimes arrive at the right decision, at the correct conclusion, more by intuition than by other methods. Now we could laugh that idea off. We could say there is no basis for it—there is no sense in it—that it is not tenable.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Like picking winners.

Mr. Lewis: By the same token, they could arrive at the wrong one, too.

Mr. HAWKE: However, I have thought along the line that there is in the mind and make-up of every person, not only women, some intuition—call it what one will—which sometimes takes them to the right decision when experts would lead people to the wrong decision. I would also remind members of this Chamber that morality—that is, on the basis of compulsion—comes into this argument and this issue. On that ground alone there is room for plenty of thought on the part of those who would rush in blindly and support a measure for compulsory fluoridation of drinking water supplies in this State.

The Minister told us that in the United States of America 47,000,000 citizens are in areas where the water supplies are fluoridated. The Minister did not give us the total population of the United States of America, and I give it now at approximately 190,000,000. As a result, we find 143,000,000 people in the United States do not take any fluoridated water. I agree, immediately, that some of these

people are so situated geographically in that country it would be impossible for them to do it because they would not be associated with public water supplies.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The significant thing is that the number is increasing, and has done over the last 10 years.

Mr. HAWKE: That may be significant, according to the circumstances. I presume the total population of America is increasing and so it could be that the percentage of American citizens who are taking fluoridated water is also increasing. However, I would remind the Minister that not every one of the 47,000,000, or anywhere near that figure, in America, who are located in districts where the public water supplies are fluoridated, are in favour of having fluoride compulsorily put into water supplies.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The same applies to compulsory X rays.

Mr. HAWKE: I would hope the Minister would not fall back on the weak subject of compulsory X rays.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is not weak at all.

Mr. HAWKE: I dealt with that question early in my speech; and I feel I dealt with it in a manner which showed it is not fair, reasonable, or applicable, to make a comparison between compulsory fluoridated water supplies which citizens have to drink all the time and X rays and blood transfusions. X rays are undergone by citizens only once every few years, and most of us never at any stage in our lifetime receive a blood transfusion.

The Minister had some questions put to him by a member on this side of the House, about communities in fluoridated water supply districts in the United States of America. In his reply, the Minister told us that during the period from 1945 to 1961, 99 communities in America had discontinued fluoridation. He then went on to advise us that 20 of those 99 communities had recommenced fluoridating their water supplies. Therefore, in the figures given by the Minister, he clearly indicated, even though that was not his intention, that from 1945 to 1961, a net total of 79 communities in the United States had abandoned the compulsory fluoridation of their water supplies. Presumably the system had been abandoned either because of local referenda which were taken, or because those in charge of the water supply systems in question had decided that fluoridation did not any longer possess the great virtues and benefits which at first had been thought.

New York City, as we all know, is a city of very large population. Strong efforts have been made, I understand, from time to time to force, coax, or cajole—or whatever method might have been tried—the citizens of New York City to agree to have

the water supplies of that city fluoridated. But New York City, and 1,500 other cities in the United States, have rejected all attempts made over the years to persuade them to adopt fluoridation. We would think, I should say, that in a city such as New York with a very large population, and with many experts no doubt advocating fluoridation, a majority of the people in that State would have embraced the fluoridation proposal with open arms.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Many do.

Mr. HAWKE: However, the people of that city have refused to have anything to do with it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: One man has refused.

Mr. Kelly: That's a beaut!

Mr. Davies: One man controls 7,000,000?

Mr. HAWKE: This is the first time I knew New York City was under the dictatorship of one individual.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I did not say that.

Mr. HAWKE: It makes one wonder whether the things we read about American democracy are so much make-believe.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Be sensible!

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister should try to give a lead in that direction, no matter how difficult it might be for him. The Minister told us that one man among all the millions of population in New York had been responsible for refusing to allow the water supplies in New York City to be fluoridated. I do not accept that; and I hardly believe the Minister was serious when he made that interjection.

I want to quote a few authorities, even though the Minister wipes these authorities off as being "little-known so-called experts"—with "experts" in inverted commas. I do not propose to follow the same rather crude attitude or approach in relation to the authorities the Minister quoted. I accept what they said, for what it is worth.

In the High Court of Dublin in Eire this year, an action was taken by a Dublin housewife against the Government in relation to an Act of Parliament which had been passed providing for the compulsory fluoridation of the water supplies in that city. The housewife, Mrs. Gladys Ryan, took her action on the basis that the Act was repugnant to the Constitution, and was invalid. There is set out a number of grounds put forward in the approach made to the High Court. Several witnesses were called on Mrs. Ryan's behalf and I want to quote very briefly from what some of them said. There are too many of them to quote them all, and certainly too many views given to quote them in full.

The first was a Professor Anton Gordonoff, Professor of Toxicology and Pharmacology at the University of Berne, Switzerland. I would not call that gentleman a

"little-known so-called expert"—with inverted commas! He is the pharmacologist member of the Commission on Medicines and Drugs. All medicines and drugs used by the National Health Administration of Switzerland have to be submitted to this commission. He is an honorary member of the Medical Society of Vienna and of the French Therapeutic Society, and has published 235 original works on his subject. He has done much research work in connection with fluorides. I propose to quote a few extracts from his evidence as follows:—

Fluorides were very toxic.

Flourine was the most toxic of the halogen elements.

It would be difficult to say what quantity of sodium fluoride would be poisonous to human beings, as no investigations about this had been carried out.

Calcium was a necessary substance for human and animal organs. Fluorine pushed it out of the way, and for that reason bones became porous.

The damage by fluorine in the water to the thyroid gland took the form of reduction of function. It could cause goitre.

There can be no contracting out from fluoridised water, and it makes compulsory the intake of fluorine from all food and all drink. This would be justified only if we were concerned with an inert material, which is far from being the case. All authorities agree that fluorine is in no way an innocuous substance; moreover since its therapeutic range is so very small it lends itself to overdosage.

At the present time when there is a lot of noise about thalidomide we must not simply overlook such questions of antagonism. Thalidomide and Softenon were on sale for several years.

Those last two substances have, of course, been combined. To continue—

Flourine is only slowly excreted, and can accumulate in the body. It is laid down in bones and teeth, and there the antagonism between it and calcium must come into action.

Because of its varied activities, there can be no question of anything but an accurately measured supplement, and in no circumstances an addition to drinking water, which makes impossible any exact dosage and control.

The next authority was Professor Andrea Benagiano, Dean and Director of the Dental School of Medicine and Surgery of the University of Rome, and member of the Medical Faculty, Rome University. He has been a Director of the George Eastman

Institute of Dentistry in Rome. He has published 120 scientific works. Among other things he said in his evidence—

Biological examination showed development inferior to the norm of surrounding villages, dysmenorrhoea, reduced birth rate, atrophy of the thyroid, predisposition to fracture of the bones, and other alterations.

I am astounded when the question of fluoridating public water supplies is brought up, because we cannot be certain of adding the correct dosage of 1 ppm of sodium fluoride; we are not able to check the amount of fluoride that will be ingested by each citizen who drinks this water. Diabetics for instance, drink several litres of water. Poor people would consume large quantities of soup, and because of the continued addition of fluoridated water in the course of preparation the soup would contain more than the safe amount of fluoride.

Another witness was Professor Sergio Fiorentini, Professor of Dentistry in the University of Rome, and Principal of the Department of Operative Dentistry in the George Eastman Higher Institute of Dentistry. He is the author of 60 papers on fluorine and dental matters. His primary work in scientific research has been on the toxicology of fluorine and the prevention of dental decay. He is a member of the European Organisation for the Prophylaxis of Dental Caries and Research on Fluorine.

Another witness was Dr. Fauzi Rozeik, Associate Professor of Dentistry in the Medical Faculty of Mainz University, Germany; Chief Physician in the Dental Institute of Mainz, and in charge of Research in the Research Institute since 1957. A member of the German Dental Association, he has published 50 scientific works in Germany, Britain, and America. He has been carrying out experiments in dental caries since 1954, particularly in relation to the effects of fluoridation and fluorine on caries prophylactically, and that research was both basic and clinical. Among other things he said in evidence—

He did not believe that the body excreted all fluorine after the danger level of intake was reached; he believed that fluorine accumulated in the body.

Another witness was—

Professor Douw G. Steyn, Professor of Pharmacology and Toxicology in the University of Pretoria, South Africa; he had done 27 years field and laboratory research work on the toxicity of fluorides as they occur naturally; he had spent a further three years collecting reports and evidence for and against fluoridation of public water supplies, and this evidence had been published in his

book "The Problem of Dental Caries, and the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies."

Among other things Professor Steyn said the following:—

He considered fluorine and lead were the two most dangerous poisons as far as chronic poisoning was concerned. Chronic poisoning usually resulted from the ingestion of very small quantities of poison over very long periods.

Flourine had a very strong tendency to accumulate in those parts of the system where calcium was concentrated; the bones and the teeth being by far the richest organs in calcium, were most inclined to accumulate fluorides. In considering fluorine toxicity, a number of factors which could influence its toxicity had to be taken into consideration. The most important of these were: diet, the state of health of the individual, the drugs which a person might possibly take, the nature of the fluorine compounds, the rate of absorption, the quantity of water consumed, and the drinking of beverages which contained different amounts of fluorine.

He believed that fluorine was the chief cause of the endemic goitre in human beings in the North West Province.

Flourine most possibly aggravates the growth of malignant tumours by affecting the normal supply of oxygen to tissues and cells.

From the many investigations he had carried out, over a period of 27 years, the conclusions he had drawn were that, with certain unfavourable conditions human beings especially children, would suffer harmful effects from drinking water containing concentrations of fluorine as small as one part per million.

Another witness was—

Dr. MacDonald Sinclair, M.A., D.M., B.Sc., M.R.C.P., Fellow of Magdalene College, Oxford, Fellow of Royal Chemical Society, Director of the Oxford University Laboratory on Human Nutrition. He is a specialist on the relationship between heart disease and human nutrition, and specialises in chronic degenerative diseases—heart and cancer.

Dr. Sinclair said—

The effects of fluorides on the incidence of dental caries was extremely complex and not understood.

When he first started research 30 years ago, he used fluorine as an enzyme poison. It was true to say that every chemical reaction in the human body was dependent upon the enzyme.

He thought it was now universally agreed that fluorine storage in the body occurred at all levels of fluoride content, even at very low ones. There were a number of factors which affected storage, of which the most important was the kidney, since most of the excretion occurred through the kidney. If the kidney was unable to excrete fluorides or, if the kidney was disabled, an increase of storage might occur.

He was opposed to the principle of fluoridating public water supplies, on scientific grounds. Some of his reasons were—the variability in the consumption of water; the known decreased ability of people suffering from certain kidney diseases to excrete fluorine in normal concentrations; and the difference between natural calcium fluorine present in water, and sodium fluoride or similar salts added to the water.

Another witness was:

Dr. George L. Waldbott, of Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A. Fellow of the American College of Physicians; Co-founder and Past President of the Michigan Allergy Society. He is a specialist in allergies; in 1958 at The Hague, he won first prize for an exhibition on occupational allergy.

Among other things, Dr. Waldbott said in evidence—

He had encountered fluoride poisoning from tea. He had also encountered cases of severe ulceration in the mouth, and inflammatory changes in the mouth from toothpaste containing fluorides.

Those who had opposed fluoridation and had written papers on the subject, had been subjected to much criticism and personal attacks. He himself had taken action in a London court because of an allegation made in a paper that he was making a lot of money by his opposition to fluoridation. A retraction of the allegation was made in court, and the defendant indemnified him against costs. On another occasion he was forced to write to an American medical journal, which later retracted certain remarks it had made about him.

Naturally, these men are not known to me personally, but I think the Minister was certainly exaggerating most unfairly by describing them as little-known "experts", with inverted commas around the word "experts".

I have had some letters from citizens—a great many letters, in fact—and I wish to quote briefly from some of them, because it seems to me they put forward the view of the citizen. I know a number of citizens are in favour of fluoridation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Some of whom have written to you also.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes; very few indeed. I do not propose to mention the names of the persons concerned: I think in the circumstances it would not be advisable. One person wrote to me from North Innaloo and said strong advice had been given to her to take calcium fluoride tablets for the liver and so on. She did not get any better and she was advised to continue the tablets and told that time would work wonders. She did so and now she is unable to digest food and has lost a stone in weight.

Another article appearing under the name of "Margaret" in the *Busselton Times* stated that an officer of the Education Health Council said his council would not engage in public debate with groups opposed to fluoridation of water supplies. Members of the shire council at Busselton were very upset indeed at the refusal of the representatives of the Education Health Council to engage in public debate.

Another person wrote to me from Subiaco and said "a statement" sponsored and backed by thousands of doctors, dentists, scientists, and health officers from all over America declares that no positive proof of the safety of fluoridation has been offered. A person from North Perth wrote to me stating that he was a diabetic and of necessity has to drink a great quantity of water. He fears that in his instance he will take in far too much fluoride and consequently suffer even worse health than at the present time. He goes on to state his wife was given a prescription from two different doctors for two different drug tablets and the first dose in each case nearly put her out of existence.

Another person from Inglewood quoted from the *U.S. Dispensary*, 24th edition, that fluorides are violent poisons to all living tissues because of their preprecipitation of calcium. They caused fall of blood pressure, respiratory failure, and general paralysis. Continued ingestion of non-fatal doses causes permanent inhibition of growth.

Another extract from a letter from the Director of the Law Department of the American Medical Association (Mr. C. Joseph Stetler) stated that it is not true the A.M.A. guarantees the safety of fluoridated water. There are many other extracts which I could quote, but time will not permit of that being done.

It might be said all the authorities I have quoted have not made direct statements to anybody in Western Australia. It might also be suggested that all of these opinions have been taken from publications, some of which have been published in Australia, but most of them published outside of Australia.

I have here a copy of a letter sent by Frederick B. Exner, M.D., who undertakes X ray diagnosis and X ray and radium therapy in Seattle, United States of America. This is a copy of an open letter which was sent by Dr. Exner to, among other persons, the Minister for Health in Western Australia. There is a great deal of very interesting information in this open letter which the doctor sent to our local Minister for Health and which, as far as I know, our local Minister for Health has not yet released for publication. I hope that before this second reading debate is over he will release the letter for publication.

Obviously, Dr. Exner has no objection to its publication in full because I have been supplied with a photographic copy of the letter. Indeed, the doctor does not pull his punches; and if you, Mr. Speaker, are sufficiently interested I am prepared to hand you this copy of the letter after the House rises, and before you go to sleep you could have a very interesting and perhaps rather thrilling time reading its contents. I want to quote only one short extract, which is on page 4. It is as follows:—

You say that "The British Medical Research Council's chief endocrinologist" (whoever that may be) has investigated Professor Steyn's findings in South Africa and found them completely groundless. No such investigation has been made; and anyone who says it has is either lying or irresponsibly parroting lies.

I am sorry time will not permit me to read the whole of the letter, because it makes exceptionally good reading. There are many other publications, but I do not propose to delay the House any longer except to say, as I did at the beginning of my speech, that the policy of the Australian Labor Party in this State is that there should be no compulsory fluoridation of public water supplies until such time as the subject has been submitted, by way of referendum, to the people in each particular water supply area. I think the subject is of such critical importance in relation to the health of the people that it should be submitted to the people for judgment before it is imposed upon them by the compulsory action of the Minister for Health.

I do not think the Minister for Health should have the power to compulsorily force fluoridated water on to the people in any water supply district in this State.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Parliament of this State will either pass this legislation or reject it.

Mr. HAWKE: Obviously there is nothing new in that. I knew that before I came into this Parliament, 30 years ago.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is a pity you do not take notice of it when you make statements as you just did.

Mr. HAWKE: What did I say?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You said that I dictated the whole issue and that I sponsored it. If it goes through Parliament it will be Parliament's action.

Mr. HAWKE: It will be nothing of the kind. I hope Parliament will not approve of the Bill. But should Parliament approve of the Bill, Parliament approves of a legal set-up where the Minister has the final decision as to whether a particular water supply district is to be compulsorily subjected to the fluoridation of the public water supply.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But Parliament approves of that by passing the legislation. You are being childish in your approach to this matter.

Mr. HAWKE: I think it is time the Minister had some sleep. Obviously he is under stress and is becoming unduly worried. Perhaps it is because of the force and extent of the views and opinions which I have quoted this evening from authorities who are opposed to the fluoridation of public water supplies.

However, perhaps we can more properly continue the argument, which the Minister for Health and myself were just having, when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. We can then take each clause and argue out what discretionary powers Parliament is asked to give the Minister in this matter. Parliament will only give the Minister discretionary powers in the final analysis should this Bill become law. The Minister will have to be the authority. He will compel the water supply boards or Water Supply Departments to put the fluoride into the water. What is more, should any water supply board or any water supply department or authority refuse to carry out the Minister's direction then the Minister is given compulsory power in this proposal to take charge; to push the Water Supply Department and the water supply authorities out of the road. As a matter of fact, penalties are provided in the law for any water supply authority which seeks to obstruct the Minister in the direction and the action which he would have to take subsequently in the matter.

In conclusion, I make it quite clear that members on this side of the House will vote solidly against the second reading of the Bill, and also against the third reading, unless before the second reading vote is taken the Government gives a total assurance that this legislation will not be put into operation until it is first approved at a referendum in each of the particular water supply districts where the Minister proposes compulsorily to apply fluoride to the public water supplies.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson. That means you are applying compulsion to your members in this regard.

Mr. HAWKE: No; we are carrying out the policy of the Australian Labor Party of which we are members—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You said that your members will vote against this.

Mr. HAWKE: —unless—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Yes, unless.

Mr. HAWKE: —the Government is prepared, before the second reading stage is reached, to give a total and complete assurance that the proposed law will not be operated until such time as the people in each water supply district have been given the opportunity by referendum either to accept or reject the proposal.

Dr. Henn: You are doing a lot of harm to the young people of Western Australia.

Mr. HAWKE: We know all about the young people of Western Australia, and it is very foolish—

Mr. Moir: At other times members opposite are not very concerned about that.

Mr. HAWKE: —of the member for Wembley to try to introduce that into the situation. We are concerned with the total health of all the people in Western Australia in this matter.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: So are we.

Mr. HAWKE: I know what dentists can do to children and grown-ups when children and grown-ups have to go to them for treatment, because I have been to a dentist. As a matter of fact, I went to the best dental surgeon in St. George's Terrace and Sonny Liston never battered any opponent in the boxing ring more than that leading surgeon-dentist battered me. So I have great sympathy for anybody who has trouble with his teeth, whether it be a child, a teenager, or an adult; and I am conscious—as conscious as the member for Wembley, and as any other member in the House, or person in the community today—of the need for doing the utmost possible to improve the situation.

I said we are concerned with the total health of all the people in the State, no matter whether they are children, teenagers, or adults, and I emphasise again that we request from the Government, if it wishes us to support the Bill at the second and third reading stages, an absolute assurance before then that the Government will not compulsorily fluoridate the public water supply in any water supply district unless the issue has first been submitted to the people in the area by way of a referendum, and an affirmative decision obtained.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Crommelin.

House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.