

feel sure this amendment will be accepted by the Committee in an effort to reduce costs in the collection of this rate.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. NALDER: I move an amendment—

Page 4, lines 1 to 5 inclusive—Delete all words and substitute the following:—

(3) The Commissioner of Taxation may, by one assessment, assess both the weed rate and the rate payable under the provisions of section one hundred and three of the Vermin Act, 1919, and the sum of the two rates as so assessed is payable on demand and is recoverable as if it were land tax of which payment is in default.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.42 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 23rd October, 1963
CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ASSENT TO BILL | 1881 |
| BILLS— | |
| Betting Control Act Amendment Bill—2r. | 1882 |
| Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill—Assent | 1881 |
| Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—2r. | 1906 |
| Government Railways Act Amendment Bill—2r. | 1882 |
| Land Act Amendment Bill—2r. | 1877 |
| Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill—Receipt; 1r. | 1880 |
| Railway (Portion of Tambellup-Ongerup Railway) Discontinuance and Land Revestment Bill—2r. | 1883 |
| Com.; Report | 1884 |
| Spencer's Brook-Northam Railway Extension Bill—2r. | 1880 |
| Com.; Report | 1881 |
| Supply Bill (No. 2), £22,000,000—2r. | 1884 |
| Com.; Report | 1905 |
| Totalsator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill—2r. | 1876 |
| Vermin Act Amendment Bill—Receipt; 1r. | 1880 |

Page

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

| | |
|---|------|
| Calcium Fluoride Tablets—Manufacture and Cost | 1874 |
| Fluoridation of Water Supplies—Health Education Council: Cost of Campaign | 1873 |
| Housing for Natives—Rentals at Norseman | 1874 |
| Industrial Deafness—Survey by Public Health Department | 1874 |
| Overhead Bridge at Merredin Station—Completion Date | 1874 |
| Successful Tenderer and Price | 1874 |
| Pastoral Lease 1727/61—Applicants and Deposits | 1875 |
| Experience of Applicants | 1875 |
| Road, Walgoolan-Warralakin—Expenditure and Mileage of Bitumen | 1874 |

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—

| | |
|---|------|
| Legislative Council Provinces—Redistribution of Legislation | 1873 |
|---|------|

STATUTE LAW REVISION—

| | |
|--|------|
| Tabling of Report: Ministerial Statement | 1875 |
|--|------|

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

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PROVINCES: REDISTRIBUTION AND ADULT FRANCHISE

Introduction of Legislation

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Minister for Mines:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce during this session the necessary Bills to give effect to the principle affecting the franchise and other matters, as contained in the motion moved by The Hon. J. G. Hislop and carried unanimously by this House?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
The matter is receiving consideration.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Health Education Council: Cost of Campaign

2. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:

What was the cost incurred by the Health Education Council in the campaign on fluoridation of water supplies for each of the following—

- (a) travelling, lecturing, etc.;
- (b) printing and distribution of literature;

- (c) pamphlets, etc.;
- (d) radio broadcasting; and
- (e) other costs in preparing the case?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) £443 4s. 1d.
- (b) Printing of the booklet *Let's Keep Our Teeth* cost £3,132 9s. 4d. for 70,000 copies. This booklet deals with general dental health—only part of it refers to the advantages of fluoride.
- (c) Nil.
- (d) Nil.
- (e) Nil.

HOUSING FOR NATIVES

Rentals at Norseman

3. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Housing:

Regarding houses on the native reserve and in the township of Norseman, will the Minister advise—

- (a) the rentals to be charged for
 - (i) Type 3 houses valued at £1,115 each; and
 - (ii) Type 5 houses valued at £2,257 each; and
- (b) whether these rentals will be in accordance with the economic rent formula?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) (i) 10s. per week.
- (ii) 35s. per week.
- (b) No. These are transitional type houses and rentals charged are based on the average native family's ability to pay.

CALCIUM FLUORIDE TABLETS

Manufacture and Cost

4. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Would the Minister ascertain and advise the House if it is possible for calcium fluoride tablets to be manufactured?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", would they be more expensive than sodium fluoride tablets; and, if so, to what degree?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes; they can be made.
- (2) They would not be more expensive—calcium salts are about the same cost as fluoride salts, for all practical purposes. In both cases the source of fluoride in tablets is not an expensive ingredient. It should be pointed out that calcium fluoride tablets have an extremely low solubility and it is

very doubtful whether there is sufficient fluid in the gut to dissolve enough of the calcium fluoride to have the desired effect.

WALGOOLAN-WARRALAKIN ROAD

Expenditure and Mileage of Bitumen

5. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:

Regarding the construction and bituminising of the Walgoolan-Warralakin Road during the year ended the 30th June, 1963, will the Minister advise—

- (a) the amount of money actually spent; and
- (b) the number of miles of road bituminised?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Nil.

OVERHEAD BRIDGE AT MERREDIN STATION

Successful Tenderer and Price

6. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Who is the successful tenderer for the overhead pedestrian bridge construction at the Merredin railway station?
- (2) What was the tender price?

Completion Date

- (3) What is the completion date of the contract?
- (4) Is it considered that the job is up to schedule?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Structural Engineering Company of W.A. Ltd., Welshpool.
- (2) £15,400.
- (3) Original date set for completion was the 8th September, 1963.
- (4) No. The completion of the work is behind schedule. This position has been due to inability of cranes to operate on portions of the area because of sodden conditions caused by the excessive rains during the winter.

INDUSTRIAL DEAFNESS

Survey by Public Health Department

7. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the interest of the very many miners and other people suffering hearing loss disability through industrial noise—

- (a) when is the survey proposed by the Public Health Department likely to commence?
- (b) (i) Who will be the people conducting the survey; and

- (ii) what are their qualifications?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) March, 1964.
 (b) Undecided, but under general control of physician, occupational health, with assistance from the Commonwealth Acoustic Laboratories.

PASTORAL LEASE 1727/61

Applicants and Deposits

8. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

Further to part (5) of the question asked by me on the 17th October, 1963, regarding pastoral lease 1727/61—

- (a) On what date were applications invited?
 (b) Who were the applicants?
 (c) On what date did each apply and pay the necessary deposit?

Experience of Applicants

- (d) What grazing or farming experience, or any other ability, does George Ross Ibbotson, or Hazel Ibbotson, or Graeme Ross Ibbotson possess over the other applicants?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Applications for the pastoral leasing of an area of 70,000 acres closed on the 31st July, 1963. The notice advising that the land was available for pastoral leasing appeared in the *Government Gazette* of the 21st June, 1963.
 (b) and (c) Applications were received from—
 (i) N. R. Morton, on the 16th July, 1963.
 (ii) J. E. Norton, on the 24th July, 1963.
 (iii) G. R., H., and G. R. Ibbotson, on the 29th July, 1963.
 (iv) K. G. Fuller and W. G. Bryant. The deposit lodged with the original inquiry on the 22nd June, 1961, was transferred to the new application, and a further deposit was received on the 11th July, 1963.
 N. R. Morton withdrew his application on the 14th September, 1963.
 (d) On the evidence submitted, the Land Board decided that Messrs. Ibbotson were the most suitable applicants after giving consideration to all aspects including grazing experience and other qualifications of each applicant.

STATUTE LAW REVISION

Tabling of Report: Ministerial Statement

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [4.45 p.m.]: I have today laid on the Table of the House a progress report on Statute law revision, which as Minister for Justice I have received from Mr. G. D. Clarkson. There are three aspects of this report I desire to mention.

Firstly, it suggests for consideration a general plan for the reprint of the Statutes, which would include not only enactments of the Western Australian Legislature, but over a period would absorb the adopted Imperial Statutes and also those Imperial Statutes passed before the foundation of Western Australia, which still apply here.

Secondly, it contains the draft of a Bill for the repeal of 197 enactments passed in Western Australia prior to federation, which are thought to be now ineffective. This has been included as a suggestion as to the type of Statute law revision Bill which will require consideration in the process of tidying up the Statutes before they are reprinted.

Thirdly, it contains two lists of Statutes which it is thought can be safely repealed, but which are being referred to the appropriate Government departments for further consideration.

The Government is anxious to ensure that there is ample opportunity for everyone to consider the proposals which have been made, and has therefore decided to table this progress report for examination and comment before proposing any legislation.

It is obviously desirable that this whole project should be undertaken in accordance with an overall plan and that the outline of the plan should be worked out with the advice and assistance of all interested. The method of producing the reprint, which has been suggested by Mr. Clarkson, is one which I understand has not been adopted in any similar jurisdiction and, for that reason alone, he has been the first to suggest that it should be critically examined.

Presumably everyone will support the idea that where any doubt exists the appropriate department or authority should be consulted before an Act, which is apparently dead, is buried, but I shall be very interested to receive comments on the form of the Bill which has been suggested and also on the explanatory memorandum which accompanies it. It is intended that each Statute law revision Bill as it is introduced, will be accompanied by a similar memorandum.

I have discussed this report with Mr. Clarkson and informed him of the Government's intentions. Mr. Clarkson is most

willing to explain or amplify his proposals to anyone interested. I hope that members will consider the report and express their views.

Western Australia has lagged behind other places in revising and reprinting its Statutes, but this delay can now be turned to our advantage. I am confident that with the interest and co-operation of those concerned, we can profit by the experience in other jurisdictions and reproduce our Statute law in an up-to-date and convenient form.

I would just like to add that I thought it appropriate to make some statement to the House when tabling this report to indicate the progress that has been made to date. The present situation, I would say, is partly—if not largely—due to the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition in this House last year with which suggestion I concurred at the time. I told him then I was hopeful of being able to make some progress of this nature. Recently a permanent Crown law officer in the person of Miss Shirley Offer has been placed to help Mr. Clarkson in his work. He has pursued his task with considerable fervour, and I am quite agreeably surprised and pleased that he has been able to make this preliminary report after three months' work.

I feel that if the work he is doing receives the confidence, not only of the Government, but also of the Opposition, it would be to the advantage of our State.

The report was tabled.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [4.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Preparatory to proceeding with an explanation of the purposes of this Bill, it may be as well to convey to members some points of interest on particular aspects of the Totalisator Agency Board's betting activities. Apart from accepting straight-out bets, the board at the present time conducts certain quinellas, a doubles pool and one all-up for a win on two selected races.

These are conducted on the main race days, namely, Saturdays and public holidays. Two quinellas and one double pool are conducted on Eastern States racing but not on local racing. One all-up for a win on two selected races is conducted on local racing. The investments on these are sent to the on course totalisator. Similarly, an all-up for a win is conducted on local trotting.

It is further explained that 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.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is what a quinella is, is it?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As if the honourable member did not know! 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 place in two horse races selected. It is necessary for members to have some understanding of these matters in order to appreciate the purpose of this Bill being introduced.

The board has received many requests for it to consider the desirability of conducting a greater number of quinella and double pools. These have apparently become quite popular. The reason that no quinella or double betting is undertaken on local racing and trotting is mainly because of the time required and the cost incurred in collating and transmitting the necessary information to the on-course totalisator. This may not, at first glance, be apparent but may be better appreciated when it is pointed out there would be 105 different combinations in an event of 15 runners. Consequently, it would be 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.

The position in relation to the collation of a double is somewhat easier as there are no on-course doubles conducted on the local races. But doubles are not permitted under the Act as it stands at present. The W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association conduct on-course quinellas at the local races and trots on every race, and the Trotting Association also conducts a double on each two successive races. The board would be interested in conducting one double on two selected events, preferably with at least one intervening race. On the other hand, the board is not anxious to increase the quinella and doubles betting on Eastern States events. Such an increase would tend to encourage interest in racing outside the State at the expense of local racing and trotting.

What the board has in mind 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 that to be done, an amendment to the Act is necessary, and that is the reason why this Bill is being introduced. In other words, the purpose of the 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 the State. Given this permission, it is intended that the commission to be fixed by regulation will be 15 per cent. That is the standard deduction applicable generally in Western Australia.

It is not thought that this move will encourage an actual increase in the incidence of betting. One reason for this is that the all-up for a win on the local races and trots will be dropped in favour of the double. It is expected that the moneys invested in the quinellas—one only on the races and one only on the trots—will likely be diverted from moneys at present being invested in win and place betting on events conducted both outside and inside the State.

The double is apparently more acceptable than an all-up for a win, perhaps because there is only one commission deducted for the double as against two for the all-up. At least that may have some bearing on the matter. The limited opportunities which are proposed for quinella betting in local races and trots—and the Minister when explaining the Bill in another place assured members it would be very limited—is considered likely to be very acceptable to the investing public. It is understood these facilities will be particularly acceptable in country areas without, it is thought, encouraging any increase in the actual incidence of betting.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [4.56 p.m.]: 1 move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Members may recall that the Lieutenant-Governor, when addressing the House on opening day, predicted the introduction of an amendment to the Land Act relating to pastoral leases. Much of the legislation proposed in this measure relates to pastoral leases.

When introducing the Land Act Amendment Bill in another place recently, the Minister in charge expressed in appropriate words the Government's appreciation of the work done by the Pastoral Leases Committee in the preparation of the 1963 report. It is not considered necessary or desirable for a repetition of those words of appreciation, though it would be quite inappropriate to introduce this measure here in this Chamber without alluding to the positive and active interest taken in our pastoral industry, particularly in the northern parts of the State, by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise.

As previously mentioned, much of the contents of this Bill has to do with pastoral leases; and, in consideration of that, it may be as well to deal first with those which do not altogether apply to the pastoral lease section of the Act. The Bill extends the definition of "Crown Lands" so as to include lands below low water mark on the seashore and on the banks of tidal waters and all lands being the beds of water courses which are leased or licensed under sections 116 or 118 of the Land Act; that is, for purposes which necessitate the lessee or licensee to operate on land under the sea or on river beds. As a consequence, the words "bed" and "water courses" are defined in the Bill.

The necessity for the extension of the definition of "Crown Lands" is reflected by the operations of such companies as the Shark Bay Salt Company Ltd.—to operate in shallow waters in Shark Bay—and also by the dredging activities of licensees in the Swan and Canning Rivers.

The power of the Governor to reduce the maximum area that may be acquired in prescribed localities was inadvertently excluded from the amending Act of 1962, affecting section 47 (a). That is rectified in this Bill. While 5,000 acres of land may be necessary to constitute an economic working unit in some areas, a reduction of the maximum area to a lesser figure would be desirable under conditions of closer settlement and more intense agricultural production.

The Act at present gives a right to freehold, but only to lands which are not within a goldfield or mineral field. In point of fact, it is well established now that there is only a very small proportion of our pastoral lands which do not come within either a goldfield or mineral field. On the other hand, very few pastoral lessees have availed themselves of the right to freehold.

The intention to delete sections 55 and 56 of the Act is to remove the right of pastoral lessees to obtain the freehold of any portion of their pastoral leases. The deletion of these sections is desirable as it has been established they have practically no application, but in the event of forfeiture, surrender, revision, or termination of pastoral leases, small freehold blocks could seriously affect the operations of future lessees.

An examination of the extensive amendment to section 98 of the Act, which will cover the matters dealt with in sections 92 to 96, will indicate why these latter sections are being deleted. Under this Bill, the term of all new or converted leases will expire on the 30th June, 2015.

There will be four members on the Pastoral Appraisal Board in future instead of three. The Director of Agriculture will be the new member. Then there is the Surveyor-General, who is

chairman, and two members to be appointed by the Governor. The board at present consists of the Surveyor-General as chairman, the Deputy Surveyor-General, and Mr. W. E. Butcher.

More frequent reappraisements of new or converted leases are to be carried out. The present 15-year interval is to be modified in respect of any lease granted in the Kimberley Division and not being a lease that is due to expire on the 31st December, 1982, so that the rental payable shall be subject to reassessment as and from the 1st July, 1969, and again, on the 1st July, 1979, 1989, 1999, and 2009.

As to other leases not in the Kimberley Division and not being due to expire on the 31st December, 1982, reappraisalment of rent will take place on the 1st July, 1967, 1977, 1987, 1997, and 2007. Rent may be waived by the Minister provided lessees expend not less than two and a half times the rent for a particular year on improvements in accordance with a plan to be approved by the Minister. The right is reserved by the Minister, however, to require payment in full of any rent waived. That is in respect of any lease being transferred within seven years from the date of commencement.

The pastoral year at present concludes at the end of the calendar year. It would be more convenient for the pastoral year to coincide with the financial year ending the 30th June, and this Bill makes that provision. Should the pastoral lessee be prohibited under the provisions of the Soil Conservation Act from grazing stock on the whole or any portion of his lease, such areas will be exempt from rent on a *pro rata* basis. The lessee will be responsible for vermin control under the Vermin Act.

There is provision that after the passing of this amending legislation, a pastoral lease will not be granted unless, in the opinion of the Pastoral Appraisalment Board, as prescribed by regulations, it is an economic unit. An economic unit is at present regarded as one that will carry, when fully developed, at least 6,000 sheep or 1,200 head of cattle. Amendments in this regard may be made from time to time by regulation. The provisions in this amendment do not apply to converted leases. In the case where unleased land abuts pastoral leases and is insufficient to provide an economic unit, the abutting land may be granted to an adjoining lessee. This is subject to the limitation of area under section 113.

This measure provides that each pastoral lessee may hold one lease only to comprise all his land. The lease must be identified by a station name to be approved by the Minister. There are approximately 1,742 leases at present, but there are only about 558 stations. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure there will be only as

many leases as there are stations. A right has been extended to pastoral lessees to ascertain from the Government, or the Minister, intentions regarding the future of their leases 20 years before the expiry date; that is, in 1995.

A change in title from the Board of Appraisers to the Pastoral Appraisalment Board is provided for. The common date for appraisalment in respect of unconverted pastoral leases as set out in section 98B will apply only to leases which expire on the 31st December, 1982. As there are now no leases to which section 101 of the Act refers in respect of the adjustment and appraisalment of rents of pastoral leases granted before the commencement of the 1933 Act, that section is to be deleted.

Lessees of new or converted leases will be required to furnish to the Under-Secretary for Lands, within 12 months after commencement of the lease, a return setting out the improvements which the lessee proposes to effect on the land and the proposed situations of such improvements. The improvements planned will need to provide for reasonable development of all portions of the land capable of being used for pastoral purposes. Such plans will be considered by the Pastoral Appraisalment Board with a view to recommending the Minister's approval either without modification or subject to such modifications as the board may specify. Upon its being approved, all improvements effected by the lessee must be in accordance with the plan, or any later amendment of it by the Minister made on the recommendation of the Pastoral Appraisalment Board.

Lessees will be required each year to outlay on improving the lease an amount which is not less than two and a half times the rent payable for each year until such time as the planned improvements have been effected. Any excess of required improvements in any one year may be carried forward to the following year, and so on. For instance, if a pastoral lessee expends on amount of £20,000 on improvement in one year on a lease for which the rent is £2,000 he would be covered for ten years. Lessees will be required to submit an annual return to the Under-Secretary for Lands showing full particulars of improvements carried out during each year ending the 30th June.

Every lessee must stock his lease with such numbers of sheep and/or cattle as the Pastoral Appraisalment Board considers a reasonable and fair assessment of the capacity of the land, having regard to all circumstances. Such circumstances shall include seasonal climatic conditions and the period the lease has been held. His failure to stock the lease will render the lease liable to forfeiture, subject to such notice being given to the lessee as the Minister considers reasonable.

The Minister may, on the other hand, require the lessee to reduce stock numbers, if, in the opinion of the board, a lease is considered to be overstocked. Particulars of the numbers of stock carried during the preceding year ended the 30th June are to be furnished to the Under-Secretary for Lands not later than the 31st December in each year. Agistment of stock will be permitted only on the recommendation of the board approved by the Minister. A pastoral lessee as a result will not be able to eke it out by agisting another person's stock unless the Minister approves on the advice of the Pastoral Appraisement Board.

Lessees are required under this measure to manage and work the land in a proper and husband-like manner at all times during the term of the lease and according to sound and approved methods, and with particular attention to the conservation and regeneration of pasture. If the Minister considers that a lessee has permitted or suffered any part of the subject land to deteriorate to such an extent as to necessitate a lengthy period of protection from grazing, the lease will be liable to forfeiture.

This Bill contains an appropriate amendment to remove any question of doubt as to the powers of the Governor to resume lands from a pastoral lease, where such lands are needed for industry, or for purposes other than agricultural, or horticultural development. In this connection there is provision for the Governor to resume, enter upon, and dispose of the whole or any part of the land comprised in any pastoral lease for agricultural, or horticultural settlement, mining, industry; or for otherwise facilitating the improvement and settlement of the State.

The Governor is empowered under section 89D of the Land Act to enter into an agreement with an approved corporate body for the disposal of any area of Crown land, provided that the corporate body is bound by agreement to develop the land for agricultural purposes. A similar provision has been included in this Bill in respect of pastoral land, which could accelerate the development of outback portions of the State. Any such requirement will, however, require within six months ratification by Parliament, otherwise it shall be void and of no effect.

There is provision for any lessee holding a pastoral lease which expires on the 31st December, 1982, to apply—not later than the 31st December, 1964—for a new lease for a term expiring on the 30th June, 2015. An extension of time to the 30th June, 1965, for lodging such application may be authorised by the Minister in special circumstances. Ill-health could be a special circumstance if it prevented the lessee from lodging an application before the 31st December, 1964. There could be other

circumstances beyond his control which would make it impossible to lodge application before the stipulated time. As a consequence, the Minister is given authority to extend the time for six months under such extenuating circumstances.

Unless there are extenuating circumstances, lessees cannot expect to delay their applications beyond the 31st December, 1964. On the other hand, there is no compulsion for them to convert, and should a lessee not desire to convert before that time his lease will continue until 1982, when it will be subject to surrender as it will have expired.

Although all land developed as a station property will be the subject of one lease in future, action necessary to protect securities under existing leases is provided for in the Bill. Anybody who has advanced money against the security will be given that protection. It is the normal procedure to protect the securities under existing leases. Provision is made for the Minister to call in and cancel the existing lease and issue an alternative composite station lease for the term expiring on the 31st December, 1982, where a lessee of a pastoral lease or leases is entitled to, but fails to apply for, a new lease to the 30th June, 2015.

Areas which are not contiguous may be included in the consolidated lease to be run as one station. It is desired to unify the position of leases and stations. This is desirable for purposes of consolidation and uniformity. There may be three or four separate leases, and, under the new provisions, one lease may comprise one station. It is not unreasonable that Parliament, in the interests of uniformity and consolidation, should agree to this amendment to the 1982 leases, they being the ones which are not converted.

There is provision to ensure that an uneconomic unit may not be created by transfer of portion of a lease. For the purposes of improvements within the meaning of the Act, the dwelling house on a pastoral lease has been excluded. A person might, for instance, occupy a lease and spend perhaps £20,000 on a homestead. The Bill will exclude the dwelling house from improvements expected within the meaning of the Act. It is important to ensure that the amount enforceable by law for improvements will be applied for the purposes of increasing productivity and earning capacity.

The 19th schedule comprising the form of pastoral lease has been amended to enable resumption of such areas as may be considered by the Governor to be necessary to facilitate and improve the settlement of the State without limitation to areas required for reservation under part III of the Act, which provides for the creation of reserves. There are provisions in the 19th schedule for lessees to comply with the requirements of the Vermin, Soil Conservation, and Noxious Weeds Acts, and failure

to comply will render the lease liable to forfeiture. This is an additional penalty over and above those set out in these separate Acts.

The previous Government called for a report on pastoral leases in 1958 because it was concerned about the pastoral industry and the need then to do something about bringing stability and security to the industry. The initial report was made in 1959. The current report was tabled in Parliament on the first day available to the Government to table it after Parliament met, and this Bill was introduced in another place on the first day the Government had an opportunity to do so.

Thanks are due to all who have co-operated with the committee in supplying information which has assisted the Government. By their co-operation, it has been possible to submit to Parliament a Bill which, in the opinion of the Government, will protect the overall interests of the State.

Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 29th October, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Vermin Act Amendment Bill.
 2. Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill.
- Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

SPENCER'S BROOK-NORTHAM RAILWAY EXTENSION BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Provision is made in the second schedule of the Railway Standardisation Agreement Act of 1961 for the construction of associated narrow gauge works. When this agreement between the Commonwealth and the State was first made, it contained a proposal for the diversion of the Great Southern Railway from a point in the vicinity of Burges Siding across the Avon River and to run more or less parallel to the Northam-York Road to a point east of East Northam. That is the point where a new Northam marshalling yards was to be established.

The route would continue through East Northam and join in with the dual gauge to Midland via the Avon Valley. This would permit the lifting of the line lying

between Bellevue and Northam via Spencer's Brook to the take-off point near Burges. However, it would have been necessary to retain the railway between East Northam and Northam and its bisection of the town in order to maintain rail connection to the Northam Flour Mill and the oil companies.

The alteration to the 3 ft. 6 in. railway at Northam was deliberately omitted from the Bill presented to the House authorising the construction of the standard gauge railway, because neither the Government nor the Railways Department was satisfied that the original idea provided the most efficient railway set up in the interests of the town of Northam.

There is set out in the first schedule of the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State the following proposals:—

The routes of the associated narrow gauge railway works are—

| | Approx. Main Line Mileage |
|---|---------------------------------|
| (a) East Northam to Midland on the same route as the standard gauge railway | 59 |
| (b) Necessary deviations in the Northern and Great Southern Railways in the vicinity of Northam | 15 |
| | 74 |

The required elasticity is apparent in paragraph (b) and subsequent events have proved this to have been very desirable. Extensive investigations and discussions with the local authority and other interested parties resulted in an agreement being reached, which was acceptable to all including the Commonwealth. Copies of the proposed route were made available for viewing by local residents. In brief the proposal is as follows:—

- (i) Reverse the junction at Spencer's Brook, so that trains from the Great Southern Railway can run direct to Northam.
- (ii) Provide a new delivery siding at Spring Hill.
- (iii) Make use of the existing railway between Spencer's Brook and Northam.
- (iv) Construct a new railway from a point west of the existing Northam yard, across the river and the Great Eastern Highway to a new marshalling yard to be built just north of the Northam sewerage depot between the Toodyay Road and the river.

- (v) Remove the main line rails between East Northam and the existing Northam yard.
- (vi) Build a 3 ft. 6 in. line along the route of the standard gauge between East Northam and this new yard so that trains from Goomalling can run into the new yard and thence to Perth.
- (vii) Construct a new station and administrative buildings near East Northam.
- (viii) Construct a passenger halt on the new line between west of Northam and the new yard, alongside the Great Eastern Highway.
- (ix) Reduce the size of the present Northam yard.

The retention of the shunting line connection from Northam is necessary in order to maintain a siding connection to the flour mill and oil companies situated between Northam and East Northam. Negotiations in respect of the relocation of oil depots are in course between the local authority and the two oil companies concerned. Should current proposals be agreed to, the only street in the town, which will be crossed by rails, will be Charles Street. Fitzgerald Street at the eastern end will be crossed by the standard gauge, but this is unavoidable.

The route covered by the provisions in this Bill provide for a crossing over Fitzgerald Street at the western end by means of a bridge across the Avon River, and by overhead bridge across the Great Eastern Highway. The Toodyay road will be crossed by means of a level crossing. The closing of the existing railway between Bellevue and Spencer's Brook, and from a point near Northam to East Northam, will be made the subject of a further Bill at a later date.

It might be added that a successful outcome of negotiations between the local authority and the oil companies would mean much to the town of Northam, for it would enable the local authority to replan a part of the town now quite congested. An undertaking has been given by the Government that, upon this matter being clarified, consultations will be entered into between the Government and the local authority as to the use to which the land will be placed, this being contingent on the oil companies' sidings being removed.

Though the economics of discontinuing the rail siding into the oil terminals and the use of a pipeline from where the siding goes into the flour mill have been investigated, they did not prove very promising. The long term interests of the town would best be served, so we are advised, by arrangements being made with the oil companies for the removal of their siding, as that would substantially aid the development of the town.

In moving that this Bill be now read a second time, it is desired to place upon the Table of the House, the railway plan required under section 96 of the Public Works Act, together with the report of the Commissioner of Transport under section 11 (7) of the State Transport Co-ordination Act.

The plan was tabled.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [5.23 p.m.]: This is a very necessary Bill in order that the agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government in connection with the broad gauge railway and contingencies can be carried out. I am sure nobody could raise any objection to the principles involved. The Minister has given us a thorough explanation of the effect this proposed railway will have on the townsite of Northam, particularly central Northam.

As we know, railways were originally put through towns before those towns started to grow, with the result that the towns have grown around the railways; and, although railways are certainly essential, the stage has been reached where they have become noisy, quite a nuisance, and an obstruction to the growth of the business centres of the towns. There are several towns in Western Australia which suffer from that type of disability. On the other hand, I expect the town planners of those days did not interest themselves sufficiently to take precautions. We find the same thing occurs even in the centre of Perth.

This Bill is one that is absolutely necessary, as its provisions will be of great advantage to the residents and the business people of Northam. More land will be made available in the business centre and around the business area, and more business will be brought to Northam. The junction at Spencer's Brook will go out of existence and all Great Southern traffic will pass through Northam. That is not the case now. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of this Bill is to remove the limitation of the liability of the Railways Commission in respect of the loss of life or injury to a person, whether he is a passenger or not. Section 39 of the Act limits the commission's liability to a maximum of £6,000. In the light of present day judgments, the limitation in the Act is considered unreasonable. The original 1904 Act limited liability to £2,000. It was increased to £6,000 in 1955 and it is desired now that the limit be removed entirely.

The limitation in respect of liability has already been removed from the Statutes governing the majority of other State railway systems in Australia. Victoria, with a limit of £10,000, is the only State still retaining a limitation. Similar action to that as proposed in this Bill was taken by New South Wales and South Australia in 1950, by Tasmania in 1952, and Queensland in 1958.

Apart from liability being limited, there is another very good reason why this provision should be removed from the Act. The limitation of liability is in favour only of the Railways Commission. It does not preclude an employee of the commission from being personally sued and suffering judgment in excess of £6,000 for damages in respect of loss of life or injury to the person.

If a person suffers injury to the person, such person may sue both the employee, as the person actually causing the damage, and the commission. In that event, the plaintiff's right to claim damages against the commission would be limited to £6,000 but would be unlimited so far as the employee was concerned.

It has been proved from experience that this circumstance can have far reaching and unfortunate results. There was an instance some time ago of an injured man giving notice of a claim at common law against the commission, which resulted in settlement being reached between the man's legal representatives and the State Crown Solicitor on the basis of the limitation of liability of £6,000.

Later, a different legal representative of the man gave notice of intention to issue writs out of the Supreme Court claiming damages against each of seven Railways Department employees because of alleged negligence on their part. Though the matter was resolved in that particular case, it occasioned a most delicate situation, which resulted in the Government making

an *ex gratia* payment on the basis that the maximum liability provided in the Government Railways Act was overdue for revision in comparison with the legislative provision existing in other States. The *ex gratia* payment was in excess of £6,000. In this case the Government endeavoured to arrive at a fair and equitable figure in order that the employees of the Railways Department would not be exposed to the writs that were threatened.

The introduction of this measure is in accordance with the present day outlook that the Government should not, by legislation, deprive a citizen, injured by the action of Government servants, of compensation to which he is justly entitled. It is appreciated the Government can act only through its servants and agents, and where injury is caused to a person through negligent action of these servants and agents, the Government should be liable in the same way as private employers are liable. Upon the passing of this measure, it would be logical to assume that all future claims against the commissioner for liability would be made against the Government.

The only other provision in this Bill is to bring section 76 into line with an alteration in the title of the Death Benefit Fund to the Western Australian Government Railways Employees' Death Benefit and Endowment Fund Incorporated.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. E. M. Heenan.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.33 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

There are still some 47 licensed off-course bookmakers and most of them are operating in small country towns.

Since September, 1961, off-course bookmakers have been required to pay out on the basis of the actual totalisator dividends, as declared by the respective on-course totalisators, both inside and outside the State. Prior to the proclamation on the 31st December, 1960, of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, off-course bookmakers paid out at starting price odds with limits. After December, 1960, they were required to pay out on the same basis as the Totalisator Agency Board, and that basis is the one previously explained; namely, the actual totalisator dividends as declared by the respective on-course totalisators locally and in other States.

Some off-course bookmakers have since been inclined to refuse bets on outsiders by reason of the attendant risks. Unquestionably, the removal of the limits has increased the risk to the bookmaker and, particularly, the small bookmaker, who could quite easily be placed in a position of not being able to pay as the result of a fluke bet.

The fluke bet does not affect the Totalisator Agency Board to anywhere near the same extent, for the reason that a bad result arising from fluke bets in one or two agencies is cushioned by more favourable results from the bulk of the agencies.

It is considered desirable, therefore, to reintroduce the fixing of starting price limits for licensed off-course bookmakers, and that is the purpose of this Bill.

There is a further feature which might be added, and that is the experience of the Totalisator Agency Board which has been running into difficulty in securing licensed bookmakers for those country towns without legalised betting facilities.

The purpose of this Bill, therefore, is to enable the limits to be fixed in the Act itself and not by way of regulation. The statutory limits will then need to be referred back to Parliament for amendment when considered necessary.

The passing of this measure will provide an encouragement to the smaller bookmaker with a weekly turnover of something between £200 and £500 a week to carry on business until such time as his area is proclaimed a totalisator region.

The limits proposed within the State, as compared with those operating prior to January, 1961, are as follows:—

Metropolitan racing: 50 to 1 for a win; 12 to 1 for a place. (50 to 1 and 12 to 1.)

Metropolitan trotting: 50 to 1 for a win; 12 to 1 for a place. (33 to 1 and 8 to 1.)

Country racing: 33 to 1 for a win; 8 to 1 for a place. (25 to 1 and 6 to 1.)

Country trotting: 33 to 1 for a win; 8 to 1 for a place. (16 to 1 and 4 to 1.)

Eastern States racing: 50 to 1 for a win; 12 to 1 for a place. (50 to 1 and 12 to 1.)

Trotting outside the State will in future be covered by a 50 to 1 and 12 to 1 place limit. There were some special limits in regard to feature events such as the Melbourne Cup. These limits were previously fixed by regulation. It will be seen from the foregoing that the limits now proposed are substantially the same as previously in existence, except that they have been increased in regard to both metropolitan and country trotting within the State.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee.

RAILWAY (PORTION OF TAMBELLUP-ONGERUP RAILWAY) DISCONTINUANCE AND LAND REVESTMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban
—Minister for Mines) [5.37 p.m.]: I
move—

That the Bill be now read a second
time.

Provision is made in the Railway Discontinuance Act of 1960 for the closure of the Gnowangerup-Ongerup railway commencing at the south-western alignment of Yougenup Road in Gnowangerup to the end of the railway reserve at Ongerup. It has since been decided, in response to representations by the Gnowangerup Shire Council, that the termination of the railway would be best effected beyond Gnowangerup station on the south-western alignment of Whitehead Road.

The section of the line between Yougenup and Whitehead Roads is not, however, within the jurisdiction of the Closure of Lines Committee under the previous Act. Nevertheless, it is most desirable for early action to be taken to implement a decision on release of the railway reserve in that section. The committee is dealing with the portion of the railway reserve within the townsite of Gnowangerup from Yougenup Road eastwards. This requires a considerable amount of investigation and survey work by the Lands Department. It is desirable this work should be co-ordinated with similar work needed on the short section between Yougenup and Whitehead Roads.

Early representations were made in this regard by the Gnowangerup Shire Council. The council made an urgent request, prior to the proclamation of closure of the Gnowangerup-Ongerup line, for early action to be taken. The committee also desires the two sections to be dealt with concurrently.

In view of the urgency of permitting the Lands Department to proceed with the necessary investigation and survey work, the matter was submitted for approval, as it was understood that the small section remaining within the railway reserve could be excised by a recommendation and Order-in-Council.

Since the Minister approved of the commission's recommendation, advice was received by the Commissioner of Railways that Crown Law felt this area would need to be the subject of a special piece of legislation for the reason that it did not come within the land covered by the Railways Discontinuance Act of 1960.

It may be as well to read from a minute addressed to the Minister for Railways by the commissioner. I quote:—

Reference is made to my memo dated 15th May, 1963, at folio 1 hereunder regarding the proposed termination of the Tambellup-Gnowangerup railway at the south-western alignment of Whitehead Road instead of Yougenup Road, as provided in the Railway Discontinuance Act, 1960, and particularly to paragraph 5 wherein it was suggested that this could be effected by Order-in-Council.

This matter has been discussed with an officer of the Crown Law Department and the opinion has been expressed that a further Closure Bill is necessary.

As this particular section of the railway is within the Gnowangerup Townsite, considerable interest has been shown in the land which will be available to local business people and the Lands Department is anxious to proceed with the survey and necessary subdivision of the area. This, of course, cannot be done until the land has reverted to the control of that Department.

As a consequence, it was decided the correct procedure was the introduction of a special Bill and this explains the reason why this measure was introduced in another place.

The land involved consists of an area of 1 acre 0 roods 25.9 perches. We are advised that, though this is a comparatively small lot, the survey would not be as effective without its inclusion, nor would the development be as effective.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [5.41 p.m.]: This measure is really a matter of legalising the transfer of land. The provisions of the Bill have been examined by the Railways Department and the Lands Department, and the measure is to the advantage of the local people. The local shire council approves of the measure. As members will see from the map, the land is situated in the heart of Gnowangerup. There would be no point in delaying a Bill of this nature, as it is very necessary to carry out the promises and agreements which were agreed upon some months ago.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2), £22,000,000

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 22nd October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition [5.45 p.m.]): I do not intend to delay the House very long on this Bill. It is one on which, if the necessity arose and there was a desire, one could speak about any subject on earth. However, I will confine my remarks to two or three matters only.

When introducing a Bill today the Minister mentioned the necessity to survey the townsite area of Gnowangerup because of the transference of land back to the Lands Department from the Railways Department. It is on the matter of surveys that I wish to speak briefly. Those of us representing the North Province have increasingly, in recent years, had considerable worry in all matters affecting land transactions. Those transactions involve surveys not merely in connection with townsites, but many other areas; and it is obvious that there is, in this State, privately and governmentally, a serious shortage of surveyors and survey staff.

The Crown has had to resort to the employment almost continuously of outside contract surveyors. There is nothing wrong with that if those surveyors have no private work to do. My point is that if one looks at the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for this year one will find that there is a slight increase in the vote for contingencies for the Lands and Surveys Department. This increase covers survey expenses of all kinds.

In my view something very ambitious and very extensive should be done by the Government towards the training—encouragement in training—of many more young men for appointment to the profession of surveying in this State. It is a profession for which there is a keen demand for skilled men—men proficient indeed in town planning requirements. Although it can be said that the outback part of the State associated with rural land—I mean farming land—has been surveyed for a long time, there is an ever-increasing demand for surveyors not only in urban subdivisions, or suburban or rural subdivisions, but in the wider areas of the State.

When I point out that very few of the many hundreds of pastoral leases have a boundary surveyed, the need for such men and such work becomes obvious. In my view we have reached the point, especially when we consider the Land Bill which has been introduced into this Chamber today, where the ability to implement the provisions of that Bill rests upon the knowledge of where the boundaries are. I venture to suggest that not 10 per cent. of

pastoralists know the fixed points which constitute the corners of their many leases. I would like to say—and this is not in any unkind or critical vein, but merely in an endeavour to be constructive—that in the approach to this problem a lot more money will have to be spent. Surveys in the pastoral areas alone could cost £100,000 or more, and this would probably only give an indication of where the boundary points are.

The same applies to mining leases. Years of work need to be done to know the exact boundaries of the mineral leases, but what I say applies more particularly in the case of pastoral leases. I make this plea to the Government for an early and earnest consideration to the formulating of a plan—indeed a 20-year plan if necessary—for the surveying of those areas. Then in 20 years we could say we know where the boundaries of the leases are, which we do not know today.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I do think that the mineral exploration of the north will give rise to more surveys being done. I have constantly had difficulty with this sort of thing because of the large areas and great distances that have to be travelled.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think the Minister will acknowledge that there is great difficulty in getting surveyors. I had occasion recently to have an urgent survey job done in the Gascoyne district of the North Province. I was able to convince the acting Surveyor-General to allow a surveyor to deviate 500 miles from his course to get one little job done. This problem obtains throughout the length and breadth of the outback parts of Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The problem is a very expensive one to solve.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, but where it is a matter of urgency something must be done. We know that a title cannot be passed without a survey; and a lot of inconvenience is caused to the public at the moment. We must know more about the boundaries of the leases.

I raise this problem because I would like to see this Government, or any Government, knuckle down to a long term plan to achieve a better knowledge of the boundaries of the leasehold and freehold properties and also leases under the Mining Act.

For a moment or two I wish to refer to the operations of the organisation known in this State as Wapet—the Western Australian Petroleum Company, which is boring for oil in more than one district in the State. These areas are far apart, particularly in the north-west. The operations of some of the teams were visited by members from both Houses recently. I think it is pertinent to observe and to give credit where it is due. This company has spent £20,500,000 in the search for oil. It has

spent £5,600,000 in one little corner of the State. This expenditure has not been fruitful so far as a commercial discovery is concerned.

There are still many sceptics who say that the company knows much more than it discloses to the world, but this is an attitude which I deprecate and would not support for a moment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Neither would I.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have had the privilege of seeing logs and samples and cores of the impervious material through which, in one drive, the company bored nearly 15,000 ft.; and at that level oil was discovered in the first well put down. However, at every other stab the sands at the same level were dry. This company has put down 90 holes so far to depths of 15,000 ft. The depths have varied according to the nature and structure of the ground that has been encountered.

The company has spent over £1,000,000 on roads in the north, and that is quite apart from tracks. Indeed, their contribution as a spending power would be in excess of the complete Public Works programme in the north-west of Australia until the Ord River project was commenced. So we cannot carelessly or in any cavalier fashion disregard the importance of the work being done. This work was done after considerable expense to the State Government and after collaboration with notable people as to the best prospects for boring for oil in the north-west.

I raise this point to pay tribute to this company which is at the moment employing nearly 300 men in the north-west of Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am very pleased to hear you talking in this vein. That company is doing a creditable job.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I never talk in any other way.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I think we all endorse the remarks by Mr. Wise.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I now wish to refer to something which shocked many of us this morning when we read of the drain on the railway finances of the State. There had been no prior warning of the seriousness of this drain. As I have mentioned previously when speaking to similar Bills, it would assist the thinking of those of us who study financial trends and State finances if we could return to the monthly statement of accounts as of yore. The condition of the railways, unfortunately, has been progressively made much of by the present Government in an endeavour to glamorise, and give full voice to, the enormous improvements in the railways.

Without any doubt, in my view, these improvements were initiated by no-one other than the previous Minister for Railways, The Hon. H. C. Strickland. He was the

one who faced all the odium and all the difficulties of putting the railways on a firm basis. But we have, until recently, seen almost sickening references to the enormous improvements in railway finances because of certain action by the present Government. I want to dispel that notion, at the same time deploring that this drain has occurred. It shows one can take too much unction to one's self long before such unction is warranted; and that is the situation as I see it with the railways.

The second reference in this morning's paper which gives us food for thought and shows that we are a long way from being out of the woods is the ability of the £50,000,000 or more worth of capital satisfactorily to earn all that such capital requires.

I did not wish to be ungenerous in my comments when I referred politically to it just now, but I simply draw attention to the fact that the position of the railways is not as good as we were led to believe it was in its progressive improvement because of the adjustments that were faced up to by the previous Government. There is no doubt that the Grants Commission will have something to say later on on this subject; and it is pertinent to observe that in this morning's paper also was an intimation that the special grants to Western Australia, under section 96 of the Constitution, will be £5,900,000, and £172,000 as a final grant for 1961-62. Last year's figure was in the vicinity of £6,120,000.

The Grants Commission has been for this State not quite a fairy godfather, but a basis for adjustment with the full force and weight of constitutional authority, and it has given to this State in serious times some measure of justice as between a claimant State and a standard State. Prior to the alteration of the formula, and prior to the alteration of the methods, which alteration was made in recent years, the Grants Commission used to weigh in all sorts of different ways certain amounts for the disabilities of this State, and as members who have studied the subject will recall from the initial days—from the days when Mr. Eggleston was chairman—right through until now, the questions of disabilities have been weighed in some form or another.

But there is one aspect, in spite of the enormity of the task with which the Commission is faced which I think we as State people, people belonging to a claimant State, have a right to make unfavourable comment upon. The Grants Commission, while not usurping any authority, because tremendous power is vested in it, has given unto itself the right to criticise a State such as Western Australia for not doing something—for not levying a toll, or raising a tax which is not kindred to a tax in a State where the comparison is entirely irrelevant.

I am often prompted to think, although I have had many years—I think nearly 13—in one Government or another, that Governments should—and I still think this way—resist the direction of the Grants Commission about having to pay a penalty if, within the policy of the Government, something which creates a deficiency in the State is considered to be in the best interests of the whole of the people.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: You might run the risk of one-armed bandits.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: No, never with any approval of mine.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Heaven forbid.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Take the position in New South Wales.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, but I think the honourable member will concede the point I am trying to make that there are many things as between States which are not and never can be parallel.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I hope we never become parallel with them in respect of the one-armed bandits.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Leaving the one-armed bandits aside altogether, I have heard the parking meters of the Perth City Council called one-legged bandits, which I believe they are in very truth.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I understand that some people cannot leave them aside.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: However, I firmly draw attention to the fact that I think anyone associated with the finances of the State could be, and should be, in a position to rebel against the finicky detail which, in every Grants Commission report, is raised against one of the two claimant States; and because they are out of plumb with their social services, or some other matter they should be penalised against the standard States and the amount deducted from their total grants.

Possibly, however, with their magnanimous attitude on other points, the details are made up; but I raise the aspect that although the members of the Grants Commission are not taking unto themselves any ungiven authority, I think it is becoming almost a borderline matter in regard to instructing a State on something which is very important to it as a matter of Government policy. I sympathise with Governments who feel that they must bow or be penalised.

That is all I wish to say on the Bill, and I will conclude by saying that I am fully conscious of the great contribution the Grants Commission has made, and the remarkable work and research in which it has engaged, but I think these minor inequities are most important to the smooth government of a State such as Western Australia.

Sitting suspended from 6.7 to 7.30 p.m.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [7.30 p.m.]: I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to mention two matters, both of which are of extreme importance. The first concerns the flooding of the Moore River, the town of Moora, and the land adjacent to the river on both sides, particularly on the west side, down as far as the Gillingarra section.

For a number of years—I do not know how long this dates back—the Moore River has flooded at various times, and on some occasions three or four times in one year, to the extent that half the township of Moora was under water to a depth of more than 12 inches. The flats which embrace the farm lands further south also became inundated with water to a depth in places of two or three feet, and in some other places to a depth of four feet. It is therefore easy for us to realise that something should be done to alleviate the position.

I am aware that this Government and those in the past have taken steps to ease the position—I give credit to this Government as well as to previous Governments for such action—but to my mind what they did was only to toy with the whole situation.

The other day I asked some questions in this House to enable me to obtain figures to make a comparison between the flow of the Moore River and that of the Avon River. I do not know to what extent the Avon River floods, or to what extent the houses and farm lands adjacent to that river are affected; but I do not think they are affected nearly as much as houses in Moora and farm lands south of Moora are affected, otherwise we would have heard more about the flooding of the Avon River.

The Moore River drains an area of 2,340 square miles, whereas the Avon drains an area of 18,950 square miles, or eight times as great an area. The area drained by the Moore River has an average rainfall of 17 inches a year, whereas the area drained by the Avon River has an annual rainfall of only 14 inches; so the Avon River must carry a greater amount of water in normal circumstances, than the Moore River, but, of course, the Avon River is so much larger and is able to cope with the greater flow of water; that is, with the exception of flood periods.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Was the position not as bad 20 odd years ago?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: This year was an exceptional one but the flooding was just as bad as in former years. On this occasion the Moore River flooded twice, and the height of the floodwater was just as high as it was in 1927; so the position has not improved.

The training of the Moore River has been going on for quite a number of years; I can recall for at least 20 years. When I made inquiries as to the amount of money spent by the Government in

training this river I found that only £4,183 had been made available to the Moora Road Board, now the Moora Shire Council. The Victoria Plains local authorities, between them, have contributed £1,105, making in all a total of approximately £5,700 over a period of 20 years. It is not difficult to realise that a sum of £400 or £500 spent each year on training the river would be used in the main for taking a plant up there, and for bringing it back again. It is illogical and rather stupid to tackle the job in this way, and the Government should be prepared to make available sufficient money to complete the job in one operation.

Recently I made an inspection of a bridge in my province, because I, with other members, received a message that it was inadequate for the purpose it was intended to serve. I was told that this bridge had been covered by four feet of floodwater 10 days at a time, so that traffic could not make use of it. That happened on five occasions this year. Similarly, farms nearby were affected.

During my inspection I was taken up the river, although I had been up that river three times. I found 200 yards of the river to be clear with nothing obstructing the flow of water, but in the next mile the river was like a jungle, similar to those found in tropical countries, and the water had no chance of flowing quickly. It is my claim that the Government, in training the Moore River north of Gillingarra, hastened the flow of water down from Moora, and so increased the potential flooding of the area south. If the river had been trained where it starts to dip away at Gillingarra, and where there is a good fall, the flow of water would be continuous and there would be less likelihood of floods.

At present there is no possible chance for the Moore River to carry the water it is called upon to carry in a heavy winter, unless some considerable thousands of pounds are spent and the work is done in one operation, because in my humble opinion, as stated before, piecemeal snagging and training is a waste of time and money.

The bridge which I mentioned as being under four and a half feet of water this year is a small one. My lay mind, as I am not an engineer, cannot follow the reasoning in the planning of this bridge. It seems obvious that it is unable to allow the flow of the river, particularly in flood periods.

In my view this bridge causes obstruction to the river, because it is built practically at the bottom end where the flow is very slow and the fall very gradual. Until a larger bridge is established, and the water has a greater opportunity to flow away, the area will always be subjected to flooding.

I am aware that a Government survey party is undertaking a survey in the area, and that it will report to the Minister before very long. I hope the Minister in this House will bring this matter to the attention of the Minister for Works, and the Government, to see if more money can be made available to train this river, so as to alleviate flooding in the township of Moora and the land south of it.

The other point I wish to mention concerns farm labour, and the training of aboriginal youths—particularly boys—to take their place in the community. As a result of a speech I made some time ago, when I suggested that annexes to schools be established as training grounds for young people who wish to take up farming as their way of life, the Minister for Education has since made inquiries as to the possibility of establishing them. I understand he has requested his departmental officers to submit practical ideas on the establishment of such a school on a small farm close to the city, provided with the necessary implements and stock of all kinds.

Perhaps such a school could be run in conjunction with a high school so that the students would have access to woodwork, plumbing, or welding tuition; or perhaps it could be self-contained where boys could learn farm work. Such a school could be established close to Northam or Geraldton, to enable boys to learn the fundamentals of agriculture, the care of farm machinery, and stock husbandry, so that they would be of some use when they start work on a farm.

At present it is very difficult to obtain any sort of farm labour—whether the labour offering be good or bad. One has to pay anything up to £20 a week for a fully-fledged farm worker of 20 to 21 years of age, even though he might not know much about farming. To encourage such a worker to remain working in the country, he still has to be taught. An employer may engage one of these young men for a period of six months or six weeks, and then find he is of not much use. The employer then lets him go, and sends for a replacement from the labour bureau. This change of labour costs the employee and the employer a half-week's wages.

It seems to be very difficult to obtain a reasonable type of labour; and I feel that the sooner the Government can come to light with a scheme to enable these fellows to put in some initial training in a school or an annexe to an agricultural college or high school in suitable selected areas, the better it will be for all concerned. This country depends so largely upon agriculture that we cannot neglect it.

With regard to the native population, we are educating them as well as possible at present, making educational facilities available; and quite a number of them are responding very well. However, when

they leave school there is no opportunity whatever for them to train in any way, and they go back to their parents. In my opinion, many of these parents are a bad influence upon the children, and we are losing very good talent in regard to farm work. If the Government could pursue a policy whereby not only the young boys, but also the young girls could be given some tuition in the way of life they may prefer to follow, we would have many good useful citizens from that particular population.

I commend these two items to the Minister in the hope that the Government in future planning will make provision for many thousands of pounds to be set aside for them.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (West) [7.47 p.m.]: I feel that the time has arrived when the Government and members should give urgent attention to the proposal to introduce decimal currency into Western Australia, and to the various problems associated with that introduction.

On the 7th April last the Treasurer (Mr. Holt) announced that conditionally on the national mint at Canberra being completed on schedule late in 1964, the Government was working towards a changeover to decimal coinage in February, 1966. That move conforms completely with world thinking. After New Zealand converts to decimal currency in July, 1967, the only major country in the world which will not have decimal coinage will be the United Kingdom. There the Government has approved its introduction in principle, and has appointed a committee which will advise on the best way to make the changeover from the present system.

The decision to introduce decimal currency has not been taken lightly. As far back as 1822 Governor Brisbane considered the introduction of decimal currency and thought that he should move to have it introduced. A Select Committee of the Federal Government recommended decimalisation in 1902; and a Royal Commission on banking in 1937 made a similar recommendation.

The present move stems from a committee called The Decimal Currency Committee established by the Federal Government in February, 1959. It submitted its report to the Government in 1960. The move by the Treasurer gave us almost three years from that time, but it will not be long before we will only have two years left.

I would suggest to members that the time will travel very quickly and we have to start to move now so that when the introduction does come we will not be found lacking. Already we have had visits to Western Australia by representatives of various banks which will be affected by the changeover; and they are starting to make

preparations. I know, of course, that the Government has men employed on this matter, but I feel that the preparations will have to be speeded up or the time will come when we will be found wanting.

The decimal notation, or the denary notation as it is sometimes called, has been in general use throughout the world for centuries. It is not the most satisfactory method mathematically. Many leading mathematicians feel that almost any system bar the nonal system involving nine could be as good as, or even better than, the decimal system. However, as most countries are already committed to decimal currency, a change to a different form would be so expensive that it would not be considered by the Government.

The Australian Decimal Currency Committee has not minimised the immense task of converting to the new currency. There are going to be endless difficulties. First there will be the re-training of staff. Members can just imagine the work which will be entailed in training the staff of any business or institution—Government or private—which is a big employer of labour. There will be the alteration or replacement of the various forms, statements, invoices, and other commercial documents which play their part in our life.

Also to be considered is the replacement and conversion of all machines. Some of them I can mention, such as the adding and accounting machines, cash registers, electric petrol pumps, price-computing scales, punch card tabulators, franking machines, cheque writings, ticket-issuing machines, and even our local parking meters. In the Postmaster-General's Department, of course, there are coin attachments associated with our public phones, and there are the stamp vending machines which are part and parcel of the organisation of a post office.

I would draw the attention of members to the difficulties which are going to be encountered by our shop assistants in retail stores. During the changeover period there is going to be the problem of the two currencies, so we will probably witness in every retail store notices in two currencies to help buyers and also the shop assistants in determining the price and then the registering of it on their cash registers.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The 19s. 11d. will have to disappear, I should think.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I should think so, too. The report issued by the committee said that the list of difficulties is almost endless. Now, there is going to be a considerable readjustment of prices in the changeover and we might as well have a look, at this stage, at the system the Commonwealth Government has decided to introduce.

There are 138 systems of decimal currency in the world and of those systems the Australian committee has recommended the 10s. or cent system. Instead of the present pound we will use the dollar which was originally called a royal. This will be the equivalent of 10s. and it will become the basic unit. This has many advantages, of course. The present 2s. will be a 20 cent piece; the 1s. will be 10 cents; and the 6d. will be 5 cents. In these circumstances there is an equal number of cents and the same relationship between those coins as there is in our present currency.

There is a major disadvantage and I ask members to have a very good look at it. The new value of a cent will be 1.2 pence; that is, the 12 pence divided by 10. We can see its implications. Let us take, first of all, our daily paper, which is at present fourpence. If the price is to be changed it can be changed to four cents or three cents. If it is changed to four cents it will be the equivalent of 4.8 pence, which is a rise in the cost of the morning paper of 20 per cent. If the newspaper company decides it will change the price to three cents—which I think is most unlikely—it will go down to 3.6 pence and there will be a corresponding loss to the company of between 10 and 16 per cent.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: They would not be losing much at that, would they?

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: We will be able to put .8 pence tax on them. It would be handy for the Treasury.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: We could do something like that. This is the disadvantage which must be envisaged. In the ordinary articles we use in the home—the basic articles like milk and bread—the customary rises have been, generally, a halfpenny or a penny. The smallest rise that can take place under the new currency—I would much rather there be a decrease in the price—would be the equivalent of one cent which is 1.2 pence. That rise is something we will have to face up to.

Without labouring the point, I would suggest that we have to face up to the fact that when decimal currency is introduced, inflation will, as usual, rear its head and we will have to do something to keep prices within compass.

We could overcome some of those difficulties by introducing a half cent piece, but of course there are so many difficulties associated with it and so many alterations would have to be made to the machines, if fractions were involved, that it has been decided not to introduce the half cent.

There are a number of benefits which will accrue from the introduction of this system. There will be a more versatile use of office machines. There will be less likelihood of office errors. There will be

fewer manual operations necessary, and much simpler calculations will be involved. There will be more streamlined accounting procedures generally.

It has been estimated by the committee which has carried out very thorough investigations, that in the Victorian State Electricity Commission alone there will be a saving annually of the equivalent of 16,000 man hours. Members can see the problems which will arise from this; one problem which already exists is that of automation. The Commonwealth Department of Customs and Excise will save time on each operation of which there are about 750,000 a year.

The committee unanimously decided that despite the inconveniences which will arise in the changeover, the conversion from our present coinage to decimal currency will be well worth while. It is estimated the changeover which will cost the Commonwealth—which includes public and private businesses—the equivalent of more than £30,000,000. It is also estimated that the annual saving which will be pretty hard to calculate because it will be spread over all the activities in the Commonwealth, will be £6,000,000. Therefore, if things continue as they are, within five years the conversion will have paid for itself and then the country will begin to enjoy the profits which will accrue.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We will have to make the same economic adjustments that other countries must have made when they changed over.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I would say to the Minister that all countries which have made such a changeover encountered all types of difficulties, and so also will we; and we will overcome them in the same way as they did.

The Commonwealth Government will benefit most by the savings; and in particular it will benefit because the new alloys will be minted more cheaply than are the present ones. I will not go into the various factors which will bring that about, but will just make the statement, which is perfectly true.

So, from the benefits that the Commonwealth Government is going to get, I hope the Education Department will derive some advantage. It will be necessary for considerable research to be undertaken by the Education Department, and it will be necessary for the department to train its teachers at in-service courses; and it will have to provide new text books when the changeover in currency takes place.

I consider it most desirable that some of the savings which the Commonwealth Government will make shall be devoted to recouping the States for the expense in which they will be involved, and that in subsequent years the profit that the Commonwealth will be making shall be channelled into education; because I have

always felt that if there was one avenue which would benefit by increased efficiency and by having more money spent on it, it is education.

Perhaps I could give the new items of currency with their equivalent value, in cents. Ten shillings will equal 100 cents; 5s. will equal 50 cents; 2s. will be 20 cents; 1s. will be 10 cents; and 6d. will be five cents. Then there will be a 2 cent piece and a 1 cent piece. That should cater for all the small transactions we will find in our ordinary way of life.

Finally, I would say this: The committee has carried out extensive tests in order to make sure its predictions are correct, and as a result of one test the following time savings were made: for ordinary straight-adding, 22 per cent.; for card-punching, 9 per cent.; where there are two operations like multiplication and checking, 22 per cent.; adding and calculating—that is, manual operations—32 per cent.; and when only multiplication is involved, 43 per cent.

I repeat, that the estimated saving to the Commonwealth will be the equivalent of £6,000,000 a year. So I feel that the changeover is going to be of considerable advantage and benefit to this country. I consider that now is the time when we have to gear up the changeover process to see that when the moment arrives in February, 1966, we are ready to go ahead.

The other point I would make before I resume my seat is that in all parts of the world a changeover to decimal weights and measures is considered to be completely out of the question at present, and it will be a long time before any country will think of introducing decimal weights and measures.

I commend my remarks to members for their close scrutiny and study, and I feel that if we move now we will be well advanced in our thinking and our preparations when February, 1966, comes.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [8.4 p.m.]: I support the Bill, and my contribution to the debate will concern a matter affecting my province. I wish to deal with the Spearwood, Hamilton Hill, Jandakot and Mandogalup areas. Some people living within five miles of Fremantle and some who live within a mile of a water main and electricity extensions—and at times some who live even closer—are denied these essentials: water and electricity.

With the introduction of trace elements into modern fertilisers, land in these areas that was left idle for many years has come into production. Virtually any type of crop can be grown successfully on this land now, yet the available water is undrinkable; it is a filthy brown fluid which, in most cases, not even the stock will drink. Electricity is also necessary so that people can have some amenities in their homes.

I consider that two Government departments—the State Electricity Commission and the Water Supply Department—should carry out surveys in this area and progressively extend their mains and lines to the land which has been settled. If they like to carry out the surveys, they will find that thousands of acres of land will be brought into production.

Several weeks ago the Minister for Police was deputising for the Minister for Local Government, and he, as a guest of the Cockburn Shire Council, made a tour of this area. He was astounded to see the progress that was being made, and he was also astounded to note the very primitive conditions I am mentioning.

I ask the Government to give earnest consideration to bringing these departments together so that they can act simultaneously to make a survey to see whether it is possible to provide these extensions for the benefit of the district.

When we have a look at the area so close to the port—three to seven miles away—and then we look at the advancement and growth that has taken place at beach resorts, where roads have been constructed and electricity made available, even before the blocks were sold—and the blocks do not produce anything—we can realise just what the position is. These resorts are purely holiday resorts. A good example is an area south of Mandurah—and an area north of Mandurah—where thousands of blocks have been sold, and where the amenities are there for the people before they buy the land. But if anyone wants to go in for primary production he has to battle for many years under primitive conditions, and he has to fight to have water and electricity connected to his property; and when the connections are made, they are provided under a guarantee system whereby he has to pay £20 or £30 a year in excess of the normal rate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What water supply is at Mandurah?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I did not say there was a water supply at Mandurah.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said, services.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Electricity is there.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is one service.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is there; but I could take the Minister to a place four miles from Fremantle where there is no electricity; and at least people can drink the water that is available at Mandurah.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The reason I asked is that the Mines Department is drilling there.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It cannot have fluoride in it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: According to the notice paper, that is the next Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The only animal life which enjoys the water in the areas of which I am speaking is frogs and mosquitoes.

The only other matter I wish to mention—and I trust the Minister for Justice will have a close look at it—concerns the high pressure selling of goods. I noticed in the *Daily News* last night that the Victorian Government is introducing an amendment to its hire purchase legislation to include a provision whereby all contracts made as a result of high pressure salesmanship at doors—it is called the “cooling-off” clause, I believe—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is a new Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Under the provision being introduced into the Victorian Parliament, if within three days of signing a contract the person wants to repudiate it, he tears off a portion of the contract and returns it to the seller and the contract is then not enforceable.

I do not suppose there is one member in the Chamber who has not had the experience during the last few years of his constituents complaining of the tactics employed by high pressure salesmen—very low tactics in most cases. Therefore, I trust that even at this late stage of the session, the Minister will have a look at the Victorian legislation to see whether it is possible to introduce it here.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I have already had a look at the proposition. I will tell you something about it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I certainly hope the Minister will introduce the necessary legislation during this session of Parliament.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [8.12 p.m.]: My main reason for rising tonight is because I had thought of asking several questions. Recently I made a trip to Esperance in company with our good old friend, the ex-Minister for Justice (Mr. Nulsen) and several propositions were put to me. I thought that by speaking on the Supply Bill tonight I could better put them up to the different departments than by asking questions.

As members know, this district is advancing rapidly. I suppose it would be growing faster than any other part of Australia; but it lacks many of the amenities that are required to keep labour, and other people, in the area. I heard Mr. Jones mention the shortage of farm labour, and that exists in the Esperance district, too.

I want to know if the Government would consider making a long-term loan to the Esperance district. It could be a free-of-interest loan or a loan based on a very small percentage. On account of the

advancement of this area and the delay in regard to town planning, people have not been able to build homes there. Also, because of the town planning scheme coming into operation shortly and funds not being available—as the Minister for Local Government would know—the shire council has been taxed very heavily; and not only the Esperance Shire Council but others in different areas. If the Government sees fit to give the Esperance Shire Council this money and allow it to improve the town to catch up with what is taking place in the outlying areas, great improvements would come about in the district.

As members know, the people, in these far-flung areas have to face many hardships. At the moment, for example, there is no dentist available in the Esperance district and many other remote towns in the goldfields districts are suffering from a lack of dental services. In view of this need, only recently the mobile dental clinic paid a visit to the districts to perform very necessary dental services.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They should fluoridate their water supplies.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: If the people there are desirous of fluoridation they can agree to it by referendum. The people in the Esperance district have now to make an appointment with a dentist, either in Kalgoorlie or in Perth, for themselves or their children. One such trip alone would be very expensive, but when a person's teeth requires several fillings the cost becomes prohibitive because many trips have to be made either to Kalgoorlie or Perth.

I suggest that the Government could either rent or purchase a building in Esperance and equip it with a view to encouraging a young dentist fresh from the University to conduct a dental clinic in that district. The expenditure incurred by the Government could, perhaps, be recouped from the dentist by payments extended over a long term. If the Government could not see its way clear to approve of this suggestion, perhaps it could establish a Government clinic and appoint a dentist to serve in that area.

Before I retire as a member of this House I would also like to see the history of the goldmining industry and the out-back districts recorded. All the people of Western Australia owe a great debt to the goldmining industry. Its commencement was in 1893, and I arrived in Kalgoorlie in 1896. I have lived there ever since and I would be one of half a dozen pioneers who have resided continuously in that town. One of these men who is residing there at present is a retired geologist with outstanding ability and an excellent education. He knows every part of the goldfields and every goldmining centre in the State. That man is Mr. Spencer Compton, who is extremely well known,

and who, at the moment, is president of the Eastern Goldfields Historical Society. He writes many articles and features for the newspapers. I do not think anyone would have a greater knowledge of the goldmining industry of this State.

As Mr. Compton is now retired and is a pensioner, I would like to see the State Government advance him a sum of money for his services in writing a history of the goldmining industry of Western Australia.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Have you made a request?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I have made many requests over many years, but I do not seem to make much progress.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: The world is "agin" you.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Well, I am still going to battle on as I have done in the past. Mr. Compton was in Southern Cross in 1893, and I can assure the Government that he is fully acquainted with the goldmining history of this State. I know the Minister has taken a great interest in this industry, and I feel sure he would be pleased to see all the past events of the goldmining industry recorded.

Gold production has played an important part in the development of Western Australia, and I therefore hope that the Government will grant some concession to the mines which are still in existence and which are handicapped with high costs of production. The concessions I am referring to are in regard to the proposed increase in freight charges. I hope that these mines will be granted some exemption, because at the moment they are operating on extremely small margins.

The Gold Mines of Kalgoorlie company, which recently took over the Mt. Charlotte lease in Kalgoorlie, will be operating that mine in February or March of next year. The lode is producing only a few dwt. to the ton, and the 700 tons of ore which is to be mined daily will have to be carted three miles to the company's treatment plant. This plant, valued at thousands of pounds, has been purchased from America. The company's existing charges are extremely high, and if it has to bear further freight charges, I feel sure it will greatly disadvantage its operations.

At the moment approximately 25,000 people are residing in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. Not all of them are working on the mines, but I think I can safely say that 90 per cent. of them are dependent on the goldmining industry. The population at the goldmining centres of Southern Cross and Coolgardie is rapidly dwindling and eventually they will become ghost towns similar to Bullfinch, which, up to about 12 months ago, was a thriving goldmining centre. If there is no further goldmining activity at these centres, the population will comprise only pastoralists

and farmers. Further, if the mines at present operating had to close down I do not know what the Government would do with the men who became unemployed, because at present Western Australia has a high unemployment rate.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: You said that there were about 25,000 people employed at Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Yes, that is correct.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: You were born there, were you not?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did I not understand you to say that there was a shortage of labour at Esperance?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I said there was a shortage of labour in all farming districts throughout the State. The main deterrent in those parts is that there are no amenities offering for the people who work there. As a result—which is only natural—most people want to work in the metropolitan area where they can enjoy all the facilities that are offering. In the country districts the people have a hard life. They are forced to suffer many hardships.

I would also like to see the Government pay more attention to the provision of homes for the aged on the goldfields. There is one such home in existence at the moment which was provided by the people of Kalgoorlie. Mr. Teahan, other goldfields members, and myself have assisted towards the establishment of this home for the aged people on the goldfields. But more such institutions are required. Every week in the metropolitan area one reads reports of flats, homes and institutions being built for the aged. I wish those people the best of luck, but, at the same time, the aged people on the goldfields are also deserving of some consideration in this respect.

The Hon. R. Thompson: There is still a two-year waiting period before one can get into them, though.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Members can well imagine what the position is like on the goldfields. I will be looking for admission to one of these homes for the aged very shortly, but I am afraid I will not be accommodated at Kalgoorlie but will be forced to come to Perth to place my name on the waiting list for admission to one of the homes for the aged in the metropolitan area.

I would remind the members of this House that Esperance enjoys the best climate in Western Australia, so if any member is anxious to take a holiday he should go to Esperance. The Government would be well-advised to establish a home for the aged at Esperance which would serve the people of all the goldfields north

of that centre who had reached retiring age. Such a home would be greatly appreciated by the goldfields' people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And tired members of Parliament.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Another proposal for the future which has caused a great deal of discontent in Coolgardie is the announcement that the standard gauge railway will bypass Coolgardie. According to the recent survey, the railway will go through Parkeston, Lamington, and direct to Kununoppin. I fully realise that if we desire an efficient railway service it should follow the best route possible. I also realise that if the new route is followed, many steep grades and a great deal of work will be avoided. Nevertheless, the foundations for that line, the telegraph line, and the pipeline run parallel to that centre.

With the aid of modern appliances and equipment the grades could be lessened if the line still passed through Coolgardie and a good railway for the future could be provided. In my opinion, if the railway is routed according to the new survey it will run through the district eight miles from Coolgardie and great expense will be incurred as a result of shifting the pipeline and the telegraph line. Further, the people who are now dependent on the railway on the existing route, will be forced to have their foodstuffs and other commodities transported by some other means because the standard gauge railway will not be of much use to them.

I would like to see the standard gauge railway run through Coolgardie because that centre was where the second gold discovery in Western Australia was made. It is known as the "Old Camp" and is one of the most outstanding gold mining centres in Western Australia.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.28 p.m.]: In supporting the second reading of this Supply Bill, which seeks to provide £22,000,000 to the Government, I wish to speak on three matters. Before doing so, I want to make it quite clear that tonight I will be speaking from a State point of view, because apparently the Ministers are of the opinion that every time I rise to my feet I am criticising one of their departmental officers.

I realise that the Metropolitan Town Planning Scheme is now almost a *jait accompli*. However, over the past three years I have been concerned in regard to the construction of the western switch road which will extend from the Narrows Bridge through the city and down George Street. Having travelled on the overway from Coogee, Sydney, where the road has been routed through a solid hill of granite, I discovered that the people of Sydney found it quite practicable to do that to

enable free access to the North Shore Bridge. Therefore, I am still unable to understand why the Main Roads Department, which has been influenced by American advice on these matters, still insists on putting through a cutting from the top of St. George's Terrace so that the western switchroad can be built.

On page 55 of the latest report of the Main Roads Department issued to us a few days ago there is a picture of the proposed cutting. I know a plan and a model have been in the corridors of this House for some time, and that the plan will take some shaking or alteration. I am still of the opinion however, that if in Sydney they could cut a tunnel through granite, it should be possible to go underground through sand across St. George's Terrace.

I know from my own experience while working underground in the mines that there are vast stopes in some mines with very little timber to support those stopes. I hope the Press of this State will publish this picture for the people to see, because despite the fact that we are told by the Minister, and by the Department of Town Planning, that there has been plenty of time—about five or six years—for people to study the town planning of this State, a map of which is on the Table of the House now, I am sure that a great number of people do not know that there is to be an open cut across Malcolm Street at the top of St. George's Terrace on to George Street. Malcolm Street will have a bridge across that open cut. We will have the road going underneath Hay Street, which will have to be raised approximately 8 ft. It will then continue across Murray Street, over Wellington Street, and thence over the railway line.

I have no complaint with that portion of the plan, but why should we completely isolate Parliament House from the rest of the city by an open cut at the foot of it? It is beyond my comprehension as an ordinary citizen why this should be done. I am not an engineer, but I am satisfied that there is no reason why we cannot have George Street in a similar position to that in which it is at the moment by building a concrete tunnel.

The picture to which I have referred shows Parliament House to be completely isolated. At the foot of the hill there is a drop of about 30 ft. to 45 ft., and the open cut that is to go across George Street and Malcolm Street is one that should not be allowed, particularly when it affects a scenic site such as that at the top of St. George's Terrace, which is unequalled in Australia.

I am sure no other Government body in Australia would have been allowed to get away with this. We have a picture of Malcolm Street crossing the road over the top of a six-laneway with two slip roads, and proceeding through an open cut at

the bottom of the Public Works Department buildings. I have drawn attention to this fact for no other reason than that my comprehension of the situation is that it is so unnecessary; that it could easily be avoided; and that the area of land at the bottom of the Public Works Department could still be used as an access through to Parliament House, instead of completely isolating it.

Having said that, I repeat again that I am not attacking any departmental engineers, or anybody else; I am merely attacking a system which allows the desecration of one of the most magnificent sites in Western Australia. There are few views like it in Australia. I hope the map will be published. I do not know whether anything I can say will alter this in any way, but I did feel it ought to be mentioned. When one considers that in Japan one can travel 11 miles under the sea on a beautiful bus service, it is a little difficult to understand why we cannot build a tunnel in a sandy patch extending from 5 to 20 chains near the Public Works Department.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How far?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I said it could be a distance of 5 to 20 chains. I am referring to the southern boundary of Mount Street to Hay Street. That is where the cutting is to be. The plan is there, and I am referring to the report of the Main Roads Department. Having referred to that matter, I would now like to touch on a further question which I feel is of great import not only to Western Australia, but to Australia as a whole.

I wish to quote a couple of items from the *Australian Quarterly* of March, 1963, published by the Australian Institute of Political Science under the heading "Collusive or Level Tendering and Public Authorities." Every time we ask for money in this Chamber, or in another place, to build more schools, roads, water supplies, or to provide more electricity, we are everlastingly told that there is no money beyond that which comes from the Commonwealth. I believe a great amount of money could be saved if we could do away with this system which has developed in Australia; and there is no doubt that it is continuing to develop, because it has developed to such an extent that an organisation like the Institute of Political Science publishes articles dealing with it.

I believe that the cost to local government and to the State is tremendous in relation to what is going on in the matter of collusive tendering. We know that in the oil industry, for example, there is a set price for petrol at all main points of delivery intrastate. From places like Kalgoorlie and Fremantle there must be a basic price. When the P.M.G.'s Department requires petrol it does not have to

pay tax; nor does the military. But when the Government requires petrol for the transport of its buses, etc., it must pay high taxation on that petrol.

The situation arises where the oil companies have a system of monthly deliveries. It is possible that B.P. will deliver one month, Shell in another month, and so on. I am not objecting to that sort of tendering. But when it comes to the point where local government is concerned, we find that the amount of collusive tendering has reached an astronomical figure. I would like to quote from page 17 of the report which says—

Collusive tendering is that particular set of restrictive trading practices whereby "competing" firms seek to eliminate any element of price competition through prior agreement on the tender price to be offered. Thus a pre-arranged set of bids is presented to the tendering company or authority; either they are identical in their price quotations (level tendering); or a previously selected company or companies, presents a markedly lower bid than any other. Hence the main objective of tendering procedures—to ensure that contracts are awarded on a competitive basis to the most efficient supplier—is undermined from the start.

The extent to which collusive tendering is practiced in Australia is a source of great concern particularly to public authorities. The volume of complaints over the last 5-6 years from municipal and shire councils, from State government departments and from semi-governmental authorities has been consistently high. Moreover, Commonwealth government departments have not been immune. During the last two years, in preparation for the long-awaited Federal legislation on restrictive practices and monopolies, an inter-departmental committee has succeeded in building up a voluminous dossier of level-tendering practices and incidents directed against Commonwealth supply authorities.

The second part I wish to quote reads as follows:—

Level tendering is not, of course, a practice directed solely at public authorities. The private sector of the economy also suffers when tenders are called for supplies, fuel, constructional materials, buildings, etc. On the other hand, although they are not willing to discuss this matter, there are some reasons for believing that companies are less subject to level tendering and that most of this practice is concentrated on the purchasing activities of the various types of public authority.

In the first place public authorities, by law, or by virtue of long established public service policy, must call for tenders when purchasing supplies over a certain value.

From speaking to secretaries in the shires concerned in my own electorate I know that on many occasions when they call for tenders for materials or services, they generally know the tender price before the tender is called. To continue—

Broadly speaking, members of a trade association which practices "commercial regulation" or "orderly marketing" are under an obligation always to consult with fellow members on the terms to be offered for any tender under consideration. This consultation may easily be accomplished by a series of telephone calls to the known likely co-tenderers. Alternatively, there may be an automatic procedure if the goods in question are standard products such as motor spirit, bitumen, fencing wire, spare parts, cement, tyres, paper products, electric lamps, or cables. There is likely to be an already agreed retail price or wholesale price; and the appropriate discount for public authorities (if there is one) is simply deducted regardless of the quantity involved.

Just before I close, there is another section which I wish to quote which reads as follows:—

Consider, for example, the negotiating successes of the British electrical authorities in purchasing electrical generating and transmission equipment (Monopolies Commission, the *Supply and Export of Electrical Machinery and Allied Plant* Chapters 9 and 26). By insisting on an examination of the costs of the level tendering companies they secured reductions in price ranging from 5-12 per cent. on contracts totalling over £20 million per annum in the 1950's. These prices were substantially lower than what could be obtained by overseas purchasers including Australian authorities. Another example, the writers have knowledge of one set of negotiations which, over a period of years, reduced the price of a drug to Australian authorities by over 30 per cent.!

I am drawing attention to this fact because, like Mr. Dolan when he spoke to-night in regard to decimal coinage, I believe the situation so far as collusive tendering is concerned is most costly to State Governments, local authorities, and to private industry itself. I do not know whether my voice will have any effect, but I want it to be made public that I, as a public man, am concerned about collusive tendering. I feel that the big organisations that practice this type of thing will not take much notice of Fred Lavery; but I feel some publicity should be given to the

matter. Therefore, I have drawn attention to the fact in the hope that some action will be taken by the Government, through its Department of Industrial Development, to use its influence in an endeavour to stop this practice.

There is one more matter about which I wish to speak. It is something that has been dear to my heart for some considerable time. When the Prime Minister (the Rt. Honourable Sir Robert Menzies) went to England, one of the things he did was select a Governor-General for Australia. I want to be very careful that I do not offend anybody in regard to this because I have nothing against Lord de Lisle, or against Major-General Sir Douglas Kendrew, who will be arriving in a few days' time. I am concerned about the statement Sir Robert Menzies made when he said that there were no people in Australia who were suitable to occupy this very high position.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Only him!

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I have a book here entitled *Who's Who in Australia* 1962, and from this book one could choose hundreds of men who would be suitable to occupy the position of Governor-General of Australia. I would point out that Sir Charles Gairdner, while he was here, was probably one of the most popular governors we ever had, and when Sir Douglas arrives in a few days time I will be introduced to him, as will other members, and I will welcome him and extend to him all the loyalty I can. It is my intention to quote to the House the details of one gentleman whose name appears in this book in order to provide an answer to the statements made by Sir Robert Menzies and by The Hon. David Brand that there are no suitable men in Australia who could occupy this position.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did The Hon. David Brand say that? Do you say the Premier said that nobody was suitable?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Premier had to go home to England to select a Governor because there was nobody suitable in Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He did not say that.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would like to quote the following from pages 253 and 254 of the book I previously mentioned:—

DOWLING, Vice-Admiral Sir Roy Russell, K.B.E., cr. 1957, C.B. 1955, C.B.E. 1953, D.S.O., R.A.N., i.d.c., F.R.G.S. (A), Director Royal Tour of Aust., 1963; Chairman Aust. Chiefs of Staff Cttee. 1959-61 (retd.); First Naval Member and Chief Naval Staff 1955-59; Flag Officer Commdg. Aust. Fleet 1953-54; Second Naval Memb. 1950-53; Dir. of Ord. and Underwater Weapons 1950-52; son of

Russell Dowling, Syd.; b. May 28, 1901, Condong, Tweed River, N.S.W.; ed. Jervis Bay Naval Coll.; R.N. 1919-23; Capt. H.M.A.S. *Swan* 1937-38; Commdr. H.M.S. *Naiad*, Home Fleet (Atlantic) and then Mediterranean Stn. 1939-42; served Crete, Syria, N. African campaign, Malta convoys; *Naiad* sunk Mar. 1942; Dir. of Plans Navy Office Melb. 1942-43; D.C.N.S., Actg. Capt., R.A.N. 1943-44; Capt. R.A.N. 1944, Capt. H.M.A.S. *Hobart* 1944-46, Philippines, Borneo, N. Guinea, Tokyo, for surrender; Japan occupatn. forces; later Capt. H.M.A.S. *Sydney*; m. May 8, 1930, Jess S., d. late George E. Blanch, 2 s. 3 d.; recreations, tennis, golf; club, Navy and Military (Melb.); address, 91 Empire Circuit, Deakin, Canberra.

There are many men in Australia who are nearly the equal of Sir Roy Dowling in public service and who could well fill these important offices.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: How do you know that gentleman didn't refuse the position?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would not know; and so far as Mr. Mattiske is concerned, he would not know whether I know or not. I attended a civic reception at the Fremantle Town Hall, which was in the nature of a farewell to Sir Roy; and all of his prophesies regarding the future of the world, some of the pitfalls that faced Australia, and the international situation have come true. I believe men of his type are fitted to be Governor-General of Australia and certainly the Governor of a State. I say that, because, as a citizen of this State, I regret very much that our Prime Minister and our Premier had to go outside of the State to bring in people who had to be given certain honours before they could fill these prominent positions.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you regret that the Labor Government of Tasmania did the same thing?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: However, I will offer my loyalty to Sir Douglas when he arrives. I support the Bill.

THE HON. D. P. DELLAR (North-East) [8.53 p.m.]: A fortnight ago I was fortunate in being able to take a trip to the north in order to visit the oil fields. Being a mining man, the trip brought to my mind something that has occurred to me for a long time with regard to the goldmining industry. First of all, I would like to congratulate the WAPET oil company for the wonderful work it is doing in the north-west, not only in its own interests but for the benefit of Western Australia. I was able to see what is being done, and was able to form an opinion as

to what can be done. I feel something similar could be done with regard to our goldmining industry.

Quite a number of members have spoken this evening with regard to their electorates and, in the main, they have desired that more money be spent in them. Therefore, there will be not much left for the electorate with which I am concerned in connection with goldmining in the north-eastern and Murchison fields. The only way I can see in which we can develop the mining industry, which is very important not only to Western Australia, but to Australia as well, is first of all to prove further fields in the north-eastern and Murchison goldfields.

I would like to see geologists in the fields at all times; not where mining is at present taking place, but in the new fields. We have the little fellow—we will call him the prospector—moving around fossicking about, but, unfortunately, there are not many of them in the fields that are already developed. Therefore, I think it is time—before it is too late—to have permanent geologists in the fields.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We have got them.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I hope the Minister for Mines does not think I am outspoken on this subject, because I feel the Minister and the Government have done all in their power with the money available. Therefore, I would like to see more money made available to the Minister so that these permanent geologists can be put into the fields.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you know how many geologists we had in 1959, in Government employ? We had 12, and now we have 32.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I am not asking how many geologists are employed by the Government. I would like to see permanent geologists in the fields. I do not mean 10, 15, or 20, but at least two or three at all times.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not practicable.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I am not condemning the Mines Department in any way. In common with a lot of other people, I feel that we will have to start moving now and face up to the fact that the goldmining industry is at a pretty low ebb, apart from three or four major companies. In order to assist the goldmining industry in its further development, I am of the opinion that the prospector should be assisted to the level of the basic wage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are not really serious?

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I am serious; and I will endeavour to tell the Minister how I think it can be carried out.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Look at your friend and see what he thinks of it.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I know the present Government is helping the prospector, but as everyone knows, one cannot live for long on £5 per week.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is that what it is?

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: Life has changed.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Conditions have changed.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: Today we have modern methods of movement; and conditions are very different from the time when one had to use a horse and cart. With a bag of flour and a case of tinned meat, a person could stop in the bush for a month to six weeks.

A prospector must have a vehicle in order to move around. So £5 will not keep a person for long in the bush. Petrol costs from 5s. 6d. to 7s. per gallon, for a start. Where in the past we were paying around £3 to £4 a case for explosives, we now have to pay around £8 or £9.

The Minister said that I was not serious when I referred to the prospector being on the basic wage. I am serious. The whole thing has to be controlled.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you are being serious, then you are just not being realistic.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: Right; then I will carry on. The situation can be controlled by inspectors from the Mines Department. If we are going to pay a man the basic wage to go out into the scrub, then the situation has to be controlled. We have enough inspectors of mines to control it. If an inspector of mines does not know what is a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, then he should not be in his job. However, I know that these inspectors are very capable. If the Minister and the department wish to assist the goldmining industry and wish to open up the north country I hope they will do all they can.

In opening up the north country and in keeping the north country alive, I would like to see far more money being set aside for main roads grants. Better roads would open up the country; also bitumen airstrips. We do not wish to see a repetition of the past winter. The Main Roads Department can assist by allocating more money to provide better roads. Finally, we have our water problems in the back country.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: With fluoride!

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I was hoping that the fluoridation question would be kept out of the discussion for a while. Every time an approach for more water is made to the Water Supply Department, there is a fight. It is like pulling a tooth out of a person's head. The Shire of Kalgoorlie is to be congratulated for creating a lagoon. That was done to provide the children of the north country

with a few of the amenities which the children in the metropolitan area enjoy. Unfortunately, the lagoon will not hold enough water to meet requirements. Playing fields for all types of sports need grassing.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Did the Government play any part in that?

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: Yes; on a pound for pound basis.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How much did it give?

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: £10,000.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not bad, was it?

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: It was a very good effort.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That was the fight you were referring to.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I am not condemning the previous assistance we have received. I am looking for more assistance. I think we are entitled to more.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You said that every time you asked for help there was a fight.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I said it was like pulling a tooth out of a person's head. We have quite a number of playing fields in Kalgoorlie which need grassing. We need to give the children the amenities they deserve. Sporting clubs are doing a lot to improve the situation. We produce a lot of sportsmen on the Goldfields.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You tell that to Mr. Dolan, and see what he says!

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: The lagoon that was created by the shire council, ably assisted by the Government, is not quite adequate.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That's better!

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: Recently the powerhouse on the Goldfields closed down. The turning-off of a tap saved the Water Supply Department millions of gallons of water. The same thing happened at Bullfinch, another mining town that closed down its water supply. That was another saving. I hope something can be done to assist the playing fields of the Goldfields, and that the Government will give us all the assistance it can. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. J. GARRIGAN (South-East) [9.10 p.m.]: As usual, I will be very brief. Firstly, I will cast my mind to that area east of the Darling Range, where the wealth of Western Australia comes from. In that area we have our rural industry, our pastoral industry and our goldmining industry; and I certainly think that is where the wealth of Western Australia lies. Irrespective of whatever Government is in office, I believe that more attention should be paid to those people who live eastwards, northwards, and southwards of those hills.

I have spoken before on the matter of providing assistance for prospectors. I endorse Mr. Dellar's remarks concerning this matter. With all our technicians and with all our latest machinery we should be able to find new shows. Not enough assistance is given to those men who are prepared to go out into the bush and to sacrifice something in order to look for the wealth of Western Australia; and, of course, the goldmining industry is only part of the wealth of this State.

New settlers are coming into Salmon Gums and into other areas of the State. These people have only a limited amount of capital. Our forefathers went into those areas without any capital and the next generation received the benefits. But this is a different generation. There is a lot of wealth in this country, and it should be equally distributed. New settlers should receive the financial assistance necessary to carry them over the early years while developing their farms. These remarks might be directed to the Minister for Local Government, since he is an ex-farmer and he would know all about the hard times that the pioneering people of this country went through.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I certainly do.

The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN: With the closure of various portions of railway line in Western Australia, there is only one answer left: we should have better roads. Gravel roads should be a thing of the past. If we are going to build a road it should be an all-weather road and should be able to carry all kinds of traffic at all times. I am referring to those towns such as Westonia, where the people have to transport their wheat for some 50 miles. Gravel roads are very hard on the vehicles which have to use those roads. I hope the Minister will do his utmost to ensure that the people in those areas are provided with an all-weather road that will last for all time.

Many children in the State have to travel 38 or 40 miles each day along gravel roads to get to school. That is not good enough. Those children have a good bus service, but the roads are poor. Education is essential. I hope the Minister will make every endeavour to have finance made available to ensure that our children can travel along good roads. I speak with all sincerity, and I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [9.15 p.m.]: I will be very brief in what I have to say, although I had intended to speak at length on the question of local government. However, I will leave that matter until later in the session. I saw a statement in the Press last night that the Police Force is to recruit 27 more constables. In this regard I would like to preface my remarks by paying a tribute to one member of the Police Force who is known to me for the good work he has

done in the community. This person has just retired and I should like to pay a tribute to him for the work he has done.

I refer to Inspector Liddelow who is known to his friends as Mick Liddelow. This officer was stationed in the north, south, and eastern parts of the State at various times and over a period of 38 years. I have known him for some years, and since I have had something to do with welfare work I have been able to discover what great work he has done among the native peoples and also in social welfare circles, particularly in conjunction with Alcoholics Anonymous.

I have called on him for help on different occasions and I have never been refused assistance. He has never made the excuse that he was too busy, even when I knew he was busy; and even when he has not been well he has never refused to see me. He has gone out at night to different functions when he could have refused, but he has accepted the invitation in the hope that he would be able to do a good turn for the people in the community. I think a police officer with the record that Inspector Liddelow has is deserving of recognition, and some mention should be made in Parliament regarding those who serve. I wanted to pay this tribute to him and compliment him for the work he has done over the years. I wish him well in his retirement and I know many people in this community are grateful to him for what he has done for them.

Another subject I would like to discuss briefly is the question of youth unemployment. The Labor Party set up a national committee to examine this problem and the leader writer of *The West Australian* on the 8th October referred to the fact that the A.L.P. Federal Executive was endeavouring to do something about the problem. I think it is an indictment against a community when youth cannot obtain employment on leaving school. There are plenty of other types of employment, but at the moment I am talking about youth unemployment because it is having a devastating effect on young people who look for work and are unable to sell their labour at the beginning of their working lives.

We hear a lot about delinquency and the ills of society, but what do we expect? The blame for this position rests fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the elders of the nation—it rests squarely on our own shoulders. It is our fault that there is no employment for the youth of this country.

I have girls and boys coming to me day after day asking for references in an endeavour to obtain work, and it has a terrible effect on them when they are unable to obtain employment. Teenagers leave school full of hope and vigour; they want to go to work and make a career for

themselves, but they are finding that there is no work available to them. Some of them have studied and become experts in a particular field, but when they try to find work they are thrown back, and sometimes girls end up in domestic service doing something they had no intention of doing when they were at school.

Youngsters in this position want to know what is the good of studying and sitting up night after night, or going to night school or the University, if they cannot sell their labour when they have finished their studies. I have no hesitation in blaming any Government in power that allows this rot to set in in the community.

It makes one wonder when one reads the sort of flamboyant articles that the Government has in the Press. I have with me a cutting from *The West Australian*. It states that Senator Henty was at a dinner organised by the Corio Committee of the Liberal Party and at that dinner he said that the economy of this country has never been better. I cannot say what I would like to say to Senator Henty, but I hope he reads my remarks, particularly when I say that there is a lot of untruthfulness in what some members say when they make a public statement like that. In my opinion, things have never been worse in the employment field in Australia than they are today.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Never?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: We do not hear of it, because social service benefits, introduced mostly by Labor Governments through the National Parliament, and meant to be an alleviation during distress, provide people with sufficient to starve respectably but not enough to live on.

People get into debt because they buy articles on time payment. They do this because the people engaged in trade and commerce put these articles in front of their eyes and tell them how easy it is to buy goods on time payment. People see somebody with a particular article and they want to have the same sort of thing, and so it goes on. Many items these days are becoming a necessity in our modern world. We find that in order to keep food it is necessary to have a refrigerator, and so people struggle to buy a refrigerator. Then they want their children to learn music and they struggle to buy a piano, and they struggle to get all the things that other people have.

Teenage children will not stay at home unless there is a TV set in the house. That is the form of entertainment these days, and so it goes on. Many articles which people really cannot afford to buy are bought on time payment because somebody else has the same thing. The people find they cannot get work and they are soon in debt and, as I said, social service payments provide them with sufficient to allow them to starve respectably but not enough to

live on respectably and to meet their commitments in a crisis. It is not one particular person's fault if they cannot get work, but I just want to bring these matters forward to show members what is happening.

I will leave what I was going to say about local government, and particularly the local government franchise which is a baby of mine, as all members know, but I wanted to speak about those few items because I consider they are grave wrongs in our community.

There is one other comment I would like to make. I read in the paper that in three years there will not be any mentally defective children in Claremont; they will be removed to a better institution. When I entered this House a Labor Government was in power and the first matter I placed before the then Minister for Health was the plight of the little boys at Claremont. He immediately made a section of the institution available for those children so that they could be housed and taught.

I know that we have to move slowly in regard to these matters but I do think that as it is nine years since I came to this House something should have been done for the little girls at that institution. When I went there I saw little girls in with the women, and also in other places where they should not be. I know that the present director thinks as I do—and I am not casting any reflection on him because I have not seen him or talked to him about it. But it is not right and this sort of thing should not be tolerated.

If the Government was vigilant enough it could make some section of Claremont available for these female children so that they could be better looked after for the next three years that they have to stay there and some efforts could be made to improve their lives by modern methods and training. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [9.24 p.m.]: There is only one matter which I would like to refer to the Minister and ask him to send on to the appropriate quarters. From time to time I see cases of distress among men who have been injured and who are claiming workers' compensation. In the main I seem to see these cases among migrants, and I refer to two possible types of conditions. One is when an individual has been certified as fit for work yet feels that he is still unable to work and, because of language difficulties, finds it impossible to make himself understood—even with an interpreter it can prove difficult.

Having reached this point he is almost at a deadlock because he does not know where to go. This state of affairs can drift on for some considerable time, and once the insurance company says that it

is not responsible for any further compensation that man must either apply for unemployment relief or sickness benefits.

The second type of case that can occur is where an individual suffers some disability as a result of his work. I do not want to outline the type of condition because it could mislead, or could make clear the particular case to which I am referring. However, if this condition is the result of his work and the condition heals or improves, the individual then searches for the same occupation, that being the only one in which he has been trained. He applies for a job in that field and he obtains it but before long the condition breaks out again and he is out of work once more on compensation. This sort of thing may even happen a third time, and when it does, particularly with migrants who are unable to speak English well, the person concerned is in a very sorry state; because the first company can say to the second or the third, "This has got nothing to do with us"; and the second and third can say, "It has nothing to do with us, it belongs to you and it is your responsibility."

So the argument can go backwards and forwards for quite a long period and the individual and his family have to live on Commonwealth aid. I understand that this sort of thing does not happen only to migrants, but it is much more obvious with migrants. The Australian in the main has a union to whom he can apply for aid and generally unions do assist their members. However, as regards migrants, a number of them, because of the conditions under which they were compelled to exist during war service and during the time of enemy occupation, hesitate to join a union. The result is that when they get into the position to which I have referred they have no one at all to help them and there is no avenue open to them through which they can make a claim.

I suggest that the Minister in charge of the Workers' Compensation Act might look at the position from the point of view of allowing men who are dissatisfied with decisions that have been made by insurance companies, or men who have got into a position where it is a question of debate as to the responsibility between companies, should be able to approach the Workers' Compensation Board, direct, and it then should take over the responsibility of deciding—

(a) whether a man has been fairly treated; and

(b) which company is responsible.

I think the Act wants to be clarified in order to be quite certain for the injured worker which company is responsible for the recurrence of an injury or of a condition which has arisen during the course of his work. I have seen several who

suffered great distress. I trust the Minister will refer this matter to his appropriate colleague. I support the measure.

THE HON. J. D. TEAHAN (North-East) [9.30 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to register a protest against the proposed increase in rail fares applying to country centres. The increases were announced recently, and I believe they are to apply from the 1st November. This matter brought to my mind what was published in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 22nd October. This was what the report stated—

Most 'Fields Holidaymakers to Pay More for Train Travel:

New Schedule of W.A.G.R. Fares in Operation on November 1.

Most goldfields holidaymakers will pay more for their train travel under a new schedule of W.A.G.R. fares which will come into operation from November 1.

Under the schedule, the goldfields workers' concession, used by more than 90 per cent. of local rail travellers during the summer holiday period, has been discontinued.

Before I left the goldfields last week I heard about the proposed increase in rail fares, and about the discontinuance of concessions given to the workers there, but I could not believe what I heard. I regarded them merely as rumours, until I saw the matter published in cold print. The concessions that are to be discontinued have been given to workers for as long as I can remember, and it will be a jolt to them to know that in future they will have to pay more.

Furthermore, it is bad business on the part of the Government to increase rail fares and to discontinue the workers' concessions. People value the concessions very highly, and their discontinuance will cause workers on the goldfields to remain home during their holidays, and to spend what they have saved for their holidays in their home towns. They will have to do that because they will not be able to afford to travel away on their holidays. This would be bad for both the worker and his family, and the Railways Department.

I travel frequently on the trains, and I know from the conversations I overhear that concessional rail travel is highly valued. Many of the workers on the goldfields sum up the position, and they plan their holidays on the basis of concessional travel. The article to which I referred continues—

Single fares have been increased, but in most cases the return fare will be slightly cheaper.

The return second-class fare is now based on the same formula as for the goldfields worker's concession—single fare plus 50 per cent.

Fares To Perth

The new return second-class fare to Perth will be £6/2/3—or 4/5 below the present rate, but an increase of 27/3 on the fare now available with goldfields worker's concession.

In addition, sleeping berth charges have been increased from 11/- per sleeper to 15/- per sleeper in four-berth cabins and 21/- per sleeper in two-berth cabins.

The new return first-class fare will be single fare plus 60 per cent.

Up till now it was single fare plus one-third. To continue with the article—

In the past there has been no advantage in purchasing return fares, which have been merely double the single fare applying.

Students, Children

All concession fares, with the exception of students' vacation and social service concession, will be discontinued.

Students' vacation fares will be calculated at separate rates for students under or over 15 years. In the past this rate has applied to students under or over 16 years.

Half fare will now apply to children under 15 years (in the past under 14 years).

I would be remiss if I did not protest on this matter. The Minister may say in reply that people today have to pay more for other services also, but I regard the proposed rail fare increases as bad business for the department. In these days we hear so much spoken in support of decentralisation, and about the necessity to retain people in the country; yet here is one way in which people from the country will be tempted to live closer to the capital city.

During the last week-end I remarked to my neighbour that he did not go out in the week-ends. He told me he was economising to pay for his holidays at Christmas. I am sure when he reads the article to which I have just referred he will get the first jolt.

There is another bad feature about this matter: Whereas at present concession or half fare applies to those under 16 years of age, in future it will apply to those under 15 years of age. People are being encouraged to keep their children at school till they are older, but to do that in future will cost the parents more, because of the increase in rail fares. A very close relative of mine said that when a child turned 16 years of age it was ever so much more costly for his upkeep, because a child of that age is not eligible for child endowment. So it is bad business to treat the family man in this way by increasing the rail fares for children over 15 years of age.

Mines and industries established away from Perth are always on the lookout for efficient, skilled, and family labour. They prefer to employ family men, because they will stay put and will not jump from job to job, or from place to place. In my view it is better for a train leaving Kalgoorlie or Albany with 200 passengers each paying 30s., than with 100 passengers each paying 35s. The greater number of passengers will increase the turnover of the railway refreshment rooms and the buffet cars.

I now turn to the subject of housing on the goldfields. Approaches have been made to the Minister for Housing to provide more houses on the goldfields, but in fairness I should also say approaches have also been made to all Governments in the past. The reply given generally has been that it is not sound practice to build homes on the goldfields, because the life of the gold mines is so short.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That was not the reply I gave you.

The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: That is so. One member has informed me that the Minister has agreed to build a small number of houses on the goldfields. In reply to the argument that it is not sound practice to build houses on the goldfields, I would point out that it is sound enough for the municipal council to spend many thousands of pounds on a new lighting plant; it is sound enough for the shire council to spend a large sum of money on water reticulation and on the grassing of new playing fields; and it is sound enough for each of the mines to spend thousands of pounds on power plants. Previously they obtained their power supply from other sources. All this was done in recent years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It will be sound enough to provide houses if the people are prepared to pay the economic rental, which they are unwilling to pay.

The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: I do not know anything about that aspect. In the last two weeks two Government employees who have been transferred to Kalgoorlie and Boulder asked me about the prospects of securing a rental home.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If you speak to the member for Kalgoorlie he will tell you that I showed him a report on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN: The member for Kalgoorlie has spoken very fairly on what the Minister has done. I decided to undertake a personal survey in regard to housing on the goldfields, and I spoke to each of the land agents operating there. I asked about the prospects of obtaining a rental house, and the reply I received in most cases was, "practically nil." One of the busiest land agents there said that he had approximately six applicants each day for rental homes, but he had to reject the applications.

I asked him about the prospects of purchasing a house, and he told me that for the poorest type of house a deposit of at least £200 was required. He said that he did not have very many houses for sale on his books, and the ones he had were substandard. These were built 60 or 70 years ago, and were white ant ridden and dilapidated. He told me not to hold out much hope.

That is the picture in regard to housing on the goldfields. I hope the Minister will give this matter further consideration to see if something can be done, because the position is fairly bad. One of the applicants I referred to told me he wanted a house with three bedrooms and asked me what were his prospects. The agent told me that unfortunately the old types of houses contained two sleeping units and were dilapidated. With those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [9.42 p.m.]: A number of people have been very patient this evening in listening to the debate on the Bill before us. Perhaps their interest lies more in the next item appearing on the notice paper. The Supply Bill gives members an opportunity to air their grievances, and to bring to the notice of the Government matters concerning their electorates; in fact, so far as the Government is concerned, the Supply Bill enables the Government to provide the services which members seek on behalf of their electors.

It is my task, in replying to this debate, to impart to members as much information as I can give on the spur of the moment. When I am not able to supply the information sought, according to my usual practice I refer the matters concerned to my ministerial colleagues controlling other departments. I religiously do that when Supply Bills are before the House. There are some matters on which it is competent for me now to make some comment, before the second reading is agreed to.

Mr. Wise pointed to the necessity for further surveys and for the employment of more surveyors in various parts of the State, particularly by the Government. He asked me to convey to the Government the necessity to undertake a greater number of surveys than is undertaken. He mentioned the Mines Department. Surveys of that department involve a great deal of expenditure, because frequently it has to wait until a surveyor is available to undertake surveys of mineral leases and claims in the north-west. To send a surveyor to the north-west to carry out one survey is very expensive.

I was pleased to hear Mr. Wise refer to Wapet in the way in which he did; and in his usual manner he supported the efforts of this company. I was also pleased to be able to extend an invitation to members of Parliament, through the courtesy of the

company, to make a tour of the north-west, which we did approximately 10 days ago.

It gave some members who have not perhaps as much knowledge of the country as others an opportunity to see the vastness of the north and the problems which beset companies of the nature of Wapet—and for that matter other mining companies too—and the difficulties they encounter in prospecting for a particular mineral whether it be oil, iron, gold, or any other mineral. It has given the members a realisation, I believe, of these problems, and the members who have spoken on the subject have done so with the knowledge that they have now a far better appreciation of the subject.

As members will know, when they fly over the country and look down, no matter how far up they are, they can see the enormous expanse of country and can quite clearly see the geophysical work the company has done. It is then realised that somewhere in this enormous area of country a hole about 10 inches in diameter has to go down into the ground anything from 3,500 ft. if it is a stratigraphic hole, to perhaps 15,000 ft. if the search is for oil. I said before, and I repeat now, that I only hope this company does not get tired of investing its money in this search because it is one of the most important economic factors we have. I believe that this search will continue and that ultimately we will find ourselves in possession of commercial quantities of oil in Western Australia.

Mr. Wise mentioned the question of railway finances as did also Mr. Teahan, but they mentioned it in different strains. Mr. Wise said he was surprised the Railways Department had shown a loss of £1,000,000 this year. Mr. Teahan said he was equally surprised that fares had gone up. I would say to the honourable member that he cannot have his cake and eat it. In respect of country passenger fares there has been no increase since about 1952.

The loss on the railways was explained by the Minister for Railways in the paper this morning. He said that the biggest drop in earnings was in goods traffic which had fallen by £1,038,134 to £13,676,287. The reason for this was directly related to the shortage of wheat haulage to November, 1962. The only other comment I would make is to remind the House that the deficit of £5,400,000 which the Government showed in 1958 was reduced in 1963 to £2,040,000, which I think is a very creditable effort.

The special grants made to Western Australia are, of course, a good thing, and if we can obtain additional money from the Commonwealth Government in the form of special grants it will be very handy for the purposes to which it is put. The remarks of Mr. Jones in regard to the Moore River I will pass on.

Mr. Dolan gave us quite an interesting dissertation on the question of decimal currency and I repeat what I said by way of interjection earlier that other countries of the world have experienced these economic changing conditions and have overcome them. As the honourable member said, decimal currency seems to be recognised throughout the world as being the best form of monetary exchange. The honourable member was good enough to relate the benefits of the system.

I will take heed of the remarks made by Mr. Ron Thompson. He questioned me, as Minister for Justice, in connection with high pressure salesmanship. I supplied answers to questions in another place this afternoon on this very matter and stated that the matter was receiving attention. I am obtaining a copy of the Victorian Bill and will have my officers study it. This is a question which has to be considered carefully. It is not, in my opinion, a question of just introducing a Bill which will give all forms of contractual arrangement a three-day cooling off period because we do not want to interfere with legitimate business and the usual contractual arrangements which are entered into with legitimate business.

However, with regard to high pressure salesmen—and there are such people whose ethics, to say the least, are questionable—it would be a very good thing if their practices could be prevented, particularly the tactics employed on housewives, sometimes to the wrath of their husbands when they come home. This is a matter we could look into and I certainly intend to do so.

Mr. Bennetts raised the question of long term loans but I do not know how what he suggests can be done. It is a fact, of course, that originally when local authorities commenced operations they did receive grants. However, I think it would be a little difficult to make a grant to a local authority now because if this were done the problem would occur in many other parts of the State.

The same honourable member mentioned the goldmining industry. Of course, I am well aware of the great economic influence on and the benefit to the State made by the goldmining industry. It is still of great benefit to the State. The decline of Bullfinch, Coolgardie, Southern Cross, and any other mining towns, is not due to any economic condition but simply to the fact that the particular ore resources have run out.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That is correct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is the unfortunate but undeniable truth. No-one, of course, likes to see this sort of thing happen; but it is quite certain that these resources cannot last for the rest of time. It is, however, gratifying to know that the Kalgoorlie fields certainly appear to have sufficient ore reserves to keep Kalgoorlie going for many years to come.

Mr. Lavery mentioned the switch road and the proposals to open cut this road as being the most practical solution to the problem. I would just like to tell him that the engineers examined three particular methods of doing this. One was tunnelling, one was cut and cover, and the other was the open cut method as provided for in the plan. This was considered to be the most practical and economical method in the circumstances.

I am sorry in a way that the honourable member mentioned the arrival of the Governor. The only point I would ask him to bear in mind is that I am not aware of the fact that the Premier made a statement to the effect that there were people unsuitable to fill this position in Western Australia. I do not think the Premier thinks like that. However, the Premier and the Government believe that the link between the Crown and the State is very important.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is just as real here.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is the point: It is just as real here. It is interesting to know that the Labor Party in Tasmania lost no time in offering Sir Charles Gairdner the position of Governor of that State.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: He is an Australian now.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The Labor Government here reappointed him.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so, and that lends strength to the argument that the link between the Crown and the State is important.

I was interested in the remarks made by Mr. Dellar in connection with geologists' assistance to prospectors and his desire that prospectors should receive the basic wage. As Minister for Mines, perhaps I could say that I would like them to receive it, too, but I repeat that one has to be practical in a matter of this nature.

So far as geologists are concerned, it would not, in my opinion, be practicable to put them in various mining centres permanently. As I said by way of interjection, in 1959 when I became Minister for Mines, there were 12 geologists; and now there are 32.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: Where are they all?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry the honourable member does not know what is going on in his own district because they are up there quite frequently.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They are not all there.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They are all there and are all working very strenuously on an exciting plan of mineral discovery and exploration right throughout the State from Wyndham to Esperance.

These men are imbued with enthusiasm and with the idea that they are performing an important task for the State.

The prospector's allowance in this State is £5 a week in the eastern goldfields and £6 a week in the north; but in addition to this amount paid to them there are some of the ways in which the department helps them: It provides them with tools free of charge, such as shovels, picks, drill steel, windlasses and buckets, wire rope, tanks, dolly pots, dishes and pestles, and Gypmie hammers. They are also provided with explosives as approved by the department. They are provided with compressor units and prospectors' drilling units at a very reasonable hire charge. I have been responsible for placing these compressors in various centres throughout the goldfields areas, and the drilling units are very costly items of equipment. The State Batteries crush the ore at a cost of 10s. 6d. per ton or 8s. 6d. per hour for 5 head or 16s. 6d. per hour for 10 head.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: That has been going on for years.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so. The State Batteries bill is over £250,000 a year. The average cost to the department for ore crushed is 50s. per ton. These prospectors are also given free assays at the School of Mines and at the State Batteries; and they also receive a cartage subsidy on ore, if approved, to a maximum of 12s. 6d. per ton.

There are at present 42 prospectors in the field and the amount of sustenance paid to them for the year ended the 30th June this year was £12,300. The gold produced by them during that period was 706 fine oz. If we multiply that by 12s. 6d. we have an income in the order of £11,000 a year in respect of an outlay of £12,300, which is the amount paid out to assist them. I know that may be good insurance, because from small findings sometimes come very big mines. However, if we were to put these people on the basic wage we would be up for at least three times the amount we pay them now. This would be in the vicinity of £40,000 a year.

On the question of supervising their work, this is an extremely difficult matter. As I replied to Mr. Jones on one occasion some time ago, long before I was the Minister for Mines, there were organised prospecting parties sent out into the field under the charge of one senior prospector. However, that scheme broke down because the department was just not getting worth for its money.

I would say that I am very anxious to help the prospectors and I do so in every way possible. I will continue to do this, but I do believe we have just got to employ ourselves in a practical approach to this

problem, bearing in mind that many of these 42 prospectors are not young men and are not really capable, physically.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: They are the right type though.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not saying they are not the right type, but some of them are not young men, and they would rather earn this prospector's allowance than humble themselves to the point of receiving subsistence of some other sort. I do not blame them for that, but I assure the honourable member that the same practical approach to the problem of the prospectors is made by me as was made by the previous Labor Minister for Mines, who never found it practicable to do what the honourable member suggests I should do.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: You are only part of the Government.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: A very important part! Mrs. Hutchison paid a tribute to Inspector Liddelow, who has retired, and spoke about the unemployment of our youth. She indicated there were a number of people going hungry in the State. I think that is an exaggeration; and I am always reminded of the ominous silence of the honourable member in regard to the employment figures for the years 1958 and 1959 when they were at their peak. But that was different, of course, because there was a Labor Government in office.

The point raised by Dr. Hislop in respect of cases of distress under the Workers' Compensation Act will be passed on to the proper quarter. Mr. Teahan raised the question of increases in rail fares. I repeat: we cannot have it one way without having it the other. Despite the increases, our rail fares compare very favourably with those of the other Australian States; and we must bear in mind that the Grants Commission will penalise Western Australia if it does not maintain not only its rail fares, but its charges for all other services, in a manner comparable with that of the standard States of Victoria and New South Wales.

The question of housing was raised by Mr. Teahan. The problem in Kalgoorlie is to get the people who are looking for State houses to pay the economic rent. At the request of the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Evans) I sent an inspector to Kalgoorlie and he came back with a report to the effect that there were quite a number of houses available there. I think, from memory, there were nine people who wanted State houses but most of them were unwilling to pay more than £2 to £2 10s. a week.

This was in conformity with the thinking of the honourable member who, if I remember correctly, made a speech on the previous Supply Bill and suggested that the Government should provide houses in

Kalgoorlie at £2 10s. a week. I say it is just not practicable to do that. The amount of capital required to build a house anywhere means that we have to have an economic return in relation to the capital investment, unless the rents are to be subsidised. Incidentally, the honourable member knows that the State Housing Commission is already subsidising rents in many fields—widows, and people out of employment—to the extent of approximately £100,000 a year. I think that is a pretty fine service which the commission gives to those people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Tell us the full story; tell us that the commission is loading all rents to cover that aspect.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is a loading on all rents. The rents are calculated in accordance with a formula under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and there are various factors which have to be taken into consideration when calculating the rent. It is just as well that the commission is able to accumulate surpluses in one respect, because it has to deal with deficiencies in other respects.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It just about balances itself out.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It does better than that, particularly in recent years. We have accumulated surpluses which have enabled us to put more money back into housing for the people. Incidentally, in connection with Mr. Ron Thompson's interjection that the waiting list was now two years behind, I point out that it is not two years behind in all cases; and, whatever it is, it compares very favourably with what it was five years ago.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Don't you believe it!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do believe it, because I know.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You build another thousand houses in the West Province and I will fill them in a week.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is because the economic conditions are so good now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That must be it; but there are certain portions of the honourable member's province where I could not build a thousand houses, because the land is not available. The State Housing Commission is constantly on the alert to get more land in the Hamilton Hill district, particularly, where the industrial area is growing. I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 22nd October, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [10.8 p.m.]: When this legislation was first mooted, and even later, when it was introduced, it was more or less commonly understood that it would be a non-party measure. But what has been the result of that understanding? The Bill has developed into a party measure and I would not like to say on whom to lay the blame; but what I have said is factual, and the result is that it is left to a few members—members who were not prepared to be regimented but were prepared to make a thorough study of the matter; or as good a study as they could possibly make on the evidence available from both sides—to arrive at a decision on this issue.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you suggesting the rest of us did not make a study of it?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, I am not. I am appalled that what was originally intended to be a Bill to be treated by this House as a House of review has developed to the stage where it has become a party issue; because this is a matter of too great importance to be treated on party lines.

We can gauge, even by the statements of those who are behind the Bill and mainly concerned with it, how they regard this issue; and I refer particularly to a statement made by the Minister for Health to a newspaper—I am not alluding to any debate—in which he was reported to have said—

The fluoride issue was too technical for a public referendum.

If it is too technical for a public referendum, is it not too technical for laymen such as the ordinary members of Parliament—excluding the professional members in our Houses—to make a decision?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is this the line you take on all Bills that Parliament considers?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, because we do not often strike Bills of this nature which deal with matters of medicine and health to the degree that they become so technical that it is difficult to decide them. I defy the Minister to give me any technical or medicinal terms, or to deal with this on a health basis in the terms that a doctor or chemist would deal with it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You could rely on Dr. Hislop to satisfy your argument.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: If that is the honourable member's contention, I am most surprised; because I say here and now that the human body is one of the most complex organisms on this earth, and doctors—even the highest qualified doctors—do a lot of guessing in diagnosing complaints of the human being. Yet the honourable member says we can rely on Dr. Hislop to give the absolute answer in respect of this measure. Of course, Mr. MacKinnon may believe that, but I will not be convinced in that direction.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: He knows more about it than you do.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Who is your authority?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not quoting any authorities at present. I will deal with the matter as I go along. To show how technical the matter is, one has only to take the opening remarks of Dr. Hislop when he stated that it was a very involved question. I think that is clear enough for any member of the House or any member of the public.

Actually, this is a momentous decision for members of Parliament to be asked to make—a decision on the compulsory medication of the majority of the population of the State. Members may call it what they like, but it boils down to one thing: compulsory medication. One might apply the same principle to any disease of the human body and try to deal with it through the water supplies of the State. In certain places, the water coming through the pipes now is bad enough without injecting any other chemicals into it. There are 13 chemicals put into it at present.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: What about the water at Cue?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: We could finish up, if we carried this matter to its logical conclusion, with some sort of chemical mixture which would not even be drinkable. We are getting to the stage when we seem to be relying on chemicals for our very existence. Some years ago the rage amongst the medical profession was calcium. The next thing was antibiotics—they were the answer to all the ills and ailments of the human race, or a lot of them. But what happened? How many people proved to be allergic to antibiotics? Quite a percentage. Yet antibiotics were supposed to be the answer, according to the medical profession.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That does not belittle the efficacy of them.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I know, but it does show that people could be allergic to sodium fluoride; particularly when I explain to the honourable member some further facts concerning this matter.

Before dealing with those facts I would like to point out that some members, particularly those in this Chamber, were

criticised in past years for some of the decisions made on what Liberal Party supporters termed socialistic measures, yet the same Liberal Party today is solidly behind this measure which is nothing more nor less than socialistic compulsory medication of the people.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: What about the rest of the Country Party?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am not talking about the Country Party. I am talking of those who spoke on some matters dealing with what was good for the people and what was not good for the people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are not all public health measures socialistic to a degree?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yes, but not to the degree where the people cannot refuse to accept them. Apparently the Minister for Health and his supporters—according to the statement given to the Press—are not prepared to allow this issue to be decided by the holding of a referendum among the people of this State, which is surely the democratic way to approach the problem. Despite statements made by many eminent authorities, the Minister for Health and his supporters still maintain that a great majority of the people in the State are in favour of fluoridation, and that medical and dental authorities are in favour of fluoridation, which they aver is completely safe for all age groups. On what premises does the Government fear the holding of a referendum among the people?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Because you don't go to the people with a referendum on every item.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Minister and his supporters consider that fluoridation is good for the people and not harmful. They state that the majority of the public is in favour of it, including members of the dental and medical professions. They quote this authority and that authority as being in favour of it, and yet they are frightened to hold a referendum of the people.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Will you tell us how a referendum would work?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is not my intention or my responsibility to tell the Minister how it shall work.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: It is a lot of poppycock!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It is not a lot of poppycock. There are people in some areas who will not be able to have their drinking water fluoridated. Even then, it is possible for them to get it if they so desire; and I will tell the Government about that later on.

Yesterday evening, Dr. Hislop quoted from various documents with a view to discounting the opinions of many people and authorities who are against fluoridation of public water supplies. I will make no comment on his statements, but, instead, I will quote the opinion of an eminent authority who does not hold the same view as Dr. Hislop. This gentleman is a well known doctor and is one whose opinions, I feel sure, cannot be refuted. I am referring to The Hon. Sir Stanton Hicks. I have here a copy of *Who's Who* from which I will quote the *bona fides* of this eminent gentleman. They are as follows:—

Hicks, Sir (Cedric) Stanton, Kt., cr. 1936, M.Sc. N.Z., M.D., Adel., Ph.D. Cantab., F.R.I.C. Lond., O.St.J., Professor of Human Physiol. and Pharmacology Univ. of Adel. since 1926;—

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Who is this?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Sir Cedric Stanton Hicks. Continuing—

—Col., Dir. of Army Catering Allied Land H.Q., founder Aust. Army Catering Corps, designer one-man operational ration. Memb. Scientific Advisory Committee. (Foodstuffs): son of Geo. H. Hicks, journalist and newspaper proprietor; b. June 2, 1892, Mosgiel, Otago, N.Z.; ed. Otago High Sch., Otago Univ., M.Sc. first-class honours in chemistry, M.B. Ch.B. N.Z. National Research Scholar, Institute of Chemistry of Gt. Britain, Assoc. 1918.

I will not tire the House by reciting all his qualifications. Any member of this House can read them as set out in this copy of *Who's Who*. From that alone any member can realise that Sir Stanton Hicks is a very eminent man in the field of medicine. I will now quote what he had to say on this question, as follows:—

Writing in *The Medical Journal of Australia* for November 11, 1961, Sir Stanton Hicks, former Professor of Physiology at the Adelaide University and a recognised world authority on nutrition, outlines the reasons why he was opposed to the fluoridation of public water supplies. After pointing out that those opposed to permitting fluoridation to become the subject of public debate and local plebiscites were insulting the intelligence of the average citizen, Sir Stanton concluded his letter with the following comment:

If we cease to base important social actions on argument with our fellow men and cease to accept each our individual share of responsibility—even in the matter of our children's teeth—we are merely proving that Khrushchev's contempt for a free society

is thoroughly deserved, and we may as well resign ourselves to being more than symbolically clubbed on the head with his shoe.

This is a comment on this subject published by the League of Rights, headed by one Eric Butler who is no fool or charlatan. Continuing to quote—

As Sir Stanton Hicks points out, "It is deliberate sophistry to claim that fluoridation is not mass medication." A community whose members cannot defend themselves against a policy of mass medication, irrespective of how the promoters of this policy describe themselves, has suffered a serious erosion of the very foundations of the free society. This erosion delights the Communists, who are experts in exploiting all developments which weaken a belief in freedom and personal responsibility.

I do not think any member can refute a statement such as that by a gentleman of the status of Sir Cedric Stanton Hicks.

At this stage I wish to refer to some further parts of Dr. Hislop's speech in which he told us that those who had seen the mouths of children with dental caries in teeth which were beyond repair, and children of 15 who were fitted with dental plates, would not hesitate to accept fluoridation. I think even Dr. Hislop will admit that fluoridation will not necessarily eliminate dental decay in children's teeth. Despite all the suggestions regarding the intake of fluoride being quite safe, he would agree that there are many more factors which are necessary for good healthy teeth.

For instance, the state of the health of the mother whilst she was pregnant would have a great bearing on the healthy state of her child's teeth. This would still apply irrespective of how much fluoride is ingested. Another important factor would be to ensure that the child had an adequate diet. No matter how much fluoride was ingested by a child, if that child was not fed on an adequate diet it would tend to suffer from dental caries. Another important factor is the failure to take good care of the teeth and to clean them thoroughly.

A further important factor which is paramount—and I blame parents for this to a great extent—is the over-indulgence by children in sweets, and aerated waters particularly. Some of these aerated waters which contain certain acids must cause dental caries in the teeth of children; particularly those of a tender age.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Hard tooth-brushes could have an effect on the gums, too.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: There is one particular brand of aerated water, which, if some of it is poured on to a penny removes the tarnish. Therefore, would not

the acid contained in that aerated water be strong enough to cause dental caries in children's teeth?

Dr. Hislop told us that only the fluoride ion was stored in the bone structure of the body and in the teeth. He did not tell us of the residue components of sodium fluoride which remain in the body when sodium fluoride is ingested. He more or less pushed that aside and intimated that the body got rid of those by natural processes.

I will cite my own medical case. For a period of nine to 10 years I suffered pain. I visited doctors, was examined, and various diagnoses were made, but finally I suffered three severe attacks and my trouble was eventually diagnosed as gallstones. I have mentioned my own medical history to illustrate that the systems of many people can act quite differently in excreting waste matters from the body. In my case, for instance, possibly certain acids—I do not profess to know the medical terms for them—accumulated in my body, resulting in gallstones and my suffering a great deal of pain. However, as a result of an operation I got rid of them.

We are told that the sodium fluoride ion is absorbed in the bone structure of the body and the residue is passed out. It seems strange to me that the residue of sodium fluoride, which is metallic, will not collect in certain bodies in the same way as acids collect in the bodies of certain persons who eventually suffer from gallstone. This is the only conclusion that one can reach, and I do not think that even the most expert members of the medical profession can say yea or nay to my submissions. For instance, how much do the members of the medical profession know about rheumatoid arthritis? They can tell us what causes it, but they cannot tell us why it occurs in one person and not in another.

I maintain, therefore, that they cannot tell us that the intake of sodium fluoride will not have any deleterious effect on any one person, because in my case the residue from sodium fluoride may accumulate in my body and do some harm, in the same way as acids accumulated in my body to form gall stones.

Dr. Hislop admitted in his speech—and Dr. Hislop, of course, is a medical man and a member of this House, and we look to him as a man of professional standing to give us a lead on this subject—that we are taking in fluoride in many things that we consume; and that this measure is only trying to bring the amount of fluoride up to the medical level of 1 p.p.m.g. He did not state what he thought the average person may require by way of additional fluoride intake.

In answer to that I would refer to a paper I have here, together with section 12 of the Bill. Firstly, I would refer to the

natural intake of foods containing fluoride. I do not believe anybody would print figures like these unless they were correct; if they would, I have been misled. The statements says—

| | Parts Per Million |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Acid Calcium Phosphate baking powder | 3,000.0-4,000.0 |
| Tea | 30.0-1,750.0 |
| Gelatin | 160.0- 200.0 |
| Celery leaves | 60.0- 135.0 |
| Cabbage leaves | - 34.0 |
| Canned mackerel | - 26.9 |
| Canned sardines | 7.3- 12.5 |
| Canned salmon; rice | 8.5- 9.0 |
| Spinach | 6.0- 8.0 |
| Celery stalks | 3.6- 7.6 |

An so on. There are a large number of articles eaten by people which contain those quantities of fluoride. So we find there is quite a considerable intake of fluoride by the average person. I would not like to say how much. The medical men would be better able to speak on that aspect.

We were given to understand that the idea was to bring the water supply of this State up to 1 p.p.m.g. For the information of members, I would like to read clause 12 of the Bill, the marginal note of which says—

Maximum and minimum concentration of fluorine in water.

Clause 12 itself says—

12. (1) A water supply authority that adds fluorine to any public water supply under its control pursuant to a direction of the Minister given under this Act shall—

- (a) maintain the content of fluorine in that public water supply at a concentration of not more than the maximum nor less than the minimum concentration, calculated as parts per million, as is specified in the direction;
- (b) not add to that public water supply fluorine in a form other than that specified in the direction; and
- (c) not fail to comply with any conditions, as may in any case be determined by the Committee and specified in the direction.

(2) Where a water supply authority fails to comply with any requirement of subsection (1) of this section, the Minister may—

And then it goes on. I have looked through this Bill, and outside that clause I cannot find anywhere stated in the measure that the maximum amount to be inducted into our water supply shall be 1 p.p.m.g.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It will.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I am surprised to hear the Minister say "it will." We should have it in the Bill. That is where it should be.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are here to try to talk common sense.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I object to that statement, but I am not going to ask the Minister to withdraw it. I will leave it in *Hansard* to indicate the Minister's attitude; to let the people decide who is talking common sense.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Has it occurred to you that an amendment will be placed on the notice paper?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: We have had the Bill before the House for some time, a measure which is supposed to provide the maximum amount of fluoride to be added to our water supplies—an amount of 1 p.p.m.g.—and after all this time, and despite the fact that the Bill has passed another place, the Minister has the effrontery to tell me that I should talk common sense; when there is no mention of the maximum amount in the measure. I object strongly to the Minister's remarks.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You will burst a blood vessel in a moment.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Minister should take cognisance of his own actions when he refers to my talking common sense. It is not laughable; far from it. This is very serious from the point of view of the people of the State. I am surprised that the Government should tell us that the majority of the people are in favour of the measure. Let us look around the public gallery and see how interested the public of the State are. I have as many letters on my files as there are people in the public gallery tonight. I have about 35 to 40 letters. Where are the rest of the public?

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Sitting at home.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That is right; they are sitting at home watching television. They are not the least interested in the fluoridation of water supplies. For the most part they are probably hoping the Bill will not be passed. Irrespective of what the Minister said about an amendment—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What amendment?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: An amendment is to be moved. It is with the clerk.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Irrespective of what the Minister said about the amendment, it is left to the Minister for Health to prescribe additional doses, as provided in this Bill. I notice that in clause 9 subsection (2) provision is made by the Minister to exempt from public liability the

committee which will advise on this matter. So if things go wrong, the committee will be free of any liability.

It appears therefore that we will have perfect machines inducting the substance into the water supply, and nobody is going to make a mistake. I propose to be a little ridiculous and take the matter a step further—just as ridiculous as the Minister, when he asked me to talk common sense. Somebody may have an idea of fooling around with one of these plants. I may be told it is not possible, but if it is possible for somebody to steal the Melbourne Cup from under the nose of the law, then it is quite possible. One wonders how far one can go with this.

I would now like to deal with the statement made by Mr. MacKinnon during his second reading speech last evening, when he said that although he had not had to be persuaded of the rights or wrongs of this measure—I am not attempting to use his exact words—he would have been persuaded by the fact of a doctor ringing him over the week-end and telling him of two cases of fluorine poisoning in children. He said that if he was doubtful, that would have persuaded him to support the measure. What a ridiculous statement to make!

I wonder whether the same doctor contacts Mr. MacKinnon every time he gets a case of a child who has been poisoned by sleeping tablets, which are readily obtainable at chemists, without a doctor's prescription! A lot of other poisons are also readily available. We cannot prevent the carelessness of parents. On the other hand, it might not have been carelessness; it might have been misadventure. Fluoride tablets are marked poison, and anything marked poison in my house is put safely away. That should be the responsibility of every parent. It is a very poor story to put up in support of this measure, to make people believe it is the right thing for the public.

I would like to refer to what the Federal Government is doing in relation to drugs. In *The West Australian* of the 21st October, 1963, there was an article headed "Government Plans Tighter Control on Drugs," which says—

Doctors throughout Australia will soon be asked to report any adverse effect from drugs they prescribe.

This means that even the Federal Government is suspicious of the toxicity of certain drugs available to the public today, and it is taking steps to see what can be done about them.

As I said before, people have developed allergies to antibiotics. We all know what happened in the case of thalidomide, which was recommended by medical men, and which had disastrous results. To deal with this matter further, I would like to

quote a letter from a gentleman who is a professor in a certain university. I do not know what his qualifications are, but he is a doctor from the University of Tasmania. In a position such as that he would be no fool, and certainly no charlatan. In a letter that has been forwarded to me, he says—

The scientific case against fluoridation is that there is no scientific case for it. Some dentists, without any other achievement to their credit, have asserted that fluoride is beneficial: this is a claim not a fact. Such claims appeared in trade journals, full of arithmetical errors, never in journals which scientists regard first-class. No purely scientific body of any standing has ever approved fluoridation. Some medical associations and dental bodies gave qualified support, but 95-98% of their members lack scientific training, their views do not matter. To check up on the claims, some dentists (anonymous) were sent by British politicians (anonymous) to America; they saw the dentists who made the claims and returned stating that those who made claims still make them. The "statistics" are so obviously cooked that any student of mine coming up with reports of this kind would be sent down from the University. Lack of proof and evidence of incompetence and dishonesty in claims for fluoridation does not disprove fluoridation but certainly does not "prove" it. In order to quote reliable figures one must carry out experiments in an exemplary manner. Now, the Australian Dental Journal admits that experiments in favour of fluoridation "are not models of scientific method"; until they are, the whole business is not serious scientifically.

I read that statement for what it is worth. I would not state that I agree with its facts, but it comes from a doctor of a university of Tasmania who, I should say, is not a charlatan.

In conclusion, without dealing with a lot of the claims by various people for and against fluoridation, I would like to deal with an article published in the July issue of *News Review* under the heading, "Fluoridation of Water a Vexed Question." *News Review* is published in Perth by, as far as we know, a number of business people in this State—people who, in everybody's estimation, would no doubt be very sound men. The article I am about to read is one that has been contributed, and printed by this paper. It reads as follows:—

Judging from all the recent Press propaganda which has been going on regarding the question of fluoridation of metropolitan water supplies in Western Australia it would seem that it is almost a foregone conclusion.

The bulk of the propaganda in favour of compulsory fluoridation has emanated from the Health Education Council.

State Cabinet appears to have allowed itself to be unduly influenced by allowing an officer to address it on the subject as recently reported in the Press. Whilst many eminent world authorities are in favour of compulsory fluoridation there are also many authorities of equal standing who are quite definitely against the proposition and who are convinced that such a scheme has no general beneficial effect.

I do not want to weary the House by reading the whole of this article, but the final paragraph is as follows:—

If the Health Education Council and the State Government and others who support fluoridation are so certain of its widespread benefits, there should be no doubt that a greater majority of the people could be influenced to approve it. Taking into account that there is also a major principle at stake, namely, the right of the individual to make a free choice, the present "stand over" methods being adopted by the Health Education Council in particular are not likely to influence those of the general public who are against the proposal. There are always two sides to a question.

With that, I think we must all agree. Dealing with the Health Education Council, I was advised in the House tonight in answer to a question that £3,400 had been spent on propaganda to further fluoridation in this State. That is not a large amount from a Government point of view, but it was enough to start the propaganda on fluoridation in this State.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: Wasn't that booklet issued in order to fight tooth decay?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: In spite of what the honourable member says, it was issued to further the case for the fluoridation of water supplies in this State. I do not think that can be denied. Mention has been made of those who oppose fluoridation, but they have not £3,400 to spend. So we got all sorts of correspondence from people interested in this subject.

The Health Education Council visited my province and gave lectures, showed pictures, and spoke to the people about fluoridation. But what chance did they have to hear the other side of the question from a responsible person? None at all.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you implying they are charlatans?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: No, I am not; and I do not think the honourable member can take that inference from what I

have said. But only one side of the case has been put up by the Health Education Council to the people in my province. Therefore, what chance have they had to hear the other side of this problem?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Just as much as any others.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Some of my electors are in favour of fluoridation, but in regard to many others, I do not know whether they are in favour of it or against it.

Looking at the overall picture as contained in some of the literature which I have and which I think is authentic, there are many places in the world that have fluoridated their water supplies and then discontinued it for no reason at all. It may have been the expense, but the fact remains that it has been discontinued, which proves that the fluoridation of water supplies is not the great success it is boomed up to be. I have read quite a lot from the favourable report of the Royal Commission which inquired into this subject in New Zealand, but did that country fluoridate its water supplies? No, only in some local option area. That report should have been good enough for the Government of that country to adopt fluoridation *holus-bolus*, but it did not accept it; and the statement that we in Western Australia should be leaders in this field is one with which I cannot agree.

A few places in the Eastern States are fluoridating the water supplies on a local option basis; but we cannot always make comparisons with America. We are a nation of tea drinkers, and we are told that tea contains a large amount of sodium fluoride. However, the Americans are coffee drinkers. All these facts add up, and they certainly do come into the picture.

How much do we really know about this matter? I think we know very little; and, in my estimation, it would take no less than 40 years to prove the case for fluoridation. We have only to think of Louis Pasteur who studied medicine for many years. How long did it take him to come to a conclusion which was of benefit to the human body? It took a longer period of time than has been spent in considering fluoridation.

I was told last night by a certain gentleman that he had that day seen in the city a small machine about the size of a small suitcase which was capable of being used to induct fluorine into a water supply. The cost of this machine was the huge sum of £125; less than the cost of a washing machine, and less than the cost of a refrigerator. So I say this: If there are people in this State and city who are keen to induct sodium fluoride into their own water supply, it is not beyond their own financial means and capabilities of purchasing one of these machines to do the job.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You know that is absurd. How could an ordinary working man on £17 or £18 per week purchase one?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: If the honourable member would like to walk into their homes, he would find that they have washing machines and refrigerators.

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

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The majority of them have a motorcar; so is £125 too much to pay if people want to protect the teeth of their children if they sincerely believe in the beneficial effects of fluoride? It is only absurd because the honourable member wants it to be. He cannot deny that today £125 is not beyond the means of any person if he is sincerely of the opinion that fluoride, if given to their children, will overcome the problem of bad teeth.

I leave the matter on that note. I am not going to deal with the use of pills, but there is a method which can be adopted by people who are keen to take sodium fluoride. I think that is the answer to the question.

THE HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [10.53 p.m.]: It appears to me the debate on this measure divides itself into two important sections. The first is: Is the fluoridation of water supplies beneficial? the second is: Should fluoridation of water supplies be imposed on any community? Accepting the statement of Mr. Stubbs last night when he said he spoke on behalf of the Labor members of this Chamber, I would say there would be no difficulty in this measure passing the second reading, because those who have already spoken, with the exception of Mr. Baxter, have expressed views which are favourable to the fluoridation of water supplies.

It then boils down to the question of whether or not there should be a referendum of the people to determine whether water supplies in various water board districts should be fluoridated. When it was first intimated that legislation may be introduced by the Government to fluoridate water supplies I, in common with many other members, received a considerable quantity of correspondence, I also had personal contact with quite a number of people who were very interested in this important subject. Many of them expressed views very strongly opposed to fluoridation. Others, however, expressed quite strong views supporting the proposed measure.

Subsequently, I read quite a considerable quantity of literature dealing with the subject, both for and against. In due course, when the legislation was being formed, at meetings held for that purpose I expressed very strongly the views that

were given to me by those who were opposed to fluoridation of water supplies, because, at that time, I felt in view of the opposition from certain sections of the public: why should a Government bother to introduce fluoride into the water supplies with the view to protecting the teeth of perhaps only a certain section of the community?

I felt that if we had existed for so long with decayed teeth and with dentures, and with all the other things that go with faulty mouths, then surely we could continue along those lines in the future; that the Government need not be bothered to go ahead with this measure in the light of opposition. Then on further reflection I realised that we were dealing with something of great importance; namely, the health of the public. It is realised that the health of the public is a matter of great importance to the Government when one sees in the Estimates the amount of money that is spent annually on trying to preserve the teeth not only of the children but of many of the adult population of this State.

It is quite a financial burden on the State and therefore the State has every right to inquire into any form of treatment which might not only prevent decay but might also assist in alleviating the decay after it has occurred.

I therefore commend the Government for introducing this measure. It is not a preventive measure in the sense that it is going to cure decayed teeth after the damage has occurred, but it is a measure that is going to enable the teeth of young people of the future to be so strengthened that they can withstand the decay that normally does occur in this age in which we live.

We all realise that much of the decay is caused through faulty diet and through many of the sweets and other things which the children of today eat; and not only the children. But we must also take a realistic view and realise that it would be practically impossible, if not cruel, to deny the children of today the pleasures they would derive from eating sweets or even sweet cakes and other things which no doubt, according to the dental fraternity, are injurious to the mouth and to the maintenance of the teeth.

When we were considering the legislation, I put forward as strongly as I could the views of those who were opposed to fluoridation. But I was extremely surprised to hear Mr. Baxter speak the way he did just now, because to my knowledge he was not present at any one of the meetings that were held; nor did I hear him on any occasion voice opposition to the proposed measure.

After I had submitted the points that were raised by opponents of fluoridation, I received answers that satisfied me to

the extent that I was sure that those responsible for the introduction of it had really a case for the fluoridation of water supplies. With the information that I have gained, I am now quite convinced—as obviously are many other members of this Chamber—that fluoridation of water supplies as a principle is entirely beneficial to any community.

On the question of fluoride being a poison, I should like to make one or two comments. There is no denying the fact that fluoride is a poison. It is stated in certain literature that I have received, that it is used as a rat and cockroach killer. That may be so; but many other things are poisons. Chlorine is a poison, yet we have that in our water supplies at the present time. As Dr. Hislop stated last night, it is essential for the proper functioning of the human body that we have a certain intake of poisons; but that certain intake of poisons must be regulated to a very small quantity. With many of these things, if we take them to excess, there will be injurious effects. We have even seen where people have been killed by drinking a bottle of whisky at one go; and would we call that a poison?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That could be a slow or a quick death.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: As Dr. Hislop said, it is essential for the human body that we have a certain intake of various poisons including fluorine. But the point is that it should be controlled. As the honourable member said, in order to take an excessive dose of fluoride through water supplies it would be necessary for one to drink a bathtub of water each day; and even then the body could deal with a quantity in excess of that required, by passing it off naturally. I feel therefore that the fears of those who are of the opinion that serious poisoning effects might result are entirely groundless.

I was very impressed with the speech delivered last night by the one person in this Chamber who is qualified, and highly qualified, to speak on medical matters. I think that all of those people who have any doubts whatsoever regarding the effect of fluoridation of water supplies might well read the *Hansard* report of the speech given by Dr. Hislop. He gave a very clear exposition which could be assimilated by laymen, such as we are, and it proved conclusively, so far as I am concerned, that there can be no injurious effect from the proposed fluoridation of water supplies.

When we have certain medical ailments and require medical attention, we go to those qualified to give advice and we ask them what is wrong. In many cases they prescribe medicines and give us prescriptions, many of which are written in a

language we cannot understand. We take those prescriptions to a chemist for preparation.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: And in handwriting that we cannot read!

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: That is quite right—except when the bill arrives! When we take those prescriptions to the chemist, the pills or the medicines are made up. We swallow them in accordance with the directions and we have every confidence in the person who prescribed the medicine. Those medicines are taken freely by the vast majority of people without any question whatsoever, because they have been prescribed by persons who are competent to prescribe.

I believe, in view of the wealth of evidence that was tendered last night by Dr. Hislop, that it is evident the leading medical authorities of the world are satisfied that this is a good thing.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are being presumptuous, aren't you?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: In my opinion, Dr. Hislop is very highly qualified to speak on this matter, and I accept his words.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: More so than the interjector's!

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: There is no denying that mistakes are made and, in the light of further knowledge and experience, it may be found that some injurious effect does arise from the fluoridation of water supplies. That being the case, it could be discontinued quite easily. One might say that there have already been certain injurious effects which have made themselves evident; but from what we have been given to understand—and I accept it as good medical advice—it is necessary for the intake to be continuous, even though gradual, and for a long period.

So far as the distribution of the fluoride is concerned, much has been said. I will admit frankly that earlier on I thought that if it could be administered by way of tablets, then the solution was to make tablets freely available to those people who required them. But I have since found out that this method can not only be extremely costly but also very wasteful in that a large number of tablets would be issued and comparatively few of them would be used—and by used, I mean used efficiently. As Dr. Hislop stated, if tablets are taken only spasmodically, they would be a waste of time. In order for the fluoride to have any proper effect it is necessary that the intake be gradual, but consistent and continuous.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Why force it on to those who are allergic to it?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has not yet been proved that anybody is allergic to it.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: There is no need for me to labour the point as to whether or not fluoridation of water supplies is beneficial to the community. I think that is generally accepted by the majority of members in this Chamber. The matter comes down to whether or not there should be a referendum in order that the public may have an opportunity of deciding for themselves whether or not they want to have their water supply fluoridated.

I believe that it is just so much humbug, for this reason: The argument is that as a certain number of the public is opposed to the fluoridation of water supplies, then it should not be foisted upon them. What will be the position if we do have a referendum in any particular water board area? There will still be a certain number of people who will object to it, even if it is only one or two per cent. We do have dissentients, and if those people who favour a referendum are going to be consistent in their thinking, then we must have complete unanimity among those who are going to be affected by the introduction of fluoride.

It is a cowardly way of avoiding the issue. I think we are here to determine whether or not there should be fluoridation of water supplies, and I think we should deal with the matter fearlessly but according to our consciences, in the same manner that we deal with all other forms of legislation that come before us. If we are of the opinion that it is wrong for the community, then let us throw the Bill out of the window. But if we are of the opinion that it is a good thing, then let us make the decision here. Although we are laymen we have had the opportunity of receiving expert advice not only from those who are in favour of fluoridation but also from those who are opposed to it. A considerable amount of time has been devoted to educating us one way or the other. I think we are competent to judge for ourselves, from the information that has been placed at our disposal, whether fluoridation of water supplies is a good or bad thing. If the public is asked to vote yea or nay on the question, they would not have the same opportunity that we have enjoyed of being educated on the matter.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Some might have.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: They would need to be educated on the matter if they are to vote on it. In many cases they would not take the interest that they should and they might not pass a vote that is truly indicative of the wishes of the whole of the community. Therefore a referendum would not only be a waste of time but would also be an inefficient method of determining whether or not there should be fluoridation of water supplies in certain districts; and, further, it

would be an unnecessary cost to the public of this State, and I do not think that cost is warranted.

As I said just now, I think we in this Chamber should determine whether or not the various water supplies should be fluoridated, and then we should vote according to our consciences. My conscience tells me that I must support the measure.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [11.16 p.m.]: I think every speaker who has addressed himself to this Bill has approached it with a very genuine desire to be realistic because it is such an important question. It could be asked what angle do I consider realistic. That is a matter of opinion, and this is the place in which opinions can be expressed and where, although they need not necessarily be accepted, opinions should be respected.

That is as it should be, but if this measure is of such vital importance as it would appear to be considered, because of the presentation of a Bill such as this to Parliament, I think we as members of Parliament must be convinced and have adequate and undeniable proof presented to us that mass fluoridation is absolutely necessary and essential. Because I am not convinced, even with all that I have heard in this Chamber last night and tonight, that such a Bill is absolutely necessary, it does not find favour in my sight.

We have heard all the arguments in favour of the Bill presented to us with a view to getting it passed by a majority of the House. But it is just as essential that those who may have different opinions from those already presented should express the doubts that still exist in their minds.

It is because of the state of affairs that exists in various large towns and cities in the United States where, we have been led to believe, fluoridation has been given a thorough testing, that I have some grave doubts about the proposition. I am concerned about it because I have become aware that of the number of towns and cities in the United States which had mass fluoridation, no fewer than 174 have seen fit to discard it. I shall not attempt to read the names of the places involved, but when we realise that in those towns there are approximately 3,000,000 people, and they have seen fit to discard the mass fluoridation of their water supplies, we must ask ourselves the reason for it.

I suppose the cost could be one of the reasons, but I would say the main reason would be its effect on the older people—that is people older than the children who receive the main benefit from fluoridation. I do not say that we should disregard efforts to improve dental health. Far be it from me or from anyone else to attempt

at any time to disregard that very important matter, but there is still a responsibility on the parents in regard to this question.

Why should we as a Parliament insist on taking away from parents the responsibility which is rightfully theirs, and one which parents should accept—the responsibility for the care of their children? Disregarding what we have heard about children not taking the proper dose, I say again it is the responsibility of the parents to see that they do. All parents should be responsible for their children.

We cannot disregard opinions that have been expressed through the literature that has been placed before us, and I was quite concerned last night to hear one member deriding or belittling a person who is recognised to be a qualified authority on this matter. That sort of thing never influences my thinking, and nobody should decide any authority in an endeavour to bolster up the case he is advocating.

Reference was made by Mr. Baxter to Sir Stanton Hicks, and there is no need for me to say anything more except that Sir Stanton Hicks is accepted as a man who has had a brilliant academic career. He has on a number of occasions expressed himself forcibly against the fluoridation of public water supplies. Why should a competent person like that—one who is just as competent as those who are advocating fluoridation—issue a warning about the dangers of fluoridation for adults if there is no danger at all?

We also see that Dr. Polya of the University of Tasmania did a comprehensive survey on the question of fluoridation, and he has this to say—

Fluoridation for adults means a hopeless and for youngsters an unpredictable gamble.

The effect of fluorides, even in small doses, on people suffering from skeletal and related troubles has not been tested to my knowledge. Hence fluoridation may expose old people and others already ill to avoidable ill-health or avoidable acceleration of disease.

He also has this to say—

We do not know which fluoridation statistics can be believed.

I think that while there is a doubt in the mind of any of us we should approach this matter with great caution, and it is for that reason that I am opposed to the measure. I also resent the idea of compulsory medication. We should not be compelled to do anything that can be adequately dealt with by the issue of tablets, which are available. I refuse to accept that people will not take tablets, or that they will not give them to their children in proper doses.

In my view this is a matter to which both Houses of Parliament have given considerable thought, but I would say that if the Government through the Health Department were to devote more time and funds to educating people, and particularly young married folk, on health education programmes, such as correct dietary habits whereby children would receive the food which would assist in the preservation of their teeth, we would be better off. Those health education programmes could be aimed at the discouragement of the consumption of such items as icy-poles, icecreams, sweets, and aerated waters which as members have said tonight are detrimental to the dental health of our children.

These are matters that we should leave to those who are capable and competent to carry them out, and it should not be the responsibility of Parliament to enter into the field of health education; that should forever remain the responsibility of the parents in this State.

I am not in favour of a referendum on this matter. I consider that Parliament should be and is competent to deal with this very vital question. The people elect us to Parliament to do this sort of thing and when we come to a difficult or controversial question such as this, the people expect us to express our opinions and make up our minds in regard to it.

While travelling through the country districts in the lower portion of the State, as I have done, and while travelling around the city, the expressions of opinions I have heard in regard to this matter are to the effect that Parliament and Parliament only should decide it.

Why waste time, energy, and money in conducting a referendum on a matter which we, as a Parliament, should and must accept the responsibility for, and decide one way or the other? If we agree to a referendum it will be simply passing the buck; and it would be one way of getting out of something that we do not want to face up to. Possibly that is a matter of opinion, but it is my opinion, and I am opposed to a referendum. If the second reading is agreed to, and we get into Committee, I will oppose the amendment on the notice paper which reads—

provided a referendum of the electors on the roll of the Legislative Assembly within the water supply authority's area has first approved of the direction of the Minister.

If the referendum proposal is agreed to then I think the decision should be made by the whole of the State rather than localising it and leaving it to different areas. It would be utter nonsense to have a referendum and for one locality or water supply district to have a fluoridated water supply and the district alongside of it to oppose such a proposal. With all due

respect to the leading article in *The West Australian* on Monday last which said that the Government, rather than lose the Bill, should give way and agree to a referendum, I would say that if such a proposal is agreed to it would be questionable whether we would have the power to instruct the Government to spend the money on a referendum.

We are not empowered to involve the Crown in such expenditure. We have to be realistic in this matter in more ways than one. I say in conclusion that I am not yet convinced, even if fluoridation of public water supplies is implemented, that we will obtain the full benefits which we have been led to expect, because there is no guarantee that when a householder turns on the tap in his home the right percentage of fluoride will be consistently found in the water.

If this scheme is not to work effectively and efficiently, why implement it at all? I say we can well afford to proceed as we have proceeded up to 1963, and leave the responsibility with the people, and not with the Crown, in respect of fluoridation. Therefore I have to indicate that I shall oppose the second reading.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [11.32 p.m.]: If this House were to follow the views of Mr. Jack Thomson in respect of the holding of a referendum on this issue—I suggest he was speaking along sound and common-sense lines—there is no doubt this legislation would be passed.

This debate has taken an unusual turn. We have listened to well-reasoned speeches, and also those which I regard as being not so well-reasoned. When I listened to the speech of Mr. Baxter I wondered what was going on in the mind of Mr. Stubbs, because, as we all know, he is a champion of the cause of fluoridation, and by no means is he ashamed to admit that.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Providing a referendum is held.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: To quote his words, he said—

I want to make it plain that we of the Labor Party will support this Bill.

Then he qualified his statement by saying he wanted a referendum. I want to take this opportunity to say a few words to Mr. Baxter. Before doing so I point out that this debate has taken the usual trend which important Bills take.

When an important Bill is put up by the Government the situation invariably arises when the Opposition asks, "What are we to do with this?" I have heard that question being asked, both when I was on this side of the House and when I was in the Opposition. On this occasion the Opposition must have decided to support the Bill, because if it did not there would be some

very red faces. At least a number of members of the Opposition are in favour of fluoridation. How can we escape from the situation where we will be obliged to accept something about which some of us are not sure?

The Hon. R. Thompson: You could not be further off the beam if you tried.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am merely putting forward what I regard as the probable situation. If it is not as I have put it, then certainly it has not been explained to me in any other way.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I hope the Minister is expressing himself on the Bill before the House.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Without any doubt whatever.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: At this hour of the night you would not do otherwise.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not at any hour of the night. On this occasion I think the Labor Party said, "The fair approach to this Bill is to support it. Then we should suggest it be referred to a referendum."

For some reason Mr. Baxter thought it convenient to bring the Liberal Party in. I remind the honourable member this is a composite Government.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not think it was convenient. It was factual.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If it was factual, it was also convenient. This is a composite Government which is comprised of four Country Party Ministers and six Liberal Party Ministers. The decision to introduce legislation to implement fluoridation of public water supplies was made at Cabinet level. There was no pressure, as the honourable member indicated.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not use the word "pressure."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: From the speech he made one would believe that. Mr. Jack Thomson made his position quite clear. When I read the newspapers during the weekend I learnt that he did not like the Bill.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I repeat, I did not use the word pressure.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I did that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All I can say to Mr. Baxter is that from not being too sure of his like for the Bill—according to the week-end Press—he has certainly since expressed a great dislike of it.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you think I expressed all my thoughts to the Press?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. It is just as well the honourable member does not. The honourable member did not say one way or the other what he intended to do in respect of this measure, even when I interjected and asked which way

he intended to vote. But he was almost in a rage when he said I had the temerity to put on the notice paper an amendment which would provide that fluoride should not be added to water supplies at more than one part per million.

I have given a copy of my amendment to the clerk, and it was put forward as a result of an undertaking given by the Minister in another place when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked for certain assurances. The Minister undertook to have the matter considered in this House.

There is nothing new in such a course of action. At times I have adjourned the debate on Bills in order to meet the wishes of the House in respect of the submission of amendments which would clarify the situation. The honourable member should not have become unduly upset. The way I went about submitting the amendment was not unusual. I said that in order to allay the fears of the honourable member who objected to the provision in clause 9, and who said there was nothing to show we would not all die of poison the day after the implementation of fluoridation—

Point of Order

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: On a point of order, I did not use those words or in any way intimate what the Minister says, and I ask the Minister to withdraw those words.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I withdraw them, because I would not like to indicate the honourable member said something which he did not say.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

When I said that an amendment was to be placed on the notice paper I did not intend to deal with it this evening. It will appear on tomorrow's notice paper and the honourable members will be able to read it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you going to put an amendment on the notice paper for the holding of a referendum?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Such an amendment is already on the notice paper.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I asked if you were going to put one on it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is already there. We can deal with that amendment at the appropriate time. The Government is prepared to accept the responsibility for introducing legislation which will bring about fluoridation of public water supplies. The Opposition has indicated that it would support this proposition, provided the Government agreed to a referendum. As far as I can recollect, the opponents of the Bill have put forward the names of no more than four authorities who are opposed to fluoridation.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You know they could have put forward 44 if they had wanted to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That may be so.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I have 27 authorities right here.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Against that, there are hundreds of people who have expressed their approval of fluoridation. Mr. Baxter objected to the Public Health Department going around the State telling the people about the value of fluoridation.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not object.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Public Health Department officers went around the State, and the department spent some £3,000 in telling the people about the value of fluoridation. What else would one expect that department to do? Is it not reasonable for it to send officers to various parts of the State to explain to the public what the Government proposed to do?

The Government had no ulterior motive. The Public Health Department advocated this move. There is nothing new in it. I can remember going to a dental association annual dinner in the days when a Labor Government was in office, and fluoridation of water supplies was being advocated at that time. Apparently, the Government of the day did not decide to introduce legislation into Parliament. Who else can accept the responsibility for this sort of reform? As members know, history has proved that any type of reform has always been received by the community with some fear.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Some people say that big brother does it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Some people say all sorts of stupid things. I will tell members in a moment what big brother thinks, or what this particular big brother thinks. There is a natural reaction of fear to a reform of this nature.

In my early days in Parliament in the Legislative Assembly there was a debate on a Bill to introduce compulsory X-rays for T.B. There was a great protest against this particular reform. I myself had kindly people write to me and tell me they objected, which objections may or may not have been valid. However, the result of the introduction of that reform is that the incidence of T.B. in our country has now been reduced to an absolute minimum. I know that members will say that the compulsory X-ray of people is a different proposition from the enforced taking of fluoride; and so it is.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They had no alternative.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: However, I am demonstrating that there is a natural reaction of people to fear a reform. Do not you, Mr. President, fear in a way the prick of a needle in your arm when you get some sort of anti-serum? I do. During

the war, servicemen were used almost as a pincushion, but those who received the injections were grateful because of the benefit to their health in certain very difficult parts of the world.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Plenty of the soldiers toppled over before they got the needles.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is perfectly true. It takes time before people will accept these things. If we had a referendum, what would be the result? Mr. Stubbs said he wanted local option. Let us consider the section from here to Kalgoorlie. Perhaps the people in Toodyay would want fluoridation while those in Northam would not want it. All the towns are supplied by the same water main.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Every town has a reservoir.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Kalgoorlie has; but a lot of them do not have. However, do not let us develop that as an important theme. Let us consider what I do regard as important. In the travels of the Health Department officers throughout the country, large majorities of the people were in favour of fluoride in the water.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Because they heard only one side of the story.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I repeat that large majorities were in favour. If a referendum were held and carried by a small majority, or a large majority, what then would be the situation? We would pass on to the people who voted in favour, the responsibility that the Government is prepared to accept. If the percentage in favour of the fluoridation was 51, then we would be forcing 49 per cent. of the people to have fluoride in their water whether they liked it or not.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What is the difference now?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The position is that the Government is prepared to accept the responsibility for taking this action. In the words of Mr. Jack Thompson—and I endorse his sentiments in this regard—a referendum would serve no useful purpose.

I have no fears as to the issue in this case, because this Bill has come to us having been passed by 49 members in another House—not merely members of the Government, because it was voted for on the second reading by everyone and carried on the voices. As Mr. Stubbs said in leading the debate for the Labor Party in this House, the Labor Party will vote for the Bill.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: If there is a referendum. I made it plain that we would not support it if there was no referendum.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I understand what the honourable member said. The week-end Press has been busy. It even gave you, Mr. President, an honourable mention. It suggested what you would do if you had a casting vote in this matter. The Press was quite wrong of course, if it suggested—and I do not know whether it did—that you would vote this Bill out on the second reading, because I have never known a President to do more than maintain the *status quo*.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: No kidding to the President, now!

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

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is these humorous and pleasant interjections which sometimes keep us normal and human. I do not think that you, Mr. President, would do anything else than give the Bill a second reading if it reached that stage.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I have known it otherwise.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am prompted now to quote from a newspaper. It puzzled me a little when I read this article. I could not line it up with the attitude of the Labor Party at the moment, and then I thought that perhaps it was consistent. The paper is called *The Western Sun*.

The Hon. R. Thompson: A good paper, usually, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sure it is.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do you contribute to it regularly?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, I do not, but I read it quite often. I sometimes read some disparaging things about myself, too.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It only prints the truth.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am glad to hear Mr. Ron Thompson say that, because it means he endorses this article. It appeared in the June, 1963, issue, and reads as follows:—

Fluoride and the "Fruitcake Fringe"

Some Australians are still gullible enough to accept the contentions of the Tony McGillick's and other members of the "fruitcake fringe" that proposals for fluoridation of public water supplies are, among other things, part of a communist plot.

After a vigorous campaign waged by both sides, Tenterfield (N.S.W.) has voted down by a five-two majority eminent medical opinion supporting fluoridation in favour of a pottage of emotional nonsense put up by the "antis".

But the fight goes on, and eventually commonsense must prevail.

The British Ministry of Health recently released a report showing a substantial improvement in the teeth of young children living in a number of towns where the fluoride content of the water supply was raised to one-part-per-million.

The average number of decayed, missing or filled teeth under fluoridation was 66 per cent. less at age of three years, 57 per cent. at four, and 50 per cent. at five.

The report sums up its findings in this way:

"Fluoridation has brought about a substantial improvement in the dental condition of the deciduous teeth of children in the study areas.

The result for children aged four to five years, which alone can be compared with American results, appear to be in line with them.

There is good reason to expect that the longer term effects of fluoridation will be similar to the excellent results obtained in the United States."

A Sydney professor of preventive dentistry recently bought into the argument by asking what all the tumult was about.

Professor N. Martin said that people were consuming natural fluoride all the time.

It was merely a case of lifting quantities to lift dental and other health standards.

I do not think I heard Professor Martin quoted in the House. To continue—

Professor Martin said that Sydney's beer contained natural fluoride.

This was also true of other major beer drinking cities and towns in Australia.

He said that if Australians started drinking beer from the cradle, they probably would have perfect teeth.

Now all members with perfect teeth will know the reason. To continue—

Australians had among the lowest international standards of dental health.

This was because among other things they did not get the necessary supplies of fluoride in the early stages of the formation of their teeth.

Professor Martin said that beer—like wine, tea and many of the fruit juices advocated by anti-fluoridationist naturopaths—contained one part-per-million of natural fluoride.

This was the same as the amount recommended by medical and dental authorities for Australia's domestic water supplies.

At their 1963 annual conferences, both the New South Wales and Victorian branches of the ALP supported the fluoridation of water supplies as a means of preventing dental decay.

The NSW conference recommended that fluoridation should be a part of Labor party policy at the next Federal elections.

In Victoria the conference accepted as policy fluoridation principles approved by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia, the Australian Medical Association, and the Australian Dental Association.

That article was written under the name of Penny Price, and I presume that the editor knew it was going into the paper.

The Hon. R. Thompson: As does *The West Australian*, we invite people to write columns and letters. When you were reading it out, I thought it was a paid advertisement by the Swan Brewery.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Methinks the honourable member doth protest too much! I thought the article would be of interest to members. I received today from the Minister for Health the following extract from the Medical Journal of Australia, vol. 2, No. 14, of the 5th October, 1963, page 575:—

The Philippines will soon join the growing number of countries which have embarked on the fluoridation of their water supplies as a means of combating dental decay. The President of the country has recently signed into law a Bill authorising the appropriation of funds for the fluoridation of water supplies throughout the country. During the meeting of the World Health Organisation Western Pacific Regional Committee held in New Zealand in 1961, it was revealed that children who had been drinking fluoridated water all their lives had a reduction of over 60 per cent. in dental decay. The fluoridation programme has been conducted over a period of six and a half years in the city of Hastings, N.Z. Hongkong, Singapore and parts of Sarawak and Taiwan have had their water supplies fluoridated.

That was a World Health Organisation Press release.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You would not have the July issue of *The Western Sun*, would you?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. Did you change your opinion in it?

The Hon. R. Thompson: No. There was an anti-fluoride article in the July issue. You should have read that as well.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have not seen the July issue. I have not been that privileged. I was quoting from the June issue.

The Hon. R. Thompson: We will give you an application form for the paper.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I could go on for a long time in reply to this debate. I repeat, that I am quite surprised really at the attitude of Mr. Baxter—quite surprised. Nevertheless, he is entitled to have his own views.

The speech made by Mr. Jack Thomson was a well-reasoned one. At least he knows exactly what he is going to do. But the suggestion put to the House that the speech made by Dr. Hislop was not a well-informed address on the subject is something which I will not accept. I think Dr. Hislop's views on matters of this nature—

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: You are not implying that I said that, are you?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Mr. Jack Thomson did not say that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. The views expressed by Dr. Hislop must have been well received by everyone who listened to them because he, as a practising physician gave us an informative, experienced outline of his knowledge of the subject.

I am prepared to leave the matter on that basis, and I am also satisfied that the Government is prepared to shape up to its responsibilities. It believes it should accept the responsibility to present this Bill to Parliament, and asks Parliament to pass it.

Question put.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: No.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): The Ayes have it.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Divide.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Ring the bells.

Point of Order

The Hon. A. R. JONES: On a point of Order, Mr. President, there was only one call for the Noes.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Would you call the question again, Sir?

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: On a point of Order, Mr. President, Standing Orders lay down distinctly that if there is only one vote for the Ayes or only one vote for the Noes there shall be no division.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Was there only one vote?

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: Yes.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Very well, the question passes in the affirmative.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 12.1 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 23rd October, 1963

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ASSENT TO BILL | 1921 |
| BILLS— | |
| Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill—Assent | 1921 |
| Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Intro.; 1r. | 1929 |
| Licensing Act Amendment Bill—Intro.; 1r. | 1929 |
| Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill—3r. | 1929 |
| Taxi-cars (Co-ordination and Control) Bill—Intro.; 1r. | 1929 |
| Vermin Act Amendment Bill—3r. | 1929 |
| LEAVE OF ABSENCE | 1929 |
| MOTIONS— | |
| Geraldton Harbour—Improvement to International Standard | 1963 |
| Koongamia-Darlington Railway—Reopening | 1946 |
| Onslow Town and Port—Rehabilitation | 1929 |
| QUESTIONS ON NOTICE— | |
| Education— | |
| Carnarvon Primary School: Tenders for New Classrooms | 1925 |
| Junior and Leaving Certificates— | |
| Number of Candidates and Percentage of Passes | 1925 |
| Successful Candidates at University | 1925 |
| Kalgoorlie School of Mines: Alterations and Additions | 1922 |
| Fruit Industry— | |
| Fruit Cases: Price Increase | 1923 |
| Scale in Fruit— | |
| Effect on Exports of Fruit | 1923 |
| Examination and Control Measures | 1924 |
| Increase in Fruit-growing Areas | 1923 |
| High-pressure Salesmen—Victorian Legislation to Combat | 1926 |
| Land at Williams— | |
| Applications for Farm Area | 1921 |
| Availability of Other Land | 1922 |
| Motor Vehicles— | |
| Thefts— | |
| Cost Involved in Maintaining Offenders | 1927 |
| Number in Metropolitan Area | 1927 |
| Offenders: Ages and Punishment | 1927 |
| Unlawful Possession— | |
| Minimum and Maximum Penalties | 1928 |
| Offenders: Punishment | 1928 |
| Native Land Settlement Farms—Reserve in Agricultural Zone | 1926 |
| Railways— | |
| Fares: Effect of Increase on Goldfields Workers' Concession | 1922 |
| Refreshment Services—Female Staff: Facilities Available for Off-duty Hours | 1922 |
| Road Bridge: Carnarvon-Babbage Island—Departmental Investigations and Report | 1925 |
| Shannon River Mill Club Land— | |
| Club Application for Lease | 1926 |
| Owner and Lessee | 1926 |