

he thought Mr. Strickland knew of one. I do know the case the Minister had in mind, but I would remind the Minister that in the case I discussed with him, that was not the initial offer—that was the final offer. By no means was it the initial offer—it was the final settlement and the price finally paid.

In my experience, I do not know of many cases—possibly I know of 10—but I can say, quite honestly, that not one of those owners accepted the initial offer because it was a long way below the final settlement; that is, the final offer agreed upon.

Although the Government tries to be fair, to my mind one of the greatest objections to the system is the long delay and the haggling in between the initial offer and the final agreement. I think that could be overcome by a court to which those who are losing their properties had free access. I think a court should be established for the purpose and that type of court would study offers, would have the records on its files, and would be able to do something about the situation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 5.4 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 13th October, 1966

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—Com.....	1415
Supply Bill (No. 2)—	
Standing Orders Suspension .....	1408
Message : Appropriations .....	1408
Com. of Supply .....	1408
Com. of Ways and Means .....	1414
Intro. ; 1r. ; 2r. ....	1414
Com. ; Report ; 3r. ....	1414
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Barracks Archway : Cost of Restoration .....	1405
Canning Dam : Landscaping and Picnic Facilities .....	1404
Chiropractors : Registrations, and Name of Board's Solicitor .....	1405
Housing—Jarrahdale : Current Programme .....	1404
Karnet Rehabilitation Centre—Recreation Hall : Provision .....	1404
Muresk Agricultural College : Suspension of Students .....	1406
Prisoners : Rights under Regulations, and Solitary Confinement .....	1408
P.W.D. Employees, Albany : Dismissals .....	1406
Reserves : Leasing by Local Authorities for Stables .....	1405
Road Transport of Goods and Superphosphate—Balla Area : Exemption by Transport Board .....	1405
Swan River Drive : Commencement of Construction .....	1404
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—</b>	
Mitchell Freeway—Work near Parliament House : Effect on buildings .....	1408
Muresk Agricultural College : Suspension of Students .....	1407
Television for Country Centres : Provision by Commercial Interests .....	1407

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

### QUESTIONS (12): ON NOTICE

1. This question was postponed.

#### HOUSING

##### Jarrahdale: Current Programme

2. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Housing:

How many houses does the State Housing Commission intend to build at Jarrahdale this financial year?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:  
Seven dwelling units.

#### CANNING DAM

##### Landscaping and Picnic Facilities

3. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Is it intended eventually to landscape the surroundings of Canning Dam and improve the picnic facilities?

(2) If "Yes," when is it expected this work will commence?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) When funds are available for this purpose without prejudice to works of a more urgent nature.

#### KARNET REHABILITATION CENTRE

##### Recreation Hall: Provision

4. Mr. RUSHTON asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is it intended to provide a recreational hall at the Karnet Rehabilitation Centre for use by the staff and their families?

(2) If "Yes," when is the hall expected to be built?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Plans have been drawn and the project will be commenced as soon as the necessary finance can be arranged.

#### SWAN RIVER DRIVE

##### Commencement of Construction

5. Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has any decision been made on the construction of the Swan River drive to relieve traffic congestion on Guildford Road?

(2) If "Yes," when is it anticipated work will commence?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. The consultant firm of De Leuw Cather & Company is at present undertaking a planning study for the Main Roads Department, which will enable the Gov-

ernment to determine the priorities which should be given to the construction of the various elements of the freeway system.

(2) Answered by (1).

### RESERVES

#### *Leasing by Local Authorities for Stables*

6. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Lands:

Is it permissible for a local authority to grant permission to a racing club to erect stables and horse yards on—

(a) "A"-class reserves;

(b) on any other class of reserve, under its jurisdiction and to lease the same to horse owners?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

This would depend entirely on the purpose for which the reserve, proclaimed Class "A" or otherwise, was set apart.

If the erection of stables and horse yards was conducive to the purpose of the reserve, then their establishment thereon could be permitted.

Ability of the local authority to grant a lease of a reserve would depend on the particular conditions under which it is controlled; that is, vesting order, board of management, power to lease.

### CHIROPRACTORS

#### *Registrations, and Name of Board's Solicitor*

7. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Referring to the answers given to parts (4) and (5) of my question on chiropractors' registrations asked on the 21st September, will he check the details given?

(2) On what authority is the Chiropractors Registration Board able to refuse to return the 20 dollars registration fee paid by an applicant who died before his application was considered?

(3) What is the name of the Chiropractors Registration Board's solicitor or solicitors?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) The details given were correct as at the 21st September, 1966.

(2) The Chiropractors Registration Board rules published in the *Government Gazette* on the 9th May, 1966, require a fee to be paid with every application. Neither the Act nor the rules require or authorise the board to refund fees so paid.

(3) There are none.

### ROAD TRANSPORT OF GOODS AND SUPERPHOSPHATE

#### *Balla Area: Exemption by Transport Board*

8. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware that after the closing of the Northampton-Ajana and the Wokarina-Yuna railways farmers previously served by these lines were allowed to cart superphosphate from the Geraldton works without interference from the Transport Board as it was considered an open area and not offering competition to any railway system?

(2) Is he aware that 20c per ton has been levied on superphosphate carted by road contractor to the Balla area?

(3) As road transport is the only way that farmers' requirements can be transported to these districts, will he have this area declared an open area for the transport of goods by road transport?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

(1) An exemption applicable to primary producers throughout the State authorises them to convey their own superphosphate in their own farm vehicles without a license.

(2) A general exemption permits delivery of superphosphate to places within a radius of 50 miles from the place of manufacture. Beyond this distance, carriers are required to obtain permits, for which fees are payable according to a standard scale applicable to the whole State. For distances not exceeding 100 miles, which would appear to cover the Balla area, the correct fee for fertiliser is 10c per ton, or 15c if the distance exceeds 100 miles.

Should the honourable member know of any instance where a higher fee has been charged I will investigate it if he will advise me of the particulars.

(3) The scale of fees for permits is standard throughout the State and has no relationship to the existence or non-existence of railways. An alteration for one area could not be made without affecting others.

### BARRACKS ARCHWAY

#### *Cost of Restoration*

9. Mr. ELLIOTT asked the Premier:

Will he give an estimate of the cost of refacing the rear of the Barracks Arch and of providing

stairways to give access to the upper floors, together with the anticipated cost of beautifying the nearby surrounding area?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (a) \$19,500.
- (b) A beautifying scheme for the nearby surrounds of the archway is estimated to cost approximately \$1,500, dependent on the design adopted.

#### P.W.D. EMPLOYEES, ALBANY

##### *Dismissals*

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

In view of the statement that finance will be made available for P.W.D. works in Albany, how does he account for the dismissal of P.W.D. workers in Albany with many years of service?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Two departmental employees with one and 1½ years' service respectively, who were normally employed in Albany, resigned when offered alternative work at Elleker for a short period prior to the commencement of major water supply works in Albany.

#### MURESK AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

##### *Suspension of Students*

11. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What were the complete circumstances of the suspension of the group of 10 students from Muresk Agricultural College recently?
- (2) Is he aware that the respective parents of two of these students are resident overseas?
- (3) Is he aware that parents of students concerned who live in the metropolitan area were not advised until the Thursday after the Monday on which these students were sent away from the college?
- (4) As these students are minors in law, have not the college authorities some legal responsibility in regard to the welfare of such minors in their care?
- (5) What arrangements were made to accommodate or superintend the welfare of the two students whose parents were overseas?
- (6) Would not the action of the college authorities in sending the students away from the college before contacting their parents appear to be one of irresponsibility?
- (7) How long before the disciplinary action was the breach of college rules alleged to have taken place?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) After consideration of the circumstances associated with the breach of rules, the principal interviewed each student on Monday, the 12th September. Each student was informed of the decision to suspend him for the remainder of the academic year. Each student was directed to inform his parents and to request that the parents contact the principal.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Most parents had contacted the principal by Tuesday, the 13th, some visiting the college for this purpose. On Tuesday the 13th, the decision was confirmed to the parents by letter.
- (4) The action taken was in recognition of this responsibility.
- (5) In one case the guardian was contacted and collected the boy. In the second case the boy decided to go to a nearby farm owned by the parents of another student. The principal eventually spoke by radio telephone to his father in New Guinea who subsequently visited the college.
- (6) The parents were informed through the students before the students left the college, with the exception of the parent in New Guinea, and the principal was aware of arrangements in each case. Most parents contacted the principal in this regard.
- (7) The breach occurred late on Friday, the 9th September, and after consideration of all the circumstances over the weekend, action was taken on Monday, the 12th September.

#### PRISONERS

##### *Rights Under Regulations, and Solitary Confinement*

12. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is a prisoner who submits to a prison officer a request to attend a superintendent's parade for stated reasons, and whose request is noted, entitled to such access?
- (2) If the request is to see a visiting magistrate is he entitled to such access?
- (3) If the request is to see the Comptroller-General of Prisons is he entitled to such access?
- (4) What procedures are followed in order to ensure a fair inquiry (when a prisoner is charged with committing breaches of certain prison regulations) and fair punishment in the event of the charges having been proved?

- (5) What redress and what rights has a prisoner who considers he has been wrongfully found guilty of breaches of prison regulations, and how may these rights be exercised?
- (6) What is involved in the punishment of a prisoner being held in a state of segregation?
- (7) What personal effect is such a prisoner entitled to retain?
- (8) Would a *Holy Bible* owned by him be denied him?
- (9) Has a prisoner held in a state of segregation any right of appeal or approach to the Minister for Justice or other Minister of the Crown—
  - (a) with, or
  - (b) without
 the contents of such approach being revealed to the prison authorities?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.
- (4) Prisoners are charged before visiting justices, and decisions as to verdict and sentence are their prerogative.
- (5) He may appeal through the superintendent or Comptroller-General to the visiting magistrate.
- (6) He is placed in segregated accommodation with separated exercise facilities and works in this environment.
- (7) There is no differentiation between personal effects retained by segregated and ordinary prisoners.
- (8) No.
- (9) Yes, if in the opinion of the visiting magistrate this is warranted. The details of the case would be made available through the superintendent to the Comptroller-General.

#### QUESTIONS (4): WITHOUT NOTICE

##### TELEVISION FOR COUNTRY CENTRES

###### *Provision by Commercial Interests*

1. Mr. EVANS asked the Premier:  
 Yesterday I asked a question, without notice, of the Deputy Premier, as he was then in charge of the House, and now I do not know whether I should address a further question on the same subject to the Deputy Premier or the Premier. Yesterday in reply to a question regarding television facilities in Geraldton and Kalgoorlie, the Deputy Premier said that the Government would support any application or move made in this regard. Will the Govern-

ment not only support a proposal but also make a plea, as requested in the question yesterday?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The Government quite naturally supports any move that would provide television services in isolated parts of the State and, in particular, in the two places referred to—Kalgoorlie and Geraldton. I have myself, as one of the persons concerned in the areas, written urging that a decision be made either to provide the services through the A.B.C. or to allow private enterprise to participate on the basis that has been referred to in the Federal Parliament by, I think, Senator Branson. We as a Government would be quite willing to lend our support, having regard for the fact that the main reason for the services not having already been provided is the enormous amount of money involved. We could only press the case on the basis that the services are required by the people in the country and will, if they are made available, contribute to the greater contentment of the people, particularly of young people.

##### MURESK AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

###### *Suspension of Students*

2. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

With regard to question No. 11 on today's notice paper dealing with the suspension of 10 students from Muresk Agricultural College—

- (1) Does the Minister know the type of offence alleged to have been committed by these 10 students?
- (2) Have representations been made to him by the parents of the students; and, if so, when is it likely they can expect some decision from him concerning those representations?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
  - (2) Letters are being prepared today to be sent to the parents who have written to me asking for details.
3. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Agriculture:  
 In view of the answer the Minister just gave to the first part of my question—
    - (1) What was the offence?
    - (2) Has the college instigated any inquiry to ascertain the

source of the liquor which was found in the possession of these students?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) I think the situation as outlined by the honourable member is not in the interests of the students. I would urge him to at least think of the students, because he is not doing so when he enables this information to be made public. The honourable member should think of the students and their future. If he had been prepared to seek this information from me privately, I would have been glad to make it available to him.

Mr. Jamieson: It was announced in the Press and on TV.

Mr. NALDER: It is not in the interests of the students concerned to publish this sort of information across the pages of the Press in Western Australia.

Mr. Jamieson: It has already been in the Press.

Mr. NALDER: But why keep on pushing this information out? Why not think of the students themselves—

Mr. Jamieson: I am.

Mr. NALDER: —and allow them to rehabilitate themselves.

Mr. Jamieson: I am thinking of the students.

#### MITCHELL FREEWAY

*Work near Parliament House: Effect on Buildings*

4. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Minister for Works): Some time ago I promised to obtain further information for the member for South Perth in connection with a question he asked concerning the tremors or vibrations felt in the House.

Mr. Bickerton: Was that last night?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The last time I spoke about this matter I advised that an engineer would visit Parliament House the next time compaction operations, involving the use of vibration equipment, were taking place. This has been arranged with the result that the engineer reports that it is possible to sense vibrations, emanating from a 4½-ton vibrating roller, within the external galleries of Parliament House. In his opinion, the vibrations would be extremely small and could not possibly cause any damage to the building.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

##### *Standing Orders Suspension*

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [2.30 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Question put and passed.

##### *Message: Appropriations*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

##### *In Committee of Supply*

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, the Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [2.32 p.m.]: I move—

That there be granted to Her Majesty on account of the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1967, a sum not exceeding \$50,000,000.

Supply of \$61,000,000 has already been granted for this current financial year, made up as follows:—

	\$
Consolidated Revenue Fund	42,000,000
General Loan Fund	14,000,000
Advance to Treasurer	5,000,000

Expenditure incurred on services financed from the Consolidated Revenue Fund amounted to \$52,889,000 for the period of three months ended the 30th September, 1966. Of this total, payments of \$12,543,000 were authorised by appropriations under special Acts and the balance of \$40,346,000 was expended under the authority granted by the first Supply Bill, 1966.

Revenue collected in the three months to the 30th September totalled \$51,961,000 and fell short of expenditure in the same period by \$928,000. The result for the first quarter of this financial year does not indicate any variation from the estimated deficit of \$618,000 provided in the Budget. In this respect it is normal for the deficit to accumulate in the early months of the year and to reduce later as certain items of revenue are brought to account.

Expenditure from the General Loan Fund for the three months ended the 30th September totalled \$9,731,000, but this rate of spending will increase as the capital works programme gathers momentum. Further supply of \$50,000,000 is required to carry on the services of the State until the Estimates have been passed. These are in the hands of members and give full

details of proposed expenditure both from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan Fund.

Of the \$50,000,000 now being sought, the sum of \$40,000,000 is to be issued and applied out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the balance of \$10,000,000 from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund.

As you know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, both of the Estimates have been introduced; that is, the Loan Estimates and the General Revenue Estimates. Members will have a full opportunity of debating each one of these in turn and almost immediately. Until these Estimates are passed, it is necessary to get a further overdraft, as it were, of \$50,000,000, which is referred to in this Supply Bill (No. 2).

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) (2.35 p.m.): It is necessary for the Government to be voted authority by Parliament to expend moneys to carry on the activities of the State. It is not my intention this afternoon to make any extensive criticism of Government policy as it has been operated in the financial and taxation fields over the last year or so and as it has been foreshadowed by way of further instalments in the Budget speech which the Treasurer delivered to Parliament a few days ago.

I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to register a protest against the way the proceedings of Parliament were unduly extended over Tuesday night and into Wednesday morning and over last night and into this morning in connection with the fluoride Bill. I am not one of those members who complain when Parliament has, of necessity, to sit very late—such occasions arise periodically. Members come to expect that there will be very late sittings when the notice paper before the House is a heavy one, and this applies particularly when the proceedings of Parliament in a particular session are moving towards their close.

However, in my view there was no warrant for the very long sitting which took place on Tuesday night and into Wednesday morning, and the even longer one which took place last night until almost 3 o'clock this morning. This fluoride Bill was not one which required immediate decision—it would not have mattered, from any practical point of view, if the consideration of it by this Assembly had not been completed in relation to the second reading until the end of today's sitting, or even until the end of next week. There cannot be anybody who is waiting to burst into action in connection with the scheme which the Bill proposes. Therefore, there was no necessity whatsoever in my view for members of this House and the staff members of the House and those in other parts of the building to be kept here until almost 2 o'clock one morning and 3 o'clock

another morning to ensure that the second reading debate on the Bill would be completed before Wednesday's sitting of the House concluded.

Mr. O'Connor: It was the debate from your side which held us up mostly on Tuesday night—it went on for three hours.

Mr. HAWKE: I am surprised at the nature of that interjection from the Minister for Transport. The honourable member who led the debate on this side in opposition to the fluoride Bill proposals was exercising a right which this Parliament gives to him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. O'Connor: And I agree with it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Further, the Government agreed not to go forward with it until 9.15 p.m.—in fact, the Government arranged the time for him.

Mr. HAWKE: That is all right, and I ask the Minister: What is wrong with such an arrangement?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I am merely pointing out how accommodating the Government has been.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not complaining about any lack of accommodation which the Government has given to anyone.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It seems you are being unreasonable.

Mr. HAWKE: I would hope the Minister for Works, who is the Minister in charge of this Bill, would try to remain rational and cool on this matter. My protest is not against any lack of accommodation which the Government might have granted to any particular member of the House on this side or on the other side. My protest simply is that it was unreasonable and unfair for members on this side of the Chamber—and this applies to members on both sides—to be kept here until 1.45 a.m. Wednesday and until 2.45 a.m. today debating this Bill.

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

Mr. HAWKE: If there had been any necessity for the proceedings to continue until such a late hour each night, I would not have made any protest whatsoever.

Mr. O'Connor: I think you have made a mistake about the finishing time on Tuesday evening. I think the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Wednesday. After the only speaker had concluded his remarks, the House adjourned.

Mr. HAWKE: All right. I am happy to find the Minister assisting the Minister for Railways so interested in this matter. Is my statement on the time we finished this morning approximately correct?

Mr. O'Connor: I would think so.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister thinks so; but he is not sure.

Mr. O'Connor: Yes, I am sure.

Mr. HAWKE: I will excuse the Minister for not being sure, because after a more

or less all night sitting on Tuesday evening and practically an all night sitting yesterday evening I would excuse any member for not being sure of the exact time at which each of the two sittings finished.

My complaint is based entirely on the ground that there was no necessity for these unduly long and exhaustive sittings. What would it have mattered if the second reading debate on the Bill had concluded at, say, 6 p.m. today, or for that matter at some time next Wednesday evening or Thursday evening? It would have made no difference whatsoever; yet members of the staff and other people were kept here without reason and without necessity, to go through this unfair and, in my view, rather stupid proceeding.

The whole matter is made a lot worse by the fact that the Bill we are debating is a health Bill sent to Parliament by the Department of Public Health, sponsored in this House by an ex-Minister for Health on behalf of the present Minister for Health. I am reminded of an experience I had some years ago one Sunday afternoon in Melbourne when I was listening to a speaker discussing health matters at an open-air gathering. I think her name was Pearl Dimell—a very fine speaker, and a most attractive-looking woman, too. She was very healthy, I should imagine.

Mr. Brand: How were her teeth?

Mr. HAWKE: She had her own teeth and did not take fluoride. She was a naturopath, and a most convincing speaker. I think she might even have impressed the Minister for Lands had he been fortunate enough to have the opportunity of seeing her and hearing her. She had great faith in naturopathy—if there is such a term. She did not have a great deal of faith in the members of the medical profession, although she did not criticise them unduly. But she did not have much faith in Ministers for Health. She related a personal experience she had in seeking an interview with the Minister for Health in Victoria.

She said that she went to Parliament House in Melbourne and sought an interview with the Minister for Health. An attendant said he would do his best to find the Minister for Health. He went away and within 20 minutes he had not returned, so the woman rang the door bell again and another attendant came, and she told the second attendant that she was concerned about the health of the people of Victoria and wanted to interview the Minister for Health to discuss with him some ideas and suggestions which she had for improving the health of the people of Victoria. So the second attendant said, "I will do my best to find him." He went away and within about half an hour he returned and said, "I am sorry, Madam, the Minister for Health is home ill in bed."

So, as I have said, this Bill, which kept us here on Tuesday night till about mid-

night, and last night until 2.45 a.m. today, is supposed to be a health Bill. It is certainly direct from the Health Department, has the blessing of the Health Minister and the Government, and yet, without any shred of necessity to have these unduly long and exhausting sittings, the Government compelled members to carry through a long range of hours to get the second reading of the Bill completed. Goodness knows why! There was never any doubt that the second reading of the Bill would be passed. So just why the Minister for Health and the Minister for Industrial Development—who, I think, was for the most part in charge of the proceedings of the House in the absence of the Premier—insisted that these long sittings should be held, I am absolutely at a loss to know.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You did the same thing yourself when you were the Leader of the House and in Government. On many occasions when you were in office, we have sat here well beyond the time when we could have gone home.

Mr. HAWKE: It is obvious the Minister is impressed with my protest. It is obvious his conscience has been stirred a bit. Instead of trying to justify what the Government did in this matter on Tuesday night, early Wednesday morning, Wednesday night and early this morning on the merits of the situation, he rakes back into the past and says in a general, airy sort of way, "Your Government did this sort of thing when it was in office."

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have answered yourself.

Mr. HAWKE: I said earlier, in making this complaint, that late sittings of Parliament had been held over years gone by, and I also said circumstances did arise from time to time, when the notice paper was heavy and when the proceedings of Parliament in a particular session were moving towards their close, that justified late sittings of the House. However, there was no possible justification for the very long sitting we had on Tuesday night and the longer one we had last night. There was no justification, no necessity, and no urgency for them! Can the Minister for Works give one reason on the ground of urgency why these very long sittings should have been held?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was not a long sitting on Tuesday evening at all, but we were kept to a late hour because of the very long speech made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; so that is one sitting accounted for.

Mr. HAWKE: After last evening, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I will again move a step towards the Minister for Works. Let us disregard Tuesday night. Can the Minister give me one reason, based upon urgency, why this House should have been kept sitting until the early hours of this morning?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Because it was the same topic, and there was a natural desire on the part of the Government to get the Bill into the Committee stage.

Mr. HAWKE: That is no reason.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And because we felt there was justification for it.

Mr. HAWKE: There is no justification for that. The Minister has not given any reason based upon urgency; he has just given an excuse based upon convenience.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have just cut your argument by half.

Mr. HAWKE: As I said, I am always willing to go a step or two towards the Minister when he is prepared to adopt a conciliatory attitude, which is not very often. He is now getting petulant.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is what you are doing.

Mr. HAWKE: He gets very petulant when any criticism is directed at his actions.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That has applied throughout your speech.

Mr. HAWKE: I say there was no reason to keep the House sitting until the early hours of this morning—no reason based on urgency. All the Minister can give is a reason based upon convenience, and upon the Government's desire to do something. The Government should consider more than its own convenience; it should have some consideration for the members on its own side of the House, if not for the members on this side.

If we look at yesterday's notice paper, we will see there has not been a smaller one during the present session. It consisted of only one sheet, and half of it was taken up with questions on notice. So the balance of the notice paper containing the business which was before the House comprised less than half of a single sheet.

Mr. O'Neil: There was also an addendum.

Mr. HAWKE: Not on the same single sheet to which I am referring. There was a separate sheet, by way of an addendum, which contained amendments proposed to be moved during the Committee stage by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Neil: I concede that point.

Mr. HAWKE: I wish the Minister for Works were half as reasonable as the Minister for Housing. If he were, the proceedings in this House would be conducted in a more friendly and more co-operative manner, and they would be discharged much more expeditiously. I make my complaint—I prefer to call it a protest—because there was no real necessity, on the basis of urgency, for the House to sit beyond midnight. If there was any urgency, I would be as willing as anybody else to stay here as long as might be thought necessary in the circumstances; but there was no necessity last night what-

soever. The proceedings could have been brought to an end by 11 p.m. or, at the latest, by midnight, in view of the late sitting the night before, and the second reading could have been completed today.

The Bill is a tremendously important one, and I think every member who spoke on it will agree that is so. Therefore any member who wished to make a contribution should have been allowed a reasonable opportunity to do so. Another result of the very late sitting until nearly three o'clock this morning was to reduce the amount of time which some members took in putting their views before the House; in other words, they jettisoned much of what they would have said had the debate taken place in more reasonable and more civilised hours. By doing what it did, the Government was not fair to the members concerned. They should have been given an opportunity to take the full time allowed under the Standing Orders.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is generally agreed it was a very good debate.

Mr. HAWKE: It was an exceptionally good debate. However, that has nothing to do with the point I am making, which is that some members, because they did not have the opportunity to start speaking until two o'clock this morning, did not express all the views they wished to express, and did not express in full those which they did put forward.

As a result of what I have said I hope more reasonable consideration will be given to the proceedings of this House from now until the end of the session. I anticipate, as can any member, that before the end of the session it may be necessary for the House, on one or more nights, to sit until three or five o'clock in the morning, providing the circumstances are reasonable, the business before the House is urgent, and the notice paper is fairly solid. In those circumstances there would be no protest from me. However, in the situation which I have discussed this afternoon there has been, and there is, room for a protest to be made.

**MR. TONKIN** (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.57 p.m.]: Although I shall have an opportunity later on to speak at greater length on a subject which is causing me concern, I now wish to say a few words about it. Before doing so I want to make reference to one of the subject matters in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition which he just concluded.

I was not enthusiastic at having to speak for 2½ hours the other evening, but with many of these subjects very few members will apply themselves sufficiently to get the whole history of a proposal which might be embodied in legislation. There could be no proper consideration of the subject matter of the Bill, unless the background was known; and I could not



see that any member in this Chamber was able to supply the information if I did not supply it myself.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Nobody blames you for having spoken that long.

Mr. TONKIN: It was known I would make a fairly lengthy speech. When the notice paper was drawn up, it was done so in a way to permit me to commence my speech almost straight after the tea suspension. After the notice paper was drawn up, the Government lifted a Bill which was lower down than the fluoridation measure—I refer to the Bill for the pegging of the basic wage—and it took half an hour of the time of the House to deal with it. That amount of time could have been available for debating the fluoridation measure. Under the circumstances it was inevitable, seeing I did not commence my speech until after 9 p.m.—and I am not sure of the exact time—

Mr. Craig: It was about 9.30 p.m.

Mr. TONKIN:—that the sitting would be too late. I did not consider I should remove from what I intended to say a good portion of what I had prepared. But, as it turned out, because I realised I had spoken for what I considered to be a reasonable length of time under the circumstances, I left out quite a lot of the information which was of value, and which would have further strengthened my case. So if there is any criticism because the House was kept here until 12.30 a.m. or thereabouts the next morning, it should not be levelled at me.

The Government has brought down a Budget for greatly increased charges and I may not get an opportunity to speak on them for a considerable time. So there is one aspect of this matter which I desire to emphasise now; and, that is, the rush to put up the bus fares which fall heavily upon a section of the people. Increasing bus fares does not make any difference to people who drive themselves to and from work in their motorcars. I believe the majority who are using public transport—not all of them—are people on low incomes and a goodly proportion are pensioners. Some of these pensioners make journeys involving two or more sections. So the increases in bus fares rest heavily upon them; and they have not received any increase in their pensions yet.

I have had complaints from pensioners on this matter pointing out how unfair it is they should bear the brunt of these increases. They are the first ones to feel it. We can look in other directions and find the Government throwing money around without proper concern for economising at all. Large sums each year are being wasted because of Government policy; and I refer to two instances. The first is the sale of the State Building Supplies, which involves the Government in substantial loss from revenue every

year because it has to meet loan fund charges; and then there will be the further expense in connection with the sale of Wundowie, where a somewhat similar situation will arise.

We come to a much smaller sum, but it still points in the same direction, in connection with the Gallup poll for the retention of the Barracks Archway. The Premier indicated some \$800 would be the cost of this; and what is to be the value of it?

Mr. Hawke: Nil.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier indicated that irrespective of the decision of this poll, the Government would make the decision; so it was a heads I win, tails you lose, proposition.

Therefore the expenditure involved in it is clear, absolute waste and cannot be justified in any shape or form. This is indicative of the general attitude of the Government so far as finance is concerned. It throws money around left, right, and centre believing it will be able to retrieve the situation by increasing taxation. This Government has the record for the most comprehensive and severe imposition of taxation in the history of the State of Western Australia. There has never been a single instance up till this one where increases of taxation—imposts upon the people—have been so comprehensive and so steep as the proposed increases in connection with this Budget. It will be pretty hard to justify that in view of the attitude of the Government in throwing money away.

The Minister for Industrial Development, on one of his frequent trips abroad, went recently to Europe to deliver a paper. Why could not he have done it here and sent it across by mail and got somebody else to read it for him? It just staggered me to think, in view of the financial position of this State and the supposed need to load these imposts upon the people, that we were to pay to send a Minister to Europe to deliver a paper. I hope at some time or other I can become possessed of a copy of that paper—

Mr. Court: I will be glad to give you a copy.

Mr. TONKIN: —to see whether it was worth while in any direction as far as this State is concerned.

Mr. Court: I did more than deliver a paper; and this was of value to the State.

Mr. TONKIN: That is the Minister's complementary cover to justify what he did; but the primary purpose was to deliver the paper. I say the expenditure was not justified.

Mr. Court: That is your point of view, of course.

Mr. Hawke: I wish the Minister would not mumble.

Mr. Court: It puts him off if I do.

Mr. TONKIN: It is a further illustration of the prodigal way in which the resources of the State are expended when it is in a serious financial difficulty. I saw a figure quoted somewhere—I have looked for it since, but have not been able to locate it, so I stand subject to correction—which indicated the State had gone \$7,000,000 to the bad in 12 months, and in order to retrieve this situation an impost, which would amount to some \$2,000,000, was to be made to obtain money through increased hospital charges. So this is a case of slugging the sick to pay for trips abroad by the Minister for Industrial Development to deliver papers!

I am told that the increase in bus fares was made against the desire of the people in charge of the concern; and it is an arbitrary increase imposed upon them against their will for the sole purpose of raising revenue and not to encourage people to use public transport. Yet that is what the Government ought to be doing.

It is a stupid policy to bring about a set of circumstances which will result in fewer people using Government transport; and it is throwing upon the Government an increased burden for the provision of more roads and parking facilities, when the right way to go about it is to make transport so cheap and attractive, even to the extent of providing it for nothing—as is done in some places—that expenditure might be saved elsewhere for the provision of roads, thus obviating the necessity to resume people's property. But no; that does not matter.

Can the Minister for Works give me any idea what the bitumen on the sandheap is costing at the Narrows Bridge? Every time I go past I see someone spreading bitumen on the sand, and the cost must be running into hundreds and hundreds of dollars—and it is a complete waste.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is not a waste.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes it is; because it is for no purpose other than to stop the sand from blowing around. It will not serve any purpose later on, and a lot of sand will have to be carted away.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It keeps the sand there. It obviates a nuisance and it keeps the tons of sand there.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course it does.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They are two very good reasons.

Mr. TONKIN: It keeps the sand there which is to be subsequently carted away.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is for an engineering purpose.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; to fill in the space between Heirisson Island and the mainland. That is the engineering purpose!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Well, well, well!

Mr. TONKIN: When the Minister was recently questioned on this, he did not know where the sand was to go. He ad-

mitted it was to go away, but he did not know where. I am telling him where—it is going to fill in the space between Heirisson Island and the mainland.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you like a bet?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not bet.

Mr. Bovell: Since when?

Mr. Hawke: I do not think the Minister for Works is licensed by the T.A.B. to bet either.

Mr. Brand: We will offer credit.

Mr. TONKIN: One could go on citing example after example of complete irresponsibility with regard to expenditure. The Government is following the line of: it does not matter; we will increase taxation to make good the deficiency.

Mr. Hawke: I remember the Minister for Industrial Development kicking in a glass door.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): Order The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [3.11 p.m.]: I would like to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I cannot speak as one who experienced the late night and I am, therefore, somewhat at a disadvantage. However, it is sufficient for me to say we have noted the protest.

In all the years I have been in this House there have been, from time to time—as the Leader of the Opposition says—occasions when we have sat on and on, even, in fact, past breakfast time. I am wondering whether those measures which were debated were thought to be of sufficient importance in the minds of the Opposition—whichever party it happened to be—to warrant our sitting until that hour. It would seem to me to be fair to say that members would feel tired after last night's late sitting, particularly as it followed a late sitting the previous night.

However, I can quite imagine the situation developing where the Government was hoping to get the measure through and, when getting so near to the end, yet another speech was made, and so it carried on. When it got so late the problem would have been whether to go on to finish the measure or to come back to it the next day. That is a predicament which the Leader of the House has to face, whoever he happens to be.

Mr. Jamieson: It is well known that some people will only speak after midnight.

Mr. BRAND: I understand that some of the best speeches were made after midnight.

Mr. Hawke: After something else, really, I think.

Mr. BRAND: That is not for me to say; I am only interested in the speeches which are made here. Nevertheless, I

think the Leader of the Opposition does understand the position.

On the other hand, I would like to think we could avoid, as far as possible, some of these nerve-racking experiences of sitting here night after night so very late, particularly as in the early part of this session we had a light notice paper and the House rose quite early.

I registered the fact that the Leader of the Opposition thought that perhaps during this session we might sit here until 5 a.m. That is an interesting point, but sufficient has been said. The questions which were raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are those which are raised by any Opposition when taxation measures are before the House. All through the years I have heard the arguments raised; and each one of us has protested against the amount, and has made allegations against the Government that it is frittering away the taxpayers' money.

If I were able to get hold of papers printed during the time when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a Minister in the Government, I could find reports of where expenditure was considered unnecessary in everybody's eyes but those of the Minister. That applies to each Minister and to each Government.

Regarding the question raised about the Minister for Industrial Development going overseas, I want to emphasise that, while in the first place he went as a result of an invitation, he made some profitable journeys in the various countries around the world. I have heard members on the other side of the House say how important it is for us to keep in touch with developments, whether that contact is made by private members or Ministers.

I think it is a matter of satisfaction when the Minister of a Government is invited by an international organisation to speak at a conference, irrespective of the subject or the organisation.

Mr. Tonkin: Irrespective of the cost?

Mr. BRAND: Not at all. The costs were clear; and everybody knew what it would cost to go to England and other places by air. I might say that when the Minister for Industrial Development goes abroad he is quite frugal, and there is never any extra expenditure involved. I have noted this; and I want to make it clear to the House that I have no concern at any time about public money being spent during the time the Minister is away. Having replied in that vein, I move the motion.

Question put and passed.

#### *Report*

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

#### *In Committee of Ways and Means*

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, the Deputy

Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [3.17 p.m.]: I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1967, a sum not exceeding \$40,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and \$10,000,000 from the General Loan Fund.

Question put and passed.

#### *Report*

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer), and read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [3.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Beeloo) [3.19 p.m.]: I would like to take this opportunity to again protest about the cumbersome nature of the procedure of this Chamber in connection with supply matters. We have spent some considerable time on this subject just to introduce the Supply Bill. We achieve nothing by all the associated ramifications. It is obvious to members that the procedure is out-dated and out-moded. If any member has anything to say in connection with the matter before the House, surely it can be said at the second reading stage of the Bill.

The sooner we implement our move to alter Standing Orders and bring our procedures up to date, the sooner we will receive more respect from the public.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [3.20 p.m.]: As you know, Mr. Speaker, you have been requested to initiate some action in the matters to which the member for Beeloo has referred. I agree that the present method seems to be an extraordinary one to adopt in order that we may achieve the ultimate goal. However, the answer is a simple one. We have followed this procedure for many years and as yet we have done nothing to alter it.

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.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

## FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL

### *In Committee*

Resumed from the 12th October. The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 1 had been agreed to.

#### Clause 2: Commencement—

Mr. TONKIN: Members will note that there is a proposed amendment for the deletion of this clause in my name on the notice paper. The clause provides that the Act shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. It is necessary for me to act in this way in order that I may insert a new clause in its place, not to prevent the Act from coming into operation, but to permit certain provisions to come into operation immediately upon proclamation and to defer the operations of other provisions until such time as a referendum of the people has been taken to see whether they are in favour of the proposition or not.

In order to determine whether this is a fair proposition or not, one must first of all consider whether, under any circumstances whatever, an appeal to the people is justified. I doubt whether there is a single member in this Chamber, which is supposed to be representative of democracy, who would take the stand that under no circumstances whatever should the people be consulted on any question, irrespective of how grave it may be, or of how important it may be, but that the Government is entitled to go ahead and to do whatever it thinks fit by using its numbers.

I for one would not agree to that proposition, and I doubt whether there is anybody else in this Parliament who would subscribe to it. If that is a correct assumption, the next point is under what circumstances should the people be consulted, and on what questions; and I can think of no stronger argument than one where the people are to be obliged compulsorily to do something because the Government thinks it is good for them to do it.

In the history of Australia we have had a few examples of decisions being referred to the people. Under the Constitution the Commonwealth has been obliged to endeavour to obtain from the people a judgment on proposals which that Government desired to implement. The very fact that it is written into the Constitution that the people must be consulted on certain questions is indicative of a widespread belief in a democracy that under certain circumstances and conditions, before action is taken the people should be consulted. So we come back to the ques-

tion in this State: On what questions should they be consulted? I would say on questions of the type before us at the moment, where it is known there is considerable opposition to what the Government wants to do.

I am reliably informed that petitions are in the course of being prepared and already some 6,000 names have been obtained. It is probable that before the petitions are handed in some 10,000 names will have been obtained from people who object to the Government's proposal. That is indicative of the existence of substantial opposition.

Only an hour ago I was speaking to a gentleman who said he had yet to talk to somebody who was in favour of this proposition. In those circumstances surely we have no right to say, "Parliament is imposing this upon you even though we know there exists in the State substantial opposition to what we propose to do"; and more especially as it is held by top scientists that the complete safety of this measure has not been amply demonstrated or proved.

Nobody is prepared to guarantee its safety, with the possible exception of the Minister for Works. The American Medical Association will not guarantee its safety; the World Health Organisation will not guarantee its safety. So it must be accepted that all we have up to now are statements from people who say there is no proof of harm; but, of course, that could have been said of thalidomide for six years, but finally very substantial proof was produced, and the experts were then forced to take action where previously they had taken none.

It must be accepted that it has not yet been proved satisfactorily that nobody will be harmed as a result of this measure. On the contrary there are many examples in the literature to show that harm has occurred. So, as we are to compel people to take fluoridated water, we should consult them beforehand to see whether they believe that the supposed benefits will be sufficient to outweigh any disadvantage or harm.

The Premier was not here when I quoted his letter while I was speaking, so I propose to remind him of it if he will do me the courtesy to listen. This is most important on this question, because I consider from the letter that the Premier has indicated that for election purposes the Liberal Party policy is a referendum. I have a photostat copy of the Premier's letter, and he can check it, because I am in a position to supply the original if he wants it. It is dated the 25th January and is signed by the Premier and was sent to a resident of South Perth. In it the Premier said—

As for the policy speech, because we believe that this is still a desirable development and a progressive decision

in health, the matter will receive every consideration. I would point out to you that the Liberal Party supports holding a referendum. I haven't any doubt about the result of such a referendum and therefore more political support to this quarter will not achieve a great deal.

Even though this was only written to an individual, who had the right to show it to other individuals, in that context it was an undertaking that the policy of the Liberal Party, which was shortly to stand before the electors, was that, on this question of fluoridation there would be a referendum.

Mr. Brand: Oh, no!

Mr. Hawke: That commits the Liberal Party.

Mr. TONKIN: How can it be read any other way; because it is obvious that the person who wrote to the Premier asked what was the policy of the Government in connection with fluoridation? If that were not so, the Premier would not have written in this strain. The Premier said—

Thank you for your letter of the 18th January making reference to the vexed subject of "water Fluoridation" particularly in relation to its place in any policy speech which might be put forward on February the 2nd.

So it is clear that in his reply the Premier made a direct reference to the query as to what the Government's policy was on fluoridation. The Premier then said—

As for the policy speech, because we believe that this is still a desirable development and a progressive decision in health the matter will receive every consideration. I would point out to you that the Liberal Party supports holding a referendum.

Mr. Brand: I then went on to say that I did not think it would serve any purpose.

Mr. TONKIN: The letter continued—

I haven't any doubt about the result of such a referendum—

Mr. Brand: That is right. I went on to say it would not receive political support.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh, no; the letter did not say that! To refresh the Premier's memory it says—

I haven't any doubt about the result of such a referendum and therefore more political support to this quarter—

whatever that means, I do not know—

—will not achieve a great deal.

Apparently the writer of the letter suggested that if the Premier gave some indication of this in his policy speech, it might bring some political support. But that is an assumption on my part; I have

no ground for coming to that conclusion, because I have not the slightest idea what was in the original letter.

But if I received a letter of that kind I feel I would be entitled to say that before any proposal for the fluoridation of water supplies was put into operation it should be submitted to a referendum.

Mr. Hawke: That is clear enough in the Premier's letter.

Mr. Brand: Only you would come to that conclusion.

Mr. TONKIN: In those circumstances—and if one concedes there must be some circumstance in a democratic machinery when the people can be consulted—why should not they be consulted in connection with this matter? Why should this be excluded? It has State-wide application, and involves everybody in the State; and I feel everybody in the State who is entitled to vote at an election should have the right to vote on this referendum.

Although it was not a public declaration of policy in the form that would be made from a platform, the Premier, in writing this letter, made public the Liberal Party policy on this question, and it is that it should be referred to a referendum. If I were an elector and had voted for the Premier at the last election, and I had seen such a letter, I would feel the Premier was bound to refer the question to a referendum. I cannot see how one can come to any other conclusion.

I would now like your guidance, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I am aware that new clauses are moved when all other clauses in a Bill have been dealt with. I have a clause which I seek to substitute for a clause I propose to delete. It will therefore come in as new clause 2. Do I just move for the deletion and defer further action until the end of the discussion on the Bill; or do I proceed, if I am successful in achieving the deletion of clause 2, to endeavour to insert a new clause 2 in its place?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): No. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition must vote for or against the clause. If he is successful and the clause is deleted, a motion for a new clause will be taken at the end of all the others.

Mr. TONKIN: I assumed that would be the case, but I wanted to make sure.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I propose to vote against this clause, as I believe provision should be made for a referendum to be held on this very vital matter. Under this legislation, people will be forced to drink water containing fluoride, and therefore I think it is right and proper that they should have a say before the Bill becomes law.

I can say truthfully that all the correspondence I have received on this subject has contained protests against the introduction of fluoride into our water. I have received correspondence not only from people in my own territory but from people in other electorates as well. They have asked me to exercise my vote against this measure.

The Government has no mandate concerning this matter. It was not an issue at the last election; nor was it contained in the Premier's policy speech. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition just read a letter to us concerning the Government's attitude on this issue. The letter indicated that before the measure would be introduced, the people would be consulted by way of a referendum. We believe that referendums should be held on vital issues, and this is a vital issue for all those in Western Australia. Although the Government does not have a mandate concerning this matter, it does have a majority in both Houses and therefore intends to force the people of Western Australia—both inhabitants and visitors—to drink this type of water. Therefore I support the proposition of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.4 p.m.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY: When the House suspended for afternoon tea, I was supporting the proposal to delete clause 2 from the Bill for the purpose of including, later on, a provision that would permit of a referendum of the people on this vital issue. I did say the referendum is a democratic measure of democratic Parliaments.

I know that in Parliaments in Europe the people are consulted on many issues by way of referendum. As a matter of fact, under the constitutions of certain countries in Europe, the people have the right to initiate proposals for consideration by the Parliament and subsequently to be consulted by way of referendum.

On an issue of this kind, which is fraught with certain consequences to many people—and nobody here can foretell just what might happen to many people in this community if this measure becomes law and fluoride is injected into the water system—it is not an unreasonable suggestion in an allegedly democratic country that the people be consulted by way of referendum.

That is why I rose to support the proposition to delete clause 2. I feel it is extremely important that the people should be consulted.

Mr. NORTON: As indicated in my second reading speech, I would agree to the provisions of this Bill provided it was amended to give the people the right to say whether they wished to have fluoride in the water or not. That right should be given by way of referendum; and I gave my reason at the beginning of my speech;

namely, I consider the compulsory addition of fluoride to water is another method of whittling away the civil liberties of the citizens of this State.

I consider that where there is compulsion in the way of medication for something that is not contagious, the people are being forced to do something which is unnecessary. The people should have the right to make their own decisions on this matter. If a decision is taken as a result of a referendum, then the Government is doing what the people desire, because they have judged the matter for themselves. Why should we, even though we are elected by the people, make a decision on a subject such as this? This matter is a controversial one, and it is one on which there are no definite findings. Because of this, we should not take it upon ourselves to force upon the people a type of medication which is, or could be, dangerous to health.

Whilst it is admitted that fluoride will do some good in a certain age group, it is also admitted that after that age group, it might be very detrimental. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is moving in the right direction when he seeks to delete this clause with the idea of adding a new clause to take its place. Therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the honourable member.

Mr. BRAND: I oppose the deletion of the clause because of the attitude of the Government right from the time when the first move was made to introduce this measure some two years ago.

I must admit that when my attention was called to the letter which was read out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and written to Mr. Foynes of South Perth, who is mentioned in the *Daily News* today, I was a little surprised. However, I do admit that this portion of my letter is not very clear. Nevertheless, I do not want to indicate to the Chamber that my thinking on this matter has ever changed; and, as far as the Liberal Party policy is concerned, it would seem to me I endeavoured to point out that the Liberal Party, itself, was not opposed to a referendum. In fact I was questioned on this on a number of occasions during the campaign, both at meetings held inside halls and in Forrest Place, and I made it quite clear that the Government, as such, opposed a referendum and felt a decision should be made here in this Chamber one way or other.

The member for Belmont said that no mention of fluoridation was made in the policy speech but, although there was not a definite undertaking one way or the other, the fact was that at that time our friends the Country Party were bound by one of their conference motions, which has since been altered. However, I did say on behalf of the Government—

The Government is seriously concerned at the poor standard of dental

health in this State, and the cost to parents for the dental care of their families.

For this reason, legislation for fluoridation of water was introduced—after studying world authorities—but it was not accepted by Parliament.

However, we will continue the fight against dental decay.

To minimise the problem of a critical shortage of dentists, we will introduce legislation to license a new kind of dental worker—to be known as a dental hygienist—thereby following the latest British and American practices.

These workers will be trained and will operate under the direction or supervision of qualified dentists, directing their work to the prevention and early detection of dental decay. By this means, they will enable dentists to double their work capacity—and help alleviate the shortage.

Meanwhile, we will continue to study world trends in dental care, and the prevention of dental decay by the best means available, including fluoridation.

That was the policy speech of the Government and it was sent in all directions where one finds policy speech utterances.

I simply want to assure the Committee it was not my intention to say we would hold a referendum, nor have I done so.

In the paragraph in the letter which, I think, has been fairly queried by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, after pointing out the Liberal Party supports holding a referendum, I went on to say that I did not have any doubt about the result of such a referendum and indicated that I thought the result would be in favour of fluoridation, and for that reason—we have always followed this line—the Government did not propose to give any more political support in that quarter.

The balance of the letter goes on to talk about policy and that is the part that matters most. Clearly, right through the campaign, there was evidence the Government was prepared to study the fluoridation problem, and never at any time did we say we would not proceed with fluoridation if we were satisfied about it and could satisfy ourselves we could get the support of both Houses of Parliament.

Last night before I left the Chamber the Leader of the Opposition made reference to the fact that we were holding a Gallup poll on the archway and compared the two issues. Again, in speaking for the Government, I have said we would not hold a full referendum on the question of fluoridation. The only reason why we are holding a poll in connection with the

archway is because I had said we would test public opinion. As I have already mentioned to this Chamber, it seemed to me that, having said that, there was only one way of actually testing public opinion. This matter will be the subject of another debate, but I simply make that explanation.

On the other hand I feel very strongly that the Government has taken the step; and no Government would take such a vital and important step if it did not firmly believe in the outcome of fluoridation as a means of resolving one of the very real problems of the dental health of the people of Western Australia. The more I see of the dental health, the more urgent I feel the need is to take some positive action. This is the line the Government has taken. The line of least resistance is a referendum; and I am glad to see that again, we, as two parties in coalition, have, after two years, come back here with a firm proposition in the form of legislation.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I did not speak on the second reading but I have studied much correspondence and literature both for and against fluoridation. At this stage I have no hesitation in saying, as I did on a previous occasion, that I oppose the Bill. The Premier has said that the easy way out is to refer the Bill to a referendum. This would be the democratic and the decent way to determine this issue. There are many members on this side of the Chamber, and on the other side, who are laymen, and whose minds must be unsettled on whether they are doing the right thing. This is only natural because of the conflicting evidence we have heard both for and against fluoridation.

If, as the Premier has said, the easy way out is to hold a referendum, why should we not hold one? In the course of his remarks he said the Liberal Party did not have any objections to a referendum, so I do not see why one should not be held. The measure does not deal with material things, but the health of human beings. It is not dealing with the Freeway, industrial arbitration, the Barracks Archway, or other issues which, from time to time, are readily determined by Parliament. The people have the right to determine whether this legislation should be implemented.

It has been said by those who are against fluoridation that some people who could be allergic to fluoride could have parts of their body seriously affected if fluoride were ingested by them over a period. Other experts, who are in favour of fluoride, say that no harm can result from taking fluoride if there is a certain quantity of it in a certain quantity of water. The populace is comprised of children, youths, and adults. I believe it is true that the taking of fluoride tablets at an early age is beneficial to children's

teeth until a certain age is reached; but has it been definitely proved that certain children, who are allergic to various things, would not have their systems disturbed by taking fluoride?

Has it been proved that no harm would flow to any adult in this State if he were to partake of fluoride? The Bill has State-wide application and, therefore, in due course, if the Bill is passed, every person in Western Australia who drinks water obtained from a reticulated water supply will be subject to the results that will flow from the passing of this legislation. Therefore all the people in the State are entitled to say whether the legislation should be implemented.

There are 80 members in both Houses of Parliament and no member represents himself. Each member represents a constituency and is responsible to the electors of that constituency. I know that in my electorate some people are in favour of fluoridation and some are against it. Therefore, I do not think the Government is justified in adopting what I consider to be a dictatorial, arrogant, and pedantic attitude. In fact, I strongly object to such an attitude.

If the Premier, by way of correspondence, has indicated to one of his supporters that the Liberal Party is not opposed to holding a referendum, why object to it? The member for Belmont very ably pointed out that provision is made in the Commonwealth Constitution for a referendum of the people of Australia to be held before the Constitution can be altered. This Bill does not seek to alter the Constitution, but it will have far-reaching effects on the people of the State. It is not a matter of passing importance. After an effluxion of time the Bill will not lapse; the proposal contained in it will continue indefinitely unless the position arises that it can be shown, without a shadow of doubt, that many people are being harmed by the taking of fluoride.

This is a non-party issue as far as the Labor Party is concerned, and although I have endeavoured to form a definite opinion on this question, the conflicting evidence both for and against fluoridation leaves the question in such a state that I will oppose the passing of the Bill; and I am not adopting the easy way out by seeking that the people shall be permitted to determine whether they want fluoride pushed down their necks by the Minister for Works and others sitting on the opposite side of the Chamber. I support the proposal to delete clause 2 with a view to inserting the other words envisaged by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Brand: I might say it would be the easy way out for the Government to hold a referendum, and not to take a stand.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is right; it would be the easy way out for the Gov-

ernment. Even if it would be the easy way out for the Government, I suggest a number of private members are of the opinion the matter is so important, and will have such a far-reaching effect on the people of the State, that the Government should adopt the Premier's suggestion of taking the easy way out and holding a referendum. I repeat that the people have the right to decide whether this proposal, which will have such a tremendous effect on their way of life, should be adopted.

Mr. MITCHELL: I oppose the deletion of the clause. I did not say anything on the Bill yesterday evening, and I thought that because only one member of the Country Party spoke to the second reading of the Bill, members on this side of the Chamber and especially those on the other side, would think the Country Party members were being regimented on this particular matter although we were not wholeheartedly behind the Government.

I make it quite clear that when the previous Bill was introduced I was wholeheartedly behind the Government, and I have been ever since, and I congratulate the Government for introducing this Bill. It has been known during the last few weeks that the Government was to introduce the Bill, and I have received only one letter from an elector of mine asking me to oppose the Bill on the ground that it was an abrogation of human rights. I replied to that correspondent to the effect that everything the Government does affects the rights of human beings, but that members of Parliament have to weigh each matter carefully and make a decision on the evidence submitted to them, and if the decision is wrong the electors have an opportunity to get rid of them when the time arises.

As far as I am concerned the Government has followed the proper course, and I had made up my mind that I would support the Bill when it was introduced. Although I have had only one letter from an elector who is opposed to the Bill, I have received almost hundreds of notes, particularly from young people in my electorate, asking me to make sure I supported it.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition contends that a referendum should be held, but I am of the opinion that the Government could not possibly hold a referendum on an important issue such as this. In fact, we have a referendum among the people every three years, and it was well known three years ago that the Government supported fluoridation. The Government introduced a Bill in 1963, but it was defeated in another place, although it was well known that the majority of the members of the Government supported fluoridation. Therefore, anybody with any intelligence must have known that if the Government were returned to office it would reintroduce a Bill for the fluoridation of water supplies.



The Premier made it perfectly clear at the last election that the Government was considering the reintroduction of the Bill, and yet the Government was returned to office with an overwhelming majority. The Government introduced the Bill because it considered it was the right thing to do. There will be another referendum of the people in February, 1968, when they will have the opportunity to say whether the Government has done the correct thing, because they will either vote the Government back into office or vote for members of the Opposition so that they may become the Government.

As the question was asked last night, I would say that if the Opposition were returned to office in 1968 I do not think it would be prepared to repeal this legislation and stop the fluoridation of water supplies, because it knows that the majority of the people in this State are in favour of fluoridation, support it, and will continue to support it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is appropriate that I should have something to say at this juncture. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition seeks to delete clause 2 with a view to inserting a clause which will provide for the holding of a referendum on fluoridation. As is known, the Government does not agree that Parliament should abrogate its obvious responsibility to decide this issue. No good purpose would be served by putting this question to the people—a question which, more easily, can be decided by the representatives of the people in Parliament.

It has been said that a referendum offers the easy way out. It could be suggested that that is a politically-coward way out, but I do not include in this suggestion members who believe in fluoridation and who think that before fluoridation is introduced, a referendum should be held. That would not be a politically-coward way out; that would be taking a course which is consistent with their views.

Those who hotly oppose fluoridation, who say that it will poison the water, who say it is dangerous, and who even go to the extent of saying it will kill people, seem to think fluoridation is all right if the people decide by referendum to destroy themselves. That is inconsistent, to say the least. Members who have supported fluoridation are consistent in their views when they suggest that a referendum be held prior to the health reform being introduced; but those who do not support fluoridation are prepared to surrender their principles, and to permit the so-called poisoning to take place.

Mr. Davies: Why are you holding a Gallup poll on the retention of the Barracks Archway?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is an entirely different matter.

Mr. J. Hegney: It has a great deal of similarity.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Not one bit. It is quite open for the Opposition to declare prior to the next election that it is Labor Party policy to repeal the fluoridation Act, should this Bill become law, so that if it is returned the people's views can be tested.

Mr. May: Do you advocate that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is a course open to the Opposition. I have already explained that the Government believes this is a valuable health reform which will confer great benefits on the people of the State, and, because of that it is grasping the nettle, in the face of the question being very controversial. I wanted to explain my position as the Minister in charge of the Bill in this Chamber, and officially on behalf of the Government.

Mr. TONKIN: This should not be argued on the merits or demerits of fluoridation. There are two principles involved. Firstly, should a democratic country at any time under any circumstances hold a referendum and seek the opinion of the people? So far no attempt has been made by the Government to answer this question. We believe there are circumstances when an appeal to the people is justified. Secondly, if this is agreed to, what are the subjects which should be referred to the people? I cannot think of any which would be of more far-reaching importance or of greater impact than the question of compulsorily obliging the people who are opposed to this measure to put up with fluoridation without having a say on the matter.

The position is made even worse by two special circumstances. At the last election the people at large knew the Government was not in a position to indicate in its policy that if it was returned it would introduce fluoridation; because it had already been made public that the Country Party was opposed to it. As the Country Party was half the coalition Government which was offering for election nobody at that time could assume that if the coalition Government was returned fluoridation would be introduced. The Liberal Party could not make such a promise at that time, and that is the reason why it did not make it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Premier has read out his policy statement.

Mr. Craig: Could not the Country Party members express their own judgment?

Mr. TONKIN: Are we entitled to assume that when the Premier of a State at election time makes a statement of his party's policy, he knows what he is saying, and that he intends to do what he has promised; or are we to assume he is deliberately falsifying the position?

Here is a situation where the Premier of the State sent a letter to a Liberal Party supporter in which he did not say that his party was not opposed to a referendum. He went further; he said the Liberal Party policy was for a referendum. The Liberal

Party is the major party in the coalition Government.

Is it that this policy of the Liberal Party—if that is its policy—cannot be put into operation because of the opposition of the Country Party to a referendum? If the Country Party is not opposed to a referendum then there is nothing to prevent the Liberal Party from putting its policy into operation. What I would like to be told is this: Was it the Liberal Party policy to hold a referendum at the time the Premier said it was? If it was not, then the Premier deliberately misrepresented the position for political advantage.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The Premier has read out his political statement.

Mr. TONKIN: He read out his letter and it was word for word what I read out.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He also read out his statement.

Mr. TONKIN: It has nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was the official policy.

Mr. TONKIN: Was it; and was it Liberal Party policy to hold a referendum? If it was not, then the Premier had no right to say so. In saying what he did say he was using a confidence trick. If it was the policy of the Liberal Party to hold a referendum, then the Premier should stand up to it, because he made the statement at election time with reference to the policy of his party. It was not some idle phrase used in the course of correspondence; it was in connection with a communication which had a distinct and direct bearing upon the Government's policy on this question before the election.

I submit that the Premier indicated in writing to an elector and a supporter of his Government the Government's attitude with regard to fluoridation. No other interpretation is possible by anyone honestly endeavouring to find out what was meant. To what depth will the Government sink if this sort of thing is allowed to go unchallenged? One is entitled to rely upon the written word of the Premier of this State.

How would any member feel, if he were the recipient of this letter, and if he had written to the Premier and got a reply such as the one I read out with regard to the undertaking given? Is there no shame on the part of the Government? Is there no feeling of responsibility to honour one's word given under such circumstances?

This was not something said in reply to an interjection, but a deliberate statement by the Premier before the election when the policy of his party was under consideration. His reply was that the Liberal Party's policy was for a referendum. People would expect that under

those circumstances if the Liberal Party was returned to office it would put that policy into operation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are still ignoring the Premier's policy speech.

Mr. TONKIN: I am ignoring nothing.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are.

Mr. TONKIN: What good does that do for parliamentary Government when the written word of the Premier can be brushed aside so lightly?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not lightly. It was the official statement.

Mr. TONKIN: The statement to which the Minister refers was not one which indicated that if the Government were returned it would introduce fluoridation. All that the statement said was the Government would continue to study the question. At the time the electors knew the Government was not in a position to introduce fluoridation, because the Country Party was opposed to it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That party could change its mind.

Mr. TONKIN: What the Premier should have said in his letter was that the Liberal Party policy was, for the time being, for the holding of a referendum, but that if the Country Party changed its mind the Liberal Party would change its policy accordingly and there would be no referendum.

That would have been the fair, honest, and decent thing to do. But no, the Premier wanted to indicate to this supporter, whose support he looked likely to lose, that there was nothing to fear from the Government on this question, because the Liberal Party policy was to hold a referendum. In other words, he was saying to this elector, "The people will have the opportunity to decide this question. Do not worry we will not impose it on you without the people having the opportunity to decide." That is what was conveyed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. MAY: I listened to the Premier's explanation of this argument; and I also listened to the member for Stirling, who reminded me of the little sheep tracks one sees going through the paddocks where one follows the other. It was just like a sheep following the old ram.

The Government is using a backdoor method and dodging this referendum. Should the 12 men who form the Government be allowed to override the people of this State? Of course they should not. Then why is the Government afraid to agree to a referendum? Because it knows it will get beaten. That is why the holding of a referendum was not included in the Government's policy speech.

Instead of agreeing to hold a referendum at the next election, the Government is using a backdoor method in an endeavour to fluoridate our water supplies under the lap. I will not have a bar of it. I cannot understand members of the Liberal Party supporting this Government in this Chamber since these 12 men—I almost said faceless men—who form the Government are overriding the wishes of a majority of the people in this State in regard to the holding of a referendum.

In regard to the question of fluoridation, most of the people I have contacted have been against it. Those people have said, "If we believe in fluoride we will give it to our children. What is the good of giving fluoride to us with our false teeth? What good will it do us?" Yet these people have to suffer it, because 12 men in this State say so. I will not agree to that.

There was no provision for a referendum in the policy speech at the last election, because the party represented by the Government was afraid to put it there, as it knew the referendum would be lost. I do not agree with fluoridation and will oppose it at every opportunity. I think it would be well for the party which I represent to take particular notice of the way this legislation was brought into Parliament and raise the matter at the next election.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am pleased the member for Collie thinks I am as silly as a sheep!

Mr. May: I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am wondering why the Opposition is so keen on the idea of a referendum. It occurs to me that perhaps the position is not quite so simple as the Opposition would have us believe. It opposes the introduction of fluoride quite vigorously and strongly, but I feel quite sure its members know that fluoridation is supported by the majority of people in this State. Therefore, in order to get themselves off the hook, the Opposition members want this referendum. No responsible Government could run away from its responsibilities in this manner.

If a referendum is held, what does it prove? If one person votes against fluoridation, one might as well say that there can be no fluoridation; but assuming there are 800,000 people in this State and 401,000 vote for fluoridation and 399,000 vote against it, will it be introduced, or not? I do not think a referendum would be of any use at all.

As I have said, I feel quite certain the Opposition is using this as a smoke screen to get itself out of a difficult position as it knows fluoridation is the wish of the people of the State. The Opposition wants to be able to say, "We oppose it; the people support it; so we accept it."

Mr. TOMS: I am surprised at the statement just made by the member for Stirling. I support the move by the Deputy

Leader of the Opposition to delete clause 2. It was absolute hypocrisy for the previous speaker to say that he knows a referendum would be carried by an overwhelming majority of the people in this State. I suggest the reasons he advanced for not wanting a referendum are reasons why a referendum should be held.

I challenge any member of this Committee to study his conscience on this question after taking into consideration the mail he has received from time to time. If he were then happy about public opinion, he could support a referendum.

Since the introduction of this Bill, I have received some two dozen letters; and no doubt other members have received letters also. These were hand written letters—not the card stuff we had before—and not one person was happy about fluoridation. Other members possibly have had the same experience; and if they went through their correspondence they would probably find more letters opposing fluoridation than favouring it. Therefore the statement that if a referendum were held it would be carried by an overwhelming majority of the people of this State is without foundation. The member for Collie made a point when he said the Government is afraid of a referendum.

I challenge every member here, if he is satisfied that public opinion is in favour of fluoridation, to get up and say so. I do not believe it is in favour. I believe the fear of the Government is that if a referendum were held the result would be overwhelmingly in opposition to fluoridation. Experience has shown that it is difficult to get something approved by referendum, yet this Government says there would be an overwhelming majority of people in favour. I challenge it to put that view to the test by agreeing to the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DAVIES: I feel a lot of double talk was engaged in by the Minister for Works when speaking on this matter and by the Treasurer when he recently introduced his Budget and dealt with the paradox of having to raise extra taxation at a time when the State was apparently booming.

I find the Minister's approach to this question extremely confusing. He puts into two categories the people who want a referendum—those who support fluoridation and want a referendum, and those who do not want fluoridation and want a referendum. I do not think it is possible to differentiate between these two groups. We are dealing with the principle of a referendum.

I am wondering what category this puts the Premier in, because he gave a one-time supporter to understand that he liked the idea of a referendum.

Mr. Brand. I did nothing of the sort.

Mr. DAVIES: A letter, which has been incorporated in *Hansard*, clearly indicates that at that time the Premier did want a referendum, although the policy of the Liberal Party may have been quite different.

In the short time since the Minister for Works spoke, I have gone through newspaper reports of the Liberal-Country Party coalition policy speech in 1965 and there is not one single mention of the word "fluoride" even though the speech covers page 1 and takes in almost another page further back in the paper. I went through the index to see if I could find any reference by the Premier during the campaign that year, but I could find no reference whatsoever.

Mr. O'Neil: That is not conclusive evidence.

Mr. DAVIES: I agree, but fluoride was a very controversial issue—and still is—and I am sure if the Government had announced itself on the question there would have been some report, not only then, but later in the year. The only thing I could find was where the Fremantle City Council decided to give away free fluoride tablets, but there was some handicap to this proposal because the Pharmaceutical Guild considered fluoride tablets were poisonous and could not be sold by any person other than a registered chemist. We know that subsequently the council overcame this difficulty.

I am appalled at the incidence of decay in children's teeth; and I am appalled at the waiting time before any child can get an appointment at one of the dental clinics. These points would indicate it is reasonable to take any step that is likely to improve the dental health of children.

Last night I read from the report of the Royal Health Society and the conclusions were to the effect that there is little danger with fluoridation; but, because of the unrest and uncertainty in the community, I feel the people should express themselves on this matter, and the only way this can be done is by referendum or by Gallup poll. The Government is prepared to run a Gallup poll on the Barracks Archway, so let it run one on fluoridation. Is the Government prepared to go that far; because I believe a case has been put up?

Mr. O'Neil: A number of polls have been held.

Mr. DAVIES: I have not seen any reference to them, but they may have been held. The fact remains that the Government does not have a mandate to introduce this measure, even though it might consider the measure desirable.

Because it is a controversial subject it should have been given particular mention during the election campaign, but it was not. We know the reason was because the Country Party, at that time, did not sup-

port fluoridation. According to Press reports earlier this year, the Country Party decided in favour of fluoridation by 35 votes to 31. Then there was a move to upset the decision, but apparently it was unsuccessful. The decision was carried by a majority of four, which is a very narrow majority, and it reflects the concern within the community.

Government members know that this issue will be lost in the overall election in 1968. However, in future elections I think the public is entitled to know the details of specific matters of a controversial nature. The public must be given an opportunity to express its view on this matter of fluoridation in view of the Government's reluctance to bring it to the public's attention at the last election.

Mr. JAMIESON: Because of my picketing position during the second reading debate, I want to make it clear that I have committed myself fully to the provisions of this proposed amendment and I will be supporting the move for a referendum. Very rarely has a matter been so controversial. I still cannot make up my mind on this issue and I feel that, under the circumstances, it is necessary to seek guidance from other than the experts; that is, from the people who will have to suffer the consequences. Consequently, I indicate that I will be supporting the proposal put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Up to date I have not intervened, and I did not intend to intervene. The only reason I have risen now is because of two remarks which were made, one by the member for Bayswater and the second by the member for Victoria Park. Dealing with the remarks in reverse order, the member for Victoria Park asked whether the Government would be prepared to hold a Gallup poll on this subject.

For the information of the member for Victoria Park, there have been something like six or seven Gallup polls held throughout Australia on this subject since 1957.

Mr. Davies: Australia-wide?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes. If I remember correctly—and I have the figures if the honourable member would like to see them—there were about 1,600 people in the first Gallup poll and the figure went up to 2,000, and on each occasion a different age group of people was approached. The majority in favour of fluoridation has been as high as seven to one. The lowest, from memory, was something of the order of 70 per cent. The overwhelming majority has been in favour of fluoridation.

A most noticeable thing was that the largest majority was amongst the people who had the most to gain, namely, the young people. The number of opponents to fluoridation rose with increasing years. The elderly people who had lived their

lives had nothing to gain from fluoridation and were inclined to oppose it; that is, according to the Gallup poll figures. The greatest majority occurred among the non-voters—the 15 to 20-year olds. That majority was something like eight to one.

The member for Bayswater referred to letters he had received. It might be of interest for members to know that in this year of 1966, I have received exactly six letters on the subject of fluoridation. I will agree that all those letters were in opposition to it. I can safely say that fluoridation was opposed for four or five different reasons. It might also be of interest to know that when replying to one of my constituents I made the statement that I believed the vast majority of the public favoured fluoridation. That reply caused the particular constituent to write to the local newspaper and her letter was published on the 22nd September. She quoted my words on this subject and invited my electors to write to me and protest. From that date until today, I have not received one letter in response to that invitation.

Mr. Graham: What a member!

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not one person has been sufficiently interested to write to me in answer to that invitation, and that newspaper goes to 4,000 or 5,000 homes in my electorate. Not one constituent wrote to say that he disagreed with my statement that the vast majority of the public was in favour of fluoridation. I do not know what further evidence one needs.

On the merits and demerits of a referendum, I understood that we were a Parliament, that we made decisions and did not run away from them when they were awkward by referring them to the people, knowing full well the difficulty of people being able to understand the question that is put to a referendum. I understood it was always our responsibility to make decisions.

Mr. EVANS: I did not intend to speak on this occasion after clearly enunciating my stand yesterday evening. However, the concluding remarks of the member for Subiaco have prompted me to rise to at least suggest that he possibly would desire to take some responsibility for this letter that I received this afternoon from a lady who lives in Salisbury Street, Subiaco.

Mr. Guthrie: I had a letter from her today, too.

Mr. EVANS: Her letter reads—

I sat in the Public Gallery last night and wept when I heard you betraying the people of Kalgoorlie into the hands of the Dictators who go under the name of the Liberal Party. I used to live in Kalgoorlie and I know how wonderful and freedom loving the Goldfields people are and knowing also the climate and the water consumption (including that which is used to make their famous beer),—

Concerning that last remark, I agree with the lady. Continuing—

—I shudder to think of the consequences of overdosage that will occur in that district.

Please consider deeply your actions in voting for fluoridation before it is too late. The children can have the tablets but the responsibility of enforcing it on the rest of the community is great.

There is no doubt in my mind about the sincerity of this correspondent, and her letter reflects the unrest in the community. This unrest cannot be justified because I believe in the principle of fluoridation, but the Government should have regard to the pulse of the community on a question such as this.

Obviously, for political expediency, the Government is prepared to pander to the public by sponsoring a Gallup poll to ascertain what might be termed the pulse of the people on whether the Barracks Archway should be removed. Yet it is quite clear the Government is determined, and that, irrespective of the result of the poll, the fate of the archway is already sealed, because the Premier has made known the Government's intention; and this afternoon notice was given of a motion to be introduced to the House to remove the archway even before the result of the poll is known.

If the Government is prepared, because of political expediency, to pander to the people and waste public money on the conduct of this poll when the result will not be worth the effort or the time of the people who participate in it by answering the questions put to them when the poll is taken, we must ask ourselves: How do we gauge the sincerity of the Government? I have heard, with great interest, a quotation from a letter purporting to be written by the Premier in acknowledgment of a letter dated last year, in which he said the policy of the Liberal Party on this subject was that a referendum should be held. That letter was written in 1965, only two years after the Bill which was introduced in 1963 was defeated in another place. On that occasion the Bill failed to pass the test.

The Government, in 1963, opposed the principle of a referendum, and yet, in 1965, the Premier stated that the policy of the Liberal Party was that a referendum should be held. Is it not time the Government banished sham and political expediency and recognised the dignity of the community? I appeal to the Government to have second thoughts on this matter, even at this late stage. If the proponents of this issue are so confident of the result of a poll on the fluoridation of water supplies, I cannot understand their attitude, because I share their con-

fidence. I believe there would be no doubt as to the result of a referendum held on this issue. I am certain there would be a clear majority in favour of fluoridation. Therefore, I cannot understand the sham of the Government and its dictatorial attitude on this issue. It is an honour to support the amendment proposed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government has already informed us that the introduction of fluoridation is not likely to become operative within the next 18 months or so. I hazard a guess that that timetable is influenced by the forthcoming State elections. It cannot, therefore, be suggested that the move of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is designed to interfere with the Government's programme; because it would not. Nor do I think the Government can get away with the allegations made by a number of speakers that there is a whole lot of baseless emotionalism being expressed, and that there are only a few cranks in this State and elsewhere who are opposed to the fluoridation of water supplies.

As has already been said, some of the most outstanding authorities in the world, to say the least, have expressed doubt with regard to the wisdom of this step and, therefore, it is a most serious one, and it will have an impact—if indeed there be an impact; and I am not in a position to know—on practically every citizen in Western Australia.

Being a most serious step, the public is accordingly entitled to express itself. It is all right to say the next State general election will give everybody an opportunity to vote; but there is a whole host of considerations and policy matters, to say nothing of the personalities of the candidates, that will have an influence on the position and cause the people to decide whether the present Government should continue, or should be rejected in favour of the Opposition party.

Accordingly, in my view it is difficult to understand the attitude of the Government. I say that, because I have before me extracts from the Federal *Hansard* of March, 1965, when there was a resolution before the House moved by a Mr. Killen, who was elected on a Communist Party preference, and who received commendation from no less a personality than Sir Robert Menzies for the part he played in saving the Government in the Federal election held earlier. In 1965 Mr. Killen moved—

That as the Canberra Advisory Council is but part elected and believing that the citizens of Canberra have a right to say whether or not they want fluoridation of their water supply this House is of opinion that a referendum of the question should be held.

The resolution was seconded by Doctor Gibbs, and when the vote was subsequently taken there were no less than eight Liberal Party members who voted for the resolution, which was carried by 56 votes to 52. But the Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government is about as democratic as the Government in this State, and the Government over there took no notice of the majority voice of Parliament having decided in favour of a referendum. I would like to read a few statements made by Mr. Killen. They are as follows—

My argument, as I shall unfold it, is this: Whereas loyalty to a Minister and to a government is an admirable quality that we all respect, there are occasions when there devolves upon the individual a clear responsibility to show a greater loyalty, that is, loyalty to the House of his election. I hope to make it crystal clear, in the time available to me this morning, that this argument does not centre merely upon the question of water. It centres in great measure upon the authority of this House and the respect to which it is entitled from every Minister of the Crown.

I ask members to ponder on those words. It is a shocking state of affairs when members get dragooned into a point of view. Under this Government every single issue that comes before Parliament appears to be one of high principle, and members are conscripted, whether it be a matter of a referendum or of fireworks. I understand members are to be disciplined on that issue and are to vote the way the Ministry requires. One would imagine that what the Ministry feels is Holy Writ. Surely the members on that side of the House are no less members than those who sit here. They are entitled to their point of view, and they should be entitled to vote and express themselves in accordance with their consciences, and not at all times in accordance with decisions which are made in a party room in order to give the public an impression of solidarity and of a common front on all issues.

Have members opposite no liberty at all? Are they afraid to give any undertakings to their electors? Are they never to have an opportunity of deciding an issue upon its merits? Must they blindly follow those who now occupy the front bench of the Government?

Mr. Killen agrees with the views of many of those on this side of the House, as is evident from the following extract of his speech:—

I do beg of the Minister to recognise that in this matter the people of the Australian Capital Territory have a complete right, indeed a clear right, to be treated as respectable, intelligent individuals and that they should

be given an opportunity to express their views on this matter in a free and democratic way.

Is the only thing that matters in Western Australia the opinion of a majority of those who vote in the Liberal Party caucus room? Surely the people of Western Australia should have the opportunity to express their viewpoint on a matter which affects them as intimately as this piece of legislation!

The Government ought to be ashamed of the attitude it is adopting, more especially in view of the letter written by the Premier in which he said it was the policy of the Liberal Party that a referendum would be held on this question. In view of that statement surely members who sit behind him should be prepared to go along with it. They should not put their fingers to their noses at the electors.

We certainly have reached a critical stage in the political affairs of Western Australia, when members sitting behind the Ministry play no part whatsoever except to register a vote in order to ensure that the Ministers get their way.

Dr. Gibbs, another Liberal Party member of the House of Representatives, seconded the motion for the holding of a referendum. He had this to say, and I ask the member for Wembley to take note of his comments—

With all the conviction at my disposal, I say that the safety of fluoridation has not been proven and that the dangers are such that this matter must be resolved once and for all.

We have a magnificent organisation in this country which could do the work required to bring the matter to a conclusion. It could do the work under Australian conditions. I strongly suggest that this matter be referred to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation for full investigation, not beginning with the premises adopted overseas, but beginning where we should begin, at the beginning, with evidence obtained from experiments with animals. We should work up from those initial experiments until the matter is brought to a proper and objective conclusion.

This Liberal member of Parliament said, as we have said, there were still doubts in respect of this question. Yet this Government has decided to bulldoze the measure through Parliament. It heeds not what has been said against its point of view; and it balks at the suggestion of submitting the question to a referendum of the people.

If we on this side of the Chamber are so wrong, if there is only a handful of cranks opposing this measure, here is a glorious opportunity for the Government to prove how right it is, how fit it is to

govern, and how able it is to assess the public mind; and, at the same time, to prove how hopeless and how much out of touch with reality is the Opposition. This is a heaven-sent political opportunity to the Government, yet it balks at the issue, because it has reservations. It is doubtful of the outcome.

So the challenge is made to the Government, but cravenly the Government refuses to accept that challenge. Its members prefer to march around with a heap of books under their arms, and to quote authorities from here and there, overlooking the fact that other members can also have heaps of books under their arms—books which decry, condemn, and create doubt in respect of this issue.

I suggest there is a bounden responsibility on the Government to pause in connection with this question, to allow wiser counsels to prevail, and to give the people an opportunity to express their views one way or the other.

Mr. ELLIOTT: To prove that members on this side of the House have some initiative and freedom, I have ventured to speak without seeking the permission of the Premier or any member of Cabinet.

Mr. Graham: You will follow the line.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Apparently the honourable member finds it inconceivable for all the 29 members on this side of the Chamber to agree on the question of fluoridation.

Mr. Graham: On every issue.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Let us discuss this one. A challenge to members was made by the member for Bayswater to reveal the correspondence which they have received on this matter. The member for Kalgoorlie has shared the contents of his correspondence with us, so I feel I should do the same. I have received about two dozen letters on this question, most of which are opposed to fluoridation. From my experience I say the bulk of them are organised letters sent by members of various organisations which have been set up to oppose fluoridation.

I have received two or three letters from individual members of my electorate. One is from a lady who asked me to obtain information concerning one aspect of fluoride. She herself was not concerned with the side effects; in fact, her only concern was in regard to the effect of fluoride on her poultry. I endeavoured to answer the question to the best of my knowledge.

It is surprising to me that more attention has not been given, in a debate which has lasted so many hours, to the possible effect of fluoride on stock. I do not intend to go into all the details in this connection, suffice to say there is an abundance of evidence to suggest that stock are not affected and have a far greater range of tolerance than the figures quoted would indicate.

The member for Kalgoorlie suggested—and I believe rightly—that a referendum would be carried by a handsome majority, which is further proof that there is little need for one.

I would like to share with the Committee a letter I have received from the mother of five children. It reads as follows:—

I do not make a practice of reproving nor approving Government Acts but feel very strongly about Fluoridization. We as a family have proved beyond doubt that fluoride prevents decay.

Our two daughters had to have all their milk teeth out before the age of seven but started taking tablets at the age of six and eight years. The older girl has fair second teeth but has needed quite a few fillings. The younger at thirteen years has had only one filling.

Our twin boys started taking tablets at three and a half years. Only their first molars decayed and at ten years neither have needed fillings.

Our "fluoride baby", who has had tablets since pre-natal days and is now nearly six years old hasn't one decayed milk tooth in his head.

If this letter can be used in any way please do so. Remembering the daily dose will soon be a thing of the past we hope.

As a leader of the—

She mentions the particular company—

—Girl Guide Company I am in a position to know the condition of the teeth of the new generation and feel that those who are opposing Fluoridization are either terribly ignorant or self satisfied with their false teeth. Condemning children to tooth decay with all the side effects in my opinion is a criminal offence.

That is all I wish to say on the matter.

Mr. HAWKE: I want to spend a moment giving consideration to a peculiar piece of reasoning which the Minister for Works indulged in when comparing the attitude of members who supported this Bill and also supported the suggestion of a referendum, as against members who opposed the Bill and supported the suggestion for a referendum. The Minister told us he considered the attitude of the first-mentioned group to be consistent and understandable, and then went on to say he could not at all understand or appreciate the attitude of the second group. He told us the second group considered the introduction of fluoride in a controlled measure into the domestic water supplies would most likely, if not certainly, lead to serious results upon the older members of the population, even—I think he said—to the extent of maybe killing some of them.

He then argued that any member of this Committee who opposed fluoridation on the ground that it would in practice have injurious results upon any number of members of the public would be supporting a referendum, and by accepting the result of a referendum, in the event of the decision being favourable, would, themselves, consent to all the dangers and inimical and detrimental effects being imposed upon the people.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That they alleged would happen. They are taking an inconsistent line.

Mr. HAWKE: What alternative is there in the present situation but to oppose the fluoridation of our domestic water supplies?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Members of Parliament are in a much better situation to make a determination.

Mr. HAWKE: That is not the point. I wish the Minister would stick to the issue before us. I am not arguing that members of Parliament or the general public are in a better position to make a judgment. I am trying to analyse the peculiar reasoning of the Minister for Works in regard to those members of this Parliament who, because of doubt or fear, oppose the putting of fluoride into the domestic water supplies but who advocate a referendum of the people being taken and a favourable decision being obtained before fluoride can legally be put into the water supplies. That is the issue. If the Minister would try to concentrate his mind upon that and not allow himself to wander or wobble in this, that, or some other direction—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do not be objectionable, because you manage to do it quite easily without trying.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not trying to be objectionable in any shape or form but am trying to help the Minister to see the various issues associated with this subject in a clear light. What alternative has any member of this Committee who is opposed to fluoridation, in relation to the situation in which we now find ourselves, but to seek to have this proposal referred by way of a democratic referendum to the people of Western Australia?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He could not support the Bill at all under any consideration; that is the alternative.

Mr. HAWKE: That is not a practical alternative—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is the consistent line.

Mr. HAWKE: —because it is obvious—and the Minister knows this—the Bill will receive majority support at every stage in this Chamber and in the other House of Parliament and therefore is absolutely certain to be passed into law.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not the point you raised first.



Mr. HAWKE: It is the point.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I came right to the point you raised.

Mr. HAWKE: As it is certain there is a majority in both Houses to support this Bill and to place it on the Statute book, what other alternative is there for those who have doubts and fears about the proposal than the suggestion which is now before us for the submission of this issue to the people by referendum?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are changing your tune. They have no doubts; they are convinced! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is completely convinced of the dangers!

Mr. Tonkin: No doubt about that!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And yet he is prepared to support the Bill if a referendum is carried.

Mr. HAWKE: No, he is not. The Minister is becoming impossible. A few moments ago we were getting closer together and now we are miles apart.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He said he did not oppose the proclamation. You missed it when he said that. You are getting into deeper water now.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not in water at all. It is the Minister who is in water; and that reminds me of a story of a chap who rushed up to another chap and said, "My glory! Mike Smith is down there in the quicksands and he is up to his neck!" The first chap said, "I will come up a bit later on. There is no hurry." The other chap replied, "But he is in head first!" That is the position the Minister is in in connection with this matter. I will give up trying to reason with him because time is pressing on, and it is an impossible proposition, anyway.

The proposal to support a referendum does not necessarily involve support for fluoridation of domestic water supplies. The Bill as it stands would, with the approval of a majority in both Houses, impose fluoridation upon all the people in all the water supply districts in Western Australia. However, the submission of the fluoridation proposal to the people by way of a referendum then puts the whole matter in the hands of the people themselves for a decision. Those who oppose fluoridation would take part in such a referendum and vote against it.

Should a majority of people in Western Australia in a referendum vote for the fluoridation of public water supplies, then the decision would be a decision of the people, and not a decision of members in this Chamber who oppose fluoridation or who support it. I am sure I have cleared up that point to the satisfaction of all but one member in the Committee.

Mr. Dunn: Two!

Mr. HAWKE: I did not think for one moment that there would be another mem-

ber in the same category as the Minister for Works. Who is the second?

Mr. Dunn: Me!

Mr. HAWKE: The football basher from Kalamunda! I am not surprised. I want to make one brief reference to the letter the Premier sent on the 25th January, 1965, to an elector in South Perth. In this letter the Premier states that the Liberal Party supports the holding of a referendum. That letter was written only a few weeks before the State general election of that year. Obviously it was written by the Premier to influence this elector—

Mr. Brand: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. HAWKE: —and other electors who would be in contact with that gentleman.

Mr. Brand: I went on to say that I did not agree with it.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not concerned whether or not the Premier agrees with the Liberal Party policy. If the policy of the Liberal Party is in favour of holding a referendum, it is the duty of the Premier and every other member of the Liberal Party in this House to support the move for the holding of a referendum on this issue. Otherwise the statement in that letter is a political confidence trick.

Mr. Brand: No, it is not!

Mr. HAWKE: Of course it is!

Mr. Brand: It is not!

Mr. HAWKE: What would the Premier think if the situation were reversed and he were the elector in South Perth and he received a letter like that from the Premier?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. TONKIN: I was wishing when I heard the Minister for Works endeavouring to elucidate the various points, that I could obtain a similar response from someone on that side in regard to the two points I raised.

The first point is whether under any circumstances a referendum is justified. No-one has attempted to answer that point, so apparently there is no opinion. My second point is that if a referendum is justified, what are the circumstances under which it would be justified? That has not been answered. I also wanted to know whether it was indeed the Liberal policy, at the time the Premier said it was, to hold a referendum.

Surely we are entitled to the answers to these questions, because they are very vital to this argument. If it were not Liberal Party policy, the Premier had no right to say it was. He was being dishonest. On the other hand, if it were the policy of the Liberal Party, how can he now avoid the obligation to carry it out? Surely we have to face up to these issues!

I would say that if any question deserved to be referred to the people it is this question, for two reasons. The proposal is incompatible with human freedom because it is forcing people to take an ingredient which is non-nutritive and poisonous. If anyone wants any proof of that, I will refer him to the standard textbook of one of the universities. It says straightout that it is non-nutritive and toxic. This Government proposes to force this ingredient into the human body without the person having any right to avoid it; and so it is a violation of human liberty.

It could be justified, but that is not the point I am arguing at the moment. This is an entirely new principle never before put into operation anywhere else in Australia. Therefore, surely, if any subject requires a referendum, it is this one, which breaks new ground, establishes a new principle, and is a violation of fundamental human liberty! If such a question should not be referred to the people by referendum, I cannot think of any question that should be.

We have got to the stage where under our democracy we are led to believe that when a Government is elected it should govern, and no question should be referred to the people for their opinion. If that is the view of the Government I think it ought to be stated. That is not my view and I do not hesitate to say that I do not hold with that view. I do not think that every matter should be referred to the people; on some matters the Government is entitled to take full responsibility. However, this matter will break entirely new ground and will establish a new principle; and once the principle of using the water supply for prophylactic purposes is established—and this is not drawing the long bow—the way is open for the Government to add any other ingredient it likes for the same purpose.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That was established years ago.

Mr. TONKIN: No, it was not. Will the Minister enlarge on his statement?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Yes; many minerals are introduced into water, one of which is chlorine.

Mr. TONKIN: Chlorine is not one. That mineral is introduced for the purpose of purifying the water, not for the purpose of doing something to the body of an individual.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Twist it a bit, if you like.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot advance a single instance of any chemical being introduced for prophylactic purposes; nor can anybody else in this House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Iodine has been introduced into flour.

Mr. TONKIN: I did not know iodine was a liquid.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But you are dealing with the principle.

Mr. TONKIN: My statement is in regard to the water supply; because people can please themselves whether they eat flour or not. Fluoride is to be put into the water supply and the people will be forced to use it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What about bread?

Mr. TONKIN: If something is put into bread, which people do not like, they can bake something else. At the moment I am not arguing whether or not such a measure might or might not be justified. Time will tell whether this is a justifiable thing to do. But at the moment it cannot be argued that it is not an entirely new principle; and, once it is established, any ingredient can be put into the water.

Mr. Court: What attitude did you adopt on the question of compulsory mass chest X-rays?

Mr. TONKIN: That is not the same thing as this.

Mr. Court: The principle is the same.

Mr. TONKIN: It cannot be compared to this principle. Forcing a person to stand in front of a machine while an X-ray is taken, cannot be placed in the same category as forcing something into a person's body.

Mr. Dunn: How will it be forced into anyone's body?

Mr. TONKIN: Because once the fluoride is put into the water supply it will be impossible to avoid it.

Mr. Court: There are a lot of people who are more fearful of X-rays than fluoridated water.

Mr. TONKIN: We cannot go into all those side issues. Let us determine whether this is the establishment of a new principle or not.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No, it is not.

Mr. TONKIN: I say it is, and I have good authority to back me up. It is the first occasion that a water supply will be used for prophylactic purposes. That is fact and not opinion.

If any matter should be referred to the people by way of referendum, surely such a matter as this ought to be. If any member on the Government side has other ideas about very important matters which should be referred to the people, I would like to hear them. Up to date there has been complete silence from the Government side on the question whether the people ought to be consulted.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

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

## Ayes—23

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Court	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Durack	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Elliott	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. I. W. Manning
Dr. Henn	

## Noes—17

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Davies	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hall	Mr. Toms
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Hart	Mr. Curran
Mr. Williams	Mr. Fletcher
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Burt	Mr. Moir

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 put and passed.

Clause 5: Establishment of Committee—

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There are two small amendments to this clause which I would like the Committee to agree to—each is of the same type; that is, to change the words "Chief Engineer" to "Director of Engineering". It was intended that the head of the Public Works Department be deputed to be a member of the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Advisory Committee, and the Crown Law Department thought it was the Chief Engineer, which title has been changed and is now the Director of Engineering. The Chief Engineer actually is the Deputy Director of Engineering. Accordingly, I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 26—Delete the words "Chief Engineer" and substitute the words "Director of Engineering".

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The next amendment deals with exactly the same matter. Accordingly, I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 31—Delete the words "Chief Engineer" and substitute the words "Director of Engineering".

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 12 put and passed.

## Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 6.5 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 18th October, 1966

## CONTENTS

ASSENT TO BILLS	Page
BILLS—	1430
Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Cemeteries Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Debt Collectors Licensing Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Evidence Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1437
Com. ....	1446
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill—Sr. ....	1432
Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Railway Bill—Assent	1430
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Leslie Solar Salt Industry Agreement Bill—Assent	1430
Local Government Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r. ....	1432
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Act Amendment Bill—	
Reference to Select Committee ....	1447
Com. ....	1451
Report ....	1454
Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1430
Public Works Act Amendment Bill—Sr. ....	1432
Strata Titles Bill—	
2r. ....	1454
Com. ....	1457
Report ....	1459
Supply Bill (No. 2)—2r. ....	1432
QUESTION ON NOTICE—	
Pastoral Leases: Compliance with Conditions	1431
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Midland Junction Abattoir: Establishment of Meat Hall	1430

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

## BILLS (9): ASSENT

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

1. Leslie Solar Salt Industry Agreement Bill.
2. Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Railway Bill.
3. Agricultural Products Act Amendment Bill
4. Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill.
5. Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill.
6. Cemeteries Act Amendment Bill.
7. Evidence Act Amendment Bill.
8. Debt Collectors Licensing Act Amendment Bill.
9. Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill.

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

## MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

## Establishment of Meat Hall

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has the Minister for Agriculture's attention been drawn to an article under the heading "Shock Meat Plan Hits at Country," appearing in *The Albany Advertiser*