

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 1st November, 1966

CONTENTS

	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	1822
BILLS—	
Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Eastern Goldfields Transport Board Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill—2r.	1880
Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Legislative Council Abolition Bill—Leave to Introduce	1822
Local Government Act Amendment Bill—3r.	1822
Medical Act Amendment Bill—Returned	1824
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Perth Medical Centre Bill—Recom.	1824
Com.	1824
Poisons Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill—Recom.	1824
Com.	1824
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Supply Bill (No. 2)—Assent	1822
Swan River Conservation Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1822

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

BILLS (10): ASSENT

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

1. Supply Bill (No. 2).
2. Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Act Amendment Bill.
3. Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill.
4. Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill.
5. Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill.
6. Swan River Conservation Act Amendment Bill.
7. Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill.
8. Eastern Goldfields Transport Board Act Amendment Bill.
9. State Electricity Commission Act Amendment Bill.
10. Poisons Act Amendment Bill.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ABOLITION BILL

Leave to Introduce

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (North-East Metropolitan) [4.40 p.m.]: I move—

For leave to introduce a Bill for "An Act to abolish the Legislative Council of Western Australia and for incidental and other purposes."

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

Ayes—10

Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willsees
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wlao
Hon. F. B. H. Lavery	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs

(Teller)

Noes—19

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. A. R. Jones	(Teller)

Question thus negatived; leave refused.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [4.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [4.46 p.m.]: During the second reading and Committee stages of this Bill, some members quoted figures. One member implied—I would not say that he suggested—that the Fremantle City Council was using a threat. This was when we were dealing with clause 17 of the Bill regarding the non-levying of rates against Co-operative Bulk Handling.

The figure quoted for total revenue receipts was \$953,520, which is quite correct as far as total revenue receipts are concerned. The query was whether or not that matched up with the figure I had suggested of a 4.5 per cent. increase in rates.

In 1964-65, which was the base year in which that statement was prepared, the actual rate receipts paid to the Fremantle City Council were \$436,618; 4.5 per cent. of that amount is \$19,647.81. Therefore, members can see that the loss of this revenue is actually \$352.19 under the base figure of \$20,000, which represents 4.5 per cent.

In 1965-66—and these figures have only just come to hand—the actual rate receipts of the Fremantle City Council were \$502,029; 4.5 per cent. of that figure would amount to \$22,591.30. Therefore, members will see from the revaluations, which I gave during the course of my speech as having taken place around Fremantle, that there had been some increase in rates. However, the Fremantle City Council was quite correct in stating this figure, because it would mean 4.5 per cent. based on the 1964-65 revenue.

Mr. Robinson was quick to his feet in reference to my suggestion and said that the Perth Shire Council did not support this motion. Further, by interjection, Mr. Robinson said, "Has it been referred to the member bodies?"

The minutes prove that the Perth Shire delegates were not present at the Local Government Association meeting held on the 6th June, but they were present on the 16th June and also on the 16th Sep-

tember. The feeling of those with whom I have had the opportunity to speak is that, at all times, the decision was emphatic. There was not one dissentient voice on any vote taken by the Local Government Association in this respect. The representatives fully supported the moves made by the Fremantle City Council to both myself and to all members of Parliament to the effect that the amendment to the Act should be opposed. Even since the time the vote was taken in this House, the Fremantle City Council has received letters of support from other shire councils, and these have not been prompted in any shape or form.

The day after this matter was reported in the Press two letters arrived at the Fremantle City Council office. I have not read these letters, but I am told the local authorities are very concerned. The feeling is that, although there is a Minister for Local Government whose responsibility is not so much to protect, but to guide, steer, and be the responsible person as far as local authorities are concerned, a Bill has been brought down which will deny one local authority from receiving revenue. The feeling is that, with the advent of the standard gauge railway line, this policy could extend in the very near future into other areas adjacent to Fremantle.

Therefore, at present, things are not too happy on the local government front. I would suggest to the Minister—that is, if he can hear me above the noise that is going on behind me—that before the Bill passes through another place he should seriously reconsider this matter. It would be futile to amend section 532 of the Act to achieve the objective, because this is not the section which deals with rating. Section 532 deals, purely and simply, with those bodies which can be made exempt from the payment of rates.

Mr. Watson had the key to the solution when he made his contribution to the debate, and I think his suggestion would be well worth following for the sake of harmony within local government, if not for anything else. He suggested that a proportion of the rates should be paid by C.B.H. to the local bodies for any installations, provided that such payment had been requested by the local authorities. If the Minister would follow this suggestion nobody would be hurt.

Other speakers who took part in the debate said that some local authorities did not want silos erected in the middle of their towns. If those local authorities are prepared to allow C.B.H. to build its silos outside the town limits, and they are prepared to forgo rates, that would be quite all right; but if a proviso were inserted in the Act that 25 per cent., or 33½ per cent. of the rates shall be payable on demand, or following a request made by the local authority, I think that would help to clear the air surrounding this particular matter.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Or if the rates were assessed on the unimproved value.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes; that may be satisfactory. A basis better than that which is provided in the Bill will have to be found. The relevant clause in the Bill will only create discord. Some local authorities have already threatened that they will not attend Local Government Association meetings from now on. This decision has been made, apparently, because of the discontent created among them by the Minister's action in introducing this measure.

We have tried to do our best to have common sense prevail in regard to this question, but it is entirely up to the Minister because he is in a position to amend the applicable section of the Act at this stage. I would strongly and earnestly urge the Minister to have another look at this matter with a view to amending section 533. That is the section which provides for rating, and it could be amended so that rates could be levied when requested by the local authority.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [4.54 p.m.]: When I took the oath of office as Minister of the Crown, I took the oath that I would, without fear or favour, serve all sections of the community and not one section only. Because I happen to be Minister for Local Government, it cannot be assumed that I have to be 100 per cent. on the side of local government if it clashes with other sections of the community on any particular question. I endeavour to observe my oath of office at all times.

I am sure that if the Local Government Association would only stop to think of the case I presented the other evening, it would have second thoughts on this question. However, the association has not tried to find the reason which I put before the House the other evening. What is more, the Fremantle City Council is now coming around to accepting the suggestion I made in the first place.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Fremantle City Council did not suggest this to me.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No; the honourable member suggested it. I made a similar offer to the Fremantle City Council in the first place, which it refused point blank. The honourable member should put himself in my position. At that stage I did not consult C.B.H. because I was trying to find a solution myself; but when I made my suggestion to the Fremantle City Council it categorically refused. I took this matter to Cabinet and, in actual fact, this was a Cabinet decision. When I move an amendment to an Act of Parliament in this House, I am merely implementing a decision of Cabinet; I cannot do more nor less than that.

However, I appreciate the situation. It was my intention to discuss these prob-

lems with C.B.H., because I am not over-satisfied that the section dealing with the payment for roads presents an answer to the problem. I can give the assurance that I intend to discuss this matter with C.B.H. in an endeavour to find a solution which may be found in *ex gratia* payments, rates paid on the unimproved capital value, or implementing the suggestion that has been put forward by Mr. Watson.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: I think the rates paid by the BP Refinery at Kwinana are assessed on the unimproved value.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They may be. I am prepared to go further into the question. The suggestion that local authorities will refuse to send delegates to Local Government Association meetings in the future will not have any bearing on the situation. I am satisfied that the men in local government are bigger than that, and will not permit this problem to cloud the issue with the association.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You know that some local authorities have not been happy for some time.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not. In what respect?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Mainly on the question of representation.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In which way?

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Shire of Perth has something like 25,000 people and it has two representatives on the association, and Peppermint Grove has two representatives also.

The PRESIDENT: I direct the honourable member's attention to the fact that he must confine his remarks to the Bill before us.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I cannot answer Mr. Ron Thompson now, Mr. President, but I will answer him later. As far as I am concerned, the Bill goes forward, because it represents a Cabinet decision. However, I am quite prepared to discuss the problem with C.B.H. to ascertain whether we can find some alternative which will be acceptable to everybody.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE BILL

Recommittal

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [4.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of clause 16.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Before the Minister again rises to his feet, I would like to let him have the last say on what I wish to contribute.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister has moved that the Perth Medical Centre Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of clause 16.

Question put and passed.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 16: Teaching hospitals on reserve—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There is an amendment in my name on the notice paper which can be disregarded, because it has been replaced by the ones on the addendum. It is considered that the ones on the addendum are more suitable. I move the following amendments:—

Page 9, line 32—Substitute for the full stop, a comma.

Page 9, line 33—Add the passage, "each of the three persons referred to in paragraph (b) and in paragraph (c) of this subsection, shall be a person who is a medical practitioner within the meaning of section three of the Medical Act, 1894."

It was understood by those in agreement with the Bill that the persons mentioned would be medical practitioners, but in one or two instances there has been a difference of opinion. It is considered desirable that the matter should be placed beyond doubt, and for that reason the amendments have been moved.

Amendments put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported, with amendments.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Recommittal

Bill recommitted, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), for the further consideration of clause 2.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. A. R. Jones) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2: Section 19 amended—

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 27 to 29—Delete paragraph (d).

Clause 2 basically empowers the bank to acquire and sell any land, including Crown land. For reasons which need not be proclaimed from the housetops it has been considered expedient that if a substantial area of land owned by the Government, which is probably worth \$2,000,000 is to be realised on, it ought to be realised on through an institution, such as

the Rural and Industries Bank or some similar institution, rather than through the ordinary Treasury method with the proceeds going into Consolidated Revenue. For that reason I raise no serious objection to empowering the bank to acquire and sell Crown land.

When we turn to paragraph (d) we find it is proposed to give the bank the power to build, or cause to be built, dwelling houses on any acquired land. It seems to me this is not part of the bank's business, and if paragraph (d) remains in the Bill we would virtually be setting up another Housing Commission or State trading concern. I see no necessity for that to be done.

It is one thing for the Rural and Industries Bank to acquire land from the Crown and then to sell it in the same manner as the Perth City Council sells its land at Floreat Park and City Beach from time to time, but I submit it is an entirely different matter when a financial organisation, such as the Rural and Industries Bank, is to be permitted not only to acquire land, but then to build, or cause to be built, dwelling houses thereon; in other general words, to engage in developing land.

To my mind the proceeds realised from the sale of such land—if it is sold as vacant land—would be much better employed in the normal method of bank financing of lending money to home seekers and home builders who are desirous of obtaining finance, particularly in industrial areas and in the country. However, we find it is contemplated that the proceeds of the sale of land shall not be used in the manner I have just indicated, but shall be employed by the bank in the building of houses which, presumably, it would then sell.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I want to make my position clear in relation to this amendment. During the second reading I thought I explained the purpose behind the Bill. At that stage the manner in which the Rural and Industries Bank would operate in respect of this measure was explained. It was pointed out that some revolving fund would be created as a result of the operations of the bank in acquiring land, building houses thereon, and selling them to its customers, etc.

The fear that the bank would become another Housing Commission did not arise at the time. It is true to say that since the Bill was dealt with in the second reading stage some view has been expressed that that might be the case. Ordinarily I would oppose the deletion of paragraph (d), and if it were not for the fact that I have an amendment to substitute another paragraph to give the provision a new concept I would oppose the amendment before us.

The fact is that my proposed amendment will limit the bank's activities to the build-

ing of a certain number of houses each year, and in that way the original intention will be fulfilled, because it was not intended that the bank should become another housing authority.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If paragraph (d) is deleted and the proposed new paragraph is not inserted, the entire intention of the Government, as clearly outlined in both Houses, will be nullified. If paragraph (d) is not replaced the initial intention of the Bill will be destroyed; but if it is replaced by the new paragraph outlined by the Minister then the original intention would be restored to the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: With a limitation.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The limitation was mentioned by the Minister. It was suggested that between 80 and 100 houses was an attainable figure, but there is nothing new in such a restriction.

That was the original intention of the Bill, and I think perhaps a very good starting point. The bank, with the moneys available to it in connection with this \$2,000,000 discussed by Ministers in both Chambers, should provide sufficient funds to assist with the building of those homes which the State Housing Commission cannot handle by virtue of its own legislation. The bank will not interfere in any way with any other similar organisations, most of which are doing a very good job in the community.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The only comment I would add is that the limitation of 100 will give legislative effect to the proposal which I explained during the second reading, and to what was explained in the Legislative Assembly. I want to make it perfectly clear that the Government has no intention whatsoever of making the Rural and Industries Bank a second housing authority. The Government is taking advantage of an opportunity to have more houses made available for more people. If we can make such provision by this process, surely this must be acceptable.

I agree, of course, with the deletion of paragraph (d). However, without any words to replace it, the intention of the Bill would be destroyed, but the limitation in the new paragraph which I will move to include in its place, if the Committee agrees to the deletion of paragraph (d), will place a ceiling on the activities of the bank.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I would ask the Minister, in the event of Mr. Watson's amendment not being carried, will it then be necessary for the Minister to move the proposed amendment?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I sought to make it clear that I intended to agree to Mr. Watson's amendment; but I would like the Committee to have well in mind that it is conditional on the fact that the

amendment I propose to move, which will provide for a new paragraph (d), is agreed to.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I do not feel happy with the proposed procedure. During his second reading speech, the Minister said that the purpose of the Bill was to permit the Rural and Industries Bank to engage to a greater extent in the State's housing programme. The Minister qualified that statement by giving the estimated number of houses to be built. He went on to say that as an assurance that the bank's activities in this regard will, in fact, be implementing a policy in line with the State's requirements, the new proposals were to be subject to the approval of the Minister.

So at all times it would have been within the province of the Minister to limit the number of houses to be built, in accordance with the overall requirements of the State.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is correct.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Furthermore, the Minister said it was envisaged that many of the homes to be built under this scheme would be available to those who, by reason of their incomes, would be ineligible for State Housing Commission assistance. The Minister also said that the scheme generally would be available to all sections of the community. Basically this Bill fulfils a direct need of the State in regard to housing. At any time the Minister, in his own right, could say that there was no necessity to go on with this facet of building activity.

Therefore, I see no reason at all not to accept the Minister's amendment. However I cannot see any point in proceeding with Mr. Watson's amendment. I think we should vote against it and let the Minister take the natural course of moving the amendment himself.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: For the third time, I want to make it clear that I am not going to oppose the amendment moved by Mr. Watson because I had in mind moving the amendment which is in my name on the notice paper. I will have regard for the situation if and when anything goes wrong.

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

Ayes—17

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. Heilman	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. E. C. House	(Teller)

Noes—11

Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. H. C. Strickland	(Teller)

Amendment thus passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 27—Substitute the following for the paragraph deleted:—

(d) enter into contracts in respect of which tenders have been invited from the public, for the building on acquired land of not more than one hundred dwelling houses in any year ending on the thirtieth day of June;

By way of brief explanation, this amendment achieves two purposes. It limits the number of houses for which the bank can be responsible to 100 for one year; and it also ensures that the bank will, in fact, call tenders and will not go into the house-building business. That was never intended so far as the Government was concerned.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I oppose the amendment. Mr. Wise said that if paragraph (d) was left out of the Bill it would render it inoperative and the Minister said much the same thing. I would point out that if paragraph (d) is deleted from the Bill it will not render the Bill inoperative. Paragraph (a) will still stand, and paragraph (e) is still there. The Bill would achieve its purpose without paragraph (d) because it will provide for a couple of million dollars which the bank can lend for financing the building of houses.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think it will be found, when *Hansard* is printed, that I did not say the deletion of paragraph (d) would render the Bill inoperative. I said that the Bill would provide a special fund so that the Rural and Industries Bank could provide finance for the building of houses. Unless this paragraph goes into the Bill, the legislation could be entirely against all the principles which were mentioned in both Chambers by the Ministers concerned.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let me point out that in relation to the deletion of paragraph (d), in the event of there being no new paragraph (d), and the Committee agreeing to the next amendment which Mr. Watson has on the notice paper—to delete all words after and including the word "whether"—then indeed the effect of the Bill would be considerably reduced, to say the least.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: If by any means I did mistake Mr. Wise's comment on the Bill I apologise to him. It was quite without intention.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In view of the decision of the Committee on the last question, I will not move the next amendment which stands in my name on the notice paper. However, I move an amendment—

Pages 2 and 3—Delete paragraph (g).

Paragraph (g), which is ambiguous, reads as follows:—

(g) enter into any agreement under which dwelling houses will be built

on acquired land by or for the Commissioners either on their own behalf or in association with other persons, organisations or bodies; and

If this power is to be given to the commissioners then my submission is that it should be restricted to the commissioners, and all the activities should come within the bank's operations.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Now that the Committee has accepted my amendment to paragraph (d), I think that paragraph (g) can be deleted. It is intended that the bank call tenders and houses be built as a result of those tenders.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am amazed at the attitude of the Minister on this point. I thought the Minister would strongly defend the Bill, the principles that are contained in it, and the purpose for which it was introduced. It was a matter of Government policy; a matter of great moment; and there must have been a change of attitude caused by something somewhere for the Minister to agree that paragraph (g) should be deleted. Those of us who have watched all the proceedings in this matter know that the bank already has in hand quotes for the building of houses. We know that the bank, in anticipation of the passing of this legislation, may have come to some understanding with bodies or people active in the building industry and the paragraph in question could be very important. I hope the Minister does not agree to the amendment but will stick to his Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I do not agree to the amendment there will be a conflict in the Bill. We have already agreed to insert a new paragraph (d) which states, "enter into contracts in respect of which tenders have been invited from the public" etc., and those words would conflict with the wording of paragraph (g).

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They could be two distinct matters.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The wording of paragraph (g) conflicts with the wording of new paragraph (d).

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: No.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Government's intention was not that the bank would become a housing authority or a building firm—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Not like the A.M.P.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know what the honourable member means.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is exactly the same principle.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As I said, I do not know what the honourable member means. If we do not delete paragraph (g) the wording will conflict with what is contained in new paragraph (d).

The intention is that the bank will call tenders for the construction of houses and the Government believes that the provision in new paragraph (d) is the most satisfactory way of handling the position. Agreeing to delete paragraph (g) will certainly not defeat the objective of the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: What the Minister has said does not satisfy me. The provisions in paragraph (g) do not conflict with any provision which is now in the Bill. The provision in paragraph (g) will permit of an arrangement which could be quite separate and distinct from the calling of tenders, as provided for under new paragraph (d). I can only conclude that there has been some strong influence somewhere to cause even Ministers to change their minds since the introduction of the Bill.

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

Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. C. E. Griffiths	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. E. C. House

(Teller)

Noes—12

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. T. O. Perry
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. R. A. C. Stubbs

(Teller)

Amendment thus passed.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In view of the Committee's decision on new paragraph (d) I will refrain from moving the amendment I have on the notice paper to delete all words commencing with the words "dwelling house" in line 38 on page 3 down to and including the word "there-with" in lines 4 and 5 on page 4.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 39—Delete the words "or part of a building."

The intention of the Bill is to provide for the building of houses, and that intention is limited to houses. It is not proposed to embark on the building of flats or anything of that nature. The definition of "dwelling house" includes the words "or part of a building" which could cover other than single-unit houses. Therefore it is proposed to make the position clear, that the bank will build houses and will not engage in the building of flats. That was never intended.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

Page 4—Add the following definition:—

"tenders" means tenders based upon plans and specifications prepared by or for the Bank.

Hitherto a definition of the word "tender" has not appeared in the legislation but I think it is necessary to have it included clearly to define just what is meant by the calling of tenders. When introducing the Bill the Minister stressed the point strongly that the Bill would allow all sections of the building industry to share in the erection of the houses covered by the legislation and, later on, he went on to say that small builders would be given an opportunity to tender.

We could find ourselves in the position where public tenders could be called on a design-and-erect basis. By this I mean that a firm could submit to the bank a design or layout covering an area on which five, 10, or even 20 houses, to the contractor's own design, could be built. However, this system could debar other builders who have not the wherewithal to draw up such a programme on a design-and-erect basis to submit to the bank. To ensure that tenders are called in the normal way, and to give the ordinary builders ample opportunity to tender for this work, I think an amendment such as I have moved should be agreed to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry that I am not satisfied about this amendment. In new paragraph (d) we say that the bank will be allowed to enter into contracts in respect of which tenders have been invited from the public. If a man wants the R. & I. Bank to build him a home he may have the design prepared by an architect, a draftsman, or someone else. He may want to build it according to some set specification and all he may want the bank to do is to help him with the finance. So the bank will say, "All right. The job is being done through an architect and tenders will be called in the normal way."

I do not like the words, "prepared by or for the bank," in the honourable member's amendment. This could mean that the bank could go into the business of preparing plans and specifications. Why should we not allow normal practice to prevail with the calling of tenders where plans would be necessary?

The Hon. R. Thompson: The State Housing Commission and the war service homes section will accept your own plans.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is right. When I was Minister for Housing we had a pick-a-box system under which people were asked which design they liked and, after selecting the design, there would be no extra cost for the preparation of plans and specifications. By this we got a variation in design, a difference in colour scheme, and so on. I do not necessarily oppose the amendment, but I cannot see any force in it.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Mr. Jack Thomson's point is that every builder who tenders on a house will tender on the same set of plans and specifications as are provided by the bank, or by the client of the

bank, so that all those who tender for the job tender on exactly the same basis. The alternative is that the bank could call tenders for a five-roomed house. I could design a brick house with an asbestos roof; while the next builder might use tiles, and put a different price on the house; while yet a third may make it rectangular, thus having a different price again.

I have spent many years tendering for things where one is not sure what is required. Different builders could submit different designs while tendering. One could provide for gold-plated door knobs, while the other might not have any at all. I think Mr. Jack Thomson's amendment is worth supporting, because some of the smaller builders do not have the facilities to prepare plans and specifications, whereas the larger builders have a separate section for this purpose.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sure Mr. Jack Thomson will be grateful for the assistance given by the honourable member.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: I am.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Does the honourable member mean to tell me that a small builder—one who builds five, 10, or 15 houses a year—does not have the facilities to prepare plans for a client who might want a house built?

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: I did not suggest that at all.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am glad of that, because it would not be correct. The average builder would have this sort of situation well in hand. Does Mr. Clive Griffiths like the words, "prepared by or for the bank"?

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: Not necessarily.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But the honourable member did not mention them.

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: I was talking about the principle involved.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Does Mr. Jack Thomson like the words, "prepared by or for the bank," in his amendment?

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Yes, I do.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have an open mind in the matter, as long as the amendment does not interfere with the Bill.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: In the event of Mr. Jack Thomson's amendment not being carried, and these words not being included, can the Minister tell me whether this would prevent the bank from having plans and specifications available for this purpose?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure it would not.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: So, in effect, it would mean that the bank will be committed to having these plans and specifications, and only these, available for the tenders. As Mr. Clive Griffiths has said, it may be desirable for the bank to have the plans and specifications available in the event of their being required; but if the Minister's assurance is correct I would oppose the amendment.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The situation mentioned by the Minister does not arise, because the man has the plan he wants and tenders are called on that particular plan and specifications.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why limit it to this one; why not have this and other methods?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not suppose the bank will be building individual houses. I daresay it will say, "We have 25 blocks of land, and we will have 25 houses built on them. After they are built we will advertise them for sale." The bank will not start building when someone asks for a house; because the house will have been completed and the bank will merely arrange the finance.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The Minister has confused the Committee. He gave the illustration of Bill Bowyang, having his own builder with his own plans and specifications wanting to build a house and asking the bank to help him. My point is that paragraph (a) is all that is required. That is the right way. A man decides to build, approaches his builder, who draws his plans and specifications and tells him it will cost \$10,000. The man concerned then asks the bank to advance him \$7,000 on the security of the house. That is what the bank should be doing. But the Bill contemplates that the bank will do nothing of the kind.

The Minister's amendment says that the bank will build the houses and then auction them, or advertise them for sale. But it is the bank which will build houses at the rate of five, 10, or 20 at a time. We now come to the point raised by Mr. Jack Thomson. The word "tenders" is susceptible to more than one meaning, but the true meaning is that put on the notice paper by Mr. Jack Thomson. Some people call tenders on a supply-and-erect basis, but they are not really tenders at all. The only way to call tenders is to have the plans and specifications prepared either by oneself or by an architect, and then ask several builders to tender on those plans and specifications.

That is the purpose of Mr. Jack Thomson's amendment. On the other hand people may tender for a five-roomed house with each tenderer preparing his own plans and specifications. These, of course, could be poles apart. Yet the story is that the R. & I. Bank did contemplate something like this. That would be subject to all sorts of manipulation and should not be tolerated by a Government department.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I have confused Mr. Watson, it will be the first time I have done so.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think he confused you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have been confused many times, but I cannot attribute the blame to anyone in particular.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: I said you confused the Committee.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is part of the Committee, so I must have confused him. If we accept Mr. Watson's explanation, and take Mr. Jack Thomson's amendment in its literal sense, it means tenders must be called on plans and specifications prepared by the bank and for the bank, and with no other conditions or under no other circumstances.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Is that what the honourable member wants?

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: So if Bill Bowyang—referred to by Mr. Watson—comes in with his own plan the bank could say, "We are sorry we cannot use this plan because it says we can only use a plan that is prepared by the bank or for the bank."

The Hon. H. K. Watson: The bank could adopt it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Would not we be equally confused with that?

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: I am not particularly happy with the wording.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think it will be agreed the amendment will assist in clarifying what was intended by the Minister when he said, on introducing the Bill—

It is considered a fair proportion of its building blocks would be sold by the bank not only to accelerate progress, but also to give purchasers the opportunity to make their individual arrangements as regards the choice of design, finance, and builder. Thus, the small builders will be given an additional opportunity to participate in the scheme by building homes for individual owners.

All this amendment seeks to do is to supplement that intention. The idea is that the bank will be entirely free to accept or reject a plan as submitted to it; but it will be able to adopt and approve a plan, no matter by whom it is submitted, if it is prepared to finance against it. I think that is what this amendment means: Tenders will be based on plans and specifications prepared by or for the bank, and approved by the bank.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I agree.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: It is my desire that the bank have a plan and specifications prepared by its architect and tenders will be called on that in the ordinary way. This is the full purpose of my amendment.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: We seem to have moved into the field of conjecture. Surely there are sufficient plans in the State Housing Commission for them to be brought into a branch of the bank as a

foundation on which to build. These plans would have been tried and tested over a period of years.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Only to a certain standard.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Possibly; but if a person were prepared to go above that standard, there is nothing in the Bill to stop him. Whilst I do not intend to oppose this amendment, I do not see any value in it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported, with amendments.

Sitting suspended from 6.5 to 7.30 p.m.

FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 27th October.

THE HON. R. F. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [7.32 p.m.]: I might as well say at the outset that I am as opposed to fluoridation now as I was in 1963, and even before that. I could make a very long speech on this matter and could quote from some 76 documents I have received from America, from England, and from all over the world—from places with fluoridated water supplies and from others where fluoridation has been discontinued.

However, I do not want to quote all those documents, but I do want to pass a couple of comments in regard to the effect of this Bill if it is passed. I am not naive enough to think that the expressions I use against the Bill will be sufficient to stop its progress through the House.

I would like to ask some questions which I believe are pertinent. Firstly, how much is fluoridation going to cost the Government annually; secondly, is the Metropolitan Water Board the authority which will administer the Act; thirdly, where will the funds, staff, and plant come from; and, fourthly, at what point of time does the Government believe it will be in a position to add this noxious treatment to the water supplies we have to drink? I think they are questions to which the Minister could be asked to reply.

I have it, not on official but on reasonable authority, that the Government will find some difficulty in implementing this legislation at the time it has in mind because it will have to train officers, purchase and install plant, and then distribute the fluoride in the water scheme.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are taking it for granted they are going to do this?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That interjection has helped my speech quite a lot because, as I said before, I am not

naive enough to think the Government has not cracked the whip sufficiently to be in a position to have the numbers to pass this Bill. Unfortunately I have to speak for a lost cause.

I may be being a little unfair to other speakers who may follow, when I say that, because perhaps some of those whom I believe will vote for this Bill will, in fact, not do so. However, I again emphasise the fact that, as one of the smart little reporters stated in the Press the other day, I very often feel frustrated. I go to a lot of trouble to investigate a cause. I put a lot of research into the matter and then when I speak in this Chamber I know I am speaking practically for the sake of speaking because no-one at the top is taking any notice of what I have to say.

The general public may think that is a funny attitude for a member of Parliament to adopt, but it is an actual fact. No matter what Government is in office, when the numbers are for a proposition which is submitted, those in opposition can only state the case as they see it and believe in it, knowing full well that the final vote will go against them.

I was very interested to read of the expenditure for 1965-66, and the estimate for 1966-67, of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board. In the General Loan Fund Estimates, on page 10, item 41, the expenditure for 1965-66 is shown as \$6,000,000. The estimate for 1966-67 is \$6,114,000. On page 11 are given the main items of proposed expenditure, and item 41 includes the Serpentine Dam and trunk mains, high-level tanks, and so on. I am wondering whether the extra amount is really required for the purpose of injecting fluoride into our water supplies. I could be wrong, but it is a rather strange coincidence that that is the amount of the increase.

The Minister read a letter when introducing the Bill. I was not sure of the letter's contents so I asked him if he would let me see it. He was kind enough to do so. It was from Sweden and concerned the Norrköping water systems. The letter stated that that town had resumed fluoridation of water supplies, but I do not know how many members would be aware of the fact that this town is divided and has two separate water supplies. For nine years one of those water supplies was fluoridated, but the Supreme Court of Sweden in 1961 declared fluoridation illegal.

It is a strange thing that from 1961 to 1966—a period of five years—no attempt was made to reintroduce fluoridation until this time. According to the letter the Minister was kind enough to let me read the authorities are now going through the process of resuming fluoridation of this particular water supply. Perhaps the Minister could enlighten me

when he is replying as to whether both water supplies are to be fluoridated, or is it just the one. As I have just explained, there are two water supplies in this town, one being fluoridated and the other not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I took it for granted that they are doing just the one, but I do not know.

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

The Hon. R. Thompson: They do not have the power to do the other one, that is why.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I have a lot of correspondence here from local people and from others from all over the world. However, I received very recently two telegrams which may be of interest. People do not usually sign their names if they do not want them to be used so I will quote them in this case. One of the telegrams is addressed to me and reads—

Vote against fluoridation for our continued support and thanks.

R. and T. Chessel, Applecross.

I would not know who those people are, but they have had the fortitude to put their names to paper and I congratulate them for doing so. The other telegram I wanted to mention was sent to another member and handed to me for certain reasons. This telegram requested the member concerned to point out that those who signed the petition concerning fluoridation were not from the metropolitan area only, but from all over the State. Perhaps one or two came from Cue. I do not know.

Considering the amount of printed matter, and statements which have been made by some of the greatest scientists in the world, it ill behoves me, a very ordinary citizen of Western Australia, to argue the point with people who are trained in the medical and biological professions when I know nothing about the subject. I am not going to be like Mr. George Brand who said he knew nothing about it, and also that he had lost his place. I have not lost my place, but in 1963, when the matter was before Parliament, we in this Chamber received—no, I think it was in the Assembly—

The Hon. R. Thompson: In another place.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: —a very fine address from the Medical Department of Western Australia, in which, by illustration and by lecture, the possible effects of fluoridated water on the teeth of the children of Western Australia were set out. I do not want to take any credit away from the research undertaken by those people. However, it is rather amazing to me that one finds all kinds of pamphlets after the style of the one which I have here coming in through the mail. I would not argue very much except to say this poster reads, "Freedom of Choice? The principle is the same. (The individual's

freedom of choice). Only the ingredient is changed." This sort of thing appeared when the proposal to nationalise the banks for our own good was put forward.

The poster depicts a bottle with the notation, "To be taken whether you like it or not." Alongside there is a placard prescribing nationalisation of labour, banks, insurance, medical services, shipping, whaling, etc., to reach a state of socialisation, with the footnote, "And it's all free?" It is on the side of freedom. Reference is made to the fluoridation Bill and the comment is that "they" did not like it then—meaning they did not like to nationalise the banks—and we do not like it now. "They" say they will vote against every member who supports the proposed Bill.

In 1949 the Liberal Party adopted as its platform anti-bank nationalisation and as a Government brought down legislation to this effect. What is the difference? The placard is signed by H. Wilke, 54 Corinthian Road, Riverton.

People do not go to all the trouble of having these things printed unless they believe that their cause is just. I give the Minister for Health, and those who proposed this Bill to him, just credit for that; they believe their cause is just. However, I have so many pamphlets, so many documents, and so many letters in opposition to the proposal that I cannot believe their cause is just.

I have here a letter from a lady whom I happen to know because she has become a distant relative of mine through about five marriages. I did not know the lady was even alive. The letter is dated the 1st October, 1966, and it reads—

Dear Fred,

Just a line to ask you and your wife to turn down that Bill for fluoridating our drinking water. I think they had a darn check to even bring it up again after it was turned down last time it came up. Those who want it can buy it in pills. I read where a doctor in England said it hardened the liver and another one in America said it hardened the arteries. Mr. Brand said it did not matter about the older people. He's not so young himself. I should say he is about 57, or round that anyhow. He'll tell us what to eat next.

Hoping this finds you both well.

Best wishes,

F. BIRD.

P.S.—Daylight saving too. The days are long enough in summer now for most people, especially for mothers.

A dear old lady of 82 wrote this letter. That is her opinion and she is entitled to her own opinion in the same way as some in the medical profession are entitled to the opinion that fluoridation of public water supplies is in the best interests of the community.

I do not want to go to great lengths in discussing this Bill tonight, but I would mention that those in favour of the measure have probably received as much propaganda and as many publications as I have received. Probably, this time I received a little more than I received the last time the same sort of Bill was before the House in 1963; on that occasion I received 61 letters and on this occasion I have received 76. I voted against the Bill in 1963 and, as I have said before, I intend to vote against it on this occasion. I read some of the speeches which were made in this Chamber in 1963 and I simply cannot accept the story that the people who are opposed to this measure are not people of repute. Reference was made to a doctor who had some sort of mythical letters after his name in regard to his qualifications, etc. It was suggested that these letters could be bought from any of the smaller schools and colleges in America. That sort of allegation does not go down with me any more. In 1963 I entered into a rather heated debate on that matter in this Chamber.

I would like to quote from some of the people who are nearer to home, and the letter which I propose to read is from the Christian Science Committee on Publication for Western Australia and it is dated the 22nd July, 1966. This letter is addressed to myself and I quote—

It is quite obvious from news items, letters, and leading articles in our daily newspaper, that the Government is probably proposing a Bill on the question of Fluoridating the Public Water Supplies under its control.

If this is so, it is felt that now is the time to place before you a brief statement on behalf of the Christian Scientists in this State, to clarify our Church's position on this question. Attached is a "Statement on Fluoridation."

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) Oscar Abrahams.

Committee on Publication for
Western Australia.

This statement is not a very long one. I would like to read this to the House, but subsequently I do not intend to read any more, although perhaps I may mention some of the remarks contained in other letters. The statement reads—

We wish to make it clear at the outset that it is certainly not our desire or intention to oppose legitimate public health and sanitation programs, or to deny any of the various medicinal health measures to those who desire them.

But when it comes to compulsory fluoridation or any other program that would undermine the basic freedom of the individual in matters of personal

health and religion, then we feel it is our duty to register our convictions and deepest protest.

We wish to emphasize that our Church supports the establishment of an orderly, just, and lawful society—and that as individuals, we obey the laws, including public health laws, whenever they apply to us. At the same time, however, we are definitely opposed to any measure which involves unnecessary compulsion, especially on something so personal as individual health. We believe that the question of fluoridation cannot be separated from those larger issues of individual freedom, and compulsory regimentation, including mass medical treatment, which today loom large in our society.

We believe that fluoridation of the public water supply violates the individual rights of all citizens; that the Government should not have the power to compel any citizen to submit to unnecessary treatment which violates the dictates of his conscience, his personal integrity, or his day-by-day control and responsibility for the care of his own body.

We believe that the individual's right to choose his own diet and method of health treatment should be preserved because this is a fundamental human and civil right. It is therefore our deepest conviction that the public water supply should not be used for the purposes of mass medication, nutritional additives, or for any substances except those necessary for purification of the water.

It should be made very clear that we are not concerned here with the medical question of whether fluoridation is effective or ineffective. Our only concern is with the methods being proposed, which would deny the individual his freedom of choice.

The fact is that other methods of making fluoridation available do exist—tablets, toothpaste, direct application, milk, and so forth—and these methods can be used in a large scale community-wide programme without infringing unnecessarily on the rights of those who do not want to take part. These other methods have been endorsed by many medical and dental authorities and can be made available to all those who desire their children to have such treatment.

This being the case, we earnestly question the justification or necessity for medicating all citizens involuntarily by means of the public water supply—especially since it is clear that no threat or danger to the public welfare is involved in any way.

On the contrary, we wonder if compulsory fluoridation would not be a

dangerous precedent for a very serious erosion of individual freedom.

We would like to call attention to the fact that compulsory fluoridation goes far beyond almost all public health measures now in existence, even those for serious contagious diseases. It would force "automatic" mass medication—

And the next few words are underlined in the statement—

—on every citizen using the public water supply, without regard to individual needs and conditions. It introduces a whole new order of compulsory public health measures which deprive the individual of his right to determine his own form of treatment—on even so personal a matter as dentistry.

We would therefore like to respectfully request that consideration be fully given to the effect which the enactment of compulsory fluoridation would have on the individual freedoms of all those who use the public water supply of this State and the ultimate cost in terms of fundamental individual human rights.

I quoted that letter particularly, because in my opinion of all the letters and publications which have been received, this is the most searching.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You sound like a man of letters.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I do not know whether I sound any different from the way Fred Lavery has always sounded and perhaps I am not sufficiently educated to understand the import of the words "man of letters". I repeat that I particularly wanted to quote this letter because nowhere in it is it suggested that the committee was concerned with anything other than the freedom of the individual. In one or two places mention was made that the members of this organisation felt that fluoridation was an unnecessary treatment which violated the dictates of the individual conscience.

I have yet to learn that the average citizen who lives in a country, which has a democratic Government such as ours, should not be able to object if the Government brings down legislation which provides for the ingestion of certain medicines.

I am one of those who has a great respect for the medical community inasmuch as I have been in hospital on many occasions. I hope members will not laugh at what I am about to say, but I do not care if they do. Perhaps they have heard the story of the old lady and the number of operations she had had, but nevertheless I, personally, have had five major operations and 26 minor ones. Consequently I know a little of what goes on in hospitals and I have not the slightest doubt that all

the doctors and nurses, or any of those who had anything to do with it were only doing their best to help me get well. At the same time, one finds there are people who will, in fact, try to convince one that any person who is opposed to fluoridation does not know what he is talking about. In an attempt to discredit these people, they ask: Who are they; where do they get their information from; where did they receive their learning, and how are they qualified to speak?

There are many publications on this subject and one is called, "Aqua Pura." This publication is registered for transmission through the post as a periodical and volume 3, No. 8 of January, 1966 quotes the economic motives behind fluoridation. I am not in a position to argue that, but I still believe that if there had not been some economic motives behind this situation probably Western Australia would not have heard of it for a long time to come.

I also received a letter from Carter Street, Hamilton Hill, dated the 12th September, 1966, which was addressed to me. I am not going to read it all because it contained a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Minister for Health and the Minister would, himself, have a copy of that. However, I would like to quote from this letter, as follows:—

I am enclosing a copy of the letter written to the Director of Health regarding the compulsory fluoridation of the water supply.

We my sister and myself do wish to lodge this very strong protest at this act as it is detrimental from reports received over the air by scientists, and further we do not wish to take drugs that are not tested and where the doctors have no authority to stop them or reduce the dosage if necessary.

Secondly we do not require them as I have no teeth and my sister who is over 50 years of age has her own original normal teeth which are perfectly good and healthy.

Trusting you will see our objections,

Yours faithfully,

C. H. Heins.

I do not intend to read to the House the letter he wrote to the Minister. I will say that I do not agree with all he said in it. There is a case of an elderly couple who have reached an age when they do not wish to be subjected to this medicine.

I have also received documents from scientific men not only of the United States of America, but also of the United Kingdom and other places. We also have men in this State who should know what they are talking about, and I have received a document which contains the names of many of our local medical men. To be fair I will quote from two documents. The first one is as follows:—

The following letter was sent on 30th August, 1963 to the Editor, *The West*

Australian the Editor, the *Daily News* the Editor, *The Sunday Times* and the Editor, Australian Broadcasting Commission News Service.

Dear Sir,

We, the undersigned, support the action of the Minister of Health, the Honourable Ross Hutchinson, in introducing legislation into the Parliament of Western Australia to enable local authorities to fluoridate their water supplies. We consider this to be a public health measure of the first importance.

In making this decision we have taken into account the recommendations of recognized expert committees of the World Health Organization, the Central Health Services Council of the Ministry of Health in the United Kingdom and the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia.

We note that the proposals have the support of the Australian and British Medical Associations and the Australian and British Dental Associations.

Before reading the signatories to this letter I interpolate by saying that I have noticed that no American authorities have been quoted. The letter continues—

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Gordon King.

Dean of the Faculty of Medicine in the University of Western Australia and Chairman, W. A. Branch, Australian Regional Council of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

(Signed) Kenneth Sutherland.

Dean of the Faculty of Dental Science and Professor of Dental Science in the University of Western Australia.

(Signed) Eric G Saint.

Professor of Medicine in the University of Western Australia.

(Signed) W. B. Macdonald.

Professor of Child Health in the University of Western Australia.

(Signed) Ralph H. Crisp.

Immediate Past President, Australian Paediatric Association.

(Signed) A. L. Dawkins.

Chairman, State Committee, Royal Australian College of Surgeons.

(Signed) Cyril Fortune.

Chairman, State Committee, Royal Australian College of Physicians.

(Signed) J. T. Irvine.

Chairman, W.A. Faculty Board, Australian College of General Practitioners.

(Signed) Robert Godfrey.

Medical Superintendent, Princess Margaret Hospital for Children.

(Signed) Noel Peverill.

Superintendent, Perth Dental Hospital.

I have quoted that list of names because they are the names of the medical special-

ists in our own State. I now wish to quote a list of the names of medical men who are opposed to the fluoridation of water for scientific reasons—

Fluoridation

All the eminent medical men listed below, oppose the addition of fluorides to drinking water for scientific reasons, discovered during their studies into the effects of fluorides on the human body.

They consider water fluoridation far too hazardous a way of administering doses of fluoride to people over a lifetime, regardless of the fact that "people" are individuals and react to drugs differently.

Dr. C. Mackay: 35 years study.

Dr. H. M. Sinclair, M.R.C.P.: Fellow & Tutor in Physiology, Magdalen College, Oxford.

Dr. Alton Oschner: World Authority on Cancer—opposed to Fluoridation.

Dr. C. C. Bass: Dean Emeritus of Tulane University, 40 years study in Dentistry. In his opinion the bad effects offset the good.

Geoffrey Dobbs, Ph.D., A.R.C.S.: Associate of The Royal College of Science, Microbiologist, College of N. Wales, Snr. Lecturer University, Wales, formerly at King's College University, London.

Dr. G. Waldbott, M.D., F.A.C.P., F.A.A.A., F.A.C.A.

Prof. D. B. Steyn, M.D., B.Sc. (Pharm.): Medical Faculty of Pretoria, South Africa.

Dr. M. C. Martin, M.D.: New York.

Dr. G. B. Knight, M.D., F.A.C.A., F.I.A.A.

Dr. V. O. Hurme: Forsyth Dental Infirmary for Children, Boston, U.S.A.

Dr. E. B. Hart: Prof. Bio-Chemistry, University Wisconsin, U.S.A.

Dr. E. A. Lawrence: Director Medicine at Lennox Hill Hospital, U.S.A.

Dr. G. F. Ogerrender: Director Otolaryngology, Lennox Hill Hospital, U.S.A.

Dr. Simon Beisler: Chief of Urology, Roosevelt Hospital, U.S.A.

Dr. F. S. Dunn: Head of The Oral Surgery Dept. Lennox Hill Hospital.

Phillip R. N. Sutton, D.D.S. (Melb), L.D. (Vic.): Research Fellow Dept. of Oral Med. and Surgery, Dental School University of Melbourne.

James Kerwin, D.D.S.: Fluoridation and Strontium 90 and Fluoride Danger.

Prof. A. Gordonoff: Prof. of Toxicology and Pharmacology, University of Berne, Switzerland.

Prof. A. Benagiano: Dean and Director, Dental School of Medicine & Surgery University, Rome.

Prof. S. Fiorentini: Prof. Dentistry, University, Rome, Principal of Dept. of Operative Dentistry, Eastman Higher Institute of Dentistry.

Dr. F. Roziek: Ass. Prof. Dentistry, Med. Faculty of Mainz, Germany. Chief Physician Dental Institute of Mainz, and in charge of research in the Research Institute since 1957.

Dr. G. W. Heard: Hereford, Texas, U.S.A.

Dr. D. C. Badger: Hobbs, North Mexico.

I will not weary the House by reading other names which appear on this letter.

I wanted to point out that those are men who are experts in their own particular field, who practice in various parts of the world, and who are definitely opposed to fluoridation. Therefore how can I, a layman with no medical experience, but standing here with the goodwill of the people of Western Australia to represent their wishes in matters of such importance as this, have on my conscience that I voted to force some person to take orally an ingredient I am not prepared to take myself?

I can recall when, in 1916, referendums were being taken on conscription and on prohibition. I was a young man, living in Westonia at that time. I was too young to become a member of the Armed Forces, but I was secretary of the Camp Comforts Fund, assistant secretary of the Red Cross and secretary of several other organisations dealing with—

The PRESIDENT: I would like the honourable member to address himself to the Bill before the House.

The Hon. R. F. H. LAVERY: I respect your wishes, Sir, but I do not know how you or I could divide what I am about to say and that which I have already said. When I have completed my remarks, perhaps you may excuse me. I want to point out that at this time when a referendum on conscription was being held, I was not old enough to enlist, and when I was approached to support conscription I refused point blank. I was asked, as a person of repute in the district, to work for the campaign for prohibition, but I pointed out to those who approached me that although I was not a drinker myself, I did not intend to enter into a campaign to deny someone else the right to have a drink if he so desired.

In recounting all this I am reaching the point in question; namely, that my attitude to this Bill is much the same. I am not in a position to judge for myself whether it is right or wrong, and I can only be guided by all the literature I have received since the original Bill on fluoridation was first brought before the House. That literature included the document signed by our own local medicos, which I have quoted to the House, a little book with a blue cover in favour of fluoridation which I received from the Minister, and, as I have said before, I have also received 150 communications from all over the

world from men who rank high in the field of medical science and who oppose fluoridation.

All I can say is that I cannot understand any Government asking people to accept compulsory fluoridation of water, which is our basic drink. Water is even used in the manufacture of beer, and how the brewery will separate the chemical content of fluoride from the water that is used for the making of beer, I do not know. I am also concerned that a Government which had a Bill of a similar nature defeated in 1963, when people apparently thought it was unacceptable, should, within a short period, introduce this Bill for the fluoridation of water supplies without making any attempt to educate the people on why it is necessary.

I feel that ill-health will result from the introduction of fluoridation of water supplies. I hope it will not, but I believe it will. I am also concerned as to who will be clothed with the authority to add this medicinal ingredient to the water we drink.

I am afraid that I will have to go along with the thought expressed by many people in America and in other places—I have a great number of documents here to verify this—that fluoridation of water supplies has only come into being since big companies began to produce alumina in vast quantities, with the resultant by-products.

People who are opposed to my views could ask me whether I believe in compulsory chest X-rays. I do not say that I am in favour of this, and I certainly do not believe in fingerprinting of the whole community, but I have had chest X-rays taken and I have been fingerprinted, but this was done voluntarily on my part.

I certainly think it is the right of the people themselves to decide whether they should take fluoride, just as they have the right to decide whether they should be fingerprinted.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Fingerprinting is not compulsory.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Exactly, and the honourable member could not have helped my argument more by making that comment. I therefore say that the intake of fluoride should be left to the individual himself to decide. A mother of four children who lives in Attadale—and she is not a supporter of my political party—said to me only this morning that she hoped I would vote against the Bill. She said that three of her children were taking fluoride tablets, and one of these is only 11 years of age. She said that she had got her children up to the right stage, and with the introduction of fluoridation she and her doctor were worried as to what she should do. The only help the doctor gave her was his suggestion that it will probably take two years for this Government to implement fluoridation of

water supplies, and in that time anything can happen. In that time there might be a change of Government.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: That is wishful thinking.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: It is not wishful thinking. It is the hope of every Opposition to be the Government one day, and to be put out of office is a very sorrowful event for a political party that has been in Government for too long. That event is yet to befall the Government of which Mr. Ferry is a member.

I have received many letters and much propaganda on the question of fluoridation, but in all only two letters favoured the fluoridation of water supplies. I say emphatically that I have not been presuaded by anybody to oppose the measure. I am only doing so because of my conscience. I do not believe that I have the right to compel a person to do something to his body which he does not want to do. On one occasion a doctor wanted me to undergo a certain operation, but as a result of other advice I declined, and today I still have a part of the body which I could have lost six years ago. Doctors make mistakes and so do the people who advocate the fluoridation of water supplies. Some of the greatest scientists are opposed to fluoridation, and some are in favour of it; therefore how can I, an individual without experience in these matters and without medical knowledge, vote in favour of a proposition such as this?

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [8.20 p.m.]: Mr. President, I propose to support the Bill for the fluoridation of public water supplies. To make it perfectly plain and clear, I say I support it without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation of any kind.

In the course of my contribution to this debate I hope to tell the House why and how I arrived at my decision. At the outset I wish to say that I respect the views of my colleagues who do not hold the same views as I do on this question, but I am sure they have come to their decision as a result of a deep study, just as I have come to mine.

I have examined all the publications I could obtain on this question of fluoridation. When I was in Tasmania I made it my business to examine the teeth of the children. I was surprised at the perfect mouths of those who had been taking fluoridated water. I was also able to see the mouths of some of the children who had been taking fluoride tablets from birth, and whose mothers also took fluoride before their children were born. People who have been able to examine the mouths of these children would be convinced of the benefit of fluoridation of water supplies.

Thousands upon thousands of publications have been issued on this question,

and it is impossible for one to keep up with them all, but I have read enough to convince me. I do not lean heavily on the American literature; I come closer to home. My first references are from Tasmania, New Zealand, and New South Wales. Fluoridation has been in operation in Tasmania since 1953, at Hastings in New Zealand since 1954, and at Yass in New South Wales since 1955.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What does that prove?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: If the honourable member will be patient I will even convince her. I wrote to New Zealand to obtain the latest information, and I received a publication which was issued this year dealing with the fluoridation of water supplies at Hastings. The conclusions in this publication are—

The results obtained in Hastings after 10 years of fluoridation closely resemble those obtained in overseas studies after an equivalent period of exposure to water fluoridation. The reductions in caries prevalence rates in both permanent and deciduous teeth which have been described in Hastings children very closely resemble for example, those described at Grand Rapids after 10 years of water fluoridation. Since at Grand Rapids evidence has been brought forward to show that the lower caries experience has extended into children at least up to the age of 15 years, it would seem reasonable to ultimately expect similar findings at Hastings.

I have here another New Zealand publication headed "The Effect of Fluoridation on a Dental Public Health Programme," issued in 1966, so we cannot get a much later publication. The conclusions are—

The results show that fluoridation has had a marked effect upon a dental public health programme. There has been an increase in the number of children that one School Dental Nurse can be responsible for and, therefore, there is a reduction in the number of School Dental Nurses needed. The reduction in the need for School Dental Nurses has a twofold benefit for New Zealand in that there is a saving in the cost of the programme, and a saving in labour in a country with a labour shortage.

The cost of operating the General Dental Benefits programme is reduced. Further, the dental practitioners have more time to devote to the population over 16.

These benefits are in addition to the advantages to the children who are spared unnecessary pain and discomfort, require fewer fillings and extractions, lose less school time taken up by treatment, and who finally pass to adulthood with more tooth tissue and less restorative dentistry.

Summary

The effect of fluoridation on a dental public health programme was investigated. It was found that there was a reduction in the staff and a reduction in the overall cost of the programme.

In 1963, before the fluoridation legislation was introduced in this Parliament, I wrote to the Minister for Health in Hobart, and I quote the following extracts from his reply dated the 14th March, 1963:—

Fluoridation in Tasmania commenced in 1953 at Beaconsfield, a town in the north of Tasmania, with a population of approximately 6,000.

At the present time, approximately 20 per cent. of Tasmania's population is drinking fluoridated water.

On the 24th August this year I again wrote to the Minister for Health in Hobart, asking the following questions:—

- (1) How long has fluoridated water been in use in Tasmania?
- (2) Approximately the number of people using fluoridated water supplies since commencement?
- (3) Any statistics regarding the improvement of children's teeth?
- (4) Have there been any adverse effects whatsoever to any children?
- (5) Have there been any adverse effects clinically or otherwise to elderly people due to fluoride?

I received a reply from the Minister dated the 5th September, 1966, supplying the following information in answer to my questions:—

- (1) I presume that the question refers to Tasmania, and not New Zealand. The answer to this question is "1953."
- (2) Fluoridation was introduced in Tasmania at Beaconsfield in 1953, serving approximately 2,000 people. In 1963 Beaconsfield was absorbed into the West Tamar Regional Scheme. In the same year the Launceston City Council decided to fluoridate their water supply, and this decision, together with the West Tamar Regional Scheme, would cover approximately 42,000 people.

In 1964 the Hobart City Council decided to fluoridate their water scheme, which is serving a population of approximately 60,000.

- (3) In 1963 after a period of ten years of fluoridation the Department of Health Services conducted a survey in regard to the prevalence and severity rates of dental caries. The results of the survey are as per attached.
- (4) No.
- (5) No.

It seems that the people of Tasmania are very hardy, if they cannot be destroyed by fluoridation of water supplies! The

survey which was mentioned in the reply gives the following information:—

	Per 100 Erupted Teeth	
	1953	1963
Children aged 6, 7, 8 years drinking reticulated water (i.e., fluoridated since 1953)—		
D.M.F., 6-year molar	52.54	19.62
D.M.F., all permanent teeth	25.12	9.99
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), 6-year molars	6.80	1.50
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), all permanent teeth	2.80	0.70
Children aged 6, 7, 8 living outside reticulated water supply (i.e., no consumption of fluoridated water at home, but an appreciable intake at school from the age of 5 or 6)—		
D.M.F., 6-year molar	50.01	44.00
D.M.F., all permanent teeth	22.89	19.69
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), 6-year molars	9.00	6.00
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), all permanent teeth	3.75	2.90
Children aged 9, 10, 11 years drinking reticulated water (i.e., fluoridated since 1953)—		
D.M.F., 6-year molar	92.90	57.48
D.M.F., all permanent teeth	38.25	16.34
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), 6-year molars	46.10	14.40
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), all permanent teeth	10.00	3.22
Children aged 9, 10, 11 living outside reticulated water supply (i.e., no consumption of fluoridated water at home, but an appreciable intake at school from the age of 5 or 6)—		
D.M.F., 6-year molar	83.74	80.29
D.M.F., all permanent teeth	36.09	24.16
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), 6-year molars	33.30	30.17
Tooth mortality (teeth missing or requiring extraction because of gross caries), all permanent teeth	8.60	6.05

So it can be seen that a dramatic change occurred where there was full use of fluoride in the water supply. On the 24th August, 1966, I wrote a letter to the Minister for Health in New South Wales, and I asked him the same questions as follows:—

- (1) How long has fluoridated water been in use in New South Wales?
- (2) Approximately the number of people using fluoridated water supplies since commencement?
- (3) Any statistics regarding the improvement of children's teeth.
- (4) Have there been any adverse effects whatsoever to any children?
- (5) Have there been any adverse effects clinically or otherwise to elderly people due to fluoride?

The answer I received was as follows:—

- (1) Fluoridation was introduced in New South Wales in 1955 at Yass.
- (2) At the present time fifteen communities have introduced fluoridation schemes and seven more are installing the plant to do so. Approximately 150,000 people are now drinking fluoridated water. When the Sydney Metropolitan Water Board completes its present plant to fluoridate, approximately three-quarters of the population of the State will be drinking fluoridated water. I am sure

that within a very few years fluoridation will be almost universal in New South Wales.

It is an interesting fact that fluoridated water was introduced by a Labor Government. Now there is a Liberal Government in New South Wales and it sees fit to carry on with fluoridation, and no doubt this is because the Government can see the good that is being done to the children's teeth. To continue—

- (3) Studies of the dental condition of children in Yass after seven years of fluoridation demonstrated a 60 per cent. decrease in dental decay among five-year olds, findings similar to those in America, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Significant reductions in decay among children of Goulburn, New South Wales, were shown after three years of fluoridation.
- (4) No adverse health effects have been noted in children drinking fluoridated water.
- (5) To date, no adverse effects of any kind or change in the pattern of mortality or morbidity have been reported from those cities and towns which have fluoridated their water supplies.

Again, on the 24th August, 1966, I wrote to the Minister for Health in New Zealand, and asked the same five questions. I particularly wanted to see if there were any adverse effects on children, or any adverse effects on adults or old people. The answer I received from the Department of Health, was dated the 6th September, 1966, and was as follows:—

At the direction of the Minister of Health, I acknowledge your letter of 24th August, 1966, asking about fluoridation in New Zealand.

Fluoridation commenced at Hastings in 1954, and a continuing study of the effects of the measure has been carried out since that date. To date eleven communities have fluoridated water supplies, and a further nineteen intend to commence in the near future. The total population receiving fluoridated water is 966,833, and when the other communities install fluoridation a total of 1,199,613 will be served. This latter figure represents 64.71% of the total population in New Zealand on a reticulated water supply.

I am able to say that there have been no substantiated cases of illness directly or indirectly attributable to fluoridation in New Zealand, in any age group.

A Commission of Inquiry was set up in 1956 to investigate fluoridation, and its conclusions as set out in its report have stood the test of time and have

been reinforced by the experience of those communities in New Zealand that have adopted fluoridation.

In 1963 I wrote to Professor Noel D. Martin, Professor of Preventive Dentistry, University of Sydney. The reply I received is a fairly lengthy document, and I will read certain extracts from it. The letter is dated the 18th July, 1963, and the first part I propose to quote is as follows:—

There is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that sodium fluoride at one part per million is used to render circus animals docile.

I particularly mention that because at the time, in 1963, we were inundated with letters, and this was one of the objections to fluoridation. To continue—

However, it is true that at high concentrations it is used as an insecticide. Of course, there is a very considerable difference between the concentration which is toxic and the concentration which occurs naturally in drinking water. In point of fact, sodium fluoride as such does not exist at concentrations of 1 part per million. When sodium fluoride is dissolved in water, it splits into sodium ions and fluoride ions, and it is chemically incorrect to use the expression sodium fluoride at 1 p.p.m. The antifluoridationists always refer to sodium fluoride instead of the fluoride ion simply because they wish to distinguish, without any valid scientific reason, between natural and artificial fluoride.

Sodium fluoride, of course, is claimed by them to be an artificial compound which is used as a poison and for this reason when added to the water supply is supposed to be harmful, whereas fluoride which is present naturally in water they claim is not sodium fluoride but calcium fluoride, and hence is of no health significance. However, from a chemical point of view the fluoride which is present in water at 1 part per million is always the same irrespective of the source of the fluoride itself. It may be calcium fluoride, sodium fluoride, sodium silico fluoride or hydrofluorosilicic acid. There is no difference whatsoever in the way fluoride at 1 part per million is metabolised or used by the body irrespective of its source, and this is the reason that the dental effects and the general effects of a natural water containing 1 part per million are identical with the effects produced by a drinking water containing 1 part per million fluoride which has been added mechanically.

I also asked, in my letter, if fluoridation was costly, and whether it was unworkable or dangerous. The answer to that question was as follows:—

Fluoridation is inexpensive—the overall cost in the United States being between 7 and 9 cents per person per year. It is not unworkable, as more than 2,000 communities now use fluoridated water, and the communities range from small villages to cities the size of Chicago, and every possible technical difficulty which could be associated with fluoridation has been met and overcome. The New York University College of Engineering has prepared a special report on Fluoridation Practices in the United States, and has analysed all the problems associated with the technical aspects of fluoridation. There are no grounds whatsoever for advancing any technical reasons as to why fluoridation should be considered unworkable.

The most fictitious argument of all is that it has been discarded because it is dangerous to health. No one has been able to substantiate any claims that fluoride at a level of one part per million has harmed their health, irrespective of whether it has been claims made in court or Congressional inquiry.

The most recent decision of the Superior Court of Cook County concerning the legality of the fluoridation of Chicago's water supply definitely and unambiguously stated after a most thorough hearing which continued over a period of some years, that there was absolutely no evidence that fluoride was harmful to health.

My province, which I have the honour to represent in company with Mr. Garrigan, takes in the towns from Esperance in the south right through to Merredin and includes Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Westonia, Yilgarn, and Bruce Rock, and all of those towns are served by the goldfields water supply. If the water supply is fluoridated, the people living in those towns will drink it. According to local government statistics, there are 50,000 people—men, women, and children—living in those towns and not one person has written to me and said that he did not want fluoridated water. Not one person out of 50,000.

As a matter of fact, it has been the reverse; some people say they want it. I was requested to convene a meeting at Norseman so that the people could be told about fluoridation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Northam or Norseman?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Norseman. I convened the meeting and representatives from the Health Education Council attended. Those gentlemen were cross-examined at length, and at that meeting a motion was moved to the effect that the people wanted fluoride in the water supply at Norseman. A committee was formed immediately consisting of the local doctor and other citizens to seek the fluoridation of the water supply at Norseman.

The same thing happened at Esperance. A meeting was held there which I attended. So it can be seen that in the area which I represent with Mr. Garrigan, not one person said that he did not want fluoride in the water.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are the local health inspector, are you not?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I was the health inspector; I am now a member of Parliament.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is the reason why.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I do not see that makes any difference; as a matter of fact, it puts me in a better position to judge. I would like to quote from a publication of The Royal Society of Health, in London. One article is headed, "Dental Decay: Control by Fluoridation." It sets out the dental aspect, and is a lengthy article but I am not going to quote all of it. It is written by Miss Jean R. Forrest, L.D.S., R.F.P.S., F.R.S.H., Senior Dental Officer, Ministry of Health. She had this to say—

The poor, it has been said, are always with us—be that as it may it is certainly true so far as teeth are concerned. Dental caries affects all ages from very early childhood, all sections of society and is so common that it has come to be regarded as one of the unfortunate and inevitable consequences of modern life and standards of living.

It is not only in this country that caries is an increasing problem: It has become a major health issue in practically every country in the world.

Attention is frequently drawn to the bad condition of this nation's teeth in articles published in the popular and scientific Press, in magazines, posters, pamphlets and leaflets, yet a great many people still fail to appreciate the position and many do not even care. They do not realise the serious consequences of dental ill health, nor what it means in terms of suffering, ill-health and disability when young children have more than half, or even all their teeth hopelessly decayed.

In her conclusions she sets out the results, which are quite lengthy and in which she gives all the statistics. I will not weary the House with those, but under the head of "Results" she said—

Fluoride appears to exert its maximum effect if it is absorbed continuously during the whole period of tooth formation and calcification. In deciduous teeth this means from before birth and in the first year of life.

The conclusion she reaches reads in part as follows:—

Since the first fluoridation studies were started in 1945, it has been introduced in many other districts in the U.S.A. and Canada. According to

the latest published report, 45 million people in the U.S.A. are now drinking water containing fluoride at the concentration recommended for fluoridation. Of these, 38 million live in some 2,000 communities in which the fluoride level of the water supply is adjusted, the other 7 million live in natural fluoride areas. Fluoridation has been introduced also in 36 districts in Canada, with a total population of 1,000,000.

In this book there is also an article headed, "The Waterworks Aspect," which is written by J. Longwell, D.S.C., F.R.I.C., F.R.S.H., Deputy Government Chemist. It is quite a lengthy article but the interesting part of it is the conclusion which reads as follows:—

It is true that most of the fluoride added to a drinking water is wasted since only a small proportion of the water is used by babies and young children. This is inevitable since it would be impracticable to fluoridate part of a water supply and still ensure that fluoride went where it was needed. Nevertheless, when the cost of fluoridating a water supply is related to the population served it is remarkably small, having regard to the cost of dental treatment, the suffering due to bad teeth and the improvement that can confidently be expected in the future for both children and adults. Collins has given a figure of 4½d. per head per annum. In some places the cost may be higher, but a figure of 10d. per head per annum has not been exceeded in the present series. Equipment in use in this country was especially manufactured or imported, and it is likely that the cost will be reduced when fluoridation becomes more widespread. The cost of the fluoride chemicals may also be reduced and ultimately a figure of 6d. per head per annum should not be excluded . . .

The publication then has an article called, "The Safety Aspects." This article is written by W. Alcock, M.B., CH.B., D.P.H., F.R.S.H., Medical Officer of Health, Waterford, and in it he states—

Five years ago, at the invitation of the Royal Society of Health, the author took part in a symposium on the fluoridation of public water supplies, when he reviewed the current medical and public health aspects of the subject. In the intervening period much research and many scientific papers have been added to the already voluminous literature on the safety aspects of fluoridation. The conclusions drawn five years ago were that in the light of the available evidence the consumption of fluoridated water would in no way adversely affect the general health of the community drinking it. It is reassuring to be able to report that the additional scientific

evidence that has accrued has only served to strengthen those conclusions.

He also deals with the subject under the heading of "Ecology" and goes on to state—

Fluoride salts are widely distributed throughout the earth's crust. During the whole of geological history the rocky strata containing fluoride mineral deposits have been exposed to the natural agencies of weathering, releasing fluoride salts into the soils and water-bearing strata, albeit somewhat haphazardly, but nevertheless on so wide a scale that fluoride salts are found everywhere. Through the medium of the soil they find their way into the substance of growing plants, so that all vegetables grown for human consumption are found to contain them; moreover, through the medium of herbage cropped by cattle and sheep small amounts of fluoride which are taken up by the tissues of these animals are in due course absorbed through the consumption of meat and other animal products. In fact, the fluorine element is present to some extent in all foodstuffs. Although in most natural drinking waters it exists only in trace amounts, it is present in substantial quantities in the widely consumed liquid beverages, tea and beer. So it comes about that throughout life a certain amount of fluoride is consumed in the daily diet, irrespective of whether the drinking water contains significant amounts of this element or not.

The author then deals with the fate of ingested fluoride and states—

The body possesses two important protective mechanisms for dealing with fluoride: (a) rapid excretion; (b) storage in bone.

(a) Excretion:

Fluoride is eliminated through the kidneys, the alimentary canal and the skin. The question frequently asked is whether the fluoride ingested as a consequence of consuming fluoridated water might damage the kidneys or aggravate existing kidney disease.

The ten-year study carried out on the inhabitants of Bartlett in Texas and the nearby town of Cameron failed to detect, *inter alia*, any evidence of impaired kidney function attributable to fluoride in Bartlett, where the water supply contained 8 parts per million, compared with Cameron, where the water contained only 0.2 p.p.m., although participants in the study had resided in the respective communities for at least 15 years.

He also had this to say—

It would be reasonable to conclude therefore that in temperate climates

where the fluoride content of water supplies is in the region of 1 p.p.m. no damage to the kidneys will occur. Where kidney disease is present, again the risk of fluorosis as evidenced by bone storage is most unlikely. If the kidney disease is so advanced that fluoride elimination is impaired, the individual will die of the kidney disease long before manifestations of fluorosis develop.

In regard to the effect on the alimentary canal, he said—

In the mouth

It is well-known that the teeth can absorb fluoride and the topical application of fluoride salts to the teeth is a recognised form of caries prevention. In fact the beneficial effect of drinking fluoride-containing water may be due in part to its topical effect on the teeth during the act of drinking.

In relation to the stomach he goes on to state—

During the course of the fluoridation trials, general practitioners in the three study areas were asked to supply information about any symptoms of which their patients complained attributable to the consumption of fluoridated water. None was reported.

I never cease to be amazed at society and the behaviour of certain people. Some people poison themselves with alcohol and become alcoholics. But there is not much done about it. No-one seems to worry too much. Some people smoke to excess and get lung cancer. But no one seems to worry very much about that, either. On the screen we see glamorous advertisements indicating that it is fashionable to smoke. The idea is to encourage young people to smoke and drink alcohol. But no-one does much about it. Yet when a beneficial health measure, such as the fluoridation of water supplies, is suggested by our medical advisers—people upon whom we depend to tell us about these things—there is, to say the least, quite a stir.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There are just as many against it.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: We get brainwashed and inundated with literature about it and it becomes a gigantic issue. I have elected to go along with the people for fluoridation and I have complete faith in our medical advisers.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Half of them say "No" to it.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I have complete faith in the World Health Organisation; I have complete faith in what has been done in Tasmania and what I saw for myself while I was in that State. I have complete faith in the literature and letters I have received from New South Wales in regard to this matter;

and I have complete faith in the information I have received from New Zealand. This question has been the subject of many committees. A committee in New Zealand reported on the matter; and a committee in Ireland deliberated on it. There was also another committee set up in Canada.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There are just as many against it.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: This question has been the subject of court action; there have been Supreme Court cases, High Court cases, and appeals to the Privy Council; and everyone has come down in favour of the cause of fluoridation.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: No, not Sweden.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I am talking about the places I have just quoted. The optimum level of fluoride in water supplies is only one part per million, and in a couple of towns in Western Australia there is a certain amount of fluoride already in the drinking water, but not in sufficient quantity. All we are going to do is add fluoride ion to the water to bring the level to the maximum of one part per million. This practice has been in operation in many places for a number of years. It is not something new. Opponents of the idea talk about the effects it will have on the human body, the legality of the action, and all that sort of thing. I think the cases I have just quoted, and the latest figures—for the year 1966—do not show many adverse effects on the human body through the use of fluoride.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That's your opinion.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: That is the opinion of doctors and people who are in a position to know what they are talking about. Australians have deplorable teeth. Military and school surveys have shown this to be so. A large number of Australians lose their teeth at an early age and many others have bad teeth.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is not for the want of fluoride.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I believe there is ample evidence to show that fluoride ion added to the water at the rate of one part per million is beneficial.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Where is the evidence of that?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has made her main speech, and many subsidiaries, and I would ask her to refrain from continuing. Mr. Stubbs may proceed.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I go along with the fluoridation of public water supplies because I believe it is the only effective method for the distribution of fluoride to ensure that all our children receive it. They will be able to

receive it in spite of the apathy of their parents, the neglect of their parents, the forgetfulness of their parents, or for some other reason. The fact remains that if fluoride is added to the water children will be able to ingest it either through drinking plain water, tea, or from consuming anything when water is used in the cooking.

In Australia dental decay is more common than the common cold; it causes pain and a premature loss of teeth, impaired mastication and therefore bad digestion and, of course, many people have had to be fitted with artificial teeth. I have artificial teeth.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Haven't we all?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I know they are a poor substitute for the dinkum thing. Dental decay costs Australia \$40,000,000 a year. Let us consider the addition of one part of fluoride per million of water. As a comparison this would mean two drops of fluoride in the bath tub; or one teaspoonful in 500 gallons of water; or, to convert it to distance, it would be the equivalent of one inch in 15 miles. It is as minute as that.

The Hon. J. Dolan: It is still too much.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Is that externally or internally?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I should say that the honourable member has had plenty of fluoride. We all know that when any public health measure is proposed there is always opposition to it. We can recall the position when Salk vaccine was first introduced, at a time when polio was at its worst. We all know the dramatic effect that Salk vaccine had in the control of polio; as a result it is no longer the dreaded disease it was. The same applies to the pasteurisation of milk. There was opposition to that when it was first introduced. Pasteurisation of milk destroys all animal and human pathogenic organisms. But up to that time it was the vehicle which carried children's disease, like typhoid, dysentery, diphtheria, scarlet fever, tuberculosis, brucella, and bovine tuberculosis. Even though there was an outcry at the time it was first introduced, it is now generally accepted.

The same applies to X-ray. There was a great deal of opposition to its introduction but we all know how dramatically the X-ray has reduced the incidence of tuberculosis. At one time the Wooroloo Sanatorium and the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital were full of patients suffering from tuberculosis; but X-ray discovered this in its early stages and, as a result, the disease was arrested. Consequently the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital is now used for other purposes. The only weak spot in relation to tuberculosis is the goldfields because of the incidence of silicosis and the weakening of the lungs that results.

Not long ago we brought in an amendment to the Health Act to make blood transfusions compulsory. We all recall the occasion when a person allowed her child to die, because she did not believe in blood transfusions. It is now compulsory for blood transfusions to be used. I suppose some people will say that this amounts to taking away a person's rights and liberties; but it must be remembered that such people were quite prepared to see their children die rather than use blood transfusion.

The chlorination of water also kills pathogenic organisms. It is used in swimming pools and in our water supplies generally. The quantity that is used is half a part of chlorine to a million parts of water. Yet chlorine is a deadly gas which it might be said is likely to poison people. Of course it will if it is taken in a large quantity.

The purpose of fluoride is to prevent dental caries, and if the majority of the people want it I think they should have it. When we consider fluoride in the light of one part per million parts of water it is merely used as a trace element. We all know the dramatic things that have happened in agricultural science. The gentlemen on the farms know of the wasting disease that have afflicted cattle and sheep in what were apparently good pastures. The agricultural scientists found that this wasting was caused by a lack of cobalt and iron, together with other mineral deficiencies. When that position was remedied the cattle were fattened on lush pastures. It is these same scientists, and others like them, who tell us of the good that fluoride will do; and I am prepared to go along with them. They have done, and are doing, a remarkable job.

We all know that otherwise useless land has been brought into production by the addition of such trace elements as copper, zinc, molybdenum, magnesium, cobalt, boron, and others. As a result of these greater areas of pastures have been grown and more cattle have been fattened. In the case of the 90-mile desert in South Australia, we find it is now carrying five sheep to the acre as a result of the controlled use of trace elements. After all, fluoride is only a trace element. We all know that agricultural science has perfected fertilisers, weed killers, and pesticides.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: And insecticides.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: They may also have their uses. As a result of myxamatosis we all know that rabbits have been exterminated to a considerable degree. Constant research has shown that fluoride is quite safe to take in the quantities prescribed in the Bill.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Of course it is. The same health authorities who look after our health advocate the use of fluoride. Surely we can have faith in them. We know that if it were not for the health authorities there could be the possibility of our being given rotten meat. We all know that some butchers use sulphur dioxide in the meat to make it look good; but if this were not watched the meat we get might quite easily be tainted. The same is the case with bread where the health authorities look for excess moisture. These are the same health people who advocate the use of fluoride. If it were not for the constant vigilance of the health authorities the people's budgets would be seriously affected as a result of their purchasing commodities that were not of the best. We all know that copper salts are added to peas to give them an attractive appearance and colour. If this were not watched carefully it would prove a hazard to health.

We also find in the case of low quality tomato sauce that it is tinted with red coal tar dye. And here again this activity is closely watched by the public health authorities. I think we all know and have had experience of milk being adulterated by the addition of water. The worst part of this, of course, is that the child who is being fed on this milk does not get the full benefit from it. It may not generally be known but it is also possible for people who drink beer to be poisoned. I well remember a case in Kalgoorlie when the beer was poisoned, though I am glad to say that it was not our local beer that was affected—it was beer that was imported from the Eastern States. This beer had arsenic in it and quite a number of people were poisoned from it. Apparently the poison was created as a result of the reaction of the glucose and malt. That happened in Kalgoorlie, so some of my friends had better be careful.

It is due to the activities of medical science that children survive now in the first year of their lives, whereas previously deaths were only too common during this period. In people generally there is a greater life expectancy in spite of the motorcar and traffic accidents; and this is all due to the work that has been done by scientists. Surely we should have faith in their work and in their opinions! Should we not have faith in them when they recommend fluoride?

We all know what medical research has done in the field of controlling infectious diseases; we all know how people have been immunised through the use of vaccines. Diseases that afflicted our children years ago, and which were considered as serious, are considered quite ordinary now. In the past whooping cough was a child killer but, today, as a result of immunisation it is not considered at all dangerous. All these tremendous advances are due to the efforts of our medical scientists; the same men who advocate the use of fluoride.

Fluoride is a necessary nutriment, because it has the same value as vitamins. Vitamins are accessory food factors; they are substances contained in foodstuffs which are essential to life, growth, and reproduction. This is also the case with fluoride. We all know the beneficial effect of vitamins.

It is interesting to note that Christian Eijkman was the first to discover the benefits of vitamins. He came from Holland and went to the East Indies to investigate the cause of beri beri. The meaning of beri beri is "I cannot." This is easily understandable because the victim becomes helpless as a result of the failure of his nervous system. We all know that scurvy in sailors and rickets in children are brought about by a lack of vitamins "C" and "D." If we are going to worry about fluoride, then I think we should also worry about our food. Fluoride is, of course, a poison if it is taken in massive doses; but one part of fluoride per million parts of water, it has been found, will prevent dental caries.

We know that wholesome potato tubers contain about 90 parts of solanine per million. Broad beans are also poisonous because they contain certain chemicals. The same is the case with peach stones and apricot stones, because they contain cyanide. If we considered all these things poisonous we would have to go on a starvation diet; and the same applies to the fluoridation of water.

The fluoridation of public water supplies was the subject of a report of a commission of inquiry in New Zealand in 1956-57. Members of that commission were Wilfred Fosberrey Stilwell, Norman Lowther Edson and Percy Vernon Esmond Stainton. I would like to read some part of their remarks from page 27. The following points are the conclusions they reached in regard to dental health problems:—

We regard the following matters as established:—

- (1) Virtually every child born in New Zealand experiences dental decay and in consequence an unduly high proportion of the population over the age of 21 years uses some form of denture.
- (2) Sustained efforts over many years by both the Department of Health and the dental profession to introduce improved dietary habits have been ineffective. At the present time there is no hope of any programme of dental health education achieving a significant beneficial effect.
- (3) The filling of teeth is not a preventive measure but a means of treating decay.
- (4) The problem of controlling the rate of dental decay by treatment is beyond the re-

sources of the dental services in this country.

- (5) The incidence of dental decay in New Zealand is so widespread and severe that it constitutes a major problem in public health and is a matter for grave concern.

Those are the findings of the committee which was set up to inquire into fluoridation. On page 46 we find the following remarks:—

Summary of our conclusions on the relation of fluoride to dental health.

Excepting radioactive fluoride, all fluoride ions are the same irrespective of their origin, and they behave in the same way in both a chemical and a biochemical sense.

There is no evidence that the consumption of fluoridated water would do harm to the pulp of the teeth or to the tissues which surround and support them.

The present state of dental health in this country is a matter for serious public concern.

There is a further comment on page 58, under the heading, "Conclusions as to the Nature of Fluorine," as follows:—

We regard the following matters as established:—

The element fluorine does not occur in a free state in nature and has no relevance to the fluoridation process.

The process is aimed at increasing the concentration of fluoride ions in water supplies and those ions do not possess the properties of fluorine in its free elementary state.

Excepting radioactive fluorine, which is not relevant, all fluoride ions are alike and, irrespective of their source, do exactly the same things in both a chemical and a biochemical sense.

Organic compounds of fluorine are extremely stable and do not dissociate to give fluoride ions in aqueous solution.

No distinction can be drawn between the fluoride naturally in water and the fluoride proposed to be added to it by the fluoridation process.

The conclusions on page 61 regarding the intake of fluoride are as follows:—

Our conclusions in regard to the ingestion and storage of fluoride by the body are:—

Fluoride is a normal constituent of human diet and in fact no diet is completely devoid of this element.

The principal source of fluoride is drinking water in all normal circumstances.

Fluoride is a normal constituent of the bony structure of the body and of teeth.

It is absorbed easily, but since most of the fluoride absorbed is rapidly excreted by the kidney, or readily deposited in bones, it does not impair the activity of enzyme systems.

There is a further finding on page 67. It is as follows:—

I know of no reliable evidence that 1 part per million of fluorine is definitely toxic to human beings.

Conclusions as to the Toxicity of Fluoride

In summary, our conclusions in regard to the toxicity of fluoride are:

Fluoride is beneficial in proper doses and the optimum level in drinking water can be established with certainty.

In common with all foods including pure water, it can become harmful in substantial overdoses.

Acute or violent reactions could be produced only by such huge overdoses that the possibility becomes irrelevant in relation to the fluoridation of water.

In the proposal to fluoridate water, there is no risk of chronic fluoride poisoning.

The suggestion that fluoride is an enzyme poison has no relevance to fluoridated water.

The implication contained in certain anti-fluoridation literature that fluoridation involves the use of a substance with properties similar to certain deadly organic compounds of fluorine, is absurd and entirely misleading.

This is a summary on page 86—

Summary of Conclusions on the Complaints that Fluoride is Harmful to Health

After full consideration of all the evidence we are satisfied that fluoridated water does not cause or aggravate any of the following disorders:

Disorders of the brain and nervous system, disorders of the special senses, and disorders of the mind.

Disorders of the heart and blood vessels.

Disorders of the kidney and urinary tract.

Cancer.

Diabetes or disorders of the thyroid gland.

Disorders of the gastro-intestinal tract and the liver.

Disorders of pregnancy and labour or developmental defects in children.

Disorders of bones, joints, and the bone marrow.

Irritation of the eyes or irritation of mucous membranes.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Who said that?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: They are the findings of this committee.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is only a committee, after all. There are as many against it as there are for it.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: At the risk of offending Mrs. Hutchison, I will have to keep on reading.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I will shut up after that.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: Under the heading, "Summary of Our Conclusions on the Relation of Fluoride to General Health" the report virtually repeats what I have said before, that fluoride is not a poison and is not toxic. Under the heading "Conclusions" on page 130, the report says—

Several chemicals of a high standard of purity are manufactured for the fluoridation of public water supplies and these are entirely suitable for that purpose.

The process of fluoridation involves no new or unusual problems in water-works engineering.

Apparatus capable of mixing the fluoride in water supplies with precise and unvarying accuracy is readily available.

The process does not involve disadvantages to industry or in respect of water reticulations or plant.

The report on page 134 has the following to say in regard to tablets:—

We are satisfied that there are weighty objections to the use of fluoride tablets. These are:

There are no published studies on the use of tablets containing fluorides.

The obvious difficulty with this method is that it is necessary for the parent to administer fluoride to each child each day and every day for the first 8 to 12 years of the child's life.

The studies establishing the effectiveness of fluoride show that if the full protective effect of the fluoride is to be obtained the daily fluoride ration must be consumed in liquid form on a number of occasions. This adds substantially to a mother's domestic activities.

While in individual instances the use of tablets may prove a feasible method, generally for families containing more than one child, it tends to be troublesome and spasmodic in application.

It is suggested that if these tablets are used the majority of people will cease using them in adolescence and any subsequent benefit arising from the topical

affect of a fluoride on the teeth would be lost.

The conclusions are—

We regard the following matters as established:

The food alternatives suggested are not practicable as vehicles for fluoride as they do not permit a low optimum concentration of the substance.

Humans naturally obtain the greater part of their dietary fluoride in water which is universally consumed.

Because the consumption of water is regulated by physiological need the ingestion of fluoride by this means is self limiting.

The efficacy of fluoridation as a public health measure is proven.

No alternative suggested to us would be effective as a public health measure.

For the foregoing reasons we are satisfied that there is no practicable method of adjusting the daily intake of fluoride other than by addition of that substance to public water supplies.

On page 142, under the heading "Conclusions," the report says—

Concerning all the foregoing matters it is our conclusion:

That the avoidance of fluoridated water might cause inconvenience but in no case would its use be compulsory; that the process does not involve medication of community supplies; that humans have an inherent right to water as one of the essentials of life but not such wide interest in regard to community water supplies which are merely one of the means of providing it.

I have a copy of a High Court judgment on a case in New Zealand. The anti-fluoridation people took the matter to court. The case finished up with the Privy Council and a decision was given in favour of fluoridation. I could quote from that case, but will not do so as it is available if members wish to read it. I have the judgment which was delivered by Mr. Justice Kenny as a result of a High Court judgment in 1963.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Is that a majority decision?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Unanimous.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: In this case he came down in favour of fluoridation. The fluoridation of public water supplies was challenged and the matter went to the Supreme Court of Ireland. In every case that has gone to court, a decision has been given in favour of fluoridation. The lawyers are learned men; and those supporting fluoridation are

learned men. That is the strength of my case and I am right behind the fluoridation of our water supplies.

THE HON. E. C. HOUSE (South) [9.26 p.m.]: I think the Government is to be complimented on this Bill to adjust the fluoride content of the water supplies. This, of course, will ensure at least 60 per cent. reduction of dental caries in the teeth of our children. There is ample evidence to prove there is an ever-increasing accumulation of dental disease throughout the entire community which has reached proportions of almost national calamity, as well as being a serious economic problem to the parents of the children affected.

The results of research that has been carried out to ascertain the required safe amounts of fluoride to be added to water to help prevent decay have only been readily available for something like 30 years. It is approximately 30 years since the surveys began in regard to the testing of fluoride in caries prevention. However, like most beneficial health measures, it has been a very slow process in order to bring about an appreciation of the advantages both from a health point of view and from an economic angle.

This can be illustrated by the progress of medicine between 1800 and 1900—indeed, up to this day. In certain aspects, I think the public has become more adaptable to the rapid advancement of medical science, its discoveries of drugs, and its ability to cure diseases.

The Ministers, both in another place and in this House, when introducing this Bill have stressed it is a public health measure designed to help with the serious dental diseases in all age groups; but if we study the progress of medicine during the period of the 1800s when the profession started to become a force in presenting new ideas and providing a benefit for the people of Europe, England, and America, we will see all of those ideas met with strong opposition, not only from the public, but also from within the ranks of the medical people.

Every innovation which was suggested brought forth a terrific amount of controversy and in many cases 50 to 70 years elapsed before what to us now appears the obvious was accepted. We look back in amazement now to think that this should happen, but the very same thing is occurring in our own day in connection with the important discovery of a commodity which will prevent disease in teeth.

It is very interesting to note that chloroform was one of the first anaesthetics used to deaden the terrible pain involved in teeth extraction. The use of chloroform was met with ridicule and scorn, and when it was later used for child birth it was stated it would poison the blood stream of the child. Those opposed to its use said it was a question of morality

and religion, and quoted from the Bible the passage, "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." At the time doctors stated that progress could not be stopped merely because the clergy described chloroform as the sleep of the devil. But victory was a long time coming to this addition to medicine which enabled life-saving operations to be carried out.

Let us consider the violent resistance to Pasteur's findings on the cause of fermentation and bacteria, and the long, hard struggle that Lister had to convince his colleagues of the value of preventive measures in medicine. Thousands of people died unnecessarily in childbirth and surgery because of the difficulty in convincing people of the worth of these important discoveries, which were applied only after careful testing.

Millions of teeth today are decaying for this same reason, and the very foundation for the prevention of decay lies in the fluoridation of water supplies.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Who discovered fluoride?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Does the honourable member mean who discovered its presence in water?

The Hon. R. Thompson: Yes.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I think it was back in 1894, if I remember correctly, when the mottling of teeth was observed and someone tried to find the cause. A person does not have to be a top-line chemist to extract chemicals from the water to find out what is happening, and it was 30 to 50 years ago when this took place.

Our medical and dental leaders, who have done so much research, study, tests, and experiments on a world-wide basis, covering all age groups in areas containing high percentages of fluoride, can take heart in the knowledge that the vocal force of resistance they are experiencing is not new, but is similar to what has been experienced in connection with nearly all beneficial health measures. Those scientists, doctors, and dentists—with many letters after their names—who have been quoted as opponents to increasing the quantity of fluoride in our water, are no different from the opponents of Lister, Pasteur, and other discoverers of improvements in medicine and hygiene from the 1800s up to this day. These opponents are found in all professions, societies, and trades. Generally they are only a minority, but unfortunately they can and do create mistrust, doubt, and even fear among even the most stable members of our community.

We have received masses of literature which has not been of a very high standard. However, I would like to thank the person who was thoughtful enough to provide us with a folder in which to place it all.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You still do not take any notice of it?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I am not saying I am over-intelligent, but I think I show a little more intelligence than do the contents of some of these letters I have received. I am not referring to all the correspondence and books written on fluoride, but this correspondence I have received leaves me with a grave suspicion as to some of its origin.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Tell me, did your shire council ever try to issue free fluoride tablets?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes, and still does.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How are they going?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I do not know the numbers, but I could quote the Fremantle ones, if the honourable member would like them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I can give you those.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They will not be able to afford it next year after they lose the \$20,000.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: It is rather unfortunate that opponents always exist for some reason or other, although they are very few. Some of them have religious beliefs and others have professional jealousies. Often a combination of reasons exists for the opposition. There is nothing existing in the world today which has not had opponents of some sort, including those with letters after their names. I do not think that even in connection with the Snowy Mountain scheme all the engineers were in favour of it.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Not even the Liberal Party.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Who here would vote against the Ord scheme? However, some of the economists do not agree with it. They might have their points, but in the main the majority decision must be accepted.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The point is that the Ord scheme is not being forced upon us.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: No, by jove! It is the opposite. We are trying to force it on them! I think the quality of the literature I have received has scraped the bottom of the barrel, shall I say, in a last-ditch attempt to find a reason for not proceeding with this health-giving measure.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Scare tactics!

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: No trace element has been more thoroughly tested than fluoride. It has been in its natural state in the drinking water throughout different countries of the world, and in all varied percentages. In this way generations have had a continuity of fluoride and in such places tests have been made on people of all ages right up to those in their 80s.

These people have been taking into their bodies fluoride in percentages far in excess of what is proposed for this State.

It has been ascertained from all the tests made on the human organs that no harmful effects result from the intake of fluoride. I think I would be correct in saying that there would be no medical organisation in the whole world which could submit a justifiable reason for stating that fluoride damages any organ. The human race has lived with fluoride because it has been in its natural state in so many countries.

Very few foods, with the exceptions of fish and fish products provide fluoride. Diet, in the main, in ordinary nutritional terms, has little influence on the fluoride intake. Tea has a small content of fluoride and although it has little benefit in establishing decay-free teeth, because it is not drunk in sufficient quantities by those in the young age group, it holds no danger in conjunction with fluoridated water because the excess is simply excreted from the body.

Tests carried out by scientists indicate that the fluoride content of edible foods grown in areas where the fluoride content of the water is above normal, or where phosphatic fertilisers are used, is not appreciably greater than normal, and neither is the fluoride content of milk significantly increased by the higher fluoride intake of the cows. The fluoride content of eggs is not increased when hens are subjected to water with a high fluoride content, not even when that fluoride is 20 parts per million.

In experiments carried out on rats it was found the fluoride absorption was fairly rapid during growth, but reached a constant level on maturity, and this level was maintained through the remaining years of the rat's life. A similar relationship between age and the fluoride absorption obtains in relation to the human system.

Fluoride is a trace element and all trace elements exert toxic effects if of a sufficiently high level, as Mr. Stubbs pointed out. This applies to aspirin, common salt, vitamin A, and so on; and it is because fluoride is a toxic element that so much research has been carried out. It is why experiments have been undertaken to find the toxic levels.

Most of the opponents to fluoride obtained from these high percentages the ammunition they need to try to prove that fluoride will be damaging to the organs of the human being.

We expect our scientists to carry out experiments on anything like this which could be toxic, before it is introduced to the water supply. We are naturally confident that we can rely on their tests which have been conducted over many years.

The toxic dust from the phosphatic deposits in North Africa, India, and America, which contain about 3 per cent. to 4 per

cent. of fluoride, has blown on to pastures and had toxic effects on stock; but the pure dust is a very different proposition from the soluble content which will be added to the water supply, under control.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr. Stubbs explained that very well.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Yes. He did a very good job, I thought. However, once again these facts are used fully in an endeavour to create fears and to stress the dangers which really are not relevant in many cases to the situation which exists in Western Australia.

I mention these matters because I think it was the Country Party conference which passed a second motion requesting compensation from the Government for any damage that was done to stock from irrigated pastures, and so on. I thought it quite important to find out a little about these things.

In experiments which were carried out, no adverse effects of any sort were observed in sheep given unrestricted amounts of water which contained fluoride at 2.5 parts per million. With a fluoride content at five parts per million, there was a slight mottling of teeth but there were no other adverse effects. Dental lesions occurred at 20 parts per million, over a long-term experiment, but there was no change in the general health of the stock, the wool production, the body or growth rate, and there was no accumulation within the tissues. As I have said, this was at 20 parts per million. Some of these tests have been carried out with up to 40 parts per million without any real damaging effects.

We are very fortunate in Western Australia in having a State-controlled water scheme which will allow the adjustment of the fluoride content to the correct quantities in the different parts of the State to be supervised by expert engineering, medical, and dental committees. I think the Minister mentioned previously that the content in the water in the southern part of the State is lower than the content in Perth, or in the northern parts of the State. When fluoride is injected into the water scheme, it will be possible to raise the content a little in the south and to lower it in the city, or in the northern areas. It is a very important factor to have this control.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: At what point of time would anyone in authority be able to tell a mother who has persisted in giving tablets to her children during the time that fluoride was being introduced to the water scheme, to cease doing so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That will be done.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: That brings me to another very interesting point. If we were just to supply tablets and were not to have any fluoridated water addi-

tives, people could take these tablets anywhere in the State. They could go up north, and it would be easy to poison themselves there. It is far more dangerous to leave the question of fluoridation in an uncontrolled state than it is to bring it under State control.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was even found that people were taking tablets in a town which has naturally fluoridated water at slightly over one part per million. Of course, that was stopped.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: This would be one very good reason for the Bill. Fluoride now has become popular and so many people are taking tablets. People go north and use fluoridated water, about which they know nothing. When I went to Canberra I did not realise the water had been fluoridated, because the tea and the water tasted just the same.

Until fluoride is introduced into our water supplies we will not appreciate that so many of our weirs are so low in the content of this trace element. As Mr. Stubbs pointed out, some areas are notoriously deficient in the phosphatic substance. It has only been the discovery of this factor over recent years which has led to our dramatic agricultural progress with stock and pastures. In the areas which have been adjusted, stock are thriving and healthy through the addition of these mineral trace elements from which there are no detrimental effects. I think it is worth while repeating these things in order to emphasise that these elements are the answer to general health and are meant to be included in the water supplies.

There has been a great play of words on the Alcoa aluminium company and the by-products which are going to be used, and the huge profits which will be accumulated by these big firms. It is interesting to note that the Port Kembla fertiliser works in New South Wales are extracting fluoride and providing it as an additive to the water supplies. This fluoride is being extracted from the phosphatic rock. It is doubtful whether any aluminium by-product would be used today, because it is a very expensive commodity. The extract from phosphatic rock would have the same effect as if the fluoride were added by nature.

I believe that in China, too, it has been taken from phosphatic rock. If it is extracted from the phosphatic rock, it is, of course, similar to the natural fluoride which comes out of the soil.

I have heard so many people say that they do not mind naturally fluoridated water, but they do not like the additive—whatever it is—which is going to be put in. To my mind, this does not make sense, because they must be one and the same thing. Mr. Stubbs went to a lot of trouble to explain this.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Mr. Stubbs went to more trouble than the Govern-

ment has. The Government has not gone to one-half of the trouble which Mr. Stubbs went to.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: Most of the public knows about fluoride and believes in it, and only a very small group is opposed to it.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Phooey!

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: We should not underestimate the costs of dental treatment to families; it has become a very serious problem. It is very difficult to estimate the exact cost of dental treatment over the lifetime of each person.

Even if sufficient dentists were available adequately to cope with our tragic dental deterioration, or if the majority of the people were aware of the necessity to protect their children's teeth, there are figures available to prove that if everyone wanted his teeth filled, this would be impossible with the number of dentists available. In 1964-65 the school dental service saw and treated 7,000 school children and the costs to the State were approximately \$180,000. The cost per child was \$23 per annum, so treatment over a five year period would be \$125 per child. Therefore if a family were conscientious and endeavoured to have their children's teeth attended to when they decayed, a family with four children would have to expend at least \$100 per year at the very minimum. Of course, this amount would vary considerably, but it could not be less than that. This has been arrived at by taking the figures of the dental clinics as examples.

It is this aspect which amazes me when people start talking about the cost of installing these fluoride plant cylinders, and the cost of fluoride itself. Do these people stop to work it out against the average wage earner and what he is confronted with? It is not the big companies which will make a profit out of this venture—it is the wage earner who is going to make a saving. That is the very important point of this exercise. Not only will a lot of pain and suffering be saved, but also the economic angle is a sound one. The Government is so often bringing in measures which tax the people, but here is something which will give the wage earner more money.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Are you interested in wage earners?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I have always been interested in the wage earner and I think every conscientious member of Parliament would be interested in the wage earner.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Very interesting!

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: We have all been on wages at some stage or other—at least, I have. The State dental service does not provide a comprehensive service

and it can only treat the bare needs of the children up to the age of nine. Certainly it cannot treat children beyond that age. After that age—at schools in the country in any event—they seldom have time to even look at the children's teeth. Unfortunately, most of the damage has occurred by this time, because the children have not consumed any fluoride. The dentists can only partly help in bringing about some relief to the enamel structure by painting teeth, and so on.

These dental services will still continue but they will have a far more worth-while purpose and will be able to cover greater numbers of children and continue to do what they now do, but more thoroughly.

The cost in the country areas is far greater than it is in the city. One person in a country town came to me and complained about the dental costs. He wondered if the Government could not bring in some dental scheme similar to the medical health scheme. The Government would not, of course, unless fluoride was already in the water supplies, because it is quite natural that if the individual is not prepared to help himself, the Government would not bring in such a scheme.

This person had just received an account covering a visit by his wife and his three children to the dentist. This account covered just one visit, but the whole lot of the teeth were examined and attended to at the one time. The total of the account was £123—or \$246. This is a substantial amount to cover one six monthly period, because I gather the family goes every six months.

I know of another case where a broken plate of three teeth involved the individual in five 80-mile round trips; that is, 400 miles. In addition to that there was the loss of time incurred in making this journey. The account was for £45—or \$90—for the plate. These examples could apply to the average country person who is in the position of seeking treatment and who has to travel hundreds of miles, sometimes for only one filling. Of course, there is a minimum period of three months waiting time for an appointment and in some cases it can be much longer than three months.

Tablets have been mentioned quite frequently as the answer to this problem, rather than having fluoride placed in our drinking water. However, tablets have been tried in many places in the world—not only in Australia—but they have not been a success. I am sorry Mr. Ron Thompson has left at the critical moment.

The Hon. J. Dolan: He will be back.

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: However, tablets quite definitely have not been a success on a wholesale basis in trying to solve this very real problem. Human nature is lackadaisical rather than conscientious and most of the damage is done

before the average person takes any notice of his children's teeth. He generally takes notice when there is the first cry of pain from toothache. It is estimated that only 20 per cent. of the Australian population seek dental treatment. Therefore, we can well imagine that if only 20 per cent. are sufficiently interested to seek dental treatment we could not expect more than 20 per cent. conscientiously to take the tablets. Can members imagine the impossibility of trying to educate the public to the merits of giving a tablet every day to each child from birth to the age of 12 to 15 years? It would be quite an impossible task.

The trend today is to ask the Government to provide everything possible, and every member in this House would know this to be true. The Government is asked to do practically everything which comes within, or without, its sphere or capacity. Therefore, it is quite obvious, and not unnatural, that we should expect the Government to fluoridate the water supplies. As a rule, the public does not complain when the Government does something—the public likes the Government to do it.

I think one of the greatest advantages of fluoridating water under Government control is that it can be so carefully controlled and supervised. It is something that needs attention.

As evidence of this we have about 16,000 children in each age group at our schools and if we take the costs of the dental services only as a base it would cost \$400,000 to give minimum treatment to only one age group per year. If we introduce fluoride, within five years the one, two, three, four, and five-year olds will be at least 60 per cent. free of dental caries. That would cover 90,000 children, and would represent, in value to the State, an amount between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000. This group would obtain almost total benefit from fluoride.

Partial benefit will be derived by the six seven, eight, nine, and 10-year-olds receiving fluoride. Within 10 years 160,000 to 170,000 children would be at least 60 per cent. free of dental caries. By achieving this it would mean a benefit, in a monetary sense, of about \$3,000,000. That is big money at any time if taken out of one's pocket.

They are impressive figures, and I do not think we have the right to deny these children the opportunity to avoid the pain, discomfort, ill-health, and the disfigurement that result from bad teeth, to say nothing of the absence of the children from school, health economy problems from teenage onwards, and the misery they would be caused as they become aged.

Only 10 per cent. of our 20-year olds throughout the Commonwealth have been called up for national service and, on being medically examined, it has been

revealed that 90 per cent. of them needed at least three extractions and 5 per cent. required the removal of all their teeth.

One of Mr. Ross Taylor's articles in *The West Australian* is worth repeating. He said that in Western Australia approximately 130,000 primary school children have an average of seven untreated infected teeth. At the Perth Dental Hospital alone, in one year, 459 children had 1,823 teeth extracted under general anaesthetics. The dental expectancy of the average Western Australian is that he will have lost most of his natural teeth by early adulthood and, in many cases, before reaching 21.

If fluoride was in any way harmful, it is doubtful if 70,000,000 people in the United States of America alone could continue taking it daily without any fears that have been expressed becoming apparent. No doubt the members of the medical profession would be watching the position carefully and so we should have no fears now that anything can go wrong with the fluoridation of water supplies. Human rights have always been quoted by many people as one of the aspects that rile them in regard to the fluoridation of water supplies. It was Mr. Justice Kenny, of the Supreme Court of Ireland, after a most exhaustive hearing at which evidence for and against was heard from the world's experts, who concluded with these remarks—

Let me say then that I am satisfied beyond the slightest doubt that the fluoridation of the public water supplies in this country at a concentration of 1 p.p.m. will not cause any damage or injury to the health of anybody, young, old, healthy or sick who is living in this country and that there is no risk or prospect whatever that it will. The evidence on which I base this view consists of a number of separate items each of which is conclusive; when taken together, they are overwhelming.

I think Mr. Stubbs dealt very fully with the fluoride findings arrived at in New Zealand which are also quoted in this article published in *The West Australian* and written by Mr. Ross Taylor. His remarks in this regard are as follows:—

Fluoridation is a public health measure to reduce the incidence of dental decay in the community. Its effectiveness and safety have been proved beyond all doubt; it is actively promoted by dental associations in almost every country in the world; it is advocated by the World Health Organisation and by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia; and it is the policy of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and 40 other countries.

These statements are well worth quoting in view of the fact that so much criticism

has been levelled against fluoridation of water supplies. Groups of people have been formed; others have signed petitions, and committees have been formed in a campaign against fluoridation of water supplies, but I think this is because the citizens of Western Australia believe the Government will proceed with this measure and therefore no committees have been formed in an endeavour to influence the Government to bring about fluoridation of water supplies.

However, this happened in Canberra only two years ago. Committees were formed in that city requesting the Government to introduce fluoridation of water supplies, but the Government would not take heed of their requests before sending men to America to investigate thoroughly the position in that country. Those men returned to Australia fully convinced that the evidence in favour of fluoridation of water supplies was overwhelming.

Mr. Ron Thompson asked me if I knew of a country town that was issuing fluoride tablets free. I can tell him that a notice appeared in a Western Australian country newspaper recently stating that the shire council would issue free fluoride tablets to those interested, but only because all the efforts of the council to have the town water supply fluoridated had been to no avail. I can also state that the Lower Great Southern Regional Council, representatives of P. & C. associations, progress associations, shire councils, and various other bodies covering a large section of the southern part of this State, voted 33 to eight in favour of fluoridation of water supplies.

Generally, the attitude of people in the country has not been against fluoridation. On the contrary it is a question of their asking when they can get it and when it will be brought about. It is admitted, of course, that in the country there is only one dentist to every 7,000 persons, whereas in the city there is one dentist to every 2,000 persons. Also, the dentists in the country are not evenly spaced throughout the community, which means that a person requiring dental attention has to travel long distances on occasions. In fact, many people do not see a dentist. Younger people do attend the school mobile dental clinics when they come around. Nevertheless, I know of some children who do not have a tooth left in their heads and who have never seen a dentist. This state of affairs still exists today.

I would be pleased if the Minister, when he introduces fluoridation of water supplies to the towns that he mentioned, would consider the introduction of fluoride to country towns which have filtration plants. These plants have electric cylinders pumping in additives to the water supply. It would be a simple matter to add another cylinder for the purpose of pumping in fluoride in relation to the consumption. This is the wish of the

people in the country, and I hope this can be brought about.

It is rather interesting to check the results of fluoridation of water supplies in the various countries that have introduced it. These results prove conclusively how far Australia is behind these countries in conferring this great benefit on the people. A Canadian Minister has endorsed fluoridation. In an address to the Hamilton Academy of Dentistry on the 20th April, 1966, Federal Health and Welfare Minister A. J. MacEachen said that fluoridation was the most effective, safest, and least costly method of reducing the need for dental care, and constituted the most important preventive measure in any realistic health programme.

Ottawa, the capital of Canada, has fluoridated its water supplies, which it began on the 15th November, 1965. Belleville in Ontario, with a population of 33,000 also began fluoridation in November. Almost 3,000,000 Ontario inhabitants are now served by fluoridated water. The Canadian Minister of National Defence has approved the policy that water for human consumption in defence establishments not already served with naturally or artificially fluoridated water be fluoridated. Direction has been issued to implement this policy. With the fluoridation of Ottawa, Toronto, Winnipeg, and Windsor, 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. of the total Canadian population is receiving the benefits of fluoridation.

In Ontario, fluoridation of water supplies was commenced in 1945. Brantford was one of the first towns in the world to fluoridate. Water fluoridation has also been endorsed by the German Federal Health Council. At its meeting on the 6th July, 1966, the German Federal Health Council recommended that special permission be granted for experimental local water fluoridation installations, as fluoridation of drinking water is a preventive measure.

In New York City, U.S.A., fluoridation came to that city's 8,000,000 residents on the 30th September, 1965, after more than a decade of debate. New York thus became the largest city in the world with fluoridation, and brought the national total of persons drinking fluoridated water to 65,000,000.

The legality of fluoridation has been upheld in the U.S.A. The New York Court of Appeals has rendered the opinion that fluoridation for New York City, which began in September, 1965, is constitutional and lawful. The High Court's ruling is in response to efforts by anti-fluoridationists to have the measure declared illegal. Similarly, the South Carolina Supreme Court has upheld the legality of fluoridation in Columbia where fluoridation of water supplies has been in operation since 1965.

The Dallas Council in the U.S.A. has voted to have fluoridation. The Dallas,

Texas, population of 679,684 is expected to begin fluoridating its water supplies shortly. Fluoridation was approved by the city council on the 10th August, 1965.

Northern Nigeria intends to fluoridate its water supplies. It is hoped that at the beginning of 1966 the fluoridation of urban water supplies will be commenced initially in three towns.

Fluoridation has been introduced in China. At the end of November, 1965, the official Chinese Newsagency stated that the water supply for Canton was being chemically treated with a sodium fluorosilicate compound, which is easily obtained as a by-product of the city's fertilizer plants.

Fluoridation benefits are enjoyed by 46 per cent. of the U.S. population served by community water supplies. Almost 60,000,000 persons have controlled fluoridated water supplies, and an additional 10,000,000 reside in areas where water is fluoridated naturally. The total number of communities now having fluoridated water supplies stands at over 5,000.

Regarding fluoridation in Brazil, the special public health service foundation initiated the first public water fluoridation project in Brazil in the city of Baixo Guandu, in the State of Espirito Santo, in October, 1953. After 10 years, a reduction of 62.3 per cent. in dental caries among children in the six to 14-years' age group was noted.

There are 4,800,000 Canadians served by fluoridation. Of the two-thirds of Canada's population supplied by public water systems, 37.7 per cent., or 4,800,000 persons, have fluoridated water supplies, mostly through controlled fluoride, but a small number have water containing natural fluoride. During 1964 and 1965 fluoride began to be added to the water system of 61 communities, benefiting 751,000 people. On a percentage basis, Manitoba currently leads with 87.4 per cent. of possible coverage.

The entire populations of Hong Kong, Puerto Rico, and Chile receive fluoridated water. In the Netherlands most of the major cities already have fluoridated water supplies.

In respect of Russia, many areas, including Moscow, have natural fluoridation. In addition, fluoridation has already been introduced into a number of cities, and is planned for many more. As a matter of interest, a recent study on the health of the residents in two Russian communities has been reported—one of which has natural fluoridation at the level of four parts per million, and one without any. The results parallel similar studies in the United States of America which established fluoridation safety at levels above one part per million.

In Ireland the Health Act of 1960 which requires fluoridation was upheld by the Irish court. Since that time, Dublin with

a population of 860,000 has had its water supply fluoridated. In England the water supplies in many areas are fluoridated, including the one in Birmingham, the second largest city.

In Australia we find the water supply of Canberra is fluoridated. In New South Wales the water supplies of 15 centres are fluoridated; in Victoria one water supply is fluoridated; in Queensland the water supplies of four centres are fluoridated; in Tasmania the water supplies of four centres are fluoridated; and the water supply of Port Moresby in New Guinea is also fluoridated.

The list of countries which I have just enumerated is not complete, as fluoridation is now applied in some 41 countries. The list is intended to give an idea of the spread of fluoridation. I thought it worth while to give this information, in order to prove that more and more countries are adopting fluoridation. Persons have for 25 to 30 years been drinking artificially fluoridated water, and human beings and animals that for centuries have been drinking naturally fluoridated water are sufficient examples for us to heed the benefits.

I realise that a great deal will still have to be done in respect of dental hygiene even after fluoride has been added to our water supplies. Very few people believe that fluoride benefits those who are over the age of 15 years, but I am absolutely certain that dentists should tell people to continue to use fluoridated toothpaste in preventing teeth decay.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Were you trying to tell me something?

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I interject a lot myself, and if I hand it out then I should be prepared to take it. About 15 to 16 years ago when I had the temerity to question the quality and substance of the leaders in *The West Australian* that newspaper seemed to be highly delighted. The newspaper indicated that it was very pleased that some people did read its leaders, and that the great difficulty was to get people to read them. I feel the same thing about the speech which I am making. It might not be very good, but at least when members interject I know they are listening, and I am flattered. Many words have been spoken on this subject.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Too many!

The Hon. E. C. HOUSE: I honestly and sincerely believe that the people of Western Australia are ready for fluoridated water supplies. Three years ago when a similar measure was defeated they were not too sure, but since then there has been a change of opinion. It is unfortunate that in those three years 50,000 children of Western Australia will have to go through a lifetime of dental misery because the measure was defeated, but that has also happened in other parts of

the world. I do hope that another 50,000 children in Western Australia will not suffer similarly. I conclude by saying I support the Bill wholeheartedly.

THE HON. C. E. GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [10.21 p.m.]: I have at times been classed as a non-conformist, and I assure the House that tonight will be no exception. I will be a non-conformist in this respect. I will not speak for an hour, nor will I read reams of statements which have been made by various authorities on this subject.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You are not going to read your speech?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have prepared some notes. I support this measure. The only aspect about which I have any doubts is whether people should be given an opportunity to voice their opinion on this question. It is a vital one, and concerns not only this generation, but succeeding ones.

So many decisions are made for the people these days—decisions which determine their very way of life—that perhaps it is wise to give the community a chance to say whether they are agreeable, by way of referendum. However, as the question of fluoridation of water supplies has been under scrutiny for so long, and especially during the last months, I have become convinced that this is not a matter for a referendum, but is one on which a decision must be made by this Parliament.

Three or four instances have convinced me that we must accept the responsibility for making a decision on this important measure which is vital to the health of succeeding generations. We have been inundated with articles, booklets, pamphlets, letters, and various other information explaining both sides of this controversial issue. In spite of all this, several members have not been able to make up their minds.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is what we tell you. You cannot make up your mind.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not mind the honourable member interjecting, because she is a very nice lady.

THE PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are highly disorderly, and I wish the honourable member would not invite interjections.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am sorry, Mr. President. Libraries are available to members to enable them to study the references, yet some express their inability to make up their minds. For some time I have been convinced of the safety of fluoridation from the medical aspect, and my mind on this subject is made up. How can we expect a referendum to bring about a reasonable decision, when members with all the facilities and information available to them find it impossible to

come to a decision? As far as I am concerned that is passing the buck and shirking responsibility. As legislators we must legislate.

Members must decide this issue themselves, otherwise they would have to delegate the making of decisions on all health measures and, indeed, on questions affecting the people back to the people in the form of a referendum. That is clearly an unconstitutional method.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You mean we have to be standover artists?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have listened to all the speeches that have been made on this measure, and some very interesting points have been brought forward. I listened with interest to the comments of Mr. Dolan, who made a contribution which confused me. If I was not confused before he spoke, I certainly was confused after he finished. He proceeded to put forward a case based on three authorities which he named. He said something to this effect: At the conclusion of the experiment conducted by the three authorities, whilst they thought there was perhaps some danger attached to fluoridation, they completed their report by saying they would like to have some person or authority more qualified than themselves to make some investigations. This comment would indicate to me that those three authorities did not consider themselves to be complete experts on the subject; therefore their findings are of no consequence.

Many of the references which have been made to me follow similar lines. Whilst I am not in a position to argue about the authority of anyone who gives an opinion on this matter, I can assess the information as I see it, and the final decision is mine to make.

Mr. Dolan went on to say—and this is the part I do not like—during the second reading—

I would like to tell members that so far as the members of the party to which the Minister refers are concerned, on this issue they are free to speak as they please, and vote as they please. I would be happy if I knew the same state of affairs existed with other members instead of their having been brainwashed to the extent that they will support this issue blindly.

In making the statement that I support the Bill I can assure the House the Minister did not know how I intended to vote. He may have assumed that I would support the measure, or may have reached that conclusion from the multitude of questions I put to him and his department over the months that I have been endeavouring to answer the queries of my constituents.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Once or twice I had a doubt as to the way you would vote.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: To say that members on this side of the House have been brainwashed to the extent that they will support this issue blindly is not correct. Mr. Dolan placed great emphasis on the fact that members of the Opposition were allowed a free vote. He implied that this was a novelty to him and his colleagues.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Perhaps it is.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I can honestly say that the regimentation which is alleged to control the members who support the Government is frequently more evident in the Opposition.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You are getting mixed up.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address himself to the Bill before the House.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You have Labor members over there.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: So much for that. The members on this side of the House have the right to decide on this measure as their conscience directs them, and I am certainly going to do so. Mrs. Hutchison made several remarks.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Be careful, now.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: She said the feelings of the people who are expressing opposition to this measure are real. I could not agree with her more. I realise that, and I believe those people have the right to express their opposition to any measure being discussed in either House of Parliament. We live in a democracy and this is our way of life. People are entitled to express their point of view and I would not be a party to taking this right away from people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is rather an amazing statement if you will not let them express their views through the ballot box.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to make his speech later.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He makes them better sitting down.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I will make mine.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You terrify us!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I have received many communications from well-educated and sound-thinking people in my electorate, and some of them are opposed to this measure for many reasons. I have endeavoured at all times to investigate their questions to the stage where I can conscientiously answer them in a manner which will please them and let them see that their line of thought is perhaps not right. In some cases I have successfully done this, and in many other

cases I have not. However, I certainly do not hold this against those concerned and I do not think they are cranks or are crazy, or that they come within any of the other descriptions applied by various people to those who have a different opinion.

I have made up my mind as a result of the study I have made of the information available to me. What I disagree with is some of the tactics to which some of the not-so-sound-thinking opponents of this measure have resorted. I know many elderly people in my electorate have called on me, written to me, and phoned me. They have been petrified at the results which will perhaps occur from this measure. I have been out to see some of them and they have definitely stated that they have not investigated any of the reasons which this side of the House has put forward in connection with the safety value of the measure.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Have you?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am not allowed to talk to you.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: These people have been given one side of the story. They have had no opportunity of hearing the other side of it. They have had no opportunity, in most cases, to make themselves familiar with the reams of information and authorities which members have available to them. This pamphlet is the sort of thing which comes to us as a tactic which can be used to petrify people into believing that this measure is going to kill someone.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: How do you know it isn't?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I am telling the honourable member it is not. I believe that this is resorting to tactics—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Hadn't you better read that out for the sake of *Hansard*?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: In huge letters it is headed "Death Caused by Fluoride." Any person legitimately trying to submit a sound argument would not have to resort to these tactics. How anyone has assumed what stand I was going to take on this particular matter I do not know. Only those who have written to me and asked me specific questions on the subject could have made an assumption, because I was good enough to write to them and give them my thoughts and the answers to their problems. I could quite easily have ignored their letters and then perhaps they would not have assumed the stand I was going to take.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You do not do that to constituents.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: The honourable member is right.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: No-one does.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: No-one who wrote me a sound letter was ignored. I either made a visit, or I replied to any query sent me. It reached the stage where the various parties around the town rang me up to see if there was something wrong with me if I did not ring them.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Have you not found out yet?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: That was the way I was going.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Have you found out yet?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: Another point is that great reliance was placed on the opinions of Professor Theorell. The anti-fluoridation people say he has expressed grave doubts and, in fact, condemned the use of fluoride in the water supplies. Fair enough! The Minister, however, has read us a letter from the director of the Eastman Dental Institute, Stockholm, Sweden, in which it is stated that Professor Theorell had changed his mind.

I would think that if the opinion of Professor Theorell was of such great importance, the obvious person to consult as to whether he had changed his mind, would be Professor Theorell himself. I ask the Minister whether he has, in fact, asked the professor direct instead of letting someone else tell him the professor has changed his mind? If he has asked the professor, has the professor refused to answer him? Why have we not had a letter from the professor himself?

A member: Where does he live?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I do not know. If he is such a great authority, it is reasonable to expect that he should be personally approached on the matter. If this were done, it would dispel the doubts in the minds of many people. If I were an anti-fluoridationist, I would want to know the answer.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This was read out in the Assembly.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I was not down there. It has frequently been said to me both in this House and outside it that calcium fluoride occurs naturally in some water and that if calcium fluoride were added, less objection could be raised than if sodium fluoride were added.

As a result of a speech the other night in which reference was made to fluoride—and Mr. Ron Thompson asked questions as to whether it was natural fluoride, sodium fluoride, or some other fluoride—I decided this was one aspect which I had not investigated. Therefore in the limited time available I endeavoured to ascertain the exact position. I will further endeavour to explain to the House precisely what happens. Mr. Stubbs of course probably explained it a lot better than I will be able to, because he read it out of a book. In my own words I am going to

give my simple explanation of precisely what happens in relation to calcium fluoride and sodium fluoride when added to water.

I found out that in chemistry these substances are known as salts, and are classified under three different headings. These are calcium fluoride which is only slightly soluble; sodium fluoride which is fairly highly soluble; and several silico-fluorides which are all very highly soluble. Calcium fluoride, because it is only slightly soluble, does not produce the fluoride ions necessary to enter the enamel of the teeth and exert the protective effect.

I am now just going to refer to one book because although I know the explanation of these ions, this book explains it a bit more scientifically. It states—

Ion: one of the electrically charged particles into which the atoms or molecules of certain chemicals are dissociated by solution in water.

The idea is that when this calcium fluoride is put into the water, or the sodium fluoride is put into the water, the sodium ions separate from the fluoride ions and then there are two separate identities in the water. The same thing happens whether it is calcium fluoride, sodium fluoride, or one of the other silicofluorides I have mentioned.

Two distinct elements are found in the water. Fluoride is an element which cannot be broken down into anything else but a fluoride ion. The fluoride ion is then, of course, consumed when the water is drunk and this protects the enamel of the teeth.

I discovered that calcium fluoride, because of its low solubility—in other words, its slowness to separate into calcium ions and fluoride ions—is not particularly satisfactory because it drops down into the bottom of the water and stays there as a solid. It is very difficult to separate into the two substances. Therefore, sodium fluoride, which is much quicker to separate, is, of course, much better to use than the calcium fluorides.

Similarly, I found out also that whilst calcium fluoride is very slow to separate into fluoride ions and calcium ions, once it is separated, it works in the reverse. The calcium is very quick to reassociate itself with the fluoride ions. One virtually cancels out the other and when the water is consumed, the person concerned, if he is getting anything, is getting calcium fluoride and not the fluoride ions which are required to prevent dental decay.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: We are being taken in, then.

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: This is if calcium fluoride is used. This was a very simple explanation which I could get fairly quickly during the last couple of days after inquiring from all my chemistry friends. This was the simplest method in which it could be explained to me. The fact is that the net result is no different whether

sodium fluoride is used, natural fluoride as Mr. Ron Thompson said, or calcium fluoride. The fluoride ion is the only element which does the job.

I am not going to prolong this discussion by making references to the mass of literature I have here because it would merely weary the House and I would do what I said I was not going to do—speak for an hour.

So far as the people in my electorate are concerned, I can only report that the final decision is left with me. There are many people in my electorate who are wholeheartedly in favour of fluoridation, and there are many people who are opposed to it.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What are you going to do about it?

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: I can only make one vote, so the final decision has to be assessed by me, and it has to be assessed by me after I study all the pros and all the cons of the situation. I have done this conscientiously and I am going to support this measure, because I believe—

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Not conscientiously enough!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. E. GRIFFITHS: —that it is the wisest thing we could do. The dental decay which exists in this State of ours is such that it is imperative that we, in fact, do this. Therefore, I support the measure.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [10.46 p.m.]: I am opposed to the compulsion in the measure.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: So am I!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: As a result of the wealth of information which has been made available to all members of Parliament for and against the benefits, or the non-benefits, of fluoridation in our water supplies, I am really confused as to whether any substantial benefit would be afforded to the children as a result of fluoridation.

We have been told that in many parts of the United States, in parts of Europe, and in parts of Asia, fluoridation has been introduced into the water supplies. We have also been told by some members in the House and also through correspondence on the subject, that some of those countries and some of those shires or organisations which had fluoride in their water supplies have now discontinued the supply of fluoride—

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Plenty of them!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —because of the side-effects which it has produced and because of the doubt as to whether it is as beneficial as has been claimed. As I have already said, one receives a wealth of correspondence from

people in different parts of the world, in Australia, and here in Perth, and the great bulk of the correspondence which I have received has been anti-fluoride. I think the same thing must apply to all members of Parliament because we all receive the same type of correspondence. It is amazing to me that this question, which affects the health of the community, has not been the subject of a Gallup poll by the Government. The archway was the subject of private polls held through the newspapers and, subsequently, the Government spent quite a lot of money on a Gallup poll.

However, in this case where there is a considerable amount of doubt, we find that the Government is not prepared to submit the question to a Gallup poll as it was in regard to the archway. Therefore, the only guide we have from the public is the interest which the public shows in this matter. The public's interest is definitely anti-fluoride, if it is judged on the numbers of people who attend this House and the numbers who have protested to members. This point was mentioned by Mr. C. E. Griffiths, who has just resumed his seat. He said that members of the public in his own electorate were worried about the position.

I am not worried about it, but I certainly am confused. I would have felt much more at ease if the Government had made this question a subject for the public to decide. If the public arrived at some decision, this would guide us as to the action which should be taken.

I do not profess to have ironed out any of the benefits, the non-benefits, or the economical characteristics of fluoride in its various forms. However, I can say that in the little town of Denham, which is more commonly known as Shark Bay, the community live on rainwater. The teeth of the children and, indeed, the teeth of the community, generally, are, I would say, in better shape than those in any other community. I am unable to obtain the Government dentist's impressions of the Denham school-children, but I have spoken to one family whom I know. In this family there is one young woman who is now 18 years of age. I met this lass in Perth quite recently with her parents and I inquired about the effect of rainwater on her teeth.

She was born in Denham and reared there. She left Denham when she became 12 or 13 years of age and came down to the city in order to receive a higher educational standard. She was reared on rainwater and lived on rainwater, and she has all her own teeth. Not so long ago, she went to the dentist to have a check-up and was told that her teeth required no attention at all except for some scaling. I do not think anyone could find a better case than that as to what rainwater will do for the teeth, if water has anything at all to do with the teeth. That is a case where the community live on rainwater.

I was very interested to listen to Mr. Stubbs when he told us about Tasmania. He said that since 1953 some water supplies have incorporated fluoride.

I referred to the *Commonwealth Year Book* in order to find out whether it contained anything which would give us an indication of what is happening in Tasmania. I also referred to it in respect of the comments made by Mr. House when he said that he was of the opinion that the children of the future are not going to have so much dental care. He said that they would not require so much dental care and, as they get a little older, the wage earner will not have to pay so much for his children's teeth.

After 10 years of fluoridation in Tasmania, if one looks at the *Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia*, No. 51 of 1965, at page 656, one finds that in dealing with Tasmania and public health, the book has this to say—

Fourteen school dental officers were employed during 1963-64, operating from surgeries at Hobart, Launceston, Burnie, Devonport, Ulverstone, Currie and Flinders Island, and from mobile clinics in other districts. A full-time dental surgeon is in charge of each surgery or clinic. During the year there were 20,140 new visits to the school dentists and 26,238 repeat visits.

That is very interesting. Almost 46,500 school children in Tasmania visited the dental surgeon.

As members know, in Tasmania the total population is only 350,000. I do not know what the school population would be. I would be making a guess to say it could be 100,000, but if it is that figure, then 50 per cent. of the children attending school required dental care after 10 years of fluoridation.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: The article said that the children visited the dentists.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. House has convinced himself in any event that the wage earner and people generally are not going to have to meet dental bills once fluoride is put into our water supplies in Western Australia. Perhaps he may have to think again after considering the Tasmanian report.

The Hon. E. C. House: Is all Tasmania on fluoride?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Those are the figures in the *Australian Year Book*.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Twenty per cent. of them!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Only 20 per cent.! Mr. Stubbs told us that he had had a good look at children's teeth when he was in Tasmania.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: So he did.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. Stubbs must have looked at the mouths which had been repaired—

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: He only saw the show ponies.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —because 46,500 children received attention in the 1963-64 year, and this was after Tasmania had been using fluoride for 10 years.

It is rather interesting to work out the number of children who are attended by dentists. The dentists must be very busy in Tasmania because if there are 14 dentists attending 46,500 children, of course each dentist has over 3,000 children to attend to. I suggest the Minister might have a look at a similar position in Western Australia, as stated in the *Year Book*, because it would indicate that there might be some kind of go-slow approach in this State. On the same page, page 656, it says—

During 1963 the twelve full-time dentists employed by the School Dental Service visited 6 metropolitan schools, 84 country schools, 7 orphanages and 7 native missions. The number of children examined was 8,259. With the consent of their parents, 5,280 of these were treated. The number of dental vans operating was 12.

Here in Western Australia there are 12 dentists examining 8,259 children, but in Tasmania there are 14 dentists examining 46,500 children.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Because the water supplies are fluoridated, the dentists have so much less work to do!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am not talking about whether the addition of fluoride to water supplies means less work or not. Certainly the dentists are working very hard. Those are the facts.

The Hon. E. C. House: No one denied this was so.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: As I have said, those are the facts and I think they should weigh with us to some extent in making a decision. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Health Department and the Government, with its authority, want to force this issue upon the public, when members of the public disagree. Whether members of the public want it, or whether they do not, is their own business. However, in any case, they are entitled to have a say on the matter. This is quite a different proposition from influenza, or any other contagious disease. It is quite a separate problem altogether. For instance, influenza, and even the common cold, cause a tremendous amount of absenteeism from work; but in my working life never have I heard of anybody losing any time from work because of decayed teeth.

The Hon. E. C. House: You have not been around much.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I have done plenty of work, and I have never struck anybody in my working life who has taken time off because of decayed teeth. I had 13 seasons shearing, and I had a toothache myself; but the only time it stopped paining was when I was working. The moment I went home to sleep my tooth ached. A tooth stops aching when one's mind is otherwise engaged. That is a known fact. This happened to me in Carnarvon when the nearest dentist was in Geraldton, which is a long way to go to have a tooth attended to, particularly when the prices for shearing were so low in those days.

I have no desire at all to read to the House any of the correspondence which I have received, because I would only be repeating what has been said before. I will say, however, that this is only a fraction of the correspondence concerning the antifluoride case that has been submitted to the House. I have no doubt that much more of it will be submitted.

I am sorry that the Government has not seen fit to refer this matter to the public before again submitting it to Parliament for approval.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [11.2 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill and, like other speakers, I do not intend to read reams of evidence. I will content myself by saying that I am sure the Government is doing the right thing in attempting to measure the quantity of fluoride that should be introduced into our water supplies to help stop the decay of children's teeth. I am convinced of this as a result of the experience I have had since similar legislation was introduced in 1963. I am sure that one part of fluoride per million parts of water will be quite safe.

Mr. Strickland said that he had toothache only on one occasion—when he was shearing. I think most of us in my age group will have experienced toothache many times. I know that I have had to put up with having a tooth pulled out at the side of a road without any type of anaesthetic to deaden the pain. In those days a dentist did not go around the country for nothing; he had to be paid something to enable him to slake his thirst!

We do not want to see this sort of thing go on indefinitely. We should do all we can to make things easy for our children, and for our children's children; and we should do anything we can to help prevent tooth decay and avoid toothache.

Speaking as a farmer, I know if we did not have trace elements supplied for our different types of soil throughout the country, agriculture would not have progressed as it has done, nor would the numbers of our sheep have been built up. It would be a sorry state of affairs if we were to discard the trace elements with

which science has provided us; and it is certainly a sorry state of affairs if we do not take every opportunity to use the medication that science has made available to us over the years.

Several members have referred to what scientists and doctors have said, and I do not propose to read very much to the House on this matter; but I would like to mention the people who endorse fluoridation. Those who endorse fluoridation in the United States are the Public Health Service, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the National Research Council, the Commission on Chronic Illnesses, and the Association for the Advancement of Science. Those who endorse fluoridation in Canada are the Ministry of Health in that country; the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Dental Health Association, and the Canadian Public Health Association.

In Great Britain we find that fluoridation is endorsed by the British Ministry of Health, by the British Medical Association, by the British Dental Association, and by the Royal Society of Health; while in New Zealand it is accepted by the New Zealand Health Department, the New Zealand Dental Association, and the New Zealand Medical Association.

Members will appreciate, I am sure, that these bodies would not just accept fluoridation out of hand; they would make inquiries into every thought on fluoridation; they would study every report that had been written, and would take notice of the particular effect fluoride had on the teeth of the human being. No State medical department would go into a matter like this willy-nilly. It would take every precaution it could, and pass its knowledge on to people generally.

If in our wisdom we are not prepared to accept the advice of our experts, then we should fold up and say, "Let every one subsist as he did in the past." I am all for advancing the cause of anything that science has provided for us, particularly if it refers to medical and dental benefits. We should make certain that the people are given this advantage by medicating our water supplies with fluoride.

THE HON. J. J. GARRIGAN (South-East) [11.7 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the measure before the House. Two years ago I opposed similar legislation, and I cannot see myself turning a catherine wheel tonight; because the case made out for fluoridation by the Government members has done nothing to make me change my mind.

As is the case with every other member in this House—with the possible exception of Dr. Hislop—I know very little about fluoridation. If we are to accept any guidance in the matter at all then we should accept that guidance from Dr. Hislop. As a layman I know very little about the matter, but I do believe in democracy, and I certainly do not think it is demo-

cratic for a majority of the members of this House to poke something down the throats of the people of Western Australia whether they like it or not, without first giving them an opportunity to decide the issue by means of a referendum. That is the only fair way to handle this matter.

Perhaps it would have been all right had there been no alternative available. But there is an alternative in fluoride tablets. Why should we fluoridate the whole of the Government water supplies in Western Australia when we have fluoride tablets as an alternative? If the parents of the children are interested enough they can give their children these fluoride tablets in the correct quantity and obtain the desired result.

We are talking about a different age group altogether. Members on the Government benches say, "Drink water." I would point out, however, that there is very little water drunk by the school children of Western Australia; those for whom this legislation is particularly being brought down. I know in my own case that when my son comes home he does not drink water; he goes to the refrigerator and takes out a soft drink. We all know that near every school there is a little tuck-shop, and that the children have a soft drink with their meal.

So, on the one hand, we are providing for fluoridated water, and, on the other hand, the children are taking soft drinks. I do not intend to speak very long on this matter, as I know there are other speakers more competent than I who wish to address the House.

I would, however, like to refer to the psychological aspect of this matter, particularly as it will affect the elderly people; those who may be in their own homes, or in hospitals. These elderly people have very little else to do but think of days gone by, and those ahead of them. They have never heard of fluoride, and they are likely to be afraid of the effect it will have on them; they will point the bone at themselves and feel that if they drink fluoride they will become ill. I do not know what the psychological effect is likely to be in such cases, but perhaps the Minister may be able to enlighten us.

On the lighter side, there will be certain people who will be put out of work. Mr. Clive Griffiths said that the teeth of the people will always be good; and this of course will mean that the old fang-farrier—the dentist—will be thrown out of work. With those few remarks, I oppose the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson.

House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 1st November, 1966

CONTENTS

	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS—	
BILLS—	
Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
Eastern Goldfields Transport Board Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
Eastern Goldfields Transport Board Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Intro.; 1r.	1864
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill—Sr.	1864
Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
Medical Act Amendment Bill—Sr.	1864
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro.; 1r.	1864
Metropolitan Region Improvement (Tax Act Amendment) Bill—Assent	1864
Perpetual Executors Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.) Limited Act Amendment Bill (Private)—	
Select Committee: Adoption of Report	1864
Poisons Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
Road and Air Transport Commission Bill—	
Intro.; 1r.	1864
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
State Transport Co-ordination Bill—	
Intro.; 1r.	1864
Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
Supply Bill (No. 2)—Assent	1864
Swan River Conservation Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
Tollalator Agency Board Beilting Act Amendment Bill—Assent	1864
West Australian Trustee Executor and Agency Company Limited Act Amendment Bill (Private)—	
Select Committee: Adoption of Report	1864
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Cattle: Unregistered Stud Stock from Eastern States District Registrar for Perth: Registrations of Births, Marriages, and Deaths	1861
Federal Elections—Forrest Place Meetings: Allocation of Days to Political Parties	1860
Natives: Meat Ration Tickets	1860
Railways—	
Albany Progress: Receipts from Fares	1863
Esperance Road and Rail Services: Receipts	1862
Freight on Ammonium Nitrate	1862
Liquor Licenses for Buffet Sergeries	1861
Narrogin-Corrigin Service	1860
Replacement of Locomotives, and Use of West Northam Station	1861
Standard Gauge Railway—Northam-Southern Cross: Load Reduction on Narrow Gauge Line	1861
Statistical and Registrar-General: Staff Employed	1860
Tollalator Agency Board: Investment Tax on involuntary Beis by Employees	1862
Traffic: Congestion at Mint Street-Basinghall Street—Albany Highway Intersection	1862
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Iron Ore: Mt. Newman Consortium—Use of Port Hedland Harbour	1863
Motor Vehicles: Names and Qualifications of Shire Inspectors	1864
Native Reserve at Quairading: Siting of Houses	1863
Superphosphate: Payment for Orders	1863
Water Supplies—Desalination: Article in News Review	1863

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

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE DISTRICT REGISTRAR FOR PERTH

*Registrations of Births, Marriages,
and Deaths*

1A. Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Chief Secretary:

How many—
(a) deaths;