

Mr JACKSON: Oh yes, I did. I suggest the honourable member for Mosman should stick to local-government matters. If he goes on in the way that he is going at present there will be no councils left. They will all be abolished.

Mr MORTON: I would abolish you very quickly.

Mr JACKSON: You have been trying to do that for a long time. I hope you keep on trying. The more you do the more people in my electorate will exercise commonsense and return people of my political persuasion to this Parliament. Last time you visited my electorate it resulted in an increase in my majority. The Minister would be better advised to help his colleague, the honourable member for Kirribilli, who faces a tough time at the next elections.

Mr GRIFFITH: You should learn to tell the truth.

[Interruption]

Mr JACKSON: Before I was rudely interrupted, I was saying that the Government had something to hide in not revealing the information that I requested as a member of Parliament. If this information cannot be made available to the Parliament, the Government stands condemned. I conclude by saying that the matter that prompted me to speak on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply was the attack made by the honourable member for Kirribilli on two of my colleagues. I conclude by saying that this Government has a lot of leeway to make up. The honourable member for Kirribilli said to me, "We are going to abolish you." I do not know whether he has any inside information on a redistribution.

Mr WADDY: I did not say that at all.

Mr JACKSON: I invite the honourable member to address any organization in my electorate. When, for political purposes, he addressed an organization in my electorate I was able to increase my majority. We are very concerned and feel that new members should be heard in silence.

Mr JACKETT: They were provocative.

Mr JACKSON: The honourable member for Sutherland gave us a travel talk about the late Joe Monro, whom I knew very well. He made provocative remarks. Member after member on the Government side of the House has made provocative remarks. Members on that side of the House have been attacking members on this side. The only contribution that the honourable member for Burwood made was when he defeated Mr Doig, who did a very good job, and I am sorry that he is not back with us in this House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Mutton.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr Hughes, at 10.24 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 15 August, 1968

Questions without Notice—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fourth Day's Debate)—Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LIQUOR ACT

The Hon. C. J. CAHILL: I ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council whether it is a fact that the Minister in another place has convened or appointed a committee to submit suggestions and recommendations in connection with fore-shadowed amendments to the Liquor Act. Is it a fact, also, that the Catering Trades Organization of New South Wales, an interested party, has no representation on this committee? If these are facts will the Minister in charge of this House request his colleague to enlarge the committee by the inclusion of a nominee of this vitally interested organization?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: It is a fact that the Minister of Justice has appointed a committee to advise him on various aspects of the operation of the Liquor Act. It is a fact also that the Catering Trades Organization of New South Wales has no representative on that committee. The committee is composed of people who have particular knowledge of liquor outlets. It includes the president of the Registered Clubs Association of New South Wales, the president of the Australian Hotels Association, representatives from wholesale and retail wine and spirit merchants and an experienced club manager. My colleague has informed me that the Catering Trades Organization has made lengthy submissions to him. These submissions are being referred to the committee for consideration.

I will draw the attention of the Minister to the question asked by the Hon. C. J. Cahill and see whether he is willing to reconsider the composition of the committee. However, as the committee has been constituted for some time and as the organization referred to has already made submissions, I doubt that my colleague will accede to the request.

COLOUR TELEVISION

The Hon. EDNA S. ROPER: I ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council whether, in view of the large amount of additional revenue proposed to be levied on the people of New South Wales by the Postmaster-General, in the form of increased television fees, the Government will make representations to the Commonwealth Government for the early introduction of colour television so that viewers in this State may enjoy modern facilities like other advanced countries, instead of being treated like backward provincials.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: This is an interesting question. As Minister for Decentralisation and Development for this State I have been approaching the Postmaster-General and the Australian Broadcasting Control Board for three years in an endeavour to gain their approval for the extension of television to outlying areas of New South Wales. As soon as reasonable

coverage for the whole of the State is obtained I shall be quite willing to suggest to the Postmaster-General and the board that colour television be introduced. It should be realized that many areas of New South Wales do not have the advantage of television in any form. Cobar, which has not one of the best climates in our State is an area where tremendous mine development has taken place but it is difficult to keep people in the area to operate these mines. We should provide television for the people living in such outlying places before we endeavour to enlarge the service in developed parts of our State.

PRE-SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

The Hon. W. T. MURRAY: I ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council and Leader of the Government whether it is a fact that subsidies to assist pre-school education in New South Wales are approximately 250 per cent below subsidies made available in all other States. If this is a fact, will the Minister confer with his colleague the Minister for Education with view to having the subsidies in New South Wales increased?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I do not know the comparative figures for New South Wales as against other States. I will confer with my colleague the Minister for Education before answering further the question asked by the Hon. W. T. Murray.

LIQUOR ACT

The Hon. C. A. F. CAHILL: Apropos the question by the Hon. C. J. Cahill, I ask the Minister in charge of this House to ascertain when the committee referred to by the Hon. C. J. Cahill was constituted, who the members of this committee are, what bodies or associations they represent, what their terms of reference are and whether, when they do furnish their report, it will be available to members of this House.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I think I can answer this question to the satisfaction of the honourable gentleman without conferring with my colleague the Minister of Justice. The members of the committee are Mr W. G. Buckley, President of the

Registered Clubs Association of New South Wales; Mr McInerney of the Australian Hotels Association, Mr K. Ryan a publican who has had a lot of experience in the liquor trade, Mr W. Hall, an experienced club manager, Mr Jarman representing retail wine and spirit merchants and Mr T. Halstead representing wholesale wine and spirit merchants. I understand the committee was formed by the Minister early this year. Its purpose is to advise the Minister on aspects of the liquor trade, particularly as to liquor outlets and how those outlets might be adjusted by any amendment of the Liquor Act that comes up for consideration in future. The committee will report to the Minister and I do not expect that this is the sort of document that would be made public.

RED KANGAROOS

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: I should like to ask the Leader of the Government a question without notice in regard to the preservation of the red kangaroo. At Lower Lila near Bourke is there a property of 100,000-odd acres covered by a lease the term of which has almost expired that is occupied by people who have become impoverished as a result of the recent drought and are in need of financial assistance? Will the Minister consider the advisability of taking over this property, with compensation to the lessees, as a place where the red kangaroo may be preserved? If action of this sort is not soon taken will it be only a matter of a few years before this species of kangaroo becomes extinct?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: As the honourable member knows, the red kangaroo is the only species of kangaroo that is possibly in danger of becoming extinct in the near future, because of both its habitat and its suitability for the pet food meat and fur trades. I have not visited Lower Lila for some considerable time. However, I know that the Minister for Lands has established a national park in the Western Division. Such an area could be used to assist in the preservation of the red kangaroo. I shall refer the honourable member's request to the Minister for Lands, and I shall ask him to consider

carefully whether he should take action along the lines suggested by the honourable member.

SYDNEY STOCK EXCHANGE

The Hon. GRAHAM PRATTEN: I ask the Minister in charge of the Government whether Stock Exchange members are the only body of commission agents who receive commissions from both buyers and sellers. Are their operations not covered by legislation, in contrast with members of the medical profession, lawyers and even physiotherapists? Do members of the Stock Exchange arrange commission rates among themselves? Will the Government consider bringing down legislation to cover the activities of these people?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I think many of the honourable member's comments in regard to Stock Exchange members are correct. I know, as I am sure the Leader of the Opposition here does, that for some time the Attorneys-General of the Commonwealth and the States have been considering this matter. I should imagine that when they can agree upon uniform legislation, complementary measures will be introduced in the various States of Australia.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY

FOURTH DAY'S DEBATE

Debate resumed (from 14th August, *vide* page 179) on motion by the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers:

That the following Address be adopted and presented by the Whole House to His Excellency the Governor, in reply to the Speech which His Excellency had been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament, viz.:

To His Excellency Sir ARTHUR RODEN CUTLER, upon whom has been conferred the decoration of the Victoria Cross, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Knight of the Most Venerable Order of St John of Jerusalem, Governor of the State of New South Wales and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Members of the Legislative Council of New South Wales, in Parliament assembled, desire to express our thanks for your Excellency's Speech, and to assure you of our unfeigned attachment to Her Most Gracious Majesty's Throne and Person.

2. We beg to assure Your Excellency that our earnest consideration will be given to the measures to be submitted to us.

3. We join Your Excellency in the hope that, under the guidance of Divine Providence, our labours may be so directed as to advance the best interests of all sections of the community.

The Hon. H. D. O'CONNELL [4.45]: In continuing my remarks on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I should like to talk in particular about two matters—the pill, which has been the subject of considerable recent discussion, and the fluoridation of water, in respect of which there seems to be considerable misunderstanding. Some people are pro-fluoridation and others against it. It does not really matter to my argument whether people regard the taking of fluoride as good or bad. That is of no consequence whatever to the individual who backs his own judgment, even though he may be mistaken. What I am concerned about is that people are being compelled to take a chemical injected into our water supply system that is rarely found naturally in water.

Only 4 per cent of the people of the United States of America drink water in which fluoride is present naturally. Of them, 2 per cent reside in Texas where, as members may know, many people have mottled, distorted, blackened, and discoloured teeth. In addition, the proportion of people prone to illness is higher there than elsewhere. Actuarial figures in respect of people who live at Grand Rapids, Michigan, disclose that the death rate is much higher there than in the neighbouring town of Flint, where the water supply is not fluoridated. Incidentally, Grand Rapids is the place where a public water supply was first fluoridated in the United States of America. After ten years it has the distinction of having twice as many dentists as it had before fluoridation. The statistics reveal that the intake of fluoride may also have

some effect upon the heart, the thyroid gland, and the kidneys, and definitely on bones.

In the ten years that have passed since the fluoridation of water supplies was the subject of a debate in this House, much has happened. The rate of progress achieved here in adopting fluoridation has not been as rapid as members have been perhaps led to believe. It is difficult to get the real facts in regard to fluoridation of water supplies. A virtual iron curtain has been drawn around the facts. Since 1945, when water supply systems were first injected with fluoride in most parts of the United States of America, the practice has been discontinued at many centres. I understand that of all Americans who are drinking fluoridated water, 90 per cent are being compelled to do so. At only one or two places in the United States of America was the decision to adopt this procedure carried at a referendum. Elsewhere the people rejected it out of hand when the question was put to the vote. The people of more than two thousand cities and towns there either have directed their water supply authorities not to inject fluoride into the system, or have voted against it at referenda. More than two hundred cities and towns have discontinued the distribution of fluoridated water after having it for ten years.

I have a list of 175 cities and towns that have stopped using fluoridated water. Included among them in California alone are San Diego, La Jolla, part of Coronado, Rio Vista, St Helena, Belmont, San Carlos, and Martinez. After two years of drinking fluoridated water the people of San Diego decided against using it. The people of Rio Vista also voted to reject fluoridated water after they had been using it for five years. The people of St Helena have also changed back to ordinary fresh water. San Franciscans have reverted to an unfluoridated water source, and so have the people of Belmont and San Carlos. This type of water has also been voted out at Martinez.

A statement I have here discloses the extent of damage caused by fluoridated water supplies. Reference is made to water mains bursting and to water heaters being eaten out by it. Here in New South Wales

a Mr and Mrs Pardy who run an electrical repair business at Parkes have reported on the effects of fluoridated water on washing machines and other household equipment. They notified the Department of Health of their findings but the department, only after a considerable amount of pressure was applied to it, made a highly unsatisfactory investigation of their allegations. The departmental investigators did not even interview the Pardys; they merely rubbished the complaint. A copy of a letter I have makes hair-raising reading. It was even suggested in reply to the Pardys that somebody must have left some fluoride tablets in a washing machine. Mr and Mrs Pardy became so irate that they sent samples of a washing machine to Sydney, where the rust was tested and found to contain 39,000 parts per million of fluoride.

I would be wearying the House too much if I read out the names of the other places in the United States of America that discontinued the use of fluoride for varying reasons, including the health hazard, expense, and damage to equipment. I have copies of certificates by registered engineers and other reputable people, including superintendents of waterworks and such like, stating the result of tests that they have made. These people have helped to fight for referenda on the issue. One water supply official felt so strongly about it that he wrote a letter telling the people just what they could expect and the difficulties he had in the waterworks.

Since 1945 the authorities have been trying to compel the people to put fluoride in the drinking water in America. They have succeeded in fluoridating the drinking water supplies of 60,000,000 people, but do not forget that 140,000,000 people have refused it. As late as last year some persons in California tried to force legislation for fluoridation through the legislature. It was defeated. A big inquiry was held in San Jose, and I have a copy of the proceedings. After a thorough inquiry and investigations of deaths, damage to bones of old people, the shortening of the life span and so on, those people decided not to go on with it. Referenda were held in Alaska and Hawaii, and the people of those States threw it out.

Last year five referenda were held on the issue in Australia—three in New South Wales and two in Queensland. In each case it was thrown out by a two to one majority, except in Armidale, where all the ballyhoo and all the action possible were resorted to by the supporters of fluoridation, and the majority against fluoridation was slim indeed. I was invited by the late Mr George Gray, the former Labor member for Capricornia, to join him and Senator L. K. Murphy in a debate on the subject in Armidale with Dr Flynn of the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, Mr Wright from the Department of Public Health, and Dr Freeman from the Australian Dental Association. As a taxpayer, I do not know what Mr Wright or Dr Flynn were doing there at my expense. However, we went up there and debated the issue, and although the groundwork was done and the two members of parliament for the district, Mr Sinclair and Mr Davis Hughes, intimated that they were in favour of fluoridation, after we had taken part in an open forum in that university city and the local newspaper had said that it did not know there was a case against fluoridation, and after we conducted a very brief campaign of one week, though the local proponents of the scheme boasted that they would beat us by ten to one, when the results came out we won by two votes.

It is a question of the people versus vested interests. Unfortunately, Senator Murphy could not go to Armidale at that time, as he was busy with the leadership of the Senate. However, Mr George Gray and I took them on, and Senator Murphy told Mr Gray that if he was elected to the leadership of the Senate he would get a select committee of the Senate appointed to investigate the problem. People frequently say, "He is a good fellow but he drinks" or "He is a good fellow but he is cranky about fluoride." However, this character assassination does not get very far. I am very proud to be in the company of many of the people, whose names I shall mention to the House, who are in favour of giving the people the right, and of protecting their right, to say whether they will take a medicine against their will. Let there be no doubt, this is a

medicine—a chemical—which is a registered poison, not because I say so but because a statute of this State makes it so and because statutes of all other countries provide that it is a poison.

It is also recognized in the highest scientific circles, and it is agreed by its proponents and opponents that it is a cumulative poison. We are dealing with something that is put in the water not to treat the water but to treat children up to twelve years of age. As an afterthought, when the authorities realized that there may be some health damage, they suddenly decided that they would have to give other quotations and make other statements, but as time has gone by all these things have broken down. It is very difficult to hit a moving target, but I have found that no matter what they like to put up, if one can face them out with it one can beat them.

Let me mention the names of some of the distinguished gentlemen who oppose fluoridation: Dr E. N. Everingham, the new member for Capricornia, which Mr George Gray formerly represented; Professor Sir Arthur Amies, K.C.M.G., D.D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.C.S., F.D.S.R.C.S., F.R.S.E., Dean of the Dental Faculty at the University of Melbourne; Professor Andrea Benagiano, Dean of the Dental Faculty of the University of Rome; Dr A. J. Cahill, of Torrens Street, Braddon, Canberra; Dr F. W. Clutterbuck of Grafton; Dr E. P. Dark of Katoomba; Professor Bergio Fiorentini of the Dental Faculty, University of Rome; Dr W. T. Gibbs, a member of the Australian House of Representatives; Professor Anton Gordonoff, Department of Toxicology and Pharmacology, University of Berne, Switzerland; Dr E. T. Hale of Tasmania; Dr C. P. Harrison, St Kilda Road, Melbourne; Professor Emeritus Sir Stanton Hicks, University of Adelaide, who was in charge of the nutrition of all our forces in World War II and is also a member of a world-wide nutritional body; Dr A. Horton, Caulfield, Victoria; Dr M. Kelly, East Melbourne; Dr B. J. Piper, Balgowlah; Professor J. B. Polya, Hobart, Tasmania; Professor Fauzi Rozeik, Dental Faculty, Mainz University, Mainz, Ger-

The Hon. H. D. O'Connell]

many; and Dr MacDonald Sinclair, Director of the Human Nutrition Laboratory, Oxford University.

I shall not mention the names of many others on this list; honourable members can gauge the calibre of those who are concerned, such as Senator L. K. Murphy, B.Sc., Q.C., Senator S. H. Cohen, Q.C., and the Hon. Gough Whitlam, Q.C., all of Parliament House, Canberra. If these men are to be fobbed off as of no account, there is something very peculiar. Other world authorities who oppose fluoridation of public water supplies are Dr James J. Rae, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Chemistry, University of Toronto, and Dr Alfred Taylor, Ph.D., Research Scientist of the University of Texas, who says that the mice on which he tried fluoride lost 9 per cent of their life span. He has felt that the incidence of cancer is increased because of it, and this was confirmed somewhat by a Russian experiment. Other opponents of fluoridation are Dr Robert Newton, Ph.D., recently retired from the position of Director of the Biology Division of the National Research Council of Canada; Dr R. J. Berry, M.D., Director of the Radiobiology Laboratory, Churchill Hospital, Oxford, England; and Dr R. J. H. Mick, D.D.S., dentist and scientist of New Jersey, U.S.A., who was one of the first men to advocate fluoridation, and after twenty years of advocating it is now its most ardent opponent. He has published, in reply to a dentist who tried to get a bit funny, a standing offer, which is a challenge to anyone, whether a dentist or not, and to any organization. He has said: "This offer is still open—\$20,000 to any man, organization, or gathering of people who can prove that fluoridation of one part per million does not do any harm to people." This offer is open, and it has been made by a converted man. If he is to be put in the ratbag class, I do not know what is wrong.

Other opponents of fluoridation include Dr Bouw G. Steyn, B.Sc., Dr. Med. Vet. (Pharmacology), Vienna, D.V.Sc. (Toxicology) Pretoria, the Chief Research Officer, Division of Life Sciences, Atomic Energy Board, Pretoria, Republic of South Africa, and Emeritus Professor of Pharmacology,

University of Pretoria. I have here a copy of his book, and he would be one of the most knowledgeable men in the world on fluoride. He is also a member of the world nutritional body to which I have referred. Dr G. L. Waldbott of Detroit, U.S.A., is one of the most outstanding allergists in the world. He is the man who first discovered the allergy from penicillin which resulted in deaths from that drug. He is also the man who first discovered the connection between cigarette smoking and emphysema. These men are not to be fobbed off. Fluoride is one of the most insidious substances known. It cannot be felt. One can have it and might not even feel its effects for six or eight months. In America there are more claims for damage by fluoride to industrial workers and people generally than by any other pollutant in the air. Do not forget it is a pollutant under the Clean Air Act. Though it is not the most prolific pollutant, it is first in the litigation field. More money is being paid in legal damages for it than for any other pollutant one can think of.

Proponents of fluoride claim at times that 60,000,000 Americans are using fluoride, and at other times say 70,000,000. Then, in speaking of dental caries, they will give percentages varying from 40 per cent to 65 per cent. Indeed, they appear to accept whatever percentage is put to them. When we fight them on their own facts, we can make awful liars of them. These promoters are not democratic people. They stand brazenly on a platform, as they did at Armidale. I challenge them to show any place in the world where doctors, dentists or chemists have had a plebiscite on fluoridation. I challenge them to say they are opposed to a referendum of the people. They declare undisguisedly that they are opposed to the people having a say by way of referendum.

The brilliant Barry Jones must be a person who knows a lot about many things and apparently nothing about some things. The other night he prostituted himself on the air. This most egotistical man in Australia turned humble and said he would have to listen to some experts. One of the experts said, "Look at pasteurization,

water purification, immunology." Look at them: you are talking of chalk and cheese. These are viruses which are inimical to life and health, but we do not object to them. They are used against communicable disease. I do not object to fluoride, as fluoride. Anyone wanting to give it to his children in an accurate dose should be allowed to do so. However, I object to it in an unspecified and uncontrollable dose in a public water supply.

The people promoting fluoride tell a half truth. They say that the World Health Organization is a strong advocate of the fluoridation of water. But it is not. The promoters are the sort of people who run round minding everyone else's business at the taxpayer's expense, getting us into a lot of trouble. The World Health Organization said by way of introduction to its report:

This report contains the collective views of an international group of experts and does not necessarily represent the decisions or the stated policy of the World Health Organization.

Inside the cover and on top of the first page one sees a note, which is meant to be seen, to the effect that they take no responsibility and give no guarantee. The Hon. J. L. Kenny asked in this House three times who will give this guarantee. Will the members of the water board give the guarantee? Will the Government? No one will give the guarantee, not even the World Health Organization. The Duke of Edinburgh recently said that people are more important than industry. Members should realize that people are more important. It should be recognized that the man who works the hardest and sweats the most will drink the most, and will get the biggest dose of fluoride.

This House debated a motion for the disallowance of the fluoridation regulation on which the Hon. C. J. Cahill spoke. The regulation permitted a concentration range of from 0.9 to 1.5 parts a million—that is a 50 per cent increase above the concentration advocated by the promoters of fluoridation. The maximum dosage is the one we are worried about; we are not worried about the weak one. The water board or any other authority going

below the minimum dose or exceeding the maximum dose may be fined \$400 immediately and \$40 a day for a continuing offence. This panacea, this experiment which out-Hitler's Hitler, is an experiment on human beings. I brought in a film and showed it in this Parliament. What did they say? They said that you cannot take notice of it because the experiment was on animals. How is the effect of drugs evaluated? The drugs are first used on animals; this is standard procedure. Are we to accept that because someone did not go further and try it out on human beings, the tests were not to be considered? The point is that most scientific investigators realize that these things must be tried out on animals to get the result. If a member's accountant said, "Here is your financial return, which is within 50 per cent of being correct", that member would not be happy.

People tend to shrug off the importance of water. Seventy per cent of the human body is water; if you lose 20 per cent you die. A man can live longer on water than he can on food. Water is such a basic element in the life of man that we cannot afford to shrug this matter off. Our responsibility in this House is to protect the people, the men and women in the street. If we shirk our responsibility and let five men in the water board take a responsibility that no doctor, dentist or chemist, can, by law, take, we shall be recreant to our trust. A doctor, dentist or chemist would not want to treat people compulsorily. This concept is reiterated day after day when heart transplants are being discussed. Even the Minister for Health is talking of the inviolate right of the individual to say yea or nay. We cannot shrug off our responsibility and think it will disappear: it will not.

In Western Australia before the last election, Mr Tonkin, Leader of the Labor Party, opposed fluoridation tooth and nail, saying that if the government introduced fluoridation, he would remove it within the first week of gaining power. Five people opposed to fluoride and calling themselves democrats, contested the election and gave their preferences to the Labor Party. What happened in Tasmania? People there were

The Hon. H. D. O'Connell]

forced to take fluoride in the water. Sir Robert Cosgrove, Labor Premier of Tasmania for thirty years, warned that fluoridation must not be introduced without the consent of the people. The subject of a referendum has been a thorn in the side of the authorities. The commissioner in Tasmania has done his job well. He will recommend that the local-government field be by-passed and that the government introduce it. It will be interesting to see the results there. The results of referenda throughout Australia show that the Australian people do not like to be told to do something or to be compelled to do it. They like to be asked. I think they are entitled to be asked.

I think this House should take the view that the people ought to be asked. We see also in Queensland that wherever a referendum has been held, it has been defeated. I had an indication today that the Mudgee council intends to hold a referendum next December. There are important considerations in this matter. We must think seriously of the role of fluoride in our environment. The Department of Agriculture in California outlaws, as an adulteration, the fluoridation of milk. It also demands that fluoride be removed from fertilizer because it is highly poisonous to plant life and soil, and to people and livestock feeding on the affected plants. It is an air and a water pollutant. It contains trace elements.

On 14th April the Sydney *Sun* carried photographs of fluoride being put into the water, and the cat was out of the bag. We do not have to be told, as the commissioner suggested, that this is all nonsense about fluoride being a by-product of industry. We were told clearly that these fluorosilicic acid fumes have been going into the air. Incidentally, it is highly probable that a prosecution should have followed this. I have never seen a monitoring report that has mentioned fluoride, though it must have been released into the air. This waste product has been put into the air. It is so corrosive that it attacks metal, glass, and virtually everything.

A significant thing is the full-page advertisement in the newspaper advertising Greenleaf fertilizer. The advertisement

specifies the trace elements that are included in it, such as zircon, molybdenum, and so on. The significant thing is that the trace element of fluorine has been put up into the air. Though previously it has been an economic responsibility to them, now it has become an economic benefit to them. Instead of having to spend money to take it out of the air, they will retain it and put it in our water supply. We shall not get it through the fertilizer, for its use is prohibited, and the company advertises defluoridated fertilizer. Honourable members will realize that though it is considered to be not good enough to leave in the fertilizer, it is put into our water. It is outlawed in California. I have seen some South Australian advertisements advertising defluoridated superphosphate. Fluorine is a pollutant and it is possible that under the Act under which the water board operates today, it might be an offence to include fluorine, as the law forbids the adding of certain things to water, including pollutants.

It is interesting to note recent rejections in the United States of America. In Flagstaff, Arizona, not so long ago, in November, 1967, the city council rejected fluoridation. In Michigan State, the legislative committee deferred a decision. The committee recommended that it be taken out, but a decision has been deferred. Honourable members might consider the results of these referenda. These places decided against fluoridation by the following majorities: North Brunswick, New Jersey, 2,400 to 1,700; Barberton, Ohio, 4,500 to 3,900; and Fostoria, Ohio, 2,500 to 2,100. Turning to Canada, these were the majority decisions against fluoridation: Woodstock, Ontario, 5,748 to 1,547; Kitchener, Ontario, 13,000 to 6,800; Fort William, Ontario, 10,600 to 6,860; Port Arthur, Ontario, 6,635 to 5,666; Lethbridge, Alberta, 3,923 to 3,788; Viking, Alberta, 228 to 106. Eugene, Oregon, discontinued fluoridation on 28th September, 1965. It is interesting to note also that a Kentucky judge barred the adding of fluoride without the consent of the people. This article

appears under the heading "Kentucky Judge Bars Fluoride Without Consent of the People":

"I have made up my mind that you cannot put this on the people without their consent."

Thus Judge R. C. Tartar of the Pulaski Circuit Court in Kentucky rejected administrative attempts to fluoridate the water of Somerset, Kentucky, and the surrounding area.

"The State Board of Health has no more power than the Maharaja of Benares to order the fluoridation of water," Judge Tartar said. "Shall I turn over Pulaski County, the health and lives of our people, to a rat poison?"

In firmly rejecting this attempt at fluoridation, Judge Tartar posed this question:

"Can people without authority, without power, on their own initiative, on their own choice without consent of the people, direct that an element concededly poison can be placed in the public waters, the public drinking waters?"

He reviewed the testimony and literature concerning the many unanswered questions about fluoride, and noted at the same time that some things were not unanswered, such as the fact that "fluorine or any derivative is highly corrosive".

He also pointed to testimony on damage done to water pipes as a result of fluoridation, and took note of the cost involved in replacing them. He cited Grand Rapids, Michigan; Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; Miami, Florida; San Francisco, California, and other cities.

"It doesn't make sense, it just doesn't make sense," the judge said, "that a substance that will rust out a pipe will not hurt the human body . . ."

Judge Tartar also questioned the high-pressure, costly campaign for fluoridation, and declared:

"I can see hanging over all of this propaganda . . . the hand of these big concerns . . . getting rich out of it."

The judge, in his concluding remarks, said:

"Like all nostrums, fluoridation will soon pass away . . . In fifty years from now it will be known as the greatest hoax in medical history."

He thereupon let stand an injunction against the Kentucky Water Company, barring it from proceeding with fluoridation.

Recently I met a publican to whom a health officer had given something to get rid of cockroaches. I said to him, "What did he give you?", and he replied, "Sodium fluoride, and he told me to mix it with sugar," This is not a joke; it is absolute fact. This journal gives the names of another sixteen

places and towns that have discontinued fluoridation. The document contains other information, too. In Sale, Victoria, a postman took action in the Supreme Court and succeeded in getting fluoridation stopped in Victoria. With regard to fluoridation around the world, we must remember that 60,000,000 Americans, less than a third of the population, are being compelled to take it. This is not such a pretty record. We in Sydney are coming in on the tail end, and we serve so many people with water, about 2,800,000, that the addition of fluoride could have a serious result. Ratepayers are being compelled to pay rates to meet the cost of the addition of fluoride, which many do not want. In the Randwick area, where a revaluation is taking place, my water rates have increased 156 per cent, and this revaluation will proceed throughout the area. The Government has given \$400,000, and the Water Board \$400,000—the first year's estimate is \$200,000—to finance this scheme. Only one-quarter of 1 per cent of the water is drunk by people, one-fifth of which is drunk by children. One hundred dollars worth of fluoride goes to the children, \$400 worth to adults, and the remaining \$199,500 goes to clean the sewers, to wash the gutters, toilets, baths, and so on. In France fluoridation is against government policy as evidenced by a statement, dated 12th September, 1966, from the French Embassy in Australia. I do not think honourable members would wish me to read it, but it states that fluoridation is against government policy. There is no evidence that in any other Mediterranean country the water is artificially fluoridated. In Switzerland, the only place with fluoridated water is Basle. Aigle, which started fluoridation in 1960, has stopped it. In Austria no place has fluoridated water. In West Germany no place has fluoridated water, excluding part of the town of Kassel, in respect of which a special dispensation has been issued by the Minister for Health for purposes of research. In other places the government is opposed to fluoridation and the food laws do not permit it. This is evidenced by the following translation of an

The Hon. H. D. O'Connell]

extract from a reply given by the Minister of Health in the West German Parliament on 10th November, 1966:

"Leading German nutritionists have recently spoken out against general fluoridation because an uncontrolled uptake of fluoride is not unobjectionable from the nutritional physiology point of view. Therefore it appears to me that the effect on health is not sufficiently clarified to justify altering the food law to the end that general fluoridation could be undertaken."

This should interest the Hon. Anne Press. It is claimed that fluoride will affect wildlife and animals. In New York there have been court cases and huge sums have been paid out when domestic animals, cows and fruit trees have been affected by fluoridated water. Citrus orchardists in particular have won heavy damages.

In 1958, the Board of the German Association of Gas and Water experts stated:

Irrespective of the experiments at Kassel and its results, the Board confirms its first statement (of 1955) with the following declaration of principle:

It cannot be the duty of public water-works to deliver to their consumers together with the drinking-water substances suitable to prevent or to cure disease. An exception could only be considered if drinking water were the sole possible vehicle for such substances. This is not so in the case of fluorides as a prophylactic against dental caries.

On principle, additions to public drinking-water would appear to be permissible only if their purpose is to alleviate harmful properties of the water itself.

This attitude is based on ethical considerations which result from the duty of supplying the public with a pure water and are supported by legal aspects.

The committee feels that additions to water supplies are permissible only when the purpose is to alleviate harmful properties of the water itself. Fluoride will make safe water unsafe. In Denmark, fluoridation would be contrary to law. This has been confirmed by the Danish authorities and no place has been fluoridated. In Norway, no place has been fluoridated; in Sweden, no place has been fluoridated. Half of the town of Norrköping was fluoridated in 1952 for research purposes: this was stopped on February 1st, 1962, having been declared illegal. Later a law was passed enabling the Government to permit local

authorities to fluoride the water supply on certain conditions and permission was given in 1966 to resume fluoridation in the half of Norrköping for research until the end of 1971: however, to date it has not been resumed.

In Finland a small fluoridation plant has been working in the small town of Kuopio since 1959. Otherwise no place is fluoridated. In Belgium a fluoridation research project was started in Assesse, near Namur, in 1956 and it may still be working. Otherwise, no place is fluoridated. The only country in Continental Western Europe in which fluoridation is practised to any extent is Holland—Rotterdam and Amsterdam, in particular, being fluoridated. However, just recently Hague City Council refused to adopt fluoridation and this may be the turn of the tide in Holland. In England, only three counties will retain fluoridation of water supplies.

Are we suddenly so smart that we disregard the rest of the world or are we so far behind that we are coming in when the rest of the world is getting out? It must give us cause for thought. There are other aspects about which we must be most concerned. I am sure all honourable members have seen recently in the press a reference to the Federal Drug Agency in the United States of America. This is the official arm of the health department and it deals with drugs. The Federal Drug Agency is concerned with the giving of fluoride to pregnant women, and states that the drug would affect the embryo in the mother's womb. The Australian authorities that follow America in everything are late in following on this occasion; they have come in with a peculiarly worded statement, saying in effect, "We do not go along with that." It is a serious thing when the future of our country is considered so lightly and when the press does not publish comments like this. It is virtually a crime.

We all pretend to be interested in our grandchildren and children and we are all interested, I am sure, in ourselves. We have to realize that fluoridation is a prescription more vicious than anything envisaged before. We all have to drink water and it will affect us all from our mother's womb

until our dying day. The Russians claim that degenerative disease—old age—will occur at 40 years of age but Dr Taylor whom I have mentioned shows that the life span will decrease by up to 10 per cent. The *National Fluoridation News* of September-October, 1967, has this comment:

The International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances, an organization devoted to "combating civilization diseases", with headquarters in Hanover, West Germany, has recently announced a resolution against the fluoridation of public water supplies . . . the bluntly worded Resolution No. 39 states: "The Scientific Council of the International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances . . . recommends that all governments, state parliaments, and city councils concerned with the problem of fluoridation of drinking water and protection against dental caries should refrain from fluoridating drinking water."

This is an authoritative body. We live in a democracy and this is a democratic movement, but 93 per cent voted to the effect that fluoride is not a good thing. The people should take considerable notice of this decision. The people concerned are outstanding in the scientific world; they have no equal in their field.

I see that at the recent medical conference in Sydney it was stated that we in Australia do not have the money to undertake research. This is holding us back to an extent, so it is not in our disfavour to say that we have not had the experience of fluoride and we do not do the same amount of research work. Our people are still doing some things that have been thrown away in other parts of the world especially with osteomalacia and osteoporosis. Our conscience will have to be our guide. A man who was director in charge of fluoridation of the water supply for 600 people on Rhode Island said, after fifteen years: "I am sorry I ever had anything to do with it." I have already told the House about Dr Mick, who was concerned with fluoridation. I should refer the House to one other important matter. Is it possible to have good teeth without fluoridation? The Sydney water supply has no natural fluorides; Bowral water supply has none. A youth welfare association

conducted by Mr L. O. Bailey, a philanthropist, was the subject of an article appearing in the *Australian Dental Journal* in these terms:

The children of Hopewood House have approximately one-twentieth the amount of caries experienced by similar groups of white children in Australia and New Zealand, and their freedom from dental caries is even greater than that enjoyed by the children of three villages in New Guinea.

There were no large open cavities.

In a population of children living under certain controlled conditions, sixty-three out of eighty-one, whose ages range from four to nine years, were free from caries.

The outstanding difference in the environment as between this group of children and groups living in the population at large is in the nature of the diet. Foods containing refined carbohydrates (for example, sugar, white flour), are either excluded from the diet or eaten in very small amounts.

All these things show that fluoride is not the beginning and end of everything. Honourable members should not conclude that everyone wants to give it to his children. The main argument seems to be that the proponents believe that, as everyone will not give it to his children, they will force him to do so. I have conferred with doctors and others, and they have told me about how many children have been examined and how many dental cavities have been found. The race has not been run, and the weight flag has not been hoisted.

In the 16- and 17-year age group the evidence is that these children have as much dental caries as they would have had without fluoride. The difference shown was one-third of a tooth a child. The judge in Tasmania reported that 10 per cent would have mottled teeth. My sister-in-law, who has six children, has had an unfortunate experience. Three of her children, aged 18, 16 and 14 years, have mottled teeth, and I should like to see anyone try to sell her the idea of fluoridation. In America they have figures to show that a large percentage, involving some millions of children, have mottled teeth. The judge in Tasmania said that 10 per cent of children receive one-part in a million. Goodman and Gilman states the incidence rises from 40 per cent to 50 per cent at a concentration of 1.7 parts.

The Hon. H. D. O'Connell]

With a concentration of 1.5 parts one can count on 30 per cent of the children having mottled teeth.

I note that Goodman and Gilman, the doctor's bible, says that at one time sodium fluoride was used as a food preservative, but that it is much too toxic for that purpose. The Poisons Act allows the strength of sodium fluoride as a preservative to go up to 3 per cent. That should not be so. As I have shown on the blackboard, every day one must eat food and have a drink, whether it be water or some other liquid. The figure of one quart of water is given. Food intake would be variable, for none of us eats the same food every day or in the same quantity. The liquid, also, would be variable, for none of us drinks the same amount or the same type of liquid every day. Therefore, the results must be variable. Suppose that the water that is delivered has fluoride at a concentration of 1.5 parts in a million—which is the toxic range? By the American standard, 1.2 parts a million gets into the toxic range. Of course, there is a great deal of room for error. According to the United States standard, the fluoride concentration in water should never be more than 1.2 parts a million. These matters should cause people to stop and think.

Suppose that an elderly person drank twenty or thirty cups of tea a day; he would be well and truly within the toxic range, for the tea will contain a variable amount of fluoride. One hundred grammes of tea leaves can contain from 200 mg. to 650 mg. of fluoride. A clinic matron approached me at the races the other day and said she was very concerned that the doctor had told her that she must drink 5 pints of water a day because she was suffering from kidney trouble. Five pints would be equal to two-and-a-half times the normal average liquid consumption of 40 ounces. Instead of getting 1.5 parts of fluoride she could be getting 3.75 parts, which is well into the toxic range.

The American figures show that 73,000,000 people in the United States of America are chronically ill. At our age none of us is organically sound, and doctors

say: "You are weight for age. You will not get any better, but we might arrest the trouble or hold it back". Now there is the possibility of taking something that does further damage to our bodies. Take the case of a diabetic. The commissioner in Tasmania says that we can afford to have 10 per cent of our children displaying personality complications at 16 or 17 years of age, because of their mottled, psychedelic teeth. One can often see that they are affected and try to hide their teeth. The judge also said that there are hypersensitive people.

I have some copies of papers dealing with allergies. One comes from a lady whose husband was a member of this House—Mrs Elliott from New England, who is willing to be examined by any doctor and to have her case examined. I have here a letter from Forster on the North Coast. The local aldermen had this matter thrust upon them, and they invited Mr Dugdale of the Department of Health at Newcastle to discuss the matter with them. They said that the council made its decision on:

Recognition of the individual right of freedom of choice bearing in mind fluorides in tablet form.

Absence of any conclusive report from recognized medical authority on the long-term effects of fluoridation on the human body.

From the information available, the lack of unanimity on the question of fluoridation of public water supplies among members of the medical and dental professions.

I have already mentioned that no doctor, chemist or dentist organization has had a referendum, so it is a little presumptuous to assume that all these people are in favour of fluoridation. As a result of my own little Gallup poll, I know this is not so. I know, too, that some younger professional men rush in where angels fear to tread. America has 20,000 physicians and surgeons and 2,500 persons in the dental and medical professions serve on the evaluation committee. Also, the World International Nutritional and Vital Substance Body with headquarters in Hanover, met at Luxembourg last year. Four hundred professors and scientists, including six Nobel prizewinners, spent their lives on

these experiments. They have compiled treatises as the written record of their work. Those 20,000 American physicians and surgeons have said:

Whereas, the right to decide what shall be done to one's own body is fundamental, and

Whereas, water is necessary for life, and

Whereas, many people are dependent on public supplies for water;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., assembled in San Francisco this 12th day of April, 1958, condemns the addition of any substance to a public water supply for the purpose of affecting the bodies or the bodily or mental functions of the consumers.

In January, 1957, a proposed amendment to the State Constitution was introduced in the State of California. It would have provided that any public or private corporation or individual or other agency engaged in distribution or sale of water to the public for domestic consumption might add to and distribute with the water so distributed fluorides and other substances which it may determine from time to time to be beneficial to its consumers.

The amendment was killed on that occasion, and it was killed again last year.

I have here some quotations from an American publication entitled *Fluoridation: Its Moral and Political Aspects. A New and Comprehensive Study* by F. B. Exner, M.D. The first is on page 5, and reproduces the remarks of the United States Minister of Health, who said:

If the principle (of fluoridation) is admitted, we might just as well recognize that we have opened a door which the Province might never be able to close. The principle simply cannot be confined to fluorides, and there are already indications of this.

On the same page reference is made to the case of *Kaul v. City of Chehalis* in the Washington State Supreme Court, where Justice Hamley said:

What future proposals may be made to treat non-contagious diseases by adding ingredients to our water supply, or food, or air, only time will tell. When that day arrives, those who treasure their personal liberties will look in vain for a constitutional safeguard. The answer will be, "You gave the constitution away in the Kaul case."

On page 7 Dr Exner says:

The physician, in caring for his patient, must choose the drug, the method, the procedure that he believes most suitable and

most likely to succeed. But he must be ever alert to the possibility of error; and when his judgment dictates, he must try a different drug or method. This "experimental" trial-and-error approach is essential to good practice and is justified because, and only because, the physician is solely and directly responsible to his patient, and committed to placing the rights and welfare of his patient above every other consideration.

The principles of medical service are these: first, at university level the doctor, dentist or chemist is taught that his first consideration must be that he will do the patient no harm. That which he is in doubt about he must pour down the sink and not down his patient's throat. At all times the patient must voluntarily give his consent to take the treatment, advice or operation. This is his right at law, and doctors, dentists and chemists would not have it otherwise. The doctor, dentist or chemist must give personal, interested and safe observation to his patients and carry high personal insurance to ensure compensation against misadventure, carelessness or error. This is his guarantee to the patient, and his responsibility at law. The cardinal principle of medicine is that a chemical is given for a specific purpose in a specified dosage, and in a controlled manner to the patient. This dosage can be varied at any time, or discontinued at any time. To be able to do this may mean the safety of a person's life, and certainly prevents the exacerbation of allergic conditions and their development into chronic illness. We know that after twelve years of age a child's teeth formation is complete, and that fluoride is unnecessary for the rest of the population, who can be shown by the four substantiated causes of death to run grave risks.

What was said by the eminent justices has come to pass. In a recent edition of the *Daily Telegraph* there was a heading, "Birth control on tap". The article said that it is now proposed by a scientist that the birth control drug be added to the water supply. This is not a new suggestion. I have here a photographic copy of a similar article that appeared in 1964. So the chickens are coming home to roost. Finally, I should like to say a few words about the pill.

The Hon. H. D. O'Connell

The Hon. R. H. ERSKINE: How much fluoride is in the pill?

The Hon. H. D. O'CONNELL: Never fear, you will be getting the fluoride in your water. I want to take the press to task on this matter. Although there is a theological aspect to the question, I feel that most people will settle the matter in their own way. After all, birth control was practised for a long time before the advent of the pill. We have certainly had birth control since commercial interests found that they could make money from it. Couples were able to control their families, and can still do so, if they give the matter some thought or are informed, without the expenditure of any money. No knowledge of the rhythm method is necessary. However, I consider this matter to be on all fours with the use of fluoride. But no one is forced to use the pill. I do not know, theologically, of anything drastic happening to anyone who has practised contraception. It is a matter for individual conscience. But with the pill and many other medications a person may choose to take them or not.

It is unfair and unreal that newspapers should make people over-confident and less thoughtful than they ought to be about these matters. I have one article here from the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 24th October, 1967, headed "Pill gets experts' approval". Almost inconspicuously at the bottom of the article there appears a reference to fibroid tumours and other frightening complaints. On the same day the *Sun* had an article headed, "Risks seen in the pill". At the end of the article side-effects are mentioned. On the same day the *Daily Mirror* had an item headed "The pill 95 per cent safe, doctors say". On 12th November last another article appeared in the *Sunday Mirror* headed "Professor says the pill can kill". Then one read in the *Daily Telegraph* of 2nd December, 1967, the sad story of a damages suit for \$300,000 having been filed against a drug manufacturer and chemist for the death of 22-year-old woman allegedly caused by the birth control pill. Honourable members will notice that the chemist was joined as a defendant in the

suit. It will be interesting to see the outcome. Perhaps it will not be thought in future that the chemist charges too much.

When I was in business I carried insurance of \$200,000 against something going wrong and my being sent bankrupt overnight. I have been handed a document setting out forty side-effects of the pill. I also have a list showing the side-effects of fluoride. This discloses that of the seventeen symptoms of arsenical poisoning and seventeen symptoms of fluoride poisoning, fifteen are the same. American doctors are now realizing that instead of attributing deaths to arsenical poisoning, they should consider the possibility of fluoride poisoning. A survey in that country shows that 50 per cent of death certificates ascribing the cause of death to arsenical poisoning were wrongly issued.

It is extraordinary how young people are told that the pill is safe. All that they are concerned about it that the pill will control the size of their families. They have my sympathy. This is an important matter, and I believe that at some stage the Government will have to take a stand to ensure that the health of the community is protected. There is no doubt that serious side-effects can occur. I thank the House for its courtesy in listening to me, and hope that I have not worn out my welcome and caused any confusion in the minds of some honourable members. I am reminded of the words of Omar Khayyam:

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great Argument
About it and about; but evermore
Came out by the same Door as in I went.

I am not absolutely opposed to anything; I have merely tried to collect the evidence, to assess it, to look at the people who have provided the evidence and to apply a lifetime of experience of dealing with the health of men and women.

From the very outset I have been sure that economic motives have forced people to use the pill. Economic motives have led to the birth and the extension of pharmaceutical processes. Laboratory chemists are required to find uses for by-products in industry. As an example, the by-product

phenathiazene was found useful for administration to cattle, horses and sheep. In this instance there were more cattle and horses than there were people. It was found to be successful in the treatment of worms, and so a use was found for this by-product I used to own racehorses which I decided to treat for worms. I rang the University of Sydney and asked for advice; I was told to administer 10 drams of phenathiazene to each horse for three days. I gave it to one of my horses with little apparent effect. I gave it to another horse and it died. Today the prescribed dose is one teaspoonful or one dram, which is one-tenth of the dose I was told to use on my animals.

All over the world evidence is mounting against fluoridation of water supplies. A lot has happened since this subject was dealt with in this House as a non-party measure. I hope that some time in the future it will be reconsidered and I intend to move that a committee from this House should be appointed to investigate fluoridation. Fluoridation affects the human form from the embryo in the mother's womb until death. Pregnant women are told they should keep taking fluoride tablets until the end of this year, but even now our water supply has a fluoride content of .95 parts per million. Women and children who are taking fluoride tablets as well as drinking fluoridated water are receiving an overdose of this dangerous chemical. There are many other aspects I should like to discuss on this subject which is well worthy of further consideration by the House in the future.

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH [5.53]: I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion now before the House. I congratulate the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers and the Hon. H. D. O'Connell on their maiden speeches. From time to time in this House questions have been raised regarding beach mining operations at popular beach areas on the North Coast. Following representations made to the Minister for Mines on 29th April, 1968, he visited the North Coast and met deputations from the Byron Bay Jetty area, the Suffolk Park area and at the Ballina Municipal Chambers he met a large and representative deputation from Shelley

Beach. I record the fairness and courtesy shown by the Minister to these deputations and thank him for the decisions reached in respect of those three areas.

In the course of his visit the Minister stated that beach mining is an important industry. He said this industry is a good dollar earner and that beaches will be mined for some time to come. The Minister also indicated that consideration will be given to re-mining some of our beaches, but that in any decision due regard would be paid to beaches close to habitation and popular beaches which provide amenities for the public.

From time to time in North Coast newspapers correspondence referring to beach mining has appeared. Following the Minister's visit an anonymous letter under the pen name of "Disgusted Mine Workers" made personal attacks upon me. The writers stated they were fed up with the self-appointed do-gooders and suggested they might take quiet but effective action against them. I have made press statements pointing out that I consider mining royalties and shire rating of mining companies to be inadequate. I have stated also that minerals belong to the people. In the process of winning minerals from beaches mining companies make enormous profits, but cause inconvenience to the public. If there was ever a case for a prosperity loading in a mining industry, beach mining qualifies. Beach mining companies should pay a loading to employees in the industry. This money would circulate in the course of business and the district would prosper. However, this is a matter for the unions. On 20th May, 1968, in the *Northern Star*, Mr J. P. Murphy, Managing Director, N.S.W. Rutile Mining Company Pty Ltd, Tweed Heads, replied to my statement. He said:

Mr J. C. McIntosh (*Northern Star*, 7.5.68) in commenting on the Minister for Mines' statement on Monday, April 29 "that beach mining is an important industry to the State", says he accepts that position so long as certain of the popular beaches are protected. Would Mr McIntosh be good enough to let us know, since 1940, what particular popular beaches in New South Wales have been mined and dredged by the mining companies? It would appear that Mr McIntosh is not anti-beach

The Hon. J. C. McIntosh

mining as long as the local government authorities and other municipal and shire associations receive a percentage of the profits earned by the companies.

Mr McIntosh apparently is not aware of the fact that the companies, apart from paying royalty to the Crown, are already heavily taxed by the municipal and shire associations in New South Wales.

Regarding Mr McIntosh's reference that the mining companies should pay a loading to employees in the mineral sands industry, let me point out that the mineral sands companies were the first people to pay a reasonable wage to employees engaged by the industry in that in the period 1935-1940, the companies were paying around 2s. per hour for a 44-hour week, whereas rural industry was not prepared or could not afford to pay more than 9d. per hour for a working week up to 50-60 hours.

Most of the companies' employees now travel to and from work in their own cars, whereas in 1940 the rural worker either walked miles to work in all kinds of weather or pedalled a push-bike.

The industry has been employers of labour in the remote areas of New South Wales and have been consistent employers of labour for the past 30 years.

Now the question could be asked of Mr McIntosh: Why does he single out the mineral sands industry as one to be saddled with a prosperity loading as he should know that this only increases the cost to the end-user, namely all the people of Australia?

This letter is not an attempt to discredit Mr McIntosh's arguments, but to place some pertinent facts before your readers.

On 28th May a telephone call was made to my residence at 8.55 a.m. The caller was referred to my office. At 9.40 a.m. a call came from the N.S.W. Rutile Mining Company. The speaker made some personal attacks on me and I rang off. A few minutes later a further call came from the same mining company and the same caller, who identified himself as Mr Murphy, said, "I am telling you now to get off the company's back." I said, "Mr Murphy, if you are threatening me I will refer the matter to the Inspector of Police", and he immediately rang off.

As far as the second last paragraph of Mr Murphy's letter is concerned, the pertinent fact is that the cost to the end-user has by forward contracts been already determined up until 1974, and I cannot see how he claims they will be affected. Only the profits of the companies will be

affected. So far as beach mining is concerned, what are these forward contracts? This is what the financial review in the *Sun-Herald* of 5th May had to say—

With an eye on the possibility of tighter supplies and higher prices for rutile in the 1970's, major titanium dioxide producers in both the United States of America and Britain are scrambling to secure their requirements from the Australian mineral sand producers. The latest to act was Laporte Industries of the United Kingdom, which last week signed a contract worth around \$8,000,000 with the Foyster Companies, Cudgen R.Z. and Consolidated Rutile, for the supply of 100,000 tons of rutile during the years 1969 to 1974.

The new contract brings forward rutile and zircon sales by the two companies over the \$19,000,000 mark and starts when Consolidated Rutile should be feeling the benefits from its major plant reorganization.

Associated Minerals Consolidated brought its forward contracts for mineral sand sales up to \$37,000,000 earlier this year when American Potash and Chemical Corporation extended its existing agreement by 105,000 tons of rutile for delivery between 1971 and 1974.

Rutile and Zircon Mines (Newcastle) whose main contract buyer in the past has been Du Pont, wrote a 150,000 ton rutile contract last December with U.S. paint maker Sherwin-Williams covering deliveries up until 1974.

It followed this last month with a further contract with the Glidden Co.—another U.S. paint manufacturer—to deliver 37,500 tons of rutile by 1971 and additional tonnages up to 60,000 by 1974.

Mineral sand mining has been carried on in our area for many years. What are the present ramifications of the industry? Before answering that, let me refer to two press items concerning family groups associated with the industry. A report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 13th March, 1968, stated that the Foyster family, which is interested in Cudgen R.Z., had made further purchases at the bloodstock yearling sales bringing their total purchases of blood stock up to \$1,500,000 in the past eighteen months. It has been reported also in the press that the Murphy family—James, William and Thomas Murphy, who are associated with N.S.W. Rutile and other companies—had on 9th April this year floated on the stock exchange Murphyores Limited, that at 10 a.m., the Murphy empire was worth \$2,000,000, and that before 10.30 a.m. they were worth \$16,000,000.

Let us consider the ramifications of this industry with a view to determining its capacity to pay increased royalties, to pay adequate council rates and to meet a prosperity loading out of profits. Without the benefit of a public inquiry it is difficult to obtain full information concerning the operations of all these beach mining companies. However, in a reply to a question I asked in this Chamber I received this reply from the Department of Mines:

The previous royalty rates were 1½ per cent of f.o.b. value for leases of Crown Mineral and 1¼ per cent for leases of private mineral. The present royalty rate on all new rutile-zircon leases and on renewal of such leases is 2 per cent. The royalties received from beach mining operations for the financial year ending June 30th, 1967, were \$254,843.

The Hon. GRAHAM PRATTEN: What happened in regard to Murphyores? Was its machinery broken down when the company was floated?

The Hon. J. C. MCINTOSH: That is so, it broke down for a week or ten days.

The Hon. GRAHAM PRATTEN: It broke down and the company did not tell the people.

The Hon. J. C. MCINTOSH: I shall refer later to a statement made on that matter. A number of mining companies operate between the Tweed border and Newcastle. Through the interweaving of their operations it is somewhat difficult to pinpoint their full operations. However, I shall refer to the activities of some of the companies, my source of information being chiefly the Sydney Stock Exchange Research and Statistical Bureau. Coff's Harbour Rutile No Liability was incorporated in Sydney on 6th April, 1956, with an issued capital of \$655,250. Kathleen Investments (Australia) Ltd, through its subsidiary, Australian Oil Exploration Ltd, has acquired over 94 per cent of the issued shares of the company on the basis of a two shares for three shares exchange. As a result of a contract in February, 1962, for forward delivery of rutile to E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company of America, a partnership was formed with Peko-Wallsend Investment Ltd, and a company was formed known as Rutile and Zircon Mines (Newcastle) Ltd, the

issued capital of which is owned equally with Peko-Wallsend Investment Ltd. The accounts of Rutile and Zircon Mines (Newcastle) Ltd, made up to 29th June of 1966, disclosed a net profit of \$610,078 after providing \$573,192 for redemption, depreciation etc., and dividends totalling \$600,000, which is equal to 50 per cent of the issued capital, were approved.

Rutile and Zircon Mines (Newcastle) Limited is now a subsidiary of Kathleen Investments (Australia) Limited and Peko-Wallsend Investments Limited, each owning 50 per cent interest. On 28th June, 1967, the chairman of Coff's Harbour Rutile No Liability stated that for the financial year ending 30th June, 1967, Rutile and Zircon Mines would show, after redemption and depreciation of \$556,000, on products a profit of \$1,071,000, and after taxation a profit of \$695,000. He stated also that Rutile and Zircon Mines had carried out a most active policy of exploration and had established resources north of the Hunter River exceeding 750,000 tons of rutile and 750,000 tons of zircon. The gross value of these resources on present market values exceeded \$80,000,000. The prices for rutile and zircon products for the ensuing year appeared still at this stage to be buoyant, with rutile prices over \$80 a ton and zircon over \$40 a ton.

On 28th December, 1967, the directors of Coff's Harbour Rutile No Liability advised having declared a final ordinary dividend of 62 per cent, being 31 cents a share; 5 cents of this dividend would be exempt from income tax. They advised also that the directors of Rutile and Zircon Mines (Newcastle) Limited have declared an interim ordinary dividend of \$555,000 being 46.25 per cent on the issued ordinary capital of the company payable on 31st December, 1967. The amount of the interim dividend is in accordance with the agreement between shareholders of the companies for the full distribution of profits. Final dividend will be of a smaller amount.

New South Wales Rutile Mining Company Proprietary Limited is a private company controlled by the Murphy organization. No figures are available for it. It was floated on the stock exchange on 6th

May, 1968. In Melbourne 50 cent shares which had been issued at \$1.52 had opening sales at \$4.50. Later the price dropped back to \$3.90 and final sales were at \$3.99. The prospectus has forecast dividends of 10 per cent partly tax-free starting next April and profits rising to more than \$1,000,000 by 1970. The Murphy empire on opening was worth \$2,000,000 and twenty minutes later was worth \$16,000,000.

Cudgen R.Z. Limited was incorporated in Sydney on 3rd March, 1967, with capital of \$5,500,000 and 50-cent shares. One-third of calls are deductible for income tax purposes. Cudgen R.Z. has been operating as a producer of beach sand minerals for seventeen years. According to the Research and Statistical Bureau the company estimated its profitability after allowing for additional company expenses, being a general figure of \$84,000, a prospecting allocation of \$50,000, and amortization of leases—a general figure of \$200,000—the net profit after tax being estimated as 1968, \$1,026,332; 1969, \$985,485; 1970, \$605,400; 1971, \$553,069; 1972, \$611,523; 1973, \$710,566; and 1974, \$618,552. The statement says:

Although it would appear that the company may be taxed as a private company, taxation in the table attached has been calculated at the higher rates applicable to a public company. In the event that the company is taxed at the lower private company rates of tax it is the intention of the directors to make sufficient distribution to avoid undistributed profits tax.

Mineral Deposits Limited was incorporated in New South Wales on 17th June, 1955, and converted to a public company on 15th September, 1967. The issued capital is \$6,000,000, in 50c shares. Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Company Proprietary Limited, wholly owned subsidiary of the National Lead Company of the United States of America, holds a controlling interest. The statement states dividends per annum were: 1962, 10 per cent; 1963, 20 per cent; 1964, 30 per cent; 1965, 30 per cent; and 1966, 40 per cent. Taxation has been charged at public company rates and under current legislation 20 per

The Hon. J. C. McIntosh]

cent of the company's income from mining activities is exempt. Present assets are \$16,789,000 on the issued capital of \$6,000,000.

Consolidated Rutile Limited was incorporated in Brisbane on 21st February, 1963, and operates mainly in Queensland. It has an issued capital of \$6,000,000, with shares of 50c. The statement set out estimated net profit after tax at \$1,137,230. Several companies were interested in supplying the necessary funds, and after full consideration of these and other possible methods of financing the profit the directors unanimously preferred the offer of Cudgen R.Z. Limited and have entered into an agreement with that company whereby it will take up 1,379,310 ordinary shares of 50c in the company at a premium of 95c a share. The company is pursuing a policy of exploration with a view to increasing its reserves of mineral, with satisfactory results to date. In some instances heavy mineral depositions of economic grades have been proven to extend from 60 feet to 120 feet. Continuing good values at 120 feet require still deeper drilling and improved equipment in order to assess the significance of these deep deposits.

Associated Minerals Consolidated Limited was incorporated in Sydney on 21st August, 1953. It has an issued capital of \$2,279,561, with shares of 50c, and operates mainly at Cudgen and in Queensland, though its operations extend from Wyong to South Stradbroke. This table shows the consolidated net profit and dividend:

1964	1965	1966	1967
\$734,000	\$948,000	\$720,000	\$983,000
30%	30%	32%	40%

An interim dividend was declared payable on 8th March, 1968, at the rate of 40 per cent per annum. For the extended rutile supply contract with American Potash and Chemical Corporation the price agreed upon is satisfactory and, as before, the company is protected by a labour cost variation clause. The company now holds forward contracts for 520,000 tons of mineral worth approximately \$37,000,000.

The main minerals in the beach mining operations are rutile, zircon and then, to a lesser degree, ilmenite and monazite. I quote now from an article by Brian Hoad in the *Bulletin* in the issue dated 1st June, 1968:

Beach sands are another good example of the sound development of raw materials in the national interest. In 1950 a ban on the export of crude mixed concentrates of these minerals forced the miners to take over the profitable separation of the sands themselves—despite howls of protest—and has enabled vast new reserves to be opened up, turning a “backyard” industry into an export earner of \$30 million a year. It also brought to Australia two big manufacturers of titanium pigments (from rutile) creating a self-sufficient industry saving \$9 million a year on imports and well placed to develop an export market of its own.

Australia is the world's largest producer of rutile and zircon and takes second place in ilmenite. At the present rate of extraction known reserves are sufficient for at least 20 years.

Mr Murphy stated that companies pay heavy shire rates. The position of shire rating on mines is as follows. Section 118 (a) of the Local Government Act states:

The general rate levied upon a mine worked for the purpose of mining for any minerals other than coal and shale shall not exceed threepence in the pound upon the unimproved capital value.

Section 153 (3) states:

In the case of a mine other than a coal or shale mine the unimproved capital value thereof ascertained by valuation based on output shall be a sum equal to twenty per centum of the average annual saleable value to the mine-owner of the ore or mineral won from the mine or of the product derived from such ore or mineral during the three years next preceding the year in which the valuation is made, or during such part of that time as the mine has been worked, such value to be determined as such ore, mineral or product leaves the area within which such mine is situate.

In the Byron Shire Council there are twenty-six mining leases with a total unimproved capital value of \$125,960, the shire rates on which are \$1,980. In the Tweed Shire Council, where several mines are being fully worked, there are seven with an unimproved capital value of \$677,026 and the rates on them are \$8,466. This is where Mr Murphy operates. In the Woodburn Shire Council there are twenty-eight mineral leases, with

an unimproved capital value of \$32,842, the rates being \$1,202.25. Four of the leases are valued on output, the rate being 1.25c in the dollar. The other leases are rated at 5.5c in the dollar, which is the general rate on all land in the shire. Having regard to the profits earned and the damage done to the roads in the area these figures do not substantiate Mr Murphy's claims that the mining companies are heavily rated.

I agree with the Minister that beach mining is an important industry to the State, because of dollar earnings, but surely there should be some protection to the people in the area. There is a justifiable and continual outcry about the damage being done to the popular beaches by the mining companies. When I use the term popular beaches, I mean beaches which are accessible by road to the public and used by the public.

Because of their accessibility these areas are at present being mined while hundreds of miles of beaches are not being mined. The reason is that the companies would have to provide and maintain means of access out of the enormous profits they are making. Where the beaches at present have access roads, these have been provided and maintained by the shires concerned at the expense of the ratepayers in the area, and the companies are not prepared to pay a fair and reasonable rating for the heavy loads carried over the roads and the extensive damage being done to them. Though the mining companies have claimed in the press that certain areas have been fully restored, others have not been. In the course of mining operations, the whole of the native flora that were there for many years have been destroyed. In the so-called rehabilitation certain trees and grasses have been planted. These take many years to replace the flora that was there, and of course the fauna has entirely disappeared and will not return.

I am not an expert on erosion but I have fished the whole of the beaches from Tweed Heads to beyond Ballina where these mining operations have been carried on, and I know that when we have cyclonic conditions the sea surges in, spending its force over the top of the sand dunes, causing only minor damage, if any. However,

The Hon. J. C. McIntosh

once the dunes have been destroyed, a steep wall of bare sand is created, and when the sea comes in it surges in at the bottom, builds up a wall of water and creates a tremendous suction. The water, in receding, causes extensive erosion. The result of the disappearance of dunes can be seen in many areas. In the area of Southport, mining operations were allowed on certain beaches, and we all know the extent of damage that has been sustained and the terrific burden placed on the ratepayer in the area to prevent any further damage. In Queensland the State government is bringing in legislation to protect the foreshores. It would appear that at Collaroy the damage has been created by speculators and developers in the area removing the dunes and building on the foreshores. Only recently we have seen the damage at Botany Bay.

When the Minister visited the area on 29th April I took him to the three areas first mentioned. While he was in the Byron Bay area he said—and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong—a sum of \$60,000 is being retained under guaranteed bonds to restore those areas where the mining leases have been worked. One of the residents on the beach front, Mrs Hawkins, complained to the Minister in July, 1967, and the following was stated in a long reply from the Department of Mines:

The application granted for the mining of the area was subject to the observance of certain special conditions, including the requirement of a deposit of \$1,000 to be lodged as a guarantee that the special conditions imposed should be observed. Actually mining operations commenced during March, 1967, and were completed during April, 1967, but the actual dredging operations ceased when the dredging pond was breached by the heavy cyclone "Glenda".

I produce photographs showing the area west of the old jetty, including Mrs Hawkins' house, prior to the mining operations in which the dunes which have stood the cyclones for so many years can be plainly seen. The position is that \$1,000 has been deposited to restore the damage that honourable members can see in this photograph.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: That could not be done for \$10,000.

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: That is so. This photograph shows what they call "fixing it up". It was taken a few months ago. It might be a fine solution for Mr Murphy, but it is no solution for the people who live in these houses. I now produce photographs showing the damage done to the area through the mining operations following the cyclone "Glenda" and also photographs taken in June of this year, fourteen months later, showing how far these restorations, which were promised under the guaranteed bonds to restore the area, have been made. The position in this area is that the lease to mine the area was granted to the company, with the consent of the shire council, by the Minister and the bond is \$1,000. During his visit I endeavoured to ascertain from him upon whom the final responsibility for the damage or future damage rested—whether it was the Mines Department, the shire, with the liability upon the ratepayer, or the mining companies.

From the photographs, the damage can be seen, and it is felt now that the dunes have been removed, now that the sand has been removed and not replaced, that untold damage will be caused to the properties concerned. This is only one of the areas affected and there are a number of areas and popular beaches where this damage is continuing.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: Having pointed this out to the Minister, what reaction did you receive?

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: The work that can be seen in the photographs. The Mines Department representative in Lismore, Mr Salter, came in. They put down brush fences in front of the houses, covering the sand with brush. This is a popular fishing beach, and in the cold weather the fishermen burned the brush. What was left was pulled up by the children. That is the present position.

The Hon. R. R. DOWNING: Who did this work?

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: The mining companies, under the instructions of the mines officer in Lismore. We understood that the companies would take the sand

away, extract the minerals, and bring it back. However, it has not been brought back, and in the next blow the six or seven people in the front will lose their houses.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: You made a complaint to the Minister. What action is being taken now?

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: We are entirely in the hands of the Department of Mines. This is at Cudgen, where the Foyster family and others have leases. In the other matter, we took the Minister to look at Suffolk Park, where the company had to plant trees. A week before some small trees had been planted for the Minister by the mining company. I walked over the area with him and, although we found holes dug, many of the trees had not been planted. That was the result of two years' agitation, and nothing has been done. In this photograph honourable members can see a tin fence. When the northeaster blows the sand comes up and the people cannot open their doors. Nothing has been put on the sand, and the beach will remain in this condition until some protest is made.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: I think the Minister has let you down. Did he give you any explanation?

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: We are hoping to get him to do something.

The Hon. C. A. F. CAHILL: That is a pious hope.

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: Since you have raised the point, the difficulty is in finding out the policy. Members should not form their opinions on these areas at Byron Bay and the other places where there are roads and picnic grounds. These are areas where leases have been granted and the habitation has been destroyed. Companies are not interested in mining hundreds of miles of beach between Ballina and Newcastle because of the cost of building roads. There will have to be a different outlook on this matter of beach mining.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: You should attack the Government, not just talk to them.

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: I have been attacking them. I stand up for my area.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: But you are telling the story without having a go at the Minister.

The Hon. J. C. McINTOSH: I am going to show honourable members something more before I finish.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. J. C. McIntosh.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Motion (by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller) agreed to:

That this House, at its rising today, do adjourn until Tuesday next.

House adjourned, on motion by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, at 6.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 15 August, 1968

Questions without Notice—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fourth Day's Debate)—Adjournment (Pedestrian Crossing, Princes Highway, Bulli).

MR SPEAKER (THE HON. KEVIN ELLIS) took the chair at 11 a.m.

MR SPEAKER offered the Prayer.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HEALTH SUBSIDIES

MR MASON: I ask the Minister for Health whether he has had the opportunity of studying the federal Government's proposals regarding health, which were announced on Tuesday night. Will these proposals do anything towards remedying some of the many grave disadvantages suffered by people undergoing medical treatment? Will the federal Government's proposals in any way correct the financial imbalance in the hospital system in New South Wales?

MR JAGO: I agree, in a general sense, that the Commonwealth Government's proposals announced by the Treasurer go a long way toward solving many problems. First, the limitation of fund benefit to eighty-four days for the chronically ill or long-term sufferers who have been under considerable strain has been eased. There has been an increase from \$2 to \$5 a day in the subsidy for beds in nursing homes when intensive care is required. This field of activity is of tremendous importance to our health services, as nursing homes and convalescent homes provide about 12,500 beds that otherwise we should have to provide. Third, the Commonwealth proposal to join with the States in expanding home care programmes is of considerable importance. At the end of July discussions took place between representatives of the States and of the Commonwealth health, social services and treasury divisions, with a view to sorting out these proposals. As the House is aware, the Government has had before it for about two years a programme for the care of the aged, but one of the big problems has been finance. May I say how much I appreciate the interest of the federal Minister for Health, Dr Forbes, and of the federal Director General of Health, Sir William Refshauge. I am sure that the developments that have been announced will be of considerable benefit.

MINERS' PENSIONS

MR SIMPSON: I ask the Minister for Mines whether it is a fact that traditionally any increase in federal age pensions is applied to recipients of pensions under the Coal and Oil Shale Mineworkers Superannuation Act. Is it a fact that the budget now being considered by the Commonwealth Parliament contains a provision for an increase in the pension? If these are facts, and the budget terms are ratified, will the increase apply to mineworker pensioners in this State? If so, will the increase be made retrospective to the commencing date of the increase in federal age pensions?

MR FIFE: In the past these automatic increases have applied. I have noted the terms of the proposition before the federal