primary objective is if this scheme does not have integrity it will not survive commercially. I thank them for their contribution.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud to bring this legislation into the House. It is a great win for the business community, for workers in general, and our community. Much needs to be looked at in the review. Charges for workers compensation claims within Australia need to be looked at. We talked about the integrity of this scheme; charges within Australia need to be looked at as well. I thank members for their contribution and I look forward to it passing.

Madam SPEAKER: The question is that the bill be now read a second time.

The Assembly divided:

Ayes 12	Noes 12
Mrs Aagaard	Ms Anderson
Dr Burns	Mr Bohlin
Mr Gunner	Mr Chandler
Mr Hampton	Mr Conlan
Mr Henderson	Mr Elferink
Mr Knight	Mr Giles
Ms Lawrie	Mrs Lambley
Mr McCarthy	Mr Mills
Ms McCarthy	Ms Purick
Ms Scrymgour	Mr Styles
Mr Vatskalis	Mr Tollner
Ms Walker	Mr Westra van Holthe

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, there being 12 ayes and 12 noes the question is found as an equality of votes.

Honourable members, pursuant to section 27(1) of the *Northern Territory (Self-Government) Act*, I record my casting vote with the ayes. Accordingly, the question is resolved in the affirmative. In making this decision, I advise that I have listened very carefully to the debate today and have received detailed briefings, including on matters raised by some members today. I am convinced the legislation is fair and required.

Motion agreed to; bill read a second time.

Mr KNIGHT (Justice and Attorney-General) (by leave): Madam Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to; bill read a third time.

MEDICINES, POISONS AND THERAPEUTIC GOODS BILL (Serial 180)

Continued from 23 February 2012.

In committee:

Madam CHAIR: Honourable members, the committee has before it the Medicines, Poisons and Therapeutic Goods Bill 2011 (Serial 180) together with Schedule of Amendments No 71 circulated by the Minister for Health, Mr Vatskalis.

Clauses 1 to 88, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Clause 89:

Mr VATSKALIS: Madam Chair, I was going to move an amendment to section 89, but following the debate we had previously, in consultation with members, I withdraw the amendments I proposed and have a new amendment in place - clause 89(2)(b).

Mr ELFERINK: That is fine. Is it the one circulated yesterday morning?

Mr VATSKALIS: Yes.

Mr ELFERINK: All right, no worries.

Mr CONLAN: Are we on clause 89(2)(b), minister?

Mr VATSKALIS: Yes, the one circulated yesterday.

Mr CONLAN: Okay. What we have in that amendment is the Schedule 4 substance for treating the prescribed medical condition. I realise, under the next clause, the prescribed medical condition is now being defined as chlamydia - we have specified what it is. However, it still does not specify the particular drug, does it? It could be any drug on Schedule 4 that is treatment for chlamydia. It could be any Schedule 4 drug.

Mr VATSKALIS: Yes, the prescribed medicine for chlamydia is under Schedule 4.

Mr CONLAN: Yes, that is right. I understand that. It could be any Schedule 4 drug that is a treatment for chlamydia.

Mr VATSKALIS: It is a generic description; it does not specify in the act what drugs we use because today we use one particular medicine, tomorrow we change the medicine to another one. These medicines are listed on Schedule 4, so it is a medical decision of which particular medicine to use to treat chlamydia. You cannot specify in an act a name, either generic or otherwise, because medicines change. However, you have to use a medicine included in Schedule 4.