

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, April 29, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

JUVENILE COURT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In recent weeks the magistrate of the Juvenile Court has seen fit publicly to make remarks about a number of schools, particularly about schools in my district. The parents of children at those schools and the teachers bitterly resent his statements, which criticize, in effect, the conduct of and the events that take place at those schools. The overwhelming majority of children in those schools are law-abiding, properly cared for by their parents and properly taught by their teachers. What is more, the parents of children who come before the Juvenile Court and who may come from schools in my area now very widely have the impression that their cases are not going to be dealt with individually but are prejudged as a result of the things that the magistrate has had to say.

I notice that the Minister of Education has suggested that a meeting should take place between officers of the Education Department and the magistrate in order to try to clear this up. In fact, there are provisions under the Juvenile Courts Act and the Maintenance Act for the magistrate to be involved in the whole of the social consequences, both during the course of his consideration of cases and in after-care of those children who come before him. I ask the Attorney-General what has happened since the magistrate said that he did not know whether it was proper for him to (and did not know whether he would) meet officers of the department. Will he say whether a meeting has taken place; if it has, what has transpired; and whether this sort of thing is going to continue?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the Leader was speaking, I could not help recalling that the present magistrate in the Juvenile Court was appointed during the Leader's term as Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Clark: In that case, we can say that under your Government he has not been sacked.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General can answer only one question at a time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am surprised at the reaction of the Opposition. I made a statement of fact, saying that the magistrate was actually placed in his position in the Juvenile Court while the Leader was Attorney-General.

Mr. Corcoran: What inference are we to draw from that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Millicent may not ask a question now.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the Leader knows, the matter to which he has referred has been causing me great anxiety over a long time; I have said that in reply to questions he has asked before. Yesterday morning I saw Mr. Wright and had a discussion with him, particularly about one case that is known to the member for Glenelg. Mr. Wright is prepared (indeed, he is anxious) to discuss the situation in schools with officers of the Education Department, as suggested last week by the Minister of Education. I expect that a meeting and discussion will take place within the next few days (I hope so, anyway). On the broader question of juvenile procedures, the Leader may be aware that when I was Minister of Social Welfare I asked the Social Welfare Advisory Council to report to me and make recommendations on procedures in our Juvenile Court on all the matters that have been in issue in the last 12 months or so. I hope that that report will be available. I have discussed this with the present Minister, who tells me that the report should be available in about one month. Therefore, I hope that it will be possible, provided the Government accepts the recommendations in the report, to bring down legislation during the next session of Parliament to give effect to the recommendations. One other matter which has been considered, as the Leader may know, for some time and which may also result in some legislation during the next session, although I cannot say for sure whether it will, as that is a matter for Cabinet—

Mr. Jennings: A new Cabinet, too.

Mr. Casey: Which Cabinet?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —(I do not think there is any doubt about that), is the institution of juvenile aid panels such as exist in many parts of the world. I made inquiries about this when I was in New York and other parts of the United States last year, and some

such system operates in Queensland, I think. Although those are broader matters, I hope that my information to the Leader that a meeting between Mr. Wright and officers of the Education Department is likely to be held soon will satisfy his immediate inquiry.

Later:

Mr. JENNINGS: A couple of days ago I notified the Minister of Education that I intended to ask him a question on statements made recently by Mr. Wright, S.M., about the Gilles Plains High School, in my district. The first question this afternoon was asked of the Attorney-General by my Leader on a similar subject, although relating to a different school. I wondered then whether I should persist with my question, but the Minister has indicated that he would prefer me to do so. I am hopeful (or, more correctly, confident) that I will receive a more intelligent and less biased answer than the Leader got from the Attorney-General. Members know that Mr. Wright is holding a position in relation to which members could sympathize with him because of its complexities; we realize that he has a difficult job to do. However, it seems that he is succumbing to the blandishments of the press. I do not know whether the press approaches him or *vice versa*, but he is obviously receiving more publicity than is the Prime Minister or the Commonwealth Cabinet, or the Premier and the Cabinet of this State. As the Leader has pointed out, the latest thing he is resorting to is naming a whole school if a student of that school is convicted of a misdemeanour. I have had considerable association with the Gilles Plains High School, and it is a hard-working school. The students, parents and teachers work tremendously hard and, as it is a comparatively new school, they are doing much to provide necessary facilities. However, the teaching staff and parents alike have complained to me that they are all now branded as a consequence of Mr. Wright's recent statements. Has the Minister of Education anything to say in addition to the excellent statement he made the other day about endeavouring to arrange a conference between the Ministers concerned and Mr. Wright?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: First, I thank the honourable member for his courtesy in telling me in advance that he wished to ask this question, because the matter is of such significance that I should like the opportunity to elaborate on what has already been said this afternoon. The first point I wish to make—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Minister desire to make a Ministerial statement?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No, Sir. First, I admit that Mr. Wright, S.M., has a most difficult task to perform and that he is entitled, quite rightly, to make from the bench any comment he wishes to make. Further, if a child is convicted of a misdemeanour committed outside school, he must bear the consequences. However, I reserve the right to disagree with some of the statements that Mr. Wright has made from the bench. Indeed, I believe it is right and proper that any person can disagree in this regard, and I certainly consider (and this is the opinion of the officers of my department) that many of the statements made by Mr. Wright in carrying out his official duties are far too sweeping and far too embracing.

As a result of those statements, I have received numerous telephone calls and letters, not only from headmasters and members of the teaching staff but also from parents, expressing great resentment at the blackening of the image of their own school as well as that of the students and members of the staff. This is particularly unfortunate at a time when most excellent work is being performed in our schools not only by our teachers, for whom I have the greatest admiration, but also by welfare clubs, school committees and councils.

Mr. Clark: And the children themselves.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes. As a matter of fact, I believe that the staffs of our schools go to much trouble to help students in matters dealing with civic, morality and the responsibilities of future citizenship as well as in regard to the courses that are conducted under the curriculum, and I believe that this is borne out by the way that teachers take care of the children during school hours. I think the statements that have been made are rather damaging in this regard, and I join with the honourable member in expressing resentment at some of those statements. I had a discussion on this matter only last week with Mr. White (President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers) who informed me officially that his institute shared the views that I had expressed the day before in a press statement and, I think, on television and also on radio. With his concurrence, I issued a joint statement in both our names, and the statement that appeared under my name carried the full support of the teaching profession and members of the South Australian Institute

of Teachers. As mentioned earlier this afternoon, I invited Mr. Wright, S.M., to confer with officers and headmasters of the Education Department. My view was that this would be to the benefit of both departments concerned. I realize that it is Mr. Wright's privilege to accept or refuse my invitation. The Attorney-General has said today that Mr. Wright has agreed to accept this invitation. The second matter that I referred to was a statement that the three Ministers concerned (the Attorney-General, the Minister of Social Welfare and I) would hold a meeting to see whether there could be closer liaison between the three departments. The meeting has been held, and we are awaiting the report of the Social Welfare Advisory Council for guidance in this respect. Where I consider that a great injustice is being done to schools, to parents and to the teaching staff is that we have, say, a school of 1,000 students, one of whom commits an offence and the whole school is named, and the whole image of that school is blackened, so that all the people concerned with the school have a grave reflection cast on them. I believe this is grossly unfair. The magistrate has, of course, the right to say what he likes, and I have the right to disagree with him. This in no way condones the action of any child found guilty of a misdemeanour. I am looking forward to a successful outcome of a conference that will be held between Mr. Wright, S.M., and senior officers and headmasters of my department.

EDUCATION WEEK

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last evening the Minister of Education referred to the holding of an education week. Can he say what are the aims of an education week, when it will be held, and who will participate?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: When speaking about this matter in the debate last evening, I referred to the Government's intention to hold an education week. As I know the matter will be of great interest to all members, I thank the honourable member for asking his question. Last evening I said that an International Education Year was being promoted through the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization in which all States of Australia were participating. When it was suggested that South Australia should participate I agreed readily. As I said last evening, I invited representatives to a meeting which I chaired and which was attended by the widest possible representation of educationists in this State. The people whom I invited to attend that conference

have formed a small working party, which has met once and which I think will meet again next week. Originally I invited to the conference not only officers of the Education Department but also representatives of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the Director of Catholic Education, the President of the Association of Headmasters of Independent Schools, the President of the Association of Girls' Independent Schools, the Vice-Chancellor, University of Adelaide, the Vice-Chancellor, Flinders University, the Director, South Australian Institute of Technology, the President, South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association, the Regional Director of Adelaide Office of Director of Education and Science, the Secretary, Kindergarten Union, and the Principal, Roseworthy Agricultural College. I think all members will agree that this is a fairly wide representation. The representatives of the university say that they will certainly participate in this week and they have made the very valuable suggestion that, instead of the Vice-Chancellors being represented on the working committee, a representative of the Students Representative Council at Adelaide University, Flinders University, or the Institute of Technology be on the committee. I have written to the President of each of those councils asking the Presidents to get together and nominate one to be a representative on this working committee so that we can have a student voice on the committee. The objectives of holding an education week are to promote educational activity within this State, to show what can be done and is being done, to highlight some of the deficiencies in education in other countries, and perhaps to show some way in which we in South Australia can help backward countries.

It is expected that an education week will be held towards the end of July, and I hope to give honourable members ample notice of when it will be held so that they may participate as fully as possible. I emphasize the point I made last evening, that I hoped this would be an informal type of week, not the formal type of education week held at least twice previously, to my knowledge, and that we would ask everybody in the community interested in education, including members of this House, to participate. I hope that we will have the co-operation of business houses and all other types of organization in promoting education generally. This conforms to the general broad principles set out by U.N.E.S.C.O. in its desire to have an International Education Year.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: The *News* of April 7, reporting an announcement by the Minister of Health, states:

A centre is to be established at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to attract mothers back to nursing. The creche will be established in a section of Austral House, near the RAH.

The Minister was also reported as saying that the premises, which until recently had been used as a nurses home, had been vacated and that it was expected that the centre would be opened as soon as possible, although he was unable to give a firm date. The Minister also stated yesterday in another place that he believed that six wards at the Royal Adelaide Hospital were not being used at present. Will the Premier ask his colleague what progress has been made in this matter and whether every effort will be made to complete the project as soon as possible?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get this information as soon as possible.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' FINANCE

Mr. VENNING: My question is supplementary to that which I asked yesterday regarding the plight that primary producers are in at present. I express to the Premier my appreciation and, on behalf of primary producers, their appreciation of his reply yesterday and of the sympathy he has shown in this matter. Yesterday, the Leader said that through the Reserve Bank it had been announced that the concessional rates of interest would apply to primary producers in respect of carry-on finance. Can the Treasurer say whether private banks are co-operating to the same extent and allowing customers the same concessional rates of interest in South Australia? If they are not, will the Treasurer ask the private banks whether primary producers could receive this concessional rate in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sure that the honourable member understands that this is a recent decision and has been operating for only a short time. I shall be pleased to investigate the situation to ascertain how the requirement is working, and to assure the honourable member and myself that it is working as it was intended to work by the Commonwealth Treasurer. I shall obtain a report for him, but if I cannot do this before tomorrow or next week (if the House is sitting then) I shall inform him personally of the results of my inquiry.

F

FISHING HAVENS

Mr. CORCORAN: Some time ago I attended a meeting held in the Port MacDonnell District Council chambers at which representatives of the Professional Fishermen's Association from Port MacDonnell, representatives of the District Councils of Port MacDonnell and Mount Gambier, of the town council of Mount Gambier, and of the Chamber of Commerce of Mount Gambier were present. They met the advisory committee on fishing havens that operates in this State and advises the Government on the needs of various fishing havens throughout the State. Much evidence from all interested parties was placed before the committee at this meeting about the desirability of a breakwater being erected at Port MacDonnell. However, the only information the Chairman of the committee could give the meeting at that time was that some preliminary investigations had been made by the Mines Department concerning the supply of suitable quality and quantity of stone. I understand that, at that stage, no design or planning to construct the breakwater had taken place. However, the Chairman, in undertaking to relay to the relevant authority the information that had been given him, pointed out that the committee was a technical committee which could not take action or make recommendations. As this is a matter of considerable interest not only to people at Port MacDonnell, and fishermen in particular, but also to people living in the surrounding district who use Port MacDonnell for various reasons, can the Minister of Marine say what progress has been made in providing this necessary improvement at Port MacDonnell?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member is correct when he says that it has been established that material of the necessary quantity and type is available (I understand at Mount Schank) and that the need for a breakwater in this area has been recognized. However, the honourable member would know that the provision of this expensive facility would involve more money than is at present available. When the Minister of Agriculture returns from overseas next week I intend to discuss this matter with him. This will be a question of priorities which Cabinet will have to consider. I will note the honourable member's representations and, after discussing them with my colleague, bring down a report.

WINDSCREENS

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: My question relates to the heavy damage caused to

windscreens of motor cars travelling over newly sealed bitumen roads. Last week, when travelling overland to Adelaide, I noticed as I passed the Stirling junction, this side of Port Augusta, that the Highways Department had commenced the resealing and recoating of a part of the road. On Saturday morning (only two days later) when returning home, my wife and I counted the remains of 29 windscreens on the section of road, the length of which would be no more than two and a half or three miles, that had apparently been broken during that period. This appears to be a drastic waste of good material and, although they are probably replaced under insurance policies, the cost of such windscreens is eventually charged to the motorist through the insurance premiums he pays. This problem could be largely solved if people understood that it was the speed of the recipient vehicle (that is, the vehicle that gets hit), whether it be overtaking a vehicle travelling in the same direction or passing an oncoming vehicle, that caused the fracture. Although the other vehicle throws the stone into the air, it is the speed at which the recipient vehicle collides with the object thrown up that shatters the windscreen. Although the Highways Department erects signs advising drivers to travel slowly on the new work, the motorist generally thinks that such signs are intended to protect the department's work rather than his own vehicle. Will the Attorney-General therefore take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to having the Highways Department erect either speed zone signs or some other kind of sign on such newly sealed roads so as to indicate to the motorist that he could prevent damage to his windscreen if he travelled at a speed below, say, 20 miles an hour?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am surprised, indeed shocked, at the apparent number of windscreens the honourable member says he believes were shattered in such a short time.

Mr. Riches: That would be right.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister cannot reply to the member for Stuart.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I readily accept the calculations the honourable member has made, and I am sure they would be accepted by other members. I will bring the matter to my colleague's attention and ask whether he can do as the honourable member suggests.

KANGAROOS

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently the Western Australian Government advertised that it had decided to limit the number of licences available in that State for the killing of kangaroos. It appears that the killing of kangaroos in the Eastern States has become less profitable because of the uncontrolled killing which has almost resulted in the extinction of this animal. As the kangaroo is well known in most parts of the world and is on many crests and emblems of Australian sportsmen, and as it has a certain value as a tourist attraction, can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what precautions have been taken or are contemplated to ensure that this Australian animal does not become extinct in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: First, I point out that the common variety of kangaroo is in no danger whatever of extinction in this State. Kangaroos generally are protected throughout the State and are killed only under permit, although in certain areas there are exceptions to what I am saying. The danger of extinction might apply to the rarer species. The question having been addressed to the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of the Fauna Conservation Act, I will pass it on to him. Anticipating that he will corroborate what I am saying, I think it might be of interest to the honourable member if I say that the danger to the major species is not considerable but that some of the rarer species are being specially protected in certain respects by the acquisition of reserves through purchase or dedication of Crown lands. The matter is, I think, often confusing to the average person, because it is not realized what a difference there is between the areas outside the dog-proof fence and those inside it. The areas inside the dog-proof fence have large numbers of kangaroos in some seasons, and these numbers undoubtedly have to be reduced so that grazing can be carried on successfully. Outside the dog-proof fence, where they are not protected from the dingoes, there are considerably fewer kangaroos of any kind. It must be borne in mind that the build-up in population of kangaroos inside the fence is to some extent helped by the provision of water and other improvements for the grazing of sheep. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture what precise answer should be given to the honourable member's question, but I assure him that the Director of Fauna Conservation has been busy on this matter and that there is today a greater awareness than ever before of any dangers to the rarer species.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM CAMPAIGN

Mr. GILES: The New South Wales Minister of Education has decreed that students attending public schools in that State shall be allowed to wear the Vietnam Moratorium Campaign badge but he says they are not allowed to discuss at school the moratorium situation. Can the Minister of Education say what is the position in South Australia? Will the children be allowed to wear the moratorium badge? Will there be a ban at schools on discussing the moratorium, or will students, in fact, be allowed to discuss it?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I think Mr. Cutler (the New South Wales Minister) went even further and considered banning the wearing of this badge. I have said publicly that I will not in any circumstances ban the wearing of a moratorium badge by children attending school. The reply to the second part of the honourable member's question is that if discussion is desired in the schools it may be held, and no restriction will be placed on it. When an important matter such as this arises, it will be discussed anyway, and it would be just as well if it were discussed openly in the schools, although I should hope that both sides of the question would be put. I would certainly not ban discussions in the schools. This does not supersede any previous instruction that has gone out regarding Party policies that may be discussed. I think that in this case free and open discussion can be helpful, rather than to be pushing it under the carpet. I made a public statement last week pointing out (a) that I would not ban the wearing of the moratorium badge at schools, and (b) that in no circumstances would I ban discussion. One stipulation, however, that I wish to make is that in the event of any disturbance being caused in the schoolyard during recess or lunch periods, or at any other time, the headmaster must have the right, as he always has had, to take any action designed to avoid such a disturbance.

MARION CROSSING

Mr. VIRGO: In reply to a question asked yesterday, the Premier indicated his interest in road safety, and I hope that this question will interest him just as much and that he will take some action in the matter. On March 6 last a report in the *Advertiser* stated that two young boys had been injured as a result of an accident at the Marion level crossing. The report went on to say that the boys had both waited for a south-bound railcar to pass and, while the flashing lights were still operating, began to cross into the path of the Adelaide-bound train. True, it may be argued that they

should have waited but, humans being as they are, this is the trap, and the only way to eliminate this trap is to provide a grade separation. I have often asked the Premier, and the Attorney-General representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, to expedite the planning and building of over-ways both at Marion Road and at Morphett Road, as has also the member for Glenelg. The last time we received information it was hoped that in about two years the planning for both these grade separations would be completed. In the interests of road safety and the safety of the public at large, will the Premier take action to have these over-ways constructed in an endeavour to prevent further loss of life at either of these two crossings?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to find that the member for Edwardstown is, for a change, in favour of some road construction, and I will do my best to take up his question and to see what has occurred in relation to the projects to which he refers. I hope that we can get his co-operation this time in regard to road construction.

SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. EVANS: My question is more or less supplementary to the one I asked yesterday about land subdivision in catchment areas in the Adelaide Hills. A statement was made on April 22 that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had agreed to send one of its representatives to meet members of the councils concerned. Can the Minister of Works say whether anything has been done to solve the problem of subdivision in Hills catchment areas to the satisfaction of the district councils concerned?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: True, much concern has been expressed by people living in catchment areas in the Adelaide Hills about the proposed subdivision to control pollution of our metropolitan reservoirs. To this end, there seems to be perhaps a lack of communication with local councils and residents. It has now been arranged that on May 6 an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will attend a meeting at Gumeracha to meet representatives of local councils in the catchment areas. Although I do not know the time of the meeting, I have no doubt that this information will be conveyed to the people concerned. This officer will explain in detail at the meeting the reasons for the regulations in question and the need to take the action that the Government has taken. Members of local councils in the Hills will be

given an opportunity to make themselves more conversant with the necessity for the Government's action in this matter.

MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the treatment of infants at certain hospitals to prevent mental retardation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Guthrie test is being carried out at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the cost is estimated at the very low figure of 20c a test. The test is now part of routine management for practically all hospitals in the State where babies are born. Specimens are received from the metropolitan area, from all country areas, and from private doctors. The specimen is taken by the attending doctor and forwarded to the Adelaide Children's Hospital laboratory by post or other convenient means. The child does not need to go to the laboratory. The Biochemistry Department of the Adelaide Children's Hospital has reported that 20,730 Guthrie tests were made during 1969, of which six showed positive results. As the number of births in South Australia for this period was less than 22,000, a good coverage by this test is being achieved. The difference between those figures is 1,270. I can assure the honourable member that the Government will try to ensure that all children undergo this test. I understand that it is now usual to conduct a test, but that any extension involves administrative difficulties that will be attended to as soon as possible.

TINTINARA OVER-PASS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last session I asked several questions about the road over-pass over the railway line south of Tintinara. I am grateful to the Minister of Roads and Transport for the improvement that has been effected to sign posts on the "S" bend approach to the present over-pass. I am concerned now about the construction of the new over-pass. As I understand there has been some delay in planning, will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether the planning has been completed and, if it has, when work is expected to commence on the new earthworks? Also, will he obtain from his colleague an assurance that, if tenders are called for these earthworks, they will be called on a general tender basis and that the call will not specify any special type of equipment for carrying out this work,

as I understand people interested in doing this work believe they may be excluded should the call for tenders stipulate the use of certain equipment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly submit that question to the Minister.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDON: As the Premier will be aware, I have often made representations to the Chief Secretary and to the Hospitals Department for the establishment of a separate geriatric ward at the Mount Gambier Hospital. For this to be done, the top floor of the hospital will have to be made available for medical cases and this will necessitate certain alterations to the top floor. As the Minister has previously indicated that the work will be done so that Mount Gambier will have a separate geriatric centre, will the Premier raise the matter urgently with his colleague so that I may be informed of what progress, if any, has been made towards providing this necessary separate geriatric centre as soon as possible?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

MANOORA RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr. ALLEN: During the two years I have been a member of the House several people have approached me about the railway level crossing at Manoora. As people living in my area use this road extensively, I have on occasions forwarded submissions. I have received to the member for Light in whose district this crossing is situated, and he has made several representations to the Minister of Roads and Transport about the matter. As this is also the main road to Broken Hill and to the District of Frome, much traffic uses it. At present I understand the crossing has a "stop" sign and that heavy transport vehicles are compelled to stop. Following the crossing there is an up-grade of several miles, so that such vehicles take a long time to work up speed on the up-grade. According to this morning's newspaper, the Commissioner of Highways has said that this financial year the department will spend about \$150,000 on improving warning systems at level crossings and \$300,000 towards the cost of traffic signals. In view of this sum being provided, perhaps flashing lights could be installed at the crossing to which I have referred. With the co-operation of the member for Light, I ask the Attorney-General to find out from his colleague whether provision has been made for the installation of traffic lights at the Manoora railway crossing.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member was kind enough to give notice of this question.

Mr. McKee: A Dorothy Dixier.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, but, as he gave notice that he would ask the question, I was able to get information for him for this afternoon. The Railways Commissioner has reported to my colleague that the installation of automatic protection at this crossing is not included in the current year's programme for work of this nature. However, the inter-departmental committee will be determining the programme for 1970-71 soon, and this crossing is listed for consideration. It is at present protected by "stop" signs, as the honourable member said, and also by standard railway level crossing signs. The honourable member may know (and perhaps I can refer to this) that the inter-departmental committee is comprised of officers of the Highways and Railways Departments. By Government direction, the cost of installations of this kind comes from the Highways Fund. This year the Government has agreed to increase the sum to be used on these crossing installations to \$150,000 as against \$100,000 allotted previously. This will allow 14 additional crossings to be equipped with automatic warning devices.

WILLSDEN SCHOOL

Mr. RICHES: Recently articles appeared in the Port Augusta *Transcontinental* referring to the delay in carrying out maintenance work at the Willsden Primary School. Part of one article states:

Efforts of the Willsden School Committee to convince the Public Buildings Department that maintenance in and around the infants school is long overdue have been to no avail. The school chairman, Mr. D. R. Scott, said this in his annual report and instanced the fact that the internal painting was three years behind schedule. Repairs to the infants building, which partially subsided following the failure of a water pipe in April 1968, had not been attempted. The subsidence had jammed the main double doors which had not been used since. The replacement of the corroded water pipes resulted in large grooves being cut in the school yard bitumen. Despite repeated approaches to the Public Buildings Department no attempt has been made even temporarily to repair the broken areas which must be a constant hazard to children.

A week later, a leading article in the same newspaper, headed "Cause for alarm", referred to the situation again and expressed the opinion that this matter should be brought to the Minister's notice and to my notice, as member for Stuart. I now bring this matter

to the Minister's notice and ask him whether he will call for a report on the reason for the delay in effecting repairs to the Willsden Primary School. I point out that the Chairman of the school committee referred to, who is responsible for this statement, is the Manager of the Thomas Playford power station at Port Augusta and a man not given to making statements that are without substance. Will the Minister of Works also obtain for me a report on the progress of construction of a new Samcon building for the primary school there, as well as on the maintenance work at the infants school?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I will have the matter of maintenance at the Willsden Primary School examined and will discuss with the Minister of Education the progress being made in the construction of the Samcon building about which the honourable member has asked.

POLLUTION

Mr. McANANEY: Some weeks ago I was pleased to read that the Premier had taken steps to look into the problem of pollution in South Australia. I am sure all members will agree that pollution is a menace that has crept up on many countries, until today it would cost billions of dollars to remedy. The United States and Japan, for instance, have many serious pollution centres, and the number of deaths directly attributable to air pollution is reported to be increasing each year. South Australia is very fortunate in that this State as yet has none of these serious problems. However, pollution is something that we must safeguard against, and I would hope that all members would be aware of the need for action in this respect. As I understand that the Premier has set up a special committee to look into the problem of pollution, will he say how the work of that committee is progressing?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: At the moment the committee is laying the basis for its study and I am sure that the honourable member will understand that much organization is needed for such a comprehensive study of the problem in South Australia and of what is being done in other States and other parts of the world. The honourable member is correct in his reference to pollution in the United States and in Japan, although when I was in Europe in 1968 I crossed the Rhine River and found that the mouth of that river was nothing more than a dirty sewer as far as water quality was concerned, and that fact struck me most about the care that we here must take and the

need for us to profit from the mistakes that have been made in other countries. As a result of this the Government has set up a committee headed by Professor Jordan of Adelaide University, and also comprising Dr. David Morgan, who brings a wide experience in the uses of insecticides; Dr. Inglis (Director of the South Australian Museum); Mr. Warren Bonython who, I think, is well-known for his interest in South Australian water quality and quantity; Mr. E. M. Schroder; Dr. Woodruff; and Mr. Mason, who is a Bachelor of Science. These men are being assisted by Mr. John Holland (Assistant Secretary of the Premier's Department), who has been made available from that department and is co-ordinating the research which is beginning. He has written to all councils in South Australia asking what the problem is in each council area. I notice that one or two councils have written saying that they have not been contacted yet, but I am sure that will be remedied, as we intend to contact all councils.

Mr. Riches: What's happened to the Clean Air Committee?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That committee is still operating. There is no intention at present of taking over, or preventing from acting, any body concerned with the prevention of pollution. I may tell the honourable member that I have taken action regarding industrial promotion and, although I cannot make an announcement yet because financial obligations are involved, that action will deal with effluent in a certain way in South Australia for the first time, and I am conscious about encouraging industries to set up here. Day-to-day activity continues on that matter. I consider that this committee will present to the Government the most worthwhile and intense study on pollution ever made in Australia and the report will be most valuable to the Government in guiding it on the administrative and legislative measures it must take to control pollution in our midst. Therefore, my reply is that I am most optimistic because of the better conditions that we have here, a state of affairs that has been caused partly by our smaller development in comparison with that of the larger cities and areas in the Eastern States and partly by our being careful. We have not developed into the huge society that we will become eventually. If we have this advantage, we can take note of it and take proper legislative and administrative advantage by asking all the experts what we should do. The report may take a year or 18 months to prepare, because it will be an

extensive report. However, the Government is taking day-to-day measures in its administration to prevent pollution in South Australia.

WHYALLA FIRE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I consider it imperative that, to avoid a repetition of the recent fire at the Whyalla shipyard, all the facts surrounding that fire be ascertained. I have examined the reports in State and local newspapers regarding this fire, but cannot find any suggestion of a public inquiry being held into the fire. I consider that only such an inquiry will elicit the full facts, and that it should be conducted by a person competent so to elicit the full facts. In view of the State's heavy commitments in Whyalla (and these are largely dependent on the successful continuity of the ship-building industry), will the Premier say whether the Government will appoint a Royal Commission to inquire thoroughly into every aspect of this disastrous fire in order to ensure that adequate action is taken to prevent a repetition?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sure that the inquiries are still proceeding, and any decision to appoint such a highly-placed committee of inquiry would depend on the initial findings. However, I want to tell honourable members that certain allegations have been made politically about this fire and the Leader of the Opposition recently made a statement in which he said the Government's attitude to fire-fighting projects that were started when the Australian Labor Party was in office was one of the major reasons why the *Amanda Miller* blaze had not been brought under control. That is a fairly serious statement. The Leader also said:

At the time we left office our Government had been in the process of arranging in Whyalla the establishment of a full-time, properly equipped fire service. The present Government decided not to carry on with the project, so that Whyalla is still being served by an auxiliary fire service manned part-time by six men.

My researches show that there is no substance whatsoever in this claim by the Leader, and I should like to explain the action that has been taken and the course of events concerning the establishment and operations of fire services in that area. The Whyalla Fire Service was established in 1946. I understand that the boundaries were fixed in consultation with the Whyalla City Commission and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, and the company's works were excluded from the fire district. The B.H.P. works are, therefore, "out

of district", although the local brigade has rendered assistance to B.H.P. on occasions. The Whyalla Fire Brigade is established to cater for the township of Whyalla and is not for the protection of the B.H.P. works, which has its own facilities.

The Whyalla district has, at the request of the Whyalla City Commission it seems, been extended from time to time to cater for development. Four years ago the Fire Brigades Board had obtained, through the Housing Trust, a block of land on the corner of Moran and Ian Streets, Norrie, for the establishment of a second station. In February, 1969, the board discussed with the Whyalla City Commission the question of whether Whyalla should have a permanent station or a second auxiliary station. On March 25, 1969, the commission wrote to the Fire Brigades Board as follows:

The commission has considered the question of the establishment of a station manned by permanent personnel, but in view of the expense involved, considers that the suggestion for a second station manned by auxiliary firemen is preferable. Consequently, I am to advise you that the commission is in favour of a second station being established in due course.

The Fire Brigades Board intended to build a second auxiliary station within the next 12 months, but when the Chairman of the board visited Whyalla a fortnight ago to inspect the scene of the fire in the shipyard with the Chief Officer, he spoke to the Acting Chairman of the Whyalla City Commission regarding the second auxiliary station and was informed that it would have to be submitted to the commission.

To extend the fire district to include the B.H.P. works would require the Fire Brigades Board to give notice, in accordance with the Fire Brigades Act, to the Whyalla City Commission, and His Excellency the Governor would subsequently issue a proclamation under the Act. There has never been any such notice either in the time of the present or immediately prior Government, other than a proclamation issued in October, 1969, to extend the district.

There is no record whatsoever of any action taken by the previous Government to establish a full-time fire service at Whyalla and, as I mentioned earlier, in March, 1969, the Whyalla City Commission itself expressed the view that a second station should be manned by auxiliary firemen. I hope that that in some way is a reply to the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition in his unfounded statement. Whether or not the inquiry should continue

in the form of a Royal Commission must obviously depend on any initial information that one gleanes from the first report.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently, I noticed a reference in the *News* to a film about South Australian industry, and from what has been said about South Australian industry recently this film would be much in demand. As I understand that it has been prepared by the Premier's Department, I ask the Premier whether he has any information about it (I understand there is to be a preview next Monday), and whether he can give any estimate of the cost of producing it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The staff of the Premier's Department in the Industrial Development Branch is extremely proud of the film that has been produced, particularly after having had it approved by other competent people involved in film work in Australia. I have tried to promote South Australia industrially and generally on the basis of what I call warm contact. In the world scene, as a State we are too small to advertise widely and one would need a tremendous budget to supply newspapers and journals throughout the world with articles and general information about South Australia; so we have selected specific targets and produced the material with which to meet and inform those targets. One method that has been adopted wherever possible is for films that will present South Australia in the proper light to be shown to people who count. We costed films outside of Government operations and found them to be extremely expensive.

Mr. Hudson: Did you show the film to the Adelaide Club?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know that it may irk the member for Glenelg to realize that such an excellent work has been prepared by the Premier's Department, but if he would like to make his own assessment an invitation is available for him to attend the preview next Monday, when he can observe the film and make his own judgment. The film was taken by the photographer, Mr. Ellson (an extremely able cameraman), to the Commonwealth Film Unit for its critical appraisal, and he received great approbation for his work. We have since submitted it to Commonwealth departments in the hope that they will distribute it in their work overseas. We were grateful to find that the Immigration Department had ordered 48 copies of the film; the External Affairs Department is examining it;

and one other Commonwealth Department is interested in it. Also, we will exhibit the film locally as much as possible, because we believe that to build up local morale is as important in selling the State as is informing people elsewhere. It is a 10-minute film of great pictorial capacity: in colour, it is carefully scripted to present the correct emphasis on South Australian opportunities. I shall be happy to see the honourable member present at the preview next Monday.

RAM EMBARGO

Mr. CASEY: Early this month the Victorian Minister of Agriculture (Hon. G. L. Chandler, C.M.G., M.L.C.) said that his Government disagreed to the lifting of the embargo on the export of merino rams, that the Victorian Government believed that there were strong reasons for opposing the sale of merino rams to our oversea competitors, and that it was aware that it was not the only State Government adopting this attitude. Because of the close ties that this Government has with the Victorian Government, and as this measure has no doubt been discussed on numerous occasions, will the Premier make a responsible statement about this Government's attitude toward the embargo on the export of merino rams?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to speak to the Acting Minister of Agriculture on this matter. As I informed the honourable member yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture is touring overseas at present seeking the latest trends and marketing opportunities for South Australian agriculturalists. When he returns (I think on May 3) I shall be pleased to discuss this question with him and ascertain his latest assessment of the worth of this ban.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. EDWARDS: Once again it is almost seeding time, and in some early districts it has already started. Farmers are worried and would like to know and be sure of what wheat quotas will operate for the coming season. They do not wish to encounter the same problems in this regard as they had last year. It has been stated that there will be a 20 per cent cut of quotas: some say it will be 22 per cent, and others refer to a 21 per cent cut. Many farmers are anxious to know what the position is about short-falls and whether anything will be made up to those who had short-falls on last year's harvest. Some farmers residing in my district, and in other districts, were not able to market a bag of wheat last year because of the rust problem in their districts. These

farmers are worried because some of them consider that they will not be able to make up short-falls in one season, and they would like to know how much of the short-fall is going to be made up to them. They also wish to know how many acres to sow in order to make up the short-fall that may be granted to them. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Acting Minister of Agriculture the replies to these questions soon, so that farmers will know what to plant for the coming season?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer that question to my colleague.

MOONTA COURTHOUSE

Mr. HUGHES: On February 23 a justice of the peace representing the Moonta justices called at my home and informed me of the unsatisfactory position obtaining at Moonta in relation to the administration of justice. When I came to Adelaide two days later I rang the Attorney-General's office to seek an interview with the Attorney, only to be informed by his secretary that he had left for New Zealand on the preceding day. It was suggested that the letters from 12 justices of the peace and a letter from the Moonta corporation be referred to the Attorney's office so that they could be attended to on his return. I did as suggested, and in the latter part of my covering letter I said that upon the Attorney's return I would appreciate the opportunity of discussing this matter with him. This courtesy was not extended to me and, when I revisited Adelaide a few days later, I again rang his office, knowing that the Attorney had returned from New Zealand, and spoke to his Secretary. However, I was informed that the Minister was busily rushing around that morning and that he had to go to his district to open a fete. Apparently, the administration of justice had to take second place to the opening of a fete. I was informed that no purpose could be served by discussing the matter with the Attorney, as he had already called for a report and that, upon receipt of the report, he would confer with me. I do not know whether such a report has been presented to the Attorney yet, but I have not had the courtesy of his informing me one way or the other. I am indeed disturbed about this matter because of the facts that were made known to me by the justice concerned, who said that because the Moonta courthouse was being demolished the senior constable in charge had been instructed that all future sittings of the court must be held in the local police station office. He said that,

although this had been done in recent months, it was far from satisfactory, for the following reasons:

- (1) The dignity of this court can hardly be upheld.
- (2) There is no facility for arraigning the defendant.
- (3) During the hours that the station is used for court proceedings it is obviously not available for use of the public as a police station.
- (4) It would deviously appear to the public that the court held in a police station is not a justices' court but a police court—(apart from justice being done, it must also appear to be done).
- (5) There is no space for provision of seating other than for prosecution and defending counsel.
- (6) The Bible rests on top of the telephone switchboard.

The justice concerned asked me to discuss this matter with the Attorney at the earliest opportunity, which I tried unsuccessfully to do. The Moonta corporation is also concerned about this matter because, on inquiring, it was apparently informed that a new courthouse had not even been mooted for Moonta. I know I am not allowed to read all the letters I have received on this matter. Can the Attorney say whether the report, which I was informed had been called for, has now been submitted to him? Also, does the Government intend that the administration of justice in Moonta is to proceed as it has recently in the police station, or is a new courthouse to be built at Moonta?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I most certainly apologize to the honourable member for any discourtesy that he feels has been done to him. I was unaware that he had tried to get in touch with me.

Mr. Jennings: That makes it worse.

Mr. Hughes: Didn't you read my letter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think I have read the letter; nor have I opened any fetes lately.

Mr. Hughes: Apparently, then, you were—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot ask half a dozen questions.

Mr. Hudson: Apparently he misinformed his Secretary.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think that happened.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light.

Later:

Mr. HUGHES: Regarding the unsatisfactory conditions under which justices are asked to perform their work in Moonta, the Attorney-General has admitted that he has not read my letter of February 26. Is the Attorney-General willing to meet me during the dinner adjournment this evening or some time tomorrow morning at a time convenient to him in order to discuss this important matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: When I was replying to the honourable member's question earlier this afternoon, he interrupted to such an extent that you, Mr. Speaker, asked me to sit down and not continue my reply. I shall be only too pleased to talk to the honourable member about the matter at any time. The most convenient way to proceed is for me to make inquiries tomorrow morning, to obtain all the letters concerning this matter, to bring them down to the House tomorrow afternoon, and to talk to him then.

ACCIDENTS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week a tragic accident occurred on the Main North Road near Watervale, when two vehicles collided causing loss of life. This has drawn attention to the dangerous condition of the Main North Road, especially north of Auburn, where it is too narrow and is not designed for modern traffic. Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, say what is the Highways Department's policy on the improvement of the Main North Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member was kind enough to inform the Minister of Roads and Transport that he would ask this question, I can inform him immediately that the highways department is currently undertaking a detailed survey and design of the Clare-Auburn section of the Main North Road in preparation for reconstruction, which is planned to commence in January, 1971. This work will involve general widening and improvement to the road structure, including the easing of several curves. Yesterday a departmental engineer inspected the site of the tragic accident that occurred last weekend at Watervale. It has been reported that this accident took place on a slight curve and resulted from driver behaviour rather than the condition or geometrics of the road. It is not expected that plans for reconstruction will provide for any great improvement at the accident site

but, as pointed out earlier, general widening and other road structure improvements will result.

Mr. Freebairn: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member for Light that it is not the Attorney-General's opinion from which he is quoting.

SMALL BOAT REGULATIONS

Mr. ARNOLD: During the past six months Upper Murray ferry operators have brought to my notice the increasing danger of pleasure craft becoming entangled in ferry cables. I do not know whether there are any regulations controlling pleasure craft and ferries but, if there are no regulations, I ask the Minister of Marine whether he will examine this matter. On several occasions pleasure craft have become entangled in ferry cables and have been lifted completely out of the water. On one occasion even a catamaran houseboat was lifted completely out of the water by a ferry cable, and a serious accident could happen in the future. Members of the public are unaware, I think, of the danger that exists in this regard, and I believe that they should be made aware of the situation before a serious accident occurs.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will most certainly take up this matter with the Director of Marine and Harbors. As the honourable member has pointed out, a serious accident could occur, and I will take the earliest opportunity to have a discussion with the Director and bring down a report.

PORT PIRIE WELFARE OFFICER

Mr. McKEE: The Minister of Social Welfare is probably aware that for some time I have been asking the Government to appoint a full-time social welfare worker at Port Pirie to serve that city and the surrounding districts. The previous Minister informed me by letter in about the middle of December, 1969, that a survey had revealed that there was more than sufficient work for a full-time social worker at Port Pirie and that he thought the appointment would be made early in 1970. As we are well into 1970, can the Minister say whether this appointment has been considered and, if it has, when it is likely to be made?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: We have not yet been able to appoint a social worker for this purpose. In other aspects of the department's work, services are being provided in country towns and are progressively being extended, so

this appointment would be in line with the policy. I will find out for the honourable member the latest position with regard to this appointment.

SHIPYARD EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked yesterday about shipyard employment?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I said when the honourable member raised this question yesterday, the Premier's Department has been constantly in touch with the trends of the shipbuilding industry. The Director of Industrial Promotion conferred with the management of the company and presented a case to the Tariff Board Inquiry on Shipbuilding. The report of that inquiry has not yet been released. Furthermore, on February 19, 1970, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport and the Commonwealth Minister for Supply. In those letters I stressed the success of the company in the construction of tugs and small ships and its first-class shipbuilding facility and highly skilled work force. I gave the Ministers confidential information regarding the position of the company's order book at that time and the effect that lack of further orders would have on the work force. In the letter to the Minister for Shipping and Transport I raised the question of foreign small ships being brought to Australia and the effect that this could have on orders for new ships being placed with the company.

In my letter to the Minister for Supply I asked whether he would have Commonwealth defence requirements for small ships examined to see whether early orders for Commonwealth requirements could be placed with the company. The Minister for Shipping and Transport has informed me that all Australian shipbuilders are encountering problems in maintaining a satisfactory level of production. One reason for this shortage of demand is that Australian construction costs are, even with the present subsidy, higher than costs in certain other countries. In regard to the entry of foreign ships in excess of 200 gross tons or any second-hand foreign ship in excess of 1,500 cubic feet internal measurement, the Minister has intimated that approval is not given if a suitable Australian-built ship is reasonably available. When approval is given it is generally on condition that a suitable replacement will be built in Australia.

The Minister has assured me that the evidence submitted on behalf of the Adelaide Steamship Company will be taken into account in the

Government's consideration of any recommendations that the Tariff Board may make in respect of assistance to the shipbuilding industry. I am still awaiting information in reply to my letter to the Minister for Supply.

Mr. RYAN: A few months ago I attended the launching of a ship called *John Burke*, which was built at Adelaide Ship Construction yards at Port Adelaide for a company to operate in Queensland waters. Today I received a letter and a circular from the Managing Director of this company, and rather than make a long explanation I shall read briefly portion of the circular, which states:

The Queensland shipping company, John Burke Proprietary Limited, has "deferred indefinitely" construction of its second roll-on-roll-off freighter, because the Commonwealth Government has permitted entry of two new Bulgarian-built ships to serve the gulf traffic. The company will put into service early next month the 2,000-ton freighter *John Burke*, built by the Adelaide Ship Construction company. Mr. John Burke, the Managing Director, said in Brisbane today (April 27) that construction of a second and larger roll-on-roll-off vessel had been planned to start immediately. "Had the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping not sanctioned introduction of foreign-built vessels this second vessel could have been under construction in the next few weeks," Mr. Burke said.

Because of that statement and the loss of important work to South Australia as a result of the action of the Commonwealth Government, will the Premier discuss with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister the action the Commonwealth has taken that has been to the detriment of industrial promotion and work in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Perhaps the honourable member was not present when I read a previous reply.

Mr. Ryan: I have just received the circular.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I read my reply to a question by the honourable member's colleague, I can only reiterate the contact I made. I am still awaiting information in reply to my letter to the Minister for Supply. However, the subject of the difficulties of this shipyard is not only a question of permission to allow foreign-built ships into Australia. It includes the cost of production to the shipyard and also obstructions to production. The shipyard has experienced great difficulty concerning industrial matters within this province, and the honourable member would know that only a few weeks ago about 90 staff members were prevented by picketing from entering the yard. This incident came at a crucial time

when the organization was trying to gear itself to tender for specific jobs. I do not know the cost of this incident to the company, but obviously it added to the cost of ships built in that yard, and there is no other way of taking up that cost. Although I agree that some responsibility rests with the Commonwealth Government, there is also a responsibility in another direction as to the costs of production that cannot be covered in all instances if they are beyond what should normally apply in that industry. I believe that the resuming of proper industrial relations in that company and a reduction in the frequency of demarcation disputes in the industry will ultimately be resolved for the benefit of the shipyard and of all other parties involved.

EDUCATION BROCHURE

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Education will recall that last evening I raised with him the question of the memorandum that was issued last year to headmasters stating that they should not allow schoolchildren to be used as postmen for circulating to their parents information of a controversial nature, whether political or not, and that headmasters were required to use their discretion in reaching a decision whether or not the information was controversial. I understand that, since this matter was raised yesterday, the executive of the South Australian Institute of Teachers has decided to recommend to members of the institute that they do not assist in distributing to schoolchildren the Government brochure *What Our Schools Are Doing* before the forthcoming election, if an election is, in fact, to be held soon, and that the Minister is to be informed that this view has been strongly held by the institute. In view of the previous Minister's memorandum of last year and the decision of the institute to recommend to its members that they do not assist in distributing this brochure, can the Minister say whether, if an election is held in the next few weeks as a result of the current controversy, the distribution of this brochure will be postponed? If he refuses to postpone the distribution of the brochure, can he say what action he will take in relation to any headmaster who, following the recommendation of the Institute of Teachers and the memorandum issued last year by the previous Minister, refuses to assist in distributing the brochure because he regards it as controversial at present?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the Minister replies I point out to him that I do not know

whether he is required to answer a question in relation to an anticipated event.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I realized immediately that this was a hypothetical question, Sir, but I prefer to use my right to reply to it. The brief answer is that I do not intend to postpone the distribution of the brochure. As I explained last evening, this is not political in any way. The political implications in this matter were made by the member for Glenelg, and by him alone. I am also aware of the motion discussed last evening at the meeting of the Institute of Teachers. I intend to invite the President of the institute to discuss the matter with me. I point out to the honourable member that the distribution of the brochure, about which I have a further reply for the honourable member for which he has not yet asked, is intended to proceed in exactly the same way as previous distributions of publications have proceeded in the past.

Mr. HUDSON: As I understand that the Minister of Education is now able to tell the House and the public how many thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money is to be spent on producing the pamphlet telling everyone what a marvellous job the Education Department is doing, I shall be pleased if he will give that information.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I told the honourable member last evening that I did not have the figure with me, but that I would give him the information today. I think the figure the honourable member gave the House was about \$40,000.

Mr. Hudson: I thought it could be as much as that.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: For the information of the honourable member and in the interest of all members of Parliament and of the public, I have prepared a fully detailed report. In 1947 the Education Department published an illustrated brochure of 56 pages entitled *What Our Schools Are Doing*, which gave a comprehensive account of the work of the department at that time. In 1958 a 40-page brochure *Living and Learning* was published along the same lines. Accordingly, in October, 1969, consideration was given to production of a similar pamphlet to those produced previously, aimed to inform the public of the many activities and services provided by the Education Department. It was decided to adopt the title used in 1947, namely, *What Our Schools Are Doing*. A total of 220,000 brochures are to be printed at a cost of \$26,500.

Distribution is to be arranged on the basis of one copy for each family with departmental school-going children, with copies for interstate bodies, tourist bureaux, Agent-General in London, local government bodies, and other organizations interested in education. The publication is expected to be available shortly (the date I previously gave was that it would be available before the May holidays) and for reasons of economy, sufficient copies have been printed to cater for expected requirements over the next five years.

The honourable member has also said that this is a glossy production. I have checked on this: it is not glossy, perhaps in the term one may think of, but it is of high-quality paper with full-colour illustrations on parts of 16 pages out of 48 pages.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. WARDLE: Late last year the House discussed the matter of a crisis in education, most members contributing to the debate. I recall saying then that, amongst other things about which teachers complained, one thing that disturbed them and brought complaints was the inattention being given to alterations, additions and repairs to school buildings, classrooms and residences. Can the Minister of Education say whether this aspect has been discussed in the department and, if it has, what future policy we may expect?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Last year, when I had the honour to be Minister of Works, the matter was discussed. I remember outlining in the House some plans that I was putting into operation in the Public Buildings Department to decentralize work through various parts of the State by setting up depots and sub-depots in various remote areas and other places outside the metropolitan area. At that time I said I had had discussions with the then Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele) about decentralization and about the responsibility of headmasters and school committees. Only last week I said that repairs could be made far more promptly if more authority were delegated to headmasters. Under revised education amendments, headmasters and chairmen of school councils and committees can now spend up to \$120 for any urgent minor repair to a school building or residence under their jurisdiction. There is no limit to the sum that may be authorized in any one year. The view taken is that urgent repairs to school buildings or residences that previously tended to lag behind because of the necessity for a remote school to write to Adelaide can now

be made, either under the authority of the headmaster or school council or committee, to the extent of \$120 for each repair. The streamlining would be effected by the officer concerned, the headmaster or the chairman of the committee, authorizing a tradesman in the town to carry out urgent minor repairs to the building. Of course, major works must still be referred to the Education Department or the Public Buildings Department for consideration, but what has been done considerably improves the scheme that has been in operation for many years and I consider that the action taken will be appreciated by school councils and headmasters, particularly of country schools. This policy has now been extended to include the effecting of minor repairs to teachers' residences.

PORT AUGUSTA GAOL

Mr. RICHES: The rebuilding of the Port Augusta Gaol has been under consideration for many years and three years ago the Public Works Committee recommended a rebuilding scheme. Because of the number of escapes from the present gaol (one as recently as last week) and the uneasiness that those escapes cause among local residents, will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary a report on when this work is expected to be put in hand?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain such a report and give it to the honourable member.

OFFSHORE MINERALS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: According to press reports, the Commonwealth Government intends to take legislative action regarding offshore minerals and, if these reports are correct, the control of extremely important areas would be taken out of the hands of the State Governments. Can the Premier tell the House the present position in this matter and can he say what is his Government's attitude to these proposals?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is a history of involvement in this matter extending over the past year. In March, 1969, the then Minister for National Development (Hon. D. E. Fairbairn) presented to the Minerals Council (a council consisting of the Commonwealth Minister and all State Mines Ministers) a statement that the Commonwealth Government intended legislating to assert its alleged constitutional rights over all offshore areas outside territorial waters (that is one marine league outside low water mark). The State Ministers forcibly expressed their opposition to this pro-

posal at this time, pointing out that agreement had been reached on offshore petroleum without having to differentiate between either Commonwealth and State powers over or beyond the territorial sea, whatever that may be, and such unilateral action would not solve any problems.

The Commonwealth Minister agreed to call a further meeting soon after March, 1969, to discuss the document presented. No such meeting was called. The States, anxious to clarify the issue, themselves forced a meeting with the Minister for National Development in September, 1969. The next thing the States knew was a lengthy telegram received from the Minister for National Development (Mr. Swartz) on March 2, 1970, on the eve of the Governor-General's Opening Speech to Commonwealth Parliament, and stating that the Commonwealth Government intended proceeding with legislation which would now include all waters from low water mark out. The States view this action as a breach of faith.

There is the question of State rights, but I do not wish to develop this theme, because, whilst State rights are important, the question of national interest cannot be overlooked. The national interest can best be served by co-operative federalism. Three years ago the States and the Commonwealth reached agreement on offshore petroleum exploration, legislation which was hailed as a magnificent example of co-operative federalism. The States and the Commonwealth, having shown the world the way in this legislation to co-operative federalism, are now, owing to the Commonwealth attitude, returning to a position where embittering litigation and uncertainty for offshore explorers (as well as for Governments) must result. The only way satisfactory to all concerned in regard to offshore minerals is to have similar legislation to the offshore petroleum legislation. The Commonwealth Government has made quite clear that it intends to assert sovereign rights over all minerals beyond low water mark and has introduced legislation to this effect.

The South Australian Government has also made clear its position that at the moment its attitude will be one of non-co-operation. This Government, along with other State Governments, considers that this is a further whittling away of State powers in an unjustifiable way. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the Commonwealth Government intends to press on, and at this stage that Government appears to have the support of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament. Therefore, little effective voice is discernible in the

Commonwealth parliamentary sphere to protect State rights and, as I have said, this matter concerns the State Government greatly.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. EVANS: Yesterday, certain figures were used with respect to the recent expenditure for school buildings in this State, and accusations were made that a reduction had been made in the expenditure and money planned to be spent on school buildings. Has the Premier details of the exact expenditure on school buildings, and can he say how much is to be spent in the future?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: True, there was a significant decline in the expenditures on school buildings, but not in the present lifetime of this Government. The decline began in 1966-67 and to give some idea of the fall and the then subsequent rise in expenditure I shall give details of the expenditure in various years. In 1965-66 the actual expenditure was \$11,759,000; in 1966-67 it was \$10,757,000; in 1967-68 it fell to the low figure of \$8,678,000; but the first year of responsibility of this Government saw a lift from that figure to \$11,670,000 actual net expenditure from State Loan funds. In this, the second year which is now finishing, we can confidently predict that the expenditure from State funds will definitely exceed \$12,000,000, and it could rise to \$12,300,000 as my research figures show. However, to be safe, I say that the expenditure on schools buildings will exceed \$12,000,000. The honourable member can see that the low spot occurred in 1967-68, the last year of the previous Government.

FINANCES

Mr. NANKIVELL: During the last session of Parliament there was much discussion about the financial relationship between the State and Commonwealth Governments. I think I am correct in saying that new arrangements were to be negotiated and would come into effect after June 30 this year. Can the Premier say what progress has been made in the negotiations at this stage between the States and the Commonwealth on this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member would know that the States collectively prepared for submission to the Commonwealth Government a case that covered many issues involving State-Commonwealth finances. This resulted in a well prepared document, which was submitted to the Commonwealth Government at a meeting on February 26 of this year. The Commonwealth Government

refused to return to the States any part of the income taxing powers, but the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, said he would make significant moves to alleviate the financial stress that is now being revealed in the States. He made three promises, not in quantitative terms but as matters of principle. He said that the Commonwealth Government would be a party to substantially increasing the basic grant available to each State, that it would in some manner relieve the States of a significant amount of their public debt, and that it would consider the proposition to provide some of the capital requirements of each State on an interest-free basis. The Prime Minister said that the Commonwealth Government would make available interest-free capital finance to some extent in the same way as it is available to the Commonwealth Government.

The States are extremely interested in what quantitative terms will be applied to these three measures. Treasury officers from the various States have conferred as late as last Friday, and I notice that the Premier of New South Wales is calling a fresh conference to be held before June, to ascertain the Commonwealth's thinking. I have supported the calling of this conference, though I will have to wait and see what happens during the remainder of this session. Sir Henry Bolte, of course, has to face an election later this month. With this proviso, I firmly intend to attend the conference to press the case that so far has been successfully pressed by the State Premiers.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. VENNING: At present many school buses are operating in this State. I think all members agree that it has been a good move to close many small schools and create area schools in larger centres. As a result, many buses, owned by the Education Department as well as by private contractors, transport the children to these area schools. Because parents in my district are concerned about this matter, can the Minister of Education say what maintenance is regularly carried out on school buses owned by the Education Department and by private contractors?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Because the honourable member was kind enough to telephone my office this morning, I have a reply ready for him. The Education Department school transport services are provided by 277 buses under contract, 309 departmental buses, and 47 subsidized bus services. To ensure a satisfactory standard of service and

safety, all buses are examined twice a year by Education Department school bus examiners, who are skilled motor mechanics. Operators of these services must conform to the provisions of the Road Traffic Act. They are required to obtain from a police officer a safety certificate—

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report. That, in the event of the joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions. That the Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse), the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Mr. Nankivell be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) reported the minutes of evidence of the Select Committee.

Minutes received.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE moved:

That the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill, 1969, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1969.

Motion carried.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE moved:

That the Select Committee on the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill, 1969, have leave to sit during the recess and to report on Tuesday, July 21.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Standing Order No. 83 be so far suspended for the remainder of the session as to enable the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant to be accommodated with seats in the Chamber on the right-hand side of the Speaker.

Motion carried.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 28. Page 1.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The Government of South Australia has seen fit to sign an agreement with the States of New South Wales and Victoria and with the Commonwealth in flat denial of the majority vote of this House clearly expressed and representing the overwhelming majority of the people of this State. What is more, having signed that agreement in contravention of the clear resolution of this House and in contravention of the unanimous resolutions of this House passed on more than one occasion, it now presents the agreement to the House again, contrary to the expressed wishes of this House. Although it is true that the terms of the amending agreement that the Government has so signed have been ratified in three other Parliaments, the ratification in the other three Parliaments has no effect whatever until such time as all parties to the agreement ratify that amendment. It is not possible for a contract to be altered without all parties to the contract formally altering that contract. It is not possible to have a unilateral alteration of a contract by some parties to the contract without the others and, without ratification of the further amending agreement, the existing River Murray Waters Agreement stands. That agreement provides that the Chowilla dam must be built. That is the agreement that stands now. What the Government has failed to explain to this House is why it is now suggesting to South Australia that, in order to get an agreement with the other States and the Commonwealth for the building of the Dartmouth dam, this State must agree that the Chowilla dam shall never be built, for that is the expression of the agreement that we are being asked to sign. There was never any demand publicly or privately by the

other States and the Commonwealth that, in order to get the provisions for the Dartmouth dam written into the River Murray Waters Agreement, this State had to give away the existing Chowilla agreement altogether. The other Governments did not say it publicly and they did not say it privately, yet that is what has been put into this amending agreement.

Let us turn to the specific provisions of the agreement as they now stand and as contained in the River Murray Waters Agreement Act, which is the law of Australia today. Clause 54 of the existing agreement in the River Murray Waters Act Amendment Act, 1963, for which every member of the Government voted, states:

The States of New South Wales and Victoria, so far as they can do so and may do so and may be necessary in pursuance of this agreement, will authorize and facilitate the construction and maintenance by the State of South Australia and the use by the commission of the Lake Victoria and the Chowilla reservoir works mentioned and described in this agreement.

A further clause was written in at the time providing us with protections to the effect that, if a difference of opinion arose amongst the Commissioners on any question, not being a question of law or prescribed as formal business, then the matter could be taken to an arbitrator, and the decision of an arbitrator appointed to decide the question "shall be binding on the commission and the contracting Governments and shall be deemed to be the opinion of the commission". As I will show in a short while, that had certain specific effects as a result of other clauses of the agreement. What is the Government now asking us to put in place of that? It wants us to add the following:

However, completion of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir shall be deferred until the contracting Governments agree that the work shall proceed.

That is not a decision to be taken inside the commission, which is bound by the terms of the agreement, but a separate and new decision that may be taken by each of the contracting Governments; so that each one of them may say, "No, we don't agree that any further work of any kind shall be done on the Chowilla reservoir." If any one of them says that, that is the end of the matter, and the whole of the existing River Murray Waters Agreement relating to Chowilla reservoir disappears.

Mr. Clark: The right of veto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is a complete right of veto by each of the other contracting Governments outside of the com-

mission; it is not subject to dispute within the commission or subject to litigation before an arbitrator. So, as soon as any one of the contracting Governments says "No", that is to be the end of the matter, and the extraordinary thing is that this was not asked for. How did it happen that this got written into the amending agreement? There is a simple answer to that; when the negotiations concerning this amending agreement were made the opinion of the Crown Law Office was not sought on it. I say that advisedly. The opinion of the Solicitor-General was not sought regarding the contents of this agreement before it was made. It was negotiated by politicians and engineers; and, while engineers may be competent in their area, they are not competent, frankly, to understand the effect on the total of this agreement of legal alterations to it.

Having committed itself to this wrongly and foolishly, the Government now demands of South Australia that we needlessly give away our rights to the Chowilla dam. That clause was not asked for; it is written in and we blithely concede all the existing rights to the Chowilla dam for which this State negotiated and fought, as members opposite have said, for years. Then there is another clause in the agreement, and this was not asked for by the other States: it was asked for by the Government of this State. I refer to clause 10 (a). The Government deletes the words after "Lake Victoria" and inserts in their stead the following:

with inlet and outlet works that are of a size that will, in the opinion of the contracting Governments, ensure the effectiveness of the system of storage in the regulation of the River Murray (including operations after the Dartmouth reservoir has become effective for the purpose of this agreement).

This refers to inlet and outlet works at Lake Victoria which, according to the technical committee's report, will be necessary for the operation of the Dartmouth reservoir to give the benefits to South Australia which are conceived at the moment if the Chowilla dam is not operating. The original technical committee's report, on a submission that was made by Mr. Beaney, estimated this work at between \$4,000,000-odd and \$7,000,000-odd. The Premier's second reading explanation now discloses that these works are expected to cost \$8,000,000, so we are to agree to spend \$8,000,000 at Lake Victoria and, as every member of the Government knows, if Chowilla is built to its expected capacity every one of those works will be under water, and the works will be gone; they will be flooded and will be utterly useless to the contracting parties and to the

commission. It is straining the credibility of this Parliament and the people of this State a little far to suggest that, having given the right to the other States and the Commonwealth to say "No" to any further work at Chowilla and then getting them to spend \$8,000,000 on the inlet and outlet works at Lake Victoria, they will afterwards say, "We will disregard this \$8,000,000 and flood the lot. We'll agree to do that."

Mr. McKee: Who would do that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No-one would do it, and not even the Government of this State intends to do it. It is clear that this Government has no intention of proceeding with the Chowilla dam. When this matter of Lake Victoria storage was raised, the Premier came up with this extraordinary answer: he said, "Oh well, if the Chowilla reservoir were built immediately, the annual interest rate on the total expenditure on the Chowilla dam would be \$3,000,000-odd a year", as though he thought \$60,000,000 could be spent in one year. He seemed to be saying that since we are not building the Chowilla dam immediately there will be a saving of \$3,000,000-odd, and therefore the others will not regard the \$8,000,000 that they have spent at Lake Victoria at all; they will not take that into account! That is rather like the story of a woman going to a sale and saying, "I saved an awful lot of money today; I spent only \$25, because the goods might have cost me \$30." What is more, there is absolutely nothing in this agreement which says that in consideration of further storages the contracting parties will treat the money spent at Lake Victoria on outlet and inlet works as lost cost and will disregard entirely those works in assessing the value to the River Murray Commission of the system of further storages.

Of course, they will not disregard the \$8,000,000; they will still be paying interest on it, and they are not just going to flood those works. Under these conditions, what the Government is asking us to do is to give away our rights to the Chowilla dam completely, and it does not need to do so. Let us have a look at the next argument that has been brought forth by the Government on this matter. The Government has now announced, according to a press report, that it has received advice from the Solicitor-General that in fact, under the existing agreement, we have no legal rights to Chowilla. That, apparently, is its present argument. I find this extraordinary.

However, I want to recall to the House what has been said by members and by the House on other occasions. Let us look at what has been said about the legal rights of the State to the Chowilla dam.

Of course, actually the senior law officer of the Crown is not in fact the Solicitor-General: he is the Attorney-General, who is responsible for the legal advice to the Government. The Attorney-General is a competent lawyer and, if he is saying now what I have just pointed out that the Premier is reported as saying, I can only say that the Attorney-General must be the original of the story of Kingsley Martin's about a gentleman who went around the United States of America looking for a one-armed lawyer. After he had looked for a long time without finding such a lawyer he was asked, "Why are you looking for a one-armed lawyer?", and he said, "I want someone who will not say to me 'On the one hand this and on the other hand that.'" I shall quote to the House the express words used by the Attorney-General on the question of the binding nature of the legal agreement we have to Chowilla. These words are recorded in *Hansard* of August 15, 1967, when the Attorney-General was debating a motion before the House (and this was the original motion put forward by me) which finally became the unanimous motion of the House and the terms of which I shall read in a moment. He said:

One does not give away one's case before negotiations start, yet that is what this motion would do. Something once conceded is impossible to get back. The Opposition believes that nothing should be given away to Victoria or to any other State. That is not the way to beat Sir Henry Bolte who is not giving anything to anyone if the attitude as reported in this morning's paper can be taken as a true guide to his feelings.

We are now told that we can rely on Sir Henry Bolte's kindness and generosity without the need of any binding agreement whatever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader needs no assistance to make a speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General continued:

Why do we concede things which we do not need to concede? We are sitting on an agreement, binding on other States, which Sir Thomas Playford worked for many years to obtain. We should not give it away in a couple of hours. The agreement, which is the basis of this matter, is contained in the 1963 Act. Paragraph 8 incorporates the Chowilla works in clause 20 of the original agreement, and provides that they should be "works to be provided for under this agreement". The

agreement signed in 1963 on behalf of Victoria by Sir Henry Bolte, on behalf of South Australia by Sir Thomas Playford, and by the Prime Minister and the then Premier of New South Wales, provided by new clause 54 (which was put into the agreement by paragraph 18 of the 1963 agreement):

The States of New South Wales and Victoria, so far as they can do so and may be necessary in pursuance of this agreement, will authorize and facilitate the construction and maintenance by the State of South Australia and the use by the commission of the Lake Victoria and Chowilla reservoir works mentioned and described in this agreement.

That is still binding on Victoria and New South Wales, and yet Sir Henry Bolte can say (as is reported in the paper this morning) that the matter is dead and gone. Surely we are not to concede that to him.

He then agreed, as did all members of the Government and of the Opposition at that time, to the following motion:

That the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay.

But the Attorney-General did not stop there. After the Government had been in office for a considerable time and had received reports from Mr. Beaney (I had a much earlier report from Mr. Beaney on the studies initiated by the River Murray Commission), and after all this information was available to it, there was a motion before the House and it was the Attorney-General who moved the motion in similar terms to the previous motion as follows:

That the House considers that the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without delay.

Is the Attorney-General now seriously saying that we do not have any legal rights at all? Does he say that what happened before was a lot of "my eye", that it was put up merely as surplusage, and that he did not mean it? We have heard a few things said about the contents of the River Murray Waters Agreement; we have had a few vaguely expressed bits of information culled from here and there to give the public the impression that we have nothing worth anything at all in this agreement regarding binding other States about Chowilla. However, members of the Government and of the Opposition have not been quite as incompetent as all that. We examined this agreement when it was passed and got the advice of the Crown Law Office on it. I shall draw to the attention of honourable members some of the clauses of the agreement. This is not some vaguely expressed bit of an opinion: what

I shall quote can be understood by the public because it is in simple and plain terms. Clause 3 of the agreement states:

Each of the contracting Governments as far as its jurisdiction extends and so far as may be necessary shall provide for or secure the execution and enforcement of the provisions of this agreement and any Acts ratifying the same.

Clause 24 states:

The construction as provided by clause 21 of this agreement both of the storage works and of the weirs or weirs and locks mentioned in clause 20 hereof shall be commenced by the Governments of the several States as soon as may be after this agreement comes into effect and shall be continued without cessation (other than may be due to unavoidable causes) until all of the said storage works and weirs or weirs and locks are completed.

We have heard much about our having no rights as to time, but that clause requires that time is in view, and people are required to proceed with the works with all due speed and haste. Clause 34 states:

The commission shall in the month of March of each year prepare detailed estimates of the amounts of money respectively required during the 12 months from the first day of July then next ensuing—

(a) for the cost of carrying out the works mentioned in clause 20 of this agreement; and

(b) for the costs of maintenance operation and control mentioned in clause 33 of this agreement.

showing the manner in which it is proposed to expend such moneys. A copy of the detailed estimate of the amount of money required for the cost of carrying out the works mentioned in clause 20 of this agreement shall be forwarded to each of the contracting Governments and the contracting Governments shall provide the amount of money so required according to the shares set out in clause 32 of this agreement and pay so much of the same as is required by the commission before the expiration of the said period of 12 months. A copy of the detailed estimate of the amount of money required for the costs of maintenance operation and control mentioned in clause 33 of this agreement shall be forwarded to each of the State contracting Governments and the State contracting Governments shall provide the amount of money so required according to the shares set out in clause 33 of this agreement and pay so much of the same as is required by the commission before the expiration of the said period of 12 months.

Clause 43 (and this is very important) states:

If any contracting Government whose duty it is under this agreement or under any direction issued in accordance with this agreement to construct or continue the construction of or to maintain operate or control any works or to carry on any operation or to provide its share of the cost of the construction maintenance operation or control of such works or of carrying on such operation refuses or neglects

to do so after being thereunto required by the commission the other contracting Governments (or any one or more of them) with the sanction of the commission—

- (a) may without prejudice to their or its other rights under this agreement construct or continue and complete the construction of or maintain operate or control the whole of such works (or any portion thereof specified by the commission) or carry on such operation (or any part thereof specified as aforesaid) and provide the cost thereof; and
- (b) may in any court of competent jurisdiction recover as a debt from the contracting Government so refusing or neglecting the share of such cost to be provided by such contracting Government in pursuance of this agreement together with interest on any sums expended at a rate to be determined by the commission.

Of course, any decision of an arbitrator is as binding on the commission and on the contracting Governments as if it were a decision of the commission itself. The only objection that has been raised to the enforceability of this agreement that has any sort of validity at all is the fact that in the agreement as it stands there is a limitation as to the total sums to be spent. But the commission is competent to decide to go beyond that, and in fact it did at the time of the design of the dam and at the time of calling tenders. We are now able to show that it is the intention of the contracting Governments to expend moneys within the works of the River Murray Commission to the extent that would be necessary for the completion of the works now specified in the agreement. It is not true to say that South Australia has no binding legal agreement in relation to the Chowilla dam, and there is not the slightest reason why we should give away the contents of that agreement unnecessarily.

Let me turn to the latest ploy of the Government in endeavouring to head off our objections to it, because it had got through to the Government that we were prepared to agree to the building of the Dartmouth dam but were not prepared to give away our rights to Chowilla; and, what is more, the other States have not asked us to give away our rights to Chowilla. Why then should we do it? Why should we simply accept the view that the Government is trying to put over to this Parliament and the people of this State that any agreement is better than none? The level at which this agreement has been negotiated is about as effective as the agreement that was negotiated by the Commonwealth Government for the F111 aircraft; it gives us no

more protection than that does, and any lawyer would condemn it as outrightly as the lawyers who have at least had the chance to see it.

Having found that the Labor Opposition had a clear and simple case upon this matter, the Premier decided last week apparently to do some heading off somewhere, so he sent a letter to the other two State Premiers concerned and to the Prime Minister asking whether they would agree to something going into the Bill which had not been in the ratification agreements in the other States. This requires new legislation in each of the other States. Previously, the Premier had said that that would be an impossible delay and that "we cannot have that sort of thing at all." Now, apparently, it is all right.

Mr. Corcoran: Put him right on it!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What we have from the Premier is a proposal that, having given away all our rights to the Chowilla dam so that this State has no special benefits to come out of it (because South Australia was to get special benefits, relating to its position, out of the Chowilla dam), we now go to the other States to request the River Murray Commission to make some studies on future storages on the Murray River and, in the course of those studies, to look at the Chowilla dam site. This is supposed to be a guarantee to South Australia, after the provision giving the other States a power of veto over Chowilla and power to build works that would have to be flooded if we built Chowilla. But there was a further clause in the letter, so I am told, that made it quite clear to the Premiers of the other States (although I notice nothing about it was said in the Premier's release of this story last Friday) in these terms:

The substantive addition I have made in sub-clause (b) will not in any way commit any party to the River Murray Waters Agreement to anything beyond the further studies which I am sure we all agree are necessary.

I should like the Premier to table the correspondence and show me what he did say.

Mr. Broomhill: He is very quiet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What he has done is to try to put up something that is completely meaningless and ineffective and will not achieve anything for this State. He says, "Oh well, I am trying to compromise and to get something that will be acceptable to the people of this State and to the Opposition." I assure the Premier that what the Opposition requires is the maintenance of the legal rights we at present hold in the Chowilla agreement and the River Murray Waters Agreement relating to the

Chowilla dam. We will not give them up in order to get the Dartmouth dam; we do not need to.

I need not reiterate here the long history of the proven benefits of the Chowilla dam to South Australia. Every member opposite has laboured this at great length. It is pointless to recall their words to them—they should remember them—but the early studies done by the River Murray Commission and part of these computer runs showed additional benefits to South Australia from the Chowilla dam beyond those originally planned. Let me read from Mr. Beaney's minute relating to those early studies:

With Chowilla at a capacity of 1,500,000 acre feet—(a) South Australia would never have been restricted under its present entitlement—

not that we were going to have periods of restrictions, and we would have one drought in 50 years, but that never, even with a smaller capacity than that planned for Chowilla, would we have had a period of restriction under the existing entitlement. He went on further to say:

I am confident that a storage at Chowilla offers the greatest security to South Australia's share of the River Murray waters and expect to have this view vindicated by the studies. As to the size of storage the commission may recommend, I cannot attempt to predict. When the 1961 studies were undertaken some degree of restriction to the South Australian allotment was accepted as likely to be inevitable. The studies made then and the new series both show that full supply can be maintained.

So the new studies enhance the benefits to South Australia from a storage at Chowilla. We have very real benefits from this dam for which we traded rights, and that again is something that every member opposite has spoken about. South Australia gave up very real rights to obtain the Chowilla dam. It was to be a dam that gave us special benefits in recompense for those that we lost. The other States got advantages out of our giving up our rights in relation to the Snowy Mountains diversion—the withdrawal of our rights to it. Sir Thomas Playford and the Attorney-General have spoken about this in the House many times and, during the period since we gave up our rights in the Snowy Mountains diversion, every citizen in this State has been paying about \$4 a head a year for nearly 20 years towards the cost of that series of storages that are providing water and cheaper electricity to the citizens of New South Wales and Victoria without giving us anything.

Are we now to be denied a facility that gives a major investment and great protection to South Australia, additional benefits beyond those that can be got from a single storage on the Murray River, and to give them up without it being necessary to do so in order to get the very benefits that the Government says it wants to get for us now under the Dartmouth scheme? To that sort of agreement we will not submit. As far as we are concerned, we believe that the agreement must be renegotiated. We say it can be renegotiated and, if this Government is not prepared to do it, a Labor Government will be prepared to do so.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I think it is about time we remembered the aim at present before us: what do we in South Australia want? The answer is "water", and the aim of the exercise in which we are now engaged is to assure South Australia the water it must have not only if it is to develop in the future but indeed if it is to maintain its present level of development. The agreement, the ratification of which we are debating now, gives us not only an assurance of the water to which we have been entitled under the River Murray Waters Agreement since 1914 but also an extra 250,000 acre feet every year. What we are debating in this Bill is whether or not South Australia gets extra water for use along the Murray River in the irrigation areas, here in Adelaide by the reticulation system, and all over the State. That is the objective we have before us.

Mr. Broomhill: We think you are wrong.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Our object is that we should have not only our entitlement to water assured but that we should have extra water, and a great whopping lot of extra water, every year for South Australia. The Labor Party never asked for that, and I will come to that matter in a moment. I remind honourable members opposite who are inclined to interject on me that the extra water that we get under this agreement is more than the whole of the water resources of this State, except those in the Murray River itself and whatever may be the resources (at present they are unknown) in the South-East of the State.

That is the magnitude of the advantage that we are to get under this agreement and, if we do not get it, if no further storages are built along the Murray River, then, as we are informed (and we accept as a Government and we invite every other South Australian to accept the view of the engineers), we will be subject to extremely severe restrictions in one

year in every three in this State. Do not just take that from me: this is the opinion expressed by the Executive Engineer of the River Murray Commission, who is not a South Australian civil servant, of course. Mr. Johnson states, on pages 4 and 5 of his report—

Mr. Hudson: Will you table that report in full?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am quite willing to table it, if any member wants to see it. The report is freely available, as the member for Glenelg knows.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It was in the Parliamentary Library.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Mr. Johnson states:

It will be noted that, under drought conditions, the current requirements for irrigation diversion cannot be satisfied unless the storage reservoirs are virtually full at the commencement of the irrigation season. Under the existing situation of irrigation development along the Murray, where to some extent resources are currently over-committed, it can be anticipated that, until further storage works are constructed, severe restrictions in supply for irrigation purposes will be necessary in dry years. Indeed, restrictions would be necessary, on the average, about one year in three.

Then Mr. Johnson tabulates those restrictions, and at page 5 he states:

Irrigation authorities consider that restrictions to the extent indicated above are well in excess of what is considered economically desirable, and, therefore, have strongly supported the need for further storage works to relieve the situation.

Sir, in a State which must have an assured water supply, this matter is crucial. We, as members of the Government, consider that we have done the right thing, despite all that has been said about us and to us. We are prepared to stake the life of the Government upon the actions we have taken; we are willing to do that rather than avoid this issue. We will not put our own interests or Party interests above what we regard as the true and best interests of this State and, even if it costs the Government its life, we are prepared to do that, because we believe what we are doing to be honest and honourable.

It is beyond my comprehension that anyone or any Party could be prepared to endanger the enormous advantage of extra water that we get under this agreement for his or its own benefit, yet that is just what the Opposition intends to do. The Leader has already quoted clause 1 of the amending agreement, and he has made clear the point that I intend to make, that until this Parliament ratifies that agreement it might as well not be there: it is a

nullity. The agreement comes into operation only when it is ratified by all four Parliaments, and it will be the law binding on us and on the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria only when the South Australian Parliament passes this Bill. The question we have before us is whether we are to have Dartmouth, with the benefits that it will give to this State, or whether we are to have nothing at all. That is the question that faces us now, as a matter of practical politics.

Mr. Hudson: That is not so.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is so, and I shall point out why. If we do not ratify this agreement, if we do not agree to it as it has been signed, if we try to put conditions on it, then we will not have any agreement: there will be no agreement whatever by the States. The Dartmouth reservoir cannot be constructed in those circumstances, and we would be back to where we were in August, 1967, when the then Government of South Australia, led by the present Leader of the Opposition, agreed to a deferment. The Leader has seen fit, in his speech, to mention me several times and to canvass the question of the fundamental legal rights that we have to get the Chowilla dam built.

Mr. McKee: You were going to build it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Pirie can make his speech later.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the Leader believes, and if he believed when he was Premier of this State, that we have a fundamental legal right to the building of the Chowilla dam, why did he agree to a deferment? Why did he not insist, in August, 1967, that Chowilla should proceed? The only reason he has ever given, publicly, at any rate, is that he agreed to the deferment and the reappraisal of the whole scheme so that he could collect evidence to go to arbitration to show that Chowilla should be built.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We instructed the Commissioner to create a dispute, and your Government withdrew those instructions.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That is not correct.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The question I ask the honourable gentleman, or whoever may speak next on the Opposition side, is this: what evidence in favour of the building of Chowilla rather than Dartmouth came out of that reappraisal? I do not know

of any. It certainly is not contained in the River Murray Commission's technical committee's report that we have here. What evidence was available to them or to us to enable insistence upon arbitration on this matter with any hope of 'success whatever'? There was none, and there is none, because the technical study showed conclusively that Dartmouth was a better proposition at this time than Chowilla.

While we are dealing with this time, in August, 1967, I remind honourable members that the Leader has seen fit to quote some of the things I said then and later about our legal rights to Chowilla, and I should like to remind him of an opinion which was furnished to him, as Attorney-General, by the then Crown Solicitor, Mr. Kearnan. However, before I do that, I shall remind the House of the motion the Leader himself originally moved in this Chamber. It is in these terms:

That, in the opinion of this House, assurances should be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that whatever action is taken by the River Murray Commission concerning the Chowilla dam or any alternative proposal, South Australia will be provided with water in dry years to the extent intended to have been assured by the Chowilla dam project.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Who said that?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, he is sitting over there, with a red tie on. I ask members to note the words "or any alternative proposal". Yet, the Leader and his Party have the gall now to complain when we do far better. We are to get 250,000 acre feet extra, yet in that motion the Leader was saying that we should get only the same quantity. He complains! It was not until after six hours of debate that the motion which he saw fit to introduce on August 15, 1967, and which he invited this House to pass was passed unanimously by this House. The opinion to which I desire to refer (and which I am prepared to table if honourable members wish me to) is dated August 21, 1967. It is a memorandum to the Attorney-General, but it is an opinion, in effect, and it canvasses the question of our legal rights at that time to the Chowilla dam. I do not remember the Leader's having disclosed this document. He had accepted a motion moved by the member for West Torrens after the debate was under way for some time that we had a fundamental legal right, but this is what the Crown Solicitor told him a few days later:

I understand that the River Murray Commission has resolved that work on the Chowilla

project be reduced to a minimum pending further investigation, the reason stated being that it, the commission, desires to have time for further study of all aspects of the project. If this is a correct summary of the commission's decision—

I think honourable members can accept that it is—

it appears to me that the commission has acted within the powers given to it by the agreement to "direct . . . the rate of progress of works"; and I am unable to see any legal ground upon which that decision can be challenged.

How the Leader can square that opinion which he received from the Crown Solicitor in August, 1967—

Mr. Hudson: You are deliberately misinterpreting it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —with what he now says and what he has said in the intervening time, that we have a fundamental legal right to it, I do not know. I was not aware of this opinion until recently, but one can assume that the Leader was aware of it at the time it was given. I certainly do not hear him refuting that. I am prepared to table a photostat copy of this opinion, if necessary.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That may be why he talked of the alternative.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, let us be fair. This was given six days after. I have other opinions furnished to me as Attorney-General by the present Crown Solicitor. One dated January 22, 1970, canvassing the question of the likelihood of our success at arbitration, stated:

If the question of Chowilla was brought before an arbitrator pursuant to this clause, it is unlikely that he would decide in favour of the immediate construction of Chowilla reservoir if a majority of the commission were of opinion that construction should be postponed.

There is no doubt about that being the stated opinion of the members of the commission.

Mr. Hudson. He said "unlikely".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes: perhaps he is one of the two-armed lawyers the honourable member has referred to, but I am prepared to accept the Crown Solicitor's opinion on it, because it is my opinion also. His statement continued:

A further reason why it is likely that the arbitrator would decide in favour of the immediate construction of Chowilla reservoir is that clause 32 of the agreement sets out the estimated cost of the works to be carried out under the agreement, and provides that the contracting Governments shall bear the cost in

equal shares. There has been such a great increase in the estimated total cost of Chowilla since the sixth amending agreement of 1963 that the estimated cost of Chowilla is now more than double the estimate of 1963; and an arbitrator would be unlikely to decide that the three other contracting Governments should be compelled to contribute their proportionate shares of an amount so greatly in excess of what was contemplated in 1963.

Again, this is available to the Leader if he wants to look at it. The Leader quoted clause 43 of the River Murray Waters Agreement. I have an opinion dated two days ago from the Crown Solicitor dealing with that, in which he sets out that it would be extremely difficult for any other Government to compel us to operate the machinery under clause 43 to compel a defaulting Government to proceed. It is here and any member is welcome to look at it. These are opinions to which I subscribe, but they are not the opinions which I have prepared: they have been prepared by public servants, by successive Crown Solicitors of this State. I put them forward with confidence and invite members to accept what is set out in them.

Opposition members know that what I have canvassed in the last few minutes is fact, yet at the risk of jeopardizing the future development of this State they are prepared to defeat the Bill in the hope that it will give them the chance to scramble back into power in South Australia. This is the most cynical playing of politics that I have known in the 15 years I have been a member or that I have ever heard of. That is exactly what it is. The Leader will do anything: he will say anything and sacrifice anyone to get back into office in South Australia. Perhaps there is one thing he will not do (and I beg his pardon, because I must be fair): he will not debate with the Premier on television about this matter. He will do anything else he can to get back into office, but he will not debate, because he knows he will be beaten for the third time. The Leader debated with the Premier once on this matter and lost because of his overwhelming self-confidence before the debate began. He debated against the Premier on another issue that was canvassed in this House in November, and he lost again. He would not have a return bout. The irony is that a few years ago he was offering to debate with the Premier on any issue, but when it came to the crunch this time he put up the weakest of excuses that there was no need to debate this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I was with the Premier on television last evening.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Why not on Monday evening, when the opportunity was there to debate this matter? The answer is that the Leader was frightened that he would be beaten. However, let us not be diverted but let us consider some ways in which the honourable gentlemen has changed his ground and trimmed his sails (if I may change the metaphor) to suit the prevailing winds. I have already mentioned the resolution of 1967 and the motion that he introduced into the House, but I have a few other quotations since then to show how the Leader has changed his tune to catch the prevailing winds (that is a mixed metaphor).

Mr. Clark: You haven't done that at all!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is what the Leader was reported to have said in February, 1969:

Technical studies undertaken by the River Murray Commission had supplied information which would have enabled South Australia to go to arbitration and enforce the agreement for the building of Chowilla dam, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said tonight.

I have already said that the technical report does not give any such evidence that I can find. I invite his deputy, who seems to be ready to speak next, to point out the evidence that would have supported arbitration. What did he say a few months later? In July, 1969 (and perhaps we should all be mindful of this) a press report stated:

A two-dam policy could put South Australia in an impossible position financially, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said today.

The report continued:

But to tie South Australian finances up in a way which would mean one would have to stop all other public works would be an impossible situation.

Mr. Corcoran: Read on. He probably had a solution.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That was in July, 1969. In September, 1969, the following report was issued:

A notice of motion that no major storage on the Murray River system be allowed to supersede the building of the Chowilla dam was given by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) in the Assembly today.

He now says that the Dartmouth dam must be built. Then, a press report of March 3 of this year states:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said the Labor Party would not vote for Dartmouth on the basis of details so far published.

And, to give him credit, he has stuck to that one up to this point. What did he say on

the morning of April 2 of this year, according to the *Advertiser*? (Actually, he probably said it on April fools' day, but it was reported on April 2.) The press report states:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday it was pre-election year and the Government did not want to risk accidents.

He was referring to the fact that it did not appear that Parliament would be sitting. He implied that the Government would be pretty careful and would not take any risks that would endanger its existence. He said this on the day that a proclamation was made by Executive Council summoning Parliament. What did he say on television on the evening of the same day? It was an extraordinary coincidence, and a most unhappy coincidence for the member for Frome, that he was at Peterborough. He was questioned by Mr. David Flatman, a wellknown A.B.C. television interviewer whom most of us know and like. He said he was surprised at the Government's move (he could not say anything else after what he had said in the press earlier that day). The interview proceeded as follows:

David: So the Labor Party will not agree to the legislation in its present form?

Don: No.

David: Are there any changes to which you would agree in this special session?

Don: No.

The Leader of the Opposition now has some amendments on file, but on April 2 he said "No changes", because changes would mean that the agreement would have to be renegotiated. He said that the vote on this matter would have to be "Yes" or "No". He continued:

We can't amend the agreement, because it is an agreement between the States. What needs to be done is that the agreement should be renegotiated between our States, the other States, and the Commonwealth.

Later in the same interview David Flatman asked him:

Well, the point still remains in front of the people of South Australia that we want this water as soon as possible but, if the Government was defeated and the Labor Party elected, it is going to be longer before an agreement is reached.

He was right on the beam, of course. The interview continued:

David: How will you get around that?

Don: Well, it's only a matter of months.

David: You say, that you could renegotiate a new deal and agreement with the other States in a matter of months.

Don: I should think so, I don't see any reason why not. I don't see that a renegotiated agreement, without ensuring that we will get Chowilla in the future, is so difficult to negotiate.

That is what the Leader of the Opposition said on April 2, but by April 9 he had had some second thoughts. In the *News* of that date he is reported as saying:

I have not suggested for one moment that I can renegotiate the agreement in three months to get Chowilla started in that time.

These are very amusing changes of attitude. Later, in the *News* we find the Leader denying that there had been any switch in relation to the Dartmouth dam. The report states:

Opposition leader Mr. Dunstan today denied he had shifted ground on the Dartmouth dam issue. Mr. Dunstan said Labor had from the signing of the agreement said it was not opposed to the building of Dartmouth.

Previously he had insisted that it had to be Chowilla first. I understand the Leader had one set of amendments on the file yesterday but he has replaced that set with another set today. So, there we have some of the changes in the Leader's attitude. What I would like to know from the Opposition, particularly the Leader, is how he would renegotiate this agreement. How does he intend to persuade the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria, let alone the Commonwealth Government, to renegotiate the agreement? What does he intend to use by way of persuasion or coercion on the other States to renegotiate the agreement? What does he expect to get out of renegotiation of the agreement? I have never heard him suggest one card that he would have in his pack to get a better agreement or a renegotiated agreement for South Australia. One of the other ironical things about it is that the Leader is not a very good negotiator. Anyone who has been to a conference of managers of the two Houses knows that he personally is not a good negotiator. From experience I know his strong points and his weaknesses, yet he says he will renegotiate this agreement and get a better deal for South Australia without a card in his pack.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I got the town planning legislation through.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: South Australia is only one party to the River Murray Waters Agreement. We are out after our own interests. The Government believes it has got a very good deal for South Australia, but every other State is looking to its own interests, too. One only has to look at the debates on this matter in the other three Parliaments to see that. I must admit that the Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament opposed the agreement; it created much fuss, fury and sound over it, and some disgraceful

scenes resulted. It did that after the announcement of this special session had been made. It is a rather different story if one looks at the debates that took place in the New South Wales and Victorian Parliaments. However, before I leave the Commonwealth scene I point out (because I see a member of the House of Representatives here) that no South Australian A.L.P. member of the Commonwealth Parliament got up in either House and suggested that the Chowilla dam should be built or attempted to amend the agreement. Why did A.L.P. members there not move in that way? It is in conformity with the resolution of the last meeting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members are not careful I will apply the gag.

Mr. HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney-General ought to avoid provoking a scene in this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question. Does the Attorney-General have to forgo his time limit because of the disturbance created by the Opposition?

The SPEAKER: If both sides are going to waste the Attorney-General's time, I cannot help it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No A.L.P. member of the Commonwealth Parliament moved an amendment in favour of the Chowilla dam. The reason was that Victoria and New South Wales would not have countenanced it for one moment. The only reason why the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament could oppose this legislation was that it knew it was certain to pass without its support. It opposed the Bill in an attempt to bolster the South Australian Opposition for political ends and for no other reason whatever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let us look at what happened in the Parliaments of New South Wales and Victoria. In both Parliaments there was no opposition whatever by the Labor Party, the Country Party or any other Party to the ratification of this agreement. In New South Wales, there was a division on one clause of the Bill. Mr. Johnstone,

the member for Broken Hill, who was, I think, leading for the Opposition, disagreed in Committee to clause 4, which would include the Menindee Lake storage in perpetuity in the Murray River scheme. He said he was being selfish about it and, of course, he was (so would anyone be in New South Wales if the Leader came along and tried to renegotiate it). But there was no division on the second reading and no suggestion of an amendment to get Chowilla. The only point at issue in New South Wales was the inclusion of the Menindee Lake storages in perpetuity in the scheme. To underline the urgency of this matter, I may say that the agreement with regard to the Menindee Lake storages expired at the end of 1969. The commission is carrying on now under the arrangements but there is no legal basis whatever for that until this agreement is ratified by this Parliament and, if it is not, we are going to be in a pretty pickle indeed.

Mr. Virgo: More threats!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, that is not a threat; it is a statement of fact. That is the New South Wales position. There was no opposition and no suggestion of opposition in that State. I have the New South Wales debates here if any member wants to look at them. Even more interesting is the attitude to this matter of the Labor Party in Victoria. It is a most extraordinary thing. The Leader was questioned about this by Andy Thorpe, I think, the other day, and he said that he did not know what had happened in Victoria; all he knew about was the motion passed at the twenty-eighth annual meeting or conference of the Labor Party. It is a pity that he does not look at what happened in Victoria, because his Party colleagues are not behind him on this matter. Mr. Floyd, the member for Williamstown, led for the Opposition in the Victorian Legislative Assembly, just over a month ago on March 17 (St. Patrick's Day), and I will refer to what he said about the Chowilla project. This is a Labor spokesman speaking, one of the people with whom the Leader hopes to be negotiating in about a month's time, because is there any member opposite who does not at least hope that the Labor Party will win the general election in Victoria in a month's time?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: These are the people, if that were to happen, with whom members opposite would be negotiating. The

Leader would be negotiating with Mr. Floyd on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, Mr. Holding.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, that gentleman was content to allow Mr. Floyd to lead for the Labor Party in this debate, and every other member who spoke in the debate, whether he be Labor or Country Party, complimented Mr. Floyd on what he said. At page 3383 of the Victorian *Hansard*, Mr. Floyd stated:

In 1963, the agreement was varied to allow for the construction of the Chowilla dam. In 1961, in desperation, the South Australian Government thought it was an excellent idea because South Australia had suffered droughts in earlier years and it has no great streams to supplement even its metropolitan water supply, which depends on a couple of holes in the hills. South Australia relies to a great extent on the River Murray for water. A Federal election was due in 1961 and the Commonwealth Government—which this Government—

that is the present Victorian Government, I presume—

hates but will not say so—as is its usual custom at election time, threw out a sop. Sir Thomas Playford, who was getting old in his job, was anxious to do something before he retired. He dreamed that the construction of Chowilla dam could solve the water problems of South Australia. He hurriedly put up the proposition, so hurriedly that subsequent events demonstrated that whoever put up the scheme ought to be ashamed of himself. However, in its desire to offer sops to State Liberal Party Governments, the Federal Government jumped on the bandwagon and provided Sir Thomas Playford with this wonderful propaganda just prior to a State election.

At that point Mr. Floyd, the first spokesman for the Labor Party, was pulled up by the Speaker, and after that he went on to say:

I intend to deal exclusively with the Bill and to explain that Chowilla was a fake. I intend to quote the Premier and other honourable members of the Liberal Party to show that they fully supported the scheme. The proposal was a fake and a political gimmick.

His Party is the Party with which the honourable Leader, when he comes to power in South Australia, as he devoutly hopes he will in a few weeks' time, will be negotiating.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A general observation was then made which I think cannot be controverted. Mr. Floyd said that the Labor Party expressed some reservations about Chowilla in 1963 and continued:

In fact, any person with a knowledge of water would have done so because it is not sound policy to build a water storage at the

mouth of a river. It is wiser to build a storage at the head of a river so that the stream can be commanded from its head down to its mouth.

There is much good sense in that, and that is said not by us and not by Sir Henry Bolte but by Mr. Floyd, the chief spokesman for the Labor Party. I will not quote all of these things (others can do it) because it is a little tedious and painful for the Opposition. However, there is just one other quotation I will give from Mr. Floyd's speech, as follows:

At the time, the Opposition queried the validity of this hasty decision, which had been conceived in 1961 for the purposes of the Menzies Government as a sop to bolster Sir Thomas Playford's brainchild, which turned out an abortion.

That is the official attitude to this matter of the Labor Party in Victoria and, while I do not subscribe to it for one moment, it shows the difficulties that the honourable gentleman will have in convincing his colleagues in another State that this agreement should be renegotiated. We know, as he knows, that he cannot renegotiate this agreement. He does not care two hoots, though, whether he can renegotiate it or not so long as he can defeat us in this House and cause an election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader does not care two hoots about any future benefits to this State or about the future of this State, so long as he is Premier again. He thinks this is the way to become Premier again and he will do anything, as I have said, to become Premier again. His name was actually referred to in the debate in Victoria. Sir Henry Bolte referred to him and suggested that he would not like some of the things Mr. Floyd was saying. This is what Sir Henry Bolte said:

Dunstan will not be too pleased about that.

Mr. Floyd said:

Never mind about Dunstan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Surely if anything shows the hollow sham that the Party opposite is putting up it is that speech of Mr. Floyd and his colleagues in the Victorian Parliament only about five or six weeks ago. There is not much more that I want to say. There are a couple of points which the Leader made in his speech and to which I can reply, although I will not be able to reply to everything he said, but there will be others who can do that. As I understand it, the Leader bases

his claim that Chowilla is being abandoned in this agreement on the fact that the works at Lake Victoria, which may be enlarged, would be flooded and therefore wasted; and he says, therefore, that no Government would ever agree to the building of Chowilla, because this would be a waste of money. May I point out to him something which he either does not know about or has deliberately overlooked, namely, the reference to this matter in the technical committee's report. If one reads page 5 of the technical committee's report one finds that this matter is dealt with, as follows:

Revised information on the estimated cost of the Chowilla project has been provided to the committee by the South Australian representative. In making an economic comparison between the Chowilla and Dartmouth alternatives it is proper that the appropriate cost for Chowilla be based on the additional expenditure required to complete this project and allowance made for any additional costs which might be required to the Lake Victoria works if the Chowilla project did not proceed. The South Australian representative has indicated the extent of these works in a separate report on the "Role of Lake Victoria". The estimated costs of the proposals range between \$4,700,000 and \$7,200,000.

Of course, the Leader chose the higher figure and did not refer to the other one. I now come to the following sentence to which I wish to draw attention:

If Chowilla does not proceed as the next stage of development this capital will need to be found in addition to that required for the construction of Dartmouth.

Clearly, if one looks at the technical report those works at the inlet and outlet of Lake Victoria are contemplated only if Chowilla does not proceed. The change has been made in the agreement so that we will not have to go back and change the agreement again if it is decided to proceed with these works, but the works are not to proceed if Chowilla is to proceed. Therefore, the point the Leader makes has no substance in it whatever. I will read the sentence again as follows:

If Chowilla does not proceed as the next stage of development this capital—

that is the capital to do the works at Lake Victoria—

will need to be found in addition to that required for the construction of Dartmouth.

If the studies that are to be initiated as a result of the moves by the Premier last week result in Chowilla's proceeding, that work will never be done, because it will not need to be done. That is the answer to the point the Leader has made. As I do not want to be the first member to be belled out, I will not be able to say any more, but I hope I have said enough—

Mr. Clark: You've said too much.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —to illustrate the cynical, political opportunism of the Leader of the Opposition and his Party in this matter. Members opposite are putting their own interests and those of their Party above the interests of South Australia and its future welfare. I hope they do not succeed.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): The Attorney-General should be a good judge of cynical, political opportunism, because no-one is better qualified than he is to judge. On this occasion, however, I believe he has made a big mistake. During his speech, the Attorney-General wandered a little. I must say that, in view of the fact that this is a subject that is so serious for South Australia, I think the Attorney-General treated the matter rather lightly, and I do not think his attitude did him much credit. He said that the Leader and his Party would do anything and were desperate to have an election. There is only one person in this Chamber who will be responsible for an election if this agreement is not ratified, and that is the Premier, because it is he who has laid his Government on the line, so he says. We did not make that decision: the Premier made it, and there was no need for him to do so. I do not know whether members of his Party had an opportunity to be involved in the decision.

Nevertheless, the person who will be responsible for any general election, as a result of this matter held in this State, before the normal time will be none other than the Premier, who is doing everything he can to get an election. He has even gone to the extent of insulting you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose that, in the past, you have been insulted by experts. I dare say that on many occasions Opposition members have, probably rightly, taken the opportunity to do just that, because we have had good reason at times to do so, but I do not think the Premier has had good reason to do so unless he is trying to get you off side because he wants an election.

Mr. Clark: He checked to make sure that this would be so.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, I suppose he did. The Premier is keen to have an election. He has insulted the person whose votes have propped up his Government in office undemocratically for the last two years. The same vote propped up for three years from 1962 to 1965 the previous Liberal Government. Now we see the gratitude that that vote receives. The following report of a meeting in Renmark appeared in a newspaper:

Referring to the Speaker (Mr. Stott), Mr. Hall said it was incredible that after 37 years in Parliament Mr. Stott did not understand what the River Murray Waters Agreement was about. "Mr. Stott says he knows better than the unanimous combined reports of the engineering experts of four Governments," Mr. Hall said. "Mr. Stott will speak no facts, see no facts and hear no facts. Mr. Stott is no longer the balance of power. He can be dismissed from this argument."

Sir, the Premier was inviting you on a personal basis to vote against him so that he could have an election, yet the Attorney-General has said that we are desperate and will do anything, irrespective of the issues involved, to get an election. If a general election occurs as a result of a debate on this issue, I will have to face my third election in a little over two years; I do not think any politician savours that sort of treatment.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And some members of our Party will go out of Parliament if an election is held now.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is so, and we may have more feeling for our colleagues than members opposite have for theirs. The real issues at stake on this occasion affect South Australia vitally. The Attorney-General spoke about the advantage of the additional water that will accrue to this State if Dartmouth is proceeded with. Let me tell the Attorney that, before we left office, we were aware that additional water was most likely to be available if we accepted this sort of deal. Although we knew that, we also knew that other matters had to be taken into account apart from additional water. No wonder the Attorney has spoken about the remarks of Labor Party members in Victoria and New South Wales and of his Liberal colleagues in those States. They are not keen on Chowilla because they know that for their States they will possibly get a far better deal out of Dartmouth, but where does South Australia fit into this picture?

Mr. Nankivell: People will be better off with Dartmouth.

Mr. CORCORAN: They will not be in the long term, as the honourable member knows.

Mr. Nankivell: That's rubbish.

Mr. CORCORAN: The honourable member is saying that we get a better deal from Dartmouth. We will get a better deal if we have Dartmouth and Chowilla, too. The real issue is whether we, as South Australians, will stand by the things that were done. I want to go briefly through the history of this, in this State prior to the Labor Government entering office, so far as the future water supplies of this State

were concerned. In order to do this (and too many people overlook this fact) we must go back to February, 1956, and the moves then made by the Commonwealth Government to divert water from the Snowy River into the Murray River. Victoria and New South Wales were the only States that would benefit from it; South Australian rights in the matter were to be completely ignored.

Mr. Nankivell: But they did not have any water.

Mr. CORCORAN: Just a moment. In a few minutes, I will read what Sir Thomas Playford said about this because it is important to establish in the minds of the people of this State and of members these facts so that they cannot be ignored when we are thinking about the moral rights in this matter—not the legal rights, because they have been adequately covered by the Leader.

In 1958 there was an amendment to the River Murray Waters Agreement. Sir Thomas Playford (the then Premier) introduced the River Murray Waters Act Amendment Bill, and this was the start of some alteration to the agreement which culminated in an agreement being reached between the three States and the Commonwealth in 1963 to build Chowilla. Sir Thomas said:

This Bill ratifies the amending River Murray Waters Agreement by which the claim of this State to a share of Snowy Mountains water is accepted by the other parties to the agreement. The agreement was signed on the 11th of last month and was the result of nearly three years' difficult and complicated negotiations between South Australia on the one hand and the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales on the other. It was early in 1956 that the Government first learned that New South Wales and Victoria proposed to share between themselves the water which would be diverted into the Murray from the Snowy River by the Snowy Mountains Authority, and that South Australia was to be excluded from any share in this water.

The Government immediately took the matter up with the Commonwealth. On February 27, 1956, we wrote to the Prime Minister pointing out that the Snowy Mountains project had been financed from revenue and that South Australia as a contributor would expect to receive a fair share of the water. We asked to be allowed to see the draft agreement before it was signed. This request, though reiterated from time to time, was consistently refused. It was not until the Snowy Mountains Agreement was signed more than 18 months later that South Australia received a copy of it. The agreement confirmed the information which the Government had previously received. It provided that the Snowy Mountains waters were to be shared equally between New South Wales and Victoria. It also provided that the River Tooma, one of the tributaries above

the Hume reservoir, whose waters had to be taken into account in working out South Australia's share in a time of restriction, was to be diverted from the river by the Snowy Mountains Authority without any provisions for compensating South Australia for loss of its share of this water.

From the outset of the negotiations, South Australia has claimed that if Snowy Mountains water is diverted into the Murray above Albury it will become part of the Murray and must be taken into account in working out South Australia's allocation of water in a time of restriction.

There were various opinions to support the views expressed by Sir Thomas Playford. When the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth refused to come to the party on this, Sir Thomas Playford thought that South Australia's rights in this matter should be protected, and he took out a writ in the High Court to prevent this action being taken.

Mr. Broomhill: And he had the Attorney-General's full support.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. He issued a writ and after that the negotiations and conferences continued. Finally, New South Wales and Victoria conceded the justice of South Australia's claim and agreed to define our rights by the only effective method. On that occasion the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria would have sat on South Australia, but Sir Thomas Playford did not let them. As a result of his action in taking out that writ, Chowilla was conceived and planned, and in 1963 the agreement was ratified; the present member for Flinders (Hon. Sir Glen Pearson) introduced the Bill. When he explained it, he said in his final remarks:

I know that it is dangerous to mention particular persons when discussing such an achievement, but I should like to mention Mr. Dridan (Engineer-in-Chief), who is South Australia's representative on the River Murray Commission.

The successful conclusion to the negotiations that had been carried on for so long by Sir Thomas Playford and other Ministers of his Government was the fact that the Chowilla agreement was ratified.

Are we in South Australia to turn around without a fight of any description and lose forever the right to build Chowilla? That is what it amounts to, because I am not deceived by what the Attorney-General has said. I am prepared to back fully the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in this matter. There is plenty of room for doubt when we look at the agreement as drawn here: any other contracting Government or party to the

agreement (the Commonwealth, New South Wales or Victoria) has the right at any stage to veto work commencing on the Chowilla dam. The Attorney-General has said that nobody asked for that right, that obviously it was given away on a plate.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Attorney-General did not say that: I said it.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Leader said that it was obviously handed to them on a plate—I correct myself on that. The Attorney has made great play of the fact that certain things were said in the Victorian and New South Wales Parliaments on this matter by some of our colleagues. It is appropriate that we should relate to the House some of the things said by the Attorney's colleagues on the matter not so long ago. Let us see what the top dog of the show had to say. On August 15, 1967, the Premier himself said:

It is imperative to South Australia that this project be proceeded with, particularly in view of the action that has been taken in the last few decades by other States to construct additional storages on the tributaries to the River Murray. Examples are the Burrinjuck dam on the Murrumbidgee River, the Eildon weir on the Goulburn River and the Menindee Lakes storage on the Darling River. We know the present rate of use in other States of water that would otherwise flow into the Murray, and we also know what the future use will be. Not only is the supply, particularly in such dry periods as this, important to those in South Australia who use the Murray River for domestic supply and for irrigation purposes: we are also faced with the important matters of the salinity and quality of the water. To rely on storages built in other States is not to do justice to ourselves. We want this water impounded not in Victoria or New South Wales but in South Australia.

Mr. Virgo: What does the Premier say to that?

Mr. CORCORAN: He then said:

Sir Henry Bolte suggested building a dam 60 miles from Melbourne.

Sir Thomas Playford interjected that it would cost as much as Chowilla. The Premier also stated:

I do not know the figure, but we have to stand up to these negotiators and be hard-headed about the matter. We must not give away even one inch. This morning's *Advertiser* reports Sir Henry Bolte as saying:

It is expected that "shelving" of the Chowilla project could lead to an early move by the Commonwealth Government over the use of water from Victoria's proposed \$60,000,000 Buffalo dam.

Why should we stop work on a project ideal for South Australia and accept a \$60,000,000 project in Victoria for which we may have to contribute?

That is what the present Premier said about this matter when he was Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Broomhill: It sounds like a statement by a different person.

Mr. CORCORAN: It certainly does. The Attorney-General says that this agreement has been ratified already by the other Parliaments. He admits that the Leader is correct in saying that, although it has been ratified, it is still not law, because this agreement will not become law until the legislation has been passed by this Parliament. The Attorney has said that we will deny water to South Australia if we fail to pass the measure, but he knows as well as you, Sir, and I know that the fact that we do not pass it on this occasion does not mean that something will not be done reasonably soon to provide the water that the State needs.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: In three months?

Mr. CORCORAN: I am not stating any particular time. The Attorney knows that it is not true to say that we will deny South Australia this additional water. He was trying to prove that we would deny it for all time! He has handled many truths badly this afternoon. He has said that, if we refuse to pass this measure, we will be responsible for water restrictions in South Australia one year in three. I ask the Attorney when the Dartmouth dam would be effective if construction was started tomorrow. He said that filling could be commenced by 1975. Because of the average rate of flow in the Mitta Mitta River, the dam would not be effective before the end of this decade.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Nonsense!

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney is trying to convince the people that, if we do not act now, we will be in trouble immediately. The Chowilla dam was planned to meet our needs by the end of the last decade.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What is your authority for saying that about Dartmouth?

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney said that it could not commence to fill until 1975.

Mr. Nankivell: No. You said that.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What is your authority for saying it would not fill before the end of the century?

Mr. Broomhill: He said the decade, not the century.

Mr. CORCORAN: I also ask the Attorney what steps have been taken in Victoria and New South Wales to control the expansion of permanent plantings. The Attorney knows that

those Governments have not taken action similar to the action of the Australian Labor Party Government in South Australia. I am referring to our action to control the expansion of permanent plantings in this State. The Attorney also knows (in fact, he said it in his speech) that the position regarding demand is far more desperate in New South Wales and Victoria than it is in this State, and this is one of the best bargaining points we have. If we are to get what is due to South Australia, these are the matters that we should have been considering. Can you imagine that old bush-ranger, Sir Henry Bolte, softening up on a point unless not to do so would hurt him and his electors? We have the points with which to bargain. The Government asks us how we would negotiate for Chowilla. The situation with water requirements in New South Wales and Victoria is such that there is a need to do something immediately.

Mr. Broomhill: There's excess demand.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, yet the Attorney says that this is one reason why New South Wales and Victoria are so anxious to get on with the storage. The Government is destroying the yield to the other States from the Chowilla dam. One assumption fed into the computer was that there should be a flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura at all times. That destroyed the figure of yield to the other States and turned the people of New South Wales and Victoria against Chowilla. No-one can tell us why that assumption was made. Was it made because the people of the Sunraysia district in Victoria put pressure on Sir Henry Bolte, saying that the quality of water in that area must be improved and that the way to do that is to provide a flow past Mildura of 900 cusecs at all times? The effect of this study on opinion in the other States about Chowilla was drastic. No-one had studies made on the basis of a flow of 300 cusecs or 600 cusecs, and no-one seems to recall that the quality of water at its worst at Mildura is twice as good as that at Renmark at its best. These matters must be considered, and we have a moral right to Chowilla.

Mr. Virgo: And a legal right.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Leader has dealt with our legal right, and the Attorney knows that we have a legal right. The people of South Australia will not be fooled by Government statements designed to panic them. An example of such a statement is contained in the Governor's Speech, part of which states:

If these agreements are not ratified there is no prospect of any increase in the entitlement of this State to water from the Murray River nor for the building of any additional storages.

One would think this was the be all and end all of the matter, that if something did not happen now, it would never happen. What rubbish! Of course it will happen, but it should happen on our terms, not on terms laid down by Victoria and New South Wales. On television the other evening we saw the Premier standing in front of the House, waving his arms around and indicating that this was where the matter would be debated. I do not know when he will be sent to Hollywood. Supporting him he had Mr. Fairbairn, the former Minister for National Development, who has been sacked because he nearly toppled the "boss" in Canberra. He is extremely keen on Dartmouth, because it is near his electoral district. This is the person whom the Premier puts up to convince the people of South Australia that the Government is doing the right thing by this State in introducing this Bill.

Mr. Broomhill: Did the Premier tell us where Mr. Fairbairn's district was?

Mr. CORCORAN: No, but I have told the House where it is. I do not think that there is any need to wrangle over this matter. I consider it to be clear-cut. If we vote for this amendment now, we sound the death knell of Chowilla: Chowilla would be gone forever. The so-called experts know that, too. The Premier has told us that we should not ignore the advice of the experts in this field, but I recall the argument about fluoridation, with some top experts being against it and some being in favour. Where do we go? Do we go down the middle?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: This House took the right decision on that matter.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am explaining that we cannot place complete faith in experts. On another matter the experts made a report in 1961 and a different report has turned up in 1967. The basic assumptions are the matters that count. The Attorney was criticizing the Leader of the Opposition for having moved a motion that provided for alternatives, and he was extremely upset about that. The present Government issued a pamphlet *Fourteen Facts About Chowilla* in November, 1968, which was some time after the Leader had moved the resolution that was eventually amended and voted for by the Leader.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: After they got their studies.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. Point No. 13 (which may be unlucky for the Government) stated:

The South Australian Commissioner at the last River Murray Commission meeting accepted the move by the other parties for comparison between Chowilla and an alternative site rather than create a dispute which would have unduly delayed the project. We are determined to have this comparison made on the basis that South Australia must receive all of the advantages from any alternative that it would obtain from Chowilla.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This is what the Government said.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, and I repeat, "all of the advantages from any alternative that it would obtain from Chowilla". Yet the Attorney-General was critical of the Leader for saying exactly the same thing. It was amended, but there it is in the pamphlet issued by his Government.

Mr. Evans: Do you still support it?

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not think the honourable member knows what to support.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He has not been listening to the Premier's speeches. He had better catch up on that.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney-General made great play about the fact that only one amendment was moved in the House of Representatives and that there was a great fuss over the whole affair, because we were upset about it. The Attorney knows the score and he knows that the disturbance was not concerning the merits or demerits of Dartmouth and Chowilla. It concerned the gag that was applied by the Leader of the House (Mr. Snedden) when the Opposition tried to move a further two amendments to the measure. The Attorney-General is as honest in that instance when he was describing it to the House as he has been in many other things he has described. We have heard so much about Dartmouth and its effect, and we have been told that this is the best dam for the whole system and that that cannot be disputed. We are concerned particularly about South Australia, and should consider the history leading up to the planning of Chowilla in the first place and our moral right to have Chowilla, the thing we should be fighting for but which has been given away by this Government. This Government thinks it has had a great victory in getting the additional water that we would get, but we should have Chowilla on our front doorstep, and not a dam six weeks away.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You do not know the facts if you say that.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney said that we would get the additional water in every year.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Rubbish!

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney said that: I heard him. He knows that that is not the case. Where do we get the water if there is a series of drought years? How much will there be to get?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: If you read the report you would know the answer.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is borne out by the report.

Mr. CORCORAN: We have heard about the estimated cost of Chowilla rising from \$28,000,000 to \$43,000,000, and then a firm tender price of \$68,000,000. Naturally, this increased cost caused concern to the contracting Governments, but that was not the only problem. Salinity was another problem, and we know of this, because we were in Government at that time. However, in a comparison of salinity Chowilla comes out better than Dartmouth for this State, and concerning cost we had a firm tender of \$68,000,000 for Chowilla.

Mr. Hudson: And \$6,000,000 less without the lock.

Mr. CORCORAN: Of course, and we should take into account the \$6,000,000 already spent on the dam. We have an estimate of \$57,000,000 as the cost of Dartmouth, plus \$8,000,000 for the cost of works at Lake Victoria. This is only an estimate but it still totals \$65,000,000. We know what Chowilla would have cost if it had been built. I do not think that this Government has made the correct decision. The fact that at the last minute the Premier had to alter his Bill is sufficient for me to say that he did not negotiate this matter as well as he should have. He has included what we could call a sop in the Bill and that should indicate to the people of South Australia that he is pulling the wool over their eyes, and he has included it in order to say to them that he is still trying for Chowilla. The Leader pointed out that that does not affect anything. The Premier knows this and so do Government members, but they are prepared to include it in order to deceive the people of this State into thinking that they are fighting for something that they have already given away.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): At this time we are not debating whether we want Dartmouth or Chowilla. It is a simple issue: it is either we get Dartmouth now or we get nothing.

This fact has been shown many times. The member for Glenelg may laugh in his usual raucous manner but the proof of what I am saying will be evident if he defeats the legislation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are no more convincing to us than you are to the people in your district.

Mr. ARNOLD: That will be a selfish point of view but it will prove once and for all who was correct. Members would know of the petition that had been circulated supporting the simultaneous construction of both dams. A small percentage of the people who signed this petition would be prepared to accept nothing. If you ask them they will tell you that they support the simultaneous construction of both storages but they will not support a proposition that gets them nothing. If it means that we are to finish up with nothing we will have to proceed with the Dartmouth storage, and this is precisely what the Leader of the Opposition has said recently in the newspapers. We have heard of the overwhelming support for constructing both dams. There was an uproar at Loxton when the council voted to support the immediate construction of the Dartmouth storage, and out of that uproar came a ratepayers' meeting. In the Loxton district there are 1,558 ratepayers and, of those, 150 attended a ratepayers' meeting to protest at what the council had done. Of those 150 ratepayers only two-thirds supported a resolution that both dams should be constructed simultaneously.

Mr. Hughes: Not a bad percentage.

Mr. ARNOLD: They did not move a motion supporting the idea of double or nothing; they supported what was circulating in that petition—the simultaneous construction of both dams. For the benefit of the member for Wallaroo, the number of ratepayers I have referred to is 6.4 per cent of the ratepayers in the Loxton district.

Mr. Hughes: I did not mention that: I said "Not a bad percentage".

Mr. ARNOLD: A report in the *Advertiser* of April 16 states:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) has now stated quite clearly that Labor agrees that Dartmouth should be built first. Earlier the impression had gained ground that Labor was firmly wedded to the proposal to build both dams at once. Mr. Dunstan said on radio on Tuesday night: "The L.C.L. either doesn't understand—or hasn't heard—that Labor agrees that Dartmouth will have to be built first. It has missed—or has not understood—that the essence of our stand is that in building Dartmouth first, South Australia should not lose its right to Chowilla later."

And this is precisely what the Premier has placed before Parliament. At a well-attended public meeting on the night of April 16 in the Ozone Theatre at Renmark many Opposition supporters did their best to see that the remarks of the Premier and me could not be heard. I congratulate the editor of the *Murray Pioneer* on the well-balanced report he gave of the meeting held by the Premier and that held by the Leader of the Opposition on the following night. Concerning me, the report in the *Murray Pioneer* states:

Mr. Arnold was the first speaker for the night, but the majority of his audience was unable to hear the arguments put forward owing to the raucous interjectors. It was obvious to many spectators that a number of those in attendance had no intention of listening to the address nor allowing others to hear what Mr. Arnold had to say on the issue.

I do not know whether the Opposition considers that these are fair tactics to use in these circumstances. Concerning the meeting held by the Leader of the Opposition, the report in the *Murray Pioneer* states:

The Labor Party in South Australia supported the building of the Dartmouth dam, but considered that we should retain the right to build Chowilla also. This was stated by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan), when he addressed a capacity audience in the Ozone Theatre, Renmark, on Friday night.

People in the Upper Murray are thankful to the Leader of the Opposition for helping to show them what the situation is! There is a vastly different opinion in that district since those two meetings have been held. A letter, written by a constituent on the night of Mr. Dunstan's meeting, states:

Mr. Dunstan stated at the meeting tonight that he cannot guarantee that Chowilla will be built simultaneously with Dartmouth or will be the next reservoir after Dartmouth but he will negotiate, and this depends on the computer figures for the next priority, which is exactly what Mr. Hall promised last night at his meeting.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. ARNOLD: As I said before the dinner adjournment, we are here to determine whether we accept or reject an additional 250,000 acre feet of divertible water for South Australia. Every member in this Chamber knows in his own mind, if he is prepared to be honest about the situation and to face up to the reality of the evidence (both legal and technical) that has been placed before us, that we have no alternative at this stage but to proceed with the building of the storage at Dartmouth and to make use of this additional 250,000 acre feet of water.

This issue has been completely clouded in the minds of the public because of many laymen's theories put forward by the Opposition, theories that are not supported in any way in legal or engineering circles. This was pointed out by the Premier when he referred in the House to the opinion of the Crown Solicitor. At present this State uses about 700,000 acre feet of divertible water. I ask the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), as an economist and so forth, that, if he could place an estimated value on this 700,000 acre feet of divertible water, what would it be worth to South Australia as capital development, on the one hand, and as gross annual income on the other?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: When we look at it from the point of view of the river districts with a population of about 30,000 people, we realize that those people are completely dependent on one factor, namely, the Murray River and on using a portion of this 700,000 acre feet of divertible water. Whyalla and Port Pirie, as well as the bulk of the industrial complexes in the metropolitan area, are also dependent on portion of that 700,000 acre feet. What would be a fair estimate of the value of this water to South Australia? In 1967-68 about 78 per cent of the water required in the metropolitan area had to be pumped from the Murray River.

Mr. Broomhill: No-one is denying this.

Mr. ARNOLD: The point I am making, if the member for West Torrens will wait for just a minute, is that, bearing in mind the value of capital investment and annual income gained for the State which is based on this 700,000 acre feet, we realize that an additional 250,000 acre feet represents roughly a one-third improvement on the present position. We have to face up to the reality that, as Chowilla is not being built at this stage, there is a loss of capital investment in this State of about \$70,000,000. However, when we talk about defeating this legislation, we must compare this aspect with the colossal monetary gain that can be derived from an additional 250,000 acre feet of divertible water, representing a value running into thousands of millions of dollars. We are at present determining whether we should reject this enormous impetus towards the development of the State. I do not think anyone can honestly believe that it is common sense to reject it.

Mr. Burdon: What about the water that runs out to sea at Goolwa?

Mr. ARNOLD: The greatest problem this State has to face is the parochial outlook of the various States. Let us imagine that the boundaries between the States of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia did not exist, and it was all one State of South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: Why would it be all South Australia?

Mr. ARNOLD: I said that we should imagine it was all one State and use South Australia as an example. If this study had been carried out in those circumstances and the engineers had recommended that, in the interests of the people as a whole, taking in the area of the three States, it was more advantageous at this time to construct Dartmouth in South Australia instead of Chowilla—

Mr. Burdon: Dartmouth isn't in South Australia.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am afraid the honourable member is not capable of keeping up with my argument. The point I am making is that if it were not for State boundaries the argument we are discussing this evening would not have arisen; we would look at the matter clearly and decide what would be of greatest benefit to all the people concerned. We have now been arguing over this matter for about 10 years, and we have not yet achieved one extra acre foot of water for South Australia. I am convinced that if we continue to argue we can do so for another 10 years and we will still not have an additional drop of water. Of course, we know what will be the position in South Australia in 10 years' time without any additional water. A good example of what can happen if people continue to argue is the case of the Blanchetown bridge. For several years people argued about where the bridge should go, and it was not until the arguments finally petered out that the bridge was built.

Mr. Clark: The Public Works Committee made a recommendation.

Mr. ARNOLD: It can be seen that people learned from the example of the Blanchetown bridge. When the next proposal for a bridge across the Murray River was discussed and the sites of Overland Corner, Kingston, Berri and so on were suggested, people in the area soon decided the bridge should be built at Kingston. The people of Berri and Overland Corner recognized that if they continued to argue no bridge would be built. I congratulate the Berri council, because it accepted that the next bridge would be at Kingston and, as soon as the work was commenced on the bridge at Kingston, it started campaigning for a bridge at Berri. We should

follow a similar course on this occasion. We should proceed with what we know can be proceeded with, while continuing to work for the project at Chowilla. That policy is in keeping with the views expressed by the various newspapers in this State. It has been said that the people of the State do not want the dam at Dartmouth, but let us look at the editorials of the *News* and the *Advertiser*.

Members interjecting:

Mr. ARNOLD: Perhaps members opposite are frightened to look at the editorials; I know they do not support the Opposition's argument.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What about the Renmark newspaper?

Mr. ARNOLD: I hope the Leader has read last week's edition of the *Murray Pioneer*.

Mr. Burdon: I hope you read the editorial page.

Mr. ARNOLD: I did, and I thought it was an excellent editorial. At a public meeting in Renmark I was asked, "Where does a member of Parliament's duty lie?" I answered that question by saying: "A member's duty and responsibility lie in two directions. First, he has a duty to his electorate; secondly, especially if he is part of the Government of the State, he has an overall duty and responsibility to the State as a whole."

Mr. Broomhill: You got out of that fairly well.

Mr. ARNOLD: This is an important point. We have seen too much of this business of forgetting the State as a whole. If a person accepts responsibility on behalf of the State, he must face up to it. No problem has ever been or ever will be solved by running away from it.

The Leader in today's *Advertiser* made the point that he disagreed with the legislation concerning Lake Victoria. Lake Victoria is probably one of the most important parts of this whole matter. If the Leader knew anything about water management, he would realize how important this is—how important it is now and how important it will be right up to the minute that the Chowilla dam is built. At present, the outlet from Lake Victoria is capable of issuing into the Murray a maximum flow of 2,383 cusecs. This is almost identical to the maximum figure of 134,000 acre feet monthly that we receive during the summer months in South Australia as our entitlement, but this is not sufficient to control the salt slugs that occur from time to time. They can occur accidentally at any time.

Whether or not we like it we have the evaporation basin set-up. It can happen in South Australia in our own set-up. We have the evaporation basin from the districts and if an accident occurred at any of these basins (for instance, a bank could break at any time) the only way to shift the salt slug that would occur would be to release a great quantity of water that could be pushed through quickly. When we go to 178,000 acre feet monthly in the height of summer, in the peak period of our requirements, the quantity of water at present capable of being released from Lake Victoria is quite insufficient. Even if Chowilla was commenced tomorrow, a considerable sum of money would still be needed to be spent on Lake Victoria, even at this point of time, to keep it operational and improve it above this point.

When we have a monthly allocation of 178,000 acre feet in the peak periods of our requirements, in the summer, it will be necessary for Lake Victoria effectively to control our system in South Australia by being able to release to the river at any time between 4,000 and 5,000 cusecs and not 2,300, which is the present maximum capability. This is an important factor in the management of the river in South Australia. It is a point that most growers in the Upper Murray recognize, because they are used to managing and handling water, and they recognize the need for this.

The original draft of the present legislation did not include this work on Lake Victoria. That matter was of considerable concern to me and I was extremely pleased that the Premier had been able to have this Lake Victoria work included, because it is vital. To take that out of the agreement at present would be the worst possible thing that could be done to the whole river system. I suggest that any member opposite who does not believe me should discuss this point with any good engineer who has had anything to do with Murray River management. If he does that, he will get exactly the same answer. Lake Victoria plays a vital part in the management of the river in South Australia and it is important that the output and input to Lake Victoria be increased to between 4,000 and 5,000 cusecs.

At the public meeting in Renmark it was also said that Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland have had Commonwealth grants for dams in those States, and the question of why South Australia had not had a similar

grant for dam construction was raised. Until the time that we can have a dam in South Australia that is more efficient and can supply water to us more efficiently than can one built elsewhere, we will not get such a grant. There is another aspect in relation to which this type of grant could be made. Last year a committee, of which I am a member, was formed at Barmera, in the Upper Murray, to consider various aspects of the irrigation distribution systems in the Government irrigated areas. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has made a survey of the type of system required in Barmera, Berri, Waikerie, and such places. At present a modern distribution system is being installed at Renmark.

The department freely admits that in some areas, such as the Ral Ral Division of the Berri irrigation area and in the Chaffey area, the distribution system is so inefficient that only about 50 per cent of the water pumped from the river reaches the grower. When the Government is able to present a case setting out clearly the requirements of the irrigated areas for a modern distribution system, if this shows conclusively that a saving of from 30 per cent to 35 per cent of the water we are pumping would result from it, we will have a good case based on water conservation. Such a scheme brings not only water conservation but also expansion, and this is the type of project for which we are likely to get a grant from the Commonwealth Government. This is water conservation and on this basis we can foresee the rehabilitation of the distribution systems in these areas. This is the type of project to which we can look to get a grant of \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000.

I could speak at length, because many matters are involved. I do not know whether the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) would like me to describe why, even if Chowilla is built now, we will not be able to stop all this good water running out to sea, or why we will not be able to conserve 5,000,000 acre feet of water annually. I do not know whether he has tried to work these things out, but it is simple. At this time it is accepted by all Opposition members that Chowilla will give South Australia a minimum of 1,250,000 acre feet. This means that this is the limit of development in South Australia.

Mr. Virgo: Why?

Mr. ARNOLD: Because we can only develop to our guaranteed minimum quantity.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are not arguing against Chowilla at all.

Mr. ARNOLD: The State cannot develop beyond the point of the guaranteed minimum. We have been told that there is an average of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 acre feet that passes a point near Chowilla. If we have a divertible limit of 1,250,000 acre feet and have a series of good years with the average flow past this point, the first year we build Chowilla we can divert from it 1,250,000 acre feet plus evaporation and other incidentals. That is all we can then save out of the next 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 acre feet that run past that point. We can only put back what we have taken out, and the rest of it must run out to sea. This is a fact whether we like it or not, but this is not the issue at this time. We have to decide whether we want this additional 250,000 acre feet and the decision clearly rests with the Opposition. Referring to the remarks of the Editor of *Murray Pioneer*, as mentioned by the Leader, each week he usually puts underneath his editorial a notable quotation, and I thought that last week's quotation was fitting and worth repeating tonight, because it should give Opposition members something to think about. It is by a person who should be well known by name to all, a wellknown Prime Minister of years gone by.

Mr. Langley: Ben Chifley!

Mr. ARNOLD: No, it was Benjamin Disraeli. If members do not remember him by name then they did not go to school. The quotation that the Editor used on this occasion was, "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct."

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): In addressing myself to this matter I wish to refute from the outset a charge that has been levelled by Government members. The Attorney-General has said, "Here we are in Government willing to sacrifice the reins of power on this issue, and that must mean that, as we are willing to make a sacrifice, the Opposition is simply playing politics." I point out to Government members, and people generally, that if this Bill is defeated and an election is held there will be five Opposition members who will not have a seat in the following Parliament. Those five members, in voting against the Bill, will vote themselves automatically out of Parliament. I refer to the members for Hindmarsh, Whyalla, Stuart, Frome, and Wallaroo.

Mr. Virgo: The member for Wallaroo will beat the Premier at the election.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown can make his speech afterwards.

Mr. HUDSON: I am quite happy to have interjections, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Well, I am not.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Wallaroo may well give the Premier an awful fright.

Mr. Virgo: No; he will beat him.

Mr. HUDSON: The point at issue is that members on both sides of the House could well be making sacrifices as a result of the votes they cast. So, it ill behoves the Attorney-General to make the accusation that the Opposition is just playing politics. There is one point central to the whole issue that must be made immediately. We are told by the Attorney-General and the Premier that, if the Dartmouth dam is constructed, storage of water in it cannot be commenced until 1975. I had thought that it might be 1974, but the Premier and the Attorney-General have both said that it will be 1975 before the wall of the Dartmouth dam is high enough to permit storage to commence. I presume that that will mean the River Murray Commission will not be able to call tenders for constructing the Dartmouth dam, even if this Parliament passes this legislation, before 1972 or perhaps a little later. This is because it is possible to commence storage in the Dartmouth dam before the wall is built to its full height.

So, if this agreement is delayed at this stage through non-passage through the South Australian Parliament, that does not mean that there need be any delay in the point of time at which tenders are called. It does not mean that there need be any delay at all in the point of time when storage of water can begin at Dartmouth, and it does not mean, therefore, that there need be any delay in the point of time when Dartmouth may be declared effective. So, when members opposite attempt to tell us that the choice is "Dartmouth or nothing", they are misleading us: this is not the choice with which we are faced at present. Furthermore, it must be recognized that it is highly unlikely that the Dartmouth dam will be declared effective until well towards the end of the decade, and the Attorney-General and the Premier are playing loose with the facts when they suggest that the Dartmouth dam can be declared effective in 1976—one year after storage commences.

Mr. Virgo: Their statement is contrary to the technical report.

Mr. HUDSON: First of all, clause 25 (b) of the agreement provides that once the Dartmouth dam is declared effective there must be a reserve of water held in the Hume and Dartmouth reservoirs and the Lake Victoria

storage of not less than 2,000,000 acre feet on the 30th day of April in any year, of which reserve not less than 200,000 acre feet shall be in the Lake Victoria storage. So at the end of the irrigation season in any year, once Dartmouth is declared effective, there must be a reserve of 2,000,000 acre feet in the three storages combined.

There has been no year in the last 10 years when at the end of April there has been a storage of 2,000,000 acre feet in Lake Victoria and the Hume reservoir combined. In every year for the last 10 years at the end of April the reserve of water held in Lake Victoria and the Hume reservoir combined at the end of April has been less than 2,000,000 acre feet. The lowest figure for the Hume in that period is 25,600 acre feet, and this was in April, 1968. In many other years the figure was about 500,000 acre feet, and the highest figure over the last 10 years occurred in both April, 1965, and April, 1967, when there was a little more than 1,200,000 acre feet. In Lake Victoria, for the last four years for which I have figures there has not been more than 350,000 acre feet and, apart from April, 1963, we have to go back to April, 1959, to find Lake Victoria holding, at the end of April, more than 500,000 acre feet.

Therefore, under current conditions we would normally expect the Hume reservoir and Lake Victoria at the end of April to be holding a combined storage of between 600,000 acre feet and about 1,700,000 acre feet. That would mean that, if we attempted to declare Dartmouth effective in its first year of operation or in the first year in which it was filling, we would automatically have to declare a year of restriction, because the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement, if it is amended according to the principles of this further amending agreement, require that a period of restriction shall be declared if the River Murray Commission is of opinion that there will be less than 2,000,000 acre feet in the Dartmouth and Hume dams and Lake Victoria at the end of April in any one year.

So, the commission can declare Dartmouth effective in 1976 only if a period of restriction was also declared, and the same would probably apply in 1977 and also probably in 1978. In a period of restriction (and, of course, the Premier never tells the public about a period of restriction) we do not get 1,500,000 acre feet: we get only one-third of the available water. Therefore, we do not get our entitlement. So, Mr. Speaker, let no-one be fooled that the flow of the Mitta Mitta River is

likely in any one year by chance to be so great that it would get over this problem. The average flow of the Mitta Mitta River, according to information given in this House on February 11 last year by the then Minister of Works, is 580,000 acre feet a year, and at a normal average flow we can expect that it will take 5½ years for the Dartmouth reservoir to fill. Of course, it can be declared effective before it is full, but it would be an extraordinary chance if in the year in which water was commenced to be stored at Dartmouth there was a sufficient flow in the Mitta Mitta River to allow the storage to climb to such a level that Dartmouth could be declared effective.

I do not mind Government members using legitimate arguments that they have at their disposal, but let us have no more of this distortion of the probable situation that the Attorney-General and the Premier have indulged in by attempting to tell the public of South Australia that we can expect Dartmouth to be effective and therefore our entitlement to go up to 1,500,000 acre feet in 1976. It is likely that this will occur between 1978 and 1980, and that presumes that we do not run into any difficulties in the period of calling tenders. Goodness knows what might happen if, when tenders were called, there was an escalation of costs that put the cost of Dartmouth more than 10 per cent above the estimate of \$57,000,000.

Mr. Broomhill: That's the end of the agreement.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, because as soon as it goes more than 10 per cent above \$57,000,000 every State and the Commonwealth has the right to say "No".

Mr. Broomhill: This would be likely to happen.

Mr. HUDSON: There is no guarantee that even if this agreement passes in its present form we are going to see Dartmouth constructed for sure and operating by the end of this decade. I would suspect that if we did run into a further escalation of costs concerning Dartmouth the Commonwealth, in order to save face, would have to come to the rescue pretty quickly. The burden of what I want to argue follows from this essential point that I have made. If there are weaknesses in this agreement that we can see, it is important to bargain for improvements at this stage while we still have bargaining power and while no delay need be caused in the commencement of the Dartmouth dam, rather than wait until it is too late, when we only develop a complete wrangle and

when we have already tossed away our bargaining power, anyway.

What is this bargaining power? The report of the technical committee of the River Murray Commission states that the existing water requirements of New South Wales and Victoria amount to 2,700,000 acre feet a year. The graphs in the technical committee's report make it clear that the minimum guaranteed supply to New South Wales and Victoria at present is 2,090,000 acre feet a year. At present there is an excess demand for water along the Murray River in New South Wales and Victoria of a little more than 600,000 acre feet, according to the technical committee of the River Murray Commission. This situation has occurred in New South Wales because of the system that operates in that State and Victoria, where there is not a complete system of water licensing. Some people are granted licences and guaranteed water every year, while others have to make do with water sales and get water only in the years in which it is available. Nevertheless, in both New South Wales and Victoria permanent plantings along the river have gone ahead on the basis of getting water in most years.

I want to establish first that New South Wales and Victoria at this stage are in a really difficult position with respect to meeting their existing diversion requirements. Within South Australia the position is not easy but we can still get by. We got by in the difficult period of 1967-68 in which, over the full year, less than our entitlement was passed down to us. If we take out the month of June, 1968, only about 900,000 acre feet came down during the main months during which we wanted to use the water. That was a year in which we got less than our current entitlement, but we were still able to get by without water restrictions in Adelaide.

Who has the bargaining power? Who stands to gain the most in regard to existing demands if the agreement for Dartmouth is ratified: New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia? I suggest that New South Wales and Victoria are under the greatest pressure at present to get immediate ratification of this agreement. Once we have made this ratification, any bargaining power that arises to us is lost. To illustrate the position further I refer now to the River Murray Commission minutes of April 24, 1968, when the President of the commission, the then Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn), who represents the seat of Farrer in the Commonwealth Parlia-

ment, a seat which contains a significant section of the Murray River and the town of Albury immediately downstream from the Dartmouth dam site, expressed concern at any further delay in making a decision on the site for the next reservoir when irrigators were agitating for more storage. That statement was made in 1968 by Mr. Fairbairn with regard to the political position facing him in his own district. I suggest that members on both sides must recognize that South Australia now has considerable bargaining power, with respect to New South Wales and Victoria, over this matter. Although it may be true that in the very long run South Australia will be much more dependent on water from this source than will New South Wales and Victoria, nevertheless the existing excess demand in New South Wales and Victoria is massive, while the position has been kept pretty well under control in South Australia.

What are the things for which we can bargain at present to take advantage of this situation? First, if we believe that this agreement is giving away for all time rights that we have previously had, we may wish to consider whether we should not bargain further in order to retain these rights. It has already been pointed out that the clauses in the agreement that give New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth a right to veto any further progress on Chowilla and the clause that provides for the works at Lake Victoria (works that would be flooded by the Chowilla dam if it were constructed) effectively ensure that Chowilla will never be built. The Premier says it might be built at some subsequent stage, but it will never be built, because I believe that, as long as the existing position regarding water use is maintained in New South Wales and Victoria and as long as the existing assumption that the technical committee makes is maintained (namely, that we work out a scheme that maximises the use to New South Wales and Victoria while giving South Australia only its entitlement), it will always be necessary to build the next storage on the upper part of the Murray River to ensure the maximum supply of water to New South Wales and Victoria and to ensure that the new excess demand that has been created continues to be met. I believe that, if this agreement goes through, we are saying that the next Murray River storage after Dartmouth will not be at Chowilla but will be at some site on the upper river. Sites that are mentioned as possibilities in the technical committee's report are Murray Gates and Geehi.

Do we have an interest further in trying to bargain with New South Wales and Victoria to introduce a strict system of water licensing along the Murray River? What will happen if New South Wales and Victorian irrigators get much more water available to them as a result of the construction of Dartmouth reservoir and they continue with their present pattern of water use? What will happen is that the New South Wales and Victorian Governments will issue water licences up to a level of the present guaranteed supply, increased by Dartmouth; on top of that they will continue with the system of water sales, and it will not be very long before excess demand builds up there once again. Every increase in the use of water in New South Wales and Victoria will mean over the years increased salinity in South Australia.

It is no accident that over the centuries many irrigation schemes throughout the world have killed themselves as a result of pollution, as a result of the drainage water coming back into the system or source of water supplying the irrigators and increasing the salinity, the salinity eventually rising to a stage where the water was no longer usable. We run a grave danger that this situation will occur along the Murray River unless we in South Australia see to it that further irrigation developments in New South Wales and Victoria are strictly controlled.

After all, the salinity figures show quite clearly that it is the irrigation settlements in South Australia that will be the first to be knocked out of existence as a result of the deterioration in water quality. Let me, to emphasize this point, quote from a report that I do not think has been made public. It is a report of the Engineering and Water Supply Department by Mr. J. S. Gerny on the effect of the Chowilla reservoir upon the salinity of the Murray River in South Australia, and it is dated October, 1967. At page 6 of the report, he points out the following:

There is little doubt that a large storage at Chowilla will iron out the short-term peak salinities which at the present time are a problem. Apart from this, its presence will permit the flushing downstream of saline waters ponded behind the weirs in South Australia. While this will make inroads upon the amount of water available for general release, the reduction in downstream salinities will be of considerable value to this State.

A little later he says:

A further advantage of a large storage at Chowilla is that monthly discharges may be varied to suit the needs of the season. At the present time, flow to South Australia is being

controlled in accordance with a restricted entitlement which leaves no latitude for salinity control.

Later Mr. Gerny deals with the upstream salinity problem created by irrigation upstream in New South Wales and Victoria, which returns drainage water to the river and increases salinity in South Australia. He states:

It should be noted that water diverted into the catchment area by the Snowy Mountains Scheme will carry a small load of salt which eventually will be discharged through South Australia. The intention is that all the Snowy Mountains water will be used before it reaches the South Australian border. It appears to be inevitable, therefore, that, in dry years, the salinity of the South Australian entitlement will be increased by more than 50 p.p.m. of total dissolved salts on this account alone. An essential condition of long term irrigation is that all salt introduced by the irrigation water is leached out by the drainage water which is the inevitable by-product of the process. Unless special precautions are taken this water will find its way back to the river picking up on its way some salts from the soil. In the catchment area of the River Murray most of the soils have a significant salt content. It follows that the more the water diverted the greater the total quantity of salt to be expected in the river. As both these factors add to the salinity, there is no doubt that a substantial build-up of salinity is possible.

I want to emphasize particularly this passage in the report, in which Mr. Gerny states:

In this discussion an important consideration is that, provided the South Australian entitlement is met, all drainage water can be reused until the general level of salinity becomes too high for diversion purposes. With the additional water provided by the Snowy Mountains Scheme, there is little doubt that New South Wales and Victoria (with, perhaps, help from Queensland on the River Darling) can allow the salinity problem in the River Murray to grow to the point that the South Australian entitlement can be met in quantity and yet be too salty for horticultural and domestic purposes. If this situation is allowed to occur the more valuable irrigation uses will be denied to this State and a valuable asset will be lost to the country as a whole.

That report made in 1967 (reference P.D. 48) makes absolutely clear that there are prospective dangers to South Australia from increased salinity in the Murray River and that increases in irrigation along the river in New South Wales and Victoria can lead to increased drainage water of high saline content coming back into the river and increasing the salinity of the water we get.

I suggest that it is very much in our interests to ensure that, if New South Wales and Victoria are to get more water out of the Dartmouth dam, irrigation in those States is

controlled and prevented from getting out of hand once again, because otherwise we will have a future Chairman of the River Murray Commission saying that irrigators are agitating for more storage, still more irrigation development, and a further up-river dam, and this will result in still more salinity. I suggest that, quite apart from the two-dam question and our rights to Chowilla, we should not pass this agreement until New South Wales and Victoria have agreed to introduce a strict system of water licensing along the Murray River. That ought to be a condition that we impose on New South Wales and Victoria, and I would impose a still further condition.

It seems to me that at this stage our knowledge of the sources of salinity and of the movement of groundwater is not great enough and that we are not able, even if we have the money to adopt preventive measures, to know exactly what such measures should be adopted. I should like to see established a salinity control commission into which there were regular contributions from New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and the Commonwealth for research and preventive work. I would make it a condition for passing this agreement that such a commission be established. Apart from the question of Chowilla dam, it would be in South Australia's interests, particularly if Dartmouth dam is constructed, to see to it, first, that we have strict control of water licences instituted by New South Wales and Victoria and, secondly, to see that we have an established salinity control commission with regular contributions of finance available from the other States, South Australia and the Commonwealth, and a regular expenditure on research and preventive measures.

Do not let the Premier tell us that he has the best deal he can get. When we were in Government we were told that we could have 1,500,000 acre feet in order to get agreement for Dartmouth because, as Mr. Fairbairn said, the irrigators were agitating for more storage, and pressure was being applied in New South Wales and Victoria on this question. We should see to it that we get measures instituted that ensure the long-term viability of our irrigation settlements, because I believe there is a grave danger to their future. If we get more years like 1967-68, I cannot see how a citrus grower at Mypolonga will survive for long. They got by in that year only by irrigating at night, and even then many trees in the area were knocked out. How long can Waikerie put up with the salinity that it

experienced in 1967-68? These matters are vital.

The member for Chaffey spoke about the extra investment that would come from having more water, but we must consider the capital assets we will lose if the water we get becomes too poor in quality. I believe that our position should be, first, to say that we do not object to the construction of Dartmouth dam but, at this time, we know that Chowilla will give us protection, particularly in relation to the quality of water which is not granted to us in any other way at present and, secondly, that we are not willing to ratify this agreement until we have an agreement that protects our rights to Chowilla. I hope members of both sides agree with me that we should ensure that there is proper control of irrigation developments in New South Wales and Victoria and regular expenditure on research into and control of salinity. I believe that we would be failing in our duty to the people of this State, indeed, to the whole nation, if we did not bargain for those things now. I believe that even the member for Albert, when he talks to the people at Meningie (and I know he has been telling them that if they get Chowilla they will have to drain the lake) may tell them, "Look, my friends, you will never be able to divert any of this water for any purpose unless we ensure proper control for irrigation developments upstream and proper measures for the control of the salinity problem." I wonder whether the member for Albert will care to tell them that. Perhaps you will care to tell them, Mr. Speaker. Over a period much has been said about the technical committee's report, and I have been very critical on this point.

I have previously related the story that has been told for generations about expert economists; it does not relate to expert engineers, but I think it may well apply to them, too. If we stretched all the economists in the world from one end of Piccadilly to the other, we still would not reach a conclusion. To some extent, of course, the same point applies to the question of where we will obtain the greatest yield. If we vary the assumptions behind the information that is fed into the computer, we obtain different answers. For example, although some time ago I asked a question on this matter, we were not told whether or not a condition of the computer studies was that there had to be a minimum of 2,000,000 acre feet of water in the Hume and Dartmouth reservoirs and the Lake Victoria storage at the end of April each year. Was that a condition of the computer studies?

Variations have certainly been made. Even I can see that they have increased the minimum flow conditions: they provide not only for 900 cusecs past Mildura—now we have a couple more minimum flow conditions thrown into the agreement for good measure.

In the original studies I presume that the computer was told to assume that any water stored in the Menindee Lakes above 90,000 acre feet was available for the use of the River Murray Commission but, to placate New South Wales, the figure has now been increased to 100,000 acre feet. I wonder what difference that will make to the yield of either dam, and I wonder what difference will be made if the flow of the Mitta Mitta River at the Dartmouth dam site turns out to be different from what it is expected to be. Certainly many engineers will say that one cannot really get any complete answer on where the next storage should be until the Dartmouth dam is operating. They say—and this is one opinion I have heard—that until they see the Dartmouth dam operating and can check it back with the conditions of the original studies, they will not know anything. That is how confident they are about the predictions of the studies that have been undertaken.

I do not think it is profitable to go into more detail on this matter now. Suffice to say that I believe that different results can be obtained from these studies by varying the basic conditions that the computer is told to assume. The computer does not determine these basic conditions. They are not even determined by the engineers: they are determined by the politicians. The people of Mildura will not accept less than 900 cusecs, so we must satisfy them! Some of the conditions that have been imposed are political conditions, and members opposite have never really been willing to recognize that. The main issue in this whole question, apart from the points I have dealt with, is that this Government, although it does not really want to tell the people of South Australia this, is prepared to ratify this agreement and give up Chowilla for all time. We are fobbed off with this new amendment, yet the Premier said earlier "No amendments at all." He has said many things. I came across this article today.

The SPEAKER: You cannot display it.

Mr. HUDSON: I will have to display this one, Mr. Speaker. The *News* of May 6, 1968, had the headline "Premier to sell Chowilla".

Well, he sold it all right. There have been great changes in the Premier's attitude on this matter. First, he said, "I will accept no amendment at all." Now he is going to put in an amendment about which, in a letter to other Premiers and the Prime Minister, he says, "Of course, you realize this does not alter anything, and it does not mean anything at all."

Mr. Broomhill: In other words, he is saying, "I have to fool the people of South Australia."

Mr. HUDSON: That is what it looks like. We are being asked, in effect, to ratify this agreement and to give up, in our opinion for all time, any rights that may still exist with respect to the Chowilla reservoir. I do not believe that we should be willing to do this. We still have the bargaining power, and using this power will not cause any delay in the project because the River Murray Commission is not ready to go to tender and there are important advantages that can be gained for South Australia as a result of this process of bargaining that I have outlined tonight. I believe that we would be failing in our duty if we were not prepared, in the interests of the people we represent, to try to secure these additional advantages which, after all, are vital to protect everything that depends in South Australia on the quality of the water that we get out of the Murray River.

Mr. McAnaney: Have you read the Act?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, I have, and it contains nothing about minimum flow conditions.

Mr. McAnaney: You are talking about the Murray; you seem to be right away from the agreement.

Mr. HUDSON: I know it is difficult for the member for Stirling to understand an argument, but I suggest for his benefit that he might care to read what I have said and cogitate carefully and then perhaps come back in a week's time and we can discuss it again over a cup of tea. I ask Government members to reconsider the position that they have taken on this question, and I ask the Premier to reconsider his position and to see the advantages which I have outlined and which can be obtained as a result of further bargaining and not to give all our rights away at this point of time, because once we agree to this proposition they have got us, and we shall have lost the bargaining power that exists at present. I emphasize that Dartmouth cannot go ahead without our agreement. We must use our right wisely and well.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I was very interested in the closing remark of the member for Glenelg that Dartmouth could go ahead

without our agreement and that the commission could go ahead and get everything ready and call for tenders and that it did not really matter whether there was a delay, for the commission could do this of its own free will and accord. Well, if he reads the agreement he will find that the commission cannot even put a pen to paper without there being some agreement from this State.

Mr. Hudson: All sorts of studies have been made, and there is no agreement now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg has had his say.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I listened to the honourable member for 45 minutes, and I wished that his speech had been written out so that I could follow some of the things he said and then try to put him right. The interesting thing (and I have made this point already) is that the commission cannot start work until this Parliament agrees. This is the right of veto that we have, and this is the very power the honourable member is saying we should use as a bargaining point. Therefore, how can the commission start unless we agree that it shall start? Let us see what the agreement says about the waters of the Murray River because, after all, we are talking about a Murray River agreement. I have a very well amended copy here of the agreement, clause 45 of which states:

The flow of the River Murray at Albury, including the natural or regulated flows of all tributaries of the River Murray above Albury as regulated by the Hume Reservoir shall be shared equally by New South Wales and Victoria.

Victoria and New South Wales have sovereign rights to this water. We have talked today about the Snowy Mountains Authority and the Leader referred to it. What is the situation regarding that authority? We had no rights to the diverted water except in time of restriction, and I suggest that Sir Thomas Playford used the provision as a bargaining point not because we had rights but because we wanted something else. He was pretty good at that. It is stated in the agreement that the Tooma River diversion consists of water that is diverted from above Hume into the Murrumbidgee and, therefore, New South Wales must make some compensation to Victoria for this water. However, there is a credit and debit arrangement, because there is now water coming back from the Adaminaby dam through the power stations into the Murray River. This is water that is not basically tributary water but water that has been diverted from Snowy Mountains Authority storages.

We have no rights to the water in the Snowy system, and what has been said about that is a lot of poppycock. As for this \$4 a person that we are supposed to have been paying, this is presumably money that is paid by all those people in Australia paying taxes and thereby contributing to the construction of the Snowy Mountains scheme (on the assumption that it was built out of revenue). But what about people in Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania who also make some contribution towards this? What consideration do they get? None! At least we get something back out of it in a year of restriction, because we are entitled to some of the water that is diverted.

I am informed by engineers, having taken the trouble to discuss the matter with them, that the procedure of building a dam such as the one proposed at Dartmouth is, first, to construct a diversion tunnel and then to commence building the wall. It can be controlled during the process of construction, as it is a rock and earth-fill dam, just as in the case of the Kangaroo Creek dam. The only difficulty is that when the permanent valves are put into the outlet there must be a safe storage in the reservoir sufficient to prevent an overflow of the dam, because no spillway is provided at the top, and damage could otherwise occur. Therefore, there can be a safe fill in this dam during the whole process of its construction.

It is wrong to say that it has to be completed before it can start to fill. It is also wrong to guess that it might be 1980 before the dam is filled, because it might well be longer. On the other hand, it might well involve a shorter period. As the member for Glenelg will know, he having quoted from various figures, the Mitta Mitta in one year flowed at the rate of 3,000,000 acre feet. It is unlikely that the dam will fill in one year, but it is quite likely that it will be effective by 1978-79.

I am informed that the Chowilla dam, had it been constructed, would not have been effective until the same time. It would have required a major diversion the whole time that the wall was being constructed, because that type of dam cannot be filled while it is being constructed. That was to be a most unusual dam, as one of this type has never been built in Australia; in fact, there are very few of this type in the world. This sort of dam has no pier footings; it is a floating wall, as it is called, and this is something that adds to the cost. That is why we do not know even now what would be the cost of such a dam. We have talked about who owns the water in the upper storages; what about the water below Albury which the honourable member is saying we

could tell Victoria and New South Wales not to use? What does it say in this agreement, which has been a valid document since 1915, about the tributary flow? Clause 46 provides:

Except as provided for in clause 60B hereof and subject to subclause (2) of this clause, New South Wales and Victoria shall each have the full use of all tributaries of the Murray River within its territory below Albury and shall have the right to divert store and use the flows thereof and shall have the right below the affluence with the Murray River of any such tributary to divert store and use volumes equivalent to those arriving at the place of diversion as the result of contribution by any such tributary in addition to any other share of the waters at the place of diversion.

In other words, if they put in water higher up they can take it out lower down, and they can take out what they put in: it is their water. Let us make no bones about the fact that the water in the Murray River belongs to Victoria and New South Wales except for what they give us by entitlement, or what we get purely and simply because their tributary storages cannot contain the overflow. However, it is their water and if they could contain it and divert it they could use it. There is no doubt that they are entitled to use it. The fact that they cannot contain it means that we have this flow through South Australia. No-one should think that it is a disadvantage to have this flow of water coming down the Murray. It cleans the river out, reducing the salinity, and it brings behind it a large volume of fresh water.

Mr. Hudson: It looks after Lake Albert.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, and Lake Alexandrina, and the honourable member knows that the evaporation of those lakes is not provided for under this agreement.

Mr. Hughes: You aren't so interested in those lakes now.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am interested in the quality of water at that area, and that is why it is important at that point in the river that there is a good flow of water in this way. At present we are able to guarantee that quality of water but, if at this time another dam is placed on the Murray River, we will not have the benefit of this extra flow. Much has been said about salinity. Much has been said about engineers who have argued the effect of wave action on the lake, such as the lake would be at Chowilla, whether the salt would stratify or whether the wave action on the lake would dissolve the salt slugs that come down the river. It is suggested that this would do something to counter salinity.

The member for Glenelg made quite a play on this question of flows and quality and about what the people of Mildura had demanded, but they have a right to make demands. It is Victorian water that is coming to them for irrigation. When one reads the debates in the Victorian House and the other debates on this subject, one realizes that this was one of the several mistakes made by engineers when they originally considered the Chowilla scheme. They did not consider the effect of no flow past Mildura. The people there had not been accustomed to it, and only when it happened did they realize what it meant. Reference is made to conditions to improve the supply at Torrumbarry and Euston weirs. Anything that is insisted on by the people of Victoria (such as the things insisted on by the member for Mildura in the Victorian House) to improve the quality of water at that point will improve the quality of the water that enters South Australia. This is important. What is more, the River Murray Commission at present has the power to look into and control salinity and is doing so. We do not need a commission other than the River Murray Commission to do this. In fact, this is what the honourable member was talking about: a commission on which there are representatives of the Commonwealth and three States.

Mr. Hudson: They do not get regular finances made available.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The question of regular finances is a question of application by the commission in its report of March 30 each year. In this report it applies for finance for its projected works, and this can be done by agreement. Everything in this agreement has to be done by unanimous agreement: there is no question about that. Now I come to the matter of Lake Victoria, which is a little farther down the river. The point about Lake Victoria is that whatever is stored in it is South Australian water, as no-one else can use that water. Similarly the Menindee Lakes virtually store water for the benefit of South Australia. It is low down the river and, if we have this good quality water from the Darling River stored in the Menindee Lakes, the inclusion of the Menindee Lakes in this agreement guarantees to South Australia another source of good quality water that cannot be contaminated by other States, as was suggested by the member for Glenelg.

Lake Victoria is virtually a South Australian lake and, as the member for Chaffey said, it is in our interest that something be done to improve its inflow and outflow. It would

need to be done even if Chowilla was to be built. It stores 550,000 acre feet of water and it can be used as a regulator to take in good quality water when good quality water is coming down the river. This is a question of management, as the member for Chaffey pointed out. So it is in our interest. Let us put it on the line that other States will get no benefit from this, although they will be paying most of the cost.

An interesting point as regards Lake Victoria is that I am told that the high cost was set in anticipation of Rufus Creek and Frenchman's Creek having to be completely concreted. There was some fear of the saline waters from these creeks contaminating the waters of Lake Victoria, so, to maintain quality as well as improving inflow and outflow, as one would expect from a concreted inlet and outlet, this figure of \$7,300,000 was arrived at. However, I understand that the inquiries of the salinity committee that has been conducting inquiries into the salinity of storages along the Murray River have not substantiated the need to do this, in which case the cost of works on Lake Victoria would probably be about \$4,300,000. They have not substantiated the need for concreting; therefore, at this point of time there was no need to incur this expenditure. In that figure was included the cost of devices for measuring the outflow through Rufus Creek into the Murray. That has been done by the commission and other States for the benefit of South Australia. In this agreement, it is established that it is South Australian water because the only New South Wales entitlement from Lake Victoria is domestic and limited garden usage water for areas adjoining the lake so it cannot be pumped dry, and under the agreement it must be holding 200,000 acre feet of water at April 30 in any one year.

Much play has been made of this question of a year of restriction because, after all, at this time this is what is mostly concerning South Australia. We admit there is a surplus flow of water down the Murray in most years. It is only in a year of restriction that we depend entirely on the metering into South Australia of our monthly entitlement of water.

Mr. Hudson: In a year of restriction we do not necessarily get a monthly flow.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In a year of restriction, as the honourable member well knows, there is a procedure laid down that, if New South Wales and Victoria have been unable to supply us with our base mean flow from excess tributary flow, they then advise the commission

to declare a year of restriction. So, in a year of restriction, when the tributary flow does not meet our base flow, the commission's responsibilities are set down precisely in this agreement. They are to immediately assess the storage capacity, or the water held in storages at Hume reservoir at this time, the water locked in the weirs on the Murray River, and the water stored in the Menindee Lakes and Lake Victoria and declare the quantity of available water. Although in the past, as the honourable member knows, at times we have had less than 1,000,000 acre feet of water coming into South Australia, where present storages have not been able to provide our entitlement.

Computer studies have been carried out on Dartmouth for a period of 55 years. For those years the commission has accumulated run-off, rainfall, tributary flow, and diversion records; in other words, it has built up a complete dossier on the river. In those 55 years, assuming that Dartmouth had been declared effective, there would not have been one year in which we would have been affected by restriction. We would have got slightly less than 1,500,000 acre feet, but not a reduced quantity of any consequence. I think it is important that people consider what this 1,500,000 acre feet means. In the break up of this figure, 450,000 acre feet is for irrigation. That is the total diversion we can make in South Australia for irrigation purposes.

There is a quantity of 325,000 acre feet, for pumping, for domestic, industrial and other uses, and there is a quantity of 725,000 acre feet provided for dilution. This dilution water is the water that not only keeps the irrigation water pure but also keeps pure the water that will be pumped to Adelaide from Mannum and Murray Bridge, to the South-East from Tailem Bend, and to Whyalla and beyond through the Morgan-Whyalla main. This is domestic water and its quality is important. This adds up to a requirement of 1,500,000 acre feet, but Chowilla guaranteed us only 1,250,000 acre feet. This means that although we could not expand, usage of Dartmouth would enable us to maintain our present approximate usage, provided we got this 1,500,000 acre feet. If we get less than that we will have restrictions and I venture to say that those restrictions will apply to the irrigation areas as well as to the other areas to which domestic supply is pumped. The important factor is that we are committed to 1,500,000 acre feet of usage, whereas at present we have a guarantee of only 1,250,000 acre feet.

Mr. Hudson: What is our diversion at present for all purposes?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is something less than 1,250,000 acre feet.

Mr. Hudson: Our diversion?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, for all purposes.

Mr. Hudson: That is what we take out of the river?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. We have not taken up our full allocation for irrigation. There is still about 70,000 acre feet for irrigation to be used, and I think we will be using about 100,000 acre feet for pumping when the existing pumping stations come in, but when the big pumping station at Murray Bridge comes in we will have to step up the domestic diversion to a maximum of 325,000 acre feet a year. If we go above that, we get down to the dilution water, which killed almost all the gardens in Adelaide at one time. We must consider what we will need to divert when we get to the point of maximum usage.

Mr. Hudson: We are diverting 500,000 acre feet.

Mr. NANKIVELL: No. Under the present allocation from the river water we have 564,000 acre feet of dilution water and 600,000 acre feet allowed for diversion. However, there will be a change in that balance. This is the quantity we are allowed at present and it is metered into South Australia on an agreed basis. The flow is set out in the document, in the contract, and in the amendment to the Act. In July it is 47,000 acre feet and in August 94,000 acre feet. This is water diverted into South Australia and is the minimum base flow. We can use more than that if we dare.

One of the mistakes that people have made was to think that we would gain benefit from an additional storage in that we would be able to have the advantage of water in a higher storage and also receive the benefits of having water at a lower storage on the Murry River, so that we could step up diversion from the river. This is not so and cannot be so, because the agreement states that our allocation of water would be metered below Chowilla dam. Some people say we would not only get a base flow of 1,500,000 acre feet, but also the additional water coming down the Muray River into South Australia would be the spill over Chowilla after evaporation losses had been made up. As the member for Chaffey said, first Chowilla would have to fill and then spill before we would get a flow down the Murray River below that dam. I suggest that at this time if, as the honourable member said, we are unable to divert this water for our use, why do

we need to store it? We cannot step up irrigation and increase usage beyond the safe limit of our entitlement, which would be the water we would be guaranteed in a year of restriction. These years of restriction may become more frequent as Victoria and New South Wales divert more water for irrigation, and this is a matter that we have to consider.

I support wholeheartedly the proposal to build a dam at Dartmouth, because it is in our interests to do so. We do not own any of this water: whatever we are given has been arrived at by negotiation. We cannot commit ourselves to the permanent usage of any more water than the amount of our entitlement, otherwise in years of restriction we would be embarrassed. We have not had many years of restriction on the river because Victoria and New South Wales have not been able to divert all tributary water which, under the agreement, they were entitled to. Consequently, we get a greater flow of water into South Australia than we can expect in 15 years or 20 years, or less, when the diversion increases in New South Wales and Victoria, and the water that is coming into South Australia (the surplus water from tributary flows) diminishes to the point where Victoria and New South Wales commit storage water to meet our entitlements. At that stage there would be need for another dam, and I believe that at that time the most satisfactory place to build the dam would be at Chowilla. It will be there to catch the surplus water from other States and the surplus flows at all times. It will guarantee us our entitlement and assist the other States in spreading their risk. I believe the second dam will be built, but I cannot see any reason now to commit \$70,000,000 to build a dam that would not give us any additional water entitlement, would not allow us any increased diversions, and might reduce the flow of water in the lower reaches of the Murray River thereby jeopardizing the quality of water around Murray Bridge from which it would be pumped to Adelaide, and would affect irrigation around the lakes, quite unnecessarily and prematurely. I point out to Opposition members that I am interested in the lakes area. The Hon. Frank Walsh gave a written contract to Sir Barton Pope that he could have 8,000 acres of irrigation water at Meningie. The Labor Government entered into that agreement, yet it is now jeopardizing it. I support the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I want to speak on this Bill because I am interested in the lower reaches of the Murray, which area I

represent. The people there are vitally interested with the quantity and quality of the river water. To some extent I was disappointed in the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this evening. Some of the points he made did not carry much weight, and I was disappointed that he began his speech by playing the personality of the Premier against the personality of the Speaker. I do not think that that is a good way to

begin a speech on such an important Bill. To ensure that I correctly repeat the Deputy Leader's remarks, I wish to consult *Hansard* tomorrow. Consequently, I ask that I have leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, April 30, at 2 p.m.