

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, April 30, 1970

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 1),

Supply (No. 1).

QUESTIONS**ANGASTON-NURIOOTPA ROAD**

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that the District Council of Angaston has recently communicated with the Highways Department about the bad condition of the main bitumen road, about four or five miles in length, between Nuriootpa and Angaston. In a letter to me, the council states that this road is used several times daily by the Barossa Valley road passenger bus service and is undoubtedly the roughest piece of road on the route used by the service. The council, in its letter to the Highways Department, has requested that this road be resurfaced and that, if possible, the work be carried out expeditiously and, in any case, before the next Barossa Valley Vintage Festival, which will be held in 1971. Will the Attorney-General take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to finding out whether this road, which is in such a bad condition, can be repaired as soon as possible?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will refer the matter to my colleague and ask him to give the honourable member a reply by letter if the House will not be sitting next week.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Upon inquiring of the Minister of Roads and Transport about certain matters regarding the South-Eastern Freeway, I was told that a reply to my question would be available today. Therefore, can the Attorney-General, on behalf of his colleague, tell me what cost has been involved so far in the construction of the South-Eastern Freeway, how far acquisition of land in relation to the further route of the freeway has proceeded, and when the freeway is expected to be completed to the Verdun junction, near the Onkaparinga River?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not certain that I have replies to the various parts

of the honourable member's question, but I have some notes on the topics that he has raised.

Mr. Virgo: Just by coincidence?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No. The honourable member explained that he let the Minister know that he intended to ask the question. The first section of the freeway, from Measday's to Stirling, is now completed, except for some minor works including some landscaping, a few outstanding signs, pavement markings and the completion of street lighting. This work is expected to be done before the end of the present financial year. Total estimated cost of the section, including structures, is \$4,000,000. The Stirling to Verdun section is proceeding well on schedule as a result of the dry conditions experienced during summer and autumn. It is expected that this portion will be completed and open to traffic as predicted early in 1972. About \$2,000,000 has already been spent on this length out of the estimated total expenditure of some \$4,500,000. These figures include the cost of all structures. The bridge at the old Mount Barker road and the railway overpass at Bridgewater are well under way, and tenders for other bridges will be called in the fairly near future. Two structures at Raywood were completed last year. Land acquisition and design of the freeway are not advanced sufficiently to enable full co-ordination of all construction activities. However, progress has been made in these areas and work is currently proceeding without serious delays or difficulties. One outstanding acquisition in the Bridgewater area is causing some concern but is expected to be resolved shortly. I hope this information answers the honourable member's question.

THEBARTON CROSSING

Mr. McANANEY: The Public Works Committee, before recommending new school sites, always makes sure they are suitable. I was somewhat perturbed because there was no crossing at the Western Teachers College, where several accidents have occurred. Can the Minister of Education say what action has been taken to provide an adequate crossing there?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I recall that, when I was a member of the Public Works Committee, various Governments and the committee tried to arrange that schools would be built off main streets. Many schools of the older type have been established in places which, unfortunately, are on main roads that

are becoming busier every day. The view taken to date (and the normal practice) has been that when crossings have been installed in such circumstances it is the responsibility of the Road Traffic Board first to assess the suitability of a crossing and then for the council or the Highways Department (or those bodies conjointly) to erect and install such crossing. About three weeks ago I attended the Western Teachers College at the invitation of the Students Representative Council and the President, Mr. Peter Crosby, in bringing this matter to my attention, said that the Western Teachers College was divided. I am not referring to the Currie Street annexe, but at Thebarton many activities are conducted at the part of the college situated on the eastern side of South Road and students have to move from place to place. In such a case the college is really divided. Mr. Crosby spoke to me again last week about this matter, and after discussing it with the Minister of Roads and Transport I have now authorized the installation at departmental expense of a crossing on South Road immediately adjoining the college. This applies only because this is a divided college; in the normal situation where the school is on one side of the street the previous arrangement will still stand. I have contacted the Thebarton council, and it has informed me that it has the approval of the Road Traffic Board for such a crossing to be installed, but that the council considered that it should not have to meet the cost of installing this crossing because its ratepayers would not often use it. I have authorized the installation of the crossing at departmental expense and have asked the Thebarton council to confer with the Road Traffic Board, call for tenders, and have the crossing installed at the expense of the Education Department. I think this action will overcome the problem to which the honourable member has alluded.

DEEP SEA PORT

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the investigation concerning establishing a second deep sea port in South Australia?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Government considers that the proper way to settle the location of the next "super" port is to set up a committee of inquiry to examine the question in depth and to make its recommendations to the Government. The Government intends eventually to appoint such a committee.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: On Tuesday last, the Minister of Marine promised to discuss with the Director of the Marine and Harbors Department my request to have the Wallaroo harbour deepened to enable it to become the second "super" port in South Australia. Has he any further information for me now?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not know that I promised to discuss having Wallaroo made the next "super" port.

Mr. Hudson: You aren't prepared to have it made at Wallaroo?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Wallaroo has asked the question.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have discussed the matter, but not along the lines suggested by the honourable member. About 6,400,000 cub. yd. of dredging would be required to form an entrance channel, swinging basin and berth to accommodate 65,000 dwt. bulk grain vessels drawing 42ft. when fully loaded and a further 300,000 cub. yd. if it is desired that these vessels should be able to sail when there is 1ft. of swell running. As I said in reply to the member for Yorke Peninsula, the Government considers that the proper way to settle the location of the "super" port on Yorke Peninsula should be by referring the matter to a committee, which would make a full inquiry into the pros and cons of Wallaroo and any other site that might be considered. I know that the member for Wallaroo will be able to tell his constituents to give evidence to this committee, and I have no doubt that all the evidence bolstering up the case for Wallaroo will be fully considered.

ROYALTIES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Local Government to my question of April 28 concerning royalties paid by councils and the Highways Department to landowners for road materials?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The payment of royalty for roadmaking material is based solely on the extent of damage suffered by the landowner. There are no standard rates, and the rate is assessed in each instance to ensure that fair and reasonable compensation is paid to the landowner.

MANOORA-WATERLOO WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago the Minister of Works was good enough to receive a deputation introduced by me from the citizens of Manoora and Waterloo making representations to him for a reticulated water supply for these townships and immediate

district. Has the Minister any information as a result of meeting this deputation?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I was pleased to receive the deputation comprising residents of the honourable member's district. As a result of that deputation, I can now report that officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department are re-examining the possibility of providing a supply from a bore and are bringing estimates of costs and rating up to date so that landholders may be advised. This will, of course, take some time.

IRRIGATION LICENCES

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: My question concerns licences for taking water from the Murray River for irrigation purposes. Some years ago we did not worry much about policing such licences, because at that stage we had a fairly adequate supply. However, during the latter years of my term as Minister of Works and also, I think, during the period of my successor (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) steps were taken to ascertain the precise quantity of water being diverted for irrigation purposes as well as its relationship to current licences. Statements have been made that we are over-committed in this regard and that more licences are current than can be supported by a guaranteed supply. Statements were also made recently that, unless we could get additional supplies of water, we would be facing a serious shortage of irrigation water. Can the Minister of Works say how many licences are current and what acreage is covered by these licences? A report prepared by a committee, I think about two years or more ago, showed, if my memory is correct, that licences existed for about 10,000 acres of irrigation more than the assured supply could support in years of shortage. Can the Minister of Works say whether that is correct? If he has more up-to-date figures on this matter, I shall be pleased if he will release them, because they are important at this stage.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As I do not have the precise figures, I will obtain them for the honourable member. I think it is a wellknown fact that about 450,000 acre feet is committed for irrigation. The Government has been unable to accede to what have been reasonable requests for increasing the quantity of divertible water. Currently, of course, this House is considering an agreement to make more water available in order to keep irrigationists happy and to make it possible to accede to the written requests currently lying on my desk. However, I will go into this

matter and let the honourable member know by letter, if the House is not meeting next week.

SEMI-TRAILERS

Mr. GILES: I was pleased to see that the Premier had approved the construction of two escape roads or run-offs on Glen Osmond Road so that semi-trailers in difficulty, involving a loss of brakes, etc., could go on to these roads and not career into the metropolitan area, as occurred recently when a tragic accident caused the death of three people. There are many areas throughout the Adelaide Hills in which a dangerous situation exists similar to Glen Osmond Road, and it would be an impossible task to supply a sufficient number of run-offs to cover all these dangerous situations and to accommodate semi-trailers that get into difficulty. I immediately think of Germantown Hill, where many semi-trailers have turned over, and a dangerous situation exists also at Native Valley. Can the Premier say whether Cabinet will consider making it necessary for all trucks over a gross weight of eight tons to be fitted with emergency brakes? I refer to the flap-type brakes that are held in a container in front of the back wheels; in an emergency, a flap drops on to the road, the back wheels run on to the flap, and this has the effect of locking the back wheels of the vehicle. Although I believe that structural damage may be caused to a semi-trailer, it is far better for that to happen than for someone to lose his life.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question.

Mr. GILES: Will the Premier take this matter to Cabinet, so that the implementation of my suggestion can be seriously considered?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member will realize that the Government has in the last few weeks paid much attention to run-offs in the area concerned. I have with me today a reply to a question asked by the honourable member for Edwardstown, which he has not yet requested and which relates to a more specific aspect of the problem than does the honourable member's question, which deals with the recommendation of the installation of a certain type of brake. Such a recommendation has associated with it the problem of fostering one commercial enterprise. Further, the brake would have to be subjected to many tests. The Minister of Roads and Transport is carefully examining every aspect of this matter. Indeed, his first action

has been to initiate the projected construction of two run-offs, which will not be easy to construct but with which, nevertheless, he is persevering. I will bring the honourable member's recommendation on this type of brake to my colleague's notice.

GUARD RAILS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday regarding the rail crossing accidents that have occurred in this State during the last 18 months, in which I drew attention to the solidity of the construction of the rails used?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads and Transport reports that the question raised by the honourable member is one that has been a matter of considerable public discussion since a day in 1966, after a tragic fatal accident at a railway crossing near Middleton and following a fatal accident at the railway crossing about a mile north of Melrose. In 1966, I believe under the instructions of the then Minister, the Railways Commissioner carried out some experimentation whereby at some level crossings wing fences, guard rails and other installations at level crossings were erected in timber. Those fittings were installed on the basis of an experiment to determine whether less damage would be done at level crossings in the event of accidents.

Following the recent tragic accident at Wasleys, the same point was raised in the press. Whether the railings played any serious part in the damage that occurred through that accident I do not know, because the Government does not yet have the report on that accident. Of course, honourable members will appreciate that the inquest into that accident began yesterday. I assure the honourable member that the matter is one that my colleague is treating as being a particularly serious one.

Immediately the accident occurred at Wasleys and some publicity was given to this aspect through the press, the Minister asked the Railways Commissioner to give him a further report on this whole question. When the report of the Commissioner of Police is received and studied, and if it is the opinion of the Commissioner as disclosed in his report that these railings have played a very serious part in the accident, further action will be taken. It simply means that the Minister's inquiries into this whole question have not yet been completed. The matter of the installation of

fittings made of either timber or light material is not a closed question but is still under review.

MONARTO SOUTH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: My question concerns the sealing and resealing of portions of the yard at the Monarto South Primary School. Although investigations were carried out many months ago by an officer of the Public Buildings Department, no information has yet been supplied to the school committee. Will the Minister of Works call for a report on the present position regarding the resealing of the yard?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I shall be happy to obtain a full report and to let the honourable member have it.

FARM FINANCE

Mr. NANKIVELL: As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem of liquidity in finance in rural areas and also in regard to finance for the purchase of properties in areas throughout the State where farming has become marginal. As South Australia has a Marginal Lands Act with inadequate funds, will the Premier consider, first, making representation to the Commonwealth so that South Australia can make use of this Act to provide money through special banking sources to people who wish to buy land in marginal farming areas? Secondly, as a follow up, will the Premier make representations to the Commonwealth to have implemented an overall plan similar to the marginal dairy farm reconstruction plan to cover all forms of agriculture similarly to the way in which they are covered under the Commonwealth plan? Thirdly, can he say whether the Government intends to adopt the marginal dairy farm reconstruction plan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Because of the significance of the question he asks, I will prepare an answer in some detail for the honourable member. In the last two days, in answer to questions, I have outlined some of the action I have taken in relation to financial difficulties in regard to rural areas, and I shall be pleased to add to that information any material the honourable member seeks.

SCHOOL BOOKS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Education say whether any review has been made of the free school books scheme that applies to parents in necessitous circumstances who have children attending primary schools and, if it has, will he give details of any change made in the present scheme?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Yes, a change has been made in this regard. If I recall correctly, about two years ago the Commonwealth Arbitration Court departed from the practice at that time of using the basic wage as the minimum wage and introduced a new minimum wage with loadings. The result of this new adjustment was that, in the case of the free books scheme which had operated for some years and in which there had been lines of book that did not qualify for the normal free-book qualification (that is, those lines for which parents expect to contribute), some parents were excluded. Steps have now been taken to adjust the means test to coincide with the new minimum wage that has been fixed by the Arbitration Court. This means that about 1,200 more children can now qualify. The new scheme is presently operating. In fact, I have informed several members from both sides, who have made representations to me recently, about this new policy, which I am sure will overcome some of the difficulties experienced, certainly those experienced last year. I think this is a move in the right direction whereby more deserving cases, especially indigent families, can qualify.

OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: As a result of the inadequate drainage, water has been getting under one end of the building of the Oakbank Area School, and this has caused the ground to become saturated, the foundations of the building having sunk and deep cracks having developed in the main building. As a sum of \$13,200 has been allocated to remedy this unsatisfactory state of affairs, can the Minister of Education say (so that I can inform the school committee) when this work is due to commence, as the winter is about to commence and this problem may be further accentuated?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Although I have no information with me at present, I will obtain it for the honourable member as quickly as I can.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Recently, the Minister of Works was good enough to receive a deputation from Watervale, comprising the Chairman of the Port Wakefield District Council and a councillor representing Watervale ward. Can the Minister say what progress is being made in supplying this basic amenity, reticulated water, to the people of Watervale and district?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: My officers are considering this matter and studying the economics of the scheme. When we reach a decision, I will convey it to the honourable member.

MURRAY BRIDGE NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: The provision of a toilet block and 12-room classroom block at the Murray Bridge North Primary School was approved about 12 months ago but, when pegging work was about to be carried out before building started, the overall plan of the toilet block was found to be inconsistent with the plan for the provision of additional classrooms. Therefore, it seems that a delay was caused until a different design plan was adopted. As no information has been available for some months about whether work will commence soon, will the Minister of Works report on this project?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I shall be pleased to take the matter up, consider the problems that the honourable members has raised, and bring down a report.

COURT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McANANEY: During the last session this Parliament passed legislation creating a three-tier court system in South Australia. As I understand that there is a delay in the Supreme Court in the hearing of cases, can the Attorney-General say what progress has been made in establishing the new intermediate courts system?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The arrangements are coming along satisfactorily. The House will recall that this legislation was passed (although there was opposition to it in this Chamber and in the other place) towards the end of last session. In February, Senior Judge Ligertwood was appointed as the first senior judge of the new court and Judge Williams, who had been acting head of the Local Courts Department and a temporary Local Court judge, was also appointed. I expect that we will need at least six judges before the new court comes into operation in order to cope with the work that we expect the court will attract by way of relieving the present Supreme Court work load. As the honourable member has said, this work load is extremely heavy and, if it were not for the knowledge that relief was in sight reasonably soon, it would be a cause for much concern and alarm. However, relief is in sight. Besides the two appointments to which I have referred, I think we will need another four

judges but the time is not right to make those appointments, because the court cannot be brought into operation until accommodation, such as courtrooms and judges' chambers, is available. We are making the best time we can in this regard and I thank the Minister of Works for what he has done since assuming office.

I am afraid that it will be some months before the court comes into operation and, until the required accommodation is ready, there would be no merit in appointing other judges. I expect that two more appointments will be made in about June. In the last few weeks we have appointed three new magistrates (Mr. O'Loughlin, Mr. Merity and Mr. Stokes) and this will provide some relief in the Adelaide Local Court and other local courts throughout the State. However, there are still vacancies for magistrates, probably for up to six more, and I hope that other magistrates will be appointed soon to relieve the load in the Local Courts and the Magistrates Courts.

I am pleased to be able to tell the House that today a proclamation was issued amalgamating the Adelaide Magistrates' Court Department and the Local Courts Department into a new department to be known as the Local and District Criminal Courts Department, which will be the department for all the inferior courts in the State; that is, all courts apart from the Supreme Court, the Industrial Court, and the Licensing Court. This is an administrative matter, and it seemed to the Government to be a proper step to take. Also, we have created the office of Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, who will be the head of the new department. The senior judges and other judges are not members of the Public Service. Of course, they will be senior to the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, but the occupant of the latter position, which will carry a salary of \$13,700 a year, will be the head of the new department. Gradually the scheme is being put into operation but the decisive factor is the physical one of accommodation, and that matter is under control.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The present industrial labour problems are causing the Government great concern. The public should be

aware that large-scale disruption of employment is inevitable in the immediate future if the strike in South Australia's cement works is not soon settled. Cement provides the sinews not only of the building industry but also much of the civil engineering of the State, and is the basis of our development. From the surveyor who fixes a peg with a small amount of cement, to the construction of a trunk sewer or water main, no such work can proceed without it. This not only means that we could be without these facilities (and it will be almost impossible to catch up the delay that has already occurred), but also that shortly hundreds if not thousands of men will have to be stood down from employment because their jobs depend on the supply of cement. It is well known that cement is vital to the building industry, and the Executive Director of the Master Builders' Association (Mr. West) stated that today his members were greatly concerned and their works programmes were immediately threatened. He said that with any rescheduling of jobs (and this was imminent) labour would be laid off.

The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports that in a number of trades work is ceasing on its sites. Virtually no foundations have been poured this week and the hand-over of houses is slowing down, if not stopping, because of the inability to finish paving and hard floors, while most bricklaying gangs have either stopped or will be stopped during the next 24 hours. The trust contractors depend on a flow of production, and this flow is being checked in a way which will make it extremely difficult to make a smooth resumption except over quite an extended period. Moreover, the trust reports its forward civil engineering works, including drainage, are already stopped on most of its sites, and this will mean that builders are held up soon because they are unable to get on to the sites concerned.

In the Engineering and Water Supply Department the jobs of 650 men are in imminent danger, while if the strike continues beyond next Monday the number of men who would have to be stood down would increase to 1,000. Looking even further ahead, if the strike continued for another three weeks a further 600 would have to be stood down. I remind the House that the audit regulations stipulate that before pay sheets can be passed for payment they must bear the signed certificate of the appropriate departmental officer to the effect that the employees shown thereon have been actually and *bona fide* employed for the period for which they are being paid.

In addition, the superphosphate industry is paralysed at a time when agriculture is seasonally reliant on a supply of fertilizer. Unless this strike is settled there will be serious disruption and economic loss to farmers and graziers throughout South Australia. Those who are involved in unjustified strikes outside the arbitration system bear a heavy responsibility in relation to the personal loss that will occur to tens of thousands of innocent individuals and families. South Australia in the last two years has shown tremendous industrial growth and diversification. It is the Government's firm view that this should be confirmed and enlarged by support of our arbitration system.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 29. Page 124.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Last night, shortly before I asked leave to continue my remarks, I expressed disappointment at some of the statements made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. In order to avoid misquoting him, I have read a portion of the *Hansard* pulls to acquaint myself fully with the spirit of what he said. Throughout this debate, and during the weeks that preceded it, we have heard many personality attacks rather than scientific facts. Some members seem to believe that it has been to their advantage to play personalities against each other rather than to deal with the facts. I do not appreciate the fact that the Deputy Leader began his speech by trying to play the Premier against you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Corcoran: I simply repeated what the Premier had said.

Mr. WARDLE: I have read what the Deputy Leader has said, and my interpretation of it is the obvious one. Many political philosophies and ideologies are involved in this type of debate and in the sort of policy we are discussing, and I do not think it is becoming for this kind of insinuation to be made. The second point I make concerning what the Deputy Leader had to say is rather on side (I have not had time to see whether it came out in *Hansard*), but it was a statement something like this: "It does not mean we will not pass it at a later date." If I am misquoting him, I am sorry, but I believe that is what he said.

It does not require much imagination to trace a statement like that to its inevitable end. One can easily assume what would happen (not that

I believe it will) following an election, should there be one, and the return of the Deputy Leader's Party. When negotiations commence to construct the Chowilla storage his Party will find it impossible to surmount the opposition that there seems to be from Labor, Liberal and Country Party members in the Eastern States towards it, and it could say, "We have tried, but that bandit in Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte, is the nigger in the woodpile and he will not co-operate. He is the selfish individual and the scoundrel. It is impossible to get past him. Therefore, we realize that it is impossible to have Chowilla, so we have to pass the construction of Dartmouth." I thought that was a revealing statement by the Deputy.

Further, I deprecate the statement about the Dartmouth dam's being near the Victorian border and, consequently, close to the electoral district of Mr. Fairbairn. This has been thrashed around: physically it is true, and we know that it is so. It is amazing how our minds will often grasp and take advantage of a human situation. So many people, gullible to this situation, believe in taking notice of the human situation rather than in sticking to the facts. Many people subject to this sort of conversation have minds that are ready to accept this suggestion. I believe it is not relevant, let alone an argument in the debate, that the Dartmouth dam will be built because it is in Mr. Fairbairn's electoral district and that, therefore, this is a strong argument against it. The Deputy Leader also used facts and figures (if I am wrong, I apologise, but I have not had time to check the *Hansard* pull) from the 1961 study rather than the important facts and figures that have come to light in this discussion for 1966-67 and 1967-68.

Many people are prepared to stake their faith on the 1961-62 surveys, and nothing else. Some specialists believe that the facts and figures that came to light at that time were very important but, in essence, that was surely only the beginning of the work of gathering facts and figures. The Premier's second reading explanation shows how critical the investigations made from 1966 to 1968 were. The member for Glenelg suggested (I am not sure whether he was boasting) that the Labor Government was offered 1,500,000 acre feet. I challenge the honourable member on that statement: I should like him to table in this House a copy of the conversation or document wherein this offer was made.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It was made to me through the Director and Engineer-in-Chief.

Mr. WARDLE: It is up to the member for Glenelg, who made the statement, to provide this information.

Mr. Hudson: You have heard the statement just made by a former Minister of Works.

Mr. WARDLE: I have no doubt that, if the Minister of Works who was in office during the Labor Government has this information, he will hand it to the member for Glenelg so that that member can furnish me with a copy. I should like to know the date on which the offer was made. It does not seem to fit in entirely with the chronological order of the discussions and studies.

I gather from the remarks of the member for Glenelg that bargaining is all-important, and I agree that it is. However, a fair amount of bargaining has already taken place. The honourable member, during oversea visits, has perhaps discovered in duty-free ports that much can be done by bargaining but that one gets to the point where, finally, a customer may be ordered out of the premises because the proprietor is not prepared to bargain further.

Much bargaining has already been done in connection with our water supply. The Premier has won agreement from the Commonwealth Government and the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales to the allocation of an additional quota of water for South Australia, particularly in months when our irrigators need an increased supply. The agreement to make certain alterations to the river to assist its flow and to control salinity shows, too, that much bargaining has been done. Obviously, therefore, one can easily reach the point where those involved will finally say, "Let there be no further bargaining." I will now refer to what the Premier of Victoria said in this connection. These figures concern the diversions of each State. At page 2986 of Victorian *Hansard*, on March 4 last, Mr. Borthwick is reported as having said:

However, as we are already above the safe level at present, the increase over present diversions of some 1,370,000 acre feet will be about 300,000 acre feet annually.

(b) The safe diversion by New South Wales will rise by about the same amount to 1,380,000 acre feet annually, which, in fact, is about the present level.

(c) As already mentioned, the increase to South Australia will be about 20 per cent from 1,254,000 to 1,500,000 acre feet annually.

(d) The total increase in available supply to the three States above present safe levels is 1,350,000 acre feet, at a cost, shared four ways, of \$57,000,000. The base date of this estimate is March, 1969, and it was prepared after thorough investigation by the Snowy Mountains Authority.

The Chowilla reservoir proposition would produce a good deal less than half this total benefit—570,000 acre feet—at a higher cost of \$68,000,000. There is absolutely no doubt as to which is the better proposition As there is a vast difference between the results of the earlier investigations of Chowilla and those now before us, the House is entitled to an explanation. I shall describe the position as I see it. Firstly, the benefits to the upper States have been appreciably eroded by—

(a) The recognition that today we have to maintain a flow of about 900 cusecs below the Merbein pumps in order to keep salinity in the Sunraysia area under control. My advisers consider this to be a most significant factor. This operational procedure arises from the hard lessons of experience gained during the dry period from 1965 to 1968, when for the first time the really critical nature of river salinity between Wentworth and Swan Hill came to notice.

(b) The average annual evaporation loss from Chowilla as reassessed, this loss rising by 75 per cent from 600,000 acre feet to 1,050,000 acre feet. This arose in turn from a serious underestimation in 1961 of the area of the Chowilla reservoir. After an accurate survey was done by the South Australian department it was found to be about 25 per cent greater than previously thought. In fact, it was discovered that the area to be inundated increased from 400 square miles to 500 square miles which meant there would be an enormous increase in evaporation.

Secondly the original cost estimated by the South Australian department rose from \$28,000,000 in 1961 to \$43,000,000 early in 1966, and again to \$68,000,000 when tenders were received and assessed about 12 months later. Faced with this situation the River Murray Commission acted responsibly when it called a halt in May, 1967, and deferred the project to permit closer examination.

I now wish to mention several reasons why I, as an individual, and many other people in my district and throughout South Australia who are supporting it, believe that the Dartmouth reservoir has been given priority over Chowilla. I do not believe at this stage that we are in any way saying that Chowilla is completely out. I know it has been said in the House (I, like other honourable members, have been accused of saying it) that we said we would build Chowilla. I do not deny this, and I have literature to prove it; but it is not just a matter of this being a statement that was not able to be denied by experts or by investigation: it was a statement sincerely made at the time because (and this is the important thing) to me it appeared that the Commonwealth Government and the other States were trying to escape their obligations to assist South Australia by the building of Chowilla.

I believe that this Party's pre-election promises were made in the belief that South Australia would probably be left without the security of that reservoir. It was then decided in 1967 to ask that work cease to enable another look to be taken at this issue (and some people make an issue of this point). I find no fault with taking another look at the situation as it existed then, as I do not believe there was any other option in the issue. Once another look was taken and certain results were clearly indicated, then surely it was the responsibility of responsible people to take careful notice of the reports that came forward, and I believe this to be the point in time when this was done by the Government. I believe that, when there was an opportunity to give South Australia all the security that would have been given it by the construction of Chowilla, but with other advantages added to it, there was nothing else that could be done. While it appeared politically that there was more than a great risk, I believe that nothing else could be done and no other attitude could be taken by a responsible Government.

There are four reasons why this change of mind took place: one was involved in the reports that came forward from various authorities (all well known to members of this House) recommending the construction of Dartmouth. The second was the very important additional 250,000 acre feet of water granted to South Australia under the new agreement. The third reason was that Dartmouth was a better proposition for the State of South Australia in the aspects outlined scientifically by the report, and the fourth reason was the conviction of the impossibility of getting the other partners in the agreement to agree to the continuation of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir.

I want to bring to the notice of the House and have placed on record the explanation given by the previous Chairman of the commission, Mr. David Fairbairn, in his statement to the House of Representatives, reported at page 838 of this year's Commonwealth *Hansard*. He said:

Let me run through what did go wrong. I came in as Minister for National Development nearly six years ago, and as such was Chairman of the River Murray Commission. Chowilla was under way at an estimated cost of \$28,000,000. Not very long afterwards, we were informed that its cost would not be \$28,000,000 but \$43,000,000. We all took a deep gulp, informed our Governments and said: "Well, we must press on nevertheless". So we pressed on. The stage of calling tenders was reached. It was at this stage that the tender cost came out

to be not \$43,000,000 but \$68,000,000. This was the stage where unanimous agreement was reached to cease work on Chowilla and to look at various alternatives. I stress that the agreement was unanimous because, unfortunately, a lot of politics has been played and people who agreed to the cessation of work on Chowilla now are trying to say that Chowilla should proceed.

There were two interjections, and then Mr. Fairbairn continued:

Certainly, the honourable member would know, from his knowledge of the position. So, the increase in the cost was the first thing that went wrong. That is why work was suspended until we had a look at the various alternatives. It is easy to be wise after the event. We did learn one thing. I am not casting any aspersions on the South Australian Water Supply and Engineering Authority but, from the point of view of the Commonwealth, I do think that we, in any future assessment in which Commonwealth money will be used, should make certain that the designs of proposed dams are checked by the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority. Unfortunately, that Authority had very little to do with this dam until right at the end—and then it was only of a quite minor nature.

As I say, I am not casting any aspersions on the Authority in South Australia because undoubtedly, Chowilla was a most difficult dam. It was a dam to be built on a floating site on a flood plain. It was not possible to get down into the ground and anchor it on rock. To the best of my knowledge, such a dam has never been built in Australia. There are some such dams in Russia, on the Volga River and some of the larger rivers. These dams are not easy to build. Chowilla was not easy to estimate. In addition, when work started, the salinity problem at the actual site appeared, and it was very difficult to get saline water away. This would have necessitated piping the saline water some considerable distance to an evaporation basin. All these things tended to increase the cost of the building of the dam.

Later he continued:

The next thing that went wrong was failure to make allowance for dilution flows. I cannot understand why—I know that the technical experts have said that they realize they made a grave error in this field—no allowance was made to maintain a flow past Mildura. This was one of the problems. This made an enormous difference to the assessment of the benefit to be obtained from Chowilla. The original idea was that the Chowilla dam would hold the water needed for South Australia and that this then left virtually all the water in Hume to go to New South Wales and Victoria. But the moment a steady and quite high flow had to be maintained past Mildura, this meant that the water was going down anyway and immediately the benefit that Chowilla would be was reduced quite considerably.

There were other errors which have been mentioned. Evaporation was underestimated both through estimating the area that Chowilla

would cover and through the evaporation coefficient which was not known accurately at that time. The tests with the pan showed that these were greater and so the actual loss per annum through evaporation from Chowilla would have been approximately 820,000 acre feet to 920,000 acre feet compared with 600,000 acre feet in the study. This is an enormous rate of evaporation compared with Dartmouth which would have an evaporation loss of only 15,000 acre feet per annum.

We are reminded in the report of the speech of Mr. Borthwick, who led the debate for the Government in the Victorian Parliament, that it is now expected that evaporation will reach 1,050,000 acre feet a year.

I should like now to comment upon the three different aspects of this problem as it exists in my district. I presume that mine is the average district, except that a greater interest in the conservation of water would be shown in the lower reaches of the Murray River, which is in my district, than would be the case in many other districts throughout the State, although the matter of additional water is so vital to the whole State.

There are, largely, three groups of people, the first of which says, "We must have our own dam so that we can use the water when we want it. Dartmouth is eight weeks away." Honourable members know the rest. The people in the second group have their own fixed opinions because they rely on water for their living. One does not need to say much to describe their attitude towards the possibility of obtaining additional water for South Australia. The third group of people says, "Well, leave it to the experts." I believe the whole human situation is encompassed in these three groups of people, about each of which I should like to comment briefly.

It is appalling that some people say that we must have our own dam in our own State so that the water can be used when it is needed. I hoped that, following the visits by the Leader of the Opposition to my district, this attitude would disappear. I believed that the Leader would have attempted to dispel this attitude from the minds of the people with whom he discussed the issue. An attitude that exists amongst this group of people is that we ought to conduct a referendum regarding which dam should be built. Whilst I would be the last to deprive any South Australian of his rights, and whilst I agree that a referendum would give a certain point of view, would it not be more appropriate to hold a referendum amongst the people whose very living

depends on the use of water, people whose whole financial investment is involved, and people whose life savings and everything they have done in their working life according to a plan they have evolved is concerned with producing a certain farm, dairy or orchard and bringing that property into full production?

Mr. Broomhill: Don't you think industry in the metropolitan area requires water?

Mr. WARDLE: Yes. The next point I want to make concerns industry. Only two or three days ago I received a letter from a meatworks in my area stating that the company had to build a 60,000gall. tank so that it would have sufficient water. It has laid a 4in. pipe around the meatworks, it has a water bill of \$5,500 a year and uses 100,000gall. a day. It has applied for a licence to pump from the river, but what hope has it of getting the licence? I have taken many people to the Minister of Works asking for additional licences so that they can develop more acres on their properties, but what hope have they of getting licences? They have no hope whatever. Since October, 1968, I have not been able to get an extra gallon of water to supply one extra acre for anyone who has approached me in the hope of increasing the size of his property and his production.

We know very well that at present the consumption in South Australia is over-committed by 100,000 acre feet a year. The position would not be so bad if we were sure that the present situation could be maintained. I hope that when metering has been completed and accurate figures are available as to the quantity of water being consumed from the Murray there will be thousands of acre feet left over for development along the Murray of orchards, small farms and irrigated areas generally. However, we have no guarantee that we will even be able to maintain our present commitments to irrigators along the Murray. Unfortunately, the irony of the situation is that many of the people involved in industry (and there are about 150 to 180 people employed in this meatworks) come up with the idea that South Australia must have its own dam so that the water can be used when it is wanted; they say Dartmouth is eight weeks away. I have every sympathy with an industry that wants to expand. However, what sort of reply does one expect to receive from departmental officers, who manage the system, when one states that Dartmouth is eight weeks away? That is not very encouraging to those officers, nor is it a pat on the back to them.

In fact, it is definitely an insult to their intelligence and their ability to manage the Murray River to say that we will not get a drop of water as it is eight weeks away, taking eight weeks to come to us. We know perfectly well that it is the Lake Victoria storage from which South Australia gets its quota. I wish to refer to the legal and constitutional right that we have to this particular storage. At page 1, section 3 of the Crown Solicitor's opinion entitled "The Legal and Constitutional Background" states:

Under the agreement, a River Murray Commission was established consisting of four Commissioners, one appointed by the Commonwealth and one by each of the three States. The concurrence of all of the Commissioners is necessary for the transaction of the business of the commission, except formal business. The effect of the agreement was that no State has power to construct works affecting the flow of water in the Murray River except through and by means of the River Murray Commission.

Mr. Hudson: It's a pity the Premier didn't know that before the last election.

Mr. WARDLE: The Crown Solicitor's opinion also states:

In each State a constructing authority is responsible for the design and construction of the works under its control but subject to the general approval and direction of the River Murray Commission.

Section 5 of the same report states:

The first agreement provided for the construction of weirs and locks on the river and for the creation of storages of the upper river (Hume reservoir) and at Lake Victoria for the purpose of maintaining certain specified flows in the lower river. Subsequent agreements from time to time provided for additional works (such as the increase in the capacity of the Hume reservoir and of the Lake Victoria inlet channel), and the estimated total cost of the works was correspondingly increased with each addition. By the sixth amending agreement in 1963 the works to be provided for under the agreement were increased by adding the following paragraph to clause 20:

(IIa) The provision of a storage, in this agreement referred to as the Chowilla reservoir on the Murray River between Renmark and Wentworth with a capacity of approximately 4,750,000 acre feet of water and with a roadway along the top of the containing dam in this agreement referred to as the Chowilla dam and with provision for vessels drawing 4ft. 6in. of water to pass.

The estimated total cost of the works was increased from £19,750,000 to £36,000,000. The same meeting also added a new clause, No. 54, to the agreement as follows:

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 the Chowilla reservoir works mentioned and described in this agreement."

The construction of Chowilla reservoir is therefore dependent upon the decision of the River Murray Commission as to the time when it is to be constructed and as to the rate of progress of the works;

I refer now to the second group that I mentioned, comprising the people who rely on water for a living. I consider that these people appreciate the present situation better than do most other people. These are the people who have their livelihood at stake and the ones who I find, in my area, are the first to appreciate the acute situation in South Australia. They also appreciate that there is a real advantage in the agreement that has been signed to secure for South Australia an additional 250,000 acre feet. These are the people who say sincerely that, if there is to be any vote, surely it is a sensible thought or suggestion that those whose livelihood is at stake should be given an opportunity to give their views.

There are many reports about the attitude of the people in my district, and time does not permit me to mention those reports in detail. However, I remind the House that members of the Murray Valley Development League, which is representative of about 80 councils from the Snowy Mountains to the Murray River mouth who have organized themselves into six regions, have discussed this matter throughout the length and breadth of the Murray Valley. They have affirmed their belief that it will be well for South Australia to accept the agreement that has now come to this House for acceptance. I could mention certain councils and water-user groups which have been formed throughout my district and which are adamant that the South Australian Government is doing the sensible and wise thing to develop this State by accepting and ratifying the Dartmouth agreement. Time does not permit me to enlarge on the third group, which comprises those who believe that the experts should guide us in our thinking on this matter. Finally, I reassure this House and the people of my district of my support for this agreement, believing that it is in the best interests of development in South Australia that this Government accept the agreement.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): The long road of political manoeuvring and manipulation concerning water storage in South Australia has at last come to an end.

It has weaved through the three States of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales and through the decision corridors of Canberra to finally come back to where it started. It has gone the full circle and, after long years of political manipulation and manoeuvring and of scientific investigation, it has brought success on a plate to South Australia. Here we are today (if we conclude the debate today) deciding whether or not we will accept success. We have before us an agreement containing this which cannot be altered if it is to be an effective agreement and to mean anything to this State. It is with much interest that I heard the Leader say yesterday that some members of his Party would go out of Parliament if an election was held now. In other words, he was saying that they would sacrifice themselves for his Party. It would have been much better if they had sacrificed themselves for this State instead of for their Party. How much better is it for all the people in South Australia? That is the test that is being placed on all members in this House. If it leads to an election, I and other members who are not retiring will face the electors and be accountable for refusing to accept the success that we have in this paper here. We therefore—

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to having motives imputed to me (and I am one of the members referred to) that are incorrect.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member objecting to any specific words?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. I object to its being imputed to me that I am staying on this side of the House against the interests of this State.

The SPEAKER: As the honourable member has taken objection, I must ask the Premier to withdraw those words.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I see nothing unparliamentary in my statement.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has taken objection and, under Standing Orders, when a member objects I must ask that the words he has objected to be withdrawn.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not intend to see this debate develop into that sort of argument and I, therefore, withdraw. If I can use the positive and not the negative approach, I repeat that if any members of my Party sacrifice themselves, it will be for South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: That is what our point is.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Having said that, let me say that it is not with much liking that

my Party approaches an election. My Party has been successful over the last two years; it has achieved extremely good management of this State, and we do not lightly throw away the opportunity of continuing until next March. However, if this House does not support what it is its duty to support, we will obviously go to the people and ask them what they desire.

Why have Opposition members failed to support in depth the arguments they have put before the House? I have had to restrain members of my Party from speaking in order to get some finality on this matter; this indicates how enthusiastic they are to deal with it. The subject of South Australia's water supply is not a matter for crude joking. Surely newspaper managements should not measure the amount of type they use to report speeches that are made in this House or outside it. This issue is of grave concern to every South Australian. The agreement now before the House offers to this State advantages for which my political opponents never asked. Whilst I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you will not allow me to deal with amendments that have been foreshadowed, I point out that the Opposition has vowed to wreck the agreement that is before the House.

Mr. Broomhill: Don't those remarks also apply—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: What is the performance of Party politics in this matter? The history of these negotiations began when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier. At that time there was a single proposition in connection with the Murray River system, and it was studied manually, without the aid of computers, and in as great a depth as was then possible. When my opponents came to office they were confronted with the need for further procedures in connection with the proposal. Subsequently, however, grave doubts arose around the Chowilla proposal concerning its cost and the problem of salinity. In 1967 the then Premier agreed to the deferment of the Chowilla proposal. However, he not only agreed to the deferment but he went interstate to get some expressions of intent and then introduced a measure which said, in effect, that, whatever alternative we might have, we must get from it the benefits that Chowilla would otherwise have provided.

That was the situation with which my Government was faced when it came to office. However, the Leader of the Opposition now describes that situation somewhat differently: he says he agreed to the deferment so that key facts which would support the case for

the Chowilla dam could be obtained. On television he said that he based his position on the studies he had requested. That was the situation we faced when we came into office. Not once has the Leader produced any valid reference to those studies that backs his choice today.

It is easy, therefore, to see why Opposition members do not want to speak on this Bill and why they have only a silent opinion: they are not concerned with South Australia's water supply—they want an election. This is not out of character: the Leader of the Opposition has been calling for an election ever since he went into Opposition. Surely he would seize this opportunity; let it not be thought that we did not believe he would do that. I did, however, have a sneaking suspicion, which I now know is groundless, that he would put Party politics aside and consider the State's interests first. But if the expressed intention is carried out, we shall see this Bill destroyed before this House adjourns later today, and we shall go on in South Australia facing the possibility of a combination of years in which the figures of 1967 relating to the availability of water in South Australia will be repeated (when, again, only 920,000 acre feet may flow into South Australia, dropping the lock levels all along the river from the Victorian border to the Goolwa barrage). This will be to the detriment of every irrigationist along the river, and this is the situation that lies around the corner.

Who, having studied Australian climatic conditions, would deny that this situation is approaching? Who would dare deny that? In what year will it be? Does the Leader know? I do not know. Surely the Leader must have calculated it to take this immense risk with South Australia (this entity consisting of 1,200,000 people whom he aspires to govern waterlessly). He intends to govern this State without water. What a delightful prospect for us all! At least it will be more economical; the Leader will not perhaps run up those enormous deficits of his in previous years, because he will not have any water to pump, and that may be some relief for him. But it will be tough for the rest of us.

The Leader previously sought information that he now utterly rejects as part of his performance in this House. The reasoning of the academics, including masters of engineering and science of three State Governments and the Commonwealth Government, is to be swept aside in order to get an election. It is apparently a matter of great humour to

the member for Unley (Mr. Langley). His constituents each use on average 70 gallons of water daily, and there must be another 20 gallons for each person employed in industry. These people know that their jobs depend on his decision and that the development of this State is threatened by the possible vote on the Bill in this House today (and I say that advisedly). Already, signs of cracking are showing in this economy, because of the possible defeat of the Bill. Does this amuse the member of Unley? Perhaps he will rethink the matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot have three or four speeches at once. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: So we look forward to a more serious contribution. I should have thought that the member would speak in the debate and at least try to defend the non-policy of his Party.

Mr. Langley: The speakers that we had were excellent.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They weren't answered at all.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We know that there has been a campaign from which one is expected to draw the inference that Dartmouth, for instance, will not provide the water when we need it. The inference has been drawn in public argument that, after all, we are talking about a Victorian dam and a South Australian dam. Anyone who knows the details and who has had the opportunity to study this measure knows that we are talking about a River Murray Commission dam. Do we have to repeat that this is not Sir Henry Bolte's dam, Mr. Askin's dam, or a dam belonging to Mr. X (the Premier of South Australia)? It happens to be a River Murray Commission dam, concerning which we are an equal partner.

It is interesting to examine the Australian Labor Party's view of the Murray River system, particularly when one considers the amendments that were put forward in Canberra. I have looked with much interest at the proposal to set up a "super" authority to study the Murray River system and to develop its resources. Thank heavens the amendment in question was not carried in Canberra. It was moved by the Labor Party that an authority be established to control the river system under the auspices of the Commonwealth Government. It would have handed over the equal control that South Australia has in the River Murray Commission to a "super" body

based in the Eastern States. Members of this House will have something more to say about relevant amendments when they come before them shortly. Is, therefore, the southern part of Australia, for Australian Labor Party purposes, to be divided into a set of warring factions? How convenient it has been for the Leader of the Opposition and his members to set Sir Henry and the former Minister (Mr. Fairbairn) against South Australia by saying that the Minister had formed his view because his district was close to the Dartmouth site. This kind of personal attack is not good enough when we are debating our national water policy.

Is the history of the River Murray Commission one of dissatisfaction, discontent and unco-operativeness? We know that that is not so: it is a body which has administered one of the greatest co-operative needs in the history of Australia and which, year after year in the face of difficult water situations, has made flows available to certain States. Also, it has given the various Engineers-in-Chief of South Australia the greatest satisfaction to know that we stand protected by it. So it is a River Murray Commission dam that we are talking about. We are talking about an issue of national importance that has now been approved by the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth, and we stand here at the end of the road because at present the Labor Party has its foot on the lifeline of South Australia.

Many matters have been raised in this debate. The member for Glenelg said that when his Party was in office it was told that we could have 1,500,000 acre feet from Chowilla. He knows, however, that no such offer was ever made. There may have been loose talk among his own Party members and conjectures may have been made, but all this bore no relationship to what transpired in negotiations between Governments. He and every Government official in South Australia knows that the first offer of an increased supply was made in August, 1968, when 1,400,000 acre feet was offered to South Australia—an offer that I personally refused to accept. Indeed, I went back to the negotiating table with the demand that we get 1,500,000 acre feet or we would not co-operate. That result was achieved in March, 1969. The member for Flinders knows how hard that battle was, how difficult the negotiations were, and that I kicked him under the table at one time to emphasize a point on which we were not quite in agreement. We

stuck out for 1,500,000 acre feet at the risk of no co-operation from the Eastern States and the Commonwealth Government and, after lengthy negotiations, we achieved what the Labor Party in South Australia had never even asked for.

When we came back with this first increase that South Australia has ever had (not only a 20 per cent increase in the actual allocation but, because of the dilution loss each year, an increase of 37 per cent in the usable quantity of divertible water), I wondered what the attitude of my political opponents would be. I knew they would have to take some sort of stance because we started from the low point of coming into Government with the previous Premier having given away in his public statement that, if he had an alternative, he wanted as much as he could get from Chowilla—and that was a pretty difficult situation to start upgrading.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That upgrading took until March, 1969, to achieve, but, having achieved it, what cunning little ways did the Opposition suddenly devise? They did not just say, "Look, that is good news for South Australia", or "We could have done it if we had been there", or something like that. No—members opposite said, "We want two dams." I suppose that is a fair enough thing to say, but why not three or some other absurdity? So this political attitude developed. They said, "We did not get it so we will put them on the spot and demand something else to divert public opinion; it does not matter whether half of South Australia thinks we are talking about a State dam in South Australia and a State dam in Victoria—that does not matter." So this argument has gone on with a great deal of manipulation.

The amendments that we are to consider, as I have said, will reveal some other attitudes that will also enlighten the House this afternoon, but it is interesting to note the references to Lake Victoria. Lake Victoria is an important storage to South Australia. It is a River Murray Commission storage entirely there for the purpose of supplying South Australia. Possibly, it will need to be enlarged in its inlet and outlet works to provide the additional allocation we have obtained for South Australia. We have, therefore, specifically requested that special mention be made in the agreement that the works there will be upgraded, although so far the extent of the

upgrading is not known because the investigations are not complete; but the report upon which we acted—the report that the Leader of the Opposition ordered, or agreed with the other Governments in 1967 to order—states specifically that the works at Lake Victoria will have to be upgraded by something between \$4,000,000 and \$7,200,000 (I think the figure is) if Chowilla is not the next storage on the river system. In other words, if Chowilla is the next storage on the river system, the works will not be upgraded.

The Leader of the Opposition in his remarks made something of the need for further studies of the river. Of course, many studies have been made and, since the advent of the computer, over 300 complete studies of the river system have been made in various stages in which known data have been fed in. However, he has asked for further studies. I have said, and members of the Governments in other States have said, that further studies must be made to ascertain where the next storage will be, and we have specifically included in this agreement that we are presenting to the House an additional clause in the Bill—I remind the Leader, not in the agreement; it does not require legislation by the other States, as the Leader yesterday thought it would. I correct him there. The inclusion we have made does not require that any legislation be submitted or resubmitted to the Commonwealth Government or to any State Government in Australia involved in the River Murray Commission. From the replies I have already received from the Commonwealth and the three State Governments, upon the passage of this agreement a comprehensive study of the Murray River system will be made—a study that must include the Chowilla project—to decide and define where the next storage shall be.

Mr. Broomhill: But you made it clear that you would not be committed in any way.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Having, therefore, set before the House the legal requirement that the study must proceed, I am told by my expert advisers that it could be accomplished within a matter of several months, and then this Government and the other Governments involved would know where the next storage should be. Does that mean that the proposed works at Lake Victoria are in any way impeding Chowilla? Of course it does not, and it is nonsense to say it does. We would know within months whether Chowilla would proceed, and it is futile for the Leader or anyone else to demand a starting date or any other

requirement regarding Chowilla before the study is carried out. I put this in all good reason to every honourable member: if Chowilla is as good as we all hope it is, it will stand up to any comparison made with it and, if some other dam happens to yield twice as much water for South Australia, which one should we have?

The Government therefore will rest on the study to which other Premiers and the Prime Minister have agreed, provided that the agreement now before us proceeds. Let us therefore shed politics for a little while and forget that we are on different sides of the House. I know I cannot take this to the vote: I am merely contemplating it. What is it, in all reason, that the Opposition desires? We have before us the offer for the commencement of a dam which, I believe, could start next week, if its planning has not already been started, and which will provide us with 37 per cent more usable water than we at present receive, which is an enormous advantage for South Australia, and is a matter on which a vote will have to be taken in this House today.

In addition to all this a study, which can commence at the same time as the planning and commencement of Dartmouth, will be carried out to ascertain where the next dam should be built. No-one is denying these things, so what else can members, in all reason and logic, desire? I do not wish to refer to slogans, because we will get enough of those after we walk out of here tonight, if the House is dissolved. I am referring, of course, to the needs of South Australia. What else can anyone reasonably demand? Can we demand the starting date for a dam which has not yet even been investigated? Can we demand a starting date before a study has been carried out? Is that what honourable members opposite want? Do they want to destroy the lifeline of Lake Victoria, without which the river districts cannot survive? What do honourable members want?

These are all questions that we should ask ourselves in a non-political fashion, though I am sure that we shall return to the politics of the situation soon enough. I think the issues are plain. I have found a tremendous acceptance by the news media of this State of the arguments we have advanced, and this acceptance has grown from an initial opposition to our attitude. It has grown because people have been won by our arguments and by the advice of experts, reiterated time after time, and it has not occurred through any coercion

on the part of this Government. Almost throughout the whole of South Australia the news media have, in leader after leader, stood in support of the logic of our argument, and that is no accident. This has occurred as a result of a pure, calm study of a logical case.

Therefore, this issue must be decided today, although not by the vote we are about to take, which will be the vote on the second reading of the Bill. I realize that there are amendments on file, and I am pleased that we shall at least get to the stage of considering them. At that stage we will be considering not only whether the agreement will live but also whether or not South Australia will live.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short titles."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In subclause (1) after "1970" to insert "and shall commence on a day to be determined by proclamation after the Governor is satisfied—

(a) that the River Murray Commission has completed an evaluation by computer of the benefits of operating storages of various capacities at both Dartmouth and Chowilla contemporaneously;

(b) that the contracting Governments have agreed to amend, and have amended, the agreement, a copy of which is set out in the schedule to this Act, in the manner specified in section (1a) of this Act;

and

(c) that the Parliament of the Commonwealth and the Parliaments of each of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have passed an Act ratifying the agreement and the amendments referred to in paragraph (b) of this subsection".

Having moved this first amendment, I intend to explain the scheme of the amendments I have on file. If this amendment is not acceptable to the Committee, I do not intend to move my subsequent amendments, because they are part of the total scheme. First, let us turn to the question before the Committee, and that is certainly not as stated by the Premier. The question before us is whether we accept an agreement to provide for the building of the Dartmouth dam; it is not a question whether we would prefer to have the Chowilla dam to the Dartmouth dam. The question is whether it is a necessary condition of our obtaining the agreement to the Dartmouth dam that we do away with the existing agreement relating to the Chowilla dam.

Opposition members have constantly asked the Government why this is a necessary condi-

tion. What demands have ever been made that we should so alter the existing River Murray Waters Agreement as to give away the special rights to the Chowilla dam that the State has? If we give them away, in that case, as a result of any future studies, the other States will not be bound to consider the special rights of South Australia written into the agreement but will simply look at Chowilla as one of a series of storages the benefits of which must be maximized to those States before they will agree. That is the position that the Government is asking us to accept, and we do not accept it.

We see no reason whatever why the condition of Dartmouth now and Chowilla never should be attached to the provision of Dartmouth now. For that reason, we have a series of amendments designed to retain our rights in the agreement to the eventual construction of the Chowilla dam. First, in order to be able to negotiate this, it is necessary for us to be able to have a study of the two-dam proposition to see how the two dams are to work together. We cannot negotiate starting dates for dam construction until that has been done. Indeed, clearly there may come out of these studies some proposals for alternative capacities to those that are presently specified as maximum capacities for either dam. In that case, we have to have studies: there is no way out of that.

The Premier wants studies too, saying that they can be completed within a few months. The only difference between us is that the Opposition wants them completed before this State puts its name to the agreement that gives away our rights to Chowilla. The Premier simply wants an undertaking that the River Murray Commission will have a look at the situation, with the result of the studies unknown, before we sign away all our rights to Chowilla. We want the contracting Governments to agree to amend the amending agreement, which we are supposed to be ratifying here, in order to take out provisions that will preclude the building of Chowilla in the future. The first and most important amendment deals with the provision giving to the other States a separate right of veto over any further work at Chowilla. At present the Chowilla dam is a specified reservoir requiring construction, and there are many clauses of the agreement to which I adverted yesterday which require the River Murray Commission to proceed with the building of Chowilla with all due speed. What is now proposed is that we take out of the

hands of the commission the requirement that it do this, and that we also take out of the administration of the commission the provision regarding directions in relation to construction and give to each constructing party outside the commission the right to say, "No, no further work on Chowilla," and that will be the end of the matter. The agreement will have gone. There is nothing then left in the River Murray Waters Agreement which gives this State any specific right to the future construction of the Chowilla dam. We want that provision removed. It does not need to be there. It is not a condition of the construction of the Dartmouth dam that it be there.

The second thing that we require is that we do not at this stage of proceedings commit ourselves to works at Lake Victoria which now we are required to sign to. We are required to agree to the River Murray Commission's constructing works which would cost, according to the Premier's second reading explanation, \$8,000,000 and which would all be flooded by the subsequent building of Chowilla. If we agree to proceed with those works until we have an agreement concerning the future of Chowilla, there will be an obvious obstruction to any future work at Chowilla. It would be impossible to get the other States to agree to flood works on which they had spent \$8,000,000. It is clear from the agreement that the other States have in no way committed themselves to considering moneys they will spend at Lake Victoria lost in considering any other dam proposal. Of course, they will take into account work done at Lake Victoria and the interest moneys they will be paying in relation to that work when they assess the future benefits to them of other future dam sites.

If we accept these amendments, we will be in a position to press the other States for a time when we can get the Chowilla dam, which is our right and for which we have traded other rights. The necessary conditions will be there, and the agreement will not preclude it. The agreement relating to Dartmouth could go ahead without precluding the subsequent building of Chowilla but, if we accept the Bill as it stands, Chowilla will be gone for all time. Any subsequent studies done in relation to the Chowilla dam would be a blind in those circumstances. Further, the Premier knows that nobody is bound as a result of studies that would then be requested.

If we are to negotiate concerning Chowilla, there is one thing that we must do after the studies have been made, and that is require that we get a date when it is going to proceed so that it cannot be contended that the commission can from time to time put off the date. Actually, within the agreement the commission is required to proceed at a reasonable speed, but there can be argument about exactly the time at which they do.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How do we get it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall explain the way in which we get it. The other States, as the Minister knows and as has been pointed out, have excess demands for irrigation areas to which they are committed now. We have bargaining powers in relation to the other States, and they need water in the same way as we do. There is a basis for our bargaining with them, and the Minister knows that. I know of no reason why we should give away the whole of our existing bargaining powers before we seek to make a bargain, but that is what the Government is asking us to do. We cannot do that. We have accepted the position (although, I may say, with many misgivings and unhappily) that the Government has committed us to the Dartmouth dam as a first storage. That has been done, and we are not arguing about it. However, we are arguing that we cannot give away the rights that exist in the agreement now. It is on that basis, and on that basis alone, that we are moving these amendments. This was the position which was put to Parliament yesterday and to which no Government member replied: they did not deal with it at any stage. They have not dealt with it yet, and the Premier did not do so in his reply.

Mr. Lawn: Perhaps they are going to accept it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should be happy if they would. That is our position in the matter. We do not believe we should give away our rights, and that is why we are moving these amendments.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): That was a simple explanation of a disastrously complex amendment. I am puzzled that the Leader wants a study, because he totally ignored the last one he ordered. The decision we are asking him to accept today is based on that study. Why on earth (or on water) does he want another? He should explain that. However, we want another study, so I do not suppose we should complain about it. However, that is only the

beginning of a disastrously complex amendment, which the Leader does not understand.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Rubbish!

Mr. Corcoran: Break it down!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: He and I had something to say to each other today in another medium, and I will repeat it. I thought he might have changed his amendment today for the third time in the light of what he learned this morning. In the amendments we are considering in this great national and State water equation and question, no amendment asks for or will achieve one extra gallon of water for South Australia. If by some mythical means (and this seems to be the land in which the Leader is living at the moment in relation to amendments) this could be achieved and Chowilla was built, it would not mean one additional gallon of water for South Australia. The Leader has forgotten that the River Murray Waters Agreement (and the Leader did not study it, he was too quick off the mark for an election, and he forgot) provides an allocation of water for South Australia.

Three States depend on the Murray River and by law established in the early days (I think 1914, when the River Murray Waters Act and the first formal agreement were passed—these were of immense value to South Australia) the other two States have all the water in the river except that they are obliged by Statute to provide South Australia with an allocation. Since then, and until the opportunity we now have to change it, our allocation has been 1,250,000 acre feet of water, which we can get when it is there, and, when it is not there, we get three-thirteenths, not one-third. That is all we are entitled to—no more—in a year when there is not enough water to go around or when the water position is on the borderline. Dams are built for dry years, not plentiful years.

Mr. Corcoran: That is why we want Chowilla.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We are hearing the old slogan again. I invite the honourable member to listen to what I have to say, because his Leader does not understand it. South Australia's water allocation of 1,250,000 acre feet under the Chowilla arrangement is the same as it has always been: my opponents never asked for it to be increased. In the agreement now before the House the proposed allocation is 1,500,000 acre feet, and we want to have this agreement approved. The member for Ridley wants to see the Chowilla dam built, as well as the Dartmouth

dam, and the Leader wants a starting date to be announced. There will have to be a negotiated increase: that is the only way to get more water. We must go to the other States and ask them to alter the agreement to give us more water. So, the Opposition is advocating the building of the Chowilla dam at a cost to this State of about \$15,000,000. However, Chowilla will not give us one gallon of increased water entitlement; but it will present the Dartmouth dam, almost in its entirety, to the Eastern States.

Do the people of South Australia realize what a confidence trick is being put over them by this amendment? The other States will say, "We will build the Dartmouth dam. You can build the Chowilla dam and spend \$15,000,000. You can get 1,250,000 acre feet from Chowilla, and 250,000 acre feet from Dartmouth, but we can keep the rest, because the agreement says we can do that." Yet the Leader of the Opposition has the hide to come along here and advocate that this State should spend \$15,000,000 for no reason.

Mr. Nankivell: Except for the benefit of the other States!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, except for the benefit of the Eastern States! Obviously, the Leader does not understand the River Murray Waters Act or the implications of the agreements. Consequently, he is a dangerous person in South Australia today—a man without knowledge. The Leader has a favourite phrase that he keeps on hawking around South Australia—"our undeniable legal rights". Yet every legal adviser to the Government says that those so-called legal rights are not worth tuppence—they are a fraud. Let the Leader go away and find a contractor who will build the Chowilla dam for \$28,000,000! Yet this is what the previous agreement says we can have. The Leader keeps on saying that we have an undeniable legal right to a \$28,000,000 dam. He might as well say he would like a legal right to a \$500 new car. If he can produce such an agreement, let him show it. This is the supposed logic that is hawked around South Australia by Opposition members.

Mr. Riches: You supported it two years ago.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is a good point. At first the Chowilla dam was proposed as one dam on the Murray River system, but at that stage insufficient studies had been carried out. It was not until serious doubts arose in 1966-67 that alternative studies were made. The honourable member knows that. For the first time, what was an individual item, a politician's dream, became part of the development of a

great water system. The comparisons were made (and ordered by the Leader of the Opposition as the then Premier) but they could not progress, and this is the report that the member for Stuart knows we have acted on, but with one great difference: we held out for the Chowilla project as the greatest bargaining point we had until we got something much better for this State. The member for Flinders may tell us directly how those negotiations went on. But until the death-knock (March, 1969) we stood by the only thing left for South Australia, namely, the right to disagree with other States if they did not agree to the demands that we made on them.

Mr. Hudson: And we've still got that right.

Mr. Virgo: You are giving it away.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is a grave distortion of the facts to say that this agreement means that Chowilla will never proceed. I have explained to this Parliament what it means if this Bill passes: it means a study that must include Chowilla. It is no guarantee for Chowilla, and no member of this Government has ever said so, but no Government member has ever said it means the end of Chowilla. We say that Chowilla must stand the test of comparison; and then, again, it must stand the test of negotiation. That is more important than, or at least as important as, the technical investigation itself, because the Leader was willing to give Chowilla away for our present low water allocation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I never was.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This was stated in his own words, and he cannot run away from the motion that he moved in this House in 1967.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am not running away from it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of course the Leader is. He said that any alternative to Chowilla must provide us with the same benefits that Chowilla would provide.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: So did you.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader is aware of the weak negotiating position of this State when he left office, involving an allocation that we had to upgrade to 1,500,000 acre feet from his give-away of 1,250,000 acre feet. That is the position that this Government has achieved, and do not think that we are not proud of that achievement (sufficiently proud to ask the people, if necessary, to adjudicate on it). It is, therefore, a distortion of fact (and I am being kind when I say this) to claim that Chowilla is abandoned by this

agreement; it is specifically mentioned in the agreement in the terms that I have just stated. Of course, it is an utter distortion and fraud for the Leader to hold out this amendment as meaning any additional water for South Australia; it means the expenditure of \$15,000,000 to provide water supplies for the other States of Australia.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I support the Premier in his opposition to this amendment. There is no doubt whatever that its effect will be at the least to delay indefinitely the ratification by this Parliament of the agreement and, therefore, its operation. It means that there must be an indefinite delay at the least in the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir, and therefore—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not so.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Whatever the Leader's other weaknesses and faults are, lack of logic should not be one of them, and it follows quite logically that if we do not agree to the ratification of this agreement it will not come into operation, because it is expressly provided that it does not come into operation until ratified by all four Parliaments, and until it comes into operation no works can be undertaken. Therefore, at the least we are delaying by these amendments the coming into operation of the agreement and, therefore, the commencement of the works. There is no guarantee that if this amendment is carried the agreement will ever come into operation (that it will ever be ratified). There is no doubt about this, because the Leader says that we must renegotiate the agreement, and his amendment provides for a renegotiation or an amendment of the agreement, in effect, in three ways.

The first way is by deleting paragraph (a) of clause 10 of the amending agreement (this is in clause 20 of the original consolidated agreement and concerns the Lake Victoria storage works). What he wants to do is remove from the agreement the provision relating to additional works at Lake Victoria. I do not know why he wants to do this. I thought I made it clear yesterday in my speech on the second reading, relying on the technical report of the River Murray Commission, that the provision he now wants to delete has been inserted in case it was desired to go on with these additional works at Lake Victoria. There is no inevitability about this, any more than there is about the construction of any other work. Page 5 of the River Murray Commission's technical report of January, 1969, makes clear that the construction of the Lake

Victoria works is contingent upon our not going ahead with Chowilla; if Chowilla goes ahead, then these works are not constructed.

Mr. Corcoran: It will never go ahead, and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not in the agreement.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Will the Leader contain his impatience for a moment. Paragraph 5 of the report states:

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.

There is a clear implication there (more than a clear implication; a straightout statement) that these works will be required only if Chowilla does not proceed. The report continues:

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. 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.

So there is no inevitability about the construction of these works. They have been included in the agreement so that if it is decided that it is necessary to go on with them there is no requirement for a further amendment to the agreement. This is made clear, and surely the Leader's own argument on Chowilla makes that clear, because provision for these Lake Victoria works and for the Chowilla dam is contained in clause 20 of the agreement, which states:

The works to be provided for under this agreement comprise—

- (i) the provision of a storage on the Upper Murray River (in this agreement referred to as "the Hume reservoir")—

built many years ago—

- (ii) the provision of a system of storage at Lake Victoria.

Then follows the amendment that describes which work should be done, which the Leader wants to delete. Clause 20 continues:

- (iia) the provision of a storage (in this agreement referred to as "the Chowilla reservoir") on the Murray River between Renmark and Wentworth with a capacity
- (iib) the provision of Chowilla.

If the Leader is arguing that Chowilla will never be built, why is he arguing in the same breath that it is inevitable that these Lake Victoria improvements will proceed? They are in the same clause of the agreement and are just as much subject to an agreement between the contracting Governments as every other work provided for in the agreement will be.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But Chowilla is a special provision.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know that, but the alteration to clause 28 of the agreement states:

Furthermore, in the case of works estimated to cost more than \$500,000

These Lake Victoria works will cost more than \$500,000. For the purposes of his argument, the Leader has taken the upper limit of the estimate, which is \$7,000,000.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is \$8,000,000, according to the Premier.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, \$8,000,000, if you like. It is certainly more than \$500,000. The addition to the clause continues:

the constructing authority shall obtain the approval of the commission for the acceptance of any tender exceeding \$500,000, and the approval of the commission shall not be given without the approval of the contracting Governments.

So that every work under this agreement in future costing more than \$500,000 will need the approval of the contracting Governments, and the Opposition does not seek to strike that provision out of the agreement. That applies to the Lake Victoria works as much as it does to Chowilla, Dartmouth or anywhere else. It ill becomes the Leader of the Opposition, who has a knowledge of the law and who knows and understands the provisions of this agreement, to put the point that he has put. That, I hope, will be sufficient to show the hollowness of his argument on this point. Now he wants also to delete the provision "However, completion of the Chowilla reservoir shall be deferred until the contracting Governments agree that the work shall proceed". That is only writing into the agreement what has always been the position.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Then why is it necessary?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader, above all people, should understand that, because it was he who, in August, 1967, faced the veto of the other States and the Commonwealth on the continuation of the construction of Chowilla, and he gave in: he

agreed to a postponement of the work on Chowilla because he knew he had to agree to it. He knows, as we all know, that the commission must be unanimous for such a decision as this to be made. He agreed just as surely (because of the veto of the other States) as if that provision was already in the agreement. Let no-one say that the Commissioners are independent and do not take instructions from their Governments on the decisions they are to make, because they do and the Leader of the Opposition knows this, because he got an opinion from the Crown Solicitor to that effect in March, 1968, only a few weeks before we came into office.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I surely did.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He surely did, and it is perhaps an eloquent commentary on the relationship then existing between the Government of that time and the Engineer-in-Chief.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: He said so in this House.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is what the opinion says on this point:

In general, I think it is clear that the Commissioner appointed by each State is appointed to represent the interests of that State for the purposes of the agreement, and that, like any other agent, he should carry out the lawful instructions of his principal.

So, in effect, as the Leader well knows, the Commissioners are there to represent their Governments, the decisions they make in the commission are the decisions of their Governments, and those decisions must be unanimous to go forward. That is tantamount to a veto by any Government, such as is written into the agreement in this provision that he wants to delete.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You know it is not.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know anything else but what I have said. What I have said is completely accurate, and I challenge the Leader to explain away the point I have made. Let us come now to the third matter in which the Leader would try to amend the agreement. These three points are in fact an amendment to the agreement, although he has drawn them in such a way as to avoid the prohibition against amending the schedule to the Act:

(c) by inserting therein a date for the recommencement of work on the Chowilla reservoir.

How on earth he can reconcile that amendment to the agreement with his request that there should be an evaluation by computer

of the benefits of operating storages of various capacities at both Dartmouth and Chowilla contemporaneously, I do not know. Apparently, he is assuming the result of those computer evaluations, because in one breath he asks for an evaluation to see what the benefits would be, and in the other he assumes the result and says that a date for the re-commencement of work at Chowilla must be included in the agreement. That is illogical and absurd. Although the Leader drew his amendments rather hastily to catch the prevailing winds, I hope that he will do something about that one, because it is absurd to assume the answer in the last part of his amendment to one of the earlier parts of it. That deals with the three matters that he wants to amend in the agreement.

I return now to the point I made yesterday: how is the Leader going to persuade the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Governments to amend the agreement? What arguments can he advance or what pressure can he bring to bear on those Governments to persuade them to alter the agreement?

Mr. Hudson: You heard that last night.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Will it be his 1967 resolution that South Australia should get at least as much water as we would get if Chowilla were built? What arguments will he use with the Premiers of the other States (whether it be Sir Henry Bolte in Victoria after the end of this month or his good friend Mr. Holding, who put forward Mr. Floyd to speak for the Australian Labor Party and who damned Chowilla up hill and down dale)? If the Leader is genuine in this matter, let him get up now and tell the people of South Australia what arguments he is going to advance to persuade the other States to amend the agreement in these or in any other respects. I bet he will not do it, because he cannot do it. There are no arguments that he can put forward to persuade them to do so.

Mr. Casey: Rubbish!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member can say that, in what will be his last day as a member of this place. Let the Leader get up and give the lie to the argument, because we want to know how genuine he is in this matter. What will he say to his fellow Premiers if, as he hopes he will, he becomes Premier in the next few weeks? Let me reiterate this: we are debating now whether we are to accept a greatly increased allocation of water for this State, to our immense benefit, or whether we are to get nothing at all and be back to the point we

were at when the Labor Party was in office and earlier.

The second point is that the Leader's three amendments to the agreement are completely and utterly meaningless and nugatory; they are a waste of time and mean nothing whatever. The third, and most important, point is: what argument will the Opposition, or its Leader, advance to persuade the other Governments to amend the agreement? If the Leader can answer those points, I should be happy to support his amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: There are a number of points that both the Premier and the Attorney-General have made in an attempt to deceive this Chamber and the people of South Australia regarding the correct position. They have tried to say that we have no arguments to use in relation to the other States, that we have no bargaining power and that there is no way in which we can secure any improvement in the agreement that we have been asked to ratify.

All members recognize that there is no sense in amending the schedule at this time and that any amendments to the Bill are really an instruction to the Government of the day to seek an improved agreement. Had the Attorney-General cared to read a little more of the technical report of the River Murray Commission, he would have found on page 8 the statement that the existing requirements of New South Wales and Victoria are about 2,700,000 acre feet a year. If he looks at the first graph on page 9 and examines the quantity that can be yielded to New South Wales and Victoria without either Dartmouth or Chowilla, he will see that it is about 2,100,000 acre feet. Therefore, the existing requirements of New South Wales and Victoria are 600,000 acre feet in excess of what can currently be supplied to them. Of course, that is why New South Wales and Victoria ceded what they did to South Australia, as an increase in water entitlement, without a word of controversy in any of their local newspapers. The Premier has been trying to kid us that it took hours and hours of negotiation and that it was terribly difficult to get this, but we heard nothing about it from the other States.

Because New South Wales and Victoria have not controlled irrigation development properly, plainly they are in much greater difficulty than is South Australia in relation to the provision of water. That is the fact that is spelt out by implication in the technical committee's report. It may be that the Attorney-General, with his legalistic mind, is incapable of seeing that this point gives us

bargaining power so long as the agreement is not ratified at this time. If it is ratified, any bargaining power we might have is lost. What we are being asked to do by the Government (and all members opposite will say this in private but are not game to say it in public) is to ratify an agreement to provide for Dartmouth with no provision for Chowilla, which is out the window. Even though there are some words about Chowilla still in the agreement, they do not mean anything. All members opposite know that this is what is being done. The Premier wants us to put through the agreement now, lose what bargaining power we have, and then ask for further studies.

Of course, he has said to the Prime Minister and the other Premiers that this agreement does not mean anything and does not commit them to anything, as it is of no significance, but that it will be a sop to the people of South Australia and to members of Parliament and will help him to get the Bill through. Everyone who has any common sense at all knows full well that if one believes (as we believe) that there are further points that we must bargain for, one does not give away one's position before one attempts to bargain. This is not a question of indefinite delays. We know that both the Premier and the Attorney-General want to spread the canard that if this agreement does not go through now there will be water restrictions and no Dartmouth dam. They even got the Governor to say that for them. That is not the case, for this will not mean any delay at all in the construction of the Dartmouth dam.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Rubbish!

Mr. HUDSON: It is not. Are they ready to go to tender?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: They cannot start planning until the Bill is passed.

Mr. HUDSON: What about clause 28(3) of the River Murray Waters Agreement, which gives the right to the commission to go ahead with planning? The plans were already prepared or were in the course of preparation before this agreement went through.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What you're saying is absolutely absurd. If there was a delay in the ratification of this agreement, there would have to be a delay in starting the work.

Mr. HUDSON: When will tenders be ready to be called?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It doesn't matter.

Mr. HUDSON: We have heard some non-sensical arguments from the Attorney-General before, but now he is getting over the odds. The Chowilla agreement was approved in 1963 by all the Parliaments concerned, and when were we ready to go to tender on that? In 1967. The matter is extremely urgent for New South Wales and Victoria. Are any Government members willing to say that they are now ready to go to tender on the Dartmouth dam this year or next year? When will they be ready to go to tender?

Mr. Lawn: In 1974.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Get back to the argument.

Mr. HUDSON: I am used to the Premier's evading issues and questions: he is a very evasive Premier. Repeatedly he has claimed, "Dartmouth or nothing". That must mean that, if this agreement is not ratified now, we will never get Dartmouth, that no agreement will ever be ratified. The Attorney-General has said that, if the agreement is not approved today by this Parliament, there will be an indefinite delay. The Government is not willing to say when it will be ready to go to tender for the Dartmouth dam. The River Murray Waters Agreement as it stands gives the right for plans to be developed, and even the technical committee's report contains preliminary sketch drawings of the Dartmouth dam. A whole section of the report deals with that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Without any agreement whatever.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. The section is headed "Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority, Detailed Investigations of Dartmouth Dam Site" and contains all preliminary details and preliminary survey plans in relation to the Dartmouth dam. There is no reason why the planning stages cannot continue as they have been continuing. All we are saying is that, before we are prepared to ratify the agreement, we want to bargain further. We are not prepared, as Government members are, to give Chowilla away for all time. We want to go ahead and try to bargain over other matters as well, as I said in my second reading speech last evening, a speech to which no Government member has bothered to reply. In fact, Government members have not bothered to reply to any points made by the Opposition.

Furthermore, if a further agreement is bargained for, a whole series of consequential amendments to the agreement will be necessary, and it is ridiculous for the Premier to say that, if extra benefits can be gained by constructing

Chowilla as well as Dartmouth, all those extra benefits will go to New South Wales and Victoria. The extra benefits would be shared by the three States, and a whole series of consequential amendments would have to be incorporated in a new agreement. This is common sense, and anyone concerned about telling a straight-forward story instead of a pack of evasions knows this to be the case. What these amendments argue for is this: that if this agreement is ratified now, Chowilla will be given away for all time and each of the other parties to the River Murray Commission will be given a permanent right of veto of the dam. Every Government member knows that that is the view held in New South Wales, Victoria, and in the Commonwealth Parliament, and Government members know that this is also their own private view.

Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Mr. Fairbairn said it specifically in the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. HUDSON: He also said it specifically on the Premier's television programme. This agreement as it stands means the end of Chowilla. We say that the agreement has certain advantages for South Australia but we also say that we should not be giving away rights to the Chowilla dam now without attempting to improve on the agreement that we already have. An agreement is not improved by giving away one's bargaining powers. The bargaining power we have now is that New South Wales and Victoria are desperate to get this through, because their immediate need for extra water is many times greater than ours. This is set forth clearly in the technical committee's report, in the minutes of the River Murray Commission, and in statements that have been made by members of Parliament representing the river areas in New South Wales and Victoria in the Commonwealth and State Parliaments. In order to give them this water we are being told that we must give away our rights to Chowilla for all time. We say that it is not appropriate to do it now, and we tell this Government that it should further bargain in order to obtain a better agreement than the one we have now.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: I have never heard so many distortions or attempts to distort as have been made by the member for Glenelg. He suggested that we do not need an agreement to start Dartmouth. Does the honourable member think that any Government will agree to spend money from this point until the agreement is properly amended and properly approved by this Parliament? The member for Glenelg is saying that we must blackmail the

other States into further concessions because of some mythical bargaining power that we have over them. Let us consider this magnificent bargaining power for South Australia, this place so full of water that we do not have to worry about this year, because next year will do! That is what the member for Glenelg is saying. He refuses to pass the agreement in its present form and wants it amended, so that it will be reduced to a nullity. He said:

The other States are in dire need, because their needs are 600,000 acre feet above what they can now be supplied.

Between two States with a total of about 8,000,000 people they are short by 600,000 acre feet. How much are we short in this State? How many acre feet were we short in 1967? We were short of the 1,500,000 acre feet by 580,000 acre feet. At that time the river in this State became a stagnant pool. I visited these areas to ascertain what the situation at Myponga. In some areas waste water was flowing upstream and being collected in the pumps there. We were short of the entitlement that this agreement gives us by 580,000 acre feet.

Is this not a marvellous bargaining power! Was 1967 the worst year we can expect? Does it compare with the situation before 1945? Does it compare with the eight or nine years of drought during which Chowilla would never have filled? What if a drought period began next year? Yet the member for Glenelg says, "We will risk all. We will risk the economic, primary and secondary development of this State on a huge gamble. We will risk it on the possibility that there will not be a drought in the foreseeable future. All of the people on the river should come with me and pledge their properties and livelihood in this huge gamble." This is what the Leader is saying, supported by the member for Glenelg. For what purpose will we make this gamble?

Mr. Hudson: You sound like Hans Christian Andersen.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The great water policy of the Australian Labor Party seems to be based on facetiousness, humour and snide remarks. We have the jovial member for Unley (Mr. Langley) back again; he is sitting there with the protection of his electors in mind. They do not want water: they have the honourable member.

Mr. Langley: Yes, they do want water. They want both Chowilla and Dartmouth; they have told me so.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is A.L.P. policy to take everyone's livelihood and pledge it

on a huge gamble, but this will not work. In 1967, South Australia was short by 580,000 acre feet of the entitlement we are now offered. Our experts tell us today that we need 1,500,000 acre feet to meet the planning that we have in hand. Yet the member for Glenelg will take all this and risk the future of every citizen in South Australia!

Mr. VIRGO: I rise in the hope that we may get rid of some of the dramatics that the Premier and the Attorney-General have attempted to introduce into this question. I wonder whether the Premier has planned his election policy speech and whether he has given us a rehearsal this afternoon. The Committee ought to realize that many of his claims are completely false. He tells us how he bargained around the table. He even had to kick the member for Flinders (Hon. Sir Glen Pearson)—probably to wake him up! Let me quote from the following press report in the *Advertiser* of March 1, 1969:

An extra 250,000 acre feet of water a year would be available to South Australia if the Dartmouth dam in Victoria were built instead of Chowilla, the Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) said today. . . . A Commonwealth-State conference is expected to be held next week to discuss the sharing between New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia of the extra 860,000 acre feet estimated to be provided by Dartmouth.

That is how hard he bargained! He had it on a plate! What he has said in this Chamber is utter rubbish. On February 26, 1969, he said, "It's time South Australia realized that Chowilla was not achievable." That is the attitude that this man has adopted when he has gone bargaining. What a position of bargaining he put himself in! Why does he not practise what he preaches? The Premier accused Labor members of playing politics, but he should look in the mirror to find out who is playing politics.

The Leader of the Opposition has said, to the Premier's dismay, that the Labor Party is not opposed to Dartmouth. The Premier thought we were, but he had not worried about reading what the Leader had said. He is now disappointed, so he is looking for some other fodder. What the Labor Party is saying (as has been adequately stated by the Leader, the Deputy Leader and the member for Glenelg) is that we cannot give away our bargaining power. There is an agreement that a former Liberal Premier entered into to build Chowilla. It cannot be built forthwith; but, for goodness sake, do not let us close our option and sell South Australia down the river, which is what

every member opposite will be doing if he rejects this amendment or, alternatively, supports the Premier's proposition.

The Premier of Victoria made a statement 12 months ago that he would support Dartmouth only because that would give him 500,000 acre feet of water, but no-one talks about that. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the former Minister of Works, that Dartmouth has greater benefits for Victoria than Chowilla would have, and that is the reason why Victoria wants it. I do not blame Victorians for wanting it, but I want Chowilla at some stage or another, because it will give South Australia greater benefits.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE (Minister of Education): After listening to some of the remarks of the last couple of speakers, I think it is about time that we got back to the matter before the Chair. The matter now before the Committee is that the amendments which the Leader seeks to introduce alter the schedule to the Bill in certain specific ways. The computer studies that he requests, by the very fact that they affect the schedule of the Bill, will completely wreck the measure and in doing so will, in fact, bring immediately to a complete halt any work on any dam whatsoever on the Murray River.

Mr. Hudson: That's not true.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The member for Glenelg had a few words to say about this a short time ago. I will specifically deal with the points he made in just a few moments, because he made some allegations that I said were not true. The plain fact is that the Committee has before it today these amendments of the Leader, who has been good enough to say that the second part of his amendments is contingent on the carrying of the first part. Indeed, that is obvious. We are talking here today about the ratification in Committee of an agreement already agreed to by three Parliaments of this nation that will provide, for the first time since 1915, a greater quantity of water than ever before. The allegation was made by the Leader and subsequent speakers that we are signing away Chowilla. We are not. There are still in this Bill many references to Chowilla: if we had wanted to sign away Chowilla, they would not have been made at all. But the Leader specifically referred to clause 13, which deals with the right of the contracting Governments to (as he put it) veto certain works. In other words, he has said that Chowilla shall not proceed until the contracting Governments,

parties to this agreement, agree. Is this not exactly the position, in practice, that we have today?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I heard the honourable the Leader deny that earlier when an interjection was made, but he knows as well as I do that the River Murray Commissioners act as agents for their State Governments. The Leader said yesterday that he, when he was Premier, issued instructions to Mr. Beaney, our Director and Engineer-in-Chief and also our Commissioner at that time. When I became Minister of Works, I too issued instructions, and the Leader yesterday chided my Government for repudiating or withdrawing or altering those instructions. I said at that time that that was not true, and the Leader said I had altered the instructions. If I may, to give the direct lie to the Leader, I quote from page 138 of *Hansard* of June 26, 1968, a reply I gave him—and he knows about the instructions to the Commissioner. Referring to a forthcoming meeting of the River Murray Commission, I said:

The South Australian Commissioner went to the April meeting of the River Murray Commission with the clear direction that he should not support any resolution to cancel or indefinitely defer the construction of the Chowilla dam.

I went on with a long statement after that, but that was the effect of it. I quote that only to rebut the statement made by the Leader yesterday in that connection.

The River Murray Commissioners are responsible public servants of their respective States. They can and do take directions from the contracting Governments. This is, in effect, what happens today. Both the Leader, when he was Premier, and I as Minister of Works have given instructions to our Commissioner and, if there is a matter upon which the Commissioner requires guidance from the Government, he comes to the Government and gets a direction. A Crown Law opinion has been given upon this matter. So, in effect, where clause 13 states that work shall not proceed until the contracting Governments agree, that is exactly the position that obtains today under the River Murray Commissioners' powers. So this statement by the Leader is fatuous and falls to the ground.

The Committee must now decide one simple matter: it must either ratify or defeat the agreement. I say plainly that an amendment to the schedule would mean the defeat of the whole Bill—there is no argument about that.

That is the choice before the Committee today. Ratification of this agreement would mean greater future security for South Australians in all walks of life. The defeat of the Bill, either outright or through the carrying of amendments, would mean no dam at all on the Murray River for any number of years to come, with the resultant retardation of this State's development. It would certainly mean extreme hardship and privation in dry years for people living along the Murray who derive their livelihood from its waters. Members who may choose to vote against the ratification of this agreement should bear this in mind: it could be on their conscience for years to come.

One inescapable result of passing the Leader's amendment will be that no dam will be built for years to come. However, if the agreement is ratified work can commence on Dartmouth dam. The member for Glenelg asked when tenders could be called, when the design work could commence, and similar questions about Dartmouth dam. I recall that decisions on these matters were made at conferences I attended as Minister of Works and, having since checked this with Mr. Beaney, I can say that no design or final survey can be commenced at Dartmouth until this agreement is ratified by the four Parliaments concerned. I recall discussing this very aspect with engineers at one of the Canberra conferences that led to this agreement. The engineers said clearly then that no design work on Dartmouth could commence until the agreement was ratified.

The member for Glenelg referred to the Snowy Mountains Authority report, which is contained in the tripartite report previously presented to this Chamber. Of course, that is part of the work that authority was asked to do, but no detailed work can commence until the agreement is ratified. If the agreement is ratified today, tenders can be called this year for the diversion work, which is the first step and which could commence in the summer. Possibly tenders for the main dam could be called in mid-1971.

Mr. Hudson: It isn't possible.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: As the honourable member asked these questions, I am providing the information he sought. As Minister of Works I relied on the integrity of the engineers of my department, led by the Engineer-in-Chief. I am sure no-one would question his integrity. Further, I have spoken to engineers from other State authorities in relation to the time schedule I have just

announced. I am told that to call tenders for Chowilla would take up to 15 months because of the variations that have become necessary since the dam was first approved. I suppose that construction time would be about the same as for Dartmouth because they are similar types of dam. If we ratify this agreement now, it is possible that in about 1975 the Dartmouth dam will be at such a stage that we can start to store water, although the dam will not be completed then. Of course, various assumptions have been made about when water would be available from Dartmouth and I have heard it said that that would not be until 1980. How silly can one get? If we approve the agreement now, we can store some water in 1975.

Mr. Hudson: We wouldn't be able to use the water straightaway.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I did not say that. I am coming to when we could use the water. Last year I gave the member for Glenelg Mitta Mitta River flow figures taken over a period from about 1880, but I have not those figures with me.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was about 580,000 acre feet.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The information also showed that storms occur in the hilly country where the dam will go, and all the information indicates that the dam could fill in two years and be effective. In one extraordinary year the maximum flow was 1,100,000 acre feet over seven days. The catchment area is about 1,400 square miles of high-rainfall country. If we started to store water about 1975, we could get some effectiveness from the dam in about two years from then.

Mr. Corcoran: That would be in the best circumstances.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: That would be in normal circumstances. I would not say they would be the best circumstances, because they could be better. In clarifying this I would like to make clear one point. It has often been said that we would have to wait until Dartmouth filled before using it, but, we do not have to have any reservoir full to use it. If that were the case we would not be able to draw water out of any of Adelaide reservoirs because they would have to be kept full. We draw water away from them. The important point in having a reservoir on the headwaters of the river is like having money in the bank—as a reserve to be drawn on. The Hume reservoir is not big enough to supply the added water we shall get. I shall not

dwelt on what other members have said about statements in the 1967 debate, when the Leader, who was then Premier, spoke about accepting any other alternative, because that point has already been covered. However, I recall with much vividness how his Whip (the member for West Torrens) rushed around and drew up another motion, to cover up the Leader's error about being willing to accept any alternative. The amendment, which was eventually carried unanimously, is reported on page 1298 of *Hansard* of August 15, 1967, as follows:

Assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the (Chowilla) dam South Australia will be supplied in dry years with the volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure.

That motion was carried unanimously, because it was the only proposition before us. After the Whip had rescued his Leader, the Chamber eventually agreed to it, and following that direction this Government has achieved it and obtained far more water than has been obtained by any other person or Government, or has been demanded by any other person. The Leader now puts before us a series of amendments that really defeat the purpose of the motion to which we agreed. The Leader glibly spoke about renegotiating this agreement: he said that yesterday and again today. He said that he could probably do it in a few months. There was some divergence of opinion yesterday, in the rather brilliant speech of the Attorney-General, about whether it would be a few months, three months, or something like that, but it was to be a matter of months. The Leader has said, and it has been repeated by some of his colleagues, that this whole agreement could be renegotiated within months.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, I have not.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You said it at Peterborough in the first flush of your excitement.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that the whole agreement could be renegotiated.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: How long will it take?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Leader has now qualified what he said.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not at all, I am giving you what I said.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Leader must either accept or repudiate the agreement.

The Hon. Sir Glen Pearson: He was referring to the vital parts of the agreement.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I see. Let us be charitable and accept the Leader's

explanation. I remind the Leader that it has taken more than 18 months to get the agreement to its present stage. As Minister of Works I played a leading part in the negotiations: The Premier started it off, and over a period of 18 months I attended conferences all over Australia with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and other officers, and the Premier attended many others. As a Minister, I have been to many conferences, but these were some of the hardest I have ever attended. We set out to get more water for South Australia, and we succeeded. We were the first Government that had asked for more water.

The agreement provides that we will get more water, but the amendment seeks, in effect, to wreck the agreement completely. I say advisedly from bitter experience of hard bargaining and as a result of my discussions with other State Ministers and with the River Murray Commissioners and advisers and engineers from other States, that the Leader has no more hope of renegotiating the agreement within months than a snowflake has in hell. And the Leader knows it as well as I do. What arguments will he advance? The Attorney-General posed this question just now. The Leader knows that he cannot renegotiate this agreement within months, particularly as the Parliaments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth have already ratified it. Are they going to alter it? I remind members again of the delay that would be involved. Even if the Leader were able to renegotiate the agreement in, say, six months, it would mean that each Parliament would have to go through the whole process again and there would be another year or two of delay.

From bitter experience and from personal contact with the Victorian Minister (Mr. Borthwick), the New South Wales Minister (Mr. Beale), the former Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Fairbairn) and the present Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Swartz), I assure the Leader that there would be no chance at all of renegotiating this agreement in the terms of the amendments that he has put before us today. What he will succeed in doing is having no dam built at all on the Murray River for many years to come. If this State suffers as a result of the Leader's opposition or his amendments, the blame can and must fairly rest on his shoulders and on the shoulders of those who support him in this regard. If ever, by some mischance, the Leader became Premier of this State he would be faced with a dilemma. He would have no

alternative to getting up in this House as Premier (heaven forbid!) and moving that this ratification Bill be agreed to. I say this advisedly because I cannot for a moment see that the Leader has any hope of having this agreement renegotiated. No debate is complete without a speech from the member for Edwardstown, and now and again we hear something of value from him. He said that South Australia did not bargain very hard: it did not have much of a job to do.

Mr. Virgo: That is right.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: That is the point that the honourable member made. Apparently, I have interpreted him correctly.

Mr. Virgo: You gave South Australia away to the whisperings of Bolte, and you know it.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Thank you.

Mr. Virgo: He stood right over you.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Thank you. That is just what I wanted the honourable member to say. If one dangles a sufficiently large and delicate bait, in will come the fish. Reference has already been made to the negotiations that led up to this State's gaining more water than has ever been granted to it previously. On February 6, 1969, referring to the River Murray Commission meeting that was going to be held on the same day, I made the following statement:

The River Murray Commission will discuss the future of water storage on the Murray River and must consider the reports of its technical committee—

which came out, as members may recall, I think a month before—

in relation to findings on Chowilla and Dartmouth as alternatives for dam sites. If the commission does not come to a decision favourable to South Australia, this Government—

and we are talking now about the Liberal Government—

will request a conference between the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia and the Prime Minister. The technical committee's report is now available for study and indicates that Dartmouth will provide a greater yield to the river system than Chowilla. However, the Government has consistently said that any alternative must provide greater benefits to South Australia than Chowilla. Because of Dartmouth's ability to provide approximately 860,000 acre feet of additional water above that which Chowilla can provide in terms of average supply, the South Australian Government maintains that South Australia's entitlement must be increased to share in this additional available supply. It has therefore informed the other members of the commission that it cannot contemplate the construction of Dartmouth unless there is an increase in

South Australia's water entitlement from 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 acre feet, and in addition it would be necessary to spend a substantial sum (in the vicinity of from \$4,000,000 to \$7,000,000), as indicated by the report, to renovate Lake Victoria and increase its capacity for taking in and passing out water to facilitate the short-term management of the river in South Australia.

The Government is optimistic that the other States will show their confidence in the technical committee's report by agreeing to share the additional water supplies from the Dartmouth scheme. In short, the South Australian Government has substantially increased its demands in relation to overall water supply from the Murray River system above that required by the previous Government, when an endeavour was made to have the other State Premiers guarantee from any alternative only that which Chowilla would provide.

That was the statement issued on February 6, 1969. The River Murray Commission met, and the next thing that happened was that a Ministerial meeting was held in Sydney, as has been referred to by the Premier, on March 7, 1969. The Minister for National Development at that time was the Hon. David Fairbairn; Mr. Beale represented New South Wales, Mr. Borthwick represented Victoria, and I represented South Australia. These were the matters on which we obtained complete agreement, and I will read them in the order in which they were published in the press on my return from that conference, as follows:

The Ministers agreed on the conditions under which Dartmouth would be built, but the States' agreement was conditional upon Commonwealth finance being made available to assist them in financing their share of the cost of Dartmouth. All Ministers agreed that South Australia's basic entitlement to water with Dartmouth should be increased to 1,500,000 acre feet per annum. Under the River Murray Waters Agreement, South Australia's present entitlement is 1,254,000 acre feet per annum.

In times of restriction the available water would be shared equally between three States. This sharing basis was originally agreed to take effect following the construction of Chowilla. It was agreed by all States and the Commonwealth that they would meet their share of the cost of any future storages which may be required on the Murray River after Dartmouth was built.

It was also agreed that the investigation of the future development of Lake Victoria now under way should be completed. This study is designed to establish the works necessary to ensure the effectiveness of Lake Victoria as a Murray River storage operating in conjunction with Dartmouth. It was further agreed that the Menindee Lakes Storage Agreement under which these lakes in New South Wales operate in conjunction with the Murray River system should be continued in perpetuity.

That was a result of the negotiations at that meeting. There was another meeting that I

attended at which we spelt out the very words we are considering today in the schedule.

Let us look for a moment at the effect upon South Australia of a comparison between Chowilla and Dartmouth. From what the Leader has said, I understand he has agreed that Dartmouth can be built but only upon the terms set out in his amendments. The entitlement with Chowilla was 1,254,000 acre feet; with Dartmouth it is 1,500,000 acre feet, a 20 per cent increase. The diversion water allocated to us of 690,000 acre feet would rise by about 246,000 acre feet with Dartmouth. The dilution water would be about 564,000 acre feet in each case. The over-commitment on our present allocation—I am talking here as though Chowilla were in operation—would be 85,000 acre feet. That would mean licences had been issued on the river for more water than we could get from the river in a dry year. On the other hand, if we had Dartmouth instead of Chowilla, the additional water available after covering that over-commitment would be 161,000 acre feet, some of which would be likely to be required for improved quality control, but the balance likely to be available for further use would be 41,000 acre feet.

Evaporation has been mentioned earlier. In the case of Chowilla it would be 1,050,000 acre feet whereas with Dartmouth it would be 15,000 acre feet. Here comes the crux: the issuing of further irrigation water licences on the Murray River is absolutely vital to the blockers on the river. I have already said that if Chowilla was built it would only ensure our entitlement. We are already over-committed by some 85,000 acre feet. The position would be that, if Chowilla was built today, there would be a complete ban on the issuing of any more licences, with the distinct danger of some reduction. If Dartmouth was built, the existing supply of licences would be assured and there would possibly be some future expansion. Investigations have already been commenced by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to see how this water could be allocated. The number of years of restriction taken during the period from 1905 to 1960 would have been three, of which Chowilla would have been empty during only one year, while with Dartmouth there would have been only one year of restriction, which would have been minimal.

There are one or two major aspects that have completely changed the outlook on Chowilla since it was originally agreed to. Two main changes have occurred. One is salinity, the true importance of which was not appreciated

at the time, but later it came to be fully appreciated. The second aspect was the great increase in the issuing of water licences in South Australia. Enormous increases in the number of licences granted along the river (I may say the indiscriminate issuing of licences) occurred a few years ago. This was so serious and the over-commitment became so dangerous that the then Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens—and I give him full credit for this) imposed a complete ban on the issue of new licences back in February, 1967, for river plantings above Mannum. Later in 1967, with the support of Parliament, he had to extend the Control of Waters Act to include the whole of the Murray River for the first time right down to the lakes. This shows the seriousness of the position. To his credit, at that time the member for Hindmarsh strictly enforced the decision he made not to issue any more licences.

When I came into office I continued the practice. On December 1, 1968, I made slight extensions to allow areas of up to 50 acres, which was considered a reasonable working area for a blocker, but people applying for anything larger than that got nothing. Too many large parcels of land had been handed out in the past. In cases of hardship, I permitted some transfers, but I reserved the right to prevent trafficking in licences. I introduced the system of metering on the river, and I believe this will prove a great advantage to blockers, to irrigationists, and to everyone else. While I was Minister, because of the over-commitments, on the basis of Chowilla, that would have occurred in dry years, I steadfastly refused to grant extra licences.

The effect of the Leader's amendment will be to continue the critical condition that obtains along the river today. In a dry year, these people will not thank the Leader for wrecking this Bill. People from Whyalla, Keith, Stockwell, Milang, and the metropolitan area, who use water from the Murray will be adversely affected if the agreement is not ratified. I can say plainly that the defeat of this Bill today will wreck any chance blockers and irrigationists have of getting relief. We must remember that in this agreement, as in the previous agreement, South Australia is the only State that has a specified allotment. In dry years, New South Wales and Victoria must drop back to about 70 per cent of their normal requirements before any restriction is placed on South Australia. The studies on Dartmouth show that a restriction would be likely to have occurred in only one

year in 50 years, and then it would have been minimal.

There have been many misunderstandings about arrangements concerning the river. One of the greatest misconceptions is that if we had Chowilla, which would be just inside South Australia, we would have as much water as we wanted. However, all we would get from Chowilla is the allotment to which we would be entitled under the agreement. From time to time people have spoken about surplus flows coming down the river, and these are not necessarily bad for us. We must keep the river clean and the salt slugs moving. If there are headwaters in the Mitta Mitta or water in Lake Victoria, surplus water that is released and moves down the river naturally must move salt and bring clean water after it. We are dealing with water usage in all parts of South Australia and all members should realize that, if we cannot get water from the Murray River, we will be in trouble, wherever we live. If we ratify this agreement, we can get on with constructing the dam straightway. However, if the ratification agreement is defeated, no dam will be built on the river for years to come. Whoever votes against this Bill and wrecks it must stand the odium for and the charge of destroying or impeding the future development of South Australia in all the areas that need water so badly.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): This is an extraordinary situation. The amendment would completely destroy the present agreement and require every part of it to be negotiated again. The one ingredient for success that our vigorous and progressive community requires to have assured is water, and we have been offered, by this agreement, benefits vastly greater than anything that we have asked for or been offered previously. However, the Committee is divided fairly solidly about whether to accept the offer. We are committed regarding future water needs to such an extent that the Chowilla dam by itself would not give us the additional water that we will need, and we can meet our future commitments only if we have the Dartmouth dam. If this amendment is accepted, we are in effect rejecting the Dartmouth dam. It is difficult to dispute that we have negotiated an agreement that provides for a better dam than Chowilla.

The studies started and agreed to by the previous Government showed that situation conclusively, and no-one can refute it. Every expert advising us tells us to agree to this

agreement and that Dartmouth is a better proposition for South Australia than is Chowilla. What is left is an emotional type of argument about the dam sitting partly in South Australia with the implication that if it is in South Australia it cannot be stolen by the other States. This argument has been effectively discussed and refuted by other Government members, who have pointed out that, since the commission has operated, there has never been trouble between the States about managing the waters of the Murray River. Any disagreements have been easily resolved and none of the Commissioners has betrayed or tried to break any agreement. Why, then, should we place such store in having water which it is implied we can draw on but no-one else can? If we had Chowilla and tried to use its water illegally the other States could effectively counter this, because they control the upper parts of the river.

It is more to our advantage to have an agreement whereby we have a guarantee of water: the other States have a guaranteed supply of water, but they have now guaranteed more water for South Australia than we have ever had before. This agreement has been ratified by three Parliaments, but now we are asked to amend it in such a way that it will be completely nullified, so it would have to be returned to these Parliaments.

Mr. Clark: Until it is ratified by Parliament the agreement does not exist, so we cannot break it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is so, but it has been suggested that Chowilla will give us water which only we can draw on. The implication is that otherwise the water can be stolen from us. The Commissioners have never operated in such a piratical way, and there is no need for us to doubt the integrity of the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. They will stand by the agreement, and if we make improper use of the Chowilla dam we would leave ourselves open to such easy reprisals that it would be unwise to undertake that action. So, in that respect the advantage of having a dam within our borders is quite illusory. There is certainly an advantage in having a dam built within one State from the viewpoint of the money spent on the construction work in that State. However, there is absolutely nothing more to any objections to the Dartmouth dam, yet this amendment will effectively stop it.

It is no good trying to argue that, if Parliament does not ratify this Bill, the authorities

will go ahead and make further plans. They will not make such plans: they will have plenty of warning of trouble if they read the records of this debate. They will not be spending any money on the Dartmouth dam site until the four Parliaments have ratified the agreement. Here we have an agreement better than we ever dreamed of, and we are asked to throw it away! All the argument that I have listened to adds up to political advantage. I have even heard Opposition members saying that we are putting this forward for political purposes. Do members opposite seriously think that we adopted the Dartmouth proposal with the idea that there was some easy road to political success through doing so? As has been seen over and over again, the initial reaction to the adoption of the Dartmouth proposal was hostile. However, by the energetic and clear efforts of the Premier to demonstrate the advantages of adopting the Dartmouth proposal, most South Australians who have any interest in the matter have concluded that the Dartmouth dam is better. After all, most people do not distrust experts. I have heard many expressions of distrust of experts from the Opposition, but most people are instinctively impressed by experts.

Mr. Jennings: Your Leader said today that they did as they were told.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That interjection is irrelevant, because the honourable member knows that the Premier was referring to policy matters within the River Murray Commission, not to advice by experts. However, we are paying experts to advise us, and every one I have met has conclusively favoured the Dartmouth dam. They did conclusively favour Chowilla in the days before computer studies were made. However, when hundreds of variables were fed into the computer, the experts concluded that Dartmouth was clearly a better proposition not only from one State's viewpoint but from the viewpoints of all parties to the agreement. So, it is not for us now to try to stop the progress offered to us in this agreement. Members opposite may argue that they are trying to safeguard Chowilla, but having two dams built simultaneously would be less advantageous to us than having one dam built at a time, and Dartmouth should be first. If Dartmouth is built (and it should be built and in operation before the end of the decade) we will then have an assured water supply in relation to our 1,500,000 acre feet, but a large part of the catchment of the rivers is not under the control of the River Murray Com-

mission, and there is nothing to stop other States, in whose territories those rivers exist, building dams on them; and, in fact, they have plans to do so.

Victoria has had a plan to build a dam at Buffalo; New South Wales also has plans; and those rivers, which now flow into the Murray system, will be taken away from them, at least in part. The result will be to degrade the system as we know it, and with the Dartmouth dam there will be a great assurance to us that we can counteract the influence of dam-building by other States. If we insisted (and this is not possible), for example, that Chowilla be built at the same time as Dartmouth, we would not get any more water; we would get exactly the same quantity of water as is specified in the agreement. What is the point of having two dams if we are going to get the same quantity of water from one?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member is dealing with something that is envisaged in an amendment to be moved by the member for Ridley.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that the other amendment has more relevance to what I am saying, but I suggest that my remarks are relevant to this amendment in the terms in which it is expressed. Although I will not press the point, I should like to be able to finish the argument that I was advancing, namely, that simultaneous construction would be bad. The construction of dams in other States will degrade the system over the years, and when that happens the commission will want to build up water supplies to maintain our entitlement (not necessarily increase it but maintain it). Sometimes, people think that just by building new dams more water will be provided, and they overlook the fact that the building of a dam does not necessarily increase the system's yield.

The system's yield has an overall maximum and, when the commission is faced with the degrading of our water supplies by the legal construction of dams by other States, then it will look to building another dam to make up our supplies of water here, and it will most likely look to Chowilla. Chowilla will not produce much more water after Dartmouth is built; in fact, according to the experts (and I believe the experts; I am on their side), it will actually add to the system yield only about 250,000 acre feet. Nevertheless, it will be a valuable addition to the works of the River Murray Commission, because if put in its proper order, not now but later,

it will be able to upgrade the system, which has been degraded by the Victorian and New South Wales dams. There are causes of degrading the system other than the building of dams.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have an agreement offering us more water than we have ever asked for before or was expected when planning Chowilla. We have negotiated for a better dam and all the experts advising us tell us that it is a better dam. The agreement has been ratified by three Parliaments, and we have by no means abandoned the Chowilla reservoir. Undoubtedly, our best interests will be served by having the Dartmouth dam built as soon as possible with the Chowilla dam held in reserve to up-grade the system after the other States have filled their own dams, which they are entitled to build outside the catchment area controlled by the River Murray Commission. As far as we can tell at the moment, the Commissioners expect that to happen.

If we reject this agreement now, it will be on the most sordid political grounds. This afternoon, the member for Edwardstown again accused the Premier of playing politics, but he has not explained what political advantage there is in advocating the construction of the Dartmouth dam. It was most courageous of the Premier to take the action he did after several days of close consultation with his advisers, who advised him that the Dartmouth dam was the better proposition. I shall stay with the experts. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: Although over the years I have had much to do with the subject matter of this amendment, I have not so far in this debate advanced any views. I shall now review what, to me, are the salient points involved and the effects of this amendment. The effect of the amendment is that nothing at all will be done until the Cabinets of the three other Governments are able to consider the matters proposed in the amendment, put them to their Parliaments, and have them ratified because, as everyone knows, this is an amendment to the agreement and not merely to the Bill.

As has been said, we have had long and protracted negotiations in order to achieve this point of agreement. Contrary to what has been said this afternoon, it was not at all easy to arrive at this point of agreement. I will not go back to the point where the technical committee was asked to report.

That matter has been well canvassed, and it is a historical fact that that report was ordered during the régime of the Labor Government and that its results were such that we changed our minds about the relative values of Chowilla and Dartmouth to the point where the Cabinet of which I was recently a member, was compelled by the weight of incontrovertible technical evidence to take the only feasible, reasonable and proper course, which was to set aside Chowilla for the moment to make sure that we got the Dartmouth dam started at the earliest possible time. We were acutely aware of the fact that this would have a most unfavourable political reaction on the people of South Australia.

As Minister of Works at the time the Chowilla project was born, I was in charge of the department during the conduct of the whole of the technical assessments. All the planning and exploratory work done across the bed of the stream was done during that time. A tremendous amount of work had to be done. The further we went the more problems we found. We found the profile of the river bed so variable and uncertain and, from the point of view of building a reservoir, so unstable that, very much against the wishes of the Treasury and the Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford), I was persuaded by the Engineer-in-Chief, and eventually Cabinet agreed, to employ consultants from overseas at a cost of £270,000 so as to ensure that we would build a dam at that point (and that was the only point where we could build one) that would stay up against a head of 50ft. of water. Unless we could be sure the dam would stay there, there was always the lurking risk in my mind (and this was not easy to sleep with) that if anything went wrong when the dam was full (and that would be the time when it would go wrong) the township of Renmark would disappear within two hours.

So I know something about the developments of the Chowilla project. We went ahead with it, solving the problems of construction. We made sure that adequate margins of safety were provided in the design structure, weight of bank, and so on. We then decided that we would be able to go ahead with it. As we had determined what was required, specifications and design plans could be drawn and an estimate of cost made. We went along with this project for several years and my successor as Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) took over from me when the negotiations were well advanced and a realistic estimate of costs could be made.

Then the cost factor arose ominously and further studies were decided on. I do not want to canvass the wisdom or otherwise of making those studies, but they were made and, as a result, we got the report to which I have referred and we decided to change our mind. I was attached to the Chowilla project, having campaigned in favour of it at election time, because until then Chowilla was the only project we knew of that could ensure the maintenance of 1,250,000 acre feet of water for South Australia and Chowilla was the only place where we knew we could build a dam on the lower part of the river.

Even when the technical studies were undertaken I maintained that the committee would be strongly in favour of Chowilla, because a dam at Chowilla would encompass all the tributaries of the Murray River and the Darling River and also because any water that spilled over the Hume reservoir would eventually find its way into that dam. Because of all these matters, I could not understand how any technical investigation could submit a proposition that was better than Chowilla. However, I was proved to be wrong, but I tell the Chamber and the public that I was not convinced easily. We had incontrovertible evidence that was sifted and resifted and calculated not only by the commission's computer but also by our own computer in South Australia, into which we fed data, and we got complementary results. As the Premier has said on a famous occasion on television, what can an honest South Australian do in the face of those facts? Whatever my political opponents may say about me, I consider that I am at least intellectually honest about these matters.

Now we have a proposal to set aside that situation and make no progress in the construction of Dartmouth dam until the contracting parties agree to what this amendment provides. Amongst other things, the amendment demands that a date be set for the construction of Chowilla, regardless of whether the costs are acceptable, whether the studies justify it, and whether we have reached the time when, having exhausted the extra 37 per cent that Dartmouth will provide, we need more water. Many people are said to be overwhelmingly in favour of two dams. Probably, we are all in favour of that, but let us face the facts. This proposition seems to me to be analogous to the proposition of a person who owns a Mercedes motor car deciding that he must have a Ford motor car, or some other type of car, as well.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that reference to two dams is appropriate in debate on another amendment to be moved later.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: I was referring to the latter part of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, which provides that a date should be set for the commencement of Chowilla, but I accept your mild rebuke and shall not mention that matter until later. The Leader went to great lengths to say that this amendment was being moved because the Bill the Government had introduced and the amendment to the agreement that we are asking to be ratified meant that we had given away our fundamental legal and moral rights to Chowilla dam. The member for Glenelg's main point is the fact that other States need water more than we need it and, therefore, we were in a strong position to bargain with them to secure what this amendment provided, and that, having those two points in mind, we in South Australia could afford to take the risk now of rejecting this agreement. First, we have not given away our fundamental legal and moral rights. The requirements to build Chowilla in clause 20 of the agreement stands as it stood before the agreement was negotiated. It stands in priority in its position in the agreement, because clause 20 (iia) of the agreement, under the general heading "Works to be constructed" states that one of the works to be constructed is the provision of a storage referred to as the Chowilla reservoir on the river, and then gives details of the capacity and so on. That stands there: it was put there in 1963 and remains there, and it is one of the works to be constructed. Agreed, later, under clause 24, it recites that Chowilla shall take second place to Dartmouth.

Mr. Virgo: "Shall not proceed".

The Hon Sir GLEN PEARSON: I said that it takes second place. Do Opposition members want to quibble? This leads me to my second point. The agreement states that construction of Chowilla shall be deferred until the contracting Governments agree that the work shall proceed. Does that satisfy Opposition members?

Mr. Broomhill: No, but that is what it states.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: Does the insertion of these words in the agreement alter the fundamental legal and moral position in which we were before those words were put there? If so, in what way? The answer is "No".

Mr. Broomhill: Come off it.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: It makes no difference to South Australia's fundamental legal and moral rights, but that is the point the Leader took. It is still within the right of any of the contracting Governments at any time to say that it is not prepared to go on with any work on the Murray River. It is a simple part of this agreement: there are four equal partners in the proposition and, therefore, it is open to each of the partners to disapprove any matter that is proposed, and unless the four agree in a partnership the work is not proceeded with.

Mr. Virgo: The four have agreed to go on with Chowilla.

Mr. Broomhill: They have decided: it has gone through every Parliament.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: The four have agreed and it is in the document.

Mr. Virgo: But you are repudiating Chowilla.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: They never agreed when they would start it. I have had experience in this place, and I know that we are in a position in this matter similar to that regarding the agreement about standardizing railways in South Australia. Members know that, although the Commonwealth Government was obliged to join with this State in standardizing the railways, we had the hardest job in the world to get it to start any part of the work, simply because there was no provision in regard to time in the agreement.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections. The honourable member for Flinders.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: Many years ago we ceded the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth on condition that it built a railway to connect Alice Springs with Darwin. One can talk until one is black in the face about legal rights. The Leader said that Sir Thomas Playford succeeded in getting approval for the Chowilla dam because, when the Snowy Mountains Authority decided that it wanted to divert the Tooma River into the Tumut River, he threatened to take out a writ for an injunction to stop work on the project because it was contrary to the terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement. That was very simple. It was not difficult at all, provided he had proper legal grounds—and he did—to get an injunction from the High Court to stop the work. However, that does not say (as the Leader tried to demonstrate and to mislead us) that that was an example

of what the Government could do to enforce its rights here.

It was all right in that context, but the Leader should consider the question in the reverse context and see where he would get if he took out a writ against a Government and tried to get it to start a project. For example, suppose that the High Court did issue such an injunction and that the Government had to start the project, could we do the work without any money? Could the Government provide any money unless Parliament approved it? Where could the Government get the money? The situation is farcical. It could be said that the other States could carry out the project and charge the cost back to South Australia, but how would they recover it? If Parliament would not vote the money, how would the Government pay the bill? Perhaps the High Court could put us all in gaol—it might be a good place for some of us.

Mr. Virgo: The parties to the agreement could jack up on the Dartmouth proposal.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: I am not going to quarrel with the Leader when he talks about moral rights, but I will quarrel when he talks about legal rights, because I think they are pretty negative.

Mr. Virgo: Where will you get the money for Dartmouth?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: From Parliament.

Mr. Virgo: Parliament will not vote it.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: It will. In any case, I am quite sure it would be far easier for us to get this Parliament to vote the money for one dam than it would be to get the money for two dams. Not long ago the Leader himself said that to finance the building of two dams at once would put us in an impossible financial position.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Yet now his amendment tries to do that.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: Yes.

Mr. Virgo: Is that what his amendment seeks to do?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: Yes.

Mr. Virgo: You have not read it.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: The member for Glenelg referred to the fact that the other States were in more desperate straits for water than we were and, therefore, we had a very strong bargaining point. He said that the other States could not afford to

wait and, if we put up any sort of proposition in the terms of the amendment, they would be forced to agree to it. I was involved in some of the negotiations with the contracting parties to this agreement. I know that when the studies showed that additional water was available from Dartmouth the other States were anxious to get more than their share of it, and we said, "Well, all right, there is so much more water to be shared; the least we ought to get out of it in South Australia is another 250,000 acre feet."

Mr. Virgo: What did the other States get?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: They said "No". We had started off at about 1,200,000 acre feet; it then got to 1,360,000, and eventually it reached 1,400,000 acre feet; and then, after a long time, we got it to 1,500,000 acre feet. We were told at one point of the discussions that there would be plenty of water in Dartmouth and that we could expect to get our 1,500,000 acre feet, and I said at that stage, "Put it in the agreement." The others said, "No, there is plenty of water there; you don't have to worry; you'll get it." I said, "Put it in the agreement." And it is there.

Mr. Broomhill: Don't you trust the other Governments?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McKee: What if there isn't enough water? Where would we be in a dry year?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Port Pirie can make a speech later on.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: I do not know whether he means there is some doubt about water being in the system or whether, even if it is in the system, we will not get it. However, I will answer both points briefly. First, the technical committee's report has established that in every year (not on average but in every single year) since 1915 we would have received our water. The second point is that if it is in the system we shall get it.

Mr. McKee: If it is in the system?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: I have established that it will be in the system.

Mr. McKee: That'll do me.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: That is what the committee's report says: that in every year since 1915 the water would have been in the system; and secondly, everyone knows (in this place, anyway, if the public outside does not know it) that the River Murray Commission handles the water without fear or favour in relation to any of the contracting

parties. As a matter of fact, it has to do so, because no water can be released from Dartmouth, from the Hume or from Chowilla except by the unanimous approval of members of the commission, not the Governments.

Mr. McKee: What did we put into the Snowy Mountains scheme, and what did we get out of it?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: The commission has absolute control, and any member of the commission can object; and, unless it is unanimous, a decision is not made. Therefore, South Australia's representative could object at any time if he thought that the commission was giving more water to Victoria or New South Wales than the entitlement set out, and the situation must be corrected. The Leader also said that we had in some way given power of individual veto to Governments with regard to constructing works on the river and so on, by this new agreement.

Mr. Broomhill: He said in relation to Chowilla in particular.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, that this power of veto has always existed, still exists and must exist if justice is to be done by all parties. The individual members of the commission must agree to any action taken by the commission. Therefore, we have taken nothing or given nothing in the new agreement as regards the power of individual veto.

Mr. Virgo: Does the power of veto still exist after agreement has been reached by each State?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: It does exist concerning the point of time of construction.

Mr. Broomhill: What's that got to do with his question?

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: It has everything to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: It is no good our having this agreement with relating to Dartmouth if the parties do not in good faith act on it: it is not worth a cracker. I think I have dealt pretty well with the objections the Leader raised on the legal and moral grounds, and I think I have canvassed the situation regarding the need for water in various States. I believe it was the member for Albert yesterday who went very much into the question of who needs the water most, and I think the Premier did this also. At any rate it has been well covered, and there is no question at all that South Australia is in the most urgent need of water. I asked a question

today of the Minister of Works and he has undertaken to supply me with an answer, but in my own memory I am quite sure that we cannot now supply sufficient irrigation water to the areas on the Murray that need it. Also, I am sure that Chowilla could not supply that water.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That's right.

The Hon. Sir GLEN PEARSON: Therefore, to say that we are not in need of water is just plain nonsense. Within a short time we shall be pumping water into the biggest main in South Australia. I refer to the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main. Although I am not sure of its capacity, I know that the quantity of water will be substantial. This water is required for people living in Adelaide and for the industries here. If we do not have the water in the river, or if the river is merely a stagnant pool such as it was in 1967, we shall be in difficulties, for it will be poor quality water. Indeed, our water is not too salubrious at times now. It is nonsense to talk about our need of water being less acute than the need of the other States.

Finally, the Party opposite seems to be saying that we can afford to take a risk, ditch this agreement and go back and start negotiating again. I ask the Committee: For what reason should we take this risk? What are we proposing to gain as a result of taking it? Are we going to get any water? The answer is "No." Certainly we are not going to need more water than Dartmouth can supply to us within the next year or two. We have reserved the Chowilla dam in the agreement; let no-one make any mistake about that. I understand from my friend, the former Minister of Works, that it was not terribly easy to get this kept in the agreement. However, it is there. To suggest that we have achieved nothing for South Australia in this agreement is just plain arrant nonsense and a contravention of fact.

I believe that in our negotiations we exhausted our capacity to negotiate further. I believe, from my own understanding of the situation and from my own experience in it, that we had no negotiating strength left and that we could not have got more than we did. I do not think the situation has changed, and I am sure that the glib assertions of the Leader of the Opposition, made, I understand, off the cuff at Peterborough, that he could possibly within the space of a few short months renegotiate the vital clauses of this agreement, were just whistling to the moon.

I ask the Committee to reject the amendment, which is not a practical one. If that was all the damage it did it would not matter so much, but the fact is that it sets aside what after years of hard negotiation we have achieved for South Australia. So for heaven's sake let the Committee not ditch this proposal now.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: We have heard many second reading speeches on this amendment, and I think it is about time we got down to examining the amendment itself. The first part of the amendment is to insert after "1970" in clause 1 the following words:

and shall commence on a day to be determined by proclamation after the Governor is satisfied—

- (a) that the River Murray Commission has completed an evaluation by computer of the benefits of operating storages of various capacities at both Dartmouth and Chowilla contemporaneously;

That is the main part of this first amendment. Then it states:

- (b) that the contracting Governments have agreed to amend, and have amended, the agreement, a copy of which is set out in the schedule to this Act, in the manner specified in section (1a) of this Act.

That refers to the agreement already reached. It continues:

- (c) that the Parliament of the Commonwealth and the Parliaments of each of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have passed an Act ratifying the agreement and the amendments referred to in paragraph (b) of this subsection.

Turning to the main clause of the Bill that the Leader seeks to amend, we find that the Bill presented by the Premier reads:

- (d) that the Government of the Commonwealth and the Governments of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed with the Government of this State to request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the Murray River system, including the proposed Chowilla reservoir, with a view to ascertaining where the next River Murray Commission storage is to be situated to meet the needs of persons using the waters of the river.

As a member of Parliament for 37 years, I have sometimes been accused of not speaking facts, not hearing facts and not recognizing facts. Poor me! It has been said that I do not listen to the experts. Poor me! I do not want to exhaust all the arguments in this matter and thus invite the Chairman to draw my attention to Standing Orders, but let us look at the

effects of these two proposals. First, the Leader says he wants computer studies made by agreement. Many computer studies have already been made of the Chowilla reservoir. I hold in my hand a document called *Fourteen Facts About Chowilla*, which was issued in the 1968 election.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: November, 1968—after the election.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Fact No. 4 reads:

Is it practicable? Yes. Investigations carried out over seven years support its feasibility.

Who prepared this document, who recommended this? Do not tell me that this Government under Mr. Hall did that without consulting the experts. Who were the experts that I do not believe?

Mr. Broomhill: The same ones.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not believe it because I know nothing about experts. Somebody prepared it—who did? I know who prepared this feasibility study, because my record in this Parliament goes back many long years, and I am proud of it. The man who more than anybody else in the whole history of my 37 years in the South Australian Parliament influenced me was Sir Thomas Playford, a great statesman, one of the greatest Premiers we have ever had. I am not sure whether it was in the 1941 or 1942 election that he went out and opposed me in my District of Ridley right, left and centre. He told the people, "We must get rid of this menace in the South Australian Parliament. He is a greater menace to me than the whole of the Opposition." I won the election by a bigger majority than I had ever had. About two or three weeks later Sir Thomas came to me and said, "Look here, young Tom, I have been doing some thinking and reading, and I have had some advice from very sound people, and they tell me that if you can't beat them you should join them." I said, "What does that mean?" He said, "Join the Party." I said, "I do not know whether that is possible." At that time I was holding the exalted positions of Secretary of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and Secretary of the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers Association and to join the Party would have meant that I would have had to resign from those two positions. I said, "It isn't possible; my first love is fighting for the wheatgrowers, and there I stay." He said, "Why can't we work together?" I said, "There's no harm in that."

Sir Thomas Playford then laid down his long-range plan for the industrial development of South Australia with cheap electric power, cheap coal for the railways from the brown coal of Leigh Creek, and water. He convinced me that we could have no industrial development in South Australia without water, and that is where Chowilla came into it. Who advised Sir Thomas Playford? He did not think this up on his own. He sent his engineers overseas. Mr. Dridan came back with a strong recommendation that Chowilla was the spot, and this can be seen in *Hansard*. The very words stated at the time by the Engineering and Water Supply Department were that to provide South Australia with an adequate water supply in all years there was no other spot but Chowilla. That is what the experts said: not me. I do not believe the experts. Who the heck am I to believe in?

Mr. McKee: Tom Stott.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Many other people believe in me, too, because I have won 12 consecutive elections at the top of the poll. The first thing I must decide now is what to do about the Leader's amendment. If I agree to this amendment I am saying that we should have further studies by the River Murray Commission. Yet the experts have told us that they have made all these computer studies. The Premier has said that there have already been 300 computer studies made. How many more do we want: another 300? Therefore, if we agree to the Leader's amendment we set in motion more studies to be made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the River Murray Commission, with all its engineers. The amendment refers to operating storages of various capacities.

Let us look at the history of this matter. When the Engineering and Water Supply Department made studies it came back and said Chowilla was the spot, and every Parliament involved ratified an agreement to that effect. All engineering experts in departments throughout Australia agreed with this, Chowilla was commenced, and we spent \$6,000,000 on it. We put a railway line there. A reassessment of the cost was made by the experts and it went up to \$46,000,000. When tenders were called later the cost increased again to \$64,000,000. Then Sir Henry Bolte told the press that he would not pay a penny towards Chowilla dam because it was too expensive, and he repudiated the agreement.

The Hon. Sir Glen Pearson: How do you get the money out of them?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The honourable member took the words out of my mouth. We cannot get money out of them. This afternoon the member for Murray quoted from Commonwealth *Hansard* what Mr. Fairbairn had said regarding the money difficulties. Mr. Fairbairn, who had been Chairman of the commission at the relevant time, stated:

Let me run through what did go wrong. I came in as Minister for National Development nearly six years ago, and as such was Chairman of the River Murray Commission. Chowilla was under way at an estimated cost of \$28,000,000. Not very long afterwards, we were informed that its cost would not be \$28,000,000 but \$43,000,000. We all took a deep gulp, informed our Governments and said: "Well we must press on nevertheless". So we pressed on. The stage of calling tenders was reached. It was at this stage that the tender cost came out to be not \$43,000,000 but \$68,000,000. This was the stage where unanimous agreement was reached to cease work on Chowilla . . .

Then the River Murray Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. Fairbairn, agreed to Dartmouth, which was to cost the same amount. I do not accept that the reason was money at all, because, if it was, why was not the agreement to build the Chowilla dam carried out? I cannot accept Mr. Fairbairn's explanation that that is what went wrong. What went wrong was that in the interim period, when the decision was made on the \$43,000,000 basis, the irrigators from Albury to Mildura told Sir Henry Bolte and his State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, "This dam that you are proposing to build away over there at Chowilla in South Australia is not the answer to our problem, because we have ever-increasing salinity in this river and it is causing us grave concern." So it was then: it is now.

Therefore, something had to be done, and Sir Henry said that he would not put a penny into Chowilla because it did not answer Victoria's problem. He was quite correct: it did not answer Victoria's problem, the only answer being to get unanimous agreement to build Dartmouth. The River Murray Commission reached that unanimous decision. When we consider having one dam, we realize that Chowilla does not answer Victoria's problem and Dartmouth alone does not answer South Australia's problem. Therefore, the only commonsense thing to do is to build the two dams at once.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can deal with that matter in the debate on his amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I cannot agree to having further computer studies made of other capacities in the Murray River. If we had them made and the River Murray Commission found that we had to have another capacity between Mildura and Albury, what would be the answer?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not in my amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I know that, but that could happen. I consider that we would reach the same position as I am trying to get away from, and the member for Flinders supports me in this. How would we get Sir Henry Bolte to sign the cheque and find the money? We could not. This Parliament cannot force another Parliament to allocate money, even for Dartmouth. What made me so annoyed was that Sir Henry Bolte and the River Murray Commission could not find the money for Chowilla but could find the same amount for Dartmouth. I think that was entirely wrong. The experts tell me (although I do not usually quote them) that the annual average flow of the Mitta Mitta River is 580,000 acre feet. If this figure is multiplied by $5\frac{1}{2}$ (years) the total is more than 3,000,000 acre feet. The full capacity of Dartmouth is 3,000,000 acre feet so that it would mean a wait of $5\frac{1}{2}$ years before it reached its full capacity. Experts tell me that the annual average flow into Chowilla is 6,000,000 acre feet. I quote:

Over the past 20 years an average of 9,000,000 acre feet has flowed into South Australia from the tributaries of the Murray River proper.

A conservative estimate of the flow into Chowilla is 6,000,000 acre feet a year: if this figure is multiplied by $5\frac{1}{2}$ (years) the same time lapse, about 3,000,000 acre feet will be stored at Dartmouth and 33,000,000 acre feet will flow into the sea while we are waiting for 3,000,000 acre feet to be stored at Dartmouth. Can anyone dispute those figures? I am sure they cannot. Then there is the question of evaporation: figures have been given of 800,000 acre feet, 900,000 acre feet and 1,000,000 acre feet that will evaporate from the low Chowilla dam. The experts who have given these figures for Chowilla were fortified by a meteorological survey of the Bureau of Meteorology.

If there is an evaporation of 1,000,000 acre feet, would not 5,000,000 acre feet still be left in Chowilla?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Right!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Sir Henry Bolte says Chowilla is good only for duck shooting but I tell him that Chowilla would still be a good dam to swim in even with an evaporation of 1,000,000 acre feet. The main problem is not evaporation, because the experts consider there is not much difference between the two dams: the main problem for me is salinity. The ever-increasing salinity of the river is a worry. I shall not quote what the Victorian Minister said when introducing the Bill in the Victorian Parliament, but he said a most significant thing: if Dartmouth dam was built his Government would be able to maintain its existing water licences and increase them. What does that mean? It means that my people on the Murray River will have less water, if more water is poured into the irrigation settlements in Victoria by increasing the water licences, and that will increase the salinity.

If there is a flow of 580,000 acre feet into Dartmouth from the Mitta Mitta, and that dam holds 3,000,000 acre feet, water could not be released from it to equal a flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura. I might be wrong, but I hope that I am not. A flow of 580,000 acre feet and 900 cusecs means 54,000 acre feet a month, or 648,000 acre feet a year. So, how the heck can we get a flow of 900 cusecs past Mildura with a flow of 580,000 acre feet into Dartmouth? That cannot be done, because the figures do not add up. Therefore, the argument that water can be released from Dartmouth when it is half full does not hold water! If it is released in the second year (that is, twice 580,000 acre feet) we get over 1,000,000 acre feet. No water can be released from Dartmouth until the second year, because the water would not be there. So, if we wait two years and add the five years that it will take to build the dam, we have seven years. If we released this water out of Dartmouth (equalling 3,000,000 acre feet—its total capacity) and we release 1,000,000 acre feet in the second year, we will never fill it. The figures do not add up.

Mr. Hudson: Are you supporting this amendment?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, because I have had enough of these computer studies. I want to see both dams built. I have gone through this with Sir Thomas Playford in the last 10 to 12 years.

Mr. Riches: How are you going to get Sir Henry Bolte to pay for both?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am not willing to give him a second chance of vetoing the

Chowilla dam. If this admendment is accepted we will be playing into Sir Henry Bolte's hands. If a person feeds into a computer information that suits him, he will get the answer he wants. I pay tribute to the experts, although I cannot always agree with them. I do not want to rubbish them, although they and members on both sides have rubbed me; so, I am still independent and on my own. For a man said to be without any friends in South Australia or Victoria, I still have many friends in the Upper Murray! So, I must oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems that the honourable member has made a second reading speech.

Mr. HUDSON: I am amazed at the attitude of the member for Ridley. He says he wants two dams, but he is not willing to take the necessary steps to get both dams built and operating contemporaneously. Whether we like it or not we will not get two dams at their full capacity; even the honourable member knows that that would add such an amount to the cost that it would not be a workable proposition, and he agrees with me in this respect. I think this has gone on long enough. The honourable member has known for 15 months that this Government was going for Dartmouth rather than Chowilla, and he has let all that time go by without being willing to do anything about it. He is not prepared to face up now to the steps that are necessary (if he is fair dinkum in saying what he wants—namely, two dams).

If the two-dam proposition is going to work at all, it will require modifications to the storage capacities proposed for both Dartmouth and Chowilla. As the honourable member has said, he is not an expert and he would not know, but what capacity would he suggest for these two dams? How does one determine their capacities? It is simply a case of undertaking studies to determine the appropriate capacities of Dartmouth and Chowilla, if they are to be built and operated contemporaneously.

The simple logic of the Speaker's position in favour of the two-dam proposition requires him to support this amendment, yet he is not prepared to do so, after 15 months of knowing that the Hall Government had accepted Dartmouth and was ditching Chowilla (ditching Chowilla in such a way that it would be lost for all time). I ask the member for Ridley to face up to his responsibilities in this matter. I know that he wants the kudos for moving the amendment that brings about

the Government's defeat so that he can go into the Upper Murray and say, "It was all me, fellows; I did it. Those Labor blokes didn't have a clue, and I did it all by myself." Come on, be fair dinkum about the position! If the member for Ridley wants a two-dam proposition then he has to vary the capacities of both dams, and he cannot pluck a figure out of the air. He will not get it from the Premier; he has to go to the experts and have some studies made on it, whether he likes it or not. He has no alternative. I think it is about time we stopped playing ducks and drakes with this matter. If the member for Ridley is genuine, I believe he would have kicked out the Government a year ago.

Mr. Virgo: Two years ago.

Mr. HUDSON: Well, as soon as the Government announced in January, 1969, that it was forgetting about Chowilla and going for Dartmouth instead. He has now let the position go all this time and, when an amendment is put up which summarizes the position that he takes, he says, "I can't bear experts; let's not have any more to do with them." He said in the course of his speech, "If you build both dams at their full capacity it will double the cost, and that means that Victoria has to pay another \$15,000,000. You're not going to get that out of Sir Henry." Come on, Mr. Speaker!

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: I am trying to be polite. I ask the member for Ridley to be fair dinkum on this matter and to support this amendment because, in fact, it sets out to do what he said should be done in the only possible way that it can be done; and, if he is not prepared to support this amendment because he wants to move a subsequent one of his own, all he is doing is saying to the people of South Australia generally, "Well, it's more important for me to get the kudos of knocking this Government on the head after I have kept it in power for two years (and kept it in power for 15 months during which I knew it was knocking Chowilla over). It is more important for me to get the kudos than it is to support the Labor amendment." I know that it might be difficult in his area if he is in the position of having to support a Labor Party amendment, but it is about time that he did.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The member for Glenelg has said it is time that we stopped playing ducks and drakes and pulled a few feathers out. Well, I should like to pull one or two feathers out of his tail. There was unanimous agreement in the Chamber to build

the dam and then, 12 months later, in 1968, when the debate took place on the motion moved by the Leader, I carried it by my casting vote. Therefore, I do not accept the honourable member's criticism that I have done nothing. I have done everything I could to bring about the construction of these two dams. Everyone knows that the Premier would not accept the majority decision of this Parliament. I think this is where the mistake was made. The Premier made an election promise, and he should have told the other Premiers and the Prime Minister that he could not get the one-dam proposition through his own Parliament. Honourable members will find in *Hansard* where I said that the Premier was not being fair to the other Premiers if he did not put the position clearly to them.

The member for Glenelg says that we cannot get the finance. Although I did not wish to deal with that question at this stage, let me educate the member for Glenelg and tell him what has happened with regard to finance. The honourable member and all other members in this place should know that, when the Commonwealth Government agreed with the River Murray Commission to reach this tentative agreement on Dartmouth, it agreed to find additional finance for Dartmouth and to help the States with their finance. However, the Prime Minister made an election promise of \$100,000,000 to the States to construct dams within their own borders. So, notwithstanding the Commonwealth's contribution of finance to assist New South Wales with its Dartmouth contribution, that State said, "But we want to build a dam in our own State," and it got \$21,800,000 extra. Now, Mr. Glenelg, this is the way to get the finance.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Ridley must refer to the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I was about to say, the best way to do it is to follow the example set by New South Wales. Also, Queensland got \$28,000,000 for a dam at Emerald and \$12,800,000 for another at Bundaberg. When Western Australia said to the Commonwealth Government, "We are part of the Commonwealth, and if you don't look out you will lose Western Australia," it got \$40,000,000 for the Ord River scheme. That is the way to do it. I think the member for Glenelg now has his answer on that point.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes,

Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I record my vote in favour of the Noes, so the question passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move:

Before "This Act" to insert "The provisions of this Act, other than section 5, shall come into operation on the day on which the Bill for this Act is assented to by the Governor, and section 5 of".

The clause would then provide:

The provisions of this Act, other than section 5, shall come into operation on the day on which the Bill for this Act is assented to by the Governor, and section 5 of this Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation which may be made when the Governor is satisfied—

(a) that the Parliament of the Commonwealth and the Parliament of each of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have passed an Act ratifying the agreement, a copy of which is set out in the schedule to this Act; and

(b) that the Government of the Commonwealth and the Governments of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed with the Government of this State—

and that is where the second part of my amendment comes in, which is to strike out all words in this paragraph after "State" and insert the following words:

that the Chowilla reservoir shall be completed by works carried on contemporaneously with the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir.

The test will be on that amendment. Some strange things have happened that are difficult for a layman to follow. Clause 2 (b) provides:

That the Government of the Commonwealth and the Governments of the States of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed with the Government of this State to request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the Murray River system, including the proposed Chowilla reservoir, with a view to ascertaining where the next River Murray Commission storage is to be situated to meet the needs of persons using the waters of the river.

I have copies of the Acts passed by the Commonwealth and the other State Parliaments

and that provision does not appear in those Acts. Why is it in ours? We are being asked to agree to a provision that has not been included in the Acts passed by other Parliaments. The Premier has said this afternoon that it is not necessary to have this provision included in the agreement ratified by the other Parliaments, but I have to disagree with him. My understanding is that to have this clause as part of a ratified agreement it must be included in the legislation passed by the other Parliaments, and I will not accept anything else. This Parliament is being asked to pass a different Bill from the Bills passed by the other State Parliaments and the Commonwealth Parliament. My understanding is that if my amendment is defeated and this Bill is passed, the matter will have to go back to the other States and the Commonwealth so that this provision can be inserted in their Acts. Therefore, all the argument this afternoon and yesterday about ratifying the agreement does not hold water, the arguments used not being valid at all.

I now want to make perfectly clear and to have reported in *Hansard* and in the press (and I have stated this to the press three times and it has not been published) that I am not opposed to Dartmouth dam, that I have never opposed it, and that I want it built. We need the Dartmouth dam. All the argument about Dartmouth's being better than Chowilla is not relevant. In the driest State in the driest continent in the world we need both dams: two dams are better than one. If I had time, I could read a leading article from the *Advertiser* setting out why we should build Chowilla dam, but now that newspaper does not want it. I could read articles from the *News* stating that South Australia needs more water and that Chowilla should be built. Of course we need it. I want to help the Government get the Dartmouth dam. We can dismiss the argument that Dartmouth is better than Chowilla. I accept all the arguments for Dartmouth. I want to put to this Committee that South Australia, by getting both dams, can have better and cleaner water. That has been said not by me but by the experts to whom I pay the greatest tribute. I shall quote from an expert's report that was prepared after the proposal that both dams should be built had been made. It states:

The suggestion is being made that both Chowilla and Dartmouth should be built now. There appear to be no advantages in this and particularly to South Australia. The allotment of 1,500,000 acre feet to this State represents

more than a third of the average flow that rises above Albury and is tenable only by some contribution of tributary water from the upstream States. If the two dams are to be constructed concurrently the only gain that could accrue to South Australia would be an increased supply or a marked improvement in water quality.

Does the Committee want any more? In the words of the expert, if we had both dams we would get an increased supply of water and also water of better quality. I agree with the expert. He is an excellent officer. That is not all he says. He says that the Chowilla storage would ensure for South Australia an entitlement of 1,250,000 acre feet of water. There would be some years of restricted flow, but these would be infrequent, and the severity of restriction would be greatly reduced. He continues:

A storage at Chowilla is fully practicable. The river valley at the selected site is over three miles in width.

Then he deals with some other embankment, and continues:

There are difficulties but these have been overcome in developing the design.

He ought to know, because he was the designing engineer for Chowilla, and I accept him and agree with all he says. His report also states:

Some play has been made of the problem of saline ground water in the area. The valley floor under the dam consists of very deep sands saturated with saline water but these can be maintained out of contact with the fresh water reservoir. There would be some movement of salt water by seepage under the embankment but this water can be isolated and removed from the site into suitable evaporation basins out of the valley. As part of seepage control, and as an aid to stability, it was planned to have cut-off walls of asphaltic material penetrate the foundation to considerable depth. Field trials showed the practicability and effectiveness of this novel engineering design.

They are excellent words from an excellent engineer. He also states:

There is no doubt that the Chowilla proposal would achieve its design aims for South Australia.

Does the Committee want me to go on? I think what I have said has convinced members.

Mr. Casey: Yes, I am convinced.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: They are not my words but the words of the expert. I want to have recorded in *Hansard* again that sometimes I do listen to experts and accept their advice.

Mr. Casey: When they're right.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I think they are right in this case. I want an answer on the matter with which I shall now deal. I have been told that 580,000 acre feet is the average

annual flow into Dartmouth. Multiplying that by $5\frac{1}{2}$ we get about 3,000,000 acre feet, whereas at that time the flow into Chowilla would be 33,500,000 acre feet. If we get the Chowilla dam approved, which the experts say would take three years to build (and that is a fair estimate, because preparatory earthworks have been done and the railway is there), in my opinion work could be resumed there within three months. We can have Chowilla built in three years and, in a year like this with 9,000,000 acre feet flowing, South Australia would have water out of Chowilla within four years. Now let us consider Dartmouth: five years to build, and we could not let out water under two years, a total of seven years. I appeal to the Premier (with all his cries for water) to listen to the words of the experts and add the figures, because there will be water out of Chowilla long before it comes out of Dartmouth.

Mr. Virgo: Do you think he is playing politics?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not think there is any need in this debate to get into personalities at all. The Premier is correct in taking the stand he does, but I do not agree with it. It is unfortunate for me, but I have been brought up in the old "square" school that if a person stands for election and gives a promise to the people on which they elect him to power he must carry it out. It may be easier for members of both political Parties to get away with it and say that the Party ruled differently, but an Independent cannot do that. Once he breaks faith with his people he is finished.

For 10 to 12 long years I have advocated to my people that we want more water and, recently, I told them that I stand for building the two dams. We had a meeting at Berri at which 750 people were present. Sir Thomas Playford, the Premier and others spoke, and then we carried a resolution agreeing to the building of the Chowilla dam, with only one dissident out of the 750 people. Another meeting at Loxton was attended by nearly 400 people: they heckled me right, left, and centre and pleaded with me to throw the Hall Government out. I said, "No, I have given my word that I will not vote in favour of a no-confidence motion against the Government, and if you want a man who changes his mind every fortnight, then you had better get someone else." They carried the resolution unanimously that I should stand firm for the two dams. How can I betray them? Are you asking me to betray these people who have put me in Parliament for nearly 38 years? I would sooner walk out of public life than betray

them. Party followers can get away with it because of Party decisions, but not me. I have to keep faith with my people, and that is where I stand. I am prepared to say to my people that I have done my best.

I have introduced this amendment for Parliament to accept or reject. It is up to Parliament. It is wrong for any leader, whether he is the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition, to go to the people and say, "If you elect me to power I promise you I will do this," but then say later that he could not do it because of diversionary water or computer studies. He should go back to the people and say, "We have altered our policy. Do you endorse it?" In the school in which I was brought up a man was as good as his word, and if I betrayed my people I would not be game to go back there and face them.

What it means to me, the old, square type, is that if one endorses this action of repudiating an election promise, never again will the people of South Australia place any confidence or reliance on what a leader of a political Party has promised to do. I will not stand for that. If Sir Thomas Playford was Premier today, the Chowilla dam would be finished. What is more, Sir Henry Bolte, with his problem of salinity and the flow of the river, would have been in trouble; he would have said, "The Chowilla dam is no good to us; we must have a dam with a fresh flow to control our salinity." Then, Sir Henry Bolte would have got approval for the Dartmouth dam and it would have been half built today. No-one can deny that the man responsible for this controversy was Sir Henry Bolte; I blame him because, by refusing to find the finance, he repudiated the agreement that his own Parliament had ratified. Mr. Fairbairn, when Chairman of the River Murray Commission, ridiculed the Chowilla proposal before his own commission met to discuss it, and he was properly rebuked for doing so.

Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Fairbairn wrecked the Chowilla proposal. Had they carried out the agreement to find the extra finance from the Commonwealth Government (which they have done for Dartmouth) the Chowilla dam could have been built. Instead of finance being provided for the Dartmouth dam, it could have been provided for the Chowilla dam. If that had been done the Chowilla dam would have been built by now and the Dartmouth dam would have been half built. If that had happened all this controversy would have been unnecessary and we would have had water

from the two dams. If any member wants to oppose the idea of two dams, I will deal with his arguments later. I have several problems to overcome in connection with the election, but I am prepared to stake my political career on carrying out my promise to the people who have put me in Parliament for 38 years, and I will never betray them.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): I wish the member for Ridley could have been present during the second reading debate. If he had been present, perhaps we might have developed a little more warmth in the debate. The honourable member would have enlivened the debate and taken the place of the Opposition, which has not really supported its case. However, let me remind the honourable member that what he says we should be doing is exactly what we are doing: we are putting this change of policy before the people of this State. I want to remind the honourable member of the seriousness of the decision, which has not been lightly taken. One may ask, therefore, why we are doing it. I remind the honourable member that we are doing it because we are convinced that we are right and we, too, will go out of office before giving in to less suitable proposals. The member for Ridley has heard enough lengthy debate on this question. Government members have carried on their arguments time and time again until the Opposition failed to field speakers.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. Corcoran: Be a man for once.

Mr. Virgo: He is a rat.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! The honourable member has used an unparliamentary expression, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. VIRGO: I withdraw my remark.

Mr. Corcoran: The plan for speakers was made by arrangement with the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the member for Edwardstown has withdrawn his remark.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: My Whip has informed me that there was no arrangement of the kind referred to by the Deputy Leader, but there was an arrangement on questions. However, it is a small point. Anyone who has heard the meagre arguments of the Opposition knows that it has not really supported its case. In the light of what the member for Ridley has said, I will run briefly through the chain of events again.

Mr. Corcoran: Cut it out.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, it is unpleasant for members opposite. However, we should remember that the Chowilla project began as an isolated storage on a river system. It was promoted as such and it was not until 1967, when the Leader of the Opposition agreed to its deferment, that comparative studies were begun. The Leader having said that he chose to support those studies to gain information in order to support his case for Chowilla, we as a Government know that those studies came on to our desks when we assumed office. Not one aspect of those studies now supports the case that the Leader is putting forward here, and he cannot produce sufficient facts out of the report that was received, in order to bolster his case.

However, we have to produce facts, because we happen to be in office, and we happen to be a responsible Government. We have to decide what is best for South Australia and also what is obtainable. Do I need say again that the easiest political way out for us was to disagree with the experts (the engineers, etc.) and to say that we were valiantly fighting a battle for Chowilla for South Australia? Would that not have been the easiest thing to do? Let me remind the member for Ridley that had this myth been capable of becoming a reality we would have a dam today that would not be sufficient to meet South Australia's already committed water diversion requirements. What sort of a choice would that be?

Mr. Corcoran: That's not true.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is true.

Mr. Corcoran: It is not.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Millicent is ignoring the advice received by this Government. We need not pursue that matter any further. Having been confronted with the need to make a decision for this State, we chose to take the hard way out, and that has led to the situation existing at present in this Parliament, from which we may walk out directly, recommending Parliament's dissolution. I again remind the Committee that after two successful years of Government, witnessing an economic upsurge in this community, it is not lightly that we give up office, but if we give it up (and I may say even at this late stage that I hope we do not) we give it up for a principle, and we go to the people and say, "This is the decision we made; you be the judge."

I remind the member for Ridley that he is not the only one that acts on the motives he espoused. We hide nothing and we are proud of our decision, which would mean 37 per

cent more usable water for the people of this State. The total amendment, if carried, would destroy the agreement. I refer particularly to the intention that Chowilla be constructed contemporaneously with the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir and that each of the Governments concerned agree to Chowilla's construction. I would ask at this late stage that the member for Ridley not pursue his amendment, for it is against the declared policies of both Parties, which after a long period of argument have said that Dartmouth must come first. The member for Ridley has said that his district needs water; indeed, we all need it, and the only way that we can now get it is to take what is before us, and this is the greatest offer of water that has ever been made to South Australia. It is the only increase since the River Murray Commission first began, and if we refuse it the people who live on the river and the people in the Ridley District who use that water, in any year like the one we had in 1967, will have at their disposal 920,000 acre feet at the most. Indeed, that would be as much as we could get for all the citizens of this State.

I again say to the member for Ridley: we all have to move with the times. I can go back to the beginning of the Chowilla discussions. This was one isolated project on a river, so isolated that it was planned that in drought years the lock above that dam would become a pool of stagnant water. Further investigations led to the obvious conclusion that no-one on the river could tolerate a pool of stagnant water as a substitute for the sweet water that must be there. The fact that the area was under-estimated, and the fact that the stagnant water principle was being adhered to, meant that the first investigations were false.

In 1967 the comparisons began and new matter came to the attention of this State for the first time. In fact, it reached the Government of this State only after we came to office. At that time we stood by Chowilla and said, "We will not give it up until we get something that is obviously better."

Mr. Corcoran: You didn't say that. You said you would build it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That was the attitude we adopted until March, 1969, when the Minister for National Development, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government (and, of course, in communication with the other two State Governments), agreed to increase our allocation to the extent that I have already indicated. That is an honourable involvement

and, as I have said before, an upgrading on the very low point that this situation had reached when we came to office, when the alternatives such as a quantity equal to that which Chowilla would have provided were talked of. It meant hard work, and it meant a decision which we knew at the time meant political trouble for this Government. In fact, we were advised several times to take the easy way out. Well, it has never been my belief that one should do this. There are bigger issues at stake than one's own political survival. I believe there are bigger issues at stake than my personal political survival, and I am pleased to say that my Party joins unanimously with me in the belief that there is something bigger than my own Party's survival. We will ask the people about that, as we will have to do, if this amendment is carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I wish to say a few words about some of the things the Premier has just said which do not relate to the matter immediately before the Committee. For well over a year now I and members on this side have been constantly subjected to a consistent campaign alleging that we have said this, that and the other thing in the past, that what we are saying now is inconsistent, and that we are improper, dishonourable, cynical and opportunist. In fact, we have been subjected to practically every other term of abuse in a politician's text book. We on this side have not replied in kind. I have constantly refused, as have other members on this side, to ask what members opposite have said in the past, for it is quite possible to cull from the pages of *Hansard* and of the newspapers the most extraordinary series of utter inconsistencies on this matter. But the question before South Australia was: what was to be done now? That is what we have constantly tried to deal with. There is this that we, as the Opposition, should say to the present Government, because we have heard much from Government members in the last two days about the history of this matter.

When the Chowilla dam was due to go to contract and the tender was beyond the price appearing in the agreement, the South Australian Commissioner agreed to the deferment of the dam because his only other course was to create a dispute in the commission; he did not have evidence to go to an arbitrator as a result of that dispute and, therefore, would not have achieved the letting of the contract. Every member of the Government knows that. In those days they said, "We have a legal and binding agreement and we should go out and get Chowilla built." I

said, "What do you suggest we do, what course should we follow?"

Mr. Corcoran: What did the then Leader of the Opposition tell you to do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He would never reply; he simply went around South Australia saying, "Elect my Government and I will get the Chowilla dam built." May I point out to the Minister of Works (because he ought to know this; this is his department) that the very same statement—that the Government was aiming at getting from the River Murray Commission the same benefits as would be provided by Chowilla—is in *Fourteen Facts About Chowilla*, published by his Government as the means it said it was going to use politically, by pressure, to get the Chowilla dam. It is exactly the same phrasing. Then the Government says, "That is not what we asked for, of course". All this parade of great honour arises from the fact that what is now before the Committee is not merely that the Government has made an agreement for a dam other than Chowilla, an agreement with which the Opposition has said, frankly, it will go along. We are not disputing that; that is not the matter in issue at all.

What is before this Committee is that contained in the agreement is a series of unnecessary provisions for the giving away of the whole of our rights relating to the Chowilla dam, which members opposite have repeatedly said in this place and around the countryside were a legal, binding and enforceable agreement. That is what members opposite are saying to us: they are not at the moment arguing the question of Dartmouth, because we are not arguing that; neither is the member for Ridley. Nobody is arguing about the Dartmouth dam being built. What is being argued is whether we should give away all our rights to the Chowilla dam.

The position of the Opposition on this matter was made clear in our amendments, and that is the position we take. We have lost those amendments as a result of the vote of the Government and the decision of the member for Ridley. We regret that. We are now faced with the position that, if we vote for the Bill as it stands and reject the amendment, Chowilla is gone for all time; we have given away all our rights to it.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what is in the agreement. This was pointed out time and time again by members on this side, and we stopped speaking because members opposite would not answer us; all they

did was talk about everything else under the sun.

Mr. Hudson: There were negotiations going on outside, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, which apparently came to naught; that is why the sitting has been prolonged.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Oh!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General knows all about the negotiations.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I know nothing about them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position with which we are faced is that if we vote in favour of the Government's Bill and against the amendment we have lost all rights to Chowilla. If we vote in favour of the amendment of the member for Ridley at least we retain our rights to Chowilla. We prefer to do the latter; therefore, we support the amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I wish to put the Premier right on one or two points. As we have heard much about the dilution flow, I wish to read the following article which was written by Professor J. W. Holmes and which appeared in the *Advertiser* recently:

It is probable that, to be on the safe side for quality, there should be a dilution flow of not less than 900,000 acre feet a year at the South Australian border. Salt water seepage into the river, from the rising water tables of the irrigation areas, can be expected to increase for centuries to come. A reservoir at Chowilla would certainly increase the seepage of salt into the downstream river, and it would lose 900,000 acre feet a year by evaporation.

I referred earlier to the flow of about 900 cusecs past Mildura. This flow will not be obtained by having Dartmouth alone. The article continues:

Although there are other sources of water for South Australia, such as the catchments of the Adelaide Hills and the South-East, the Murray River is easily the largest source, even at our proposed entitlement of 1,500,000 acre feet a year out of an undiverted flow eight times that amount. The river is relatively more important to our economy than it is either to New South Wales or to Victoria. Adelaide and the industrial cities of Spencer Gulf depend upon it, just as surely as do the orchards, vineyards and water meadows along its course. South Australia seeks a fair share of the water. But keep in mind that it is quality that counts, as much as quantity.

The Premier should read that article. Unless we have Chowilla, water will be released from

Dartmouth with increased salinity, and it will flow into South Australia. It may be said that this will occur only once every 12 years when there is a drought year. Everyone concedes that the available water in drought years is equally divided. This is what gives me the greatest worry. What water will we get from Dartmouth dam to divide equally in a drought year, which could be as bad as 1967 when the Hume reservoir nearly ran dry and there was not a bucket of water to be divided? This caused acres and acres of citrus to be lost in my district. I cannot tell my constituents to trade Dartmouth for Chowilla when this could mean that their orchards would be wrecked in one year. After a drought, citrus trees have to be replanted and it takes eight years to get them into full production. I want to see both dams built. I wish to reply to the points made by the member for Chaffey.

Mr. Hudson: Is that where you'll stand?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I will deal with that later. He quoted the great Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, who stated:

It is much easier to be critical than to be correct.

I wish the member for Chaffey would read that again and practise it, because I intend to read another quotation, which states:

He who does not know how to grant a favour has no right to seek one.

Members will recall that the member for Chaffey also quoted from the *Murray Pioneer* what he said was an excellent and balanced report of a meeting held at Renmark. He said that the excellent editor had written the report in which it was stated that interjectors were not prepared to hear the honourable member. If the honourable member wants to use the Editor of the *Murray Pioneer*, why did he not quote that newspaper fully? He did not do that, but I will. I do not believe in attacking anyone. I have never done that in my career unless a person has attacked me, and the honourable member has attacked me regarding the Renmark meeting. The report in the *Murray Pioneer* states:

If they had thoughts of ensuring that they were "on a winner", it would be a mistake to take the Federal election result as it affected the local region as being a straw in the wind. It is well to remember that on more occasions than one it has been demonstrated that Party political blood is thicker than water! Also—with double punnish apologies to Chowilla—they may have forgotten that faint heart never won fair dam (sel)!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member for Ridley connect this up with his amendment?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, I am connecting it with Chowilla. The report also states:

Fortunately, electors have one outstanding protagonist for Chowilla in the person of the member for Ridley—

the member for Chaffey did not read that—

and it is reassuring that he sees hopeful signs in both the State and federal sphere that there is a relaxation in the official abandonment of this strategically placed dam in favour of the Mitta Mitta headwaters storage. The past season has certainly given further proof—if such were needed—that in a year of strong flow in the river, such as was experienced last year, a dam at Chowilla by impounding several million acre feet of water, which would otherwise run out to sea, could prove of far greater value to South Australia than a dam catching 500,000 to 750,000 acre feet at distant Dartmouth.

Why did the honourable member not quote that?

Mr. Arnold: It is a different day.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey is not in his seat.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Another report states:

The series of public meetings and personal contacts which have been arranged can only be taken as designed both to sway public opinion to the Leaders' way of thinking and, more importantly, to gauge the opinion of the people most vitally concerned with the utilization of the river's waters. Those prepared to give Dartmouth preference over Chowilla have the weight of expert opinion on their side. However, on great national issues it is the voice of the people rather than the opinions of experts that must be listened to. This is at once both a weakness and the great strength of our democratic system. Deny it, and you rob Parliament of its vital function—you may as well abandon popular government and change to a beurocracy, with all powers in the hands of departments with their teams of highly trained specialists. Such an eventuality would be anathema to all right-thinking people in this freedom-loving country. So our leaders are faced with a situation in which the people, while acknowledging that the building of a dam at Dartmouth is desirable to conserve more Murray waters in the river's upper watershed, can see in Chowilla a vital means not only of preventing an undue volume of precious water from flowing out to sea in good years, but of controlling the flow most effectively from year to year insofar as water-hungry South Australia is concerned.

That is a report from the local newspaper at Renmark, the *Murray Pioneer*, written by the Editor in his leading article. Again quoting an expert, the following details are from a letter signed by Mr. N. A. Harris:

M

In October, 1969, I assisted an economic survey of irrigated fruit properties on the lower Darling River and along the Murray River from Wentworth to Mildura and Robinvale. I noted the loose control of saline drainage water.

Mr. Harris then discussed conditions at Lake Hawthorne Mildura and Merbein in Victoria and in Wentworth, Buronga and Trentham Cliffs in New South Wales, and his letter continues:

New dams up stream will naturally increase irrigation developments in Victoria and New South Wales and increase surplus saline flows. I mention these observations as it may be additional to information already held by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Surely these matters emphasize why so many South Australians note with some distrust the attitude of irrigation water users in Victoria and New South Wales. In view of this distrust it would be unwise to throw away what advantages will accrue from Chowilla as a regulating and cleaning medium.

This evening I have brought to my aid, and to the notice of every member, the views of as many experts as I have been able to obtain. Members need not take any notice of Tom Stott, but they should listen to what the experts are telling them about the increased salinity if Dartmouth is built and not Chowilla. All the experts say that Chowilla will have to smooth out the salinity of the river. I repeat the words of one expert, that after a full survey and feasibility study the decision was that Chowilla was a possibility and that it would work for South Australia in reducing salinity with the annual flow of 6,000,000 acre feet over 5½ years for a total of 33,000,000 acre feet. Surely no-one needs to be convinced that the two dams will give South Australia what it wants more than anything else as a national development programme, that is, more water. The two dams will do it, but Dartmouth will not do it on its own.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When one is in this situation there are some surprises and some things that are not surprises, and there was not one word in the Leader's speech supporting this amendment that surprised me. I knew that he would follow this two-dam theory knowing it will not come about: I knew that for political reasons he would reject the water that has been offered to us; and I knew that, when earlier the Opposition had taken exception to the Premier's saying that not many speakers had spoken, that objection was not valid. Later, the Leader said that his members stopped talking because they wanted to hear something from Government members.

Mr. McKee: And we are still waiting.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The only speeches I have heard from Opposition members have been from the Leader and the members for Glenelg and Edwardstown.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, but what about the former Minister of Works who was in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department at the crucial time when studies were being carried out? We have not heard from him or from other Ministers who were in the Government at that time. I wonder what is keeping the Opposition so silent and why they are relying on only four speakers. We know that the Leader of the Opposition attacked the Government and brought out the inevitable statement that we had undertaken to build Chowilla. He brought that and much more out, although we have discussed it over and over again. We have pointed out how he agreed to defer work on Chowilla pending computer studies. What we said was said before these computer studies became available. We know perfectly well that, had the computer studies been presented to a Government that was led by the present Leader of the Opposition, he would have had to accept them. In fact, we have a very strong suspicion that he knew what would come out of those studies.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is untrue. You produce the Engineer-in-Chief's minute to me!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have a strong suspicion that the Leader knew the studies would go like that. Many hints came to him as Leader of the Government that would give him an indication. What we said was said before the computer studies became available. When we received them we were frankly amazed, because we did not know what was coming. Our first reaction was to say, "We will stick to the Chowilla dam." Experts discussed the details of these studies with the Government many times; again and again we tested the validity of their arguments. We saw clearly that the Dartmouth dam was the better dam and, once we had made up our minds about that, we stuck to our decision. And we are accused of changing our minds! We know that there is no crime in politics that is more publicized than changing one's mind. On the other hand, it would be a crime against the State not to change one's mind in the face of the proper evidence. And the Premier had the courage to do it, and he was criticized for doing it. He expiated

whatever crime he had committed in that respect, because he went to every area along the river where there was discontent, he held public meetings, and he debated the issue with the Leader on television—with well known results.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You didn't see television tonight.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier lost no opportunity to explain to the people of this State why there had been a change, and now he is facing up to the consequences of that change. He is saying to the people of this State that they will be wise if they take the water that is offered to them—more water than was ever asked for before. The allocation of water has been ratified by three Parliaments already. On the other hand, the Opposition wishes to carry on a political argument and throw that allocation away. It knows that the Chowilla dam, of itself, will not meet our commitments. What will happen? Will we get two dams? The negotiations that the Premier has conducted have been of some of the best that have ever been conducted on behalf of this State. They have given this State more water than has ever previously been asked for and a three-way sharing of water in times of drought. So, the Premier's negotiations have been a high point in this State's history. Consequently, this amendment should be rejected in the interests of all South Australians.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): What I said yesterday about the Opposition playing the most cynical game of politics that I had ever known has been confirmed by the Leader's action a few minutes ago in saying that he would support this amendment. We now know that his only object is to force an election in this State, because he wants the opportunity to scramble back into office. There is no other reason whatever. That is the only reason that he is supporting this amendment. He does not give a damn about water for South Australia or whether we build one dam or two dams or what we do, so long as he gets the chance to get back into office. What he is doing (and I hope the member for Ridley will mark this) is using the vote of the member for Ridley to defeat this Government, irrespective of the issue, in order to get the opportunity of an election. What he has said that he and his colleagues intend to do is to support an amendment that provides for two dams or no dam to be built, because this is the vital amendment that he has said he will support:

that the Chowilla reservoir shall be completed by works carried on contemporaneously with the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir—

and that this agreement shall not be ratified until the other parties to the agreement (the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales) agree that Dartmouth and Chowilla shall be built at the same time. Until that agreement was reached, if this amendment were to be put into operation, there could be no dam whatever. In other words, the Leader of the Opposition is now supporting a two-dam policy, and he is supporting that policy for the one purpose of getting us out of office if he can possibly do it. He said a minute ago that we had been guilty of inconsistent statements. He chided us with what we had said about the Chowilla dam and with changing our ground.

The Leader has ignored what we have said repeatedly and what the Premier has said over and over again in this debate, namely, that we stuck to Chowilla until we got something better for South Australia in the form of more water (37 per cent more water). He ignores us, and he chided us only a few minutes ago with changing our position. The Leader is the last person in this Chamber who should say a thing like that. He has now said in this Committee tonight that he intends to support an amendment that means two dams or no dam at all. That is the purpose of the amendment, yet what did he say about this very same policy in July of last year? I quoted one paragraph of this report yesterday, and the Opposition chided me and said I should have quoted the lot. Well, I will quote the lot, because this is a report of what the Leader of the Opposition said about the proposition he is now supporting:

“A two-dam policy could put South Australia in an impossible situation financially—

Mr. Corcoran: “Financially” is underlined.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will come back to that point, at the invitation of the member for Millicent, in a moment. The report stated:

“A two-dam policy could put South Australia in an impossible situation financially,” the Opposition Leader (Mr. Dunstan) said today. He was commenting on the adoption by the annual conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia of a resolution asking the Federal and State Governments involved to agree to dams at Chowilla and Dartmouth being built simultaneously.

The wording of the amendment, of course, is “contemporaneously”, not “simultaneously”. Whether the honourable gentleman will see any difference in that, I do not know, but I can see none. The report continues:

“It was all very well to advocate two dams, provided it does not put South Australia in an impossible position as far as finance is concerned,” Mr. Dunstan said, “but to tie South Australia’s finances up in a way which would have to stop all other public works would be an impossible situation.”

That is what he said, yet he has come into this Chamber now, supporting an amendment that means just that. I now answer the interjection of the Deputy Leader and refer to finance. In the amendment before me, which I believe is the one that the member for Ridley is moving, there is no suggestion of any special financial provision being made for South Australia. The situation is as it was when the Leader said, about the two-dam policy in July, 1969, that we ourselves would be under an obligation to pay one-quarter of the cost of the Chowilla dam; this would be our responsibility because that is the financial provision under the River Murray Waters Agreement. We would be responsible for finding an extra \$15,000,000-odd, or probably more, as our share in the construction of the Chowilla dam as well as being responsible for finding our share in the construction of the Dartmouth dam (which is only one-half of what it would be under the River Murray Waters Agreement, because of the arrangement we have with the Commonwealth for it to advance us half of our share).

In July, 1969, the Leader said that that would put us in an impossible position financially—and he was correct. Why does he now, if he is not merely playing politics to defeat this Government, come along and say he will accept an amendment to that effect? Would it not put us in an impossible situation financially now as it would have in July, 1969? Of course it would. Nothing whatever has changed—and that is only the financial situation. If he was to win the election that is coming, how would he persuade the Commonwealth and the other States to build two dams simultaneously? Yet that is what he has committed himself to do.

Mr. Corcoran: No.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: You say he has not committed himself to do that? Is he committing himself to this?

Mr. Corcoran: There is a difference between the two words.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member for Millicent believes there is any real practical distinction between “simultaneously” and “contemporaneously”, I invite him to get up and tell us what it is. There is none; that is the position. The disadvantages of this amendment were referred to

by the Leader in July last year, and I quoted them. I agree with him on it, but what does it mean under the Dartmouth scheme? No other party to the agreement would agree to the building of Chowilla and Dartmouth either simultaneously or contemporaneously. Why should they agree to this? Why should we agree to it? What would it mean to us if we were to build the two dams? It would mean that we would have this added financial burden for what we are told by the engineering experts would be an additional 240,000 acre feet of the total storages in the Murray River system per annum.

Dartmouth will mean an average of over 1,000,000 extra acre feet per annum in the system. Chowilla, whether it is built with Dartmouth or on its own, will mean only an extra 240,000 acre feet, and we shall have under this amendment no entitlement to extra water. There is no suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that if Chowilla was built we would get any extra entitlement to water. Why?—because the water just will not be there. If we could negotiate with the other States, provided Chowilla was built, what could we expect to get? We could expect no more than one-third of that extra 240,000 acre feet—at the most an extra 80,000 acre feet of water at a cost to this State of \$15,000,000. Under the Dartmouth deal, we are getting an extra 250,000 acre feet at a cost of one-eighth of \$57,000,000, which is much less. That is the position. There is no benefit whatever to South Australia, in view of the cost, to be had from this proposition, which the Leader is now supporting simply for political purposes. Members on this side know that there are members opposite who do not agree with the proposition that the Leader is now supporting.

Mr. Langley: Don't include me.

Mr. Virgo: Name them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We know only too well that there are members opposite who are in favour of the building of the Dartmouth dam.

Mr. Clark: We all are.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There must be no noise from the gallery.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Also there are members opposite who are in favour of ratifying the agreement as it has been presented to this Committee.

Mr. Clark: Name them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will name them. Why, for example, has the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), who was the Minister of Works in the previous Government and who was in charge of the department that had the responsibility for these matters, not spoken in this debate?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You've made an accusation against the member for Hindmarsh.

Mr. Clark: You've named the member for Hindmarsh.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am asking why he has not made his position clear.

Mr. Corcoran: It is the sort of dirty, filthy accusation you make.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I challenge the member for Hindmarsh to deny that he supports the ratification of the agreement as set out in the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Yes, I do.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Then why did the honourable member not speak in the debate?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You know I am refraining from speaking because of medical advice.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I certainly did not know that the honourable member could not speak on doctor's orders.

Mr. Hughes: Everyone in this Chamber knows it and you know it, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It has never been said to me. I apologize to the member for Hindmarsh if he cannot speak, but I believe that what I have said about his views is correct, and I stand by it.

Mr. Corcoran: Name the others.

Mr. Clark: I think we've answered you on the only one you've named.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know there are others.

Mr. Lawn: You're a squib.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I challenge the Leader to get up and deny that there are members in his Party who do not support the amendment and who believe that—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If you sit down, I will.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —this Bill should go through as it stands.

Mr. Corcoran: You're squibbing it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will let the Leader stand up and deny it, if he will.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General has thrown a challenge to me to say there are no members on this side who support the view of the Government concerning this Bill. There is not one member on this side who supports the Bill put forward by the present Government, and there was no vote whatever at our Party meeting in favour of the Bill as presented by the Government to this Parliament. Now, may I say one or two other things in reply to the Attorney-General. At times during the honourable gentleman's speech, I feared for his health. He certainly accused me of adopting various positions. I can only say to him that, upon this particular matter, he has adopted more positions than are listed in the Kama Sutra, and many of them more difficult.

I shall now reply to a few of the things that the Attorney has attempted to say relating to this particular amendment. He has suggested that this amendment will not make any other alterations to the agreement. Obviously, he has not read it, because the amendment provides that all necessary further amendments to the agreement consequent upon the principle of building Chowilla dam as well as Dartmouth be made, and that is in the agreement, so the question of additional water allowance to South Australia is covered. The Attorney really ought to read the amendment.

In addition, the Minister of Lands chided me about my knowing (and he said this as an accusation against my lack of faith with the people of South Australia) that the studies conducted by the River Murray Commission were going to produce results against Chowilla. Let me read to him the minute, dated August 14, 1967, submitted to Cabinet by Mr. Beane. It states:

I am confident that a storage at Chowilla offers the greatest security to South Australia's share of the Murray River water and expect to have this view vindicated by the studies.

That is what the Engineer-in-Chief told our Government, and the accusation made by the Minister of Lands is as baseless as the other accusations with which honourable members opposite have been so free.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Education): I was interested in the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition when he declared his intention immediately after the member for Ridley spoke.

Mr. Corcoran: You have been at this for two years.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I compliment the member for Ridley on the noble sentiments that he expressed, and I consider that they are held by a majority of members, if not all, on both sides of the Chamber. The Leader's obvious tactics are to get rid of this Government at any cost and by any means. He knows as well as I do that the effect of the latter part of the amendment moved by the member for Ridley puts upon the agreement conditions, the effect of which is that we would have to go through the whole negotiation stage once again. It means that we would have to negotiate with the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales, and we would have to get the River Murray Commission and the parties and engineers to agree. Further, we would have to go through the process of getting the three other Parliaments, which have already ratified the agreement, to re-ratify it or re-amend it.

Much time and effort would be required, and this is the point on which I take issue with the Leader. If the amendment which he now supports, for whatever reason he cares to choose (and it is obvious what that is), is carried, it means the complete wrecking of this Bill and the putting aside of the ratification which, apart from helping people in other parts of South Australia, will directly help people in the District of Ridley. If Chowilla alone was built we would still be over-committed by 85,000 acre feet, whereas if Dartmouth alone was built we would not only cover the over-commitments in water licences in Ridley, Chaffey and adjoining districts but we would also have available an extra 41,000 acre feet.

Advisedly, seriously, and with all sincerity I say that if the Leader persists in supporting this amendment there will be no dam built on the river for many years, and the people who will suffer as a result of the inability to renegotiate the agreement will be those not only from the city and country but also many people living on the river, including those in the District of Ridley. We can get what the member for Ridley seeks for his people by one dam for half the cost of what the honourable member alleges would be the cost of two dams. We can cover adequately all licences that are now available, and we will have more water available to cover expansion in those districts. At present, there are over-commitments in water licences. The carrying of this amendment would have a direct effect on the schedule and the agreement, because it would contain conditions that the other States would not accept. As the Minister

involved in about 18 months of hard negotiations with other States and the Commonwealth, I know from experience that they would not accept the amendment.

If the Leader persists in his stand in order to get office, or for any other reason, there will be no dam built on the river. If by the Leader's action and his support of this amendment this Government is defeated, and by some mischance and to the dismay of South Australia the Leader occupies the Premier's chair, he will have no alternative but to present again the very Bill that this Government has presented now, a Bill that gives this State an enormous advantage of water and the first increase that has ever been achieved in this State. To give the Premier credit, he was the first Leader of any political Party to ask directly at a conference table for this increase—and he has got it. Should this Committee lightly turn aside such a great advantage? This is what the Leader has indicated he wants to do. If the Leader succeeds in his move, the blame for any shortage of water in the coming years must lie fairly and squarely on his shoulders and on the shoulders of those who support him.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Stott (teller), and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse and Nankivell, Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move:

In paragraph (b) to strike out all words after "State" and insert the following:

that the Chowilla Reservoir shall be completed by works carried on contemporaneously with the construction of the Dartmouth Reservoir;

and

(c) that the Parliament of the Commonwealth and the Parliament of each of the said States has passed an Act ratifying the agreements relating to the completion and cost of the Chowilla dam, with all necessary amendments to the further amending agreements for that purpose.

Without wasting time, I will just move that amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Stott (teller), and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse and Nankivell, Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—"Incorporation."

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is no amendment to this clause. I believe the member for Ridley has a further amendment, which is for a new clause 5a, but I think it will serve no purpose now to proceed to that point. The path that I set earlier today for Chowilla and Dartmouth began here in South Australia and led to two other States, through Canberra, and back to South Australia. The search for more water supplies for this State was difficult but successful. The agreement has been ratified and approved by three other Parliaments. It remained for South Australia's own Parliament to seize this tremendous advantage offered to it. Tonight, South Australia's own Parliament has negated that proposal, so there is no point in continuing further with this Bill or any part thereof.

I am sorry, of course, that this has occurred. It was a possibility that I knew could well become reality. It means that today we are back where we began in 1960. Since 1960, we have had a severe drought condition in the southern part of Australia, which has demonstrated the need for this type of advantage we have just rejected. So, Mr. Chairman, there is no point really in any member here pursuing this Bill further.

It will now be up to the people of South Australia to decide for themselves. At this moment there is indeed a very great restriction placed on South Australian development, because there is no existing safeguard or any intent in legislation to cure the problem confronting us. So my advice will be on the hustings, to which we shall all now go, to all South Australians, "Vote for your life!"

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier has just delivered the first part of his election policy speech.

Mr. Wardle: You delivered yours half an hour ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh, no! I assure the honourable member that he will hear a lot more yet. The position at present is simply that the Premier has chosen to go to an election, having said to this Parliament that it must do exactly as he says or there will not be any water, and that no-one else can negotiate anything for South Australia except him. He laid his Government on the line for the people of South Australia. Members on this side are content to let the people of South Australia judge whether his contention is correct.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Premier has said again what he said some time ago and that is that he was prepared to lay his Government on the line. I repeat sincerely what I said during this debate and that was that I could not change my opinion on this matter. The Premier, all members of this Committee and everyone in South Australia know and have known for years where I stand on this issue. This Parliament carried a unanimous resolution in favour of Chowilla in 1968. A similar resolution was carried on November 11, 1969, by a majority decision. I repeat now what I said from the Chair as Speaker. Instead of delaying matters until now, the Premier should have notified the other State Premiers and the Prime Minister then that he could not get the agreement for Dartmouth through his own Parliament. However, I think we must admire the courage of the Premier in taking this matter to the people, but the point I make is that the Premier has known for a very long time that I would not change my view.

I am sorry that what has happened has happened. The Premier is prepared to put his Government on the line. However, had he taken notice of the majority decision of Parliament last year and informed Sir Henry Bolte and the Prime Minister then, or even two years ago, that he could not get this agreement through Parliament, then with all his negotiating ability and all we have heard from his Ministers he would have been able to obtain a better agreement than the one now before the Committee. Although I am sorry about what has happened, it is not my fault, because I did not put the Government on the line.

Mr. Corcoran: That's right.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: All I have done this evening is to vote against the Bill. I did not vote against the Government, and it was

not my decision to put the Government on the line.

The Hon. R. S. HALL moved:

That progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee.

RETIRING MEMBERS

The SPEAKER: Before the Premier moves the adjournment, in view of the decision that the Premier has made tonight and his statement to the people of South Australia, I think it is only proper that I, as Speaker, should make a brief reference to some members of this House who probably will not be in the next Parliament. First, I want to refer to Mr. L. G. Riches, C.M.G., who was member for Newcastle from 1933 until 1938 and member for Stuart from 1938 until 1970, a total of 37 years, and was Speaker from 1965 to 1968. That is a wonderful record, and honourable members will agree when I say, without casting any reflections or making comparisons (which sometimes are considered odious), that one would not find in any Parliament a more sincere member than the member for Stuart. Linnie, on behalf of all members, I express the hope that your retirement will be an extremely happy one and that you and your wife will look back with enjoyment on your efforts and experiences in Parliament.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner has been member for Angas since 1944, a period of 26 years. He was Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees in 1955 and 1956, from 1962 to 1965, and from 1968 to 1970, and he was Speaker from 1956 to 1962. The member for Angas has a wonderful record. He has contributed to many important debates and his legal knowledge and training have been of great assistance to honourable members who have had the pleasure of enjoying his lucid way of explaining his various points. He has been a sincere and eager worker for his district and I am sure honourable members wish me to convey to him their best wishes for a happy retirement.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens, C.B.E., has been member for Hindmarsh since 1950. He was Deputy Leader of the Opposition from 1960 to 1965, and Minister of Works and Minister of Marine from 1965 to 1968. We know the member for Hindmarsh is retiring, having decided not to seek re-election. We wish

him a very happy retirement. I can sincerely and honestly say that, during my long term in Parliament, which is even longer than that of the honourable member, I have never heard him say an unkind word about any other member of this House, and that is a very fine record to have on one's retirement. I wish the honourable member and his family well in his retirement.

The Hon. Sir Glen Pearson has been member for Flinders since 1951, a period of 19 years. At various times between 1956 and 1965 and between 1968 and 1970 the honourable member has been Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forests, Minister of Works, Minister of Marine, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Minister of Housing, and Treasurer. He has an outstanding record of having served as a Minister for 3,205 days. He is another member who has been very straightforward at all times and able to put his views before this Parliament in a sincere and courageous way. I am sure that all members wish Sir Glen Pearson a very happy and enjoyable retirement.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday has been member for Whyalla since 1956. He was Minister of Education from 1965 until 1968. My association with the honourable member goes back to 1927, a long time ago. We have been associated in many public affairs on frequent occasions during that long period. He has been a very sincere and honest man in his approach to all public problems. He has been a very keen debater and a very concise and lucid speaker. I knew the honourable member in the old days, before we came into Parliament, and I say on the eve of his retirement that I hope we shall remain very friendly and that he will enjoy a happy retirement with his wife, family and friends.

Mr. T. M. Casey, member for Frome from 1960 to 1970, was Minister of Agriculture and Forests in 1968. I think it is proper that I should refer to the honourable member, who has had a good record and who has been an able debater. He has learned a lot, and I think he has mellowed in the time that he has been a member. I think all honourable members wish him well in his retirement. As I understand it (and it would not be letting out any secrets), it will not be in this Chamber that we shall see the honourable member if he is successful at an election, so I think it is proper that we should refer to him in this Chamber.

To all honourable members who will probably not grace the precincts of this august

Chamber in future, I am sure I speak for all honourable members when I say that we wish you well and hope to see you frequently from time to time as Parliament progresses in the future.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to say a brief word about the honourable gentlemen who are retiring, and I hope members opposite will forgive me for speaking about members on my side first. Mr. Riches has been, since I first entered this House over 17 years ago, a guide, mentor, and friend to me constantly. He is a man of great honour and integrity: a kindly and expert guide in Parliamentary activities, a member with whom I have campaigned many times, whose district I have visited frequently, and whose friendship I greatly cherish. I believe that members on both sides will agree with me. We will greatly miss him in this Parliament. He has had great experience in it, and has taken a leading part in it since the darkest days of the Labor Party in this State. He lived to see the bright lights and was one of the architects of the brightness.

Mr. Hutchens, too, has been a great friend to me. I do not know how I could possibly have coped with the burden as Premier of this State, at a time that I will admit placed considerable strain on me, without the assistance, loyal support, and friendship of my then deputy, Mr. Hutchens. He has been an outstanding Parliamentarian and an excellent Minister, and he deserves many thanks from the people of this State.

Mr. Loveday and I have been associated since before he entered Parliament. We have always been great personal friends, and I have admired his intellect, integrity and forthrightness, and I have benefited at times from his being my champion when I was under considerable pressure. Although there are members in this House who have not said unkind words about others, there are others who have done so, and I am one of those about whom unkind words have been said. The Hon. Ron Loveday has been a very great help and champion to me, and we will miss him greatly. I will not address any valedictory remarks to Mr. Casey because, if I were to do that, I am afraid I would have to include in my speech many members opposite.

The Hon. Sir Glen Pearson has been a doughty opponent over all the time I have been here. I can remember his remarks to me following my maiden speech; he gave me a slight lecture, which I think was thoroughly

deserved. We have had some disagreements since then, but one could always be sure that when Glen Pearson was wedded to a matter of principle he would stick to it, come what may. One could always be sure that when his word was given on any matter that was his bond. He has earned the respect of everyone in this State, particularly members of this Parliament. Although he has not been on the same side as I, the Hon. Bert Teusner has been extremely kindly to me and to many others, and I am very grateful to him for that. Every member of this House regrets his leaving us.

I am sure that the gentlemen whom we have mentioned will watch with added interest from the sidelines the contest now to take place, and no doubt some will take part in it. Whilst we have very great differences in this Parliament, there are still things that I believe unite all members: they all desire to serve the State in the way that they think is best for it. It is with regret that we will lose some of the associations that many of us have enjoyed for a long time in this place.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I do not intend to speak at length but I thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Leader and others who have spoken for the kindly references to me; they are undeserved but very much appreciated. I have had the privilege of welcoming every member of this Parliament except you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we have established associations and friendships that mean much to us all. I have always held in high regard the reputation and integrity of this Parliament, and I feel constrained to make a comment on the events of today and yesterday, because I believe South Australia has seen from members on both sides evidence of integrity that has not been surpassed. Members have cast votes that they believe to be in the best interests of South Australia—and those votes have cost them a lot. Every member has stood by his convictions and by what he believes to be in this State's best interests. It has been a demonstration of the standard of integrity that we have come to expect from the South Australian Parliament.

I have enjoyed the years I have been here. For the whole of my married life I have been a member of Parliament, and it will be a new experience for me to be able to be with my family when I want to be and to live as one of those people who are not required so much to toe the line and attend so many public engagements. We are looking forward to that with much anticipation. I greatly

appreciated the many gestures and words of kindness directed to me, as well as the floral tributes sent by members on both sides to me while I was in hospital. One cannot live through those experiences without retaining a kindly memory of all those associated with them.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I express my appreciation of the very kind sentiments concerning me which were uttered by you, Mr. Speaker, and by the honourable Leader of the Opposition. As you have said, Sir, I have been here for 26 years, during which time I consider that all Parliamentarians with whom I was associated became friends of mine irrespective of what their political opinions might have been. While we may have had differences of opinion in this Chamber and have given expression to those opinions, sometimes during the cut and thrust of debate things may have been said which on the surface have seemed acrimonious. Nevertheless, I consider that we have, in the words of Shakespeare, done "as adversaries do in law: strive mightily, but eat and drink as friends".

During the 26 years I have been a member I have had many kindnesses meted out to me not only by members of Parliament but also by the Clerks at the table, who have frequently been very helpful. I have had great assistance from the staff of Parliament House generally, from the Library staff, the *Hansard* staff, the messengers and the catering staff, and I express to all those concerned my sincere appreciation. I particularly appreciated the assistance given me during the period 1956-62 in which I occupied the office of Speaker. I relish the fact that I was able to serve under someone whom I consider to have been South Australia's greatest statesman (Sir Thomas Playford). Finally I would feel happy if I could believe that in relinquishing my duties here I had made no enemies and lost no friends. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition for the kind sentiments expressed to me.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): For obvious reasons, I shall be brief. I thank all those concerned for their kind remarks. I am deeply grateful for the friendship shown by members on both sides. I have found since I have been here that a member's word is his bond, which is most gratifying. I have a high regard for the Parliamentary system. During the 20 years I have been here, I have always sought to protect it, and I am sincerely grateful for the help given me by every member

of the staff. Never have I had other than kindly assistance from everyone. I go out of this Parliament with a keen appreciation of the friendship shown by members and the staff.

I am proud of one thing that is peculiar, I think, to members of Parliament. When I came here, my predecessor, the late honourable John McInnes, requested the members of my Party that I be allowed to sit on the front bench. The Party agreed, and for my whole political career I have sat on the front bench. I wonder whether that is a record for all time. However, that is not important. I hope I have done my work well. I appreciate that it is only by the good grace of the Party that gave me its endorsement that I have been permitted to serve. I hope I have not let the Party down. I am confident it will live for a long time and I trust I will be spared to assist the Party that gave me my chance.

The Hon Sir GLEN PEARSON (Flinders): I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kindly remarks about me. You and I have had associations within and out of Parliament over at long period, going as far back as 1936 or 1937. Therefore, you know me pretty well. It is kind of you to say what you did about me. The Leader of the Opposition was kind in his remarks; he made one minor qualification in a somewhat humorous vein, which I accept. Those of us who hold strong opinions about things are sometimes moved to express them forcefully. If I have at any time (and I am conscious that on one or two occasions I have) said things to honourable members in this place that afterwards I have regretted and if I have neglected to make amends for those misdemeanours, I tender my apologies now. I am reminded of something I read in a magazine today: if you want to make sure that somebody does not jump down your throat, keep your mouth shut. That is not possible for either the Leader or me in this place, so there is always the opportunity to jump down the throat at odd times.

Mr. Speaker, you referred to my Ministerial experience. This has been the most rewarding part of the service I have been privileged to render to this Parliament. Not being by natural bent a stump orator or a political urger, I have enjoyed particularly the administrative work of the seven departments I have administered from time to time. Over the years I have found this work most rewarding and useful in formulating my experience. I have been very fortunate in my political career, which has not been long when compared with

the terms served by some members. However, it has been my good fortune to be around when there were empty shoes to be filled. I am sure my advancement in politics has been more than I deserved; nevertheless it has come that way. I can say honestly that I have never sought preferment in politics but that it has come along, and one feels a duty to fill a responsible position when it is vacant and offered.

I thank all members for the kindly friendship they have extended to me during my 19 years, and in this respect I think also of my brother Rex, who occupied the seat of Flinders for 10 years before I took it. He was here for so long that I became a familiar figure here and got to know most members before I became a member, and that gave me a background that was an advantage. I thank all members for their kindly remarks and the friendship they have extended to me. My only wish at this time is that the work of this Parliament shall proceed, and that the interests of the State shall be paramount in every decision made and discussion held here, for I believe that there are signs that democracy is in jeopardy in certain ways. Therefore, it is necessary for all members to demonstrate their belief in the system that has taken us so far, and to do everything they possibly can to maintain it. I believe that to be the spirit of this House.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I should like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader for your very kind remarks and to say that I have found my years in this House the most rewarding in the whole of my life, and a wonderful experience. I want to thank members on both sides for their very good friendship over the years; I do not think I have any enemies among all the members here. Also, I want to thank all members of the staff for the wonderful co-operation I have always had from them. I will miss very much my association with all of you in this place.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier and Treasurer): I wish retiring members not good luck, because they do not need it, but good health. I wish those members who remain good luck, because they will need it.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, May 12, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 10.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 12, at 2 p.m.