

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. HALL: In view of the public discussion that has taken place about the placing of rubber sound insulation blocks on the piles of the festival hall, will the Premier say why these blocks are not to be used and what will become of them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a full report for the Leader.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have an inquiry made into the activities of the taxi-cab industry in South Australia? The Minister will probably remember that, a few years ago, when taxi-cabs were controlled by metropolitan councils, something approaching a public scandal arose because of trafficking in licences and matters of that kind. As a result of this, eventually the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board was formed. Since then, the matter has proceeded with little complaint (to my knowledge, anyway). However, lately I have received many complaints, mainly that the two-plate system, which involves use of the green plate or the white plate, causes much jealousy amongst the holders of one or other of these plates, and sometimes leads to such things as two different kinds of taxi-cab pulling up in a street when a person hails a taxi. Will the Minister ask the Secretary of the board for a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that.

HOUSING TRUST BOARD

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, explain why certain persons were not re-appointed to the Housing Trust board? I refer particularly to Mrs. Ruby Litchfield, O.B.E., a wellknown person in Prospect and a former mayoress, who is well known for her charitable and other work in the community, for which she has been recognized and decorated, and who has served for several years (I believe with distinction) on the board of the Housing Trust. As she was not re-appointed recently, I ask the Premier

why she was not, particularly as we are now in the era of equality of the sexes, and as I believe Mrs. Litchfield made worthwhile contributions to the efficiency of the trust not only as a member of the board but particularly as a woman.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Three members of the board were not re-appointed. I point out that appointment to this board is not for life but for a specific period. When the time came for new appointments to be made the question of re-appointing the existing members was naturally considered. The Government had already instituted a statutory investigation into the activities of the trust, and it was already well aware that it was necessary to increase the planning and design experience on the board. That was in no way to derogate from Mrs. Litchfield's valuable services to the board in the past or her considerable capabilities and the interest she has shown. Before the decision was made public I discussed this matter with Mrs. Litchfield. It is expected that the Government will ask her to do certain work for it in a sphere other than the Housing Trust. Only three vacancies were immediately available on the board, and the Government was anxious to appoint to the board three people who had special qualifications that it was considered were needed. Mr. J. H. McConnell was appointed, and the honourable member will be aware that he is probably South Australia's most renowned architect: he is an architect of international experience and is widely well regarded, he being Federal President of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. Mr. Roberts was appointed and made Deputy Chairman of the board. He is an architectural consultant, and was widely supported by the building and architectural professions alike as an appointee to the board. He is an able administrator, and his work on the board has already been widely praised by other members of it. The third appointee was Mr. Stretton (formerly Professor of History at Adelaide University) and, as the honourable member will know, Mr. Stretton has done much academic work on the planning and development of cities in Australia, with special relationship to Adelaide, and has published works on this aspect. As it was considered that it was necessary to strengthen the board in the planning and design area, those appointments were made. It was not to indicate anything that was in any way denigratory of previous members of the board. It was simply the Government's policy

that there should be some change in emphasis in the kind of experience and expertise that certain members might have. I am sure that Mrs. Litchfield well knows that the Government regards her public work in South Australia very highly, and I have already pointed out to her that we will be asking her to do other work for the Government soon.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier again take up with the Prime Minister (whoever that might be) the urgent necessity for having in Australia a system of Commonwealth price control? A Gallup poll published in last Friday morning's *Advertiser* showed that 64 per cent of people in Australia, when asked whether they favoured such a system, said that they did, and the biggest majority in favour of price control was the 71 per cent recorded in South Australia, which State already has price control. In view of the extremely widespread support for this much desired reform, I consider that perhaps the Commonwealth Government, if it is again approached, may be a little more receptive to our pleas on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that I shall be listing some features of price control for discussion at the Premiers' Conference on April 5. Our problem at present is that, while the Commonwealth Government is interested in, at any rate, discussing some form of price control in Australia (it would not take it further than that), the Premiers of the Liberal Government States are plainly opposed to taking any action whatever and, without the concurrence of at least some other States, it would be difficult to run a price control system, because it is not within the powers of the Commonwealth Government. However, we have had one addition to the ranks of those Governments that believe in a price control system, and wiser counsels may prevail in Canberra on April 5, but we will have to wait to see.

INSECTICIDES

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether the Minister of Health is satisfied with the distribution, control and packaging of dangerous insecticides? Last Friday (I think it was), some phials of dangerous insecticide were lost by a market gardener who was travelling from the city, and widespread publicity was given to the fact that these lost phials constituted a danger to the public. It was even said by the market

gardener who had purchased these phials that, within 10 minutes, anyone breathing the fumes of or putting his finger into the liquid contained in the phials would be dead. These phials could have fallen into the hands of children or inexperienced adults, who may have suffered this fate. Fortunately, the phials were found by someone who handled them carefully and notified the authorities. In view of the public disquiet in this regard and the interest that has been engendered by what might be termed the accident that occurred last Friday, I ask the Minister of Health, or the Attorney-General, to say whether the Government is satisfied with the present situation or whether it intends to take steps to protect the public from this great danger.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This is a matter of concern; I will discuss it with the Minister of Health and furnish the honourable member with a reply.

DENTAL CHARGES

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to limit the Australian Dental Association's attempt to control dental matters, by supporting moves by the Australasian Dental Technicians Society to obtain "contractual chairside status" for its members? Secondly, will he ask the Minister to grant an interview to representatives of the latter body to discuss matters of vital concern to the general public? I have been approached by officers of the Dental Mechanics Association who have produced what to me represents irrefutable proof that the general public is being fleeced by the Australian Dental Association in respect of charges made for dental work. I have in my possession a document stating that, in respect of charges for dental work performed by dental mechanics (providing upper and lower dentures) dentists are to charge laboratory charges plus \$64 as a minimum. This is murder! I suggest that the Chief Secretary look at the matter closely, if necessary acting to stop this procedure, because it is a great imposition on the people of the State.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Repatriation when a final decision is likely to be made on rentals paid by soldier settlers in zone 5? The case concerning these rentals (and this affects many settlers in

my district and in the Minister's district) has been under consideration since, I think, 1964. The delay in making a decision has meant that considerable debits have accrued against settlers. People are concerned about this, especially in view of the current crisis affecting rural industries. On behalf of the people we both represent, will the Minister raise the matter with his colleague as one of urgency?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that. The honourable member said that the case commenced in 1964, but actually it commenced in 1963 and it has certainly been protracted. I understand that a submission was made to the Commonwealth Government in regard to the judgment given in this case. As far as I know, we are still awaiting a reply from the Commonwealth on the matter. If that is so, it will do no harm to prompt the Commonwealth in regard to a reply; if that is not the case, I will obtain a report about the matter for the honourable member.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Repatriation a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the transfer of soldier settlers' loans?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Repatriation has informed me that the Commonwealth Government has already agreed to the transfer of the mortgage between soldier settlers. The question of whether the Commonwealth Government would agree to a transfer of these mortgages to other than soldier settlers is one that would have to be referred to it. It is clear that it would not be willing to approve this on the basis of the concessional interest rates which apply to war service settlers, but my colleague will take up the question of transfer of the mortgage principal, at appropriate rates, with the Commonwealth Government. There could be some doubt whether the Commonwealth could legally agree to the transfer of mortgages financed from funds provided for war service land settlement, but an inquiry will be made.

PORT ADELAIDE TRAFFIC

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about future planning with regard to traffic using Grand Junction Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is intended to divert Cavan Road from the point where it reduces to two-lane width, to join with Port Wakefield Road on the southern side of the premises of Dalgety Australia Limited. The

new section will be constructed to provide for four traffic lanes consistent with the remainder of Cavan Road. It is intended also to duplicate the Cavan level crossing to provide additional capacity for traffic using Port Wakefield Road. It is expected that the above work will be commenced within three years. At a later stage it is intended to construct an entirely new road to link with Martin Road and Salisbury Highway, passing on the eastern side of Port Wakefield Road and linking with Grand Junction Road in the vicinity of the old sewage farm. This road, when constructed, will greatly improve access between the Port Adelaide area and Elizabeth.

TEXTBOOKS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education obtained a reply to my recent question about the supply of textbooks to students at the Daws Road High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All textbooks for the Daws Road High School were ordered in early October, 1970. Economics texts were ordered for 30 students after a survey had shown that 25 students intended to offer for the subject. It happened that over 60 students asked to undertake Leaving Economics when school reopened. Supplementary orders were lodged immediately. *Web of Life* is published for the Academy of Science, Canberra. Orders are placed direct by schools and returns are not accepted; as a consequence schools place orders with a minimum of spares. Experience had shown a heavy return of this book for second-hand sales, but last year's estimate at the school was wide of the mark because of higher retention of the books by students. A supplementary order has been placed. Regarding *Eight Metaphysical Poets*, the ship carrying this consignment was due in South Australia in January, but has been delayed a month *en route*. Early March is the estimated date of delivery. This is one of the two recommended poetry books, so students can continue to study without it for the time being. *Mainly Modern Impact Assignments in English* was delivered to the school on March 3, 1971. *Asian Modern Century* is a block book for general reading and is not vital to current study. It is expected that it will be delivered in late March. Honourable members, including the member for Fisher, can be assured that heads of schools will press booksellers for the supply of books needed by students. They will be happy to inform parents of the situation at their schools regarding textbook supply.

APPRENTICES

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question regarding apprentices?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to say that in 1970 there was a further increase in the number of indentures of apprenticeship commenced in this State. Up to February 28 last, 2,375 indentures, the commencing date of which was in 1970, had been lodged with the Apprenticeship Commission. This preliminary figure, which is subject to revision, is an increase of 28 over the 1969 figure at the same time last year. Until the Apprentices Act was amended late last year, employers were not required to lodge with the Apprenticeship Commission a copy of the indentures of an apprenticeship until after the indentures had been signed. In many cases this was not done until the probationary period of three months had expired. This figure of 2,375 is therefore subject to revision: in fact, the revised 1969 figure represented an increase of over 12 per cent compared with the preliminary figure at the same time the previous year. Therefore, I expect that the final intake for 1970 will be much higher than 2,375. This is particularly pleasing, because the 2,632 indentures of apprenticeship commenced in 1969 was an all-time record.

Although the intake of apprentices is at an all-time level, and as at the end of last year there were 10,528 apprentices in training in South Australia, it cannot be assumed that sufficient young people are being trained to be the skilled tradesmen of the future, as more and more skilled operatives are required in our developing economy. Employers should be continually reviewing their needs for skilled workers and employing the maximum number of apprentices they can effectively train. I hope that the national conference on training for industry and commerce being jointly convened by the Commonwealth and State Labour Ministers which is to be held in Canberra next May will, among other things, cause attention to be given to the needs for more people to be trained for all types of occupations, including skilled craftsmen.

ROAD FATALITIES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on February 24 regarding the number of road fatalities that have occurred in South Australia this year, including those involving blood alcohol readings over .08 per cent?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Road fatalities in South Australia for the period from January 1 to February 28, 1971, totalled 46. No figures are available to show how many of the total number involved had blood-alcohol readings over .08 per cent. During the period under consideration, 10 deaths resulting from vehicular accidents in the metropolitan and nearby surrounding districts were investigated by the City Coroner's staff. The victims included eight drivers, one passenger and one pedestrian. The following details are available regarding these cases: three had a blood-alcohol reading in excess of .08 per cent, namely .17 per cent, .20 per cent, and .36 per cent; one had a blood-alcohol reading of .07 per cent; two had zero readings; and four lived for over 12 hours after the accident or were transfused in that period and no blood tests were made (under present legislation, it is not possible to obtain the blood-alcohol readings of persons injured and admitted to hospital).

Dr. TONKIN: Is it intended to change the present legislation to enable blood-alcohol estimations to be made on all persons involved in road accidents? It is apparent that not enough is known about the correlation between alcoholism and road accidents. True, many guesses, some of them informed guesses, have been made, but not enough is known and more research is necessary not only to protect people who drive under the influence of alcohol but also to screen out the chronic alcoholics in our community who are a menace on the road at almost any time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter was studied in depth by the Pak Poy committee, whose report is, as I have already told the House, currently being studied by a committee of departmental heads who will be involved in the implementation of the recommendations contained therein. Having inquired about this matter only this morning, I find that that committee is now progressing towards the final stage of its considerations, and I hope that its report will be available to the Government soon so that it can be carefully scrutinized. Until I have received that report it would be premature for me to comment on the desirability of the honourable member's suggestion.

ELIZABETH WEST HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether finality has been reached on a plan to cover the courtyard at the Elizabeth West High School to convert it for use as an all-purpose assembly hall? As the

Minister knows, this project was submitted originally by the high school council. The department favoured it but the council considered that its share of the cost in terms of the plans that were drawn up was beyond its resources. The council considered that a modified plan would do the job just as effectively and provide a building just as effective for future use.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to examine the matter for the honourable member.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the member for Tea Tree Gully, as Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, a reply to my request that, because this side of the House has no representative on the committee, the Leader of the Opposition or his nominee be permitted to examine minutes and evidence taken by the committee?

Mrs. BYRNE: On Wednesday last I undertook to refer the honourable member's question to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I have now done this and the reply is that Standing Order 398 of the Legislative Council, whose Standing Orders relating to Select Committees regulate proceedings of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, states:

Evidence taken by any committee and documents presented to such committee, which have not been reported to the Council, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such committee or by any other person, without the permission of the Council.

This precludes the committee from acceding to the honourable member's request to examine the evidence taken by the committee until such time as it is laid on the table of the House, when it becomes public property, but the committee has decided that in future the tabling of the "No action" report after meetings will be replaced by the tabling of a copy of the minutes of proceedings of the committee, which may then be perused by any honourable member.

COOLTONG PIPELINE

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Irrigation to the question I asked last week about the letting of a contract for an irrigation main at Cooltong?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that a contract for the laying of 21,600ft. of 24in., 21in. and 18in. asbestos cement rubber jointed pipe main to replace the existing concrete channel at Cooltong has

been let to R. M. Eastmond Pty. Ltd. Notification of the acceptance of the tender was forwarded to the contractor on February 18, 1971, the time for completion of the contract being 18 weeks from that date. The contract includes the installation of temporary connections at each block outlet and the system will become operative on completion of the contract. It cannot, however, become fully operative as regards pressurization until the pumping station is completed in 1973. My colleague regrets that the delay which has occurred through the need to vary the route to avoid the destruction of a few trees on the channel reserve may set back commissioning of the pipe main. However, every effort will be made to bring the main into service as early as possible.

TUMBY BAY MAIN

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Tumby Bay main?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Tumby Bay township is supplied from the east coast main by more than four miles of 8in. asbestos cement and mild steel concrete lined pipes. The 6in. main referred to by the honourable member was replaced by 8in. diameter asbestos cement pipes in 1966 at a cost of \$31,200. This new main is in excellent condition, while the remaining 8in. mild steel concrete lined main, though not in first-class condition, does not warrant replacing at present. Boosting has never been used on this main. Pressures in the area are generally lower this year owing to the increased demand for water in the whole region. However, other than a general complaint of lack of pressure from the District Council of Tumby Bay, the only specific complaint has come from the Tumby Bay Hospital. When the first complaint was received in September 1970, an extra service, 4in. diameter, was given to the hospital to augment the supply from the existing 1in. diameter service. Since this extra service was installed, the combined consumption by the hospital from both services in each of the two subsequent quarters has been slightly more than 500,000gall. indicating an annual consumption of about 2,000,000gall. Although the pressure during peak periods is somewhat low, the consumption would indicate that the supply is reasonable. Should it be found necessary eventually to increase the pressures generally, a reorganization and enlargement of the whole distribution system in Tumby Bay would have to be carried out but this is not warranted at this stage.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works find out when work to provide sewers for houses in Harrison Avenue, on the west side of Reservoir Road and south of Smart Road at Modbury, will commence? On July 16, last, the Minister told me by letter that expenditure of \$10,500 to provide sewers for houses in this area had been approved and that work would commence this financial year.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

RIVER FLOW

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about river flows and storages?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The information is as follows:

Discharge data, July 1, 1970, to February 24, 1971, inclusive:

	Acre feet
Mitta Mitta River at Tallandoon	1,178,000
Murray River at Doctor's Point (above Albury)	4,729,000
Darling River at Bartundy	390,000
Murrumbidgee River at Balranald	1,626,000
Murray River below Wakool Junction	5,646,000
Water flowing to South Australia (to 1/3/71)	6,438,000
The River Murray discharge below Wakool Junction includes the contribution from all the tributaries upstream, such as the Ovens, Goulbourn, Campaspe, Loddon, Edward and Wakool Rivers.	

Storage:

	Acre feet
Lake Eucumbene (18/2/71)	
—Total contents	2,880,000
—Snowy Murray component	1,087,000
Hume Reservoir (24/2/71)	2,037,160
Lake Victoria (1/3/71)	546,200

BEACH EROSION

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister for Conservation make available to all members copies of the report and recommendations brought down by Mr. R. Culver in his report on beach restoration? This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report headed, "New plan: to take sand to the beaches." We know that this can be done in many ways and I consider it important that we have this report available as soon as possible. The Minister may also consider making copies of the report available to the seaside councils concerned, because they have contributed many thousands of dollars towards the cost of Mr. Culver's studies.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I cannot make copies available to all members at present. Only a limited number of copies of the document, which was printed by the University of Adelaide, has been made available. I understand that three copies of the report have been made available to each of the seaside councils that participated in this survey. However, I can provide two copies of this publication for the Opposition and, as I expected that there would be a question of this nature today, I have them with me and can make them available.

METROPOLITAN HOUSING

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, provide additional houses in the metropolitan area that would be immediately available to families now being displaced from rural communities? Recently, and particularly during the last week, many employees of stock firms have been informed at short notice that their services have been suspended and soon they would be required to leave the company houses they occupy. Obviously, as they are being displaced from rural communities, they will find it difficult, if possible at all, to obtain employment in those communities, and, for the sake of themselves and their families, their only outlet will be to flood toward Adelaide in the hope of obtaining employment. In a small town north of Gawler no fewer than two of a total of three members of the branch of a firm have been displaced, and in other towns as many as four members of an establishment have been displaced, so that additional houses will be required in the metropolitan area. In asking my question I realize the present difficulties that exist for any member to obtain from the Housing Trust consideration of his request for additional housing for his constituents.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present the demand for houses in the metropolitan area is about the heaviest that the Housing Trust has ever known, and the build up of applications for trust assistance is so grave that it has caused the Government considerable concern. It is apparent that the price of alternative housing is tending to increase and that for many working people the only assistance that can be obtained within their range of income is from the Housing Trust. As members know, the waiting period is getting steadily longer, because although the trust is building right to the limit of available funds there is a considerable backlog. I will ascertain

from the Chairman of the trust whether assistance can be given to these people but, unfortunately, I cannot give the honourable member much hope that we will be able to help, because at present there is a large backlog of applications.

OH! CALCUTTA!

Mr. VENNING: A question on this subject has been previously asked of the Attorney-General, but today I ask my question of the Premier. Will he, as Leader of this Government, discuss with Cabinet once again whether it will permit *Oh! Calcutta!* to be performed in this State? Much consternation exists in the State at present, not only about *Oh! Calcutta!* but also about many other things that are going on. Church people and other organizations are concerned and are trying to do something for the welfare not only of the elderly people but also of the younger generation. It is for this reason that I ask the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government supports entirely the view and stand taken by the Attorney-General, as we believe that it is the only proper one. I am concerned with the utterly loose and baseless statements that are being made concerning the publication of material and the other activities taking place in South Australia that are supposed to be attacking the moral fibre of our community. Let us get a few facts straight: one publication and one alone has not been prosecuted in South Australia but has been prosecuted in other States, and that was *Portnoy's Complaint*. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested publicly that that should not have been banned, anyway. That publication was prosecuted in three other States: in Victoria successfully; in Western Australia unsuccessfully; and in New South Wales there was a hung jury. What is it that is supposed to contribute to the decline in the moral fibre of our community? I have seen published statements suggesting that some material relating to girls' confession stories is debasing the moral fibre of the community, but I cannot see any difference between that and what was available in the community 10 years ago. Concerning *Oh! Calcutta!*, I do not believe that I should add anything to the statements made by the Attorney-General. The decision of the Government is in no way contributing to the delinquency of youth in our society. A specific restriction has been placed on any presentation of that performance: it is limited to people over the age of 18 years. Therefore, it will have nothing to do with

youth. Adults will be able to make up their own minds on this play (that is, if it continues), and it will only continue if there is no breach of the law. If the law is not breached we do not believe that we should sit in judgment on what other people can look at.

Mr. Venning: You are supposed to govern the country.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We intend to govern the country on the basis of allowing each individual the right to make up his own mind on what he wants to see.

Mr. Venning: And let other organizations clean up the mess.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has long been liberal philosophy (and I would have thought it was a philosophy espoused in consequence by gentlemen who call themselves Liberals) that each person in this community should be able to exercise his own judgment, and that, where things are not matters of a breach of law but matters of personal taste and judgment, each person should make up his own mind. If someone wants to see something which is offensive or which would be offensive to others if they saw it, that is for him to decide, and he does not see it without knowing what he is going to see.

Mr. Jennings: He's not forced there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No-one forces people to go there. I have seen *Oh! Calcutta!* and did not like it: I thought it was a lousy show. I do not intend, however, to impose my taste in that matter on other people in the community. I do not think that it corrupted me and I do not think it would corrupt the honourable member, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General, even at this late stage, be willing to exercise his powers under section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act and, for that purpose, see the play *Oh! Calcutta!* before it is performed publicly?

The SPEAKER: Order! A question has been asked previously pertaining to the banning of this play and we cannot have a repetition of what is, in substance, the same question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was not in the House earlier but I have inquired and I understand that that question, while it raised the subject matter of the play *Oh! Calcutta!*, was not in the form of or related to the question I have asked now.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it related to the banning of the play *Oh! Calcutta!*

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But in my question I did not ask that the play be banned. My question,

if I may repeat it, is this: will the Attorney, even at this late stage, exercise his powers under section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act and see the play *Oh! Calcutta!* before it is performed publicly? I suggest, with great respect, that that is not the same question.

The SPEAKER: A question has been previously asked requesting the Attorney-General to attend.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, no!

The SPEAKER: Whilst it did not specifically refer to that section, a question was asked of the Attorney-General.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I respectfully persist with the point of order that this is not the same question as, I understand, was asked by the member for Rocky River.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What does section 25 provide?

Mr. Coumbe: That is up to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why not read it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will read it if I have to.

The SPEAKER: I believe that the previous question suggested that in view of the public outcry the Attorney-General should go and see the play.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, on my information that was not the question that was asked.

The SPEAKER: Very well, the honourable member may proceed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate you allowing me to proceed, Sir. When I was in office last year I was faced with a situation similar to this, although there had not been quite the public outcry that there has been in this case. At the suggestion of the entrepreneur I did—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not explaining his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER: He is giving information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I saw the play *The Boys in the Band* and, as a result of first having read the script and then having seen the play, I made some small alterations.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What were the alterations?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not relevant.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think it is.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It had a far-reaching effect on the outcome.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must proceed with his explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There has been considerable public protest and expression of disquiet about the play *Oh! Calcutta!* The Attorney-General has said that he has read the

script, but I submit that it is not possible to form an opinion only on the written word: from what we know of this play, it is necessary to see it before coming to a conclusion and perhaps (this is a matter for his discretion) exercising the powers conferred on him under section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act. It is for that reason that I asked whether he would consider taking the course that I took previously in somewhat similar circumstances.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have considered whether I should have a preview of a performance in order to decide what course to take. I am very strongly of the opinion, as I have previously explained in this House, that, in relation to a live show as distinct from a film, it is a grave mistake for the Minister to attend a preview, and I think the honourable member made such a mistake with relation to *The Boys in the Band*. A live performance can be varied from time to time, and there is no way in which anyone can be satisfied that, because he has seen a certain performance on one occasion, it will be performed in the same way on another occasion. I have read the script of *Oh! Calcutta!* I formed the opinion by that reading that no matter how it was presented it would be clearly unsuitable for persons under 18 years of age, and for that reason, if they were admitted, I would prohibit it, irrespective of the manner of its performance. If its performance is confined to persons over 18 years of age it becomes a question of whether those performing in it offend against the laws relating to public decency. That can be determined only by trained observers, whose training fits them to observe what is taking place and who can give evidence on what has taken place if action is taken. Consequently, I think the proper course is for police officers, who are trained to make necessary observations and to record those observations and consequently be able to substantiate them by giving evidence, to attend and make observations. I have no doubt that they will report their observations, and a decision will be made whether a prosecution will be launched. It will be known when that decision is made that trained observers are available to substantiate the charges, if any are laid as a result of the performance.

Mr. Millhouse: In the meantime the play will go on.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If, as a result of the reports, it seems that offences are taking place and that if the play continues those

offences will continue to take place, there is ample ground for the Minister to exercise his authority under section 25. In those circumstances (and let there be no doubt about it, and let the promoters, whoever they may be, take heed) I will not hesitate to exercise the power under section 25 and prohibit further performances of the play.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Attorney-General say what aspects of *Oh! Calcutta!* make it unsuitable for persons under 18 years of age but may not offend those over the age of 18 years? The Attorney-General said that on a reading of the play he was convinced that it was unsuitable for people under 18 years. I have received many approaches and communications from people using the cutting in the newspaper advertisement, and I have also received a petition from the congregation of a church in Gumeracha, in my district.

The Hon. L. J. KING: A perusal of the script shows that the play, if it can be called a play (I think it would be more accurately described as a revue), deals with sexual themes, and the treatment of these sexual themes, in my judgment, renders it unsuitable for minors, irrespective of whether there are breaches of the law, any indecent acts on stage, or anything of that kind. The mere subject matter and treatment of the subject matter makes that so, and that is because the revue deals almost entirely (I think exclusively) with sexual themes. In my judgment, at all events (I do not know whether the honourable member agrees with me), sexual themes treated in an explicit way are unsuitable for viewing by immature persons. However, viewing by adults is an entirely different matter and I repeat (and agree with what the Premier said earlier) that, provided a performance does not offend against the law, adult persons have the right to make their own choice of what they see or hear. In my view, the choice of what we read and see is one of the most important personal choices that we make in our lives, and the intrusion of the State into that choice is a serious step which should be taken only if clearly necessary for the protection and preservation of public decency. In our society, public decency is protected by the law; certain offences are created by the law in order to protect public decency. I would not be prepared, therefore, to prohibit a performance for adults merely on the reading of a script, because I think that such a serious interference with the personal liberty of a citizen to make his own decision

about what he sees or hears can occur only if clear evidence establishes, after the performance of the play, that offences against decency are taking place on the stage, and that therefore the step of prohibiting the play is necessary. If the observations of trained observers show that those offences are taking place on the stage, that provides solid grounds for prohibiting the play: indeed, I believe it would be my duty, as Attorney-General, to prohibit future performances of the play.

I now refer to a statement in the press; I do not know whether or not it is correctly attributed to the promoter of the play. If there is any notion that the play would be allowed to continue with offences taking place on the stage while protracted legal proceedings were being conducted, I can say only that the promoter, if he believes that, is acting under a complete misapprehension of the course I would take if the performance of this play contravened the laws relating to decency.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many letters protesting against the staging of the play *Oh! Calcutta!* has the Attorney-General received in the last week?
2. How many petitions similarly protesting has the Attorney-General received in that time?
3. How many signatures do they contain?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. 85 letters.
2. 16 petitions.
3. 14,575 signatures.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether legislation can be introduced in this State providing for the modification of aircraft jet-engine combustion chambers to curb air pollution? Constituents in my district have complained about the increasing air pollution caused by jet aircraft using West Beach Airport. Last week the smell of aviation fuel was more noticeable than it has been in the past. I understand that successful experiments have been conducted in America to curtail pollution from jet aircraft, that the new jet burners are far more efficient than present models, and they also reduce fuel costs.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will see what can be done about this matter. I assume the honourable member is aware that any

legislation or action initiated in this regard must be on a Commonwealth level. However, I will have the matter examined and obtain a report.

CEDUNA COURTHOUSE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when construction work will commence on the new Ceduna courthouse?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain that information for the honourable member and let him have a reply.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works say what is the present water position in South Australia and give details of reservoir holdings?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. Each week, I bring down to the House the report that I receive from the Engineering and Water Supply Department concerning our reservoirs, and I hope it is of interest to members to know what is the situation from week to week. The following table relates to the information for which the honourable member has asked:

Reservoir	Capacity (gall.)	Present holding (gall.)	Holding Last Year (gall.)
Mt. Bold	10,440,000,000	4,235,700,000	4,459,200,000
Happy Valley	2,804,000,000	2,578,800,000	1,958,300,000
Clarendon weir	72,000,000	71,600,000	70,400,000
Myponga	5,905,000,000	3,786,200,000	3,450,300,000
Millbrook	3,647,000,000	481,000,000	755,500,000
Kangaroo Creek	5,370,000,000	1,984,900,000	250,800,000
Hope Valley	765,000,000	574,000,000	656,000,000
Thorndon Pk.	142,000,000	109,300,000	170,800,000
Barossa	993,000,000	938,900,000	935,600,000
South Para	11,300,000,000	6,784,300,000	6,979,200,000
Total	41,438,000,000	21,544,700,000	19,633,100,000

DEBIT ORDER WORK

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether debit order grants to district councils are to be reduced in the next financial year? Reports are circulating in local government areas that money allocated for debit order work on main roads is to be reduced. However, some councils that have purchased additional equipment to handle this work are afraid that if the grants are reduced they will have to retrench staff.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the programme for the ensuing financial year has not yet been finalized, no reply can be given at this stage. However, the Highways Department's commitments and the astronomical increases in costs (the increased costs in respect of work in this financial year amounts to about \$1,000,000) will have some effect on the programme finally arranged for the ensuing financial year. Until the programme has been finalized and determined, it is impossible to answer the question.

NURSING HOMES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government will consider providing assistance by way of subsidy to so-called profit-making nursing

homes? It was recently announced that the State Government would provide a subsidy in respect of each occupied bed in non-profit-making homes that needed assistance. On behalf of certain nursing homes that are run for profit, I have been in touch over a period with various Chief Secretaries and have been told that it is not Government policy to assist private nursing homes; it has been suggested that these homes approach the Commonwealth Government. One home of which I am particularly thinking accommodates about 22 patients, of whom 15 need special care (for instance, they cannot walk without assistance) and, in addition, an attached boarding house accommodates another 16 patients or boarders. Anyone visiting this home can see that there is a strong case for assistance. As a result of interviewing the proprietor of this home, it is clear that there is no lack of frankness on his part: he would have no difficulty or reservations about discussing his affairs with the Government or any authority. In addition, this nursing home has the support of many people in the community. In those circumstances it seems that there is a clear case for including homes of this nature in the assistance provided by the State Government. Will the Attorney-General raise this matter with the Government as a matter of policy?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will raise the matter with the Chief Secretary and let the honourable member have a reply.

SPECIAL JUSTICES

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Attorney-General say why four special justices were recently appointed to sit in courts on Saturday mornings? I understand that, under the provisions of the Justices Act, four special justices were recently appointed, mainly to handle Saturday morning courts. I have the greatest regard for the personal integrity and probity of the four gentlemen concerned who, as the Attorney-General knows, are clerks of court. However, I point out that for many years honorary justices have done this work at no cost to the community. In addition, sufficient honorary justices are available who are prepared to carry on this work that will now be done by special justices. Therefore, I wish to know why these special justices have been appointed. As persons appointed as special justices are, under the relevant section of the Justices Act, eligible to receive remuneration, I should like to know what the appointment of these four special justices is likely to cost the State.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The persons to whom the honourable member refers are appointed as special justices under a provision inserted in the Act by the Government of which the honourable member was a member and for reasons which the then Attorney-General (the member for Mitcham) explained at the time. The general purpose of appointing special justices is to enable them to take some of the work load normally discharged by magistrates, thereby relieving the magistrates of some of their work and assisting to get and keep the court lists up to date. It is intended that special justices will be used in this way during normal working hours for which work they will receive no additional remuneration: they will be paid the normal rate of pay provided for clerks of court. In due course, they will be used in this way, and it is hoped that the work load of the magistrates can be appreciably reduced by this method. Because of their long and special experience in the court, special justices can dispose of matters that it would not be suitable for honorary justices to dispose of. Each of the four men chosen has had a life-time of experience in the courts and is perhaps better equipped to handle the more important matters than is an honorary justice, who has had more limited experience, although I point out

that I have nothing but praise for honorary justices.

An experiment has been introduced in relation to Saturday morning work. It is hoped that two things will happen. First, it is hoped that the new special justices will gain experience. Wherever possible, I hope they will sit with an honorary justice so that this in turn will give the honorary justice greater experience. Secondly, cases which, if dealt with by honorary justices, would have to be remanded or adjourned to another day can now be disposed of on a Saturday morning. It is expected that more of the cases on the Saturday morning lists can be finally disposed of, thereby minimizing the cluttering up of lists later in the week. As we are experimenting at this stage, I cannot say on how many Saturdays of the year the special justices will sit or what this will cost. The matter is being treated as an experiment; indeed, the whole question of special justices is at this stage largely experimental. However, I hope that, with little expense to the State, their use will greatly reduce the magistrates' lists.

HALLETT COVE CROSSING

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of February 23 about the Hallett Cove Estate railway crossing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have taken it that the crossing referred to by the honourable member is that on the alignment of Kurnabinna Terrace. There has never been an open level crossing at this point. When the land on both sides of the line was held by one owner, an occupation crossing was granted for his use, but when the land was subdivided the gates were used for access by Railways Department employees. Although the Hallett Cove to Willunga railway has now been closed, the remaining crossing is still in a cutting and the provision of an open level crossing at this point would create an extremely hazardous situation.

MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the diploma course in medical technology at the Institute of Technology?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following a discussion I had recently with the President and another officer of the South Australian Branch of the Australasian Institute of Medical Technology, I took up with the Institute

of Technology the question of a third year for Mr. Gale and requested that the institute review its decision not to provide the third year of the diploma in technology course in 1971. The institute has indicated that, while it has a great deal of sympathy for Mr. Gale in his plight, through force of circumstance it is not able to alter its decision. The honourable member will appreciate that, in present inflationary circumstances, all tertiary institutions in South Australia are experiencing financial difficulty. Even so, there has been an increase in the output of students from the medical technology course and this will continue to expand. It is pointed out that, in 1970, 50 persons graduated from the two certificate courses operating. The number should again be of this order in 1971, and the total output from the medical technology course in 1972 (including the first graduates of the diploma in technology course) should be in excess of 60. These numbers are to be compared with the total production of 52 certificate holders in the five years preceding 1970. The main argument of the institute centres around the point that, if the third year of the diploma in technology course were mounted in 1971, it could only be done at the expense of large numbers of students in the certificate area. I understand that the Institute of Medical Laboratory Technology has made it clear that it is unwilling to participate in the organization and conduct of classes in the certificate course. Consequently, if full-time staff of the South Australian Institute of Technology were needed for the third year of the diploma of technology course at this stage, there would be fewer staff resources available for the continuation of teaching at the certificate level. In the circumstances I had no alternative but to accept the decision of the institute. The student will have to wait until next year.

RENMARK PARKING

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider amending the Road Traffic Act to allow councils in rural areas to make by-laws in relation to the parking of motor vehicles at the kerbs of dual carriageways? Recently, the citizens of Renmark were informed that angle parking on the side and ranking alongside the median strip of a dual carriageway contravened the Road Traffic Act. This matter having been brought to the attention of the Divisional Inspector of Police, shortly the provisions of the Road Traffic Act in this respect will be enforced in Renmark.

Naturally the people in that progressive town have become used to this method of parking. I understand that no serious accident has occurred for some time in the streets of Renmark. Part of the editorial in the March 4 issue of the *Murray Pioneer* is as follows:

This is a glaring instance of a law, framed to cater for special conditions which could apply in crowded cities or along busy super-highways, reacting most unfairly against rural dwellers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter examined.

DAIRY FARMERS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister Works examine the position of dairy farmers in the Adelaide Hills who are being asked to spend as much as \$1,000 to prevent pollution? The Minister has announced that the Government will subsidize the very necessary connections of sewerage to country towns around the lakes and in the Hills area, if the cost of each system exceeds \$30. This also applies to Blackwood, where people have polluted the area. To prevent pollution, the Government has installed in that area sewerage systems, which will be a great burden to taxpayers. On the other hand, the people to whom I have referred, who have cows in the area, are being asked to go to great expense to install such systems. However, many people who have not been offered assistance cannot afford such costs.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the matter examined. However, I point out that, although the Government has announced that it will subsidize councils in order to encourage them to construct common effluent drainage schemes within the townships (these have been selected already: they are towns in the watershed area on the Murray River and on the lakes at the lower end of the Murray River), the residents are still required to pay the \$30 referred to by the honourable member. The Government realizes that the cost of installing some effluent drainage systems will not amount to \$30. Conversely, where there are special difficulties, the cost of installing systems is likely to exceed that amount; and it is in this respect that the Government has undertaken to assist councils. This will bring those people's costs more or less into line with the amount that people are expected to pay when areas are sewered by the Government. I doubt whether any direct assistance can be given these people. The honourable member has said he is aware of the need for

these systems, but I point out that in the subsidy scheme announced recently individuals are still required to make a payment for each connection. They are, therefore, still paying for the service.

UNLEY POLICE STATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report regarding the present position of alterations to the Unley police station office? As the Administration has decided that smaller police stations are now being closed at night, the Unley police station has become a major station in the southern area, resulting in its having much more work to perform. However, its offices are old (indeed, they have been there for many years) and only minor alterations would be needed to make the working conditions more satisfactory for the officers at the station.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the matter examined for the honourable member and bring down a report.

SPRINGBANK LAND

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding an area of land at Springbank that the local residents have suggested could be made available as a children's playground?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No restrictions are imposed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on the area surrounding the Clapham tanks and pumping station, but a number of potential hazards make its use by children somewhat limited. The reserve is a triangular piece of land situated between the main south railway line on the north-west, the main Belair Road on the east and Springbank Road on the south. It is desirable, therefore, that children using this area be supervised. The playing of ball games should not be encouraged because of the close proximity of the railway line and the major roads, and also the presence of a fairly large transformer compound. There has been no change in the department's policy towards public use of this reserve in recent months. The pumping station is, however, largely attended these days and children misbehaving, damaging shrubs or trees or trespassing onto tank roofs and other parts of the installation where they could either do damage or injury to themselves would naturally be spoken to by the departmental representative and in some cases asked to leave. The present policy will continue and, while the department does not advertise or publicly invite people to come

into this reserve, it will continue to afford the public full access to the area for their enjoyment, reserving the right to discipline and ask to leave any persons who misbehave or cause damage or inconvenience.

MENINGIE DRAINAGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Local Government a more detailed reply to the question I asked last week on drainage in the Meningie area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Since the honourable member asked his question, the Government has announced that it intends to subsidize drainage schemes such as the one referred to, in certain circumstances. The scheme being considered by the Meningie council has been approved in principle by me as Minister, as required under the Local Government Act. Council must submit details of the final cost before final approval will be given. The Meningie council is aware of this and is obtaining final costs from Electrolux Limited. I understand that the council is also looking into operating costs of the Electrolux scheme as compared with what may be termed an ordinary scheme. I have been informed that the council intends to hold a meeting of ratepayers on March 26, 1971, when the details of the scheme will be submitted to the meeting. After this, the council will then prepare its final scheme for my consideration as Minister.

MURDER PHOTOGRAPH

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General ascertain how a photograph connected with last year's murder at the Exeter Hotel got into this week's issue of *Pix* magazine? You may recall, Mr Speaker, that last week, or the week before, the member for Playford asked questions about the *City Pictorial*, which contained a whole series of photographs regarding the ghastly murder that took place at the Exeter Hotel some time ago, when the then licensee was murdered. Mrs. Dini, the present licensee of the hotel, has been in touch with me this morning, saying that there is this week in *Pix*, which I understand is a national magazine, a photograph of this event. She told me that she spoke to the Attorney-General, by telephone, I understand, last Saturday, pointing out to him the damage that was being done to her business (the member for Playford mentioned this when asking the other question) and also the harm being done to her because of the upset that it caused her, naturally, to see these things. I understand from her that the only advice that the Attorney could give

her was that she should see a solicitor. In the normal course of things, this is good advice, but it was not very helpful in the present situation. I ask the Attorney the question because I can think of no other way in which what is, apparently, a leak, from either the courts or the police, could be tracked down.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter to which the honourable member refers was raised, as he has said, by the member for Playford and, following that, I transmitted through the Chief Secretary a request to the police to investigate the circumstances in which these photographs came to be published. It is a most distressing business. They have now been published in the two publications to which the honourable member refers, and I have been told that they were also shown in a television programme. This has caused great distress to people who were connected with the case, two of whom have communicated with me, explaining how horrified they have been by this and how it stirred up the horror they experienced at the time of the murder and subsequently during the long process of trial, appeals, and so on. Now it has all been revived, to what purpose only those who have published the photographs can say. I think it is a most disgraceful position and that all those connected with the publication ought to experience sentiments of shame that they have exposed people to this sort of experience, to no good purpose. I hope that, if these photographs have been obtained illegally, the culprit can be traced. If this is done, a prosecution will certainly be launched. True, the present licensee of the hotel telephoned me on Saturday afternoon. She was distressed. She had been in communication with me previously. I have the utmost sympathy for her regarding the predicament in which she finds herself. It is not true to say that the only advice I gave her was that she should see a solicitor. I told her that an investigation that had been instituted was proceeding and that, as far as I could see, that was the only course of action open to me. She indicated a desire to bring legal action in connection with the publication of the photographs, and I then followed my invariable practice in such cases, namely, of saying that her only course was to see a solicitor and act upon his advice.

SALT CREEK WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the provision of a water supply at Salt Creek?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department is aware that Mr. J. W. Tiver, together with two other property owners in the hundred of Santo, desires water from the Taillem Bend to Keith main scheme. However, the final examination and determination of the location of any branch mains to serve the hundreds of Santo and Messent has not yet been made. A departmental officer is working through the area, interviewing landholders. He is at present in the area immediately to the west of Tintinara and will be making further inquiries in the hundreds immediately west of Keith within the next few weeks. An approach will be made to the National Parks Commission to ascertain the wishes of that body concerning a water supply to the national park in the hundred of Messent. These, together with the views of other landholders in the hundreds of Messent and Santo, will then be considered in determining what branch mains should be laid in this area.

CUMMINS HOSPITAL

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Attorney-General obtain from the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked in this House two weeks ago? Normally, I am not as impatient as this regarding replies to questions that I have asked, as I have found that replies can take sometimes even longer than this to obtain, particularly when the Chief Secretary is involved. However, this question has become relatively urgent. It dealt with a subsidy for the planned new Cummins Hospital, for which I understand tenders closed last Thursday. The hospital board will wish to consider these tenders and, before making a decision, will naturally want the assurance that it has sought from the Government that the subsidy will still be available.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Chief Secretary.

RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the recently announced increased railway freight rates in South Australia include an increase in the freight on grain?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the best thing to do is bring down to the House a complete list, although I think the by-laws have been laid on the table of the Parliament. I will check this and, if they have been tabled, I will refer the honourable member to the complete list.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say what action the Government is taking to speed up adoption of the rural reconstruction scheme, which many farmers urgently need?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When replying to a question in this House last week, I said that we were awaiting from the Commonwealth Government the agreement on which we had to base the legislation. This agreement has been held up by the non-compliance with the agreement by one State; I am not sure whether it is Victoria, Queensland or Tasmania. That was the position then and I do not know whether it has changed, but I doubt that our Minister of Lands can bring pressure to bear on another State to agree to the conditions laid down. However, I, as well as the honourable member and, I am sure, my colleague, hope that agreement will be reached soon so that we can deal with the legislation that will be necessary to implement the scheme.

CONTRACEPTIVE PAMPHLET

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education use all his authority to ensure that the incident regarding the questionnaire on sex given to students at the Daws Road High School late last week, and reported in the *News* last Friday, is not repeated in any other State school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The circumstances to which the honourable member has referred involved a group of students who had been doing a course under the auspices of the Marriage Guidance Council, with the approval of parents. The people who organized the course wanted to obtain a check on the impact that the course was having. They decided on a questionnaire and, in order to get some idea of the impact the course was having, they selected a group of students who had done the course and another group who had not. Unfortunately, parental approval was not obtained for the group that had not done the course. That is what caused the whole matter to blow up. Concerning this course, the Marriage Guidance Council does an extremely valuable job and, repeating what I said on Friday, it would be a tragedy if the kind of work it is doing in our schools ceased. The course it provides is undertaken with students whose parents have approved their doing the course, and matters involved are discussed in full. If the questionnaire is part of the course and parents approve, I see no objection. The position would not be

identical with the position that arose last week. The only assurance I am prepared to give the honourable member is that, in relation to this kind of work carried on in schools, the condition that must apply is that parental approval be obtained. Where that approval has not been obtained, we would expect to find no repetition of what happened at the Daws Road school.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about work proceeding under the River Torrens Acquisition Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The River Torrens committee at its meeting held on February 17, 1971, discussed the procedure necessary to fulfil the requirements of the River Torrens Acquisition Act. The Chairman of the committee has now reported to me that, before consideration can be given to the acquiring of land, two prerequisites are essential, namely, a title search followed by land survey. I have approved the expenditure of \$800 for the title search. This will be commenced immediately and will take about eight weeks for the plans showing ownership to be prepared. On completion of the plans, the committee will further consider what parts of the river should be given priority for survey, and will make recommendations to me on this phase.

NOARLUNGA BY-PASS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on an article that appeared in the *Southern Times* (a Messenger publication) on February 24 last? The article, headed "Landowners Victims of the Noarlunga By-Pass", and subheaded "Skilled Negotiators Tying Us in Knots", contains a serious allegation against the Highways Department, particularly departmental officers. I believe the House should know the true position regarding the acquisition of land in the area. Part of the article states:

The tactics which the Highways Department is using to gain compulsory acquisition of land "are highly objectionable to say the least" . . . Complaints of "ruthless pressure tactics, vagueness and callous impersonality—all within the letter of the law" have been levelled against the Highways Department. . . .

The article refers to the example involving an elderly woman pensioner, whose husband died last year, and who finds that the by-pass comes to within 15ft. of her house. This person will be offered no more for the property than she

and her husband paid for it nearly 12 years ago. The article states that she has received a "10c piece" as a deposit" from the department, pending a financial settlement. As the Minister will see many other allegations made in the article, I do not think it is necessary for me to read any more of the report. However, as I believe that a serious allegation has been made, I should like the Minister to bring down a report in order to clarify the position.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My attention was drawn to this article only this morning, and I immediately had the matter referred to the department so that the facts of the case could be made known. I regret that the honourable member has gone into details, apparently suggesting that they may even have an air of authenticity about them.

Mr. Evans: No. I didn't say I agreed with them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member did not agree with the article, he would not have taken the trouble to refer to what are obviously unfounded rumours and wild allegations. He does not do his own cause much good when he refers to this sort of matter in the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister can answer only one question at a time. Interjections are out of order. The Minister is replying to a question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was attempting to reply to it and I thank you for your assistance, Mr. Speaker. As I have said, the matter has already been referred to the Highways Department. Members know that the Highways Department would not be able, under any conditions at all, to go on to land that it had not acquired, yet that is one of the allegations against the Highways Department with which the honourable member apparently agrees. I will obtain a full report on the matter, and I hope that the honourable member will use his good offices to have the Messenger newspaper organization print that report.

Mr. EVANS: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to defend my personal attitude, as the Minister has suggested I said that what appears in the article is true: at no time did I state that. I quoted from the article and asked that the Minister's department and his officers be protected and cleared, if possible, in respect of the allegation made. That was the sole intent of the question. These are serious allegations. At the end of

his reply, the Minister said that I had suggested that officers of the Highways Department had gone on to property before that property had been acquired; I did not suggest that—the article suggested it. However, this has actually been the case in the past. For the benefit of the Minister, I can say that that has been the experience of the member for Goyder.

MENINGIE SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ascertain what progress has been made on planning and when it is expected that a new change-room will be constructed at the Meningie Area School this financial year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will bring down a reply for the honourable member.

WILLIAMSTOWN SEWERAGE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether there is any significance in the absence of Williamstown from the list of those towns that are to be considered for sewerage? Williamstown, which is a little upstream from the South Para reservoir, has no sewerage system and has apparently not been considered among those towns to be seweraged, the names of which have been submitted to the press. This matter is causing concern to the people involved, including those who made a request last December for information about additional facilities (ablation blocks, etc.) at the Wongalere girl guide camp adjacent to the township. As a result of the exclusion of Williamstown from the list, and as Williamstown is close to Chain of Ponds, local residents are wondering whether the fate of Williamstown is to be the same as that of Chain of Ponds.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assure the residents of Williamstown that they are not fated in the same way as are the people of Chain of Ponds. In fact, Williamstown is included in the scheme, although the name of the town did not appear in the press report. Williamstown is in the watershed, as the honourable member knows, and is therefore included. I am afraid that I cannot be held responsible for the fact that the press did not include Williamstown in the list. In fact, I think it is the first town referred to in the watershed area, and so the scheme would apply to Williamstown as it does to any other town in the watershed, on the Murray River or around the lakes. I am not aware of the matter concerning extensions to the camp referred to, but I will have the matter examined and find out what is happening in this regard.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During the 1969-70 season, the Wheat Delivery Quotas Review Committee allocated a total quantity of 320,000 bushels of wheat to growers whose claims were admitted by that committee. As the honourable member probably knows, the 1970-71 season contingency reserve has been fixed at 700,000 bushels. The closing date for 1970-71 appeals was extended by the committee to March 1, and it is currently considering those appeals.

BOOKSELLERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier be kind enough to give me a reply now to a question which I asked last November and about which I reminded him last week arising out of comments made by the Managing Director of Rigby Limited (Mr. Branson) to Mr. A. M. Ramsay?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matters raised by the Managing Director of Rigby Limited in his letter to the then Director of Industrial Promotion have been examined carefully, as a result of which it is clear that the decisions taken were in accordance with Government policy for the purchase of supplies. That policy provides for the calling of public tenders and the consideration of all offers received in the light of preference to local manufacturers and suppliers. In accordance with this policy, orders for 1971 school year textbooks, valued at about \$630,000, were issued to five suppliers including Rigby Limited, whose share amounted to \$290,000. No decision yet has been made to change the system relating to secondary school textbooks, and any decision taken will be on the basis of the best interests of the Government and the parents concerned. If Rigby Limited or any other supplier considers that it is subject to unfair competition from overseas, it should make representations to the Commonwealth Government through the Tariff Board.

BAROSSA BUS SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Barossa bus services?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Messrs. F. A. and M. V. Anderson, who have operated the Greenock passenger service for the past 6½ years, recently gave notice that they would cease this thrice-weekly service after March 26.

In accordance with its policy, the Transport Control Board has invited applications for the right to conduct a passenger and parcel service between Greenock and Adelaide, and the operators of the other services travelling over this route are being given an opportunity to apply for Greenock as an addition to their existing services. Although the route of the Kapunda bus service was changed about six months ago to the direct road through Fords and Freeling, this operator is also eligible to apply to provide a service for Greenock and Daveyston.

WINE PRICES

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier obtain from the Prices Commissioner a comparison between wine prices in this State and those in other States? Also, as I believe price fluctuations will soon settle down, will the Premier ask the Commissioner to estimate expected differences in the next few months?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with the Prices Commissioner. I point out that at present retail wine prices are the subject of decisions by the Liquor Industry Council, which has been gazetted by the Government.

Mr. Hall: You still inquire into industry control of prices.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There happens to be a statutory body properly gazetted pursuant to the Licensing Act that makes rulings relating to retail wine prices. Indeed, as a result of my representations to that body, at the end of last year the mark-up on retail prices was reduced from 40 per cent to 37½ per cent. I will consult the Liquor Industry Council to see whether I can get the kind of information for which the Leader is asking.

ROAD CHARGES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what action he has taken to ensure the recovery of charges under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, following the Auditor-General's Report last September that less than 70 per cent of the sum due was being collected?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to a question on notice last week, the Premier referred to numerous committees that had been set up. If the honourable member cares to check this in *Hansard*, he will find that a committee is looking into this matter at present.

NURSES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to clarify the position regarding those country nurses who have finished the first part of their training in country hospitals? With the introduction of the new nursing curriculum and arrangements for training, many nurses at country hospitals have completed the first part of their training and would normally expect to go to a city hospital to complete their training. However, no moves are being made in this respect at present because of the intended introduction of the new system. Several girls are not sure where they stand and do not know where they will be continuing their training.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

POINT PEARCE RESERVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs report to the House on the progress being made in the transfer of the Point Pearce Reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust?

The Hon. L. J. KING: During the honourable member's term of office as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, a feasibility study, financed by the Commonwealth Government and made on behalf of the Aboriginal Lands Trust as to the economic uses that could be made of Aboriginal reserves, was instituted. The study was carried out by a firm of consultants (Scott and Company), which has recently reported its findings to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. As a result, consultations and discussions have taken place with the Aboriginal Lands Trust regarding the use to which the Point Pearce Reserve can be put and the way in which it can be managed.

Mr. Millhouse: That report was given me before I went out of office.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It was not in the honourable member's hands. Indeed, it was not. Those discussions are continuing at present. Also, the Secretary of the trust is proceeding to Point Pearce (I think this week) for further discussions there. The Government intends to transfer the Point Pearce Reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust as soon as the trust can take it over and operate it as an economic proposition.

SALISBURY TEACHERS COLLEGE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Education say when it is expected that the building

programme at the Salisbury Teachers College will be completed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOLTEACHERS

Mr. Rodda, for Mr. COUNBE (on notice):

1. What were the losses of full-time teachers from the Education Department for each of the years from 1964 to 1970, inclusive?

2. What were the net gains of full-time teachers to the department for the same years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. The following figures treat each calendar year as extending from the day following the last school day in December one year to the last school day of December in the following year. The figures cover all teachers and, therefore, include teachers colleges, technical colleges and adult education centres.

Losses of Full-time Teachers

Year	Number
1964	1,135
1965	1,166
1966	1,014
1967	1,183
1968	1,132
1969	1,388
1970	1,465

Net Gains of Full-time Teachers

Year	Number
1964	611
1965	596
1966	627
1967	484
1968	633
1969	517
1970 to December 16 ..	730

SOUTH ROAD ACCIDENTS

Mr. HOPGOOD (on notice):

1. How many accidents have occurred during the last 12 months on that part of the Main South Road between Black Road and Candy Road?

2. How many non-fatal injuries and fatalities, respectively, have resulted from these accidents?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 77 accidents.

2. 21 accidents involving personal injury; 55 accidents involving property damage; 1 accident involving a fatality.

HAPPY VALLEY PROPERTIES

Mr. EVANS (on notice): What was the date of purchase of each of the individual properties that have been purchased adjacent to the Happy Valley reservoir in an effort to control pollution?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have a schedule containing the details of the properties purchased adjacent to the Happy Valley reservoir and the dates on which they were purchased. All these properties are in the hundred of Willunga and, as there are so many, I ask leave to have the statistical table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

PROPERTIES PURCHASED	
Property	Date of Purchase
Pt. Sec. 459	March 18, 1966
Pt. Sec. 459	June 30, 1966
Pt. Sec. 459	November 14, 1966
Pt. Sec. 459	January 10, 1966
Allotment 2	June 6, 1966
Pt. Sec. 459	June 12, 1968
Allotment 3	August 23, 1966
Allotment 8	November 15, 1965
Allotment 9	} January 21, 1966
Allotment 10	
Pt. Sec. 477	
Pt. Sec. 477	} January 21, 1966
Pt. Cld. Rd. N. Sec. 477	
Pt. Cld. Rd. N. Sec. 477	} August 8, 1966
Pt. Sec. 477	
Pt. Sec. 477	November 17, 1965
Pts. Secs. 432, 477	August 19, 1966
Pts. Secs. 432, 477	April 6, 1967
Pt. Sec. 432	February 19, 1968
Pt. Sec. 432	May 16, 1966
Pt. Sec. 517	July 6, 1967
Pt. Sec. 517	November 14, 1966
Pt. Sec. 495	May 6, 1966
Pt. Sec. 495	March 8, 1966
Pt. Sec. 495	} November 26, 1965
Pt. Sec. 504	
Pt. Sec. 495	
Pt. Sec. 504	May 1, 1967
Pt. Sec. 504	} January 21, 1966
Pt. Sec. 516	
Pt. Sec. 516	March 18, 1966
Pt. Sec. 516	} January 21, 1966
Pt. Sec. 516	
Pt. Sec. 516	
Pt. Sec. 516	December 22, 1965
Pt. Sec. 516	March 18, 1966
Pt. Sec. 516	March 18, 1966
Pt. Sec. 516	May 11, 1967
Pt. Sec. 530	} October 20, 1966
Pt. Sec. 515	
Allotment 4	April 14, 1966
Allotments 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	October 19, 1966

BEACH ACCIDENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How many accidents involving motor vehicles have occurred on beaches in this State in each of the last five years?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Figures for accidents involving motor vehicles on beaches in this State for 1966 and 1967 are not available. The figures for each of the last three years are as follows:

	Total Accidents	Metropolitan Beaches	Country Beaches
1968	28	6	22
1969	20	2	18
1970	25	—	25

MINISTER FOR CONSERVATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What Acts have been transferred to the administration of the Minister for Conservation since his appointment, and when?
2. Is it proposed to transfer any other Acts to his administration? If so, which?
3. When will any such transfers be effected?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. The following Acts have been transferred to the administration of the Minister for Conservation since his appointment:

- (a) National Parks Act, 1966.
- (b) Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965.
- (c) Fauna and Flora Reserve Act, 1919-1940.
- (d) Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967 (administered by the Minister Assisting the Premier).

These Acts were transferred on the following dates:

- (a) December 3, 1970.
- (b) February 18, 1971.
- (c) February 18, 1971.
- (d) February 18, 1971.

2. It is intended to transfer other Acts to the administration of the Minister for Conservation. A firm decision in this regard has not yet been made. Consideration is being given to the transferring of the Museum Act, Control of Advertisements Act, part of the Fauna Conservation Act, and certain other Acts dealing with conservation.

3. It is expected that, where legislation is required, such legislation will be before Parliament early in the new session. Where transfers of administration can be undertaken by proclamation, such transfers will be made within the next three months.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from March 3. Page 3738.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Typical of the Government's ineptitude in finance is the following extract from the Treasurer's explanation:

I would not attempt at this stage any precise forecast of the overall increase likely in electricity charges.

One is reminded of the introduction of the Budget, when forecasts were made of taxation measures to be entered into later in the year, with no real forecast given of what such measures would mean in taxation yield or in their effect on the public. Here we have the first of these measures being brought before this Parliament and still no real information about the extent of the additional tariffs or the likely effect of such increases on individual members of the public. All we know is that \$2,000,000 will be taken from the South Australian community, and I suppose that, until the accounts are sent out, the general public will have no way of knowing what the increases will mean to them individually. It seems that the Government is intent on bringing its taxation measures into effect by stealth so that the public will not be too critical and so that the Government will be able, over some months, to phase in a tremendously increased taxation yield from all South Australians. This measure brings to mind the efficiency of the Electricity Trust over the years, to which the Treasurer alluded in his short explanation of this measure. The trust's last report is somewhat optimistic, and all members would do well to read it in considering this measure. In the section dealing with the price of electricity in its 1970 report, the trust states:

No increases were made in electricity tariffs during the year, and trust tariffs have now been stable for over 17 years. During this period, consumption has greatly expanded, and consumers have made increasing use of lower tariff steps. As a result, the average price of electricity to consumers has decreased markedly. In 1952-53, the overall average price of electricity sold was 2.71d. (2.26c) a kilowatt-hour. In 1969-70, the figure was 1.78c, a reduction of 21 per cent. Although it is normal to expect some decrease in average price with increasing use of electricity, the reduction which has occurred over the years has been quite substantial. This has been brought about by two main factors: (a) the tariff was devised when the total electricity sales were only a fraction of their present level; and (b) the general tariff structure has remained basically unchanged over

a long period. During this 17-year period, while the average electricity price was reduced by 21 per cent, most other costs have risen substantially. Wage increases will, no doubt, continue and other costs can also be expected to rise in the future. The recent substantial rise in interest rates will considerably increase operating costs. In such circumstances, the time must inevitably come when an upward movement in electricity prices will be necessary. The trust is doing all it can to postpone such an event and, at this stage, does not foresee the necessity of a general tariff increase in the immediate future.

In that report the trust told the public of South Australia about its magnificent record of not only holding the price to the consumer and, importantly, to industry, but of reducing it, and it said it would go on with this policy. Who uses the trust's services? I suppose it is easy to say that all of us do, as we debate here today under the Chamber lights or as we buy things from all those who provide services or goods in this community. It is interesting to note the comparison between residential and industrial supply. The total income from residential supply in the year ended June 30, 1970, was \$23,600,000 and that from industrial supply was about \$22,800,000. The other categories, public lighting and bulk supply, are insignificant for the purposes of this argument.

The largest grouping of users of electricity comprises residential users, so those who will bear most heavily the charges involved in this Bill will be the people in their houses. This is amazing, when we remember that over the years we have been taunted by members of the Labor Party that we keep on imposing taxes on those people who must pay regardless of whether they can afford it. Every housewife knows that, every time she cooks bacon in the morning on the electric stove, she can thank the Labor Party for paying a little more for the privilege. She had better realize this before the Labor Party takes the bacon out of the frying pan! Members opposite always evade the issue if they can. They never face up to the responsibility for their own actions if they can avoid doing so.

Let us consider some of the comparative costs of electricity in the Australian States and see what institution the Government is now attacking to fill the coffers that it has emptied so easily under its present type of administration. In 1954 the average price of electricity in South Australia was 2.24c a kilowatt. The average for the remainder of the mainland States was 2.08c a kilowatt, so there was a somewhat significant advantage for

those other States. Such has been the management by this magnificently led trust that in 1968 the position was reversed, the average for South Australia being 1.82c and that for the other mainland States being 2.02c, showing a clear advantage for South Australia, the State that Sir Thomas Playford led out of the situation of having no local fuel to the stage where it has two alternative types of fuel and the best price in relation to the average of the other States that any State in Australia can show.

This is a magnificent tribute to those who formed and led the trust, and it is no tribute to the Government that, in looking around at the various measures it may take to fill its empty coffers, it looks at the most successful. How often have members opposite pulled down success? This has always been their target, whether it is in relation to General Motors-Holden's, Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, or any other wellknown industrial organization. Members opposite say, "Pull it down if it makes a profit," yet here the Government has attacked the most successful organization within its own ambit.

We know that there are reasons why the trust has been able to promote such a successful price policy. With the new generators that have been installed at the Torrens Island power station, the unit price of electricity has decreased substantially and this, allied to the favourable fuel contracts, which were the basis on which it handled power generation over a number of years, has enabled these costs to be brought down, as the report has indicated. This has been one of the reasons behind the most successful industrial drive that South Australia had in the years I have mentioned: the late 1950's and through into the 1960's. This has been one of the main fields of development of this State, both country and city, and every person in the country who turns a switch and obtains electricity through the wide network of distribution knows that this facility is based upon the success of this organization.

Every industry here that can compete successfully with interstate industries knows that, without this very real consideration of electricity price, it could not be in such a favourable situation. Therefore, the types of development that are based on the success of the trust are automatically put under the threat of an increased cost of production. Do not underestimate, I implore you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, the effect of a 3 per cent increase in electricity charges. This could easily be, for a

large industrial user of electricity, a significant factor in determining whether to come to South Australia or whether to continue here.

I remind members opposite that several industries with which I dealt were extremely conscious of the cost of electricity in deciding whether to come here. One was a large chemical industry which, if it had come here, would have used a tremendous quantity of power, and the cost of power was critical to the calculations of that company before it made the decision, unfortunately unfavourable to South Australia. Are we to place a further impediment in the way of companies by taxing the basis of our development? This is, more or less, tending in the development field to use a type of development capital.

Members on this side find it necessary to warn Government members of the results of their continual denigrating of our development capacity. The Electricity Trust is to become a collector on behalf of the Government, and I am sure that the board of the trust will be most disappointed in being placed in this role and not to be merely serving the community as it has been doing magnificently. Now, it is to become a collector of taxation for a bankrupt Government, and I am sorry to see this happen.

This Bill is a cover-up type of instrument, as was the Government's Budget. We were told in the Budget debate that there would be further taxation measures, but nothing was said about the amount of taxation. This measure provides a rise of 3 per cent in electricity tariffs, but no details are given of how it will affect industrial and domestic users. No domestic user knows what he will have to pay, and this is the same type of cover-up instrument as was the Budget produced by this Government.

It is interesting to look back at what the Government obtained from Canberra and what it has achieved in its financial negotiations during and since the new agreement was made last year with the Commonwealth Government in relation to general financial matters. At that time the Government received \$147,700,000 as a general financial reimbursement grant from the Commonwealth Government, an increase of 14.7 per cent. The Government that I led in the last year of the previous five-year agreement obtained an increase of 9.6 per cent. If one adds the additional \$5,000,000 provided by the Grants Commission as an interim payment to this State, one realizes that this year the Government has already obtained from the Commonwealth Government for general revenue purposes, an

increase of nearly 19 per cent, compared to the increase my Government received of 9.6 per cent.

Mr. Coumbe: Why didn't the Treasurer tell us that?

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer does not do that because this is a cover-up measure. This Government thought it was in wonderland financially and that it could do as it wished. It set some rather strange priorities at that time. When the Minister of Education opened the new headquarters of the South Australian Institute of Teachers he boasted that the Government had increased expenditure on education by 15 per cent. He did not say that this was \$700,000 less than had been provided by the previous Government in the previous year. The sum provided by the previous Government represented an 18.7 increase compared to a 15 per cent increase by the Labor Government.

Mr. Hopgood: There were large wage increases: this is a big whine on your part.

Mr. HALL: Some strange priorities were set for this immense sum of money obtained by the Commonwealth Government, but it reduced the rate of increase in expenditure on education.

Mr. Hopgood: Rubbish!

Mr. HALL: The honourable member does not like it, and neither he should.

Mr. Hopgood: I object to your distortion of facts.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member can argue about distortion of facts if he wants to. He has usually taken a frivolous attitude to the government of this State. He should show other than political bias if he wants to help the public of South Australia. Why does he not ensure that the public knows what it will have to pay for electricity? Surely he has a compassion for the public he represents, and will tell them how much they will have to pay under the provisions of this Bill. The Government has no excuse for its present financial position. It cannot blame the Commonwealth Government, as it has done every time its members have spoken publicly: they have blamed someone else. In moving around this community I have found a readiness by the public to understand the financial implications of government. No longer does the taxpayer believe that there is some magical source of funds in Commonwealth quarters and that when the State cannot do what it wants the Commonwealth Government could or should provide the

funds. This attitude is going, if it has not already gone, and the Government will stand or fall according to its managerial skill or lack of it. The Government has stated that it would increase expenditure generally by 15 per cent but that that was not enough. What on earth would this Government have the Commonwealth Government do? Would it have the Commonwealth give it enough to increase expenditure by 20 per cent? It need not use emotive terms to support an increase in expenditure above 15 per cent, because the community could not sustain that: members opposite know that an increase of 15 per cent a year cannot be sustained. What does the member for Mount Gambier recommend? If he stopped mouthing political platitudes he would understand.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order!

Mr. HALL: The honourable member knows that this Government is leading the community into a financial catastrophe. Why did the Government ignore normal budgetary precautions expected of it by the public when it framed its Budget? That is what we want to know. This Government received a 14.7 per cent increase in grants from the Commonwealth Government, increasing to 19 per cent as a result of the additional money granted by the Grants Commission. Why did it not set money aside for the expected increases in wages and salaries? The Government cannot say that it was not warned: in last year's Budget debate I said:

Therefore, State budgetary expenditure expansion is significantly greater than the expansion of receipts. In addition, the receipts which constitute the 9.8 per cent expansion include a 14.7 per cent expansion this year in Commonwealth funds—funds which are unlikely to increase at the same rate next year, when the normal course of the five-year agreement reaches normalcy. The fact that the Government is budgeting for a deficit of just under \$5,000,000, including the Grants Commission subvention to us of \$5,000,000 (a large increase in the five-year arrangement) means that the Government will be on dangerous budgetary grounds if it lets this expenditure run headlong without making proper checks on it, because it cannot expect a repeat of the increase, on a yearly basis, of revenue items that it has got this year . . . One can only draw serious conclusions from an expansion in expenditure that is not matched by an expansion of revenue on a longer-term basis. It may be that the Government is well aware of this. Of course, this is its first financial document, and one cannot criticize its results before they are achieved. Indeed, I should be foolish if I

were to try to do so. I have drawn some satisfaction from studying the Budget, because one can easily see the successful story it tells of the previous two-year Liberal Administration in South Australia, an undeniable success story of financial management of this State.

The Government has, I believe, set an expansionist course. It has been lucky to receive a surplus from the previous Government and increased financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government on a scale that the public has not yet recognized, because not only do we get increased tax reimbursement assistance but we also get significant debt assistance which, as the years pass, will greatly assist our budgetary position. Having been set with two large and essentially favourable factors (of surplus and of Commonwealth assistance) one finds the Budget expenditure expanding at a rate greater than the favourable receipts situation. I must impress on the Government the urgent need to contain its expenditure within its proposals if it is to avoid serious future budgetary difficulties.

I concluded that speech by saying:

It is not so much that the points that one would criticize are included in the Budget: it is the lack of leadership in the Budget that is to be criticized, the putting off, the running away from responsibility, and the lack of mention of items on which this State needs to build its future.

The Government was clearly warned on September 15 that its revenues were not expanding in comparison with its expenditure and that they would diverge further in the next financial year than in this financial year, yet it made no provision regarding new awards and increased salaries that it knew must come. Instead, it set out on a clearly expansionist course, regardless of its effect on the Budget. The Government tends to make comparisons with the other States to justify its own deficit budgeting, stating that other States also have a deficit. It is interesting to see what was achieved in the two years of the previous Liberal Government when, for most of that time, the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson was charged with the one main duty of looking after South Australia's finances. The two results showed clearly the effects of proper financial management of the State's accounts. In 1968-69, while every other State had a deficit, South Australia had a handy small surplus (at least it was on the right side of the line by nearly \$500,000); New South Wales had a deficit of over \$3,500,000; Victoria had a deficit of nearly \$2,500,000; Queensland had a deficit of nearly \$1,000,000; Western Australia had a deficit of about \$1,000,000; and Tasmania had a deficit of over \$3,500,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is the New South Wales deficit now?

Mr. HALL: This is the point I am making for the Minister who so slowly wanders into the debate. I am telling the Minister that it is no use his looking for other forms of financial inadequacy in other States in order to justify his own. What I am saying to the Minister, if he can get it into his obtuse head, is that, although there were deficits in the other States, our management was cutting deficits and that we had a continuing run of surpluses. Perhaps the Minister cannot understand that.

Mr. Payne: Every kid who goes to school would understand that the—

Mr. HALL: I will come to the member for (what is his name?)—

Mr. Millhouse: Mitchell Park.

Mr. HALL: I will come to the member for Mitchell Park.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! Members must be referred to correctly; it is the member for Mitchell.

Mr. HALL: I am sorry; I was misled, Sir. In the second year of the previous Liberal Government (1969-70), New South Wales had a deficit of nearly \$4,500,000; Victoria had a deficit of \$15,000,000; Queensland, a deficit of \$3,500,000; Western Australia, a deficit of \$700,000; and Tasmania, a surplus (it was running close to a Liberal Government at that time). However, while all the other mainland States had significant deficits, I point out, for the edification of the Minister of Education, that we had a surplus of nearly \$3,000,000, which the Minister quickly used up, at the same time reducing the rate of increased expenditure. He established a marvellous set of priorities!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That certainly is not true. You can tell all sorts of untruths but—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Minister can make what obtuse statements he wishes, but he will not convince the public that the figures are wrong. How on earth the Minister ever became a Bachelor of Economics, I do not know; either he knows too little about the subject or he knows too much. I assume he knows too much, so he twists the facts and uses his skill in that way, instead of helping his Treasurer, who needs help. If ever any person needed help in this regard, the Treasurer does. All the Minister does is waste his substance by interjecting in the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is wasted on you because it is impossible to get the facts through to you.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: In the two years of the previous Liberal Government, this State clearly enjoyed two surpluses, which contributed to reducing the deficit built up by the former Labor Administration. I clearly and specifically warned this Government last September of the difficulties it would encounter if it pursued this course, but it took not the slightest notice. I did not expect the Minister of Education to take any notice, because that is his wilful way. Why should he take notice? He knows better! He can build bigger and better deficits than we can. The Treasurer gave background reasons for choosing certain tactics regarding the seven imposts to be placed on South Australians. He said that everyone who formed the sector that paid the taxes must make a comparable effort and that the measures must be constitutional. He then referred to receipts duty and to the High Court decision on this matter. This was followed by a reference to the extent of administration required in levying a tax or charge and to the additional work that may be entailed in the private sector. The Treasurer then dealt with equity of application and, again, with a comparable effort, and he said that we should avoid imposing charges that affect too severely the lower-income groups within the community. The next factor was the cost to business undertakings, and the Treasurer said that these must not be inordinate.

We find a peculiar basis of thought in regard to the Treasurer's financial statement, and I refer here to setting economic priorities, which has an important bearing on the taxes levied. The Treasurer said that the Government has been spending many millions of dollars less than was genuinely necessary to give South Australian citizens the standards of service equivalent to those enjoyed by the larger Eastern States, and suggested that, had those services been closer to those provided in New South Wales and Victoria, the South Australian accounts would clearly have shown heavy deficits. To which standards is the Treasurer referring? Is the Adelaide metropolitan bus service inferior to the metropolitan services provided in the other States? Do we have a city with a sewerage system less efficient than the systems in other cities? Why is it that about 96 per cent of Adelaide's metropolitan area is sewered while less than 50 per cent of Sydney's metropolitan area is sewered? What on earth is the Treasurer talking about? I suppose South Australia

has fewer water connections than have the other States! Our schools somehow are inferior! These services were inferior when the previous Government was in office, but suddenly they have been improved in the last 10 months! Members opposite know that, if the education system in this State is truthfully examined, it is found to be of a standard that is very often the envy of the other States. What Government members never admit is that South Australia has supplied more for the expenditure of less millions of dollars. Previous good management in this State under the Liberal Government has meant that there has been more value from money spent.

The basic fallacy in the Government's approach is that it believes that it must squander money rather than look at the economics involved. I am disappointed to see that this is the proposal still followed by members opposite. Whatever their philosophy on finance, Government members know that they dare not maintain an increase in State Government expenditure of 15 per cent a year, for such an increase cannot be maintained. The Government will have to do something about this. Either it will have to set up a clear order of priorities that the public will accept or it will have to cut essential services. The Government cannot run to the Commonwealth and say, "We want 20 per cent increase a year," because such an increase cannot be maintained. Members opposite will have to govern economically and well, as we did when we were in office. They must produce value for money. They are attempting to produce value for money by obviously supporting a 35-hour week in the community! That is one way in which members opposite will use the money that the Electricity Trust will provide. Wherever possible, members opposite blame other people for problems that arise. They will blame the Commonwealth Government and find other reasons to justify the Budget deficit. I am afraid that the public of South Australia will have to get used to this type of management during the present Government's term of office.

I shall deal with one or two examples of the attitude of members opposite towards financial management. When my Government came to office in 1968, we had to make a difficult decision in relation to several country rail services. Modern trains on the better of these lines were transporting an average of about 15 passengers a day. When we decided

to abolish those services and replace them with bus services, about 2,000 people signed petitions to retain the rail services. Yet we took that difficult decision.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! I must draw the honourable Leader's attention to the fact that the Bill under discussion deals with the raising of revenue in respect of one undertaking; it does not cover financial matters in respect of other undertakings. This is not an Address in Reply debate. I ask the honourable Leader to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: This Bill constitutes part of a budgetary programme. I am trying to talk about reasons why we need or do not need these taxation measures. I intend to oppose the Bill, and I want to make my reasons for doing so quite clear, for it is a serious matter to oppose a Bill such as this. I am sure members opposite will try to misrepresent to the people of the State the reasons I give for opposing the Bill. Therefore, I crave a little indulgence from you, Sir, and from members opposite to enlarge my remarks and to make this a wide-ranging debate. We are now facing far more taxation increases piecemeal (some by regulation) by the Government than we faced in the Budget, and I believe it is only fair to allow the Opposition to develop a fairly full explanation of its reasons for opposing this Bill. In relation to country train services, after we had abolished them, we were able to say—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Prior to your entering the Chamber, the Acting Deputy Speaker ruled that the Leader of the Opposition was out of order in referring to a matter such as country train services while discussing this Bill relating to the Electricity Trust. As the Leader has refused to obey that ruling, I ask what your ruling would be on the matter.

The SPEAKER: Any member speaking in a debate must speak to the matter before the House. Although I did not hear what he said, I ask the honourable Leader to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable this House to discuss all the relevant matters concerning the recent taxation measures.

I appreciate that the Standing Orders regulate the rulings that you, Sir, make in the House. However, I find it extremely restrictive not to be able to make a forceful and compre-

hensive statement on behalf of people who object to \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000 being raised by taxation measures imposed on them. I am sure members opposite would not want to prevent me from discussing these matters, which are of great importance to the State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You went on fairly broadly before any objection was taken.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: I have moved my motion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why not stage a demonstration and be done with it? You have disobeyed Standing Orders.

Mr. HALL: I remind the constantly interjecting Minister that I am obeying Standing Orders and that I am moving a motion under Standing Orders. It is no good the Minister's trying to misinterpret Standing Orders.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You've had to be pulled up twice and you know it.

Mr. HALL: I have moved my motion because these taxation measures are more far-reaching than those included in the Budget, and it is necessary for the House to discuss their importance fully. From what the public has said and from some statements in the press, members know that more criticism of these measures than the Opposition has made has been expected. I have not been willing to waste the time of the House by moving frivolous motions. I have no alternative but to move in a way that will allow freedom of debate so that the full import of the Government's financial management of the State can be discussed during the debate on this, the first of these financial measures. I remind honourable members that this Bill will mean that \$2,000,000 will be taken from the public. Yet we are not told how much will come from individual citizens. The public must have full and frank information on these matters, and so far that information has not been forthcoming. I move my motion, confident that the Government will allow the House to discuss these matters. I put it to the Treasurer that such a discussion will not ultimately delay the work of the House. If my motion fails, the only alternative I will have is to discuss the Government's credibility in another move. The Government should allow the course I suggest to be followed, as I believe it is desirable.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Coumbe: Sit down! That's what you always say to us.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept the Leader's motion. Standing Order No. 467

clearly provides that, in cases of urgent necessity, any Standing or Sessional Order may be suspended on motion without notice, provided that such motion has the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House of Assembly. I cannot accept that this is a matter of urgent necessity and, therefore, I rule the motion out of order.

Mr. CUMBE: On a point of order, Sir, you have ruled on the motion and I accept your ruling. However, I remind the House, and particularly the Premier, that in reply to a question asked by the Leader last week regarding financial measures the Treasurer said he would provide an opportunity for the House to debate the financial measures that he then outlined. I point out that this is an opportunity for the Opposition to debate those measures. I suggest, with respect, that the debate on the Bill we are now debating should not be confined rigidly to electricity matters but should be allowed to widen into the reasons why this measure has been introduced by the Government. I therefore remind the Treasurer of the undertaking he gave at that time.

The SPEAKER: That is beyond a point of order. I have ruled that the Leader's motion is out of order.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Sir, the suspension of Standing Orders is often entered into, with the concurrence of the whole House, to facilitate the passage of the third reading of a Bill or to short-circuit the introduction of a Bill from the first to the second reading. As those would be no more matters of urgent necessity than would the matter now before the House, I ask you, Sir, to attach the same importance to this issue as you would to the suspension of Standing Orders to facilitate the passage of a Bill.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has raised two entirely different matters. I rule that this is not an urgent matter and that, therefore, the motion is out of order. Does the Leader want to conclude?

Mr. HALL: I suppose I will have to conclude, as I am unable to proceed with my argument. It might help protect me if I held the Bill in my hand. The importance of this \$2,000,000 imposition on South Australia is wide indeed. I am extremely disappointed that the Government will not support my motion today to widen this debate. I can only assume that it is covering up, as it did previously in the Budget. There can be nothing more to it than that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You had a fortnight do something, but you were too lazy to do it.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer is saying that we had a fortnight to do something but that we were too lazy.

Mr. Jennings: That's right.

Mr. HALL: I suppose the Treasurer wants to order the Opposition around, just as he tries to order his own Party around. However, I assure him that the Opposition will operate on its own thoughts and judgments and not on his.

Mr. Clark: And we hope you keep on doing it!

Mr. HALL: The Opposition will accept your ruling, Sir, because you are bound by Standing Orders. We do not object to that ruling on the basis of your interpretation. However, the Opposition cannot technically accept the situation whereby it is prevented from discussing the issues of major importance to this community. I suppose we will have to waste the time of the House (in the terms of Government language) to have this matter ventilated. The imposition of this charge is to say, simply, that we will put a tax of \$2,000,000 on the public; we will not say how much of the tax the householder will bear in relation to industry, although the domestic user is a little more in relation to the trust's customers than is the industrial side. The Government's principle is not to tell but to do another Builders Licensing Act and bring it in by some other means later. Its idea is to pass \$2,000,000 worth of taxation now and tell the people later how it will affect them. That, apparently, is the Government's attitude on this issue. I obviously oppose the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I congratulate the Leader on his very able and detailed account of the State's finances. This is the first time this session that we have heard such a statement on finances, because the Government has concealed in every way how the taxes imposed will influence the lives of people in the community. When there is a deficit or when a deficit is approaching, something must be done about it. Sometimes the wise thing to do is to restrict expenditure; surely, in a time of inflation, such as at present, this is the wise course to follow. The Government might scream, "You are cutting down on education or on something else." Everyone knows that it is only a matter of cutting Government expenditure by about

3 per cent or even less in order to balance the Budget, and that is the wisest thing to do. Members of Parliament know that with pruning and supervision these savings can be made.

The Government employs a large number of consulting engineers on minor alterations to schools, but there is no check over these people's activities. The work of the Public Buildings Department is being mixed up with the work of the Education Department, and now we have consulting engineers. Surely this results in duplication of work. I know of a school where maintenance people are working in one part, another group is laying asphalt and someone else is installing new pipes. I have not seen such a state of disorganization outside a Heath Robinson story. The Public Works Committee inspected plans for a new wing at a technical college, and members of the committee went into the canteen, which had been extended. When they inspected the plans, they discovered that the new wing had to go where the canteen was. This is nothing new: there have been many similar instances. This is where Government money could be saved. At another school the Government recommended that a row of fairly new wooden buildings should be replaced. No doubt older wooden buildings need to be replaced, but this was a whole row of new wooden buildings, some of which had been installed only six months previously.

Mr. BURDON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to know what wooden school buildings have to do with a discussion of electricity charges.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen must link his remarks with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. McANANEY: In assessing a tax of this kind, we should know on what the extra revenue will be spent. I am trying to prove, in speaking against the Bill, that it is unnecessary to inflict this tax. If this tax is imposed, we must say how the extra revenue will be spent. We must assess whether it is a good or a bad tax. No-one likes paying taxes, and some people think that all taxes are bad. However, some taxes are better or less objected to by the general community than are others. The imposition of this electricity tax at a time of inflation is a bad thing. Any wise Government or any Government that has the interests of Australia at heart must in some way or other combat inflation. One thing that has always amazed me is that Governments add to the problems of demand

inflation by levying taxes that increase cost inflation, and the imposition of this tax is a definite cost inflationary move. It will add to the cost structure of this State because the amount of electricity used in private houses is only a small percentage of that used in industry.

This tax will inflate the cost of Government. If we experience a dry year, many thousands of dollars more will be paid by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in pumping costs and will thus increase the cost of electricity. That money will go into the general cost structure of the State, and everything that the Government buys will cost more. Some companies have said that, if electricity charges are increased, they will make their own arrangements to obtain electricity. Someone said to me at the weekend that if electricity charges were increased he would install a diesel engine. The trust will have its assets and lines and, if less electricity goes through, it will further increase the trust's costs. Whichever way one looks at it, it is a bad tax. There are other bad taxes such as harbour charges, which were increased at a time when the Marine and Harbours Department was showing a profit. These increased charges added to cost inflation. Where will the \$2,000,000 go, or what hole will be plugged up? The Minister of Roads and Transport boasted only last November that he was getting an extra \$1,000,000 from the railways, that he was \$1,000,000 ahead of last year, or ahead of the Budget. But what has happened? Revenue from the Railways Department is only \$300,000 greater than that for the same period last year. Because the Railways Department's expenditure has increased by \$2,800,000, it is \$2,500,000 worse off. The increases in State taxes are being used to provide for additional losses on State services. Of course, some people would say it would be inflationary if charges for those services were raised. However, there is an alternative to the service provided by the Railways Department. Losses are being made on passenger services.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about the railways in this Bill. The honourable member is speaking too wide of the Bill before the House.

Mr. McANANEY: In view of the increase in electricity charges, the best thing to do would be to electrify the suburban railway system. Therefore, electricity charges are very

much connected with railway passenger services. That is how I am linking up the two matters.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be out of order if he continues along those lines, because I am afraid he is stretching the rules of debate too much.

Mr. McANANEY: I have been here eight years, but we are now operating under a completely different set of rules from that under which we previously operated.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: There are good and bad Bills, and this is a very bad one. It is poor when one is not allowed to express one's views, and the gag is applied for the first time—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about the gag in this Bill, and the honourable member will not speak in that vein. The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The increased electricity charges will result in increased costs for many industries. Electricity is used by the South Australian Government and in every facet of industry. Somehow or other additional funds will have to be provided to meet the increased cost of electricity in the Education Department. I do not know how the Government arrived at the figure of 3 per cent. Since the Government will need much money, if it is all right to increase the charges by 3 per cent it may possibly be all right for a larger impost to be levied. I should like to know what arguments we are allowed to advance in this debate.

The Electricity Trust has been so successful because it has been very well managed. It has kept its books along sound commercial lines and has written off depreciation in accordance with accepted business practice. It has good reason to be proud of its activities. I cannot see how the trust staff will in future have the same driving force, particularly those at the top, to keep electricity charges down. They are people of great public spirit who have kept the price of electricity down in difficult circumstances, and they can be justly proud of their effort. Then we are hit with a 3 per cent turnover tax to finance some other organization that is not making a profit or carrying out commercial business practices and is not so efficient. Surely this would break the heart of anyone engaged in a commercial activity. The Labor Government likes to hit those doing well and assist those who will not look after

themselves. The Electricity Trust has proved itself to be successful, but it now has to compensate for the losses of some other organization that is not going so well. So, we must carefully consider electrifying our railways.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill does not deal with the electrification of the railways. The honourable member's remarks are far too wide of the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The gag has been applied.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the Bill and not discuss the rules of debate.

Mr. McANANEY: This Bill increases electricity charges, and if we cannot talk about how those increased charges will affect South Australian industry it is a farce to be here.

Mr. Jennings: Then resign.

Mr. McANANEY: I maintain that I should have the right to discuss how this money will be spent and what alternative ways there are of spending it. Surely we talk enough rubbish in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should speak for himself.

Mr. McANANEY: It is unfair that we are restricted in what we say. These electricity charges affect every facet of Government. They will restrict the sums available for education because the Education Department will have to pay more for its electricity. The Engineering and Water Supply Department will have to pay the increased charges, too. The Government says that we must not reduce spending on education and health services. However, it will be holding back Loan money so that it can finance the Budget deficit. This means that it is reducing the number of items on which Loan money will be spent. The Commonwealth Government made available to South Australia an additional 19.7 per cent, which was the greatest increase to any State.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McANANEY: This would have enabled this Government to spend 19.7 per cent more on education. However, without any visible sign of improvement in education, including education facilities, the Government has increased education expenditure by 21.1 per cent in seven months. We all want more expenditure on education, but the increase in the gross national product in Australia last year was only 5.5 per cent, on standard figures. Therefore, how can the Government suddenly increase expenditure by 21 per cent? Even allowing for present inflationary trends, the G.N.P. has increased

by only 11 per cent. Although we have improved educational facilities considerably—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in discussing national productivity and education in this debate. He must speak to the Bill before the House, and I ask him to do that.

Mr. McANANEY: I maintain that we should have the right to express our views, when we are increasing taxation or other charges.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will speak—

Mr. McANANEY: We must have the right to say how this money shall be spent, and this has been the position since I have been in this Parliament. I protest most strongly that we are going to have our liberties restricted in this House by having to speak to the bare phrase of a 3 per cent increase in electricity tariffs. It is beyond my comprehension that we are expected to keep down to this narrow line. The G.N.P. in Australia is most important when we are considering increases in taxation and increases in the rate of public expenditure. Those matters must be kept in balance. Where do we get to otherwise? This is the sort of reason why Opposition members oppose this Bill.

The Government is trying to race before it can walk. It would be better advised to go along at a trot or a canter. The Government's action has a worse effect on the community. Standards are rising; we have increased productivity; and the amount of public spending must increase. We must keep these matters of the G.N.P. and the amount of public expenditure in proper relationship. If we do not, the private sector, which produces the goods and wealth of this country, will not be able to carry the increased burden of this increase in public expenditure.

In the debate on other financial Bills, we have heard the Treasurer mention the Keynesian theory on spending and, in accordance with that theory, this is the time when spending should be restricted to our capacity to produce goods. This is important at present, because the Government is saying that it is not getting sufficient money from the Commonwealth Government and that that is why it must impose a tax like this one. The Minister of Education, however, knows well that, if he was given \$10,000,000 tomorrow for school building, he could not build the schools, because he would not have sufficient architects and there would be a delay with plans. Therefore, we

must cut the cloth according to the pattern and the capacity to produce and to spend.

Although imposing a tax will restrict the spending power of the people, these people already face increased expenditure in other ways. The recent 6 per cent increase in wages will increase the expenses of everyone. Now the Government is inflicting a tax that will affect every man, woman and child. Every time a pensioner, in his little room, turns on the electric light switch, he will have to pay a little more. This tax will hit the small person who, with no increase in income, will be affected seriously by this increase in electricity charges. The Government is increasing electricity charges to industry, which uses the bulk of the electricity generated.

Even if a prices commissioner assesses every increase in charges, an increase of 3 per cent in electricity charges will entitle every firm to seek an increase. Whatever kind of prices commissioner we have, unless he is a proper rogue, he will have to accept that an increase in prices is necessary. We are in a state of inflation and it is only because of the greater inflation in Great Britain and America that we are not in extremely dire straits. I could refer to Japan, but I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that I should not do that. That would be getting beyond—

The SPEAKER: Very much beyond.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, I agree. I have explained why Opposition members are opposing this Bill so keenly. There are other forms of taxation, if the Government considers that it must do something.

Mr. Langley: Would you oppose them?

Mr. McANANEY: I tell the honourable member that I will support the Bill dealing with the tax on bookmakers' turnover.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in speaking about bookmakers.

Mr. McANANEY: That tax is not inflationary and eliminates an injustice suffered by people who invest money with the Totalizator Agency Board.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about T.A.B. in this Bill, and the honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, I agree, but you must admit that I should be able to explain the difference—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: —between inflationary increases and non-inflationary taxation

increases. This will affect everyone in South Australia. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the limited amount of expression and I agree that once or twice I did go further than I should have gone. In implementing this electricity charge, the Treasurer has claimed publicly that he must have this money to keep his education expenditure up to the level of that in other States. However, I see in our Budget that \$100,000,000 is to be spent on education this year, whereas Victoria, with three times the population, will spend only \$231,000,000 on education. In Victoria the increase in expenditure is only 15 per cent, whereas the increase in South Australia is 21 per cent. I cannot see that the sudden upsurge is justified. Although I believe greatly in increased educational facilities, I ask why this expenditure has been increased so greatly.

Mr. Jennings: Isn't there a surcharge on electricity in Victoria?

Mr. McANANEY: I could not reply to that interjection.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: I cannot reply to that because it is not connected with South Australia and this Bill. Electricity is vital to everyone. This is a tax on one type of power: there are also coal gas and other fuels. If we tax one fuel only, we are upsetting free competition between the various fuels in South Australia.

Mr. McRae: Would you support a tax on the South Australian Gas Company?

Mr. McANANEY: As I have already explained, when a person runs into trouble and cannot meet his bills, either for electricity or for anything else, the first step he should take is to assess his expenditure and determine what he is getting for his money. If he is not getting his money's worth in a certain direction, he should prune his expenditure there. We try to make our industry or administration as efficient as possible, and only then do we turn around and look for revenue. When we do that and we are in a state of inflation, we have to look for an overall tax that is not inflationary. However, this increase in electricity tariffs is inflationary. I imagine that 80 per cent of it will add to the cost of industry in South Australia. As we all know, we have built up a way of life and a standard of living here not equalled in any other State. That is possibly because we have had much assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Langley: Good heavens!

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Unley may snigger, but my Leader has already in this debate set out the increases, and I am only reiterating his wise words in this respect: that in South Australia this year we shall have a 19.7 per cent increase in funds from the Commonwealth Government.

The SPEAKER: We are not discussing that.

Mr. McANANEY: It has already been said in the debate that we in South Australia this year had the greatest amount of Loan funds per capita of all the States. If a person is trained at the University of Adelaide in statistics, he examines everything as an overall case or an overall statistic. Far too many of our so-called practical people are completely theoretical in this: they try to pick out one specific item and say, "This is better than it is elsewhere"; then somebody else comes along and says that something else is better than elsewhere. However, the only way to look at it is from the point of view of an overall figure, by which we can make a comparison. It is ridiculous to interject and say that this charge is made in another State. We do not have to do what another State does.

Now that we are again under the Grants Commission, what matters is the overall collection of our revenue, of which this electricity tax is a part. It is upon our overall expenditure and not our expenditure on one item that the facts of our case will be considered by the Grants Commission: the commission will hear our whole case. So we do not have to follow the other States in imposing this iniquitous tax. If we can find other taxes to replace this tax on electricity (which I do not think is necessary), without detriment to education or health, with an increased efficiency in other services and with a slight postponement of certain projects, this tax will not be necessary. If the Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, decides that it must have money or it will have to use the Loan funds and divert them from building schools, roads and sewers, things of permanent value to the rest of the community, it should not impose a tax that will encourage inflation. It should scout around for a tax that will not harm the community so much and will not necessarily affect the poorer people, as this tax will.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In speaking to this Bill and discussing why this additional levy is to be introduced and why the Bill is being brought in at all, I regret that the Government has not acceded to the reasonable

requests made that the debate be widened to include other reasons why this measure has been introduced into this House—for instance, the general financial statement made by the Treasurer in the House some time ago. In reply to a question that he received from the Leader of the Opposition, he said that he would provide an opportunity to allow these financial measures to be debated. This is an opportunity to enable that to be done. Where else can we debate such a matter unless we make another move that will waste the time of the House? So I regret that we are forbidden or are unable to widen the debate to include reasons why this Bill has been introduced at all and what its effect will be on the community.

I intend, within those exceptions, to deal, as far as I can, with the Bill. The Treasurer has said, in explaining why the Bill had to be introduced, that it is a 3 per cent levy that will bring in about \$2,000,000 in a full year. In explaining why the Bill had to be introduced, he said:

The fourth factor is equity and the avoidance as far as possible of charges that bear heavily on a small part of the community; in particular, of course, on the lower-income groups.

He went on to say:

The fifth factor is the increasing level of costs that must be met by the business undertakings and the increase in charges necessary if the users of the services are to make a reasonable contribution to those higher costs. As a result of a review of all points I have mentioned, the Government has decided to implement the following revenue-raising measures:

If we look at the annual report of the Electricity Trust for the year ended June 30, 1970 (Parliamentary Paper 64), it is interesting to see under the heading "Price of electricity" that the trust itself points out that costs have risen substantially. The report states:

Wage increases will, no doubt, continue and other costs can also be expected to rise in the future. The recent substantial rise in interest rates will considerably increase operating costs. In such circumstances, the time must inevitably come when an upward movement in electricity prices will be necessary. The trust is doing all it can to postpone such an event and, at this stage, does not foresee the necessity of a general tariff increase in the immediate future.

Of course, that was written long before the Treasurer came up with this Bill as a means of getting more money.

Where is this \$2,000,000 coming from? Where does the money come from that goes into the trust's funds? From what sources

does the trust get its revenue? I return to my earlier remark about the community and the lower-income groups. By far the greatest amount of income to the trust comes from the residential supply. The next item is the industrial supply, and this ties up with the Treasurer's comment in this regard. Both these comments are contradictory. This will be a boomerang Bill of the first magnitude, as the member for Heysen tried to point out when he was somewhat curtailed. Let us consider how the Government is to be involved, because all Government departments will pay more for electricity.

The cost of electricity in this Chamber will increase and it will cost more for us to read and find our way around. Even the microphone that I am using now will add that little bit more to the electricity bill of the Minister of Works. Not only will every school using electric lights but also every hospital using X-ray and other electrical equipment have to pay more. The cost of pumping water from the Murray River to all the mains throughout the State will increase. Local councils pay \$1,100,000 a year to the Electricity Trust for public lighting, but now they will have to pay more. The effect of this measure will permeate through the community, whether electricity is used for private and residential, industrial, commercial, or governmental purposes. This taxation, this levy, will directly affect the cost of living index.

I emphasize that, of the Government measures concerned with fund raising (if I may use that term) or its taxation measures, most of them directly affect the cost of living of every man, woman, and child in this State. These measures contrast to those introduced in 1968 by the then L.C.L. Government. Of the seven measures announced by the Treasurer as a means of raising money, I think five directly affect the general community. Not only is there to be an increase in electricity charges but also an increase in tram and rail fares, and every time one goes to a football match or the theatre an entertainment tax will have to be paid.

Mr. McRae: Not the football.

Mr. COURCE: If the price of admittance is more than \$1 an entertainment tax of 7½ per cent is imposed, and perhaps—

Mr. Becker: What about *Oh! Calcutta!*?

The SPEAKER: There is nothing about *Oh! Calcutta!* in this Bill.

Mr. COURCE: These measures (and we are only debating one of them) affect the cost

of living and are in direct contrast to the taxation measures introduced in 1968 by the previous Government. We read in the Electricity Trust report of the marvellous work the trust has done. I pay a tribute to the trust, and I know many of its officers personally. The use of natural gas has been one reason why charges have been held down in recent years. We know of the work on Torrens Island and the proposed expansion at Dry Creek with the new turbines, in respect of which I had the pleasure of letting the contract. These have helped maintain a stable electricity charge, but all the conscientious work of the trust is now being undone by the introduction of this Bill, which will increase charges. After nearly 20 years of working so hard to keep tariffs at a reasonable figure, the trust finds that \$2,000,000, at least, will be milked from it each year.

The Treasurer, in his second reading explanation, admitted that the trust would have to increase its charges to the consumer, but he did not indicate what the increase would be: he merely said that the charges would rise. I say that he was not game to announce the increase in tariff but is leaving it to the board of the trust to make this announcement. I have already referred to the Treasurer's comment that, when we are considering increased taxation, we should try to avoid any effect on the lower-income group and on industries. Obviously, industries will be grossly affected. What may happen is that some industries, especially the larger ones, will consider alternative fuels and other methods of generating power (and there are other methods), and this will place the trust in a more difficult position.

The country subsidy scheme, under which subsidies are paid to country councils, will be affected. The effect of this Bill will be felt not only in the city and metropolitan area but also throughout the State wherever power is available. I pay a tribute to the trust on the introduction of the single wire earth return service, which criss-cross many of the rural areas of this State. The people who use that service will have to pay more as a result of the effects of this Bill. One difference is apparent between this Bill and a measure introduced in 1968 by the Liberal and Country League Government. The Treasurer made great play on that measure. He said that in 1968 the L.C.L. Government had placed an impost on the State Bank and, as that was a precedent, he would place one on the Electricity Trust. I maintain that the

situations are different: in the case of the bank it was not a charge that would affect directly the cost of living, whereas the charge imposed by this Bill will affect the cost of living, because everyone who has to pay for electricity will have to pay more.

I could develop this theme by asking why this Bill has been introduced. Of course the answer is simple. The Treasurer, when introducing his Budget last year, did not provide enough for over-award payments. Although I have asked several times what they were I have not received a reply. During the Budget and Loan Estimates debates last year it was pointed out by Opposition members that the Government was definitely over-stretching itself in this regard. In his second reading explanation of this Bill the Treasurer spoke about the Grants Commission and what it would be giving to South Australia. We know we have \$5,000,000 now, but how much will we get by the end of the year? The Treasurer could not reply to this question when I asked it of him the other day. I do not know how much the 6 per cent increase granted by the Arbitration Court will cost the State. I asked the Treasurer for this information, but he could not provide it. Of course, these costs have operated only since January 1 this year. I asked the Treasurer for the costs of service pay increases, but he has not given them to me. I estimate that in a full year these costs will amount to \$4,500,000. All these matters bear on why the Bill has been introduced. This is only one of several measures that will be introduced successively.

The Treasurer has said that he will bring in several Bills to give effect to taxation increases. The Minister of Works will increase assessments and water charges administratively. One reason why this Bill has been introduced is that the present Government is repeating the mistakes made by the Walsh Government from 1965 to 1967. The present Treasurer succeeded Mr. Walsh in 1967, about nine months before the election. In that time we went from a surplus left by Sir Thomas Playford and his Government to an accumulated deficit of about \$9,000,000; it was not a bad effort to go into the red! The Liberal Government had left a surplus and it then inherited a deficit. When he became Treasurer, Sir Glen Pearson, who, I am sure, had the admiration of all members of the House, was able to reduce the deficit slightly.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're intelligent enough to know that's not right.

Mr. COUMBE: I am intelligent enough to know facts when I see them.

Mr. Clark: What are you debating?

Mr. COUMBE: If the honourable member had been here, he would have heard me say that one of the reasons why this Bill is before the House is that this Government is repeating the mistakes made by the Walsh Government between 1965 and 1967. It is over-spending and is not making enough economies within its departments. All we know is that in a full year \$2,000,000 will come to the Treasury as a result of this measure, but we do not know how much it will cost the people. The Treasurer has said that the trust will increase the tariff, but he has not said how much that increase will be. He has left it to the trust to make that announcement. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I, too, oppose the Bill. When it comes to public instrumentalities, the Electricity Trust has been one of the wonders of Australia. All members know the history of the trust. They know that, when fuel shortages were so serious and we depended on black coal from New South Wales, the trust was established along with the development of the Leigh Creek coalfield. Development has proceeded and now forms of generating power other than Leigh Creek coal are used. During the life of the trust, unprecedented industrial development has taken place in South Australia. This process was largely set in motion by the energetic efforts of the Playford Government. Subsequent Governments have carried on as best they can, but no member should try to take away from Sir Thomas Playford the credit for the tremendous industrial expansion that took place in South Australia, and the trust played a vital part in that expansion.

The average price charged by the trust at first was well above that charged in the other mainland States. Of course, Tasmania is in a different category altogether, having a different generating system. In 1954, the average price charged by the trust in South Australia was 2.24c a unit, the charge in the other mainland States being an average of 2.08c. Therefore, in those days South Australia had a price 7 per cent above the average price charged in the other mainland States. That situation changed so dramatically that, by 1968, the average price charged in South Australia was 1.82c compared to an average price of 2.02c charged by the other States, so that the price in South

Australia was 10 per cent below the average price in the other States. In 1969-70, the South Australian average price was reduced by .04c to 1.78c, and that represents a reduction since 1954 of 21 per cent. In its annual reports, the trust has commented from time to time on the price it has been able to hold in South Australia. In 1969, it said that the 20 per cent reduction in the average price achieved in the last 16 years had occurred in a period of generally rising costs. In addition to increases in the costs of most goods and services, the wages and salaries paid by the trust in 1968-69 were more than \$10,000,000 greater than the trust would have had to pay to the same staff 16 years before.

In discussing the price of electricity in the 1970 report, the trust states that during the 17 years after 1952-53, while the average electricity price was reduced by 21 per cent, most other costs rose substantially. It states that wage increases will no doubt continue and that other costs can also be expected to rise in future. It does not refer to taxes. It says that the recent substantial rise in interest rates will increase operating costs considerably. The report states that in such circumstances the time must inevitably come when an upward movement in electricity prices will be necessary, and that the trust is doing all it can to postpone such an event, at this stage not fearing the necessity for a general tariff increase soon. Apparently the trust was effectively handling the situation, but it was not good enough to combat the Government.

Mr. Clark: Which Government?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The State Government, of which the honourable member is a member, is increasing the price of electricity in South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Would you bother to tell us why?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will, if the honourable member shuts up for a minute.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must cease interjecting across the Chamber. The honourable member for Alexandra must speak to the Bill before the House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I point out that the trust was doing all it could to hold the price of electricity to the wonderful figure at which it had been able to hold it for nearly 20 years and which has now been abandoned by the State Government, which has introduced a Bill to increase the price. It had been able to hold the price, whereas in Victoria, with its wonderful advantages of Yallourn, and notwithstanding cheap coal, the price has been higher.

We have been able to establish a situation here where we have a most favourable condition for industry to develop. In the meantime, the trust has had to face rising interest rates. I do not know what fuel prices the trust pays (it undoubtedly works on contract), but I know that the maximum price for furnace oil as set by the Prices Commissioner (and I emphasize that that may have no close relationship to the contract price) was increased in February from \$25.10 a ton to \$29.10 a ton, which is a considerable increase. The trust will also have to contend with the 6 per cent national wage increase in awards and with other awards of various kinds.

Electricity is a basic commodity. True, it is in competition in certain respects with other forms of power, but only marginally. Electricity is needed to make South Australian industry prosper. Industry has been able to prosper, and we have been able to attract industries and to help them. But if we just say, "Oh well, Victoria has done this; therefore, it is all right that we should do it, too," we will start to lose the advantages we hold. We do not have many advantages in competition with the Eastern States. Indeed, they have so many advantages that we are always kicking against the wind when it comes to attracting industry. One reason why we have been able to get industry has been that we have been able to hold electricity prices at a reasonable level, and I have demonstrated just how reasonable those prices have been.

In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said that the State Bank had had to pay a contribution to revenue, as much as to say, "If the State Bank can do it, why cannot the trust do it?" When the impost was made on the State Bank, the Treasurer made some rather unkind comments about it. He considered that it was a very poor deal indeed, and said:

The State Bank works closely with the Treasury on this basis; yet, while last year the Chairman of the State Bank told me that this year the State Bank would almost certainly require additional assistance from the Budget in order to meet the kind of industrial assistance and housing assistance we wanted (and it would probably have to be in the nature of about an extra \$200,000), the Government has taken out \$370,000 here, and this reduces the amount available for industries assistance and housing assistance in the hands of the State Bank.

Having said that in those days, the Treasurer, in order to justify this Bill, said:

As honourable members know, the State Bank of South Australia has since 1968-69

paid a contribution to revenue comparable with the amount of income tax it would have paid if it were a company. As the annual revenue of the Electricity Trust is now approaching \$70,000,000 its contribution initially would be about \$2,000,000 a year.

Electricity is a commodity basic to the State, and the trust should be left to keep the charge down. It will not help us to bring this money into State revenue, except in a most temporary way. Eventually, it will lose us industries or will tend to keep industries away from the State. We should be able proudly to say that our electricity cost is continuing to be cheaper and cheaper on average than it was previously, and we should be able to say that the gap between our electricity price and the price charged in other mainland States is becoming wider and wider in our favour. Despite the lack of natural conditions to assist us, we have been able to achieve that favourable situation through this very efficient instrumentality. Although the trust has done its best to keep down costs, it will now be beaten because the Government has decided to levy this \$2,000,000 tax on it, and a tax taken from the trust must inevitably come from an increase in electricity tariffs. There is nothing clearer than that conclusion in the light of the trust's annual reports for the last two years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened with interest to the things Opposition members have had to say. The burden of their complaint is that there is facing the trust a series of cost increases that will put pressure on its cost structure and that at the same time the Government is levying the \$2,000,000. I point out, however, that considerable cost increases face the State Government as a result of awards. The increase in the wages bill for the State for the three years prior to 1969-70 was between \$5,000,000 and \$7,000,000. I am not blaming the previous Government for this. The increase was \$10,250,000 this year, not because of any fault of the State Government or because of any marked increase in employment, but simply because of the movement of wages, so that the total increase is about \$18,000,000.

Mr. Clark: Doesn't the Commonwealth Government help?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Only to the extent of recouped amounts under the formula. As Opposition members who worked in the Ministry know, that recoups us only about one-third, which means that there will be a severe gap to be bridged. It would

not be responsible for the Government to severely cut State works or education or health and hospital expenditure, nor would it be responsible for us to run down the State's balances. On one hand I hear the cry of "Courage!" and we are told that we should insist on proper and careful budgetary practices; whereas on the other hand we are told that we are not being courageous in raising taxes. The Opposition has made an extraordinary number of inconsistent statements this afternoon.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader of the Opposition saw fit to take me to task on the basis that no completely detailed forecast of the decisions of the Electricity Trust in relation to its tariffs had been made in my financial statement. At this stage, the trust has not completed its arrangements in relation to tariffs, and therefore I cannot forecast them. I can only forecast what the total result to the State Budget will be. The Leader would suggest that this was something unusual and not something ever done by his Government. Let me draw his attention to the last financial statement of a Liberal Treasurer in his Government. That Treasurer said:

In the circumstances I propose to present the 1969-70 Budget in two parts. The first will be the formal and detailed Budget presented in the normal fashion, setting out the anticipated revenue based upon known circumstances, existing rates of taxes and charges, and such Commonwealth grants as may be expected under present firm arrangements. The expenditures will be detailed as they may be expected to occur with present rates of salaries and wages. Having constructed the formal Budget in this fashion, the result is a prospective deficiency of some \$2,240,000 in a Budget of about \$328,000,000.

All this talk of budgeting for a surplus! That was not, in fact, what was planned. The Liberal Treasurer continued:

Then I come to the second part which is neither formal nor detailed. Unfortunately it cannot claim to be precise, and members will see it set out upon the earlier pages of the financial papers. Last year additional wage and salary costs arising from awards and determinations notified after the Budget was presented amounted to about \$4,100,000, and in the current year they may be expected to be at least as great and perhaps of the order of \$5,000,000. Assuming the latter figure, some compensating increase would naturally occur in the tax reimbursement grant, and this on past experience could be of the order of, say, \$1,800,000. On such a basis the combined effect of these two factors could be a net increase in deficit of \$3,200,000, making about \$5,440,000 in all. The question then arises as to how much supplementary grant

the Commonwealth may subsequently be prevailed upon to supply. Last year it was \$3,350,000, or about 3 per cent of the tax reimbursement grant, and, as I have already pointed out, last year was a favourable one both seasonally and in economic expansion. It would be logical, and justified, to expect a rather greater supplement this year, and a 4½ per cent supplement may be expected to be adequate to cover the deficit gap, if the figures work out as are now forecast. Such a supplement would be just and reasonable in all the circumstances. Unfortunately we must proceed without any adequate assurance other than that the Prime Minister will meet the Premiers some time in the new year to review these matters and, in addition, to commence the review of the new arrangements which will apply for a period commencing with the financial year 1970-71.

The then Treasurer was forecasting just the kind of situation with which this Government has been faced, but this Government got no supplementary grant. He was forecasting a supplementary grant from the Commonwealth as against forecast wage increases of a much smaller nature than those that have now faced every State. There was a supplementary grant from the Commonwealth Government then, but we have not got one this time. The simple alternative is either to take measures that will ensure that we have sufficient revenue to cover the cost of services to the people of South Australia or to cut those areas of governmental activity that have been markedly expanding: education, health and hospitals.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They say that we are doing too much in these fields.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe we are doing too much.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Nor does anyone else with any sense.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think we are doing nearly enough in either sphere, but we are doing as much as we can.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: More than the Commonwealth is doing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be a policy of moral bankruptcy for this State to refuse to provide the basic and essential services and simply to say to the people, "We will not put up—"

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to the very narrow way in which the debate has been confined at your instigation in relation to Opposition members who spoke. Now, at this point, the Treasurer has chosen to widen the debate in a way that I think the Opposition speakers would have approved of and tried to debate. However, you prevented

the Opposition from doing this and now, on a point of order, I ask you whether the Treasurer is in order, to be consistent with your previous rulings.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is in order in replying to the matters raised by members during the debate. I ask the Treasurer to proceed in that way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The imposition of this electricity impost is vital to the revenues of the State and, if we are to get additional revenues, we must look to those areas where our revenues do not strike as hard as do those which apply in the standard States, and which the Grants Commission will consider. Members opposite know that an impost of this kind has existed in Victoria for a long time, I think since 1966, and the fact that this is a contributing factor to the overall aggregate taxation raising in that State will be examined before the Grants Commission. Victoria has already announced additional imposts and, therefore, this impost will be vital to us in order that we can get reasonably close to the aggregate figure in overall tax raisings, given the fact that we have a smaller tax base. I consider that, unpalatable as the measures that I explained to the House about two weeks ago are, it is vital that we proceed in this way rather than take an even more unpalatable alternative. Therefore, I consider this impost to be just and necessary.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Mrs. Steele, and Dr. Tonkin.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Langley and Lawn. Noes—Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 2. Page 3662.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Of all the many failures of the Government in its first 10 or 11 months of office, the failure to achieve anything of any worth regarding

the South Australian water supplies stands out at the head of the list. To prove this the Government has given us this Bill, which is nothing more than a facade. It is a notice that we are seeking (and I speak for the Government) a renegotiation of the agreement: that is all this Bill is. It is not a substantive thing of any note but is merely a notice that if the Premier gets it through Parliament he can tout it around to say that Parliament has given instructions for him to renegotiate. It achieves nothing on the road to getting Dartmouth and the water that this State needs.

Of the many failures of this Government, this one stands at the top of the list. I can visualize a visitor some time towards the end of the century who no doubt will drive around the park lands of Adelaide and look across the green coloured park lands (artificially coloured by then because there will be little water available to water them), and he will see a statue of the present Premier in the distance. If he has a telescope he will probably see on the statue an inscription that will read, "In memory of Chowilla and Dartmouth and South Australian development". That is all it will be. South Australia is being denied at this moment by this Government the right to progress: it is being deliberately denied this for political purposes and for no other reason. That is a terrible thing for this State and for those who depend on its future development. Amidst the furore in Canberra today, a question was asked about the Dartmouth argument. I have a copy of that question: it is untidy and has been taken straight from the radio description of the question and reply, but it gives a fair indication of what other people think of the South Australian Government. The following question was asked by Mr. Turnbull:

Is it true that the Premier of South Australia is going to break the deadlock existing over the ratification of the Dartmouth dam and ratify the agreement? Also, was it not his Government that (in effect) put the Dartmouth plan into cold storage for almost 10 months to the detriment of national development?

Mr. Hopgood: It sounds like a Dorothy Dixier.

Mr. HALL: I know that this is a joke to members opposite and that they have treated the planning for South Australia as a political stepping stone, a laughing stock, and a joke. Government members demonstrate that continually. The Commonwealth Minister's reply was as follows:

As I indicated a week or so ago, my understanding is that some legislation either has, or is about to be, introduced into the Parliament of S.A. along lines which have been indicated in a recent letter sent by the Premier of S.A. to the Prime Minister. As I also pointed out at the time, the Premier of S.A. had publicly stated—and whilst I have not had the opportunity of seeing the Bill, or hearing or seeing any reference to any debate in relation to it, I cannot confirm what he stated publicly, but what he said publicly at the time was that two clauses in the agreement, which have been ratified by this Parliament, by both Houses of this Parliament, and by the N.S.W. and Victorian Parliaments, those two clauses were to be deleted from the legislation introduced into the Parliament of S.A.

This would mean—without a careful study of the submission by the Premier of S.A. and without a knowledge of the legislation which is being considered by that Parliament—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He really didn't know anything at all, just like you, did he?

Mr. HALL: The junior Minister comes in again on cue. I wonder whether someone on the Government side says, "Now is your time to get in and make a smart alec remark." He is almost a Ministerial puppet when he keeps jumping in with inane interjections. The reply continues:

that if the two clauses were deleted it would leave the situation exactly the same as it was before the other three Parliaments. Those three Governments made it quite clear that such a proposal was not acceptable to them. I would like to make it clear that all the concern of the South Australian Government has been to ensure that further consideration would be given to the Chowilla project in the future of the whole of the Murray system, and that has been made quite clear, although the actual reference to Chowilla was removed from the present agreement and that was agreed to by the Government of South Australia at that time; and although that was done, there was an exchange of letters, and at a conference between the various Governments it was made quite clear that there would be a continuing study of the Murray system for future development, and that Chowilla could come into consideration at that stage.

Mr. Clark: "Could" is the operative word.

Mr. HALL: If the honourable member would listen for a moment, he could benefit. The report continues:

That was made quite clear, and that is the position as it stands as far as the Governments are concerned at present. However, we cannot really give a reply to the Premier of South Australia because the Prime Minister has not had the opportunity to study the matter fully because we are not completely aware of the legislation or the debate that is at present taking place.

The meaning of that makes members opposite uncomfortable. It means that the ploy that they are putting up to the House is exposed. They are saying that the other Governments have refused to negotiate. The Minister of Works, who has tried ineffectually to renegotiate this agreement with other Governments, knows what he put to the other Governments, which they rejected but which appears in this Bill. I think it was in Sydney that he met his counterparts or their representatives and tried to get certain provisions deleted from the Bill containing the agreement, and those people said, "No". Now he puts forward this Bill to the people of South Australia as if the Government is intent on ratifying the Dartmouth agreement. Nothing is further from the truth: the Government is deliberately obstructing the building of the Dartmouth dam. Therefore, we have an impossible situation. The Minister, who is now laughing, is laughing at the future of the State, knowing that we are now no closer towards having Dartmouth built than we were when the Premier made his famous statement at the last election in which he promised renegotiation. In fact, we are further away from it.

The wonderful group of public relations officers employed by the Government will work on the public, leading people to believe that the Government position is the right one. They could be successful: I do not say that the Government will fail in its public relations drive. In another debate today, the Premier said that we had had two weeks in which to make an attack on the financial measures he had introduced. That sounds strangely similar to what appeared in the *Sunday Mail*. In fact, one wonders what relationship there is between what the public believes and what the Government wants it to believe. What the Government is doing now is nothing more than false leadership of the community: it is a deliberately misleading operation. The Bill is designed to shift the onus from the ineffectual shoulders of Government members on to people in other States, making it appear that those people will not renegotiate.

The history of this matter has been well explained in the House before. We went through this on the night of April 30, when my Government fell on this issue. It has been well explained in the House that the negotiations over the years with the other Governments reached an apex when that previous agreement was reached, but the Labor Party refused to ratify that agreement. Now members opposite

are doing their utmost to make people believe that the Governments in the other States are the villains and will not co-operate.

Mr. Clark: But—

Mr. HALL: Members opposite voted last year for two dams or nothing: that is on the record. Let the member for Playford try to deny it. If he does not believe it, he should stand by the votes in this House. What other votes are we to take notice of? That is what members voted for, and that was the basis for the election. How quickly they turned to that impossible situation and grasped at anything to get an election then. They voted for two dams or nothing and came out with a policy of renegotiation within three of four months. However, this has dragged on for 10 months, and no renegotiation is in sight. This Government has blatantly falsified the case before the public and is now trying to mislead the House by misrepresenting the situation regarding whose onus it is to get this Bill into operation and to get the agreement working on behalf not only of South Australia but of the Eastern States.

The South Australian Government's negotiating reputation in other States is at the lowest level I have known it to be; it is even lower than it was in the days of the Walsh Government, which was the previous disaster that happened to South Australia. The Government will find that this refusal to co-operate for no other than a political reason will stand it in poor stead in future approaches to the Commonwealth Government, whoever leads it. Is it not interesting to find that this Government, which itself agreed to the deferment of Chowilla, is now putting off Dartmouth. If there has ever been a group of dam killers it is this Government which, having deferred Chowilla, is now deliberately deferring Dartmouth, with the parallel consequences?

Chowilla began at \$28,000,000, grew to \$43,000,000, and we had tenders for \$68,000,000. So the delay that occurred in those days for technical reasons drew on and on until the whole project became impossibly costly. So the alternatives were studied for the first time and were compared with the results of the Chowilla study, which then came into our hands. This Bill is the result of delay. The dam under this agreement is no longer available. There is no longer a \$56,000,000 Dartmouth dam, plus 10 per cent. It is not available, and the Premier had better get that into his head. His procrastination has meant that it is no longer an operable agreement.

This is his responsibility alone. The very factors that he said caused so much trouble to his Budget have meant that it is not available, because, as a \$28,000,000 Chowilla dam is not available, so a \$56,000,000 Dartmouth dam is not on the market. If by some strange change of heart by the end of the year he decided to turn around and agree, it would not be available. It is not there.

This therefore means that the Government talks about two objectionable courses for its political aspirations and ignores the fact that in this 10 months the whole thing has passed by. The Commonwealth Minister has already said that it has gone beyond the point of escalation allowed in the contract price. So, I suppose we can throw that agreement away! I suppose we can throw away that 37 per cent increase in usable water! Under that agreement we were granted an increase of two-thirds of the minimum flow in 1967 (900,000 gallons), making a total of 1,500,000 gallons. We can burn that agreement because time has gone. What will the Government do about it? I suppose it will use plausible words. If the Premier can explain that away, he can explain away his budgetary troubles, because the same problem of price escalation applies to both matters. This is what the people have never been told and never will be told so long as the Government uses the news media in the way it does.

The Premier would be interested in the research conducted by the member for Heysen, who investigated the last purchases of land for reservoirs. The announcement on this matter was made as though the land was purchased during the present Government's term of office, but actually none of the land was purchased in the last two years. That is the sort of news release being made in this community. What the public must be told is that the dam can no longer be built for the agreed sum. Therefore, the Premier had better go back and talk about the price before he attempts to knock any rough edges off the agreement that he does not like. If this House were to say that the situation was dangerous for South Australia, that we could not allow the opportunity to slip by, and that we would therefore pass this Bill in an amended form to confirm the agreement, we might yet prevail on the other Governments to include provision in the agreement for a greater escalation in the price. We would hope so, because there is no other hope. Escalating prices is one of the present-day economic facts that are bedeviling

all State Governments and the Commonwealth Government.

I therefore suggest that the Government should use its publicity skills to inform the public of the real situation, rather than to mislead the public and falsify the picture, as it is doing at present. Of course, as long as water comes out of the tap some people will not worry about our water supplies. The public is more inclined to worry about water rating than a far-away proposition to back up our water supplies, which at present, evidently, are adequate. It is difficult to get the public to appreciate the need for long-term planning in connection with our water supplies. I have with me some material that is worth examining in relation to the notification for renegotiation that we have been asked to approve.

Mr. McRae: Keep it simple so that the journalists will understand it.

Mr. HALL: One of the facts that the Premier has been very assiduous in promoting is that we gave away Chowilla, but he ignores the fact that Chowilla is not obtainable and that there is no enforceable agreement. He keeps on saying that there is, but he knows that there is not, because neither he nor any other group or Parliament has power to direct any other Parliaments, the other signatories to the agreement, to provide the money to build Chowilla. No-one can do that or will do it. Today Chowilla is but a figment of the imagination in any mid-term dam construction, because the estimated cost of Chowilla would have increased (as with Dartmouth) beyond the \$68,000,000 we talked about when the controversy first raged.

Let us consider how false is this talk of giving away Chowilla. When the agreement was signed, I considered that the Opposition (the Labor Party) at the time would bring up the Chowilla point. The Opposition had made much of it and had stirred as much out of it politically as it could in the river districts and amongst the general public. I decided that we had to have an undertaking from the other signatories to the agreement for Dartmouth that Chowilla must be included in a future study of the Murray River system and that a study must go ahead in a known time.

Mr. Payne: You said on television that you were going to build it.

Mr. HALL: I shall read the replies that I received to the request that Chowilla be included in a future study of this system. Doubtless, the Premier would have copies of

the communications on his files. I received a telegram from the Premier of New South Wales, who stated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There are far too many interjections. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Chaffey has not been known for his advocacy of any worthwhile programme in relation to water for his district, and I should like to know the thoughts of the people in the river area who stand at risk at present because the honourable member's Government will not ratify the Dartmouth agreement.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They said what they thought at the last election.

Mr. HALL: Yes, but I want to know what their member here is doing for his district.

Mr. Curren: They voted for what they wanted, the Chowilla dam.

Mr. HALL: With projects as large and costly as Dartmouth and Chowilla, the honourable member must understand that he cannot live forever on a negative policy. He must provide water for his district. That is the prime requirement. Nothing else is as important as that. However, at present he refuses to do that. If there is a large-scale drought on the Murray River system before one of these dams is built, the honourable member alone will be responsible, because that is the type of vote that carried this agreement out of this House unsigned early last year. If all the orchards died, as they would if conditions that have applied to the river in the past applied today, he alone would be responsible.

Mr. Curren: They will be ruined by the Commonwealth Government's policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HALL: I shall read the replies that I received from the other Premiers. The telegram from the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Askin) states:

Reference your letter April 21 re Dartmouth dam. This State has no objection to insertion in South Australian Bill of clause outlined in your letter. Written advice posted special air mail delivery today.

The Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte) replied:

I desire to acknowledge your letter . . . No objection is raised to the proposed addition in subclause (b) of Bill. The Government of Victoria is quite prepared to join with the Commonwealth Government and the Government of New South Wales in agreeing to

request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the River Murray system with a view to ascertaining where the next River Murray Commission storage is to be situated, following construction of the Dartmouth dam. Included in the Bill is a specific reference that Chowilla must be part of that study. From the Prime Minister—

Mr. Jennings: Which Prime Minister—the outgoing one?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Prime Minister says:

I am pleased to advise that I have no objection to the subclause 2 (b) which you propose. You will, I am sure, have noted that the Commonwealth legislation ratifying the agreement was approved by the Senate on April 22.

That subclause, as members know, was specifically aimed to meet objection from those people who believed that Chowilla was being dropped. It states:

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 River Murray 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.

That is rather an important ending to that clause, and I advise the member for Chaffey to study it. That gives the direct lie to the Premier's statement that Chowilla has been abandoned. It suits his political purposes in the river areas to say that it has; yet we have agreements clearly entered into by the other State Premiers. What a lot of double talk we have heard from the Premier! I have some interesting material that was supplied to me by Mr. Beaney when I was Premier in relation to a statement by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan). I have a long article concerning his views on the water situation in South Australia. I have Mr. Beaney's answers to the points that the then Leader of the Opposition made, and I think it pertinent to give them again.

Mr. Jennings: He changed his mind with the change of Government.

Mr. HALL: That would be the attitude of the member opposite about senior public servants. Here, a reputable person is involved.

Mr. Jennings: You are the person causing the embarrassment.

Mr. Clark: What about Mr. Dridan?

Mr. HALL: The then Leader of the Opposition said several things. I will not deal with them all, because they are lengthy. Are we not

enthralled this evening by the high level of attention being given by members opposite? This is a measure holding up development in three States in south-eastern Australia, and members opposite are interjecting on a level that grade I schoolboys have long passed.

Mr. Clark: Like the level of the Leader's speech.

Mr. HALL: I hope the public understands what is blocking the measure.

Mr. Clark: That is why Reg Curren got the vote, because he understood the position.

Mr. HALL: This article states that one of the points made by the Leader of the Opposition was as follows:

With the agreement the Liberal and Country League Government wants Parliament to ratify South Australia would be giving separate and permanent vetoes to New South Wales, Victoria and Canberra against Chowilla as a future water storage.

That is answered by the point I have just made, that there is no power to enforce the other Governments to build on the river any dam that is outside an agreement, and Chowilla is certainly outside any known agreement. The article continues:

Furthermore, by simultaneously providing for new works at Lake Victoria, costing \$7,000,000 and in an area that would be flooded by Chowilla if it were built, it is ensuring that the other parties to the agreement will use their veto.

The change in the agreement is made to give South Australia the opportunity to demonstrate the needs for changes in Lake Victoria should this be necessary. The original agreement specified the inlet capacity and this restriction has been removed.

The South Australian Government knows that it could prevent work being done on Lake Victoria by not agreeing to it, but this is not finally spelt out in the agreement. The works are not costed, and the Premier knows he has a veto against building what he does not like at Lake Victoria. Yet, he will not admit it to the House and to the public, and states that it is an impediment to the progress of Chowilla. The lawyer on the Government side, the member for Playford, knows that that is so. The veto now exists with the Premier and he puts it up as a furphy and something of importance in this Bill, but this shows how dishonest his Government is because that argument falls completely away as the works at Lake Victoria which are referred to here only as a proposed future work, have not been costed, and are not approved. Any talk of anything being built there being an impediment to Chowilla is within the Premier's imagination only. That

disposes of that point completely: whether Government members like it or not, it cannot be argued. The article continues:

In exchange, South Australia is to get an increased water "entitlement" amounting to 1,500,000 acre feet a year. But some years up to 8,500,000 acre feet run through South Australia into the sea. Other years we don't even get our present "entitlement" of 1,250,000 acre feet.

In reply to this, Mr. Beaney stated:

Mr. Dunstan quotes an average flow of 8,500,000 acre feet running through South Australia. This average was rather artificial in that the crucial matter lies in extended periods of drought. In the three years between 1943 and 1946 the total flow into this State was less than 7,000,000 acre feet, and studies show that under future conditions Chowilla would have been ineffective in the final irrigation season.

Do members understand that? In one known condition Chowilla would have been ineffective. Mr. Beaney stated:

The high average is also influenced by flood sequences such as in the two seasons 1965 through to 1967, 60,000,000 acre feet of water coming to South Australia.

The point that Government members cannot understand is that Chowilla then would have been ineffective in one known condition, but no-one has answered the question because they are frightened to. What would have happened then to the South Australian river areas with a highly-saline end-of-the-river drought flow into an empty Chowilla? It would have been a salt pan, and no professional officer could give an answer. Our own experts in those days did not know the answer, and threw up their hands. This is what this Government has so urgently been putting to the State—the value of Chowilla first. Recently, it has grudgingly agreed that, because we cannot get Chowilla first, it will agree to Dartmouth as long as it does some political things, too. One realizes that this statement is full of inaccuracies, and the contents have been answered adequately by professional people who still serve the South Australian Government. It is interesting to note that in the last few years the flows in the Mitta River have been very significant indeed.

Mr. McRae: So has the flow in the Darling this year.

Mr. HALL: At least one Government member is thinking about water: it may be the wrong river but at least it is water. If the Dartmouth dam had been constructed and had begun to store water over the last three or four years, it would have become a useful

storage. Much has been said previously about the fact that the Mitta River does not produce an adequate flow, yet the flows recorded for that river over the last few years are as follows: 1966-67, 934,000 acre feet; 1967-68, 364,000 acre feet; 1968-69, 1,018,000 acre feet; and 1969-70, 904,000 acre feet. This year the flow has already exceeded 1,000,000 acre feet. With that experience over the last four years, it can be seen that the Mitta River would be a valuable agent in filling the Dartmouth dam. Over 1,000,000 acre feet in Dartmouth would more than equal the capacity of Chowilla to provide a useful flow up to 1,250,000 acre feet. Past that point, we would have available 1,500,000 acre feet. The Labor Party policy on this matter has been almost totally inconsistent. On August 15, 1967, the Premier moved the following motion (the member for Chaffey will be well aware of this):

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

In those early days, after travelling to other States, the Premier said that, if we were to have an alternative, we should make sure that we got 1,250,000 acre feet of water. After intense opposition by our Party, the Government, through the present Minister for Conservation, stiffened up the motion originally moved by the Premier. However, the motion that I have quoted gives the attitude of the Labor Party on August 15, 1967, at 2.2 p.m. Since then, for political purposes, the Labor Party has dragged South Australia to a stage where it will not accept the superior allocation that my Government was able to negotiate into the agreement. At one stage, we got to the point where Mr. Whitlam, on November 3 last year, said that we should have a national authority to replace the archaic and inefficient River Murray Commission. He said we should incorporate the Snowy Mountains Authority. That policy of the Labor Party would take away from this State, New South Wales and Victoria, the right to a say about the Murray River system. All matters would be in the hands of the Commonwealth Government of the day.

Mr. McRae: That's not the national policy at all.

Mr. HALL: Surely the honourable member does not advocate that the system should be placed in the hands of a national water authority. Perhaps later the honourable member will try to justify the control of our water being placed in the hands of representatives of Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania. I want the control maintained by the parties that use the river and have the responsibility of building the works on it.

Mr. McRae: That is not the Labor Party's policy that you are putting.

Mr. HALL: The Premier spoke clearly on this matter. On February 21, 1969, he said:

Technical studies undertaken by the Murray River Commission had supplied information which would have enabled South Australia to go to arbitration and enforce the agreement for the building of the Chowilla dam.

Over the last three or four years the Labor Party has changed from one foot to the other on this question until the Premier made his famous "We will renegotiate" statement prior to the last election. In answer to a question by an interviewer, "Are there any changes to which you would agree in this special session?" the Premier said:

No. There are none, because the agreement would have to be renegotiated. The vote on this will have to be Yes or No. We can't amend the agreement, because it is an agreement between the States.

I usually read my material fairly meticulously, but I have not read before where he has said, "We cannot amend the agreement, because it is an agreement between the States." It is illuminating that the Premier last year said that we could not amend the agreement; yet he has before us (and this is the object of the discussion) a Bill for that very purpose. The Labor Party's policy speech states:

In relation to the Murray River we will renegotiate the agreement concerning the building of the Dartmouth dam to ensure that South Australia's legal rights to the building of the Chowilla dam are not ended. We will demand, further, that new computer studies are made to ascertain the benefits of operating dams at both Dartmouth and Chowilla. We will seek to negotiate a commencing date for Chowilla to be inserted in an enforceable agreement.

None of these things has the Government tried to achieve with any force. What have been other States' views in relation to Dartmouth and Chowilla? One need only read the views of people such as the Murray Valley Development League, which has consistently in the last year or so placed so much importance on the building of Dartmouth. The league wrote to the Government which I led, and I am sure

it has written to the present Government, entreating the authorities in this State to get on with the building of Dartmouth as soon as possible. On April 8, 1969, the league passed the following resolution:

That this Regional Committee of the Murray Valley Development League supports the immediate ratification of the Dartmouth dam proposals, and urges the early commencement of construction work without further delays.

There was also a letter from the Lakes Water Users Association of Meningie headed "Dartmouth Priority", with a similar type of resolution as follows:

This meeting favours construction of the Dartmouth dam and its additional entitlement of water before that of any other major storage.

So the representations go on. Members of the Labor Party in other Parliaments of Australia have consistently said that Chowilla is not a viable proposition. They have given their complete support to Dartmouth, and the Parliaments of Victoria and New South Wales have faced no opposition from any quarter concerning the building of Dartmouth. I have another representation made by the Southern Riverina Irrigation Council. In the face of all this the Premier tried to set up a committee to go to Victoria and New South Wales to promote the cause of Chowilla. He did this as recently as this year, but the committee has fallen completely on its face in relation to achieving anything worth while towards getting the dam in South Australia built.

Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth have passed legislation ratifying the agreement to build the Dartmouth dam. South Australia is the only State that has not ratified the agreement. All this State needs to do in the next week is amend the Bill, and it will then receive the benefits as soon as the dam is built and as soon as it holds enough water. What are the consequences? I have already said that the agreement we are considering is no longer viable because the dam cannot be built for the sum stated in the agreement. That is our main difficulty, but what will we do if all hope of building the dam is gone, and I believe it may well have gone? Chowilla has gone, in present circumstances. It looks as though the prospect of building the Dartmouth dam may well have gone, because of the procrastination of the Government. What do we do? Members opposite are silent on this question. It has been previously rumoured that the Government will look to the water

supplies of the South-East and that it may intend to bring water to Adelaide from that area. The metropolitan area must have water for its industries and domestic consumption, so the Government may have no alternative to using South-East water.

Mr. Burdon: You know full well that that has already been denied.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member can talk that way if he likes but, if there is no other water in the State and if he refuses to allow it to come here, he puts his district at risk.

Mr. Burdon: Does he?

Mr. HALL: The water supplies in the honourable member's district will be put at risk if they are poached and filched by this Government.

Mr. Burdon: I will see that they are kept in the district.

Mr. HALL: Will the Government go ahead with the Teal Flat scheme? The Premier owes it to this House to say what alternatives he has in mind to the Chowilla and Dartmouth dams, which he may well have lost. The Teal Flat scheme must have an up-river storage if it is to be at all workable. It cannot work in isolation because it is a short-term holding dam. The management of the river will be of no value to South Australia without a dam upstream from Teal Flat. To put a dam there would not only inundate valuable irrigation areas along the river but also prevent users upstream from having any regulated water supply in drought years. So, that, in itself, would not benefit the Chaffey District. What does the Government have in mind? There is silence from members opposite, who do not have a clue.

Mr. Clark: Interjections are not out of order.

Mr. HALL: In the light of the probable non-availability of the two dams, it is interesting that the Premier is still promoting South Australian industry. I am sure members will appreciate a heading in *Manufacturers Monthly* of February 15 this year. I ask honourable members not to laugh until I have finished reading the heading, which states:

Don Dunstan invites industry to his kingdom.

Guess who the author is! It is written by Don Dunstan! One would never accuse the Premier of being over modest, but I have never thought of South Australia as being Don Dunstan's kingdom. I guess that makes him a certain type of king. The first paragraph of the report states:

This year promises to be a year of unparalleled development in South Australia.

In another excerpt the Premier states:

Without effective planning and control our precious natural assets could be lost forever.

The statement that our precious natural assets could be lost forever is prophetic. In this prosey praise of the kingdom, the Premier invites factories and other people interested in managing enterprises in South Australia to come to his kingdom. With what does he invite them?

Mr. Coumbe: Late shopping?

Mr. HALL: No. We have had some reforms. We will not worry about late shopping or about bread sales on Sundays. We have regulated those matters but to discuss them is out of order. The Premier has removed any possibility of being able to promise an adequate water supply for these enterprises. He cannot promise that on any basis, because he has not that water and has no agreement to obtain it. When I was in office I pursued several industrial development projects and, if I can be as modest as the Premier is, let me say that I did so with some success. Those industries now are either viable or are being built in this community. In fact, every industry that the Premier has talked about and announced since coming to office has been an industry that we were dealing with before he took office.

One negotiation that required much investigation was not successful. A consortium was interested in producing steel in Australia on a scale that this country has not known and, at the beginning of their negotiations, these people were considering establishing an industrial complex to produce about 7,000,000 tons a year. In the first instance, we considered that South Australia would have no claim on this industry, because we had shallow ports and did not have the raw materials, either coal or iron ore, in the quantities required. However, in the end we found that this industry was extremely interested in South Australia, it having begun to make detailed surveys for placing this complex on the eastern shore of the St. Vincent Gulf. Finally, these people came down on the side of establishing at Jervis Bay and I think their intentions have since been revised a little and their plans reduced. Nevertheless, this was the dialogue that occurred in relation to a group interested in South Australia as the site for the biggest industrial complex this nation would have known.

One of the basic factors that encouraged them here, apart from housing and several other things, was the availability of water. With the Dartmouth arrangements practically completed (it was our intention to go ahead with the Dartmouth dam), I was able to say to this group, "You may rest assured that water supply here will not be the slightest problem to you. The immense quantities you will need will be yours." What will be the situation if that consortium suddenly finds that Jervis Bay is not so good and that it wants to go ahead with its proposals regarding the eastern shore of St. Vincent Gulf, and it arrives tomorrow at the Premier's office and says, "We want to start up negotiations again"? What will he say to them about water?

Mr. Keneally: You had already given them all the State's water, so what could he do?

Mr. HALL: Members opposite can answer only with gibes. We can forget about that type of organization coming to this State while this Government pursues this policy. Perhaps the Government does not want that type of development; that may be its policy—I do not know. However, as long as that policy continues, that type of development is not possible so the Premier had better write a new title to the next article he writes saying, "You can come here so long as you do not want water." This debate needs to be taken a little further than merely beating the air about the two dams we have considered previously: we need to project at least six months to a year into the future to see where we are going in the next period of management of this State and to the next easier planning stage, where we can at least go ahead that far. What are we going to do about this matter?

It would appear by this Bill that the Government steadfastly refuses to accept the agreement. It insists on conditions that the other States have already rejected outright in their talks with the Minister of the day, the Hon. J. D. Corcoran. We have reached the situation where South Australia has no guarantee for its future water supply in periods of drought and where the Government has no known alternative plans to Chowilla or Dartmouth. We know that at some stage in the future there will be a drought of immense proportions on the Murray River system. Shall we stand totally unprepared to meet the the future test? We do not know whether that future test will be 18 years or 18 months away. All we know is that it is coming, and

it will take at least three years to have an efficient water storage in the Dartmouth dam. Even if the Government was to turn around and change its attitude, it would be another six months at least before this agreement could be ratified. So we are going into the future at risk for at least four years. It may be that the Mitta Mitta will not flow favourably for four years, so we shall go forward at risk for eight years; South Australia will go forward without any known alternative to the proposition, and the dam may not be available now because the price has escalated beyond that contained in the agreement. It is indeed a sorry future that confronts this State. These are not political words; they are factual, based on a known situation.

There remain, as I see it, but two possibilities within the reach of this Government. One is the South-Eastern water, which I warn will cause consternation and indignation if the Government tries to filch it from the South-East. The second is the Teal Flat storage, which will be totally insufficient without an upstream storage and will give no safeguard to the river industries above it. These are simple facts that can be distilled from the argument that has now been going on for 10 or more years. Unless the Government comes to its senses and accepts the momentous increases of water available by a simple vote in this House, and nothing more, I believe that South Australia will not only be in dire difficulties in future when a drought occurs but will also refuse to face its future in the development sense. Therefore, we cannot offer our people or those who come here the water they need for the future. I shall move to amend this Bill to make some sense of it in the Committee stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Leader in his view of this Bill and on the problem of water storages in South Australia. I should like to put a few other matters before the House that perhaps appeal to me, particularly as a lawyer. I regret that the Attorney-General, the Premier, and the member for Playford are not here, because I invite their comments on the various points I shall put. In my view, this Bill does not take the argument one inch farther: all it does, as the Leader has said, is attempt to persuade the people of this State that the Government is doing something and that, if there is no agreement to go ahead with Dartmouth, it will be someone else's fault and not the fault of this Government. In other words, it is no more than a camouflage, as the Leader has said.

I turn now to the extraordinary position in which this House finds itself. We know that the former Premier, on behalf of this State, signed an agreement to build the Dartmouth dam and to make certain other alterations to the River Murray Agreement. We know (and it is set out in the first schedule to this Bill) that the agreement signed by the Premiers of the three States and by the Commonwealth Government does not come into operation until the agreement is ratified by all four Parliaments. That is the position under the agreement. Perhaps I should refer honourable members to the provision to which I have referred. It is the first clause of the agreement in the first schedule, and it provides:

(1) This agreement other than clause 2—
which is the clause agreeing to submit the agreement for ratification by the various Parliaments—

is subject to ratification by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth of Australia and of the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, and shall come into effect when so ratified.

The agreement has been ratified by three of the four Parliaments: it has not yet been ratified by this Parliament. Now, we have introduced a Bill which effects (or pretends is perhaps a better word) to ratify those parts of the agreement which the Government likes but which cuts out a part to which it objects, and it adds three extra provisions. We find those deletions and additions shown in the second schedule. The Premier and every member with any legal training, and, I believe, every other member knows that one cannot in law or in common sense ratify those parts of an agreement that one likes and reject the others. An agreement stands or falls as a whole and, unless every party to an agreement agrees to the whole of that agreement, there is no agreement. In other words, as Anson said nearly 100 years ago in his textbook *Law of Contract*, which is the basic textbook for all law students, "Agreement, then, is the expression by two or more persons of a common intention to effect their legal relations." The important phrase in that statement is "a common intention". Unless there is a common intention among the parties, there is in fact no agreement. What we are considering this evening is a pretended ratification only, because it is not a ratification of the agreement: it is a ratification only of those parts of the agreement which the Government likes and a rejection of others; it is an assertion (and I will look at the Bill in a moment) that the arrangement will not come into effect until the agreement is amended as

the Government wants it to be. Therefore, this does not take us any further.

It was rather amusing that the Leader came across the statement by the Premier that it was all or nothing and that an agreement could not be amended. The Premier knows that now, as he knew it on the day he made that statement. A few days ago, we were told that the Premier had written a letter to the Prime Minister. Having read the letter to the House, he then, at my request, tabled it and the draft Bill accompanying it. In that letter the Premier made some extraordinary assertions which he repeated in his second reading explanation. He said:

The Acts which your Parliaments have passed concerning the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement have been expressed merely to "ratify" the proposed amending agreement. Unlike previous measures amending the River Murray Waters Agreement by statute, the amendments were not expressed to take effect as statute law. It would appear that the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement, even if agreed by all parties, would not be in consequence justiciable.

That sounds tremendous, especially when it is read out by the Premier in that inimitable style of his; in fact, it is utter nonsense. What would it matter from a practical point of view whether or not an agreement was justiciable—whether or not it could be taken to law? What would that matter in the circumstances in which we now find ourselves? As far as I can see, it would not matter at all. In his letter, the Premier does not pretend that it matters, but he makes the point. Having checked back to the amendments made to the River Murray Waters Agreement in the 1960's, as far as I can see the operative clauses in the Bills of all other Parliaments in 1963 and 1964 are in precisely the same terms as the operative clauses in the Bills which they have passed to ratify this agreement. Having seen those agreements (and I will refer to them briefly one by one), I cannot believe that there is anything in the point which the Premier made in his letter to the Prime Minister and in his second reading explanation. First, let us look at the Victorian ratification of an amendment to the agreement in 1963. This was, strangely enough, the agreement to build the Chowilla dam. The form in which the operative clause appears in that Act is as follows:

The Further Amending Agreement, a copy of which is set out in the Schedule to this Act, is hereby ratified and approved and shall take effect on the coming into operation of this Act.

The Premier said later in his letter that the previous amendments were justiciable, but for some reason he does not think these are justiciable because of the form in which they have been ratified by the other Parliaments. Section 4 of the 1970 Victoria Act is in precisely the same terms: it provides:

The Further Amending Agreement, a copy of which is set out in the Schedule to this Act, is hereby ratified and approved and shall take effect on the coming into operation of this Act.

So much for Victoria: it has precisely the same form of ratification as we had in the past. The same is true of New South Wales. The New South Wales Act was No. 5 of 1964, and the operative section provides:

The Fifth Further Amending Agreement, a copy of which is set out in the Seventh Schedule to the principal Act, as inserted by section three of this Act, is hereby ratified and approved.

That agreement is to build the Chowilla dam. What do we find on looking at the New South Wales Act ratifying the Bill to build the Dartmouth dam? We find exactly the same thing. Section 3 provides:

The Sixth Further Amending Agreement, a copy of which is set out in the Eighth Schedule to the principal Act, as inserted by section four of this Act, is hereby ratified and approved.

So New South Wales, like Victoria, has ratified the agreement in precisely the same terms. Finally, the Commonwealth Act to insert the Chowilla dam provisions was No. 98 of 1963, and the operative section is section 4, which provides:

The sixth further amending Agreement, a copy of which is set out in section 6 of this Act, is hereby ratified and approved.

What do we find in Act No. 6 of 1970? Section 4, which is in precisely the same terms, states:

The sixth further amending Agreement, a copy of which is set out in section 6 of this Act, is hereby ratified and approved.

I have often said in this place and elsewhere that one cannot accept anything the Premier has said without checking it. He asserts in the letter that, because of the form in which the other Parliaments have ratified the Dartmouth agreement, it is justiciable, but he admits in the letter that previous amendments have been ratified in a form which makes them justiciable. When one compares the forms in which they have been ratified, they turn out to be exactly the same. It is bad enough to make

an assertion like that which is unfounded, but the Premier went on in the letter to his Prime Minister to say the following:

In order to break the existing deadlock, it is the intention of my Government to introduce to the South Australian Parliament a Bill in the form enclosed. The effect of this is to approve so much of the amending agreement as provides for the construction of the dam at Dartmouth and the necessary ancillary arrangements and to provide the money therefor.

When I asked the Premier to table the letter, I also added a specific request that he table the Bill. I notice that the Minister of Works rather demurred at that, but the Premier had committed himself to table both the Bill and the letter, so it was the property of the House from then on. The letter is dated February 22 and the Bill, which was in typed form, is dated February 1, I think. That Bill is not in the form in which it has been introduced into this House. In other words, the Premier has misled the Prime Minister on the form of the Bill. He said:

In order to break the existing deadlock it is the intention of my Government to introduce to the South Australian Parliament a Bill in the form enclosed.

However, if one compares the Bill that he sent to the Prime Minister with the Bill he introduced within a week in this place, one finds significant differences between the two. Not only were two clauses omitted from the Bill he sent to the Prime Minister (clauses 2 and 3 in our Bill) but also what is numbered clause 8 in our Bill is in a different form from the clause numbered 6 in the Bill he sent to the Prime Minister. Is it any wonder that I say that one can never accept anything the Premier says without checking up on it? It may be urged by the honourable gentleman or other members that the two clauses omitted (clauses 2 and 3 in the print we have before us) are not of very great political significance. Clause 2 provides:

This Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

That was omitted in the draft Bill sent to the Prime Minister, and that Bill would have come into effect on the day on which it was assented to. Clause 3 provides:

This Act binds the Crown.

That is a most important provision but, politically, perhaps it does not matter for our purposes. As the Minister of Education was laughing just now, perhaps he will say that these are merely drafting errors—omissions found by the draftsmen that do not really matter. Let us now look at clause 8, which

is in a significantly different form, and I suggest that it does matter, quite apart from the principle of saying that one is enclosing a Bill in the form in which it will be introduced and then not introducing it in that form. That clause provides:

Upon the agreement being amended in the manner provided for in the second schedule to this Act, the Government of the State may do all things necessary, convenient or expedient to carry out and give effect to the agreement as so amended.

Clause 6 of the Bill sent to the Prime Minister is as follows:

Upon the Commonwealth, the State of New South Wales, and the State of Victoria agreeing to amend the agreement in the manner provided for in the second schedule to this Act, the Government of the State may do all things necessary

There is a quite significant difference in drafting between the two clauses. One may laugh this off and say that it does not matter very much but, if the Premier had been open and frank, he would have said in his second reading explanation, "The Bill I now introduce is not quite the same as the Bill I sent to the Prime Minister a week ago." However, the Premier did not say a word and, if I had not checked and compared the Bill that he sent to the Prime Minister with the Bill introduced into this House, it probably would never have been noticed. However, one now sees the explanation for the discomfiture of the Minister of Works when the Premier tabled the Bill which, in fact, is not the proper Bill at all. These are perhaps only details, but they are typical of the whole of the actions of the Premier in this matter. I do not suppose any member who was here in April last year will forget the debates we had on this matter. I remember very well that towards the end of the evening of April 30, just before the vote was taken that toppled the previous Government from office, the then Leader of the Opposition made the following statement:

I can only say to him—
that is, to me—

that upon this important matter—

This is the question of the building of the dam—

that he has adopted more positions than are listed in *The Kama Sutra* and many of them more difficult.

Well, that was quite a good crack at the time and was well reported in the newspaper on the next day. People laughed and I am sure that the then Leader of the Opposition felt very satisfied. However, if that is true of me, it

is also true of the honourable gentleman, and I believe that he knows that from his own experience. What has been the change in attitude of the Party opposite on this matter? When it knew that we were calling Parliament together to try to ratify the agreement that we had made, the Leader of the Opposition was at Peterborough. Our Leader has referred in his speech to part of what the Premier said on that occasion and I will read that part, too, because it comes immediately before the part that I want to quote. The report states:

The Leader of the Opposition said, "We cannot amend the agreement—"

Of course, that is what he is trying to do in this Bill—

"because it is an agreement between the States. What needs to be done is that the agreement should be renegotiated between our State, the other States and the Commonwealth."

David Flatman, who was the interviewer, asked him:

Well, the point still remains in front of the people of South Australia that we want this water as soon as possible—

and we still want it—

but, if the Government is defeated and the Labor Party elected, it is going to be longer before an agreement is reached.

Those words were prophetic, as it has turned out. Mr. Flatman continued:

How will you get around that?

The interview continued:

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

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

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

That is what he said on the day on which it was announced that we would meet Parliament to seek ratification of the Bill. We know why he said that, of course. The Labor Party had realized in the two years or more that we were in office that the only way to get us out was to find an issue on which the Labor Party could join with the then Speaker of the House and thus get a majority, and this was the issue on which the Labor Party could do that. It went ahead to topple us, as a Government, without caring two hoots for the welfare of this State or for the future water supply of this State. It went ahead absolutely cynically to defeat us and to get an election so that that Party could get back into office.

That was the attitude of the Labor Opposition then. The Labor Party may not have

to pay for that. In this world one never knows when justice will catch up with one, but the chances are very high that the Labor Party will pay the price for that bit of political opportunism. The next change we find was made during the debate on the evening of April 30. The Labor Party supported a two-dam policy, which was proposed by Mr. Stott, the then member for Ridley, and it was the vote on that amendment to provide for the simultaneous construction of the two dams that brought us down.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You had better read the report of the debate again. The position was made quite clear at the time, as you well know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It did not matter what it was: they combined with the then Speaker to defeat us on that.

Mr. Hopgood: It was your choice that it was a vital issue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, and I have no regrets about it: it was a vital issue, and everything that is happening now shows that we were right in the stand we took. Anyway, that was the way they all voted on the night that brought us down. Then in the Government's policy speech, which was delivered a week or so later (and it was a deliberately thought-out document containing its considered policy on this matter), we find:

In relation to the Murray River we will renegotiate the agreement concerning the building of the Dartmouth dam to ensure that South Australia's legal rights to the building of the Chowilla dam are not ended. We will demand,—

not ask—

further, that new computer studies are made to ascertain the benefits of operating dams at both Dartmouth and Chowilla.

If we look at the second schedule of the agreement, we find that the Government has included as part of the second schedule substantially the same provisions as we put in clause 2 (b) of the Bill by which we sought to ratify the agreement. It is a far cry from the demand it put in its policy speech. Now we come to the best sentence of the lot—and we have heard nothing about this in this Bill, or indeed since the election:

We will seek to negotiate a commencing date for Chowilla to be inserted in an enforceable agreement.

We hear much about not giving away South Australia's rights to the Chowilla dam. If we do have rights now under the present agreement, why does the Government not go ahead and try to enforce them? Of

course, we have no rights, and the Government knows it. Therefore, it has done nothing to try and enforce them or to seek to negotiate a commencing date for Chowilla; nor has it said anything about that since.

That took us up to the time of the election: the Government would renegotiate the agreement within a few months; it could see no reason why it should be difficult. That was pure cynicism and opportunism because at that time the Premier and his Ministers knew the people with whom they would have to renegotiate the agreement. The Victorian Government was elected on the same day as the Party opposite was elected to govern in this State. Sir Henry Bolte and his Government carried on as it had previously. In any case, the people who had criticized the Chowilla dam more vigorously and strongly than anybody else were the Victorian Opposition, when the Dartmouth agreement was ratified. They said that Tom Playford's scheme was an abortion and we could not make water run uphill. So the present State Government knew with whom it would be negotiating in Victoria or, alternatively, it knew the attitude of its own Party in Victoria. So it cannot say that it did not know it would be so hard to negotiate.

The same is true of the Commonwealth and New South Wales. There were a few months ago just a few flickers of hope that the honourable gentleman brought forth, that there was to be an election in New South Wales in February and it was likely that a Labor Government would result, and that that Government would help us to renegotiate the agreement. That unhappy prophesy did not eventuate, I am glad to say, and the Government in New South Wales is the same today as it was previously.

Honourable members opposite may say that their Party made some gains in New South Wales but, for the purposes of this Bill, those gains matter not one jot or tittle: it is the same Government. Members opposite knew when they came to office in June, 1970, with whom they would have to renegotiate this agreement. The Government has not been able to do it because it was an impossible task, as it knew it was, yet to get into office the Government was prepared to do it. The Leader has dealt at some length with the consequences to this State of delay, and I shall not cover the same ground. I should like to make three points on this matter: the first is that South Australia desperately needs the extra water that the Leader, as Premier, was able to get for this State under the amending agreement.

Twelve months ago I set out the position, I think quite clearly, and as far as I know it is precisely the same today as it was then. Under the present agreement our entitlement to water is 1,254,000 acre feet a year, and that has been our entitlement since 1914. The water is committed now to irrigation and to water for the metropolitan area and the rest of the State through the mains, and we certainly need the extra 250,000 acre feet of water that was negotiated under this agreement. Under the agreement, South Australia would be entitled to 1,500,000 acre feet of water a year, and we need that. We are the ones who will suffer if we do not get it. The figures I shall quote were given to us when in office, and I challenge Government members to deny their accuracy. About 700,000 acre feet a year is needed to flow down the river to the sea to keep the river flowing and sweet. Our irrigation commitments along the river account for another 450,000 acre feet, and perhaps the member for Chaffey may confirm or deny that estimate. For use in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and in other parts of the State we need another 325,000 acre feet coming to us from the Murray River through the mains. These three figures give a total of 1,475,000 acre feet, which is very close to the limit that we would get in entitlement under the amending agreement and substantially in excess of our entitlement under the present agreement. If there is no additional storage built on the Murray River and we do not get that extra water, it has been calculated that within a short time there will be restrictions on our water supply in South Australia during one year in three, and those restrictions will be of such severity as to be intolerable.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is a short time? Would you say four or five years?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the Minister was not in the House when the Leader said that it could be 18 years or 18 months. I challenge the Minister to deny that the position is that unless we get extra storages on the river and, therefore, the use of extra water, there will be restrictions in South Australia of substantial severity in one year in three within a short time, within the measurable future. That is the first point I make. The longer we delay, the greater the risk we take of suffering from a shortage of water. Surely that is a matter of common sense. Although nearly 12 months has passed since that agreement was first written, we are still without the extra entitlement to water. That is the

first and most serious consequence we will suffer.

The second consequence was referred to by the Leader. There is in the agreement (and I notice that, in the second schedule, the Government is presuming to alter this) a provision that there must be a re-estimate of the cost if there is more than a 10 per cent escalation in price. Every day we delay, as with the Chowilla dam so there is a greater chance of an escalation in price and a greater chance that it will escalate up to 10 per cent, when there will be no agreement for Dartmouth. Whether or not that has happened yet I do not know, but it will happen sooner or later; the longer we delay, the greater the chance of its happening if it has not happened already. Thirdly, there is an overall consideration. We have heard many rumblings from Sir Henry Bolte that, as Victoria is no longer interested in the Dartmouth dam, it will spend the money on other things. I am prepared to take those rumblings seriously; I do not believe that, as South Australians, we can afford not to, although the Premier pretends not to. Behind what Sir Henry Bolte has said about Victoria (and that is so vital to us), there is the growing disenchantment with additional water storages not only on the Murray but elsewhere. There are the questions of conservation, upsetting the balance of nature and so on. In South Australia and throughout the world there is much less enthusiasm now for extra water storages than there was a few years ago. If we are not careful, on that ground, too, we shall have missed the boat. Those are the three consequences of delay.

Over all this there is another matter. The Premier has said that this is an attempt to show the other parties to the agreement that we are prepared to go ahead. For the purpose of argument, I accept now that that is what it is. What if this attempt does not succeed? What then is the policy of the Government with regard to water storages for South Australia? If the Government fails to convince the other parties to the agreement to agree to an amendment, as it says the agreement must be amended as set out in the second schedule, where do we go from there? Opposition members say the agreement is a good agreement for South Australia; that it should be ratified; and that it should have been ratified 12 months ago. What will Government members say if they fail in this attempt? Have they any alternative, such as Teal Flat or water from the South-East? Let them tell

the people what they intend to do if this gamble fails as their past gambles have failed. We have not heard one word from them about their plans for the future: I do not believe they have any plans.

When I first looked at the Bill, I thought it was out of order, because it pretends to ratify an agreement set out in the first schedule. Then we have a second schedule that pretends to alter the first schedule. Erskine May, at page 552 of his book under the heading "Bills to Confirm Agreement", states:

When a Bill is introduced to give effect to an agreement or to confirm a scheme and the agreement or scheme is scheduled to the Bill as a completed document—

That is precisely the position here. Erskine May continues:

—amendments cannot be made to the schedule but an amendment to the clauses of the Bill for the purpose of withholding legislative effect from the document contained in the schedule is in order, as are also amendments to those clauses which deal with matters not determined by the document contained in the schedule.

Here we have a Bill which sets out an agreement in the first schedule; then in the second schedule it purports to amend the first schedule. I raise a query as to whether that is in order in the light of Erskine May, but there is nothing in our Standing Orders as far as I know that covers the position. Personally, I do not think it matters much because I do not think that the agreement, whether passed by the Parliament or not, will get anywhere. If one reads the clauses in the Bill that has been introduced in the House, it takes South Australia little further. Clause 6 (1) of the agreement states:

The agreement is, except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, hereby ratified and approved and shall take effect upon the coming into operation of this Act.

If it were not for the exception, that would be a perfectly valid ratification of the whole Bill, but subclause (2) refers to the provision for Chowilla and provides that it shall not be taken out. Clause 8 states:

Upon the agreement being amended in the manner provided for in the Second Schedule to this Act, the Government of the State may do all things necessary, convenient or expedient to carry out and give effect to the agreement as so amended.

What is the effect of that clause? It means nothing at the moment. It only has any meaning at all if the agreement is amended. That means an amendment or an agreement to amend by the two other States and the Commonwealth. It means the drawing up

and the signing by all four parties of a fresh agreement, an agreement to vary the present one, and until that is done and that agreement itself is ratified this Bill means nothing. One cannot have a ratification of a document that does not exist. In effect, what would have to happen is that the Premier, the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria and the Prime Minister would have to sign a fresh agreement to vary this agreement in the terms set out in the second schedule (and now I am making the best possible assumptions) and submit that amending agreement to the four Parliaments. It would have to come back here again. Until that is done, there can be no ratification of the agreement, and this Bill in its very terms cannot come into operation and cannot mean anything.

If one analyses the provisions of the Bill, it means nothing at all. It will not end the matter so far as this Parliament is concerned. It will merely mean that another agreement will have to be introduced and that there will have to be another amending Bill. Even if all I have said up to this point goes past members and they reject it, an examination of that clause in the Bill will confirm what I have said.

That is the sort of Bill we have before us tonight. It is an attempt by the Government to avoid paying the political price for the action it took at the end of April last year to defeat the Liberal Party's getting back into office. It is that, and nothing more. For those reasons, I cannot support the Bill in its present form. However, it could be amended, as the Leader of the Opposition has foreshadowed, so that it would be an outright ratification of the Bill. For South Australia's sake I hope that members opposite will consider allowing that course to be taken, because I remind them that, sweet though it is to be in office and to be sitting to the right of the Speaker, they have a duty to the people of this State and to the future of this State. That duty cannot be discharged unless the agreement that was entered into and signed by Steele Hall when he was Premier is ratified.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I doubt whether in the annals of South Australia there has been a more tragic obstinacy than the refusal of the Government to ratify this agreement. I feel strongly reinforced in that view after listening to the Deputy Leader make a careful analysis of the Bill and the events leading to it. I do not think there is much that he said that can be disputed

by Government members. I hope all Government members who did not hear everything the Deputy Leader said will at least study everything he said when the printed report is available and that they will then make up their minds on what they will do about this Bill.

After negotiations between South Australia and the other parties to the agreement, the other three Parliaments ratified it. That agreement provided for more water than we had ever sought under the earlier Chowilla proposal. After South Australia was offered that, the present Government grasped office, and the cost of grasping office was to put itself in a difficult position with the other parties to the agreement. Although the agreement has been ratified by the other Parliaments, this Government has done virtually nothing about ensuring that South Australia's future water supplies will be adequate. In spite of the rosy forecasts that the agreement would be easy to renegotiate, it has not proved to be easy to renegotiate. We knew that it would not be, and so did everyone else in this State. They knew very well that there would be no chance of getting three Parliaments to amend that agreement once they had ratified it.

After nearly a year of office, the Government has the nerve to offer us a Bill that is called a Bill for an Act to ratify the agreement, and it has the nerve to call it a compromise. What sort of a compromise is this? Who would like the job of going to the other States and saying, "I would like to compromise about the agreement"? The other States would say, "What is the compromise?" We would say, "South Australia will accept the part of the agreement that will enable progress to be made on the Dartmouth reservoir but it will reserve to itself the right to create a dispute about the Chowilla dam in future." Where is the compromise in that? It is the funniest kind of compromise I have ever heard of. As everyone knows, it is not a compromise. It does not even look like one. To call it a compromise is false. The Premier, in explaining the Bill, has recklessly risked the future of South Australia. He said that Sir Henry Bolte was grandstanding. Anyone will agree that grandstanding refers to insincerity and bluffing. Charges of insincerity about Sir Henry Bolte may be all right; doubtless, Sir Henry is capable of answering those charges. After all, he has led his State for many years and has not done a bad job. Charges that Sir

Henry Bolte is bluffing are pure guesswork about a man who has shown that he is peculiarly determined to further his own State, and I consider that the present South Australian Government is being grossly reckless about this State's future. I may have said that they were trusting to instinct about Sir Henry's bluffing, but I doubt whether it is even instinct.

I do not think that the Government believes that it can renegotiate this agreement by going along with what it calls a compromise and getting the other States to accept the parts that South Australia wants, still retaining the right to kick up hell's delight about Chowilla, in addition to getting the benefits that we will get from Dartmouth over and above what South Australia was asking for. In 1967, the present Government moved a motion in this House dealing with the present dam, and the present Premier stated:

The important thing is to assure South Australia that we are going to have the results to us from the River Murray Commission to which we originally got the River Murray Commission to commit itself by the building of the Chowilla dam.

I have not the relevant quotation but I know well, as does the present Government, that at that time the motion was framed so as to ask for any other alternative that at least gave the benefits that the Chowilla dam offered. Now we have better alternatives. Everyone knows, or should know, that as a result of the long and modern research studies, with the use of computers and the much more detailed investigation into salinity, evaporation, and dam construction, the River Murray Commission has agreed that the Dartmouth dam is a better proposal. The House and the people of this State know that South Australia accepted the Dartmouth dam in the agreement signed by Steele Hall, which included an added 1,500,000 acre feet of water as South Australia's entitlement. It lost nothing by comparison with the Chowilla dam and it gained a large amount of extra water. Now we are asking the other States to give us a little more. When I say that, I say it light-heartedly because it means "a lot more". We want them to allow us to go back over the whole position, to allow us to create a dispute over Chowilla. Everybody should know by now that the Chowilla dam, if built after or simultaneously with Dartmouth, will not add a tremendous amount of water to the system. After Dartmouth is built, the Chowilla reservoir, if constructed, will not add more than 250,000 acre feet to the system's yield. I remind

members that the apportionment to South Australia, if any, from this added 250,000 acre feet would be a very much smaller amount, if we were allowed the extra.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you ever read the report on that?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister should keep quiet. I will ask him later to stand up and honestly say what will be the future of Lakes Albert and Alexandrina if the Chowilla dam is built as well as the Dartmouth dam. I am not saying that Chowilla is not a sound project, but we all know very well that Dartmouth is a better one. We do not want Chowilla built straight-away with Dartmouth. We do not want it even if we can afford it. The River Murray Commission should keep Chowilla in reserve as a possible means of augmenting the supply to maintain South Australia's future entitlement.

I remind the Minister for Conservation that the small amount of extra water that Chowilla will add to the yield must be weighed against the side effects that will come from the building of that dam. The Minister of Works recently told me that water in Lakes Alexandrina and Albert evaporates at the rate of about 500,000 acre feet a year. We know that water in the Chowilla dam would evaporate at the rate of over 1,000,000 acre feet a year and that the system could not stand that amount of evaporation without something drying up quickly. The Minister should be clear that, if we have the Chowilla dam, we will certainly sacrifice some of the lakes area.

The Minister for Conservation, who has recently been down there looking at the situation and making a study in relation to conservation, should be prepared to discuss that point, too. I am not saying that we should never have Chowilla, but the people of South Australia should be told the cost of having it in addition to having the Dartmouth reservoir. Assuming that we have Dartmouth first, we should know what will be the effect on South Australia if we have Chowilla in addition.

There are only two arguments that I have ever heard that are clearly in favour of Chowilla in the minds of those people who have argued for it. One is the comparatively small question of where the money will be expended for construction—the \$58,000,000, the \$67,000,000, or whatever will be the expenditure for one or other of those dams. It would be nice to see that money spent in

South Australia: it would be spent close inside the South Australian border and no doubt it would be an attraction for those areas in the Upper Murray to have much of the money, although not all of it, spent in South Australia. However, that is the transitory effect, even though it is a large sum. The other argument is that Dartmouth is six water-weeks away from South Australia. I am paraphrasing the type of statement I have heard used by Government members for wanting the Chowilla dam. The implication left in the mind of a listener is that it will be under our control.

The River Murray Commission has existed for half a century and its members have not let each other down by breaking agreements or treating one State as if its rights are to be overrun. The rights of South Australia through the commission have been safeguarded. We know there is a problem in the river of an increase in impurities of various kinds, and we know that other States have been making some effort, as least as energetically as we have been making and probably more so, to ensure that the quality of water is improved. The Commonwealth Government has spent a large sum on this aspect. Chowilla would be under the control of the River Murray Commission and so would the water, wherever the dam is placed. If it is placed at Dartmouth there is no reason to suppose that South Australia will not get the extra water to which it is entitled under the agreement, if we ratify it.

If the other States had wanted to let us down in this respect and to abrogate the agreement they could have done so in the past: they never have done so, and they will not do so, as we know. The argument that Chowilla will mean that the water is under our control is spurious. Incidentally, the Chowilla dam could be spoilt if other States neglected their responsibilities under the agreement. Let us not have these cheap arguments about the two dams. We should recognize that all current experts favour Dartmouth, and the contracting parties have offered South Australia more water under the agreement. We are only wasting time by arguing about creating disputes and about our rights to Chowilla. Last November, Mr. Whitlam made a peculiar statement in which he set out a proposal to abolish the River Murray Commission and replace it by having some sort of Commonwealth control. On November 3 last year, I asked the Premier the following question:

Will the Premier say whether he supports Mr. Whitlam's proposal, which is, apparently,

to abolish the River Murray Commission and to replace it with some sort of Commonwealth control? If he does not, will he do something about curbing Mr. Whitlam's ideas which would, apparently, take away from South Australia something that we already have?

In reply, the Premier said:

Mr. Whitlam's ideas are entirely in accord with those of the South Australian Government: that all elected bodies in this country have the right to an effective say in matters that affect the people who elect them; that a Commonwealth body for the national conservation of our water resources should be duly representative of State and Commonwealth bodies together; and that, instead of the present situation in which the Commonwealth Government utterly ignores the elected Government of this State and the wishes of its people, there should be a national body conserving water in this country, with priorities being determined on the basis of national and local considerations properly represented.

Obviously the establishment of such a body would mean the subjugation of South Australia's individual rights as expressed in the agreement. I think that matter should be cleared up by the Premier when he replies. Much has been made of our right to create a dispute, yet the Commonwealth Labor Leader talks about a national organization, and that would obviously mean that we would lose those rights. In conclusion, in my humble opinion I can do no better than read the following remarks that I made about 18 months ago:

I have already referred briefly to the slogan I have heard—two dams or nothing. I pose the question: what if it is nothing? There is absolutely no sign that it will be anything other than nothing, and who is responsible? Although I said that 18 months ago, there is still absolutely no sign that it will be anything other than nothing. Although this issue might be attractive to fight over politically, it would be reckless and obstinate for us to refuse to ratify the Dartmouth agreement as presently constituted. This Bill, which is supposed to be a ratification Bill, is nothing but an example of grandstanding to a great degree. All members opposite should study this matter closely, making up their own minds not along Party lines but in the interests of the people of the State. If we do not ratify the agreement now offered to us, we may have nothing in the future. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): In supporting the Bill, I congratulate the Government on the step it has taken in the rather unhappy situation that has been created in respect of South Australia's water supplies. The member for Alexandra referred to Lakes Alexandrina and Albert. He said, in relation to evaporation in

the lakes, that we should keep the Chowilla dam in reserve to preserve South Australia's future water supplies. That is what is intended by the Bill: to retain our right to Chowilla at some future date. I do not think the Opposition would disagree with me on that score. I do not hear any comment from the member for Alexandra, who has opposed the Bill, the whole purpose of which is to ensure this State's future water supply.

The member for Mitcham made a slighting reference to the fact that the Premier had gone to the river people to enlist their support in taking South Australia's case for water improvement to people in other States who live along the Murray River. On December 8, 1970, the Premier addressed a meeting at Renmark, at which 300 people attended. The meeting carried a motion that a committee be formed to take South Australia's case to the people along the river in the other two States. That committee, which is functioning, comprises people from all over the river towns. Four members are from Renmark, two are from Lyrup, two are from Loxton, two are from Barmera and two are from Waikerie. I do not have the faintest idea what the political affiliations of all of them are; however, I know that some are members of the Liberal Party. By contrast, there is the Dartmouth Dam Promotion Committee (as of January 7 its name was unchanged, according to a newspaper report), which comprises Messrs. Basey, T. W. C. Angove, H. J. Howie, S. B. Ogilvy, A. A. Rowe, J. V. Seekamp, F. I. Showell, W. G. Snell and I. S. Tolley. To the best of my knowledge, those men are all members of the Liberal Party and all reside within a short distance of Renmark, if not in Renmark. That gives an indication of how political these men have made this issue, as has the Opposition. One of the provisions of the Bill is to ensure that the Chowilla dam and South Australia's right to it are preserved in the arbitration provision of the present Act. The purpose of the Bill is to retain our moral and our present legal right to the Chowilla dam to be built at some future date. I fully support that worthy object.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Hopeless, nevertheless.

Mr. CURREN: If it is, it has been made hopeless by the negotiations conducted on behalf of South Australia by Premier Hall in 1968, when he went to the Eastern States to sell the Chowilla dam. As I have said before, he went to sell it but he finished up giving it away. By so doing he made the position

difficult for any future Government that did not agree with his ideas. At the election on May 30, 1970, the people of South Australia indicated through their votes what they required in connection with the Chowilla dam. The present Leader of the Opposition made it extremely difficult for us to ensure that we would have adequate water supplies in the long term. He made this matter a political issue all along the line. I wish to quote from an article in the *Murray Pioneer* on February 6, 1968, that dealt with the visit of the present Leader of the Opposition to the River districts. That article is as follows:

In addition a conference was held with the Renmark Irrigation Trust on Wednesday, and Mr. Hall said he assured the trust that his Party would complete the Chowilla dam as soon as possible.

"We believe this is essential because of the need to safeguard the quantity and quality of water in the river," stated Mr. Hall "and we stressed the fact, which is often forgotten, that when the dam is built South Australia's allocation of water in a year of restriction will be increased from $\frac{3}{13}$ ths to $\frac{1}{3}$ rd—a factor which was negotiated by Sir Thomas Playford with the other States when the Chowilla project was first set up."

The statement of the Leader reported in that article was made during the 1968 election campaign, and it was as a result of statements such as that that the Hall Government was elected to office for an excessive period of two years.

Mr. Simmons: It could have been worse; it could have been three years.

Mr. CURREN: Yes. With supreme confidence the Hall Government thought it could hoodwink the people still further. The then Premier laid his Government on the line on this issue, and the people expressed their opinions by way of their votes. As a result, the Liberal Party is now in its rightful place—on the Opposition benches.

Mr. Mathwin: You hoodwinked the people.

Mr. CURREN: I did not. I have no doubt that at the next election I will retain the people's confidence. I leave it to the honourable member to do any hoodwinking. Because I know that the Premier wishes that this Bill be passed at an early date I shall conclude by saying that I fully support the Bill and I hope that all members will support it.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Having carefully read the Premier's second reading explanation together with the excerpt from *Hansard* of February 24, when the Premier read a letter that he had sent to the Prime

Minister on this matter, I consider this Bill to be the biggest bluff and hoax that I have ever seen in the 15 years in which I have been a member of Parliament. This is a smokescreen of the highest order. I am not usually given to using elaborate hyperbole, but this evening the Premier, in promoting this Bill, is giving the public of South Australia the impression that he is carrying out his undertakings, given during the election campaign last year, that he now agrees with Dartmouth but wants provision for Chowilla included. How virtuous is the Premier and how virtuous does he sound? I see that he is acknowledging his virtue by silent amusement. How virtuous he sounds in his second reading explanation! He has twisted the whole argument around: he is right and everyone else is wrong. The Premier is a hero and everyone else is a villain.

In 1967 the present Premier gave Chowilla away in the first place. Now he wants it back! He was willing to give Chowilla away and accept any alternative, provided it gave the same amount of water, which was 1,250,000 acre feet, not the 1,500,000 acre feet that we will get from Dartmouth. That is recorded in *Hansard*. The L.C.L. Hall Government was the first Government since 1914-1915 to get an increased allocation for South Australia. When the Hon. D. A. Dunstan was Premier in 1967 and gave Chowilla away, he did not ask for more water. He wanted only what he was entitled to under the old agreement. Furthermore, to show the hypocrisy of the second reading explanation in which the Premier says that he is right and that everyone is wrong, I remind the House and those members who were here on April 30 last that it was the Hon. D. A. Dunstan who, as Leader of the Opposition, killed the ratification of Dartmouth.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us who killed Chowilla.

Mr. COUMBE: Don Dunstan did. He gave it away in 1967, as I have said. That is recorded in *Hansard* for our new Minister to read, if he can read it. The Premier said that he would give Chowilla away and accept any alternative. I tell the Minister to put on his glasses and read it. The Premier has got himself into a hole and is trying to find a way out or trying to cover up. He did not get much support from his side, except from the poor old member for Chaffey, and what a wonderful effort that was!

Of course, the member for Chaffey represents a district that is greatly affected by water

problems along the river and, when I heard that he was about to speak, I waited expectantly to hear a great exhortation, a great oration on what should be done. All we heard was a peroration that was very real.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us about the 14-point plan to build Chowilla.

Mr. COUMBE: I could tell the Minister about that. The honourable member has got himself into a hole.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The honourable member is talking nonsense.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. They are out of order. The member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Chaffey, too, got himself into a hole and he tried to find a way out. Last year, when speaking on this very subject, I quoted chapter and verse on the negotiations that led up to the ratification coming into this House. I do not propose to go through all that again. I dealt at some length with the detailed negotiations that took place, resulting in that agreement being presented to this House for ratification, at which time it needed only this Parliament to agree to the ratification for Dartmouth to be a going concern. Planning for Dartmouth could have commenced immediately the agreement had been ratified. It was assumed at that time (April, 1970) that within about 18 months tenders could have been available and we would have had beautiful water from Dartmouth in, say, 1974-75. It certainly would not have been full; that is true.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are talking rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. COUMBE: I can quote accurate figures given to me by the Engineer-in-Chief when I was Minister of Works. These figures are factual. Members of this House realize that it is not necessary to have a dam or reservoir completely full to be able to use it. There would have been water in the reservoir at that time sufficient for use to be made of it for flushing the river or for the provision of the extra quota of water that South Australia required.

Turning back to what I was saying just now about the Premier's second reading explanation, I remember last year during the election campaign the Premier saying he could renegotiate this agreement within a few months.

He said it deliberately. I saw him on a television interview, an interview that was mentioned tonight by my Leader. Nearly 11 months have elapsed and that agreement has not been renegotiated "within a few months". Now, 11 months later, we have a Bill that means absolutely nothing at all legally, as has been demonstrated by my colleague the member for Mitcham. Furthermore, it has no chance of being accepted by the other three parties to the agreement.

What the Premier has said, in effect, in his second reading explanation is that there is a legal way of getting around this agreement. This is completely false. I remember the legal advice given to us when we were in Government (and they are the same officers available to the present Government), that the agreement had to be ratified *in toto* or not at all. I made this clear when I spoke in the debate last year and said:

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.

I remember saying that if the then Leader of the Opposition became Premier it would not be long before he would stand on the Government side and introduce a Bill to ratify the agreement, similar to one that we had introduced in April, 1970. That is what we have seen now.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You were a member of the Playford Government. What do you think about the money it spent on Chowilla? Did you agree with that at the time?

Mr. COUMBE: I remember the Labor Party supporting it at that time.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That is correct, and we still support Chowilla.

Mr. COUMBE: One of the troubles of the present Government is that it does not move with the times.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I agree with Sir Thomas Playford, but you have no respect for his opinion.

Mr. COUNBE: One of the tragedies of this world is that there are too many people like the Minister of Labour and Industry who will not progress and will not alter their views as circumstances change.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You did because your Liberal colleagues in other States stood over you.

Mr. COUNBE: When I attended the conference at which I represented this State in February, 1969, we argued all day and were able to obtain extra entitlement that the other States were not willing to give us before the conference, and for the first time we obtained extra water. The Minister of Works, like his predecessors, is bedevilled by the question of water licences and the over-commitment on the river at present.

Mr. Nankivell: It is 100,000 acre feet.

Mr. COUNBE: With Chowilla we would be entitled to 1,250,000 acre feet but with Dartmouth we are entitled to 1,500,000 acre feet, an increase of 20 per cent. The diversion water allocated under Chowilla would be 690,000 acre feet and, under Dartmouth, 936,000 acre feet, about 35 per cent more. The member for Mallee referred to a figure of 100,000 acre feet as being the present over-commitment, and that is the figure I have. After allowing for that over-commitment, the extra water available would be about 150,000 acre feet. This water would be available not only to dilute the stream and keep it pure but also to provide for the divertees whose livelihood depends on pumping water from the river. At present, the licences issued account for more acre feet of water than would be available from the river in a dry year. At present, in a dry year we would need to have severe restrictions. The Minister of Works cannot issue any further licences; nor could I when I was Minister. I pay a tribute to the Hon. Cyril Hutchens for clamping down on the issuing of licences when he was Minister. It is to his credit that he did so, as I believe too many were issued by his Leader in 1965 and early 1966.

Much has been said about evaporation. The Bill provides for the construction of the most enormous evaporation basin in Australia: Chowilla would be the most costly and unrealistic evaporation basin possible. The evaporation from Dartmouth is estimated to be about 15,000 acre feet a year, whereas for

Chowilla the estimate is 1,050,000 acre feet a year. What is the sense of constructing something that would simply collect water and provide a quantity of salt? We could not even sell the salt. Moreover, there are grave doubts about the effectiveness of the methods designed to get rid of some of the salt from the bottom of Chowilla through the pumps to the surrounding districts, whereby it would soon percolate back again. In addition, the person receiving the water would be sitting on a huge salt pan. In the preamble to the Bill presented by the Hall Government, provision was made that a further study should be carried out.

It was provided that the Governments of the three States agreed 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 should be situated to meet the needs of persons using the waters of the river. We made that provision in the 1970 Bill. Of course, what matters is the generous financial arrangement at that time to build Dartmouth, with four partners each to contribute one-quarter, but the Commonwealth Government went further and said, "We will also help the States out with their quarter share. We will give them one-half of their quarter on loan, and there will be a moratorium for 10 years." This was a most generous offer. What I am beginning to wonder now is that because of the escalation of costs and the delay that has occurred I am frightened (and this is not only my view; it has been expressed to me by a number of prominent engineers and by a number of people interested in agricultural pursuits) that if the delay persists, there will be no dam at all: neither Chowilla nor Dartmouth, and that is the tragedy.

That is the possibility we must face, because the Bill before us will not provide for the building of any dam. What would provide for it, however, would be an amendment to the Bill to remove the second schedule and some of its preamble, thus allowing it to be passed in its original form as presented last year. What is happening is that we have a Bill which is really a smoke screen. It says, in effect, to the public who read the press in a cursory manner, "Here at last, Don and his kingdom" (I think that was the phrase used) "is going to get the work done." Nothing is further from the truth. This is a complete smoke screen, because it will not be accepted by the other parties and it is not viable in law.

Mr. Mathwin: The Premier knows that, too.

Mr. COUMBE: I am sure he does. The Premier is trying very hard to get out of the hole into which he got himself. The member for Chaffey is in a like position. In the last election, and since then, he has been going along the river urging people to keep agitating for Chowilla. I suggest to the member for Chaffey and to the Government that they would be doing South Australia a better service if they allowed the Dartmouth dam to go ahead, because there are provisions whereby Chowilla will be investigated. The Minister of Works went to a conference I think last year and, apparently, he was unsuccessful in getting the other parties to the agreement to fall in with South Australia's point of view. I know his officers and the Ministers concerned, because as a former Minister of Works I had the job of negotiating with them, the only difference being that it is now Mr. Swartz instead of Mr. Fairbairn. South Australia is in dire need of water; there is no question about that.

We must have Dartmouth. The Premier himself says that he now agrees that we must have Dartmouth, and he will put the money on the Estimates. I remember vividly that last April he put his Party before his State to get an election. I remember sitting in the centre of the Government benches when the Premier accepted an amendment by the Hon. T. C. Stott, the then Speaker. He grabbed the chance that was given to him—any excuse for an election—and put his Party before his State. The people of South Australia would have thought more highly of the then Leader of the Opposition if he had forgotten Party politics and thought of South Australia. The Bill that was defeated at that time would have given South Australia an assured water supply for years to come and a greater amount of water than we had ever had before. It would have greatly benefited people with properties near the river and people in the metropolitan area as well. However, the then Opposition defeated that Bill and brought about an election.

Because the Bill now before the House is obviously disguised to get around the difficulty in which the Premier now finds himself, I am naturally suspicious. The Bill has some clauses dealing with the Chowilla dam and it has a second schedule that asks the commission to consider where the next storage will be. That schedule means that the Chowilla dam will be considered as possibly the next storage.

No-one can guarantee that it will be the next storage, but I hope it will be. I have carefully studied the reports of the River Murray Commission, including the last one on salinity. The salinity question is really alarming, but what we have heard from the Government tonight will not help to overcome the difficulty. The way to overcome it is to accept the amendments to be moved in Committee that will allow the original form of ratification to go forward. In other words, the Bill as it stands is unacceptable. It is a smoke screen, a complete hoax, and it is completely wrong for the Government to bring it before the House.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): This Bill has been dealt with very well by previous speakers on this side, but Government members have not advanced any arguments. Even the Premier did not advance much of an argument about his failure to approve the agreement that the other parties had approved. If that agreement had been ratified, progress on the dam would have been much more rapid. It will take five years to build. Possibly extra planning will be necessary because of the delays caused by the present Government. The Government has said that we will not get water out of the dam for 10 years, but that is a deliberate lie, because, if the Dartmouth dam had been completed last June, the agreement would have come into being in April this year. I am sure of that, because it would be an earth-fill dam and I understand that water can be placed in those dams before construction is completed.

Nevertheless, without that, figures that the Minister of Works gave me today show that by April 30 this year there will be enough water in the Hume dam, Lake Victoria and Dartmouth to have Dartmouth operating by April and, in those circumstances, we would get our additional quota immediately. Records for the last 10 years show how long it would take for the Dartmouth agreement to become effective. On April 30, 1961, there was 1,300,000 acre feet in the existing storages and in that year the total discharge from the Mitta Mitta River was 865,000 acre feet. That would have added up to enough water to have Dartmouth operating.

Even in the driest years in the 10-year period we would have got water from Dartmouth within a year or two. If Chowilla alone was built, we would not have got an increased quota in any period. We cannot understand why the Premier would tell the people in the Murray River districts that we would not get water from the Dartmouth storage for 10 years. This is a deliberate misrepresentation that the

Labor Party used at the last election. It is a pity the Government did not bring election advertisements under the Unfair Advertising Bill! An advertisement in support of the new member for Playford stated:

Vote for McRae. Chowilla is on our doorstep.

I hope it is not; if it was, we would not be able to do much with it. However, New South Wales and Victoria have allowed water to be placed on a large tract in those States. The honourable member goes on to speak of our legal right, and he is a lawyer. Any legal right we had to Chowilla was lost when the Dunstan Government did not take the matter to arbitration, as perhaps there was then an issue on which we could take it to arbitration. Instead, that Government said that it would let further investigations be carried out. When the experts showed that Chowilla was not of much advantage, we had already lost any legal right that we had. I understand that the Crown Solicitor at that time said that it would not be wise to go to arbitration, because we would not have much chance of winning. If we could not win then, we would not have any hope of winning now. To say that we have some legal right to Chowilla is once again misleading the public. At that stage the present Premier said he was against Dartmouth, but I suppose he will vote in favour of this Bill. He said that Dartmouth was hundreds of miles away. It is not. There is water in Lake Victoria and, as the monthly quota is let out from that lake, water could be let out of Dartmouth and be already on the way down to replenish the storage, so we would always have water on our doorstep. The Premier says that it will take 10 years at least for Dartmouth to be effective. He still goes on misleading the people of this State with statements like that. The statistics are in *Hansard*, and have been there for a long time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much water would have to be in Dartmouth before we would get any benefit?

Mr. McANANEY: The Bill was before this House. Surely it is not too much to expect that he should read the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I have read it and there is no statement in that agreement about when Dartmouth will be effective.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: If we suffered a dry period, as we have in the past (although they do not occur very often), the River Murray Commission would have the power to use that water to make up our existing quota. If we

struck a dry year, we could have some water in Dartmouth. There was an escape clause in that Bill that that water could be used to augment our existing small quota. However, I still maintain that the agreement states that, before it becomes effective, 2,000,000 acre feet must be in the system on April 30.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much water does that mean in Dartmouth?

Mr. McANANEY: I always answer any interjections—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. McANANEY:—that are effective. It is obvious that we must get on with Dartmouth as soon as possible, if it is still possible. Conditions have changed considerably from the time when the other States were willing to put up money to provide additional storages. They had land that was used for producing fruit for canneries and for raising fat lambs. It was possible then for those areas to be economic, but many experts have shown that the use of water for irrigation has not been economic for those purposes. Now that the floor has dropped out of the market for those things, Victoria will not put up money to get more water to produce more of them. I understand, for instance, that the Shepparton cannery went broke recently. Rather than increasing production of those things for which they thought they would need water, they are now realizing it is completely uneconomic to produce them by irrigation.

Sir Henry Bolte has said over the years that he will not let Murray water be used for Melbourne but that it can be used by primary producers. However, he has learnt, as we have, that we cannot stick to something that has since been proved not so valuable as it was thought to be. Even in 1967, the irrigation settlements in Victoria and New South Wales had to reduce their consumption by 30 per cent, but we did not have to reduce our consumption. That water was needed for them to be able to go on with their irrigation. If prices had not dropped, they would still have been keen to go on with it, but conditions have changed entirely. After the 1967 drought, when lawns died in Melbourne, the Victorian Government came under considerable pressure to obtain more water for Melbourne. This could have been provided by a dam on the Ovens River a tributary of the Murray, over which Victoria has complete control. This would be

the intelligent thing for the Victorian Government to do and I believe it will do this if we do not proceed with the Dartmouth dam. As one who has lived on the Murray River for 35 years and can understand the situation, I know there are only a few years in which additional water is needed, and in these years water must be stored in a reservoir from which it does not evaporate, so that it is there when needed. Some people claim that Chowilla would satisfy this condition.

At present the Darling River has been practically taken out of the system, although under the agreement the Menindee Lakes are brought under some limited control. Thomas Stott voted the previous L.C.L. Government out and possibly lost us Dartmouth. At one public meeting that I attended he said that the mighty Darling waters were now flowing to waste at Goolwa. For the four dry years from 1965 to 1968 we received 181,000 acre feet, 46,000 acre feet, 270,000 acre feet, and 118,000 acre feet respectively. Some of this water had to be let out under the original Chowilla agreement, otherwise we would not have received any. I believe that any water from the Darling River should not be taken into account for any sort of reserve for these dry years.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much water is in the Menindee Lakes at present?

Mr. McANANEY: It is overflowing, and I understand that there has been 390,000 acre feet to the end of February. Millions of acre feet could come out the Darling River this year. We would get 1,250,000 acre feet plus 1,000,000 acre feet for evaporation out of a dam at Chowilla, but it would not last long and would not carry us over the periodical dry years. These conditions would also apply to any other tributary. Every tributary of the Murray River will eventually have a dam constructed on it by the State which controls that water. We will get water in the wet years, but no State can afford to construct dams that will conserve every drop of water in the wet years. Dams can be constructed on rivers that have an economical value in the dry or average years. We are receiving less water from the Murrumbidgee River because of the Blowering dam, the Ovens River will be closed, and the Goulburn River has a large dam on it, so that we get little water out of that river in a dry year. The water negotiated in the Dartmouth agreement is water above Albury, and that is where water must be stored for use in occasional dry years. This season water has gone to waste;

since August or September of last year, the gates have been open and water has flowed away.

Reference has been made to Lakes Alexandrina and Albert, which will be a complete write-off in a short time if the Chowilla dam is constructed. In wet years, Lake Alexandrina is flushed out, as is Lake Albert, although the flushing out is not nearly as efficient as it used to be. Since there has been fresh water in the lakes, many weeds have grown. When the winds blow, where the weeds grow the water, including salt water, is not stirred up; only the water in the middle of the lake is stirred. If the Chowilla dam is built, 1,000,000 acre feet of water will be lost in evaporation.

Only a small proportion of the water in the Menindee lakes is used, the rest being lost in evaporation. Because of loss of flow, Lakes Alexandrina and Albert may go out of existence in any case, but Chowilla will hasten this process because it will eliminate the periodical flush-outs. With Dartmouth, we will get an extra 250,000 acre feet. Chowilla will provide water at a capital cost of \$1 for every 1,000 gallons of storage. We must convince the Victorians that they will receive a return for the cost involved, and it is the same cost whether the water is used in cities or whether it is used in other areas.

A condition of the agreement for the Dartmouth dam is that the Commonwealth will pay a certain sum of money. If nothing is done and the cost of the dam increases, the Commonwealth may not meet a greatly increased sum. The Chowilla dam agreement originally became null and void to all intents and purposes because the original estimate of \$28,000,000 for its construction went up to \$60,000,000. Of course, no-one can be made to honour such an agreement. I have asked the Premier several questions about the costs involved but have not got a satisfactory reply. He has claimed that South Australia has made a large contribution towards the Snowy Mountains scheme and that therefore we should receive some benefit from it. I do not believe this is so. Ben Chifley claimed that he would pay for the Snowy Mountains scheme out of credit and, largely, that has happened. One can examine the amount of credit used by the Commonwealth Government year by year. About two or three years ago, the sum used was \$500,000,000. In view of the present inflationary trend, little credit is being used. Over a period, far more national credit has been used by the Commonwealth Government in other ways than has been

spent on the Snowy Mountains scheme, which is largely self-supporting, in that no account is taken of the cost of extra irrigation water that comes from the scheme. The two States that use the electricity generated by the Snowy Mountains Authority share the total cost of it according to the amount they use. I think Canberra, too, uses some.

There has been no cost to the South Australian taxpayer as a result of the Snowy Mountains scheme. Even if some Loan money was spent on this scheme, that money is being repaid progressively, and interest is paid on it. If Loan money has been used, it is counterbalanced by the fact that South Australia gets about 13 per cent of Loan money, whereas it has only about 9 per cent of the country's population. There is no thought that South Australia has contributed in any way to the Snowy Mountains scheme. I think the Under Treasurer supported the Premier on this matter. I should be glad if the Premier could show that my calculations were wrong. We are faced with deciding whether we go on with the Dartmouth dam as quickly as possible. It is there for the asking, but even if we pass the Bill tonight, without any tags, we do not know for sure that the Victorian Government will come to the party.

Mr. Jennings: Why say it is there for the asking then?

Mr. McANANEY: I said, "We do not know for sure," but I imagine that we have a reasonable expectation that, if the Bill is passed tonight, the Dartmouth project will be on the way. However, if these tags are put on the Bill, it must go to the Parliaments of the other two States and it will not be dealt with for another three or four months. As time passes costs will increase and there will be a more valid reason for a State to pull out if we have not ratified the agreement. It is too big a gamble to take. About 18 months ago I thought that the Chowilla dam was something we must have, but further study has shown that this is not necessarily so. Another dam must be planned as soon as Dartmouth gets going. However, I do not think it should be in the lower regions of the Murray River, because very few dams have been built in the lower stretches of any river in the world, and it is difficult to construct a dam in this area.

This Bill will delay building of the dam. There has been an assurance from the other States that they will agree to investigations into another dam. The River Murray Com-

mission's report, describing the Ministerial agreement, states that all parties accept the responsibility for their share of the cost of any future work that may be constructed by the commission. I do not think there will ever be an agreement on Chowilla. If the experts agree on Chowilla, I am prepared to swallow my words. If something better turns up, one should accept it. No-one has ever claimed that the Chowilla dam would give us more than 1,250,000 acre feet of water. The Dartmouth dam will be more beneficial to us than the Chowilla dam. I have read the salinity report; I suppose most members are not able to follow the reasoning in it. In 1967 when we had the driest year on record and the flow in the river practically stopped, how saline was the water that came into South Australia? For a short period its salinity was just over 200 parts per million; that means that the water was very fresh.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was over 300 parts per million.

Mr. McANANEY: I will accept even that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: For a couple of months it was over 600 parts per million at Waikerie.

Mr. McANANEY: I accept that; I was going to say that the water became more and more saline farther down the river. The salinity was nearly 800 parts per million at Murray Bridge and Jervois. We ourselves must take the blame for the salinity of the river; the salt enters the water in our own part of the river. There will be more chance of the water being fit for use if there is a greater flow of water coming from the Dartmouth dam. There would then be a greater flush in the river. It was claimed that after the previous Government was defeated in the election the present Leader of the Opposition went to the other States to see that the other parties to the agreement opposed the Chowilla dam. An article in a newspaper published in another State says that the Chowilla issue has been dead for 18 months or more.

It came out in the reports that the Chowilla dam would not benefit South Australia greatly and it would never be valuable to Victoria or New South Wales. I will be the first to swallow my words if the next report says the opposite. Another dam must be planned as soon as we get the Dartmouth dam under way. Unless the four parties reach an agreement there is nothing much that can be done about it. The Premier would not go to arbitration. If he had, I suppose the other States would have used as evidence that a year earlier he had said

that, if he got 1,250,000 acre feet somewhere else, he would not worry about Chowilla. In the debate here, the Labor Party would not accept our amendment. Finally, I think it was the junior Minister, the present Minister for Conservation, who moved a watered-down amendment after the dinner adjournment and then the Government allowed us to put some stiffening into the original motion.

To sum up, Chowilla is a dead duck and we should get on with Dartmouth. Even with that, I understand that we must convince New South Wales and Victoria that Dartmouth is of value to those States. If we put a tag on, we will lessen our chances of getting the dam. Let us build Dartmouth and think of South Australia, rather than the pride of a few people.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I am surprised that Government members regard this as a such an unimportant issue that only two Government members have spoken in the debate. I wonder whether they are aware, as are many other people, that the history of this subject has been one of unfortunate mistake, with a small ray of hope interposed, and then another major mistake that the present Government is trying to perpetrate in this Bill. It would not hurt the Minister of Works to remain in the Chamber and listen.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I've heard it all a dozen times.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister would hear a slightly different history now, from someone who has not participated in earlier debates on the matter. We had a concept of a dam that would benefit South Australia and would provide employment within the State. At its conception it was thought that it would be a totally South Australian project, not involved with the River Murray Commission. Every step taken indicated a fresh problem and at every move costs escalated beyond the original idea of a reasonable cost.

The annual report of the South Australian Mines Department for 1966 referred to a problem associated with the type of stone available, the only stone that could be used having to be brought from a place far distant, thus increasing the cost. The 1967 report stated that stone was probably not the answer and that it was necessary to consider a different method of protecting the wall. Once we go through all these reports, we see from the statements of the River Murray Commission that the problems associated with the building of the Chowilla dam become progressively greater, and not only that: they become more

expensive. Even doubts arise as to the practicability of a number of the methods of construction under consideration.

The reports indicate photographically that testing was done to check the effectiveness of the spillway. Brief mention is made of the fact that it was determined that waves up to 6ft. high might be expected to develop on the surface and, therefore, it was necessary to give protection of at least 10ft. to the rim of the project so that those 6ft. waves would not cause damage or any major erosion problem. It is indicated that to overcome this difficulty bituminous concrete was to be used. I quote now from a survey of June 17, 1967, when the matter was reviewed in the *Sunday Mail* by William Reschke:

Probably 1,000,000 tons of rock have been saved because of a modified design. Bituminous concrete will shield the dam even against big waves which engineers estimate will rise to 10ft.

In point of fact, the detail that is available indicates that the figure was 6ft. and they were making provision for up to 10ft., just in case. Nowhere is it reported in any of the available reports that a properly constructed model had been erected to test the feasibility or the possibility of waves greater than 6ft. or 10ft., and their effect over a continuing period of time on this bituminous concrete.

People with knowledge of this type of construction overseas and elsewhere were retained to consider the various aspects of contracting and subcontracting at the time when tenders were called. They believed that many of the specifications, or claims or indications made in the specifications, were not practical, and they indicated the method that they believed should be used to complete the construction; but in some instances they could not agree that the basis upon which those specifications had been drawn up was appropriate for proper construction.

In fact, one hydrogeologist, an acknowledged expert in Australia on ground waters, did indicate that the pumps to be installed for the purpose of taking the saline water from underneath the base of the dam could not be constructed by the method outlined in the specifications because that called for the placement of a drill or a borehole at least 75ft. deep—75ft. under 6ft. of concrete within a period of less than 12 hours, because the total period available to them for construction and testing was to be 24 hours and the tests required were to be conducted over a period of 12 hours: in other words,

12 hours of testing and a total time available of 24 hours, less than 12 hours being available for the construction of that bore.

I believe that, after the original concept, which was a good one, it was natural that further investigations should be made to determine the feasibility and practicability of the scheme, and it is not unusual, once a considerable sum has been spent on a feasibility study, to think that the answer is just around the corner, so that more money is spent, and so on.

Details available to us related to salinity, to computer studies of flows over a given period, and the availability of water. We have seen recently the problems that can occur when computers do not function correctly because the information they have been given is incorrect. Are we sure that all the information obtained from computer studies is correct? In 1967 the present Premier stopped action on the construction of the dam, and this was a courageous action, as was the action taken by my Leader in 1968 when he called a stop to further consideration of Chowilla as the next site and was prepared, on the weight of evidence available and with the knowledge that no total appreciation of the final undertaking was available, to deal with the other States and to consider all South Australia's needs.

It is important to realize that those responsible for tendering in 1967 never signed a contract. I believe that had they signed such a contract it would have given them ample opportunity to include a rise-and-fall clause relating to costs of unknown factors. Mr. Reschke highlighted the fact that there was to have been a hugh 2ft. thick cut-off curtain of bitumen extending 95ft. beneath the dam. This would reduce what engineers called percolation, but they still expected that between 30,000,000gall. and 50,000,000gall. of water a day would seep from under the dam when it was full. Is this correct and for how long would it continue?

This Bill is another major mistake. The Premier is asking us to accept the situation into which this State and the other parties to the agreement have got themselves because for too long the various States and the Commonwealth have failed to research projects totally before involving themselves in considerable expense. In the case of the Murrumbidgee irrigation area in New South Wales, subsequent investigation has shown that, in aquifers under the area, there is more water than is

immediately available from the Murrumbidgee River, and this water is available over a much greater area than the present Murrumbidgee irrigation area. Also, this water would be available at a fraction of the cost of the Murrumbidgee irrigation scheme, which includes channels and pumps and the other equipment necessary for a major scheme. In this case, what appeared to be the best course was taken before total research had been carried out. In considering what dam should be constructed after Dartmouth, we must allow for total research of the resources available. I cannot support this Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): At this late hour I do not intend to keep honourable members longer than necessary. This measure is vital to South Australia. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

In summary, it proposes the ratification and approval, but on this occasion with a vital reservation, of an agreement entered into by the then Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales and the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth. Honourable members will recall that that agreement was the subject of a detailed explanation and not inconsiderable debate at that time.

The Premier put that in a nice way. There was considerable debate, and the ramifications for South Australia were considerable. Since that debate, we have seen a change of Government and an enlarged Parliament with new members such as the member for Peake, who must face the consequences of decisions he makes in regard to Bills such as this. He must decide whether the State will become a dust bowl.

Mr. Simmons: Oh!

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. RODDA: Government members have expressions of surprise on their faces. They must bear the consequences of their actions on this matter. The Premier is looking a little pained on his \$8,000 seat, but this issue is vital to the State. This House is being asked to ratify the agreement, but if the Bill is passed in its present form it will not be acceptable to the other signatories to the agreement. The member for Peake must take a share of the responsibility, for there being no additional water. The Government came to office on a vital issue, and the Premier has all the responsibilities for the future of South Australia. However, posterity will record whether he has made the right decisions. He cannot shelve his responsibility: the decision is his, as he must realize.

The former Premier, of whose Party I am privileged to be a member, and a former Minister of Works (Mr. Coumbe) obtained an extra 37½ per cent water for the State as a result of hard negotiations in April, 1969. The present Premier has told the people that the Government will renegotiate the agreement. As the Minister of Works is honest and sincere, he would have done his best in his negotiations, but he was unsuccessful. I had the privilege of being in the United Kingdom during an election campaign, and I heard someone say that the greatest drawback in politics was that all too often we sent people on missions that could not succeed: they gave of their best to get something that could not be accomplished. The Premier knows as well as I do that he has no real chance of renegotiating the agreement. From what we have seen of the negotiations conducted so far, it seems that the Dartmouth dam is as far off as an indefinite Christmas.

Mr. Payne: Is it important to Victoria?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, because water is important to Victoria, too, but that State has the resources to get water. If we run into a period like that which was experienced in the early 1940's, it will be the Labor Party that will have to take the blame for this situation. Members on this side, who accepted the expert technological advice offered to this State, cannot be blamed. This Bill does nothing to ensure that South Australia will have the water supplies that it has a right to expect. The future of South Australia will be affected very much by its prospects of having an assured water supply. Industries will not be established here if they cannot be provided with adequate water supplies.

The present Government is holding office after an election that was conducted under new electoral boundaries, and the Government will stand or fall on the decision it makes. Under the new electoral set-up, both Parties will have to give of their best. So, if the Premier pursues a plan that he knows he cannot implement, he may well be in trouble. My Leader accepted the expert advice that was offered, but the old arguments are now being brought up. The economy is bound up hand in glove with this issue. I have reservations about this type of legislation and I hope for the State's sake that the Premier sees the real need of the people for generations to come and that he will favourably consider our amendments in the Committee stage.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I shall be mercifully brief. Various members opposite have said

on occasions that I see Socialist plots in almost every piece of the present Government's legislation. I do not regard this Bill as being any form of Socialist plot, but I say that its introduction in this form adds considerably to the Government's credibility gap. To the average man in the street, water is becoming more and more important. We have heard an excellent speech by the Leader, the Deputy Leader has dealt with the legal aspects of the old agreement, and other colleagues have spoken of salinity, evaporation, and all the other technical details which, frankly, most of us (and I include myself with the man in the street here) do not understand fully.

I think the average person was pleased at the Premier's announcement that a Bill regarding Dartmouth would be introduced and considered that, perhaps, the Premier and his Government had finally seen reason and recognized the importance of water to South Australia and its future, and had decided to get on and ratify the agreement. However, this is not a Bill to ratify: it is a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement for the further variation of the agreement. What sort of double talk is that? The credibility gap is widening all the time. No-one would think any less of the Premier and his Government if they ratified the present agreement. In fact, I think the Government would derive much credit from doing this.

Water is a vital prerequisite to life. Life cannot exist without water, and that is why there is no life on the moon. Water is vital for the viability of any country: certainly, it is vital for the future of South Australia. It is vital for the support of the expected population of the world in the next 15 years, 20 years or 30 years. Various agricultural experts have proved that sufficient food can be provided for the projected population of the world if we have enough water. Water is the key to the future of South Australia and of Australia as a whole.

I remind honourable members that it is said that the Sahara desert once was a fertile plain and supported civilizations. This could happen to South Australia in the future. We cannot stop to bargain. Let us be frank and admit that Adelaide's water is not the best. Visitors from other States and overseas shudder at our water and the water supply at my house has been smelling strongly of sulphurated hydrogen recently. However, it is water, and we need more of it. We are rapidly running out of time. The average man in the street wants to know that, whenever he

turns on the tap, water will flow out for his use. He depends on experts to get water from the tap. It has not mattered to him in the past particularly how it is done and what feats of engineering have gone into this. He takes it for granted that, when he turns the tap on, there is water. That could break down. In fact, as the Leader has already pointed out, it may already be too late. Dartmouth may not go ahead even if we ratify the agreement now.

Just as the man in the street depends on experts and engineers to bring water to him, so he depends on his representatives to negotiate for him his fair share of water. It is time we stopped playing with words and indulging in double talk. We need water; we have to get it. On a basis of sound business negotiation, we have three other parties to this agreement who have ratified it, but we, the people in the State that stands to benefit most from this whole agreement, are the ones who are holding back.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think we will drown?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think we will drown; the State may die of thirst. The man in the street wants this Parliament to get on and ratify this agreement as it stands and as it was negotiated, so that we may at least have some future to look forward to.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): What I should like to say in this debate will be brief. So far as I am concerned, what is wanted is water, and soon. It has already been said by a past Minister and confirmed by the present Minister in correspondence to me that we are embarrassed in this State because we are over-committed to the extent of 100,000 acre feet of water so far as our present water entitlements are concerned. We know that at the present juncture it is not only agricultural and pastoral industries that are in difficulties; the horticultural industry is also in some difficulty. I am aware of the position because of the number of applications I have received from small growers along the river whose blocks are no longer viable.

They require more water to enable them to stay in their occupation, but they have no prospect of getting more until more water is available to South Australia; and we can get this only, as we know, as a consequence of an agreement involving the building of a dam at Dartmouth, because this is part of the contractual agreement. If that dam is built at Dartmouth, South Australia will get an extra 250,000 acre feet of water: in other

words, 150,000 acre feet of water in excess of our present allocation, which not only guarantees the present licensees their future but makes the position better for those people who need more water if they are to stay profitably in their business.

I do not want to become involved in the scientific arguments on the feasibility of any of these dams, for that is the province of engineers. Politicians have a habit of dabbling in things on which they are not always well informed. On the other hand, we all have special knowledge of some subjects. In this House many members have made contributions to matters on which they have special knowledge. Just as members opposite have a special knowledge of industrial matters, so engineers have a special knowledge of these matters. I listen to the engineers and am prepared to accept that additional storages will have to be built on the Murray River; but the decision should be made by engineers and not by politicians if it is to be in the best interests of the people of this country, and particularly of the people of this State. I think we have the first indication that this Government intends to proceed with negotiations. When the Premier took office he said that he would negotiate immediately, but until now there have been no negotiations. So far as we know no decision has been reached. I understand that the Minister of Works has been involved in discussions, but there have been no discussions that have reached a satisfactory conclusion up to now. We cannot wait any longer, because not only is the cost escalating but also the need is growing and the risk is increasing, because we know that droughts will occur in future notwithstanding the current flow down the Darling River. We should recognize that there is urgency in this matter and that the longer we delay it by talking the longer we will be in obtaining any results.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

After "proclamation" to insert "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;

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 to request the River Murray Commission to make a study of the River Murray 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 several amendments designed to set the Bill in its correct form so as to enable this to be a proper agreement instead of a propaganda document, as it is now. My first amendment is a test amendment, because there can only be one objective by me, that is, to accept the proposal that we build Dartmouth. I shall argue my case on the first amendment I have on members' files. The first part of it is self-explanatory, and paragraph (b) is the saving clause that I had introduced into my Bill on April 28 last to ensure that Chowilla would not be given away but would be included in the future study to which the Governments had agreed. I have spoken of its significance and how it demolishes the Premier's argument that he has trailed around South Australia suggesting that for some reason my Government had given away Chowilla. We have had little to give away; there has been no enforceable agreement. The whole objective of the amendment is to remove the nonsense from the Bill.

The Government says that the Bill contains provision for renegotiation. However, the Premier said that he would take only a few months to renegotiate the agreement. The Minister of Works has been to the other States. What the States refused to accept then has now been included in the Bill. It is rather late in the day to be arguing about matters that the other parties have already rejected. Probably Dartmouth is no longer obtainable. This agreement will have to be renegotiated as to price, let alone as to the points the Premier has raised as his slant of the argument. The Government should stop opposing the agreement because it has my signature on the bottom. It should stop playing petty politics and start ratifying what the State needs. If the Government drops its pettiness and supports the amendment, the Opposition will fully support it. I am sure we can forget the long arguments of the last 10 or 11 years and produce a united effort from this Chamber this evening. This Bill is nothing but a propaganda document in which the Government is trying to shift the onus of responsibility for the probable loss of

Dartmouth from itself to the other parties to the agreement. I urge honourable members to support the amendments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Obviously from the second reading explanation and the basis on which the Government has been proceeding, we cannot accept the amendment, which is aimed at restoring the Leader's original Bill to the form in which he presented it last year when it was rejected. The Leader would have us believe that the provision in the amendment does nothing to give away the Chowilla reservoir. In fact, the studies relating to further storages on the Murray River system have been proceeding, so there is no requirement for a substantive provision in the Bill relating to them. What is clear (and this came out in statements made by Opposition members) is that without some provision which gives the State special rights in relation to Chowilla there will be a constant tendency for the other States to look for an up-river storage. I find it strange that the Leader should now urge on us that this provision will retain some rights to Chowilla, when earlier this evening he was arguing loudly that Chowilla was a hopeless and fantastic dream on which we could not rely. I am afraid Opposition members have made many contradictory statements, whereas the Government's attitude remains consistent.

Mr. Hall: What rubbish!

Mr. Millhouse: That's not true.

Mr. Hall: Public statements deny it a dozen times.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been listening patiently and quietly to what has been said by the Opposition this evening. Some of the remarks have been made foolishly and *ad nauseam*. I hope that the Opposition will do me the courtesy of hearing me in silence. The position the Government has taken on this matter has remained entirely consistent. We do not believe that this State should give away in the existing agreement the provisions relating to the Chowilla dam. The proposals of the original amending Bill do just that. In order to endeavour to break the deadlock, the Government is proposing a measure that will give us the legal right in South Australia to proceed with the appropriation of moneys for the building of the Dartmouth dam without the completion of an agreement on that matter, leaving the existing agreement as it

stands. This is a further attempt to endeavour to get the other States to see reason.

Mr. Rodda: They have ratified the agreement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware that they have passed a measure which states that they have ratified the agreement.

Mr. Rodda: You are re-opening the argument.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not propose to go over the whole of this business again. This matter has been debated here time and time again, and swapping epithets between this side and the other side will get us nowhere. The Opposition does not convince us or the people of South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't get the dam.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position which the Government has taken has remained consistent and the position we put to the people at the last State election we retain. We will not give it up. We have the support of the people in this matter and we are going to go for the things we promised them.

[Midnight]

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed but not surprised at the attitude the Premier has taken. The only thing that has been consistent in my view about him is his inconsistency on this topic and his determination to say that he is right whatever happens, whether we will get a dam or not, whether Chowilla or Dartmouth, so long as he can satisfy himself that he is right and that everyone is out of step but him. He will be happy and he hopes the people of South Australia will accept the position. I do not believe that they will accept it, and only the future will tell that. Our aim with the amendments is to get an agreement ratified which we know will be acceptable throughout Australia. The provision which we are seeking to write into the amendment was agreed by the Leader of the Opposition (when Premier) with New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That means precisely nothing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It does not mean nothing. If it means nothing, why does the Premier oppose it? It does not matter in that case.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This is a test amendment which proceeds to a whole series of others.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The series of amendments amounts to an enforceable agreement that would be ratified by four Parliaments, and Dartmouth could proceed. That is what we are aiming to do. There is no attempt on our part

to say otherwise. That is our objective, because we have waited long enough for the agreement to be ratified. The agreement contained in the Bill means nothing and will get us nowhere, and the Premier knows it. I challenge the Premier or the Attorney-General to deny what I have said. This Bill is a worthless piece of paper as it stands; it has no legal force unless the amendments are incorporated, because only then will there be a meeting of minds. That must happen if there is to be ratification and an enforceable agreement. Clause 1 of the agreement provides:

This agreement is subject to ratification and shall come into effect when so ratified.

This Bill does not ratify the agreement and, until it is ratified by all four Parliaments, it does not come into effect. It is absolute poppycock to suggest that, because there is legal authority in this Bill for the appropriation of moneys, it will take us one step farther along the road towards getting extra storages along the river. I ask members, even if the Premier is obdurate (as he is), to put the future welfare of the State above Party politics and above pride and to accept the amendments, because until they are accepted there will be no point in what we are doing.

Mr. HALL: I am disappointed at the Premier's attitude to my amendments. I wonder how long he will be able to convince the people that everyone, apart from him, is creating a deadlock. I wonder how long he will be able to say that, although all four Governments had agreed, South Australia is now disagreeing and, therefore, the other parties are creating a deadlock. I wonder how long he will be able to sustain that story before the people of South Australia. Obviously, he will try to sustain it, even at the expense of losing the dam. The Premier's attitude is as follows: "We will not drop the story, because that matters far more than the dam. All the other parties are united in their desire to create a deadlock." This Government lives for an impossible dream.

The Premier has tried to twist my attitude to the Chowilla dam, which is an impossible dream, a dam that is more and more under question technically. The location of the Chowilla dam is, in a sense, equal to a location at the mouth of the river. I recently had the pleasure of speaking to a man of standing who was deeply involved in the formation of the statistical data that was prepared during the early planning of the dam. Some of that data was used in the presentation of tenders. That man was deeply concerned at the gaps in

the information on which planning for the Chowilla dam was based. The Chowilla dam could not be built for anywhere near \$70,000,000, and the Premier knows it. The previous Government, in the face of the present Premier's criticism, ensured that any future investigations would include consideration of the Chowilla dam. However, perhaps all hope for both dams has gone.

In his reply to the second reading debate the Premier did not deign to answer anything. There was no summing up of the arguments advanced by the Opposition. The Government has not explained how it intends to get the Dartmouth dam, in the face of the Commonwealth Minister's clear statement that the price has been exceeded already. The Government may have lost the dam already on that point alone, but, more important, it will lose it because it will not move from the old stance that it has adopted over the years. The Government will fight for its pride and the stance it has taken at the cost of the dams, and I am sorry about this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that, because the second reading debate ended earlier than I had expected, I was not able to reply. I understood from our Whip that there would be other speakers, and I intended to reply. However, I will do what I am allowed to do in terms of the debate in Committee. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that from the outset we should have done what the Parliament and the people of South Australia rejected. He has said that Chowilla is an impossible dream, but that is not our advice. We have advice that, particularly with projected additional tributary development by Victoria, additional storages such as Chowilla will be essential even to maintain the provision of water to South Australia proposed in this agreement, and the Dartmouth dam will not be sufficient to achieve it.

Mr. Millhouse: Whose advice is that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the advice of the engineers in our department, that with tributary development in Victoria, the Dartmouth dam will not provide for South Australia the entitlement contained in the proposals in this agreement.

Mr. Rodda: Beyond the year 2000?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Earlier than that.

Mr. Millhouse: In what period of time?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as there is additional tributary development in Victoria.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The salinity report says this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course. South Australia will have to have additional provisions from storages on the Murray River. On the advice given to me, I cannot go along with the Leader's view about the Chowilla dam. It is strange that, because he took a different stance from that with which he stumped this State at the 1968 election, he has decided—

Mr. Rodda: We faced up to technical advice. You're not doing that, and the State will suffer for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had some technical advice when the River Murray Commission took its original views, but members opposite gave me no credit for that. Our technical advice does not accord with the view that the Leader now puts so strongly, as the only sensible point of view. The technical advice does not place the Chowilla dam, in effect, at the mouth of the Murray River. In consequence, this Government does not believe (and does not believe that the people of this State want it) that we should give away the provision for the Chowilla dam in the existing agreement. Therefore, we will not do that.

It is suggested that this Bill is put up merely as a piece of window-dressing, and for no other reason. I have made it quite clear that the agreement as proposed is not enforceable and, therefore, an agreement to part of it may well work, particularly when that part is the effective building of the Dartmouth dam. It is not necessary for the other States to alter their legislation in order to proceed, provided we have agreed to so much of the agreement as provides for the Dartmouth dam.

Mr. Millhouse: I should like to hear the Attorney-General on that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member would like to read the definition in the schedule, to which he was referring a few moments ago, he will see it defined. In fact, we shall be able to present to the other States the ability of this State immediately to proceed with the Dartmouth dam, leaving the argument about Chowilla for resolution by the studies undertaken by the River Murray Commission and by such further action under the existing agreement, if necessary, in relation to that dam, for which this State must retain its rights. That is the position the

Government takes. It believes it is the right one. We reject utterly—

Mr. Hall: I should like to know what right you are talking about.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader does not know what we are talking about, I suggest he go back over the whole of this debate. We have been through the whole matter of what right there is to South Australia under this agreement. If the Leader has not listened to this on previous occasions, I do not intend to go over it again tonight, because obviously he does not listen.

Mr. Millhouse: We should like to know the reference in the agreement to that right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Before the last election the honourable member was not only stating the nature of the rights, but was also stating his views as a lawyer on those rights. He has reiterated in this Chamber the enforceable legal rights of this State in relation to the Chowilla dam.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you done anything to enforce them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I want to retain the right to enforce them because, following the studies of the River Murray Commission in relation to further storages, it may well be that the specific rights provided in the agreement will have to be relied upon. In that circumstance, we want to be able to rely upon them and to retain this State's pre-eminent rights to the building of a dam at Chowilla, because such a dam would give specific advantages to this State. After all, we traded a lot to get those rights, and we do not intend to give them away merely because the Leader says, "Oh, well, it is only a matter of pride that we should keep them." We do not believe that it is a matter of pride: we believe it is a matter of necessary protection for this State, and we are not going to give away that protection.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am gratified that the Premier has deigned to give some sort of a reply to the debate, even though I do not agree with any of the points he has just made. There is, however, one question he has just raised that I should like him to answer. He admits that this Bill is merely an attempt to get an agreement with the other States so that work can proceed. I think he hopes that the other States will regard this as a token of our good intent. Also, I think that he acknowledges that we have not yet reached agreement with the other States, and that this effort may or may not succeed.

I believe the Premier would accept that that is the position. If we do not succeed, by virtue of this Bill or in any other way, in reaching agreement with the other States to build Dartmouth and Chowilla or whatever dam it may be thereafter, what are the Government's plans for future water storages or water supply for South Australia? If this Bill does not lead to the building of Dartmouth, what will the Government do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member wants me to give away all bargaining power.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on! You haven't any plans at all!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member wants me to say publicly to the other Governments, "It is all right, you say 'No' at this stage to what we want and we will tell you what we will do." I will not give away this State's rights in the way the honourable member wants me to do.

Mr. HALL: Because of the long political arguments, the goodwill that other States showed South Australia in the negotiations is often lost sight of. The other State Leaders are vilified as persons standing in the way of our development. Someone needs to say how much South Australia benefited from their goodwill during the negotiations, and I would be less than grateful for their co-operation if I did not say this. It is a small man that demeans them publicly for the help they gave this State. In the long negotiations, and especially in the final stages, Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin gave much co-operation and assistance to this State. If members doubt that, they should realize what trading took place between Victoria and New South Wales for water quotas for certain months in order to enable this State to obtain 1,500,000 acre feet. These States did not have to be involved, but they displayed much goodwill in relation to our needs. I place these facts on record because the Premier has tended to vilify the other States, and to suggest that they will say "No" again. They said "Yes" in a big way, and it is a small Government that tries to renegotiate this matter after negotiations were concluded in our favour.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I used no personal terms in relation to the Leader or to the Premiers of the other States. The personal abuse and the vilification that has come into this debate has come from the Leader alone.

Mr. Rodda: Who called Bolte a horse trader?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have heard members of the honourable member's Party say much more than that about the honourable gentleman. In relation to this matter, I have said no such thing. What happened in relation to the agreement, which the Leader now says was so utterly generous to South Australia, was that certain protections South Australia had in relation to Chowilla were given away. In addition, in the negotiations with Victoria and New South Wales in relation to the water they were to get from the additional yield to the system, they were not dealt with ungenerously at all.

The suggestion that they have been vastly generous to South Australia, when in fact the total assumption of the original agreement for the pooling of the river at Mildura was given away in Victoria's favour, puts a picture as to the generous nature of the negotiations by the other States that is not fair or accurate. Those States got a good deal out of the agreement, they stand to get a good deal from the agreement, and they will want to get a good deal. Despite the Leader's feeling that nothing is happening regarding this whole matter, I can assure him that, if the committee that our Murray River settlers are in touch with has any say in the matter, those States will get something good out of the agreement.

Mr. RODDA: Did the Premier tell the other parties to the agreement that he intended to bring before this Parliament a Bill in this form?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I tabled a copy of my letter to Mr. Gorton setting this forth, and I have written in similar form to the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria, including with the three letters a copy of the draft Bill.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, and Dr. Tonkin.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Venning. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 9), first and second schedules and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I did not oppose the second reading of this Bill because I hoped the House would adopt a positive policy by supporting the amendments that I planned to move during the Committee stage. However, the amendments have received very short shrift from the Government and have been negated. The Government is still pursuing what I have previously described as a no-dam policy, and the future development of this State is at great risk. The Premier has refused to comment on the problem that has arisen because the estimated cost of the dam is already greater than that provided for in the agreement. He has refused to face up to what will happen in connection with that aspect of the agreement.

Attention has been concentrated on the two clauses that he has incorporated for political reasons. We have nothing other than the Premier's determined refusal to alter his previous attitude. We have this proposal to amend the agreement even though he earlier said that the agreement could not be amended. This is confusing both to members and to people outside. The matter is now being seen in simpler terms than previously. The Government is running a risky course, and it may well have lost the gamble it entered into in not approving the agreement in the first instance. The Government still persists in not ensuring, even at this late hour, that the Dartmouth dam will be built.

I assure the Premier that the other States are not bluffing when they say that they have less interest in water now than they had before. There is very little incentive nowadays to provide large-scale investments of money for storages for agriculture. The Premier would be greatly over-estimating agricultural prospects if he thought otherwise. There is real risk that the other State Leaders are not bluffing when they say that, if the South Australian Government will not accept the favourable negotiations entered into on its behalf, they must make long-term plans to use the resources they have provided for this dam.

As much as the Premier argues for long-lost Chowilla or some form of Dartmouth agreement, possibly neither is available to

us and, in those circumstances, we would be back to the resources we already have. I have explained what that will mean for industrial development. For this reason, I oppose the third reading, but I do not want members opposite to construe that as meaning that we oppose Dartmouth. This Bill is a negation of Dartmouth and is delaying the time when the agreement can be ratified. This propaganda document puts the dam at risk and we may never have it. I disapprove of a move such as this.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Leader's attitude to this Bill. I realize, from long experience, that arguments do not make much of a dent on a solid Labor front. However, I emphasize the risks that South Australia is running by fooling about with this agreement. We have not alternative water supplies, whereas the other States have large tributaries in the Murray system on which they can draw outside the River Murray agreement. Under the agreement as we suggest it should be ratified, it is clear that, after Dartmouth is built, Chowilla is a possibility.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Leader says it is an impossible dream.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for protecting me from the rudeness of the Government front bench. Chowilla, as an addition to Dartmouth, is a possibility under the terms of the present agreement that we suggest should be ratified. However, it is impossible to take on the one hand extra water as offered to us under the Dartmouth agreement and on the other hand to say that we also want the right to create a dispute about Chowilla. The longer it takes the Labor Government to realize that, the more risk there will be to South Australian industries, both primary and secondary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition has sought to give the impression that, because so far agreement about proceeding with the Dartmouth dam has not been reached with the other States, this in itself has produced an escalation of costs. The Leader knows perfectly well that no contract for the Dartmouth dam could have been let yet even if the agreement had been signed last year. In fact, we are not yet in the time on period. No contract could have been let for some time yet. In those circumstances,

it is true that there has been an escalation that possibly would take the matter outside the clause of the agreement that provides for the escalation. That clause provides:

If a revised estimated cost rises more than 10 per cent above the estimated cost at the time the work was approved, the commission shall forthwith notify the contracting Governments accordingly and shall direct the constructing authority to suspend further work unless the contracting Governments have within six months of the commission's notification agreed to proceed.

That was a provision which the Leader agreed to in the proposed amending agreement and which was insisted on by the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, it was bitterly denounced by the Victorian Minister of Works as a severe and grave loophole in the agreement: it was not an enforceable agreement because the escalation provision left a loophole. That would have happened if the Bill had been ratified in the House last year, so the suggestion that what has happened in the interim has caused the whole project to be in some doubt because of an escalation of costs is nonsense.

The escalation of costs would have occurred in any event, and it would have meant that any one of the contracting Governments could have said "No". There is not an enforceable agreement proposed, let alone existing, under this provision.

Mr. Hall: You agree that the same thing applies to the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not. That is why we want the provision left in the existing agreement, and that is why the people of this State, too, want it left there.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, and Dr. Tonkin.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Langley and Lawn.
Noes—Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 10, at 2 p.m.