

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 24, 1971

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: A.N.Z.**BANK**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In recent months honourable members have asked several questions about the Government's attitude towards preserving the A.N.Z. bank building. As honourable members will recall, I told the House that two propositions had previously been put to the Government in relation to providing assistance for this building to be acquired by a private body or by the National Trust. When the Government examined the most recent proposition, which came from the National Trust, for the Government to provide a guaranteed loan to the trust and for the Government to be responsible for any residual losses on the annual running costs of the building, we were satisfied that there were too many risks in such a venture. It was quite clear that we could not guarantee what the actual call on Government funds would be in such a proposition, which involved the commercial letting of portion of the building and the raising by public appeal of an amount which, on previous experience, could certainly not be guaranteed.

After examining the whole position in relation to the A.N.Z. building, the Government decided that it was necessary to act to preserve this building and ensure that it would not be demolished and that the most economic proposition for us to undertake was to acquire the building for Government purposes and have the office section occupied by Government departments. This would lessen the call upon us for rents of other buildings in the Adelaide city area and at the same time would ensure that we could preserve something of considerable value to South Australia's heritage.

In consequence, the Government has decided to acquire the building in this way for Government purposes, to use Government funds to restore the building to usable condition, and to restore the major features of the building that, in the past, have in some measure been interfered with. In this way we will ensure that the one major building which is not owned by the Government and which is on the

National Trust's "A" list for preservation will be retained for South Australia.

QUESTIONS**TRANSPORT POLICY**

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he has approved the plan outlined by the Commissioner of Highways to the Salisbury council for a new four-lane highway link through Salisbury to connect the Salisbury Highway with Elizabeth? The link referred to by the Commissioner of Highways is part of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Plan and is defined on page 146 and, I think, page 147 of the report. After coming into office the Minister said, during a television interview, that the M.A.T.S. proposals had been withdrawn "in accordance with our election policy". Subsequently, the Minister, in replying to a question asked by the member for Eyre, said, "We are not proceeding with M.A.T.S., if you can get that into your head." The report states clearly that the Commissioner of Highways has referred this matter, which is contained in the M.A.T.S. plan, to the Salisbury council on the basis that a residential area and the plans for a hotel car park will be affected. Therefore, in the light of the Minister's previous statement and the Commissioner's reference to a part of the M.A.T.S. plan, I ask the Minister whether he has approved the implementation of this part of the M.A.T.S. plan.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Road construction in and around Adelaide seems to be a cause of constant concern to the Leader. Perhaps the answer I should give him is to remind him of the decision of this House, which, by 24 votes to 17 votes, approved the Government's adopting, as a philosophy of action, the Breuning report, which states:

The steady increase of car density together with the overall increase in population results in a steady growth of vehicular traffic in Adelaide. While some of this traffic occurs in the decentralized areas, much of the growth affects the arterial roads leading into the city centre. Some of the arterials are already loaded to capacity during rush hour and further traffic will tend to extend the rush hour duration. These overload conditions will be alleviated by widening arterial roads and improving bottleneck locations.

That was policy recommendation No. 3 which, although it was opposed by the Opposition, was supported by the House. As a further explanation, I made the following statement publicly and in the House:

Because it expects better modes of travel to be available within the next 10-year period, the

Government will not implement the decisions made by the previous Government to construct the freeways and expressways proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan which are within Adelaide's built-up area and where substantial demolition of private property is involved.

Since then the Government has pursued that policy implicitly and intends to pursue it in the future. The road to which the Leader refers is the extension of the arterial road system: it is extending the Salisbury Highway with an over-pass crossing the Port Pirie railway line, connecting with Gawler Street, and subsequently with John Rice Avenue. By this means the bottleneck situation that currently occurs in Salisbury will be relieved. The building of this road is completely in accord with the policy this Government is following of upgrading the arterial road network.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister make a statement, explaining what parts of the M.A.T.S. plan the present Government has accepted? As I understood the Minister's reply to the Leader, he explained that the major arterial road north of the city to which the Leader had referred was part of the M.A.T.S. plan and had been so. Therefore, because of the plans for it to go ahead, that part of the M.A.T.S. plan has been accepted. The Minister went on to refer to, I think, the third recommendation in the Breuning report, regarding arterial roads generally, and it seems from this that the Government definitely has accepted some parts of the M.A.T.S. plan. I therefore ask the question of the Minister so that everyone will know what parts have been accepted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Quite obviously, the Deputy Leader was not listening carefully when I replied to the Leader, but for his benefit I will repeat the statement which I made then and which answers his question fully. It is as follows:

... the Government will not implement the decisions made by the previous Government to construct the freeways and expressways proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan which are within Adelaide's built-up areas and where substantial demolition of private property is involved.

I think that answers the question in full. As I have just told the Leader and as I have said in many statements in this House, we would—has the Leader fixed up the next question with the member for Alexandra yet?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister cannot anticipate the next question. He is replying to the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have said many times, we will be concentrating on upgrading the arterial road system, and we are

doing exactly that. We are concentrating on providing grade separation wherever it is possible to do so, but we have said definitely that we will not proceed with the destruction of Adelaide that the former Government's freeway and expressway proposals involved.

Dr. EASTICK: Having conceded that the arterial road system is an integral part of the M.A.T.S. plan, can the Minister assure the House that, where arterial roads are planned and/or constructed, they will eventually be integrated with subsequent freeway development without unnecessary additional cost?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say whether the Government is willing to continue to commence constructing freeways in any circumstances? More than half the freeway route between Dry Creek and the Onkaparinga River traverses open country. Whilst the construction of this freeway is not being proceeded with, main roads are being further widened. For example, the main road through Morphett Vale, widened only a few years ago, is now being further widened, although no action has so far been taken with respect to freeways. I understand from the Minister's reply to a previous question that the Government is not willing to construct freeways within the metropolitan area where the route goes through built-up areas. However, I ask him whether the Government is willing to construct freeways in any circumstances, particularly as about half the route of the north-south freeway now traverses open country.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government is prepared to construct freeways. I think this question, "Are we prepared to construct freeways in any circumstances?", is rather foolish, as we have achieved a record performance during our term of office with the construction of the South-Eastern Freeway. I think the position here is plain, and I suggest that the honourable member read the statements that I seem to be making almost daily in which I have said that we will not construct freeways and expressways proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan, as advocated by the former Government of which the honourable member was a Minister, that are within Adelaide's built-up areas and where substantial demolition of private property is involved. Where those circumstances exist, the answer is, "No, we will not build the freeways for at least 10 years." But where those circumstances do not prevail, it is a different situation altogether, and we have made plain that it is a different

situation. That situation has been made known to the honourable member and his colleagues for almost nine months, but they still do not seem to have got the message.

Mr. RODDA: What is the Government's policy on acquiring land for freeway purposes in cases where the owner of the land wishes to retain mineral rights? I understand that the Minister is not unfamiliar with the situation involving land that has had to be acquired to meet the State's future transport needs. Although the Hills Freeway is a specific instance, I point out that this question can apply throughout the State. Some people have mineral rights in respect of the land to be acquired and, although they may agree to their land being acquired for freeway purposes, they have some strong feelings about their entitlement to mineral rights.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

THEBARTON SCHOOLS

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Education say whether action has been taken to improve the size of the recreation area now being used at the Thebarton Primary School and the Thebarton Girls Technical High School? If no action is contemplated, will the Minister have the matter investigated so that the area can be enlarged enough to provide both schools with sufficient space in order to improve recreation facilities? These two schools are situated on an area of slightly less than four acres that cuts off abruptly at the back of the schools. There is obviously no oval or grassed recreation area because the whole area is bituminized, and this makes it difficult for the children to enjoy any recreation activities.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not directly familiar with the problem referred to by the honourable member, but I will have the matter investigated and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

GEPPS CROSS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, ask his colleague to investigate the urgent provision of a fire hydrant at the Gepps Cross Girls Technical High School? As a result of a visit by the local fire brigade officer and a later recommendation by the Chief Fire Officer of the State, the Headmistress wrote to the Public Buildings Department in 1969 to request the installation of a fire hydrant. As nothing was done, the Assistant Superintendent of

Secondary Schools and I visited the school early in 1971, I think, and he made certain recommendations. Recently, I took up the matter with him again and received a letter from him which stated that the fire hydrant would be installed in August, 1971. I have now received from the Chairman of the school council a letter which states that August is nearly over and that no fire hydrant has been installed. The Chairman is worried, as a result of the recent fire at the Blackwood High School.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the matter investigated.

PORT BROUGHTON SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say what has happened regarding the application of the Port Broughton Area School Committee for a new school? Evidently, before Port Broughton became a part of the Rocky River District, the local school committee applied for a new school. Today, I received a letter from the Secretary of that worthy committee seeking information on the request and the application that was made to the then member for the district, the Leader of the Opposition. Can the Minister say whether any planning has been done with regard to Port Broughton? I know that the school is very old and that the people in the district will be disappointed if the information forthcoming does not encourage them to believe that preliminary plans have been prepared.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The rebuilding of the Port Broughton Area School, which is not on the design list at present, is waiting to be placed on that list. No design work has yet been undertaken with respect to the replacement of the school. The honourable member will appreciate that many replacement area, high, and primary schools, for which design work of one kind or another is being carried out, are already on the design list and represent substantial prospective expenditure. Consequently, it is not possible to say just when the Government will be able to find funds for the replacement of the Port Broughton Area School. However, in view of the honourable member's question, I will ensure that the position regarding Port Broughton is examined and a report given to me detailing the latest information on the matter.

BLACKWOOD SCHOOL FIRE

Mr. EVANS: I ask the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, whether a request was made by the Emergency Fire Services attending the Blackwood High School

fire for help from the South Australian Fire Brigade, especially the St. Marys branch. If such a request was made, will the Premier say why help was not forthcoming? I think that one should be allowed to comment here and to thank the men who gave their services voluntarily in company with members of the E.F.S. and others who helped minimize the time taken to restore the school to working order, and the Public Buildings Department also helped in this regard. However, I believe some people are concerned to know why, if an approach was made to the South Australian Fire Brigade, no help was forthcoming. Although the E.F.S. in the area is capable of handling a normal house fire or bush fire, in cases similar to that of the Blackwood High School fire there is little time in which to fight the fire. This is borne out by the way the buildings in question were completely burned out in such a short time. In addition, I believe that most of the fire hydrants in the area are around the perimeter of the school and that, as there were no hydrants between school buildings, members of the E.F.S. could not reach some of the buildings because the fire hose was too short. Indeed, with a little more bad luck, more buildings could have been lost in this fire. I believe that this is a case where the South Australian Fire Brigade should be able to go outside its own boundaries and to help a voluntary organization. If the Premier cannot give a reply now, will he seek information on the subject?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

RESETTLEMENT VALUES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, whether he can say when the Government will introduce legislation to allow for a resettlement value to be applied in relation to property being acquired by the Government. I refer here to a resettlement value, as opposed at present to the market value. This matter was raised in connection with acquiring Chain of Ponds properties and, from information I received as recently as last evening from people in the Chain of Ponds area, I believe that the scheme, to put it mildly, is not going very well. In reply to my earlier question on this matter, the Minister of Works undertook to introduce legislation to provide for a resettlement value to be negotiated in the type of case to which I refer. As I personally, as well as my constituents in the area concerned, am interested in this matter, can the Premier indicate when the relevant legislation will be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is currently being drafted, and we hope to introduce it this session.

HIGHBURY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say yet what is the result of the Education Department's investigation into providing access to the new Highbury Primary School from the east and the south, the neighbouring land being undeveloped? Last Sunday, at the request of the Hope Valley Primary School Committee, I inspected the new Highbury Primary School building and the surrounds, and the provision of access to the school from the east and the south was canvassed at that inspection. The Minister will recall that I wrote to him on June 15 regarding this matter and other relevant matters, and he replied on July 8 stating that the matter would be investigated, bearing in mind that the land in the neighbourhood is undeveloped and that roads will be provided when development takes place.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I cannot report anything further on that matter I will certainly look into it and see what stage the investigation has reached.

ROAD MAINTENANCE ACT

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what proportion of the tax collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act is collected from owners of vehicles registered in other States?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I do not recall that figure, I will ascertain what it is and let the honourable member know.

BEACH PROTECTION

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government will consider using on second priority works unspent moneys granted by the Government to seaside councils last May? After the big storm that occurred on April 15 and 16 this year, Cabinet approved a grant for beach protection, and in some cases it seems that the grant will not be used. If this is the case, when repairs have been passed by the committee concerned will the Minister consider what are listed as second priority works and enable the balance to be spent on those works?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This matter was raised by councils whose areas suffered as a result of the storms that occurred earlier this year. Assessments were

made and the Government promptly provided finance. In two instances, I believe that the councils concerned made an over-assessment, with the result that a small sum was left in each case. Those councils suggested that this money could be spent on general foreshore and beach protection work that is to be done. I have informed those councils, and I now inform the honourable member, that, rather than doing it in a piecemeal way, as has been suggested, by spending small sums remaining under the allocations, it would be far better for the work to be undertaken as one project, and at this stage the Government intends to do that.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister make available to members a copy of the final report of the beach and foreshore protection committee?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This report has been made available to the Government, which is considering the recommendations made in the report before introducing legislation. When that consideration has been completed, I will decide whether I can make the report available to honourable members.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether legislation dealing with the registration of dental technicians in South Australia is likely to be introduced this session?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

MINING BILL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will conduct an unbiased inquiry into likely effects of the new Mining Bill on the future development of the opal industry in this State? This morning I received from the opal miners at Coober Pedy the following telegram:

We, the undersigned miners and citizens of Coober Pedy, declare that whether we operate bulldozers or work by hand our livelihood is still at stake. The Government seems determined to wipe out the last chances that free men of true pioneering spirit have to earn an uncluttered and rewarding living. We suggest that it takes great courage to leave the cities and the unions and the bosses—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN:—

and to strike out on our own for a free Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to make an explanation, but he is referring to a Bill that is currently

before the House. The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand it, the member for Eyre asked a question. He then went on to make an explanation which you have ruled to be not acceptable because it referred to a Bill before the House. Surely the honourable member is entitled to have this question answered; surely he should not simply be cut off without your calling on the Minister to answer the original question.

The SPEAKER: Initially the question was framed in what I considered to be rather provocative language. The honourable member referred to an "unbiased inquiry", and I believe that was rather provocative. Even after my calling him to order, the honourable member continued to read from the letter. The other day I made it perfectly clear that, when I got to my feet and an honourable member ignored me, I intended to call on the next speaker, and the honourable member for Bragg now has the call.

MOORUNDE SANCTUARY

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation obtain a report on the present state of the Moorunde wombat sanctuary? I am sure that, during the week-end, we were all distressed to read a newspaper article relating to the wombat sanctuary near Blanchetown. This matter arose at a public meeting in March, 1968. The project captured the imagination of the public, and I believe that several young people still have certificates acknowledging gifts they made at the time. On the surface, it would appear from the article that what has happened is unfortunate. Therefore, I believe that people would be more than interested to know exactly what is the position regarding the sanctuary.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to provide the honourable member with a considered report. Having read the article to which the honourable member has referred, I believe that the present situation at Moorunde is certainly a matter for public concern. I understand that several people who have made donations to this project now believe that the money they provided is not being used in the way that they imagined it would be used. I shall be pleased to provide the honourable member with a copy of the

report that I have currently called for on the matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General table the report of the inquiry, which I believe I instigated when I was in office, into the Moorunde reserve? My recollection is a bit hazy, but I think that, not long before we went out of office, I was approached to have an inquiry instituted into the legal aspects of the Moorunde reserve, the appeal and the control of it, and so on. My recollection is that I gave directions to that effect, but I am confident that no report was received by me before I left office. Like other members, I read the report in last week's *Sunday Mail* with some distress, but it brought the facts back to my mind. I am confident that by now the Attorney would have received the report to which I refer, and, because of the publicity that has been given this matter, I suggest that the report should be made public. This report is independent of the report that is being sought by the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I received a report concerning the Moorunde Wildlife Reserve Fund Appeal some months ago. I examined it and concluded that there were no grounds for the intervention of the Attorney-General. The question of the tabling of a report of this kind is an extremely difficult one, because inevitably such an inquiry (and a report based on that inquiry) involves the reputations of people who do not have the ordinary chance of answering allegations that they would have if there were an open inquiry or some charge was made against them. Generally, I think that a Minister should exercise considerable care before deciding to make public a report of this kind that may affect the reputations of the people concerned. On the other hand, I also recognize that there is considerable public interest involved where funds have been subscribed by the public. I will consider the matter further and discuss it with the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is also most interested in this matter and, as soon as a decision is made, I will tell the honourable member.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Premier.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable Premier seems to be distracted.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was trying to get the Premier's attention.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You have it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member that I intend to stand by the statement I made in the House the other day. The honourable member for Mitcham received the call to ask a question. If the honourable Premier is not conducting himself properly in the House, I am quite capable of dealing with that. The other day I made it clear that I would not differentiate between members on either side of the House. The honourable member for Mitcham had the call on this occasion. He stood without saying anything for some time and, when I asked him to ask his question, he then proceeded on another line. It is not the function of honourable members, whether on the Government or Opposition side, to waste the valuable time of the House and to ignore the Chair. I call on the honourable member for Light.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, I suggest that you are being quite unfair. The only reason why I hesitated was that the Premier was speaking to his Whip, and I did not think (and I was looking straight at him) that he was paying attention to me or that he understood that I desired to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I take a point of order on your ruling.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member wants to take a point of order he must state it. He must not take advantage of taking a point of order to make a speech. What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that your ruling is quite unfair in the circumstances and, if you do not accept that as a point of order, I must move respectfully to disagree to your ruling to sit me down. If you persist in not allowing me to ask the question, I shall certainly move disagreement to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I will not take a threat from the honourable member for Mitcham; if he wants to move disagreement to my ruling, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham has moved to disagree to my ruling not to allow him to ask the Premier a question, on the ground that the ruling was grossly unfair and that the honourable member was deprived of the call unjustifiably. Does the honourable member wish to speak to the motion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly, sir. This is the second time in a few minutes that you have refused to allow a member on this side to proceed with a question. I point out, with respect, that, despite what you have said about treating both sides of the House equally, it always seems to be an Opposition member who incurs your displeasure and action. In this case I said that I wanted to ask the Premier a question and, when I said that, the member for Unley, who is the Government Whip, was standing at the end of the front bench, at the left hand of the Premier, and was in conversation with him. The conversation and the look on the Premier's face led me to believe that he had not realized that I wanted to ask a question and that he was not listening to me. Therefore, I waited until I could attract his attention, until, as I hoped, his conversation with the member for Unley ceased. It was while I was so waiting that you interrupted and complained that I was wasting the time of the House. I did not get a chance to ask a question at all, to get the question cut of my mouth. In the case of the member for Eyre a short time ago, you would not allow the Minister to reply, and it seems from these two incidents—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows very well that the Standing Orders state specifically that, if he wants to take a point of order, it must be taken when the matter arises, and he is entirely out of order in referring to an incident that has been dealt with by this House this afternoon. He cannot continue to speak in that strain. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make two replies to that. First, I did take a point of order immediately and, secondly, I have mentioned that incident only to illustrate the course of conduct that you have followed in this House and as something supplementary to the matter that we are now discussing. I do suggest that Ministers ought to be attentive to questions that are asked. I suggest that they ought to remain in the House during the whole of Question Time and that we are entitled to their attention when we ask questions.

This is a completely new procedure, as far as I know, and certainly not the first new pro-

cedure that you, as Speaker, have introduced during Question Time to discipline members on this side by sitting them down in the way in which you have started to do because in some way we have incurred your displeasure, or you say we have done so. I have never known a Speaker to do this before, it is a completely new departure and, in any case, I suggest that, out of courtesy to the Premier, I was entitled to wait until I got his attention. Otherwise, if I had gone ahead and asked the question. I would have had to repeat it later, as soon as I got his attention.

I ask you to be fair to members on this side of the House. As I say, one wonders whether it is by accident that it is always members on this side whom you discipline. Last Thursday (and you referred to this matter a moment ago in giving your ruling) you announced (I was not in the Chamber at the time) that you intended to pass to the next question if there were any interjections. Subsequently, when I was asking a question, a member on the Government side interjected, but you did not discipline him as you had earlier threatened to do. You simply gave another explanation of what you intended to do. All these things illustrate the fact that you are not being fair to both sides. You are not treating members impartially. Apart from that—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wants to reflect on the Chair, he should make that an entirely different motion. He must discontinue speaking in the strain in which he is speaking now. His motion is to disagree to my ruling, and I will not accept any reflection on the Chair. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, not to persist in this ruling. It is breaking new ground; it is entirely unnecessary; and it is unfair to the member involved.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I second the motion, and support the member for Mitcham in his contention that he has been treated unfairly in this respect this afternoon. On assuming office in 1970, you said, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member supporting the motion to disagree to my ruling, or is he proceeding on another line?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am supporting the member for Mitcham in his motion to disagree to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. On July 14, 1970, you said:

Confidence in the fairness of the Speaker is an indispensable condition of the successful

working of Parliamentary procedure and, therefore, I shall at all times endeavour to give the utmost protection to members' rights, collectively and individually. The majority get the decision, and the minority must be given their rights.

That comment by you was greeted with approval by all members of the House, and members on this side have tried to act in accordance with it. They have tried to ensure that, although they are in a minority, they get their rights. They agree with you that Question Time is an indispensable part of Parliamentary procedure, as are so many other parts of Parliamentary procedure. Question Time is especially important to the Opposition. Because it is important to the Opposition, it is obviously important to the electorate as a whole. The member for Mitcham this afternoon was simply trying to elicit information from the Premier. I do not know what question the honourable member had in mind, because we did not hear that, but there is no reason to assume that the information he was seeking did not concern a matter of considerable public importance on which members of the House should have every right to hear the reply. On that assumption, I say that the honourable member was incorrectly prevented from asking his question. He was simply trying to attract the Premier's attention because, as everyone knows, when Question Time becomes somewhat drawn out, Ministers frequently are not attending to every word that is spoken. Who would blame them? Several Ministers are missing from the front bench now, and no-one blames them, provided that they are—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to get away from the motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling. We are not discussing how many Ministers or members are in the House, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I gave that incident merely as an example to show that not every Minister is listening at all times nor can be expected to listen to every word during Question Time. It was obvious this afternoon that the Premier was not listening when the member for Mitcham rose to ask his question. What the honourable member tried to do was ensure that the Premier paid attention to him so that he could correctly ask his question and then obtain a reply. In doing that he was taking an action that I am sure would be supported by every member of the public. Question Time is of interest to all the people

of the State, not only to members here and to people in the gallery. This may well have been a question of public importance, the reply to which may have required prominence. Yet this House was not allowed to hear the question because you, Mr. Speaker, chose to prevent the member for Mitcham from continuing to ask his question, even though he had received the call. Therefore, I second wholeheartedly the honourable member's motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): For a considerable time we have seen specific rulings of the House that have been given to members opposite, particularly the member for Mitcham, deliberately flouted. What happened this afternoon is not quite as the honourable member has seen fit to describe. What he did was to rise in his seat to ask a question. At that stage of proceedings the Government Whip was saying a few words to me on things which he needed to speak to me about concerning the business of the House and which he had to communicate to members opposite. I certainly was aware of what he was saying, and I was aware of the honourable member's question, because I was listening to it. The member for Mitcham, in a way that he affects in this House, chose not to ask his question but to stand there putting on an act. When he was called to order for this and was told that he was being listened to and could ask his question (and he was directed to ask it), he did not do so but proceeded to argue with the Speaker in the pettifogging manner that he has seen fit to adopt in this House in a time-wasting procedure.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are not helping at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am saying what happens constantly in this House, with the honourable member refusing to obey the directions of the Chair. The direction of the Chair was given, but the honourable member refused to obey it, so the Chair has taken the only recourse available to it. The direction of the Speaker was perfectly proper. I believe there is not the slightest point of order, and there is nothing whatever in the Standing Orders or the procedures of the House on which the honourable member can base any disagreement to the Chair's ruling.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is—

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I think I am entitled to the right of reply.

The SPEAKER: Yes. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have bothered to reply had it not been for the comments that have just been made by the Premier, in which he puts his own interpretation on the incident. All I can say is that I am confident *Hansard* tomorrow will set out accurately what did occur. What occurred was this: I simply waited until I could attract the Premier's attention. When I had attracted his attention, I started to ask my question but got only as far as the words "My question is directed to the Premier" when you sat me down and said you would proceed to ask another member. I have explained why I waited, and that is all I had said. That, I am confident, is the true account of what occurred, and I say again that I am confident that *Hansard* will record it, because it is not as the Premier has put it. I, and other members, find it irritating (and I regard it as discourteous) when one tries to address a question to a Minister who either deliberately or unconsciously does not listen to the question. I may say that this is one of the few occasions on which the Premier has done it to me: the Minister of Education is more likely to adopt that tack. If it had not been for what I regarded as a lack of comprehension by the Premier that I intended to ask him a question. I would not have hesitated in that way.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is "That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to."

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Mr. Nankivell and Mrs. Steele. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of August 17 about justices of the peace?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The statement prepared by Mr. O'Loughlin, S.M., on the issuing of summonses was printed several months ago and copies have been distributed to all courts

of summary jurisdiction, where they are available to justices. Copies of the statement have also been put in the justices' room at the Adelaide Magistrates' Court for the information of visiting justices. The Royal Association of Justices, which was similarly supplied with copies, is, I understand, serializing the statement in its monthly bulletin.

COORONG

Mr. NANKIVELL: In view of the questions I have asked previously about the potential of the Coorong, can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what developments have taken place over the last 12 months in investigations into the possibility of restoring the Coorong to its original state?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As a result of the honourable member's earlier questions, I am well aware of his interest in this matter and of the various proposals he has put forward in recent years both to this Government and to previous Governments on what might be done to improve the standard of the Coorong, an area which, regrettably, is not in a good condition as a result of the South-Eastern drainage scheme, which has prevented fresh water from reaching the Coorong. As this matter is causing me much concern, I have made a careful study of the submissions that have been made by the honourable member and by other people interested in the future of the Coorong. I have had considerable discussions with a number of groups, including representatives of the University of Adelaide, but it appears that the only way that we will solve this problem is likely to cost a considerable sum if we are to provide the same volume of water as that previously available to the Coorong. I have decided that, as this matter is one that needs considerable research before the necessary information can be given the Government on how this problem can be solved, as soon as the environment committee has finished its present work and reported to the Government I intend to refer to it the problem of the Coorong, to ask the committee to examine it in detail, and to see what advice can be gained from that expert source.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, give me information on the Torrens River and its improvement? Last session Parliament passed a Bill that provided for the acquisition of certain land on the banks of the Torrens. What progress has been made in this connection and what grants are being made to

local councils for improving the banks of the Torrens, as has been done for some years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

NARACOORTE ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Naracoorte Adult Education Centre?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A suitable site to locate an art and craft building at the Naracoorte Adult Education Centre is at present being determined and construction is programmed to begin in 1972.

ABORTIONS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say what is the length of the present waiting lists for elective gynaecological operations at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Have these lists lengthened during the last 12 months, and over what other cases are abortion cases given priority?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

SCHOOL OVALS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education consider making school ovals available for organized sports on Sunday mornings? As the Minister is no doubt aware, a shortage of playing areas for the many and varied organized sports exists in most districts. If the Education Department's school ovals could be made available to local organizations, it would be of great assistance to sporting clubs.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The general policy of the Education Department on school ovals and their use by outside organizations is to give full discretion to headmasters to make arrangements that they regard as appropriate. Numerous schools in the metropolitan area and in country areas share their facilities with outside organizations. The question of what is appropriate is always, however, a critical one: first, because the headmaster must be assured that the letting out of the school oval to an outside organization will not lead to any damage to school property (and this has occurred on several occasions); and secondly, because the headmaster must pay attention to the amount of wear and tear to which school ovals are subjected. I hope that the honourable member will appreciate that the facilities of several schools are subjected to considerable wear and tear during the week and on Saturdays and, as a consequence, a headmaster might well say, "Well, in order to keep the oval in a

reasonable condition, I cannot permit any sport on a Sunday." However, in view of the honourable member's question, I will look at this policy again to see whether a change is warranted. I will check on the matter relating to Sundays.

WOOLENOOK BEND RESERVE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government will consider enlarging the Woolenook Bend game reserve east of Paringa? This matter was one of several matters raised with me when I recently visited the Paringa District Council. I understand that part of the Woolenook reserve is already under the control of the South Australian Field and Game Club and is being developed as a game reserve, whilst the balance of the reserve is leased, I think, under an annual licence, which permits limited grazing. As a result of permitting grazing on this part of the reserve, no generation of bush or trees is taking place, and I believe that the game club wishes to have the whole of the area declared a reserve, so that regeneration can occur. The council supports this request and has asked that I inform the Minister accordingly. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he will have this matter fully examined.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I understand that this matter has already been raised with me. I shall be pleased to see what stage consideration has reached and to inform the honourable member.

LEAVING EXAMINATION

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Education immediately examine the position relating to the time table of the Public Examinations Board for the Leaving examination this year? I refer especially to the day when certain students are required to sit for the French, Asian History and Japanese examinations. These three examinations are scheduled for the same day, and the students concerned will be required to carry out a marathon examination day commencing at 8 a.m. and finishing at 5.45 p.m.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Examination time tables are under the control of the Public Examinations Board and not directly under my control. However, in view of the honourable member's question, I will take up the matter with the board and ask it to consider the problem to which he has referred. Without having gone into the matter at all, I imagine that the first time table put out by the Public Examinations Board is a provisional time

table circulated in order that objections by individuals can be lodged and, if it is possible to arrive at a more suitable time table as a consequence, that can then be done. However, I will call for a detailed report on this matter from the board and bring it down as soon as possible.

SCENIC ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain for me information on the survey of the scenic road through Coromandel Valley, particularly that section intended to connect Myrtle Road with Magarey Road? The property that this section of the scenic road will traverse has been declared an open-space area, which the owner is at present developing as a recreation reserve. If he can ascertain from the Highways Department the exact location of the proposed road, the person concerned will be able to proceed with the building of clubrooms and other facilities in the area, knowing that it is not likely they will be demolished at some future date. Can the Minister obtain for me an early report on the exact location of this section of the road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be extremely happy to meet the honourable member's wishes.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Development and Mines, say whether the Government intends to invoke the provisions of the Mines and Works Inspection Act in respect of the opal industry? On November 3 last, in reply to a question asked in the Committee stage of a Bill by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said:

We do not intend to take action under this Act in relation to this matter.

He was referring to back-filling. At present, I understand that concern is being expressed by people in the opal fields that the department is issuing certain instructions that back-filling provisions and certain other provisions relating to mining operations will be enforced.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn honourable members on the Government side that the member for Mitcham has the call to ask a question of the Premier. The member for Mitcham deserves the courtesy that any other honourable member should have in the House,

and I am going to insist that he be heard with the utmost courtesy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. Will the Premier table in the House all the correspondence that has been exchanged between Ministers of this Government and Ministers of the Governments of the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales and Victoria concerning the Dartmouth controversy since this Government took office at the beginning of June, 1970? We have been told from time to time that the Government was negotiating with other Governments, trying to get a revision of the River Murray Waters Agreement, which provides for the building of the Dartmouth dam. However, on all the occasions on which we have asked the Government what arguments it was putting forward and what the correspondence was, we have been met either with a retort that the Premier does not cable his punches or that it would be inexpedient, because of the delicate stage which negotiations had reached, to make known the contents of the various communications. As I understand the position now, there are no negotiations and the matter has been concluded (up to this point, anyway). Therefore, those grounds for refusing to disclose these letters no longer apply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, the letters do not constitute the whole of the negotiations between the Governments concerned: some of them were verbal. However, I will examine the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you do that before we go on with the debate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will consider that, but I think it highly unlikely that I would have completed my examination of the file before then.

LOCK 5 ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Road Traffic Board to examine further whether or not a speed restriction can be applied to the road known as lock 5 road leading from Paringa to the Goat Island reserve, on which some koala bears have been released? As this is a koala reserve, on week-ends many people are attracted to it and travel along the road between Paringa and Goat Island. As several houses are situated close to this road, people who live in the houses are concerned for their children's safety, for it is a dirt road which becomes very dusty, and cars are apt to travel along it at considerable speed. I understand that the request for speed signs has been

declined in the past because it has been considered that it would be impracticable to police a speed limit. Therefore, I ask the Minister to refer the matter to the board again, because there are many places where it could be claimed that a speed limit could not be policed but where, once such a limit has been imposed, travelling speeds have been reduced to a reasonable rate.

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

VENEREAL DISEASE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether the 10 venereal disease clinics at the Royal Adelaide Hospital (the number has recently been doubled) are now attended at the same rate as were the original five clinics, and whether it is considered that 10 clinics are sufficient? I have seen in the newspaper that the number of clinics has been doubled from five to 10, and that this has resulted in the number of cases reported being nearly doubled from 53 to 97. This leads one to wonder whether, if more clinics were available, the number of notified cases would increase still further.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague how many persons, in age groups, are attending the venereal disease clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. VENNING: My question is similar to that asked by the Hon. Arthur White (the Legislative Council member for Northern) last Thursday. Will the Premier see that Cabinet supports the Minister of Agriculture in handling the grasshopper plague that could occur during the coming season? Already many grasshoppers are hatching in the Copley area. The Government subsidizes the provision of spray to landholders through the councils in affected areas. I point out to the Premier the urgent necessity for the Minister of Agriculture to take the necessary action at an early stage to prevent widespread damage by grasshoppers, using aerial spraying as a means of their destruction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will consult my colleague.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation inquire about

the nature of the sprays that are being recommended by the Agriculture Department to control locusts, so that the public at large can be reassured (if such reassurance is possible) that such sprays will not cause widespread environmental damage?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be happy to do so. I am grateful to the honourable member for raising this matter, which should be considered at the same time as the use of the spray is considered.

INTEREST RATES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what is the current interest rate payable by the Government for funds used in all of its housing developments? If the interest rates vary depending on the source of funds, can he say what are the total funds available at each interest rate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

SCRUB CLEARANCE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what action the Government intends to take in recommending to the Commonwealth Government plans that the Minister has to try to get the Commonwealth to take away from the rural community the taxation incentives now offered in respect of the development of scrub country and of rural properties? Within my district, many farmers have large tracts of country that they are still developing. Many of them have spent a considerable sum in reaching the stage of development they have presently reached. If any action were taken to prevent their obtaining taxation concessions to continue this development, it would endanger their livelihood and have a serious effect on rural areas.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This question probably stems from a report that the honourable member may have seen of a meeting in Perth last week of Ministers responsible for national parks, as a proposal of this type was considered at that meeting. That conference decided that Ministers would ask their Premiers to raise this matter with the Commonwealth Government. The thought that was in the minds of Ministers (and it is certainly in the minds of many people in the community) was that taxation concessions should not be provided in respect of clearing areas of land where such clearance was not necessary for development. I believe that in many areas there is no need for land to be cleared. However, as the clearing of land is occurring on a large scale, it seems clear that

land that need not be cleared for development is being cleared simply as a result of the taxation concession made available, and that situation should not be tolerated.

Mr. GUNN: Take it away from the Rundle Street farmer, and I will support that.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member says that he would support taking the concession away from the Rundle Street farmer, and this type of consideration was one of the main reasons why the matter was looked at on this occasion. Although no specific proposals have been put to Premiers to raise with the Commonwealth, if it could be established that a farmer had areas of land that should be cleared, I would think that he should still be able to receive a taxation concession for such land clearance.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation ask the Minister of Forests to have the Woods and Forests Department delay clearing, for pine forests, any additional areas that are mainly still covered with native trees and plants in the Adelaide Hills catchment area? I ask this question because the resin from the pine forests stains the water in our reservoirs considerably, and also because the mat that builds up under the pine trees causes the run-off to be less than it has been in the past from native trees and shrubs. We are concerned about our native birds and animals and the pine trees are not providing honey for the bird life. Most of our native birds are honey eaters and rely on our native trees and shrubs for food to survive. Our native animals rely on eucalypt for their food: pine is of no benefit at all. Those who believe in the conservation of our native birds, animals and plants, are concerned that the department is buying cheaper land that is still covered with native trees and clearing it for a profitable venture. In fact, the department is doing the same thing as farmers who clear land in order to obtain tax concessions, which the Minister has mentioned. It has been brought to my notice that the Government is acting similarly by clearing indigenous plants from many of our most beautiful parts of the Adelaide Hills to carry out a more economic venture. Will the Minister ask his colleague to request the department to delay clearing native trees and shrubs from further land until all the cleared areas have been planted?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to refer to my colleague the matters that the honourable member has raised and to ask him to take them up with the depart-

ment and provide a reply for the honourable member regarding the department's attitude.

GARDEN ISLAND

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Minister of Marine, will the Premier obtain for me a report on the development of Garden Island? When I had the privilege of being Minister of Marine I had some negotiations with the Port Adelaide council that would have led to the development of Garden Island, in the district of the member for Price. The idea was for the Port Adelaide council progressively to develop this piece of land, which is rather an eyesore, into a playground which could be used by the residents and which would be worthy of the State. On an inspection at the weekend, I noticed that no development of the kind I have mentioned seems to have taken place, although some bathing facilities have been provided in the North Arm and the Angas Inlet. Will the Premier obtain from his colleague a report on what has happened regarding the negotiations with the Port Adelaide council and, if these negotiations have failed, will he ask his colleague whether he has any plans, as an alternative to developing Garden Island?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

BERRI SCHOOL

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 12 regarding work on the Headmaster's residence at the Berri Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Early last year a survey was made of the requirements to bring the residence occupied by the Headmaster of Berri Primary School to a suitable standard. It was estimated at that time that the cost of the necessary repairs and improvements would be about \$7,500. As this amount is considered excessive because of the age and condition of the residence, essential maintenance will be carried out, pending replacement of the building. Consideration will be given to its replacement when the next school residence programme is drawn up.

PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when I may expect a reply to my question of August 3 regarding the Port Lincoln Hospital? It is becoming a matter of concern to members on this side that the Chief Secretary, in particular, is extremely tardy in replying to our questions. I ask the Attorney whether, when seeking a

reply to the question to which I have referred and which I asked three weeks ago, he will also ask his colleague to be more expeditious in supplying replies.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am sure that the Chief Secretary carefully considers matters raised by honourable members before providing replies, and sometimes this accounts for the delays which are involved, but which, nevertheless, are necessary. I will refer to my colleague the question that the honourable member has asked.

UNIONISM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether it is now the Government's policy that all persons working on Highways Department projects must be members of a trade union? In the last couple of days I have been sent a photostat copy of a current Highways Department equipment hire offer form in connection with work on the Hills Freeway, and I note (and this was pointed out to me as being an additional requirement) that condition No. 6 states:

Operators to be members of trade unions. Unless the owner of the machine is the person who operates the machine, all operators must be members of the appropriate trade unions.

Mr. Langley: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I note that endorsement from the member for Unley.

Mr. Hall: That's compulsion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the Leader has properly said, that is compulsion. In other words, it makes unionism compulsory. As I understand the position, the Government has stated that its policy is to give preference to unionists, but this condition seems to go far beyond preference, to a point of compulsion, the point to which the Minister tried to go about 12 months ago.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Mitcham seems to remember clearly what I said about 12 months ago, or what I tried to do 12 months ago in his opinion, but he conveniently forgets that this very matter was raised about 12 months ago and the reply given is in *Hansard*. If the honourable member would like me to check that report and bring to his attention the page number in *Hansard*. I should be only too delighted to do so, if he is not willing to do it himself.

Mr. Hall: That's not good enough! Where's your Ministerial responsibility?

The SPEAKER: Order!

LOXTON OFFICES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Works, refer to his colleague the fact that the Government offices at Loxton, although provided with certain facilities to enable gardens to be planted, have empty boxes around the buildings, with nothing growing in them? When I was in Loxton recently, this matter was brought to my attention. The general township attitude towards buildings is to try to beautify them as the town is being beautified, and it is rather odd that the new Government buildings there have no lawns close to the walls of the buildings, possibly because it is feared that water may affect the foundations. However, cement has been provided right up to the foundations and square boxes that are about 2ft. high have been constructed, but these boxes have not been filled with soil and nothing has been planted in them to try to beautify the area. Will the Minister, when drawing his colleague's attention to this situation, ask him to review the whole plan of development for this area, and to ascertain whether a concrete footing of 2ft. or 3ft. could be left around the foundation and whether it would be possible to plant lawn and upgrade the whole appearance of the area? If this action is not possible, will the Minister consider having soil placed in the boxes and creepers or other plants planted in them in order to lessen the starkness of the whole design?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to ensure that the honourable member's question is drawn to the attention of my colleague, and I shall ask him personally to make sure that a report on this matter is expedited.

WHEAT

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier censure his colleagues in the Commonwealth sphere for making a complete mess of the relationship existing between the Australian Wheat Board and the People's Republic of China in relation to wheat sales?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's question is out of order, as it is not within the competence of the Premier to do this.

Mr. VENNING: Does the Premier agree that much damage was done to the Australian wheat industry by the recent visit of Commonwealth Labor politicians to China? Recently, Mr. Whitlam went to China and played politics with the Australian wheat industry to such an extent that we now find that no sale is contemplated by the Australian Wheat Board.

Will the Premier express his thoughts on this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Premier, I point out that I do not consider this question comes within the scope of the Premier of this State. However, if the Premier desires to reply he may do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The contemptible attempt by some people, claiming to represent country areas, to cover up for their own depredations on the wheat industry of this country is extraordinary. I agree with the statement made in the Commonwealth House of Representatives by Dr. Patterson, who said that someone in the Commonwealth Government or in another place was telling lies in an attempt to influence the Australian wheat farmers on this issue. It was perfectly clear—

Mr. Millhouse: Who is telling lies?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have pointed out to honourable members that, if they ask a question of a provocative nature, they will get the reply they seek.

Mr. Venning: There was nothing provocative in this.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order in interjecting when the Speaker is on his feet, and I do not intend to tolerate it. Also, I ask the member for Mitcham to contain himself. If the Premier desires to reply to the question he may continue to do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The People's Republic of China made it perfectly clear a long time ago that it was willing, where it could give preference to people who recognized its existence, to trade with those people rather than with those who did not recognize its existence. Indeed, when I saw the Commercial Counsellor for the Chinese Mission to London earlier this year, that was precisely the message he immediately sought to convey. They wished to trade with Australia, but they would give preference where possible to people who recognized their existence. Therefore, they would give preference to Canadian wheat or other products over Australia's products. They clearly did that, and they made that determination long before the Australian Labor Party's mission went to China and made the first effective break-through of countries in our area in relation to negotiations with the Chinese Republic. The extraordinary thing is that the honourable member should try to cover up for the utter inadequacy and the depredations upon his own industry of the

Minister for Primary Industry, who has seen fit to deprive this country of valuable markets because the Commonwealth Government refused to recognize the existence of those markets.

RAILWAY TRUCKS

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when I can expect a reply to my question of August 4 about the fitting of automatic draw gear to railway trucks in Port Lincoln?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have seen the reply to this question, but I regret that I do not have it with me now. However, I will try to have it tomorrow for the honourable member.

SOFT DRINKS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to inquire into the need to re-label soft drinks? An article in the local newspaper, under the heading "Parents warned of soft drink danger", states:

The British Consumers Association has warned of the dangers to children in cola-type soft drinks. In its magazine "Which?" the association calls for a stricter labelling of such drinks. "We think that the caffeine content, or at least the fact that the drinks contain caffeine, should be mentioned on the label," the magazine says.

Caffeine in large doses tends to excite the nervous system and make the consumer more wakeful, it adds. But it can also lead to tenseness and irritability and cause headaches and palpitations. In testing 50 brands of cola the association discovered that the average caffeine content was about 150 parts a million.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask my colleague to accede to the honourable member's request.

OAKLANDS OVER-PASS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether plans and specifications have been completed for the suggested over-pass at the Oaklands railway crossing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To the best of my knowledge, the answer is "No".

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): In what circumstances did the accidents occur between motor vehicles and stationary railway vehicles from July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1971?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The following details have been supplied:

1. March 16, 1967, at 12.20 a.m. At crossing on back road between Crystal Brook and Port Pirie. Van hit train.

2. December 24, 1967, at 12.3 a.m. Rail crossing at Merriton. Car hit train.

3. February 6, 1968, at 10.55 p.m. Rail

crossing at Nairne. Car hit train.

4. February 1, 1969, at 10.3 p.m. Rail

crossing at Callington. Car hit train.

5. April 29, 1970, at 5.20 a.m. Rail crossing at Naracoorte. Semi-trailer hit train.

6. May 29, 1970, at 7.55 p.m. Rail crossing at Burrungule. Utility hit train.

7. June 7, 1971, at 8.30 p.m. Rail crossing at Lyndoch. Utility hit train.

PAY-ROLL TAX BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as

might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to impose a tax upon employers in respect of certain wages, to provide for the assessment and collection of the tax, and for purposes connected therewith. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I regret that I have only one copy at the moment to give members opposite. The negotiations with other States relating to this Bill, which were continuing as late as yesterday, have now been concluded, but it will not be until immediately after dinner this evening that additional copies of the Bill will be available. It is necessary to introduce this legislation immediately, as New South Wales and Victoria are fixing September 1 for the introduction of the measure. Therefore, it is vital for us to approve it rapidly so that we may coincide with the date of the introduction of the measure elsewhere and of the proposed

withdrawal of the Commonwealth Government from the scheme.

The need to introduce this legislation and to introduce it at this time arises directly from decisions (taken at the Premiers' Conference of June, 1971) to vary the arrangements for sharing national revenues more equitably between the Commonwealth and the States. Following submissions from the States over a long period and against the background of a rapid deterioration in the States' Revenue

Budget resources, the Commonwealth considered the practicability of transfer to the States of a major growth tax that the States could vary themselves according to their Budget needs.

At the meeting in June last the Prime Minister explained to the Premiers that, because of the constitutional barrier that prevents States from imposing a sales tax, and because of the Commonwealth's view that income tax should remain fully in its own hands for purposes of economic and financial control, it had been decided to offer the States the complete field of pay-roll tax. I make clear that the offer was made as part of a package arrangement under which there would amongst other things be a special addition to the Financial Assistance (or Tax Reimbursement) Grants in 1971-72 and future years, together with a supplementary grant to be made available for 1971-72 only. The arrangement was broadly as follows:

- (1) On the estimates supplied by the Commonwealth, aggregate pay-roll tax collections in 1971-72 (under existing conditions and at the existing rate of 21 per cent) were expected to be about \$334,000,000 in the six States (and about \$27,300,000 in South Australia). The amount that would actually be accrued to the States in 1971-72 would depend on the date of take-over of this power by the States, and that amount would be deducted from the Financial Assistance Grants otherwise payable to the States. (This was a straight swap: we were to get a tax that would yield us the same sum that was to be deducted from our Financial Assistance Grants.)
- (2) A special Commonwealth contribution of about \$22,400,000 for all States would be added back into the Financial Assistance Grants for 1971-72 and would be incorporated in the base for escalation in future years.
- (3) A supplementary grant of \$40,000,000 for all States would be made by the Commonwealth for 1971-72 only, in recognition of the States' particular current problems.

The Commonwealth also offered to assist the States to free local government from the necessity to pay pay-roll tax in respect of all its activities other than business undertakings. Thus an amount is to be added back to the Financial Assistance Grants corresponding to the cost to each State of helping local government in this way. The Commonwealth is also prepared to assist the States by meeting their estimated costs of collection of the tax. The States were unanimous in asking the Commonwealth to continue its existing organization

and to collect the tax on behalf of the States, but the Commonwealth was not prepared to do so, and, accordingly each State must provide its own legislative framework and its own administration. The Commonwealth has naturally given the co-operation of its officers to assist us in this regard. The States having accepted the offer of the Commonwealth, two matters remained for determination: the rate at which the tax was to be levied, and the day on which the States would commence to tax.

It is clear in the terms of the package arrangement outlined that some increase in rate was inevitable, since the financial grants to the States are to be adjusted downwards by about the amount that the Commonwealth would lose by vacating the tax at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Hence, if the States retained the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent there would be a negligible net increase in revenue (what was gained on the tax swings would be lost on the grants roundabouts, as it were). This then is the reason for the increase to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, the yield from the 1 per cent increase being, in effect, the real increase in accruals to the States. Since no additional revenue will accrue until the States enter the field, every State is anxious that it get under way as soon as possible. For this reason a common date, September 1, 1971, has been agreed upon. It is clear, however, that the Commonwealth will not vacate the field until it is certain that all States will be in a legislative position to impose tax from that day. All parties are naturally anxious to ensure that there is no double taxation, which itself may raise constitutional and administrative difficulties.

After lengthy and exhaustive discussions between officers representing the States and the Commonwealth, the following scheme was proposed to meet the situation. Each State will submit legislation to its Parliament that, in terms, imposes a tax from September 1, 1971. However, the legislation will of itself ensure that wages that are liable to taxation under the Commonwealth Act will not be liable to taxation under the State Act. The Bill gives effect to this scheme. Further, it makes provision to guard against the unlikely contingency that the Commonwealth would be unable to vacate the field with effect from September 1, 1971, and provision has been inserted in this measure to enable it to be modified to have substantial effect from a later day being the day on which the Commonwealth does, in fact, vacate the field.

Although operation from September 1 requires returns to be lodged and payments to

be made at the beginning of October, it is necessary that the legislation of all States and the Commonwealth be passed and in force within the first half of September at the latest; otherwise, administration will become quite impracticable and each month's delay would cost this State about \$750,000 in revenues and all States together more than \$9,000,000. The main effects in the South Australian Revenue Budget for 1971-72 to be introduced early next month are expected to be approximately as I shall now describe.

The pay-roll tax to be actually collected in this State on existing conditions and at the existing rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the nine months October to June (on salaries and wages paid or payable in the nine months September to May) would be about \$21,200,000. The Commonwealth grant is first to be reduced by a corresponding amount. However, about \$2,100,000 is to be added back to our grant in terms of the Commonwealth offer and escalated in future years, and a supplementary grant of \$4,300,000 is to be paid for 1971-72 only. The Commonwealth grant is also to be increased by about \$300,000, being the estimated cost of freeing local government non-business undertakings and by about \$45,000, being the estimated cost to us of administration in the nine months of this year. The \$21,200,000 which would be collected as State taxation by South Australia in the nine months of 1971-72 on existing conditions, and at the existing rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, would be reduced by the \$300,000 estimated cost of freeing local government.

It has been proposed by all States that the ambit of the pay-roll tax shall remain as it has been with the Commonwealth and that the exemptions shall continue as before at least until the States have had some experience with the levy. It is, however, open to each State to decide whether or not to continue pay-roll tax on State Government departments. We see no point in doing so, with minor exceptions, and accordingly this Bill exempts from tax the pay-rolls of Government departments except the Highways Department and the Motor Vehicles Department. The provisions for road purposes by both State and Commonwealth Governments have been determined having regard to the commitment to meet pay-roll tax and it seems sensible and equitable that it continue. The tax will continue on all statutory bodies now liable.

The lifting of pay-roll tax from our own departments is estimated to reduce collections by about \$3,600,000 and, of course, it will

decrease payments by departments correspondingly. The amount transferred from the Commonwealth, less the effect of freeing local government and most Government departments, would become about a net \$17,300,000. As to the reductions in payments by Government departments which will follow from their exemption from pay-roll tax, these will be primarily in respect of Revenue Account (probably more than four-fifths) but partly in respect of Loan Account and some working accounts such as that of the Woods and Forests Department. It has been the consistent practice in this State to bring pay-roll tax to debit in the month in which salaries and wages have been paid, and to hold the aggregate amount in a special deposit account over the end of the month for payment to the Commonwealth early the following month as required by its legislation.

It follows that, in order to make three payments to the Commonwealth in July, August and September, it will be necessary to bring to debit only two months' pay-roll tax in July and August, \$407,000 having been brought to debit in 1970-71 in respect of June salaries and wages and held in the deposit account at June 30 for payment to the Commonwealth early in July. The charges to Revenue Account which would have amounted to a little more than \$4,000,000 for pay-roll tax at 2½ per cent for the full year 1971-72 will now aggregate only about \$700,000. The major savings on works financed from Loan Account and carried out with departmental labour will be secured by the Engineering and Water Supply, Public Buildings, and Railways Departments.

Before embarking on an examination of the individual clauses of this measure it may be helpful if I indicate some of the considerations that gave rise to the technical form and substance of this Bill. The prime consideration was to ensure that the majority of taxpayers in this State, that is, those whose activities are entirely undertaken within the State, should suffer as little inconvenience as possible. So far as is practicable they should be able to make their returns in exactly the same manner as before, the only difference being that the returns should be made to the relevant State authority rather than the Commonwealth authority. Where the activity of the employer encompasses more than one State, some additional action will be required but, again, this has been kept to an absolute minimum.

For these reasons in appropriate cases the provisions of the Commonwealth Bill have been

carried forward *verbatim* in the State legislation and this principle has only been departed from where it has been necessary in the light of the changed circumstances or on the ground that the departure will be of benefit to the taxpayer. Necessarily, to enable those whose business extends over more than one State to have their liability determined in a similar way as between the States, many provisions of this Bill must be uniform as between the States; others, of course, are only of concern to this State. As a rough guide, these "uniform provisions" will be found generally in Parts I, III, IV and V.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 (1) sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure. Subclauses (2) and (3) are self-explanatory. Subclause (4) makes it clear that this measure will not impinge on wages that are subject to tax under the Commonwealth pay-roll tax legislation; such wages are, in terms, not taxable wages within the meaning of this Bill. Clause 4 is included merely as a precautionary measure. If for some reason the Commonwealth is unable to vacate the field with effect from September 1, 1971, this clause provides the necessary machinery to enable this Bill to have operative effect from a later day, this later day being the day on which the Commonwealth so vacates the field. As I have said, this is a very unlikely contingency but in the Government's view it would be irresponsible not to provide for it.

Clauses 5 and 6 are fairly standard administrative provisions; the measure will be administered by the Commissioner of Stamps. Clause 7 is, again, a relatively standard secrecy provision and is based on the corresponding provision in the Gift Duties Act. However, provision has necessarily been made to permit disclosure to Commonwealth and State authorities administering corresponding laws. In addition, provision has been made for disclosure with and in accordance with the consent of the taxpayer or any other person affected. Since the so-called secrecy provisions are intended to protect the taxpayer, it is somewhat incongruous if they were framed to prevent disclosure when it would be to his advantage.

Clause 8 is, of course, the key provision in the Bill, being the provision that determines liability. Broadly, wages that are (a) paid or payable in this State for services rendered in this State; or (b) paid or payable outside this State for services rendered in this State, are returnable in this State and hence taxable.

Paragraphs (c) and (d) constitute a transitional provision to ensure that no wages in respect of which tax has been paid under the Commonwealth Act will attract tax under the Act of this State. Subclause (2) is intended to deal with the case of wages that are payable but have not been paid where it is not clear or indeed cannot, at the time, be ascertained as to where they will actually be paid. The application of this provision to such wages should ensure that those wages in all circumstances will have attributed to them a notional place of payment that will play its part in fixing liability to taxation under subclause (1) of this clause. Subclause 3 also provides the basis of a place nexus for the payment of wages where wages are paid by negotiable instrument.

Clause 9 formally imposes a pay-roll tax at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; and clause 10 provides that it will be paid by the employer. Clause 11 deals in general with the question of apportioning the amount of exemption from pay-roll tax. Following the substance of the Commonwealth Act, the first \$20,800 of an annual pay-roll is exempt from tax. For the period ending on June 30, 1972, this exemption will, of course, be reduced in proportion to the months remaining in that period during which the State legislation is in operation, the balance of that financial year's exemption having already been granted under the Commonwealth legislation.

Where wages are returnable wholly within this State there is no problem but where wages paid by a single employer are returnable in two or more States the exemption must be apportioned and the apportionment must necessarily reflect the amount of wages paid in each such State. This provision then provides for apportionment as between States and it, of course, will be supported by corresponding provisions in the legislation of other States. Clause 12 follows generally the corresponding provision in the Commonwealth Act with some minor drafting modifications. As adverted to earlier, it exempts wages paid by "councils" as defined except in so far as those wages are payable in respect of business activities of those councils. In addition, payments made by the State Government departments are also exempt except to the extent indicated in paragraph (f) of this clause. Necessarily the taxing of State Government departments by the State would only be by way of book entry of a non-revenue producing nature. The exception proposed in paragraph (f) will however effectively release the amount of tax paid to revenue.

Clause 13 provides for a refund of a tax paid where the total wages paid do not exceed the amount of the general exemption referred to in relation to clause 11 and is primarily concerned to deal with questions that arise when tax is paid in more than one State. Clause 14 provides for registration as an employer, and at subclause (3) provision is made to continue in effect previous registration under the Commonwealth Act. Clause 15 provides for monthly returns of wages paid, and at subclause (2) provision is made for returns to be provided covering a longer period if, in the Commissioner's view, it would be unduly onerous for the employer to be required to submit monthly returns. At subclause (4) any arrangements under the Commonwealth Act having the effect of an arrangement under subclause (2) will continue in operation. Subclause (5) is a transitional provision amongst other things to facilitate the determination of final tax liability to the Commonwealth by, if necessary, adjusting the prescribed period for lodging returns under the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 16 provides in appropriate cases for the Commissioner to exempt an employer from furnishing returns without affecting that employer's liability for tax. Again appropriate arrangements under the Commonwealth Act are continued in operation. Clause 17 provides for the Commissioner to call for further or fuller returns in appropriate cases. Clause 18 empowers the Commissioner to seek such information as is necessary to determine a person's liability or entitlement under this measure. Clause 19 provides that pay-roll tax is payable at the time the return is made relating to the taxable wages on which the tax is payable.

Clause 20 empowers the Commissioner to make his own assessment of the tax payable by an employer. Subclause (2) of this clause limits the power of the Commissioner when the question arises as to the apportionment of exemptions as between States. In that case he must look to the apportionment before he can make his further assessment. Clause 21 provides for refunds of overpaid tax, and clause 22 provides a continuous appropriation to meet these refunds. Clause 23 enables an immediate assessment to be made where it appears that the interests of the revenue should be protected. Clause 24 provides for the extension of time to pay tax and for the payment of tax by instalments.

Clause 25 sets out the circumstances in which additional tax may become payable and

also provides for the remission of this additional tax in appropriate cases. Clause 26 provides for the recovery of tax by the Commissioner. Clause 27 provides for substituted service in appropriate cases. Clause 28 sets out in some detail the duties of a liquidator under this Act. Clause 29 sets out the duties of the agent for an absentee principal when that agent is engaged in winding up the business for that principal.

Clause 30 provides for the collection of tax owing by the estate of a deceased employer by reason that the tax was not paid in the life time of the employer and is somewhat less stringent than the comparable Commonwealth provision. Clause 31 sets out in some detail the rights and liabilities of the executors or administrators of an estate in relation to tax due and payable. Clause 32 provides that tax paid by one person on behalf of another person may be recovered by that first-mentioned person or may be recouped from any money in his hands that belongs to the person on whose behalf the tax was payable.

Clause 33 deals in some detail with the liabilities, between themselves, of joint taxpayers. Clause 34 gives the Commissioner the right, in effect, to garnishee debts due to the taxpayer to satisfy the taxpayer's liability to the Commissioner. The effect of such an action is, of course, to the appropriate extent, to discharge the debtor of his debt to the erring taxpayer. Clause 35 provides for an appeal procedure which generally follows that set out in the Gift Duty Act.

Clause 36 provides that a pending appeal or objection shall not of itself affect a liability to pay tax, and clause 37 provides for appropriate refunds or adjustments to be made following a sustained appeal or objection. Clause 38 is a general penalty provision which is self-explanatory. However, I would draw honourable members' attention to the defence provided by subclause (2). Clause 39 provides for additional tax in the circumstances set out in that clause. Clause 40 provides a substantial penalty in the case of offences akin to perjury. Clause 41 provides a penalty for tax evasion.

Clause 42 extends the time within which prosecutions for an offence against this Act may be commenced. The justification for this appears that most offences against this Act are sins of omission rather than commission, and hence are somewhat difficult to detect particularly if the time available for the detection is limited. Clause 43 provides that payments of penalties under the measure do

not relieve the person penalized from his liability to pay tax. Clause 44 is a fairly standard clause prohibiting the obstruction of people acting in the execution of their duty under the measure.

Clause 45 provides for the appointment of a public officer by a company, which as will be noted at clause 3 is given a somewhat extended meaning. This provision is somewhat less stringent than the corresponding Commonwealth provision in that under this provision such a public officer need only be appointed if the Commissioner requires such an appointment to be made. Under the corresponding Commonwealth provision every company was required to appoint a public officer. Clause 46 sets out in some detail certain provisions applicable to agents and trustees, and clause 47 sets out in similar detail the obligations of a person in receipt, control or disposal of money of a person resident out of the State.

Clause 48 provides for the preservation of books and records for a period of five years next following the completion of the transaction to which the books and records relate. Certain exemptions are contained in subclause (2). Clause 49 enables the Commissioner or a person authorized by him to enter buildings, etc., for the purposes of this measure, and I emphasize that such entry is only lawful when it is for the purposes of this Act. Clause 50 is a somewhat detailed evidentiary provision but it is suggested that in the circumstances of a taxing measure they do not unduly impinge on the rights of the citizen and generally they should serve to keep the costs of proceedings down.

Clause 51 provides for the service of documents, etc., by the Commissioner, and clause 52 provides for the service of documents on the Commissioner. Clause 53 again is an evidentiary provision and relates to the institution of prosecutions. Clause 54 provides for the protection of witnesses called on behalf of the Commissioner and follows a similar provision in the Commonwealth Act. Clause 55 provides that the minimum penalties provided for in this measure shall not be subject to reduction. I would point out that following the Commonwealth precedent the minimum penalties are generally of the order of \$2. Clause 56 provides that, except for the offence set out in clause 40 of this Bill, all offences may be dealt with summarily. Clause 57 sets out the appropriate regulation-making powers.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General):
I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Dentists Act in two major respects as well as dealing with a number of other important matters. The first major amendment relates to the admission of dentists to practise in this State. It has been apparent for some time that the statutory requirements for admission as a dental practitioner are unnecessarily restrictive upon foreign graduates. The Bill therefore invests the board with greater discretion to allow the admission of foreign graduates. The second major amendment is designed to permit the introduction of the "dental team concept" of dental treatment. There is now a need for statutory recognition to be given to the work of trained dental hygienists who perform ancillary functions assisting the dentists in overall treatment and care of a patient. I shall discuss the other aspects of the amendments in dealing in detail with the provisions of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clauses 3 and 4 deal with arrangement and interpretations of the Act and are consequential on the following amendments. Clause 5 changes an out-of-date reference to the British Medical Association to the Australian Medical Association. Clause 6 increases the fee for registration and renewal of registration to \$10. Clause 7 alters wording in relation to keeping of the temporary register. Clause 8 covers registration and temporary registration.

Registration: The Dentists Act of South Australia 1931-1966 recognizes, for the purposes of registration, university dental degrees from Australia, United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand and South Africa. The proposal would broaden the qualifications which would entitle dentists to be registered. The aim is to include persons qualified in recognized North American schools. It should be noted here that, although the graduating dental qualification in North America is a Doctorate of Dental Surgery, this is equivalent in standard to the Bachelor of Dental Surgery, Adelaide. The Commonwealth Committee on Oversea Professional Qualifications is investigating the desirability of making it possible for migrants whose qualifications measure up to our standards to be able to practise dentistry in this country. The proposed amendment would make it possible to register a man of outstanding ability

but not possessing a prescribed registrable qualification. In the case of such foreign degrees, each application for registration would be investigated by the Dental Board and, where necessary, examination would be conducted.

Temporary Registration: The University Dental School requested that action be taken to make it possible for oversea dental graduates, not holding registrable qualifications in South Australia, to treat patients during limited appointment to the staff of the university or the backing hospitals. Temporary registration would be beneficial in the following circumstances: (1) teaching; (2) research; and (3) postgraduate studies. Temporary registration would be granted for the purpose of holding a specific appointment and would not be granted for work in general practice.

Clause 9 repeals section 20. These provisions are now included in the new section 18. Clause 10 makes a drafting amendment to section 23. Clause 11 repeals sections 24, 25 and 26, which are now largely rendered redundant. A new section 24 is enacted, which provides for the suspension of a dentist to be noted in the register. Clause 12 repeals the old provisions relating to operative dental assistants and introduces a new Part providing for the registration of dental auxiliaries. We are concerned at the moment principally with the advent of dental hygienists who will be registered under these provisions. The amendment allows for any person already licensed as an operative dental assistant under this Act to be registered as a dental auxiliary without application to the board. Studies conducted by the dental profession into ways and means to increase the availability of dental services have resulted in the development of the "dental team" approach, in which trained auxiliaries assist the dentist and work as a team under his direction.

The objection is that trained auxiliaries, working under supervision, or to the prescription of the dentist, will relieve him of tasks which do not require his special knowledge, training and skill. Thus, he can devote more time to these aspects of patient care which require appropriate university education and intensive clinical training and experience. The dental team approach has the support of such international bodies as the World Health Organization and the International Dental Federation. Section 32 specifically states that dental therapists are not required to be registered under this Part. The therapist is controlled under section 40 (1) (d). Control

of auxiliaries is to be done by regulation under section 60.

Clauses 13, 14 and 15 introduce changes relating to the dental clinics, in order to fall into line with earlier amendments to the Act. Clause 16 makes it possible for the dental therapist to work in the clinic in the first year of training. Immediate supervision means a degree of supervision that is so proximate that the registered dentist is present personally to give directions. The deletion of "immediate" allows for more flexibility. The addition of subsection (6) covers the work performed by a dental hygienist.

Regarding clause 17, section 43 of the Dentists Act at the present time specifically precludes the use of the word "dental" in relation to any person other than a registered dentist. Because of this restriction, dental technicians called their association the Prosthetic Technicians Association. This title is misleading, because the word "prosthetic" has a wider connotation than the range of dental prostheses with which the dental technicians are concerned. Furthermore, the title does not give the technicians proper recognition of their close collaboration with dentists and the other dental auxiliaries as members of the "Dental Team". The amendment will allow a greater range of persons and bodies to assume a title including the word "dental".

Clauses 18 to 27 introduce consequential amendments. Regarding clause 28, instead of proclamations being made to amend the second schedule of the Act, it is considered that this would best be done by regulation. It would be possible for the board to regulate (1) registrable qualifications, and (2) courses of study and duties of dental auxiliaries. Clause 29 allows for the issuing of a certificate to a dentist or auxiliaries upon registration. Clause 30 is a consequential amendment. Clause 31 repeals the second schedule to the principal Act, which is now no longer necessary.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 19. Page 949.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): When I spoke in this debate last Thursday,

I said that the Government's credibility had suffered a shattering blow. I shall give the reasons for that statement. On March 2, the Premier introduced a Bill that he said was to ratify the Dartmouth dam agreement and I remember his stating clearly, as reported in the news media (especially on radio), that the Government had now "ratified Dartmouth". However, by August 19 we found that this Bill to ratify the Dartmouth agreement had to be repealed and that we must have a new Bill. On that basis alone, the Government is simply not to be believed, because it has taken so many diverse views on the Dartmouth issue that one does not know which view is its real policy, and one simply cannot believe Government statements on this aspect. The Premier's move has completely justified the attitude of the Liberal and Country League. He has admitted openly that he has failed to do what he said he would do. His election promise lies in the dust and now he must admit that he has failed and that he has delayed unnecessarily the construction of the dam and run us into a time of great risk. This means that Australian Labor Party policy has been put before any State interest or any other interests in the matter of Dartmouth.

The Premier has tried to get further political advantage from this matter rather than serve the people of South Australia, because he, more than any other Government member, knows that his was a sham fight. Throughout the explanation that he gave on Thursday, there ran a suggestion that he had been fighting for South Australians, whereas he knew that in 1967 his Party had given the game away. The question of whether it is too late arises now. This is what this House and the public would like to know. Have the Premier and the Labor Party delayed this issue until the dam has been lost?

We do not know this now but we do know that costs have increased substantially since I signed the agreement with the other three parties to it in February, 1970. At that time the cost stood at a certain level. Since then, I have received a rough estimate of the cost increases affecting construction of large earthworks and dams of this kind. These figures show that cost of labour, materials, and plant operating have increased by 9 per cent between January and December last year and by 4½ per cent between last December and today. This gives an increase in the cost of earthworks, labour, materials, and plant operating of 13½ per cent since January last

year, a month before the agreement was signed.

The cost of concrete materials has increased by 4½ per cent, and I gather from a quick scanning of today's *News* that the cost of cement in South Australia has been increased by \$1 a ton. The wages provided in two Commonwealth awards have been given to me as examples of increases in labour costs. The rates for builders labourers and for carpenters and joiners have increased by 32 per cent and 9 per cent respectively in this period, the hourly rate for a builders labourer having increased from \$1.18 to \$1.56 and that for carpenters and joiners from \$1.65 to \$1.80. Here lies the reason for the disquiet that the Opposition and the public feel about what may be in store for South Australia. Indeed, it will be a calamity for us if the escalation has exceeded 10 per cent and the cost of the dam exceeds \$62,700,000. That will mean that a whole new renegotiation must take place, and the surety of construction that this State had in April last year will have been lost. To illustrate this, one only has to quote from statements by Leaders of other parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. Sir Henry Bolte is quoted as stating in Victoria:

The action of the South Australian Government has delayed the project by at least 18 months.

We all know this, and this side of the House has continually warned the Government of its responsibility in this matter. Sir Henry also stated:

Had South Australia accepted the original agreement, there is no doubt that the dam would have been started and committed. If there is any doubt about it (and I say there is) they are entirely responsible.

In moving around South Australia at the weekend, I have found that people accept that the delay (and the responsibility for it) lies with the Labor Government and that the risk South Australia is running has been placed in the path of our progress by the Labor Government. Many people have spoken to me about this matter. We have the ludicrous situation of the Premier now fighting for Dartmouth! Fighting for Dartmouth, when he has treated it as a plaything of a political association. A report in this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading, "Motives on dam attacked", states:

The Commonwealth believed the Dartmouth dam was a vital national project, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday. He attacked the "motives" of the Victorian Premier (Sir Henry Bolte). "Sir Henry Bolte is quite evidently trying to set up a situation for a further appeal to the Commonwealth for some funds," Mr. Dunstan said.

Why has he given Sir Henry the opportunity to do that? He did not have that opportunity in April last year when he had just come from the table after signing the document agreeing to its implementation. The Premier admits freely that Sir Henry is playing around for further funds and risking the whole project, but the Premier is responsible for this risk to the State. We have heard (and I have warned in this House of the consequences of what we have heard) of the alternatives to the Dartmouth dam. An article in the *Financial Review* of July 28 (not a month ago) states:

In one hit it could be possible to save the Commonwealth \$60,000,000 and end the undignified interstate wrangle over the choice of Dartmouth before Chowilla as the next dam on the Murray River. The solution could be to build neither and use water stored in the existing Blowering dam on the Tumut River in N.S.W. to supply additional water for South Australia, the main reason for a new Murray River dam.

The report continues:

Construction of Dartmouth, to cost nearly \$60,000,000 on current estimates, has not started because the South Australian Government's electoral commitment to agree to Dartmouth only if a pledge is made to construct Chowilla in the future. The more rational members of the South Australian Parliament realize by now that Chowilla is a poor proposition because of evaporation, environmental and salinity problems and could accept the Blowering proposals as a chance to get off the hook and also save hard cash.

After this publicity was given to the alternative, I made my position clear that neither I nor my Party supported this alternative to the Dartmouth dam. These are the problems arising for South Australia as people see water being stored by other States not being required for its original purpose, and the alternative is being offered in this way. The behaviour of Government members has not always been at a high level in this matter, and I remember with shame some of the references that were made when this issue was debated on the night my Government fell during that difficult and important debate in April last year. I well remember what the now Deputy Premier said, and the high level at which he debated this issue! These were the thoughts that the Labor Party in Opposition had concerning South Australia's water supply, and how it considered the motives of the Commonwealth Government in supporting Dartmouth dam: this is what the present Deputy Premier (Mr. Corcoran) said:

On television the other evening we saw the Premier standing in front of the House, waving his arms around and indicating that this was where the matter would be debated.

That is how he referred to me and to my indication that this would be a matter of a confidence vote. He continued:

I do not know when he will be sent to Hollywood. Supporting him he had Mr. Fairbairn, the former Minister for National Development, who has been sacked because he nearly toppled the "boss" in Canberra. He is extremely keen on Dartmouth, because it is near his electoral district. This is the person whom the Premier puts up to convince the people of South Australia that the Government is doing the right thing by this State in introducing this Bill.

Then the present Minister of Environment and Conservation interjected and said, "Did the Premier tell us where Fairbairn's district was?", and Mr. Corcoran replied, "No, but I have told the House where it is." This was the type and level of debate that the now Deputy Premier introduced when discussing a matter of such importance to South Australia, denigrating the Commonwealth Minister on a personal level by implying that the Minister had supported Dartmouth dam because it was in his district. That despicable reference indicated how much interest the Labor Party had in Dartmouth and a water supply for South Australia. It was interested in what it could get out of it for the Party and did not care a fig for people who live on the river or in the metropolitan area. What type of leadership have we had throughout this sorry period? I refer again to the Premier's involvement. On August 15, 1967, the Premier moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice forthwith: 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.

He limited his demands to the 1,250,000 acre feet that Chowilla would have provided. When we in Opposition, in 1967, vigorously opposed the sell-out that the Premier contemplated on behalf of South Australia, he amended the motion so that he would not be faced with the embarrassment of having his words endorsed in this House. However, his true attitude to our water supply was indicated by the motion he moved. He said that if we could not get Chowilla we would want as an alternative the same volume of water as we would have obtained from Chowilla. Perhaps that is why, for 18 months, he has refused

to validate the agreement that would have given South Australia 37 per cent more usable water than Chowilla would have given. Perhaps that is why he is unable to swallow the bitter pill that his political opponents have done so much more for this State. There could be no other reason for his motives in refusing a benefit to the State that would result in an increased supply of water for the State.

On April 29, 1970, the Premier said that, in order to get an agreement with the other States and the Commonwealth for the building of the Dartmouth dam, this State must agree that the Chowilla dam should never be built, for that was the expression of the agreement that we were being asked to sign. This State must agree that the Chowilla dam shall never be built! In support of this House validating the very agreement that the Premier opposed in the manner I have just quoted, on Thursday he said:

Under the amending agreement, Chowilla will be looked at as a possible future storage. Which of his statements do we believe?

Mr. Millhouse: One must be a lie.

Mr. HALL: The one on April 29, 1970, or the one on August 19, 1971: shall we toss a coin? It is not good enough, for a subject that is of so much future importance to the State, that the Premier should immediately turn around and admit that there is something after all to the additional clause which I had inserted in the agreement when it came to this Parliament and which I had agreed to by letter with the other three parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. That will illustrate how much worth there is in the Premier's credibility. But there are other examples. Regarding Victoria's needs for water, the Premier, on March 2 this year, said:

We have had various statements from the leaders of the other States, particularly Sir Henry Bolte, to the effect that the Dartmouth dam is in danger. Sir Henry has even said that he has now appropriated, for other purposes, moneys he appropriated for work this year on Dartmouth. As the moneys he could have appropriated this year for Dartmouth were very small, this is simply grandstanding. The fact is that both New South Wales and Victoria are over-committed in relation to existing water rights, and settlers in both areas badly need the construction of the Dartmouth dam.

But what did he say last Thursday? He said:

The Victorian Government has alternative water resources that it could develop to satisfy the needs of people, other than those directly irrigating from the Murray, and it seems quite content to see a decline in irrigation activity, since markets for Riverland products are

falling, or will fall, particularly with the prospect of Britain's entry into the European Common Market.

What secret new information has the Premier got since March? What utter drivel the Premier has given us a few months apart. Again, which statement is right: do we toss a coin? They are statements directly at variance with each other. The Premier also mentioned South Australia's special rights. He said that we must maintain some special right in regard to Chowilla. He has never taken the trouble to explain to the House the effect of the rising costs of Chowilla in relation to its availability under the agreement that validated that dam; but he has continued to maintain that he is fighting for some special South Australian rights. He is a great South Australian fighter! Then, on November 4, 1970, a press article stated:

Mr. Whitlam said Australian Labor Party policy was that at least two dams were needed on the Murray to ensure a supply of water of quality and quantity ... A national authority to replace the "archaic and inefficient" River Murray Commission, and to incorporate the Snowy Mountains Authority was urged today by the Federal Opposition Leader, Mr. Whitlam. The authority could deal with conservation and construction works throughout Australia.

The subject of this national conservation authority for water was put to the Premier, who replied:

Mr. Whitlam's ideas are entirely in accordance 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 and 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 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.

The Premier, therefore, is willing to support the national leader of the Labor Party in superseding the River Murray Commission. He advocates the superseding of the commission, with which we have a special relationship. The commission has the direct responsibility of managing the resources of the Murray River and not of looking after the needs of Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, or other States or interests that do not have a connection with that river system. It is a shocking admission by the Premier that he will give this away in the general progress

of a Socialist Government in South Australia which thinks that all things come from centralization. Yet the Premier tries to continue the fiction that he has been fighting on behalf of this State. Over recent months, much has been said by him and others. The Premier has said that both dams are vital, although Chowilla would have far greater benefits for South Australia. That statement, attributed to him on February 19, is in itself a fiction, because Chowilla will provide a significantly smaller amount of water to South Australia than would Dartmouth. On February 19 the Premier said that there was no danger that the entire Dartmouth dam plan would be scrapped. On February 23, he said:

I stress that the South Australian Government will not approve words in the amending agreement providing for the ending of the Chowilla proposal.

The various statements go on; they are unending. They contradict each other, and hold out the false promise of a fight that never existed. Last Thursday, the Premier advocated the signing of the Dartmouth agreement. During all this time the people have been greatly misled by those in the Labor Party who would have them believe that they have been treated in an inferior manner by the Liberal and Country League—a great story that has been misrepresented in this manner. Chowilla, which began as a project in the early 1960's, was never examined in comparison with alternatives until 1967, when the present Premier (and then Premier) agreed to the re-examination taking place. In that first re-examination, the report that came to the Government when I was Premier indicated that Dartmouth would yield about four times the amount of additional water to the river system; that provided us in Government with a real quandary: what would we do with our support for Chowilla in the face of the first comparison that had ever been made with an alternative?

Our action was taken on behalf of all South Australians to demand a price on the acceptance of Dartmouth, and that price was a proper share of the increased water that Dartmouth would give to the system. We maintained our support for Chowilla until by hard negotiation we won that increased allocation for this State. In winning an increase of 37 per cent more usable water, we obtained the greatest victory in terms of measurable results to South Australia that this State has ever had. I believe the fact that we obtained it has been the greatest obstacle to the Labor Party in this whole matter. It was a tremendously bitter

pill for the Labor Party, which said it wanted 1,250,000 acre feet, to be presented with a situation where the L.C.L. had got 1,500,000 acre feet. It, therefore, delayed the situation by 18 months until this precarious time.

The Government knows it has been delaying at risk. I quote now from *Hansard* of October 28, 1970, when, in answer to a question, the Premier said:

We have been, in fact, informed by the Engineer-in-Chief that there will be no delay in the construction programme of the Dartmouth dam, provided agreement is reached before next March.

March was the time when the Premier brought in his phoney Bill, and he had been advised by his chief adviser on South Australia's water supply that he could continue until March without danger. The obvious inference was that any delay beyond March would be dangerous. We heard the phoney Bill presented to the House and the Premier's pronouncement that he had ratified the Dartmouth agreement. We knew that he had not, but many people were not in possession of the details, and we know how difficult it is for people without detailed knowledge to grasp the facts. Many people were taken in by this false statement that the Premier had ratified Dartmouth. The action of the Premier and the Government now is one of panic, because the Premier has changed his story from the one that Sir Henry Bolte is grandstanding and that the other States need water to the statement that we were presented with in the House on Thursday, that time is running out, the Victorians have alternative storages, and there is not such a demand for riverland products. Something has intervened in the thinking of this Government from March to August that has changed significantly its view on the availability of the Dartmouth dam and the support for it by Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. Millhouse: The Premier has not made the correspondence available to us.

Mr. HALL: No, the Premier has not made available the correspondence from the other States' leaders because it is embarrassing to him.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course it is.

Mr. HALL: The other Premiers know how co-operative we were in the negotiations we undertook. As the previous Minister of Works (the member for Torrens) knows, once we had won the principle of gaining 1,500,000 acre feet the other States were most co-operative in making available to us that 1,500,000 acre feet. This was not always an easy thing for them to do, as the member for Torrens well remembers: there was much give and take in those

arrangements. To thinking South Australians, how absurd it was for the previous Government to have reached the apex of the negotiations and to have clinched a superior deal for this State and then for the new Government to come in and say, "We want to renegotiate." Having won the game, it is absurd for anyone to say, "I want to win it twice." No wonder the other States reacted as they did.

Now, we have this panic move, this change of assessment of how the other States will act. They are not just grandstanding now, according to the Premier: they have alternative supplies and have no need for Dartmouth. It was put to me many times at the weekend that the Government should resign, that it is there under false pretences. We know the Government is there under false pretences. It ran to the honey-pot flat out when the last challenge was put to the public and to this House when we were last in office. It would have done anything to gain office, and that is just what it did. It repudiated South Australia's future to get into office. How futile it would be to ask it to resign! It has no honour, so there is nothing to appeal to. Therefore, I would not ask it to resign, because I would not expect any response. However, the public is thinking that it should resign. Many people that I have spoken to, as I have said, over the weekend believe the Government is holding office under false pretences.

This is indeed shoddy treatment, not just of us as a political Party. Politics is a matter of some cut and thrust, and one needs to be tough enough to take it in politics. It is not so much the L.C.L. that has been given a shoddy deal: it is the public of this State. The management of the State today is second-rate, second-class, as evidenced in many ways by the actions on the Ministerial bench. The lack of Ministerial responsibility was shown again today in another direction (which I cannot mention in this debate) by Ministers simply refusing to answer questions. Time after time we get no responsible answer. The Ministers continue to treat the issues of the day as their own personal property; they continue to answer as though they were answering us personally instead of answering the conscience of the public in the questions we put to them. I can only sum up by quoting from the Premier's own policy speech delivered in 1970, when he said:

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.

I have been through much of the history of this matter in the time I have used; we could spend hours describing accurately the progress of events since the early 1960s. However, for my answer I have been mainly to the Premier's own statements, for I believe it is by his own statements that he is condemned on this issue.

I am pleased to support this Bill. I support it, of course, 18 months later than I supported it previously. It would have been much better for this State had the Labor Party voted for it at that time. Had it done so, it might have given the L.C.L. Government a few more months in office; on the other hand, the Labor Party might not have gained office as it did gain it. However, that is all conjecture now. All I can say is that the dam is at the moment a matter of great controversy as regards cost. By no means are we sure that we are going to get the dam. If we do not get it, I will continue to place the blame where it rests, namely, on the shoulders of the Premier and other Government members, including the member for Chaffey, who repudiated the interests of his district personally in every vote he gave in this House in which he supported the Premier in this delay. We all hope that the costs can be contained within the 10 per cent margin and that, if they are not contained, the Premier will swiftly move to renegotiate with the other States whilst there is the slightest opportunity to obtain their agreement. In any case, this Bill should be through the House tonight. That the Government has delayed the measure for 18 months is no reason to delay it a further 18 hours. As I say, I believe the Government is panicking, as it should be. Not only is the Government in trouble: South Australia is in trouble in that the Government is presenting this Bill 18 months after it should have passed through this House. For these reasons and on those conditions, I support the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support this Bill for the second time. Having supported it in April, 1970, I support it now in August, 1971, but this time I do so with mixed feelings. First, I am hoping, as are all South Australians,

for the benefits that were provided under the original Bill, and I trust that this Bill has the speedy passage through the House that it deserves. However, that happiness is greatly tempered by the examples we have seen of the present Government's shoddy dealing and its credibility in the face of this Parliament and, what is more important, in the face of the public of South Australia, particularly the settlers along the Murray. This statement probably applies most of all to the Premier, as Leader of the Government.

The introduction of this Bill last Thursday represents a complete vindication of and justification for the attitude taken by the Hall Government in April, 1970. By negotiation, that Government had obtained substantial benefits for South Australia (the first benefits obtained since 1914 when the original agreement was written and ratified), yet the present Government sought to frustrate that Government and to negate those tremendous gains, for stark political purposes. We are entitled to ask ourselves what were the substantial gains obtained for South Australia. First, the entitlement since the year dot has been 1,250,000 acre feet, and under the new agreement it rose to 1,500,000 acre feet, a 20 per cent increase in quantity. The diversion water that was allocated rose from 690,000 acre feet to 936,000 acre feet (an increase of 37 per cent), and that means that the quantity of usable water rose by 37 per cent. The dilution water had remained at 564,000 acre feet, and we must remember that, under the present position concerning water licences (a matter of which most members who represent River districts are perfectly aware), there is an over-commitment on the present allocation amounting to about 85,000 acre feet.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. This is a very important debate, and I ask members to cease talking. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. CUMBE: Therefore, we can see that the amount likely to be required for improved quality control would be about 120,000 acre feet, and the balance available for further use would be about 41,000 acre feet. This brings us immediately to the position concerning users of the water. At present, there is a complete ban on the issuing of licences to divertees along the Murray River. In fact, if there were a series of drought years, as unfortunately we must come to expect (no-one can avoid this issue), the stark position is that some people along the Murray

would be subject to greater restrictions, and some would have to go without water. Therefore, at present there is a complete ban, with the danger of some reduction, but with Dartmouth the advantage gained here was that existing licences would be assured, with the possibility of some future expansion; I say "possibility", because investigations would have to be carried out in that regard and, indeed, I understand that investigations are being carried out. Furthermore, the people who live in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and who obtain their water supply through the mains, as well as those who live in remote country areas and who also obtain their water supply through mains, could be assured of a continued water supply.

These were tremendous advantages, which were all thrown away by the Labor Party's action in April, 1970. In addition, the Menindee Lakes agreement was to be placed in perpetuity under the control of the River Murray Commission. Those of us who have studied the matter know that the Menindee Lakes scheme was placed under the control of the River Murray Commission for a certain number of years, that that arrangement expired, but that it has been continued under a gentleman's agreement for the time being. One of the conditions was that that agreement would continue in perpetuity. These negotiations were not easy to achieve. On March 7, 1969, I remember, as the Minister of Works for this State, with the other Ministers from the New South Wales and Victorian Governments, and with the Hon. David Fairbairn from the Commonwealth Government, attending the conference at which we hammered out the final agreement and at which the Commonwealth Government agreed to give South Australia the extra quantity to which I have referred, and some of the conditions laid down for South Australia as a result of that meeting make interesting reading. I quote from the press report, issued when I returned from that conference, as follows:

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

That refers to the 5:5:5 scheme. The report continues:

It was further agreed that the Menindee Lakes Storage Agreement under which these lakes in New South Wales operate in conjunction with the Murray River system should be continued in perpetuity . . . Salinity control flows at Euston and Torumberry weirs would be continued as previously agreed by the River Murray Commission.

Some other matters that are mainly connected with New South Wales and Victoria were discussed. These were some of the material gains. I refer now to another great advantage that was available when the Hall Government introduced the previous Bill in April, 1970, to ratify the Dartmouth agreement; that is the financial assistance on which the Commonwealth Government had agreed. We hear much from the Government at present about the Commonwealth and its financial grants. This Government is always complaining about the Commonwealth Government. I should like to recite to the House what the Commonwealth Government offered the States in relation to this great project, an offer which, everyone will agree, was most generous indeed.

Under the old Chowilla agreement, the four parties were each to provide one-quarter of the required expenditure. However, under the Dartmouth agreement, not only did the Commonwealth Government agree to pay its one-quarter share but it also agreed to advance to the States one-half of their one-quarter share as a loan repayable over 15 years, and there was to be a moratorium for 10 years; that is to say, the first repayment would be made 10 years after the money was borrowed, with interest being charged at the long-term bond rate. Therefore, South Australia would have had to find from Loan funds only one-eighth of the total cost of the project. That was an extremely important advantage to this State, as it was to the other two States, and was far more favourable than ever was planned under the original Chowilla legislation. It was yet another advantage that flowed from the negotiations leading to the measure introduced into this House in 1970. However, all these advantages for South Australia were thrown away callously by the Australian Labor Party in April, 1970.

Having dealt with the advantages that would have accrued to South Australia, I will now recite what happened. The Leader of the Opposition has most eloquently stated in detail the action of the present Government in 1970, when it was in Opposition, and since then. I say deliberately that the Government's shoddy action, which it took for purely political

purposes, and particularly its credibility are becoming well known to the general public. They are under open attack. The public is now waking up to the Government's tactics, and the credibility gap to which I have referred is widening very rapidly indeed.

Whether or not the people in the metropolitan area are concerned about water is a matter for conjecture, although they should be concerned. However, this State has had a series of good years, and our reservoirs are at present full. It can probably be said that we have a supply sufficient to last for two years. Unfortunately, as statistics and history will show, we in South Australia experience dry years, and it will take only a year or two of drought conditions for the people to turn against the Labor Government, which has let them down so badly on this matter. The plain, inescapable fact is that by its action in 1970 the A.L.P. has acted culpably, it having denied to the people of this State the extra water and the advantages that were gained by extremely hard bargaining at many conferences. I assure the House that much hard bargaining took place at many of the conferences to which I have referred.

I said in the debate that took place in this House in April, 1970, that the Labor Party's action then could mean that this State would get no dam at all; in other words, the dam would be damned. Last week or the week before, the Premier estimated that costs would have escalated by at least 10 per cent during the intervening period. Only the Labor Party can be blamed for this. In his explanation last Thursday, the Premier blamed everyone but himself. First, he blamed the other States, especially Victoria, for his present dilemma. He has been forced to somersault and backtrack; however reluctantly, after 16 or 17 months, he has now had to admit that in 1970 the Hall Government was right after all. In the debate in 1970, we pointed out the facts of life regarding this dam and the advantages we had gained. Also, we said that the partners to the agreement would not be moved on the issue. However, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) went on his way, putting his Party before the State's needs and saying that he could renegotiate the agreement. We all remember his saying that he could renegotiate it within a few months. I point out that it had taken about 18 months for the previous Government to negotiate to the stage of introducing that Bill in April, 1970. Once again, the present Premier has been proved wrong. I

said in 1970 that he had a snowflake's chance in hell of renegotiating the agreement, and that has proved to be correct.

I also recall that the Premier was the first person to talk about alternatives. At page 1271 of *Hansard* of August 15, 1967, at about the time when work on Chowilla was halted, he is shown as having used the words "or any alternative proposal". If ever there was a sell out, that was it. Then the Premier introduced last session an amending Bill, which we strongly queried as to its legality and chance of success. Once again the Premier failed. Looking back, the Premier's performance in this whole sphere has been a shoddy and sorry story of failure and of misleading the people of South Australia. They will not forget this sorry record of the Premier's. In his apologia last Thursday he again tried to shift the blame to other States and to justify his action of last session with regard to the inclusion in the agreement of clauses relating to Chowilla. I listened with great care to what the Premier said, and I have since read in *Hansard* his explanation. All I want to say about it is that it is a most carefully worded statement; he and his press officers must have worked hard indeed on the wording of the explanation in an effort to cloak the Premier's embarrassment. However, no matter how the words are put together the plain fact emerges that the Premier has failed himself and the people again: he has let the people down with a fairly big thump.

South Australia has been fortunate in having good flows down the Murray in recent years, and there appears to be plenty of snow in the Alps at present. However, if before Dartmouth is effected we have a series of dry years with poor flows down the river, the Premier must take the blame fairly and squarely on his shoulders, and it must also rest on the shoulders of members opposite who support him. I will go further and say that the whole Labor Party must take the blame for this, and that includes the Parliamentary Party and the rank and file supporters of the Premier. I state most emphatically that many of these rank and file supporters outside the House are today querying the dubious leadership of the Premier. He has at last come to the end of the road on this matter. He has found that he has no alternative but to present this Bill, in the form of the Bill originally presented in 1970, and to face the music. The Bill currently on members' files has the same wording as the 1970 Bill introduced by the Hall Government except for the provision rescinding the clause included in the 1971 Act. Even the signatures are

the same. Therefore, after 16 to 18 months' delay, the Labor Government has introduced this Bill.

Where do we go from here? Because of delays caused by its shabby actions, the present Government did not make use of the great advantages gained for South Australia by the negotiations of the previous Government. Have we priced ourselves out of the dam? This is an important matter that we must examine. Today, the Leader referred to the escalating costs. The Premier has said officially that the dam costs will have escalated by at least 10 per cent. I am perfectly aware of the financial provisions in the Bill. What we must do is get on with the job of building Dartmouth before time runs out and costs are too high. Those are the two essentials. I suggest we should put the State and the people before Party, just as the L.C.L. did in 1970. We put the State first, but the A.L.P. put Party first in 1970. That Party got into office, but the people of South Australia did not get a dam. I suggest that this Parliament should pass this Bill, putting this project before Party so that the dam, which I believe to be one of the great projects of Australia and which will give to South Australia lasting benefits of immense magnitude, can be proceeded with.

Mr. Venning: It won't now be the Government's decision.

Mr. COUMBE: That is a good point. The Opposition desires a speedy passage for this Bill. Our only desire is to secure for South Australia what had been gained early last year by the previous Government and what would have been well under way now had the 1970 Bill been ratified then and had the Labor Party at that time not thwarted and delayed the passage of the Bill, denying the people the advantages to be obtained by its passing. In the time that has passed since that Bill was introduced in April, 1970, the design work and tendering for the dam could have been well under way, as all members know. I believe that the main thing we must do is get this Bill through the House and get on with building this dam for the benefit of the people of South Australia.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): It is with much pleasure that I support the Bill. I have given my full support to the present Government since I was returned to this House at the last election. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Torrens endeavoured to lay the full blame for the delays in connection with the dam on this Government. They blamed it for endeavouring to renegotiate the River

Murray Waters Agreement in accordance with the wishes of the people of South Australia, as expressed at the last State election.

Mr. Rodda: You said you were going to build the dam.

Mr. CURREN: In its policy speech prior to the last election the Labor Party did not say, "We will build the Chowilla dam." To ensure that the member for Victoria appreciates that point, I shall read the following extract from the policy speech delivered by the then Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan:

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.

Mr. Venning: On what basis—

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The next member who interjects will be named.

Mr. CURREN: In the light of that policy statement the people cast their votes on the question, as they did on many other policy points enunciated by the then Leader of the Opposition. They voted in favour of what the Labor Party put forward. The then Government, led by Mr. Hall, made the question of Murray River storages the major issue, from its viewpoint, at that election, and the people gave their verdict at the polls. The present Opposition is now blaming the Labor Government for carrying out the people's wishes, as expressed at that election. I wish to make my position clear to all members and to people in my district, whom I endeavour to represent ably. Prior to the last election I made the following statement to my electors:

The importance to South Australia and the Upper Murray of the Chowilla dam has been stressed repeatedly by myself and other Labor speakers. Our stand on this vital matter has not been and will not be altered. We accept that Dartmouth will be built, but not at the expense of giving away all our rights to Chowilla. A Labor Government will renegotiate the River Murray Waters Agreement to ensure that our legal rights are maintained and a starting date for Chowilla written into the agreement. I fully support this policy.

That amply demonstrates to members opposite that I have supported the Government's negotiations over the past 18 months. The Opposition has no justification for its attempts

to lay all the blame on the present Government for the extended period over which the negotiations have been conducted. It must be remembered that three Governments, apart from this Government, were concerned in the negotiations. Almost immediately on its taking office the present Government wrote to the Leaders of the other three Governments setting out South Australia's position. However, it took months for replies to be received, as it has taken with every communication forwarded from this Government to the other parties to the agreement. It has been necessary for our Premier almost to beg for replies.

In the light of all these facts, the other Governments must bear a large proportion of the responsibility for the lengthy period that has elapsed since this Government began attempting to carry out its election promise to renegotiate the River Murray Waters Agreement. The Leader of the Opposition has attacked the Premier's credibility, but that credibility stands or falls on whether the Premier has been carrying out the promises made prior to the 1970 election. I cannot see that the Premier's failure to obtain a satisfactory result to the negotiations is a failure to carry out an election promise. I therefore maintain that his credibility is intact. From information I have seen I know that the Leader's credibility will be very much in doubt and, indeed, will be shattered when the Premier replies to this debate. The feeling of the people in river districts about the Leader on this matter is ably expressed in the following editorial in the *Murray Pioneer* of October 29, 1970:

Our Premier, in his stand for "Chowilla next", is doing no more than carrying out both the expressed wish of Parliament and the declared policy of his Party when it successfully contested the election precipitated by the dam issue earlier this year.

The Leader claims that the Government is at present governing under false pretences, but what happened between March, 1968, and May, 1970? Was Mr. Hall's Government not governing under false pretences, having won the seat of Chaffey and the Government on the very definite promise that it would build the Chowilla dam? That promise is recorded in the press and it was included in advertisements prior to the 1968 election. The Hall Government was not in office for more than six months before it completely reversed its intention in regard to the Chowilla dam. It failed to carry out its election promise. When the people of the State next had the opportunity to vote on the credibility of the Hall Government and

the members who supported it, they ably demonstrated to the Liberal and Country League that its credibility was very much shattered and that it lay in ruins. That Party was in office in the period I am referring to, and the election I am referring to is the May, 1970, election. That Government received its just retribution for its failure to carry out its policy.

Mr. Rodda: What are you talking about?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey.

Mr. CURREN: A report in the *Murray Pioneer* of February 6, 1968, just before the 1968 election, when the Leader of the Opposition was crusading around the River towns electioneering, states:

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 3/13ths to 1/3rd—a factor which was negotiated by Sir Thomas Playford with the other States when the Chowilla project was first set up."

The Leader has claimed that he is the only negotiator on behalf of South Australia who has obtained an increased allocation for this State under the River Murray Waters Agreement. Sir Thomas Playford, in his negotiations in 1962, obtained an increase in South Australia's allocation of water in time of restriction from three-thirteenths to one-third. If that is not an increase, I am not here.

Mr. Rodda: You shouldn't be here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CURREN: Does not the honourable member think that that is an increase? The increase obtained by Sir Thomas Playford is contained in the amendment to the River Murray Waters Agreement that this House passed in 1963. Where is the Leader's credibility on that point? He claims to have obtained a wonderful increase for South Australia under the agreement. The matter of supply and availability of water to South Australia has concerned me, not only because I am a member of Parliament but because I was born in the River area. My father was one of original settlers: he took up a fruit property in about 1911. I and many other people who also have gained their livelihood from irrigated properties over the years recognize that the prime need on an irrigation settlement is an adequate supply of water of good quality.

Mr. Rodda: Did you attend the party on Saturday night to celebrate—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CURREN: The need for an adequate supply of water of good quality to supply the irrigation needs of the settlers along the river is recognized by every settler on the river and most people who have any interest in the welfare of South Australia. An election advertisement in the *Murray Pioneer* of February 29, 1968, states:

Peter Arnold says, "We aim for a guaranteed supply of irrigation water for Chaffey and the whole State." The people of Chaffey are fully aware of the vital importance of a guaranteed supply of good quality irrigation water. The Liberal and Country League-inspired Chowilla dam project is the best way to obtain this, and the best way to ensure the speedy progress of Chowilla is to vote for Peter Arnold, the endorsed Liberal and Country League candidate for Chaffey.

That member, who supported his Leader in giving away Chowilla dam, won the district of Chaffey under false pretences and, as soon as the people of Chaffey got the opportunity, they did the same to that member as they did to the Hall Government in 1970. That Government had welched on its promise, and it got its just deserts from the people. The provisions of this Bill have been discussed in this Parliament many times and are well known to most members. I, like other Government members, fully support the measure: there is no need for me to amplify the details. I have heard some mutterings from barley-grass corner on the Opposition benches, and I hope that those members who are in that delightful place will say something sensible on this important matter. I support the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill, too, but perhaps not on the same lines as does the member for Chaffey. I was interested in his chiding and recasting of history as far back as 1968. I remind the honourable member, as well as the Minister and the Premier, that at that time they were privy to the expertise that my Government availed itself of when it came to office.

I have had experience with the people on the river, and they are extremely searching people who ask questions in a most determined way. They do not like people who change their minds. However, a person may change his mind when there is good reason for it and the interests of the State warrant it. I make no apology for changing my mind about this issue. I remind the honourable member that he and his Government were privy to all the expert finding that underlined and emphasized that

Chowilla was not the best water storage for South Australia: it was as simple as that. We acknowledged that fact: we would not ride a white elephant even if the member for Chaffey thought that we should. All the information that backed up the advertisement that the honourable member proudly pointed to concerning my friend Peter Arnold was taken in the most sincere manner. We believed it at that time, and that was borne out by what I said in the earlier debate on this matter in 1968.

The member for Chaffey chided the Leader for blaming the Premier and questioning his credibility, and said that other Governments were to blame. He was speaking of the signatories to the agreement, the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales. He referred to a long delay. These Governments made their decision; they made it on the basis of the expert advice of the engineers of the River Murray Commission, and the Labor Government agreed to a deferment, a fact pointed out by the Leader. The member for Chaffey chided my Government, but he realized that his own Government would arrive at a day of reckoning. In 1968, the Labor Party saw this matter as a means of regaining Government, so that his comments about the delay, for which he blames other Governments, do not hold water. The honourable member said that much feeling had been engendered among those living in the River areas: I can imagine how much feeling there would be at present, because I had the privilege and pleasure of attending many meetings in the River areas with the Leader.

We believed in 1968 (as we believe now) that if this State was to prosper it must have an assured adequate water supply. These charges of false pretences fall to the ground when one considers the history of the dilly-dallying of the Labor Government that has caused the delay. A question mark of credibility hangs over this Government, particularly when we recall what happened in April, 1970, about 16 months ago. I hope, for South Australia's sake, that it is not too late to discuss this matter now. We have a changed scene. The Hall Government took the responsible attitude of putting the State's future before political thought, in the interests of the people of this State. This decision was made on the best engineering advice available to this State and to the country: the issue was that Dartmouth dam could assure this State's future.

It offered South Australia an increase of about 250,000 acre feet when it was completed,

and this gives more water than would be available in other storages outside the Murray River scheme. It is not an inconsiderable quantity of water, and it could supplement the life blood of South Australia. Now, after 16 months of waiting, this Bill has been reintroduced despite the statement in the A.L.P. policy, to which the member for Chaffey has referred, which declared without reservation that the Labor Government would renegotiate the Dartmouth agreement to include the Chowilla dam. This was the basis on which we went to the people in 1970, and the people have had their say. We have no quarrel with that. We have seen the utter failure of the Government to bring to fruition its statement that it would renegotiate the agreement. Last Thursday there were many stories circulating in this Chamber that the Premier would make a nation-rocking statement, and on a couple of good authorities we understood we should prepare for an election.

This was a closely guarded secret, but we had the spectacle of the Premier rising in his place to introduce this Bill. I was interested to read in *Hansard* a reference to something being said in another place about something being done soon. Little did we know that the statement was on our doorstep, but to have this knowledge was one of the advantages of being in Government. We have no quarrel with the Premier clutching his Bill to his hot little breast and telling us when he thought he should tell us. Across three sword lengths in this Chamber we learned of the contents of this Bill. Its passage is vital to the future of this State, as without its benefits industry, and all that goes with it, could wither on the vine.

When one thinks of the industrial development of which the State is capable, its central situation, its harbour facilities with easy dredging, its vast area, and the advantage given by the Indian-Pacific railway line, one must realize that this State has facilities that will play an enormous part in the future of the Commonwealth, but an adequate supply of water is vital to industry in South Australia. The rural crisis, which this and other States is facing, will pass into oblivion in the not far distant future, but this is another reason for us to pass this Bill now.

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

Mr. RODDA: I was saying that this measure is vital for South Australia. We have been considering it for a long time,

and probably many of the present speeches on it are rehashes of what has been said in the past. I hope this is the last time we shall have to rehash (I was going to say) the Chowilla story, but we are now dealing with reality—the Dartmouth story. As the Leader put it this afternoon, the Government has the responsibility for the delay. The Opposition condemns the Government for its political attitude in so selfishly clinging to the fruits of office by hanging on to office in spite of the facts of the situation. Despite its platform of renegotiation, it now has to ratify an agreement signed by Steele Hall on February 26, 1970.

Let me return to August 15, 1967. The former Minister of Works (the present member for Torrens) relates some of the story forming the background to this argument that has persisted for too long. It is interesting to note that the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) made known to the House that he had, on August 11, received a communication from the then Prime Minister (the late Hon. Harold Holt) pointing out:

In view of the urgency to resolve tenders for the Chowilla dam held by South Australian Government I feel I should advise you that today the following resolution was made by the River Murray Commission having regard to the changed relationship between costs and benefits of the Chowilla project since it was previously assessed in 1961 the River Murray Commission recommends to contracting Governments that the project be deferred pending further investigations further in view of the fact that the South Australian contracting authority is holding tenders for this work it be asked not to accept any tender currently held and arranged to reduce all expenditure on the Chowilla project to a minimum as rapidly as possible other contracting Governments have been so informed. David Fairbairn President River Murray Commission.

That was the background to the start of this long argument. That is to be found at page 1271 of *Hansard* of August 15, 1967. I well remember that August afternoon as I was then a comparatively new member of this place and had come to regard the Chowilla dam as a development that would add to the future security of this State. At page 1274 of *Hansard* of the same date, the Premier said:

If Chowilla is to be modified in some form, re-design will have to take place and further time will elapse before tenders can be called. We must impress on all Governments concerned the urgency to South Australia of getting finality in this area so that we know not only that we have an assurance (and that we must seek immediately) but also how that assurance is to be based.

Consequently, I ask members to support me in the moves that I have made to obtain from the other Governments and the Prime Minister the assurance that South Australia will get the water that was originally assured to it under this project.

Even at that time the Premier was more interested in the water than in its source. The experienced members on this side of the House (including the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Heaslip and Mr. Freebairn, all of whom have long since left this place) were behind the Premier in his attempt to ensure that we showed a united front on this matter to the other Governments, the signatories to the agreement. At the time, a motion was being debated in the House, and the Hon. G. R. Broomhill (then the member for West Torrens; his star had begun to rise even in those days) moved to amend the motion as follows:

To strike out all the words after "House" and to insert "the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay, and that assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the dam South Australia will be supplied in the dry years with the volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure."

The motion, as amended, was carried unanimously in this House. It is now history, of course, that the Hall Government came into office in April, 1968, and the Dunstan Government had had all the relevant information before it in the intervening months. The then Labor Premier and his Ministers must have had the benefit of the expert advice from those excellent engineers that we have in South Australia and from the people who are associated with the River Murray Commission, and they must have known that all was not well concerning the Chowilla dam. Up to that stage, we were in Opposition, and the then Premier had knowledge of all the facts about which the member for Chaffey was so glib when castigating members on this side for having said that we would build the Chowilla dam. It was against this background that we were considering the matter, the member for Chaffey and his colleagues being in possession of the facts; they were the people guiding the ship of State who were privy to all this information that was placed before Steele Hall and his Ministers when they took office in 1968.

Steele Hall and his Government took proper notice of the relevant facts in assessing which dam would benefit South Australia more. The

present Leader of the Opposition, when Premier, spent many hours explaining the position to people along the Murray, and well the member for Chaffey may smile. I spent much time with the Leader of the Opposition on those trips to the Murray, but what was the Australian Labor Party doing at the time? I well remember the meetings at Renmark, Loxton, Berri and Murray Bridge. At Renmark there was, shall we say, a loaded house against the Leader (the then Premier), Mr. Arnold (the then member for Chaffey), and the Minister of Works (the member for Torrens), who, having made a hurried trip to the area, was about to leave on a trip overseas in the interests of South Australia. People who had special questions to ask had been planted throughout the hall. I think that at one stage Jim had Jack's question. The briefing had gone wrong, and Jim was asking his question in a rather crude way, showing the embarrassment of a novice. It was fairly obvious something had gone wrong.

However, to give it its due, the Renmark meeting was certainly rowdy. Many people there had been misled about the Chowilla dam. The meetings at Berri and Loxton followed this pattern, but the meeting that took the cake was the one at Murray Bridge, when we faced about 500 people. One of the leading lights at the meeting was a gentleman who is now a Senator and who at that meeting castigated the member for Murray for having promised to build Chowilla dam and for not having lived up to his promise. That evening we saw the spectacle of a motion being moved from the floor of the hall charging the member for Murray to move in the House to have the Chowilla dam built; that motion was defeated.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Was that meeting stacked, too?

Mr. RODDA: It was stacked with some of the Minister's colleagues from Tailem Bend. That is the type of thing with which the previous Government was plagued during a campaign which lasted 2½ years and which eventually led the Premier and his Party back to office. Let the public take note that, when Steele Hall was Premier, he told the other States that, if he had to agree to the building of the Dartmouth dam, he would put a price on his agreement, and that price was extra water for South Australia. The member for Chaffey referred to what Sir Thomas Playford said about the Dartmouth dam. Steele Hall asked for 37 per cent extra water, a total of 250,000 acre feet. It stands to his credit that that was agreed to. I remember that, in those

early days of negotiations, the member for Torrens, who was then Minister of Works, telephoned from Sydney, where he had been fighting for South Australia's rights, to say that he had been successful in his negotiations.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Someone has to scratch his back.

Mr. RODDA: It is not a case of back scratching; the Minister had had a long day in Sydney and was able to report success. That is what we achieved, yet the Labor Party saw fit in the House to harass Steele Hall and his Ministers continually, asking unnecessary questions and moving unnecessary motions, as if a dam at Chowilla had some magic for South Australia. The Labor Party was doing what it is famous for doing: it was showing its lack of appreciation for practical action taken on the advice of the best experts in the land in the engineering and hydrological fields. Members opposite had in the back of their minds that political gain would be theirs, at the expense of the people of South Australia. With the successful negotiations behind him, and putting the future of the State first, the then Premier (Mr. Hall) decided to put the matter before the House.

History records that we were subsequently beaten at the election and were removed from the Treasury benches. Since then we have had 16 months of futility, following the promise that this Government would renegotiate the Dartmouth agreement. This Bill was brought in through the back door without any prior announcement; my Leader was told to listen to an important announcement that the Premier would make. We are considering this Bill 16 months after the time when it should have been passed. The Government has tried to sheet the blame on to the other three parties to the agreement. The policy put to the people of South Australia and the people of the Chaffey District in particular (it must have very real significance to those people) with so much assurance has never looked like materializing.

Mr. Venning: Do you think the member for Chaffey will be returned at the next election?

Mr. RODDA: We have heard rumblings that the other States are not happy about the extra water that was negotiated for South Australia. Time is running out. Although some clauses in the Bill cause me great concern, as a true South Australian I want to see this Bill passed and I want to see its aim accomplished. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting it. I hope that the Government will be able to

see the Dartmouth dam do the things it was originally designed to do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I should like to correct the impression that has been created in some quarters that the period of negotiation extending over the last 14½ months has caused any significant delay in the construction of the Dartmouth dam. Most members would appreciate that the design stages of a project such as the Dartmouth dam take a considerable time. Even if the Dartmouth proposal had been ratified in April of last year there is no likelihood that tenders would have been called before the end of this year. Probably tenders might have been called some time next year, at the very earliest, or possibly not until 1973. I remind members that, after the original agreement relating to Chowilla in 1961, the position for calling tenders was not reached until 1967—a considerable period. Of course, additional difficult design problems had to be solved in relation to that proposal.

I remind members of the problems with which we are confronted even in the design of, say, a simple area school in the Mallee District and of the time that can be spent as a consequence of such design difficulties. In almost any case that would have come before the attention of members here, a period of 18 months to two years would elapse between the initial decision to start planning a school and the time for calling tenders. Of course, this Bill relates not to a project of \$500,000 but to a project of \$60,000,000. With a project of that magnitude and with the problems of access and with the need for developing suitable plans and so on, every member well knows that a considerable period was bound to be consumed in the process of designing the new Dartmouth dam. I think that this needs to be made clear not only to the members of this House but also to the general public.

It has been suggested that the time taken in trying to renegotiate the agreement has meant that Dartmouth now faces increased costs. However, that is simply not the case. If costs were to increase, Dartmouth would have been faced with them, anyway. If tenders could not have been called before 1972 at the earliest and possibly not until 1973, the problem of increased costs would have occurred whether the agreement was ratified by this State in April last year or ratified now or within a few weeks. Honourable members also know full well that, even when tenders for this dam are called and construction commences, a significant time will elapse before water can be stored

in the dam and a further significant period will elapse before the dam can be declared effective and South Australia is entitled to any additional water. I have said previously in this House that, in all probability, the construction of the Dartmouth dam will not give any extra water entitlement to South Australia until 1978, 1979, or 1980, somewhere about that time.

Mr. Hall: You have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He knows everything!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader and the member for Kavel have once again, by their ill-informed interjections, given the game away. Apparently, the Leader would have us believe that it would have been possible, under his Administration, to construct the dam and get sufficient water into it to declare it effective within a few years.

Mr. Hall: What do you mean by "a few years"?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Three or four years.

Mr. Hall: Who stated that time?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said, and it was specifically denied by the Leader, that in the most favourable circumstances for construction of the Dartmouth dam, it would not be declared effective before 1978 or 1980, somewhere about that period.

Mr. Hall: But you don't know that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I can apply my common sense. I realize that, if one is associated with the Leader, one is not expected to apply any common sense or intelligence to these matters. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the construction period will be at least two and a half or three years after tenders are called, so the dam cannot be ready to store water before about 1975. I am sure that the Leader also knows the flow rates that apply on the Mitta Mitta River at the Dartmouth dam site and that it is likely that the dam, at an average flow rate, will take almost five years or more to fill. Consequently, in normal circumstances, the dam will not be declared effective until towards the end of this decade. The Leader of the Opposition knows that I am speaking the truth.

Mr. Hall: You're not speaking the truth, because—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned honourable members that there are to be no interjections, and I will insist that they cease. The Minister is entitled to be heard in silence, as are members on the Opposition side of the House. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I wish you would not stop honourable members opposite

from interjecting, Mr. Speaker, because I think interjecting gives them an opportunity to display their ignorance, and they should be permitted to display it. It is important that people know in general that the Leader of the Opposition is trying, for his own reasons, to suggest other than what are the true circumstances in this particular case. The point I make is that increased costs, if there are to be increased costs associated with the Dartmouth proposition and if further negotiations are required because of the increased costs, would have occurred whenever the agreement was ratified.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can say "rubbish".

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order and I shall not warn him again.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nevertheless, it is important to demonstrate that the interjection was silly. There has been no statement from anyone (in fact, to the contrary) that the Dartmouth dam could be ready to go to tender before 1972. If increased costs had occurred in the last 14½ months, they would have involved the problem of the cost of construction, whether the agreement was ratified in April last year or whether it is ratified now. The member for Rocky River can shake his head but he knows that I am speaking the truth. In no circumstances would the River Murray Commission have been able to call tenders this year to construct the Dartmouth dam. I challenge any honourable member to deny the truth of that statement. The provisions of the agreement we are now asked to ratify provide for a further review of the matter should the costs rise by more than 10 per cent, and if the costs have risen at this stage by more than 10 per cent that would have been the case whether the agreement was ratified last year or this year. That is the simple truth of the matter and if the member for Rocky River cannot understand that, I suggest the sooner he keeps quiet the better for all concerned.

A further feature that has come out of the debate, which has extended over such a long time, is that in all probability Chowilla is no longer a dam that is likely to be constructed at all. I think Opposition members (and particularly those who were Ministers in the last Government) were well aware of that when they asked Parliament to ratify the agreement to build the Dartmouth dam in April last year. However, further time having passed,

and some intransigence having occurred in other States in relation to our attempts even to secure relatively minor amendments to the agreement, it became clear that New South Wales and Victoria, having secured the death of the Chowilla project, were not going to take any risk of its being resurrected. The plain truth is that, even neglecting the cost of any development at Lake Victoria, while Chowilla (a downstream dam of main benefit to South Australia) has to be compared with upstream dams on the basis of the comparative yield not to South Australia but to the whole system, the comparison will inevitably favour the upstream dam.

The upstream dam situated in the headwaters will always be the kind of proposition that could best provide an increased yield of water to New South Wales and Victoria, while the downstream dam is in the best position to provide an immediate yield and control to the downstream State, that is, South Australia. All honourable members are aware that studies made by the River Murray Commission are made on the basis of the yield to the whole system. Assuming that the entitlement to South Australia remains as it is, the critical factor with any given entitlement to South Australia is how much extra water does any proposal give to New South Wales and Victoria. I think the Leader, although he has never come out publicly and said it in so many words, knows quite well that, at the time he agreed to the ratification of the proposal to build Dartmouth, Chowilla had had it; it was a dead duck. We on this side were not prepared to accept that Chowilla was a dead duck, that we should give away, in all probability, our rights to Chowilla for all time, and it was for that reason in particular that we sought to renegotiate the agreement.

The very fact that we failed in that attempt to renegotiate indicates the conclusion I have just stated—that Chowilla had gone for all time. If that was not the case, the amendments that we proposed relating to the deletion of certain words with respect to Chowilla and Lake Victoria would have been readily acceptable to both New South Wales and Victoria, because our negotiations were not based on building Chowilla first or even concurrently with Dartmouth: it was simply that Dartmouth should go ahead first and that the agreement should not be so worded as to remove existing protections in the River Murray Waters Agreement for the building of the Chowilla dam for South Australia.

These matters that we asked of New South Wales and Victoria were relatively simple. Their refusal to accede to any proposal put up by this Government can be taken to indicate only that the attitude is now very firm in New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth, at least in Liberal Party circles, that in no circumstances will the Chowilla dam be built. I think members opposite who were members of the previous Government are well aware that that was the case, although they were not prepared to tell the people of South Australia that it was in fact the case. When the present Leader of the Opposition, as Premier, presented the Bill for the ratification of the Dartmouth dam agreement, he tried to insert, and got agreement to insert, extra words in relation to future studies as the means of trying to suggest that Chowilla was still a viable proposition. In his heart of hearts, however, the Leader has for a long time believed that Chowilla would never be built; indeed, he even believes that it should not be built, that it is not a worthwhile proposition.

Mr. Hall: Would the Minister accept an interjection?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should be delighted if the Leader was prepared to set the record straight on this matter; I should be only too pleased to hear an interjection from him.

Mr. Millhouse: You are only laughing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader would be out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader might be out of order but perhaps it would serve the cause of truth in South Australia if he did interject and reveal his real attitude to the Chowilla dam—that he did or did not hold the view that not only should Dartmouth be built but also that Chowilla should never be built, and that South Australia would be better off without it. It would be interesting to hear the Leader on that. Certainly, we cannot but be a little amazed at the way in which the negotiations have proceeded. In each case when a proposition has been put up to the Governments of New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth, they have taken an average of, say, eight to 10 weeks to reply.

Mr. Millhouse: What are those propositions?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They have been stated previously in this House by the Premier, and the member for Mitcham is well aware of them. On each occasion, the other State Governments have taken over two months to reply.

Mr. Venning: That is understandable.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not understandable; it is incredible, because they were sitting it out under the suggestion from those States (and perhaps from certain quarters in this State, too) that, if they sat it out, they could not be forced to come in. I should not be at all surprised if some encouragement had been given within Liberal Party circles.

Mr. Hall: You're saying it's a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader may believe that he did not give such encouragement but many of the statements he has made over the last 16 months would only have encouraged people in the other States to delay negotiations, to sit down and do nothing, and not to reply to letters, and so on. The Leader of the Opposition may not have intended this to be the result, but I certainly suspect that it was the result.

Mr. Hall: That's your way of shifting the blame.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We have heard certain comments made, not the least by the Leader of the Opposition, about the delays in finalizing negotiations in this matter. The facts of the case are that the main delays at each stage occurred as a result of the actions of the Leader's Liberal colleagues in New South Wales, Victoria and Canberra, and that is the truth of the position.

Mr. Hall: That's a standard excuse.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, it is riot. If this matter were treated as a matter of national importance, as I think the current Minister for National Development treats it, I should have thought that the other Governments concerned would be willing to give quick replies to the suggestions that we were putting up from South Australia. They were not complicated suggestions; they should not have required lengthy consideration by these Governments, week after week; yet they did. We have been subjected to these delays, it seems now, as a tactic to force us ultimately to give in. At no stage did Victoria or New South Wales show any degree of willingness to negotiate. As the Premier has explained, the Commonwealth showed a willingness to discuss certain matters, especially in relation to the problem concerning Lake Victoria, but the other States showed no willingness at all; they made not one attempt to enter into any reasonable—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why did you mislead us by saying that they would—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Surely, we are not in a position to mislead the member for Alexandra about the attitude of colleagues in his own Party in other States. He ought to understand those attitudes better than we do, and surely the member for Alexandra would be better able to get up in this House and say, "There's no point at all in negotiating with New South Wales and Victoria on this matter. There's no chance that you can get any sort of change in their point of view."

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That's exactly what I said.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member may think that that is exactly what he said but certainly, to my knowledge, he has never spelt out in this House that his colleagues in other States were so intransigent and so determined to kill Chowilla for all time that they would not in any circumstances consider the most reasonable of negotiations and the most reasonable of amendments advanced.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Now you're starting to go off the rails.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not going off the rails. The member for Alexandra, who has made many speeches on this matter, including one today, knows that the amendments suggested—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I haven't spoken yet.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I apologize; it just seems as though the honourable member is always making a speech. The amendments that were suggested related first to the way in which the cost of any work on Lake Victoria should be taken into account in any future comparisons of Chowilla with any further upstream dam other than Dartmouth, and consequently in relation to the intended removal of the certain precautions relating to the Chowilla reservoir which the member for Alexandra, along with his colleagues, had previously agreed to. If these were not simple amendments, presumably they were of some importance with regard to Chowilla and, if that is the case, my conclusion that in future Chowilla is most unlikely ever to be built is reinforced. One would have hoped that the pretensive negotiations we had with New South Wales and Victoria would be conducted more speedily than was the case.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: They didn't even offer to renegotiate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is right, because they rested on the fact that the

previous South Australian Government had, contrary to the express wishes of the Parliament and contrary to what was known to be the express wish of the public, agreed to provisions which meant in effect that Chowilla would never be built.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If that is not the case, why would the other States not negotiate? Why did they stick out? Why did New South Wales and Victoria refuse to consider any change in relation to the agreement in respect of the wording of the way in which the costs of Lake Victoria were to be taken into account, when the Commonwealth would have agreed on that point? If these amendments did not do something in relation to Chowilla, why did those States take that attitude? If the amendments had no relevance to the future of Chowilla, why did the other States simply not agree to what we proposed? When they did not agree, the position was presumably that they regarded these proposals of South Australia as protecting the future of Chowilla. Now that we have been forced to give in, does that not mean that the ratification of this agreement implies the end of the prospects of the construction of the Chowilla reservoir? That is my view of the matter, and I believe it is the Opposition's view. It is time the public of South Australia was told that this is what has been the sorry conclusion for this State.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you trying to say that it isn't your fault?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am trying to say that the need to protect the future of Chowilla dam was important and that it should have been secured when the previous Government agreed to the ratification of the Dartmouth reservoir. It was not protected at that time and, having been given away by the previous Government, it could not be rescued now, because the other States had become completely intransigent in relation to the matter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you know that we are now in danger of getting no water at all? Is that better?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I dealt with that matter when the honourable member was out of the House; I pointed out that, even had the agreement been ratified in April last year, there was no possibility of tenders being called before 1972, if then, for the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir. Any question about increased costs that is allegedly worrying Sir Henry Bolte at present would have occurred

whether or not the agreement was ratified in April of last year. All that Sir Henry is doing at present is preparing the ground to get a greater share of the cost from the Commonwealth Government, should the cost of the dam increase by more than 10 per cent of the original estimate. A rumour that the Labor Government has risked getting no water at all is the kind of rumour that members opposite particularly love to spread and it is the kind of fairy tale that the member for Rocky River was putting up in Question Time this afternoon.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you sure—

The SPEAKER: Order! I object to these continual interjections. Honourable members taking part in these interjections are the first members who take exception if interjections are made during their speeches, and I ask them to desist.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for the unruly behaviour of members opposite. The position in connection with costs has altered very little as a consequence of the delay in ratification. In fact, it would not have surprised me at all to find that much of the preliminary design work on the Dartmouth proposal had been continued by the people associated with the River Murray Commission, but certainly any attempt by any member opposite to suggest that construction of the Dartmouth dam would have been under way by now is simply not true.

Mr. Venning: You talk a lot of rubbish

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not warn the member for Rocky River again. He is too persistent in his interjections.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Some members apparently have the simple-minded view that a project as complicated as the Dartmouth dam can be designed overnight and that tenders can be called overnight. They fail to remember that the design stages of the Chowilla proposal ultimately occupied five to six years. I support the Bill, but I do not do so with any enthusiasm. The agreement that the Bill ratifies does not contain the kinds of provision that I would like to see in it. I do not think it provides the kind of protection for the future of South Australia that we should have, but in the circumstances I believe that this agreement is the only thing available to us and that we are virtually left with no choice other than to ratify it. This is a sorry comment on the attitude of the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria and of members opposite, who, as a result of their own

actions, gave away most of the effective protection that was in the previous agreement, which is now altered by this one. This resulted in the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria saying, "We have got a little less than half of the political scale of opinion in South Australia on our side, so we only have to sit it out for a little bit longer and we will win the day." The whole history of the matter demonstrates that that was exactly the approach of the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria. They sat it out, delayed answering letters, and refused to negotiate meaningfully at any stage; in this way they effectively contributed to the delay that has occurred.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I am rather interested in many of the points that the Minister of Education has made and I am amazed at the sort of argument that a person of his intelligence has tried to introduce into this debate. He says that the other States have sat it out. Mr. Speaker, they made a decision. Why should they change that decision?

Mr. Coumbe: It was a unanimous decision.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, and of course they would sit it out. What would happen if we were in the position of New South Wales or Victoria? Surely we would have to consider the cost and benefit to our people of any storage, irrespective of our view on whether we ought to build Chowilla. The Minister is suggesting that Victoria and New South Wales should forget all about the cost to their own taxpayers and, out of the goodness of their heart, do something for the benefit of South Australia. I think this is asking a little too much of anyone's rational intelligence. Surely we, as responsible members, must consider the matter from the point of view of the other States, irrespective of whether we consider that they are properly motivated or whether we consider that what they are doing is in our best interests.

While the River Murray Commission is an independent organization that requires the unanimous decision of the four parties, we must expect people to be selfish in their motives. I go along with the idea that the only way to overcome this sort of situation is to have a national water authority. I support that idea, and the Minister of Works has suggested that something is moving in this direction. Such an authority would be fair and reasonable and would provide the only way to overcome State prejudice on something that is not to a certain party's benefit.

The Minister has said that this dam cannot be completed within a certain time and that planning must be done. He has said that, irrespective of whether construction of the dam was agreed to 14 months ago or now, there would be a time lapse. However, there is a significant difference between a time lapse and an increase in cost after one signs a contract and a time lapse and an increase in cost before one signs. There is no contractual commitment by all the parties until all parties have signed. If I am wrong in this I stand to be corrected, but I understand that there is no contractual agreement until all parties have signed. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the time lapse and a 10 per cent increase in cost occurring after we have signed and a time lapse and cost increase before we have signed. If we had signed, we would be in a much better position today to argue than we are in.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There is no protection in the agreement if one State stands out once the cost increases by 10 per cent.

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is all right, but a State is in a much better position if it has signed than South Australia is in now, with nothing to support it. We have the whole complex position with this argument that there was agreement by all parties but that, as a result of this matter being put to the electors, there was a change of heart. As a result of a misjudgment by the Premier about what he could do to change this agreement, we are in the present dilemma of now ratifying an agreement that we could have ratified 14 months ago, when there was a chance that the cost would have been within the terms of this agreement.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not when it went to tender?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not read into the the provisions anything about the time when the project goes to tender. It states "at the time of approval." The Premier may explain, as perhaps he is better versed in the verbiage than I am, the difference between the signing of a contract and the approval. The amendment provides that this variation is to be as at the time of approval. Will someone explain to me whether I am wrong in saying that the time of approval is the time of signing of the contract? One other matter has always been a bone of contention. The Minister of Education has said that this dam cannot fill until it is completed, but we know that is not correct.

Mr. Curren: It is.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It cannot be used but it can start to fill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There will have to be work on it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I appreciate the assistance of the member for Chaffey and the Minister of Education, but I believe the engineers know what they are talking about and they have said that the dam could start to fill immediately they started to build the wall.

Mr. Curren: Have you read the committee's report?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will look at that another time, but there is a significant difference in what has been said by the Minister and what I believe to be the case and what I have had reported to me as being the case.

Mr. Coumbe: It does not have to be full to be effective.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Of course, and it does not have to be completed before it starts to fill. These are two important matters, and I think at this time I would be correct in saying that we are discussing this Bill and not any amendments that may have been proposed, whether or not they were to the advantage of South Australia. It is clear that any dam built on the Murray River will be to our advantage, and I believe the ratification of this agreement is to the benefit of this State. I say that simply because of the advantages we know that any additional storage, and this storage in particular, will bring to South Australia. The member for Chaffey has said that Sir Thomas Playford negotiated some benefits in 1963. Nice words, but these benefits related to a specific dam which did not eventuate, and at present the only entitlement we have from the river in a year of drought or short supply is 3/13ths of the water in storage and under the control of the River Murray Commission. I think that figure is correct. Whether or not it was negotiated in 1963, it still relates to this dam. Any dam that is built would give us this extra security in time of emergency.

What are the other advantages to us at this time? Although we have not had meters installed in respect of all divertees along the river, it is estimated by people who are responsible that we may well find, when the meters are installed, that we have an over-commitment of about 50 per cent. I have been told this, I believe on good authority, and we are therefore in a serious position should critical circumstances arise. Not only are divertees likely to be in danger and placed on restriction but also we have to accept that today we have the Morgan-Whyalla main, the Mannum-Adelaide

main, and soon the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf and the Swan Reach to Stockwell mains; but more particularly as I am interested in my district, we will have the Tailem Bend to Keith main, which is supplying water to the whole of the upper South-East of the State.

I am vitally interested in this matter from two points of view as member for Mallee. My first concern is for a guarantee of an adequate and suitable supply of water to the upper river, and secondly, an assurance of good quality and an adequate supply of water to people in the upper South-East. I believe it is important not only that we get this assurance but also that we have the additional water promised under the agreement. Also, it is important that we get the benefit of something which has been written into the agreement but which has been ignored by other people. I have been asking questions in the last few weeks about the quality of water. For the first time in an agreement of this kind some reference to quality control is written in. Clause 22 of the agreement provides:

Unless otherwise directed by the Commission—

- (a) the flow passing Torrumbarry Weir shall as far as possible be regulated so as to prevent salinity in the river water at Swan Hill exceeding 300 parts per million . . .
- (b) the flow passing Euston Weir shall as far as possible be regulated so as to prevent salinity in the river water at Merbein exceeding 300 parts per million.

This has been negotiated into this agreement.

Mr. Curren: What about the quality within South Australia?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I suggest to the member for Chaffey that the quality of water passing into South Australia is important, because, as the Minister of Works pointed out in reply to me the other day, there is no question that there is a substantial build-up in the salinity of water once it passes into South Australia. However, if the water is of poor quality when it comes into South Australia it must be of much poorer quality by the time it gets to Waikerie, on this very basis of argument. If we have some control of water coming down river to South Australia, at least it is some safeguard that we do not presently have.

I do not want to say any more than that, for I do not wish to delay the passing of this Bill on this important issue. However, I cannot say too strongly that I am concerned that, notwithstanding the intentions of the Government, whether it was right or wrong, this delay

of 14½ months could have been expected, unless, of course, the Premier was gambling that the last elections would see Labor Governments in New South Wales and Victoria and in the Commonwealth that would be sympathetic towards him.

Mr. Coumbe: You wouldn't suggest that, would you?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I can only suggest that he must have been gambling on this issue, just as my predecessor in that part of my district (the member for Ridley) gambled on the basis that he could defeat Sir Henry Bolte by an argument in words. The whole crux of the matter is that the present parties to the agreement, bar one, were the parties to the original agreement, and anybody who believed that by argument he could change a decision that had been made on the basis of the cost benefit to the people concerned would be fooling only himself unless, as I said, he believed or dreamed that there would be a change in circumstances that would suddenly swing things in his favour. The passing of this Bill is vital and, if time is the essence of the contract, I believe that I have spoken for long enough. So, let us get on with the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): We often, when speaking or mentioning members from the other side who have spoken, say that we have never heard them to worse advantage, and that is usually a debating point. Tonight I think I can fairly say it of the Minister of Education. He was heavy and dull, and quite inaccurate and unconvincing in what he said. Before I get on to any other matters, there are just a few points in his speech that I should like to take up.

I was surprised at the material the Minister used. He repeated some of the things that he said in the debates in this Chamber in April of last year (over the weekend I had a look at those) and some of the things he had been saying even before that time. The member for Mallee has already answered most of the detailed points, but there are just a couple which perhaps he did or did not cover and which I should like to take up. It seems to me to be a matter of common sense that if one delays a project for 14½ months (to use the figure which he himself gave) this delays the completion of the project: it delays everything, as everything is in a state of suspended animation. Yet one would think, listening to the Minister of Education tonight, that the delay had been nothing, that it did not matter. Then why has this Government now decided to end the delay and ratify the

agreement? If delay does not matter, why do we not go on delaying for another 12 months or 18 months until we get some agreement from Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth? Of course it matters. One has only to use common sense to see that it matters. It is amazing that the Minister of Education should go on as he did.

He blames everybody but this Government for what has happened. I ask again, as I have asked in this place on many occasions: what did the Government think it could say to the other Governments to cause them to renegotiate the agreement? What cards did it have in its pack? Of course it had nothing, for the very good reason that we had negotiated the very best possible deal for South Australia, and the other parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement would not be prepared to give us any more; and that is what this Government tried to say it would do.

One point of detail that the Minister of Education omitted to mention is that he said it would take many years for the Dartmouth dam to fill. Does he not remember that in peak years the flow down the Mitta Mitta has been as much as 2,000,000 acre feet a year, two-thirds of the total capacity of the Dartmouth reservoir? We do not know whether in the first year after completion that flow will be there, but it has been there and could be there, and the fact is that Dartmouth could fill very much sooner than the Minister would have us believe.

In April of last year, I prepared a paper on the Dartmouth controversy that was the basis of a number of speeches I made in this House and in other places. It was prepared with the aid of the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In it, I referred briefly to the time table. This is what I said, and I said it on the advice of the officers of the department:

The time for action has come. If the agreement is ratified, work can begin this year—that was in 1970—

on Dartmouth. It will begin to fill in 1975 and the main contract will be finished in 1976.

That is what I said, and that was the situation when we left office. As I have pointed out, because of the flows down the Mitta Mitta, it could fill and could be declared effective within 12 months. I do not ask members opposite to accept those figures, though, as they stand, but I am surprised to hear the Minister say what he has said tonight, that it would be 1978 or 1980 before we could expect any benefit.

Mr. Coumbe: He almost seemed to be glad that that was the case.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a lie.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He seemed almost to be glad that that was so. Whether or not he was glad depends on the inflection of his voice and the interpretation one puts on it, but what he did say was that it would be 1978 or 1980 before we had any benefit from Dartmouth.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In all probability.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then that is correct. I do not ask members to accept what I have said and what I set out in that paper. On April 29 last year the present Minister of Education (the then member for Glenelg) made a speech in this House on this subject. After he had made it, I had his speech analysed by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and I have that analysis here. I am surprised the Minister has not seen it; perhaps the Premier has seen it but has not passed it on to his colleague, because I notice the Premier did not make the points that the Minister made tonight about delay not mattering, and so on. One of these points which the Minister made in that speech and which he had the gall to repeat 14½ or 16 months later was on the matter of the time when water would be available from the Dartmouth reservoir. I had a report on this matter, and the report is dated May 12, 1970. It is addressed to me as Attorney-General, and it is signed by John S. Gerny, Engineer for Investigations, who had this to say about the suggestions made by the then member for Glenelg:

Assuming that agreement to build Dartmouth is reached before April 1, 1971—well after we went out of office but over four months ago now—

tenders should be called by January, 1972, and the dam should be complete by November, 1976. On this programme, prepared by the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority, storage of water could commence in the winter of 1975, and in a normal year sufficient could be stored for Dartmouth to be declared effective for the year 1976-77. If the storage—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I challenge that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Pray, do not interrupt me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's the average flow of the Mitta Mitta?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The report continues:

If the storage on May 1, 1976, is less than the prescribed minimum, there is no obligation on the River Murray Commission to declare a period of restrictions if in its opinion the season's requirements can be met.

That was the advice which we received. Yes, the Minister would go out of the Chamber; he always goes out when a point is made against him. If there was agreement by April 1, 1971, the dam would start filling in 1975, yet the Minister, who has had the advantage of expert advice for 14½ or 16 months, or whatever the time may be, now comes along and tells the House this evening that, in any case, it will be 1978 or 1980 before we can get any advantage from it. By gum, I am glad I was able to keep some of the reports and advice that we were given when we were in office, because if I had not kept that report we would not have been able to give the lie to what the Minister of Education said this evening. Let us now leave him, because I suggest that the official advice that I have quoted really does dispose of the piffle he talked on this occasion and the tripe he has been talking for years on this matter, trying to blind everyone with words. Let us come now to some of the more general issues on this matter.

Over the weekend, as I have said, I went through the debates held in this Chamber at the end of April, 1970, and I must say that they made me utterly despondent: everything that was said by us who are now sitting on this side has turned out to be correct, and everything said by the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Leader of the Government), his Deputy, then and now (the present Minister of Works), and the Minister of Education has proved to be wrong. I do not believe that they believed for one moment at that time that they were right in what they were saying. As other members on this side have said, they used the debate on last year's Bill as an occasion to defeat the Government and to force an election, and they did this without any regard for the issue or for its effect on the well-being of the State.

They believed (and it turned out to be correct) that, given the redistribution which our Government had put through, they would win. So great was their greed for office that they were prepared to do anything. They were prepared to sacrifice honesty and honour and the interests of the State to get an election so that they could get back to office. If they gave any thought to the consequences for this State, they hoped that they could scramble out of it somehow. Let us look now at some of the things that those three honourable gentlemen said during that debate and see how they sound now compared

with what they are presently saying. In his speech on the second reading of that Bill, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) asserted that, if the agreement went through in the form in which we had submitted it to Parliament, the Chowilla dam would never be built. However, that is not what he said in his explanation the other day when he submitted the same Bill to this House. At page 95 of *Hansard* of April 29, 1970, the then Leader said:

What the Government is asking us to do is to give away our rights to the Chowilla dam completely, and it does not need to do so.

He went on in this vein, and then said:

It is not true to say that South Australia has no binding legal agreement in relation to the Chowilla dam, and there is not the slightest reason why we should give away the contents of that agreement unnecessarily.

At page 97 appears the summation of the honourable gentleman's comments at that time. Talking about the then Premier (Mr. Hall), he said:

What he has done is to try to put up something that is completely meaningless and ineffective and will not achieve anything for this State. He says, "Oh well, I am trying to compromise and to get something that will be acceptable to the people of this State and to the Opposition." I assure the Premier that what the Opposition requires is the maintenance of the legal rights we at present hold in the Chowilla agreement and the River Murray Waters Agreement relating to the Chowilla dam. We will not give them up in order to get the Dartmouth dam; we do not need to.

That was his straight-out statement in the House. Let us look at some of the things the then member for Glenelg (Hon. Hugh Hudson) said, as reported at page 115. I am sorry that he and the Minister of Environment and Conservation are not here to hear this, because the little Minister of Environment and Conservation chipped in a couple of times. The then member for Glenelg was dealing with the question of delay, as he did this evening (he had not talked with Mr. Gerny at that time and apparently still has not done so). The report is as follows:

Goodness knows what might happen if, when tenders were called, there was an escalation of costs that put the cost of Dartmouth more than 10 per cent above the estimate of \$57,000,000.

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

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

Mr. Broomhill: This would be likely to happen.

It is a jolly pity that, when they came to office, they did not take more seriously what they said there. I challenged the then member for Glenelg to say what bargaining power South Australians had to get a renegotiation of the agreement, and he said:

Who has the bargaining power? Who stands to gain the most in regard to existing demands if the agreement for Dartmouth is ratified: New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia? I suggest that New South Wales and Victoria are under the greatest pressure at present to get immediate ratification of this agreement.

So, this was the way in which the Labor Party was going to bargain: it was going to rely on New South Wales and Victoria wanting the water more than we did. Somehow that has come completely unstuck. Today I asked the Premier whether he would table the correspondence between him and other Ministers on the one hand and other Governments on the other hand, to see whether that argument was used. The Labor Party said that that argument would be used and it did not give any other way whereby it could force the other parties to renegotiate the agreement. It will be interesting to see whether we ever get that correspondence to peruse. I am sure that we will not get it before this debate has been concluded; it would be far too inconvenient if we perused the correspondence before that. The Government is careful to conceal what it has done by way of renegotiation. It will be interesting to see whether the correspondence is tabled and, if it is, what was said in that correspondence.

The Labor Party succeeded in forcing an election. I, for one, (and I know that every member on this side supports me in this) do not regret our actions for one moment. I believe that honesty and straightforwardness will always pay in the long run. In the short run it cost us office and it has meant the great risk of harm to this State. It has besmirched the reputation of the Labor Party and particularly the reputation of the Premier, because he said in his policy speech, without any qualification or equivocation, that he would renegotiate the agreement. He did not say he would try to renegotiate it or that he hoped he could renegotiate it; he said:

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.

He did not hedge it about in any way or try to suggest that there might be any doubt about it: he said he would do it. That was his election policy and that was one of the issues, if not the major issue, at the election. The Premier has now admitted that he has failed, as we knew from the beginning that he must fail. We had one absurd essay last March to ratify the agreement, but it was not in the same form as the agreement signed by the Prime Minister and the other State Premiers. The Premier of South Australia said during the debate in April last year that an agreement had to be ratified in precisely the form in which it was signed for it to mean anything, but he later tried to persuade the people that an agreement could be ratified in a form that suited the Government. Of course, that was nonsense, as we knew and as the Premier now admits. We now have a complete capitulation and about face.

It may be that on this issue the Government will get away with it, if three things happen. First, it may not be an issue in the minds of the people in the next State election. The Government may be able to persuade the people to forget the issue. It may be that, despite the rising cost and the lack of enthusiasm in Victoria and New South Wales, the other States and the Commonwealth will go ahead and the dam will be built. It may be that we will have a series of wet winters and we will not go short of water while we are waiting for the Dartmouth dam to fill. If these three things occur the Government will get away with this as an issue but, if they do not occur, the development of the State, for one or more of these reasons, will be in severe jeopardy, and this of itself will be an issue at the next election. What, then, will be the real significance of what the Government has done? Sir, this is the latest in a series of blunders and changes of front by the Government, and by the Premier in particular. We can think readily of others, such as the moratorium demonstration, the shopping hours referendum nonsense—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I give these only as other examples.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! They cannot be given in this debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, if it hurts, I will not mention any more: we all know them. This is merely the latest in that series and, because of that series of blunders and changes of front by the Premier, he is destroying any confidence that the people of this

State may have had in his reliability. He knows, as we know, that his credibility in the eyes of the people, as shown by surveys of public opinion, is dropping, and it is dropping because of actions like this. I warrant that it has dropped rather quickly in the last week, since this *volte-face* was announced.

Suggestions have been made about the resignation of the Government. Of course, this will not happen. The Government will not resign, and it will not have an election. In political theory, it should resign. It was elected on a policy that it has failed to carry out. It was an explicit policy, as I have mentioned. If it had any regard for political morality, it would go to an election on this issue, but it will not, because no Government goes willingly to an election unless it believes it will win seats, and certainly this Government would not win seats if an election were held now. So, while we can say that it should do this, it will not do it. It is all building up, however, in the minds of many people.

I have mentioned the question of the credibility of the Premier and his standing in the eyes of the people. The matter goes further than that. There is now very serious talk by many people about whether the Premier is fit to lead the Government of this State. He need not look so surprised, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think he has probably heard this himself, or at least suspected it. There have been so many about-turns, so many letdowns for the people of this State in the past 16 months, that it is not only a matter of his credibility: it is his capacity as Leader of the Government that is now in question. That is the real significance of what we are doing now.

The issue, as such, may be forgotten but it is one more ingredient in the build-up that will lead to the downfall, if I may mix my metaphors, of this Government, because no Government can go on doing things like this and still retain the confidence, trust and support of the electorate. I support the second reading of this Bill, as other members on this side do, because we know, as we have said all along, that it is in the best interests of the State. I can only hope and pray that, despite what has been said in Victoria and New South Wales, this dam will be built, because if it is not built it will be a disaster for South Australia, and long before it is a disaster for South Australia (and this would be one advantage, at least), it will have brought about the sounding of the death knell of this Government.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I am compelled to take some small part in this debate, representing as I do with the member for Chaffey most of the districts that immediately adjoin the Murray River in its passage through this State. I believe the electors in the Murray District will now be happy in the confidence they showed in one who expressed the belief that one day the Hall Government would be vindicated in its attitude towards the building of Dartmouth dam, and they will be happy about their choice of a representative in this place. One important thing we are inclined to forget is that we could have a repetition of the drought of 1967. Every year that passes brings us closer to another 1967, and many people forget that sooner or later (and perhaps it will be sooner) we are bound to have another 1967.

It was only those who lived on the river and who were put to the cost of excavating channels from the river to their property who really understood what damaging effects a drought could have on their finances, their production, and their way of life. Whilst city areas may have curtailed the watering of gardens, it is only country people who use many thousands of acre feet of water for their living who really understand what a shortage of water means. With the pumping from the Murray River of additional large quantities of water through the mains that have been, and are being, constructed, obviously more and more of the river water will be needed for distribution throughout the State. Perhaps the next thing we should do is to make that water clearer.

I shall not repeat what has already been said in this debate, but I refer particularly to one statement the Premier made in his second reading explanation about the attitude of the Murray Valley Development League. I have been involved with that league for many years, and from my records and regular attendance at its meetings I have some appreciation of the attitude of the league to this matter. That league, like the Liberal Party before 1968, believed it was important to have a further water storage on the Murray River and that the storage should be the Chowilla dam. Although I was not directly involved before the 1968 election, I believe that was the reason the Liberal Party in its policy speech insisted that it would try to build the Chowilla dam despite the fact that costs had escalated from about \$28,000,000 to probably about twice that amount. At that time some doubt was expressed by Victoria and New South Wales whether they were prepared, with the Common-

wealth Government, to provide additional money in order to build the Chowilla dam. My recollection is that that, to a large degree, was the reason why the people of South Australia, and particularly the Liberal Party, were keen to have Chowilla built as a storage area.

I now come to the remarks which the member for Chaffey made today and which he has made a number of times. He seems never to have got past first base. It has been explained to him several times that surely, when a person or an organization receives additional information which is quite convincing, a change of mind is justified. I believe this is the sole reason why the L.C.L. changed its attitude and came to realize that Dartmouth was a better proposition for South Australia than was Chowilla. If a person cannot change his mind in a situation that is tense, when he has received what he believes to be more up-to-date and more substantial information, it is pretty grim. In fact, it would be completely dishonest for a person in those circumstances not to have the courage to change his opinion.

I have no regrets at changing my own opinion, even though what I then advocated was completely unacceptable to many of my constituents at that time. Fortunately, over the months that have passed the majority of them have come to see that South Australia can be better served, first, with a larger water quota. One of the terribly important things about the original negotiations of the Hall Government with the other two States and the Commonwealth was an increase in quota for South Australia. The people who depend on water for a living really realize what these advantages are. It is the folk who use this water who know what an increase would mean. Of all the members of this House, probably only the member for Chaffey and I realize how many people would like to have additional water. I have no doubt that the member for Chaffey could quote many instances in his district of requests he has had for additional water. There is no additional water to spare at this time, and there might never be the additional quantities of water available that we would like to see if there was an endless supply. But at least the people along the river who are dependent on this water know perfectly well that they have a much better opportunity to get their present quotas fulfilled with a scheme that allows South Australia a much greater quota than before.

Mr. Venning: And better quality, too.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes. The member for Chaffey repeatedly makes the suggestion that we said we would build the Chowilla dam. Of course we did. This appeared not only in the *Murray Pioneer* up-river but in the *Murray Valley Standard* and in other newspapers, and I said it myself on the platform of the Murray Bridge Town Hall. There is no doubt that this was said. However, that it not the end of the story. I want to tell the whole story and not just stop at a suitable point where it helps our cause to stop. Fortunately, I think the end of the story is coming closer, for at least we have this Bill, which seeks to ratify the original agreement.

The Minister of Education amazed me and I am sure he staggered everyone on this side of the House when he said that it really did not matter much that 15 months had gone by. This is an incredible statement for a supposedly responsible Minister of the Crown to make. I would think that that delay of 15 months has set back by precisely that time whatever would have happened and whatever is to happen. This dilly-dallying by the present Government has set everything back by 15 months. I return now to the subject of the Murray Valley Development League. I want to contradict what the Premier said last Thursday when, speaking of people who had gone up the Murray and to the other States to talk about the general matter of water storage, he said:

The result of their campaign has been a change in attitude by irrigators in other States—

I wish I had time to develop that, because I do not believe there are many in numbers that the Premier could give that would support that statement—

and the support for the South Australian position now publicly expressed by the Murray Valley Development League.

This is the official attitude of that league, which was given to the Waikerie conference of June 19-20, 1969, in the form of three resolutions, which are as follows:

(1) That the Murray Valley Development League Executive agrees that on the evidence the proposed Dartmouth dam is the right decision for the next major conservation work for the River Murray Commission (being most advantageous to each of the "Murray Valley" States) and urges that construction proceed as soon and as expeditiously as possible on the basis of the Ministerial agreement of March 7, 1969.

(2) Further, it congratulates the Ministers concerned on the decision to meet South Australia's needs with an assurance of an increased minimum supply and an equal sharing in times of restriction.

(3) However, the league Executive records its conviction of the necessity for a Chowilla dam as the next following step in Murray River conservation and urges that all possible steps be taken to reduce salinity levels and so make it unnecessary or less necessary to provide dilution flows in the Murray River.

What is interesting is the fact that the league in region 5 in the next year, on February 5, 1970, passed two further resolutions:

1. That this Regional Committee of the Murray Valley Development League support the immediate ratification of the Dartmouth proposal.

2. That, subsequent to the agreement to build Dartmouth and its ratification by the Parliaments, the league be urged to campaign for an intensive investigation of Chowilla and any other River Murray conservation proposals for national development.

Those minutes of region 5 went to the May executive of the Murray Valley Development League and, following that, several months later the secretary wrote to the Premier a pleading letter to get on with Dartmouth and intensify the investigation of Chowilla. This is the exact situation that the Murray Valley Development League finds itself in at present. It has not changed its opinions. Certainly, it asks that the Government consider the investigation of Chowilla but the league's interpretation at all times, I am sure, has been that Chowilla along with every other possible storage site, and only along with those, must receive some attention as that possible storage site.

I want to correct the statement that the Premier made. I believe he has taken the statement of the Murray Valley Development League completely out of context. It was most unfair of him to refer to it in passing, as he did, without putting it right back where it belongs—in the original resolution form.

There is very little I want to add. I only emphasize that I am delighted, as are all other members on this side of the House, to support this Bill, because its provisions will bring, in a dry season, great protection to our State. Therefore, I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): In 1967, the present Premier, when Leader of the former Labor Government, moved the following motion:

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.

That represents the position as it is today; four years later, when it is possibly too late to ensure that that should take place, the Premier has asked us to accept the conditions that he set out in 1967. We have an alternative proposal, which assures us of an entitlement to water in dry years equal to what Chowilla could offer and now, after all this time, we are where we were four years ago, but the other States are not. An agreement has been worked out but not ratified by this Parliament and, if this Parliament had accepted that agreement when it had the opportunity over a year ago, the Dartmouth dam project would represent an assured water supply for this State, but of course that water supply is not assured now. Everyone here is fearful that there may be some catch about the Dartmouth dam proposal, because of the change in the cost structure in the meantime.

I do not refer at present to the undignified scramble for office that took place earlier; I only say that after four years we are still debating a project that could have been started a long time ago, a project of which we could have been certain then but of which we cannot be certain now. My memory of the matter goes back to when Sir Thomas Playford announced the Chowilla dam project in about 1963 and got the other States concerned to agree to it. The Chowilla dam was accepted under an agreement that provided equal sharing of water in declared dry seasons. We were happy about that project, but in the course of time the situation changed. There was a bad drought in 1967-68 and, for the first time, salinity became a serious problem in the Murray River settlements. Salinity had been a well-known problem previously, but in 1967-68, when it became a major problem, people who had previously agreed to the Chowilla proposal began to think again.

Several factors had changed and it became clear that there must be a considerable flow in the river in order to prevent salinity building up to a dangerous level. When the former Labor Government was in office, the River Murray Commission agreed to the deferment of the Chowilla proposal in favour of further studies. By the time the further studies took place it was possible to use a computer. Although calculations had first been made without the use of a computer, with only a few trial runs by arithmetical methods being involved, the use of the computer in the studies, which the Labor Government had agreed to accept, allowed an enormous number of different proposals. Because of

the effectiveness of the computer, hundreds of combinations were tested, and it became clear to the experts who followed these studies that a better proposition for the Murray River as a whole would be the Dartmouth reservoir. By that time, some of the experts who had been involved in the early stages of the project were no longer in the Government service or in Parliament. However, the fact was that those involved at the time agreed that the computer studies showed that the Dartmouth dam was a better proposition. This study was allowed by the Labor Government of the time which had agreed to the deferment.

Since then there have been no major technical changes; the changes have been purely political. A person who lives in the Chaffey District said to me outside the House this afternoon that we need the Dartmouth dam badly. All members of the House agree that we need it badly. We could have been certain we would get it, but now we are not absolutely certain. Naturally we hope that we will get Dartmouth. I do not intend to quote at length from previous speeches in *Hansard*. I cannot remember a debate when more volumes of *Hansard* have been strewn around on members' desks than are strewn around this evening. The position is that when politicians change their minds it is only natural that one should look back and see what they said before. I am not against politicians changing their minds. I believe that, for a politician to do his job, he must be open-minded and prepared to change his mind. However, when he changes his mind, he should make no attempt to conceal that he has changed it. He should not attack everyone else who at one time was against him, and it is in this connection that I complain about Government members this evening. If they had merely said, "We have changed our minds; we apologize," or words to that effect, there would not be much that we could say, but they did not say that at all. In changing their minds, they have blamed the Opposition.

I will now set out the course of events as I see it. Perhaps not all members will agree that I have picked out all the relevant points, and some members may think that I am placing the emphasis wrongly. First, Sir Thomas Playford announced the Chowilla scheme. In 1967, the Labor Government agreed to the deferment of Chowilla as a result of further studies that were to be undertaken. In 1968 the Hall Government went to the election saying that it would get on with the Chowilla dam; no-one denies that. When the Hall Government

was elected to office it intended to get on with the Chowilla dam, but studies made as a result of computer runs (to which the Hall Government had not previously been a party) eventually showed clearly that the Dartmouth dam was a better proposition. Because I was a member of the Hall Government I can well remember the Cabinet meetings at which departmental officers were questioned for many hours on their change of attitude.

At one time the experts available to the Government believed that the Chowilla proposal was the best proposition for assuring South Australia of adequate water supplies in the future, but at this time they had changed their attitude and they agreed that the Dartmouth project was the better proposition; as far as I know, they all agreed on that matter. Every public servant concerned agreed that Dartmouth was the better proposition for South Australia and the other two States. A series of Cabinet meetings took place and the Hall Government decided to accept the Dartmouth proposal as that which would assure South Australia of adequate water supplies in the future. In doing so the Hall Government had no illusions whatever. Every member realizes that politicians who change their minds are always reminded of their previous attitude. We knew that that would happen. There are no prizes in the world of politics for changing one's mind, but Steele Hall and his Ministers recognized that it was the correct course. As a result of the later studies it was clear to the experts (and on whom else could we lean?) that the Dartmouth proposal should be accepted by the South Australia Government. The Hall Government then negotiated with the other parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement.

In the meantime there was some debate on and off in this House. In September, 1969, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) moved that any contract should not precede the letting of a contract for Chowilla, but may provide for the simultaneous letting of such contract. That sort of argument went on because it was quite clear that, because the Hall Government had altered its position as a result of technical advice, there was to be some political advantage. I do not particularly wonder that the then Opposition (the Labor Party) saw some political advantage, and I do not particularly blame it for using it. However, I have long since ceased to exonerate it. It is natural that, when people change their minds, there should be some spirit of critical inquiry. However, it is not natural that anyone should want to see South Australia's future water

supplies endangered simply because of the desire for political advantage. I had no particularly bitter feelings about the Labor Party attitude soon after the Hall Government had adopted Dartmouth, but I have long since given up that attitude and my feelings now are of the greatest contempt for the Party sitting opposite, and that includes the new members who have been elected to office as a result of the election that brought about what was, in my belief, a political fraud.

In about May, 1970, the Hall Government asked the House to agree to an amendment to the agreement whereby the Dartmouth dam would be built. In doing so, the Premier (Mr. Hall) was able to tell the House that he had negotiated an agreement that provided more water for South Australia than any previous Government had contemplated, more water than would have been provided under the Chowilla scheme, and that the agreement would still maintain the equal sharing that had been projected under the Dartmouth scheme, yet the House still rejected it. The Premier was able to show that, and that rather makes nonsense of the earlier motion, in relation to which I have mentioned the statement by the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, that he wanted any alternative proposal to give at least as much as Chowilla would have given.

In May, 1970, the then Premier (Mr. Hall) was able to offer this House and the people of the State a negotiated agreement that would provide more water than had ever been contemplated. That was rejected by this House. I remember the debate well, and other members who were here would also remember it. The last few hours of it in the evening were mildly dramatic, lightened by some comic remarks from the then Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott) giving his view on what the thought of experts, and all that sort of thing. The Labor Opposition agreed with the then Speaker about the building of the Chowilla and Dartmouth dams contemporaneously, and the Government was defeated. The building of the two dams contemporaneously was a joke to us and to anyone else who had thought for a minute about public financing.

We knew that it was just about as realistic as the story of Jack and the Beanstalk, yet the Labor Party supported it. The Leader of the Opposition, who is now Premier, rose to speak and I think I detected that he was faintly smiling as he said that the Labor Party considered the contemporaneous building of the

two dams was not exactly what it wanted, but it was nearer to what it wanted than anything else. Only a few days before, he had described the proposal as one that would have been financially disastrous to South Australia, but that did not stop him from saying, with a certain amount of satisfaction, rather like a pussy that had found a saucer of milk, that the Labor Party considered that it could accept that, because it was nearer what the Party wanted. Actually, it was, in fact, nearer what the Party wanted: it wanted office.

Mr. Millhouse: That is it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It did not want water, it wanted office, and that is what it got. What has happened since? The Government has now been in office for about 14 months, and during the year we have been asking (as we should ask, but we have been accused of troublemaking) what has happened to this agreement. In early 1970, we had offered to this Parliament an agreement that assured our water future for many years, but it was rejected, because the Party opposite wanted office, and for no other reason. If anyone once doubted that, he will not doubt it this evening, because the Government has reintroduced the same Bill as that introduced then. During 1970, the Government had taken office and everyone was bustling about with new Ministerial duties: the Attorney-General, who went straight into Parliament and became a Minister, was happily engrossing himself in protecting the public and straightening out a few *faux pas* he may have uttered during the election campaign about Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated and the Minister of Education was also happily dealing with his problems.

However, during this time Opposition members from time to time asked questions about the agreement. We were not happy, as you can well imagine, Mr. Speaker. We had lost office on a matter of principle, and we were not happy to see a Government that had clawed its way to office, as we thought for no other than tawdry political motives, apparently kicking this agreement around and not worrying much about it. On November 24 last year, the member for Mitcham asked the following Question on Notice:

What does the Government intend to do next in its attempt to renegotiate the agreement between members of the River Murray Commission to build the Dartmouth dam?

In his reply the Premier said:

Proceed, as the Hall Government announced it would do, with a political solution, but no doubt with better success.

Mr. Millhouse: And what a solution it was!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have seen the result of this over-confident attitude: we have seen what has happened. The result is that the people of this State are taken back to where they were 14 months ago, but with the possibility now of not having an agreement that will provide them with the water they so badly need. The Government has come back to the House in which it made its boast, and has asked the House to accept its retraction. Should we be sympathetic? We should be if an apology was involved, but there is none. When he spoke, the Premier did not apologize for his attitude; in fact, he attacked the Opposition. He blamed it and he blamed the Leader. There was no apology. We cannot be expected to be sympathetic. We are not sympathetic to what is really a sordid episode in the political history of this State.

We are now asked to ratify a favourable agreement that our Leader negotiated skilfully, an agreement that provided us with more water than had been contemplated by any other Government. After all that, we are now asked to ratify the agreement. We hope it is not too late. Early last year, we had a Government with a Leader who had made a good negotiation. He believed in what he had done. He said it was vital to the people and the future water supply of South Australia, that the proposal he offered the House was vital. He stood on principle. He was voted out and, instead of being Premier, he is now Leader of the Opposition. The representatives of the people who voted him out are now sitting happily on the Government benches, some of them smiling, some of them looking a little modest, but there they are. Some of them are happy about it. The Leader of the Opposition went out on a matter of principle, which is a word that most members opposite could not even spell.

On that night in 1970 they joined with an Independent, whom they personally detested, to support a proposal that they knew was utterly ridiculous. We told them so at the time, yet they went ahead because of their thirst for office, and they got it. Do they look happy about it? Some do and some do not—there is no unanimity about it. They voted for the contemporaneous building of Chowilla and Dartmouth. It should not be “contemporaneous”; it should be “contemptuous”, because they knew full well that it was just too silly. No-one knew that better than the present Premier.

I have read a fair number of books about Labor statesmen in various countries. I have

been reading about Labor statesmen in the United Kingdom, and I should like to see a few of them in South Australia. At the moment I see none. I do not blame only the members of the front bench opposite in this matter (I certainly blame them, for they should understand what they are doing), but I blame also some of the members sitting behind them. For instance, I blame the member for Chaffey, who of all the back-benchers opposite should understand what this is all about. He should know the risks that South Australia has been running because of the Government's prevarication in this matter of water supply. There are plenty of others, including the member for Enfield and the member for Elizabeth. There is no doubt that those members well and truly understand the position of our water supplies, and they should be ashamed of themselves. I do not agree with the way in which this Government got into office; I do not agree with anything about it, except that I am willing to support its point of view now that it has come around to ours. However, I think the Government should have the honesty to apologize for the way in which it has risked South Australia's future in the intervening 14 months. I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Before that vital opportunist vote was taken in April, 1970, at what was to be the end of the creditable and trusted period of the Hall Government, there was a television debate, during which the following statement was made:

Our water supply in South Australia is too important a subject for political bickering. We ought to ensure the water supply.

The author of that statement was the present Premier, yet we have seen for many months now political bickering and opportunism, the like of which this State has not seen previously and which, I trust, it will never see again. It was reported in the *Advertiser* of November 15, 1967, that that same person had said that the decision to defer construction of the Chowilla dam arose from factors not previously established. It is little wonder, then, that the then Premier (now the Leader of the Opposition), when speaking on the two-dam policy during the television interview to which I have just referred, was able to say, unchallenged then and unchallenged subsequently:

We no longer have a choice. We have not had a choice since 1967 when it—

referring to Chowilla—

was deferred and the deferment was agreed to by the previous Government.

It is interesting to examine the annual reports of the Director of Mines and Government Geologist of South Australia. In the report for the year ended June 30, 1966, we find at page 12 under the heading "Engineering and Water Supply Department Projects" photographs accompanied by captions describing, for instance, work taking place at Chowilla on the Tilmy Flat site in connection with saline water disposal and referring also to the Kinchina quarry site. We find similar information in the report for the following year, but in the report for the year ended June 30, 1968, we find no reference to any work at all connected with the Chowilla dam project. As the Dunstan Government had gone to the people in March, 1968, and did not vacate office until mid-April, 1968, in effect, although it had been in office for all but 2½ months of the year 1967-68, no action had been taken by the Director of Mines and the Government Geologist in relation to the Chowilla project in those 9½ months. Work had been deferred and no investigation was being undertaken; surely this was at the direction of the then Labor Government. At page 12, the 1965-66 River Murray Commission report refers to investigation and design work being carried out on the Chowilla dam. It refers to detailed geological surveys failing to locate adequate supplies of rock suitable for aggregate and rip rap close to the dam. It states:

Plans have been developed for a quarry near Murray Bridge. This involves transport of stone by rail, and a spur line to the dam site from Paringa is under survey.

The 1966-67 report of the River Murray Commission contains pictorial evidence of work being undertaken to investigate methods of construction. This information was to determine the nature of some of the physical handicaps to be found in constructing this dam. At page 12, the report states:

Tender documents were completed and distributed to registered tenderers on October 14, 1966, and tenders closed on March 16, 1967. Four tenders were received and the River Murray Commission met to consider the tenders on May 10, 1967. In view of the considerable increase in the tendered price above that in the latest estimate, the commission decided:

- i. To advise all Governments of the revised estimated cost of Chowilla based on the receipt of firm tenders.
- ii. To make a re-assessment of the benefits of Chowilla based on present-day information and taking into consideration the effects of dilution flows in the Sunraysia area.

- iii. That it would not be possible to let tenders before the end of September, 1967, and it was agreed to advise tenderers to that effect.

The report also contains other information. The 1967-68 report has considerable information about the effect that salinity in the Murray River will have on Chowilla. At page 11, the report states:

Two progress reports dated March 1 and June 20, 1968, have been submitted and an interim report on the "Effects of Chowilla Reservoir on Salinity" was submitted on March 7, 1968.

Throughout this report there are references to investigations by the commission. Under the heading "Ministerial Agreement" the 1968-69 report of the River Murray Commission states:

Ministers representing the four Governments concerned met in March, 1969, and agreed on conditions for the construction of the Dartmouth project. The terms of the Ministerial agreement were as follows:

Agreement was reached that the Dartmouth project should be the next project to be constructed for development of the River Murray Commission resources on the conditions given below, but the States' agreement was conditional upon Commonwealth finance being available to assist them in financing their share of the cost of Dartmouth.

The commission then lists the seven major points associated with the agreement. Under the heading "Investigation of Chowilla and Dartmouth Projects", the commission's report states:

In its annual report for 1967-68 the commission advised that the Chowilla project had been deferred pending further investigation. As previously reported, the commission had:

- appointed Messrs. Gutteridge, Haskins and Davey in conjunction with Hunting Technical Services as consultants to examine the whole question of salinity in the Murray Basin;

- directed its technical committee (a committee of engineers representing the three States and the River Murray Commission) to undertake a large number of operational studies to assess the likely yield benefits from both Chowilla and any alternative storage on the Upper Murray in catchments controlled by the River Murray Commission, under a wide variety of operating conditions;

- engaged the Snowy Mountains Authority to undertake investigations to determine the engineering feasibility and estimate the cost/capacity relationship of storages on the Mitta Mitta River at Dartmouth and Gibbo and on the upper Murray River at Murray Gates and Jingellie.

These reports were accepted by Government officers over a period. There is no suggestion

that the Ministerial statement was made with other than the full agreement of the Cabinet of the day. As a result of the new evidence that was becoming available, it was the considered opinion that it would be to the advantage of this State to defer action on Chowilla. In the 1970 report we find further references to the engineering investigations on the Dartmouth project. Under the heading "Chowilla Dam" the 1970 report of the River Murray Commission states:

As previously indicated work on this project has been suspended. Both the construction camp site and the accommodation area at Paringa have been under the control of a caretaker throughout the year. Eight houses still remain at Paringa and at the construction site there are eight camp houses, a project office, workshop, mess buildings, soils laboratory, store, model hut and seven miscellaneous small buildings.

That was the only information on this matter that the River Murray Commission saw fit or necessary to include in its report of 1970. I am reminded of one of the works of the American humorous poet, journalist and lecturer, John G. Saxe, who lived from 1816 to 1887. One of the poems that he wrote was entitled *The Blind Men and the Elephant*. Basically, the story of this poem is that six blind men of Indostan were asked for their opinion of an elephant, and, after they had each felt part of the elephant, they gave the replies that I shall state. One said, after feeling his side, that the elephant was like a wall. The second, after feeling the tusk, said that he was like a spear. The third, after feeling the trunk, said that he was like a snake. The fourth felt the leg and said that the elephant was like the trunk of a tree.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Dr. EASTICK: The fifth man felt the ear and said it was like a fan, while the sixth, after feeling the tail, said it was like a rope.

The poem continues:

And so these men of Indostan
Disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion
Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right
And all were in the wrong.

This is the situation that has existed for far too long in the minds of members opposite, in that they have wanted to take individual views of the Chowilla-Dartmouth position and have believed that the whole was the only part that they personally could see. I am thankful that I am a member of a Party that has been prepared to change its mind according to the

technical and engineering information that has become available.

We have been able to see, in full perspective, the problem that is the Dartmouth-Chowilla one, and we have come out on the side of Dartmouth. That is a position which, unfortunately for this State, the Labor Party took too long to appreciate. I could not finish my speech without referring briefly to the attitude of the Minister of Education. We are fortunate that his is an administrative position, not a teaching one, because his whole attitude is, "I am right, you are wrong." He asks why should the other States not negotiate, but I ask why should those States boil the cabbage a second time. The other States are fortunately in the position that they have seen the problem and accepted the technical advice that has been available to them (and it was also available to South Australia), and they did not hold their heads in the sand as members opposite have done.

The Minister of Education went on to say that South Australia's desires were relatively simple matters. It seems strange to me that the Governments of two States and the Commonwealth could be so wrong as to believe that the minutely simple matters that the Minister of Education speaks of were so simple. In fact, it became abundantly apparent why the Minister wanted to enter the debate. He wanted to do so to hound again the fact that the other Governments, both Commonwealth and State, were Liberal Governments, and this was his chance again to get on the band waggon with his theme of "I am right, you are wrong."

In conclusion, I should like to refer to the United States Agriculture Department Year Book of Agriculture for 1955. The first chapter, contributed by Bernard Frank, is entitled *The Story of Water is the Story of Man*. It states:

You could write the story of man's growth in terms of his epic concerns with water. Through the ages people have elected or have been compelled to settle in regions where water was deficient in amount, inferior in quality, or erratic in behaviour. Only when supplies failed or were made useless by unbearable silt or pollution or when floods swept everything before them were centres of habitation abandoned. But often the causes lay as much in the acts or failures of men themselves as in the caprices of nature.

I hope that the failures of men, being the men of the Labor Party in South Australia, are not going to put this State into the situation where it will need to be abandoned, where its agricultural projects on the Murray river and its industry in Adelaide, which relies on the Murray river for upwards of 85 per cent of its

total water supply during periods of drought, are not at jeopardy because of the failure to act long before this. I support the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support the Bill. I do not intend to delay proceedings unduly, as it is urgent that this Bill pass through its remaining stages as soon as possible. It is for the good of the people of this State. However, the passage of this Bill and the circumstances surrounding it reflect no credit on the Labor Party. I must comment on the remarks of the Minister of Education in his long-winded dirge for Chowilla. We have heard many white-wash operations in this House, and of course there were many before I became a member, but I have rarely heard one, as the member for Mitcham said, so unconvincing as was that of the Minister of Education. The Minister said that Dartmouth could not be operational before the end of this decade, that it would be impossible to tender before the end of 1972, that the River Murray Commission would not have been able to call for tenders, and that the delay that has ensued would have made no difference whatever to getting water from the dam. It is his opinion that if costs have risen more than 10 per cent they would have done so last year as well as this year. How much out of touch with reality can anyone get? I have said several times that the Minister of Education is a theoretical academic or perhaps an academic theorist: he is not a practical man.

Mr. Millhouse: I think that is flattering him.

Dr. TONKIN: It may be, but I give him the benefit of the doubt. He suggests that Chowilla is no longer likely to be constructed and that the Ministers of the Hall Government were well aware of this when they advocated building Dartmouth dam. Of course they were: they had considered the matter thoroughly, and they knew that Dartmouth dam was a better proposition. The Minister said that his Government tried to get minor amendments or concessions from members of the other Governments concerned but that they would not give ground because they wanted to ensure that Chowilla was killed. Well, I cannot see the sense in this. As the member for Light has so ably said, if an agreement has been negotiated to the satisfaction of three out of four of the parties, why should the fourth party complain, especially when it is receiving a better deal from that agreement than it would have received under another agreement?

The Labor Party not only wants its cake but it wants to eat it as well. The Minister of Education tried to drag up the old emotional

argument about whether or not the dam should be built in South Australia and whether we would have absolute control of it. That is an old chestnut now, and it does not cut any ice at all. He has done everything he could: he criticized the calculations that were made on the basis of the yield to the whole system. Well, how else does one make these calculations? It is a four-way agreement, with all four parties putting money into it. What on earth does the Minister expect? He says that the failure to negotiate any change shows that Chowilla must be killed for all time, but I am not quite sure and have not been able to find out (nor have any other members of this House) just how hard the Labor Government has tried to renegotiate this agreement. I should be interested, when the correspondence is tabled (and I hope it is all tabled), to see just how hard the Government has tried.

Mr. Millhouse: So shall we all be interested.

Dr. TONKIN: I think we may be a little surprised. It is easy to talk. We must be realistic about this. We must not ask for pie in the sky. Chowilla may be built one day. Who knows? It may turn out to be one of the storages that will be proved to be necessary in the future, because storages will be needed in the future. No-one can say whether or not Chowilla will be built in the future, and certainly the Minister of Education cannot say it will not be built.

Having listened to members on this side of the House and, as a new member, having appreciated their summing up of the situation and of the events leading up to this sorry delay, I still believe that perhaps we have fallen into the trap of becoming too theoretical again and going into too much detail again, because I think that the main point at issue here is divided into two parts. The first part is: "Thank goodness the Government has seen reason and has introduced a Bill (properly this time) to ratify the original agreement." That is a jolly good thing. But the other and more important part of the issue is the credibility of the Government. It can sidetrack into all sorts of theoretical and historical considerations, but it cannot get away from the fact that its credibility has been seriously impaired, if not completely destroyed, in the eyes of the people of South Australia.

We saw earlier this year the introduction of a new technique, almost a new syndrome, called pseudo-ratification. This is in relation

to the Bill that was introduced last April, which everyone hailed in headlines. I think the press and the other media were misled, together with the people of South Australia, into believing that the Dartmouth agreement had been ratified in its original form—pseudo-ratification, a game of bluff. The member for Mallee in his most capably constructed speech spoke of the Premier's gambling on possible election results in New South Wales and the Commonwealth sphere, suggesting that perhaps he was playing poker with the future of South Australia. Certainly he was playing poker and gambling with the State's future. He had his tongue in his cheek while he manipulated this House and the people of South Australia for his own political ends, just as he did when he destroyed the Hall Government.

A sorry chapter of conflicting statements can be attributed to the Premier. He complains of delays and says that his letters were not answered. We shall be interested to see those letters. What does he expect? Does he expect instant service, with no consideration being given to them? We can imagine the outcry and the scorn that he would heap on those States from his position opposite if replies had come immediately. He would have said that the letters had not been considered, that nobody had thought to look into them, and that they were being answered as a matter of form. The thing that I can stomach least of all is his attempt to blame the Hall Government and the Leader of the Opposition (the Premier at the time) for the events that have led up to this sorry display in this session. I think much credit must go to the present Leader of the Opposition for all the work he did in negotiating this agreement and for doing it in such a way that we are able to consider the matter in this House now.

If it had not been for the Leader and for his actions while Premier, we would not have had this Bill here today, and we must not lose sight of this fact. The blame for the present situation lies fairly and squarely, no matter what Government members say and no matter how they try to sidetrack us, with the Labor Government and with the Premier, because of his shilly-shallying and his inability to play straight with the people of South Australia. I believe that the Dunstan Government will be long remembered in this State but not in the way that I suspect the Premier likes to think that it will be remembered. The Premier may not be around when the Dunstan Government is remembered; perhaps he is counting on not

being around; who knows? I believe that that blame will come and that the tragedy will be seen sooner if the costs have already escalated beyond the 10 per cent so that the agreement cannot be negotiated and, therefore, we do not get the water.

I say this again, and I do not care how many times Government members moan: if we do not get the water, which is absolutely essential to life and existence, it is the Labor Government's fault, and it will be long remembered for this. My purpose in speaking has been perhaps to bring a new member's point of view to this debate, and my point of view is concerned with this session. While I am interested in and concerned with what has taken place previously and still consider that the major issue here is the Government's credibility, the fact is that the Leader of the Opposition (when he was Premier) and the Hall Government are entirely responsible for this measure. The fact that we can now discuss it here and I hope, finally get somewhere does the Leader and the former Liberal Government much credit.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill, and I am in the happy position this evening of being able to agree with something the Speaker said earlier today. We are not often in that happy position, because the Speaker does not make many pronouncements in this place. I think it was when he was threatening to name the member for Rocky River that he said—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Reference to any decision of the Speaker is not allowed. The member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the statement was made that this was an important debate. It was actually made by the Speaker, but that statement is one with which I completely agree. This is an important debate; it is a debate vital to the future of South Australia. It is so important, in fact, that only two members on the Government side today have seen fit to speak to the debate! Nevertheless, the fact that Opposition members are speaking to the debate indicates that we consider it to be a most important measure. Therefore, I find that on this occasion we are in agreement with the Speaker. We supported the earlier measure last session to try to expedite the negotiations as best we could in Opposition. The Minister of Education said earlier that the Leader was doing his best to hinder the Government's operations. I will have more to say a little later about the

speech of the Minister of Education. The fact that we were willing to support the earlier Bill to amend further the Dartmouth agreement indicates that we were certainly not going to obstruct the Government in any way. Newspaper headlines at the time stated that the way was now open, and that was the idea the Labor Party wanted to spread then; it wanted people to believe that the way was open for the Dartmouth dam to be proceeded with. As events in succeeding months have amply demonstrated, we know this was completely false. The fact is that the Government has now seen the light and has introduced a Bill in the same terms as the Bill originally presented by the Leader when he was Premier.

The present Premier has felt for some time that his case has been weakening. It is a good question why the Government has at last decided to bring in the Bill. Despite what the two Government speakers have said, probably the reason why the Bill is being introduced is that real danger is looming that we may lose this storage, and the Premier has at last realized that perhaps the Eastern States are not grandstanding when they say that they are losing interest in the dam. It is fairly obvious that for some time the Premier has felt that his case has been weakening. That is why he thought it necessary for the Labor Party to win the recent New South Wales election to strengthen his hand. However, having had a fair dose of Labor Government over the years, the New South Wales public has seen fit in the last few years to reject the Labor Party. I dare say that the South Australian public is presently getting a dose of this Labor Government and in due course will see fit to reject it. This turn-about by the Government is one of a series of turn-about that has occurred since the Government was elected. Although I have been taken to task by back-benchers opposite for quoting from the Labor Party policy speech at the last election, the longer this Government is in office the more we realize the difficulty it is having in bringing to fruition various statements in its policy speech. Referring to Dartmouth, the 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.

During the election campaign, it was said that the renegotiation would be achieved within a matter of months. The Government has done a complete about-face in relation to other statements in the policy speech. In this connection, we have only to think of the double talk on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposal, and the business about every citizen living subject to law. So the list grows; the case of Dartmouth is another item in the list. As other honourable members have said, just where does the credibility of the Government lie?

Mr. Venning: They lie all the time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, the broad agreement with councils before the Government introduced that Bill was another instance—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! References to other Bills are out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The policy speech stated that the Premier would demand that certain things be done. We well recall that he said he would bring the Commonwealth Government and Sir Henry Bolte to heel. It is no wonder that Sir Henry said that the Premier of South Australia was inexperienced and had much to learn. Unfortunately, the Premier is learning the hard way, as is the public of South Australia.

In my own district people realize the importance of water supplies from the Murray River storages. About a fortnight ago one of my constituents spoke to me about getting an increased allocation of irrigation water from the Murray River, because he had read that the golf course at Murray Bridge was to be given a licence. He has 3,000 acres on the Murray but he can irrigate only 26 acres. He has an extensive market for carrots in another State and he has the potential to increase that market. This man's operations mean much to the economy of this State; he spends about \$50,000 a year in transportation costs. Consequently, he is vitally concerned with an adequate and assured supply of Murray water. Indeed, water supplies from the Murray River are the very livelihood of the State.

The Premier originally agreed to the feasibility studies that resulted in the technical report which indicated that the Dartmouth project would provide considerably increased benefits to the three States. The Premier can say what he likes, but four years ago he agreed that those feasibility studies were necessary, and he agreed to their being undertaken. Like the member for Bragg, I, as a new member, have been confused by the conflicting statements that have been made. Whom are we

to believe? I have the highest regard for some of the people who have made public pronouncements on this matter. For months I considered just whom I should believe. In the long run I concluded that, if we could not believe the technical experts and if we thought they were crooks and that their reports were wrong, perhaps we might believe the Premier. However, on reading the evidence and on reading what Mr. Beaney said, I concluded that, if we were to believe anyone, we must believe the experts. I wish to refer to the transcript of a television debate involving the present Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. During that debate Mr. Beaney, who was present, said:

The original concept of Chowilla came from South Australia. It was proposed by South Australia to the commission and was very thoroughly investigated by the commission on certain assumptions that were made back in the beginning of this decade, and it was very definitely shown that not only South Australia but the two upper States of New South Wales and Victoria could win considerable advantages from the operation of this storage. Tenders were called and the price escalated to a rather high level, which made the upper States query the advantages that might be had from this storage and the cost of water to themselves. We had also experienced some rather poor river conditions with poor quality water—as we had last summer—and this highlighted certain operational procedures which had been introduced in the earliest days which were no longer tenable.

In other words, some of the assumptions that led to the Chowilla agreement were now no longer tenable in the light of further evidence. Mr. Beaney continued:

The commission instructed that further studies be made.

It was the present Premier of South Australia who agreed to these further studies. Mr. Beaney goes on to deal with the result of these further studies and states:

These show that the overall benefit of a storage at Dartmouth will benefit the system by something like 860,000 acre feet more water than could be taken out of the Chowilla system, and each State is in a position to share in this water.

The point that I make, as a layman who came into this matter as a new member, is that we should ask whom we are to believe. If we cannot believe the experts, I do not know whom to believe. The technical committee reported, following expert investigation, and agreed that the Dartmouth dam provided significant advantages over the Chowilla storage, and in the end that was the point of view that I had to accept, because there is no point in having experts and engineers if we cannot rely on their evidence.

I would say that not only has the introduction of this Bill vindicated absolutely the present Leader of the Opposition and members of this Party, but it has also vindicated the former member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold). I tried hard to make anything of the speech of the present member for Chaffey this evening, as I always do when he speaks.

Mr. Millhouse: It was impossible.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As the Deputy Leader has said, it was impossible to find any coherent argument in his speech. However, for the benefit of the House, I will quote briefly one point that Mr. Arnold made during the debate that led to the downfall of the Hall Government. Speaking after the dinner adjournment, Mr Arnold said:

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

I suggest that that was a completely honest statement made in the light of the technical and legal advice. The reference to the legal advice doubtless represents the advice that had been tendered to the Hall Government about what the result of arbitration would be. It is significant that the Labor Government had not seen fit to go to arbitration on this matter, because it knew well what the legal advice tendered to the former Government was and what the result of arbitration would be. The arbitrators would have to accept the word of the experts, yet we were advised not to accept that. This is a completely untenable position that the Government has placed itself in. In fact, the Premier saw fit to repudiate what the experts had said, in a report that states:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said the giving away of the guarantees that could be provided through the Chowilla dam of quantity and quality control of water was not a triumph for South Australia but a disaster. "The Chowilla dam appears to have been swapped for a change in South Australia's formal entitlement of water," he said.

In another report he stated that he doubted the credibility of the technical evidence and said:

The report, from the River Murray Commission's technical committee, shows that Chowilla would give real advantages to the up-river States, as well as decreasing salinity in the South Australian section of the Murray

to a far greater extent than any alternative proposal, he said.

The fact is that the report indicated that although overall the salinity from Dartmouth taken over the whole year would be slightly increased, in the months that mattered, the summer months, the salinity would be decreased. When the water is needed, the salinity from Dartmouth will be marginally less than from Chowilla. Nevertheless, the Premier saw fit to repudiate the views of the technical committee on this point. I shall comment on what the Minister of Education said, although I thought the Deputy Leader utterly and completely demolished him. I have heard the Minister espouse some weak cases since I have been a member (in fact, I have heard most of the Ministers do the same), but this evening I thought he had the weakest case I have heard him try to defend. It would have been fit and proper for a Government member to congratulate the Leader on obtaining this extra entitlement of water, but that did not happen.

The Minister of Education suggested two propositions: the first was that the period of negotiation had not caused any significant delay. I have heard some nonsense from the Minister, but this must be the utterance of all time. The Minister was trying to tell us that, because we have mucked around for 15 months, this is completely inconsequential. Why not mess around for another 15 months? What is urgent about bringing the Bill in now? He said that the cost would have risen by 10 per cent anyway. We know what has happened to costs in the last 15 months. Is the Minister saying that they will remain stationary now? Will wages be fixed? The Minister's statement is nonsense: costs are increasing all the time, as they have been increasing in the last couple of decades. The fact that nothing has been done for 15 months means that we are 15 months behind where we were before. What the Minister did not say was that the chance of losing this storage has increased considerably. His argument that the fact that 15 months does not count for anything is nonsense. A person with the lowest intelligence in his department or any child would know this.

Mr. Venning: A grade 2 child would know it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He would teach the Minister something on this. The Minister said that the increased cost would have occurred anyway, but I cannot follow this argument. Is he trying to say that, because we have done nothing for 15 months but can

go ahead now, there will be no increase in the cost in the next 15 months?

Mr. Mathwin: He's only kidding himself.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't take it to a logical conclusion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: His argument is nonsense. He spoke about designing schools and said that it takes a long time to design one. He said we will build one in two years but, as costs are increasing, we will design it two years hence, so that when we build it four years hence the cost will be the same as it will be two years hence. This is tripe. The Minister's second point was that Chowilla will not be built because of intransigence in other States. The Minister was most vocal in the earlier debate on this matter, and he wrote an article for the *Sunday Mail* of January 5, 1969, in which he made the sort of snide comments about other people that he has made in this place more than once. He said:

Any irrigator wants to be downstream from the new dam, and perhaps the irrigators of the Mildura area and of Mr. Fairbairn's own electorate of Farrer are more important politically than is the State of South Australia. We are used to that sort of comment from the Minister. He supplies no evidence to support that. It is a feeling he has that everyone on the other side of politics from him plays the game dirty. On other occasions he hears of rumours floating around and says he has good reason to believe that they have come from the Liberal Party! I should like to see a better story from the Minister. He attributed political motives to the Commonwealth Minister. He said:

We have a strong bargaining position and will fail only if we do not press our case to the utmost.

The only conclusion we can draw from that is that the Government has failed because it did not press its case to the utmost. These are the words of the Minister of Education when he was making pronouncements in his usual pontifical fashion on the rights of the State. He saw fit tonight to try to make political play of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader has been consistent in what he has been doing right from the start. Once a decision was made to accept the advice of the experts, the Leader of the Opposition has been consistent in his statements about the dams. With no evidence the Minister accuses the Leader of going to other States and sabotaging the great efforts of the Government—again the sort of comment and reflection that he likes to indulge in. The fact of the matter is that

the Leader has for months been warning of the situation that has now developed. There is a danger of this State's losing the Dartmouth dam, and he has been saying that for months. The Premier saw fit to get up and say that Sir Henry Bolte was "grandstanding", but he has now second thoughts about that. The Leader summed up the position, when he was Premier, in that television debate from which I quoted a statement by Mr. Beaney, the South Australian expert on water supply. The Leader said, back in 1969, what the position was as he saw it. He said this, which I believe is a statement of fact:

Chowilla died as a first storage on the River Murray system when Mr. Dunstan hawked a letter, or a statement of intent, through to the other Premiers and the Commonwealth of Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition has been completely consistent in what he has said. He believes that the political realities of this situation are that the present Premier believed that once he had received the results of his technical studies there was a chance of another storage. Then he ran around the States with this letter to see that we simply kept our entitlement of 1,250,000 acre feet. The members of the Government have not the good grace to get up and congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on being able to foresee the eventual outcome, which he did before the last election. His statements have been completely vindicated, and it has taken the Labor Government 15 months to come to its senses and realize that this is the only tenable position and the only possibility for assured future water supplies for South Australia at present. All this nonsense in the Labor Party's policy speech about investigating the run-off from the north and tapping underground reserves in the South-East seems to have been forgotten. Fortunately, the Government has put this nonsense behind it and has now come to appreciate the reality of the situation. The Leader of the Opposition is to be congratulated on the foresight he showed as far back as before the last State election. I believe that if the Government had any gumption it would get up and congratulate the Leader on the extra entitlement which, as a result of hard bargaining, he gained for South Australia. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I also support this Bill, as I supported the identical Bill in 1970. On April 30, 1970, the Australian Labor Party, with the support of the Hon. T. C. Stott, gambled with South Australia's lifeline. In

May, 1970, the A.L.P. won an election on false pretences. Now, in August, 1971, the A.L.P. admits to winning on false pretences. If the gamble is lost, let the A.L.P. stay damned for ever. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened with interest to things that members opposite have had to say on this Bill and, before I get to the gravamen of the argument, perhaps I should turn to one or two little matters that arose out of the things the Leader has had to say. In the course of this debate, members opposite have seen fit to spend much time with regard to me and my credibility, probity and other such associated matters.

Mr. Millhouse: As well we might.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, perhaps I might have a word or two to say in reply about some of those things.

Mr. Clark: They're playing politics, as they have done right throughout.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have always played politics on this issue from the very time they went to an election to say that the Chowilla dam would be constructed by them and from the time when it was necessary to defer the works connected with the Chowilla dam because of the escalation of costs and the new salinity factors involved. We could not get the other States to let a tender, and we were blamed for that by members opposite who afterwards took the technical report and said, "Of course, you got the technical report; that's quite true, but now, of course, we rely on it, although we say you never should have got it." Let us just turn to one little matter that has been constantly raised on this subject by the Leader of the Opposition and occasionally raised by his Deputy.

I think it is like King Charles's head: the Leader has never failed in a speech in the House on this issue to raise this matter; that is, that the original motion moved in this House at the time of the deferment of the Chowilla storage referred to the maintenance of the benefits of Chowilla to South Australia if any alternative storage were to be built, and members have heard him quote it again today. The Leader has said repeatedly that the Liberal Party would never be satisfied with such a position; it would never be satisfied with only getting the entitlement provided by Chowilla, and would never make such representations to the Commonwealth Government; that was never the basis on which they would operate. The Leader came into power in March, 1968.

Mr. Millhouse: April 16 was the date. Be accurate!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry; it was April 16, 1968. That just gets us a little closer to the date of this letter, to which I will refer. The first letter written by the Leader to the Prime Minister on this subject ends as follows:

I understand fully that the Commonwealth Government is only one of four signatories to the River Murray Waters Agreement. However, it is, of course, a very influential one, and I would like to reiterate the main points of my submission to you: that any comparison which will be made between Chowilla and an alternative must, in South Australia's view, be based upon providing for South Australia all of the benefits that this State would get from the Chowilla scheme as it is now planned.

That is what is in his letter. To say that the proposal put before this House was never a proposal on which the Leader operated is untrue, and he knows it to be untrue. In fact, the suggestion that new entitlement in respect of Murray River waters might be negotiated did not occur in that letter of the Leader's: it occurred in a technical committee's report. I will turn to another matter as an example of what has been going on.

Mr. Coumbe: What was the date of the technical committee's report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is the original technical committee's report on Dartmouth.

Mr. Hall: The validity of which you denied on television.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is irrelevant to the point I am making. What I am pointing out is that the suggestion of negotiation of a greater water entitlement did not arise from Government policy initiated by the Leader in refusal of the position taken in this House with the original introduction of that motion; it came out of a December, 1968, report.

Mr. Hall: That's false.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have just produced the Leader's letter which took exactly the position of the motion, which the Leader has been constantly condemning.

Mr. Hall: Now you've produced the agreement, which is what I negotiated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In his speech the Leader has said that I am inconsistent. He gave an example to the House of my alleged inconsistency, and he was serious about this.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: There should be justice—

The SPEAKER: Order! Justice will be given. I have warned honourable members on several occasions. When Opposition members spoke today, they received utmost courtesy from Government members. I expect honourable members of the Opposition to extend the same courtesy to the honourable Premier when he is replying to the debate. I will not continually call interjectors to order: they will be named.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader pointed out that I have repeatedly said that the effect of this agreement was to give away the Chowilla dam—that the price which that Government was exacting in order to get Dartmouth was to give away Chowilla. That position was given away by the previous Government in signing this agreement which we are now seeking to ratify. I have not changed from that opinion at all. To provide a contrast and suggest some inconsistency, the Leader read from my second reading explanation as follows:

Under the amending agreement Chowilla will be looked at as a possible future storage . . . However, the Leader carefully did not say that that was only part of a sentence, the rest of which is as follows:

. . . but will be judged on the basis not of the protections it can give to South Australia but of its yield and advantages to the total river system. In other words, if some other storage will yield more water to the up-river States the special advantages of Chowilla to South Australia will be disregarded.

That is exactly what will happen. Honourable members opposite know perfectly well that in signing this agreement they gave Chowilla away. What the Government endeavoured to do was to retrieve it. Well, we failed, but we tried. However, members opposite are now putting forward the view (and we have heard it repeatedly this evening) that all is lost to South Australia because, in their view, the effect of the agreement is that we have gone beyond some escalated figure in it. The Leader cited various escalating costs. The member for Kavel has just referred to escalation, as did the member for Mallee. I do not know whether they are arguing in favour of Sir Henry Bolte's contentions of the last few days, in contrast to the contentions of his Minister of Works, but I suggest to members opposite that there are only two positions that can be taken on this matter. If one accepts their assumptions (and I suggest that they have made them without reading the agreement) the position that the Minister of Education outlined occurs. I will show that in a moment.

I suggest to members opposite that, since we are seeking to ratify the agreement, it would be a good idea to look at it. Where does this clause relating to cost escalation occur? The member for Mallee read it. It occurs in clause 24 of the agreement, part of which provides:

Furthermore, in the case of any work for which the estimated cost at the time of approval exceeds five hundred thousand dollars, if a revised estimated cost rises more than ten per centum 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.

The first figure from which escalation takes place is the cost of the dam at the time of approval.

Mr. Clark: When is that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This was changed by the agreement. In the old agreement there was a specified maximum amount of expenditure by the commission. That is where we got caught on Chowilla, but that was removed by this agreement, and this clause was included to provide that people could renegotiate on a proposal if there was an escalation after time of approval. Time of approval is provided by clause 23 of the indenture, part of which is as follows:

The Governments of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia shall each as soon as practicable cause to be prepared and submitted to the commission for its approval a general scheme of the works to be constructed by them respectively under this agreement and before commencing the construction of any of such works shall cause to be prepared and submitted to the commission for its approval, designs and estimates of such work.

That is the time of approval that takes place in relation to the Dartmouth dam after the ratification of this agreement and the submission of the designs, specifications, and costs by the Victorian Government to the commission—and that has not yet taken place. So, all this talk about there being an escape clause in the escalation factor comes from people who have not read the agreement carefully. The time of approval is not yet, and the time of approval provides the first figure from which the 10 per cent escalation clause then later operates.

Admittedly, it may well have been that the contracting Governments originally thought they did not have to worry much about the time of approval, because they thought that would be very soon, but they provided no period for ratification of the agreement. The

passing of this Bill by this House this week will complete the ratification of the agreement in accordance with the terms of the agreement. So, we are not quite in the position that some people have been talking about. I suggest to members opposite that it is a good idea to pass this Bill with due speed, and I will be seeing Sir Henry Bolte on Thursday.

Let me just turn for a moment to the matters that have been dealt with to some extent previously by the Minister of Education. They relate to the time factor involved here so far. The tentative time table for the Dartmouth project, which was set out in the Snowy Mountains Authority report, showed a series of periods in three seasons, from November to June, commencing in certain years. Originally, the time table estimated that there would be a decision to proceed (that is, that there would be ratification and that the design could then proceed) in January of the first year. That was assumed to be January of last year, but, in fact, we did not decide to proceed then and the proposal for ratification was not presented to this House until considerably later.

If the decision to proceed had been made in January, it would then have been possible in July of that year to call tenders for diversion works, but the decision to proceed had not been taken in January and, in fact, it was then imagined that the decision could be made as late as March or April in the first year, in order to proceed, but that then depended on the availability of the Snowy Mountains Authority to proceed with the initial heavy workload, and at that time its availability was not certain.

If the programme could have proceeded as originally proposed, the original date on which tenders could have been called for the dam was October this year, but that was on the assumption that the original programme proceeded, which it could not do, because we had not had, in January of last year, a decision to proceed. In fact, the other Governments introduced their measures for ratification earlier but, because of political considerations here, the Hall Government did not do so.

In those circumstances, according to the time table, there would be no commencing of storage until the fifth year. The project could not be completed in engineering form (that is, the engineering of the project could not be completed) until the sixth year. Therefore, if members were concerned about escalation of costs, upon the assumptions which I have made and which I have just pointed out are not really valid these things would occur: if they

imagine the time of approval was the time when the River Murray Commission considered this project (and that is not what is provided in the agreement), the escalation was in a position to be effective up to October this year anyway.

The very earliest date, given the commission's most favourable forecasts, for letting tenders was when one of the escalating costs, upon assumptions by members opposite, would have occurred if the Bill had been ratified last April. That is very clear from the report by the Engineer-in-Chief, which I shall be pleased to let members have. Now, in these circumstances, the contentions offered from the Opposition benches are ill-based, but I fear that they are designed to give comfort to those who would seek to avoid this agreement. They do not spring from the high moral concern for the progress and benefit of this State that members opposite have so freely given forth with in their own praise this evening. The plain fact is that what has happened in this matter is that the Government has sought to retrieve a position given away by members opposite. The fact remains that the construction of the Chowilla storage would provide South Australia with vital protection in water quantity and quality, and that these are advantages this State should have in addition to the Dartmouth storage. The position we found in negotiations from the outset was that the other States took the view that, since the Government of this State had given away these rights, they were not going to give them back. We tried to get them back, but we found we could not and, therefore, the only thing to do was to proceed with what we were left with, and what we were left with was what this Government had sought to negotiate after the vital protection of Chowilla had been given away.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier has said that the escalation clause is taken care of, and that this will have a great bearing on the commencement of the Act and its implementation, because it will be as of now: he completely ignores the parallel Act passed earlier this year concerning the financial arrangements in respect of Dartmouth dam, in which it is specifically spelt out in monetary terms what the escalation means. It is given not as a percentage of some present-day valuation but in maximum

monetary terms, and when the estimated cost exceeds \$62,700,000 the whole agreement must be reviewed. The Premier should remember that, and not try to divert the attention of members to this Bill, because the parallel Bill governs the financial provision agreed to by the four parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. When the cost exceeds \$62,700,000 no political trick or debating trick will save the Premier from the consequences of review. That is why the Opposition is concerned about the commencement of the Act.

Referring to paragraph (b), the Premier is fighting a paper war. He speaks of special rights to Chowilla, but no Act passed by any Parliament gives this State the right to Chowilla at a cost of \$68,000,000. The Premier knows that, and he knows that he talks fiction again when he speaks of giving away something that never existed. He cannot talk away the escalation of cost of Chowilla far beyond the estimated cost included in the validating legislation of 1963. These fictions need to be revealed on this clause.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 7), schedule and title passed.

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 support the third reading of this Bill knowing that it brings to fruition a long search for the guaranteeing of South Australia's water supply, a search that began in the early 1960's. I do so in the knowledge that clause 2 contains a special provision that was inserted at my behest and insistence. It provides:

. . . that the Government of the Commonwealth and 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.

In answer to that request, and conditional upon my including it in this agreement, I received the concurrence of the leaders of the three other Governments that are parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement. Now, with the passage of this Bill, it is the responsibility of the Premier and the Government to see that this survey is carried out. We do not want a dereliction of duty such as has occurred in

the last 18 months in relation to the principle of the agreement. We want the insistence that this study be carried out and that it emphasize the point that Chowilla must be considered as a part of it. It is no secret to those who watched the television debate between the Premier, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, and me that I cited the words of the then Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and of his expert who accompanied him, to the effect that they believed that there was a good chance that the next storage on the Murray River would be at Chowilla, and it behoves the Government to press on with this study.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't believe that.

Mr. HALL: The Premier has tried to use trickery throughout this debate until the last remarks of the speech with which he concluded the second reading debate, but he cannot answer my contention, which is supported by the financial Bill accompanying the Bill that was introduced last March. That financial Bill was a parallel Bill to the one which the Premier then said ratified the Dartmouth agreement, and that financial measure is still valid and accompanies this Bill, providing that the situation regarding Dartmouth must be reviewed when the capital expenditure—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Under the rules of debate on the third reading, I believe that a member must refer only to the Bill as it came out of Committee. It is a restricted debate and, therefore, my point of order is that the Leader is out of order in referring to any matter other than the terms of the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I submit—

The SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised. The Leader of the Opposition must confine his remarks to the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was confining my remarks to remarks made in the Committee stage of this Bill when reference was made freely to the financial implications associated with the building of this dam. It seems to me to be impossible to refer to the building of a dam costing about \$60,000,000 without referring to the financial provision for its construction, because the very controversy that has arisen in the other States is based on how much the dam will

cost and on how much the cost has escalated beyond the sum allowed for its construction and agreed to by the four signatories to the agreement. Parallel with this Bill is another measure of equal importance.

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

Mr. Hall: Yes, you don't like it!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not a question of liking it, or not. There are Standing Orders concerning debate, and they provide that the third reading debate is confined to the nature of the Bill as it has come out of Committee. Matters dealt with in Committee which have not been introduced as part of the final version of the Bill are not to be referred to on the third reading of the Bill. Rulings in this House have been made previously that no reference can be made, for example, to defeated amendments.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition must confine his remarks in the third reading debate to the Bill as it came out of Committee, and I ask him to do so.

Mr. HALL: I respect your ruling. I covered this subject fully in the Committee stage, and the Premier was unable to answer it, although I understand that he acknowledges the reference I made to be a proper one. I support this Bill in the knowledge that it is the result of extensive work conducted by a previous Liberal and Country League Government.

Mr. Langley: Oh!

Mr. HALL: The member for Unley may snort at the thought that another Government did the work behind this agreement, which the present Government now supports. I pay a tribute to the member for Torrens, who was the Minister of Works who carried out long and continuous negotiations which resulted in this agreement. I remember conducting negotiations in the Cabinet room, which the Premier now inhabits on false pretences, having won the last election on a promise that he cannot and will not carry out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: This Bill, which is to enable the ratification of the Dartmouth agreement, results from negotiations that I personally carried out in company at that time with Sir Glen Pearson. I know that the Minister of Education has spoken about "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." I do not expect my back to be scratched by the Minister

of Education and, if it was, I would expect the mark to be poisoned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader must not get personal.

Mr. HALL: I do not want to get personal in that way. I remember clearly the negotiations and the tenor of them at that time. Our contact with the Commonwealth Government, which was the focal point before we went back to the other two States, indicated that we might get an increase on the 1,250,000 acre feet. I discussed this matter with my Cabinet colleagues, and I remember coming to the firm conclusion that we would accept nothing less than 1,500,000 acre feet. One of the obstacles we had to overcome was that the previous Labor Government had said that it would accept 1,250,000 acre feet. This was one of the greatest obstacles, as the member for Torrens will recall, because the Labor Government had sold out on the quantitative side of the water supply for the State. The Premier may try to refute this. Let him go back to the motion he brought into the House in 1967.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Go back to your letter.

Mr. HALL: He can go back to letters; what he brings into the House is the creation of the former L.C.L. Government. It is not some figment of the imagination or a propaganda story: it happens to be the result of long negotiations that were carefully conducted. During those negotiations, the only satisfactory result for us was Chowilla or something better, and it is this attitude that members opposite have criticized. They have lowered their involvement in this question by criticizing us for insisting on Chowilla until we were able to get a greater water supply. The Premier can refer to as many letters as he likes but he cannot alter the details of the Bill. Right through the rather extensive interview that we had on television, the Premier tried to destroy the validity of the technical report. Although I have the transcript of the television debate here, I know that it would be outside the ambit of this third reading debate to refer to it. It is no wonder that the present Minister of Works said, during the debate preceding the fall of the previous Government, "You cannot take any notice of experts." It is here in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable Leader to order. At page 571 of *Parliamentary Practice*, Erskine May states:

The procedure on the third reading of a Bill is similar to that described in relation to the

second reading, but the debate is more restricted at the later stage, being limited to the matters contained in the Bill.

I must insist that the honourable Leader restrict his remarks purely to matters contained in the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Mr. HALL: Clause 4 of the Bill states that this Act binds the Crown. Clause 2 provides that the Government is obliged to pursue the study by the River Murray Commission, which has promised by agreement with the heads of the other States that the Chowilla reservoir shall be included in the next search for a future storage on the river. When I stood up I wanted to emphasize the Government's obligation to pursue this study and include Chowilla in it. I remind the Premier of the agreement I got, which he has insisted is worthless and which I insist is not worthless. The other States are obliged to pursue this and the Government is obliged to see that they do pursue it. Whilst it is 18 months late, it is most satisfactory this evening to have the Government overcome its false pride, in that it has now supported an agreement arranged by the previous Government composed of its political opponents. I hope it is not too late.

I again remind the Premier of the financial arrangements passed by this House at his instigation, and I urge him not to ignore that situation and not to be over-confident. I urge him to be realistic in his arrangements with the other States. It is his attitude so far that has alienated the other States, which know that South Australia won a tremendous victory in obtaining the first increase in its water allocation ever achieved since the establishment of the River Murray Commission. The other States were astounded that, after the previous Government had won that victory, a new Government then said that it wanted a second victory. That, of course, was impertinent, and it placed this State in the ridiculous situation of saying, "We want everything, and we will give you nothing." It was asking the other States to make financial provision for a dam that could not be needed for the next 10 or 15 years. That was an impossible situation to present to the other Governments and one which the Premier knew could not be met. However, we must keep our fingers crossed and hope that the \$62,700,000 capital limit put on this agreement before a review is necessary has not been reached. We must hope that the increased costs are of no greater order than 10 per cent. Perhaps they can be reduced by improvements in machinery or technique. I hope those improvements exist because, if they

do not, the agreement will have a difficult passage during the trials of cost estimation. I hope that even this late passage of the Bill will prove to be as successful as we hoped 18 months ago that it would be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened to this last episode with fascination. The Leader has evinced an ebullience that is exceeded only by the degree of his own self-deception. Only a few moments ago we heard him say, "We stuck out for Chowilla until we could get something better. We were in difficulties in our negotiations because the Labor Government had originally proposed that any alternative must provide the benefits of Chowilla." Let me repeat it to honourable members. I am replying specifically to what the Leader said a few moments ago.

Mr. GUNN: What's the date of the letter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The date is May 15, 1968, and it states:

... I would like to reiterate the main points of my submission to you—that any comparison which will be made between Chowilla and an alternative must, in South Australia's view, be based upon providing to South Australia all of the benefits that this State would get from the Chowilla scheme as it is now planned.

That is not "something better".

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, as the Premier is quoting from a Government docket, will he please table it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, Sir. I have to get the letter out.

Mr. Millhouse: Table the lot.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not on your life! It is not a docket.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is only obliged to table the letter from which he is quoting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With very great respect, I take a point of order that the Premier is quoting from what is, in fact, contained in—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —a file—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —which cannot be separated.

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one point of order taken at a time. What is your point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mine is a second point of order, and it is that the Premier is quoting from what is, in fact, a file—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and one cannot separate something—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —which is on a file. The Premier should table the whole lot.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the honourable member's point of order. The honourable Premier has stated clearly that he was quoting from a letter, not a file.

Mr. Millhouse: Well—

The SPEAKER: I wish that the honourable member for Mitcham, when he takes a point of order, would show courtesy to the Chair and listen to what the Chair is saying so that he may differ if he wants to do so. I have previously warned him that, if he interjects while I am on my feet, I will have no hesitation in naming him, and that still stands. His conduct in this Chamber is getting past a joke.

Mr. Millhouse: It never was a joke.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has specifically stated that he was quoting from a letter and, under the Standing Orders, if during the course of debate it is asked that the letter be tabled, it must be tabled. The Premier has agreed to do that, but there is a vast difference between a letter and a file, and the member for Mitcham should know that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to remove the letter from the file.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you table the document you read from?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because I do not intend to remove it from the letter file.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, the Premier has already undertaken to table the document from which he was reading, and now he is prevaricating.

The SPEAKER: Order! I wanted to give the Premier the opportunity to do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is looking for something else to table. What is the Premier going to table? Is he going to table the document from which he was reading, which he undertook to table, or is he going to shuffle through his papers and look for something else?

The SPEAKER: Order! That is no point of order. The letter is to be tabled.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, when is it to be tabled?

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member insists on wasting time, I will name him. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to ask you whether, under the rules of procedure set down by Erskine May, which state—

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am asking that the Premier be asked to lay on the table the document from which he was quoting, and—

The SPEAKER: Order! A point of order was taken asking that the letter be tabled, and I have asked the Premier to table the letter from which he was quoting. I assure the House that that will be done.

Mr. Millhouse: When?

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Premier to table the file.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member did nothing of the sort. He asked for the letter to be tabled, and that can be verified by the *Hansard* report and by all honourable members. I object to the reflection cast on the Chair by the member for Eyre.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I must say that the content of the letter is of little importance, but the principle contained in the tabling of the document is important. Therefore, I ask you how can members verify that this other document for which the Premier is searching in order to table is the same as the one he read from, if the one he read from is not also tabled. How are we to know? I submit that this is a sensible question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think I can clear the matter up.

The SPEAKER: Order! I give the Leader an assurance that the letter from which the Premier has been quoting will be tabled.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will you, therefore, read the file from which he read to check that the letter he read is the same?

The SPEAKER: I will read from the letter and ensure that the letter from which the Premier was reading is tabled. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are we going to get the document tabled forthwith, which is what the House is entitled to, not tomorrow or the next day?

The SPEAKER: The Premier has quoted from a letter; it has been asked that the letter be tabled, and I think that in common courtesy the Premier should be permitted to have the letter in order to reply. I give the House an undertaking that it will be tabled.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The letter is, at the moment, as honourable members can see, in a letter book that contains copies of all letters written by the then Premier. Several of these are necessarily confidential documents.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not table it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If they are tabled, the letters become public documents. I do not mind, because these letters were not written by me. Do members opposite want me to make public documents of every copy of a letter ever written by the Leader of the Opposition while Premier, including confidential matters such as police matters and things of that kind? I do not intend to do that. I will table the letter, but I can immediately give to honourable members a copy of the letter for them to look at, because I have here the original draft of the letter that agrees completely with the letter from which I read and which has the necessary alterations in the Leader's own handwriting.

Mr. Millhouse: That is not the document you quoted from, then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What does the honourable member want?

Mr. Millhouse: The letter you quoted from.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member wants me to remove it from the book now?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, as you said you would.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can remove it from the book.

Mr. Millhouse: Go on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will remove it from the book and table it.

Mr. Millhouse: Good luck: now we have it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You look as wild as you can be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the recent exercise by members opposite and the idiot titillations of the member for Mitcham make him think that, by being as utterly stupid as he has been in the last few minutes, he is serving the State or being sensible or appealing to the public, all I can say is that his self delusions are worse than his Leader's. What honourable members opposite have asked me to do is take something out of a letter file. I can do that and put something back tomorrow; it is all right, but they could have had the draft instead. They keep on with this pettifogging nonsense. The honourable member, having had his nonsense exposed, says, "Now let us get off the subject". Poor child! He is in his second childhood. Let us go back to where we were before this nonsense started. The way the Opposition is going, anything could happen. It is absolutely brilliant! The fact is that in this letter the Leader of the Opposition has completely belied the statements he made to the House previously and the ones that he uttered a few moments ago in the course of the third reading debate. How can he say that his Government was inhibited in the negotiations because of a resolution passed in this House previously, a long time ago, when in May of 1968 he wrote in exactly the same terms to the Prime Minister? Knowing that I possessed this document and had read it previously, it still did not stop him from deluding himself. Wonders will never cease! As far as the other point made by the Leader is concerned, of course I had not forgotten the financial agreement. Members opposite have been talking about the 10 per cent escalation clause in the agreement. In relation to that, escalation does not begin until after approval.

Mr. Millhouse: In the recital a net figure is set out.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The financial agreement that we passed earlier this year obviously does not provide a specific financial provision that may not be exceeded without the further consent of the contracting parties. On present indications and on the information we have, it will not be exceeded. If it was to be exceeded, it would, on the information available to us, be exceeded so narrowly that I see no difficulty in the matter. I suggest to members opposite that they do not spend their time endeavouring to encourage opposition to this proposition in other States.

Mr. Clark: There has been enough of that already.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been plenty of that tonight and plenty of evidence here that the Opposition, having begun back in 1967 to play politics on this issue, is continuing on the same course.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Elizabeth Occupation Centre,
Port Lincoln High School (Replacement).

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 25, at 2 p.m.