WHY NOT FLOOD LAKE EYRE?
The idea is not new, been known for 150 years. Larry Hannigan

A 500km open canal linking the Spencer Gulf to Lake Eyre, which is 15m below sea level. This will initially flood the surrounding salt pan with sea water. Lake Eyre would become vastly bigger than it has ever been since recorded history began in Australia. The natural evaporation from it would cause a greatly increased rainfall in the region, most of which would flow back down into the lake, reducing the salinity. The ecology change would also be dramatic.

Cost: It would cost the taxpayer for only the materials and not much more if the Army did it. They are paid their salaries anyway and our Australian Army engineers would relish the opportunity to practice their explosives expertise to build this canal. It would be quite a blast for them.

Return on Investment: It could surely be the best investment as the % return on funds invested would be astronomical. The more rain generated in the catchment area, which is one-sixth of the land area of Australia, the less the inflow from the ocean, so the salinity would stabilise at a figure well below the salinity of the oceans, similar to the Caspian Sea which is about a third as saline as the oceans.

Data to Consider:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lake_Eyre gives its surface area as 9500 sq km when full.
Dr Vincent Kotwicki’s Paper says the mean evaporation rate for Lake Eyre is 2000 mm/year. These figures equate to a mean inflow of 600 cumsecs needed to replace evaporation, so the canal wouldn’t need to be much bigger than the Bogimbah river on Fraser Island, provided the slope on the canal’s water surface was sufficient for a 600 cumsec flow. It may not need to be lined with concrete because leakage wouldn’t matter, there’s heaps more where that came from ... the ocean. This is where I bow out and let a civil engineer trained in hydrology take over!

Benefits:
The change to the ecology would be dramatic. Grasses and trees would thrive, resulting in a potential for farming and horticulture. Inland of Australia would have a thriving wetland area. Brine shrimp would go crazy, and pelicans a plenty!

Tourist revenue from the sun-and-desert seeking types.
Increased rainfall and a cooler climate due to the extra water and enormous surface area for evaporation to create rain.

Displaced rock could be used to build canal suburbs for people with too much money.
Local concrete and rock-removal industries would flourish.

Always full: The lake would always be full at sea level, even in low rainfall periods, as it would be continually topped up from the ocean.

Environmental considerations:
There are very few local plants and animals who would not be happy if the local area has more rain and water. Those living on the edge of the current lake would merely move back a bit from the area. Over decades, the salinity would continually be reduced from the new rainwater as well as from outside monsoons. The surrounding land is "Desert loams" or "sand" (soil classifications from the 1979 Jacaranda Atlas, school edition says ... virtually useless ...). Alternative spawning grounds for a wide variety of fish which would also attract bird life. This idea has got to be more sensible than using the desert as a nuclear testing ground.

What the canal might look like
We know how, we have the manpower and we can afford it. Why is it not being done? Surely not for political reasons? duh

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901
Proclaimed and Gazetted. Sect 100 The Commonwealth shall not, by any law or regulation of trade or commerce, abridge the right of a State or of the residents therein to the reasonable use of the waters of rivers for conservation or irrigation.

Remember—The Constitution is the rules for controlling the Governments, and is not for controlling the people