

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3 December 2019

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. V.A. Tarzia) took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table a report from the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, South Australia, entitled *Troubling Ambiguity: Governance in SA Health*, dated 29 November 2019.

*Bills*

### GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATED AREA) AMENDMENT BILL

*Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:02):** I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction without notice and passage of a bill through all stages forthwith.

**The SPEAKER:** There being an absolute majority, I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

**Honourable members:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:02):** I oppose the suspension of standing orders. Practice and procedure in this parliament mean something. It is a long-held tradition of this place that legislation introduced by Her Majesty's government is laid on the table for a period of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for West Torrens, be seated for one moment. If this level of interjection continues, members will be leaving the chamber. It is up to you. The member for West Torrens has the call.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It has been a long-held tradition in this place that legislation is laid on the table for a period of two sitting weeks or 10 days. Indeed, the Leader of Government Business gave me his word at the beginning of his term that the government would honour that. The word of the Leader of Government Business is now at stake, as is the Premier's.

The reason we have this practice and procedure in this parliament is that we are able to read that legislation, understand it, go away and consult on the legislation, talk to stakeholders about that legislation, get advice on potential amendments we may or may not wish to move and be briefed by the government on the intent of the legislation. That is the way the normal practice of reform occurs in this parliament and it has for decades.

The Premier interjected earlier about the fairness clause. The fairness clause had sat on the table for months. Perhaps the Premier needs education between guillotine and suspending standing orders to introduce a bill forthwith without debate, without consultation. The government may give us a debate—I do not know if they are going to guillotine the debate or not—but the minister has not even briefed the opposition on this bill.

**Mr Malinauskas:** We haven't even got a copy of it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We haven't even got a copy of it. The parliament has had 18 months since the election—18 months—no green paper, white paper process on this change of policy, no consultation with anyone. Instead, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, who believes in the institutions of this parliament, is now being asked—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —to consider a bill we have not even seen. I say to members opposite: the Premier will never spend another day in opposition. He is never going to be over here. No matter what happens in two years' time, if the government is defeated he is gone. Those of you who survive and remain will want to form what is a loyal opposition and debate the government of the day and use this institution for your constituents. Yet the Premier is trashing the conventions of this parliament for his own personal benefit because there are no consequences to him. He will never be in opposition again. He will never be in the minority again to have to argue for what they believe in. He will not have that opportunity.

He wants all of you to sacrifice all this practice and precedence over decades for him again: first it was pairs, then it was government budget measures and now it is this. At what point does the independent Liberal Party room say, 'Enough, enough. It's not about the merits of the bill but about this building, this institution.' Does it matter or does it not, or is it just who has the most votes and that is all that matters? If that is the argument of the Liberal Party, you are not the heirs of those who have gone before you. You are not even a pale imitation of them. They would never have done this.

Even John Olsen when he was privatising ETSA—the most controversial decision a Liberal government has probably ever taken—went through the process, tabled the bill, let it go out to consultation, burnt political capital every single day because he believed in the institution of democratic representative government. This government, because of the incompetence of one minister, wants us to trash all that for the convenience of a Premier, who will never be in opposition again, not worrying about the legitimacy of the Liberal Party ongoing but just him, no-one else but himself.

Members, do not give the government an absolute majority on this. Do the right thing by the parliament: let this sit on the table for two weeks and let's come back and debate it. This is not about the merits of the bill: this is about the process. Do it properly. This is how real Tories and Conservatives behave.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the minister want to use any of his reply time? No.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** There are only two speakers, per standing orders.

**Ms Bedford:** There's a gender balance here this morning, Mr Speaker. I do like that.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey! Members, per standing order 401, limitation of debate:

The mover is in every case limited to ten minutes (including right of reply) in stating the reasons for seeking the suspension. One other Member may speak, subject to the same time limit. No further discussion is allowed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 24  
 Noes ..... 22  
 Majority ..... 2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
 Cregan, D.  
 Gardner, J.A.W.  
 Luethen, P.  
 Murray, S.  
 Pisoni, D.G.

Chapman, V.A.  
 Duluk, S.  
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
 Marshall, S.S.  
 Patterson, S.J.R.  
 Power, C.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
 Ellis, F.J.  
 Knoll, S.K.  
 McBride, N.  
 Pederick, A.S.  
 Sanderson, R.

## AYES

Speirs, D.J.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Teague, J.B.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

## NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Bignell, L.W.K.  
Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Gee, J.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Wortley, D.

Bell, T.S.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Michaels, A.  
Piccolo, A.  
Szakacs, J.K.

Motion thus carried.

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:14):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004, to repeal the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations Act 2017 and to revoke the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008. Read a first time.

**Ms Bedford:** Any chance we can see the bill?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey! I understand where you are coming from, but there is a way and a means to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated for one moment. It is not that way. Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move that the debate be adjourned.

**The SPEAKER:** It has been moved that debate be adjourned. We have no debate.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move that the bill be postponed, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** It has been moved that the bill be postponed. I have been advised that to move to postpone at this point is out of order, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Is a motion of deferral within order, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** I am advised we need to move to the second reading.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, please. Members, I am calling the minister.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:17):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to introduce the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill 2019. The bill will enable the government to pursue an important reform that will give South Australian farmers on the mainland the choice to take up the opportunities that genetically modified food crops can provide them now and into the future.

The Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004 provides for the designation of areas of the state for the purposes of preserving for marketing purposes the identity of certain food crops according to whether they are genetically modified crops or non-genetically modified crops, to provide for the segregation of genetically modified food crops and to provide certain protections with respect to the spread of genetically modified plant material.

The act, therefore, is in place for marketing and trade purposes and has been used to prohibit the cultivation of genetically modified food crops. This is commonly referred to as the moratorium on genetically modified food crops. It currently applies to the whole of South Australia. I would like to stress that this legislation is not in place for the protection of human health and the environment, as these matters are dealt with through the national regulatory schemes and are not grounds for retaining the moratorium.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is called to order.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The government came into power with a clear commitment to undertake an independent expert review of the moratorium to determine its true economic merits and enable a decision on its future to be made based on evidence. The government has undertaken an exhaustive process to fulfil the commitment, which I would like to explain to demonstrate that we have been open, transparent and provided stakeholders with ample opportunity to provide their views.

An independent review was commissioned within six months of forming government, and public submissions were invited during the review, which was completed in February 2019. In summary, the review found no evidence that South Australia enjoys better access to the European Union non-genetically modified grain market, that there has been no premium for South Australian non-genetically modified grain when compared with neighbouring states and, importantly, and the moratorium had cost South Australian grain growers at least \$33 million since 2004.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** If extended to 2025, it would cost the industry a further \$5 million. The review also found that the moratorium had discouraged public and private investment in research.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is called to order.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The only exception identified by the review was Kangaroo Island, where there are some canola producers who have specialised markets in Japan based on its non-genetically modified status. In considering farmers who wish to continue to access non-genetically modified and organic markets, the review also found the experience in other states shows that segregation protocols ensure successful coexistence of genetically modified and non-genetically modified crops.

I released the findings of the review, shortly after receiving it, for public comment to assist the government to determine the next steps. After considering the feedback, and the findings of this review, the government decided to lift the moratorium across all South Australia except Kangaroo Island.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition is called to order.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The government sought to implement the decision by following the process described in section 5 of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004. The government undertook the extensive statutory consultation process as required by section 5(3) of the act on the proposal to amend the Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008 to lift the moratorium in all of South Australia except Kangaroo Island.

This third round of public consultation included releasing draft regulations and providing for public notice to be given on the Primary Industries and Regions South Australia website, and the public notice in the newspaper as required by sections 5(3)(a)(i) and 5(9) in the act, inviting the public to make written submissions to the government over a six-week period as required by subsection (3) of the act, and convening two public meetings in areas to be affected by the proposed regulations: one in Kingscote and one in Adelaide, as required by section 5 of the act.

The government also consulted with the GM Crop Advisory Committee as required by section 5 of the act. The majority of views expressed in the statutory consultation supported the proposed regulations. A total of 218 submissions were received in response to the consultation, of which 128 submitters were in favour of the proposed regulations. One submitter, being Livestock SA, favoured lifting the moratorium across the whole of South Australia, including Kangaroo Island, 75 submitters were opposed to the proposed regulations, and a further 15 submitters were opposed to the proposed regulations, referencing matters outside the scope of the act.

The GM Crop Advisory Committee also supported the proposed regulations. Lifting of the moratorium has been strongly supported by our grain growers, their representative organisations, Grain Producers of South Australia and the wider grains industry, as well as Primary Producers South Australia, Livestock SA, and the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association. Kangaroo Island farmers have supported this proposal, too, to lift the moratorium on the mainland but retain it on the island, with some stressing the importance of having mechanisms to access any new pasture and crop varieties in future which may benefit local growing conditions.

Submissions from many of our state's highly regarded research institutions have also clearly highlighted the moratorium's negative impacts on research and development investment in South Australia. The independent review findings, the feedback from consultation undertaken following this review and the advice of the expert advisory committee do not provide economic grounds for retaining the moratorium. This process has instead shown that the moratorium has resulted in costs to producers and to the state, barriers to research and investment and, if it continues, will mean that our farmers do not have access to the current and future important innovations in crops and pastures.

It is also clear that the experience of other mainland states demonstrates that coexistence is possible and that the sale of non-genetically modified food crops can continue where there is no moratorium in place. The government therefore progressed this reform and made the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designation of Area) Variation Regulations 2019, which amended the area where genetically modified food crops were prohibited to just Kangaroo Island.

This simple amendment was intended to retain the structure of the act, which makes it clear that the area where the moratorium is to apply will be designated in the regulations. As a disallowable instrument, parliament had the opportunity to scrutinise, debate and vote on these regulations, and this occurred on 27 November 2019, where the regulations were disallowed by a resolution of the Legislative Council.

During the debate in the Legislative Council, members expressed the view that the areas to which the moratorium applies should be designated in the act, not the regulations. The government was invited to bring forward a bill to provide the parliament with an opportunity to consider and debate the merits of lifting or changing the moratorium. To fulfil the wishes of the parliament, I introduced this bill to enable this to happen.

The bill is not inconsistent with the recommendations of a recent parliamentary select committee into genetically modified crops in South Australia, with two of the committee members stating that there was overwhelming evidence that lifting the moratorium on the mainland would benefit the farming sector. The bill gives effect to the government's position that the moratorium should apply to Kangaroo Island.

The bill removes the power of the Governor to designate by regulation the area for which the moratorium on cultivation of genetically modified food crops may apply. The bill also respects the wishes of the 2017 parliament in applying 1 September 2025 as a sunset date for the moratorium. It is past time here in South Australia that farmers are provided with the same choices as their neighbours in other Australian states to use new and improved crop varieties and agricultural technologies to tackle the challenges they face.

South Australian farmers should have access to choice in crop varieties that build resilience, both financially and in their production systems, to drought, climate variability and change. Farmers who do not choose to grow genetically modified crops will be able to continue to sell to non-genetically modified and organic markets, as farmers have successfully done in other states using segregation protocols that have proven to be successful and reliable.

The Marshall Liberal government has a strong reform agenda to strengthen and grow the state's economy. The bill will be another enabler—and I use that word 'enabler'—to growing our agriculture and food sector. We are committed to supporting the grains sector to be vibrant, productive and competitive. I commend the bill to the house and look forward to further debate. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

###### 2—Commencement

The measure commences on 1 January 2020.

###### 3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004

###### 4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

###### 5—Amendment of section 5—Designation of areas

The power to designate by regulation areas of the State in relation to the cultivation (and prohibition of the cultivation) of genetically modified food crops is repealed and substituted with the provision that Kangaroo Island is designated as an area in which no genetically modified food crops may be cultivated.

Provisions related to the making of regulations referred to above are also repealed.

###### 6—Insertion of section 7A

New section 7A is inserted:

###### 7A—Expiry of Part

This section provides that Part 2 of the Act expires on 1 September 2025.

###### 7—Amendment of Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

These amendments are consequential. One of them provides a power to make transitional regulations connected to the measure. Such regulations may operate from the commencement of the measure, or a later day.

##### Schedule 1—Repeal and revocation

###### Part 1—Repeal

###### 1—Repeal of Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations (Postponement of Expiry) Act 2017

The Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations (Postponement of Expiry) Act 2017 is repealed as a consequence of the amendment to section 5 of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004.

###### Part 2—Revocation

###### 2—Revocation of Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008

The Genetically Modified Crops Management Regulations 2008 are revoked as a consequence of the amendment to section 5 of the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:28):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
 Noes ..... 24  
 Majority ..... 2

## AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.	Bettison, Z.L.
Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.
Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.		

## NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

Motion thus negatived.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:33):** I guess I am in a state of shock at the absolute contempt the parliament has been treated with.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Giles, are you the lead speaker?

**Mr HUGHES:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Continue.

**Mr HUGHES:** It is just contempt for parliamentary processes. We thought something might well have been learnt as a result of what happened in the upper house with the move to disallow the regulatory change that the government was seeking. It was clear from the crossbenchers, at least most of the crossbenchers, that they were deeply perturbed by the process the government had entered into. In saying that, I acknowledge that the act did contain a provision to introduce changes by regulation, but it was the wholesale nature of those changes, as a result of an attempt to move a change to regulation, that put the crossbenchers offside.

It was an incredibly clear message when it came to process. Some people in the upper house argued that a bill should be introduced. Given the government has been in place for 18 months, a bill could have been introduced at any stage in that 18 months instead of waiting for the last week of parliament. To then do it in the way it has been done—without any notice, without any opportunity to have a close look at the bill—to be handed the bill before the debate, before the minister moved it, is just not the way to do it. It is incredibly poor process.

I reckon that the majority across there believe that this is poor process. How is it that we have come to this situation where, in the final sitting week, we are faced with the prospect of pushing this bill through? Those opposite know that we have our own internal processes, that we like to take something to shadow cabinet. Deliberation happens at shadow cabinet. We argue the points. We have a close look at the bill that is before us. Of course, we did not have any bill before us—no bill whatsoever.

We had our shadow cabinet meeting yesterday, and there was nothing before us. Here we are today; we had our caucus meeting, and there was nothing before us. There is a due process that we enter into internally: the government submits a bill, we get an opportunity to look at the bill and we get an opportunity to scrutinise the bill. We get an opportunity to go out and speak to people, and I have gone out to speak to people in relation to GM. I have spoken to a lot of people in relation to GM.

**Mr Pederick:** What do those Kimba farmers want, mate?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called to order.

**Mr HUGHES:** There are some excellent farmers up Kimba way. They do an amazing job in what is often a very challenging environment. We all know, and I will get to this soon, that Goyder's line is shifting south. I always like to acknowledge Goyder. The work he did all those years ago in drawing that line was absolutely amazing, but we know that it is now shifting south.

This has been an incredibly poor process on the part of the government. As I said, the crossbenchers in the upper house were perturbed by the way it was done. You would think that the message would have been taken on board when it came to process, but here we are in this house with a process not dissimilar to what was done in the upper house. The opposition has essentially been ambushed and is not in a position to do what an opposition should do: to have dialogue, to deliberate internally, to come to a decision in shadow cabinet and then see if caucus accepts the position that shadow cabinet has arrived at.

It is a very deliberative process, as it should be in this house. It should be a very deliberative process. That is why this bill should have sat: so we had the opportunity to take our time to go through this. Once again, I would say, 'You have been in government for 18 months. You are not serving primary industries well with the processes that you have entered into.' I might well have wanted to go and speak to people about this bill so that they could have a look at it and see what is good about it and what is bad about it. Amendments might well have arisen due to that process but, given the way the government have done this, it has been impossible.

This almost seems to be somewhat par for the course now with the minister. He put a wrecking ball through the snapper-dependent part of the commercial fishing industry; it also did not help the recreational fishing industry, and the charter industry is being gutted as well. Whatever the science on the snapper ban—whether there is a need for a three-year ban, a two-year ban or a one-year ban—the industry should have been looked after in that process. When we were in government, through cabinet and through a deliberative process, there was a \$20 million restructure put on the table, to come into play on 1 July this year—

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HUGHES:** You, as a minister, could have built upon that work—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Giles, please address your remarks through the Chair; I am not a minister.

**Mr HUGHES:** —but instead, a wrecking ball was put through that particular industry. Budget No. 1: no tangible assistance for drought-affected farmers and pastoralists in this state. Budget No. 2: no assistance, once again, for farmers in this state. Quite a bit has been said about GM and its attributes in relation to drought and climate change.

When we compare and contrast this state with others on the issue of drought, we see that the Victorian Labor government is providing real assistance for farmers and drought-affected communities in Victoria. In New South Wales, the extent and duration of the drought are far greater than in South Australia, but just look at the degree of assistance that has been provided in that state. This government always says #RegionsMatter. Well, #RegionsMatter does not help the farmers and pastoralists that are experiencing drought; they need real, tangible assistance.

We have seen the fruit fly shambles at Yamba, in the minister's own electorate. We have seen the recreational fishing council unwind, with four members leaving that council and changes to



the bureaucracy, with advertisements in the paper. Things are not looking all that good, and this is the latest example of poor timing.

Instead of giving the parliament time to consider the bill before us in a deliberative way, it is going to be truncated. We are not going to be given that opportunity. When we talk about GM, we are talking about a handful of crops that are being approved by the federal regulator. At this stage, one crop that is of interest in South Australia is herbicide-resistant canola. I imagine that would make up a very small part of the market, and the uptake is probably not going to be significant.

We have omega-3 canola, and it may well be that some farmers will be interested in that. We will see how we go if the moratorium is lifted. At the moment, we are talking about very limited opportunities in South Australia. A bunch of trials are being undertaken—some of which are happening in South Australia despite the moratorium. It is probably worth reflecting on the fact that the Waite Institute has done amazing work over the years, as have Roseworthy and some of South Australia's smaller research institutions, and they will continue to do so.

The trials being looked at in South Australia at the moment are on wheat and barley for better yields, so they are looking into tolerance for frost and drought. Those field trials are ongoing, with the anticipated conclusion date of 2021, and they will then have to go through processes beyond that. A number of other things are being looked at, including drought tolerance, as I have mentioned, and better nitrogen efficiency. If that particular attribute comes to the fore, this will save farmers money and will also be beneficial for the environment. Those trials might well come to an end early next year. There is a series of other trials, a number of which will not come online—at least the conclusion of the trials—until 2023 or thereabouts.

I am not denying that, when you look at these trials taking place here in South Australia, there are some things that we have to take incredibly seriously. When it comes to the challenges faced by our farming community and our pastoral community as a result of climate change and as a result of the drought that some are going through now, we need to have an open mind about looking at the tools that are going to be available in the future. But we do have time. We do have time to do this in a considered way and we did not need to adopt the process that we have going on at the moment.

I remember asking a few questions in estimates about climate change and farmers in South Australia, and the minister's response will always stick in my mind when he was asked questions about climate change. The response was about variability. The language about variability is often language to cover denial. I am not saying the minister is a climate change denier, but he did use the word 'variability'. We have always heard, 'Climate has always been variable.' The issue that we are talking about is this inexorable trend that science overwhelmingly indicates that we are already facing and that we are already in the early stages of.

Since the Industrial Revolution, we have had 1° of warming, but we are on track at the moment, on current trends, to 4° of warming within this century, which is a totally different planet. With the challenges that our farming sector and our pastoralists are going to face, they are going to be on the front line of those challenges. The cost to the farming community, to the state and to the nation are potentially going to be huge.

It would have been good to see the minister use some of his time to advocate with the climate change deniers at the federal level, because they have no coherent climate policy at a federal level and they have no coherent energy policy at a federal level. They have no amalgamated policy when it comes to those two incredibly important things. The response to the bushfires from Morrison was, 'My thoughts are with you. I will pray for you.' That is absolutely appalling. It is a bit like Trump after each massacre in the United States saying, 'My thoughts are with you and I will pray for you.' It is exactly the same nonsense approach.

I will get back to estimates. The question was raised and I got 'variability'. As I said, I suspect the minister is not a climate change denier, but he did mention variability. When I put to him that we are on track for a 3° to 4° warming trend, his response was, 'I haven't heard that.' I said, 'What? You haven't heard that? This is something basic.' He said, 'No, I have not heard that.' I tried to get clarification. He said, 'I haven't heard anyone say that the temperature is going to increase 3° to 4° in the next year.' I said, 'Wow! And you are the Minister for Primary Industries.'

You might think that on this side we go on a bit about climate change, but that is because we know how serious it is. Those on the other side should go on about it a bit more. I know there are some people who are incredibly scientifically literate on the other side who have absolutely no issue when it comes to assessing the scientific evidence and knowing where the overwhelming balance of that scientific evidence is.

We have a number of research institutions in South Australia doing good work, and they are doing some good work on GM crops. But that is not going to happen overnight. When you look globally at the launch of GM crops, from inception to going to the market, the average time period globally is 13 years—13 years to get a GM crop to market. And it does not come cheap. The average cost is \$130 million, and it is why the big companies are involved.

You can understand that because they have the wherewithal to go through the processes that are needed, both the regulatory processes and all the other costs associated with getting a GM product to market. When you look at some of the real attributes that are potentially down the track, we have time, as a state, to benefit if ultimately the moratorium is lifted.

I have said time and time again that I go with the science and I go with the evidence. Those on this side do keep an open mind, but there are people on this side who argue—and it is a reasonable argument—that what we are talking about at the moment when it comes to GM crops is an incredibly small fraction of the grain industry. Year in, year out, it is one of the major building blocks of the economy in this state, a multibillion dollar industry.

We know that the Anderson report indicated that there have been losses to the state of \$33 million since the introduction of the moratorium, so that is about \$2.3 million per year. When you look at a multibillion dollar industry in this state, it is not good beer, it is not big beer, but we do know that there might well be other attributes coming down the line and we do have time to seriously consider this. We do not have to do this in this truncated fashion.

When it comes to some of the priorities that are out there, I would call on the minister. I am sure he has spoken to some of the drought-affected farmers and pastoralists. They would like to see some action on that. They would like to see some action on that now. Try to give that a truncated going over. Try to do that quickly. A year ago now, we had the minister in the *Stock Journal* talking about various things that could be done, saying that these are things that could be looked at.

Well, they are still being looked at and they still have not happened for drought-affected farmers when it comes to assistance with their council rates, with their NRM levies, with a whole range of other things, stuff that the other states have actually instigated because they know that their farmers are struggling and that each bit of tangible assistance helps them to get through what is a difficult set of circumstances.

When you talk GM you get inundated with emails, and there is a lot of stuff on Facebook. I am probably one of those people in this chamber who is not a great fan of Facebook—suddenly, everyone is a scientist and everyone knows how to do research. I have truck drivers telling me about climate change and how it is all bullshit. Facebook is a very strange world indeed.

**The SPEAKER:** I caution the member about that sort of language in the chamber.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** 'Agriculture'?

**The SPEAKER:** No, not 'agriculture', member for Mawson; that word is okay.

**Mr HUGHES:** I am more than happy to withdraw that word and use something more appropriate.

**The SPEAKER:** The member has withdrawn; thank you.

**Mr HUGHES:** Everyone becomes an expert. It disturbs me that, in this era when everybody is an expert, we see the proliferation of all sorts of conspiracy theories, and some of them are applied to GM. There is a lot of misinformation out there about GM, and I accept that, but it is for those here to work through this process in a deliberative way. It has been at times a vexed issue in this state.

There are elements of the farming community that have concerns, but I acknowledge that the peak bodies representing the larger primary industries in this state favour the lifting of the

moratorium. I would say to those peak bodies that they should not be pleased with the processes that have been adopted in this house. When you are presented with a bill minutes before the debate, with no opportunity to really consider it in a deliberative fashion, that is just not good practice.

I am not sure if this approach is unprecedented. People who have been in this house longer than I have might well be able to fill me in on that, given that I have only been here since 2014, but this does look like an unprecedented act. I wonder what is going to go on in the upper house with the crossbenchers, who, as I said, were not happy with the previous process. Let's see whether they are going to be happy with this process. If it is defeated ultimately, I think it is in our interest as a state to have a real look at the direction we are going in.

Kimba was mentioned. I had the privilege—and it was a privilege—of visiting one of the young farmers in Kimba, out the other side of Buckleboo. I got in the header, and he was reaping barley at the time. It was interesting what he had to say about the barley that he was reaping. It was a traditional genetically modified crop, if you like. He was using long-established, old plant breeding methods.

**The Hon. T.J. Whetstone:** That's because he grows under a moratorium.

**Mr HUGHES:** Well, who knows?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order.

**Mr HUGHES:** At the moment, there is not a GM barley that he could use, but what he was using did generate benefits. In a not good year, he was able to get a crop. That crop will not be going into any of our beer, but it was 20 per cent protein, so it is going to provide incredibly useful feedstock for their livestock, so he got something in a poor year.

It would be of value for all people in this house—and I probably say especially when it comes to some of the people on my side of the house—if they get the opportunity, to go out on farms. There are some farms in this state that do well year in, year out just about, but there are other farms where people have to be right on top of their game. Their approach is incredibly sophisticated. They are putting their businesses on the line year in, year out. The way that they manage risk—and it is significant risk—is something to behold.

There are a lot of people still in the metropolitan area who have this image of farming, that it is a farmer with a hat on, chewing a bit of straw. They really do need to get out and listen and look, because it is far more sophisticated. When they are in a header, they are getting the readout of the soil. They know just about every inch of their soil and know where and when to apply the inputs that need to be applied. They are doing protein readouts as they are doing the harvesting. The GPS technology that is being used and the advances that are going to take place in primary industries over years to come are going to build on the advances that have already happened. These are going to be incredibly sophisticated enterprises.

There is always that fear—and I think it was a widely expressed fear—that there might well be a corporate takeover of our family farms. A lot of that has not worked out all that well because there is something about family farms in this country and the lived experience, all that historical experience that has accumulated, that shows a willingness to be open to adaption, to looking at different approaches, to look at trial and error, and when something works for one person another person picks it up.

As someone who comes from a heavy industry background, it has been a pleasure and an honour to have this particular portfolio. To me, coming from a heavy industry background, albeit quite a few years ago, we did stuff that was productive, that added to the wealth of the country, and we made stuff. We have that in common with farming, that people do stuff that is of value. I have not read the book—and I could use the b-word again but I will not—but I am told that there is a book doing the rounds that talks about work today, modern everyday work and how so much of it is just, 'What does it actually do?' So when you see people doing stuff day in, day out that does make a real difference, I think that is a great thing.

I do not think the minister has served the primary industry sector well with the approach that has been taken. I think we all should respect parliamentary processes. We all should have the

opportunity to have a look at a bill, to give that bill serious consideration, and to go through internal processes. I know they have fallen down on the other side when it comes to the mining bill and a few other bills. There have been no internal processes—at least no internal processes that appear to involve the backbenchers. At the least, we have to consider it at a shadow cabinet level and then we have to consider it at a caucus level.

**Mr Pederick:** You have to lock into a position, Eddie. You have to find a position.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond!

**Mr HUGHES:** When you look at democracy and what it is all about, I call it the four Ds of democracy: it is about dissent, about dialogue based on dissent, about deliberation and then a decision. One of the great things about an open society is that people can have different views. In our respective parties you can have different views.

We have maybe different ways of coming to a conclusion when it comes to those different views, but that dialogue is incredibly important and the deliberative process is incredibly important. It is why science is not like Facebook. It is why this parliament should not be like Facebook, where someone has a thought bubble, 'Oh, now we'll do this,' without any notice. It is not the way to do it. I cannot believe the backbenchers across the chamber think that this is the way to do it.

When did the backbenchers know about this bill that was going to come before the house today? I bet you have had a lot of time to have a look at this and seriously consider it. I know it has happened to you on a number of occasions now. We had to have a select committee when looking at the bill that the emergency services minister brought before the house. I think it was the member for Flinders who moved the motion to set up the select committee, because the minister had failed to consult. I was a little bit peeved that the member for Flinders moved that motion because we had one ready to go to set up a select committee as well.

That select committee was an incredibly worthwhile process, but the minister should have consulted beforehand instead of relying on a bill that was essentially years old and that came out of the work Paul Holloway did quite a few years back. The minister just assumed that nothing had changed, but a lot had changed. The harvesting code of practice had been brought in and bedded down and is working incredibly effectively. I think that is yet another example of how the organic, grassroots approach (no pun intended) to addressing issues, when it does work out well at a local level, does not need you to come in at a government level with jackboots and poor legislation. So that has been amended and will be an improvement.

This bill has been brought before us right at the death knock of this parliament. I am giving myself *deja vu* now, but some of the backbenchers must be perturbed about the processes that are in place. You should come over to our side: at least we have robust internal processes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**Mr HUGHES:** I ask for your protection, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Teague:** Resign, and have the courage of your convictions.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen is called to order.

**Mr HUGHES:** Our farmers are facing major challenges, so I call upon the minister, once again, to provide some tangible assistance to the drought-affected areas of our state. I would ask of the primary industries ministry that there be serious attention paid to climate change. We need to do some serious work on Goyder's line. You can smile, but this is going to have a far greater impact than whether tomorrow people can have herbicide-resistant canola. This is something unfolding, and it is major. More serious works needs to be done on adaption in this state. More serious work needs to be done at a federal level and at a global level.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morphett!

**Mr HUGHES:** You can get your federal colleagues into the right gear and get serious about mitigation. With those few words, I will conclude and move that the debate be now adjourned.

**The SPEAKER:** It has been moved that the debate be adjourned, but someone else must adjourn the debate. I call the member for Flinders because he rose to his feet. The member for Giles had spoken so he cannot adjourn. The member for Flinders has the call.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:08):** I rise today to speak in support of the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill 2019, brought to this place by the Hon. Tim Whetstone, minister for agriculture. At the outset, I must also declare an interest: I spent 30 years as an active grain grower and farmer on Eyre Peninsula prior to coming into this place. I still have an interest, obviously, in my family's property and I am watching with interest how the current harvest unfolds.

Following the election, our government commissioned a high-level independent review into the GM crops moratorium. The review found that the moratorium had cost the state's grain growers at least \$33 million since 2004 and would cost at least a further \$5 million if extended to 2025. It had also discouraged public and private investment in research and failed to provide a premium for South Australian canola growers when compared with growers in neighbouring states—pretty damning stuff.

In accordance with the findings of the review and supported by public consultations, including the GM Crop Advisory Committee, the government sought to introduce regulations to lift the GM moratorium on the South Australian mainland, while retaining the moratorium on Kangaroo Island, where KI Pure Grain have secured a niche market into Japan.

Last week, we saw SA-Best and the Greens MPs vote in the upper house to disallow regulations. They argued that the government should have introduced a bill to change the boundary of the moratorium, rather than following the process provided by the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act to amend regulations. Well, here we are: we have introduced a bill—exactly what they wanted. Should the bill pass this week, it will provide South Australia's farmers with certainty for the 2020 cropping season.

I congratulate the minister on introducing the bill. For those who have continually said in the past few weeks that they have not had enough time to do their research on this particular issue, I remind them that we have had a moratorium in place in this state since 2004. If 15 years is not long enough, I am not sure how long is.

My first introduction to GM crops was in 2002 when I was in the US as part of a Nuffield scholarship. I was in St Louis and became familiar with GM corn and GM soybeans. They were relatively new at that stage and there was much discussion about them. Monsanto had the patent, I think, or at least had the rights over GM corn and soybeans. They were essentially glyphosate tolerant or Roundup Ready tolerant.

They were being adopted with great enthusiasm by growers across the Midwest, the heart of the American corn belt, where they very much work on a corn and soybean rotation. It was the enthusiasm and the rate of adoption which struck me, which led me to believe it must be a good thing. Farmers do not do things for no reason. They adopt a new system because it is economic to do so, it is beneficial to the environment and it is beneficial to their business.

When we first had our moratorium in place in South Australia, other states also had moratoriums in place. Essentially, we were talking about glyphosate-resistant canola or Roundup Ready canola. I am not into conspiracy theories. I do not feel the threat of great multinationals taking over the world food chain and the world food supply. We, as farmers, are already purchasing our canola seed. Even non-GM canola is relatively difficult to kill in the field with Roundup or glyphosate, and usually it needs to be spiked with another chemical to do so.

While we remained under moratorium, the lifting of the moratorium in the other states enabled producers in the southern states to grow GM canola, Roundup Ready canola. It also allowed cotton growers in northern New South Wales and southern Queensland to grow Bt cotton. This had great environmental advantage. Cotton is often looked down upon, particularly for us at this end of the Murray-Darling Basin, but it has been a significant crop in northern New South Wales and

southern Queensland. It is an opportunity crop: it is grown when there is enough water—there is not at the moment.

Regardless of that, the introduction of Bt cotton meant that the cotton was resistant to certain insects and greatly reduced the amount of chemical that had to be used in controlling that insect on the crop. It reduced chemical applications by as much as seven times. Eventually, the other states lifted their moratorium. South Australia became the only mainland state to remain under moratorium. My understanding is that, in 2008, advice was given to the then Rann Labor government to lift the moratorium. We, as growers, were fully expecting the moratorium to be lifted in 2008.

Contrary to the advice that was received, the moratorium stayed in place, thanks to the Rann Labor government. In 2017, we debated a bill in this place to extend the moratorium out to 2025. It was introduced in the other place by the Hon. Mark Parnell, supported by the then Weatherill government, opposed by the Liberal Party in opposition, but ultimately led to the current moratorium being extended to 2025. We now have the opportunity to lift that moratorium and allow our producers to be at one with the rest of the world, remembering that we compete on the world market, and we cannot afford to have any disadvantages in relation to our competitors in other states, in other countries around the world.

I have a friend who farms in Essex and I have quoted him before in this place. His name is Guy Smith. He is currently the Deputy President of the National Farmers Union in the UK. Right at this very moment there is much discussion about the reaccreditation of glyphosate in Europe. It is a discussion and debate which defies logic, I might add, because in my humble opinion glyphosate has had the single biggest impact on agriculture around the world since the introduction of the traction engine, or what we know as the tractor. Amid all of this debate in Europe about glyphosate, Guy put an article in the *Farmers Weekly*, which is the UK farming magazine. He said:

When politicians and administrators stop listening to the authorities charged with scientific evaluation, you get bad regulation.

It is interesting that we have that comment coming from him, and I think that applies to this debate as well.

Throughout history, agriculture has improvised: for some 10,000 years, if that is as long as we have been growing cereals, and the general consensus is that it was probably barley first followed by wheat, which was first cultivated in the headwaters of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Since that time, agriculture and our producers have striven for improvements, for a better and more productive and more sustainable way of doing things, and that is the critical word here—sustainability.

I will give you a quick history lesson. I do not mean to bore you, but I probably will. The member for Hammond, I know, will pay attention. Back in the 18<sup>th</sup> century in England, and that is as far as we can go back really with our history books, Turnip Townshend introduced a system of rotation into Norfolk. He had a four-field system of rotation, which involved turnips, hence the nickname. Wouldn't you love a nickname like 'Turnip', member for Narungga? He was able to lift production across a whole farm, across a four-field rotation, and lift sustainability. Jethro Tull, that famous agricultural inventor at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, invented amongst other things the mechanical winnower. He was roundly ostracised at the time.

**Mr Hughes:** It was a band.

**Mr TRELOAR:** It was a band also. Did they ever play at Westlands?

**Mr Hughes:** No.

**Mr TRELOAR:** No, they did not. Yes, I am assuming the band took their name from the great agricultural inventor who I said invented the mechanical winnower and was roundly ostracised at the time for going against the will of God. Imagine having a mechanical means to thresh grain, and here we are essentially having the same discussion. South Australia has been at the forefront of agricultural developments over the last 180 years or so. The Ridley Stripper was invented here in 1842. The stump jump plough was invented by Richard Smith on Yorke Peninsula. The member for Narungga would be well familiar with that. It allowed settlers to more effectively cultivate land that was, in the first instance, populated by mallee.

We brought in fallowing. We discovered our soils were deficient in superphosphate. The Correll brothers developed a seed drill—once again, on Yorke Peninsula at Ardrossan. It was all happening then and probably still is now. That was to insert phosphate into the soil to boost production. At about the same time, we saw Federation wheat, the beginning of wheat breeding. Federation wheat was grown throughout southern Australia and was the primary source of breed stock for wheat genes for many years to come.

I talked about the tractor being introduced here in South Australia, and we introduced lay farming. Rather than constant fallow-wheat rotation, we introduced sub clovers into the more acid soils and medics into the more alkaline soils. That enabled farmers to not only carry sheep but also boost their nitrogen and hence gain a better cereal crop subsequently.

We have seen the introduction of agricultural chemicals, grain legumes, beans, lupins and, more recently, lentils, high-analysis fertilisers and the bulk handling of grain. We now have GPS tracking on our harvesters, our tractors and our sprayers. We have yield mapping and we have precision agriculture. My point is that agriculture is continually evolving. Systems are continually evolving, and they will continue to evolve. As a parliament and as an industry, we just have to recognise where we are at this point in history.

This legislation is about giving farmers choice. They will have a choice of whether to grow GM crops or not. You do not have to grow them. In fact, my feeling is that uptake in the first instance will be relatively small. I am a canola grower. I do not know that I would necessarily grow GM canola in the first instance—but I might. At least I will have the opportunity to do that.

As I said, our growers, our producers, are competing in a world market. Often, we forget that as decision-makers. We are competing head-to-head against other exporters from southern Australia. We are competing head-to-head in world markets—against the Canadians, against Ukraine, against the US, against Argentina and against Europe. I urge people not to be fearful of the science.

Interestingly, I had a quick conversation earlier with the member for Newland, who I know is going to make a contribution here. Way back in 2002, when I was in the US, there was much discussion about mapping the genome of these various plant crops. At that stage, they had mapped the genome of corn. My recollection is that there are some 32,000 genes in a corn plant. There are about 20,000 genes in the human genome, which makes us relatively simple folk. Incredibly, wheat is complex, and has about 50,000 genes. So it is important that we recognise the significant scientific effort and research going into all this development at this stage.

Gene editing is just around the corner. Gene editing is where DNA is inserted, deleted or replaced in the genome. Are we going to deny our agricultural producers in this state the opportunity to access that technology when the rest of the world has it? Should we be deprived of this opportunity, we run the very real risk of being left behind and we run the very real risk of becoming an agricultural backwater. We are dictated to by governments and a parliament who do not understand necessarily the imperatives here, not the least being a significantly growing world population that we in a way have an obligation to ensure has enough protein and food at an affordable price.

The passage of this bill will give our growers choice, certainty and opportunity. It is timely because, even though we are probably still six or seven months away from the beginning of the South Australian growing season, with the passage of this bill growers will need the opportunity to order seed and the opportunity to be organised. There will not just be significant economic benefits. Business decisions will be made, so the economic benefits will be taken into account. Potentially, gene technology could bring significant environmental benefits as well as significant health benefits.

The member for Giles talked about omega-3 being inserted into canola. Omega-3 is important to human health and available, at the moment, through humans eating fish. If we were able to make it available through our canola crops, our canola oil and our canola spread, then that omega-3 would get into our human food chain, bringing health benefits. So there are functional benefits from GM technology.

In relation to the environmental benefits, we talk a lot about frost tolerance. In some areas this year, South Australian farmers have once again taken significant hits from frost. However, there

are such things as salt-tolerant barley. I must check on this but I think breeding of that has already taken place and it is just a matter of giving our growers access to those sorts of things.

I once again declare my interest, which is not insignificant, in the grain industry because I am an active grain grower and producer still. With those words, I congratulate the minister on bringing the bill to the house. After 15 years under a moratorium, when the rest of the world has left us behind, we now have the opportunity to lift that moratorium. I commend the bill.

*Matter of Privilege*

**MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The SPEAKER (12:25):** Before I call the member for Playford, I rise to speak on a couple of privilege matters that were brought to my attention last week: one regarding the member for Kaurna and the other one regarding the member for West Torrens and the Attorney-General.

I make the following statement with regard to the matters of privilege raised, the first one by the Deputy Premier in the house on 27 November. However, before addressing the matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to the house and its members. It is obviously not a device by which members or any other persons can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by a vote of the house on a substantive motion.

I have referred to McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand* on the test that applies. Generally speaking, any act or omission that obstructs or impedes the house in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such house in the discharge of his or her duty, or which has a tendency directly or indirectly to produce such a result, may be treated as a contempt and therefore be considered a matter of privilege even though there is no precedent of the offence.

Firstly, I refer to the matter raised by the Deputy Premier in relation to a grievance debate made by the member for Kaurna in the house on 27 November. More specifically, the member for Kaurna in his grievance debate on 27 November stated:

Now today, what we have learnt is another revelation of Dr McGowan lying to the parliamentary committee, this time about Liberal Party fundraisers. Last year, he was asked at his first appearance if he had attended any Liberal Party fundraisers and he said that he had certainly not attended those fundraisers. 'Certainly not' is what he said.

The Deputy Premier, in raising a matter of privilege, quoted from page 108 of the Legislative Council record of the Budget and Finance Committee of 23 July 2018:

The CHAIRPERSON: Have you yourself attended Liberal Party fundraisers in the lead-up to the election?

Dr McGOWAN: Not that I recall.

The Deputy Premier states, and I quote:

I suggest that it is clear from this question—and you have the view of the whole of the transcript relating to that matter, Mr Deputy Speaker—that the election referred to is the March 2018 state election. That, of course, is also supported by the fact that you will see from the questions raised in that committee that they relate to the appointment of Dr McGowan obviously post the March 2018 election, when there had been a change of government.

The Deputy Premier alleges that the member for Kaurna's allegation, that Dr McGowan has lied to the parliament in referring to a fundraiser Dr McGowan allegedly attended prior to the March 2014 state election, is inconsistent with the evidence that Dr McGowan provided to the Budget and Finance Committee.

The Deputy Premier alleges that the member for Kaurna then has misrepresented both the question and response at the committee and has deliberately misled the parliament. I refer to the member for Kaurna's grievance debate and, in particular, his reference to:

Now today, what we have learnt is another revelation of Dr McGowan lying to the parliamentary committee, this time about Liberal Party fundraisers.

I take the member for Kaurna's comment that 'Now today, what we have learnt', when prefacing his comments as part of his grievance debate, equates to the member for Kaurna's reference to information he presented to the house during question time. The nature of the information is further explained in the member for Kaurna's grievance debate, and I quote:



Yet what we find out now is that less than two months after he appeared—referring to Dr McGowan's appearance before the committee—he received an email from Tess Meldrum at Silver Chain, which said:

Hi Chris

I have been able to access your calendar to provide the following plus relevant attachments.

The member for Kaurna then goes through the list of events included in the email and then finishes referring to the contents of the email by saying, and I quote:

Then we had another one, which is the latest one, being 23 June 2017: Liberal Party gala dinner, International Convention Centre at Darling Harbour in Sydney.

I have also been provided with a copy of the email with attachments which the member for Kaurna referred to. If, as the Deputy Premier suggests, the question relates to the 2018 and not the 2014 election, it is therefore plausible to accept the member for Kaurna's statement based on his reference to the 23 June 2017 Liberal Party gala dinner.

Having considered the allegation raised by the Deputy Premier and having had the benefit of examining the information that has been provided to me, I am not satisfied that a prima facie case of privilege has been made out. In the Chair's opinion, this is not a matter of privilege, for the reason I set out. Therefore, I also decline to give the matter the precedence that would allow the Deputy Premier to immediately pursue the matter. However, my opinion does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

On the matter of the member for West Torrens and the Attorney-General misrepresenting the Budget and Finance Committee evidence, I again preface my comments in the usual manner regarding the McGee test. The member for West Torrens claims that the Attorney-General, when raising the matter of privilege against the member for Kaurna, did not inform the house of subsequent questions and answers that were included in the transcript of evidence from the Budget and Finance Committee on 23 July 2018.

More specifically, the member for West Torrens asserts that the Attorney-General, in not referring to subsequent questions and answers that followed on from the Attorney-General's partial quoting of the transcript of evidence, misrepresented the evidence that would otherwise support the member for Kaurna's accusations, which were the subject of the matter of privilege raised by the Attorney-General.

The member for West Torrens alleges that, in not referring to the subsequent questions and answers when initially raising the matter of privilege, the Attorney-General deliberately misled the house by misrepresenting evidence that was presented to the Budget and Finance Committee. I have again examined the *Hansard* record, together with the transcript of evidence from the meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee held on 23 July 2018.

The information presented to the house by the Attorney-General, albeit only one question and answer, is the same as the evidence presented to the committee. Further, the interpretation of the evidence presented, upon which the Attorney-General has chosen to prosecute the matter of privilege she has raised and which the member for West Torrens has complained of, can certainly be regarded as a debating contention—very much so.

Therefore, on the evidence available to me, it is not clear that a prima facie case has been made out that would amount to, or be intended or likely to amount to, an improper interference that would genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties.

#### *Bills*

### **GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATED AREA) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**Mr BROWN (Playford) (12:31):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 19  
 Noes ..... 24  
 Majority ..... 5

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.		

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

Motion thus negatived.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (12:37):** I rise today in support of the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill 2019, a bill that is essentially enshrining in legislation what has already been attempted through regulation. There is nothing new or outrageous about what is being proposed here today.

We are seeking the speedy passage of the bill through this house and, indeed, this parliament to give our state's farmers the certainty they need and deserve: that the choice to utilise genetically modified crops is available in time for next year's season. Agriculture is a major economic driver for our state. As a parliament, we should be backing this industry and simply get out of its way. I would like to commend the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development for his diligent and methodical work in this area.

We have certainly heard a lot about process today from those opposite. I think it is worth just running through the process that has actually occurred. The Marshall Liberal team went to the 2018 state election committed to a review of the moratorium on GM crops in South Australia, which had been legislated by the previous government to be in place until 2025. Within six months of the 2018 election, the new Marshall government went about establishing a review, chaired by Emeritus Professor Kym Anderson AC, to conduct a review into the moratorium.

The independent, evidence-based review found that not only did the statewide moratorium not provide an economic advantage to South Australian farmers but, in fact, our farmers were left much worse off than interstate counterparts, even compared with those who had opted to continue to grow non-GM products. This is a critical point, I think, for the member for Mawson, who has certainly been making the case against GM crops via the media. That is presumably outside the deliberative process of the Labor Party, which the shadow minister spoke about earlier. The evidence for a market benefit for our state by remaining GM-free simply does not exist.

Following the consultation period that was prescribed in the act, the minister introduced regulations to lift the statewide moratorium leaving only Kangaroo Island as GM free, as there was a

price benefit for that particular location, particularly going to the Japanese market, but we are talking about a statewide moratorium and there is no evidence for maintaining that.

It is worth also noting that there had been a select committee on this issue that heard plenty of evidence from stakeholders supporting the lifting of the moratorium. Unfortunately, though, in spite of all this evidence, the regulations were subsequently disallowed in the other place, and somewhat puzzling, I might add, was that the Labor members were not prepared to make the case in that place for why the regulations should have been disallowed, but the arguments made by SA-Best and the Greens centred on their belief that the change in the boundary of the moratorium should have been done via a bill, and so here we are.

But now we are hearing cries from those opposite—process arguments, of course—that they have not had enough time to consider this. Certainly, the member for Mawson has been making his case for why we should maintain a GM crop ban for a while, so this issue has certainly not come as a surprise to those opposite, yet they are the arguments we are hearing now. How much more time and consultation do those opposite need? The farmers want it, the scientists want it and the evidence, both scientific and economic, backs it, and now as a parliament we need to do our job and get on with this, get out of the way and give our farmers the choice.

Just by way of some background, it is important to note that, in relation to genetically modified organisms, federal legislation deals with the protection of the health and safety of people and regulates all dealings in Australia through the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR), including research, manufacture, import, production, propagation, transport and disposal of GMOs. With respect to GM crops, the OGTR is responsible for the approval of field trials and commercial release of GMOs.

Moreover, Food Standards Australia and New Zealand is concerned with the regulation of GM food products, including safety standards and labelling. Both agencies, that is, the OGTR and Food Standards Australia and New Zealand, are tasked with administering regulatory regimes that provide very strong protections and national consistency. The state government is responsible for the regulation of GM crops for trade and market purposes.

Since the passage of federal legislation, which was shortly followed by legislation in the states in the early 2000s, different states varied in their timing in terms of the implementation of moratoria and the eventual lifting of those moratoria. South Australia is now the only mainland state to still maintain a statewide ban on GM crops, and under the regime left to us by the former Labor government the moratorium is set to continue until 2025, with no evidence of any benefit for our state.

At present, canola is the only GM crop currently approved for release that is really relevant to South Australia and the most likely candidate for use here, but there is certainly a lot of important work underway right now around the world, including right here in Adelaide (and a particular example is the Waite Institute, which has been talked about earlier) that will very likely provide many new varieties with enormous potential for improved benefits for the economy, human health and the environment.

These benefits can include increased yields. This can mean reduced fuel consumption, which not only has reduced costs for farmer but also reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced land area required, reduced use of pesticides, reduced demand for water, greater tolerance to salinity, greater tolerance to frost and many other potential benefits. Our farmers would be deprived of all these benefits under the continuation of the moratorium.

Recent amendments to the commonwealth Gene Technology Regulations have provided some greater clarity around whether the products of some newer gene-editing technologies are classified as GMOs. It is important to note at this point that random mutagenesis of plants, whether that be through a method like gamma irradiation or using some kind of chemical mutagen, does not produce a GMO. It is not regulated under that act, whereas products of gene technology generally have been.

Newer technologies, which are often grouped together and classified as gene editing, can make very small and subtle changes to the DNA sequence that may alter a gene product or alter the regulation of that product to achieve a particular outcome. This is quite different from some of the

older gene technology methods that involved the replacement of whole genes or the insertion of large chunks of sequence.

The amendments to the regulations at the federal level have had to grapple with the question of whether something is classified as a genetically modified organism due to the fact that it has gone through a particular process or it is classified as such on the basis of what the produce actually is. What the amendments have done is define that the most basic form of gene editing is now deemed not to generate GMOs, meaning that it is not regulated under those acts, and that would include under what exists here.

Essentially, every other gene editing technique remains classified as gene technology. These technologies have enormous potential because only very small and subtle changes can be made, which potentially generate many more varieties that could have enormous benefits that would also, given the maintenance of the moratorium here, be out of reach of our farmers.

It is also important to note that the continuation of the moratorium not only applies a massive handbrake to the efforts of our farmers but also severely restricts the research community's ability to do important work right here in South Australia. Without a clear local pathway to market, the South Australian research community suffers in what should really be a key area of strength for our state with enormous potential down the track for the export of technologies right around the world.

I have talked about this before, but I do think it is an important point to reiterate. Whilst the state government's decision to lift the moratorium is based on the implications for the state in terms of trade and market access, which we have already established through multiple bodies, that market benefit that has been talked about does not exist on a statewide level. There is no doubt the debate on this is often conflated with other issues not within the state's jurisdiction, and that is the notion that GM crops are inherently bad.

The fact of the matter is that humans have been genetically manipulating plants for centuries. The difference with gene technology is that the products that are being generated are altered in a manner that is highly specific, with defined changes; random changes are not considered GMOs. This technology is simply a tool, and it is true that like any tool it can be used for good and potentially it could be used to do not so good things and should, quite rightly, be tightly regulated, as it is, but it is not fundamentally bad.

The role of government is to back the experts and respond to the evidence. We do not get to pick and choose what science we like and what science we do not like. It is like the hypocrisy of championing the cause, as we have already heard this morning, for accepting the science of climate change (which, I add, I certainly agree with), but at the same time object to the use of gene technologies that could very well help address the issue.

This is not to say that science is infallible. There should rightly be robust processes and caution exercised with any new invention, but we need to accept the best available evidence when it is presented, and in this case GM crops have been available and in use for a very long period of time now. There is plenty of evidence, both from a scientific standpoint and from an economic standpoint, about where things sit.

The Marshall government has listened to the experts, listened to the key stakeholders and is making decisions in the best interests of the state as a whole. Once again, I commend the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development for his work in this area, making the case for the lifting of the moratorium using facts to the point that now those opposed to this quite frankly look quite ridiculous. We need to pass this bill to give our farmers the certainty they need for next year's season, and I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:48):** I also rise in support of this bill. The South Australian agriculture industry has a reputation for excellence in research and for more than a century has built on incredible innovation by some of the best minds that have ever graced our state institutions of learning. This issue of genetically modified organisms is one that has been around for many years now. I was looking on the internet this morning at some of my involvement in the debate over time, and I acknowledge my role as a dairy farmer previously, and the interest I have had in that space. Unfortunately, I am now too busy to be involved with dairy farming, but I am still very supportive of their pursuits.

It is important to note that in 2006 there were some reports about me commenting in the media about GM back at that point in time. It is really important to note that at that point I said it was very important that we continue the research into genetically modified organisms, and when the consumers are ready we, as farmers, need to have the ability to deliver to the consumer. We now look at how well the consumer has been prepared to take up the use of GM in their foods.

Most of the soys that are very commonly used are very much a genetically modified organism: the soy milks, etc., the soy lattes that people choose to have rather than milk lattes—I am not sure why they would, but they have chosen to do that. Interestingly, there is a very strong uptake there. We have also seen other GM products that are really important to human health: insulin is a genetically modified organism. Those who need insulin on a daily basis thank scientists for the GM technology that has been used to make the insulin available and to make their lives more livable.

It is an interesting debate that we face and it is very much, at this point in time in South Australia, focused on GM canola, being one of the few GM products that can be grown in our environment. However, as we see and have seen the progression in this space over time, it will not be long before other plant products are available. Certainly, in my time in the dairy industry, that industry, Dairy Australia and others, has invested heavily in genetically modified organisms and research in that space, looking for pastures that will be helpful for the dairy industry.

We have seen estimates of \$325 a hectare improvement in returns to dairy farmers if they had a GM product available to them that produced high milk yields and removed some of the issues they face in relation to drought and other things, such as increasing digestibility of rye-grass and other grasses to cows. All that can lead to better returns but also better outcomes.

One of the issues that I was involved with and something that was discussed at the time was looking at GM rye-grass. Rye-grass is one of the major grasses that causes hay fever. By looking at some of the genes within rye-grass itself, it may be possible to actually turn off that effect to stop people being so allergic to the pollen that comes from the rye-grass plant which will, in turn, improve people's lives.

There are many reasons why we need to get involved in this space. One thing we need to be very careful about is that we look at the science and make sure that we do what is appropriate and make sure that it is regulated, and that has certainly, to this point, been done well. We also need to make sure that we are confident in the product, which we are in Australia, and we have seen in every other state where the moratorium has been lifted that the confidence is there. We have many examples in South Australia to now look at that confidence and to allow the adoption of this technology.

Drought-tolerant crops and pastures, frost-tolerant crops and pastures, disease and pest resistance, herbicide tolerance, all these things are something that can be achieved through gene technology. We can also achieve greater shelf life for products to reduce food waste, and we can increase crop yields. They are just some of the things that can be achieved from gene modification and genetic modification of plants. It is interesting to note that if you have had a flu shot that is also something that it is fairly likely GM technology was used to come up with. Many of us in this place would have had our flu shots this year—another place where GM technology has been used.

It is something we need to have confidence in. The scientists have done the work and they have delivered their opinions. I think the member for Newland, in his address to this place on this topic, very much outlined how the science in this area is very robust and that we need to be confident in its use. In 2017, almost two million hectares were sown to GM crops globally—two million hectares—and a million of those were in Australia. That is how confident we can be in the use of these products.

In closing, there is no legitimate reason for this parliament to continue to restrict our farmers from accessing this technology. This is a stellar bill, a stellar example of evidence-based policy, and I implore all members to support the passage of this bill.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:56):** I rise today to speak in support of the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill. This bill is an important one for

South Australia's agricultural productivity and is in response to the directions outlined in the findings of the independent review into the ban on genetically modified crops undertaken in late 2018.

The focus of the independent review was to examine the merits of the moratorium on GM crops that has existed since 2003 in the state of South Australia, including investigating the benefits and costs of the moratorium to the state of South Australia and the state's ag and food production industries and considering if it is in the interests of maximising the state's economy and returns for the agriculture and food production sectors for the moratorium to continue; and, if so, under what conditions. The terms of reference of the review set out a range of matters, including:

- the available evidence re marketing benefits to South Australia under the moratorium;
- assess evidence of trading partners in South Australia and interstate of South Australia's GM-free status;
- where there is evidence of market benefits from the moratorium, examine if it is possible to retain these through segregation in the supply chain;
- examine the potential for innovations that would justify reconsideration of the moratorium; and
- examine benefits and costs of maintaining, modifying or removing the moratorium.

The bill has been drafted in response to the evidence from the independent review that the moratorium has cost the farming industry many millions of dollars, which has unfairly impacted on our ability to grow our agricultural sector. It has been estimated that the moratorium has cost the state's grain growers at least \$33 million since 2004 and would cost at least another \$5 million if extended until 2025.

Our government has recognised that it is time for our farmers to be given a choice on which crops they want to grow. Providing choice is timely, as the review report highlights many points that provide a strong case for the removal of the moratorium. Regarding price premiums, there was no compelling argument that any current price premium or market access for non-GM SA crops would be diminished if GM-free crops were allowed to be grown in the state, as long as there was careful segregation of product, noting that Kangaroo Island is the exception—and this is recognised in the bill before us.

I want to touch on the fact that I believe one of the reasons the previous government actually maintained the moratorium was the marketing to niche markets. Niche markets are generally small markets that try to find market access and points around the globe, as we trade in today. There are, and can be, some opportunities; however, one of the responsibilities of this government is to manage and govern for all producers and all the people of the state to make sure we are maximising our returns.

This is not to go about destroying small niche markets, and it is not about making sure niche markets have a priority over any other larger markets: it is to make sure that our agriculture and industry as a whole can flourish without the imposition of government regulation. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Darlington Upgrade Project Report 11 of 2019 [Ordered to be published]  
 Ombudsman SA—Annual Report 2018-19 [Ordered to be published]  
 Local Government Annual Reports 2018-19—  
     Barossa Council, The  
     Campbelltown City Council  
     Ceduna, District Council of  
     Goyder, Regional Council of  
     Grant, District Council of  
     Holdfast Bay, City of  
     Lower Eyre Peninsula, District Council of  
     Mount Remarkable, District Council of  
     Streaky Bay, District Council of  
     West Torrens, City of

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Rule made under the following Act—  
 Magistrates Court—Civil—Rules 2013—Amendment No. 28

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Regulation made under the following Act—  
 Development—Development (Solar Panels) Variation Regulations 2019

*Parliamentary Committees*

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:03):** I bring up the 42<sup>nd</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into the provision of services for people with mental illness under the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme'.

Report received.

*Question Time*

**SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** My question is to the Premier. Now that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has delivered his report on SA Health, will the Premier now provide him with the resources that he has requested to conduct a full investigation into the state's largest public sector agency?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04):** Yes, the Leader of the Opposition is right. This is the largest public sector agency, and we thank the commissioner for the report, which he delivered to the government last week, which has now been tabled in parliament and available for all to read. I myself am about two-thirds of the way through this report.

I thank the commissioner for his report. He identifies a range of issues that are of concern to the government. It's fair to say that many of these issues have been raised over an extended period of time. In fact, nowhere in this report does it say that these new problems have existed in the last 18 or 19 months. In fact, there are many references—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which go back many years which were failed to be addressed by the previous government. We are fully aware that there are very serious problems associated with SA Health, and we are trying to work as quickly as we can through the problems that we inherited from the previous government. I am personally of the opinion—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that we are making good progress, but this report I think shines a further light on some of the issues that are remaining within SA Health. This is why we announce now that the government will establish immediately an interagency task force to look at this report—

**Mr Picton:** A task force? What a joke!

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Kurna!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and we will work through the issues raised in this report. This interagency task force will be headed up by Jim McDowell, who is the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and will have representatives on it from the Department of Treasury—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and the office for public sector employment and, of course, SA Health. We will work diligently through a range of issues that have been canvassed in this report.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I go to the leader, unfortunately I have to call the following members to order: the member for Davenport, the member for Wright, the member for Badcoe and the leader. The member for Playford is also warned. The member for Kurna is also warned and the member for Elizabeth and the member for Lee. Leader.

#### SA HEALTH

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is again to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the Hon. Bruce Lander that without additional resources he is unable to conduct a widespread and comprehensive investigation into SA Health without unduly interfering with his other functions?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** The government provides a budget to the commission each year. I note that it has significantly increased. There was a very substantial increase that was included in the most recent budget that was handed down. It is not our role to be providing direction or even advice to the commissioner as to how he should spend that money.

#### SA HEALTH

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is again to the Premier. Why is it that the Premier can find millions of dollars to buy off the Greens to get his controversial land tax legislation through the parliament but not \$2 million for the ICAC to investigate SA Health?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: standing order 97.

**The SPEAKER:** Standing order 97: argument, offering facts—take your pick. Leader, you can rephrase, ask another question or move on. Which is it? Rephrase.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier rule out providing the additional resources that the ICAC commissioner has requested to conduct an investigation thoroughly into SA Health?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** Since we have come to government, I think it's evident to every single thinking person in South Australia that in fact our government has significantly increased the budget for SA Health.

**Mr Malinauskas:** But not enough, according to ICAC.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** In fact, we have increased the budget provided to SA Health by more than \$1 billion—



*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —over and above what we inherited from the previous government because we are 100 per cent committed to fixing up the mess that we inherited. Let's not forget who the minister for health was prior to the election: it was none other than the Leader of the Opposition. We didn't see the Leader of the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —coming in here saying, 'I want to put more money into investigating—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Waite!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the failure of Transforming Health.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Where was the Leader of the Opposition when he was responsible for this area? Where were his millions of dollars going into investigating his—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier—

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —failed Transforming Health? He was nowhere to be seen.

**The SPEAKER:** Would the Premier be seated for one moment. The member for West Torrens—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members! The member for West Torrens has a point of order. The point of order is for?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That was hysterical debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** For debate. With respect to the member for West Torrens, there were interjections on my left and my right. Consequently, I call to order the member for Waite and the member for Playford for excessive gesticulations. The Premier has the call. I would like to hear his answer. If he is finished—he has finished his answer. The member for Narungga and then the member for Kaurna.

## REGIONAL ROADS

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:10):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government's strong plan to fix regional roads is improving road safety?

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Comment, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens has been here long enough to know that if he has a point of order he knows how to make it, and it is not that way, and therefore he is called to order. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:10):** Thank you, Mr Speaker; I respect your judgements. I thank the member for Narungga for his question and note his deep and abiding and unrelenting interest in road upgrades in his electorate to the exclusion of all other electorates and also say that he knows, as I know, as all the regional MPs on this side of the house know, that fixing country roads remains the number one priority of regional South Australians, and it remains one of the overarching top priorities of this government.

I have given updates previously about stuff going on in the South-East, and that keeps the member for MacKillop quiet for a couple of minutes, but I would like to do the same now for the Mid North. Can I say that we are spending a huge amount of money fixing up roads in the Mid North of South Australia on the edge of my electorate, on the edge of the member for Narrunga's electorate and right in the middle of the member for Frome's electorate.

If we talk about the fact that two weeks ago now the Prime Minister of Australia came here to outline the fact that he has helped us to bring forward all the money—the \$55 million—that we have for upgrading the Horrocks Highway, we see that this is a fantastic step forward for South Australia, and whether that be the installation of overtaking lanes and shoulder sealings, whether it be improvements to the Gladstone level crossing or the replacement of the Spring Creek Bridge north of Melrose, we know that this road upgrade is going to save lives.

However, what it is also going to do is to provide better opportunity for people to get more easily to Clare and through to the Mid North. As somebody who has on occasion been stuck behind a caravan trying to get to Clare for the Gourmet Weekend, can I say that these overtaking lanes are going to be a massive step forward for tourists wanting to get to the Clare Valley.

More than that, we know that there is a whole heap of work going on, and Owen Road between Owen and Balaklava, a stretch of road that we know needs a lot of help, is getting help under this. Also, as part of this package we are upgrading Goyder Highway, and this is so we can return that speed limit back up to 110 km/h. Works are being undertaken to fix up Goyder Highway, on that stretch as you head into Crystal Brook, so that it can be returned to that 110 km/h speed limit.

We've got some stabilisation and resealing works on the Barrier Highway as part of an \$18 million package that we released only in the last couple weeks. We are also doing some shoulder sealing work on Blyth Plains Road. There is a nine-kilometre stretch between Blyth Plains Road and James Road in Clare, somewhere the member for Frome and I visited—well, we visited Blyth Plains Road, but the other roads down thereabouts.

We are also upgrading not only Port Wakefield, and the \$122 million we've got on the table to fix that very difficult intersection, but also \$11 million on the table to increase access to the Dublin saleyards. We know that, as saleyards, they do not market pigs there much anymore, but still a whole heap of other small stock and stuff gets sold through Dublin. It is an important trading point within our livestock industry, and we know that increasing freight access for heavier configuration vehicles into the Dublin saleyards is going to drive productivity for our red meat sector.

As we know, at this point in time there are parts of our state that have destocked and are destocking. We know that there are parts of our community that are doing it tough in regional South Australia, and helping to improve productivity of our roads is one way that we can help to cut costs for those producers so that they can be more efficient now as times are tough, and also, when it does rain and we can actually take advantage of the increased demand for protein around the world, we will have a more efficient distribution system to get our product to market processed and overseas to help grow jobs here in South Australia.

There is almost not a road in South Australia that isn't being touched by our regional road safety package or our regional road funding more generally. Some thousand kilometres of road out of the 12½ thousand kilometres of sealed road that we have is getting fixed, and it is not before time.

**MCGOWAN, DR C.**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier's Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, provide ministers with a copy of the draft report of the ICAC commissioner's damning findings when he was provided it by the commissioner to comment on factual matters?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14):** Not to my knowledge.

**MCGOWAN, DR C.**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Why was the Premier's Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, not one of the 10 senior health executives who fronted

a media conference this morning to explain the government's response to the ICAC commissioner's damning findings?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** I'm not sure why he wasn't there, but I am happy to make inquiries. He may have had other important work to undertake.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna is warned, as is the deputy leader. The member for Kaurna has the call and then the member for Heysen.

#### **MCGOWAN, DR C.**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, been provided or will he be provided with subsidised or direct legal assistance from the government in relation to the independent inquiry being headed by Professor John McMillan?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:15):** The Crown Solicitor is responsible for the consideration of any applications for legal representation, so that is a matter for his determination if and when he receives any such application.

**Mr Szakacs:** Who does he report to?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Cheltenham is called to order. We are moving to the member for Heysen. I will come back to the member for West Torrens.

#### **PRISON INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:16):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government is delivering on its plans to improve the safety and security of South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16):** I thank the member for Heysen for his very important question and the opportunity to update the house on the recent significant ongoing investment that we have made into our corrections system. As you know, at the March 2018 election we took a strong plan and we are delivering on that strong plan. Again, I thank the member for Heysen—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —for his interest on this side of the house. I know he is very interested. In fact, a few months ago he went out and visited some of our prisons and had a good look at what the Marshall government is doing to make sure we are improving and making sure we are keeping South Australia safe and secure. The Marshall government came into power and we made a very strong commitment to deliver more jobs and better services, and that's exactly what we are doing. In the past few months—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —we have committed another \$67 million to building on South Australia's security, and that goes on the back of a significant investment in our first budget of an extra 310 beds into the system—270 into the Yatala system and another 40 into the Women's Prison. That's a \$200 million investment there as well—again, a significant infrastructure investment that was left to go to rack and ruin by those opposite when they were in power. But it's okay: we are here to fix it. We are here to get the job done and deliver better services for South Australia.

Of course, with that have come construction jobs as well. The construction industry has been very buoyed by the work we have been doing there. Added to that as well, as part of the rehabilitation program, as we move to the 10by20 target that we are shooting for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They chortle away on the other side, Mr Speaker. They don't like the fact that we have put \$270 million into security and safety, making sure we are keeping people safe.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** As I was saying before I was rudely interrupted by those opposite, part of the work we have done is actually getting people within the prisons working. We know that if we get them working it gives them a better opportunity when they get out—a better opportunity to get a job, a better opportunity to contribute back to society. As part of those developments, it's great to see a number of the women in the prison doing this work and upskilling themselves. It's been great to meet people who have left prison and have gone on to get jobs because of this work that we have been doing.

Another thing we have done just recently is we have invested \$15 million into the new iSAFE system, a brand-new computerised management system. Under the previous government, they were left within the corrections system to be working on an old green screen, an old DOS computer system that was as old as the hills. People were really struggling to hand information between departments to make sure that we were sharing the right information to keep South Australians safe. It was not letting departments speak from one department to another.

This new iSAFE system will be able to do that. It will make sure that we can speak between agencies, share information and keep South Australians safe. A lot of this came on the back of the findings from the Lindt cafe siege in New South Wales. There were several recommendations made on the back of that. We thought to act because we know that for 16 years those opposite left this system to go to rack and ruin. They did not invest and they did not put back into these systems to make sure that we keep people safe.

On this side of the house, we know how important it is to keep people safe. We know that that is vitally important. On the back of the recommendations from the Lindt cafe siege, we have invested in an iSAFE system to make sure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —that we can talk across agencies. They are part of the better services we are supplying to South Australia—the \$52 million, as I said at the most recent budget: rapid response, district policing model, fixated threats, now the iSAFE system, as well as building better prisons in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is delivering.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. On how many occasions has the Premier or any member of his cabinet met with or communicated with Chinese foreign national Sally Zou since the election?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20):** I don't have any details of that whatsoever.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Elizabeth, you have been doing it all day and you are warned for a second time. I am trying to give the member for West Torrens another question.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:21):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Chinese foreign national and self-proclaimed businesswoman Sally Zou, or any businesses associated with her, made any donations to the South Australian Liberal Party in the past 12 months?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21):** If that was the case, then all those donations would be recorded in accordance with the appropriate legislation.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Spies always choose the weakest targets.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned.

#### ZOU, MS S.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:21):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain to the house why Sally Zou, a Chinese foreign national with no real business interests in South Australia, donated around \$1 million to the South Australian Liberal Party?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21):** That's not a matter for me as the Premier. That's a matter for the Liberal Party.

#### HYDROGEN INDUSTRY

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned. Member for Elder, can we have the question again, please, so I can listen to it.

**Mrs POWER:** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the state's renewable hydrogen industry?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:22):** Yes, I can, and it's a great pleasure to do this. I appreciate the question from the member for Elder. It was a great pleasure to be with the member for Elder, assistant minister with particular responsibility for domestic violence; the member for Morphett, the neighbouring MP to the north; and the Premier down at Hydrogen Park SA yesterday at the Tonsley Innovation Precinct. This is an absolutely fantastic project, which Australian Gas Infrastructure Group is pursuing with its subsidiary, Australian Gas Networks, here in Adelaide, a 1.25-megawatt electrolyser, which will take renewable energy, much of it from the acres of solar panels on the nearby roof of the Tonsley Innovation Precinct, and turn it into hydrogen.

That hydrogen will then be plumbed straight from the electrolyser to the Mitchell Park suburb nearby, on just the other side of the train line. Then there will be 700 houses receiving, initially, 5 per cent hydrogen into their existing natural gas reticulation system. Of course, there will then be a 5 per cent reduction in emissions straightaway. It is believed that that could increase to 10 per cent or 15 per cent without any harm to the reticulation system, without any need to change appliances or anything like that. Of course, out of an abundance of caution, we will start with 5 per cent.

The other key thing that is happening there is that tube trailers will be filled with green hydrogen produced on site. Then those trailers can transport the hydrogen to other parts of South Australia, primarily to industrial users. This is a very important step forward. It might interest the house to know that yesterday, when the Premier launched this new initiative, he was gracious enough to say that this was something that was started under the previous government.

I think that is something that has been a hallmark of our government—recognising good work which we have picked up. We have also had to recognise a lot of rubbish that we had to throw away, but where there were kernels of success we have given—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —credit to the previous government. I would also like to pay credit to the people in the Department for Energy and Mining who have worked incredibly hard on this project. This is one of four pilot plants to do with hydrogen that our government is pursuing very keenly and very aggressively.

The Premier, in September, launched the South Australian Hydrogen Action Plan, which is not just a strategy, not just a fluffy document saying, 'Wouldn't it be really nice if we got involved in

hydrogen?' It is actually a document with 20 key recommendations in five key areas focusing on investment, focusing on regulations, focusing on relationships with other partners—primarily other countries that might want to import our hydrogen—focusing on skills and focusing on bringing hydrogen into the South Australian economy.

The Premier and I and our government are all determined that in the not too distant future South Australia will be a world-leading hydrogen producer, hydrogen consumer and hydrogen exporter. It is independently estimated that by 2030 the hydrogen export business will be worth \$1.7 billion and have 2,800 jobs attached to it. By 2040, that will have risen to \$4.2 billion and have 7,000 jobs attached to it, and we are determined to retain our leadership position in South Australia and get as much of that economic, environmental and social benefit for our state as we can.

*The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay is called to order. The member for West Torrens.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. Did Chinese national Sally Zou ever make any donation to any other South Australian institution or entity at the personal bidding of the Premier or any member of his staff?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** Not that I am aware of.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. At the time that Ms Morcombe was a senior adviser in 2017, did the Premier's now chief of staff, Courtney Morcombe, suggest to Chinese foreign national Sally Zou that she should make a donation to St Peter's Girls' School, where Ms Morcombe is also a director, to honour then deputy prime minister and foreign minister and old scholar Julie Bishop?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27):** My understanding is that Ms Zou's children attend St Peter's college. I don't think this is a particularly extraordinary circumstance, for a parent to provide a donation to a school but, if the honourable member has a claim to make, perhaps he should cut to the chase.

**Mr Odenwalder:** This is the longest answer he has given this week.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth, you can leave for 50 minutes under 137A—50 minutes today. The member for West Torrens has the call and then the member for Kavel.

*The honourable member for Elizabeth having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:27):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier's now chief of staff, Courtney Morcombe, ask Ms Sally Zou to donate money to St Peter's Girls' School, due to Ms Sally Zou tweeting a copy of a Commonwealth Bank cheque made out to the Premier on the Premier's birthday—rather than the money going to the Liberal Party, to St Peter's Girls' School.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28):** It is becoming more and more bizarre.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I know for a fact that the Labor Party were making overtures to Ms Zou to try to get a donation. Perhaps they could declare whether or not she made a donation. We live in a country where people are free to make donations to all sorts of organisations. In politics, though, we have special arrangements for disclosure of those donations, and all those donations to our political party, to the best of my ability, have been made in accordance with those disclosure arrangements. Only the Labor Party can speak for their arrangements. We have seen some evidence

of that interstate of recent times—quite disgraceful behaviour by the Australian Labor Party, but if the—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, be seated for one moment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, be seated. There is a point of order. The point of order is for?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The question was about donations. The Premier is comparing and contrasting with other jurisdictions around Australia. I think he has made that point and I ask him to shortly come back to the substance of the question, please.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Certainly, sir. Obviously, the member for West Torrens is of the opinion that some people on this side of the house behave in exactly and precisely the same way as his New South Wales Labor mates behave. Well, I am here to tell you that is not the case.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:30):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier been lobbied by Mr Christopher Pyne or his associates on behalf of Chinese national Ms Sally Zou?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30):** Not that I am aware of.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is called to order.

#### **REGIONAL GROWTH FUND**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Regional Growth Fund is supporting economic development in the Hills?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:30):** Yes, I can. The Marshall Liberal government's Regional Growth Fund once again has been an enabler up in the Mount Barker district—and that is exactly what the Regional Growth Fund is about—with a \$1.25 million grant towards a new 500-megalitre water storage facility. For those who are uneducated, 500 megalitres is half a gigalitre. Half a gigalitre has a capacity to produce a large amount of food. It grows—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —the local economy. What I would say is that this grant will provide much-needed support as part of stage 1 for a significant investment of \$6.96 million for climate independent water storage. Climate independent water storage is a great initiative for any form of agriculture food production because it's not reliant on rainfall and it's not reliant on surface water; it is reliant on water being treated and re-used.

What we see up at Mount Barker is the new storage facility. It is going to provide droughtproof water for our horticulture sector to produce high-value crops up there. That is not only about the high-value crops, whether they be tree crops or the high-value crops: it's about helping our local economy grow. We are seeing that our exports are on the rise. We see that there is significant pressure on food production globally. It needs to be enhanced, and if we can drive the use of re-used water into food production it's a win-win for South Australia, particularly for our regional economies.

The agriculture sector up in the Mount Barker region already equates to about 13.3 per cent of the local economy. It employs a large amount of the workforce up there. This water storage is an enabler. It will not only attract new capital investment but create new opportunity for land that's currently not being used. It has a satisfactory climatic requirement for food production. It's resistant to frost, and that is critically important. Also, some of that unused land at the moment is very important

for our brand. The South Australian clean green brand has never been more prominent on the global stage than it is today.

What I would say is that reliable water will be an economic enabler. It will create around 25 jobs through construction, and then we will see the ongoing benefits as private investment comes on board. The Mount Barker council has shown initiative. It has come forward to re-use treated water for food production. It will create opportunity for local jobs, and ongoing we will see picking, packing and the logistics of that enterprise, which will see benefits for the local community.

The Regional Growth Fund is not about picking winners. The Regional Growth Fund is about the three Cs: it is about collaboration, it is about clustering and it is about community benefit. What we are seeing now with the infrastructure uplift through the Regional Growth Fund is exactly that. We are giving a benefit to the community, we are giving a benefit to collaboration and we are giving a benefit to the betterment of South Australian food production.

If we look around South Australia, every opportunity where there is an ability to re-use water, or to redistribute re-used water particularly, is an economic absolute boon. We see the NAIS and we see what is currently going on with South Australia through the drought. If we can continue to provide opportunities for those water infrastructure projects, it is a win-win for South Australia because #RegionsMatter.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:34):** My question is to the Premier. While travelling in China, has the Premier ever met with Ms Sally Zou in the People's Republic of China, or any other businesses associated with Ms Zou, or any other businesses at the request of Ms Zou, on his travels as either Premier or leader of the opposition?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35):** No.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35):** My question is to the Premier—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** Normally, if you want to go fishing, you would put bait on the hook first.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government is a repeat offender and he's called to order.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Do you have someone to bait it for you?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee! The member for West Torrens has the call.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir. My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier requested any background checks into the Chinese foreign national and major Liberal Party donor Ms Sally Zou?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35):** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens.

**ZOU, MS S.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35):** Thank you, sir—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Have you run out of questions?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, I'm standing here—

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier was called to order this morning and now she's warned. Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir. My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received any security agency briefings about Chinese foreign national and major Liberal Party donor Ms Sally Zou?

**Mr Cregan:** This is all you've got? This is it?



**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel is called to order. Repeat the question, please.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received any security agency briefings about Chinese foreign national, and other foreign nationals, and major Liberal Party donors, including Ms Sally Zou?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** We wouldn't talk about security briefings in an open public forum, but the answer to that question is no, but I really will not be providing evidence on *Hansard* regarding briefings that we receive. We receive them as part of COAG; they're very detailed. I think they are very important for our national security.

#### HERITAGE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister inform the house how landholders and the environment will benefit from the government's changes to the Heritage Agreement Program and how they compare to previous programs?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:36):** It's great to be able to update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's reinstatement of funding to the Heritage Agreement Program. Of course, many people might not know what heritage agreements actually do because they were largely defunded under the former Labor government.

What they do is provide funding to conservation projects on private land, which seek to see native vegetation fenced off and preserved, and the owners of that native vegetation provided with incentive-based grants in order to undertake some of that revegetation, perhaps undertake weed control, feral animal control, securing that vegetation through fence lines, etc. These are particularly focused on areas such as creek lines and linking up tracts of native vegetation across landscapes.

This program really is one that has received very significant conservation traction in the past. It was a program that was initiated by the Tonkin government in 1980. It was designed to recognise that the vast majority of land in this state is under the care and control of private individuals, either through privately owned titles or long-term leases, such as pastoral leases.

While we are very fortunate in South Australia to have the vast majority—well, a great proportion, not the majority by any means—of our land held in the reserve system, the vast majority of our land will always be owned or leased, in terms of long-term leases, by private individuals. That's why it is so important to support private individuals and families to undertake conservation work.

The new, revitalised program will look at conservation outcomes on private land, and it will be particularly focused on creating those landscape-scale corridors, joining up land in areas where there are existing conservation parks, so we can get broader corridors of native vegetation which is intact and in a sustainable and healthy state, or actually focusing on the creation of new heritage agreements as well. We have a good number of heritage agreements in regional South Australia. In fact, the member for Hammond has a very large number in his electorate. They are throughout regional South Australia, but we can always get better.

Our back-to-basics approach to natural resources management in this state, through the Landscape South Australia boards, which are in the process of being set up now, will enable us to partner far more successfully and in a much more focused way with private landowners, recognising that they have care and control of such large portions of South Australia's landscape. We want to work alongside private landowners, not-for-profit organisations and government agencies, particularly through the Department for Environment and Water, and the new decentralised landscape boards.

This is a great program. It has been really exciting to work alongside not-for-profit organisations as we have looked at developing and revitalising this program. We have had input from the Greens. It has, though, been very disappointing, extremely disappointing, that the South Australian Labor Party chose to vote against the opportunity to set up this program, a shameful situation—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: that is clearly debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for debate. Minister, I have allowed some compare and contrast to a point. I ask you to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will just conclude by saying this is a great program. It has been reinstated after it was defunded by the Labor Party and we are getting on with delivering it.

#### ZOU, MS S.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:41):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier ever been advised that Ms Sally Zou could be a Chinese agent of influence?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:41):** No, but I would say to the member for West Torrens, if he has any information that would suggest that anybody in South Australia is a spy, then perhaps he should report that to the appropriate authorities.

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is warned. Member for Florey.

#### NATIONAL POWER OF ATTORNEY REGISTER

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:41):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney explain what time frames are intended for what is referred to as a staged approach to the reform of enduring powers of attorney and the establishment of a national register for such instruments as per the communiqué of the recent meeting of the Council of Attorneys-General held in Adelaide?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42):** I thank the member for her question because she demonstrated her interest last week in advancing both the harmonisation and the establishment of a national register in relation to powers of attorney. It's an important initiative. It has been under discussion at the Council of Attorneys-General over the time that I have been privileged to be at those meetings. This year, we have held two meetings in Adelaide, which I have had the responsibility to chair.

The advance of this initiative, I think, will be very significant for a number of reasons. Firstly, powers of attorney are written differently in every state. They are an important instrument because, when properly constructed and authorised, they provide a secure letter of intent, or document of intent, of appointment for somebody to handle the financial affairs of another, usually when they are facing a period of diminished capacity or might simply be overseas and away and need to have someone attend to their financial matters.

Historically, in South Australia that has been a document which has been prepared in a registrable form, that is, recognised and able to be accepted by the lands titles office. I think we have a pretty high standard in South Australia and I think we have a pretty good system. What has happened increasingly, though, is that there are numbers of powers of attorney that are prepared that never go to the lands titles office for a number of reasons. Firstly, they are not mandatory. Secondly, somebody might not own real estate, in which case they have nothing to register the power of attorney against for it to be recognised. So there is a deficiency in that regard.

This is one of the reasons why we need to have a national register—so that anyone can identify if a document exists, if a person has been appointed, if it has been validly dated and signed and is on that register. The important initiative that happened last Friday in this regard was that the commonwealth Attorney-General, Christian Porter, confirmed that his government were prepared to establish and maintain a register.

The cost of that is obviously always something that is under discussion, but that is a commitment he has made. Obviously, as states, we have made a commitment to populate it with information that is sufficiently across the jurisdictions, that is able to be registered in a form to the extent of the areas of consistency.

By that, I simply mean that, although there are different rules around the establishment of, signatures on and legality of powers of attorney, essentially, having a power of attorney that is signed and dated by the relevant parties—that is, the person granting the power of attorney and the person

receiving it—and the recording of its existence, the names of the parties and obviously the dating of it, is very important to add to the validity and the status of that document.

It doesn't interfere with any claims that may be made in relation to whether a signature has been obtained under duress as a result of a fraud or anything like that. Those things will always be available to challenge the validity of a document. This was designed to be a useful tool, and I think it will be a useful tool, for people to be able to understand whether there is somebody who has that valid authority to act and whether that can be relied on. That has been called for, and I thank the member for her advocacy in that regard.

#### **NATIONAL POWER OF ATTORNEY REGISTER**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:46):** Supplementary: did the federal Attorney-General give you any indication of what a staged approach might equate to in weeks, months or years?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:46):** The next meeting will be mid next year. There will be an expectation to resolve a number of things, but the staged approach is to accommodate the states being able to identify what the areas of overlap are and what can be usefully provided in the knowledge that there are a number of states that haven't advanced to a contemporary standard—if I can be as kind to describe it as that—the law surrounding powers of attorney.

Our state started to under minister Hill. He didn't progress that, so it has been left in abeyance. I think we have some fairly good standards of powers of attorney, but I have already initiated areas in my department that I think need some reform and to get some advice on those matters, irrespective of what is going to happen at the national level. I think it is important that we have a contemporary set of rules in relation to our own powers of attorney.

Incidentally, this parliament has passed law, certainly in the time I was in opposition, to mutually recognise powers of attorney in Victoria because of the significant overlap in the population that the member for Mount Gambier represents. I am not sure whether he was directly involved in the matter at the time of advocating for it, but it had some merit because of the significant overlap. That is the type of thing we need to be able to bring up to contemporary standard. In the meantime, we are very pleased with the federal Attorney's announcement. We will get our agreements in order, but the commitment to have the money on the table to not just establish but maintain a register is a very important advance, and we are appreciative of it.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today, on behalf of the member for Hurtle Vale, members of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Education Centre. Welcome to parliament.

#### *Question Time*

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it is acceptable that his Minister for Health and Wellbeing has just admitted to the other place that, over the four days since the government was provided with the 64-page report from ICAC, he hasn't completed reading it?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: the member makes some claims purporting and establishing facts in that question without leave.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. Does the member for Kurna want to have another go?

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that his Minister for Health and Wellbeing should have read the ICAC report of 64 pages over the past four days?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:49):** Perhaps the member would be advised to review the public statement made by the commissioner on Friday.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You should put out a press release.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** He made a public statement—it's on his website—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —in which he indicated that he had provided copies of the report to the parliament and that he had given me advice, which had come to my office while I was at the CAG meeting I have just referred to, that I had authority as Attorney-General to request that the Speaker and the President table the report and make it available in less than the 28 days that otherwise applied. I did and that request has been made.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is warned.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The documents were provided to the parliament and to me to make that request.

**Mr Malinauskas:** Sure, but why hasn't the minister read it? Why won't you answer the question?

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, we have the question. The Leader of the Opposition is warned. The member for Kurna.

#### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:50):** Supplementary question to the Attorney-General following her answer: is the Attorney-General saying that the minister did not see any copy of the report until it was tabled in the parliament today?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:50):** I don't think I could add any more. Ask him.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is warned. The member for King—and the member for Kurna, if he's still here. The member for King.

#### LOT FOURTEEN

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is delivering on its commitment to make South Australia the nation's leader in innovation?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:50):** Yes, I can. I thank the member for King for her advocacy for her constituents' access to modern jobs in the innovation sector. I am very pleased to update the house on the progress of the FIXE innovation hub at Lot Fourteen. Last Thursday marked the official launch event for the innovation hub manager, Stone and Chalk. Already, we have 130 resident desks at the centre and over 35 start-up businesses. Those businesses include people who are working in the industry of cybersecurity, defence, space, artificial intelligence, big data analytics, creative industries, medtech, agtech, fintech and robotics. It all sounds extremely exciting. I can see your excitement from here, Mr Speaker.

The opening of the FIXE innovation hub has been a major milestone in the Lot Fourteen redevelopment, and I thank the Premier for his leadership at Lot Fourteen to get to this stage so quickly. The Marshall Liberal government has an ambition for Lot Fourteen to be the largest innovation precinct in the Southern Hemisphere, where eventually 650 start-up workplaces will spread across multiple buildings.

Having Stone and Chalk as the curator of our innovation hub is a major coup for South Australia. They have proven expertise as hub managers. This expertise will create employment and

global business opportunities right here in South Australia and assist with the government's goal of retaining and attracting the talent necessary for careers in new technologies here in South Australia. Stone and Chalk has also been celebrating the milestone of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, could you be seated for one moment. Member for West Torrens and member for Waite, you can both leave for the remainder of question time.

*The honourable members for West Torrens and Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Stone and Chalk have also been celebrating the raising of half a billion dollars in four years for their residents at their start-up centres in Sydney and Melbourne. Stone and Chalk are not only nurturing our local start-ups but also attracting new businesses from their start-up residents interstate and high-profile investors, who are partnering with local start-ups to create jobs and opportunities right here in South Australia.

One resident start-up at the hub is Ping, a company that uses machine learning to optimise the maintenance of wind turbines. It is incredible how, just by analysing the sound of the turbines blowing in the wind, they can actually determine if there is a crack in the wing, what size the crack might be or even if there is a chip at the end, which of course saves thousands and thousands of dollars in maintenance costs because they can get to the maintenance early.

The Ping Monitor recently won the Australian Technologies Competition in the new energy category, and they are tenants right here at the hub at Lot Fourteen. Another innovation hub resident is CyberOps, which has announced a partnership with the Department of Defence to determine how space technologies can be used for military purposes. I would say that fits in perfectly with the ambition that South Australia has to be the defence industry state.

As part of our growing space industry, this CyberOps contract will develop security for nanosatellites. I have to say how impressed I was to visit Inovor Technologies on Friday at Lot Fourteen with the minister, the Hon. Melissa Price, to sign the memorandum of understanding for another defence contract with the defence industries.

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:55):** My question is to the Attorney-General. When did the Minister for Health and Wellbeing first receive a copy, or his office receive a copy, of the ICAC report tabled today?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:55):** I am assuming that he has read the report from 11 o'clock like the rest of us. That is exactly why I have actually presented the correspondence to the President and to the Speaker to ask that it be tabled today.

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:55):** Supplementary: so the minister did not receive a copy before 11am today?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We have the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left, be quiet. We have the question. The clock is ticking. It's your question time. Would someone like to answer the question? The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:56):** I refer the member to my previous answer.

**SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General rule out the Minister for Health and Wellbeing receiving the ICAC report into SA Health before 11am today?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:56):** I can't answer it any clearer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think it has been very clearly identified in relation to this whole issue that the ICAC commissioner has met with the Premier and me after we came into office, has met with the Minister for Health, and in fact other ministers, to advise us in relation to matters. This is a matter which has been in the public arena. We have discussed—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Yes or no—which is it?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —this issue in relation to the concerns that Mr Lander had in relation to this, and he has provided a report. I was at a CAG meeting. I authorised this to be made available as promptly as it could be made available, and that is today.

**Mr Picton:** Did the minister get the report?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna is warned for a second and final time. The member for Flinders and then the leader.

**DOG FENCE**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on progress of the commonwealth, state and industry funded dog fence rebuild?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:57):** Thank you, sir, and thank you to the member for Flinders for his very important question. Yes, I was recently up in his electorate and travelled into some of the pasture country north of Ceduna to have a look at the very aged dog fence. A lot of that fence is over 100 years old, and it is a piece of infrastructure that has long been neglected.

What I can say is that the tender process is progressing nicely. What we have seen is that a Morrison Coalition, a Marshall Liberal government and industry have come together. They have collaborated and put \$25 million on the table for a rebuild of 1,600 kilometres of that fence. The fence in its totality is 2,150 kilometres. We embarked on a BDO report to highlight the inefficiencies and the weaknesses in that fence. Along the way we have made a commitment to the livestock industry as a priority to rebuild the majority of that fence to give certainty and security to the red meat sector and to the pastoralists here in South Australia.

What I can say is that on 1 March 2020 that dog fence will commence being built, and that is a landmark decision for the livestock industry. The Premier himself in the very near future is heading up to the pastoral country to have a look at the fence because we know the importance of that piece of infrastructure. It is a generational piece of infrastructure that has been overlooked by previous governments again and again, but no more. The tender process is out and expressions of interest will close on 10 December, and that is next week.

We have empowered a dog fence rebuild committee, ably led by Geoff Power, a well-known pastoralist here in South Australia, as well as Joe Keynes, the chair of Livestock SA. We've also got private owners of a section of the dog fence and dog fence committee members as part of that panel who have travelled to Queensland to understand the best ways, methods and materials that should be used to build a significant piece of infrastructure that we hope will last another 100 years. Those applications will be evaluated by PIRSA.

Once those tenders have been given for both materials and for the crews that will do the rebuild, it gives an opportunity for our pastoralists and our drought-affected farmers to be part of the rebuild. We know that, for some of those managers of the land, for some of those managers in our pastoral areas and also for some of the Aboriginal communities this presents an opportunity for them to be part of the rebuild.

Again, it can offset some of the job losses that have happened through that part of the country. Particularly, we have seen a lot of destocking, and we have seen a lot of impact, because a lot of those areas have not received rainfall for three years. For those of you who can only imagine what it means to those businesses, it means that their cash reserves are being drained, they have destocked and they are now looking for supplementary income. That supplementary income is an absolute certainty if they have the qualities and the skills to be part of those rebuild teams. It's going to take potentially four years to finish rebuilding that fence. In that time, we hope that it will rain again.

Once that dog fence is rebuilt, those pasture lands will restock. They will have a fence that will give them security. It will give them certainty about protecting their animals because we know that wild dogs are heading south. In my recent trip up to some Far North pastoral country, I passed through some of the station country and saw firsthand the pressure of wild dogs. Not only were there wild dogs in abundance up there but they had litters of dogs. That shows that they are breeding, they are moving south and they are putting more pressure on the viability of the sheep industry and the cattle industry.

More importantly, it's the health and wellbeing of our pastoralists that should be an absolute concern. While they lie awake in bed at night wondering how many sheep will be taken by those wild dogs, this piece of infrastructure that a Marshall Liberal government, a Morrison Coalition and industry have come together on as a collaboration is providing certainty for our red meat sector and it's providing certainty for South Australian exports.

#### **QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL CAR PARK**

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:02):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Minister, were local residents told that they would be informed of the opening date of the new multistorey QEH car park or that there would be an official opening they would be invited to?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:02):** I don't know whether local residents were invited or informed of an opening, but I would be very happy to take that on notice and try to get the information for the member.

#### **QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL CAR PARK**

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:02):** My question again is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Minister, when was the decision made to open the new multistorey car park at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital on 1 December and who made that decision?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:02):** Again, I would be very happy to take that question on notice and get those details from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

#### **REAL-TIME FUEL PRICING**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware that motorists in Queensland have saved \$122 million since the introduction of real-time fuel pricing?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:03):** I think the member is actually mistakenly referring to some data that is an opinion piece provided by, if I am correct, the equivalent of our RAA in Queensland. It was published in some material which was supplementary to another article of which there had been an assessment made on the effectiveness of their fuel app equivalent. This is a trial that they are undertaking. We have made inquiry with the government in Queensland as to the availability of the data that they are reviewing, which they have indicated would be available here before the end of the year. We are obviously expecting it fairly soon to review.

As the member knows, unfortunately, in relation to fuel apps that have been applied in New South Wales, the data reviews suggested that they may have increased fuel prices. The Victorian government did the same in looking at this matter and decided they would not progress with that option. The ACT, I think, are in a similar position. Western Australia have an entirely different approach. Queensland weren't all that keen on it, but they said they would do a trial. Obviously we are waiting to see what that trial is.

In the meantime, as I have advised the member for Florey and kept her briefed on this area of interest to her, I think the Western Australian model has some capacity and may, with modification, be able to give greater assistance to motorists. That's something we are also developing. We are trying to find out what will work and actually be of service without putting petrol prices up—it will obviously cost money whatever we do—and will not actually result in a disadvantage to motorists by having an overall increase in petrol prices.

Unfortunately, this is not as simple as one would expect: just put it in an app, that's easy; tick the box, this will be fine, we have actually provided a service. It has to work and it has to have no negative outcomes. We have reviewed the data that the member is referring to and we can seek some further information from Queensland.

They did recently, in the last few weeks, do an article on other information, which didn't ultimately turn out to be confirmed but, nevertheless, we are open to consideration of this material. I think our own Royal Automobile Association (RAA) are keen to try to come up with some resolution on the matter—so are we.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **SA HEALTH**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:06):** Another day goes by and more evidence of the government's mismanagement of Health—this time from the ICAC commissioner himself and this time following a request made by the ICAC commissioner to the government for resources to investigate SA Health. That request was made to the minister last year and that request was completely rejected by this government.

The ICAC commissioner said that he was aware of significant maladministration, misconduct and potential corruption and that he needed \$2 million over two years to conduct a proper inquiry into this matter. What did this government say? They told him no. They told him, 'We will not provide you the resources to do that.' Now what has happened is that the ICAC commissioner has delivered a preliminary report, based on the information that was available to him, that outlines some very serious revelations about what is going on in SA Health.

It talks about conflict of interest issues, it talks about bullying and harassment, it talks about contracting and procurement issues and it talks about the rights of private practice arrangements and benefit schemes underway in SA Health and their management. These are very serious issues. These are serious questions that have been raised. You would think that the government, now having had access to this report, would say, 'Well, we think this should actually be properly looked into and we should properly now have a proper ICAC inquiry. We were wrong before.'

But, no, not this government. They are continuing to deny the ICAC commissioner the resources he has requested to investigate our largest public sector agency that costs the state \$6.6 billion a year. Over two years, that is \$13,000 million that SA Health uses, but they are refusing \$2 million over two years to properly investigate the issues. Their response now is, 'We are going to have a committee of public servants to investigate the issues.' Well, what a weak response. It is such a weak response. It is a complete joke. It is dismissing these issues.

There is no way that this is going to get to the bottom of these issues. Getting the Premier's department, treasury department and health department boffins in a room is not going to address the issues that are in this report, so the question is: why does the government not want to properly get to the bottom of these issues? Why do they not want to properly investigate the issues that Bruce Lander has pointed to here? I do not think that there would be a South Australian out there who would think that the ICAC commissioner should not have every resource he needs to properly get to the bottom of these issues.



Then today, in question time, more dismissive attitude to this, more questions as to exactly what is going on and their management of this, and the minister telling the other place, 'I haven't finished reading the report yet.' This is the minister in charge of this \$6.6 billion portfolio, that has just been slammed by the ICAC commissioner, saying he has not finished reading the report. The Attorney-General's response to that is, 'Who knows, really? It's a bit unclear whether or not the report was provided to the minister before it was tabled in the parliament.'

I think it is a bit extraordinary that, if this report had not been provided to Health before 11am when the Speaker tabled it, the government would have had a response to that report ready to go for an 11.45 press conference and an 11.15 briefing of public sector unions. How would they have known what they were responding to if they had not read it before then? Was the Attorney-General wrong in saying that it had not been provided, or was it provided and the minister just had not got around to reading it over the past four days? This is not *Ulysses*: this is 64 pages. If you were the minister and you were getting slammed by the ICAC commissioner, you think you would find time in four days to read a 64-page report. I have almost finished it and we have only had it for a couple of hours.

This is just more evidence of the attitude of this government. We had the parading earlier today of the minister with almost all the heads of the local hospital networks. Who was missing? The Chief Executive of SA Health was missing. The person who is paid \$561,000 a year to administer this portfolio, Dr Chris McGowan, was missing and what was the Premier's response to that? 'Oh, he might have had some other pressing business to attend to.'

What is more pressing than dealing with the ICAC commissioner's report for the Chief Executive of SA Health, than being out there to talk about it and to answer questions about the administration and his responsibilities under the Health Care Act? This is a shocking betrayal of trust in their management of this issue. I think all South Australians will be ashamed that we do not have the ICAC getting the resources they need. It is yet another example of this government failing when it comes to the health care of this state.

Time expired.

#### KAVEL ELECTORATE

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:11):** Christmas is a time for family, love and friendship and it is a time when my community comes together to celebrate Christmas and the passing of the year. Many volunteers have been working exceptionally hard to ensure that our carols, pageants, parades and community events can be widely enjoyed in the Hills. I want to take a moment to acknowledge in this place the work of those volunteers.

Last Friday, I was able to join the Littlehampton community for Carols on the Glebe. The Glebe land comprises eight hectares of community land to the east of Littlehampton, and the Littlehampton Community Association has worked to protect the Glebe so that it can be enjoyed by future generations. I am very grateful for their work. The Littlehampton carols, amongst other events, demonstrate the value and utility of the Glebe as community open space.

I also want to mention LCA President, Glenn Liebelt; his daughter Amanda; secretary, Lyndal Schliebs; Michelle Raison; Kaye Nieuwenhuizen, who organised the letters to Santa; members of the Littlehampton hall committee, including Frank Jacob and his daughter Ruth; and, of course, stallholders, bands and community members who attended and participated.

On Saturday, the annual Balhannah/Oakbank Community Carols were held at Oakbank Area School. Many local families were able to attend. It was also an opportunity to thank CFS volunteers, ambulance volunteers and others who have worked so hard to assist fire-affected communities in South Australia, Queensland and New South Wales.

I also thank musical director, Karen Redman; the Mount Barker District Concert Band and the Mount Barker Big Band, who formed the carols superband; vocalists, Lisa Duffield, Ashleigh Jocks, Yvette Hawke, Eliza Lovelock, Willow Rist, Matilda Lovelock and Sophie McCallum; and the Hills Christian Community School vocalists, the Angelicus Choir from St Francis De Sales College, and JIVE from Cornerstone College, who made up the choir and ensembles on the night.

I would also like to acknowledge Ron Pitcher, David Fletcher, Michelle Bull and Kay Gibb for all their efforts as members of the organising committee, together with Karen Redman, who I mentioned earlier. I also acknowledge volunteers from the Balhannah Uniting Church who were also on hand to ensure the night was a success.

A number of further Christmas events are planned in Kavel. This Saturday promises to be a big day in Mount Barker. In the morning, the Mount Barker Christmas Pageant will wind its way through the township. I thank and acknowledge the president of the organising pageant committee, Phil Barnett; the secretary, Cherie de Wit; and the treasurer, Simone Hansen. I also acknowledge Judy Barnett, Greg Menei, Darcy Walsh, Chris Whittall, Gayle Allwood, Michael Buckley, Ben Herbig, Maria Lezuo, Shannon Hemmings and Matthew Lander.

On Saturday evening, following the Mount Barker pageant, Keith Stephenson Park will come alive for the Mount Barker Christmas carols. I wish to acknowledge and thank David Fletcher, Pastor Garry Leach, Father Thomas Karamakuzhiyil, Pastors Caleb and Renee Saldanha and many others who have been working hard to ensure the night is a success.

The Lobethal Valley will light up on Sunday 8 December for the Lights of Lobethal Christmas Festival. In the true Christmas spirit, the event has continued for over 60 years and has now evolved into what is believed to be the largest community Christmas light display in the Southern Hemisphere. The festival continues until Sunday 29 December.

The community of Nairne will come together for the Nairne Community Carols at Nairne Primary School on Saturday 14 December. The Nairne Community Carols is an annual event supported by the Nairne and Districts Residents' Association and enjoyed by approximately 300 people. I wish to recognise the carols' organising committee, comprising Ellen Lyall, Kelly Richardson, Emma Martin, Annette Gladigau and Margaret Vincent, for their work, as well as NDRA President, Stephen Lucas, and his team for their ongoing service to the Nairne community, and all other volunteers involved in bringing the event forward.

Finally, the Woodside Christmas Pageant will be held on Thursday 19 December. For many years, the pageant has been organised by parade coordinator, Jim Hennessey, and the Woodside Commerce Association. It is always a wonderful occasion. Jim has been ably assisted for many years by his wife, Glenice; Jodie Hogben; WCA President, Tremaine Kerber; MC Andrew Stratford; and a dedicated band.

Carols, pageants and parades bring joy and delight not just to my community but to many people across the state. It would not be possible to run them without the substantial commitment and passion of volunteers, some of whom I have acknowledged in this place in the time available to me. Their names are representative of all the volunteers in my community and volunteers across the state who continue to serve and enhance the Christmas spirit.

#### **INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:16):** Today is International Day of People with Disability. We celebrate the rich diversity that community members bring and also acknowledge the hardship and exclusion that they have experienced over the years. I think it is also a good time to remember that over the last year we have heard the federal government announce a disability royal commission, which I am sure we can all agree is long overdue. It is likely to highlight some horrific stories and the community needs to prepare for this.

I know many people will need support during this time and I am sure those in this place will be ready to provide that. I also hope that the royal commission can highlight and recommend some best practices that are occurring already in the space of disability. It should also help us to continue to make the sector safer and the service better and more dignified. The end result should be true equality and inclusion.

I will take the opportunity to do a review of 2019 from a human services point of view. It has been quite an eventful year. There has been a real need to focus on the transition of people from state-based disability support services and funding to the NDIS, which itself is an amazing scheme, but we cannot be complacent. As we in this place all know from the number of complaints and concerns that come through to our offices, it does not work for everybody all the time. People who

are within or transferring to the scheme often need somebody to support them in order to get better outcomes. We in this place are trying to do that.

One of the biggest issues of transition across this year has been the threatened end to the South Australian taxi subsidy scheme. This would leave many people in the disability space without any support because not everybody receives funding through the NDIS for transport. As we know, these people have also lost their Centrelink payments.

With that compounding amount, we have seen a great grassroots campaign happen, which I was happy to support with members of our parliamentary Labor Party. We have since heard the announcement of an extension to the scheme until 2021. We do need to watch this and make sure that actually happens for all people and that no hidden surprises or concerns come to light. There is still a long way to go in terms of transport and we will certainly be making sure that we hold the federal government and the state Liberal government to account for those changes.

It was a pretty embarrassing backflip that we saw from the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Michelle Lensink) in the other place. She had to walk away from plans to privatise the supported disability accommodation after concerns were highlighted not just by participants but by their families and carers and by workers regarding that privatisation.

With the introduction of the NDIS, we have also seen the rapid withdrawal of block funding arrangements from the disability space. Many organisations have come forward independently to talk about this, including Deaf Can:Do and the Royal Society for the Blind. Many have raised concerns that their financial position and their capacity to deliver services have been compromised by the withdrawal of block funding and the transition to the NDIS, which simply does not equate to the same capacity to provide services as it did before. We need to fight to get this reviewed, and we need to see a better way forward for people with a disability who have previously received block-funded services.

Homelessness is an issue that we all think is becoming more visible in our community, particularly in the CBD. Those numbers came to light in May 2019. Since the Marshall government was elected in 2018, inner city homelessness has pretty much doubled. According to the Don Dunstan Foundation's by-name list, there are currently around 150 people living rough on the streets of the City of Adelaide. We have seen delays by the minister in the calling of Code Blue on cold, wet evenings. This means that people on our streets suffer through extreme conditions, and one woman sadly passed away in the South Parklands. It should not happen. We need to see investment in more services and shelter provisions around the state and in the CBD.

We also need to see a stop in the rise of Housing Trust rents. I met with a woman named June in Modbury last week. Her rent has increased by 10 per cent over the past 12 months, which has seen poor June have to give up her home insurance, stop eating meat and give up her private health insurance. It is a disgrace.

### **MOUNT GAMBIER ELECTORATE**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:21):** The definition of the word 'representative' is 'a person chosen or appointed to act or speak for others'. I represent the seat of Mount Gambier, including the largest regional city in South Australia, and the surrounding communities. My electorate has over 35,000 people, and I can tell you I take that responsibility very seriously.

To stand here, you have to put aside your own interests, opinions and ego and work for the people you represent. By that, I mean all of them, not just those who tick your name on the ballot box. You have to be a champion, an advocate and a fighter for your electorate and, above all, accountable to the people. You have to be a good speaker but also a good listener, and not always to those whose voices are the loudest. As the Dalai Lama says:

When you talk, you are only repeating what you already know. But if you listen, you may learn something new.

Thousands of people contact my office each year, and at this time I want to thank those who have done so. They do this in person, via phone, Facebook or email, and they bring to my attention matters that I do not always know about. The path to legislative change, funding wins or opportunity have often begun with a simple conversation with a member of my community.

By working constructively with the state government, we can achieve big things. Representative democracy is often described as government 'of the people, by the people, for the people'. One of my greatest achievements in office so far has been the enactment into law of the 10-year moratorium on fracking. It is an achievement for me because that is what the people of the Limestone Coast told me they wanted.

Contentious issues bring with them immense pressure to heed all the different sides and opinions, the views of activists, interest groups and lobbyists, but you can never lose sight of the issue at hand: what your electorate truly needs. When a politician can be influenced, they lose the power to influence. When it comes to politics, particularly in recent years, memories are short.

Recent statistics show that trust in politicians and politics is at an all-time low. For me, this is a sad fact. Trust is based on a simple premise: do what you say you are going to do, be open and transparent, admit your mistakes and work for the greater good. Each year, legislation comes before parliament and has the potential to have considerable impact on the lives of South Australians. Issues include abortion, land tax, sex work decriminalisation and euthanasia.

As their representative, I welcome my community telling me their thoughts and opinions on every piece of legislation. My personal opinions might differ, but it is my job to ensure the views of my constituents are fairly represented. For my part, a bill that is poorly written or does not go far enough to address the concerns of my constituents will not get my vote. In my speeches, I have often mentioned Sir Thomas Playford, South Australia's longest running Premier. He is a politician I greatly admire. Sir Playford once had these words said about him by Steele Hall:

Playford is still the greatest champion South Australia ever had... South Australia was ever so much the better because of him.

Long after I am gone, I hope my time in office is remembered in a similar way for my electorate. It is an immensely powerful thing for someone to tick your name on the ballot box and place their trust in you as a representative. I thank the people of my electorate for continuing to place their trust in me.

## TOURISM

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:26):** Of course, it was the Liberal government that came up with the 'old mate' campaign. Not even two years into their term, this campaign was widely panned as offensive, out of touch and not representative of South Australians, and that is exactly what we have with this Marshall Liberal government. The only contribution that the Liberals have been able to make in this portfolio has been to advertise party houses, launch 'old mate' and deliver cuts to tourism. The Marshall Liberal government has turned its back on South Australian tourism. In fact, they are taking tourism backwards, and I will explain why.

Tourism is a supergrowth industry. Since 2013, the growth rate of visitor spend is triple that of our gross state product. Jobs growth in tourism is 15 times greater than the rest of the economy. It is going well nationally, but in South Australia our national share is decreasing. The Tourism Industry Council South Australia recently released their modelling that shows that we are missing out on almost \$1 billion a year in economic activity because our national share is slipping. That could have been an additional 5,400 jobs in our state. We need our fair share of tourism.

But the Marshall Liberal government is doing the complete opposite of what needs to be done. More tourism equals more jobs for South Australians. Our state has more than 18,000 tourism-related businesses across the state; they directly employ about 39,000 people in South Australia. But our drop in international tourism numbers is alarming. South Australia gets only \$3.50 for every \$100 spent by international visitors to Australia and, under this government's watch, international visitor spend is down 5 per cent.

Adelaide's hotel supply is growing rapidly. It is expected that hotel room supply will be increased by 20 per cent by 2021. These hotels need to be occupied with paying customers, otherwise what has been a really positive investment will just dry up and the pipeline, which takes some time, will not be there for the future. The whole tourism sector has been unequivocal: increased government investment in tourism advertising will help boost tourism. Let us remember that the vast majority of tourism operators are small to medium enterprises. They do not have the capacity to launch large-scale advertising campaigns.

What have we seen under this government? It cuts the advertising budget, and now it is at a five-year low. These are savage cuts to tourism: \$23 million cut from the South Australian Tourism Commission over five years. They are savage cuts, and these cuts will have direct negative consequences to our visitor economy. That is how short-sighted this government are. They do not see a \$1 billion lost opportunity: they just see a \$23 million cost saving.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey):** Order! Member for Ramsay, you have the call.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** If the government are content for their legacy in tourism to be 'old mate', so be it—that is their decision—but we on this side of the chamber want what is best for South Australian jobs. The Minister for Tourism cannot hide from this. He needs to be held responsible.

It was with great concern that I heard the minister's comments on radio yesterday morning. When asked about 'old mate' and his role in it, his answer was, 'I am just a minister.' Unfortunately, whether he likes it or not, he is the minister. He is the minister and part of a government that clearly has no interest in South Australia trying to get its fair share of this supergrowth tourism industry. They are busy patting themselves on the back, largely due to a target set by the previous Labor government.

Time expired.

#### **KING ELECTORATE AWARDS**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:31):** Today, I would like to speak about the recent kindness and volunteer awards that I have presented in schools in my electorate of King on behalf of the King community. I have been so very inspired by the recipients put forward at our local schools. One of my favourite sayings is, 'In a world where you can be anything, be kind.' I would like to thank our local schools for providing me with the opportunity to be involved in their special events and hand out some awards.

The King Kindness Award was introduced last year as a way of recognising students who have shown considerable acts of kindness to their peers and out in the community. At the 2019 Golden Grove High School year 11 final assembly, I had the opportunity to present the King Kindness Award to Gemma McCann. Gemma was selected by the school due to how she positively relates so well to both adults and her peers, constantly showing her caring nature. Gemma was commended for her support and empathy for others. Overall, Gemma has had an outstanding year, showing exemplary caring and kindness in so many ways.

At the Golden Grove High School year 12 graduation ceremony, I had the opportunity to present this kindness award to Kimberley Cornelius. Kimberley was selected as she has been a source of guidance and constant encouragement for her peers. She has made her learning community the best it can be by role modelling respect and inclusivity and promoting social justice. Her patience, kindness and caring nature make her a very deserving winner.

At the Our Lady of Hope School and Greenwith Primary School annual joint campus volunteers' morning tea, I had the opportunity to present the Paula Luethen Volunteer Award to Alan Murphy from Our Lady of Hope and to Cristy Hinttala from Greenwith Primary School. Alan was selected based on how much volunteering he does for the school and how, on an ongoing basis, he supports staff and students. I have known Alan for many years as the volunteer helping students at Pedare primary and Golden Grove primary safely cross the road and always with a smile.

At Greenwith primary, Cristy was selected due to all the help she has provided in all areas across the school, including classroom support, school camps and the canteen, and for SAPSASA with the transportation of students. Cristy is also working and raising a family but still makes time to volunteer. She is an amazing lady who came to see me after the award to give back her donated cheque for it to be regifted to a cancer charity fundraising team. It will now be given to Alison Warner, a local and Greenwith primary school teacher, who has herself raised nearly \$200,000 in the last few years for cancer-fighting causes. What absolutely amazing, generous ladies.

At Tyndale Christian School's year 12 graduation and presentation assembly, held recently at the Influencers Church because so many people come along, I had the opportunity to present the Paula Luethen RISE Award to Faith Rantala-Hay and the Paula Luethen Volunteer Award to Stella Salter.

Faith was selected for the RISE Award, where candidates are considered and selected based on the Tyndale criteria of respect, integrity, service and excellence. Faith was selected based on her respectfulness, genuineness, work ethic, determination, striving for excellence and for always being encouraging and understanding of others.

Stella was selected for her volunteer efforts over 20 years of volunteering in the art department, canteen and classrooms during her children's and grandchildren's time at the school. Amazing Stella has now chosen to retire from her volunteering at the age of 81. Her contribution has been immeasurable.

At Salisbury East High School's senior school awards and graduation leavers ceremony, recently held at the Golden Grove Arts Centre, I had the opportunity to present the kindness award to Sam Georgiou. People throughout the stadium cheered for Sam. He was recognised for his kindness displayed to his peers overall and the way he positively represents the school.

At Golden Grove's Pinnacle College year 6 graduation dinner, held recently at the Stamford Plaza, my Kindness Award was presented to Nada Al Balawi. Nada was a very popular winner and was chosen by her school for kindness. Thanks, everyone, and well done.

#### *Bills*

### **GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATED AREA) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:37):** I was speaking to this genetically modified crops bill and the area of niche markets. The member for Mawson would be interested that we are keeping Kangaroo Island exempt from lifting this moratorium. I want to touch on niche markets and the fact that I think Kangaroo Island, if it chooses to remain in a moratorium environment based on its grower sentiment, is welcome to do so. One of the reasons I am supportive of that idea is that it is an island surrounded by water and it can be managed well.

I think Kangaroo Island may also want to pick up Kangaroo Island-type marketing opportunities that may come their way, if they choose to go down this line and stay that way, but it has to be proven that it is a market and a benefit. If it is not and the impetus is turned away—in other words, they turn it down because the opportunity is lost by having no access to genetically modified crops—then that should also be addressed later on in the future.

One of the things that is really frustrating for the area of MacKillop is that we are a state electorate bordered by Victoria. We have farmers and operators in that region who farm both in Victoria and South Australia and run enterprises over a line in the sand. It was certainly difficult for them to operate their cropping regimes when on one side of the line they were allowed to put in whatever crop they so desired and on the other side of the line, the South Australian side, they were restricted by rules and regulations.

Another issue to touch on in relation to niche markets is that, yes, they can have a premium. They can be highly sought and economically viable for some, but one thing about niche markets is that they are all small and only really owned by a few. One of the things that we have to do in government is to manage for everyone, and I think lifting the moratorium for South Australia is an advantage for all rather than restricting the majority to look after the few who may participate outside that line or guidelines.

With respect to access to markets, evidence was presented that, for instance, the markets for canola exports from Australia to the EU did not support the view that South Australians enjoy better access to EU non-GM grain markets. It is interesting that, in regard to having a moratorium, the rationale from the previous government was that they thought that we would have better access to world markets because we would be GM free.

Something that really flies in the face of that, as the member for Flinders highlighted, is that one of the most genetically modified crops—and successful in that, too—is the cotton crop. I know this from data and from being in New South Wales for a period that cotton used to be sprayed 12 times to keep insects like heliothis out of the canola crop, and now they are back down to five sprays because of genetically modified new varieties that are more resistant to insects.

Cotton oil and cottonseed, but particularly the oil, is the most used oil in food processing in the world, particularly for frying, yet it is a highly genetically modified crop. Although we do not consume it directly as a food substance, it is certainly used in the cooking of food, and it has never been considered a problem nor does it cause any issues. The environmental benefits of such genetically modified varieties has been a huge win for that industry as well as general consumers because it means that buying a product that is produced more cheaply and is more accessible means that it feeds more people around the world at an affordable price.

Research funds have been lost to other states based on our GM-free status, which is restricting research to market pathways. This means that our state is attracting fewer research dollars, scientists and postgraduate students. This investment is going to other states that are not subject to GM crops with a moratorium over them. I know that we still have research going on here.

I know that scientists in South Australia are still looking at the opportunities that GM might be available to South Australia, but South Australia certainly had the doors closed to these opportunities, and I know now that, once this moratorium is lifted, the Waite Institute and perhaps other universities, like Roseworthy, will have more opportunity to pursue genetically modified crops that would benefit not just canola we have heard and talked about so far.

A couple of opportunities I have heard about include looking at wine grapes and grape varieties that are more frost resistant to those we have today. Certainly, as the climate has changed slightly in our regions, we have seen more damage in the early period of fruit set, particularly in my region in the Limestone Coast, where over the last few years we have been hit hard by patches of frost. You can see that by the number of wind fans that have been used to try to protect these crops and also sprinkler irrigation trying to mitigate against the frost as well.

Another opportunity I have been made aware of is that lucerne might be a good answer for a region on the northern end of my electorate, perhaps even reaching into the good, dry country of Hammond where we have a rising watertable region between Salt Creek Road going up and through to Tailern Bend. The watertable seems to be getting closer and closer. There used to be a huge amount of lucerne in that region 20, 30, 40 years ago, but obviously that is no longer the case.

Certainly, we are planting lucerne in those regions, but if the watertable continues to rise we are going to want lucerne varieties that can utilise a more saline watertable, and perhaps if the water comes closer to the surface we are going to need lucerne varieties that can accept a little bit of what they call 'wet feet'. These are all opportunities through science and research, and if we are a state that is open to that research, if we are a state that pursues these opportunities, then this can be pursued in the full breadth of what that might be, rather than thinking, 'Oh, but we've got a GM moratorium. We can't use those genetics. We won't look that hard anymore.' If this moratorium is lifted, we can go full steam ahead in this direction.

Segregation of GM and non-GM crops is working. Segregation and identity preservation protocols and codes of practice are robust and can ensure the successful coexistence of GM and non-GM crops. I know that it is always fraught with danger. I know that if you just have a blanket rule you could say that it is more assured, but apparently we can put processes in place that will meet the needs of those who wish to be GM free and keep those GM harvests free from those that are not GM.

Community sentiment is supportive of allowing GM-crop production. The community engagement process, undertaken as part of the review, resulted in the majority of submissions being in favour of the immediate removal of the moratorium. There has been extensive consultation in this area. We know that the farming community really are looking for a change through this moratorium, to have the opportunity to plant as they like, to make their life and their business model stack up as much as possible. I want to just touch on that.

This morning's contributions were very interesting, particularly the contribution from the member for West Torrens. He accused the government of not working through the right processes. Yes, we may be jumping the gun. Yes, he may think that this is a quick move at the end of the parliamentary process this year. But this is a new discussion—he knows that. It is something that has been running along for many years. He knows of the opposition that we as a party had while we were in opposition. It is ironic that they have not been as straight as they claim to be.

The Labor government did a few things in its last few weeks or months of government. When we were in opposition, we as a party felt that those matters were railroaded through. One of those was the extension of this moratorium. That was railroaded through in the last few months of their government. Another thing that was railroaded through in the last couple of months that the opposition were in government was the reduction of the speed limit down to 100 km/h on eight roads, and there was another one that does not come to mind right now.

The government of the day before the last election claimed that we might be scuttlebutting, saying that we were not doing all that we could to work through the processes of parliament. There is a time line. It is not news to the opposition that this government is opposed to the moratorium. The minister has done everything he can to engage with the opposition and the community, with looking at the select committee and all the pros and cons of this moratorium, and it has been found that we are well justified in putting this bill through so quickly.

It is anticipated that there will be many benefits to farmers. We are missing out on the benefits of new crop breeding technologies, the disease resistance of new crops and the ability to grow breeds of crops that can better handle climate variability. The Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill is a bill that our state needs to ensure that South Australia does not continue to suffer from the lack of opportunities and costs to farmers, research facilities and agricultural productivity that is playing out under our current GMO-free status.

I want to highlight opportunity costs. We can look back in the mirror and say, 'We missed it. It's gone.' I think it has been quoted that this moratorium has already cost us \$33 million. There will be \$5 million more lost in opportunity costs if we do not move this through between now and when the moratorium was to be reviewed in 2025. The previous government needs to understand that opportunity costs can never be caught back. They have gone. You do not go back and catch them again.

The amount of \$38 million that this moratorium would forgo cannot be found on the next fruit tree or in the next canola crop in the next run of cropping rotations. That is all history. I liken it to benchmarking in the business world of livestock that I work in. In a life of benchmarking of 10 years, there are two optimum years in which you must get it right. That is when your stars are aligned and you have good seasons, good commodity prices and good management. You cannot miss them. If you do miss them, you cannot go back and pick them up again. If you lose one or those two years you are only going to have one good year in 10 years.

I call this opportunity costs. We want to see this state ticking all boxes financially for our croppers and farming families who work on the land. Although they are going through dry periods now—and the years have been harder and harder because of the lack of rainfall, and seasonal outcomes are out of our control—choosing the right crop is not beyond their management decisions. They should be allowed to choose the right crop, the right variety, and perhaps they need to do it more than ever because of our variable climate.

The Marshall Liberal government is seeking to grow our agricultural sector, enhance and expand the ability for our research facilities to attract funds and to build our knowledge base for the future of the agricultural sector in South Australia. To do this we need to remove the impediments to growth. This bill is about removing impediments and enabling opportunities and choice for our farmers. I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:49):** I rise to make a brief contribution on the bill. I strongly support the removal of the moratorium on genetically modified crops on the South Australian mainland and note my frustration with being compelled to undertake this additional parliamentary process, which was required due to the actions last week of the Labor Party, in conjunction with the



Greens and SA-Best, to block and disallow the regulations that were to lift the moratorium and take effect on Sunday 1 December 2019.

The research, debate and discussion have been well and truly done on this issue. It has been an ongoing debate for some time, with extensive consultation over several years and a high-level independent expert review and a GM Crop Advisory Committee, ironically set up under the former Labor government, which recommended the lifting. Another parliamentary select committee also made clear recommendations that the lifting of the moratorium would finally free our farmers to have the same choices to use new and improved crop varieties that farmers in all other jurisdictions on mainland Australia have long had access to.

It is very disappointing that Labor, Greens and SA-Best chose to play politics and debate parliamentary processes and procedures while our farmers continue to face reduced yields and further hits to their bottom lines as a result of this continued ban on their using modern, universally available crop varieties, scientifically proven to better cope with drought, weed management and disease. This is a serious setback for our agriculture sector, as publicly stated by the National Farmers' Federation, Grain Producers SA and the Australian Seed Federation.

The bill before us now will right the unnecessary disadvantage that South Australian farmers currently have and give an actual outcome for our primary producers rather than more political posturing and ignorance of all the research and consultation that have been done that have provided the evidence that it is in this state's best interest to lift the GM ban that has proven to be ineffective. It is removing choices for our farmers, it is penalising our farmers and it is costing our farmers money. It is time for politicians to get out of the way and trust in the ability of our farmers to grow this state in every way possible available to them.

Back in November 2017, when the bill by the Greens to extend the moratorium until 2025 was put forward, passed the upper house by a single vote and went on to be passed by the lower house, Grain Producers SA described that decision as an unmitigated disaster. Their chair, Wade Dabinett, stated that the moratorium to that point had 'put us a decade behind other states and I am flabbergasted that this topic is still being discussed'. Way back then, in November 2017, Grain Producers SA expressed anger that this issue was being 'kicked around like a political football at the expense of a significant industry—agriculture', and the National Farmers' Federation was equally disappointed.

One can only imagine how frustrated our farmers and stakeholders are now, two years on, culminating again last week in the disallowance of the regulation process that would have most efficiently corrected this issue for our farmers once and for all. Growers in all other grain producing states are successfully growing GM canola for better weed management, better prices, increased competition, better yields and with access to improved varieties developed to tackle drought and climate change better. They are making informed decisions about what to sow, based on their individual businesses and specific conditions.

We cannot afford to continue to disadvantage our South Australian farmers by this GM ban. The extensive reviews show the stance is economically damaging. The independent review found the GM moratorium had cost this state's canola farmers at least \$33 million since 2004, which would extend to an additional \$5 million if that moratorium were allowed to continue to 2025. It has discouraged investment in public and private research

What a wonderfully underutilised investment that might be and the chances that might provide for future crop development. Great minds, like the member for Newland, could be working on things like this for improved GM options, which would be fantastic. It is discouraged at the moment and it has failed to provide a premium compared with prices paid to growers in neighbouring states. If there were a massive marketing advantage for this state to remain GM free, this evidence would be clear, but there is not.

It is time to lift the moratorium. Those who wish to continue to grow GM-free canola can do so. Segregation has proven to be successful interstate. Let's not delay this reform any further with more political posturing. I put to this house that there is absolutely no excuse not to pass the bill through both houses this week. This has been a live issue for some weeks. The merits of it should have been debated, investigated and interrogated at length by everyone in this chamber in that time.

To claim that it cannot be debated now because we need more time to consult and review is, in my view, a ridiculous proposition.

We need to get this done this week and not put at threat next season's sowing. We need to give growers the certainty to order and buy seed so they can get ready to plant it in time for next season. They have done without for long enough and we need to provide them with all the means necessary to have a profitable business going forward. I commend the bill to the house and urge those who are here to stop debating political procedure and give farmers certainty for next season.

Failure to pass this bill through both houses this week will mean that farmers are unduly laden with that uncertainty until next season and are potentially subjected to another year without access to the same technology that their interstate colleagues are using. They will not have that access, which is not fair to them.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:55):** I rise to support the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill 2019. Much has been said about science and much has been said about time, and I am going to add a little bit more to this debate. Quite frankly, it is ridiculous that our farmers have been denied this technology for the last 15 years simply based on ideology, and it is ideology.

What we are talking about here with genetically modified crops is basically accelerated breeding. We have seen our fantastic Waite campus—our great research centre here in South Australia—hampered in its ability to fully utilise its plant breeding services and the plant accelerator process, certainly in regard to the GM side of that research, because of this Stone Age approach to genetically modified crops.

If people did the research and had a look at which supermarket foods are genetically modified they would be absolutely stunned. As has been said here today, there are hundreds of products but the one I want to dwell on for the moment is soy, 99 per cent of which comes from a genetically modified source. Basically, you could say 100 per cent. Anyone who has anything to do with soy milk or soy lattes, you are consuming a genetically modified product.

Something else that has been discussed today is Bt cotton. What a boon it was to develop Bt cotton so that many insecticide sprays did not have to be used. In the old days, cotton crops were maybe sprayed 10 to 12 times and now it might be only two to five times because of the benefits of that genetically modified product. I know from being a farmer—and I have grown plenty of canola in the past, thousands of acres of it, obviously not GM canola—that you want to have the best seed you can get and the best access to technology. With whatever crops you grow, you want to use the least amount of insecticide possible.

Two products I have used in my farming career are spray seed and insecticide sprays. They are some of the most dangerous sprays you can handle. Obviously, insecticides kill living organisms. I guess any chemical will have a detrimental effect on you in the right amount, but insecticides—S7s and S8s—can really have a damaging effect. I have spoken before in this place about how DDT was previously used in large quantities in the agriculture sector. It was a great chemical but I think it was overused.

Before GPS technology, we used it with the spray planes to spray barley grub in crops. You would stand there with a red flag and then run 30 or 40 yards to the next spot for the next mark. Occasionally, the tap did not come off so you wore a bit of DDT. Certainly, knowing as a young bloke that you had to get in and get sheep that would not come out of those arsenic-based dips that used to be used, you had to be very careful how you managed these products.

I would like to commend what has happened in the cotton industry, not that there has been a lot of cotton grown, obviously, with the crisis in the Murray-Darling Basin, as generally cotton is only grown when there is rain. We know that Cubbie Station has been dry for two years, and that is just one place; there are plenty of others that grow cotton north of South Australia. When they are growing it, if there has to be less insecticide, that is only a bonus and a boon for people growing that crop and operating in the field.

When I look at drugs that have been manufactured with genetic modification, one is insulin for sugar diabetes. What a great boon that is for people suffering the health effects of sugar diabetes.

We would not have insulin if it were not for genetic modification, and that is just a fact. As the member for Finniss said, some of the flu vaccines that most of us are injected with have some level of genetic modification.

So the time for debate is over. We need to get on with it and we need to pass this legislation. It is a real shame that when people get off their ideological bandwagon they then resort to process and say that process was not followed when we used regulation, or the minister used regulation from this side of the house, to get rid of the moratorium. I call on people in the parliament to have a good think about how they are voting on this. We are going to get there: we either do it this way or we do it the regulatory way. People can disallow and we can bring back the regulations.

Why are people standing in the way of our drought-stricken farmers? We have people in here preaching to us about climate change and their views of the world, but when it gets to this will they really stand up and vote to support this change? I notice that in his speech the member for Giles, the shadow minister for agriculture, talked about a lot of things, but what he could not bring himself to say—he is probably not allowed to because they speak as one over there, or so we are told—was that he actually supports this. He could not say that. He wanted to say it. It would be churning him up inside. It would be just chewing him out.

I would have loved to have been around the table for some of the conversations he would have had with the Labor members—the member for Mawson and others—because this might be causing quite a bit of internal division on the other side. It is absolute madness that at a time when farmers not just in this state but right across this country are really suffering with the effects of dry and drought we restrict the ability to use one of the absolute vital tools and to give them choice.

This does not mean that 10,000 farmers are going to go out there and sow canola. What it means is that the many thousands of farmers in this state can make a choice and say, 'Hang on. Yes, we'll have a go. We'll put in a paddock or two and see how it goes.' It is all about rotation. In discussing that, I note the fantastic contribution from the Deputy Speaker, the member for Flinders, on the use of Roundup.

I believe, as he does, that Roundup is the greatest invention since traction engines. It has been a boon for agriculture. We seem to have this senseless debate in other parts of the world, where they are trying to say that Roundup is this huge problem. I can tell you, and I have said it in this place before, that if you get rid of glyphosate, or Roundup, the trade name, you will have one of the biggest environmental problems known to man. If we ever go back to farming the way we used to, when we used to cultivate land many multiple times, we will have a real problem.

It irks me that we came into this place today and heard all the filibustering, votes and calls for division so that we would not reach a decision. Labor members—we do not yet know whether it is most of them or all of them—blocked the regulatory change and are putting the livelihoods of South Australian farmers at risk. This is putting another tool in the toolbox so that our farmers can catch up with their counterparts in the Eastern States and Western Australia.

It is ludicrous. This moratorium has been in place for far too long. Seed has to be transported around South Australia to reach Western Australia. It is absolutely farcical. I know that genetically modified seed has been grown in South Australia under licence. Trials have been conducted with genetically modified seed. Farmers who own land on both sides of the border can quite happily grow genetically modified canola or safflower on the Victorian side but not on the South Australian side. It is keeping us so far back on a production basis and on a research basis that it is absolutely ludicrous.

Some of those in this house or in the other place who use words like 'process' make out that they are the farmers' friend. Let's see who are the farmers' friends. Let's see who stands up in this debate this week, because this bill will sniff you out. This bill will identify the farmers' friends, because farmers just want the right to grow this. As I said, they do not have to grow it.

Some interesting things have happened over time. There was a significant court case in Western Australia that involved a crop between Kojonup and Katanning. Some friends of mine live very close to where that happened, and all was not as it seemed. There were allegations of manipulation to achieve a result. There has been some senseless carry-on in the background of this debate. We just need to get on with it. We need to move this legislation.

Yes, we have brought it in this week because the regulatory change could not happen. There is feigned outrage from the other side, especially from the member for West Torrens. He is trying to preach to our side about procedure, especially to our new team from 2018. I am not going to be lectured by the member for West Torrens, when I sat for three terms in opposition and saw what the previous government did with regard to bills that were introduced and debated without notice.

If you are going to make an argument, come in here with clean hands. The member for West Torrens does not have clean hands on this issue. I refer to a piece of legislation that was debated in this way. When the planning bill was debated in 2016, the then member for Enfield (Hon. John. Rau) introduced 300 amendments to his own legislation. You have to wonder why the previous government had 300 amendments to their own planning legislation. Yes, it was big legislation, but you would think they would have had it organised.

We were not at the introduction stage of the legislation, as we were today when we heard the feigned outrage. We were 50 clauses into the committee stage when the Hon. John Rau introduced environment and food protection areas as part of the legislation. It was outrageous. I have heard the feigned outrage from the other side in this place and how we are terrible people. If you are going to make those accusations, come in here with clean hands.

It is absolutely ridiculous. As to the Environment and Food Production Areas, I know some people may think that I, as a farmer, would think that it is a great idea, that we can slow down development so that farmers do not have the opportunity to build a second house on their property, maybe for a son or a daughter or a workman. But it actually hinders the development process, which is obviously going through the Planning and Design Code changes now under that legislation through our new minister, the member for Schubert. But it is actually a hindrance. We have enough regulatory process and enough red tape during the planning process.

I have the bizarre situation in my electorate where on one side of the river, in the Rural City of Murray Bridge, they are affected by the Environment and Food Production Area and, on the other side, with the Coorong District Council they are not. It is just absolutely bizarre. It hinders development and there is no sense in it. Yes, people can check *Hansard*, do their homework. At the 50<sup>th</sup> clause in committee, that was introduced, so people should come in here with clean hands if they are going to wring their hands. It was not the only piece of legislation that has been pushed through.

For people to think this has snuck up on them out of the blue, where have they been for the last 15 years since the moratorium was put through with legislation in 2004? They must have been hiding under a rock. There have been reports, there have been committees and there has been a lot of research. Let's just get on with it and give our farmers the choice, and it is just the choice. They do not have to grow it. Get on board. Nothing has gone wrong in Victoria, nothing has gone wrong in New South Wales. We have not seen dramas in Western Australia. What the heck are we doing?

Let's get behind our farmers. For all those people in this place, or that other place somewhere else in this building, they want to have a good think about whether they are the farmer's friend. I support the legislation.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:11):** It probably will not surprise too many people that I rise to oppose the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designated Area) Amendment Bill 2019. It has been terrific to sit here and listen to everyone's contribution. I think we need to have a respectful discussion about this because this is not necessarily politicians versus farmers, city people versus farmers or however some people try to characterise it. There are farmers who have a particular point of view and other farmers out there who see it a different way. Some want the GM moratorium kept in place; others obviously want it lifted.

What we need to do in this place is look out for the good of all in some instances, and that is not always a very easy thing to do. But I do point out, as I have over the years, that when we look down at the carpet here and we see the wheat and the grapes it shows the important connection that this parliament has always had to the land and to farmers and food producers in South Australia.

If we look back to the late 1800s, when the phylloxera act came into being in South Australia, I think that is a great demonstration of how our parliament can work with the farming sector to ensure that we have the very best standards in Australia. I do not say that lightly because we are the only

mainland state in Australia that is phylloxera free because of that legislation that was brought in in the late 1800s. Successive governments have maintained those strict controls on vines and rootstock coming into our state.

That is a pretty good claim when you are surrounded by Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia that all have phylloxera. When you look at how phylloxera devastated the European vineyards and North America back in the 1800s, it was very prudent and excellent work by the politicians of the day, working with the wine industry, to ensure that we had the right framework in place to keep phylloxera out.

We have also had outstanding success through a lot of hard work by both sides of parliament to keep fruit fly out of South Australia. We saw Victoria and New South Wales just throw their hands up basically and say, 'We cannot beat it,' yet South Australia, which sits there surrounded by these other states, has managed to remain fruit fly free.

When I was agriculture minister, we spent a lot of time building up our premium reputation around our food and wine. If we look at New Zealand and their Pure New Zealand market angle, there is no doubt that people, consumers right around the world, really go after the purest products they can get, and they are willing to pay a premium for that. When we went into department stores and food halls in Malaysia, and when we went to conferences with buyers in China, Europe and North America, we told the story.

I heard someone over here (it might have been the member for Narungga) use the phrase: 'Politicians should get out of the way and let the farmers get on with their business.' I agree with that, and that is traditionally what we have done, but when it comes to things like phylloxera and fruit fly we have worked with them to come up with the discipline and framework to keep us pure in South Australia. Being able to stand up in these places overseas and promote the fact that we are one of the few jurisdictions anywhere in the world that is fruit fly free, phylloxera free and where it is illegal to grow GM crops was a huge selling point.

I think we need to look at that when we talk about lifting the moratorium on the growing of GM crops. We have heard a lot of people talk about how it will save the planet in terms of providing more food and all these sorts of things. At the moment, the only thing that a farmer could grow in South Australia is the GM canola, which is able to be sprayed with weedkillers. We need to put it all in context. The seeds to plant what people want to lift the GM moratorium for are not out there yet, so we cannot solve all those problems and do all those things that many people in this place have argued that we can do today.

We need to keep that in the back of our minds to ensure that we do not get a bit carried away and tell the community that we can offer them something that we cannot actually offer them. As I said at the outset, this is not city people versus farmers. This is a discussion that has pitted farmers against farmers in many parts of our state and in the area that I represent, which is the western side of the Fleurieu and, of course, Kangaroo Island, which I am very grateful is being carved out and can remain a GM-free spot.

A lot of farmers on this side of Backstairs Passage want to remain in a zone or a state that is GM free. I think of people like Ben Ryan down at Deep Creek, who is doing an amazing job on his farm. I have been out to visit him, as well as Trevor Paech near Mount Compass. I have been out to talk with Tom Bradman, who is at Finniss. He is doing an amazing job with his poultry, which he only feeds GMO-free seed. They want us to keep the moratorium on the growing of GM crops in South Australia.

It is not just one side of politics versus a bunch of farmers. It is a lot more complex than that, and I think that all sides of the argument should be heard. When we look at what the agribusiness sector is worth to South Australia, first of all, it is worth a lot of jobs because one in six working South Australians is employed in the agribusiness sector. If we look at what food and wine is worth to South Australia, it is around \$21 billion a year, which is an amazing boost to our economy in South Australia.

The significant input that crops provide to the \$21 billion for food and wine is about \$4 billion or \$4.2 billion and the make-up of canola is about 5 per cent. If we look at Victoria, where they have been allowed to grow GM crops for many years now, the last rate that I saw was somewhere between

an 11 to 13 per cent take-up of GM canola. So we are talking about 11 to 13 per cent of 5 per cent of \$4 billion to \$4.2 billion of \$21 billion.

Canola farmers have put the case that, if the moratorium extends out to 2025, they estimate they will lose about \$5 million over that six years. I wonder if there is a better way that we can repay those people who are missing out in a monetary sense. It might be more money for R&D or it might be more money to help bulk them up and start up the sort of cooperative we have seen on Kangaroo Island, which has undoubtedly been successful. They are getting a \$60 per tonne premium on their canola.

I wonder whether something could be engineered along those lines, where we get to keep our premium high-level reputation of being the only mainland state in Australia that is fruit-fly free, phylloxera free and where it is illegal to grow GM crops, but they have a win as well in some sort of monetary sense. They could use that money to come up with some better way forward for them that does not include GM foods.

Food South Australia is an important group in South Australia. It is the independent, industry-led and membership-based organisation representing small, medium and large food manufacturing companies based in South Australia. Their submission on GM food last year stated:

South Australia currently has an excellent international reputation as a source of premium, clean, sustainably grown produce. This reputation is at significant risk if the moratorium is lifted. Therefore, specific measures need to be taken in close consultation with industry to reduce or negate any reputational risk that could occur if the moratorium is lifted.

I am not sure if any of that discussion has happened. They go on to say:

A rigorous and comprehensive cost benefit analysis is required to examine this issue. In addition, any plans to manage identified reputational or market access issues must be fully developed, in place, and shown to be effective before the moratorium is lifted.

Again, I am not sure whether any of that work has been done. They continue:

It is essential that the current state export growth focus should be considered in this process. There is a current trade focus on export growth for the food and beverage industry targeting China, Japan, Singapore, United Arab Emirates, and the United States. Food South Australia believes further and more detailed analysis of these priority market opportunities, and evaluation of the potential barrier to market entry (or otherwise) that lifting the moratorium may represent, is required.

People have said in here that it is proven there is no premium for non-GM canola. Kangaroo Island would dispute that. But we are not just talking about the premium on canola. We are talking about the premium that is available today and into the future if the moratorium remains in place for all our food producers and food manufacturers. We are talking about not just the people who grow a primary product and sell it but those in our community, whether it be a small business, a medium-sized business or a large business, who value add to that raw ingredient.

Those people are providing our state with lots of jobs, and many of them are getting a premium for what they are producing because, guess what, people around the world really want to get their hands on the cleanest and best food they possibly can. It is not just me saying that. A University of Adelaide study a few years ago pointed out that it was the fastest growing segment in North America, Japan, China and Europe, so why would we walk away from the biggest growth area in food consumers around the world at a time when that is the very area that is growing at the fastest rate?

As I said at the outset, I have travelled and spoken to people in the marketplace. I was with the Viterra people in Rotterdam a few years ago and they said that they were seeing a big increase in demand in Europe and North America for non-GM foods. I spoke with Ivan Glasenberg, who is the CEO of Glencore, which is one of the biggest companies in the world. It owns most of the logistics framework in South Australia for getting grain. We had an amazing hour sitting down in Zurich and chatting about what the possibilities were. He was not against them working with our grain growers here to come up with a marketing tool that could label South Australian grain from this wonderful part of the world as being GM-free. Just like New Zealand has done with its Pure New Zealand, we could, through marketing, add to the price that we could get.

I wonder whether that has been followed up enough. We tried to do it after that meeting. We understand that there are a lot of steps in the process between a farmer growing their crop and that crop meeting the market, including through the logistics sectors, and then you have to get it to export, get it shipped overseas and into market. I know it is not that easy, but I just wonder whether we could add a lot of value to our crops here in South Australia by working with the chain to see whether we can have our grain promoted and put into a marketplace that would get a premium for all those things.

It is not just about the premium we get for our canola: it is about the premium we get for everything that we offer up in South Australia. I spoke to Maurice Crotti last week, a great South Australian and the CEO and family owner of San Remo, and he is very keen for us to continue having the GM moratorium in South Australia. They have an amazing set-up at Windsor Gardens, as well as four factories in Italy and another one in Thailand. I would say that when Australians are selling more pasta to Italians than I think any Italian producers are you have to give this family a big tick for the way they go about their business.

Angelo Kotses has Bickfords and Beresford Wines. Again, I have spent a fair bit of time with Angelo, and he does great things. He is always about the premium. I know that the minister in his own electorate has the Twenty Third Street Distillery just outside Renmark. Angelo and his family could have bulldozed that whole building, but he wanted to redo it because he knows the importance of that building to the town.

He has also built a wonderful Beresford cellar door in McLaren Vale, and he has just bought some land on Kangaroo Island at Kingscote to do a premium upgrade over there, which is really important. Angelo is all about premium, and he is the sort of person who invests in a business not just for him but for his kids and his grandkids. He really is a long-game player, and he believes that we should keep this moratorium in place for our children, for their children and for their grandchildren. Sam Tucker from Tucker's Natural, another producer in South Australia, makes amazing crackers that are sold all around the world.

These are people I have stood side by side with in China at food fairs where we are telling the Chinese our wonderful story about South Australia and the great heritage we have here of the government working closely with industry to make sure that that reputation is absolutely at the top level. As fate would have it, I bumped into and had a bit of a chat last night at the cricket with some of the Grain Producers SA people.

I was there with Caroline, Wade and Adrian, and we had a good discussion. We had about three hours together. We did not agree, just as we have not agreed over the past three, five or 10 years but, as I said on radio yesterday, I think this needs to be a respectful discussion. There are many points of view. It is not about putting anyone else down: it is absolutely about making sure that we do the right thing by the people of South Australia. We have a really important job. There are only 47 of us in here and 22 in the other place, and we have a really important job to do when we come into this place.

We need to make sure that we do the very best we can for all South Australia and for all that is produced in South Australia and not just take out one slither of a sector to look after them. As I pointed out before, we have the grain and the grapes in the carpet—there is no other industry represented on the floor of this house—as well as in the stained glass windows at the back of the chamber. That tie is really important. We are going to have differences across the political divide and across the farming communities and everything else, and I think what we need to do is to make the very best decisions for the whole.

I also want to comment on the media coverage of this matter over the past couple of weeks. It has been pretty narrow. I do not think they have really gone out to look at all the different views. They have made it more about city politicians versus farmers, and farmers are all collected into one—farmers are all farmers, so they are all pro GM—which we know is not the case. It took me back to a time when I worked in the media in the early 1990s.

One of the big discussions then was about the introduction of poker machines. As a member of the media, as a journo, we were telling people that story, too: 'If we don't bring in poker machines here, South Australians are just going to go to Melbourne, the Gold Coast or Broken Hill to play the pokies.' I am not sure that would have happened, but I reckon we got sucked in by that argument a

little bit without thinking things through what other repercussions that legislation might have had on the people of South Australia.

I urge everyone to think not just about the canola farmers—and we must care about them and help them—but about all farmers and all food producers in South Australia who are part of this \$21 billion industry, which employs one in six working South Australians, because it is a really important sector and it is one that needs our support and protection. Reputation is everything. If we lift the lid on our GM moratorium just to be like New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia, Victoria and the other mainland states, then we are doing ourselves a disservice. We will join in a race to the bottom to be like everyone else.

I remember a time when we were proud of the differences we had in South Australia, such as 40 years of being the only state in Australia with a container deposit scheme, when people were refunded 5¢ or 10¢. I like the fact that we stand apart from the rest of Australia. If this bill gets through, the only person I know who will be more pleased than the Liberal Party in South Australia is my good mate Will Hodgman, the Liberal Premier in Tasmania—because he wants to get around and say that he is the Premier of the only state in Australia that is GM free, phylloxera free and fruit fly free. We still have that reputation. If this bill gets through, we take one of those amazing attributes out of our selling point.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:32):** I am very glad to take the opportunity to rise briefly in support of the bill. I have listened carefully to the debate and the merits of it, and I will come in a moment to the relative urgency of the introduction of the bill and the lifting of the moratorium.

In a short contribution, I want to stress that the agenda of this government is very focused on the merits of the debate. In this case, that means taking on board the science, having gone through a rigorous process of assessment over a period of time to consider the outcome of that assessment and then to respond on the merits with a view to the productivity improvements that will come with responding to the science.

We have already heard from someone eminently more qualified than I am, that is, the member for Newland in his reflections on the importance of adopting an evidence-based, science-based approach in taking these steps towards improvement. I very much endorse the contribution of the member for Newland in reflecting on that important set of criteria that really should guide us as we look responsibly to legislate.

As the member for Mawson observed, indeed there are just 47 of us in this house and we have a responsibility to legislate on behalf of all South Australians. It is my firm view that we need to do so in the light of the evidence based on the science and then to make the right decision in the light of all the available knowledge. It is not and nor should it be in any way an occasion for some sort of populist or knee-jerk response—good this way, bad that way—or some opportunity to be in any way alarmist. On the contrary, this is about implementing incremental improvement based on the science and the evidence.

One aspect that I really want to emphasise, because I talk about this a lot in my community in the Adelaide Hills, is that we talk a lot about the urgency to act in relation to climate change. Much is said about the complexity of what we face in relation to climate challenges. I think it is relevant in this space to reflect on what we are actually doing that is outcome driven in response to climate challenges. Again, I wholeheartedly endorse what the member for Newland had to say in this regard.

We know that by the application of the latest technology we have the prospect of being able to produce food products with less inputs—less water used, less pesticides used, less diesel fuel used in terms of the application of those inputs—and at the same time the prospect of a greater level of productivity to come from those inputs. Where those improvements are available and the science backs it up, we should take steps to allow that to proceed.

What we must be about in legislating in this space is acting on science with a view to enabling a confident and curious environment for those who would innovate and one in which, where there is a problem, we have an appetite for solving it, for making a change and for moving on for the better. Yes, that may be incremental. As the member for Flinders has observed, there have been incremental improvements in both the way we manage agricultural land and the agricultural products that are grown on them. Those improvements have been taking place over decades, if not centuries.



It would be entirely perverse if we were to decide somehow that we are no longer interested in problem solving in this space, that we are no longer interested in science-based improvements in productivity, but rather that somehow we are motivated by some sort of fear of the future and, even worse, some sort of preoccupation with virtue signalling or with sending messages that are based on nothing more than a banner or a slogan, as opposed to the substance. We need to be practical and we need to be innovative and we should very much continue along that path.

Can I say even more explicitly than that that there has been reference in the debate to the clean, green reputation that the state enjoys and that we should do all we can to enhance that clean, green reputation. While I respect that there may be genuinely held views that differ across the board, in my view it is entirely consistent with a clean and green state and a clean and green outlook for us to embrace the science and the technology in improving in this way. I do not know what part of the pollution-filled environment that we see in lots of areas to our north has to offer that is somehow better than what we have here. Clearly, we have a clean and green environment. We should celebrate that and the lifting of the moratorium will be entirely consistent with it.

In the context in which this bill is brought before the parliament, there has been some noise, particularly on the other side, about the urgency with which this debate has been brought on today in this place. Because there has been some protest about the urgency of the debate, I want to note that this debate does not occur somehow in a hypothetical vacuum. We are late in the calendar year and we are heading towards a growing season in the early part of next year.

Farmers need to make decisions about what crops they will sow and, before they do that, they will need to make seed orders and get themselves organised ahead of the new year. It is for that reason that these changes were first introduced by regulation, and in my view properly so. Again, there has been some protest about a change of this nature being made by way of regulation rather than by substantive legislation.

The minister—in my view, entirely appropriately—has at the first available opportunity said, 'Alright, you want to have a substantive debate on a topic that is known not only because it has been researched for a long period of time and has been thoroughly aired in the community, whose views are very well known, but because it has been the subject of regulation until it was disallowed. At the first opportunity, we will come back and bring in substantive legislation and debate it as efficiently as we can with a view to getting on and ensuring that we legislate as quickly as we can to permit the growing season ahead to go ahead in circumstances where the moratorium is lifted.'

I say to those who might appeal to the usual process and who talk about how this has come on too quickly, and about the fact that the niceties have not been observed and so on, that there are people out in the community, real farmers, real members of our state, who have real business to get on with in the new year. Frankly, they do not care too much about the niceties of the parliamentary process where the substance is behind the change. If it is necessary to do something in order to achieve a better outcome, they expect us to get on and do it. This is now occurring in circumstances where there is no time to waste and we should get on with it. I commend the bill and its hasty passage through both houses of this parliament.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:44):** Firstly, I would just like to talk on this matter. There has been a lot of discussion today from both sides. When the regulations were disallowed last week, I said to the minister that I thought this may not have been brought up in the parliament again until the new year; however, it is here today. I have been making some phone calls today to my community to ascertain whether there are any concerns with the lifting of the moratorium. I have had six phone calls today from people who thought the moratorium was still in place. Of course, a few of the regulations the minister was trying to put through last week were overturned.

These six people were very agitated at the thought they were not going to have the choice of whether to grow GM crops, etc. I assured them that the minister had today reintroduced a bill into the parliament for us to debate here in this chamber, and they were much more relaxed about having the opportunity for the discussion to go on. They indicated to me that they would like to see the moratorium lifted. During the discussions I have had with various people over the last 12 months, only three people have come forward asking for the moratorium to stay in place.

I know that members on both sides have their views, but I live in an area where there is mixed farming. There are grapes, barley, wheat and also canola. When I was talking to the minister this morning, my concerns were with the grapegrowers association, particularly in the Clare Valley, and whether there is any risk there. The minister has given me a very good commitment that he has had discussions with the grapegrowers association, the peak body, and they did not have any concerns regarding the moratorium being lifted and people in the Clare Valley, in particular, having the opportunity to be able to grow the crops that they are looking for.

Farmers out there are no fools. They look at every opportunity scientifically. We have to make a decision on whether or not we support this proposal from the minister. I think farmers have to have the opportunity to grow the crops that they choose and, at the same time, we have to be very mindful of the return that they will get for their produce across the whole of the region. I heard that farmers were achieving a premium for GM-free crops across the region. This has been disputed on many occasions by farmers saying to me that they do not achieve any premiums on them.

I am a little bit disappointed in the time frame. I have had a discussion with the minister and the Government Whip, because I was only told on the way to Adelaide at 3.30pm yesterday that this bill was going to be introduced and that there would be a suspension of standing orders. I would have thought that the protocol would be to allow for this bill to sit on the table for a period of time for members to consider and liaise on it. That is not the case and we have it before us today. I am happy to listen to all the debates, but I would certainly be looking for the speedy passage of this bill through the parliament. I will be listening very clearly and intently at the committee stage.

As I said, I had only three people in the last 12 months asking for the moratorium to stay in place and I had six people today asking for it to be lifted. That gives me an indication that my community in the electorate of Frome, particularly in the Georgetown and Clare Valley areas, are looking for an opportunity to choose the crops they would like to grow, whether they are GM free or whether they are GM crops. I certainly look forward to the speedy passage of the bill through the parliament.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:49):** I rise on behalf of the people of Stuart to support the Minister for Primary Industries and, of course, our government team with regard to this bill. A little has been mentioned about the timing of this bill. I can certainly understand the discomfort of members with a bill being tabled and debated very quickly under normal circumstances, but these are not normal circumstances. Every member of parliament has had weeks within parliament, and in fact months and years outside of parliament, to determine a position on this issue.

It was put to us very clearly in the previous sitting week that some members who voted against the change in regulations might have chosen a different position if they had the opportunity to do so with regard to the consideration of a bill. With that in mind, the minister and our government have given them a bill to consider. Under the circumstances, I am quite confident that every member in here and every member in the Legislative Council has already considered this issue very thoroughly.

As such, it does not actually take any more time for any of them to consider the bill. The bill essentially does exactly what the regulations would have done. I do not accept any argument that this is being pushed through without due consultation or without due opportunity for people to consider their positions or to do their research, because they have actually already done all that.

I have not heard one person in this place express any equivocation about their position on the debate of this bill. This includes the member for Frome, who was good enough to share with us that, overwhelmingly, the people in his electorate who have contacted him have done so in favour of removing the moratorium. I also listened closely to the member for Mawson, and I appreciated the way he went about putting his thoughts together. The member's position on this area of work is well known. It is not my position, but I think he did a good job in trying to express his concerns.

An area where I differ with the member for Mawson is comparing the removal of a ban on GM—or allowing GM—to phylloxera, foot-and-mouth or a similar disease. Yes, of course, as he said, we need to do everything we possibly can to protect our state from incursions of those diseases and many other things from which South Australian agriculture is, thankfully, relatively free at the moment.

However, genetically modified seed is not a disease. It is not as if, if you plant it, it suddenly takes over and destroys all the crops all over the place.

There is a situation, as we speak, on the border between South Australia and Victoria. The border, which we happily have in South Australia, is literally just a farmer's fence between two paddocks. On one side, the crops are GM free, and on the other side there are GM crops. That is as distinct a border as we have needed until now, so there is no reason why that exact type of border could not exist within a state. There could be a farmer on one side of the fence with a GM-free crop and a farmer on the other side of the fence with a GM crop.

Here is the crux of the debate for me: removing a moratorium is not the same as making everybody plant GM crops. We are going to remove a ban; we are not going to force anyone to do it. That is a very important distinction. I will put myself, as best I can, in the mindset of growers who believe that there is a price premium—or, if not a price premium, then a consumer preference for their product at a similar price—because it is GM free. That is fantastic; good luck to them.

It might actually be that those growers are significantly advantaged by the removal of the ban. It might mean that if they are right, as they believe they are—who better to judge their own business or the wants of their customers?—then they will become part of a smaller, more select and presumably more highly sought after group of growers.

They may or may not be able to attract higher prices but, as is put to us, even at the same price they might just be a preferred producer to a market that wants GM free. Fantastic! If there are fewer of them there, if they believe it is true that somebody on one side of the fence in South Australia can do better than a grower on the other side of the fence in Victoria, then let them continue to be the grower on one side of the fence with a GM free crop within South Australia and let them continue to do better than the other farmer on the other side of the fence within South Australia with a different crop.

I also believe in the basic premise that no-one as yet, after decades in fact, has come up with any evidence to say that there is a problem with GM crops. I accept that it is a step that needs to be taken cautiously. I accept that you do not jump from one side of the fence to another willy-nilly, but the research is that this is new, better, more modern technology. It is available to us in South Australia, if this bill passes the parliament, for canola only at this stage. I would expect, like everybody else, that if this passes and it is available for canola in the new year then in subsequent years it would become available for other seeds, other crops and other opportunities over time.

In my mind, let that be the case and over time let the grower who in five, 10, 15, 50 years' time may still prefer to grow a GM-free crop do so. Let that person do so, if they believe there is a market for them. They might have an ethical preference, they might be doing it because it is an input into another organic product, perhaps as a feed or something like that. Let them do it. Removing a ban does not force anyone to grow a GM crop. It just gives the opportunity for those who would like to grow a GM crop to do so. In these years of very low rainfall and other climatic challenges, in my mind we absolutely could not withhold any longer this opportunity from growers who want to take it up and we certainly will not be forcing it on growers who do not want to take it up ever.

*Personal Explanation*

**MCGOWAN, DR C.**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:58):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** In question time today I was asked a question as to the subsidy or payment to provide legal fees for Dr McGowan. I have paraphrased that question. I had understood that he was referring to an application for whether there was any right to have private legal costs, which is a matter in the purview of the Crown Solicitor's Office.

But in respect of the referred inquiry to be undertaken, I think by Ms Ranieri, I am advised to correct that; that is, the existing government policy does not deal with the reimbursement of legal fees associated with the type of independent inquiry being undertaken in relation to Dr McGowan.

The question of reimbursement would be a matter for government. Dr McGowan would be entitled to make representations to government if and when he sees fit. To the best of my knowledge, no applications have been made.

*Bills*

**GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MANAGEMENT (DESIGNATED AREA) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:59):** This is, of course, the bill the government should have introduced some time ago if they had wanted a proper debate about changes to the moratorium on genetically modified crops. Instead, a few months ago they proceeded with a regulation that was eventually disallowed in the other place last week. The government claim this was playing politics, but I disagree. Today's manoeuvres or tactics are the continuation of a worrying trend of dangerous disrespect for parliamentary processes and tradition.

Instead of proceeding with the parliamentary agenda before us, which includes important legislation on bushfires, our health system and the corruption watchdog, the government have chosen to use their parliamentary numbers to suspend standing orders today and push a debate through this chamber. In my view, this is an abuse of the democratic system and considerably less than I was expecting of the new government. They have to understand two wrongs really do not make a right. The brutal fact is that this government again choose to reinforce they have the numbers, and that the action is really all in the other place.

That said, we need to concentrate on the bill before us, which is about genetically modified crops. Twenty-two years ago, when I was first elected, very little was known or clear about the impacts of the genetic modification of crops. Given this, the proposal for a moratorium seemed to be a reasonable approach and was adopted widely across the nation. Since that time, much more scientific evidence has emerged, although it is fair to say the issue remains controversial among the public, among consumers and among some in the farming community.

Of course, with the pace at which this bill is now pursued and because it seemed destined for examination in the new year, I am unable to engage with my constituents, peak bodies, scientists or others in order to fully inform myself of the merits of the government's proposed changes to the moratorium. I have received two representations from electors in Florey, a Ms Harris of Pooraka and a Mr Barlow of Valley View. Both seem very well informed, and they object to any change to the moratorium. I thank them for taking the time to contact me on this issue.

I also received a representation from a group called SAGFIN, with which I have been associated for almost the entire 22 years of my parliamentary career. This group was formed at the very beginning of the GM debate, and they are the same scientifically minded people. I do not know whether they are necessarily farmers, but they are engaged with the farming community. They still maintain the same position; that is, they are very cautious about the relaxing of the moratorium.

They and other constituents in my electorate will look upon what is happening in this chamber today and wonder whether this government respects their voice or their votes. Does democracy happen every day or just once every four years? This has been a theme for me in the year of the quasiquintenary because, unfortunately, we feel disenfranchised. Even though we have a participatory democratic system, it does not seem we are encouraged to be part of it.

My electors and many people across the state who have made submissions to the select committee in the other place must wonder what the point was of engaging in the democratic process when the government can act to make such a significant change when and if it thinks fit. It will be up to me, not the Premier or the minister, to explain to Ms Harris and Mr Barlow why the concerns they and others have raised were dismissed without a proper, informed parliamentary debate. We rush through the debate on this matter at our peril. The precedent it sets is very worrying.

There are many arguments for and against the moratorium. Indeed, if I were allowed the time to acquaint myself with more of this information, you may well have persuaded me outright of the merits of the change. But now I feel I have little choice—despite the numbers and despite the body

of evidence over time—but to oppose the bill, a bill that has been brought forward as a result of political miscalculation and a lack of respect for the parliament and its long-established processes.

It is known full well regulations are subject to disallowance, and just as well. This could have been an inherent risk in adopting the approach you adopted last week. I see no reason to rush this legislation through today. We do have an optional week at our disposal, and many have felt it would have been proper to have used it. The sitting calendar for next year is out, and it is clear you can schedule and likely complete a debate on this bill in February, notwithstanding the time constraints on seeding and the other issues that have been brought to our attention this morning. As we all know, you will remake your regulation next week once the parliament is not sitting.

What is the result of all this? It means a delay to debating and passing laws that will support our firefighters and emergency workers in the bushfire season that has already started. It means a delay to debating important governance legislation for a healthcare system that is seeing a continuing and ongoing ambulance ramping crisis. It means a delay to finalising the ICAC legislation, which this government once considered an urgent priority.

It also means the government can divert attention from the extraordinary report of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption into corruption, misconduct and maladministration in the health portfolio, a report that should keep people awake at night and deserves a thorough and timely debate in this house.

It has not been possible for me to attend a briefing today, not because I did not want to but because I cannot change everything I do with 10 minutes' warning. The government should, of course, be wary of ignoring the long-established practices and procedures of this parliament.

In past weeks, especially on the land tax debate, we saw filibustering and guillotining employed as tactics in this parliament—an unfortunate precedent that will have ripple effects for the remainder of this parliamentary term. Both are torturous, but one is actually fatal. If this government continues to treat this parliament with the contempt we have seen in recent weeks, it will sadly have very severe consequences.

Rushing this bill through may seem useful and not harmful in any way. You may believe that after the torturous debate on land tax, which ended in what would generously be described as a stalemate, this bill gives you another chance to end the year with a hasty 'win', but at what cost? Do not take voters for granted. They are watching, and if you think their memories are short you are making a big mistake—a very big mistake.

Democracy is degraded by this kind of behaviour. At a time when trust in politicians is at an all-time low, I can only express my profound disappointment about the deliberate choice you have taken with this bill. People care about democracy being seen to be in play and a tool they believe they have some control over. They do remember what is going on and they are very certainly watching.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (17:06):** Thank you to those members who have made a contribution. I think that the majority of the contributions have been valuable and that everyone has sat and respectfully listened to each member's version of the story. Some of it is backed up by fact and some of it is really backed up by ideology. Sadly, some of that ideology has been the handbrake that has continued to see the moratorium restrict our grain sector. By and large, it is not just the grain sector.

We can look further afield at what this moratorium has meant for advancement, particularly in R&D and money coming into South Australia's research programs. We can look not far from here at the Waite Institute, which we know full well is probably one of the most respected research stations on the globe. By and large, it is definitely the best and most significant research station in the Southern Hemisphere.

The amount of lock-up of R&D programs that has affected not only Waite but Roseworthy and some of our other research stations around the state has again seen that we are overlooked, whether it is the grains industry through the GRDC or the AGT. These are class research businesses that are advancing grains research like no other area that I know of. It really is ironic that here in South Australia we can go into a supermarket and buy GM products.

We can look further afield. We can feed our livestock with GM products, yet we cannot grow GM product here in South Australia under the current legislation. I am concerned that we have that ideology that continues to begrudge our grain industry's advancement. It begrudges a grain grower's capacity to have choice. This morning, I listened to the member for Hughes, the shadow spokesperson. With respect, he has not stated his view. It is very well documented that the member for Mawson is opposed to the lifting of the moratorium.

Privately, the shadow spokesperson has said that he supports lifting the moratorium, yet he has party room machinations that he has to work against and he is not able to express his view. That is fair enough, but his contribution this morning was more about everything else bar GM. We talked about the reform within the fishing industry that was never funded. We talked about the stock assessment that was defunded, we talked about the snapper stocks that are decimated in South Australia, particularly in our gulfs, which we know are the nursery of the snapper stocks, and we talked about drought.

We have put in enabling pieces of infrastructure to help with those who are impacted by drought. We have worked with the Coalition to work our way through those who are impacted by the harsh climatic conditions, and whether you want to call it climate change, whether you want to call it climate variability, it is much of a muchness: it is all about dealing with today's climate, the changing climate, and that is what farmers do so well. They work with a variable climate every year, because no one year is the same as the previous year, or as we know as the following year. It really is important that we have this constructive debate.

I have already mentioned the research and development dollars that South Australia continues to miss out on because those organisations that have significant industry backing, commonwealth government backing, continue to point the finger at states that are prepared to adopt and prepared to advance their industries. Here in South Australia we look at those industries as our largest stable, our largest foundation, and the only way that we are going to produce more with less is to use the advancement of technology. Of course, there is the opportunity to use that technology to help grow more food, to use less chemical and at the same time to deal with the variable climate, to deal with climate change, and if we do not do that we continue to deny our grain growers, our farmers, that opportunity.

I will talk about choice a little later. Again, the ideology is probably one of the things that frustrates me the most. As I said, I have listened to the debate respectfully. We have had two contributions from the opposition, which is very, very disappointing. Those two contributions are, obviously, diametrically opposed. The opposition is in turmoil because its party room has not really come to a firm position. We know that, but what I can say is that if we continue to use the process as an excuse that really is just the weakest link in this debate.

We have seen the process through the introduction of regulation, and my statutory obligation was adhered to: the six-week consultation process; the public meetings; we have had the select committee; and we have had the independent review, and it is compelling that the moratorium has been a handbrake. We have had some talk about it being only just a mega two and a bit million dollars a year since this has been implemented, but the two and a bit million dollars is the economic bottom line. We do not see the opportunities that have been missed.

We do not see, as I said, the research programs which could be coming to South Australia and which are overlooked for the states that are looking to be more progressive. When I was speaking with the CEO of GRDC, he was dismayed when I asked him, 'What is the barrier for you to bring more research money into South Australia?' He said, 'Well, the underlying factor is the moratorium,' because that moratorium is an indicator that we are not prepared to adopt advancement, and it is sad that we continue to use that ideology.

Respectfully, the member for Mawson did point to the carpet a couple of times, and he talked about the wheat and he talked about the vineyards, but he mostly talked about biosecurity. I accept that. Biosecurity is of paramount importance. He would understand, as I understand, that biosecurity should never have the bar lowered in any circumstance.

Under a previous Labor minister, we saw the very real threat of the reduction of our biosecurity border forces. They were going to reduce the hours worked. They were going to close

the station after hours. That was absurd. The then minister's ability to continue that 24/7 border operation was critically important. Yes, biosecurity is a threat to South Australia's reputation, but GM is not about biosecurity. GM is about advancing plant genomics. It is about using the ability to use those R&D programs that take decades to get through. The regulation that they go through and the scrutiny they are presented with certainly know no bounds nor are they a threat to GM.

The wine industry is the other staple on the carpet. At the moment, we are looking at the modification in the wine industry, particularly with genetics, because we are looking to breed vines that are mildew resistant, whether it be powdery mildew or downy mildew. That would be a game changer in today's grapegrowing sector or more so in the wine industry. Of course, we cannot forget the table grape industry and we cannot forget a number of foods that are affected by powdery mildew or downy mildew. Again, that is an example of the advancement of gene altering.

The majority of today's vineyards are now seeing rootstocks planted, and those rootstocks are planted for very good reason—that is, dealing with climate variability and dealing with a hotter climate. It is also dealing with the staple varieties that have been built on a reputation that no other country on the planet has. The uniqueness of our climate gives us the characteristics of an industry that is continuing to grow and continuing to present to the globe as a producer of one of the most premium products in the marketplace.

To do that we have to have the ability for commercialisation within that sector, and that is happening as we speak. The advancement of the wine industry is profound. We see now that South Australia is a leader in that industry for not only quality and quantity but for looking further afield for advancement. In my previous travels to the US, I visited UC Davis and Gallo's research farm. Some of the work they are doing is instrumental for advancement in the grape sector.

What really caught my attention is that Australians are advancing that technology, Australians are heading up those programs over there and Australians are leading—leading professors, leading agronomists, leading experts in their field. It is as much advancing the reliability of our vineyards as it is dealing with climate change. We know that climate is varying and affecting our vineyards. We know that we are seeing earlier ripening, which does not allow for a lot of our vineyards to develop the flavours they once did. Those flavours give South Australia the reputation for being one of the premium grapegrowing sectors on the globe. So we need to debunk the fact that GM is not a biosecurity threat.

We can talk about some of the iconic food brands here in South Australia. San Remo—owned and operated by the Crotti family—is an outstanding success story. Their durum wheat, converted into products not only here in South Australia but globally, has been under siege this year. We know that durum wheat has copped a hit, particularly with the drought. It has also copped a hit with the bushfires. Morris Crotti said he is going to have to look further afield for his durum wheat. So what are we going to do to help him secure that supply of grain for advancement in his business?

We talked about Angelo Kotses, a great South Australian entrepreneur. I have met with Angelo many times. Over a glass of Twenty Third Street gin, we talked about the perception of risk that the GM technology would pose to his business. He has not actually given me a reason to suggest that the GM technology introduced here in South Australia would really affect his business. It is an unknown of the unknown. That is exactly what I put to him. I spoke to him yesterday because he again wanted to have a conversation about the introduction of this bill to amend the moratorium on GM.

If we look across to New Zealand, they probably have one of the better reputations on the planet for their 100 per cent pure. The silver fern is their marketing arm. What we are seeing now is a letter from 150 young professors and scientists in New Zealand calling for the lifting of the moratorium for countries that are now being constrained by that very moratorium, particularly on GM crops. It is about advancement, it is about having the ability to use the tools to grow more—whether it is grain—and the advancement will see other products that can use that GM technology.

In relation to our livestock industry, we cannot grow GM products here in South Australia, but we can feed our livestock GM products. We can feed them cottonseed meal, we can feed them soybean, but we cannot grow it in South Australia. It really does beggar belief that there is this

ideology that we can feed our animals GM products but we cannot grow it. We allow someone else to grow the feed for our animals—go figure. Again, that is the ideology that I think is confounding.

The member for Mawson suggested, with R&D funding, that there should be a compensation-type package for those who are impacted. Why? Why would we put a compensation package together when all we are looking to do is give our farmers and grain growers a choice? For those who want to remain on Fleurieu Peninsula, for those who want to remain anywhere in South Australia, they still have the ability to do that. They still have the ability to grow a GM-free product.

For me, my family farm is cereal standing crop and livestock forever. As a 30-year irrigator in the Riverland, I was a conventional farmer. Unashamedly, I would say that I was a very highly productive conventional farmer, but I also respected my neighbours. My neighbours were organic farmers. One was organic and one was certified NASAA organic. We respected one another's farm practices and we also responded to needs. We had open dialogue, understanding that, if we felt there was any form of pressure or risk involved with administering management protocols, picking or that type of thing, there was never an issue. It is just as we see with the wine industry and the grain industry working with the Mesonet wet weather stations.

The myth that needs to be dumped is about contamination. The segregation has proven extremely successful in all other mainland states. It has proven successful right around the world. It is a furphy that, when the wind blows, there is cross-contamination and that it is going to impact a crop. That is nonsense. The science has debunked that over and over again. There is an ability for coexistence. There is an ability for this moratorium to be lifted so that it gives our farmers the choice.

As the member for Mawson rightfully said, this is not about them and us, this is about understanding what the moratorium means to South Australia. The independent review has made it very clear that, economically, we are missing out on opportunity. It showed that there is no financial gain here in South Australia to have the GM moratorium.

If we go back less than a week ago to last Friday, after the disallowance motion was supported, I went to the grain market to look around the country and compare what was going on in the marketplace. I am talking about a comparative—eggs with eggs, apples with apples. In Western Australia, they returned a \$60 premium over South Australia; in New South Wales, a \$30 premium; and in Victoria a \$10 premium. Why is that? That is legitimate. Go on the website and have a look at it. It shows that South Australia has been constrained by this ideology that a GM moratorium is helping.

I met with the four Japanese businesses that buy grain from KI Pure Grain on Kangaroo Island. Out of respect, they wrote me a letter to thank me for hosting them and for being open and transparent. I said to them that, if I had my way, the moratorium on Kangaroo Island would remain and I would give the choice to mainland South Australia. The choice would mean that, if you went to a South Australian mainland grower and wanted to buy a product from him, he has the choice to not grow GM canola or he has the choice not to grow a GM product.

They respectfully thanked me and said that they would now continue with certainty to buy their product from Kangaroo Island and, should they seek further product from the mainland, they would do business in the way most importers and businesspeople do business: they negotiate. They go to the negotiating table and say what sort of product they want, and they will get that product.

Under the 15 years of moratorium, it is very clear that the primary sector has been the loser. For many years, we have heard the grain growers—the majority of grain growers, not every one of them—call for the moratorium to be lifted. That is exactly the point of this bill: it is not saying that everyone has to grow a GM product and it is not saying that every farmer has to be under that GM banner; it is about giving our farmers the opportunity to be diverse, it is giving them the tools they need and it is giving our farming sector the opportunity to grow in those conditions.

I will touch on climate change and on the inputs. Under the moratorium in South Australia we continue to put on more chemical than the average GM grain grower. We put on more insecticide because, as we know, the GM canola is more resistant to insect damage. If we look at what farmers are about to remain globally competitive, we have to reduce our inputs and we have to increase our productivity. To do that, we need those tools, and those tools are about giving farmers the capacity to plant the seed they deem necessary, particularly in a rotation.



The reason this bill has been brought to the house in a speedy way is to give some certainty to our grain growers. Our grain growers deserve that certainty. As I have said to a number of people, you do not just go and order a truckload of grain and expect it to turn up, plant it and get on with it; you need the equipment that is calibrated to suit. We also look at the conditions that we are dealing with. Currently, if we look around the state, parts of South Australia are in their third year of no rain or their third year of well below average rain. What would it be to give farmers that opportunity to have a dry start? What would it be to give them that opportunity to potentially have a make or break crop?

As the crop progresses, we get to that August or October period when we are frost prone, and this year we saw a lot of the standing crop decimated by frost. I am not saying that GM canola is frost resistant, but there are characteristics in some of those GM canola seed types that are more tolerant to frost. When I say tolerant to frost, I am talking about 1° or maybe 2°. That 1° or 2° can make or break a crop. We know that. If the stem of that plant freezes and it burns the emerging seed component in that plant, it is done and they have missed that crop and that opportunity. That opportunity could have been there if the moratorium had been lifted.

In closing, I have been overwhelmed by the support within my electorate of Chaffey. I live in marginal grain growing country and those farmers are doing a remarkable job in growing grain that once upon a time would have never even emerged. When we had a full till, once upon a time we saw the paddocks blowing across the highways. There would be graders grading bitumen roads. Right across the state, we have seen advancement in grain growing.

What we see now, in dealing with that more marginal country and dealing with low rainfall country, is that they need every tool in the toolbox to help them achieve a crop. They need every tool in the toolbox to deal with adversity, with weather—changing weather, variable weather, climate change, call it what you want. It is there for the advancement of the grains industry. The grains industry is the largest commodity sector here in South Australia. It is our largest export industry here in South Australia. Lifting the moratorium gives us the capacity to be part of a bigger industry, a growing industry, and give our farmers the choice.

I would like to think that the parliament will support the lifting of the moratorium. It is win-win for South Australia: it is a win for the farmers and it is a win for the grain growers. It should not be about politicians dictating what our farmers can and cannot do. It is giving them the responsibility and it is giving them the tools to advance our grain industry, to deal with climate change, to reduce inputs and to increase productivity. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (17:32):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (17:33):** I seek to make a brief address at the third reading stage in regard to the Labor Party's position on this bill, which has already been indicated by previous members. I think it is important to get on the record my view as the leader of our party. I have been rather disappointed, and I suspect a lot of people around the state may have been disappointed, over the course of this exercise being undertaken today. To understand that in its entirety, it is worthwhile reflecting upon how we got to this point.

The government is well and truly within its rights to undertake an exercise that reviews a policy position that the state has or a legislative regime that the state has at any given time. That is clearly within the purview of government. They undertook an exercise to do that by conducting a review into the GM ban and the moratorium through a process that did hear public submissions. There are reservations around some of the way in which that review was undertaken but, nevertheless, it was a process that was undertaken by this government. That manifested into a proposed regulatory change on behalf of the government. Therein lies where some of the concerns start.

The idea that we would have a law that applies to the land but then, through a regulatory process, would exempt the entirety of mainland South Australia from the law of the land is unorthodox at best. It seems to the opposition—and, I think, to most reasonable observers—that it would be an extraordinary proposition to seek to use a mechanism within a piece of legislation to exempt the entirety of mainland South Australia and leave Kangaroo Island on its own, in terms of undermining the objects of the bill.

That is an unorthodox process at best; at worst, it is irresponsible. For those reasons, the opposition decided to vote in favour of the disallowance, as the minister referred to in his previous remarks. I appreciate and understand that some people in South Australia would be disappointed by that. Some people, quite reasonably in their own view, have made a determination that lifting a moratorium would be in their material interest, particularly broadacre farmers who would seek to obtain access to GM canola.

The problem, however, is that this is an incredibly blunt instrument that has been imposed upon the entirety of the state through a regulatory process, as distinct from a legislative one. It deprives them of their legitimate ability to pursue partaking in a growing exercise, or potentially a manufacturing exercise, and certainly a marketing exercise, that sees them and their businesses reap a benefit from the state's GM-free status.

Well-known businesses in our state—and indeed the minister referred to them in his earlier remarks—such as San Remo have made representations to the opposition, including to me directly, that they are in favour of the retention of the moratorium so that they can produce and market their product as GM free. They see that as providing a value to their business and that it will allow them to see a premium around their product on an ongoing basis and employ people as a consequence. That is a legitimate concern. They are legitimate businesses undertaking a legitimate activity and employing people in our state. I think we would collectively like to see more of this.

The opposition takes the view that to try to accommodate the concerns of one group at the expense of the concerns of many others is not necessarily the best way to go, particularly through a regulatory process that we would characterise—and I do not mean this in a belligerent way—as being rather ham-fisted. It lacks nuance and imposes upon one very significant group within our community—producers and manufacturers within our economy—the opportunity to be able to realise premium on their brand and on their product. This is something that they have exploited to the benefit of everybody in this state.

We do not think that denying them of this ability is a worthwhile exercise; hence, our position in regard to the disallowance. Yes, that is the citation of a process issue, but what has really disappointed me is the response the government has undertaken in relation to that. To address a bad process is never going to be realised through an even worse process, yet that is exactly what this government has decided to do and in a way that we cannot support.

In order to realise that, the minister, as legitimate as his views may be and as honest as his pursuit may seem, has trashed the most elementary of conventions that we have in this place. Worse still, in my opinion, is the Leader of Government Business seeing to it that a bill would be dealt with on the floor of this parliament that the opposition had not even seen until 11 o'clock this morning.

Under no reasonable objective analysis could anyone ever suggest that good laws are made in the space of five hours, yet that is exactly what this government is trying to do. In order to facilitate a ramshackle expedited legislative process, they are denying the opposition the ability to do something that was never denied to them.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** No. They are doing something that is inconsistent with the very commitments that the Leader of Government Business in this place provided to the opposition that all bills would lie in the parliament for at least two sitting weeks or 10 days before consideration.

**Mr McBride:** The fairness bill.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** The member for MacKillop raised the fairness bill. He was not here when that occurred; I was. I was in the other place and I would like to advise the member for MacKillop, before he chimes in, that he might want to reflect upon the facts, because the fairness bill

lay in this parliament for weeks before it was dealt with in the Legislative Council. Everybody had access to it, including members in this house and including every single member of the public of South Australia—fact. Everybody in the state had access to that bill, including the now member for Heysen.

That is not true in this instance. This bill was introduced into the parliament today at 11am—no briefing to the opposition, not so much as even an email to the opposition saying, 'Here is a bill that we want to ram through the parliament tomorrow.' That never happened. Our reservation is that is not how good laws are made. I have not had the opportunity, nor has anyone else on this side of this chamber, to engage with our constituencies, to engage with stakeholders, to be able to formulate a position on this bill. No-one would suggest that is how good laws are made.

It would be utterly irresponsible on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to vote in favour of a bill that we only saw a matter of hours ago and that we have only seen in the context of an overruling and trashing of the most elementary and basic conventions of this place, and that is also inconsistent with the word of the Leader of Government Business.

The people who I dare say would be entitled to be most frustrated by this are the very people the minister seeks to purport to represent the interests of here today. If the minister were sincere about having a dinky-di debate in the parliament on the merits of this issue, then he would be facilitating exactly that. Instead, he is doing the opposite. I fear that this represents nothing short of an entirely political exercise at the expense of the merits of the argument that he is seeking to pursue.

Here we are, six or seven-odd hours after we have received this bill, being asked to vote for something which is utterly impossible and would be extraordinarily irresponsible. It is regrettable. It is not through the actions of the opposition or any members of the crossbench. It is entirely a function of very conscious and deliberate decisions this government has made and renders the opposition in the insidious position of having to formulate a position on this, which is principally around a bad process, which could only lead to a bad piece of legislation. We should have it on the record that we think the actions of the government are unfortunate, including in regard to those people they seek to represent; thus, we cannot support the bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE (CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:45 the house adjourned until Wednesday 4 December 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***DESALINATION PLANT**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (25 November 2019).

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The commonwealth government has agreed to provide funding to support the production of up to 100 gigalitres of water from the Adelaide Desalination Plant. This will reduce the need for water to be taken from the River Murray to meet local urban water needs and will allow the release of water to farmers in the southern Murray-Darling Basin.

The commonwealth payment to increase production at the Adelaide Desalination Plant will not result in any budgetary benefit to the South Australian government as the funding will only cover the cost differential between sourcing water from the River Murray and producing an equivalent volume of desalinated water.

In addition, the purpose of the commonwealth funding is to release water to irrigators in the southern Murray-Darling Basin region who are predominantly located in New South Wales and Victoria. The funding is therefore providing a national benefit rather than a benefit to a single jurisdiction.

The Commonwealth Grants Commission is not likely to assess this component of the funding as having any impact on GST revenue sharing relativities. This is due to the commonwealth payment not providing any net budgetary benefit to South Australia and due to the national purpose of the program.

The Prime Minister has provided written confirmation that up to \$10 million of drought assistance that will also be paid to South Australia as part of the agreement will be excluded from the assessment of GST revenue sharing relativities. Consistent with normal practice, the Commonwealth Grants Commission will be advised of this direction as part of terms of reference issued for annual relativity updates.