

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 12 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.

Motions

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT REGULATIONS

Private Members Business, Notices of Motion, No. 1: Mr Teague to move:

That regulations made under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, entitled Development Assessment, made on 20 June 2019 and laid on the table of this house on 2 July 2019, be disallowed.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:01): The committee resolved to take no action in relation to this matter.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: REBUILD OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN DOG FENCE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:02): I move:

That the 34th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence, be noted.

Witnesses presented to the Public Works Committee at a public hearing on 17 October 2019 regarding the proposed Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence project. The South Australian section of the dog fence is 2,150 kilometres long and stretches from the Great Australian Bight to the New South Wales border.

The Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence project proposes to rebuild the South Australian sections of the dog fence that are in disrepair, many of which are over 100 years old. Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA) has advised that the South Australian dog fence is the most important asset protecting the \$1.5 billion South Australian sheep industry.

Members present at the committee hearing heard that over the past 10 to 15 years the impact of wild dogs on the South Australian livestock industry has increased dramatically and that wild dog numbers have significantly increased, with dogs spreading to the zone used for sheep farming in South Australia. In 2018, the South Australian Dog Fence Board reported that \$25 million was required to rebuild around 1,600 kilometres of the dog fence that are the oldest and most degraded sections of this very significant piece of infrastructure.

Public Works Committee members heard that the cost-benefit analysis from 2018 indicated the likely benefit of repairing the South Australian stretches of the dog fence could be up to \$120 million over 20 years. This represents a possible return on investment of about 48 per cent. An expected outcome of this project is that the renewed dog fence will dramatically reduce the impact of wild dogs on livestock (mainly sheep) inside the dog fence. According to PIRSA, more than 60 additional full-time jobs will be created as a result of the rebuild project.

The PWC received evidence that the new dog fence would reduce wild dog management costs for pastoralists by up to \$97 million over 20 years, and a sales income of sheep enterprises is expected to increase by up to \$69.7 million. The cost breakdown of the project is as follows: the commonwealth government will contribute \$10 million, the state government \$10 million and the livestock industry \$5 million. The rebuild of the dog fence is expected to commence in autumn 2020 and be completed by June 2024.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances by PIRSA officials that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects as set out within the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:06): I rise to also speak on the dog fence and acknowledge that this is an important project. Clearly, my electorate of Giles will benefit and the pastoralists and others in my electorate will benefit. The member for Stuart and, obviously, the member for Flinders will benefit, but that benefit extends into other electorates as well, as the state of the wild dog fence has been an ongoing issue. I believe that the \$25 million will be well spent. As has been said, there will be a return over the years on that investment.

Indeed, I thought it was so important a project for the livestock industry that in the lead-up to the last federal election I approached our federal colleagues—if there was going to be an incoming federal Labor government—for them to also match the Morrison government's commitment to the dog fence, and that commitment was forthcoming. I think that is worth knowing because it indicates bipartisan support at a federal level.

Clearly, in my role as the shadow primary industries minister, I see the value of this fence. I know that a lot of the pastoralists in my area have destocked, but over time, hopefully, when this drought breaks there will be a rebuilding of stock. That will take a considerable period of time because a number of pastoralists have been severely impacted by the ongoing drought. Indeed, some of the people I have spoken to in the north of our state indicate that, from their records, this is the worst drought they have experienced, and some of these families go right back to the 1800s in the areas where they run their pastoral properties.

There are also important peripheral benefits from work like this. It will create jobs out there in the north of the state and, hopefully, it will also provide some Aboriginal employment in that part of the state, and I know that a number of pastoral properties, around Roxby Downs in particular, have moved back into Aboriginal hands. This is a worthwhile project and I commend the government for making this commitment to the project—it was overdue.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:09): I have to say that it is actually a huge pleasure on my part to speak on this report on behalf of the people of Stuart. This has been an enormous issue for a very long time for people in my electorate and other parts of the state as well. It is something that has been perhaps one of my highest priorities since becoming a member of parliament.

I am really pleased, incredibly pleased, that the state government, the federal government and industry have come together to share this \$25 million investment. I give credit to the Minister for Primary Industries for pulling this together under a fairly tight time frame in the middle of this year. I also give great credit to Geoff Power, who was the president of Livestock SA and worked incredibly hard on this issue for many years. Of course, Rowan Ramsey had a part in it as well with regard to encouraging the federal government.

I would also like to give credit to a person named Heather Miller, who is a local person in Stuart. As somebody who lives on stations, she has a background in NRM and in wild dog control. She has shared a lot of detailed information with me in regard to the behaviour of dogs, their patterns of movement, their breeding times and other details I was not intimately familiar with and helped me build a stronger case and share more useful and more productive information with my colleagues in parliament and in cabinet.

It is always tricky, of course, because there are a lot of people who have been involved in this, who I will not mention for the sake of time. However, a person I really want to mention is Geoff Mengersen from Depot Springs Station, just east of Copley. Very shortly after I was elected in March 2010, he got in touch—I think it was in about April 2010—and said, 'I really want you to come and sit down and have a talk. I need to explain this issue to you.' Of course, I was very pleased to do that.

He was the first person, not the only but the first, to really explain—in greater detail than I was already aware of as a person living in Wilmington and having worked in the outback with lots of friends on lots of different grazing properties—what it means to a pastoralist to have a wild dog, or half a dozen wild dogs, on your property, what it means to a pastoralist to be surrounded by other land where the control of wild dogs is not enthusiastically undertaken, what it means not only in regard to the financial impact on your property and your business but also in regard to the very severe impact on the sheep that suffer from predation.

He also explained to me very well—and he was not trying to sensationalise it—the emotional impact on a grazier, who feels a responsibility for his or her stock, knowing that there is a wild dog in the hills, often coming nightly from somebody else's property onto yours, and the very serious impact that that has. So I thank Geoff Mengersen for that.

There were others. In more recent times, Richard Treloar from Strathearn in the north-east, the Barrier Highway area, has been a strong campaigner on this. I have mentioned Peter Litchfield, from Mundowdna in the Marree area, as another person, and of course there are many others. They are the ones who actually sat down with me and tried to explain the impact of this, in far more detail than I already knew as just someone living in a country town. It really spurred me on to make this an incredibly high priority.

At one level, it is about economics. We have an approximately \$1 billion a year sheep industry. It is less than that at the moment because we are currently in drought, so people have sold off a lot of their stock. However, in round terms, that is a good number for MPs to keep in their mind: a \$1 billion a year impact, and if 5 per cent or 10 per cent or 15 per cent of that is impacted, that is serious.

You also think about the impact on lambing percentages, so you get down to that individual farm or station impact. There are people who have lost in excess—in some cases, well in excess—of a thousand lambs in a year. What is the impact on the lambs? What is the impact on the ewes? What is the impact on that business, and what is the impact on the grazier, whose life is about looking after those animals, knowing that he or she has not been successful in this case because the job was actually too difficult?

Linking all that back to the dog fence, the dog fence will never be perfect, but it can be, and it will be, much better than it is today. We have had, not in the last few years but in the several years before that, a massive breeding up of wild dogs below the fence. A few get in. Whether camels knock the fence over, a flood knocks the fence over or the maintenance is not quite right, dogs come streaming in and then they breed up inside the fence.

They have no desire to go back north. Typically, the animals in the north of South Australia prefer to move south. It is where there is more to eat, it is where the climate is kinder and it is where there is more to drink, and the dogs are no different. They breed up inside the fence. They are not trying to bust through it to get back up north, and the problem just gets greater and greater, to the point where we have seen wild dogs in parts of South Australia that you would never have expected to, as far north on Eyre Peninsula as Port Neill. There have been a lot of dog sightings out from Waikerie in the Riverland and around the Laura area in the Mid North.

This is a problem for the entire state, so I really do appreciate the state government, the federal government and Livestock SA stumping up, because if you are running sheep in Port Lincoln, if you are running sheep in Mount Gambier, you may not feel an immediate pressure from wild dogs but you are still, to a lesser extent than your northern neighbours, a significant beneficiary from a robust dog fence.

This is incredibly important. It is not an exaggeration to say that this is state and nation-building work in the same way that it was when the previously privately owned fences were joined up to create what we know now as the dog fence. Notwithstanding the hard work that people have put in to keep it up to scratch, insufficient resources over the years have seen it fall into greater disrepair. To renew—not fix up, but actually replace—such a significant amount of the dog fence and to leave behind only what is already the very best of it is an incredibly important step forward for our state and for our whole grazing industry.

There are some significant vectors through the Marree area and the Roxby Downs area, and also through the Frome Downs area, and I am sure there are other key vectors further west for dog incursions that I am not as personally familiar with. The member for Flinders would certainly know about those and the member for Giles would have some insight from his constituents as well. To take this step forward is critically important.

What we also need to do, though, is still work on the dogs that are already inside the fence. Over the next few years, we will renew the fence, but that does not mean that we can ease up in any way on the work to remove dogs from inside the fence. It is every landholder's legal responsibility to remove wild dogs from their property below the dog fence. Whether they hold the land for grazing purposes or not, it is still the responsibility of every single landholder to put the effort into that so that all graziers below the fence can benefit as much as humanly possible from what we are doing.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:19): I rise to speak briefly on the 34th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence. I do so with great pride because the dog fence, as previous speakers have expressed, is a piece of infrastructure that has long protected a very important industry in South Australia.

Currently, as the numbers stand, the sheep industry in South Australia is worth about \$1.48 billion. We are looking to grow that industry, and to do that we have had to put policy, mechanisms and infrastructure in place to not only protect the industry but also give our sheep producers, meat and wool producers, and our pastoralists the confidence to continue to invest in and look to the future of how they are going to be a part of the growing sector that is one of the great economies in South Australia.

We know that the grains industry is not only a major contributor to our commodity bottom line but also our largest exporter. The red meat sector is growing very quickly and it is looking at ways it can grow. Traditionally, the SASAG group have been instrumental in overseeing funding and government liaising on how we work with the sheep industry. The guard is about to change as both the sheep industry—the South Australian body—and the cattle industry are now coming in under the Livestock SA banner.

Working our way forward, we are working with industry now on how we can rebuild the dog fence. We instigated a BDO report that gave us a better understanding of exactly what sections of the fence needed to be replaced—21,050 kilometres in South Australia—and there was an underlying need for 1,600 kilometres to be replaced. With that 1,600 kilometres came a price tag, and the price tag has been deemed to be \$25 million. Along the way, we have developed a relationship with the member for Grey, the member for Stuart, the member for Flinders and myself to work our way through this and, as a collective, collaborate and lobby both the commonwealth and the state government, and understand that the industry had to have some skin in the game, so we came together.

Very proudly, we were able to work with the Morrison Coalition prior to their election to secure a commitment of \$10 million. The Marshall Liberal government have seen fit to invest a further \$10 million, and industry have said they will put \$5 million as their co-contribution into the rebuild in any way they can, and they have consulted far and wide. We have seen sheep producers, the pastoralists, having to dig into their pockets to be a part of the solution, and I thank them for that. It is a commitment, and it is a commitment that comes at a time when they are experiencing hardship, particularly through the drought, and they have seen the worth of the rebuild of this fence.

Currently, we have the Dog Fence Rebuild Committee led by Geoff Power, a well-respected grazier-pastoralist in South Australia. He and his team have travelled to Queensland to have a look at some of those exclusion fences to make sure that this rebuild is just, that it is warranted and that we put a piece of infrastructure in place that will potentially last another 100 years. Of course, with that comes a maintenance program; we understand that.

Looking at the dog fence, there are parts of it that have been there for many, many decades and are well past the use-by date. Previous governments have looked at the fence, they have kicked the fence and they have walked away from the fence, and that has been quite sad. We have seen the lack of will to put significant investment into that fence to protect the industry.

Regarding the Sheep Industry Blueprint, the aspiration is to grow that industry to \$1.8 billion by 2020. The \$1.8 billion target is achievable, but we are pushing against a headwind with the drought. On my recent visits to some of that pasture country I have seen real heartache up there. We have seen a lot of destocking. We have seen a lot of animals being moved to other parts of the country in order to preserve breeding stock, to preserve some of the investment that has been accumulated over a long time—in some instances decades—into those properties, collecting breeding stock, making sure they can grow their piece of the pie as part of the industry.

At the moment, dealing with drought and with uncertainty certainly questions the ability to generate that \$1.8 billion economy, so the fact that a Marshall Liberal government and a Morrison Coalition, with industry, have stumped up for their belief in what the dog fence is worth, and in its ability to underpin an industry that is very buoyant at the moment, should be applauded. If we look back to the 1982 drought, through low commodity prices you could not get enough money to buy a bullet to shoot a sheep.

We are experiencing very buoyant returns for sheep and wool and that is why we see fit to invest in the fence, to give those pastoralists, those sheep producers, the confidence to be part of a growing industry. Of course, coming into government we saw the initial pressure on a dog fence that was not maintained or that had little focus on it by the previous government. However, we came in and acknowledged the pressure on the fence but also thought we would be more proactive and so invested a further \$1.2 billion into a tracking program, a more coordinated baiting program.

That said, pastoralists have been doing an outstanding job but they needed a hand; they needed some funding that would help decelerate the growing numbers of dogs. Prior to coming into government we saw some very good breeding seasons. Good rainfall produces life, accelerates the life cycle, and we have seen dog numbers increase and, as the drought bites, those dogs are moving south, as the member for Stuart has rightly said.

I previously owned a vineyard at Overland Corner and there were wild dogs sighted down there at Taylorville. We have seen wild dogs in the Mallee. That just demonstrates that the dogs are moving south, and some of them are very cunning, smart animals and very hard to track, trace and destroy. The baiting program has been very important, our coordinated program by both land and air. I know from my trip up into some of the pasture country a couple of weeks ago that there is a large baiting program going on not only in South Australia but also Queensland, because if those dogs are heading south they are heading south out of Queensland, south out of New South Wales, and south out of our pasture country.

I think we are working extremely well with industry. We are working well in having the dog fence rebuilt. Tenders have closed for materials, and for those fencing gangs to put their best foot forward so that we can get on with rebuilding the fence in the first quarter of 2020. The member for MacKillop, as a large sheep producer, would be quite buoyed by this project, and the member for Stuart and his constituency are very excited at the prospect of a government that actually cares and is investing in and protecting an industry that is so valuable. So roll on the sheep industry, the growth agenda of \$1.8 billion, and the \$7.5 million blueprint we are currently supporting.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:29): I rise to make a contribution on the 34th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence. What an exciting day this is. I thank the minister for agriculture for taking the time to visit the electorate of Flinders earlier this year, when we travelled north from Ceduna and inspected part of the dog fence within the electorate of Flinders which, as it happens, is part of the dog fence that has actually been identified as being up for renewal.

I appreciate the contributions from both the member for Stuart and the member for Giles, who have significant portions of the dog fence running through their electorates, as it wanders its way through pastoral country, from the north-west through to the north-east, from the Great Australian Bight, in the electorate of Flinders, just west of Nundroo, or just west of Yalata actually. It really delineates the sheep country from the cattle country. Our sheep flocks need to be protected from what was originally the dingo but is now known as the wild dog population because, more often than not, we are not seeing purebred dingoes but, rather, populations of dogs that have interbred with domestic dogs, which are regarded as wild dogs.

When we were in the West, we met with local landowners who have an interest in the dog fence. The Minister for Energy and Mining mentioned Geoff Power, who comes from his neck of the woods and is a prominent member of the Dog Fence Board. That part of the fence in the West is looked after by the Penong Dog Fence Board. There are a number of dog fence boards throughout the state. Quite a few members of the Penong Dog Fence Board met us north of Ceduna. It was a really productive meeting in the lead-up to this project being announced.

The Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence project proposes to rebuild sections of the South Australian dog fence that are 100 years old to ensure protection of South Australia's livestock industries. The South Australian dog fence is 2,150 kilometres long and stretches from the Great Australian Bight to the New South Wales border, and as much as 1,600 kilometres has been identified as needing to be replaced.

PIRSA advised the committee that the South Australian dog fence is a most important asset. I think that has been identified today. The minister for agriculture even referred to it as 'nation building' it is so significant. Even though it might not be a particularly high priority for people in metropolitan Adelaide, or even farmers and graziers further south in the state, it is critical to keeping the wild dog population at bay and protecting our sheep industry in the southern part of the state.

Dogs will travel: once they are through in numbers enough to breed up then they will travel. Famously, a few years ago a wild dog was shot as far south as Port Neill on Eyre Peninsula. It is not inconceivable that, should a significant population build up inside what is now a decrepit fence, they could travel far south and be on the outskirts of metropolitan Adelaide.

As I said, the dog fence is 2,150 kilometres long. Over the last decade, the impact of wild dogs on the South Australian livestock industry has dramatically increased. It is not just the numbers and the damage they do to sheep flocks—even calves on a property running cattle—it also means that an extraordinary amount of time, an extraordinary amount of resources and much worry is spent by the pastoralists and their families on trying to control the dogs and protect their flocks and livelihoods.

In 2018, the South Australian Dog Fence Board reported several strategic priorities to reduce the impact of wild dogs. The board highlighted that \$25 million was required to rebuild 1,600 kilometres of the dog fence. Agreement was reached between the commonwealth, the state and industry, with the commonwealth contributing \$10 million, the state contributing \$10 million and industry contributing \$5 million to renew the fence. As well as that, there will need to be ongoing maintenance, monitoring and repair. Baiting and trapping will continue—a little while ago, this government announced funding for an extra two trappers—and shooting is critical to maintaining dog numbers at a low level.

Hopefully, once the fence is renewed it will preclude any dogs getting through—that would be in an ideal world—but there are situations where camels might break through, floodwaters might come down or strong winds might blow the fence over and the dogs will still have an opportunity to get through, so regular patrolling is critical. Rebuilding the dog fence will protect South Australia's \$4.3 billion livestock industry by supporting the economic priorities for South Australia, and they are: increasing and securing productivity for the livestock industry inside the fence, growing the regions through a stronger livestock industry and employment to rebuild the fence.

Tenders were called for (the tender process has closed) and there would have been a good number of applications, I am sure. It is going to be a huge job. Obviously, it will take more than one successful tender to rebuild this, particularly given that the build is expected to commence in autumn of next year, only a few months away, and be completed by June 2024. Within a four-year period we should have a brand-new dog fence over much of the distance and certainly a very serviceable dog fence over the rest of it.

An independent economic analysis predicted that replacing the 100-year-old sections of the dog fence could benefit South Australia by up to \$120 million over 20 years, which is a significant return on investment, estimated to be around 48 per cent. There are not too many investments where you can get that sort of return in the current economic climate.

There will be more than 60 additional full-time jobs created as a result of the rebuild. I assume that is over the life of the build, which we have identified as being over four years. The new dog fence

will reduce wild dog management costs for pastoralists, which I alluded to before, by up to \$97 million over 20 years. That is a significant saving in time, resources and money for pastoralists who abut the fence and also those who are a little bit further south.

The sales income of sheep enterprises is expected to increase by almost \$70 million. That really identifies part of the problem, because dogs can significantly impact sheep numbers on any given property or in any given enterprise. It only takes the loss of a few ewes and many lambs to significantly impact the bottom line of any pastoral enterprise.

I congratulate the Marshall government and the minister for agriculture on pushing this, and I also congratulate the Public Works Committee, ably led by the member for Kavel, and the other members who have considered this proposal, understood the importance of it and are recommending that it be approved.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:37): I rise to add my support to that of others in this place in relation to the 34th report of the Public Works Committee, on the Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence. The South Australian dog fence is the most important asset protecting the \$1.5 billion South Australian sheep industry. It is a strong line of defence to protect the sheep industry from wild dog attacks. With the numbers of wild dogs reportedly growing, the rebuild of this fence is a priority for our government.

The scale of the fence is, of course, significant: at 2,150 kilometres long, it stretches from the Great Australian Bight to the New South Wales border. This ageing infrastructure, which in sections is 100 years old, is costing our sheep industry dearly. It really is welcome to see bipartisan support for this build and reconstruction, particularly on the opposition side, and I welcome the member for Giles' support of the dog fence. His seat also takes in the dog fence, so no doubt he is fully aware of all the implications amongst his constituents.

The dog fence is not a new issue for me and my family. We bordered some of the dog fence many years ago until we sold the property, Wooltana Station. One of the reasons for selling was the cost of the maintenance and upkeep of the dog fence. The age and deterioration of the fence was certainly an issue but, not only that, there was a dog fence board that used to maintain the fence, but the main maintenance was meant to be upheld by the growers at the time.

In fact, if you go back far enough, the dog fence was originally put up by individual landowners to protect their patch of dirt. Eventually, a number of landowners got together and joined the fence to make it as long as it is today, keeping the dogs out from the north and the south. The dog fence means a whole lot; in fact, more so today not only for its pure value but for the choice it gives us to grow what we want in our region and whether to have sheep in this country.

They say that Australia once rode on the sheep's back; it was developed through the farming of sheep in its early heydays and pioneering economics. In Longreach, Queensland, they used to have a flock of around two million-odd sheep in that region. I think that figure is now below 700,000 due to drought. Most importantly, dogs were an issue that caused people to turn away from sheep and move towards cattle. But this has changed. In the area around Longreach, people are doing exactly the same as our pioneers did in South Australia over 100 years ago—fencing off their properties from dogs at their own cost so that they can run the sheep.

I want to touch on a couple of big properties that used to run sheep. One was called Isis Downs in Queensland, a property that was owned by Kerry Packer. It has a huge shearing shed and is a bit of a tourist attraction with 120 stands. Apparently, in its heyday when it was shearing time, you could be sacked from one end of the board and re-employed on the other end because there were two or three teams running depending on—

Members interjecting:

Mr McBRIDE: I am not sure how many roustabouts 120 stands would require, but it would have been a whole community shearing nearly in excess of 80,000 to 120,000 sheep. The property no longer has sheep on it, and one reason for that could have been the labour component associated with sheep. It is more intensive. The other reason was the wild dog issue. We were also lucky enough to see Cordillo Downs on the Natural Resources Committee. That also has another large shearing

shed. It is now a tourist attraction and it is an all-cattle station. They would not even contemplate putting sheep on that property today because of the wild dog issue.

Dogs are certainly an issue in New South Wales. We had a property in New England near the Great Dividing Range. We were on the western side and would never confront the eastern side. On the eastern side were a lot of national parks. All those properties that abound or adjoin the national parks are cattle properties. One of the reasons for that is that if they had sheep they would be eaten by wild dogs.

Another phenomenon about wild dogs that most will not recognise here is that South Australia suffers from wild dog, but it is more of a dingo wild dog than the crossbred wild dog of the eastern coast. Originally, the east coast wild dogs mated with dingoes, but Alsatians and greyhounds and other dogs that people abandoned in the national parks have crossbred with the dingo and now they are a real predator. They are more of a predator than the dingo because it is said that the dingo will only hunt for its needs. It only hunts because it gets hungry. It does play occasionally and is known to do that.

However, the wild dog from the east side of Australia, with its crossbreeding, hunts just to play around and take the delicacies, and that is the kidneys of the sheep. When they capture sheep they rip the kidneys out and walk away and leave the rest. This is why wild dogs in the New South Wales area are a really emotional issue. They kill large numbers when they get amongst the sheep producers on the east coast or in the Great Dividing Range west of that. When I was living in the area, there was a dog there and there was a great deal of concern because of the damage that even one dog or many more dogs could do.

We had a meeting up there and obviously all rationale was sought to find a way of getting rid of the wild dogs or the dog that was in the area—it could be shooting it, it could be poisoning it, it could be baiting it. When there was a wild dog issue in the region, you would get 200 or 300 people living within an area of 50 to 100 square kilometres gathering to talk about it. That just gives you an indication of its importance. When we talk about a wild dog issue, it might involve 100 kilometres and only one property with a station and staff, but up there it was very intense and well populated and obviously the matter of economic difficulty created by wild dogs was certainly well received.

The rebuild of the fence will have significant benefits. Analysis has shown that the rebuild of the 1,600 kilometres of dog fence will create significant benefits in the vicinity of \$120 million over 20 years—a return on investment of 48 per cent. This analysis provides a compelling case. More than 60 additional full-time jobs will be created as a result of the rebuild. Wild dog management costs will be reduced for pastoralists by up to \$97 million over 20 years and sales income of sheep enterprises is expected to increase by up to nearly \$70 million.

Increasing and securing productivity for the livestock industry inside the fence will in turn underpin stronger regional economies through benefits that a stronger livestock industry would bring and through employment generated through the rebuild itself. The \$10 million investment by our state government together with the \$10 million from the commonwealth government and the \$5 million from the livestock industry is a partnership that underscores the importance of this fence to our state.

Another great point is the fact that we have the federal and state governments and our industry all working together, understanding the issues. It is known that these dogs obviously start in the pastoral regions and then head further south. Something that has been said here already in some of the supportive speeches is that landowners have to take responsibility for managing these dogs, but then so does National Parks.

While the rest of the community plays their part, a property like Bon Bon station, out from Glendambo, bought with federal funds back in 2008 and looked after by National Parks, also has to play its role in managing vermin—wild dogs and other predators—in these parks so that they do not create a haven for dogs to live in.

Obviously, we also want the landowners to be part of this. One of the problems with wild dogs and controlling them (and we face this issue ourselves personally now) is gun control and having guns in vehicles so that when you see a wild dog it is paramount that you actually destroy it. However, having guns in a vehicle with employees who may not be full time and may even be

backpackers from overseas—because it is so difficult getting employees out in these regions—is another reason that this issue of the dogs has become so hard.

It is okay when you are a family out in the pastoral regions and you can even train your son, your children, and your wife can even have a gun licence; they are all responsible people. But when you have employees, especially from overseas—getting labour from any source that you can—having gun licences given to those types of people is a really difficult challenge because, firstly, they do not have a licence and, secondly, it is very difficult to get a licence. By the time you get them upskilled and so forth, they have to move on because their visa will have expired. These are all the difficulties we are having with employment and controlling dogs inside the dog fence.

Baiting is another difficulty. More than 20 or 30 years ago, people used to bait up a dead sheep or a dead kangaroo or something like that by chucking a few 1080 and strychnine baits out the window as they were going down the road. You cannot do that anymore; you are not allowed to do that anymore. You could lay them right across your property for 100—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr McBRIDE: Yes, I know—for a very good reason. Things have changed. But that makes the task of controlling these dogs that much harder. This is why this dog fence must work. This is why it must be improved and redeveloped and looked after more than ever before.

I am pleased that the Public Works Committee has undertaken its assessment and recommended the proposed public works. The generational investment by the Marshall Liberal government in this important piece of infrastructure is a testament to the fact that we are listening to our regions and that we value our primary industries and the value our regional communities bring to our state. I commend this report to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:48): I want to keep my remarks brief because I certainly do wish for the house to move in line with the member for Kavel's motion that the 34th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Rebuild of the South Australian Dog Fence, be noted. Indeed, I think it is important that that occur. I confine my remarks to some short observations about the importance of the dog fence in terms of the history of South Australia and the history of pastoral development in this state.

What we know is that in the early development of pastoral country in the north there were two matters of particular significance and particular gaps in knowledge that caused catastrophic losses in the very early days. One of those was the carrying capacity of the land, and the other was the dramatic effect that wild dogs had almost immediately once sheep were introduced into that country. So the development of fencing, at first around properties, was a very early priority, and how to get to grips with the danger of losses caused by wild dogs was a matter that exercised people's minds right from the start.

As the member for Kavel has indicated, the rebuild that will occur with this \$25 million of much-needed capital funding will restore sections of the fence that are now over 100 years old and well and truly required as we combat the pressure of dogs coming on that fence and then pressing south of the fence. I also want to make it clear from the point of view of my role as the Presiding Member of the Natural Resources Committee of the parliament that this has been a matter of significant interest for my committee.

I want to note the visit the committee did to the arid lands in August last year at which time we had the opportunity to inspect the fence near Coober Pedy and receive briefings in relation to the work that has been conducted south of the fence in relation to the Biteback program. That program has been operating since 2009, effectively to bait with a view to eradicate wild dogs south of the fence.

To be clear, we know that inside the fence the status of wild dogs and dingoes is clear: they are a declared pest under South Australia's natural resources legislation, now the Landscape SA legislation. We know that the present threat of wild dogs inside the fence is something that we directly endeavour to deal with. Outside the fence, wild dogs and dingoes are neither specifically protected nor are they declared, but they are acknowledged for their significance. There is a balancing act to be achieved, hence the very important role of the fence in drawing a clear dividing line between an

area where we know there will continue to be dogs and dingoes and an area where we want to be able to run sheep without the devastating effects that the dogs can cause.

I want to specifically recognise at this time that a history of the dog fence was prepared on the occasion of the centenary of Federation of South Australia and that was concerning the period from 1947, the initial dog fence legislation, until 2012. It is a publication entitled *Holding the Line*. It was originally authored by Leith Yelland and, after his unfortunate passing, it was revised and updated by Patricia Fraser in November 2012. Time does not permit me to go through that publication at any length; I would like to do so given an opportunity. But I want to make the observation that what has happened with the development of the dog fence has been a very practical endeavour. It has been driven by people who actually live and work in the area.

As I said at the outset, it started with individual pastoralists looking to fence off their own properties and it became clear that it was going to be far more efficient not to ring fence individual properties but to have a single fence that covered the entire state. There was very early on a high degree of cooperation among those pastoralists, legislation and the establishment of the Dog Fence Board which has served us well for those many decades ever since.

I particularly recognise in that regard the sustained work on the dog fence, commencing with Byron MacLachlan at Commonwealth Hill and Ian McTaggart of Nonning Pastoral and their descendants, notably the long ongoing work of Hugh MacLachlan and his sons in recent years who continue that work. This is the government coming to the development of much-needed capital works to restore and maintain one of the state's key pastoral assets. I commend this work and I commend the motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:55): It is with great pride that I rise to speak to the 34th report of the Public Works Committee in relation to the rebuild of the dog fence. What an important motion this is. This is something that has been debated for many years and, thankfully under the Marshall Liberal government, we have been able to auspice \$25 million, which is a contribution of \$10 million of state money, \$10 million of federal government money and \$5 million from industry. In the little bit of time that I have, I want to commend the industry for getting behind this scheme—

Mr Teague interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: No, I'm not complaining. It is something that industry are obviously concerned about and I am glad that they have got on to it. There is an extra levy per head of sheep that is sold. I really want to commend industry because I remember the days, about eight years ago, when we were all working towards getting Primary Producers South Australia, Livestock South Australia and Grain Producers South Australia. There was talk of industry levies coming in to make it work because, quite frankly, through South Australian Farmers Federation membership dropping, the funds just ran out and it basically fell over in the end. I really want to commend the industry.

I want to commend Geoff Power for his absolutely tireless work in lobbying politicians of all colours to make sure we get this bill progressed for the 1,600 kilometres of the 2,150 kilometres of the South Australian section of the dog fence. It is absolutely vital to our industry, vital to the billions of dollars of livestock production in this state, and it is a great project.

I want to comment ever so briefly on people who live north of the fence and station owners, like Sharon Oldfield at Cowarie Station, who I have visited multiple times. She wants to keep up her organic status and cannot use 1080 baits because she is north of the fence. This shows the impact that dogs have on cattle: they pull down calves and that sort of thing. They spend a lot of money and time shooting dogs north of the fence.

I would just like to commend the Public Works Committee and commend the Marshall Liberal government, the federal government and certainly the industry for getting behind this. I commend the motion.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:58): This is a very substantial and significant project, and I am appreciative of the member for Stuart, the member for Chaffey, the member for Flinders, the member for Giles, the member for MacKillop, the member for Heysen, and the member for Hammond for not

only contributing to the debate in the house today but also being very strong advocates for this vital project.

I said in my earlier remarks that the dog fence is the single most important asset protecting the \$1.5 billion South Australian sheep industry. It is also right for the member for Stuart to say that it is a nation-building project and for the member for Flinders to reflect also on that point. This government has made a significant commitment and so has the industry to ensure that this vital work can be performed now.

It is difficult work, it is hard work, it is important work. Members may know that over \$1 million is being spent on topping out sandhills alone and putting in place a clay surface to better allow for the construction of this fence. As I say, it is vital work, and I am very proud that we have been able to recommend this project and to bring it forward so quickly as a government. I know that all South Australians will benefit.

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REGULATION) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

LAND ACQUISITION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. New clause, page 3, after line 15—Insert:

5A—Insertion of section 9A

After section 9 insert:

9A—Operation of section 26B to be set out in certain communications

Without limiting any other provision of this Act, the Authority must ensure that any written communication of the Authority to an owner of land that is, or is to be, acquired under this Act contains information setting out the operation of section 26B.

No. 2. Clause 6, page 3, after line 18—Insert:

(1a) Section 10(3)—after paragraph (a) insert:

(ab) it must set out the operation of section 26B; and

No. 3. Clause 13, page 5, line 30 [clause 13(3), inserted subsection (7)]—Delete 'land'

No. 4. Clause 19, page 12, lines 12 and 13 [clause 19, inserted section 25A(1)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

(a) at the time the notice of intention to acquire land was given in relation to the land, the person was an owner and occupier of the land; and

No. 5. Clause 20, page 13, after line 8 [clause 20, inserted section 26B]—Insert:

(1a) However, nothing in this section authorises the Authority to make more than 1 payment under this section in relation to a particular acquisition or proposed acquisition.

No. 6. Clause 20, page 13, line 16 [clause 20, inserted section 26B(3), definition of *prescribed person*, (a)]—Delete 'and occupier of' and substitute 'of the fee simple in'

No. 7. Clause 20, page 14, line 11 [clause 20, inserted section 26D(2)]—After 'section' insert 'or on its own motion,'

No. 8. Clause 20, page 14, line 17 [inserted section 26D(3)(b)]—Delete 'the prescribed period' and insert '24 months'

No. 9. Clause 21, page 15, after line 15 [clause 21, inserted Part 4A]—Insert:

26EA—Special provisions applying where acquisition of underground land for certain tunnel construction

- (1) Despite any other provision of this Act, a special Act or any other Act or law, the following provisions apply to a proposed acquisition of underground land under this Part where the land is to be acquired for a purpose related to the construction of a tunnel (however described) to be constructed less than 10 metres below the surface of the underground land:
 - (a) the Authority must prepare and submit a report to the Public Works Committee of the Parliament in respect of the proposed acquisition and tunnel construction (and the function of inquiring into and making recommendations will, for the purposes of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*, be taken imposed on the Committee under this Act);
 - (b) the report under paragraph (a) must be accompanied by—
 - (i) an engineers' report prepared in accordance with any requirements set out in the regulations; and
 - (ii) such other information as may be required by the Public Works Committee,
 and must comply with any other requirements under the regulations;
 - (c) a dilapidation report in respect of any premises on surface land under which the underground land is located must be prepared in accordance with any requirements set out in the regulations.
- (2) The Authority or a person authorised in writing by the Authority may, for the purpose of preparing a report under subsection (1)(a), (b) or (c)—
 - (a) exercise a power referred to in section 27 or the relevant special Act; and
 - (b) take such other action as may be reasonably necessary for the preparation of the report.
- (3) Subsection (2) is in addition to, and does not derogate from, section 27 or any other provision of this Act or a special Act.
- (4) Nothing in this section prevents an Authority from acquiring land under Part 3.

No. 10. Clause 21, page 16, line 1 [clause 20, inserted section 26F(5)]—Delete 'Despite a provision of this Act, or' and substitute 'Except as is provided by section 26H, and despite'

No. 11. Clause 21, page 16, lines 13 to 16 [clause 20, inserted section 26G(1)(a) and (b)]—Delete paragraphs (a) and (b) and substitute:

- (a) any person who, to the person's knowledge, has an interest in the land, or who had an interest in the land immediately before the acquisition, and the nature of that person's interest (including, to avoid doubt, the person to whom the notice is given); and
- (b) the existence of any well, bore or other infrastructure located within the underground land, or on surface land under which the underground land is located, and any entitlement (whether of the person or otherwise) that exists to take water by means of that infrastructure; and
- (c) such other information as may be specified by the Authority in the written notice.

No. 12. Clause 21, page 16, after line 19 [clause 21, inserted Part 4A]—Insert:

26H—Limited entitlement to compensation where certain water infrastructure or rights affected

- (1) Subject to this section, a person (the *interest holder*) who—
 - (a) holds a prescribed interest in underground land; and
 - (b) notifies the Authority of the prescribed interest in accordance with section 26G,
 is, on an application under this section, entitled to compensation in relation to the acquisition of the underground land to the extent that the acquisition—
 - (c) involves the acquisition of the prescribed interest; or

- (d) results in the discharge of the prescribed interest; or
 - (e) results in the interest holder being unable to take water by means of, or pursuant to, the prescribed interest.
- (2) An application under this section—
- (a) must be made within 6 months after publication of a notice of acquisition in relation to the relevant underground land; and
 - (b) must be made in a manner and form determined by the Authority; and
 - (c) must be accompanied by such information or documents as may reasonably be required by the Authority; and
 - (d) must comply with any other requirements set out in the regulations.
- (3) On receiving an application under this section, the Authority must assess the application and must make a written offer of compensation (not exceeding the prescribed amount) to the interest holder.
- (4) The following provisions apply in relation to the payment of compensation under this section:
- (a) the Authority and the interest holder must negotiate in good faith in relation to the compensation;
 - (b) the Authority may offer non-monetary compensation to the interest holder (including, to avoid doubt, compensation consisting of relocation of any infrastructure affected by the acquisition);
 - (c) the Authority's liability to pay compensation under this section is reduced by the value of any non-monetary compensation provided at the request of, or by agreement with, the interest holder;
 - (d) the amount of compensation payable under this section is to be determined on the basis that the interest holder is to be compensated for loss occasioned by reason of disturbance (and regard is to be had to such of the principles set out in section 25 as may be relevant to such a loss);
 - (e) the Authority or the interest holder may refer a question arising in the course of negotiations into Court (and the matter may be dealt with as if it had been a matter referred into Court under section 23C);
 - (f) compensation under this section may be paid directly to the interest holder in a manner determined by the Authority;
 - (g) the payment of compensation must comply with any other requirements set out in the regulations.
- (5) In this section—
- prescribed interest*, in underground land, means—
- (a) ownership of a lawful well that provides access to underground water in the underground land, and any underground infrastructure associated with the well; or
 - (b) a right to take underground water from the underground land by means of such a well,
- in each case being an interest existing immediately before a notice of acquisition is published in relation to the underground land;
- underground water* has the same meaning as in the Natural Resources Management Act 2004;
- well* has the same meaning as in the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004* and includes, to avoid doubt, a bore.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that the government will be accepting all the amendments. I am pleased to support the passage of the bill as already passed by the house and with the amendments in the other place. The Land Acquisition Act 1969 establishes a process for the acquisition of land by acquiring authorities. Land is generally acquired to accommodate various road and infrastructure projects, and this process will continue to assist South Australia growing and our economy developing into the future.

Operationally, the land acquisition process is overseen by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI). They liaise with landowners to follow the process under the act to acquire the land and negotiate compensation for the landowner and other claimants holding interest in the land. We understand that no acquisition is easy or simple. It requires a significant level of cooperation from the government in assisting property owners, landlords, tenants and businesses to move residences or locations.

It is crucial that the rights of all prospective parties are maintained and solidified in legislation and that the proper compensation is provided, something the government has firmly acted on in this bill. I indicate our appreciation to members of the other place for their consideration of these matters. From those contributions, it is clear that they, too, have an understanding of the significance of making sure that we both protect the interests of parties in this legislation and ensure that, in new matters such as tunnelling under roads to provide for infrastructure, this is at the front of our considerations.

In essence, this bill deals largely with recommendations from the 2017 select committee, which examined the compulsory acquisition processes for properties acquired for the Torrens to Torrens project. This was chaired by the Hon. John Darley, a member of the Legislative Council. That report made a number of sensible changes to the process of land acquisition in South Australia, especially around increased compensation for landowners, greater security for payments and more security for tenants. The Hon. John Darley, who is a member of the other place, was active in the consideration of these matters in the debate in the other place and many of the amendments that are brought to our attention this afternoon.

The bill also makes consequential changes as requested by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the Crown Solicitor's Office, the two work groups that deal with land acquisition. I place on the record my appreciation of those advisers from DPTI and our own Attorney-General's Department, and particularly the Crown Solicitor's Office, who have really worked extremely diligently to make sure that we come up with practical solutions to modern issues.

Finally, the bill acts on a government policy to allow for the underground land to be acquired to ensure that tunnels or otherwise can be built to grow South Australia and complete those crucial corridor projects. Much has been said about the concerns of those in the western region of metropolitan Adelaide who may have some impact on them as a result of the important north-south corridor project, which is a project traversing governments and one which has very significant investment from state and federal governments, not to mention some inconvenience for local governments.

In any event, it has thrown up a very critical aspect, including how we protect infrastructure with these major projects, such as the Thebarton Theatre, a place of entertainment and meeting for generations in South Australia. These are all considerations which have made it important for us to pass this legislation to provide options to those who are expert in providing advice to the government on how we should progress with that infrastructure. I thank all members for the consideration they have given in the course of the debate on this bill, which, at the most basic level, ensures a more even playing field for landowners, tenants and investors.

The select committee made a number of recommendations. Largely, these have been incorporated in this legislation. In fact, they formed the basis of the original bill. Again, at the most basic level this bill ensures that landowners will be in the strongest position possible, should their land be acquired, with market value, professional costs and now solatium payments being made.

On an operational level, although DPTI endeavour to undertake the best processes possible, the bill adds recommendations from both DPTI and the Crown Solicitor's Office to further strengthen the land acquisition process in South Australia. These changes include:

- legislating on existing DPTI policy that stamp duty, lands titles office fees and transfer fees associated with buying a new residential property be paid by DPTI. Stamp duty will also be payable to owners of investment properties where certain conditions are met;
- the introduction of a valuer's conference to allow the values for the landowner and DPTI to discuss factual issues in the evaluations early in the compensation negotiations;
- allowing an offer of compensation to be varied up or down;
- changes to the way DPTI determine rent to be paid by claimants if they remain on the land after the expiration of the three-month grace period. The rent payable must not exceed the acceptable market rate for the property; and
- a range of other amendments that will improve the compensation negotiation process between the parties and reduce administrative and legal costs.

Finally, the bill looks to the future and the work being undertaken by the Minister for Planning, Transport, and Infrastructure and this government to grow South Australia, build our economy and help families get home sooner and safer through expanded road networks.

As we have seen across the country, the bill contemplates the future use of tunnels to avoid above-ground land acquisition where possible. I thank all members for their interest in this aspect specifically and note the government members' amendments now included in this bill, which ensure compensation to be provided for landowners with legal bores.

On that note, I want to acknowledge across the party spectrum of the composition of our parliament that the question of protecting the interests of those who have legal bores and ensuring they are not either interrupted or damaged has been a matter raised by a number of members, and I thank them all for that contribution. It was an important issue to look at: we did, we provided advice on it and we have made sure that those interests are protected.

Upon the passing and the commencement of this act, there will be work done on regulations and changes to the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan to reflect any future plans for the city corridors. I appreciate the consideration in the other place, the comprehensive debate on this bill and thank all members for their participation. I commend the amendments to the bill to the house.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly without any amendment.

SUPREME COURT (COURT OF APPEAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 15, page 10, lines 18 to 23 [clause 15, inserted section 19B(e)]—Delete paragraph (e) and substitute:

- (e) all causes and matters which are required by the rules of court, or by the express provision of any other Act, to be heard or determined by the Court of Appeal.

No. 2. Clause 21, page 12, lines 18 to 24—Leave out the clause

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The government accepts amendments Nos 1 and 2 as presented from the Legislative Council. In doing so, I am pleased to support the passage of the bill accordingly with these amendments. We have debated it in this house and the other place and welcome the amendments passed in the other place, which I place on the record were at the request of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Australia and were moved by the government in the other place.

This bill marks a new era for the South Australian judicial system and is a reform that I am incredibly proud to have developed and to see pass the parliament today with members' approval. In South Australia, the highest state court is the Full Court of the Supreme Court. For criminal matters it is referred to as the Court of Criminal Appeal. The Full Court and Court of Criminal Appeal comprise two or three Supreme Court judges sitting together. Appeals from the Full Court and Court of Criminal Appeal, if appealed as such, go on to the High Court of Australia.

Under the current structure, I should also mention that since 1986 we do not have another option to go to the Privy Council in Britain, for good reason: we have passed the Australia Act and we are truly independent, but we have a very important appellate structure that operates. At present, the judges of the Supreme Court work on a rotational basis in the Full Court hearing civil appeals and in the Court of Criminal Appeal hearing criminal appeals. They also sit as a single judge to hear serious civil and criminal cases, the latter incorporating cases such as murder.

Many members of the legal profession in South Australia have raised with me that South Australia should establish a separate dedicated court of appeal, as has been done in many other jurisdictions. If members take the opportunity to read the contributions in the other place, it is abundantly clear that they have also presented those same arguments to members in the other place. It is disappointing that the Labor Party in opposition have opposed this move. Clearly, they have not been persuaded by these presentations, but it will not be too late for them to come on board and recognise the significance of having a dedicated separate court of appeal, as has been done in other jurisdictions, and the benefits thereof.

The bill establishes a court of appeal, following in the footsteps of other states, bringing South Australia to the forefront of the Australian legal fraternity and opening the doors for South Australia to be one of the best jurisdictions to practise and preside over law. It would not have escaped the attention of most of our members here—if it has, I will refresh your memory—that, since Federation and the establishment of the High Court of Australia, South Australia has never been represented on that forum. It is time that we are considered and respected in our legal system and that we are restored to a level of confidence where we will have that opportunity.

As Attorney-General, I consider South Australia to be a very important part of our federation. We are a major economy and we are going to be a stronger group at the table under this government, but it is also important that we have a mature system where we have the opportunity to promote our own for consideration on the highest court in the country. I will commit the time that I am here as Attorney-General to give every opportunity to South Australians to do that.

The draft bill sought to amend the Supreme Court Act 1935 to change the structure of the Supreme Court. This includes establishing the Court of Appeal as a division of the Supreme Court, with a separate general division for all matters that are not to be heard by the Court of Appeal. Again, this is consistent with interstate models.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court will remain the principal officer of the Supreme Court, including the Court of Appeal, and the President of the Court of Appeal is responsible to the Chief Justice for the administration of the Court of Appeal. The jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal will include the existing jurisdiction of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia and the Court of Criminal Appeal. The Court of Appeal will be constituted by at least two judicial officers, with the potential for three judges to hear matters.

Given that the change to the court's structure is currently in the parliament, the decision regarding appointments to fill the vacancies is being considered simultaneously. In the meantime, to assist the court to manage its workload, 10 judicial auxiliary appointments to the Supreme Court have been made for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 and a further three from 5 September 2019 to 30 June 2020. This follows two further recent appointments to the District Court, which I hope

members have read about and are pleased to note. Certainly, they have been warmly received by members of the profession and also, of course, my own Attorney-General's Department.

I appreciate that who populates courts may not have a wide spectrum of interest in the general community, but it is important that we have good men and women to take up these areas of responsibility to ensure that we maintain a standard of our courts that retains the public confidence in them. Let me say to South Australians who may not be listening to this debate and may never read it: someday, at sometime, you or someone you love may need to have a dispute resolved in a court, and/or come before a court as either the victim or the accused. You will be looking to be dealt with fairly, in accordance with the law, and to be protected through that process. It is very important that we maintain that, and in that of course is this very important appellate role.

While the Labor opposition have actively opposed this proposal, I do not really understand their objection, other than to suggest that the matters raised by the Chief Justice were sufficient for us to stay as we are. I would suggest it is a very anti growth, anti South Australian approach for the Labor opposition to take that view. To leave South Australia stagnant in this area of reform, which is clearly needed, as has been voiced widely, is not wanting to be the best we can be.

We as a government are not shy in progressing these reforms. We want the best for South Australians and, in that, we want the best structure to ensure that we have an effective and efficient state system, and one which is the best it can be. It is not just a question of South Australia being one of the only jurisdictions left without a court of appeal. Obviously, the Northern Territory does not have a court of appeal; I think they have five Supreme Court judges. They do not have a district court; they only have a local court. I think they have a population that would fit into the MCG.

You obviously need to compare apples with apples and not apples to oranges. South Australia has had the benefit of looking interstate to New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia, which are very significant economies and populations within the federation. It has been very successful for us to consider the more efficient structures within their superior court processes.

We found, on assessing their introduction of appeal courts, and the reviews that were done of them, that there was an increase in the speed of delivery of judgements, shorter hearings and, overall, that they produced consistent judgements of a higher quality. That is not my assessment; that is the assessment of those of a level as high as now-retired High Court judge Michael Kirby, who undertook a very comprehensive assessment of the New South Wales structure. In terms of South Australia's need for, in particular, improving the time taken to deliver judgements and improving the quality and consistency of such judgements, judgements are a primary reason for pursuing this reform.

Quite a number of examples were presented in the other place, not only by stakeholders such as the South Australian Bar Association and Legal Services Commission. One example was highlighted by the Hon. Connie Bonaros in her contribution. A member of the profession had presented to her that they elect to litigate matters in the Adelaide registry of the Federal Circuit Court even though, in this example, it cost \$20,000 more, because they were looking to receive a greater level of consistency and what they perceived to be reliable judgements received in a timely manner. That is something we just cannot ignore.

The exodus of our solicitors making decisions, presumably in conjunction with counsel where it applies, to litigate matters in another registry of another jurisdiction rather than come to our own is a disturbing trend. I suggest we have to resurrect that and ensure that we restore confidence in the profession that is advising South Australians as to their legal matters, including where they might seek a dispute resolution and to litigate where appropriate.

It is just not acceptable to leave it in a situation where that exodus continues. I suggest that to do so would be a failure on behalf of the government, and indeed us as a parliament, if we were to allow that to continue. We have very highly skilled and highly trained persons already on the Supreme Court, including our Chief Justice, of course, and the judges, who to some degree are almost wasted if we do not fully utilise those skills and work to complement their number so that they may continue their work. With the passage of this bill, that will now have the flavour of considering skills for those who have appellate capacity.

We have looked at the options to make our state's justice system the best it can be. We are confident that this progress in the reform that is being proposed will help us to make sure that we can be the best we can be in the establishment of a court of appeal. The bill returns to the House of Assembly having been approved by the majority of the Legislative Council. I am pleased that there has been comprehensive support in the other place. I am not going to say anything further to that, otherwise it reflects on a vote, but it is well known in this house what the Australian Labor Party's position has been.

As I have indicated, the incorporation of the amendment came as a result of requests from the Chief Justice. It effectively deals with the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal to hear and determine matters. The provision of the bill relevantly includes all clauses and matters required to be heard and determined by the Court of Appeal by rules of the court made by any three or more judges of the Court of Appeal with the concurrence of the Chief Justice. The amendment under consideration, which we have indicated we support—and I am speaking in support of the motion of its passage—removes the reference to the rules needing to be made by any three or more judges of the Court of Appeal with the concurrence of the Chief Justice.

The additional jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal would still be able to be conferred by the rules of court, but it would be rules made under the existing section 72 of the Supreme Court Act 1935, which simply provides for the rules of court to be made by any three or more judges of the Supreme Court without distinction as to whether they are judges of the Court of Appeal or otherwise. The addition therefore speaks for itself.

But, in acknowledging this as a request of the Chief Justice, I place on record my appreciation to both the Chief Justice and other judges of the Supreme Court who have presented their views in relation to this reform. I respect them. Obviously, I have indicated that the government does not agree with a number of them, but nevertheless I will continue to work with the Chief Justice and, at his request, to meet with any judges of his court to progress matters, such as the composition of and venue for the accommodation of a court of appeal with the passage of this legislation.

Already, the Chief Justice has been very helpful in providing advice on the early draft of this legislation. He made a valuable contribution at that stage as to how it would best be drafted and then, during the course of consultation to the broader legal community when proposals came forth, obviously we conferred again and he was able to indicate whether he felt those were necessary enhancements of the structure that was being proposed. That does take considerable work.

It is fair to say that members of the Courts Administration Authority have also been part of that, including in the provision of advice on the cost of judges and in looking at the expenses, support and resources that are required for judges. These are all important matters, including data, for the consideration of the government to ultimately bring to life a court of appeal on the passage of this bill.

I also urge members, if they are not aware, to take note of the High Court's development at the Supreme Court, which is underway and which was initiated by the previous government. It includes a very significant capital improvement to the Gouger Street Supreme Court complex, which, for members who are not aware, sits primarily in duties relating to Supreme Court work. Over the years, it has in fact done a number of other tasks and has had other forums accommodated there, but I will make a contribution on that on another day. I just make the point that there have been substantial capital improvements.

This month, new court 11, as it is known, is being occupied. Indeed, there are other new courts that have been completely rebuilt. If members are interested in following the Electoral District Boundaries Commission, they might have noted that it sat last week and commenced its deliberations in one of the new courts. It is great to know that that is now underway and that there is a refreshed facility at the Supreme Court complex. I would also like to let members know that the refit and expansion of a number of jury trial courts is already underway at the—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Chair: I realise that we have been recalled for important business today, but I do feel that the Deputy Premier has not only strayed from the topic that we are here to speak on—that is, the Court of Appeal amendment bill—but is now seeking merely to gobble up time today, beyond what is provided for in the standing orders.

The CHAIR: I certainly uphold the last part of your argument, member for Lee—that is, in committee we ordinarily have 15 minutes for a contribution, and at the moment we are tending towards 25, I think.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's most unlike her, sir.

The CHAIR: Ordinarily, the Attorney is very good at keeping to time. She has moved the amendments and is speaking to them but will close her debate soon.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Of course, I could just move the first amendment and then have another 15 minutes. I am sorry that the member for Lee has not appreciated the significance of this, but there is a question of where the Court of Appeal is going to sit. So, in explaining our superior courts, the Supreme Court currently sits, including all the appellate work—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: it appears the Deputy Premier seems intent on defying your ruling, Chair.

The CHAIR: I have indicated to the Attorney that she has gone beyond the usual 15 minutes, and I have asked her to bring her contribution to a close. I remind her that she moved two amendments at the outset.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct. For those who are interested, I indicate to the committee that, with the upgrade of the jury courts underway, I have commenced discussions with the Chief Justice—indeed, he has taken me on a site visit—on where he might propose accommodation of the new Court of Appeal. And so, with that—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir: perhaps I could suggest, if the Attorney continues to defy your point of order, that you recall the house so that we can have the Speaker consider naming her.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, thank you for your third point of order. I have asked the Attorney twice to close her debate, so I am expecting that she will do that now.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In this exciting time of a new era, I commend the work and contribution of all members, including the member for Lee, even though I did not agree with him in his contribution. We will see these as positive reforms. I move that the amendments be accepted and commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It appears that third time is a charm for the Deputy Premier. I rise to speak on the amendments that we have received from the other place to the Supreme Court (Court of Appeal) Amendment Bill 2019. It is unsurprising, I suppose, that the government has been pushed to the position where it is being forced to consider and adopt amendments to this bill, particularly at the request of the Chief Justice, to make the government's bill more workable for what is being imposed upon him and his fellow justices—presumably against their will, given that they have all indicated publicly that they oppose this reform.

I also indicate that the Labor opposition continues to oppose this reform but will not stand in the way of these amendments. We are happy that at least the Chief Justice should have some improvements to the regime that he is now to be forced to live with as a result of these changes. The Deputy Premier advises the house that she cannot understand why the opposition would oppose this measure: it is because there has not been sufficient justification for it.

As we have pointed out, both here in the second reading contributions during the passage of the bill through this place and also in the other place, there have been some vague assurances of efficiency, which I presume have been unable to be substantiated by the government, because we have had data placed on the record, cited from the Supreme Court's own annual report, showing ongoing improvements with them dealing with their case load, and in particular the ongoing trend of reduction in the matters pending before them, particularly as it relates to Supreme Court specific matters and appeals regarding both criminal and civil matters.

I understand that the Attorney is a passionate advocate for this reform, because even in today's contribution on these amendments we are getting new justifications for this reform. According to the lengthy contribution that we have just enjoyed from the Deputy Premier, there are some new

benefits that will arise from this. Apparently, the appearance of this Court of Appeal in the make-up of our judicial system will give us a much better opportunity of having an appointment to the High Court.

What a spurious claim. If ever there were a more spurious claim, I would look forward to being presented with it. You do not really have to understand too much how Australia's federal political parliamentary system operates to understand why we have not had a High Court appointment. That is because since Federation we have had a succession of largely Eastern States based attorneys-general appointed in the federal parliament, and they have continued the trend of appointing, exclusively, High Court judges from jurisdictions other than South Australia.

I should add, though, that you do not have to ask too many questions of members of the South Australian legal profession to hear stories of people who have been contacted by a federal attorney-general's office asking whether they would be happy to throw their hat in the ring for a federal appointment, even a High Court appointment, and then, of course, when they are willing to do so being once again let down—decade after decade, as we have seen in South Australia—only to have a crony of that particular federal attorney-general appointed to whatever that particular role is. South Australians are used as—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: That's disgusting.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, it's not disgusting; it's true. It is absolutely true.

Mr Duluk: Who is the crony?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Who is the crony?

Mr Duluk: David Cox.

The CHAIR: Interjections will cease, and the member for Lee I think is tempted to respond but will not.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am interested to hear that David Cox was a federal attorney-general. That is news to me. There we go—perhaps his knowledge of the federal parliament does not extend quite that far.

We have had that argument today, from the Attorney-General, not placed anywhere else because it is of course a spurious argument. Secondly, we have had our heartstrings tugged by the Attorney-General, saying, 'Please, South Australians, just imagine you or someone you know might appear before the judicial process, and wouldn't it be in your interest to appear, eventually if required, before a specific court of appeal as proposed in this bill rather than the existing arrangements?' Well, spurious? I described the first claim as tenuous at best, but the second as completely bogus at best.

But then we had the third claim put by the Attorney that the emergence of this new Court of Appeal would stop the exodus of solicitors heading interstate from South Australia to work over there. Really? Well, I am interested. I am interested in the dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of young South Australians—I should not say young South Australians; predominantly young South Australians but not exclusively young South Australians—who graduate from our law schools in South Australia. Apparently, they will stay here because of this shining beacon, this great Gatsby-like light across the lake that appears to them, of an appointment to the Court of Appeal.

I actually thought many of these solicitors were just interested in finding a job and seeing the large part of the legal profession in South Australia, the commercial legal practices, already burdened with the enormous weight of graduates who flood each year out of our law schools, struggling to accommodate them. I am not quite sure that that argument can possibly stack up either. If we put those three new arguments to one side, we are back to what was offered up originally by the government, and that is some vague commitment towards efficiency.

We have heard that those people who are best placed to provide an opinion on this, people with direct and contemporary experience in hearing matters before the Supreme Court, let alone appeal matters, either civil or criminal jurisdiction, do not support this. Unfortunately for us, we were not able to hear from the government and from the Attorney why the Chief Justice and all members of the current Supreme Court did not support the establishment of this Court of Appeal. It was only after those of us who made a second reading contribution had concluded our contributions and after

the Attorney made her closing remarks that she deigned to provide the parliament with the advice from the Chief Justice. I think that is outrageous.

I think it is deliberate that the Attorney withheld that from this place. Of course, the Attorney is right to say that the Chief Justice recognises that the parliament has the right, if it wishes, to establish such a court. However, I would have thought that we would have all been better off understanding the concerns of the Chief Justice and his associates—his colleagues, I should say, not to confuse the employment descriptors of people who work in the Supreme Court—fellow justices of the Supreme Court. I would have thought that we would have been better off knowing what their concerns were. It was only after we were able to make our contributions—indeed, from our position—that we were able to hear what those concerns were, valid concerns and unaddressed concerns as they are by the government, about this Court of Appeal.

Much has been made about the need, because of the volume of matters that go through other jurisdictions, for us to have a court of appeal, but that also undermines the Attorney's argument about why we need a court of appeal. We have a much smaller state with a much smaller population, a much smaller case load and a much smaller demand for appeals.

There was also no real rebuttal or attempt to address concerns about how the practice of the court would be experienced by justices in the Supreme Court. There are valid concerns from the Chief Justice about how many should be available in this Court of Appeal, that there should be at least five not only to enable an ongoing rotation through cases but also, for those who have just heard cases, to step back from hearing cases so that they can write their judgements. Without that, these justices are likely to be placed under considerable demand and stress to get these matters out.

At this juncture, we should recognise that these judgements are extremely important. It is extremely important that these justices have the time they need without unnecessary distraction to get these judgements right because they are likely to be used as precedents in further similar matters if required or will be used as the basis of a consideration of those same matters for, potentially, the High Court. Making sure they have that time for these judgements is absolutely essential. This was largely unaddressed.

However, I was pleased to hear that the Chief Justice did say that it is important to maintain some capacity to rotate justices who will sit on this Court of Appeal, if established, through the court generally. I would have thought that the cognisance of how a case or trial is run would benefit the justice sitting in this appeal jurisdiction so that they are familiar, contemporaneously, with the conduct of a matter when they are considering whether there are valid grounds for appeal. Likewise, it might also assist a justice presiding over a trial to have that understanding of how the conduct of such trials is likely to be interpreted if it should ever proceed to a proceeding before a court of appeal.

There was also the matter of the additional costs required to provide for additional justices if they are to be appointed. I know that the Attorney is quick to talk about the refurbishment of the courts currently underway, an initiative commenced by the former Labor government and funded by the former Labor government—one of the many capital works projects for which, I notice, the current administration is claiming credit.

There was also concern about whether the prospect of being appointed to an appeals court makes the prospect of a judicial appointment less attractive to some members of the bar. While we have an assurance from those opposite, particularly the Attorney (I cannot remember whether or not this was canvassed by the member for Heysen), it may not be a matter that they will ever need be concerned with, certainly not in the Deputy Premier's case. That was also a valid concern that remains unaddressed. In the eighth and final matter considered by the Chief Justice, there is no recognition of the downward trend in pending matters before the Supreme Court.

For those unaddressed reasons and for the flimsy, tenuous and spurious arguments put forward by the government in favour of this, we do retain our opposition to the bill. As I indicated, we are willing to see these amendments go through because at least they add some improvements at the suggestion of the Chief Justice to this change.

The CHAIR: Before I call for any more speakers or put the question, I want to clarify standing order 364 in relation to time limits in committee. The standing order states:

In Committee ...

1. a Member other than the Member in charge of the Bill, motion or amendment may not speak more than three times on any one question, nor for more than fifteen minutes on any one occasion;

Given that is the standing order, and the Attorney was in fact in charge of the bill, she was within order. We have clarified that and you stuck to your time, member for Lee, so well done.

Motion carried.

CROWN LAND MANAGEMENT (SECTION 78B LEASES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LEGALISATION OF SAME SEX MARRIAGE CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

MARRIED PERSONS (SEPARATE LEGAL STATUS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (FOREIGN LAWYERS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEASES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 5, page 5, lines 36 to 38 [clause 5, inserted section 4(3)(b)(i)]—Delete 'that is lodged for registration by the lessor within 3 months after both parties have executed the renewal' and substitute:

that is, following execution by both parties, lodged for registration by the lessor not later than 2 months after the day on which the lease would, but for the renewal, expire

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

It is Christmas so, for the member for Lee's sake, I will be mercifully brief. While this legislation is quite technical in nature, it is of great importance to small business in this state for making South Australia a better place to stay and invest. I am proud that the government is finally enacting these changes, which, frankly, ought to have been made back in 2017. I accept the amendment.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:55 to 14:00.

Petitions

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson): Presented a petition signed by 161 residents of South Australia requesting the house to take measures to disallow private accommodation facility

developments in their current proposed locations in Flinders Chase National Park and instead insists that the proponent returns to the original proposed project and sites approximately one kilometre inland and adjacent to the existing Kangaroo Island wilderness walking trail.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Report—

Grant, District Council of—Corrigendum Annual Report 2018-19
Mount Barker District Council Annual Report 2018-19
Onkaparinga, City of Annual Report 2018-19
Unley, City of Annual Report 2018-19
Victor Harbor, City of Annual Report 2018-19
Walkerville, Town of Annual Report 2018-19
Wudinna District Council Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. T.J. Whetstone)—

Industry Advisory Group—

SA Cattle Annual Report 2018-19
SA Sheep Annual Report 2018-19

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Environment Protection Authority—Corrigendum to Annual Report 2018-19
Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Annual Report 2018-19
Report on the operation of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 (South Australia)—Report December 2019

Condolence

NEW ZEALAND VOLCANO ERUPTION

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): On indulgence, I would like to quickly turn the house's attention to the recent events in New Zealand. For Gavin and Lisa Dallow, and Lisa's daughter, Zoe, their departure from Adelaide on Wednesday last week was to begin the trip of a lifetime—a cruise of New Zealand and the South Pacific. This was to be a celebration of the end of Zoe's year 9 school year at St Aloysius College. The death of Gavin Dallow has now been confirmed.

Gavin had recently completed a decade of work with the Legal Services Commission before establishing his own legal firm. He was an active leader in Rotary and, as a tennis umpire, had officiated 11 times at the Australian Open. Lisa, his wife and Zoe's mother, remains in a critical condition in hospital in New Zealand. For more than 20 years she has been part of the Santos community, our gas producer, where she is a highly respected engineer. I know all South Australians will be praying for Lisa's recovery as we also share in the grief that this family is enduring.

Other families around Australia have also been caught up in this terrible disaster, and we offer our thoughts and prayers to them as well as to those in New Zealand also affected. This is the second time in less than a year that tragedy has joined our nations in grief and mourning. On this occasion, tragedy struck at a place visited each year by 20,000 tourists. Those who embarked on their day visit to White Island on Monday did so with the same sense of anticipation and adventure as those before them had done.

What happened next needs to be the subject of further investigation. But let us first take time to mourn the dead and pray for the recovery of those who remain in hospital. Let us also thank the rescue, recovery and medical teams in New Zealand that continue to respond to the events of Monday.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): I, too, rise on indulgence in support of the Premier's comments regarding the tragedy in New Zealand. The sadness of this week's events in New Zealand is underlined by the loss of two members of our South Australian family. Yesterday's confirmation of the loss of life in such unexpected circumstances is indeed a tragedy.

No words that I can express today will be adequate to express our sympathy to the families of Gavin Dallow and Zoe Hosking. We know that Brian and Ruth Dallow, who are treasures of the north-east community, are devastated. To lose their son, Gavin, who trained as a lawyer and who followed in their footsteps as a dedicated member of their local community, through Rotary, and his stepdaughter, Zoe Hosking, in these dreadful circumstances is a huge sadness for these two remarkable community contributors at this time of their lives.

Both Brian and Ruth have been involved in Modbury Meals on Wheels, UnitingCare Wesley and the Modbury Uniting Church for more than 40 years. Both have been honoured many times for their service to their community, Brian most recently receiving the City of Tea Tree Gully's Outstanding Citizen of the Year award in 2018. Their son, Gavin, followed in their footsteps and worked at the Legal Services Commission, combining his concern for others in the community with his interest in dispute resolution and commercial law.

He was a member of Rotary International for 23 years. He was a member of the Rotary Club of Prospect where he has served as president and in other leadership roles. He did volunteer work on a project in the Philippines that improved the lives of remote villagers. In addition to his community work, tennis was his passion, having umpired in community, regional and local games for 17 years. He had also been invited to umpire at the highest level, officiating as an umpire at the Australian Open 11 times.

Zoe Hosking was a highly conscientious and motivated student at St Aloysius College, where she attended from reception in 2010 to recently completing year 9. She was a student who excelled across all learning areas and demonstrated strong leadership skills. She embraced curriculum extension activities with energy and enthusiasm, having played water polo, lacrosse, tennis, basketball and volleyball and indeed participated in the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme.

Zoe also took part in the Catholic Schools Music Festival choir and the Tournament of Minds. Zoe has been a social justice leader and student representative and was actively involved in the community beyond school through Girl Guides and Rotary. Zoe put 100 per cent into everything she did, and she did it with a smile. I know that her family, friends and school community will miss that smile. Her principal, Ms Paddy McEvoy, has said that the school community are beyond words, but they cherish all they have shared with Zoe and her family over 10 years.

Our prayers and thoughts are also with Lisa Dallow, formerly Hosking, a high-profile engineer with Santos, as she struggles in a critical condition, fighting for life in Hamilton hospital with severe burns to over half her body. Her brother has been maintaining a bedside vigil and providing support, and our thoughts are with him and all Lisa's family and friends. I would also like to thank the New Zealand emergency service workers, the medical staff and the New Zealand government for their compassion and their efforts and assistance.

These stories emerging from New Zealand are stories of families and friends enjoying a holiday in a beautiful part of the world at a special time of the year. In that context, I also urge South Australians to be safety conscious this holiday season, whether it be on the roads, out and about or even at home. I express our deepest sympathies to the family and friends, classmates and colleagues of Gavin and Zoe. We send our love to Lisa and the Dallow and Hosking families, and we hope that she pulls through from these terrible injuries.

Finally, I would like to thank the member for Florey, who has been assisting and supporting Brian and Ruth Dallow during this difficult time. I, too, would like to join the member for Florey in calling for the Dallow and Hosking families to be given privacy as they deal with these difficult

circumstances. We hope that South Australians spare a thought for these families during this time of the year and have a safe and merry Christmas.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:10): I bring up the 47th report of the committee, entitled New Whyalla Secondary School.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, is a man of integrity?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): Absolutely.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Do you have confidence in the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): Yes, absolutely.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Was the ICAC commissioner, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, wrong to publicly discuss your conversation regarding the report into SA Health?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): That's a matter entirely for the commissioner to determine. One of the great things about our commissioner and the way that it was set up in the legislation here is that he is completely and utterly independent of the government. We don't direct the commissioner in any way, shape or form.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This differs in its design from other commissioners we have, for example, the productivity commissioner. We can write to the productivity commissioner and we can ask him to do work and we can direct him, in fact, to do work. This is not the same way that the legislation was drafted with regard to the ICAC commission. He remains completely independent and he needs to determine those things for himself.

The SPEAKER: The members for Badcoe, Wright and Elizabeth are called to order.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Why was the Premier angry with the ICAC commissioner when they met last Friday?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: standing order 97. It seeks to identify facts without the leave of the house.

The SPEAKER: If I allow the question, I also give the Premier quite an opportunity to respond, so I am going to allow the Premier an opportunity to respond.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): Thank you very much, sir. I meet with the ICAC commissioner on a very regular basis, right since the very day—

Mr Brown: Are you always angry?

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when I became the Premier of South Australia. In fact, before I became the Premier of South Australia we met with the ICAC commissioner whenever he sought a meeting. He sought a meeting last week on Thursday or Friday and that was put into the diary. I held a meeting with him. I have no interest whatsoever in canvassing the issues that we discussed in our private conversation.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But I stand by all the comments that I have made privately and publicly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We welcomed the reports. The commissioner was going to prepare a review for the parliament to be given to us before the end of the year. We welcomed it when it arrived, but it doesn't mean that it hasn't been demoralising for many of the very hardworking men and women who are working very diligently at the moment, trying to turn around the mess that we inherited from the previous government.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that they are doing a great job fixing a complete and utter shambles that they inherited from the previous government. Have we solved every single problem? Of course not, but they have been working extraordinarily hard over the last 18 months to address the issues that those opposite would have known full well existed. They would have known all these issues existed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The commissioner, of course, when we came to this side of the parliament, onto the treasury bench, sought a meeting and outlined the concerns that he had with regard to the health department in South Australia. They were, of course, pretty grave concerns—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that the ICAC commissioner had. I can only assume that the same briefing that I received on day one of our government was exactly the same as what the Leader of the Opposition knew about because he was, in fact, the minister for health at the time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can only assume that what the ICAC commissioner was providing the Leader of the Opposition in his role as the minister for health was exactly the same. It begs the question of what he did about it—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when that advice was provided to the previous government and what they did about it. But we are very clear: we started work on the cure plan within SA Health on day one and we have worked very hard to turn around the mess. Part of that, of course, is putting more than a billion dollars into the health budget in South Australia—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir. The question was: why was he angry?

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. Thank you, member for West Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, be quiet. The question had an accusatory flavour, hence why I have allowed the Premier some latitude. I also note there has been constant interjection on both sides of the chamber. I ask that to cease and then I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. I was just outlining the work that we are doing to fix the system that we inherited from the previous government: more than a billion dollars put back into the health system in South Australia, progress on all the issues that were raised in the review. Now, of course, we have worked very hard and very quickly to establish the interagency task force, which is charged with the responsibility of providing advice to the government—

Mr Picton: Oh, the task force!

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is on the board.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —before the end of this year. They have already met on I think two or three occasions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Reynell!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are working through their response to us. We look forward to receiving that and then, of course, after Christmas they will have a continuing role to monitor the progress that is being made on that overarching cure plan. Let's be clear: there is nothing new in this report. These were the same issues that were raised with the government in March 2018.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We started the program of fixing the mess we inherited, not when we received the report a couple of days ago—

Mr Brown: Why were you surprised and angry?

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but the very day that we took responsibility and took government.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MORATORIUM

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development and Primary Industries. Can the minister please update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to deliver choice for farmers by lifting the moratorium on GM on mainland South Australia?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:18): Yes, I can. I thank the member for Narungga for his important question. I am actually surprised he is even here. His phone has been ringing off the hook with angry farmers who have been denied a choice.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Yes, that's right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Those opposite laugh, because you are not the farmers' friend. You are not the farmers' friend, I can assure you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Waite and member for Morphett! The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: On Tuesday, farmers were again denied the opportunity—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —to work under the no-GM banner, and that is really sad. What we have seen is that, when the regulation was introduced, we had this lame excuse of 'process'. We had members in the upper house from SA-Best who used the 'process' to scuttle lifting the moratorium on you. Now we introduce a bill, the legislation, and it is 'process' again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: You are not the farmers' friend.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the minister is reflecting on a vote of this parliament within the same session.

The SPEAKER: That he may be doing. He is out of the blocks pretty enthusiastically. I ask members on my left not to provoke the minister and I ask the minister not to respond to that provocation. I will be listening carefully to the minister's answer. I would like to hear the answer, please. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Again, the grain growers, the farmers of South Australia, have been denied the opportunity to have choice. They have been denied the opportunity to farm—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: last week, we had this debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I do not think that the minister was infringing the standing orders with that last comment, but I will be listening carefully. Members, if this level of interjection continues, some members will be departing the chamber. Minister.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I can say is that the farming community, the grain growers of South Australia, are furious. They are furious that they have been denied a choice. What I would say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is on two warnings.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Again, what we have found is that some opposite have decided to use politics over policy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir—

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, if this is for debate, I am not upholding that point of order for a general comment, but I take your point. Believe you me, I am listening to every word carefully.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: The decision not to support our farmers, to give them the choice, has come at great cost.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is called to order. The minister is well aware of what the standing orders are, and I am listening carefully.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I would say is that here in South Australia we are the only mainland state of this nation that has been handbraked, if you like, by living under a moratorium. The ideology of a moratorium here in South Australia takes away the advantage. It takes away the opportunity for our farmers—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Sit down.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. We had this debate not last week.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. History is beginning to repeat itself. If this becomes trivial or vexatious and members raise trivial points of order, they will be leaving the chamber. I reiterate my earlier remarks, and I caution the minister about his future comments.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: We come back to the moratorium here in South Australia.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I would like to say is that the consultation we have been through as a government has been extensive. Kym Anderson is a well-renowned professor. He has been out and consulted with the independent review. We have had a select committee from the upper house. We have seen a considerable amount of consultation and public meetings through a statutory obligation, through a regulation, that would give our farmers the choice. Along the way, we have seen many, many representatives come—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Do you want us to just ignore the standing orders?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned. You're not leaving yet. The minister has about 30 seconds left.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Again, as we travel around South Australia, there have been many farmers who have been part of the social media campaign, and they are alarmed. Some of those comments are from Wayne Hawkins. He owns a property on both sides of the border. On one side, he has productivity gains; on the South Australian side, he is dictated to by some archaic moratorium.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: We look at others. Tanja Morgan from the southern Mallee said that we need those tools in our toolkit to help us remain productive and sustainable, and that includes GM technology. We look at David 'Skeet' Lawson at Pinnaroo. We need those tools in our toolbox—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —to be more competitive, reduce our inputs and stay ahead of the game, just like our interstate counterparts do.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Is it appropriate for a premier of South Australia to be angry with an ICAC commissioner for doing his job?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): As we have stated on numerous occasions, we welcome the ICAC commissioner investigating any—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —single solitary thing that he wishes to investigate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, be seated for one moment. The member for Badcoe will leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Leader, you have asked your question. I would like to hear the answer. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, we are very pleased that the ICAC commissioner can investigate any single solitary thing that he wishes to investigate in South Australia. That is his right or obligation, in fact, under the legislation. We welcome him looking at anything.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We provide the budget. We believe it's an adequate budget that is provided. Of course—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is on two warnings. We have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can tell you one thing: there wasn't any conversation—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I just make this point: we provide the ICAC with a budget each year. We believe that it is adequate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In fact, we believe that it has increased since we came to government, increased again in the most recent budget, but it is up to the ICAC commissioner to determine what he is going to investigate. So we are very happy that he can choose what he wishes to investigate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Now, of course, he has provided us with a review. We have provided our response to that, both to this house and to the general public. We will have a report back from the interagency task force by the end of this year. We are 100 per cent committed to fixing up the mess that we inherited.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite have no interest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in fixing, no interest in coming clean with the people of South Australia on just how dire the situation was in South Australia when it comes to health. Nothing would give me greater pleasure from a political perspective than to have a royal commission into the mess that we inherited from the previous government in terms of health in South Australia. How would the opposition look if there was a thorough investigation into exactly and precisely the atrocities that were being committed under the previous government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the hopeless financial mismanagement. It will be an absolute disaster. But we don't have time for royal commissions and the expense and the delay. We have a health system to fix. The people of South Australia were very clear at the election. They wanted us elected to get on and fix the health system in South Australia.

In fact, some of our political opponents at that election promised a royal commission. They were comprehensively rejected by the people of South Australia in that election. I don't hear the Leader of the Opposition calling for a royal commission, but it would make for very interesting reading. But interesting reading doesn't serve the interests of the people of South Australia. They are served by improving health outcomes in South Australia. That's why last week I was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —at the Flinders Medical Centre. I was announcing \$86 million worth of new money—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —going into fixing the mess that we inherited.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We put that money in to fix the mess that we inherited from the previous government. The previous government closed the Repat hospital. They downgraded services at Noarlunga Hospital.

The SPEAKER: Has the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have one more minute to go.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is still going. I will take the point of order. The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. He has mentioned the previous government more than he has anger.

The SPEAKER: Again, that question was a little bit accusatory in nature. Hence, while I have given the Premier latitude, I ask for the interjections to cease and the Premier to wind up his answer. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have only known one member of this parliament to actually have an ICAC finding about anger management mentioned about them. I think it was termed 'conversational stirring'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't know what conversational stirring is; I can only imagine what it would be. Of course, we wouldn't use such grubby, gutter-type words on this side of the house.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But we are committed very much to improving health outcomes in South Australia. That's what we're going to remain focused on.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Innovation is called to order. If he is going to refer to members, do it by their electorate name. The member for Playford, you can leave for half an hour under 137A for leading that chorus, and then the leader will have a question.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Were you lying when you told the parliament last week that you found the ICAC report into SA Health helpful?

The SPEAKER: I remind the Leader of the Opposition to address his remarks through the Chair. The leader is well aware of standing order 97. I am going to ask him to rephrase the question, even though I didn't hear it in its entirety. Leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thanks, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier honest when telling the parliament last week that he found the ICAC report very helpful?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): As I said last week and as I said today, I stand by every single statement that I have made. It was helpful, but some things can be very helpful and also have perverse outcomes, and that is exactly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and precisely what has occurred.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I think it is useful.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: That is forced laughter, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, that may be so, but you are called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: These guys can't understand nuance whatsoever. The fact of the matter is something can be useful and have perverse outcomes at the same time. The reality is I think it was helpful to us to have that review.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It certainly confirmed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that there was no further additional information that was hitherto not known to the government. From that perspective, it's not like it uncovered a whole pile of corruption that we now have to deal with on top of the mess that we inherited from the previous government, so from that perspective I think it was very useful. I think it was very useful in so much

as it provided a focus, and now we have established the interagency task force to deal with this issue and we are pulling together people from across government and I think that is very helpful.

I also stand by my public and private comments regarding how demoralising this report ended up being with regard to people who are working very hard in Health at the moment to turn it around. I have heard that people who work in the Health department have been stopped in the streets and queried about all the corruption going on within their department. This is very demoralising. This is actually not what is occurring in SA Health. The commissioner does not point to widespread corruption.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be very clear: it's only a 60 or 70-page report.

Mr Malinauskas: So why didn't you read it?

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They probably could have got through it by now. They have failed to actually raise one single solitary point with regard to corruption. What the commissioner says is that there are poor systems, there is a poor culture, there are poor practices which exist which could lead—could lead—to corruption. He goes on to outline more than 1,100 complaints that have been made to Health in the time since he has been the ICAC commissioner. Of course, the majority of that time that he has been the commissioner has been under the previous government.

What we really need to know from the ICAC commissioner, and hopefully this information will be provided, is how many of those complaints, those corruption allegations, occurred under the previous government. What was the advice to the previous government, what action was taken and was he satisfied? Because we have to be clear: this is a report, a review which canvasses a large period of time, the majority of which we were not in government. I emphasise that we are very focused, since day one of coming to government, on fixing the mess that we inherited.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We put more than \$1 billion back into the health system. We have created five new local health networks so that we can have a greater focus as close to the action as possible. We have put new boards in place. Those boards only came into place on 1 July this year.

We put KordaMentha in to fix up, quite frankly, the financial atrocities that were occurring under the previous government, presided over by the previous government, never divulged by the previous government or the previous health minister, the now Leader of the Opposition—no transparency whatsoever, and we are just getting on with fixing it. Were we supported with the appointment of KordaMentha by the Labor Party? No. Were we supported by them to establish the new LHNs and new governance arrangements? No. We are not perturbed. We are just getting on—getting on with fixing the mess that we inherited from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is on two warnings.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Why should South Australians ever believe a word you say when you say one thing publicly and one thing privately?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Apart from the fact that the question was not directed through the Chair, I uphold the point of order for, take your pick, probably 97. Premier, I have upheld the point of order, so you will be seated and I will give the leader another go.

An honourable member: Don't make him angry, sir.

The SPEAKER: Wouldn't be the first time.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier's credibility now in tatters?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33): Can I be very clear: if anybody's credibility is in tatters, it can only be the Leader of the Opposition's.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Innovation!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's unpack exactly and precisely what the concerns of the people of South Australia are on this matter. On coming to government, the immediate minister before coming to government was, of course, the Leader of the Opposition. He knew exactly and precisely, or at least he should have known exactly and precisely, what was going on in the largest agency in the South Australian government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He really only has two options here.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: (1) He failed in his responsibility to fully understand what was going on within CALHN, or (2) he actually knew exactly and precisely what was going on and failed to tell the people of South Australia. Either way—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: this is all debate. The Premier spent a minute talking about the Leader of the Opposition, not his own credibility.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: Speaker Atkinson made it very clear that a question of that nature invites an answer of this nature.

The SPEAKER: Well, not literally like that, but he would allow more scope, and I am going to uphold that point of order. He was a very wise man, but I do caution the Premier and ask him to come back to the substance of the question. The Premier has the call, but, yes, with that sort of question he will have some latitude.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. I think the question was very clear. It was about credibility and the lack of credibility. Let's unpack exactly and precisely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what occurred within CALHN. When we came to government, we were almost immediately presented with a range of issues associated with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, none of which had previously been disclosed to the people of South Australia. Some of them were very substantial. Some of them have cost the taxpayers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of South Australia a very, very large sum of money. Why didn't the Leader of the Opposition come clean with the people of South Australia? Why didn't he tell them the truth? Or maybe he didn't know. Let's give him the benefit of the doubt: maybe he simply never asked.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. The point of order is for debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir, impugning an improper motive and unparliamentary behaviour.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. I will allow some preamble and some compare and contrast and then ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We had very, very substantial issues with regard to the hospital and its functionality—very serious.

Mr Malinauskas: It was brand new.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition is now shouting from the other side of the chamber, 'It was brand new,' like that means it was all perfect. Actually, there were—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Light!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —major deficiencies with this new hospital, which previously were not disclosed to the people of South Australia ahead of the last election. Then take a look at the financial situation.

Coming to government, CALHN, just part of the overall health sector in South Australia, was over budget, tracking between \$300 million and \$400 million over budget per year. Was that made clear to the people of South Australia? Absolutely not. Then when we actually appoint KordaMentha to go in and take a detailed look—opposed by those who never wanted anyone to ever find out exactly and precisely what was going on—they complain and complain—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —about the costs. But what did they find out? Major, major systems problems right across that organisation. Tens of millions of dollars' worth of activities had been performed here in South Australia and the bill was never passed on to the commonwealth who were responsible for it, so the state taxpayers were wearing this bill every single year—tens of millions of dollars—because of the ineptitude of the Leader of the Opposition. If anybody's credibility is in tatters, it is one person in this parliament—and that is the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Police will be quiet.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister outline to the house how—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Can I have that question from the start, please. I make a real effort to try to listen to them.

Mrs POWER: Most certainly, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister outline to the house how the government is meeting the challenges of a changing climate?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:39): It always amazes me that when we try to answer a serious question about something such as climate change the opposition just make a lot of fuss and noise and cannot listen.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is on two warnings.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I thank the member for Elder for her question. It's a question about something very pressing facing our nation and our state at the moment, and that is the challenges we are facing in the face of a changing climate. It was a great opportunity yesterday, down at Business SA on Greenhill Road, to stand alongside the Premier to launch the state government's climate directions statement, where we outlined what our approach would be to ensuring that South Australia is well placed to mitigate and adapt to a changing climate. It is a—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, you will be leaving if this continues.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker, last time I answered a question about climate change, the Leader of the Opposition just continually interjected until you chucked him out, and he is doing it again because he has proven that he has no interest—no interest at all—in our responses to a changing climate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It's all political, it's all noise, it's all slogans, it's all activism; it's not doing. They are climate whingers, not climate doers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment. The member for West Torrens, you can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

Mr Pederick: He ordered his coffee.

The SPEAKER: And the member for Hammond will be leaving shortly if this continues.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Environment and Water has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. A raw nerve was touched on the other side of this chamber, that's for sure. Back to our climate directions statement—a very, very valuable document to help guide not only environmental challenges but also to look at, potentially, the economic opportunities that can be present here in South Australia as we look to adapt to climate change.

We know that a considerable amount of work was done by the previous government to position us quite well when it comes to our change in climate, particularly around renewables and particularly around our state brand. We need to give credit where credit's due: I think one of the most seamless transitions in the change of government was in the area of climate policy.

We have taken that brand that South Australia has and we have continued to work towards ensuring that our state can maximise both the resilience of our state in the face of a changing climate, ensuring that our population is prepared for it, ensuring that our environment is prepared for it, and also looking for potential economic opportunities that can flow from sharing our knowledge, sharing our experiences and sharing the products and services which we have developed here in South Australia as a result of the particular climatic challenges that we face.

The key policy platform areas that form part of our climate directions statement include unlocking innovation and economic opportunities, reducing net emissions, building resilience and adapting to climate change, providing accessible information on our changing climate, and government leading by example. All are key areas that will position this state in the best way possible to deal with climate change and to identify and maximise the benefits as well.

Under the unlock innovation and economic opportunity platform of this policy, of course, one of those opportunities, one of those innovations that presents itself to this state, is dealing with genetically modified crops. We know that genetic modification can give our crops the resilience to

deal with a changing climate and can really position our farmers, our food producers, to stand firm and to benefit, or at least create resilience, in the face of that change in climate—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: standing order 118, sir. Unless a member or minister is making a personal explanation, it is unparliamentary to refer to a matter which has been canvassed by a bill of the same session.

The SPEAKER: I will listen to the minister's answer. I caution the minister.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Except when it was questions on land tax.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Well, exactly—pot calling the kettle black there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I just want to finish by emphasising that this government is responding to the impacts of climate change. We understand it and we want to make a difference in this important policy area.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua, then Florey

Mr Ellis: The minister for Transforming Health.

The SPEAKER: The member for Narungga is called to order.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier tell the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, in his meeting with him last Friday, that his report into SA Health 'had put back the chances of correcting the problems in health', and if so, why?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): I refer the honourable member to my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is on two warnings. Member for Kaurua, then Florey.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier tell the ICAC commissioner the public would be surprised by the content of his report, when last week he said that there was nothing new in it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): I am just going to state this once: I meet with the commissioner on a regular basis.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Don't get angry.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The contents of our discussion remain private—from my perspective, anyway. We welcomed the review being done. We welcomed it when it came to the parliament. We think that it has been useful, but it also has unequivocally been demoralising for people who work within SA Health.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Why has the state government not approved the bilateral bid for funding of a minimum of six new replacement heavy-pumping firefighting appliances per year over the next five years? Can the minister confirm that over half the MFS firefighting appliances are between 10 and 20 years old, with some in excess of 20 years old?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:45): I thank the member

for the question. I can't regurgitate the age of every truck that's in the MFS, but I know that we were handed trucks from the previous government, when we took over, that was an ageing fleet. We are doing a lot of work to rectify that. In fact, we have given money in the most recent budget for a number of turnkey trucks to roll out into the system. It's something that we are very conscious of. We are also doing an expenditure review on the MFS to find more funds to make sure we can keep re-injecting and fixing the mess we were left.

OAKDEN FIRE STATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:46): Supplementary: can the minister confirm whether the Oakden Fire Station will be losing a fire engine, and whether this is related to the failure to procure new fire trucks at the rate necessary to ensure obsolete units are not stretched beyond their expected life?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:46): That would be an operational matter. I am not the person who actually puts the trucks in the station—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and nor were the previous ministers. If the Leader of the Opposition, who was minister in this portfolio—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —at one stage, was actually placing trucks in fire stations, I would be incredibly surprised. But I am very happy to take that on notice and have a chat with the fire chief.

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders. Sorry, is the minister still going?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I was, but I am happy to finish.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is supporting our farmers impacted by the drought?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:47): Yes, I can. I thank the member for Flinders for his genuine question. On my visits over to Eyre Peninsula, we have seen firsthand the impacts of drought, particularly in large parts of the electorate of Flinders on Eyre Peninsula. Sadly, much of South Australia is drought affected, with 72 per cent drought declared. What it tells us is that many of those drought-affected farmers are now looking for support. Of course, this government's priority is the health and wellbeing of our farmers.

What I can say is that we have rolled out a number of initiatives to address the health and wellbeing of our farmers. On Tuesday, I was very proud to make an announcement, to stand side by side with our farmers: a \$21 million package that will help both financially and to give them the support that they need inside the house and also giving them the skills—the financial literacy—that they are looking for.

The \$21 million is made of a number of initiatives: \$13.2 million goes towards council and pastoral rate rebates. That gives them some financial support. We know that many of our farming families on average pay about \$15,500 dollars in council rates or in pastoral rates, and so we are going to help support them financially. We have also seen money going into Rural Business Support. A million dollars has gone into that business that is doing outstanding work, headed up by a team of dedicated people who are out there knocking on doors, giving people financial advice, offering them literacy so that they can actually look at ways and are able to access some of the commonwealth government's funding schemes.

When we look at the Farm Household Allowance, we look at the RIC. These are financial supports. The Farm Household Allowance gives a capacity for farmers and their families to access around \$26,000 a year and that helps them with putting food on the table and making sure their kids get to school. We also look at the RIC loans. They are loans of up to \$2 million and they are able to restructure their finances.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: The member for Lee should listen because he might learn something here with finance.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: From you? I doubt it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I would say is that they can save over \$120,000 in restructuring their finances, going through a really tough period. On Tuesday, I stood with minister McKenzie and minister Littleproud, with the commonwealth's financial assistance, and I was very proud that here the Marshall Liberal government's drought assistance funding sits side by side with the commonwealth's assistance package.

What I will say is that we have worked collaboratively together in making sure that we do not duplicate, like other states have, and in making sure that my dry working group continues to give me fearless and frank advice on the best way to support our farmers who have been drought affected and those families and communities who are all doing it extremely tough at the moment.

We have also put \$5 million on the table for our on-farm water efficiency programs. That now gives a 50 per cent rebate, to a total expenditure of \$100,000, so that they can droughtproof and futureproof their farms—being able to clean out dams and install new bores and pumps so that they can actually water their livestock and bring water to their homes and their yards on farm. These are important initiatives that have been designed not to duplicate but to work with industry and to give our farmers real support financially, mentally and on farm. It's about keeping the family structure together. I am very proud to say that this government has recognised the need, the necessity, for a drought support package that is giving them real momentum and real belief—because #RegionsMatter.

SA HEALTH

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:51): My question is to the Premier. Premier, is it correct that in your first year of office complaints and reports to ICAC about SA Health increased by 25 per cent? Does that demonstrate the need for an ICAC investigation to be funded by your government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): I don't have the detailed breakdown on the number of referrals or complaints that have been made to the ICAC and in which—

Mr Malinauskas: You were talking about it before.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Mr Malinauskas: You were talking about it before.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will make the leader angry if I kick him out, so I ask him to cease interjecting. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can only assume that the Leader of the Opposition is getting a little bit delirious.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He seems to think that he is the Premier. I think he would like to be, but I don't think that's going to happen anytime soon because he is answering questions from his own shadow minister. I don't know whether they could get together in the bar or in the corridor—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pederick: In the dream factory.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's difficult to know what's going on over on that side at the moment. The previous leader of the Labor Party of course had a bit more backbone. He could stand up to people in his own party.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: For debate. I uphold the point of order. I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question, which was about ICAC and certain numbers allegedly in the report.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question that was being asked was about what number of complaints had come and in which year, to which the Leader of the Opposition provided the answer to the shadow minister, so I am not quite sure why they are not talking to each other. We all get along well on our side. I don't know why they don't just get together and answer the questions between the two of them.

The SPEAKER: Has the Premier concluded his answer? The Premier has concluded his answer. Because of that, we will move to the member for Kaurna and then to the member for Mount Gambier, who has been patiently waiting. The member for Kaurna.

SA HEALTH

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Is it more important that ICAC delivers reports into maladministration and corruption or that some staff be protected from such ICAC reports that might be 'demoralising', in the words of the Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:53): I am not sure why the shadow minister hasn't really caught on. It's really up to the ICAC to determine for the Office for Public Integrity to receive the complaints and for the commissioner to determine how his resources are applied. We play no part in this whatsoever. I repeat that the commission is provided with adequate resources, relative to other jurisdictions in Australia. I was very interested—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was very interested—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition says 'not according to the commissioner'. Let me tell you, the commissioner has had an increase in his budget since we came. So we have provided additional resources. The most recent budget provided for a further increase—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader!

The Hon. A. Piccolo: So the commissioner is wrong?

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be very clear: the ICAC receives around \$15 million worth of funding per year. If we compare that to, for example, the largest state in Australia, New South Wales, that ICAC receives \$27 million worth of funding per year. If it was on a pro rata basis, New South Wales should be on \$65 million per year, rather than \$27 million per year. The reality is we unequivocally believe that the ICAC is provided with an adequate budget each year, but it is not our job to prioritise that expenditure.

SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Is it within the minister's and the police commissioner's power to issue a directive not to proceed with fines and disqualifications for those drivers who are facing a loss of licence and substantial fines on the South Eastern Freeway before legislation was changed last Thursday recognising the previous legislation was unfair and unjust?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55): I would like to thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. I would also like to thank him for the conversation that we had last week on this very matter. I also had conversations with the member for MacKillop, who takes a very keen interest in this issue, as well as, actually, the member for Barker, who also raised the same issues.

I can set aside the police commissioner, because the police commissioner is not somebody I can certainly direct, and what he is or isn't able to do in terms of directing his staff is very much a matter for him. In terms of the latitude that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has, the registrar does not have discretion in this regard. The police do have discretion and have used discretion in relation to the South Eastern Freeway offences where, for instance, it has been demonstrated that the vehicle has been wrongly classified.

We have seen a number of instances where vehicles that actually did have a tonnage of less than 4½ tonnes were wrongly classified, and those fines were revoked. There was also an instance where a bus had a couple of seats removed and therefore definitionally came in under, where it was registered over, the threshold. That is a discretion that the police have and have used. The registrar and certainly the minister do not have discretion in relation to how these things are enforced.

The way we make laws in this country and in this state is that the law that is applied is the law that is in place at the time that the offence is committed, and so we have a situation, and have had a situation, where in 2017 this parliament decided that it would increase the offences on the South Eastern Freeway in line, broadly, with what the Coroner recommended, although the Coroner actually recommended to go a lot further than the parliament suggested. The Coroner was indeed suggesting that there should be gaol time on first offence for speeding down the South Eastern Freeway. The parliament chose in 2017 to do something. In fact, I remember in early 2019 being attacked by some members of this chamber about not being quick enough to institute the new penalties that related to these offences.

They came into place with much fanfare in May. There was correspondence—in fact, a five-page letter—sent to everybody who owns a truck or a vehicle that is subject to these laws, between 4½ and six tonnes, where we have seen a lot of issues, as well as correspondence to those people with heavier vehicles, and a whole heap of other communication tools have been used to try to tell people about these offences.

The parliament decided last week to now take a different approach. We did what a responsible government should do and that is find a way to make these new offences come into place as soon as possible. In fact, I would like to thank the Attorney-General, as well as the Hon. David Ridgway in the other place, for meeting with the Governor on Friday last week so that the laws that were passed on Thursday were assented to on Friday and came into effect as of midnight Thursday night in so that there is not this odd transition period where, the parliament having now made a different decision, the will of the parliament had a delay in being implemented.

The truth is that when we change laws in this place, to either make them harsher or make them softer, that is something that happens on a regular basis. Retrospectivity is something in this case that we looked at but could not practically implement without creating some really perverse outcomes. On the one hand, whilst I certainly agreed and pushed with the Hon. Frank Pangallo in the other place, as well as other members of this chamber, to get a better balance, the laws that were in place at the time are the laws that stand, and that is appropriate. It is appropriate not only for these offences but for all offences that this parliament chooses to put in place from time to time.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall Liberal government is continuing to deliver jobs, creating projects throughout South Australia's record \$12.9 billion pipeline of infrastructure works?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: it's debate.

The SPEAKER: Given the nature of the way that questions have gone today, I take the member for Lee's meritorious point. I am going to allow the question, however.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow it, and if you've got a problem with it, move a motion. Minister and then the opposition.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Is that right?

The SPEAKER: Yes. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00): I want to thank the member for King for her question and note that yesterday was a fantastic day for the people of the north-east and the people of the member for King's community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Golden Grove Road is now underway. More than that, what we had on display yesterday was the best example of community engagement that I have seen, and the fact that there were some dozen to 15 representatives of the local community who we invited to be involved. Whilst we in this place sometimes pretend that the money we spend is our own, it's not: it's community money and it's taxpayers' money. And this is not our project; this is their project. The people that were there yesterday—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I must admit, there was a little bit of Twitter slacktivism going on yesterday, having a hack about why there were so many people at the sod-turning ceremony. Well, they were the people who have been wanting this project for decades. We had there, apart from Deputy Mayor Damian Wyld, a staunch supporter of this project, apart from Councillor Bernie Keane, a poor guy who has been advocating for this project for a few decades, who was so excited—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to finally see real work on the ground happen, we also had members of the community who have been engaged in the consultation on this project. For instance, pastor John Napier, let's be honest, was pretty excited yesterday and may have interrupted the press conference to give us a bit of a gee-up. I saw him out of the corner of my eye jumping up and down and fist pumping the air whilst the Premier was speaking—a little bit disconcerting, but he was very excited. What we did is we made sure that we maintained access to his parish and his church so that his community can be fully embraced as part of this project.

We also had Meh Patel, a guy who runs a local pizza shop, who was concerned early on about the loss of on-street parking and the fact that that would have had an implication for his liquor licence. What we were able to do, as part of this project, is make sure we maintained that on-street parking, maintained the access to his premises and make sure that his local business can thrive throughout the course of this project as well as after this project. We also had representatives of the Musolino family, people who own land along that corridor, and a whole host of other people who were just keen to get involved.

I can confirm that not a cent of taxpayers' money was spent on the extra shovels that were used on the day. That's something that the taxpayers haven't picked up the tab on. It's just a great example of what happens when you actually sit down, listen to a community and work with a community to deliver a fantastic infrastructure project. But, more than that, the shovels have had a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphet is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —good workout this week, Mr Speaker, because we were out with you on Tuesday to do the sod turn on the Paradise park-and-ride, again a project that may have appeared in some budgets from time to time but nothing actually kind of got off the ground because Labor thought it was okay to punish the people of Hartley because they didn't vote the right way in the 2014 election.

Well, this government put the Paradise park-and-ride at the top of our agenda because we know that, for all those poor souls who have to walk all the way up Darley Road to find a park after 8 o'clock in the morning, they needed an upgraded Paradise park-and-ride, and this government is delivering, with works beginning right at this very moment.

Just earlier today, we got done what the former government tried to put in their budget but they just forgot to talk to the feds about funding their half of the project. We have finally secured the money, together with the federal government, to deliver the next stage of the north-south corridor, the all-important Regency Road to Pym Street section of the north-south corridor, which is going to save money for 50,000 motorists a day.

It is a fantastic week to show that the Marshall Liberal government is getting on with our \$12.9 billion pipeline, some record of \$600 million over what else has been done previously, to show South Australians that we are willing to invest their money to help grow our state, grow our community and grow jobs for South Australians.

Time expired.

SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:04): My question is to the Premier. Why have government members refused calls from Labor and the crossbenchers on the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee to hold a hearing this year to hear Commissioner Lander explain his report into SA Health, and will the Premier ask those members to make themselves available before February?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:04): Can I just have the question again?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier would like the question again, member for Kaurna.

Mr PICTON: Why have government members refused calls from Labor and the crossbenchers on the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee to hold a hearing this year to hear Commissioner Lander explain his report into SA Health, and will the Premier ask these members to make themselves available before February?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As I understand the question, it relates to members on the committee making a decision about who and when they convene that committee. That is really a matter to be addressed to the committee. To the best of my knowledge, the Premier is not on it and I am certainly not on it.

I make this point: if the committee themselves determine that they will meet to hear any integrity matters—from time to time, as members know, that committee meets to hear from all sorts of people, including Mr Lander, the police commissioner, the Ombudsman and all parties undertaking integrity matters which they, as a parliamentary committee, have responsibility for—they have certain processes in regard to how they activate that. So I would invite the member to address the matter in correspondence to the committee.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:06): My question is to the Premier. Have any members of the government's media unit or the Premier's office been backgrounding against the ICAC commissioner and the significance of his comments this morning?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:06): Absolutely not. I have no information to suggest that was the case, and I suggest to the honourable member that if he has any information on that he should provide it immediately. I would like to clear up a statement I made in a previous answer, because the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —member for Kaurna asked whether I had any information regarding the number of complaints or reports that had been made to the—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, Premier. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is the Premier making a personal explanation, or is he merely debating?

The SPEAKER: Yes. With respect, what I might do is allow the Premier to close this answer and then, if there is a personal explanation, we could hear it. Would the Premier like to make a personal explanation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The SPEAKER: Okay. Member for Kaurna.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:07): My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier's meeting with the ICAC commissioner last week consistent with the Ministerial Code of Conduct regarding having dignified personal conduct when he got angry with the commissioner?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): I have made all the comments that I will regarding this matter, but let me tell you that there has been no breach of any Ministerial Code of Conduct that I am aware of whatsoever—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in my behaviour or the behaviour of any of my cabinet since we came to government. Of course, that cannot be said for the previous government. In fact, if I were permitted time I could outline—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a very large number of breaches that occurred over a period of time. One of the most stark examples of a breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct that the previous government failed to address was the way the previous minister for environment—

Mr PICTON: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order; one moment. This is your question time. The point of order is for?

Mr PICTON: Debate.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. The question contained a few facets, and one mentioned the code of conduct. I imagine the Premier is going to contrast the behaviour of the

former government with the current government. I will allow that to a point and then I would ask him to come to the substance of the question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sir, I am here only as a humble servant of this parliament and I am providing information that I think is relevant—

The SPEAKER: Aren't we all.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for people to understand with regard to the Ministerial Code of Conduct. I am not aware of any breaches of the Ministerial Code of Conduct since we came to government 20 months ago. By contrast, there were many, many breaches of the Ministerial Code of Conduct under the previous government, and those went completely and utterly unpunished. Take, for example, that disgraceful episode in our state's history when the former minister for environment was caught screaming, shouting and swearing at an interstate minister for environment. This was absolutely disgraceful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There were no consequences whatsoever—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Primary Industries is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for the behaviour that occurred under the previous government. Of course, the behaviour of the member for West Torrens, the way that he spoke to members of his staff, is of course now a matter of an ICAC inquiry—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we have all the details that flowed on from that ICAC inquiry for everybody to read. It's in the public domain now for all time. What was the response from those opposite when they were in government?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it was just to laugh it off—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and to say it was just a slip of the tongue, it was conversational swearing. It was a very clear breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct and it wasn't—

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Premier, be seated for one moment.

Mr PICTON: Debate.

The SPEAKER: I would ask that interjections stop. The member for Kaurna raises a fair point and I would ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will wind up, but I do make the point that when asked about our performance in terms of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, I am very pleased with the way that ministers have behaved. Of course, I contrast that with the way that the previous government's ministers behaved over an extended period of time—no consequences for poor behaviour. That's what the people of South Australia came to expect from the previous government.

But there was a changing of the guard in March of last year and, of course, we will always act with respect and we will do whatever needs to be done to restore public confidence in the government and the way that the cabinet behaves.

RACING INDUSTRY

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister inform the house about some of the projects that are off and racing across South Australia as a result of the government's \$24 million investment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:11): Thank you very much to the member for Morphett. This is a good news story so, member for Morphett, why the long face? This is fantastic. You should be upbeat, like I am, because we are off and racing with the South Australian racing industry.

Despite the rumblings and negativities from those 'neigh-sayers' opposite, we are here to support the hardworking racing industry and establish and refresh the vitally important industry. On this side of the track, we are not a one-trick pony like they are on that side. No, the Marshall Liberal government is here to support jobs and we are getting racing galloping again. That's what we are here to do.

The racing industry knows that the Marshall Liberal government has a strong plan for real change and we are here to deliver more jobs, lower costs and better services. We know that the industry wants to saddle up with us; they want to get along for the ride. Those over there don't like it, but we are delivering for a very important industry.

Our government is injecting \$24 million across the industry, and eight South Australian racetracks have had significant upgrades and this means jobs as well. The big-ticket item includes \$500,000 going towards Morphettville to upgrade facilities there. As I said, that means jobs. That's in the member for Morphett's electorate as well, and a wonderful establishment. In Murray Bridge, the member for Hammond's electorate, a great electorate, there is plenty coming there. In Gawler, more than \$600,000 is going towards a new equine pool and stabling. A big win for the member for Light—and you're welcome, member for Light—that there are plenty of things happening in your area as well.

The pool will also be available to a broader horse community and the Gawler racing club is in charge of its use. They will be financially assisted with the rent that they can charge there. This is wonderful news that we are delivering for the racing industry. Along with the half a million dollars that the state government is putting in, the SAJC is also putting in \$1.7 million to Morphettville. Again, there are more jobs there, there is infrastructure being built and this is going to be absolutely outstanding. There will be 80 new horse boxes at the south-western corner of the course on Morphett Road. This will be a big win for everyone involved.

The Marshall Liberal government also knows that country racing and regional communities are vitally important and that's why we are putting \$105,000 into refurbishing the Port Augusta Racing Club's unique dirt track in the member for Stuart's electorate. The Port Lincoln Racing Club, in the member for Flinders' electorate, and the Strathalbyn Racing Club, in the member for Heysen's electorate, are getting \$400,000 and that's being used to build more stables on each site.

The trainers running our horses in Port Lincoln and Strathalbyn often find that there aren't enough stalls to accommodate their horses, so this will mean more runners in more races, and it is a great, great outcome. Strathalbyn will also redevelop the wash-down bays and provide a sand roll to upgrade the facilities, so we will get more trainers at clubs there as well.

There is also money also going into Clare, in the member for Frome's electorate, and at Oakbank, in the member for Kavel's electorate—more than \$140,000 to upgrade their function spaces—again, giving them more input and more opportunities to generate funds. I am sure that we will see the member for Frome and the member for Kavel at events at these new function centres. I know they will jockey for an invite and some say they have 'colt' followings, and we know they are outstanding people in their communities.

As we fast approach the finish line, I am going to rein in my answer because it is sure to be past the bedtime of those opposite. We are injecting more horsepower into this industry. Unlike those opposite, who had an each-way bet, we are backing the industry for a win. We know we will grow jobs, we know we will build infrastructure—and that is good for South Australia.

*Parliamentary Committees***JOINT COMMITTEES**

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:15): I seek leave to move a motion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I move:

That the members of this house appointed to the joint committees on the 125th Anniversary of Women's Suffrage, End of Life Choices and the Social Workers Registration Bill 2018 have power to act on those committees during the recess.

Motion carried.

*Adjournment Debate***STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): The year 2019 has undoubtedly been a year that has defined this government. It is worthwhile applying a degree of thought at this time of the year, as the house adjourns until next year, to exactly what has been exposed throughout the course of calendar year and parliamentary year 2019.

Let's cast our minds back to March last year when this government was elected with crystal clear promises to the people of this state. It started with more jobs, lower costs and better services. Then, of course, there was the fundamental premise on which this government was elected of not having a privatisation agenda. As 2019 has gone on, the promises have been distilled down in a way that has exposed them to be nothing more than slogans, which goes to the very credibility of this government.

Let's start with more jobs. More alarming economic statistics have been revealed during the course of just the last week, including the state final demand figures, which have seen two consecutive quarters of state final demand going backwards in this state, something that the member for Dunstan himself once described as a recession.

We have seen house prices fall this week. We have seen in the most recent employment statistics released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics that over the course of the last 12 months we have not seen one new job here in South Australia, and unemployment has risen to be the second highest rate in the nation, in excess of 6 per cent—6.2 per cent I believe—well in excess of the unemployment rate that this government inherited not 18 months ago. Their promise of more jobs has been nothing short of a broken promise.

As to lower costs, this year's state budget has done the exact opposite for the households and families of South Australia, with higher taxes to the tune of an additional \$500 million imposed on the state. This year, 31 December will be the last night that the people of South Australia go to bed without having the threat of higher hospital car parking fees imposed on them, without the threat of additional taxes for so much as putting their bins out. Ask those South Australians whether or not this government has delivered lower costs, let alone those people who catch public transport, let alone those people who seek to register a motor vehicle, particularly on Kangaroo Island, where their fees and charges have gone up exponentially. So much for lower costs—a broken promise.

When it comes to better services, this government's whole agenda is predicated on cuts to services: Service SA, public transport, health, education, child protection, sport, multicultural affairs, you name it. We are seeing nothing but cuts from this government. There is not even an inkling of better services. Yet again—a fundamental broken promise.

And then there is the big kahuna: the no privatisation agenda. This year, that promise has been completely smashed. Whether it be public transport, whether it be hospital patient transfers, whether it be the continued threat of privatisation of SA Pathology, whether it be selling our state-owned generators to provide backup power to the people of our state, we have seen a fundamental broken promise.

To most people in the political commentariat, to many people who observe politics, they might think, 'Oh, well, government breaks promise, dog barks.' I think those opposite would be thinking to themselves, 'This is nothing that we can't sustain,' except for the fact that these guys promised everyone they were going to keep every last promise. In the very first question time in this place, in the very first question, we asked the Premier, 'Do you promise to deliver on every last one of your commitments?' and his answer was unequivocal. Since then, we have seen broken promise after broken promise. This government's credibility is in tatters. This government's credibility is shot to pieces.

At the heart of any government is more than just the day-to-day policy promises that ministers have gone about breaching. At the heart of any government is their leader, their Premier. And what of this Premier's credibility? Notwithstanding the broken promises, notwithstanding all the commitments that have not been fulfilled, how is the Premier's credibility looking? Today, we have heard something that is essentially unprecedented: none other than Hon. Bruce Lander QC, Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, today on public radio has made statements that directly contradict the remarks of the Premier of the state. The Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has absolutely unequivocally contradicted the Premier of the state. One needs to think through the gravity of this situation.

How can any South Australian possibly believe the Premier of this state, the member for Dunstan, on anything he says if he walks into the parliament and says one thing and then walks into the office of the ICAC commissioner and says the complete opposite? What are we to believe? What the Premier says in the parliament or what the Premier tells an ICAC commissioner in private? It is a dreadful choice that the people of South Australia are left with. I suspect that most South Australians will be far more inclined to believe what the Premier says to an ICAC commissioner than what he says in the parliament. That then means that this parliament to this government and to this Premier means nothing at all.

Consistently over the course of the last 12 months we have seen minister after minister face privileges motions, we have seen the Premier himself face privileges motions, not because of some scurrilous accusations but because they have consistently sought to mislead this house and vis-a-vis the people of this state. How can anyone believe what this Premier says? Those opposite might want to start to think about what the political consequences of this might be.

In the paper today, in *Adelaidenow* and in *InDaily*, senior journalists are rightly pointing out that the Premier's credibility is being questioned by none other than one of the highest independent law officers in this state. At the next election, which is now a little over two years away, what are South Australians to believe when this Premier comes up with his next set of promises? What happens when he goes to the next election and says, 'We are going to create more jobs, deliver better services and lower costs'? They will not be able to believe him.

What happens when he looks down the barrel of the camera and says, 'We won't be privatising SA Water'? They will not be able to believe him. When the government loses its credibility that is one thing, but when the Premier loses his ability to tell the truth that is a different proposition entirely. The way this government has handled the ICAC report over the last seven days is an example of just how incompetent this outfit is.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Last week, last Tuesday, the Premier receives a copy of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —a report from the ICAC. About half an hour later, he announces his response to the report from the ICAC.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —but guess what the Premier has not done. Guess what the health minister has not done after announcing their response. They have not even read the report. Then eventually, having been shamed and embarrassed into reading the report on which they have already provided a response, the Premier has the gall to meet with the ICAC commissioner and then lay into him—walk into the office of the ICAC commissioner, not thanking him for his report, not acknowledging the hard work that he has done but instead getting angry with the author of the report for having the audacity to do his job and look into important issues of state within public health.

What sort of show are we running here where a Premier is getting angry with the ICAC commissioner for doing his job? Why not just say, 'Thank you, commissioner. I appreciate the work that you do, commissioner. I have taken the time to read your report, commissioner, and I would now like to discuss with you the response'? That might have been a good idea before he announced his response, of course, which he failed to do.

This last week has exposed this government for the incompetent shambles that it is but, more fundamentally, this week and this sordid sequence of events have demonstrated that this Premier is a fraud who has problems with telling the truth.

ALICE SPRINGS (MPARNTWE) EDUCATION DECLARATION

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:26): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on an adjournment debate. It has been some time. I do not want to spend 10 minutes talking about the Leader of the Opposition's speech, other than to reflect that it takes an extraordinary level of chutzpah I thought I would never see again after Christopher Pyne retired from the federal parliament to be able to have a look at a report that is eviscerating of one's own time as minister for health and one's former government's time in the health department and say that it reflects a level of incompetence in the current government.

It takes extraordinary chutzpah—or 'hootspah', as Christopher Pyne would remind me it is supposed to be pronounced—for the Leader of the Opposition to try to frame it that way. Not content with their failure to prosecute this argument last Thursday, the Leader of the Opposition has a crack this afternoon. Good luck to him, because that is indeed the pleasure these adjournment debates give us, where we can speak for 10 minutes on any topic that delights us. The Leader of the Opposition has chosen to have another crack at this topic, having failed to prosecute it effectively in the past. I think he has failed again, but I give him full marks for the chutzpah.

I am particularly keen to talk about two issues, one of which is of significant substance to our education system in South Australia.

Mr BROWN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am so pleased to have this time to now talk about the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration, which was signed by education ministers around the country this morning. I am expecting my copy any minute. I was very pleased to be here in the parliament today. It is an important declaration for the people of Australia, for the students of Australia, in the years to come. It will help us to find and drive the national policy agenda for our state and our nation for years to come, as did the former Hobart and Adelaide declarations—and, up until today, what was the current Melbourne declaration—on educational goals for young Australians.

That is not to say that every aspiration in the Melbourne declaration over the last decade or so has been fully achieved, but it has been a good measure to help all principals, school leaders, teachers and system leaders be defined around a united purpose. We believe that the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration will provide that unified purpose going forward.

Its focus is fundamentally to help all young Australians realise their potential. That fits in very well with our government's repeatedly stated ambition that we want all young South Australians—whatever classroom they are in, whatever school they are in, whatever city or suburb or country town they are in in South Australia—to be fully supported to realise their potential. So the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration fits in very strongly with the South Australian government's agenda for improvement.

The Mparntwe declaration requires education systems to promote excellence and equity. We are looking to empower all young Australians to become successful lifelong learners, confident and creative individuals and, critically, active and informed members of their community. We want to support the whole child to be successful in their community, successful in their career, successful in their life. I commend the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration to all members. I think that the opportunity it provides our system in the years ahead will indeed be significant.

The Education Council, which met over the last 24 hours to discuss the Mparntwe declaration amongst other matters, has had a very productive year—a productive two years, in fact. Last year, I had the opportunity to chair the council; this year I do not but I have been enjoying the opportunity to participate.

Some of the matters on the Education Council's agenda that have been of the highest importance throughout the last two years have been a reflection on what has been called Gonski 2.0—the review of educational achievement in Australia, conducted by David Gonski and his panel of experts. That panel included our very own Wendy Johnson from Glenunga International High School, who did that work last year. There were a number of priority areas set that the Education Council has been pursuing, significantly with the federal government providing funding, and indeed with everyone making a contribution.

There are three areas on that agenda that are getting particular focus and we were able to announce today that progress is being made. One critical one is in relation to the learning progressions and online formative assessment. Some people from the more progressive wing of education policy debate, and indeed some people from the more conservative wing of education policy debate, have in some circles been critical of this progression.

I am very optimistic that when the public is fully aware of the opportunities it represents, the insight that was given by the Gonski committee and the work that is being done and that ministers had the opportunity to be exposed to yesterday, it will give so much confidence to the value that this work will create to help us achieve the goal of not just that every student will be given the opportunity to have one year of learning for every year in school. Of course, there are many students who we want to see more than one year of progression from every year they are in school, and I think that these progressions and the online formative assessment tools that are being worked on will help us get there.

Another key initiative that is being prioritised is the national evidence institute. Schools across Australia have the opportunity to be bombarded with thousands and thousands of products from companies or non-government organisations or different people supporting different types of professional development at the moment, and the national evidence institute will be establishing their operations in 2020 and will provide a lot more clarity to educators around that.

One issue I have spoken about before in the house is the Unique Student Identifier, on which significant progress is being made. The Unique Student Identifier will help us support the progress of all students across South Australia and across the country, because not every student stays in the same school the whole way through. Last year, for the first time, the full extent of students dropping out of our public high schooling system was revealed. Previously, we had heard the former government talking about 90 per cent, 100 per cent, 110 per cent retention rates through to the end of high school. When we actually looked at the figures on the number of year 10 SACE students commencing and also students in public high schools going through to complete their SACE, the numbers were much lower. We do not want to lose track of these students, so the USI will be important.

Critically important in relation to the reading instruction in initial teacher education review, the Education Council agreed that the 'Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: standards and procedures' document would be amended to include explicit reference to early reading instruction, including phonics, and an increase in the component allocated to English and literacy within primary initial teacher education programs. This fits in so neatly with what we are doing in South Australia. We are the first state to have the year 1 phonics check, that is going to be so important for our students. We are so pleased that all ministers saw the value in that.

Finally on this matter, I would like to reflect the feelings of the room yesterday, which welcomed the commonwealth's decision to continue funding and provide ongoing funding for the Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority (ACECQA). It does critically important work and fits in neatly with the Universal Access National Partnership review, which is going into the support we give to preschools.

That review is important, of course, because we have been very clear with the commonwealth that we want them to fund us over a long period of time for their component of that preschool funding. At the moment, we are going year to year. That is inadequate. This review comes first and then the new agreement, so we are very excited about the opportunities for South Australian early childhood education facilities once that is complete.

I want to take my remaining time to reflect on the life of a great South Australian who passed away in the last couple of weeks and whose achievements I think are known to the house. The legacy of his life should be reflected in this house. Eric Webb lived in Rostrevor on Spring Gully Road. He was one of the early establishers, along with his stepfather and family, of Spring Gully Foods, as it is now, and Spring Gully Pickles, as it was then.

Eric's life was one of service to his staff, to his family, to the South Australian business community, to our local community and to the South Australian community at large. He made an impact wherever he went. He was a Rotarian and was honoured at his funeral on Friday at the Rostrevor Baptist Church by an honour guard of Rotarians in their dozens from the Campbelltown Rotary Club and around South Australia. Staff from Spring Gully Foods came in their dozens to the funeral to honour somebody who had been chairman of their board, their boss, their friend and a member of their family.

Eric's family—his sons, Kevin and Ross, who are the face of the company; his daughters; his grandchildren; and, indeed, the generations of Webbs—are so well known to so many people in our community. Our hearts went out to all of them on Friday at the funeral and continue to. Eric is somebody I have known for about 10, 12 or maybe 15 years. I always found him to be one of the kindest, most generous and most supportive men I have ever met. I can only imagine what sort of loss he will be as a father and as a grandfather—indeed, as a great-grandfather to be—for that family.

While we mourn his loss and we are so sorry for that loss, the legacy he has created, both through his business and the contribution it has made to the community, is one that will never be forgotten in our area. His children and grandchildren continue to live that purpose and those values to this day. They will uphold his spirit and I know how proud he was of them.

At 15:39 the house adjourned until Wednesday 5 February 2020 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***PHONICS CHECKS**

1506 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (27 November 2019). How many year 1 students did not participate in the phonics screening check in 2018, and separately, 2019?

1. Are the reasons for students not participating recorded?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

All year 1 students should participate in the phonics screening check. However, students can be exempted in certain circumstances or may be absent. Where a student does not participate in the phonics screening check these reasons are recorded.

In 2018 14,044 year 1 student records were entered for the phonics screening check. Of these records, 13,817 students actively participated in the check, while 227 did not participate.

In 2019 14,227 year 1 student records were entered for the phonics screening check. Of these records, 13,899 students actively participated in the check while 328 did not participate.

In 2018 a small number of schools did not record data for students exempted from participation in the phonics screening check. In 2019 the management of these students' data was clarified and these exemptions were correctly recorded. This explains the increase in students exempted from 2018 to 2019.

LAND TAX

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (10 September 2019).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): The Treasurer has provided the following advice:

Since the honourable member asked this question the government introduced a number of changes to the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019 and associated measures, this includes:

- reducing the top tax rate to 2.4 per cent with a threshold of \$2 million;
- reducing the 1.65 per cent marginal tax rate to 1 per cent;
- introducing a new lower marginal tax rate for site values between around \$1.1 million and the top tax threshold of 2 per cent;
- providing concessions for companies undertaking residential developments of 10 or more lots or affordable housing; and
- introducing a three-year \$25 million transition fund to help taxpayers impacted by the changes to aggregation transition to the new arrangements.

It is estimated that around 92 per cent of individuals and 75 per cent of company groups affected by the government's changes will be better off as a result of the land tax reforms announced by the government since it was elected.

*Estimates Replies***PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2019). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): I have been advised of the following;

Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, there were zero executive roles abolished within the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA. During this period there were zero executive roles created.